6. DISCUSSION

Ian Hill and Michelle Gamble

The Contextualising Hume Project used a variety of archaeological techniques, investigating the remains of a village, church, and castle that are believed to have their roots in the medieval period. Through the results of the surveys, historical analysis, excavation, and gravestone recording, it is possible to flesh out the story of Hume Village and begin to analyse the nature of the wider settlement by addressing what type of settlement model Hume fits and how it was affected by the abandonment, and possible destruction, of the former parish church and destruction of the castle; when occupation and activity in the settlement remains immediately surrounding Hume Castle ceased; and what significance is maintained at a settlement whose church and castle have been abandoned and/or destroyed. Settlement activity at Hume appears in part, to be distinguished by distinct episodes either side of the destruction of the castle, and the deterioration (or destruction) of the parish kirk. Historical documents have described the importance of Hume Castle, and indeed the Home family, through the late medieval period, with a decline in significance of the castle following the relocation of the Earls of Home to the Hirsel in the early 1600s (Kidd et al 2003), and the castle's ultimate destruction in the early 1650s. Whilst the site of the castle itself, and the later folly, served as a warning beacon during the Napoleonic Wars (Kennedy 2013: 164), the village and wider settlement began a steady decrease in size evinced in mapping and historical records from the late 1600s through to the 1900s. This narrative is mostly borne out in the archaeological evidence, with the excavation results providing evidence of activity surrounding the castle in the later medieval period, followed by a gradual abandonment of certain areas of the village, particularly those immediately surrounding the castle.

Whilst Hume originally boasted both a castle and a kirk (and possibly a kirk prior to the fortification), the majority of the village and settlement appears to have built up around the castle rather than the former kirk. There is evidence to suggest an earlier kirk located in the vicinity of the 12th-century one, and whilst the kirk and castle were not immediately adjacent they were likely intimately linked (Dixon & Fraser 2008), with local lords and landowners playing an important role in the patronage of ecclesiastical sites (Creighton & Barry 2012: 64). Beyond the church, castles and manorial houses (or similar lordly sites) also had an important relationship with the rural landscape and agriculture, intrinsically linked with the local social and economic spheres (ibid: 64), and Hume the castle is located within 1km of the former kirk, Hume Orchard, and Hume Mill. The position of a castle in the landscape is often oversimplified from a militaristic viewpoint (Creighton 2002: 5); however, the location of Hume Castle does lend itself to strategic purpose, being positioned on the highest vantage point (and closest to the location of the former kirk) for a 5km radius. Given the number of earlier period hill forts in the Borders, it is not infeasible for the castle to have been founded on an earlier settlement/fort, and it is not unknown for this to occur (Wright et al 2015: 31), with the extensive remodelling and construction on the Hume Castle mount potentially obscuring signs of activity preceding the 13th century. The location of the castle in relation to the possibly earlier kirk therefore presents a number of suggestions as to their founding: the early timber and earthwork castle may have been founded at a later date than the kirk, positioned in a prominent, strategic, and defensible position; kirk and castle were possibly contemporary with the settlement at Hume much larger than that seen today, extending between both castle and kirk in a planned fashion and incorporating wider economic factors including a mill and orchard; the castle was positioned on the location of an earlier hill fort, with settlement growing around it and expanding to include a kirk.

Previous survey work shows settlement extending up to 500m west of the current extent of the village towards the location of the former kirk, whilst mapping indicates that the settlement in the 18th century spread towards Hume Orchard (1km west of the current extent of the village), and also had a dense cluster of buildings to the east of the castle. Part of the settlement remains have been disturbed/destroyed by more modern activities, in particular ploughing in the fields to the east of the land immediately surrounding the castle, and an active quarry located on the north

side of the village. Excavation results in the Glebe fields indicate that this area of land has been used for agricultural purposes for centuries, with little to suggest settlement or occupation adjacent to the former kirk.

Later medieval occupation and use of the site are particularly highlighted in the archaeological remains by the French coin, SF242, found in Trench 2 in the castle grounds, and the cannonball found in Hume Gardens, indicating activity in the 16th and 17th centuries respectively. The location of the cannonball (approximately 150m to the west of a probable gun platform adjacent to the west of the current castle) and its probable date indicate that it may have actually been fired from the castle during the attack by Cromwell's troops in 1651. The radiocarbon date from beneath floor C1013 in Trench 1 in the castle grounds suggests earlier (but still late medieval) activity in this building in the 15th to 16th centuries. Whilst it was not possible to determine the age of the trackway identified in Test Pit 2 in the castle grounds, it is possible that this trackway provided an original access up to Hume Castle, and at the very least will have served as an access track to the building in Trench 1. All of these instances are isolated in demonstrating medieval activity at Hume, with the majority of the archaeological and artefactual remains demonstrating activity and use in the area (both at the village and castle, and at the kirkyard) in the post medieval and early modern periods. The excavations are limited, however, to discrete areas of the settlement, with excavation only permitted in the land immediately surrounding the castle and in the modern village of Hume, and not in the lands between the western extent of the modern village and the location of the former kirk. It is entirely feasible therefore that earlier, medieval, activity and occupation at Hume is located further west from the castle, and these areas would benefit from being tested by excavation.

It would be over simplistic to suggest that the destruction of the castle would have gone hand-in-hand with a destruction, or abandonment, of the settlement surrounding it, and the archaeological results also do not support this. They do however, indicate a gradual contraction of the village to the buildings still occupied today, with the buildings around the south and west of the castle potentially falling into disuse first, with a steady contraction of the village to the north, in the lee of the castle ruins. The inhabitants of the village also appear to be towards the poorer end of the economic spectrum, with the ceramics in particular not displaying any high-class materials. The Hearth Tax Roll of the late 1600s also indicates that only one building in the village had more than one hearth at that time (see Section 2.2).

The artefacts retrieved during excavations in Trench 1 in the castle grounds indicate that the building there was still in use, after the destruction of the castle in the late 16th to early 17th century, with the window glass recovered all dating to this period. The occupation of this building, or at least activity within this building continued into the 18th century, possibly even into the 19th century, however, the lack of any window glass dating to the 19th century, and only one sherd of decorated ceramic that could be dated to the 19th century (SF2) suggests that this building may have fallen out of use by the 19th century. The sealed deposits below floor C1013 with a radiocarbon date from the 15th or 16th century suggests that whilst the artefactual evidence indicates post medieval and early modern occupation and activity, this building may have been in use for a much longer period of time. The nature of the walls also suggests a more complex structure than a simple sub-divided rectangular building, and it is possible therefore that this building, or complex of buildings was in use prior to the destruction of the castle, and may have formed an outbuilding of the castle complex. The remains uncovered during the excavations may be evidence of a repurposed, or indeed reconstructed, building on top of earlier structures that continued to be used many years after the destruction of the castle, with window glass dating to the late 17th and early 18th century suggesting that this building maintained a higher status than others even after the destruction of the castle, possibly representing the building registered with more than one hearth in the 1690s. The limitations of the excavation due to the scheduled nature of the site, however, make it difficult to investigate earlier remains below extant walls and floors.

The nature of the artefacts uncovered from the building in Trench 2 in the castle grounds suggest that this building was likely a domestic structure,

with large amounts of glazed ceramic and bottle glass uncovered. The majority of the ceramics and glass date from the 19th and 20th centuries, and whilst the late medieval coin, SF242, was retrieved from here, it is not an indication of medieval activity in this building, more likely the coin tumbled down from the castle outcrop above. What must be borne in mind, however, is the proximity of these building remains to the road and the modern village of Hume; it cannot be discounted that some of the artefacts may be rubbish deposits thrown over the low boundary wall located to the north.

In contrast to the gradual decline and contraction of the settlement at Hume following the destruction of the castle, the significance and use of the kirkyard as a burial ground has continued from the early 1700s to the present day, notwithstanding the fact that an active kirk has not been located there for over 400 years. It is intriguing as to why Hume, despite a decline in population and settlement size, has clung on and maintains an active cemetery following the destruction of its castle (and possible destruction of its parish kirk) and has not ended up as a medieval settlement that became entirely deserted as was the case with Rattray in Aberdeenshire, or nearby Springwood Park in Kelso (Dixon 2003: 57). This may, in part, be due to the ecclesiastical independence of the parish noted by Gunn (1899: 218).

It would seem that the longevity of the village of Hume is due to more than its strategic location at a high point in a rich agricultural valley. The landscape as we see it today has been impacted by a thousand years of inhabitants, politics, and social reforms. This landscape has, therefore, been shaped by both humans and nature, and when we consider the changes that took place here we must place them not only in their historical context, but also in the social memory of the people who inhabited this landscape, 'In as much as they can thus evoke, or indeed hide, the past, landscapes are linked to socially or culturally mediated remembrance and memory' (Holtorf & Williams 2006: 235).

At Hume, we can trace a shift in the nature of the settlement there through archaeological methods which, when placed in the context of the changes occurring through society at the various key moments in Hume's history, allow us to create a narrative for this location and here we focus on three aspects – Hume the Castle and medieval village;

Hume the folly and small, 'burdensome' village; and Hume Kirkyard as an active record of the people who lived and died in this area. Each of these facets of the Hume story are unique and, while linked to each other, are very much embedded in the wider narrative of Scotland. It is beyond the remit of this paper to explore the wider history of late medieval and early modern Scotland, but in this section we will touch upon the changes to the village and the aspects of that wider history that impacted this area and its landscape, alongside the concept of memory of place.

6.1 Hume Castle and medieval village

Hume Castle and the landscape surrounding it provide insight into the archaeology and theory of memory of place and the re-use of space as a symbolic aspect of establishing legitimacy and power. There are several phases and aspects to this at Hume. The castle itself has gone through several transformations, initially as a seat of lordly and administrative power or control and as a strategic location in the ongoing border conflict with the English, and finally, as a folly or visual representation of the wealth and power of the local laird. Hume Castle was amongst those built in the 13th century and whilst many of these castles and associated settlements fell out of use and into disrepair or were destroyed in various conflicts and not re-built, Hume maintained some level of habitation in the surrounding village to the modern day.

The re-building of a castle as technology changed is not uncommon and is seen frequently across the British Isles (Liddiard 2003, 2005; Tabraham 2005; Coventry 2006). Hume Castle, as a castle, falls into a rather typical grouping of border fortifications which were held by powerful and wealthy nobility in the medieval period that saw several modifications until the 16th century (see Section 2.2). Its earliest iteration was probably linked to the earlier kirk (Creighton 2002: 110), and whilst settlement at Hume extended most of the way between castle and kirk, there is no distinct evidence of a planned settlement, with no evident buildings adjacent to, or surrounding, the former kirk. Indeed, even with extensive archaeological survey and excavation it can still be difficult to identify evidence of settlement planning, and a modern understanding of settlement

'design' may also be misplaced (Creighton & Barry 2012: 71, 78). Recent survey work (Dixon 2016) helps to highlight that settlement patterns are not fixed, with former buildings at Hume immediately surrounding the castle on the west, south, and east sides potentially representing a more organic spread, suggestive of a 'castletoun'; in contrast, the modern, occupied village to the north side of the castle is more representative of a nucleated settlement with buildings part of thin rectangular plots, emanating from a central street. This differing nature of settlement pattern may be related to changes during the occupied and abandonment phases of the castle, with the earlier village building up around the castle during its occupation phases, and the modern village following the pattern of a declining nucleated village in the later medieval and post medieval periods (Dalglish 2012: 282), particularly after the destruction of the castle.

The changes identifiable from survey work, historic documents, cartographic sources, and excavation help to illustrate the fact that settlements are not static but are subject to change, redevelopment, improvement, and even abandonment during their lifetime (Dixon 2003: 57), and further excavation of the wider settlement may help to identify earlier medieval activity in the settlement, and help to elucidate its origins. It seems plausible that once the castle was destroyed in the 1650s, the nature of the village changed and soon after this episode it was transferred to the branch of the Hume/Homes of the Polwarth family, holding the title of Earl of Marchmont, and who were based at Redbraes Castle (Cruft et al 2006).

A castle is both a symbol of power and a living organism inhabited by people who keep it working. As a focal point in the landscape, the village would have grown around the castle, yet the primarily rural and agricultural nature of this area would have remained. As the castle changed, so too would the village, and the symbolic way that power was presented to the people, therefore, also changed, further emphasised by the rebuilding of the castle as a folly in the late 18th century.

6.2 Hume Folly and the 'burdensome' village

The site of Hume Castle became folly, in the late 1780s or early 1790s when Hugh Hume-Campbell,

3rd Earl of Marchmont (who died in 1794) commissioned it to be built as a picturesque view from his newly built home, Marchmont House (Canmore ID [58561](#)). A folly, in architectural terms, is a structure or building that is constructed primarily for decorative purposes but whose appearance suggests a different purpose. They were very popular in the 18th and 19th centuries, when landscape design followed the tenets of Romanticism, inserting sham medieval castles, crumbling Classical period temples or monumental statues and columns to emphasise the pictorial qualities of the landscape. While many were built to resemble medieval castle ruins, few were built on the site of an actual medieval castle. Headley and Meulenkamp (1999) provide an extensive list of follies in Great Britain and while only a brief survey was conducted, few follies were found to be built atop medieval remains – notable exceptions include Cardiff Castle and Castell Coch.

This is where Hume is somewhat unique. Possessing the elaborate history of a medieval border fortification, followed by the aesthetic installation by a relatively newly established earl, who, following the success of his father and grandfather, was able to build a new palatial home (Marchmont House) and the necessary landscape features (Hume Castle) befitting his noble title. In the 18th century, when the folly was built at Hume, the village was rather smaller than it had been during the heyday of the medieval castle when in the 15th century the Earl of Home could draw on 400 or so men (see Section 2.2). This suggests a rather substantial independent village, compared to the 1792 Statistical Accounts of Scotland which records 959 people in total living in both Stichill and Hume Parishes, with Stichill the slightly more well-off community thanks to the Pringle family who were the landowners (Old Statistical Accounts 1792: 291). By 1835, the population of the united parishes of Stichill and Hume was 850 (New Statistical Accounts 1845: 457). Given that these numbers represent the entire parish area, it confirms a decrease of the overall population, and infers a general decrease at the village level. Within this decline however, a period of improvement took place at Hume, noted in David Low's report of 1819 (SBA/1314), which was undertaken to keep up the name and importance of such an historic village (ibid), despite the fact that

the village was viewed as a financial burden to the Marchmont Estate.

One has to wonder what it meant for the people of Hume to have this folly built in the centre of their village. Given the landscape of the castle mount, it seems likely that it was being used for grazing, though the archaeological evidence also suggests there were still buildings and enclosures in use directly north-west of the steep-sided castle hill (see Sections 3.5.3 and 3.5.4). It is from the archaeological remains that it seems clear that there was not a strong middle-class presence in Hume during the 19th century, as all artefacts suggest rather typical rural remains (see Sections 4.1 and 4.2). While the castle had been almost entirely demolished, the folly was built on the remains of original foundations (MacGibbon & Ross 1889: 108), and is evinced by visible architectural remains of the medieval castle at the lower sections of, and within, the folly walls (RCAHMS 1915: 96–7). To date, no contemporary accounts from Hume regarding the folly have been found, though this is not unusual given the highly agricultural nature of this area and the regularity with which follies were constructed in the 18th century. The Old Statistical Account (1792: 293) records no industry in Hume Parish, only agricultural practices are recorded and the difficulty of getting fuel to this area is noted. The presence therefore of this imposing, somewhat useless structure on the castle mount would have provided the local people with a conspicuous landmark on the landscape, perhaps reminding them of the differences in their situation from that of the person who could afford to build it.

6.3 Hume Kirkyard

Hume kirkyard is of particular interest in the discussion around memory and continued use of space. The history of the kirkyard is provided above and there is a very detailed church history provided by Reverend G. Gunn (1899), which pulls together an interesting combination of ecclesiastical records and local folklore/memories. Whilst the kirk would have become a Protestant institution by 1560 at the latest (as this was when the Scottish Confession of Faith by the Reformation parliament took place) the parishes of Stichill and Hume were united by 1611, with the kirk building itself being in a ruinous state

by 1637, and possibly completely destroyed by the 1650s. Despite the lack of a kirk, this seemingly remote and rural cemetery remained in use, and is currently still in use, with the most recent burial, at the time of writing, in 2019. Following the most recent kirkyard surveys (see Section 3.2), the earliest recorded date on any of the visible memorial stones is 1703. A previous survey by the BFHS was completed in 1994, and records a death in 1647 (BFHS 1994: 243) however, this inscription is no longer visible. This means that the kirk itself was no longer in a usable state when the earliest visible memorial was erected in the kirkyard, even when considering the earlier BFHS inscription date. The earliest grave recorded within the footprint of the ruined kirk dates to the 1757, approximately 100 years after the possible destruction of the building. While there are no grave markers reflecting use of the kirkyard during the time when the kirk was in use, it seems likely that any earlier memorials were either destroyed, made of an organic material or the burials were unmarked.

Whilst the continued use of kirkyards for burial following abandonment of a parish church is not unique to Hume, Tarlow (2013: 1150) has written on aspects of belief and religion in post medieval burial practices in Scotland, and notes that there is a growing body of research on burials that took place away from active kirks, such as that at Hume. Accordingly, there is a tradition where various types of sites, such as abandoned early ecclesiastical monuments, archaeological remains, or natural places, are used as burying places for those typically excluded from Christian burials (there is a long tradition in Ireland called *cillíní*). While the burials at Hume do not seem to be excluded from a Christian burial, it is perhaps noteworthy that they were buried away from the parish kirk in Stichill, and Hume Kirkyard still remains active today. The choice of the location of burial is an aspect of changing Christian beliefs, with Catholics believing the efficacy of burying close to the altar/holy remains and Protestants eschewing this for burial outside of the kirk (Tarlow 2013: 1148) with the Kirk in Scotland actively discouraging burials within the kirk building after the Reformation (Spicer 2000: 150). This practice at Hume continued until the mid-1700s when the first burials are recorded within the footprint

of the kirk; the passing of at least 100 years since its abandonment, and possible destruction, was possibly seen as long enough to remove the notion of the kirk building as an intransigent obstacle or of burials within its footprint being insanitary. Interestingly, the erection of the Earl's Aisle, which in all likelihood postdates the abandonment of the former kirk, follows the tradition of burial aisles being constructed as an annex to a kirk to allow for some lairds or patrons to exact their rights and/or traditions to a place of burial whilst maintaining the wishes, or demands, of the Kirk (ibid: 153). From the memorial inscriptions it seems that there are a variety of individuals, primarily farmers and/or tenants in the local area who are buried within the kirkyard, and it is perhaps the attachment to the land in the area which prompted these individuals to be buried there. It is clear, that despite the unity of the two parishes and the only kirk in use being in Stichill, the people of Hume still felt drawn to this spot for memorialising and burying their loved ones.

The attachment to the land and land ownership would suggest that the Earls of Home (and then later the Earls of Marchmont) could have possibly been buried in the 'Earl's Aisle' as part of their claim to the land. However, this does not seem to have been the case. The earliest Lords of Home (from the 15th and 16th centuries) do not have their place of burial recorded (Kidd et al. 2003) and whilst the parish kirk at Hume may have still been active at the time Alexander 6th Lord Home was made 1st Earl of Home in 1605, the Home family had a Collegiate Church at Dunglass, founded by Alexander Home, 1st Lord Home, in 1443 (Cowan & Easson 1976: 219). From the time the Homes were earls the primary seat of the family was the Hirsel (Kidd et al 2003), and with strong links to Kelso Abbey and of Alexander Home, 1st Earl of Home to Jedburgh Abbey (Cowan & Easson 1976: 57, 90), there are several other likely locations for the Earls of Home to be buried, as opposed to in Hume. It is possible that one of the three Earls of Marchmont were buried there, however. while poetic in nature, it is unclear whether any earls have ever been buried in Hume Kirkyard, and it seems particularly unlikely that any were buried there from the 19th century when the recorded structure is noted as dating from (OS Name Books 1856–58: 17).

The archaeology of the castle and surrounding area suggests that Hume remained a primarily agricultural community and suggests that while the village itself changed its configuration, the people who lived here felt connected to this land. This can therefore be seen in the burial monuments, memorialising people who lived and worked in this parish, and it was this connection to the land which made it more important to be buried within the parish than near a kirk.

While the border abbeys and some kirks had suffered extensive damage by English attacks during the 'Rough Wooing', (see Bonner 1997; Fawcett 2012 for further discussion), it is unlikely that the kirk at Hume was directly affected by this. Its decline was likely more related to parish reorganisation in the 17th century (Maitland Club 1835), particularly given the record of the kirk's poor state of repair in the mid-16th century, and the merging of the parish of Hume with that of Stichill by the early 17th century. Gunn notes, however, the wonderful permanence of 'church-sites' in Scottish history (1899: 218); he goes on to say:

> So that a church that has been Celtic and Saxon, Roman Catholic and Protestant, Presbyterian and Prelatic, has witnessed on the same spot for centuries to the continuity of the Truth appearing in varying external garb, it may be, but in its inward and vital meaning essentially the same (ibid: 220).

This continuity of place would have been felt strongly by the people living in the parish and perhaps still remains today (see Holtorf & Williams 2006: 241 for further examples of churches as places of memory, connecting the living with ancestors and past communities even if they have moved away). All of these details seem to indicate that there was a community memory associated with this land as consecrated land suitable for Christian burial (van Dyke 2019 provides a review of social memory and archaeology which is helpful in this interpretation). It reflects a continuous use of this area for religious purposes for at least 900 years (300 of which there are memorials present for).

The archaeology and history of Hume weave together a story of a place that holds a significant position in the landscape and overall history of

Scotland, and this attachment to the importance of place is evinced in Low's report of 1819 (SBA/1314: 141) where the village was improved as a result of its ancient and historic status. Hume Castle has seen many transformations over the centuries and yet still captures the imagination of the visitor and holds a special place for locals. The kirkyard at Hume is an active aspect of community life with people still choosing to be buried within its precinct. While the nobility came and went with various lords and earls holding the deeds to the land, the local people have remained and continue to make their mark on the landscape. In the latest iteration, they are exploring the rich past of their landscape through the Contextualising Hume Project, ensuring that the story of Hume continues and that the ever-present changes in the landscape are memorialised for future generations.