



Figure 1.

PALISADED SITES IN NORTH BRITAIN: THEIR CONTEXT AND AFFINITIES

Anna Ritchie

It is now more than twenty years since Steer discovered from air-photographs the existence of palisaded sites in the county of Roxburgh (1949), and since the first excavation of such a site at Hownam Rings (Piggott, C.M. 1948). The work of the Scottish Royal Commission in Roxburgh and Peeblesshire and of Jobey in Northumberland and Durham has since widened both the knowledge and the distribution of palisades to a considerable extent, while the relevant sections of the introductions to the Roxburgh and Peeblesshire inventories have provided the clearest and most definitive accounts of these sites to date (RCAHMS 1956, 1967). With a total of some sixty palisades throughout Britain in the first millennium B.C. (Appendix), the time has come for an overall survey of the characteristics and cultural and chronological context of this class of site.

The distribution of palisaded sites throughout Britain shows a marked concentration in the Cheviot hills of S. Scotland and N. England, with a scatter to the north, west and south (Fig. 1). This distribution may be misleading to some extent, for the concentration of sites in N. Britain (Fig. 2) is liable to be the result not only of intensive fieldwork in the area but also of the peculiar quality of Cheviot turf, which renders it particularly susceptible to the survival of surface traces. There is also the possibility that more sites exist throughout Britain which, like Muntham Court in Sussex, are enclosed by palisades set into individual post-holes rather than into trenches, for these would be invisible on the surface. For the purposes of the general survey on which this paper is based (Ritchie 1969), palisaded sites have been treated as a single structural tradition throughout Britain, regardless of the cultural differences reflected in their associated artefacts - particularly pottery. This is perhaps an unorthodox approach, especially since it involves linking together two such culturally disparate sites as Little Woodbury in Wilts. and Glenachan Rig in Peebles., but its justification is inherent in the resultant pattern of structural traditions revealed not only by palisades but also by other types of site. For the purposes of the present paper, however, the study will be directed primarily to the elucidation of the palisades of N. Britain, and reference will be made to the southern sites only where necessary for comparison.

Following the terminology established by the Scottish Commission, palisades are classified as homesteads, settlements or enclosures according to the

number of houses known from excavation or surface traces. Sites containing up to three houses are termed homesteads, while those containing more than three houses are termed settlements. Enclosures include all those sites at which evidence for occupation is either absent or, more usually, unknown. There is, of course, considerable difference in social terms between a settlement containing four or five houses and one containing a dozen or so, but, on the whole, the social unit represented in simple terms by the homestead and settlement classes provides a more reliable criterion for classification than do detailed structural features such as the number of lines of palisade, the shape of the enclosure or even the area enclosed. These features are liable to be governed individually by local factors of function and topography, and are, therefore, less suitable as criteria for a general classification. It must be admitted, however, that surface traces of houses may be misleading since only those surrounded by gullies or ditches will be visible in the turf, and partially excavated sites can only provide partial information. A timely warning against interpretation of social unit from the area enclosed has been provided recently by Wainwright's excavation of the earthwork enclosed homestead on Berwick Down South in Wilts.; here the site was totally stripped, revealing the presence of a single house to one side of the enclosure and a large empty space over much of the remaining area (Wainwright 1968). Another limiting factor is the possibility that not all the known houses were occupied at the same time, though this is not as vital a factor for palisaded sites as it is for sites enclosed by rather more permanent materials such as stone or earth.

The classification into homesteads and settlements is, nevertheless, sufficiently simple to be generally reliable. Only those sites at which there is patently no space for more houses than those visible have been classed as homesteads, while those enclosures, superficially lacking traces of occupation, which are too small to allow the presence of more than three houses may be regarded as probable homesteads. All the rest are either settlements or indeterminate enclosures. It is necessary to establish firmly at this point the reasoning behind the classification, for upon it will be based an argument for a significant chronological difference between homesteads and settlements.

All the known sites in N. Britain possess palisades set into a narrow bedding trench rather than into individual post-holes; the reason for this must be a desire for closely-set posts as well as the greater ease in digging a continuous trench into intractable sub-soils. At Huckhoe, for example, the posts of the inner line of palisade were set at intervals of 8 ft., yet the limestone sub-soil made it easier to construct a continuous trench like that of the outer close-set palisade than to dig separate post-holes. Most sites are surrounded by a single

or a double line of palisade. A distinction should be drawn between the true double palisades with trenches set from 5-10 ft. apart, and pairs of palisades as at Braidwood and Castlehill, where the trenches are set 46 and 16 ft. apart respectively. Double palisades are normally concentric, but those at South Hill Head and Craik Moor are eccentric to one another. A few double palisaded sites possess the addition of an outer single line of trench at some distance from the main palisades, thus providing, perhaps, space for penning sheep or cattle.

Two sites are enclosed by unusual palisades which are set into low earthen banks instead of into the ground surface; these have been called embanked palisades, but the term palisaded bank is preferable, since embankment implies earth piled up on either side of an existing palisade rather than posts set into the crest of a bank, which is the sequence in these cases. One of these sites, Woolshears Wood, shows the addition of a shallow ditch beyond the palisaded bank, which may have provided the material for the bank. Similar shallow ditches accompany the true palisades at Harthill and Inchtuthil. On analogy with southern examples at Playden and Muntham Court in Sussex, where the ditches are set close against the palisades, it is possible that the material from these ditches was used to construct embanked stockades. The ditches can hardly represent separate lines of enclosure, for they are only about one foot deep.

The settlement at Harehope in Peeblesshire is also enclosed by palisaded banks, but it should not be classed with Woolshears Wood and Dead Side since the banks are of such proportions that they represent fortification; it is doubtful whether Harehope belongs to the same category of sites as palisades proper, though for convenience it has been retained in the catalogue.

Northern palisade trenches are normally from one to two feet in width and depth with square or U-shaped sections, and contained quite substantial posts set close together. The outer trench of the double palisade at West Brandon is deeper than the inner and, presumably, represents a sturdier fence, a feature repeated by the outer line of the pair of palisades at Braidwood. This discrepancy in size is reversed at Huckhoe, but there the more substantial posts in the inner trench may have acted as supports for tie-beams at 8 ft. intervals with the outer stockade, the posts of which were set close together.

The use of double palisades is a characteristic of the larger sites, both settlements and homesteads, and predominates among the larger social units represented by settlements. Homesteads surrounded by single palisades range in area from less than $\frac{1}{16}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ acre, while double palisaded homesteads cover



Figure 2.

from $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ acre. Among settlements, single palisaded sites extend from less than $\frac{1}{4}$ to $1\frac{3}{4}$ acres, while double palisades range from less than $\frac{1}{2}$ to $2\frac{1}{4}$ acres in area. This correlation between area and use of double palisades must reflect social conditions to some extent and will be discussed presently in connection with the origins of the palisade tradition.

Entrances into single palisaded sites are normally simple gaps, sometimes with larger terminal posts in the palisade trench on either side. These should probably be reconstructed either as single gates hung on the terminal posts or, in the case of wider gaps, as portable sections of fencing barred or strapped into position. Surface traces at Greenbrough indicate the additional feature of two large post-holes set back from the entrance within the homestead, which should probably be interpreted together with the large terminal posts of the palisade as supports for a roofed structure over the gate. The advantage of such a structure is, of course, in prolonging the life of the gate-timbers. Entrances into double palisaded sites are achieved either by simple gaps through each line of stockade or by linking together the two trenches to form short entrance-passages. At West Brandon, a pair of post-holes set immediately behind the terminal posts of the outer lines of palisade should be interpreted as support-posts for a horizontal bar set behind the gate when closed. The entrance into Braidwood must have been unusually daunting to the uninvited visitor, for the two palisades are linked by fencing to form a passage some 46 ft. long, with a double gate at the outer end and a single gate at the inner. The excavations at the anomalous site at Harehope revealed a setting of four post-holes on one side of the entrance between the two lines of palisaded bank, which was interpreted as a guard-house (Feachem 1960, 187); it is unfortunate in view of this unique elaboration that only one side of the entrance was excavated, for one hesitates to assume an identical arrangement for the other side.

From the evidence of excavated examples, the internal arrangements of northern palisades seem to have been few and simple, consisting for the most part of timber-framed houses alone. The only exceptions are Staple Howe and Huckhoe, where rectilinear settings of postholes may be interpreted as store-houses for grain, meat or skins, while pairs of post-holes at these two sites and at West Brandon may represent racks for drying meat or skins (Brewster 1963, 47-55, end-plate; Jobey 1959, 234, figs. 8, 6; Jobey 1962, 22, fig. 6).

The present paucity of finds from northern palisades, with the exception of Staple Howe in Yorkshire, allows little estimation of either cultural context or chronology. Dating relies primarily upon radio-carbon measurements and observable stratigraphical sequences of structural types. Up until the last few

years, northern palisades were assigned to a period late in the first millennium B.C., continuing into the first couple of centuries A.D. They are now considered to date very much earlier. This is in part a measure of the historical development of archaeological thought, according to which a general tendency towards late dating has been replaced by one towards earlier dating, but it is also, and primarily, the result of more advanced knowledge. The excavation of Staple Howe indicated the way, for the finds included Hallstatt C bronzes which had to be dated at least as early as the sixth century B.C., and this was supported by a radio-carbon date with a central point in the sixth century. Since then, two more radio-carbon dates have been obtained from Huckhoe and Craigmarloch, again with central dates in the sixth century B.C., and with probable date-ranges of 670 - 430 B.C. according to their standard errors.

These dates suggest, therefore, that some palisades at least should be as early as the sixth or seventh centuries B.C. The supporting Hallstatt C bronzes from Staple Howe are well-known, and include both double and single looped razors. The crescentic razor from the filling of the primary palisade trench must be derived from the initial occupation of the site, and it may be significant for more northerly palisades that the only British parallel to this piece is the razor from Kinleith in Midlothian (Coles 1960, 48). The Staple Howe bronzes are the only certain examples of Hallstatt imports associated with a palisaded site, but Piggott has suggested (in conversation) that the iron spearhead from Hayhope Knowe might also be a Hallstatt import in view of the example recognised recently by Burgess in the Llyn Fawr hoard (1968, 43). Verification of this idea must await expert examination of the Hayhope spearhead, but, superficially at least, it does seem possible to detect the lozenge-shaped section typical of Hallstatt C spearheads (C. Burgess has agreed, by letter, that this is a possibility).

Other artefacts from northern palisades include saddle querns from West Brandon and Castle Law, flat stone discs from West Brandon and Harehope, stone rubbers or pounders from West Brandon and Glenachan Rig, and a flint scraper and flake respectively from the last two sites. Shale or jet rings are associated with the palisaded phase at Craigmarloch, and a plain clay spindle-whorl with Hayhope Knowe. Iron is represented by fragments from Craigmarloch and slag from Ingram Hill and West Brandon. More helpful for dating purposes is the fragmentary beehive rotary quern found on the paved floor of the latest house at Harehope, for it indicates that the second palisaded phase of the occupation ought not to be earlier than the second century B.C. at most; this late dating reinforces the impression given by structural evidence that Harehope stands apart from the main group of palisades.

The pottery from Staple Howe should be linked with S.E. England rather than with the north. The use of fingertip decorated cordons and incised linear decoration is derived, like comparable pottery from E. Anglian sites such as West Harling, from Bronze Age pottery and metal traditions, while the carinated bowls are similar to those from the second phase of occupation at Minnis Bay in Kent, where they are also datable to the sixth century B.C. This particular link is mentioned because there is sufficient evidence from the original excavation to suggest that Minnis Bay phase II possessed a timber-laced bank of Hallstatt tradition (Worsfold 1943, 33); if this is accepted, the hoard of bronzes datable to the later seventh and early sixth centuries B.C. found buried in the bank makes it the earliest known example of timber-lacing in S. Britain.

Eight of the other palisaded sites north of the Humber have yielded pottery of a coarse gritted fabric, which takes the form of plain barrel- or bucket-shaped jars with simple rounded rims, or jars with rather smaller bases and simple in-turned rims. It has been labelled variously as a regional form of the ubiquitous Flat-Rimmed Ware and as Border Ware, but it is really not susceptible either of typology or chronology.

A number of palisades occur in direct stratigraphical association with other forms of structure, thus providing a demonstrable sequence which runs: open sites, palisades, stone-built forts (timber-laced or otherwise), earthen forts and settlements. This is a relative chronological guide which can be useful in the absence of other evidence for dating, and the sequence can be supported broadly by that apparent among southern British palisades. Primary phases of open settlement are known at West Brandon and Harehope from structural evidence, while the finds from the first palisade trench at Staple Howe might be taken to indicate a rather longer pre-palisade occupation than that involved simply in constructing the primary fence. Six sites were succeeded by stone walls, those at Ingram Hill, Huckhoe, Dead Side, Castle Law, Hownam Rings and Craigmarloch. At Ingram and Huckhoe, there is evidence to suggest that the stone-wall phase followed swiftly upon the palisaded phase, and the radio-carbon date for Huckhoe is thus important, as Jobey pointed out (1968), for the dating of stone forts. Ten sites were succeeded by earthwork phases, representing either hill-forts or less defensive enclosures; these comprise the sites at Braidwood, Hayhope Knowe, Camp Hill (Trohoughton), West Brandon, White Hill, Hurlly Hawkin, Inchtuthil, Kempy, Orchill and Skelmore Heads.

This evidence of sequence may be matched among southern British palisades; Castell Odo and Swallowcliffe, for example, began as open sites, while the

palisaded phases at Castell Odo, Little Woodbury, Ffridd Faldwyn and several other sites were succeeded by earthworks.

Analysis of the nature in social terms of the sites involved in these stratigraphical sequences reveals a number of significant points. One is that no certain, and only two probable, homestead units became defensive forts (Blackbrough and Hurly Hawkin). This must be explained either in social or chronological terms, and the answer is probably an amalgam of the two. A survey of the dating evidence for homesteads and settlements throughout Britain indicates a noticeable tendency for homesteads to be established and to continue in occupation later in the first millennium than settlements. In approximate terms, and with the understanding that there is no strict division between the two periods, settlements may be assigned to the centuries between the seventh and the fourth, while homesteads belong to the fourth to the second centuries B.C. This contraction in the social unit towards the end of the first millennium is part of a widespread movement among both main types of non-defensive site, palisaded and earthen, throughout Britain, and should be linked with the appearance of earthen hill-forts; the change in the overall pattern represents a development in social conditions and an elaboration of social organisation.

In connection with the cultural context of northern palisades, it is necessary to consider the idea put forward recently by MacKie of two major cultures in Scotland in the first millennium B.C. (1969): the Hownam culture and the Abernethy culture. He offered this idea as a successor to the chronological framework devised by Piggott (1966), and, in doing so, has attempted a simplification but has achieved an over-simplification.

MacKie's Hownam culture belongs to the Tyne/Forth province of Piggott's scheme for the Northern Iron Age and is defined by palisaded sites alone (MacKie 1969, 21). His Abernethy culture covers the North-Eastern province, the Forth-Clyde valley and parts of the west coast in the Atlantic province, and is defined by 'the frequently recurring assemblages of mundane artefacts found in the timber-laced forts and in other sites' (*op.cit.*, 19). The first point to emerge from this is a difference in cultural criteria; the Hownam culture is defined by a single type of domestic site, whereas the Abernethy culture is defined by a number of portable artefacts. This is an immediate weakness in the argument, for it betrays rather uncertain thinking about the meaning of the term 'culture'. If MacKie is using the orthodox definition of an archaeological culture provided by Childe, neither of his cultures exist as such; a culture should represent a way of life, and Childe's definition requires a recurring assemblage of associated types which illustrate all possible aspects of that way

of life (1929, v-vi). It is true that little prehistoric material in Britain fulfils this requirement, but, to make a culture out of one structural type, the palisades of MacKie's Hownam culture, or five types of portable artefact, the pottery, jet rings, hammerstones, stone lamps and saddle querns of his Abernethy culture, is as unacceptable as would be a culture defined by bronze axes. The distribution of palisades is not even confined to the Tyne/Forth province, so they can hardly stand alone as diagnostic of a regional culture in that area.

Moreover, it is difficult to distinguish between the Hownam and Abernethy cultures as defined on other than geographical grounds. Three of the five artefact-types diagnostic of the Abernethy culture are common to the palisaded sites of the Hownam culture, while the types of structure on which Abernethy artefacts are found include at least one palisade at Craigmarloch as well as timber-laced forts which are not entirely absent from the Tyne/Forth province of the Hownam culture. Although the latter is considered by MacKie to survive 'almost unchanged' until the arrival of the Romans (1969, 25), it does not, apparently, include the stone-built forts or earthen forts and settlements which abound in its area during that period and with which it shares the same few artefact-types. Are we really to believe that there was a complete break in cultural tradition between the first and successive phases of occupation at Hownam?

The limited range and ubiquitous nature of the artefacts associated with Tyne/Forth palisades will simply not allow estimation of their cultural context. MacKie's Hownam culture is thus no more than a synonym for palisade, and does not exist as a culture.

The subject of the origins of palisaded sites in N. Britain is normally avoided in published papers which include any discussion of palisades. The most obvious point to consider is whether they may be attributed to the efforts or influence of Hallstatt settlers from the continent. The idea of Hallstatt settlers in N. Britain arises from the presence of bronze imports which can be traced to Hallstatt C contexts in N. Germany and which appear in E. Scotland during Coles' Adabrock phase of the Late Bronze Age (1960, 47f.; though Coles considered these imports to be 'in all probability only the representatives of occasional trading or warlike expeditions'). The earliest palisades appear during this phase, as do the timber-laced forts which are closely comparable in structural technique to continental prototypes of Hallstatt B and C times from the eighth century B.C. Close-set double palisades show affinities of technique with timber-lacing, and a connection with the builders of timber-laced forts might seem to be indicated by the fact that the use of double palisades

predominates among the larger sites.

Against this may be set the fact that, with the exception of Staple Howe and the possible iron import from Hayhope Knowe, none of the Hallstatt C imports in N. Britain come from palisaded sites, neither may their distribution be correlated significantly with that of palisades. This is to some extent limited by the provenances of most Late Bronze Age metal objects, for few can be related to domestic sites. Staple Howe is not a double palisaded site and shows no structural affinities with Hallstatt tradition; Brewster offered a reconstruction of the secondary palisade which involves horizontal tie-beams linking with short posts set behind the main palisade, thus providing a timber-framed platform, but there is insufficient evidence to support this idea (Brewster 1963, 11). Craigmarloch is the sole northern example of a double palisade replaced by a timber-laced fort.

There are few continental parallels for palisaded sites, and none for close-set double palisades. The house surrounded by a pair of palisades in the Hallstatt C-D village of the Goldberg in S. Germany should probably be compared in function and significance with Enclosure 36 at Hod Hill in Dorset (Richmond *et al.* 1968, 21-3), rather than with palisaded homesteads. The two closest parallels for British palisades are the single-palisaded homestead beneath Tumulus IV at the Heuneburg in S. Germany, dating to the sixth century B.C. (Piggott 1965, 201, fig. 114), and the single-palisaded settlement at the Kyberg in Bavaria, dating to the seventh-sixth centuries B.C. (Pätzold and Schwarz 1961). These do not constitute convincing evidence for deriving British palisades from continental origins.

The scarcity of permanent settlement sites in N. Britain prior to the construction of palisades makes it unnecessary to invoke either intrusion or population change to explain them. The appearance of palisades in N. Britain is the equivalent (though at a later date) of the rise of the Deverel-Rimbury culture in S. Britain in the later second millennium B.C., and represents nothing more than the development of widespread permanent settlement instead of the impermanent and insubstantial settlement that must be assumed, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, for earlier periods. It is surely significant that, in S. Britain, the increasing stability of economic conditions which produced the Deverel-Rimbury culture also resulted in the adoption of palisading as a method of enclosure. The use of palisades continued in S. Britain into the early first millennium B.C., both on late Deverel-Rimbury sites and on truly Late Bronze Age, non-Deverel-Rimbury sites, and their distribution suggests that these are the prototypes for later palisades in that area.

Palisades throughout Britain in the first millennium B.C. are of insular rather than intrusive origin, and, in structural terms, the change in N. Britain is from open to enclosed sites. This is a measure of developing social conditions and involves increasing stability of economy and growth of population.

Appendix

Palisaded sites in N. Britain

Homesteads:

Durham

West Brandon II, NZ 201399

850 ft. O.D., double palisade, $\frac{3}{4}$ acre

Jobey 1962

Kirkcudbrightshire

McNaughton's Fort I, NX 873778

400 ft. O.D., single palisade, 60 ft. diameter

Scott-Elliott et al. 1966

Peeblesshire

Glenachan Rig, NT 106328

984 ft. O.D., single palisade, 108 x 84 ft.

Feachem 1959; RCAHMS 1967, no. 197

Hillside Knowe, NT 340433

1050 ft. O.D., double palisade, 160 x 100 ft.

RCAHMS 1967, no. 200

Meldon Burn, NT 215414

950 ft. O.D., double palisade, 85 x 70 ft.

RCAHMS 1967, no. 202

South Hill Head, NT 220416

1200 ft. O.D., double palisade, 155 x 120 ft.

RCAHMS 1967, no. 205

White Knowe, NT 169463

1200 ft. O.D., single palisade, 115 x 105 ft.

RCAHMS 1967, no. 208

Roxburghshire

Gray Coat, NT 471052

1100 ft. O.D., double palisade, 154 x 123 ft.
RCAHMS 1956, no. 994

Greenbrough Hill, NT 813169

1250 ft. O.D., single palisade, 95 x 75 ft.
RCAHMS 1956, no. 316

Shoulder Hill, NT 825233

1000 ft. O.D., single palisade, size unknown
RCAHMS 1956, no. 670

Yorkshire

Staple Howe, SE 898749

370 ft. O.D., single palisade, I 210 x 80 ft.
II 255 x 100 ft.
Brewster 1963; Barker and Mackey 1960, 28f.

Settlements:

Dumfriesshire

Camp Hill, Trohoughton, NX 997727

300 ft. O.D., double palisade, 140 ft. diameter
Simpson and Scott-Elliott 1963

Midlothian

Braidwood, NT 193596

1050 ft. O.D., double palisade, 180 x 120 ft.
Stevenson 1949; Piggott 1958; D. & E. Scot. (1968), 26

Northumberland

East High Knowes, NT 971125

1200 ft. O.D., double palisade, 220 x 205 ft.
Jobey and Tait 1966, 9-23

West High Knowes, NT 971125

1200 ft. O.D., double palisade, 150 ft. diameter
Jobey and Tait 1966, 9-23

Huckhoe I, NZ 073828

500 ft. O.D., double palisade plus outer single palisade, 300 x 240 ft.
Jobey 1962; 1968

Ingram Hill I, NU 012158

550 ft. O.D., single palisade, 128 x 145 ft.
Hogg 1942; 1956

Peeblesshire

Castle Hill I, NT 291400

1050 ft. O.D., double palisade plus outer double palisade, 250 ft. diameter
Feachem 1966, 63f., fig. 3; RCAHMS 1967, no. 195

Dead Side, NT 268361

1100 ft. O.D., single palisade, 110 x 190 ft.
RCAHMS 1967, no. 196

Harehope, NT 203448

1100 ft. O.D., double palisade, II 240 x 200 ft.
III 155 x 120 ft.
Feachem 1960; RCAHMS 1967, no. 199

Nether Dod, NT 078227

900 ft. O.D., single palisade, 118 x 76 ft.
RCAHMS 1967, no. 204

Roxburghshire

Craik Moor I, NT 811190

1500 ft. O.D., single palisade plus outer double palisade, 480 x 320 ft.
RCAHMS 1956, no. 650

Hayhope Knowe I, NT 860176

1100 ft. O.D., double palisade, 300 x 175 ft.
Piggott, C.M. 1949; RCAHMS 1956, no. 665

Steer Rig, NT 859254

1200 ft. O.D., single palisade, 225 x 150 ft.
RCAHMS 1956, no. 1044

Enclosures:

Angus

Hurly Hawkin I, NO 332328

250 ft. O.D., single palisade, 50 ft. diameter
D. & E. Scot. (1965), 2f.; (1967), 1

Dumfriesshire

Harthill, NY 132825

200 ft. O.D., single palisade, 300 x 220 ft.
Cormack 1963

Morton Mains I, NS 892006

1000 ft. O.D., double palisade plus outer single palisade, 300 ft. diameter
Feachem 1955, 63

Potholm Hill, NX 362880

700 ft. O.D., double palisade, ?

Feachem 1955, 63

Midlothian

Castle Law I, NT 229638

1000 ft. O.D., single palisade, ?

Piggott and Piggott 1952, 191-4

Lancashire

Skelmore Heads I, SD 274752

325 ft. O.D., single palisade, ? 470 x 350 ft.

Powell 1963

Northumberland

Newbrough, NY 877677

200 ft. O.D., double palisade, ?

Jobey 1962, 32

Seghill, NZ 282748

150 ft. O.D., single palisade, 1 acre

Jobey 1962, 32

West Sinkside, NT 882264

900 ft. O.D., single palisade, 130 ft. diameter

Jobey 1962, 32; 1966, 92f.

Yeavinger Bell I, NT 929293

1182 ft. O.D., single palisade, 160 ft. diameter

Jobey 1962, 34

Peeblesshire

Glenwhappen Rig, NT 068228

1100 ft. O.D., single palisade, 230 x 125 ft.

RCAHMS 1967, no. 198

Hogbridge, NT 260390

590 ft. O.D., single palisade plus outer triple palisade, 155 x 140 ft.

RCAHMS 1967, no. 201

Mitchelhill, NT 064340

1000 ft. O.D., single palisade, 215 x 150 ft.

RCAHMS 1967, no. 203

Ven Law, NT 258 412

1000 ft. O.D., single palisade, 75 x 60 ft.

RCAHMS 1967, no. 206

White Hill I, NT 055338

1300 ft. O.D., double palisade, 400 x 240 ft.
RCAHMS 1967, no. 207

Woolshears Wood, NT 144425

900 ft. O.D., single palisade, 115 x 105 ft.
RCAHMS 1967, no. 209

Perthshire

Inchtuthil I, NO 115393

150 ft. O.D., single palisade, 200 x 100 ft.
Abercromby *et al.* 1902, 230, fig. 1

Kempy Fort I, NN 977213

200 ft. O.D., single palisade, 250 x 165 ft.
Christison 1900, 119f.; 1901, 38, fig. 12

Orchill Fort I, NN 869122

600 ft. O.D., double palisade, ?
Christison 1900, 117-9, fig. 56; 1901, 21-3, fig. 4

Renfrewshire

Craigmarloch I, NS 344719

450 ft. O.D., double palisade, c. 210 x 115 ft.
D. & E. Scot. (1963), 42f.; (1964), 46f.; (1965), 34; (1966), 39

Roxburghshire

Blackbrough Hill I, NT 809177

1250 ft. O.D., single palisade, 110 x 85 ft.
RCAHMS 1956, no. 302

Cappuck I, NT 690200

310 ft. O.D., single palisade, ?
Richmond 1951, 142f.; RCAHMS 1956, no. 803

Fasset Hill, NT 851206

1220 ft. O.D., single palisade, 205 x 168 ft.
RCAHMS 1956, no. 660

Henfield, NT 753113

1000 ft. O.D., single palisade, 143 x 113 ft.
RCAHMS 1956, no. 801

Hownam Rings I, NT 791194

1000 ft. O.D., single palisade, ? 375 x 250 ft.
Piggott, C.M. 1948; RCAHMS 1956, no. 301

Stanshiel Hill, NT 780133

1160 ft. O.D., single palisade, 455 x 175 ft.
RCAHMS 1956, no. 317

Palisaded sites S. of the Humber

Homesteads:

Wiltshire

Little Woodbury I, SU 150279

270 ft. O.D., single palisade, 410 ft. diameter
Bersu 1940; Brailsford and Jackson 1948

Settlements:

Berkshire

Blewburton Hill I, SU 547863

300 ft. O.D., single palisade, ?
Bradford 1942; Collins 1947; 1953

Caernarvonshire

Castell Odo II, SH 187284

550 ft. O.D., single palisade, 280 ft. diameter
Alcock 1960

Montgomeryshire

Ffridd Faldwyn I, SO 217969

950 ft. O.D., double palisade, ?
O'Neil 1942

Sussex

Muntham Court, TQ 109095

400 ft. O.D., single palisade, ?
Burstow and Holleyman 1956; 1957; Holleyman 1960

Wiltshire

Swallowcliffe II, ST 967254

730 ft. O.D., single palisade, 500 ft. diameter
Clay 1925, 62, pl.II; 1927

Enclosures:

Leicestershire

Breedon Hill I, SK 406234

400 ft. O.D., single palisade, ?
Trans. Leics. Arch. Hist. Soc. XXXIII (1957), 79f.; XLII (1967), 85

Shropshire

Minsterley I, SJ 356057

375 ft. O.D., single palisade, ?

PPS XXV (1959), 276

Sussex

Hollingbury, TQ 322078

550 ft. O.D., single palisade, 153 x ? ft.

Curwen 1932

Playden, TQ 9121

100 ft. O.D., single palisade, c. 40 x ? ft.

Cheney 1935, 157

Probable palisaded enclosures:

Cornwall

St. Mawgan-in-Pyder, SW 874654

300 ft. O.D., single palisade

Threipland 1956

Devon

Hembury, ST 113030

750 ft. O.D., double palisade

Liddell 1930-5

Hampshire

Winkelbury, SU 613529

400 ft. O.D., single palisade

PPS XXVI (1960), 345

Hertfordshire

Wilbury Hill, TL 202325

280 ft. O.D., single palisade

Applebaum 1949

Norfolk

Broome Heath, TM 343912

25 ft. O.D., double palisade

M.P.B.W. Exc. Ann. Rep. 1965 (1966), 6

Shropshire

Old Oswestry, SJ 296310

425 ft. O.D., single palisade

O'Neil 1942, 11

Sussex

The Caburn, TQ 444089

450 ft. O.D., single palisade

Wilson 1939

References

- Abercromby, J., Anderson, J., & Ross, T. (1902) 'Account of the excavation of the Roman station at Inchtuthil, Perth'. PSAS, XXXVI (1901-2), 182-242.
- Alcock, L. (1960) 'Castell Odo: an embanked settlement on Mynydd Ystrum, near Aberdaron, Caerns.'. Arch. Camb., CIX (1960), 78-135.
- Applebaum, E.S. (1949). 'Excavations at Wilbury Hill, an Iron Age hill-fort near Letchworth, Herts., 1933'. Arch. J., CVI (1949), 12-45.
- Barker, H. & Mackey, C.J. (1960). 'British Museum Natural Radio-Carbon Measurements II'. Radio-Carbon, 2 (1960), 26-30.
- Bersu, G. (1940). 'Excavations at Little Woodbury, Wiltshire'. PPS, VI (1940), 30-111.
- Bradford, J.S.P. (1942). 'An Early Iron Age site on Blewburton Hill, Berks.'. Berks. Arch. J., XLVI (1942), 97-104.
- Brailsford, J. & Jackson, J. (1948). 'Excavations at Little Woodbury'. PPS, XIV (1948), 1-23.
- Brewster, T.C.M. (1963). The Excavation of Staple Howe (1963).
- Burgess, C.B. (1968). 'The later Bronze Age in the British Isles and North-western France'. Arch. J., CXXV (1968), 1-45.
- Burstow, G.P. & Holleyman, G.A. (1956). 'Excavations at Muntham Court, Findon'. Sussex Notes and Queries, XIV (1956), 196-8.
- Burstow, G.P. & Holleyman, G.A. (1957). 'Excavations at Muntham Court, Findon, Sussex'. Arch. Newsletter, 6, 4 (1957), 101f.
- Cheney, H.J. (1935). 'An Aeneolithic occupation site at Playden, near Rye'. Ant. J., XV (1935), 152-64.
- Childe, V.G. (1929). The Danube in Prehistory (1929).
- Christison, D. (1900). 'The forts, "camps" and other field-works of Perth, Forfar and Kincardine'. PSAS, XXXIV (1899-1900), 43-120.
- Christison, D. (1901). 'Excavation undertaken by the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland of earthworks adjoining the "Roman road" between Ardoch and Dupplin'. PSAS, XXXV (1900-1), 15-43.
- Clay, R.C.C. (1925). 'An inhabited site of La Tene I date on Swallowcliffe Down'. Wilts. Arch. Mag., XLIII (1925-7), 59-101.
- Clay, R.C.C. (1927). 'Supplementary report on the Early Iron Age village on Swallowcliffe Down'. Wilts. Arch. Mag., XLIII (1925-7), 540-7.

- Coles, J.M. (1960). 'Scottish Late Bronze Age metalwork: typology, distribution and chronology'. PSAS, XCIII (1959-60), 16-134
- Collins, A.E.P. (1947). 'Excavations on Blewburton Hill, 1947'. Berks. Arch. J., 50 (1947), 4-29
- Collins, A.E.P. (1953). 'Excavations on Blewburton Hill, 1948 and 1949'. Berks. Arch. J., 53 (1953), 21-64
- Cormack, W.F. (1963). 'Palisaded enclosure at Harthill, Lockerbie'. Trans. Dumfries. Galloway Nat. Hist. Ant. Soc., XLI (1962-3), 116f.
- Curwen, E.C. (1932). 'Excavations at Hollingbury Camp, Sussex'. Ant. J., XII (1932), 1-16
- Feachem, R.W. (1955). 'Iron Age and Early Medieval monuments in Galloway and Dumfriesshire'. Trans. Dumfries. Galloway Nat. Hist. Ant. Soc., XXXIII (1954-5), 58-65
- Feachem, R.W. (1959). 'Glenachan Rig homestead, Cardon, Peebles'. PSAS, XCII (1958-9), 15-24
- Feachem, R.W. (1960). 'The palisaded settlements at Harehope, Peebles. Excavations 1960'. PSAS, XCIII (1959-60), 174-91
- Feachem, R.W. (1966). 'The hill-forts of Northern Britain', in Iron Age in Northern Britain (ed. Rivet) (1966), 59-88
- Frere, S.S. (Ed.) (1960). Problems of the Iron Age in Southern Britain (c. 1960)
- Hogg, A.H.A. (1942). 'Excavations in a native settlement at Ingram Hill, Northumberland'. Arch. Aeliana, XX (1942), 110-33
- Hogg, A.H.A. (1956). 'Further excavations at Ingram Hill'. Arch. Aeliana, XXXIV (1956), 150-60
- Holleyman, G.A. (1960). 'Muntham Court, Findon, Sussex', in Problems of the Iron Age in Southern Britain (c. 1960), 20
- Jobey, G. (1959). 'Excavations at the native settlement at Huckhoe, Northumberland'. Arch. Aeliana, XXXVII (1959), 217-78
- Jobey, G. (1962). 'An Iron Age homestead at West Brandon, Durham'. Arch. Aeliana, XL (1962), 1-34
- Jobey, G. (1968). 'A radio-carbon date for the palisaded settlement at Huckhoe'. Arch. Aeliana, XLVI (1968), 293-5
- Jobey, G. and Tait, J. (1966). 'Excavations on palisaded settlements and cairnfields at Alnham, Northumberland'. Arch. Aeliana, XLIV (1966), 5-48
- Liddell, D.M. (1930-5). 'Report on the excavations at Hembury Fort, Devon'. Proc. Devon Arch. Explor. Soc., I (1929-32), 40-63, 90-120, 162-90; II (1933-6), 135-75
- MacKie, E. (1969). 'Radio-carbon dates and the Scottish Iron Age'. Ant., XLIII, 169 (1969), 15-26
- O'Neil, B.H.St.J. (1942). 'Excavations at Ffridd Faldwyn Camp, Montgomery, 1937-9'. Arch. Cambrensis, XCVII (1942-3), 1-57

- Pätzold, J., and Schwarz, K. (1961). 'Ein späthallstattzeitlicher Herrensitz am Kyberg bei Oberhaching im Landkreis München'. Jahresbericht der Bayerischen Bodendenkmalpflege (1961), 5-15
- Piggott, C.M. (1948). 'The excavations at Hownam Rings, Roxburghshire, 1948'. PSAS, LXXXII (1947-8), 193-225
- Piggott, C.M. (1949). 'The Iron Age settlement at Hayhope Knowe, Roxburghshire: excavations 1949'. PSAS, LXXXIII (1948-9), 45-67
- Piggott, S. (1958). 'Excavations at Braidwood Fort, Midlothian ...'. PSAS, XCI (1957-8), 61-77
- Piggott, S. (1965). Ancient Europe (1965)
- Piggott, S. (1966). 'A scheme for the Scottish Iron Age', in Iron Age in Northern Britain (ed. Rivet)(1966), 1-16
- Piggott, S. and Piggott, C.M. (1952). 'Excavations at Castle Law, Glencorse ...'. PSAS, LXXXVI (1951-2), 191-4
- Powell, T.G.E. (1963). 'Excavations at Skelmore Heads near Ulverston, 1957 and 1959'. Trans. Cumb. Westmor. Arch. Ant. Soc., LXIII (1963), 1-30
- Richmond, I.A. (1951). 'Exploratory trenching at the Roman fort of Cappuck, Roxburghshire, in 1949'. PSAS, LXXXV (1950-1), 138-45
- Richmond et al. (1968). Hod Hill, II (1968)
- Ritchie, A. (1969). Settlements and Economy in Britain during the 1st millennium B.C. (unpublished thesis presented to University of Edinburgh)
- Rivet, A.L.F. (ed.) (1966). Iron Age in Northern Britain (1966)
- RCAHMS (1956). The County of Roxburgh (1956)
- RCAHMS (1967). Peeblesshire (1967)
- Scott-Elliot, J., Simpson, D.D.A., and Coles, J.M. (1966). 'Excavations at McNaughton's Fort, Kirkcudbright'. Trans. Dumfries. Galloway Arch. Soc., XLIII (1966), 72-9
- Simpson, D.D.A. and Scott-Elliot, J. (1963). 'Excavations at Camp Hill, Trohoughton, Dumfries.'. Trans. Dumfries. Galloway Arch. Soc., XLI (1962-3), 125-34
- Steer, K. (1949). 'The identification of palisaded enclosures from surface indications', in Piggott, C.M., 1949, 64-7
- Stevenson, R.B.K. (1949). 'Braidwood Fort, Midlothian: the exploration of two huts'. PSAS, LXXXIII (1948-9), 1-11
- Threipland, L.M. (1956). 'An excavation at St Mawgan-in-Pyder, North Cornwall'. Arch. J., CXIII (1956), 33-83
- Wainwright, G.J. (1968). 'The excavation of a Durotrigian farmstead near Tollard Royal in Cranborne Chase, S. England'. PPS, XXXIV (1968), 102-47
- Wilson, A.E. (1939). 'Excavations at the Caburn, 1938'. Sussex Arch. Coll., 80 (1939), 193-213
- Worsfold, F.H. (1943). 'A report on the Late Bronze Age site excavated at Minnis Bay, Birchington, Kent'. PPS, IX (1943), 28-47

THE HOWNAM CULTURE: A REJOINDER TO RITCHIE

Euan W. MacKie, Hunterian Museum, Glasgow

It has been agreed that the criticism of my views expressed in the last paper should be answered briefly and I am grateful to Dr Anna Ritchie for letting me read the typescript of her lecture before its publication. A new theory must inevitably provoke discussion and sometimes dissent: a science without argument would be sterile. However we must ensure that any such disagreements are founded on the facts and on an accurate understanding of what the new hypothesis is suggesting. It is also, I submit, necessary that the refutation of a theory, if it cannot point to errors of fact, must be accompanied by an alternative and better explanation of the data. Only if these rules are observed will the ideal result emerge - the blending of the knowledge and ideas of the various interested workers to produce a generally acceptable synthesis.

We may consider first the question of factual errors and then the more general problem of the framing of theories of archaeological cultures. However the first point to make is that the article objected to¹ was a very brief outline summary of the new situation presented by a number of radiocarbon dates, all obtained since 1966, and of a new theory which I have evolved to explain them. It was an inappropriate target for a detailed attack. The full exposition of the part of the offending hypothesis dealing with the Abernethy culture is currently being prepared, but these comments will serve as an interim reply.

Turning now to the allegations of errors in, or avoidance of, facts the attack on the idea of a Hownam culture in the foregoing paper credits it with notions which were not expressed and thereby implies that its author has been guilty of careless thinking. The critic says (p.57 above), 'it (the culture) does not, apparently, include the stone-built forts or earthen forts ... with which it shares the same few artefact types. Are we really to believe that there was a complete break in cultural tradition between the first and successive phases of occupation at Hownam?'. This implies that the Hownam evidence was ignored to make the culture appear more plausible and homogeneous. Yet I actually said the very opposite (MacKie 1969, 15-16), namely, 'The possibility that the bronzes and even the different forms of forts themselves, were on the whole simply adopted by pre-existing communities was always real but has not had the attention it deserves, though the stratigraphy of sites like Hownam Rings in Roxburghshire suggested in 1948 that it might be true. There the primary wooden palisaded enclosure was replaced by a fort with a single drystone wall which was in turn replaced by a small multivallate hillfort, yet there was no