

Durham E-Theses

Aspects of the archaeology of the brigantes

Kenneth J. Fairless

How to cite:

Fairless, Kenneth J. (1989) Aspects of the archaeology of the brigantes. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/6643/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

2.

ASPECTS OF THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE BRIGANTES

(TWO VOLUMES)

VOLUME I

Kenneth J. Fairless

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,

University of Durham, Department of Archaeology. 1989.



- 6 JUN 1990

Kenneth J. Fairless:

Aspects of the Archaeology of the Brigantes.

In aiming to understand more fully the historically attested Brigantes of Central Britain (northern England and part of Scotland) questions are addressed to the location of the people, their social and political organisation, economic basis and religion. An attempt is also made to estimate the influence of Rome. Written sources are used but the emphasis is on archaeological (including epigraphic) material. Palaeobotanical evidence is taken into account. A catalogue of rural sites as well as maps, illustrations and tabulated lists add support.

The exact boundaries of Brigantian control are not discernible but Derbyshire and most of Cumbria are probably to be excluded. Most settlement occurred in the lowlands east of the Pennine Highland which dominates the region. All the evidence combines to indicate a multiplicity of distinct communities within Brigantia and the model of a confederation of tribal groups is retained. Stanwick in North Yorkshire is postulated as the capital of Brigantia under the pro-Roman queen Cartimandua. It is argued that the tribal nucleus was located in its vicinity and suggested that the Brigantes originally came from the nearby Pennine uplands. The economic basis of the main population was mixed farming. The concept of a region dominated by semi-nomadic pastoralism is rejected. With regard to religion, open air ritual was probably normal. Besides the eponymous goddess Brigantia numerous deities are identifiable, many of them tribal. Prominent characteristics are evident: warrior-protector and woodland-hunter elements, connection with watery contexts and the cult of the head. Apart from the distinctive mounds of the Central Pennines burial evidence is rare pointing to some such practice as excarnation. The influence of Rome is very evident at Aldborough, the civitas capital Isurium, but within rural contexts, slight. There are only a few villas and remaining rural settlements reveal little cultural impact.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

2.

ASPECTS OF THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE BRIGANTES

(TWO VOLUMES)

VOLUME I

Kenneth J. Fairless

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,

University of Durham, Department of Archaeology. 1989.



6 JUN 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTSPAGE NOS.

VOLUME I

Abstract	1
Title	2
Table of Contents	3
List of figures	4-5
List of plates	6
Declaration and statement of copyright	7
Acknowledgements	8
Chapter 1 Introduction	9-33
Chapter 2 Documentary and epigraphic evidence	34-58
Chapter 3 Large fortified sites	59-74
Chapter 4 Rural settlement: Eastern Lowlands	75-148
Chapter 5 Rural settlement: Northern Pennines	149-199
Chapter 6 Rural settlement: Central Pennines, Northern Part	200-256
Chapter 7 Rural settlement: Central Pennines, Southern Part	257-349
Chapter 8 Rural settlement: Southern Pennines, Northern Part	350-374
Chapter 9 Stanwick and Aldborough	375-432
VOLUME II - Title	433
Table of Contents	434
Chapter 10 Religion in Central Britain	435-594
Chapter 11 Economic and Social aspects	595-682
Chapter 12 Conclusions	683-701
Appendix 1: Catalogue of rural sites	702-742
Appendix 2: Calibrated radiocarbon dates from sites.	743
Appendix 3: Select list of calibrated radiocarbon dates from pollen diagrams.	744-745
Main Abbreviations	746
Ancient Authorities	747-748
General Bibliography	749-776
Figures	777-845
Plates	846-856



LIST OF FIGURESFig. No.

- 1.1 Central Britain.
- 1.2 Rural settlement: study areas.
- 1.3 Eastern Lowlands: Tyne to Swale.
- 1.4 Eastern Lowlands: Swale to Aire.
- 1.5 Northern Pennines.
- 1.6 Central Pennines.
- 1.7 Southern Pennines, Northern Part.
- 2.1 Northern England, physical.
- 3.1 Map: Large fortified sites in Britain.
- 3.2 Table: Comparison of some hillforts in Britain.
- 4.1 House plans, West Brandon.
- 4.2 Woodham, crop mark sites.
- 4.3 Sunderland Bridge, Croxdale: crop mark sites.
- 4.4 Compton (near), crop mark site.
- 5.1 Milking Gap, plan.
- 5.2 Old Park Farm, sketch plan.
- 5.3 Forcegarth Pasture North, site plan.
- 5.4 Forcegarth Pasture North, plan of central house.
- 5.5 Forcegarth Pasture South, site plan.
- 5.6 Forcegarth Pasture South, plan of house 'c'.
- 5.7 Winch Bridge settlement site, plan.
- 5.8 Briar Dykes enclosure, plan.
- 5.9 Tees Bank Plantation, crop mark site.
- 6.1 Burton Moor Settlement, from oblique air photo.
- 7.1 Fortress Dike Camp, plan.
- 7.2 Kilnsey Moor Settlement, sketch plan.
- 7.3 Blue Scar settlement, 1.
- 7.4 Deepdale settlement, plan of apsidal building.
- 7.5 Deepdale settlement, (part of), sketch plan.
- 7.6 Langscar Gate settlement, sketch plan.
- 7.7 Prior Rakes site, plan.
- 7.8 Middle House Pasture, settlement plan.
- 7.9 Dewbottoms settlement, plan.

LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

Fig. No.

- 7.10 Caves near Settle
yielding Romano-British artefacts.
- 7.11 Helwith Bridge settlement, plan.
- 8.1 Royd Edge, plan.
- 9.1 Stanwick, N. Yorks, schematic general plan.
- 9.2 Stanwick, N. Yorks, main phases.
- 9.3 Stanwick, N. Yorks, stages of development.
- 9.4 Plan of Isurium Brigantum.
- 10.1 Central Britain: Later Iron Age.
Metalwork Finds from Watery Places.
- 10.2 Central Britain: Indigenous deities not equated
with classical gods (excepting Veteris).
- 10.3 Central Britain: Dedications to Veteris etc.
- 10.4 Dedications to Veteris - name variations.
- 10.5 Central Britain: Indigenous Deities Equated
with classical gods
(excepting Cocidius and Belatucadrus).
- 10.6 Central Britain: Dedications to Cocidius and
Belatucadrus.
- 10.7 Central Britain: Dedications and sites sacred
to Maonus.
- 10.8 Central Britain: Celtic Deities also found on
the Continent
(excepting the Matres and Maonus).
- 10.9 The Goddess Coventina: name variants.
- 10.10 Central Britain: Uninscribed warrior figures.
- 10.11 Central Britain: Uninscribed figures of the
native Mercury and Silvanus.
- 10.12 Central Britain: Horned Heads.
- 10.13 Central Britain: Some stone heads in the Celtic
tradition.

LIST OF PLATESPLATE

- I East Forcegarth Celtic fields.
- II Settlement and fields south-east of
Scot Gate Lane.
(a) Above: General view.
(b) Below: Remains of hut circle.
- III (a) Above: Scot Gate Pasture 1, settlement.
(b) Below: High Hill Castles (S.of),
settlement, 2.
- IV Hill Castles Scar (NE of), site 1.
(a) Above: general view.
(b) Below: view of wall passage.
- V Hill Castles Scar (NE of), site 2.
(a) Above: general view.
(b) Below: view of wall passage.
- VI (a) Above: Comb Scar hut circle, Malham.
(b) Below: High Hill Castles (S.of),
settlement, 1.
- VII Torlery Edge, Malham, hut circle.
(a) Above: General view from rear.
(b) Below: view of entrance from exterior.
- VIII Dedication to Vinotonus Silvanus from
Scargill Moor.
- IX Horned warrior from Maryport.
- X (a) Above: Warrior figure, unprovenanced
in Joint Museum, Newcastle upon Tyne.
(b) Below: Horned warrior from Burgh by Sands.
- XI The 'Serpent Stone' from Maryport, Cumbria.
(a) Above: Reverse.
(b) Below: Obverse.

I, Kenneth J. Fairless, declare that no part of this material has previously been submitted by me for a degree in this or any other university.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks are due to the owners and trustees of the following collections for permission to examine and photograph the objects shown: Plates IX and XI, the Senhouse collection, Maryport, Cumbria; Plate X, the Joint Museum of Antiquities, The University, Newcastle upon Tyne. Plate VIII was kindly provided by the Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle, Co. Durham. All maps, redrawn plans, unattributed sketch plans and plates are by the author. Other sources of illustrations are acknowledged individually.

I also wish to thank Angela Cartledge and the staff of The Manor House Art Gallery and Museum, Ilkley, Yorkshire, and M.N. Petch and the staff of Manchester Museum, Manchester University, for answering my enquiries about Celtic Heads; Dr. Jeremy Evans and Louisa Gidney for helpful discussion; and the staff of the Department of Archaeology, University of Durham, for general help.

I am deeply grateful to Joan Scott and the late Peter Scott for the opportunity to consult their personal copy of Roman Villas in the North of England; also to Professors Dennis Harding and John Mann for help in the earlier stages of the work; to Denis Coggins for his help in many different ways and to John Casey who guided me through to completion of the work.

I wish to record my thanks to Lucille Thomson for her care and interest when preparing the final text; and to my wife for her patience and support.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Since the time of Camden, writing in the sixteenth century, many writers have given consideration to the British tribe known from the ancient authors as the Brigantes. Such consideration has usually been part of a wider study of the Roman occupation of Britain (e.g. Collingwood, 1937) or else incidental to the presentation of a special topic such as the discussion of an individual site (cf. Wooler, 1915). However, some scholars have paid particular attention to the Brigantes as such although no major work on the subject has been published.

In 1937 Pedley in his article The Brigantes in Britain attempted an overall assessment. He made use of ancient documentary sources, especially Ptolemy's Geography, as well as epigraphic and numismatic evidence. The epigraphic evidence included dedications to the goddess Brigantia and the numismatic evidence comprised ancient British coins then attributed to the Brigantes. The nine poleis ascribed to the tribe by Ptolemy were discussed as well as potential tribal strongholds such as Almondbury, Ingleborough and especially Stanwick. No stress was laid on general rural settlement or analysis attempted of economic or religious aspects of the tribe.

Despite gaps in the information Pedley felt that conclusions could be reached whose broad outlines must be

correct. The ultimate origin of the Brigantes could be found in central Europe close by Lake Constance. In Britain at the time of the Roman conquest they were a powerful tribe existing as a monarchy centred on south west Yorkshire but controlling much of northern England. Derbyshire and present-day Cumbria were not part of their territory. The Parisi of east Yorkshire too were separate. Their northern frontier lay along the Tyne-Solway isthmus and their southern frontier along a very approximate line joining the rivers Humber and Mersey. Small sub-tribes such as the Setantii existed on the fringes of Brigantian territory. Besides being agricultural and pastoral farmers they had a well developed civil life. They were well organised politically and militarily. Under Roman rule the influence of the conqueror though felt in urban centres did not penetrate significantly beyond.

Two years later, Clark tackled the question of the extent of Brigantian territory in her article Where were the Brigantes? (1939). She began with Haverfield's statement, 'The Brigantes lived ...in what is now Yorkshire, Lancashire, Durham and Cumberland' (1905, 200). Using the same range of sources as Pedley she concluded that the central core of the tribe lay in south-west Yorkshire. Their rule extended as far south as the Trent but it was doubtful if it extended any further north than Cumberland in the west and the northern border was perhaps

situated not even as far north as the Tyne in the east. In discussing the two fortified sites of Almondbury and Stanwick, Clark suggested that the former was a Brigantian 'citadel' and probably the tribal capital. As for Stanwick, there was even doubt that it should be regarded as a Brigantian centre at all. Local tribal centres, she suggested, were also implied by the names Rigodunum and Portus Setantiorum given in Ptolemy's list. It was likely that there were other separate tribes in the region making up a Brigantian confederacy.

With the Roman conquest of the tribe, Clark suggested that the tribal nucleus may have been established as a Roman canton with Isurium Brigantum, itself perhaps a Roman creation, serving as its capital. The remainder of former Brigantian territory might well have come under military control and furthermore, as vici outside forts grew in size, they may well have become centres of local government as appeared to have happened at Chesterholm. As for Roman influence, Clark estimated that the Brigantes in due course were 'fairly thoroughly Romanised'.

A decade after Clark wrote, Wood in his paper The Brigantes - some problems (1949) laid more emphasis on archaeological evidence while seeing merit too in a philological approach as advocated by Elgee (1936, 206). With regard to the origin of the tribe, the view that they were an offshoot of the continental Brigantii located next to Lake Constance left obscure the date of their

migration. A possible occasion was that of Hallstatt incursions into Britain although evidence for a late Bronze Age-Hallstatt transition was scarce in Yorkshire. There was also La Tène influence as indicated by scattered finds. This probably emanated from the Parisi of East Yorkshire. A likely conclusion to be drawn from the evidence was that basically, the Brigantes were a Bronze Age people affected by later intrusive influences.

The question of tribal organisation was also in need of a solution. Various small forts may have been the centres of local chieftains, while large forts such as Almondbury and Ingleborough were probably main centres. The status and nature of Stanwick was a problem here. It was not clear whether it was really a Brigantian capital or a Belgic outpost.

Another problem was the difficulty of distinguishing between pre-Roman artefacts and settlements and those of the Roman period. Rural life continued in much the same fashion during both periods. Imported religion apart, during the Roman occupation native religion survived and in this, the emphasis was on the female aspect - witness the goddess Brigantia. This feature was another indication of the tribe's Bronze Age connections. Roman influence indeed was not all-pervasive. While it was undoubtedly present at the civitas capital of Isurium, probably a Roman foundation, in remote districts such as the Pennines, Romanisation made little or no headway.

The problems discussed showed that much work in the form of research and excavation needed to be done before the full history of the Brigantes could be written.

In 1952 Birley published his paper The Brigantian problem and the first Roman contact with Scotland. The main purpose of this was to elucidate Roman military activity in the second century AD. In seeking to do this, Birley discussed the location of the 'Genunian district' referred to by Pausanias (Description of Greece, VIII.43) and sought to explain the statement that the emperor took off the Brigantes 'the greater part of their territory'. He argued that the nucleus of the Brigantian state lay in south-west Yorkshire but that in pre-Roman times the northern limits of Brigantian territory at large followed more or less the line of the Hadrianic frontier, except on the west where they extended further north into Annandale. This meant that part of the tribe was cut off from the remainder by the building of Hadrian's Wall. The part north of the Wall formed what Birley called the 'Free Brigantes'. It was these Free Brigantes who had caused trouble by attacking the Genunian district, located somewhere north of Hadrian's Wall, and it was they not the Brigantes within the Roman province who were punished by loss of territory.

It is convenient at this point to take note of the article by Richmond The Geography of Brigantia (1954a) which formed the Appendix to Wheeler's Stanwick Report (Wheeler,

1954) for this too was concerned to discuss the evidence relating to Brigantian territory. This may be usefully combined with argument presented in Richmond's important contribution to the study of the Brigantes published during the same year, Queen Cartimandua (Richmond, 1954b).

Richmond made use of the ancient geographical sources, namely, Ptolemy's Geography, the Antonine Itinerary and the Ravenna Cosmography as well as dedications to the goddess Brigantia. Account was also taken of topography and Bronze Age settlement patterns. Identifications of named sites, the extent of tribal territory and the nature of overall tribal organisation were discussed.

Richmond concluded that the Brigantian realms certainly embraced south-west Yorkshire (formerly the West Riding). The Hadrianic frontier marked the tribal boundary on the north except at the west end where a zone beyond that line was to be added. Southern frontiers were far from certain but were perhaps bounded by the river Mersey on the west and occurring in a zone between the rivers Don and Idle on the east. It could be argued that the Peak district of Derbyshire did not come under Brigantian control. As for tribal organisation, taking account of the regional topography and the hints afforded by the written evidence, such as the tribal name Setantii and the hillfort name Rigodunum, a series of distinct communities, twelve to fifteen in number, could be postulated. Thus the

Brigantes represented a coalition of these smaller communities or tribal septs.

In 1969 Feachem's lecture of the previous year Some Brigantian Problems Reconsidered was published and this was followed shortly after by his paper The Brigantes (1971). Feachem was mainly concerned on both occasions to describe and define the pre-Roman Brigantes.

In the 1969 paper Feachem emphasised archaeological evidence pointing to the difficulty of classification where there was a poverty of material remains. Fortified sites, he suggested, provided a clue to the development of society within Brigantia. The Bronze Age population of the earlier part of the first millennium BC consisted of simple communities where there was little differentiation of status. Timber-laced forts intruded upon this situation. They represented the strongholds of Celtic-speaking Hallstatt immigrants who became a controlling minority in a two-tier society. Multivallate forts succeeded the timber-laced examples. These represented La Tène influence and their occupants were an élite controlling a largely pastoral society.

A major problem, however, was the absence of dwelling sites assignable to the majority of the population. If tents were rejected for this purpose then timber structures of a relatively simple kind were likely. Feachem suggested the type of structure of about 6.5m

diameter often described as the simple-ring house consisting usually of spaced posts and sometimes with surrounding ditch. An example was that found on the Tofts by Wheeler in the course of his excavations at Stanwick. A variant of the type had a bedding trench for contiguous timbers. Such a structure was in contrast to the timber house of advanced design as found for example at West Brandon in County Durham. The latter was not a common type in Brigantia and represented a stratum of society superior to that of the indigenous peasant.

Feachem concluded that the pre-Roman Brigantes were descended mainly from the Bronze Age population. Forts in the region represented the strongholds of an aristocracy. The dominant dwelling houses were made of timber and of relatively simple design accounting for the failure to identify them except during excavation. The economy of the region was based upon pastoralism which left little trace by way of artefacts. With the coming of Rome, urban civilisation became available and was taken up by some.

In his 1971 paper Feachem was again concerned to examine the question of who the pre-Roman Brigantes were. He suggested two avenues of approach, the first involving consideration of the language, the second concerned with material remains.

With regard to the first approach, personal, tribal, place, river and deity names of Brigantia all combine to

illustrate the former presence of the Celtic language in the region. Thus at the dawn of history the Brigantes were a Celtic people.

Material remains included hill forts and habitations. Some hill forts such as Almondbury were assignable to the first half of the first millennium BC. Others, such as Stanwick, were built during the later first millennium BC or in the early years of the first millennium AD. Habitation sites were sparse and it must be concluded that until early in the first millennium AD such sites were of a simple archaic type more akin to a tent than to a house.

Other types of remains - funerary and religious monuments - followed a conventional pattern except for Eastern Yorkshire where the distinctive later burials resulted from immigration. Field systems were widespread but there was little or no evidence of their significant use during the second half of the first millennium BC. Little was known about communication routes but no doubt they followed the same cross-country links as were utilised by later Roman roads. As for artefacts, they had little to reveal. Pottery development owed little to outside influences but Brigantian metalwork of the later pre-Roman period was distinctive.

From the evidence adduced, Feachem concluded that there had been little immigration into Brigantia for the best part of two millennia, since the time of the Beaker

incursions. Since the Brigantes were Celtic speaking, the Beaker immigrations must have been the occasion when the language was introduced. The Beaker newcomers merged with people already living in the region to establish the basic population which later became the various communities forming what became the historical Brigantes.

Feachem's essays were presented against a background of continuing and quickening research in prehistoric settlement studies involving new ways of looking at the available data. His emphasis on material remains is no doubt a reflection of this background as much as the fact that his predecessors had concentrated on the written evidence. Shortly after Feachem wrote, Cunliffe in Iron Age Communities in Britain provided an invaluable survey of the development of Iron Age studies to date as part of his pioneer attempt to write an overall account of the British Iron Age (1st ed., 1974; 2nd ed., 1978). It is not proposed here to recapitulate Cunliffe's survey but it is evident that much of the research to which he refers has had relevance, direct or indirect, to the study of settlement and society in the region occupied by the Brigantes. Reference may also be made to Cunliffe's approach, with his emphasis on communities and his suggestion that "...it may be that simple descriptive treatments will remain the standard way of presenting complex material...". At the same time he pointed out

that the devising, testing and modification of new theoretical models was essential to further progress.

Since Feachem's articles and Cunliffe's Iron Age Communities in Britain, much work has taken place. From the point of view of the study of the Brigantes the most important contribution has been the publication in 1975 of Later Pre-history from the Trent to the Tyne by Challis and Harding. This was an attempt to survey and evaluate sites and material remains belonging to the Later Bronze and the Iron Ages found within the region extending from the Trent basin in the south to the Tyne in the north. As such it embraces the territory attributable to the Brigantes and provides an essential basis for investigation of the tribe involving archaeological evidence.

The work of Challis and Harding stopped short at the point of the Roman conquest of the region but other relevant investigations have been published which deal with Roman times too. One important aspect of indigenous activity is covered by MacGregor's Early Celtic Art in North Britain (1976). This is a study and catalogue of decorative metalwork from the third century BC to the third century AD. The region to which this applies lies north of a line drawn in an arc from the Mersey in the west to the Humber in the east, material from East Yorkshire and North Humberside being included. Brigantia is included within

this region and therein lies its value for the present enquiry.

An important publication too was that of Rivet and Smith: The Place Names of Roman Britain (1979). With its collection and survey of written evidence, especially of geographical material, as well as its alphabetical index of names it is an essential tool for students of Roman and Celtic Britain.

In the decade following the work of Challis and Harding (1975) other publications having varying degrees of relevance to a study of the Brigantes have come thick and fast. It would be tedious to list them all here and attention is drawn to the bibliography. Mention, however, should be made of archaeological surveys which have dealt in detail with restricted areas thus providing basic raw material for wider study. These include Faull and Moorhouse, 1981; Spratt, 1982; Hart, 1981; and Coggins, 1986, covering West Yorkshire, North East Yorkshire, North Derbyshire and Teesdale respectively. Final mention should be made of a trio of publications, all collections of papers concerned with the interaction of Roman and Native within the region north of the Humber. These are Branigan, 1980; Clack and Haselgrove, 1982; and Wilson et al, 1984.

Relevant excavations have proceeded in various parts, notably in Teesdale, Lowland Durham, County Cleveland,

North-East Yorkshire and West Yorkshire to mention only rural sites occurring within territory attributable to the Brigantes. An outstanding site has been Thorpe Thewles in County Cleveland. Most important of all, however, is the investigation of Stanwick which has re-commenced under the direction of Haselgrove and Turnbull. When Pedley, Clark and Wood wrote their articles on the Brigantes, Stanwick was unexcavated and regarded as a problem. Wheeler's excavation in the early 1950s established its authenticity as a fortification belonging to the time of Cartimandua and Venutius, leaders of the Brigantes, and his interpretation seemed to have solved the problem which it posed. The investigations of the 1980s have led to a reappraisal which is of the utmost importance to the student of the Brigantes.

Air survey too has been of outstanding importance. To complement the work of Professor St. Joseph and others, may be mentioned the activities in this field of Higham and Jones in Cumbria, Harding and Selkirk in County Durham, and Riley in various parts of Yorkshire. Scores of new sites have to be added to the lists compiled by Challis and Harding (1975).

Thus, since the mid-1970s a wealth of new material has been accumulated. Following this progress, it seems possible to examine again the evidence relating to the Brigantes and attempt a fresh appraisal. In doing this

the general aim is to achieve an increased understanding of the Brigantes. A detailed and systematic history of that community, dealing with all aspects of their existence in both pre-Roman and Roman times is not the intention. The data for attempting this are not yet available. What is more, so much of the basic material to be used as evidence requires detailed examination and discussion that selection has been necessary to retain the presentation within a reasonable compass. Allowing for these restrictions, clarification of the general aim is necessary and so more specific aims need to be formulated. These are as follows:

1. To explore the question of the whereabouts of the tribal population.
2. To assess the economic basis of their existence.
3. To elucidate as far as possible their social and political organisation.
4. To gain an understanding of their religious life.
5. To estimate the influence of Rome.

Before proceeding further it is necessary to explain two terms that are often found to be useful in the subsequent discussion. First is the term 'Brigantia'. Although not recorded in the ancient sources as a geographical term it may be usefully employed to convey the concept of territory under the control of the Brigantes. Second is the phrase 'Central Britain'. This is used here to indicate the region encompassed within lines drawn roughly

across country from the Humber to the Mersey in the south and from the north shore of the Solway to the Northumberland coast at about Alnmouth in the north (see fig.1.1). A glance at the map shows that this region does in fact constitute the central portion of the island of Britain. Its use as a descriptive term is a succinct means of directing attention to this particular region and avoids the confusion that can arise by including it within the description North Britain.

Turning now to the general approach designed to fulfil the aims stated above, the documentary and epigraphic evidence relating to the Brigantes is of necessity dealt with at the outset. The term 'documentary' is employed here as a substitute for the term 'literary' which is normally used to indicate written sources. This leaves the term 'literary' available to refer to the works of authors such as Caesar and Tacitus. Thus geographical source material such as Ptolemy's Geography, the Antonine Itinerary and the Ravenna Cosmography is classified as documentary without being categorised as literature.

Following consideration of the documentary evidence the evidence for settlement calls for treatment. Sites that stand out from the others are those that are so well protected by man and nature that they may be called 'fortified'. Such sites may have been centres of control - what may be called 'power centres' - or they may relate

in some other way to communities, for example, by having functioned as communal gathering places or border look-out posts. Whether permanently occupied or not such sites should be regarded as part of settlement in general. However, size may indicate influence and control and accordingly it has seemed worthwhile to discuss separately the largest fortified sites within the overall region of Central Britain as a preliminary to further discussion of settlement sites in general, including smaller fortified examples.

When dealing with settlement, it must be realised that all sites considered in this category are not necessarily occupied by people. Enclosures may sometimes have been intended for animals. Even so, they, along with field systems, are the result of human occupation and thus may be considered under the general heading of settlement. As for those places which were used for human occupation, the term 'habitation sites' may be employed if a distinction between these and other sites needs to be drawn. By far the greatest extent of settlement, even in Roman times, is rural. Accordingly, special attention is given to rural settlements. In this respect, it is necessary to review, discuss and evaluate the evidence in some detail. It provides the basic data for establishing the whereabouts of the population, and enables estimates to be attempted and conclusions to be drawn concerning the economic life

and social organisation of the communities discernible in the material remains of the settlements.

The region of Central Britain as a whole is deemed to be too extensive for this degree of detailed examination to be applied to it. Accordingly, a more narrowly circumscribed region has been chosen for special treatment of this kind. The basis of its choice may be explained.

In the discussion of larger fortified sites and power centres, the argument is presented that in later prehistoric and Roman Britain any centre of power for exercising control over Central Britain is likely to have lain east of the Pennines. The two fortified sites of Barwick in Elmet and Stanwick Camp are suggested as potential pre-Roman sites suitable for this purpose. Whether contemporary or not both places must have been able to call upon considerable manpower to construct their fortifications and this implies habitation sites in the vicinity. Later, when the Romans assumed control, the civitas capital of the tribe was established at Aldborough near Boroughbridge, North Yorkshire. Even if it was a purely Roman-inspired foundation the administrative centre of the civitas can hardly have been located elsewhere than in a position which would allow contact with the main centres of population. The centre of gravity as it were in later pre-Roman and in Roman times then would seem to have lain east of the Pennines. For that reason it would

seem to be of value to examine this part of Brigantia more closely.

The region concerned extends from the Tyne in the north to the Aire in the south, a distance of ninety statute miles (144km)(see fig.1.2). It embraces the Vale of York (including its northern part sometimes called the Vale of Mowbray) with its northern extension the valley of the lower Tees. On the west are the Pennine uplands with their river valleys or dales providing not only means of penetration but also areas of habitation. The former enhances the means of control over a wider region and the latter provides a greater potential of manpower and economic wealth. The Pennine uplands are therefore included for consideration. Their highest points are on the western side providing the main watershed so that almost all the rivers draining the area flow eastwards. This watershed is broadly the boundary chosen to mark the western limit of the region under consideration. That is not to say that where necessary for the sake of unity, as for example in the case of the Craven uplands, districts beyond this main boundary are not brought under consideration. Indeed, such an approach is employed in respect of all boundary lines. It would be inflexible and unwise to make them hard and fast frontiers in the absence of known political boundaries. The eastern boundaries of the region, however, are fixed for much of their extent. From the Tyne southwards as far as Teesmouth it is the

coast that provides the eastern limit. The uplands of north-east Yorkshire, the Howardian Hills, the Vale of Pickering and the Yorkshire Wolds are excluded from detailed examination. Thus in effect the boundary after Teesmouth comprises the northern edge of the Cleveland Hills and the eastern edge of the Vale of York. This region is in itself an extensive one and it provides contrasts and variations in elevation and topography and therefore potential contrasts in settlement pattern and lifestyle. In order to deal with it adequately treatment has been divided into different chapters (Chapters 4-8).

In discussing rural settlement the main evidence used is in the form of site remains. Problems inherent in the recovery and recording of evidence need to be borne in mind. With regard to lowland sites much of the information is dependent upon aerial survey and in areas subsequently heavily populated or intensively cultivated a considerable amount of the evidence must have been destroyed or at least concealed from view. Similarly, industrial activity may have removed or altered relevant evidence. By definition, areas of woodland and pasture do not yield crop marks and even on cultivated land the chances of crop-marks are variable. For these reasons, and others, not to mention the bias which may be introduced by individual investigators, the overall picture may be distorted. Field evidence relating to upland regions tends to be different from that found in

the lowlands. Crop marks of aerial photography have less to contribute. Most of the material is in the form of earthworks, whether mounds or hollows, or stony foundations. However, intensive later cultivation, occupation or industrial activity may have removed or damaged such evidence. In addition, areas of woodland, moorland covered with bracken or ling, and peat-covered areas often make recognition and interpretation of archaeological features difficult. Many districts too have received incomplete survey from an archaeological point of view and often indeed no such consideration at all. The contrast between districts which have been the subject of intensive research by field workers and those that have not is a potential source of considerable distortion.

These or similar constraints, however, are liable to be present in any historical or archaeological research and they need not prevent the attempt being made at interpreting such evidence as is available.

Even when sites are identified a major problem is often that of dating. Paucity of material remains, especially on upland sites, has for long hampered this process. This means that any objective method of providing dates such as radiocarbon dating is to be welcomed and utilised. However, the interpretation of radiocarbon determinations is still fraught with difficulties. Consequently in this

study unless otherwise stated, radiocarbon 'dates' are cited in their 'uncorrected' form and the convention 'bc', 'ad' or 'bp' ('before present', i.e. 1950) used for them. The normal practice of capital letters is employed for calendar dates and for calibrated dates. Dates are calibrated according to Stuiver and Pearson, 1986 and Pearson and Stuiver, 1986 in Stuiver and Kra, 1986. Appendix 2 lists calibrated dates from sites referred to in the main text and Appendix 3 provides a select list of calibrated dates from pollen diagrams cited.

When considering early settlement palaeobotanical research is another line of enquiry which should be taken into account. There is now a large body of research material which helps to throw light on early environments and in this respect it is of value to the student of human communities in earlier times (cf. Simmons and Tooley, 1981). Pollen diagrams are an important source of such information and their value is greatly enhanced when they are radiocarbon-dated. Such diagrams indicate the presence or otherwise of forest, grassland and other vegetation as well as showing whether farming activities were taking place and whether these were pastoral or agricultural in nature. However, besides the reservations to be applied to radiocarbon dating in itself, it should be noted that pollen diagrams only reflect the vegetational history of their own individual catchment areas. At the most, a catchment area might extend to a

radius of some ten miles (16Km) around the pollen site. In less favourable circumstances the catchment area is limited to a few hundred metres (Turner, 1978, 2; 1979, 285). It follows from this that to be strictly relevant pollen diagrams need to have been obtained from the immediate district under discussion. Further, it is clear that there is the danger of error in applying the results of pollen diagrams beyond the catchment area and caution is required.

There are now many pollen diagrams available and they must rank as primary evidence. However, the construction and interpretation of these diagrams is a specialised field and in this present investigation the guidance of such specialists where available is followed in regard to palaeobotanical (though not necessarily historical or archaeological) matters.

Following the extensive discussion of rural settlement attention is concentrated on two sites, Stanwick and Aldborough. As noted above, Stanwick by reason of its surface remains and location ranks as a major centre of the region. Furthermore, excavations both in the 1950s and the 1980s have provided much additional information. More detailed examination of the Stanwick results is required than is possible in a general discussion of large fortified sites as attempted in Chapter Three. As for Aldborough, it was Isurium Brigantum the tribal capital

in Roman times. Excavations here too have yielded additional information. Consequently Stanwick and Aldborough, as two important power centres of the Brigantes, require special treatment and a separate chapter is devoted to them (Chapter 9).

A separate chapter also is devoted to consideration of evidence which has a bearing on religious activity (Chapter 10). Religion can provide an insight into the ethos of a community but since the exact limits of Brigantia are unknown treatment is accorded to the overall region of Central Britain. Most of the evidence bearing on indigenous religion comes from urban sites of the Roman period. There is very little evidence from rural sites. For this reason the picture that emerges is incomplete and no doubt somewhat distorted. There is also the problem of identifying, amidst a welter of material, those aspects of religious life which are indigenous. It is essential where possible to apply to the evidence full and detailed discussion. Such treatment has not hitherto been accorded to this evidence although there exist distinguished studies of religious life relevant to the period (e.g. Ross, 1967; Green, 1976, 1978; Henig, 1984; Birley, 1986). It is hoped in this approach to establish a firm foundation for drawing conclusions and progressing towards better understanding.

Economic and social aspects next fall to be considered and

many of the conclusions drawn are based on discussions in the preceding chapters. In addition, appeal is made to other sources which deal with topics and districts not covered in detail previously. Also included under the heading 'social aspects' are what may be termed 'political' matters in the sense that the question of individual communities within Brigantia identified in previous discussion is also dealt with. In discussing the economic base and social organisation of the Brigantes, it must be remembered that the battery of information, especially statistical material, available to the researcher dealing with more recent times is absent in the case of ancient times. Consequently, the picture that is drawn is that much more incomplete than would be the case in assessing present-day communities occupying the same territory.

The text in general is supported and supplemented by maps, illustrations and additional printed material. Amongst the maps is a set intended to serve both as location and as distribution maps of rural settlement sites (figs.1.2-1.7). An appendix is provided listing these sites arranged alphabetically within sub-regions, and cross-referenced to the settlement maps for the sake of consultation. A set of maps (figs.10.1-10.12) matched by tabulated lists (except in the case of fig.10.6) also gives important support to the discussion on religion.

Other illustrations and tabulated lists, including photographic plates supplement this material. The closing date for consultation of publications is December 1986.

CHAPTER TWO

DOCUMENTARY AND EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE

That a community or tribe known to the Romans as the Brigantes actually existed is not in doubt. The testimony of ancient sources makes that clear (Rivet and Smith, 1979). Leaving aside adjectival and abbreviated forms and those that contain any element of doubt there remains nevertheless unambiguous evidence in Ptolemy's Geography and in the works of ancient authors, notably Tacitus, to support this assertion. Ptolemy, writing his Geography about the years AD 140-150 but using earlier source material refers to the Brigantes when listing the peoples and places of what is now northern England (Geog., II, 3, 10; see below). Tacitus, the Roman historian, employs the name several times in those parts of his works which deal with Roman Britain. He provides too the information that they were ruled by a queen called Cartimandua whose consort was Venutius and that they were 'the most numerous tribe in Britain' (Agricola, 17, 2; Annals, XII, 32, 36, 40; Histories, III, 45). Juvenal, the Roman satirist, in a poem probably written in the years between AD 122 and 127 makes a reference to the 'forts of the Brigantes' (castella Brigantum) (Sat. XIV, 196). The earliest extant reference to the tribe, however, occurs in a satirical description of the death of the Emperor Claudius in AD 54, ascribed to Seneca the Younger (Apocolocyntosis, XII, 3). To these classical sources should be added the evidence of

the second century tombstone of Nectovellius found near Mumrills on the Antonine Wall in Scotland. Nectovellius, son of Vindex, serving in the cohorts II Thracum is described on his tombstone as a 'Brigantian by tribe' (nationis Brigans)(RIB.2142).

With regard to the whereabouts of the Brigantes in Britain modern students of the period have regarded northern England, excluding most of Northumberland, as Brigantian territory. They have marked out the southern boundary in general terms by drawing a line across the map from the Humber in the east to the Mersey in the west, perhaps with a bend southwards to include the Peak district of Derbyshire. To the north, the consensus of opinion is that the Tyne-Solway isthmus marked the northern boundary of the tribe with perhaps a loop into south-west Scotland at least as far as Birrens. Not all would include this region, however, and the same applies to Derbyshire. Again, the Lake District in Cumbria seems to others sufficiently isolated and remote to have seen no part of Brigantian control. On the east coast there is disagreement concerning the extent of territory belonging to the neighbouring tribe of the Parisi. That they occupied a considerable part of eastern Yorkshire is agreed but exactly where their borders lay is less certain especially with regard to whether their northern boundary lay along the northern edge of the Vale of Pickering or further north on the northern edge of the limestone hills.

Most students set the Parisi apart from the Brigantes since Ptolemy mentions them separately but some would be inclined to classify them as a client or sub-tribe.

Thus there is a coincidence of agreement regarding the main tribal territory of the Brigantes but some diversity of view within that agreement. It seems necessary therefore to return to the ancient source material to consider the matter anew.

The geographical documentary sources are basic. Ptolemy states that the Brigantes were to be found 'below the Selgovae and the Otadini, stretching from sea to sea' (Geog. II, 13, 10; Rivet and Smith, 1979, 141). He assigns to them nine 'cities' (poleis) of which four can be identified for certain. These are Vinnovium which is Binchester in County Durham; Caturactonium and Isurium, which are Catterick and Aldborough respectively, in Yorkshire; and finally Eboracum, Legio VI Victrix, which is the city of York. All are found in the Antonine Itinerary (e.g. 465-6 Iter I) and, except for Isurium, in the Ravenna Cosmography also (107, 13 and 14; Rivet and Smith, 1979, 208). Indeed, if Rivet and Smith are correct, Isurium too occurs in the Ravenna Cosmography in the garbled form of 'coccuveusuron'. They would explain it as a conflation resulting from a misreading involving Coccueda and Usuron (= Isurium) (1979, 379).

Inscriptions too from Binchester (RIB.1036) and York (RIB.674; 678 etc.) as well as ample literary evidence for the latter (e.g. SHA. XIX, 1) add further certainty in the case of these two locations. Thus, the four names provided give evidence of the presence of the Brigantes east of the Pennines in the Vale of York and somewhat further to the north, as far as the river Wear at least, on which stands Binchester. However, in view of Ptolemy's reference to the two seas, presumably the present-day North and Irish Seas, their territory must have extended west of the Pennines.

The remaining five names would help to fill out this territory but identification of each is subject to varying degrees of uncertainty. Rivet and Smith agree with Richmond (1954a) in proposing Burrow in Lonsdale (i.e. Overborough) for the name Calagum. The suggestion is that this is the Galacum which is found in Iter X of the Antonine Itinerary. The route, however, is difficult to interpret and uncertainty remains. There is close correlation, however, between Ptolemy's distance from London and the actual distance, with a discrepancy of only five miles (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 119, Table 1). Rigodunum is placed by Richmond in the Lancaster area with the suggestion that it could very well apply to the native stronghold of Ingleborough (SD 741747) (1954a, 61). Rivet and Smith, however, suggest the Roman fort of Castleshaw (SD 9909) because of the position of Rigodunum in Ptolemy

(1979, 448). Olicana is tentatively accepted as Ilkley by Richmond, but Rivet and Smith prefer to see applied here the name Verbeia, attested by an altar from Ilkley dedicated to Verbeia, goddess of the river Wharfe (RIB.635). This leaves Olicana unattributed and they suggest that it should, on the basis of distance from London, be applied to the next fort west of Ilkley, namely, Elslack (SD 9249). They would equate it in that case with Olenaco of the Notitia Dignitatum (XL.55) and Olerica of the Ravenna Cosmography (107, 5), all three readings having been corrupted from an original 'Olenacum' (?) (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 430). Camulodunum (corrupted to 'Camunlodunum' in most manuscripts of Ptolemy) is tentatively identified as the Roman fort of Slack (SE 0817) by both Richmond and Rivet and Smith. The former (1954b, 44-5) suggested that the name had been transferred from the hill fort of Almondbury, five miles distant (SE 152140). The latter (1979, 295), admitted Almondbury as a possibility but suggested as an alternative the nearer site at Old Lindley Moor (SE 091182). As for Epiacum, Richmond was unable to offer a satisfactory derivation or identification (1954a, 61). Rivet and Smith (1979, 369) suggest its meaning as 'the estate or property of Eppius' to be identified with the Roman fort at Whitley Castle, in the northern Pennines near Kirkhaugh, Northumberland (NY 6948). Ptolemy's distance for it from London was 280 miles, only five miles different from the true distance of 275 miles (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 119, Table 1).

Epigraphic evidence adds more information. This falls into two categories, lead pigs and religious dedications.

Two pigs of lead have come from Heyshaw Moor, Yorkshire. Each has stamped on one side the letters 'BRIG' conjectured to stand for the adjective Briganticum agreeing with metallum understood, thus giving the meaning 'Brigantian mine' (CIL.7.1207). They are both dated to AD 81 by reference in a stamp on the bottom to the seventh consulship of Domitian. This part of the central Pennines then would seem to be clearly within Brigantian territory.

The religious dedications comprise seven altars dedicated to the eponymous goddess Brigantia and one to a male version, Bregans (fig.10.5). They fall into two geographical groups, south-west Yorkshire and the Hadrianic frontier. Altars in the first group come from Greetland (RIB.627), Adel (RIB.630), Woodnook, near Castleford (RIB.628) and Longwood, near Slack ('to Bregans') (RIB.623). Altars from the second group come from South Shields (RIB.1053), Corbridge (RIB.1131), from Castlesteads (RIB.2066) and from Birrens (RIB.2091). The group from south-west Yorkshire would seem to reinforce the assignment of these parts to Brigantian territory implied by the presumed location of Camulodunum discussed above. All four dedicators were civilian; one a non-citizen, Cingetissa from Adel, and the other three Roman citizens and therefore either descended from ex-army settlers or else native aristocrats granted the

citizenship. The shrines at which they worshipped would accordingly be civilian, thus reducing doubt concerning transfer of the cult from elsewhere. Not the same can be said, however, about the northern group of dedications. These, coming as they do from the northern frontier region, may represent movement of the cult northwards following the troops. Indeed, two of the dedicators, namely, those from Birrens and Corbridge, were soldiers of Legio VI. They presumably had connections with the legionary base at York, situated within Brigantian territory. However, two of the northern dedicators were not soldiers. Congennicus from South Shields was a non-citizen, probably a civilian and, from his name, apparently a Celt. The other, who dedicated the Cumberland altar, was no less a person than M. Cocceius Nigrinus, the procurator Augusti, setting up his altar for the 'welfare' of the emperor Caracalla. It does seem rather a coincidence that four dedications involving the same goddess should have been set up at four different places along the general frontier line. Consideration of the Birrens and Corbridge examples indicates that in textual and sculptural terms they were set up in honour of the Severan dynasty (Jolliffe, 1941, 55, 43-44). The dedication of Cocceius Nigrinus clearly belongs to the same category (Jolliffe, 1941, 58). It seems quite likely that these altars were dedicated as a result of imperial decree or encouragement. That does not entirely rule out transfer of the cult from further south but it does seem

to make it less likely; the territorial goddess Brigantia would hardly be singled out for honour beyond her own lands. The arguments for either side of the problem are inconclusive but on balance it seems likely that the northernmost dedications to Brigantia do in fact truly reflect territory formerly under the control or at least influence of the tribe in its heyday before Roman military occupation. In that case it seems reasonable to regard the northernmost collection of altars dedicated to the goddess Brigantia as reflecting the general location of the northern limits of the Brigantes. As for the southernmost group of dedications, following a similar scheme, it could well be that they mark out the general whereabouts of the southern boundary of Brigantian territory.

Literary sources add little to the evidence. Seneca and Juvenal are of no help in locating tribal territory. Pausanias the Greek traveller and geographer mentions a 'Genounian region' which was attacked by the Brigantes but does not state where it was (Descriptio Graeciae, VIII, 43). There has been much discussion amongst scholars concerning its location. In fact, however, it seems quite probable that the 'Genounian part' of Britain never existed. Hind has argued convincingly that Pausanias, faced with recording troubles involving the Brigantes in Britain, an unfamiliar part of the world, mistakenly transferred thence the 'Genauni', neighbours of the

'Brigantii', located near Lake Constance in the province of Raetia (Hind, 1977).

Tacitus in recounting the relations between Rome and the Brigantes might at first sight appear to be more helpful. The story is well known. Tacitus refers to the campaign of the governor Ostorius Scapula in AD 47-48 against the Decangi (Deceangli?) of north Wales when disputes amongst the Brigantes forced him to return, intervene and settle the trouble. Later, in AD 51 the rebel chieftain Caratacus fled to Cartimandua, Queen of the Brigantes, who surrendered him to the Romans. Then came a quarrel between Cartimandua and her consort Venutius, followed by war between them and hostility towards Rome on the part of Venutius. Cartimandua captured Venutius' kinsfolk and a warband in support of the latter invaded her realm. The Romans sent military assistance, first some cohorts of auxiliaries then a legion commanded by Caesius Nasica (Tacitus, Annals, XII, 32, 36, 40). Their success confirmed Cartimandua in her control and it was not until the Year of the Four Emperors following the death of Nero in AD 68 that a renewal of the quarrel between Cartimandua and Venutius compelled the Romans once more to intervene, with cavalry and auxiliary infantry. They had limited success, managing to rescue Cartimandua but failing to defeat Venutius (Tacitus. Hist. III, 45). Unfortunately, Tacitus fails to provide details of locations or lines of march and his account is open to various interpretations.

The argument of Clark is that all this interchange between Brigantes and Romans meant that the former 'lay for perhaps twenty years along the Trisantonan or Trent frontier.' (1939, 82). This, however, is not an inevitable conclusion. It seems clear from Tacitus' account that the Brigantes were in alliance with Rome (Tacitus, Annals, XII, 40) and this would account for the queen's surrender of Caratacus. As a client kingdom there would be good communication between the Queen and the Romans, and perhaps even Roman troops stationed within her boundaries (Thompson, 1965). At any rate, foot columns could penetrate some 120 miles within five days by ordinary marching (cf. Watson, 1969, 54-55) and cavalry units could of course operate more swiftly still. Where Cartimandua's headquarters may have been is an interesting problem that will call for consideration later but they do not have to have been located near the river Trent. The evidence of Tacitus, lacking as it does the geographical information, is not as helpful as it appears at first sight.

A further point may well have a bearing on the matter. The majority of surviving Roman lead pigs from Derbyshire are stamped with inscriptions indicating that they were from mines of Lutudarum (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 403-4; cf. Tylecote, 1962, Tables 33 and 34). This is in contrast to the Yorkshire pigs from the central Pennines mentioned earlier which identify themselves as 'Brigantian'. This difference perhaps suggests that

Derbyshire was not in fact to be regarded as Brigantian territory.

Thus the documentary and epigraphic sources combine to enable the general location of the Brigantes to be worked out. It is quite clear that they are to be placed in what is now northern England. The overall extent of their territory is impressive. On the east of the Pennines it reaches from the Wear valley at least, and probably the Tyne valley, in the north, to the Aire valley and possibly beyond in the south. It embraces the central Pennines, part at least of the southern Pennines, probably the northern Pennines too along with peripheral lowlands on their western flanks. There is no indication in the ancient sources that the Lake District of Cumbria is to be included although there is the distinct possibility that part of south-west Scotland around Birrens should be. The evidence of the lead pigs suggests that north Derbyshire should be regarded as separate. Boundaries may lie within the Aire-Calder basin on the south and along the Hadrianic frontier on the north. Separate mention by Ptolemy of the Parisi of east Yorkshire may mean that they too, at least during the first century AD, should be regarded as independent of the Brigantes. When further refinement of boundaries is attempted using documentary and epigraphic sources the exercise founders for lack of sufficiently detailed evidence. That is not to say that progress in this aspect cannot perhaps be made, using geographical

considerations in conjunction with field evidence and material remains. What it means is that such documentary and epigraphic sources as have survived are in themselves inadequate.

Whatever the actual boundaries of the Brigantes - and they may well have fluctuated over the years - the extent of territory under their suzerainty was vast. Size alone must have posed problems. When the nature of that territory is considered the problems become more formidable still as a glance at a physical map of northern England will illustrate (e.g. Fox, 1952, Map B; [see too fig.2.1]). The region is dominated by the Pennine Highlands, stretching from a point near the Scottish borders in the north to the Peak district of Derbyshire in the south. The Pennine range tends to separate the eastern side of the region from the west although it does not form an impenetrable barrier for there are clearly defined transverse routes such as the Aire Gap, the Stainmore Pass and the Tyne Gap which allow cross-Pennine movement and divide the range into three main blocks: the north Pennines, the central Pennines and the south Pennines. On the west of the Pennine range are the Cumbrian mountains, a land of high mountains and radial valleys often occupied by lakes; here communication between the valleys is difficult. On the east, in north-east Yorkshire, are the North Yorks Moors including the Cleveland Hills. This region is bounded on the north by

the estuary of the river Tees and on the south by the Vale of Pickering. Much of the region then is upland and even mountainous terrain. Lowland areas, however, do exist: on the west, the Solway Plain and Vale of Eden to the north; and further south the Lancashire and Cheshire plain; on the east, the Vale of York with its northern extension into the lower Tees valley; then again in east Yorkshire the Vale of Pickering between the North Yorks Moors on the north and the Yorkshire Wolds on the south. The Pennines themselves have lowland areas in the form of deep valleys or dales, such as Swaledale and Wensleydale but these tend to be isolated from one another by high intervening ground. Even without considering further, influential factors such as climate and drift geology which have a bearing on settlement patterns, the broad outlines of topography which have been presented are sufficient to indicate that the layout of northern England tends to encourage fragmentation. It would not be surprising to see evidence of this in early times, and further consideration of the documentary and epigraphic material from Roman times indicates that such fragmented groupings did indeed exist.

In addition to the Parisi (Ptolemy, Geog. II, 3, 10) the Geography of Ptolemy provides information from which two 'tribal' or 'sub-tribal' names may be gleaned. These are the Gabrantovices and the Setantii. Both are derived from Ptolemy's account of the coastline of Britain.

The first is recorded as 'Gulf of the Gabrantovices suitable for a harbour' (Ptolemy, Geog. II, 3, 4). It occurs in the east coast list after the entry 'Dunum gulf' which following the progression of names southwards along the coast fits well with present-day Tees Bay. The meaning of this last is 'fortress gulf' (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 344-5) and there can be little doubt that the reference is to the hill of Eston Nab which dominates the area and on which is situated a fort (Elgee, 1930, 152-6). It is clear that the Gabrantovices are to be placed in east Yorkshire south of the Tees. Their exact location, however, will depend upon the position of the gulf bearing their name but unfortunately this cannot be positively identified. It could be applicable to any one of a number of bays along the east coast of Yorkshire, for example Runswick Bay, Whitby Bay at the mouth of the river Esk, Scarborough Bay, Filey Bay and Bridlington. Of these, Whitby is certainly the most attractive suggestion in that it provides excellent harbourage for sailing ships. Rivet and Smith suggest Filey Bay or Bridlington Bay but favour the latter (1979, 364) on the grounds that Ptolemy placed the Parisi (of east Yorkshire) 'beside the gulf suitable for a harbour' (Geog. II, 3, 10). The assumption is that this gulf is the same as that of the Gabrantovices by reason of the description applied to it. Such an equation is extremely tempting but not inevitable. It is possible that more than one gulf is involved. The position of the gulf under discussion and thereby the location of the

Gabrantovices might well affect one's interpretation of the affiliation of the tribe. If located around Bridlington Bay or indeed even Filey Bay there would be the temptation to regard them as perhaps a client tribe of the Parisi. If their territory were further north, and especially in the hinterland of Whitby, they would more naturally be seen as being associated with the Brigantes.

There seems little to choose between the arguments on either side but on balance the undoubted excellence of Whitby harbour would seem more to merit Ptolemy's description than the other candidates. As to the meaning of the name Gabrantovices, the philologists suggest 'horse-riding fighters, or cavalrymen', or 'goat fighters', the reference being perhaps to emblems or totems rather than necessarily literal descriptions (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 363-4).

The second tribal name given by Ptolemy occurs in the names in his west coast list (Geog. II, 3, 2). It is given as 'harbour of the Setantii' and, fitting this into the progression of names along the west coast, it must be situated somewhere between Morecambe Bay and the Ribble estuary. The harbour at Fleetwood would suit, and the Fylde district of Lancashire would then be assigned to the tribe. How far their territory extended northwards coastwise or how far inland can only be guessed at. It seems likely, however, that they extended as far south as the estuary of the river Mersey which is almost certainly

the 'estuary Seteia' listed by Ptolemy (Geog. II, 3,2) and whose name contains the same basic element as the tribal name (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 457). As for the meaning of the tribal name, there are difficulties in derivation but a tempting interpretation is that it denotes something like 'the wayfarers', possibly taken from a divine name also incorporated in the river name mentioned above (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 456-7).

Three more tribal names can be postulated by appeal to inscriptions. These are the Carvetii, the Textoverdi and the Corionotatae.

From the evidence of a Roman tombstone and a milestone it would appear that a civitas of the otherwise unrecorded community the 'Carvetii' existed in the third century AD. The tombstone, seen by Camden, at Old Penrith, Cumbria about the year 1600 but since lost, was set up in memory of Flavius Martius a 'senator in the civitas of the Carvetii' (RIB.933). The milestone, found at Brougham in 1964, if correctly restored, referred to the 'civitas of the Carvetii'. It is dated to AD 258-268 by reason of its reference to the emperor Postumus (Wright, 1965, 224). The civitas capital would seem to have been Carlisle according to an undated milestone found at Middleton four miles north of Kirkby Lonsdale, Cumbria. It is inscribed m(ilia) p(assuum) LIII, that is 53 miles, which matches the distance by Roman road to Carlisle (RIB.2283). Carvetii is a British name meaning something like 'deer

men' (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 301-2) and it seems reasonable to suppose that they were already in existence earlier, at the time at least of the Roman conquest but that it was not until the third century that they attained the status of a civitas.

The Textoverdi are attested by an altar found in Beltingham churchyard, two miles south-east of the Roman fort and vicus at Chesterholm, Northumberland. It was set up by the 'curia of the Textoverdi' (RIB.1695). This may merely stand for the 'assembly' of the Textoverdi taking account of the Latin word curia which can bear this interpretation. However, it seems very likely that it was a written (though not a spoken) version of the British coria which signifies 'hosting place' originally and then comes to mean 'tribal centre' (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 317-319). The similarity in meaning as well as orthography of curia and coria may well have aided the assimilation. Thus, in Roman terms, a 'pagus centre' is being indicated. Whether that was at Beltingham itself or else at nearby Chesterholm depends upon whether the stone was moved from Chesterholm or not. In any case it is in the vicinity. It does not seem unreasonable to suppose that the community in question traced its origins to pre-Roman times. It is tempting, as suggested by Rivet and Smith (1979, 502), to regard the Vicani Vindolandesses attested on a late second or third century altar (RIB.1700) as continuing or replacing the native Curia Textoverdorum.

However that may be, it seems clear that a community called the Textoverdi occupied a district along part of the South Tyne, a position which would have some importance in controlling the route running east-west through the Tyne Gap. As for the meaning of the name, there is difficulty in interpretation. The first element may be connected with 'ruling', 'controlling' or 'possessing' (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 471) and this would be in keeping with their strategic position in the Tyne valley.

The name 'Corionototae' is provided by an altar discovered in the Anglo-Saxon crypt of Hexham Abbey but since lost. It was dedicated, to a deity whose name is missing, by Quintus Calpurnius Concessinus, a praefectus equitum 'after slaughtering a band of Corionototae' (caesa Corionototarum manu) (RIB.1142). The name is susceptible to interpretation and the most likely one seems to be that the people bearing the name belonged to the community called the *Koriono-tota with a possible reference to their tribal god (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 322). Be that as it may, the location of this tribal group is unknown, for, whether the altar had been set up originally at Hexham where it was found or at nearby Corbridge, this is no help in deciding where the tribe belonged. It has been supposed that their lands lay north of Hadrian's Wall (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 322) and that they were a sept of the Selgovae (Frere, 1978, 77). The assumption here must

be that Calpurnius Concessinus had been campaigning in territory beyond the frontier line. It is possible, however, that their tribal territory lay south of the Hadrianic frontier and that they were an unruly sept of the Brigantes. Without further evidence it is impossible to decide or be more specific.

A return to the ancient geographical sources provides the evidence for a final ethnic designation. It is perhaps concealed in the corrupt form of the name for Roman Corbridge, namely, Corstopitum as it is given in the Antonine Itinerary, with variant readings 'Corstopilum' and 'Cor stopitu' (Ant.It. 464, 3 = Iter I). The form given by the Ravenna Cosmography is 'Corie Lopocarium' (Rav.107, 18 = Richmond and Crawford, 142). Rivet and Smith discuss in some detail the difficulties of interpretation and derivation involved in the names as they have survived in the sources. They argue in favour of the version provided by the Ravenna Cosmography and suggest that the name is composed of Coria in the sense of 'hosting place' or 'tribal centre' plus an ethnic name in the genitive dependent upon it (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 322-324), as in the case of the Curia Textoverdorum discussed above. The obvious version of the tribal name 'Lopocares' may indeed be the correct one but Rivet and Smith are not prepared to go further than invite conjecture on the basis of the alternatives '-stopitum' and 'Lopocarium'. Whatever the true version of the name

may be it does seem likely that a tribal group was centred on Corbridge in pre-Roman times and it is possible that the Roman-period settlement became a 'pagus centre' afterwards. If that is correct then this is a case of another community, probably a sept of the Brigantes, holding territory in the fertile and strategically important valley of the river Tyne.

Thus a half dozen or so ethnic names seem recoverable from the documentary sources. This does not, however, exhaust the possibilities of this class of evidence. Reference has already been made to the existence of hosting places or tribal centres both in pre-Roman and in Roman times. Place names provided by the ancient sources would seem to offer potential evidence for more such centres. Of these names, the most promising are those which incorporate the 'dunum' element. This element was used in Celtic terminology to mean 'fort', but being derived originally it appears from the word meaning 'hill' (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 274). There are at least sixteen names in Britain which employed the element and it is widespread on the Continent (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 274; Piggott, 1965, 173 map fig.95). '-dunum' also seems to have been taken into Latin and to have been freely used to create new names such as Branodunum for the Roman fort at Brancaster (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 274). Even so, '-dunum' names in a native context would quite naturally apply to hill forts prior to their transfer to Roman establishments.

Three such names, as mentioned previously, are supplied by Ptolemy, two of them indeed being included in his list of nine poleis attributable to the Brigantes. Of these, one that would seem to be a prime candidate for consideration as a pre-Roman stronghold is Rigodunum, meaning 'royal fort' (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 448). One might expect that such a place, could it be identified, would indicate the headquarters of a ruler of a sept at least, if not indeed of an entire major tribe. Another potentially important centre is Camulodunum, 'the fortress of Camulos' (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 295). Incorporating as it does the deity name, the stronghold may well have involved a combination of spiritual and political functions. The third '-dunum' name is, as has already been seen, one of Ptolemy's descriptive names referring to the east coast and is used uncompounded (Ptolemy, Geog., II, 3, 4; Rivet and Smith, 1979, 116). It must refer to a prominent site which was a landmark when viewed from a position out to sea. There may also be here an indication of the importance of the site by reason of its uncompounded use. Just as the inhabitants of a district nowadays often refer to the main urban centre, perhaps Newcastle, as 'the town', or as the ancient Romans referred to urbs, 'the city', meaning of course Rome itself, so the implication may here be that the 'dunum' in question was pre-eminent in its region.

Before proceeding further with consideration of other Ptolemy polis names in this search for centres two other

'-dunum' names obtained from other sources are worthy of mention. The first is Segedunum, which means something like 'strong fort' or 'victory fort' (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 452-3). Its identification with the Roman fort at Wallsend at the eastern end of Hadrian's Wall is securely fixed by the evidence of the Notitia Dignitatum (XL.33) combined with inscriptions from the site itself (RIB.1299-1301). Rivet and Smith would see the naming of the fort as a Roman naming process which involved the application of a Celtic name to a purely Roman establishment. By way of comparison they cite Durobrivae (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 453). Another similar case is that of Branodunum cited previously. However, there remains the possibility that the name came originally from a fortified native site. A possibility here is the headland at Tynemouth (Jobey, 1963). The second '-dunum' name in this pair under consideration is that of Uxelodunum (Rudge Cup:Uxēlodum; Amiens patera:Uxelodunum; Ravenna, 107, 28: Uxelludamo; Not.Dig.XL, 49: Axeloduno). It means 'high fort' but its identification is not as securely fixed as Segedunum; Rivet and Smith equate it with the Roman fort of Stanwix situated in the western half of Hadrian's Wall (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 483 and 221). Although they do not discuss it in this particular case, Rivet and Smith would seem by default to regard the naming process here as the same as that which they argue for Segedunum. Once more, however, a native predecessor is a possibility.

Proceeding now to the other names attributed as poleis to the Brigantes, these have already been listed but their meanings not yet discussed.

Of the four securely identified examples, Vinnovium (or Vinovia, Ant.It., 465, Ray.107, 13 etc.) is an unsolved problem with regard to derivation and meaning (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 504).

Caturactonium (Cataractonium, Ant.It., 465, 2 etc.) has been derived from the Latin cataracta meaning 'waterfall', 'rapids' with reference to the river Swale near Richmond (~~Williams and~~ Jackson, 1970, 70; Jackson, 1953, 409). This has been generally accepted but Rivet and Smith doubt if the process involving a Latin word provided the original basis for the name even if mistakenly accepted as such in later Roman times. They would prefer to see a British original for the name and they suggest '*Catu-ra(c)t-on-ion' which would have the sense of '(place of the) battle ramparts' (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 302-4). They suppose that, in the manner of Durobrivae, the name was applied directly to the Roman fort which preceded the town (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 304). As in the case of Segedunum, however, there remains the possibility of a native predecessor.

Isurium is the Latin version of the British '*Isurion' perhaps ultimately derived from a British name for the river Ure (Jackson, 1970a, 75). The meaning, however, is

unknown and, like Vinnovium above, nothing more could be said about it were it not for the testimony of the Antonine Itinerary. This, by providing the version 'Isubrigantum' (476,1 = Iter V) which clearly stands for 'Isurium Brigantum', shows that the place was not merely a polis of the Brigantes but also their civitas capital.

Eboracum (with its alternative form Eburacum) is, as already seen, to be identified with York. The Latin name was derived from a British form which can be interpreted either as 'place of the yew trees' or else as 'property of, estate of Eburos' (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 357). If the second version is correct, then it might be suggested that the Eburos in question could represent a leader or chieftain whose centre at York had preceded the Roman occupation. However, no less an authority than Jackson (1970a, 73-4) preferred the first version of the name's meaning and this weakens an already tentative suggestion.

Three names remain from Ptolemy's Brigantian list: Epiacum, Olicana and Calagum.

As already stated Rivet and Smith see the last as a corruption for the name '*Calacum', a latinised form of a British name derived from application to a river or stream and meaning 'noisy stream'. Such a descriptive name without additional evidence is not susceptible to an explanation involving a territorial centre. However, the first two do lend themselves to such an explanation:

Epiacum can be explained as meaning 'the place, or property of Eppius' whilst Olenacum (of which Olicana is thought to be a corruption) means 'estate of, property of someone called '*Olen''

Thus, of the twelve place names discussed, one was the tribal capital in Roman times at least but whether its name was applied to a Roman predecessor is unknown. Three sites were probably pre-Roman strongholds in elevated positions and two were possibly so. A seventh site was perhaps a lowland fortified position, and three were possibly centres of communities named after their leaders. Finally, two names are unhelpful and conclusions cannot be drawn from them.

CHAPTER THREE

LARGE FORTIFIED SITES

Hitherto in this discussion, emphasis has been laid on written evidence set against the geographical background and aided by philological interpretation. Reference to material remains has tended to be incidental. Documentary evidence, however, is incomplete and insufficient in itself. It will be necessary to appeal increasingly to archaeological evidence together with the findings of the palaeobotanists in order to supplement and expand evidence derived from documentary and epigraphic sources. Taking up the discussion postponed from Chapter 2, it will be appropriate too to consider in this context the whereabouts of Queen Cartimandua's headquarters whilst she was in charge of tribal affairs.

In looking for political centres, strongly fortified sites have an immediate claim for attention. Size in the sense of area enclosed would seem to be one factor calling for assessment. When comparison is made between Central Britain (embracing the postulated territory of the Brigantes and the Parisi) and Southern Britain, a stark contrast is immediately apparent. Central Britain has many fewer large sites. A glance at a map of Britain on which all sites exceeding 15 acres (6ha) in size are plotted, illustrates this effectively (fig.3.1). Some 150 sites over 15 acres occur south of a line drawn across

country from Humber to Mersey. A total of only eight such sites can be mustered within Central Britain. It will be convenient to list them as follows:

1. Mam Tor, near Castleton, Derbyshire (SK 128837).
2. Castle Hill, Almondbury, near Huddersfield, Yorks (SE 152140).
3. Barwick in Elmet, near Leeds, Yorkshire (SE 399376).
4. Roulston Scar, near Sutton Bank, Yorkshire (SE 514816).
5. Ingleborough Hill, near Ingleton, Yorkshire (SD 741747).
6. Warton Crag, near Carnforth, Lancashire (SD 492728).
7. Stanwick, near Richmond, Yorkshire (NZ 180115).
8. Burnswark, near Ecclefechan, Dumfries and Galloway (NY 185785).

Within this group, two stand out by reason of their much greater size. Roulston Scar, enclosing 53 acres (21ha) is comparable in this respect to such hillforts as Maiden Castle and Hod Hill in Dorset, covering 47 acres (19ha) and 54 acres (22ha) respectively. Stanwick, in its final form as interpreted by Sir Mortimer Wheeler (1954), enclosed some 850 acres (344ha) and consequently stands quite apart from the rest. Even Wheeler's phase II enclosure at Stanwick encloses a vast 130 acres (53 ha).

Phase I at Stanwick, however, enclosing 17 acres (7 ha) is comparable with the other large sites under consideration.

With size as the sole criterion these eight large sites might be seen as major centres exercising influence of some kind in their surrounding districts. With so few involved over such an extensive area they could even be regarded as regional capitals. That is to suppose, however, that they are all contemporary and possessing the same function. These and other factors need to be taken into account. Before looking at these aspects, however, it may be instructive to compare these and other sites not merely by their enclosed area of land but by considering what territory might theoretically be associated with each fort. Hogg has pointed out that this does not simply mean the actual extent of land but in his words, 'how many people that area could support'. He has suggested a formula employing figures based upon population densities of various parts of the country in AD 1100. The result enables objective comparisons to be made between one site and another (Hogg, 1971, 105-125). The results of calculations applying Hogg's formula to the eight sites under consideration together with two smaller sites are tabulated in figure 3.2. Three sites from the classic hill fort region of Wessex are added for outside comparison. The resulting radius may be regarded as merely an index figure for comparative purposes or as an approximation to a real quantity.

Not unexpectedly, two identically sized sites from the south of the region, Mam Tor, Derbyshire and Almondbury, Yorkshire are assigned the same radius, namely 3.6 miles (5.8Km). Yet Barwick in Elmet, only 12 miles (7.5Km) north-east of Almondbury and slightly smaller at 15 acres (6ha), has a larger radial number, namely 4.75 miles (7.6Km). If comparison is made with the similar sized sites of Ingleborough and Warton Crag, west of the Pennines, then it can be seen that their index figures are larger still. The Scottish site of Burnswark has by contrast a smaller index figure. When the very large sites are looked at they can be seen to have very big radii and this is not unexpected. If the radius does approximate to a real figure, however, then the results are startling: nine miles for Roulston Scar, 14 miles for Stanwick II and almost 37 miles for Stanwick III.

When the Dorset sites are brought in for comparison then a considerable contrast is observed. In the terms of these calculations Maiden Castle and Hod Hill are not to be compared with Roulston Scar but with Mam Tor and Almondbury. Poundbury at 15 acres (6ha) is not Barwick's equal, much less the equal of Warton Crag, but rather to be compared with Eston Nab, a site which at 3.25 acres (1.3ha) has not even been listed with the big-sites. Similarly it is interesting to note that at 5 acres (2ha) Carrock Fell in Cumbria is comparable to Burnswark listed among the big sites of Central Britain.

If it be objected with regard to this exercise that the calculations based on Hogg's formula take no account of variables such as function, then that is correct but no more does comparison by sheer size alone. Hogg's method does have the merit of attempting to achieve objective as opposed to intuitive comparisons. He realises the difficulties and dangers inherent in the calculations and in fact points out that other data need to be taken into account. If the present results have any value then the overall potential importance of the large sites of Central Britain is magnified and by the same token that of the smaller ones is enhanced. Thus superficially small sites such as Eston Nab and Carrock Fell may well qualify for consideration as important centres.

It would be tempting at this point to endeavour to relate this evidence derived from field archaeology to that obtained from the other sources already discussed. Richmond did this in suggesting that Camulodunum was to be identified with Castle Hill, Almondbury and Rigodunum with Ingleborough and that the former was the headquarters of Queen Cartimandua (1954b, 61). Wheeler (1954, 17-23) more ambitiously interwove documentary and archaeological evidence to relate Stanwick to the events of the late first century AD involving the conquest of the Brigantes by Petillius Cerialis and the defeat of the anti-Roman faction led by Cartimandua's rejected husband Venutius.

However, other factors need to be looked at before such a synthesis can be hazarded.

Besides size there are various other factors which might throw light on the part played by large fortified sites. The most important would seem to be situation, defensive capability, development, interior features, location and dating.

The situation of a fortification obviously has a bearing on defensive capability as do man-made defences. Elevated position might add to defensive capability but remove the site from close contact with its surroundings. This could indicate whether a stronghold functioned as a place of retreat or whether it was a means of control over the population. Situation also has a bearing on whether a site is likely to be intended for permanent or temporary occupation. An extremely elevated site, exposed to bad weather, might well be thought unsuitable for long-term stay.

Interior features too might offer guidance as to whether the site was occupied or what its function was otherwise. House positions or foundations of a religious structure are obvious clues but with regard to the former there remains the possibility of temporary occupation. Development of the site can be seen in two ways: first, additional lines of defence, which may indicate expansion (or contraction); second, changes in the nature of the

defences, which might suggest changes in fashion and so in period.

Location and situation are related concepts. In the present context, location is distinguished from situation in the sense that it has a broader implication, possessing what may be called a strategic dimension. A fortified site placed in a strategic location can control routes, whether by land or water, for military, political or commercial ends.

Finally, dating is vital to organise the information available in proper order so that valid deductions can be attempted. In the words of Renfrew, 'Dating is crucial to archaeology. Without a reliable chronology the past is chaotic ...' (Renfrew, 1973, 20).

Turning now to the eight sites under consideration and looking at situation, it can be seen that six of them occur in elevated positions with strong natural defences, supplemented by the hand of man. Two of them are very high: Mam Tor is situated at about 518m (1700ft) while Ingleborough is even higher at 723m (2373ft) O.D. Such heights raise the question of how permanent the interior occupation, evident at both, might have been. Clearly this is also dependent to a considerable extent on the climate prevailing at the time of occupation. It is in fact hard to envisage long-term occupation under normal circumstances in any climatic conditions prevailing in

this country during the last three milleniaⁿ (Lamb, 1981). That there was occupation of some kind, however, at the top of Ingleborough Hill is evident by the presence of a score of stone foundations of circular huts which can be identified on the ground (Raistrick, 1964, 27; HBM.C.SAM. N.Yorks 217). A short-term retreat or else seasonal occupation seems a likely explanation. Foundations for timber houses have also been reported (Challis and Harding, 1975, 123) suggesting that some chronological depth is present.

By contrast with the six elevated forts two of the eight sites are seen to occupy lowland situations. The two sites are Barwick in Elmet and Stanwick, both at about 91m (300ft) O.D. The first is placed on a spur of land overlooking the Rake Beck (Ramm, 1966, 555; 1980, 28; Radley, 1970). The second occupies undulating terrain but at its greatest extent it is so vast that it cannot be said to occupy any particular high ground although it includes in its compass the hill known as Henah Hill (Wheeler, 1954, Plates 2 and 29). Henah Hill must be regarded as a potentially strong point but recent excavations have failed to discover any fortifications on the top (Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1984, 40). Both Barwick and Stanwick, although low-lying, are provided with formidable defences, whether for protection or ostentatious show, which may indeed be in itself a means of protection as a result of the awe so engendered.

However, their comparative lack of natural defence, especially in the case of Stanwick, suggests that another reason for their location should be sought. Both control routes. Barwick is located between the rivers Wharfe and Aire at the eastern end of the Aire Gap. Thus it is in command of the cross-Pennine route travelling east-west and at the same time of the north-south route following the higher ground west of the Vale of York (Ramm, 1980, 31). The position of Stanwick in strategic terms has been well expounded by Wheeler. It is located at 'the natural focus of communications' (1954, 25, fig.6). Routes running north-south from Scotland down through the Vale of York and east-west across the Pennines, through the Stainmore Gap, converge hereabouts, nowadays at Scotch Corner. The two sites in question may well owe their importance to strategic considerations. Furthermore, they are both well-placed to exercise wide control over their respective regions, Barwick in the south and Stanwick in the north. The use of the word control perhaps implies military coercion but other motivations are possible, involving trade, peaceful communication and co-operation. In other words, the possibility of economic, political and even spiritual centres must be entertained.

The locations of the remaining sites are not as favourable from this point of view but their locations do suggest functions for them.

Burnswark is well placed to dominate its surrounding area and might well be thought of as a tribal centre. Warton Crag next to the coast at Morecambe Bay might have a role connected with water transport as well as controlling its hinterland. Roulston Scar and Mam Tor are neither in close contact with major routes and might be thought to have a more restricted role thereby. Both no doubt were gathering places for the folk around, the situation and extent of the former being perhaps indicative of connection with a pastoral economy for its extent would make it suitable for gathering flocks and herds. Of the two remaining sites in this series, Almondbury and Ingleborough, a role in control of routes seems very likely. Almondbury overlooks the route from York across the Pennines to Manchester. Ingleborough is located near the junction at Ingleton of the minor route over the Pennines from Wensleydale to the west, (followed later by the line of the Roman road from Bainbridge) with the route which penetrates the Pennines via the Aire Gap. The north-south route west of the Pennines is close at hand and indeed the line of the Roman road itself is only four miles west of Ingleton.

It should be emphasised that when control of routes is referred to, the question that arises is not one of the fortified sites actually overlooking and physically preventing passage. They are too elevated and remote from the routes for that in the context of ancient warfare. It

is rather a matter of the sites being used as bases from which control could be exercised by means of armed parties. Indeed, as suggested for Barwick and Stanwick, control might not so much involve actual military coercion as the opportunity for communication with others, thus widening the influence of the sites themselves.

None of the eight sites considered is as well placed for wide influence and control as Barwick and Stanwick. It could be that in some way these two were pre-eminent over the others. As Richmond pointed out in discussing the location of York (RCHM. York, 1962, xxix), a site such as York is in a key position for the control of the Brigantes, and indeed the Romans and others after them followed a similar policy in their choice of York as the military and administrative capital of the North. Instead of one controlling centre, however, there may earlier have been two with Barwick in Elmet being the capital, as it were, of southern Brigantia and Stanwick the capital of northern Brigantia. These are speculations based upon location and it is essential that other evidence be appealed to. None is more important than dating.

Unfortunately, there are no dates available for Barwick in Elmet and indeed hardly any other evidence. Some Roman coins have been found on the site (Ramm, 1980, 31) but this is totally inadequate for making any kind of assessment. As for Stanwick, Wheeler dated its fortified

phases as falling within the first century AD (1954, 17-18). Recent excavations have in general confirmed this conclusion whatever important differences of detail and interpretation might have emerged (Turnbull, 1984, 45). It will be necessary to return to a closer consideration of Stanwick later (see Chapter 9).

With regard to the other large fortified sites, radiocarbon dates are forthcoming for Almondbury, Burnswark and Mam Tor (Megaw and Simpson, 1979, 288 and 500; Challis and Harding, 1975, 118). The last phase of the defences at Almondbury yielded a date of 555 ± 100 b.c. (I-4542) whilst Burnswark's last stage of defences are dated to 525 ± 90 b.c. (I-5314). Mam Tor's dates come from hut positions in the interior; they are 1136 ± 115 b.c. and 1180 ± 132 b.c. These dates do not strictly speaking apply to the defences but in the absence of stratigraphy the excavator believed that there was a short occupation on the site and so perhaps a similar early dating for these would be acceptable.

The remaining three big sites are not provided with radiocarbon dates. Roulston Scar with its timber-framed rampart (Challis and Harding, 1975, 106) is perhaps best seen in an early context along with such a site as Dinorben which yielded a radiocarbon date of 895 ± 95 b.c. for its phase 1 timber-framed rampart (Challis and Harding, 1975, 105). Warton Crag and Ingleborough are undated. The former as a large multivallate hill fort

(Challis and Harding, 1975, 123) would more naturally fit in with the sequence of such sites within the first half of the first millennium BC. Ingleborough with its massive stone wall may be later. Richmond pointed to the interruptions in the wall's circuit and suggested slighting of the defences by the Romans (Collingwood and Richmond, 1969, 189). Roman coins and a sherd of Castor ware have been found on the hill-top (Challis and Harding, 1975, 123). Stone huts would also be acceptable in this context (cf. Forcegarth North in Teesdale) and timber huts even more so. However the evidence is slight. The walls could well have collapsed through weathering in such an exposed position and the presence of huts may indicate no more than re-occupation during the Roman period. More evidence is required to place Ingleborough confidently in its proper chronological position.

Thus it would seem that only Stanwick remains as certainly contemporary with the time of Cartimandua, Venutius and the Roman conquest. Those sites that are definitely and probably much earlier in date may indeed be regarded as strongholds of the proto-Brigantians but they are not relevant to the last period of Brigantian independence.

It may be appropriate at this point to consider briefly a problem postponed from earlier in this discussion, namely, the location of Cartimandua's headquarters. Almondbury no longer qualifies as a candidate for consideration. Not only is it far too early as has been seen but the coin

hoard supposedly found there containing British and Roman coins has been shown to have been falsely provenanced (Allen, 1963, 22-5) thus removing the basis for even a hint of possible slight occupation undetected by archaeology. Ingleborough if a late date for it were acceptable might qualify. Its identification by Richmond as Rigodunum, 'the royal fortress', would suit very well and its distance from London as given by Ptolemy is correct, namely 230 Roman miles (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 119, Table I), thus adding support to the suggestion. However, such a site as Ingleborough could equally well have been the power centre of Venutius or some other ruling figure not recorded in our sources. More suitable locations for control of Brigantia have been argued for above. Barwick is well placed and Ramm argues strongly in its favour (1980, 28-9), but as has been seen it is undated. Both Isurium Brigantum, the later civitas capital, and York are ideal but there is no evidence of later pre-Roman occupation for the former. A possibility is Catterick from which there is evidence of pre-Roman occupation (Challis and Harding 1975). This is given some support by the alternative interpretation of the name Caturactonium discussed above, namely, 'place of the battle ramparts'. However, another, more likely contender, has emerged in the form of Stanwick mainly as the result of recent excavations (Turnbull, 1984, 46-47). Evidence of very considerable Roman influence in the form of pre-Conquest fine wares and Roman roofing tiles

suggesting Roman-style buildings has been recovered. Wheeler suggested that Stanwick was the headquarters of the anti-Roman Venutius (1954, 23). The recent findings now suggest a situation more in keeping with the pro-Roman policy of Cartimandua (cf. Haselgrove, 1984, 21). Stanwick is in any case hardly a site that would be chosen by a leader of Venutius' ability, 'pre-eminent in military skill' (Tacitus, Ann. 12, 40), to make a stand against the Romans. It is far too difficult to defend. Venutius would be much more likely to retreat to some such stronghold as Ingleborough, which as has been pointed out is hardly suitable for permanent occupation but with massive fortifications supplementing its inaccessibility would be suitable as a temporary retreat and much more suitable than Stanwick for a 'last stand'. Be that as it may, Stanwick can now be seen as the strongest candidate to date for the headquarters of Queen Cartimandua. One additional point, admittedly tentative, may provoke further thought. The distance in Roman miles of Stanwick from London is about 215 miles which is only 15 miles short of the distance derived from Ptolemy for the location of Rigodunum (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 119, table 1). It is clear that Ptolemy's bearings are often wrong (Rivet and Smith, 1979, 118) and possible that just as Vinnovium was wrongly placed according to Ptolemy, so Rigodunum may be in the wrong position. Hitherto there has been no reason to question the general location of

this '-dunum' site. Now perhaps there is a case for considering whether Stanwick should in fact be regarded as 'the royal fortress' (see Chapter 9).

CHAPTER FOUR

RURAL SETTLEMENT: EASTERN LOWLANDS

Larger fortified sites of Central Britain have already received consideration and it is to other categories of settlement, including smaller fortified sites, that attention must now be turned. It is proposed in this chapter to deal with lowland areas east of the Pennines, excluding the Vale of Pickering, stretching from the river Tyne in the north to the river Aire in the south.

An overall survey of the settlements will be presented. Most of the sites are plotted on two maps (figs.1.3 and 1.4). Where available and appropriate detailed information and discussion are provided for individual settlements. For convenient handling of this material the following scheme is adopted. Those sites situated in the region between the Tyne and the Tees are marshalled into various categories of fortified site, curvilinear enclosure, rectilinear enclosure, unenclosed settlement and Roman villa. South of the river Tees these various types of site are noted as they occur within smaller districts which are dealt with in order working eastwards from the mouth of the Tees as far as the district around Stanwick Camp (NZ 184116), and then southwards as far as the river Aire.

Following the overall survey of sites the palynological evidence is briefly presented and discussed. It then

becomes possible to attempt an overall evaluation of settlement within the eastern lowland region chosen for detailed study.

Region between the rivers Tyne and Tees

Fortified sites

Within the Tyne-Tees region there are four sites whose recorded earthworks allow them to be called fortified. In internal area none of them is extensive. They range in size from 0.28ha (0.7ac) (Shackleton Beacon) to 0.81ha (2ac) (Maiden Castle). Thus they do not compare at all in size with the classic hill-fort sites of south-western England. In respect of size much closer parallels exist among the large numbers of fortified sites in Northumberland, including the half dozen or so occurring within the Tyne corridor yet to be discussed (Chapter 5).

The first of the Tyne-Tees fortified sites to be considered is that on Maiden Castle (NZ 282417) near Durham city. It occupies a steep-sided promontory 30m (100ft) above the river Wear. Only on the west does a level approach provide easy access and this is protected by a rampart and (formerly) a ditch. During investigations in 1956 Jarrett (1958, 124-7) found slighter traces of similar defence on both the north and south sides but these were not continuous. A section cut through the western rampart revealed three phases the earliest of which was a clay rampart revetted with cobbles

and over 3m (10ft) wide. On top of this were traces of an insubstantial palisade. The second phase was represented by a retaining wall of roughly dressed sandstone for which the clay rampart had been cut away. Phase three consisted of wooden stakes to support the wall which was bulging from the pressure caused by the clay rampart. These last two phases were assigned to the medieval period on the basis of a stone from the retaining wall bearing a medieval mason's mark. Potsherds found unstratified and assigned to the fifteenth or sixteenth centuries AD could, as Jarrett remarked, belong to the ~~same~~^{post-} medieval occupation of the site.

Searching for parallels Jarrett referred to medieval defended sites in Roxburgh mentioning especially the promontory fortification of Lintalee the interior of which was occupied in 1317. He concluded that Maiden Castle was probably a defended farm or manor site of this kind. However, this still leaves the first phase in the rampart construction which Jarrett conceded could be prehistoric, although he thought it unlikely. If this interpretation is correct, and on present evidence it seems incontrovertible, then Maiden Castle falls clearly into the medieval period at least with regard to its later occupation. Even so, the site is distinctly reminiscent of promontory fortifications of the later prehistoric periods and Steer (1938 quoted by Jarrett 1958) was quite right to compare it to such sites as Eston Nab and Boltby

Scar in Yorkshire. This, together with the doubt about the first phase in the fortification, would seem to leave the question of early occupation and initial fortification an open one. Further excavation of the defences and especially of the interior seems called for in an attempt to resolve the problem.

Stockley Beck Camp (NZ 185379), Brancepeth, is situated between two branches of the Stockley Beck on a low promontory all sides of which are fairly steep except that to the west. Here a mound and ditch protect the approach and similar defences exist on the southern side and were formerly to be seen on the northern side. Afforestation preceded by deep ploughing and followed by root action and erosion have damaged the site and made archaeological interpretation difficult as excavations conducted by Turnbull in 1978 demonstrated (Turnbull and Jones, 1978, 22). Sections across the western and southern mound showed that it had been built of yellow clay and this same yellow clay formed part of the ditch fill. This was interpreted as being back-filled from the mound but it does seem possible that it had been the result of erosion. No revetment of any kind was found connected with the mound. Unfortunately, neither samples suitable for radiocarbon dating nor datable artefacts were recovered to confirm the presumed Iron Age date of the enclosure.

Shackleton Beacon (NZ 229233), Redworth near Heighington is a small multivallate contour fort with an internal area

of about 0.28ha (0.7ac) (Turnbull and Jones, 1978, 141). It is heavily overgrown by trees and bushes and a windmill occupies a high point in the interior. The ramparts are denuded and ditches are not visible in the south-east quadrant where the single entrance seems to be situated. Elsewhere the inner mounds average only 0.9m (3ft) in height. No excavations have taken place on the site and consequently it has not been securely dated but judging by its general character it is most probably Iron Age in date.

The Castles (NZ 103331), South Bedburn is a trapezoidal enclosure just over one acre in area within. It is massively fortified with dry-stone rubble walls which average 4.9m (14ft) in thickness and which had an apparent original height of at least 3.3m (11ft). A single entrance occurs in the centre of the east side; inserted within the walling on the southern flank of this is a corbelled oval chamber (HBMC. SAM. Durham 13). Hodgkin's excavations (1936) revealed an outer ditch, 4.3m (14ft) wide at a distance of 7.3m (24ft) from the defensive wall. However, he found no traces of occupation within the interior. Thus, despite excavations, there is no clear dating evidence to place the Castles firmly within its proper period. Its general squarish form might suggest Roman origin or influence by analogy with Roman military architecture. It can hardly be considered to be a normal Roman fort in view of its single entrance and oval guard

chamber. Wooler (1922) suggested that its function was that of Roman penal establishment connected with lead production in Weardale but this theory has not been corroborated. E. Birley referring to it as 'an enigmatic structure' suggested that it belonged to the sub-Roman period (1954b, 223). This would seem to be the theory most favoured currently and despite the lack of direct evidence appears not at all unlikely. Even so, the claim of the Castles to be earlier in origin should not be entirely overlooked. Its guard chamber is reminiscent of the entrance to Rainsborough hillfort, Northants., which has a semi-circular guard room on either side of its entrance (Harding, 1974, 67). The Castles' guard-chamber also bears comparison with a similarly corbelled oval chamber to be found at the settlement site at Whitcliffe Scar (NZ 137019) in Swaledale. In addition, the Whitcliffe Scar example belongs to a massively fortified rectangular enclosure thus providing another point of comparison. A full description of the Whitcliffe settlement site is to be given later (see Chapter 6) but in anticipation it may be said that parts of it at least were occupied during the Roman period. Roman influence might be seen as operating in producing the rectangular shape of such sites as the Castles and Whitcliffe Scar. At the same time, the rectilinear form need be no barrier to acceptance of a pre-Roman origin bearing in mind the confirmed prehistoric origins of the site at West Brandon

in County Durham itself, to mention only the nearest example of several (see below).

A fifth site has not been able to be described here since all that is known about it is that it was a hillfort situated at Toft Hill, (NZ 1428), Bishop Auckland. Inspection on the ground is impossible since it has been completely destroyed by open-cast mining (Turnbull and Jones, 1978, 14).

Most of the remaining settlement sites in the Tyne-Tees region are known through aerial survey and it seems best to classify them broadly as curvilinear and rectilinear enclosures, noting variants, as well as unenclosed and villa sites. It does not seem meaningful to deal separately with D-shaped enclosures as a major category since such enclosures can fall into either the rectilinear or curvilinear classification.

Curvilinear enclosures.

There are several curvilinear enclosures to be considered and these display some variation. A single-ditched type can be identified at Hedley Hall West (NZ 217563) which has a rather irregular perimeter (McCord and Jobey, 1971, 26). At a site south of Coxhoe Hall (NZ 332356) (Air Photo, Selkirk) there are signs of what are apparently hut circles within the enclosure. The circles would appear to be overlapping in which case they would indicate hut replacements, perhaps extending over a considerable period

of time, as was the case with those at Burradon and West Hartburn, north of the Tyne (Jobey, 1970 and 1973a). At Woodwell House, Carrville (NZ 301454), besides traces of hut circles within the enclosure, there appear to be others outside and possibly a field system if the straight lines showing as crop marks are anything to go by (Aerial Photo, Selkirk). Haselgrove, however, has reservations with regard to this example and lists the field systems amongst sites possibly or certainly natural in origin (Haselgrove, 1982, 102). At Heugh (NZ 193431) is a small irregular enclosure with one hut-circle within (Jobey, 1962, 2, note 4). This site is only two miles north of the rectilinear site of West Brandon yet to be discussed. Another site with internal circle is at Mordon South Side (NZ 331258) (Haselgrove, 1982), while at North Lodge, Picktree (NZ 280537) a circular feature occurs outside the main rounded enclosure but close-by (Harding, 1979, 27). Further examples have been noted of sites with circular features enclosing small circles: these have been gleaned from vertical air photographs and therefore must be treated with caution, although worth noting as possibilities. They occur at sites near the following places: Cockfield (NZ 136239), West Auckland (NZ 179243), Bishop Auckland (NZ 186313) and Consett (NZ 116543) (SMR. Durham).

A variation to be noted is the 'banjo' enclosure, that is a circular enclosure which has two roughly parallel lines

leading away from the perimeter. The latter possibly represent droveways designed to herd animals into the enclosure to which they are attached. One example of such a site occurs at Esp Green Farm, Greencroft (NZ 147493) (Air Photo, Dur. Univ. neg.nos. 13/1, 2,3,4) and another near Chilton (NZ 293298) (SMR. Durham, NZ22 NE52).

A possible sub-group of the curvilinear enclosures is a small collection identified by Still and Vyner during aerial survey of the Tees Valley (1986, 13). Crop mark examples occur at Barmpton, near Darlington (NZ 321176) and Burnwood Bridge, Long Newton (NZ 3915). Other examples occur south of the river Tees and will be noted later.

Notice of curvilinear enclosure sites which occur in close proximity to rectilinear enclosures is best postponed until the rectilinear types have been dealt with.

Rectilinear enclosures.

A much greater number of rectilinear sites is known in the region than curvilinear types. Four which have been excavated require initial attention.

West Brandon, first identified from the air (Air Photo St. Joseph.DS/001,11.7.49) provides an important reference site for other similar examples in the same region. It is located west of Durham City and situated on a long sandstone ridge at 259m (850ft) O.D. The aerial view showed a sub-rectangular ditched enclosure of about

0.4ha (1ac) with a centrally-placed round house and with faint traces of two internal palisade trenches. Three occupation phases emerged from the excavations (Jobey, 1962) (fig.4.1). The earliest was a small timber hut 6.3m (21ft) in diameter with a central post and an off-centre hearth. This was outside the palisaded perimeter and partly undercut by the surrounding ditch and is therefore presumed to have been unenclosed, and perhaps late Bronze Age in cultural context. It is informative to note that this small hut did not show up on the aerial photograph. The second phase was House A, the first of two overlapping round houses within the enclosure. It was represented by four concentric rings of postholes and its overall diameter between the eaves was 17.4m (58ft). It was presumed that this first centrally-placed timber house was contemporary with the double-palisaded enclosure. This consisted of two palisade trenches 1.8m (6ft) apart and each about 50cm (20in) wide and deep. Post positions, about 23cm (9in) apart were indicated by the presence of stone slabs. The total area enclosed was about 0.3ha (0.75ac). The entrance was situated on the east and narrowed from 2.6m (8.5ft) on the outside to 2.1m (7ft) wide on the inside. The third occupation phase of the West Brandon site was House B, the second of the two central round houses. House B was the same size as its predecessor which it overlapped, but it had possessed a solid timber wall and a porch. An inner ring of ten posts and an inner square of four posts served as roof supports.

In the centre an area of burnt rock represented the hearth. It was presumed that House B was contemporary with the perimeter mound and ditch which replaced the double palisade. The ditch, 3-4m (10-13ft) wide at the top and narrowing to a flat bottom 0.6m (2ft) wide, followed only the general line of the palisades, and indeed its eastern entrance was not aligned with the earlier enclosure. Moreover, the width of this entrance was different for it was 4.9m (16ft) wide on the inside. Other structural features found within the enclosure area but outside the centrally placed houses were two bowl furnaces for iron smelting and pairs of postholes, possibly representing drying racks. A sterile area north of the central house position was thought possibly to have been a stockyard. Finds included coarse native-type pottery, saddle querns, rubbing stones and pounders and a stone disc.

With regard to economy and dating, the excavator suggested that the main site had been occupied by an individual family of farmers who, in view of the short growing season, concentrated on stock-rearing rather than extensive arable farming. He thought that the smelting they carried out was merely for their own requirements. Close dating was not possible but the presence of saddle querns pointed, he suggested, to the second or third centuries BC with an occupation lasting about one hundred years. It might be added that the absence of Roman

pottery is in keeping with this pre-Roman dating and suggests that occupation had ceased before Roman times.

Thorpe Thewles in the south-east of the region about five miles north-west of Stockton also appeared from the air as a sub-rectangular enclosure containing a large central round house. It is situated on the boulder clay at 61m (200ft) O.D. Excavations revealed at least three phases (Heslop, 1983). The first was in the form of field boundaries on a slightly different alignment to the ditched and banked rectangular enclosure which followed and seemed to have been fitted into the preceding system. This ditched enclosure, some 90m square with a gateway on the south, represented the second phase. Within this was placed the main round house which was surrounded by a ditch. This house 12.8m (42ft) in diameter was itself triple-phased, with a total life-span estimated at being from seventy to one hundred years. Its end came by fire but whether deliberate or accidental is uncertain. Close by this house were other smaller circular structures represented by grooves and gulleys which often overlapped showing successive building phases (Heslop, 1983, fig.8). These smaller structures were not all necessarily dwellings, and indeed the excavator suggests that they included ancillary buildings, such as byres, connected with farming activities. That some were dwellings, however, is implied by his description of the settlement during its third main phase, which came with the

dismantling of the bank and ditch perimeter; he refers to the settlement at this stage as akin to a village. This final phase then is one of an open, undefended settlement. The basic economy was that of farming, with stock raising and agriculture both playing a part. A final analysis of the faunal remains has not yet been published but preliminary observation indicates that the most numerous species was cattle, followed by sheep. Besides rotary quernstones, direct evidence for crops came in the form of carbonized grain and husks. Spelt wheat and six-row barley have been identified. The inhabitants of the site also produced coarse, hand-made pottery and there was indirect evidence for metal-working from slag found amongst the occupation debris. However, no pottery which could be assigned to the Roman period was found and it is suggested that the settlement was abandoned some time during the second half of the first century AD, before the Roman occupation of the north.

About ten miles north-west of Thorpe Thewles is the third site which has been excavated; this is West House, Coxhoe (NZ 326360). It is situated on the western edge of the Magnesian Limestone escarpment at 140m (450ft) O.D., close to the junction of boulder clay deposits and limestone outcrop. In area it is about 0.4ha (just under one acre). The excavations revealed a flat-bottomed ditch 2m (6.6ft) wide at the lip, marking the perimeter. Material in the ditch possibly came from an inner mound. Also found in

the ditch were animal bones, mainly cattle and sheep. The entrance to the enclosure was located on the eastern side; the gateway, marked by substantial postholes was 3m (10ft wide). Within the enclosure were the foundations of a centrally-placed house whose maximum diameter was 13m (42.5ft). Its entrance matched that of the main enclosure. Internal supports and partitions were indicated by apparently concentric gullies lengths and a circle of postholes, no doubt roof supports, just off-centre. Linear gullies for the most part seemed to belong to an earlier phase of activity on the site, possibly palisaded. Other features, such as apparent stakeholes, a rectilinear system of markings suggestive of a field-system and a curvilinear crop mark, all outside the main site, were on closer investigation found to be natural geological phenomena. In view of the erosion that has occurred on the site certainty is impossible but the site seems best interpreted as a single farmstead whose occupants were engaged in mixed farming. The animal bones found indicate stock rearing whilst a small but important sample of soil yielded evidence of cereal production, including wheat and barley. This evidence belongs to both phases of occupation on the site. As for the dating of this occupation, no radiocarbon determination was possible, but the excavators suggest that the second phase enclosure and circular structure belong to some time within the first centuries BC to AD. Fragments of a saddle quern seem to belong to the phase preceding this.

Lack of Roman pottery, despite the site's proximity to a Roman road, suggests that occupation had ceased before the Roman period (Haselgrove and Allon, 1982; Van der Veen and Haselgrove, 1983).

The fourth excavated rectilinear site to be noted is Strawberry Hill, Shadforth (NZ 339402) which is also located on the Magnesian Limestone escarpment, about three miles south-east of Durham City. It occupies a commanding hilltop position some 168m (550ft) O.D. and was first identified by aerial survey (Harding, neg.nos. 112/6-8; 113/5-8; 114/1-2). It appeared as a polygonal enclosure containing two circular features within measuring in diameter about 9m (29.5ft) and 15m (50ft) respectively. Outside, close to the west side, was another circle some 20m (66ft) in diameter. Besides these features a lattice-work system of markings appeared. The excavations that took place were strictly limited (Haselgrove, 1980) but were enough to show that the enclosure crop mark, as suspected, represented a ditch of which two phases were identified. It was 5m wide and cut more than 1m deep into the underlying boulder clay. Although no bank survived it was presumed that stones from the bottom of the ditch had formerly served as a revetment to bank material which had subsequently been ploughed away. No finds were made to aid dating nor were the circular features examined. However, an important conclusion was made with regard to the lattice system of crop marks, namely, that it did not

represent a field system but that it probably resulted from the natural fissuring of the underlying limestone. The results from the excavations and from surface inspection did not permit a close date to be assigned to the circular features and the polygonal enclosure. Thus no chronological refinement is possible beyond the conclusions that can be normally hazarded by analogy with other similar sites.

Of the remaining rectilinear sites in the region under consideration, not all are necessarily of the same type and period as those at West Brandon, Coxhoe or Thorpe Thewles. Some indeed may be Roman military sites and some may be post-Roman, but a native rather than a Roman origin seems likely for most of them, which, superficially at least, appear to be similar to the West Brandon example.

Those sites which, although rectilinear in outline, betray internal circular structures would seem to be prime candidates for inclusion in a prehistoric or native category. Not far from West Brandon itself an example of this kind occurs. At Brandon (NZ 234405) is a rectangular enclosure with a single entrance in the centre of one side; a possible hut circle can be detected towards the rear, a variation in this respect from West Brandon. Another eight or so similar sites have been identified by oblique aerial photography in the region whilst ten more rectilinear sites with interior circular features may be mentioned to supplement these. These latter have not been

obtained as the result of deliberate archaeological aerial survey but have been gleaned from vertical air photographs and are therefore less reliable for the present purposes. Six of these sites are situated in the vicinity of Cockfield, four lying to the north, between the rivers Gaunless and Wear and two lying to the south-east. Four more are situated further east near Heighington (SMR. Durham).

There remain a considerable number of sites, rectilinear in form but without the tell-tale internal circular crop marks. Most probably belong to the native tradition especially when they seem to be part of a grouping or cluster of similar sites. Such a cluster would appear to occur, for example, in the vicinity of West Brandon where five rectilinear sites are situated within about a one-mile radius. It will be necessary to return to this point later.

Neighbouring rectilinear and curvilinear enclosures.

Meanwhile it is necessary to turn to those instances where rectilinear and curvilinear sites occur in close proximity. The first example to be noted is that of Low Grange, Belmont, near Durham City (NZ 298448). Here the circular feature within the rectangle is so large as to arouse the suspicion that two different periods are involved. Which preceded the other is impossible to say although the circular site is fainter, which could indicate greater age but may be explicable in other terms.

At Woodham, near Newton Aycliffe, is a case where the square and circular crop marks would seem to overlap (NZ 291260) (fig.4.2). Careful inspection of the aerial photograph suggests that the curvilinear site succeeds the rectilinear one but without excavation there can be no certainty in this. Indeed, the suggestion has been made by Professor Harding that the reverse could be the case (Harding, 1979). However that may be, it seems likely that the Woodham sites exhibit successive occupation. Another possible dual-period complex occurs between Elstob and Merton Grange where a square site (NZ 345241) would appear to consist of a double palisade, most clearly seen at one corner. What may be interpreted as curvilinear enclosures and hut circles can also be detected but it is not clear whether these are enclosed by the square site or overlapped by it. At Croxdale (NZ 269369) a more complex system of crop marks has been noted (fig.4.3). Here three enclosures are evident. The smallest is circular, the next largest is sub-circular or D-shaped and the largest is an irregular curvilinear outline. Also present and most clearly seen around the small circular feature is an apparent rectilinear field system. Whether all of these features are contemporaneous or not is impossible to say but the apparent field boundaries seem to terminate at the perimeter of the large curvilinear structure thus suggesting that it was in existence when the fields were laid out.

Further west, on the edge of the upland zone is a series of sites on Cockfield Fell (NZ 120250). Here in the Pennine foothills at least five banked and ditched enclosures can be identified, and they are situated in close proximity (SMR. Durham; Roberts 1975, 48-50, Pl.4). One of these enclosures can be shown to be later than the others, probably nineteenth century in date. The remaining four seem likely to belong to the later prehistoric to Roman era. Three of them are rectilinear, whilst the fourth is curvilinear. In addition, a field system can be seen, surviving in fragmentary form, as well as an irregular linear ditch. These last may relate to one of the enclosures, a large rectangular one with entrance on the east and probable stone-built rampart. The sites at Cockfield Fell illustrate not only the phenomenon of close-by rectangular and curvilinear enclosures but also that of site cluster already referred to. In addition, the presence of one enclosure more strongly protected than its neighbours is to be noted.

Hitherto in this discussion, enclosed native sites have been under scrutiny but unenclosed sites fall outside this simple classification, as well as more Romanised establishments which may be described as villas.

Unenclosed sites.

In the region under immediate consideration, there are only three sites which may be assigned to the unenclosed native settlement category. The last phase of Thorpe

Thewles is one and it has already been dealt with. In addition, a likely candidate, identified by aerial survey, is located at Holborn Wood, near Brandon (NZ 193409) (Air Photo Durham Univ. neg.no. 9/7). Here, no enclosure, rectilinear or curvilinear, is to be seen on the aerial photograph but there is an apparent rectilinear field system which includes circular features, presumably house sites. No excavation has taken place on this site and thus no firm conclusions can be drawn about it. Furthermore, the possibility remains that the features observed from the air have been caused by natural geological processes. However, failing evidence to the contrary, it is tempting to accept Holborn Wood at least tentatively as an example of an open settlement. The third open settlement is at the extreme eastern side of the region at Catcote, Hartlepool (NZ 490315). Identified neither by aerial survey nor by fieldwork, the site was revealed unexpectedly in 1963 by bulldozers clearing the ground for school playing fields. The emergency excavations which followed in 1963 and 1964 established the presence of a settlement. This was located on a gentle hill-slope facing eastwards towards the sea and sited on well-drained subsoil of gravel and sand. The earliest features on the site were various shallow ditches or gullies. That some of these were connected with house or similar structures is probable not only by analogy but because one at least formed an almost complete circle. This would have served as the drainage ditch around a

structure some 7.5m (25ft) internal diameter. The entrance was on the east where a gap some 4m (13ft) wide was cobbled. No postholes, other than one at the entrance on one side, were recognised and the excavator suggested the use of turfs for walling. However, other solutions are possible including the obvious one that on such a disturbed site with a thin cover of soil the postholes had been removed prior to excavation. The conclusion was also drawn that since no internal hearth was found the structure could not be counted as a dwelling. However, it does not seem necessary to adhere too strictly to this criterion and the possibility of a house for human habitation must remain, without precluding alternative uses. Two further structures may be represented by a length of curving ditch and a hard clay floor. Within the first hut circle, but probably preceding it, was a large pit containing traces of burnt wickerwork and charred grain. Pottery from the pit suggested that it had been filled in by the middle of the first century AD.

Across the site ran a deep linear ditch, presumably serving as a boundary line of some sort. Its fill contained much Roman pottery, some native ware and animal bones. Fourth century AD material predominated indicating that it was not completely filled in until that period.

Other discoveries included an iron-working bowl furnace, a horse burial and two human burials. The two burials were found within the penannular hut area and so may be

presumed to be later being inserted after the hut had gone out of use. The horse burial was made in a neat square grave in the middle of a hollow on the hillside. The excavator suggested that it was medieval or later but it would not necessarily be out of place in an Iron Age context.

A considerable amount of pottery was recovered from the site both hand-made native and Roman including fine Gallo-Belgic wares imported into Britain during the first century AD. Occupation during the later Roman period was indicated by the presence of third and fourth century Roman coins. Other finds included a bone weaving comb and a number of spindle whorls, providing evidence for spinning and weaving, and fragments of quernstones, indicating the grinding of corn. Animal bones recovered comprised cattle, sheep, pig, horse and red deer in that order of abundance (Long, 1965, 1986; Challis and Harding, 1975; Hodgson, 1968).

Catcote is clearly a most important site for the period under discussion and further investigation both of the material already recovered and of the site itself would be highly desirable. This much seems clear, namely, that a settlement which started before the Roman occupation of the region, survived and continued to flourish into the Roman period; indeed it was still in existence in the fourth century AD. Although dogmatism would be unwise in view of unexplored parts of the site, on present available

evidence it does not appear that, despite Roman influence seen in the pottery for example, the settlement ever achieved the status of a Roman villa.

Only one villa site is known in the region north of the Tees, namely, at Old Durham, east of Durham City.

The Old Durham site was the subject of three rescue excavations between 1941 and 1951. It is located in a sheltered valley on a gravel river terrace providing good drainage but with a readily available water supply. The land is potentially good for farming. Only parts of a complex site were recovered but the identification of a small non-military type bath-house together with circular floors interpreted as designed for threshing corn suggests the fact that a villa is in question. Traces of other structures were found in the form of debris and trenches. Occupation of the site extended from at least the early second century AD to the fourth century AD. A ditch which presumably served as a boundary was dated by pottery in its primary silt to the early second century. It is possible that this ditch surrounded a native-style establishment and a further hint of such a connection is seen in the hand-made cooking pot of native ware also found in the bottom of the ditch. The excavators reporting in 1943 pointed to the sites at Langton and Rudston in east Yorkshire as possible parallels. Salway however, writing in 1965, emphasised that the ditch could just as easily be the boundary of a purely Roman type

site, namely, a villa as of a native homestead. The native pottery in itself was not enough to prove non-Roman settlement (Richmond et al, 1944; Wright and Gillam, 1951; ibid. 1953; Salway, 1967).

Region south of the river Tees

Looking first at the north-east of the region (fig.1.3), in the area between the Tees on the north and the Cleveland Hills on the south, the first site to note is the hill fort of Eston Nab on the Eston Hills. Although strictly speaking part of the uplands of north-east Yorkshire, not chosen for detailed study here, the Eston Hills form an isolated outlier of the main system. They rise up to 183m (600ft) and more to dominate the flatlands of the lower Tees Valley below. Consequently, they are included in the present discussion.

Eston Nab (NZ 568183) occupies the highest position on the Eston Hills at 229m (750ft) O.D. A semi-circular fortification on the edge of a cliff encloses an area of some 1.3ha (3.25ac). The fortification consists of a rampart varying in height from 2.7m to 4.3m (9ft to 14ft), with an outer ditch 1.5m to 2.4m (5ft to 8ft) deep (Elgee, 1930, 154).

In 1927 to 1929 Elgee carried out excavations at the site which yielded material including pottery assignable to the Bronze Age. He reported the finding of cremations and hearths together with pieces of calcined human bone and

concluded that the site had been the scene of burial ritual. He also suggested that these activities took place prior to the erection of the fortifications (Elgee, 1930, 154-156).

In 1966 to 1967 excavations by Aberg elucidated the site further. The rampart was revealed as a clay dump 4.9m (16ft) wide backed by a drystone wall 4.3m (14ft) thick. Beneath and within the rampart was found pottery classified by Aberg as Iron Age but by Challis and Harding as Late Bronze Age assignable to the seventh or sixth century BC. In addition, a palisade trench about 0.3m (1ft) deep was uncovered by Aberg some 46m (150ft) inside the visible rampart (Aberg, 1968, 111; 1969, 241). Challis and Harding suggested that this trench was the feature interpreted by Elgee as a series of hearths (Challis and Harding, 1975, 101).

On the basis of these findings the enclosure sequence at Eston Nab is susceptible to the following interpretation. Initially, a stockade of timber was erected. Later, some 46m beyond the line of the stockade, a drystone wall was built and lastly, this was supplemented by a dump rampart and outer ditch. As for dating, it seems clear that the original fortification of the site belongs to the late Bronze Age. The later fortification, however, that is the wall, and the rampart and ditch, is in effect undated.

With regard to the function of the Eston Nab fort Elgee

argued that the enclosure was rather a 'refuge in time of war' than a settlement site since no huts were found in the interior. That it was not a settlement is the view taken by Spratt who points out that it must have been the work of 'many hundreds of people' and that the builders must have lived in the surrounding area (1979, 12). At the same time, as he points out, the small size of the enclosure militates against its being a place of refuge. As an alternative explanation he tentatively suggests a 'command station' serving as a rallying point and a signal post (Spratt, 1982, 202). It should be pointed out, however, that the excavations at Eston Nab have been limited. Open area excavations could yet reveal the postholes and gullies of timber-built huts. In that event it would be easier to explain Eston Nab as a centre of power with more importance than its relatively small size might suggest (cf. Chapter 3, fig.3.2). Be that as it may, aerial survey has revealed several presumed occupation sites both in the vicinity of Eston Nab and in the wider area of the Tees lowlands.

In the Eston Hills at Harrison's Plantation (NZ 578178) was recognised a circular ditched enclosure measuring 15m (50ft) in diameter. Within was a circle 6m (20ft) in diameter. Further investigation on the ground revealed a probable palisade trench 25cm (10in) deep and 50cm (20in) wide (Spratt, 1971, 192; Challis and Harding, 1975, Pt.2, fig.93, no.23). Surface finds comprised a rubbing stone

and several worked flints. Such a site may be interpreted as a timber hut and drainage ditch. At Upsall (NZ 557164) was another circular feature 12m (40ft) in overall diameter. To the west of the circle 12m (40ft) were two parallel ditches, approximately 6m (20ft) apart, aligned north-south and 46m (150ft) long. From the surface came two fragments of rubbing stones, eight pot boilers, burnt sandstone and calcined flint (Spratt, 1971, 192). This may be interpreted as the site of another hut with a lane nearby. At Guisborough Park (NZ 597171) two circles 12m (40ft) in diameter have been noted contained within a heart-shaped ditched enclosure 61m (200ft) across. From the ground surface was obtained a large fragment of a well-worn saddle quern made of the local sandstone (Spratt, 1971, 192). None of these sites is dated but Spratt compared them to the late Iron Age settlement site at Percy Rigg (NZ 610115). This may be described as a hut cluster with attached rectangular field (Close, 1972).

Rectangular enclosures are also known. At Barnaby Side (NZ 573168) are a pair of conjoined rectangular enclosures. The larger of the two is approximately 70m by 50m (230ft by 164ft). Attached to this is a smaller enclosure 30m by 20m (98ft by 68ft) from which a boundary ditch runs off to the north-west (Spratt, 1975, 11). The Barnaby Side site is perhaps explicable as a settlement enclosure of the type now well attested in lowland Durham but with an annexe and with traces of a field system



beyond. At a lower elevation than these sites on the Eston Hills, which are all above 160m (525ft) O.D., are crop mark sites observed in the vicinity of Stokesley. At North Tanton Farm (NZ 527113) and Tanton (NZ 519108) are rectilinear enclosures (Brown 1978, 7) which may be presumed to be ditch-enclosed settlement sites although internal features are not recognisable. Further west at Crathorne (NZ 450076) is a double-ditched example (Brown 1978, 19). A more complex site near Stokesley (NZ 5308) displays a series of multiple rectilinear divisions with smaller rectilinear and curvilinear features among them (Still and Vyner, 1986, fig.9). There would seem here to be part of a planned system of fields with circular and rectangular structures amongst them and a main trackway or lane with subsidiary lane present too. Such a site as this would appear to be open settlement and a similar collection of crop markings at Croft (NZ 283096) lower still at 40m (130ft) O.D. next to the Tees itself, indicates the same thing (Still and Vyner, 1984, 19). Further downriver at Quarry House, Ingleby Barwick (NZ 437151) a similar system of rectilinear fields has been recognised (Spratt, 1975, 11). This has been the subject of further study including selective excavation by Heslop (1984, 23-34). By closer inspection of an aerial photograph taken by Professor D.W. Harding, Heslop was able to differentiate between two groups of field system. The first involved a sub-rectangular enclosure and rather irregular enclosures or fields, the second set, much more

rectilinear, appeared to sub-divide similar-sized fields and to be on a slightly different alignment. It appeared that the second set of arrangements embraced and extended the first one. The latter were assigned to later Iron Age and the former to Romano-British contexts. The excavations did not examine the sub-rectangular enclosures which by analogy with others in the region may be presumed to have been a settlement site, but instead investigated other parts of the revealed crop marks. These proved to be ditches of various kinds which probably represent two types of field boundary, the first involving hedgerows and assigned to a late Iron Age context, and the second, involving timber fences and placed in a Romano-British context. Pottery produced from the excavations suggested that occupation in the vicinity had lasted from the late Iron Age until the fourth century AD.

Other sites identified on the basis of finds are more enigmatic. Normanby on the edge of the Eston Hills, yielded from an ancient 'refuse heap' various sea shells, bones of oxen, sheep and pigs as well as querns, part of a jet ring and pottery including one fragment of Samian ware (Clark, 1935, 112 citing Atkinson, *Hist. of Cleveland*, 1874, 42-3). Atkinson considered the find to be pre-Roman, regarding the Samian ware as a stray, whilst Elgee (1923, 13) considered it Romano-British. As Clark points out, Atkinson's description of the coarse pottery as 'of a black cast when broken' fits calcite-gritted ware. That

and the presence of the Samian fragment tips the balance in favour of Romano-British attribution. Whether the find belongs to a rural or urban context is, however, uncertain and if the former, whether peasant or more Romanised equally uncertain. Whorlton (NZ 482024) has also produced material without proper identification of an occupation site but in this case there is no doubt about the fact that objects of Roman period are involved. A hoard of silver coins and ornaments was found on the side of Whorl Hill as well as Roman period pottery of the second and third centuries in the extension to the churchyard (Clark, 1935, 139-40; Elgee, 1923, 8-9). A ditch found during excavations by R. Inman near the churchyard in 1977 also yielded Roman pottery, including fourth century ware. The ditch only measured 0.8m wide by 0.2m deep and was traced for 42m (Inman 1978, 10). This is not a fort ditch and seems likely to belong to a rural settlement, perhaps representing a field boundary. Spratt lists several more locations from which various finds including pottery sherds would seem to indicate the former presence of pre-Roman and Roman period settlements. Most of this material is unpublished and it is difficult to draw conclusions from such incomplete evidence (Spratt, 1982, Tables 31 and 33.2).

In the north-west of the region, within the district between the Tees and Scotch Corner, more than a score of sites are known, mainly through aerial survey (fig.1.3).

These comprise both ditched rectilinear enclosures and curvilinear examples and include the villa site of Holme House 1 (NZ 221152) near Piercebridge.

The villa of Holme House was first discovered from the air when it showed as a sub-rectangular ditched enclosure measuring some 90m by 80m (295ft by 262ft) with traces of a central circular structure and of rectangular buildings within. A track marked by flanking ditches approached its single entrance from the east. Before excavation Salway suggested that the site was either that of a villa or of a temple (Salway, 1967, 147-8). The site was excavated in 1969 and 1970 (Harding, 1984).

Excavation revealed that the perimeter ditch was shallow, on average 1.07m deep, indicating that it must have functioned as a protective and delimiting feature rather than as a defensive one. It represented in fact a replacement of an earlier inner ditch. From its upper fill it yielded three Samian sherds belonging to the date bracket AD 70-100, indicating that it was virtually obsolete by that period. The excavator indeed points to the cumulative evidence to suggest a pre-Roman context for both phases of the enclosure ditch.

The rectangular structures seen from the air did indeed prove to be a Roman-style dwelling. This had two phases. The first phase was in the form of a simple rectangular house or cottage measuring 18m by 7.5m (50ft by 25ft) and

consisted of four rooms with a veranda. The second phase was an extension of this at each end, a bath-suite on the north and an apsidal suite, probably a dining room and reception room, on the south. At its northern end the extension overlay the perimeter ditch. The bath-suite had patterned floors and painted plaster walls whilst the apsidal suite contained two heated rooms with painted walls but plain flagstone floors. As for dating there was no independent evidence for the villa in its cottage phase. Its late first-century date is inferred from its sequential relationship with the subsequent second-century enlargements. Dating for the extension phase mainly depended upon Samian ware from inside the buildings assignable to the mid- and late-second century. Thus the enlargement occurred in the mid-second and occupation ceased by the end of the second century.

The central circular structure measured 15m (49ft) overall and had roughly dressed unmortared stone walls 1m (3.3ft) wide set on cobbled foundations. The entrance was on the south-west. A chord wall serving as a revetment for a raised platform or dais occurred on the west side of the interior. Since it is not bonded in with the main wall it is taken to be a later modification though of course this might merely be the mode of construction employed. At the centre of the circle were four large post pits making a 4m (13ft) square. By analogy with the Iron Age round house at Little Woodbury in Wiltshire these pits were

interpreted as being intended for roof supports (Bersu, 1940; Harding, 1974, fig.9). Thus this central circular building may be interpreted as a round house in the Iron Age tradition. Even so it is subsequent in date to the phase 1 villa for it interrupted a water channel leading to the cottage villa of that phase. Coin and pottery evidence enable it to be assigned to the second century, contemporary with phase 2 of the villa.

The central round house, however, built in stone was only the final phase of a series of at least three major phases of construction on the same location and one phase of abandonment apart from the presence of the water channel supplying the phase 1 villa. The two previous circular buildings on the site had been constructed of timber. The earliest, represented by a circle of postholes and a four-post porch, was comparable in size to the Little Woodbury-Pimperne class of round house found in southern Britain (cf. Harding, 1974, 38-40). Probably the next structure was a timber hut with its perimeter set in a ring-groove and its roof supported by six posts arranged in a circle of some 9 to 10m (30-33ft) in diameter. There is no close dating for these earlier timber structures but taking account of the building phases and various episodes of reconstruction within those phases Professor Harding has suggested that an initial date in the middle or late Iron Age would not be unreasonable.

Other aspects of the Holme House site to be recorded are the enclosure wall around the buildings instead of a ditch, foundations to the west interpreted as intended for paddocks and gardens, and a well next to the bath-house, on the west side, discovered during quarrying operations in 1980. This well yielded material dated to the second century AD. It is thought to have been filled in when the bath-house was dismantled in about AD 200 along with the rest of the villa. Animal bones from the well comprised sheep, pig, ox and chicken.

There is no sign of burning or of an otherwise violent end to the settlement and it is supposed that it was merely abandoned or more probably deliberately dismantled. As already observed, this occurred by the end of the second century AD. Threat of flooding from the wayward Tees would have been sufficient reason for such action. There is no need to suppose an abandonment of the villa estate as a whole but merely a transfer of the dwelling house to higher ground nearby. By the fourth century there was some re-use of the site in the south-east corner of the enclosure as exploratory excavation showed but enough work was not carried out to illuminate this phase of activity.

Thus at Holme House it would appear that a pre-Roman indigenous settlement with its own relatively long history was succeeded by a Roman villa of modest proportions towards the close of the first century AD. The scheme of rectilinear enclosure with central timber house is very

much in the traditions of native farmstead typified at West Brandon as described earlier. The villa underwent elaboration during the course of the second century to become a comfortable and well-appointed although not luxurious dwelling. Yet even while the extended villa was in existence a round house in native style was erected on the site of the former timber structures in the centre of the site.

Roman influence is clear in the form of the villa yet the round house shows adherence to the indigenous custom and strongly suggests native ownership. At the same time, the Roman villa must be regarded as the main dwelling house and it may be that the round house was used by servants and retainers.

The story revealed by the various structures on the site would seem best interpreted as one of native occupation and ownership continuous from pre-Roman into Roman times. There is little direct evidence concerning the economic basis of the settlement in either its pre-Roman or its Roman periods. The animal bones from the well illustrate the food eaten by folk on site, whether from round house or villa is unclear, during the later second century and presumably obtained from home-bred stock. Of grain produce, of which evidence might well have been expected, there is no clue nor is there much indication of the size of the estate of which the villa may be presumed to have been the centre. However, it seems fair to argue that the

rapid Romanisation after the Roman pacification of the region points to a successful economic strategy. As Harding has pointed out, Holme House was well situated to exploit the important crossing place over the Tees in the vicinity of Piercebridge where the Roman road Dere Street made its way north. There is as yet no proof of an early Roman garrison hereabouts but its existence is almost obligatory. In any case, early second century civilian settlement is known in the Tofts Field to the east of Piercebridge village (Scott, 1977, 4). In other words, a ready market for farm produce would be available as well as perhaps a labour force. This in itself might well be enough to ensure prosperity for the Holme House villa. Another possible contributory factor to its economic success is the presence of the Tees itself, which would provide a means of cheap transport with the possibility of commercial connections much further afield.

Among other sites in the vicinity, a curvilinear enclosure has been recorded close by Holme House villa. Another similar pair of curvilinear and rectilinear sites is found at Barforth (NZ 173162) on the south bank of the Tees. A third curvilinear site is known from the Tofts field, Stanwick (NZ 184117). It is oval and has circular features inside (Haselgrove, 1982, 101). This is interesting in that it is located within the famous fortifications. Of the rectilinear enclosures, some have internal features thus marking them out as probable

habitation sites. An example at Gatherly Moor (NZ 185066) has a circular feature within and linear earthworks attached. Another, at Street House, Manfield (NZ 215138) has three circular features inside and a linear feature attached (Haselgrove, 1982, 100). Brettanby Farm (NZ 230106) contains a large circle and appears to be double-ditched (Dur. Univ. slide no.595). Gatherly Moor would appear to have a palisaded phase (Haselgrove, 1982, 98). Without known internal features, but worth special mention because of its size and character, is Cockshott Camp, Wycliffe near Ovington (NZ 125146). It is a semi-circular promontory enclosure taking in about 1.6ha (4ac) and is recognisable on the ground (MacLauchlan^a, 1849, 340; Elgee and Elgee, 1933, 252). It was dismissed perfunctorily by Wheeler (1954, 18, footnote) but its position overlooking the steep southern bank of the Tees and the remains of its ditch and ramparts show that it was nevertheless quite defensible. Still and Vyner classify this site along with other D-shaped curvilinear enclosures which they suggest have a separate significance. Examples north of the Tees have already been mentioned. Others south of the Tees are Black Scar, Gainford (NZ 174163), Petticoat Bottom, Cliffe (NZ 195145) and Swine Lairs, Manfield (NZ 238143).

South of Scotch Corner at Catterick a curvilinear enclosure is known on the same site as a rectilinear one (SE 232987). Excavations by Brewster showed that the curvilinear one succeeded the other which at 30m (100ft)

long was the smaller of the two. Both had been surrounded by palisades. The rectilinear enclosure had its entrance at one corner and contained at least one hut possibly with two extensions. Its successor contained an oval hut with circular extension, a smaller circular structure whose foundations were represented by a set of slots and, in the centre of the site, a four-post structure measuring 2.4m (8ft) across. Pottery recovered was comparable to that from Staple Howe and therefore the Catterick sites are dated to a period within the sixth to fifth centuries BC. A further complication at Catterick is the presence of a ring-post hut of 6m (20ft) diameter, which preceded the rectangular enclosure (Challis and Harding, 1975, 132). Whether alone or part of a settlement where the houses are somewhat dispersed, it is tempting to see this early phase as unenclosed.

Before moving further south the find of a Romano-British burial in an uninscribed stone coffin at Uckerby (NZ 2402) should be noted (Thubron, 1975, 4). This and a scatter of Romano-British pottery sherds in the vicinity suggests the presence of a Romanised occupation site such as a villa, even though no buildings have as yet been found.

South of Bedale several rectilinear enclosures varying in size from 0.5 acre to 0.75 acre (0.2ha - 0.3ha) have been recorded by Riley (1975, 13) during air survey in the vicinity of the known villa site at Well (Elgee and Elgee, 1933, 166 and 251; Gilyard-Beer, 1951).

The Romano-British site at Well occupies the narrow valley of the Well beck amidst good farming land on the west side of the Vale of Mowbray. Re-excavation of the site produced no certain evidence for pre-Roman occupation but revealed a wingless corridor house which had possessed tessellated pavements. Even so, in the parts examined there were no heating arrangements. The house had been built in the latter part of the second century AD and lasted until the latter part of the fourth century AD when it fell into ruin. Besides the dwelling house other structures were identified including a hot bath and a plunge bath. The plunge bath seemed too grandiose for the other unpretentious buildings on site leading Gilyard-Beer to question the conventional interpretation of Well as the site of a villa. Although with reservations, he argued for its role as a small spa or shrine of a water-deity. However, failing evidence for the presence of a shrine and associated offerings, it seems best to retain the view that the site at Well was in fact that of a Roman villa.

Among the enclosures near Well is another probable villa at Snape (SE 266847) which shows up as a square building with interior divisions surrounded by a ditched enclosure with rectilinear field boundaries around (Riley, 1977, 29; Branigan, 1980, fig.3.3). Branigan has remarked that Snape villa is unusual in form and has its nearest parallels in Gaul. He has accordingly suggested that its owner was very likely to have been a retired soldier

(1980, 22). Nothing is to be seen on the ground apart from the hint of a ditch in the field in which the site is located (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.1224). More field boundaries together with several curving lanes are recorded some three miles east of Well villa (Riley, 1977). South of Well, no more than four miles distant, is the villa of Castle Dikes, North Stainley (Elgee and Elgee, 1933, 158 and 257; Lucis, 1875). In the vicinity, Riley has noted rectilinear enclosures at North Stainley (SE 299764) and Wath (SE 309766). The latter had a lane attached (Riley, 1977, 29).

At Castle Dikes (SE 2975) a rectilinear area of some 5.5 acres (2.2ha) is enclosed on three sides by a double bank and deep medial ditch. The north side is flanked by a marshy area and the Lightwater stream. Gaps in the east and south sides presumably represent entrances (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.104).

From the evidence of the nineteenth century excavations Scott (1973) has conjectured the former existence within the enclosure of a large courtyard villa with an open veranda. Occupation of the villa, certain for the third century AD, probably began in the late second century AD and extended until the fourth century.

There are two likely explanations for the massive perimeter earthworks. The first is that they represent a drainage ditch to be associated in function and date with

the Roman villa. The second one is that they were the fortifications of a native-style settlement preceding the establishment of the villa. Scott favours the latter explanation citing in support the re-interpretation of the Langton villa in East Yorkshire (Webster, 1969, 248). It is tempting to agree with this conclusion which seems to be reinforced by the discovery of additional rectilinear sites since Scott wrote his account. Only excavation, however, can elucidate the problem and Castle Dikes would seem to be a prime candidate for further investigation.

Nearer Ripon, is one of the few curvilinear enclosures noted - at Marrow Flatts Farm, Hutton Conyers (SE 361726). Another more irregular example, occurs four miles north-east of Harrogate at Walkingham Hill with Occaney (SE 348615). In the latter case earthworks still survive and nearby crop marks reveal former field systems (Riley, 1977, 29).

South of Boroughbridge is the location of the site of Grafton Hills (SE 420631) which has been the subject of excavation. Only remnants survived quarrying operations and no huts were found but evidence was recovered of probable enclosure by palisades and occupation which yielded pottery as well as bones of ox, horse, pig and sheep (or goat). Two bronze objects were also found: a pair of tweezers and a fragment of a bronze armlet (Waterman et al., 1955, 383-97). This metalwork and the finger-tipped pottery exhibit the same mixture of native

tradition and Hallstatt influence as to be seen in material for example from Staple Howe (Challis and Harding, 1975, 45 and 49) and Grafton is to be assigned to the same period, that is, the sixth or fifth centuries BC.

York itself, despite its potentially important strategic position, has produced no direct evidence for Iron Age settlement. However, Radley (1974, 12-13) has pointed to its Celtic name and to two finds from the area of the present railway station to support the argument for such settlement. The first of these finds consists of several contracted burials from below Roman-period burials (RCHM. York 85b, area f(vi)). The second is the enamelled bronze belt-plate probably from the same area and dated by Fox to around AD 70 (1958, 119, pl.52; MacGregor, 1976, no.37). The site itself would have provided a broad, well-drained area of cultivable land suitable for a small agricultural settlement. The paucity of Iron Age objects from the area can be explained on the grounds that they would have been easily overlooked by those clearing the site in the 1870s, especially in view of the wealth of Roman remains that came to light at the time. As a further fragment of evidence for Iron Age occupation, Radley cites the cross-dyke surviving as Green Dyke Lane which would have controlled the route following the morainic ridge across the Vale of York (1974, 13).

In the immediate vicinity of York, too, there is little else of the period to refer to. Within a five-mile (8km)

radius of the city, very few sites have been identified. At Lingcroft Farm an enclosure with field system has upon excavation produced hand-made pottery but nothing of the Roman period, a fact which encourages its excavator, R.F.J. Jones, to suggest its pre-Roman origin (Jones, 1984, 40). East of York, near Dunnington, air survey has revealed three rectangular enclosures with rectilinear field systems, as yet undated (Riley, 1975, 14). To the north-east of the city, just beyond the five-mile radius, a single curvilinear site is known at Strensall. Here at Howard Road (SE 638595) is a double ditched enclosure with another enclosure within (Challis and Harding, 1975, pt.2, fig.93, no.58; YAJ, 1967, 7). A ten mile (16km) scan brings in a few more sites which have been revealed by aerial survey but these seem to belong to other systems and groupings which extend further away from and not towards York.

To the east of York, near Stamford Bridge, is a rectangular enclosure and some two miles south of this, near Wilberfoss are field boundaries apparently connected by a branch road to the Roman road from York to Brough (Riley, 1977, 28). Other sites similar to these are to be found between the Derwent and the foot of the Wolds on the east and those within ten miles of York must represent the westernmost extension of such settlements. South of York, in the vicinity of Skipwith and Riccall, many crop marks have been recorded. Here in the region between the

Derwent and the Ouse, immediately south-west of Adamson's Farm is a large complex of adjacent rectangular enclosures (SE 645379) one of which contains a circle, presumably a hut. Another rectangular enclosure, measuring about 1000 sq.m., also with internal circle, of about 14m diameter, is recorded about one mile distant (SE 658391). In addition a rectangular system of fields occurs nearby (Riley, 1977, 27). Field walking at a Riccall location (SE 629374) produced pottery of Romano-British type but also medieval pottery. However, a small excavation of a probable ditch section yielded Roman pottery, including Samian Ware, ranging from the second to the fourth century AD (Thackrah 1976, 4). Further south an apparently well-planned settlement site occurs near Cliffe (SE 684327) where there is a complicated series of adjacent rectangles, several of which contain the tell-tale interior circle, representing no doubt the sites of houses (Riley, 1977, 27).

On the western side of York, near the perimeter of the ten-mile radius are four villa sites, certain or probable, namely, Kirkby Wharfe, Cawood, Newton Kyme and Cave Road (Branigan, 1980, fig.3.1). In addition the ten-mile sweep just clips the edge of a complex field system south of Newton Kyme and west of Tadcaster (Ramm, 1980, fig.4.4). This system continues westward and would seem to bear little direct relationship with York. The Tadcaster-Newton Kyme system is only one example of many more

widespread traces of early settlement which have been revealed mainly by aerial survey. A considerable number of enclosures, mostly rectilinear, as well as field systems often in association, have been recorded in the tract of land extending between Wetherby and Pontefract and indeed beyond, southwards. These sites, being mainly crop marks, are for the most part undated but limited excavation and fieldwork have provided some chronological depth together with other important information. It will be necessary, therefore, to consider two sites which have been the subject of excavation, namely, Ledston and Dalton Parlours, before considering further the results of other work.

The Ledston site is located north of the village of Ledston in undulating farmland on the Magnesian Limestone belt (SE 436305-434295). It was discovered by Riley during air reconnaissance in 1975 (Riley, 1976, 14, fig.1). The aerial photograph shows several small enclosures, parts of fields and a group of apparent pits; converging on these pits are three lanes (Riley, 1977, 22, fig.4A). Excavation by the West Yorkshire County Archaeological Unit took place in 1976 (Keighley, 1981, 119-20). The area chosen for investigation was at the place where the pits existed and an area measuring 80m by 20m was uncovered. A concentration of actual pits was shown to exist, generally sub-rectangular in shape, with flat bottoms and steep sides. Dimensions were 1.5m long

by 0.75m wide by 1.5m deep. Stretches of linear and curvilinear ditches were also found as well as a complicated series of postholes and gullies with at least one hut circle identifiable. Some of the postholes found seemed to belong to structures designed to protect the pits and four-post structures were also identified. In addition, two burials were discovered, neither of which had grave goods. One body was flexed, lying on its right side, head to the west and within a pit which conjoined another pit. The second body lay on its left side, in a crouched position with head to the west and centrally positioned within a four-post structure. To the north of this burial was another four-post structure without a burial.

Material remains from the Ledston excavation were few, flints, bones, charcoal fragments, upper and lower stones from beehive querns and an undecorated 'weaving comb' (Keighley, 1981, 119-20). Dating evidence is provided by radiocarbon determinations ranging from the second to fourth centuries b.c. (Riley, 1980, 25).

The Ledston site as excavated seems clearly to be part of a more extensive settlement - witness the system of adjoining enclosures, fields and trackways shown on the aerial photograph (Riley, 1976, 14, fig.1). The ditches no doubt marked off working areas, with conjoined pits as well as the linear ditch cutting across pits indicating chronological depth. The two most important conclusions

to emerge from the excavations are the fact of pre-Roman dating for what seems to be an open and extensive settlement and agrarian activity implied by the quernstones and especially by the presence of what were presumably grain-storage pits (cf. Fowler, 1983, 181-2). An interesting additional point perhaps worth noting is the presence of four-posters along with the grain-storage pits, since the former are often interpreted as being for the same purpose, namely, to serve as granaries (Fowler, 1983, 183). If that is true in the present instance then one possible explanation is that the two systems were in use for two varieties of cereal, the pits for wheat and the four-poster structures for barley (Fowler, 1983, 183). The large numbers and concentration of storage pits also bespeak an extensive settlement occupied perhaps over a considerable period of time. As for the burials, these were not numerous enough to be part of a cemetery and so, if they are at all susceptible to rational explanation, they may best be explained as fertility offerings to aid the harvest, although it must be admitted that on present available evidence there is no corroboration for this suggestion. Whimster has shown that such burials belong to a class usually found south of a line drawn from the Severn to the Wash (Whimster, 1981, 5-16).

The other excavated site, at Dalton Parlours, Collingham (SE40344615), revealed Iron Age occupation below the villa site (Keighley, 1981, 120; Britannia, 12, 1981, 330).

A palisaded area was succeeded by an extensive settlement. Within irregular ditched enclosures, linked together, were found traces of timber circular houses, sunken hearths, storage pits and four-post structures. The Roman villa, with its hypocausted rooms, walls of painted wall-plaster and mosaic pavements, re-used the Iron Age boundary ditches (Moorhouse, (ed): 1978, 7 and 9). It must therefore be presumed that these ditches were at least visible when the villa was first being constructed. Whether this represents any meaningful continuity is impossible to judge without more evidence but it would seem to imply at least late Iron Age occupation of the site. When that occupation began and what period is represented by the stockaded phase are unfortunately unknown. Like the Ledston site, Dalton Parlours Iron Age site provides evidence for pre-Roman agrarian activity with the same possibilities available to explain the pits and four-post structures.

Returning now to consideration of sites known mainly as crop marks from aerial survey, there would appear to be a tendency for clustering of sites. Indeed, in some places, this amounts to a quite heavy concentration and the district around Dalton Parlours itself is one of the most obvious.

At Compton, south of Collingham is a large rectangular enclosure about 5000 square metres in size (SE 398444) (Riley, 1977, fig.7). It is crossed by a double-ditched

linear feature, probably a trackway, to which a field boundary line seems to be related (fig.4.4). The enclosure and track are clearly of different periods. About one mile to the north-east of this location is a complex of crop marks near the junction of the Great North Road and the Collingham to Boston Spa road south of Wetherby (SE 407458) (Riley, 1977, 22 and fig.8), and conjoined rectilinear enclosures which are smaller than the Compton example, being estimated at 2000 square metres in size. There are also lanes, field boundaries and possible hut circles as well as a smaller curvilinear enclosure. Chronological depth is indicated by the superimposition of at least one rectilinear feature upon another. The field layout seems to be irregular and in addition one rectangular enclosure is quite out of alignment with the others. Another member of this cluster is a large sub-rectangular enclosure situated a short distance to the south, west of Clifford (SE 412451) (Riley, 1978, 23).

North of the Dalton Parlours group and west of Wetherby occurs an extensive area of fields together with occupation sites. These features are at North Deighton and Kirk Deighton (SE 383499 to 383511). The fields are rectilinear and there are smaller rectilinear enclosures, lanes, two incomplete curvilinear enclosures and small circles of 15 to 20m diameter, no doubt representing hut positions (Riley, 1977, 22, fig.3; 1978, 23). This system

presents a more complete plan than is usually possible when only fragmentary crop marks are observed. The plan indicates a rectilinear scheme yet there is in it an element of irregularity and Riley compares the complex to the well-known Grassington enclosures.

No more than two miles south of Dalton Parlours occurs another grouping of sites and field systems. At Well Hill (SE 419419) and Bramham Park (SE 420413) are rectangular enclosures each with the beginnings of field systems. In the former case the double line of a lane can be seen. Further south sub-rectangular enclosures, traces of field systems and of a lane can be seen near the springs at Whitewells (centred on SE 420402). About one mile to the north-east, near Spen Farm, is a grid-pattern of crop marks (centred on SE 435410) (Riley, 1978, 24, fig.2).

In this particular grouping of crop marks and sites, unlike the North Deighton-Kirk Deighton group, only fragments of more extensive systems can be observed. However, the general trend of the various fragments of field and site alignments is north-east to south-west. This may well indicate that the features here observed were all part of a single related system. Be that as it may, another, probably later system of land division has been identified by Ramm in the same area. That this is a different system is clear for it is aligned differently, namely, east-west. It is equally clear that it was Roman for it is effected by division of the terrain into broad

strips by means of Roman roads (Ramm, 1980, 33-35, and fig.4.4). Such a system, Ramm argues, should belong to a time shortly after the Roman conquest of the Brigantes for it was referred to by Frontinus who was governor of Britain from AD 74 to AD 78 as 'old-fashioned' though still in use for public lands in the provinces. If this is correct then any preceding system must either belong to very early Roman times or to the Iron Age. Whatever the case, however, the impact of Roman officialdom is manifest in the imposition of a new system on the old and presumably the acquisition of the land for public use.

Further south in the vicinity of the excavated site at Ledston already described Riley's air survey has revealed a cluster of crop marks (Riley, 1977, 22-3, fig.4). Just north of the excavated site, near Sheepcote Farm, is a group of adjacent rectilinear enclosures, fields and a lane (SE 438304). To the east, north of Ledsham village are a rectangular enclosure next to a lane and the beginnings of field enclosures (SE 459301). South of Ledsham village is another rectangular enclosure, measuring about 3000 square metres and fields (SE 458292). Further south, at a location north-west of Beckfield House, Fairburn is an enclosure of about 2000 square metres which has a lane along two of its sides and the beginning of a field system indicated by a line extending from one corner (SE 455284). A short distance away, at a spot west of Newfield Farm is yet another enclosure of

about 3000 square metres (SE 441287). This enclosure apparently contains a few pits. No doubt more crop marks would be visible were it not for areas of woodland and marl in the district. Even so, the sites that have been recorded show a considerable concentration with a radius of less than one mile. The alignments are not all the same and it is difficult to perceive any overall scheme. A greater extent of crop marks is required to resolve the difficulty but on present evidence there is localised regularity without overall systematisation.

One last group must suffice in this consideration of lowland settlement at the southern end of the region under present consideration. This is in the vicinity of Swillington and Rothwell, still within the Aire valley but on the edge of the lowland zone. A complex of rectangular enclosures (SE 385312) a D-shaped enclosure with part of another structure (SE 353295) and a rectangular enclosure (SE 377322) are among sites revealed by air survey (Riley, 1978, 21-22). A short distance away, on the south side of the river another rectangular enclosure recognised from the air at Rothwell Haigh (SE 352297) (Riley, 1978, 21) has been the subject of rescue excavation by the West Yorkshire County excavation unit (Keighley, 1981, 125; Faull, 1981, 152). The site is situated on the sandstone of the Coal Measures at 46m (150ft) O.D. Much had already been lost. Three shallow gullies were found, one connecting the ditch terminals and the other two inside

the enclosure. No doubt these last two were related to house positions. There was also a sub-rectangular pit. Finds included coarse hand-made pottery and one upper and one lower stone of beehive querns. In the north-west corner of the enclosure was a well, 12m deep which amongst other artefacts produced Roman pottery assignable to the fourth century. Faull suggests that if the well is to be associated with the enclosure then this date could mark the end of its occupation since without a water supply the site could not function. Rothwell Haigh seems best regarded in the light of the available evidence as occupied in the Roman period but not much Romanised, in other words, a native settlement. Whether its occupation began earlier is impossible to say but if Faull is right the fourth century saw its end.

Before proceeding further with discussion of the settlement evidence, it is necessary to take account of palynological findings. These can provide a background as it were against which to set the settlements. Dated pollen diagrams, however, are available only for the Tyne-Tees region (see Appendix 3).

From Bishop Middleham situated on the magnesian limestone escarpment of County Durham a pollen diagram shows intense forest clearance and cereal cultivation during the early part of the second millennium b.c. This phase begins at 1710 \pm 80 b.c. (GaK-2072) and attains a maximum at 1410 \pm 80 b.c. (GaK-2073) (Turner, 1979, 286; 1981, 267). This

farming activity should be reflected in actual settlement sites and it may be that some of the sites listed should be assigned even to this early period. But the Bishop Middleham results are exceptional and Turner suggests that they are related to the presence of lighter, better drained soils (Turner, 1979, 286). Haselgrove, however, sees difficulty in this explanation on the grounds that the diagram does not in fact provide evidence for what was happening in the first millennium and because the two sites excavated on the limestone escarpment, namely, West House, Coxhoe and Strawberry Hill, Shadforth were situated on heavy not light, well-drained soils (Haselgrove, 1982, 77). These two sites, however, may not be a true reflection of the farming potential of the district as a whole. Whatever the true explanation there is other palynological evidence to call upon. This shows that most of the major forest clearance took place at a later time. A diagram from Hallowell Moss near Durham City indicates an open landscape with the practice of both arable and pastoral farming, but with emphasis on the latter. This is dated to 6_±70 b.c. (SRR-415) at its commencement and a.d. 595_±50 (SRR-413) at its close (Turner, 1979, 288; 1981, 271). From Hutton Henry too on the eastern edge of the Durham plateau comes evidence of similar extensive forest clearance dated a.d. 108_±70 (SRR-600) (Turner, 1979, 288; 1981, 271). Not far away, at Thorpe Bulmer near Hartlepool, evidence has been obtained which shows woodland clearance together with pastoral and extensive

arable farming, including the production of hemp. The beginning of this phase is dated to 114 \pm 60 b.c. (SRR-404) and it lasted until a.d. 1098 \pm 60 (SRR-405) (Turner, 1979, 287; 1981, 269).

In the Tees lowlands there is evidence from Neasham Fen, near Darlington of some grassland early in the first millennium BC in a phase lasting from 900 b.c. (SRR-98) to 538 \pm 75 b.c. (SRR-100) (Turner 1979, 288) but there is no major forest clearance until a.d. 733 \pm 60 (SRR-96). The evidence from Seamer Carr, although undated may be cited. It indicates large scale clearance together with the presence of cereals at a period assigned to the conventional Iron Age (Spratt & Simmons, 1976, 206).

It is clear even from these uncorrected radiocarbon dates and despite the occasional deviation from the pattern as at Neasham Fen that most of the activity involved in clearing the land for the establishment of farming communities in parts at least of the Tyne-Tees lowlands was occurring during the latter part of the Iron Age and in Roman times. Consequently, it seems reasonable to suppose that many of the settlement sites under consideration should be assignable to these times.

This conclusion is in accord with the triple-phase pattern postulated by Wilson and arising from his study of the palynological evidence in relation to settlement archaeology in the north-east of England as a whole

(Wilson, 1983, 45). First comes a 'Later Bronze Age' clearance and cultivation phase during the late second or early first millenium BC. Second is a phase of gradual but permanent woodland clearances beginning during the first half of the first millenium BC. Finally, is a phase of intensive clearance during the late Iron Age or Romano-British periods.

Looking now at the distribution of sites in the lowland region as a whole, settlement extending north from Scotch Corner to the Tyne and beyond can be seen to be comparatively intensive (figs.1.3 and 1.4). South of Scotch Corner settlement appears to be less concentrated but includes an increasing number of villa sites. The concentration of site numbers increases south of Harrogate extending southwards as far as Castleford in the Aire valley, and beyond. Notable blank or almost blank areas are the coastal territory of the Tyne-Tees lowlands, Teesmouth, the lower Tees valley, the central extent of the Vale of York southwards from the Tees as far as York itself. As for York, there is little occupation within a nine-mile radius.

In attempting to explain reasons for these differences, the drawbacks pertaining to the nature of the evidence, discussed above (Chapter 1), need to be remembered.

Taking therefore a somewhat more detailed view of site distribution it will be convenient to work from north to

south, beginning in the Tyne-Tees region. Here, despite the numbers of sites referred to above, the spread is not everywhere uniform. Most inexplicably perhaps there is a thinning out towards the coast. Some of the factors mentioned above, such as the conurbations of Tyneside and Teesside (Clack and Gosling, 1976, fig.1), as well as considerable industrial activity of later times, could have conspired to bring about the results as we have them. That there was human activity and indeed occupation in the area, is evidenced by the site at Catcote, with its apparently long occupation. Furthermore, the palynological evidence already cited from Hutton Henry and Thorpe Bulmer supports this conclusion. In general, it is difficult to believe that the vacant area appearing on the distribution map is a real one. Nevertheless, possible inhibiting factors making for a more scattered and thus perhaps less easily identifiable pattern exist. One reason may be the spread coastwards of glacial drift with heavier more difficult soils, combined with the cold, north-easterly winds which blow off the North Sea (Smailes, 1960, 54)

The heavy, clayey soils of the lower Tees valley no doubt made early settlement more difficult and they would hardly be suitable for primary agricultural settlement. Yet that there was Iron Age settlement is seen by the site at Thorpe Thewles and the other apparently similar sites grouped around it. Occupation of clay-covered lowlands is

seen in south-east Northumberland at the excavated site of Burradon with similar crop-marked sites observed in the vicinity (Jobey 1970, McCord and Jobey 1968). No doubt in the Tees valley, other sites remain to be discovered. Most of the known sites are situated on land above 61m (200ft) O.D. Only a few sites, however, are known south of the Tees on the Cleveland Plain yet this was in later times rich farming land and given the support of the Seamer Carr pollen diagram the explanation must be that more sites are yet to be discovered. The very success of the region may have obscured earlier evidence. Around Teesmouth itself, the marshy lowlands and shifting sands would certainly have inhibited permanent settlement (Elgee and Elgee, 1933, 21). Some five or six miles upstream is the site of Ingleby Barwick situated only 300m south of the river on a sand and gravel terrace at about 20m O.D. This is the only site known in such low-lying terrain within the lower Tees valley and it is probable that such settlements were few and far between owing to the danger of flooding for which the Tees in historic times at least is notorious (Wardell, 1957, 123; Scott, 1977, 12). Indeed the next similarly placed site, namely Croft, is twelve miles distant further upstream. The results from the pollen diagram at Neasham Fen suggest yet another reason for a considerable blank on the distribution map, namely, woodland. That this was not sufficient reason in itself to deter clearance and settlement of such areas has already been seen for example in the case of Thorpe

Thewles and the other sites nearby. The main deterrent in this instance may have been wet and ill-drained land.

The general lack of occupation sites along the central length of the Vale of York from the Tees to York and for some nine miles beyond may well be due to similar conditions. Forest, sandy heathlands and peaty marshes no doubt discouraged settlement (Elgee and Elgee, 1933, 5; Radley, 1974, 10). These conditions, however, do not obtain along the higher land fringing the Vale and settlement is evident along the western edge. Yet the paucity of settlement sites on the north-eastern fringe at the foot of the Hambleton Hills is inexplicable. One possible explanation, lack of survey, becomes less cogent in view of the work of Riley. As he reports, extensive flights in the northern part of the Vale of York were undertaken but '... it was disappointing to be unable to locate new areas (of settlement) ... near Northallerton and Thirsk, where the geological map suggests that conditions should be favourable' (Riley, 1977, 19). His record of unproductive flights illustrates the blanks that were drawn in the Vale of York north of York itself (Riley, 1977, fig.1). Stead may well have been correct in his assessment that 'the Romans must have found the Vale of York but sparsely populated' (Stead, 1971, 21).

The larger, negative areas, as it were, of occupation have been considered but even within those areas deemed to be comparatively well settled, there are definite gaps. No

doubt some of the reasons adduced earlier to account for the larger blank areas could be operative here too. Probably more sites await discovery and others have been destroyed without trace. But in certain cases the gaps may be real and susceptible to explanation, whether topographical, economic or indeed social. Examination of the settlement distribution map shows these blank districts as well as those under occupation. Often only detailed local and sustained investigation, both from the air and on the ground, will reveal the reasons for such differences. However, even from a generalised survey an interesting phenomenon may be observed, namely, the apparent clustering of sites. The case of West Brandon has already been mentioned where five rectilinear sites are in close proximity, not to mention a possible open-type settlement. Other similar clusters can be seen in the Tyne-Tees region at Hill Top Farm, Broomside, Dene House Farm, Cockfield Fell, Heighington, High Coniscliffe, Thorpe Thewles and Stanwick. Further south a similar cluster of sites occurs at Snape. Other clusters have already been noted at Dalton Parlours, Compton, North, Deighton, Bramham Park, Ledston and Rothwell. Clusters south of York at Skipwith and South Duffield might be added to the list. Even when curvilinear, open and villa sites are removed from consideration, clusters of rectilinear sites remain. If these clusters are valid, then this could have implications for interpretation of social organisation; it could mean that a group of

homesteads is forming a community. Alternatively, the explanation might be that a succession of settlements is exploiting the same district but why in that case the actual occupation site should shift its location is in itself a problem. It is always possible that the true explanation lies in a combination of these alternatives.

A difference between the clusters in the south of the study region and those further north should be noted. Rectilinear enclosures in the southern part often occur not merely in close proximity as do those in the north but as double or multiple conjoined enclosures. Add to this the fact that field systems are very much more in evidence in the southern area and the impression is given of a more intensely organised landscape.

Two further points emerge from consideration of distribution of rectilinear sites. First, in the Tyne-Tees region, even where sites occur singly, they usually seem to be positioned no further away from other sites than two miles. This can be seen especially along the line of the Roman road of Dere Street between the fort sites of Binchester and Lanchester. It is of course possible that discoveries yet to be made will change the picture so that, for example, apparently single sites turn out to be themselves only one member of another cluster. By the same token, sites that seem to be isolated could emerge as not being exceptions to the rule. However that may be, apart from economic there are possible social

implications in the siting of homesteads or settlements fairly close together. It could indicate a fairly intensive exploitation of the terrain with the potential for co-operation rather than competition. That the latter seems less likely than the former is indicated by the paucity of fortifications. More information, however, is needed to test such speculations not least about the dating of the sites in question.

The second point is that many sites seem to have very close or quite close contact with a Roman road. If the sites could be shown to be of Roman period then it would be a fair inference that these were native farmsteads attracted to their locations by good lines of communication with Roman markets at or outside the forts. However, to take one example, West Brandon in the Tyne-Tees region although almost on the actual line of Dere Street is, as has been seen, definitely pre-Roman and it seems unlikely that it was exceptional in this respect in view of other evidence which is available, some of which has already been cited. Some at least of the other similar sites are also pre-Roman and it is likely that many more fall into the same category. Thus it is possible to argue for the initial settlement of such areas as prior to the building of the Roman roads. In that case the explanation of the proximity of sites to Roman roads, if not purely fortuitous, could be that the Roman engineers were following routes already laid down in

pre-Roman times or else deliberately siting the roads to pass by a centre of population. These are only possibilities and the reason may be simply that the terrain was suitable for both roads and settlement. Once more dating is crucial and more chronological information is required to change possibilities into probabilities.

In attempting to evaluate the various kinds of sites already reviewed and whose distribution has now been discussed, it will be immediately apparent that an outstanding difficulty is the lack of sound, factual information available, especially with regard to chronology. The background provided by the palaeobotanical data has already been sketched out.

The difficulty of dating is acute with regard to the fortified sites. It is far from certain that they should all be assigned to the same period and indeed it could even be the case that none of those discussed belongs to the Iron Age at all. It is quite possible too that some fortified sites have not been identified, or have been destroyed by later building or industrial activities, as in the case of Toft Hill in County Durham.

The eastern lowlands possess few fortified sites. Now that so many potential habitation sites are known in the region it is possible to see fortified examples as having a role to play in relation to the others. They might be seen as focal points within their own district or region.

However, for them to be regarded as parts of the same economic and social network contemporaneity would need to be established and that is the very information that is lacking. It is tempting to see fortified sites as the strongholds of local leaders or chieftains. Evidence of permanent occupation might be expected in such circumstances but this is absent in the information so far gleaned about them. If truly unoccupied, fortified sites might be regarded as mainly look-out points or as border posts set at strategic positions. Eston Nab overlooking the Tees lowlands and Teesmouth might easily fall into these categories. Maiden Castle could have fulfilled a similar function, with the river Wear serving as a boundary. However, all of this is pure speculation and more facts are required to test these and other possibilities.

In the lowlands, most of the sites referred to have been ditch-enclosed but a few palisaded sites are known. That only a handful is recorded is certainly owing to the difficulty of recognition without excavation. Of possibilities noted from aerial photographs only one comes from the region between the Tyne and the Tees, namely, that at Stillington Cottages, near Elstob (NZ 345241) (Air photo, Selkirk), which may have a double palisade. North of the Tyne in south-east Northumberland is another example, this time with a single palisade, at West Farm, Seghill (NZ 281751) (McCord and Jobey, 1968, 66). South

of the Tees a third example has been identified at Gatherly Moor, Gilling (NZ 185066) (Haselgrove, 1982, 98). Excavated examples, as described above, are known from West Brandon, Catterick and Grafton Hills. It seems certain that many more remain to be discovered but only excavation can reveal them for certain. Thus on present evidence, no general conclusions can be drawn about the distribution of palisaded sites. With regard to dating, the possible range of palisaded sites within a broader context is wide (see Appendix 2). Fenton Hill in Northumberland has yielded a radiocarbon date of 690 ± 100 b.c. (Har.825)(Burgess 1984). When calibrated this could take initial settlement back to 1000 BC. The palisaded phase of Huckhoe, Northumberland produced a radiocarbon date of 510 ± 40 b.c. (GaK 1388), calibrated to eighth to fifth centuries BC. Staple Howe in east Yorkshire has a radiocarbon date of 450 ± 150 b.c. (BM 63)(Brewster, 1963, 140), assignable to a range of ninth to second centuries BC, although material evidence narrows this to early sixth to fifth centuries BC (Challis and Harding, 1975). The small settlement of Ingram Hill, Northumberland yielded a radiocarbon date of 220 ± 90 b.c.(I-5316) giving a date range of late fifth century BC to early first century AD (calibrations given to twice the standard deviation). The excavated sites with palisades from the lowland regions seem to fall easily within this range. As has been seen above, Grafton Hills is assignable to the same tradition and period as Staple Howe, as are the two

Catterick sites, be it noted, one curvilinear and the other rectilinear. The estimated initial dating for the enclosed site at West Brandon in view of the lack of rotary querns is more likely to be third than second century and indeed it might well go back to an earlier period still.

As has been noted the curvilinear enclosed occupation sites of the lowlands are few in number. Their distribution seems to form no recognisable pattern except one of widely scattered settlement. No ditched example has been excavated and this rather hampers the drawing of conclusions. On the fringe of the study region the Northumberland site of Huckhoe, although not ditched but enclosed by a stone wall replacing a twin-palisaded phase, may give a clue to the kind of date range possible for such curvilinear enclosures. Occupation of Huckhoe ranges from the first half of the first millennium BC into the Roman period and beyond (Jobey, 1959; 1968). However, it is far from certain that all curvilinear enclosures are comparable to Huckhoe. In those cases where they seem to overlap or be overlapped by rectilinear sites some chronological distinction is clear. The details of this, however, will depend upon excavation. The case of Woodham has been cited above. The reason for change of shape is a problem.

One explanation could be the introduction of a new building tradition by a different cultural group. Another

could be a change in the organisation of the landscape reflecting a change in the basic economy or social organisation of the inhabitants of the district. Topography in itself cannot always be called upon to furnish the explanation, as is self-evident. In those instances where curvilinear enclosures occur close by other sites, usually rectilinear as has been seen, the explanation involving chronological sequence is possible. Yet it is equally possible that it is a question of contemporaneous usage, with one of the enclosures perhaps serving as an occupation site and the other as stock enclosure. Some of the curvilinear enclosures were probably intended for human habitation since they seem to contain hut positions if the circular features noted within are anything to go by. The site at East House, Coxhoe, County Durham, with its overlapping circles, suggests extended occupation whilst that at Woodwell House, Carrville, is perhaps an example of expanded population, since it has what seem to be additional huts outside the main enclosure. The probable trackways and possible field systems attached to some curvilinear sites suggests a certain amount of organisation of the landscape, whether for pastoral or agrarian purposes. The information to hand about such enclosures is insufficient to provide more than hints and possibilities and it is necessary that more excavation on lowland curvilinear sites should take place before firmer conclusions can be arrived at. Whether the D-shaped sub-group occurring

within the Tees valley has a special significance apart from the rest is a question that also requires testing in the same way, namely, by selective excavation.

In the lowland region, ditch-enclosed sites far outnumber other types and those which are rectilinear in shape are more numerous than curvilinear types.

The most usual shape for the rectilinear enclosures is rectangular or squarish and this is formed by a perimeter ditch usually with internal mound. West Brandon, County Durham is a good example. Sometimes, however, the shape is pronouncedly rhomboidal, as for example at Strawberry Hill, Shadforth, County Durham, or even polygonal, as at Hag Wood, Esh Winning, County Durham. Occasionally, there is an outer as well as an inner mound. Cockfield Fell, County Durham provides two examples of this in enclosures 3 and 4 (Roberts, 1975, a3 and a2). Internally, most sites fall within the size range of 0.2ha to 0.5ha (0.5 ac to 1.2 ac), with a few smaller and a few larger examples. Some sites have double ditches as at Crathorne and possibly Brettanby in North Yorkshire. More examples of such types have been recorded north of the Tyne than elsewhere, where in any case a considerable number of rectilinear sites in general is known from aerial survey (McCord and Jobey, 1968). Excavations have provided information probably applicable elsewhere on similar sites with double ditch systems. Both Burradon (NZ 269729) and West Hartburn (NZ 081867) have widely spaced double

ditches. The outer ditch at Burradon is best interpreted as belonging to an enclosed settlement assignable to the pre-Roman Iron Age, and occupied perhaps as early as the fifth or sixth centuries BC. The inner ditch with single round house belonged to a native homestead occupied during the second century AD at least (Jobey, 1970, 51-95). The sequence for West Hartburn is similar with the larger enclosure serving a pre-Roman settlement dating perhaps originally from the fifth or sixth centuries BC and the smaller enclosure set inside it belonging to a Romano-British homestead and having one or possibly two cobbled yards. Occupation of the later site was assignable to the second and possibly even the third centuries AD (Jobey, 1973).

The range in dates for ditched rectilinear sites can be seen from excavated examples to have been wide. Dates appear to range from the mid-first millennium BC as suggested for Burradon for example until the third century AD as seen at West Hartburn. Indeed, Phase II at Apperley Dene extends the range into the fourth century AD (see Chapter 5). Some chronological distinctions, however, seem clear. Smaller sites like those within Burradon and West Hartburn may well like them prove to be Roman period or at least late Iron Age. This last qualification is necessary bearing in mind the pre-Roman radiocarbon dates obtained from earlier phases of similar upland area sites at Belling Law (Jobey, 1977) and Kennel Hall Knowe

(Jobey 1978a) (see Appendix 2). By the same token, sites comparable in size to the larger, earlier versions of West Hartburn and Burradon could well be, like them, firmly pre-Roman. Indeed, Thorpe Thewles in County Cleveland which is comparable in size to the earlier Burradon site has been seen above to have been pre-Roman. However, it has also been seen that Thorpe Thewles probably falls later in initial date than both West Hartburn and Burradon, and that its termination came very close to the beginning of the Roman period. Again it might be argued that sites comparable to Coxhoe and West Brandon have their origin in the pre-Roman Iron Age but although tempting it would perhaps be incautious, especially with Rothwell Haigh and Holme House in mind, to argue further that the type did not usually survive into Roman times. The fact is that not enough excavation has been done to allow a reasonably based hypothesis to be submitted with full confidence. This applies especially in the south of the lowland region where only Rothwell Haigh has been examined by excavation. However, whatever the arguments about the finer points of detail, rectilinear enclosed settlement is a dominant type in the eastern lowlands from the Aire to the Tyne and beyond.

Looking for other types of site to supplement those settlements included in the fortified and enclosed groups, one turns to unenclosed settlements and villa sites.

The term 'unenclosed' is to some extent a misleading one since strictly speaking it implies the absence of enclosures altogether. This would rule out settlements where dwellings were set within ditches and among field enclosures. This is not what is intended. The distinction to be drawn is between settlements which are closely confined within a protective enclosure, usually mound and ditch, and those which are not. It is to the latter, irrespective of whether enclosures of other kinds are present or not, that the term 'unenclosed' is being applied here.

Unenclosed settlements are not common. In the northern part of the region there is Catcote and the last phase of Thorpe Thewles. Holborn Wood, Stokesley and Croft and perhaps Ingleby Barwick seem to be the only other candidates. Ledston and pre-Roman Dalton Parlours are recorded as such towards the southern end of the region. Such a distribution, however, cannot by any means be taken at its face value. It seems very likely that other similar open sites lie as yet undiscovered. The fact that they are rarely visible from the air need occasion no surprise bearing in mind the experience of Thorpe Thewles. Failing a reasonable estimate of the true numbers that existed and their chronology discussion is seriously hampered and only a few general remarks are possible.

Unenclosed settlements might well be expected in the Roman period when the Pax Romana was in operation engendering a

feeling of security. However, the evidence from Catcote, Thorpe Thewles, Dalton Parlours and Ledston indicates that such developments occurred prior to the Roman period. The occurrence of unenclosed settlements would seem to have been connected with population increase. At Thorpe Thewles, for example, the process can be seen at work with the overriding of the constricting enclosure mound and ditch and the increase in presumed dwelling structures. This in its turn must have depended upon success in the basic economy. That this involved increasing agricultural activity is suggested by the evidence from the four places listed above but especially in regard to Ledston with its grain storage capacity. Economic factors in themselves, however, would not have been enough to persuade folk to abandon barriers and defences unless the need for protection against wild animals and hostile persons were eliminated or at least reduced. Where unenclosed settlement occurs this suggests a landscape around the settlement sufficiently cleared of woodland which might harbour such foes. Furthermore, it might suggest a well-ordered society at peace within itself flourishing economically without undue competition or the stress that goes with it. Otherwise, population increase would manifest itself in a multiplication of enclosed settlements to accommodate the extra numbers yet maintain security. Only further research can show how far the unenclosed settlement process had gone before the imposition of Roman control.

With regard to villas the numbers are few, only about a dozen. It is quite probable, however, that others remain to be found, especially in the Tyne-Tees region where the two known, Old Durham and Holme House, stand sixteen miles apart. Each is situated on good farming land with ready access to a good market, in the case of the former, Chester-le-Street with its fort and vicus. Other villa sites might well be expected to have developed among farming establishments exploiting such lucrative markets. Similar conditions too obtain in the vicinity of the Roman fort of Binchester where both Roman garrison and civilian settlement would provide a market and at the same time security.

South of the Tyne-Tees region, villas in common with other farming settlements avoid the central portion of the Vale of York but occupy its western edge. Thus they utilise the good, well-drained farming land on the magnesian limestone belt. At the same time they have access to good communications. These villas fall into two main groups. The most northerly group is strung out in a line stretching northwards from Ripon towards Bedale. It includes Well, Castle Dikes, Snape and Ripon. In no case is a villa in this group more than four miles distant from the major Roman road of Dere Street. Farming produce from this group of villas would find markets at the civitas capital at Aldborough and Catterick further north, both located on Dere Street. The second main group of villas

occurs south of Wetherby in the vicinity of Tadcaster and includes Dalton Parlours, Newton Kyme and Kirkby Wharfe. Here again there is close proximity to major Roman roads and indeed hereabouts are junctions of Roman roads travelling north-south and east-west including a major connection with York as a glance at the Ordnance Survey map of Roman Britain will show (South Sheet, 4th ed. 1978). Possible markets for agricultural produce would be available in centres of population at Newton Kyme, Tadcaster, Wetherby, Adel and perhaps even York itself.

The villa at Drax (SE 690261) stands apart from the rest occupying as it does a low-lying position between the rivers Ouse and Aire at the southern end of the region (Scott, 1973). At only 5.5m O.D. its precarious position largely surrounded by water hardly marks it out as a normal Romanised farm. Instead one might suppose that the Drax villa had been established to capitalise on the conditions thereabouts which were ideally suited to the growing and treatment of flax required to produce the linen winding sheets much used in sarcophagus burials found at York and elsewhere (Richmond, 1966). Drax may perhaps be seen as the venture of some entrepreneur exploiting local conditions to take advantage of a special market. The remaining villas can best be seen as responding to the increasing demands for food required by the economy under Roman rule.

CHAPTER FIVE

RURAL SETTLEMENT: NORTHERN PENNINES

The boundary of the Northern Pennines is formed by the Tyne Gap. Considerable concentrations of fortified and other settlements are recorded north of this east-west communication corridor. They thin out, however, as they approach it (Steer, 1964, 13, fig.1; Jobey, 1965, 55-7, fig.18). Along this line within the extent of some 30 miles between Gilsland in the west and Heddon on the Wall in the east little over a score of sites may be quoted as having relevance to the present discussion (fig.1.5). Of these five, or perhaps six, sites may be classified as fortified. Only one is multivallate, namely, the bivallate site of Warden Hill (NY 904678) situated at 181m (593ft) O.D. (Jobey, 1965, 62). Although small, being only 0.8 acres (0.3ha) internally, Warden Hill is located at a strategic position overlooking the confluence of the rivers North and South Tyne. By analogy it seems likely that such a multivallate hill top site must be pre-Roman in period but when occupation ceased is unknown, or indeed whether there was any re-occupation. Further to the west the D-shaped univallate fort at Barcombe (NY 783668) was somewhat larger at one acre (0.41ha) (Jobey, 1965, 63). At 244m (800ft) O.D. it commands an extensive view and this accounts for the later Roman look-out post set in its north-west corner. Whether this was a consideration in the siting of the pre-Roman fort itself is problematical.

It may be that if the surrounding territory continued to be well forested until Roman times as the pollen evidence from Fellend suggests (Turner, 1979, 288; 1983, 8-10), the viewpoint factor can be over-rated. The relatively inaccessible and defensive position may have been the prime reason for its choice. That, however, would suggest fear of attack, not necessarily from neighbours but perhaps from strangers following the route from one side of the country to the other. The date of occupation is unknown except that it is pre-Flavian as the evidence of Flavian pottery from a small oven inserted into the rear of the rampart belonging to the Roman structure shows (Woodfield, 1966, 71-7, fig.1). The remaining fortified sites are Houghton (NZ 123666), Shildon Hill (NZ 035671), Grindstone Law (NZ 004734), Hill Head (NY 968706), and Wall Hill? (NY 922691) (Jobey, 1965, 63-4). These sites, on present evidence, would appear to be pre-Roman in period although more precision is impossible. They range in size from 0.6ac to 1ac (0.2ha-0.4ha). Warden Hill and Barcombe fall into this same range. None would seem to stand out from the others in respect of size. It is difficult on such grounds to pick out any of these sites as pre-eminent. Warden Hill, however, is the most strongly fortified and on that score could be regarded as outstanding especially when coupled with its important location. Such a site as this could conceivably have gained an importance because of its control of routes. Lack of dating evidence, however, hampers further

discussion. It is not known, for example, whether all these fortified sites were occupied simultaneously, with Warden Hill playing the lead, as it were, or whether Warden Hill preceded or succeeded the others. By the same token it is also unknown whether any of these sites was occupied at the time of the Roman conquest of the region, or whether they had gone out of use at an earlier time.

Turning now to the other sites, these are all rectilinear in shape. None belongs to that group of native sites characterised by round huts and twin stockyards for which Riding Wood, Northumberland (NY 818846) may serve as a type site (Jobey, 1960, 1-38, and especially fig.3). Two, however, belong to a type having stone enclosure walls and round stone-based huts identified by Jobey as belonging to the Roman period (Jobey, 1960, 32). The two sites in question are Tower Tye (NY 886707) and Milking Gap (NY 773678). The latter site has been excavated (Kilbride-Jones, 1938, 303-350).

Milking Gap comprised a sub-rectangular stone-walled enclosure with an entrance on the south-east, (fig.5.1) and five huts. Within the enclosed area, which was less than 0.5 ac (0.2ha), the largest and most substantially built hut was placed centrally (hut no.1). Its internal diameter was some 5.8m (19ft) and its superstructure depended upon a circle of an estimated twelve posts of which eight holes survived. A substantial wall measuring overall 1.4m (4ft 9in) thick surrounded this circle. It

consisted of earth and turf fill contained by facing stones. The entrance was on the east. The remainder of the internal area of the enclosure was sub-divided into six yards by means of radiating cross-walls. Two huts (nos.2 and 3), incorporated in the perimeter wall flanked the entrance and two more huts (nos.4 and 5) were positioned outside, abutting the perimeter wall on the south side. Beyond the settlement proper are remnants of ancient walling around a triangular enclosure situated on the west side, traces of a former track to the south and on the north signs of a single cultivation terrace. There is no proof of association of these features with the settlement site but this seems not at all unlikely. If the terrace at least belonged to the site then some crop growing, for which there is no direct evidence, would seem to have been followed by the occupants of the settlement. From the site itself no finds were obtained to reflect its basic economy although as Kilbride-Jones suggests the internal divisions of the enclosure no doubt served as animal pens. The site was well chosen to suit a farming community for it was well-drained, with good pasture available and fresh water supplied by the nearby Bradley burn. That it attained a fair degree of prosperity is indicated by the presence of fragments of several Samian-ware pots as well as its increase in size. Constructional evidence indicates that hut 2 was secondary for its west wall was partly laid over paving associated with hut 1. (Kilbride-Jones, 1938, 333). The excavator was of the

opinion that the other four huts were contemporary but a much more likely explanation would be that the settlement started with a single hut, namely hut no.1 in the centre of the enclosure, and that the huts placed outside, nos.4 and 5, represent later expansion. Hut no.3 seems to have been inserted in the enclosure wall and it too must have been a later addition. Thus it would appear that if all huts were occupied at the same time, and there is no reason to suppose that they were not, the settlement grew from one to five huts. A decision upon how long this process took depends upon the dating of the site. Some scholars have interpreted the finds of second century AD period as being Hadrianic (Gillam, 1958, 63; Breeze and Dobson, 1978, 199; Greene, 1978, 48). Professor E. Birley, however, who contributed to the original report, has averred that the period of occupation was Antonine (Birley, 1961, 275). On the first interpretation, the settlement, situated as it is between the Roman Wall and the Vallum, would have come to an end with the construction of the Hadrianic frontier works. How long the process of development had taken before that event is unknown. On the second interpretation, however, the planting of the settlement would belong to the 140s when the Antonine Wall was built in Scotland and as a corollary the Vallum on Hadrian's Wall slighted (Breeze and Dobson, 1978, 82). The life of the settlement in this case would extend over about 20 years for the end would come on the occasion of the reoccupation of Hadrian's Wall in the

mid-160s (Breeze and Dobson, 1978, 124). If the initial Antonine date is correct, then as Jobey has pointed out (1966, 4), the expansion of the settlement at Milking Gap from one to five huts occurred within a generation.

Of the remaining rectilinear settlements, there can be no certainty as to their period without more information than is at present available (Jobey, 1960, Appendix B, nos.3-4; 6-12; McCord and Jobey, 1968, Appendix nos.23-26). As has been seen in lowland Northumberland and Durham, however, rectilinear enclosures can indicate sites belonging to the pre-Roman or Roman Iron Age. In view of this it seems quite likely that some at least of the Tyne Valley rectilinear sites should be so classified. None falls into the double-ditched category as at Burradon (Jobey, 1970, 51-95) but the site at North Dunslawholm, Horsley (NZ 089676) (Jobey, 1960, no.7; McCord and Jobey, 1968, no.24) consists of two overlapping rectangular enclosures. The larger enclosure is apparently the earlier one and it may well be that a similar sequence to that at Burradon applies, with the smaller enclosure representing a Roman native homestead and the larger one an Iron Age settlement. Whatever the true explanation, chronological depth is certain.

There is in addition to those sites already discussed some evidence of palisaded sites within the Tyne corridor. At Newbrough (NY 877677) air photography has revealed part of a sub-rectangular enclosure surrounded by two fairly wide

palisade trenches (Jobey, 1962, Appendix 2, no.3 and p48, fig.1).

At Corbridge Roman site (NY 9864), excavations on Site XI revealed a palisaded enclosure of oval shape with maximum dimensions of 18m (60ft) east-west with an entrance on the west roughly 2.1m (7ft) wide. Within were the remains in the form of six clay packed postholes of what had been originally a circular hut of about 6.7m (22ft) in diameter. In addition, two postholes some two feet apart within a slot, formed a separate feature, perhaps representing a loom as the excavators suggested. There is no dating material for these features apart from the fact that they underlie buildings of Flavian period. (Richmond and Gillam, 1955, 221-224, fig.1 and Pl.22). There is in addition other evidence, as yet unpublished, of pre-Flavian settlement activity on the site (Jobey, 1979, 104).

Palisaded enclosures are also recorded from Bishop Rigg (NY 976653) west of Corbridge (Jobey, 1979). Here a little over 0.5km north of the river Tyne and at 45m (148ft) O.D. excavations in 1974 revealed two parallel lines of trenches, 0.8m apart, designed to hold the upright timbers of palisades. These confirmed the evidence of aerial photographs showing a curvilinear enclosure. However, the two palisade trenches were interpreted as belonging to two separate enclosures although the sequence was not established. The areas

enclosed by these successive palisades would have been at least 80m by 70m. Neither datable artefacts in direct association with the palisade trenches nor material suitable for radiocarbon dating were recovered. However, the palisade trenches yielded no Roman pottery in an area which otherwise produced plentiful supplies of Roman-period sherds. This suggests a pre-Roman or at least early-Roman origin for the enclosures. This is supported by the fact that a Roman-period stockaded enclosure impinged upon the outer palisade trench (Jobey, 1979, 102-104, fig.2). This rectangular stockaded enclosure measured about 30m (98ft) north-south by at least the same distance east-west. Structurally it was in the native rather than the Roman tradition although, as pottery from the construction trench showed, early Roman in period. (Jobey, 1979, 108-110). Lengths of three more apparent palisades have been noted on aerial photographs of an area between 80 and 100m south of the excavated examples (Jobey, 1979, fig.2) but there is no way of relating the two groups. Nor can it be decided whether apparent cultivation terraces (Jobey, 1979, 102, fig.2) noted on air photographs should be associated with the palisaded sites or otherwise. It is thus difficult to draw any conclusions about the close date or function of the various palisaded enclosures on Bishop Rigg. The rectangular enclosure could perhaps be a small settlement of the rectilinear type so well known from the Roman period although usually built of stone and not timber.

The curvilinear enclosures exhibit some chronological depth with the two palisades representing no doubt rebuilding possibly after the decay of timbers in the ground. As Jobey points out there is considerable difficulty in dating palisaded structures (Jobey, 1979, 104) examples of which can be assigned to a wide range of time. Even so, the Bishop Rigg palisaded enclosures give evidence of activity of some sort on the part of the native folk in the district. Indeed, a short distance to the north of Bishop Rigg, John Casey has uncovered more evidence of the native presence in the form of the ditch of a presumed rectangular native settlement, sealed by Roman cremations along the west side of the Roman road of Dere Street (Casey, 1975, 9).

Thus it is that the number of settlements known to exist within the region of the Tyne Gap is comparatively small. It seems unlikely that many more stone-based or embanked sites remain to be discovered in this frontier region which has been the subject of so much detailed investigation. On the other hand it is probable that many more palisaded sites remain undetected. By their very nature only rarely can they be identified on the ground or from the air. Most of the information available has resulted from excavations, either confirming aerial survey, as at Bishop Rigg, or in the pursuit of other objectives, as at Site XI at Corbridge.

Although close dating is not available, it seems fair to argue that settlements such as palisaded examples where the main building material is timber belong to a landscape which is woodland dominated. Stone-based or stone-built settlements would more naturally belong to an environment which has been at least partially cleared of its woodland. Thus the general sequence of settlement construction is likely to be that of timber phase preceding stone phase. This is observable in excavated sites not far distant from the Tyne Gap, as for example at Huckhoe (Jobey, 1959), Tower Knowe (Jobey, 1973b), Belling Law (Jobey, 1977) and Kennel Hall Knowe (Jobey, 1978a). It is not of course possible to argue from this that palisades sites are invariably earlier than other types but it does suggest that they are in general assignable to an earlier wooded landscape. There is a little evidence to indicate what the environment was like within the region under discussion: a pollen diagram from Fellend Moss, near Haltwhistle, and pollen analysis from a ditch infill at the civil settlement at Vindolanda, near Bardon Mill (Turner, 1979, 288; 1983, 9-10). Both of these sites are located towards the western end of the region, beyond the confluence of the North and South Tyne rivers.

Fellend Moss (NY 679658) is situated just to the south of the Hadrianic frontier at 210m (689ft) O.D. The pollen diagram shows a woodland dominated environment in the pre-Roman Iron Age. At a level dated by radiocarbon testing

to a.d. 2₊45 there is a drop in the frequency of tree pollen and increases in the frequency of pasture plants, with comparatively small counts of cereal and grass pollens. This marks the beginning of a period of clearance which lasts until a.d. 620₊40. Turner has suggested that the building and manning of the Hadrianic frontier might be associated with this clearance phase revealed in the botanical record.

The evidence from Vindolanda (NY 7764) is from a ditch dated by its contents to AD 100-125. The pollen diagram from this ditch indicates that the surroundings were treeless. Cereal pollen together with that of pastoral and arable weeds suggests too both stock rearing and crop cultivation.

The wooded environment of the pre-Roman Iron Age would have been the setting for palisaded settlement sites. Whether these were contemporary or not with the few pre-Roman fortified enclosures discussed above is unknown. These fortified sites, as has been seen, appear to have been in themselves too small and too few to have served as occupation sites for a large population. It seems more likely that they served perhaps as centres for petty chieftains or control points of some sort, possibly at sub-tribal borders. The occupation sites of the rest of the population have not been discovered and the explanation could well be that they were timber made and enclosed by palisades. In saying this the few possible

pre-Roman rectilinear sites have not been forgotten. Their numbers however are negligible when considering a population base. Nonetheless, they do represent probable habitation sites but how they should be fitted into the overall population pattern is unclear. It is tempting to see in them a spread into the Tyne Valley of the rectilinear type from the lowland region involving colonisation from further east. This can be no more than a tentative suggestion which has yet to be tested.

As for the period of Roman occupation, there is little evidence of native settlement, even if the rectilinear sites referred to above were included in the total. Whatever view is taken of the dating of Milking Gap, the evidence from it is enough to show that native settlement was not allowed to intrude upon a militarized zone. Such a stance on the part of Roman officialdom would seem to be perfectly understandable with regard to settlement close to or within the more narrowly militarized zone demarcated by the Wall to the north and the Vallum to the south. The paucity of settlement assignable to the Roman period in general along the length of the Tyne Gap suggests that influences were at work which in general inhibited such settlement. One factor, perhaps the main one, may indeed have been military prohibition. Yet civilian settlements were allowed to flourish outside the forts showing that non-military development was in fact permitted if not indeed encouraged. The solution may be that such

settlement was permitted because it was able to be under the more immediate control of the military. This, however, may not be the only factor. It seems not unlikely that, even if there was a measure of initial direction, the forts acted as magnets by providing ready-made markets as well as a means of protection. Again, once the settlements outside the forts began to flourish, they would in themselves serve to attract more folk in preference to the harsher life in a native settlement or homestead. Some such explanation seems necessary to help account for these contrasts in settlement pattern within the region of the Tyne Gap.

South of the Tyne corridor in the region extending south to Weardale sites become very sparse indeed (fig.1.5). No doubt adverse environmental conditions help to account for this but there would seem to have been settlement potential within the valleys of the south Tyne, East and West Allen and Derwent. Absence of appropriate fieldwork may well be the prime reason for the present site distribution. Nor are there any pollen diagrams to appeal to in the attempt to make an assessment. Of the three or four possible settlement sites within this part of the northern Pennines only one, namely that at Apperley Dene (NZ 056581), has been investigated.

Situated at 123m (430ft) O.D. next to Dere Street, Apperley Dene is on the edge of the upland region. For long regarded as a Roman fortlet, excavations in 1951

(Hildyard, 1952, 223-36) reinforced this view. Re-excavation in 1974-5 led to a new interpretation (Greene, 1978, 29-59). Two phases were identified both showing occupation within the Roman period. Phase I was a double-ditched farmstead enclosure with entrance on the east and containing at least one round house. This measured about 11.5m (38ft) in diameter according to the five postholes which had survived ploughing. Pottery finds indicated occupation during the second century AD and more specifically within the period ranging from about AD 120 to about AD 170. Thereafter the site was abandoned for about 100 years or more then re-occupied. During Phase II a new ditch was dug at a distance of about 4.5m (Greene, 1978, fig.7) within the previous main ditch, now partly silted up, of Phase I enclosure. No structures survived from Phase II occupation but it is argued that these had been stone-built, for stonework was found within the ditch and there had otherwise been much stone on site, the removal of which in modern times is on record. The end of this second occupation, probably in the form of intentional demolition, took place in the fourth century AD, probably during the middle years. Phase I occupation with its circular hut is firmly assigned to native occupation but whether Phase II was civilian or military is uncertain, although on balance the first is the more likely.

Apperley Dene on the fringe of the upland region is in

itself little enough evidence as to what was happening in this part of the northern Pennines. It possesses no pre-Roman phase and this, together with the paucity of known settlements, may be taken to suggest that this part of northern England was virtually unsettled. However, as indicated above, further investigation could alter this viewpoint. As for Roman-period settlement within the immediate frontier hinterland the presence of Apperley Dene shows that the establishment of new sites did take place. In addition, as Greene has pointed out, further deductions are possible when the dating evidence from Apperley Dene is considered alongside that from the nearby Roman fort of Ebchester (NZ 1055). Phase I occupation of Apperley Dene coincides with the abandonment of Ebchester between the AD 120s and AD 160s. Greene has suggested that the district around Ebchester fort had been 'demilitarized' and made available for civilian occupation. Ebchester fort itself reacted to the fortunes of the frontier and when the withdrawal of forces from Scotland occurred in about AD 165, Ebchester was re-occupied. At this time Apperley Dene's abandonment was perhaps the reversal of the policy of allowing native settlement. Similarly, in the later period the systematic demolition of Phase II may have resulted from official action to remove a native settlement, if such it was, from the proximity of Dere Street.

If these suggestions are correct, they may well have

implications for assessing the presence or otherwise of native sites elsewhere in the vicinity of zones of military sensitivity.

Turning now to Weardale, sites in two areas of the upper dale are known.

Near Eastgate, at Old Park Farm (NY 926382) are rectangular fields earlier than the existing field boundaries (HBMC. SAM. Durham 102; Durham University Air photos, 104/8; 120/1-2)(fig.5.2). Amidst these is a square enclosure some 42m across with an entrance on the east side near the north-east corner. A modification of the field system is evident from the fact that one embankment crosses the enclosure but it is not clear on the ground which came first. It would seem reasonable to suppose, however, that the square enclosure preceded the embankment for otherwise, as a complete unit in itself, it would have been fitted into the corner of two embankments. Be that as it may, some chronological depth is indicated by such a modification. Less than one mile away, at Dun Hill (NY 937386) are rectilinear fields which also precede present-day field boundaries (Durham Univ. Air Photos, 104/2-5)(SMR NY93 NW28). Not far distant, at High Northgate (NY 937400) is a double-banked oval enclosure with medial ditch, measuring about 100m by 95m internally. A gap of some 16m on the west where the ditch appears to be out-turned is probably the entrance (HBMC. SAM. Durham 65; Dur.Univ.AP.neg.0132A). The foundations of a wall

intersect the site from east to west. This was a boundary wall of the medieval Park (Clack, 1980, Pt.4), indicating that the site was at least Early Medieval in period.

Circular houses have not been identified either within or alongside any of these sites and they have not been closely dated. It seems quite likely, however, that they should be assigned to a time within the later Iron Age to Roman period.

The second area providing site evidence relevant to this discussion lies south of Stanhope on Bollihope Common (Clack, 1980, Pt.4). At Brian's Folds (NY 975354 - NY 978351) on the north side of the Bollihope Burn is an extensive settlement complex made up of sub-circular enclosures, circular and sub-rectangular house structures together with fields and cairns (SMR. NY93 NE79). At Peg's House (NY 982352) too a curvilinear enclosure is known (Dur.Univ. Air Photo neg.120/4). These remains may well represent settlement over a considerable length of time with a change in fashion and era marked by the two styles of house building, namely, the curvilinear and rectilinear. The sub-rectangular form of house structure may possibly be the rural native response to the Roman rectangular style of construction. Once again, there has been no excavation of the sites themselves but a peat sample from nearby Bollihope Bog is particularly relevant to the question of dating. It shows forest clearance and the presence of grassland around a.d. 220_±100 (GaK3031)

(Turner, 1979, 288; 1981, 271). Another dated peat sample of 110±118 b.c. (GaK3033) from Steward Shield Meadow to the north (Turner 1979, 289; 1981, 271) shows the presence of grassland at this earlier time. While strictly speaking this does not necessarily apply to the Bollihope Common settlement it does show similar activity within the same general area. That activity, within the two districts referred to, probably involved pastoral farming according to the pollen evidence for grassland.

Environmental evidence is also available from Upper Teesdale where in addition many more potential settlement sites are known. The information derived from pollen diagrams can provide a useful background as it were against which to view the evidence of settlement sites. Whilst it would appear that in common with most of north-east England most of the landscape was well forested (Turner 1979, 286) in pre-Roman times, there is evidence to show the spread of grass and heathland as early as the second millennium BC. A pollen diagram from Cow Green yielded a carbon 14 determination for this at 1220±100 b.c. (GaK-2027) (Turner, 1981, 270). Nearby on Widdybank Fell at Tinkler's Sike the same process is delayed until a date centred on 620±80 b.c. (GaK2027) (Turner, 1981, 270). Further up the Tees valley the same landscape changes are seen at a height of 550m (1800ft) at Valley Bog on the Moor House Nature Reserve. As might be expected the dating for this is later still, namely, between 262±55 and

255±46 b.c. (SRR 88 and 89) (Turner, 1979, 287; 1981, 270-271). In conventional archaeological terminology the earliest clearance is taking place in the Bronze Age and the others during the Iron Age. A pollen diagram from Simy Folds on Holwick Fell at 366m (1200ft) O.D. shows a similar sequence. At an undated level but one appropriate to the middle Bronze Age a rise in herbaceous pollen occurs together with appearance of ribwort plantain, the latter indicative of agricultural activity; other open habitat species especially dock, plantain and buttercup point to pastoral activity. Yet the high proportion of tree pollen shows that the landscape is still mainly wooded. After a layer of alder wood radiocarbon dated to 450±80 b.c. (HAR 3791) there is a dramatic increase in the pollen of grasses as well as in sedges, heather and bog moss. At the same time tree pollen decreases (Donaldson, 1983, 16-18).

If it be accepted that Man as well as climate had a part to play in these changes, then of the various habitation sites identified in the upper dale some may be expected tentatively to belong to the various phases marked out by this palynological evidence and indeed the Bronze Age settlement of Bracken Rigg (NY 862282) (Coggins and Fairless, 1984) yielded a radiocarbon determination of 1230±80 b.c. (HAR 2414), almost identical with that from Cow Green. This date came from the large circular stone-based house of 9.0m diameter and provides a warning

against too readily assigning sites containing circular structures to later contexts. At the same time the pollen evidence is such as to urge the claim of later periods also to the possession of sites.

With regard to settlement sites most of the fieldwork has concentrated on the upper dale above Middleton (Coggins, 1986). This probably accounts for the contrast in numbers between this area and the district between Middleton and Barnard Castle. It will be convenient to deal with these two stretches of the Tees valley in succession.

For the upper stretch, three relevant settlement sites have been excavated, namely Dubby Sike, Forcegarth Pasture North, and Forcegarth Pasture South.

Dubby Sike site (NY 795311) consists of two groups of foundations about 30m apart which occupy a south-facing slope on the east bank of the Dubby Sike, a stream which now flows into the Cow Green reservoir (Coggins and Gidney 1985; Coggins 1986). The location of the site at 488m (1600ft) O.D. is such that it is normally below the high water mark (1603ft) of the reservoir but the remains were revealed during the drought of 1984. The eastern group of remains included a boat-shaped building measuring 4m by 2m internally with an entrance in the gable end. Adjoining this on the north was a circular structure having the appearance of a ring-cairn of 5m diameter. Large whinstone boulders had been used in the building of these

structures. The western group of remains was a complex of interconnected circular buildings with courtyards and passages somewhat reminiscent of the remains at the Neolithic settlement at Skara Brae, Orkney (Feachem, 1963, 28-9). Once more whinstone boulders were used in the construction but the floors were paved and cobbled. Other structures may have existed in the space between the two groups, concealed by the spread of shingle and stone rubble. Certainly at a point along the shore some 70m to the east of the excavated sites the present writer noted the battered remains of another boat-shaped structure of similar size to the one referred to above. It seems quite probable that the site investigated formed only part of a more extensive settlement area.

Unfortunately, excavation yielded no finds apart from a few non-diagnostic flints. There were no hearths but enough charcoal was recovered to obtain four radiocarbon determinations, as follows:

Eastern Group:

Pits in 'ring cairn':

161±90 b.c. (HAR 6551);

91±100 b.c.(HAR No. not yet available).

Boat-shaped house:

120±100 a.d. (HAR No. not yet available).

Western Group:

Paving outside circular building: 221±100 b.c. (HAR 6552).

These results are in themselves sufficient to dispose of the suspicion arising from the form of some of the remains that Neolithic or Early Bronze Age periods were involved.

Calculating these dates within the 2-sigma range to achieve a high degree of probability the earliest date in this series, that from the paving, is 421 b.c. and the latest, from the boat-shaped structure, is a.d. 320. Human activity on the site taken as a whole has a very high chance of having occurred between the limits of these two dates. Calibrated dates (Stuiver and Pearson, 1986) give this range as 403 BC to AD 416. In other words the chronological range is that of the Iron Age to Romano-British periods. Whether it is possible to refine this result further is more problematical and hazardous for a non-statistician. If it is assumed that all the structures in the settlement are exactly contemporary then the common overlap in the date ranges which occurs between 43 BC and AD 21 (calibrated according to Stuiver and Pearson, 1986), suggests that the settlement belongs to the later Iron Age. However, other permutations are possible if it is supposed that the structures on site are not contemporary. It would be possible in this case to hold a view involving a lengthy occupation within the limits already set or even abandonment followed by re-occupation.

The only other evidence available results from examination of soil samples by Dr. M. Van der Veen

(pers.comm. D. Coggins). These showed the absence of cereal pollen and grasses and in fact indicated a landscape identical with that of the present day. This would suggest that tree clearance had already taken place on a wide scale. Taking account of the palynological evidence from the area already cited such evidence would support a period within the late Iron Age or later. The indications are too of the absence of farming activities on any large scale, even pastoralism. Thus if in fact engaged in farming at all, the Dubby Sike settlement seems best interpreted as lacking intensive occupation. That might well mean that it was not occupied all year round but rather during summer grazing, in other words, the practice of transhumance. It seems not at all unlikely that folk living in settlements further down the valley such as those living in the vicinity of Forcegarth Pasture were involved in such activity.

Forcegarth Pasture North (NY 875284) and Forcegarth Pasture South (NY 876283) are two settlement sites to be found in rough pasture on the north bank of the river Tees.

The former is situated next to the Smithy Sike at the foot of a slope. It survives in the form of a partly grassed-over stony mound forming an oval enclosure measuring some 40m by 35m. In the centre are the remains of a house complex and a separate circular hut next to it. Following excavation, (Fairless and Coggins, 1980a) the site may be

interpreted as a farmstead or small settlement protected by a substantial stone-based timber stockade (fig.5.3). The central house was a three-roomed building of stone and timber combined constructed in the curvilinear tradition (fig.5.4). The north room was the largest with an internal diameter of 4.3m. Its paved entrance was on the east with a small alcove containing a hearth on the left upon entering. Abutting the house-complex was another circular structure of similar size to the north room described above. It too had an eastern paved entrance and although in this case there was no special alcove to contain it the hearth was yet again to the left of the doorway for it was here that a small concentration of charcoal and burnt bone was found. This structure was in effect a separate hut although it may be regarded as an additional room to the house-complex. Close by the central house-complex, on its north side, was a separate circular hut with well-paved floor of 7m internal diameter. No hearth was found within this hut but almost half of the interior was unexcavated including the area on the eastern side where the entrance was located. The main entrance to the enclosure measuring 2.6m wide was on the east. A track running along the north bank of the Smithy Sike led towards this entrance. A subsidiary entrance, 2m wide, was situated on the north side of the enclosure. This allowed direct access to two exterior hut circles situated 10m north of the enclosure itself.

Finds from the excavations were few. They included spindle whorls and quernstones. The former suggest the use of textiles, presumably from the wool of sheep, while the latter indicate the grinding of corn, quite probably grown locally in view of nearby field systems. A few fragments of native pottery were found but no Roman pottery. The recovery of quantities of birch bark, used perhaps for waterproofing the huts and probably for making containers, when taken with the many 'pot-boilers' found helps to account for the shortage of pottery. There was probably little dependence upon pots and it may be argued that one is dealing here with a virtually aceramic culture. There was also evidence of iron working on site, of an order to be regarded as sufficient for domestic needs. Charcoal from the hut added to the central house gave a radiocarbon date of a.d. 140_±70 (HAR 864).

Forcegarth Pasture South is located about 120m south-east of the North site and is situated on the south-east facing slope above the river Tees. Slightly larger than its northern neighbour, in plan it is an oval, of 40m internal diameter, with a small rectangular enclosure attached (fig.5.5). Excavations (Fairless and Coggins, 1986) revealed that the perimeter mound of the main enclosure had been a substantial stone wall possibly surmounted by a timber fence but with no outer ditch. The entrance to the site, which was unexcavated, is represented by a gap 4m wide on the northern side of the perimeter. Inside the

enclosure, four contiguous hollows almost cross the site in an irregular line from south to north. Excavation of two of these, marked A and C on the plan, showed that they represent the positions of stone-based oval huts, measuring 7.2m along their major axes, partly set into the hill slope. After a narrow gap a fifth hut position occurs, adjacent to the perimeter wall on the north side.

In the case of House C a well-paved alcove at a higher level than the floor was built into the wall on the north side (fig.5.6). Measuring 4.7m long by 1.5m wide this feature might well have served as a sleeping place. Use as a pantry or storage space are other possibilities. Two hearths were also found. Removal of the cobble floor of House C revealed the prior existence of a circular ring-groove timber structure with porch. This measured 4.7m (15ft) in diameter. A similar two-phase sequence probably applied to House A also and it is permissible to suggest the likelihood of the same situation for the other, unexcavated examples. Besides the ring-groove in House C large postholes were found which may represent an earlier phase still or else have held posts which provided additional support for the ring-groove hut itself.

Once more, as in the case of the north site, finds were few in number. Loomweights indicated textile weaving and quernstones the use of corn, probably locally grown as was suggested for Forcegarth North. Again, there was evidence of metalworking on a domestic scale. By contrast with

Forcegarth North Roman contact was evident in the presence of Roman pottery. There was only a small amount but this included both Samian ware and coarse pottery. The probable date for the assemblage was the middle of the second century AD (Gidney, in Fairless and Coggins, 1986, 34). Nails closely resembling hobnails in the Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle from the excavations at the Roman forts of Piercebridge and Binchester are also indicative of Roman contact. Charcoal from one of the large timber-phase postholes produced a radiocarbon determination of a.d. 210₊₉₀ (HAR 1447). A rare glimpse of the spiritual aspect of the settlement's inhabitants is afforded by the find of a small crudely carved stone figurine the size of a chess piece, being no more than 34mm in height and 15mm in diameter. The stylised figure depicted is reminiscent of a seated Mother Goddess, symbolic of fertility and maternity. The reverse, with its sinuous pattern, may represent a divine serpent, often associated with healing, the Otherworld and also fertility (see Chapter 10).

Adjacent to both Forcegarth sites are the remains of field systems preceding the present-day arrangements. These include small squarish fields flanking the access trackway leading to the northern site. Such fields would be suitable for crop cultivation on a small scale. They could equally well have served as paddocks for activities involving stock. However, lynched areas in East Forcegarth, some 400m north-east of the ancient settlement

sites, must be regarded as arable fields (Pl.I). What does seem improbable is that both ancient settlement sites were occupied and flourishing at the same time. The present-day Forcegarth Pasture supports only one farm which is given over to stock raising. The North site produced no Roman pottery despite the fact that the entire central house complex was excavated while the South site did do so. This in itself argues for North being the earlier of the two, and for being pre-Roman or at least early Roman in period. The Roman pottery from South shows that the stone phase settlement was flourishing about the middle of the second century AD or slightly later perhaps. The radiocarbon determinations lend support to this sequence. The various phases of the two settlements add possible complications to the detailed working out of the relationship between the two sites but the general sequence seems able to be established. Whether there was any break in continuity between the two settlements is uncertain. Whilst it cannot be proved that Forcegarth South not only followed North in time but also succeeded it as the home for the same community, it seems quite likely that this was the case. In short, it seems probable that Forcegarth Pasture North was an Iron Age settlement exploiting the resources of the area which was succeeded by Forcegarth Pasture South, a native settlement of the Roman period. As far as one can judge from the limited evidence the basic economy of the changeover had not altered significantly. The reason for the end of

Forcegarth North may well have been the increasing wetness of the site brought on perhaps by the removal of trees from the slopes round about. It is significant perhaps that Forcegarth South is located on a steeper slope having better drainage as if the siting had been made with this in view.

In addition to the evidence from the three settlement sites of Dubby Sike, Forcegarth North and Forcegarth South, other evidence has emerged from excavations elsewhere in the upper dale.

From Holwick Fell at 366m (1200ft) O.D. there is evidence of Iron Age activity. This comes from the excavations at the Early Medieval settlement of Simy Folds (Coggins, Fairless and Bat^ey, 1983). Within Building 2 of Site 1 (NY 889276) was found a rock-cut hearth containing charcoal which yielded a radiocarbon determination of 380 \pm 100 b.c. (HAR 4035). No structural remains were identified but it seems reasonable to argue that Iron Age activity represents one episode only in a long history of occupation of the area, with Bronze Age activity preceding it and the early medieval settlement coming much later. This latter is represented by the structures whose foundations are now surviving (Coggins et al, 1983, 22-24). The excavations showed that these later settlement sites belong to the 8th century AD but that they had been inserted into earlier field boundaries identified on Holwick Fell. These field systems on Holwick Fell as well

as others on Harter Fell have been mapped by Coggins who has argued for their initial second millennium date. At the same time he points out that they contain elements of more than one period (Coggins, 1986, 36 and 65-67, fig.9). It does seem quite probable that just as the eighth century settlements on Simy Folds utilised the prehistoric field boundaries so in earlier times other settlements subsequent to the field systems did the same thing. Be that as it may, further support for Iron Age activity is provided by the find near Simy Folds site 1 of two fragments from a wheel-turned shale vessel of a late Iron Age type (Coggins et al, 1983, 23; Coggins, 1986, 34). This takes on greater significance when considered in the context of the palynological evidence for Iron Age activity referred to above.

At Middle Hurth (NY 867308), a ceremonial or funerary site located above Langdon Beck at 457m (1500ft) O.D., charcoal from a cairn has produced a radiocarbon dating of 260 \pm 80 b.c. (HAR 2918) (Fairless and Coggins, 1979; 1980b). No relevant settlement site has been identified in the vicinity but some 300m to the north overlooking Middle Hurth is the site of Teesdale Cave. This has yielded evidence, unfortunately undated, of cereal cultivation including oats amidst an environment of grassland and woodland. Turner, who examined the environmental material, considered that this assemblage was typical of pollen zone VIII (i.e. sub-Atlantic, c.500 BC - 450 AD)

(Sims 1971). Coggins' suggestion that this phase from Teesdale Cave and the Middle Hurth cairn were contemporary is an attractive one. However, whether the cave itself served as a settlement site is open to doubt. There is a strong possibility that it too was a sacred site in view of the decapitated skeleton found within it. The skull was found "jammed into a narrow fissure a few feet away from the other bones" (Coggins, 1986, 37, quoting Backhouse, 1896). However that may be, the Middle Hurth evidence is enough in itself to indicate Iron Age activity high up the dale.

Returning now to the evidence provided by the remains of unexcavated settlement sites, several may be noted in the neighbourhood of those on Forcegarth Pasture already discussed.

On the same side of the river at Calf Holm (NY 865284), a small settlement is located within a bend of the river Tees (Coggins, 1986, 88, no.28). At least one circular hut position is visible together with a small walled enclosure and traces of another similar enclosure. Three larger enclosures butt up against the steep cliff to the east of the settlement. Clearly not a strongly defensive site, Calf Holm is nonetheless well protected from both the weather and wild animals. The larger enclosures suggest stock rearing. Dating evidence is lacking but a later prehistoric date seems probable. Re-use of the site by a recluse in the nineteenth century is also attested.

Some 600m north-west of Forcegarth South another settlement is recorded at High Force Quarry (NY 880290) (Coggins, 1986, 101, no.26). This site has been partly destroyed by the quarry. Only two hut circles can now be identified, one of about 5m internal diameter, the other surviving as a circular platform of 3.5m diameter. The former is situated within a ditched concentric enclosure, now partly destroyed. The find of a Roman quernstone in the vicinity may point to the Roman period as likely for this otherwise undated settlement (SMR. NY 82 NE32).

Along the slopes of the right bank of the river Tees, more or less opposite to Forcegarth Pasture, are other settlements. At Pasture Foot is an extensive unenclosed settlement (centred on NY 872280) (Coggins, 1986, 112, no.20, fig.24). It is a complex of walls together with round and subrectangular house foundations. Such mixed building traditions may well represent a fusion of Roman and native traditions and with this in mind Coggins' tentative classification of the site as late prehistoric would seem to merit revision to one of Romano-British.

By contrast an enclosed settlement occurs at Bleabeck Foot (NY 875280) (Coggins, 1986, 84, no.27, fig.33). It is near the river edge and has six circular house foundations which have internal diameters ranging from 4m to 5m. Massive stone walls 2m thick give the impression of permanent occupation. A trackway travels from the river bank to the site and continues beyond uphill. Coggins

quite reasonably tentatively classified this site as Romano-British but in view of the evidence from Forcegarth North discussed above an earlier date is also possible. Further upstream, an unenclosed settlement (NY 867281) is situated next to Skyer Beck at its confluence with the Tees (Coggins, 1986, 118, no.84, fig.50). It consists of small circular hut positions, walled enclosures suggestive of small fields and clearance cairns. Only excavation can decide whether such a settlement should be assigned to the Iron Age or Romano-British period. Whether the small fields should be regarded as mainly paddocks for animals or as cultivation plots is uncertain. Multiple use would make good sense in a mixed farming regime.

Further upriver are other sites. Two of these, situated on the left bank of the Tees, require notice. One at Holmwath (NY 833291) (Coggins, 1986, 103, no.11) consists of one small circle of 2m internal diameter and two large circles of 6m internal diameter, with an adjoining irregular enclosure. Another, at Lingy Holm (NY 820281) (Coggins, 1986, no.10) on a ledge between the river and the cliffs of Falcon Clints, has three circular hut positions of 7m internal diameter. Such sites as these, with their circular huts, are clearly in the prehistoric tradition. Coggins lists them as candidates for classification amongst sites belonging to the last phase of the Early Bronze Age (Coggins, 1986, 31). Other possible sites which he lists in this category are:

Bleabeck Washfold (NY 873274), Wool Ingles (NY 882271), Keld Smithy (NY 889268), Stone Houses (NY 908253), Crosthwaite Common Sheepfold (NY 923251) and Buck Riggs (NY 921245 - 916247). Following the example of the excavated Bronze Age site of Bracken Rigg (NY 882282) (Coggins and Fairless, 1984), this classification is based on the criterion that settlements above about 381m (1200ft) O.D. which have large huts within an irregular enclosure could well belong to this period. This is an attractive theory and it would be useful if it could be applied with more confidence. However, more evidence is required before this can be employed other than tentatively to make such distinctions between obviously prehistoric-type sites.

Holmwath and Lingy Holm, whether Early Bronze Age or later, have been considered here as settlement sites located close by the river Tees and this may be a significant factor to be added to height above sea level. Fish from the river and ready supplies of water would be advantages. Less obvious advantages are shelter and protection yet with access to terrain on the opposite bank. Such factors might have operated also in the case of a third settlement site on the right bank of the Tees some 300m upstream from Lingy Holm. At the foot of Black Hill (NY 817284), east of the confluence of the Maize Beck and the Tees are to be found three circular foundations, the largest of which has an internal diameter of 4m, and

one oval foundation measuring 8m by 6m. There are also traces of an irregular enclosure (Coggins, 1986, no.40). The fact that these remains are insubstantial may point to their temporary nature. It is possible that they were occupied for only part of the year, presumably during the summer months if part of a system of transhumance.

Before leaving this discussion of unexcavated riverine settlements one more needs consideration. This is a settlement down-river from the High Force waterfall, near the Winch Bridge (NY 901279) (Coggins, 1986, 123, no.21). Winch Bridge settlement (fig.5.7) occupies low-lying rough pasture land close to the river Tees. It utilises rock outcrops as partial boundaries for field enclosures. There are two types of hut position in the settlement as it now survives. In the first type, a small irregular enclosure measuring 39m by 30m contains three circular huts, two of which are built into the enclosure wall. The other is attached by means of a cross-wall. The biggest of these huts is about 10m internal diameter. In the second type of hut, the position consists of an unenclosed circle about 8m in diameter to which is attached a slightly smaller trapezoidal enclosure. This perhaps represents a small yard but it may have been the second room of a two-roomed structure.

The surviving remains at Winch Bridge clearly form only part of a once larger site for as they extend eastwards the ancient field boundaries fade out upon entering

meadowland. Here fainter traces of a linear earthwork, no doubt a former field boundary, and a possible circular hut position can be discerned. Such a non-defensive site as Winch Bridge in its riverine location seems likely to belong to the Romano-British period. Even so some chronological depth seems possible taking account of the two types of hut identified on site. Each type involves a circular hut and thus belongs to the native tradition but excavation is needed to aid further interpretation.

It is not proposed to discuss in exhaustive detail all the remaining possible later Prehistoric and Romano-British sites known in this part of Upper Teesdale. A full list of sites has been recently published (Coggins, 1986). However, a few sites which are more remote from the river Tees than the unexcavated group just discussed seem worthy of some consideration here.

To the north of the river Tees is a rectangular earthwork (NY 893288) on the summit of a ridge which is situated between Newbiggin and High Force (SMR. NY82 NE7). Surviving remains indicate that originally the enclosure was formed by a double bank and ditch. A bank divides the interior into two parts. The south-west corner is occupied by a smaller enclosure which has an apparent entrance at its south-east corner. There are no traces of habitation and it has been suggested that the purpose of the main site was that of stock enclosure. This site is included here because it is a rarity in the area.

No dating evidence is available for it but, if it is not medieval, there is the possibility that it has some affinity with rectilinear settlements of the type now so well recorded by aerial survey in the lowlands of Durham further to the east.

Hut circles, apparently isolated, are another type of site to be noted. One possibility is to be found at Chester Sike (NY 882302) in Ettersgill at 351m (1150ft) O.D. north of the river Tees (Coggins, 1986, 90, no.67). The remains are in the form of a circular bank of 9m diameter. South of the Tees, another doubtful example occurs at Birk Rigg (NY 859281) (Coggins, 1986, 82, no.31). This one, at 3m internal diameter, is small and may in fact be the remains of a cairn. Two other hut circles are more definite; both occur on the steep slopes of Holwick Scar. The first at Hind Gate (NY 902269) has a diameter of about 8m (Coggins, 1986, 102, no.44). It is situated at the top of a steep track ascending Holwick Scar. The second, at Fairy Dell (NY 912262), further along the scars to the south-east, is located on a shelf about halfway up the slope. It is smaller, having a diameter of about 6m (Coggins, 1986, 96, no.64).

Without additional information close dating of such sites is impossible but they are clearly in the native tradition. In Malhamdale a Bronze Age context has been proposed (Raistrick and Holmes, 1962, 80) for an isolated hut at Comb Scar (SD 894648) (Pl.VIa). A similar context

was suggested for the small apparently unenclosed hut belonging to phase I of the site at West Brandon in County Durham (Jobey, 1962, 22) as well as for unenclosed Cheviot settlements (Jobey, 1985). However, the bottom stone of a rotary quern was found built into a wall close to the circle at Fairy Dell. This is not likely to have travelled far from its site in the ordinary course of events. There is a good chance - trading activities excepted - that it came from the Fairy Dell circle. If that is correct, then a likely context for this hut at least would be later Iron Age or early Roman.

As to the function of such isolated hut circles, various explanations are possible and it is not necessary that a single explanation need apply to all. They may be individual homesteads, as was proposed for Comb Scar. Certainly huts of the order of 6m to 8m in diameter would make suitable dwellings. Alternatively, isolated huts may have been intended for temporary accommodation, perhaps for shepherds. Indeed, in the case of the two Holwick Scar huts it is tempting to see them as having been so located as to be of advantage to folk travelling between the low-lying land down by the river and the high pastures on Holwick Fell. These and other possibilities however must remain speculative in the present state of knowledge.

What does appear to be a permanent single farmstead occurs on Crossthwaite Common (NY 934247) at 320m (1100ft) O.D. (Coggins, 1986, 92, no.23, fig.48). This is a

sub-circular two-roomed hut which has attached to it a sub-circular embanked enclosure of about 20m diameter. In the immediate vicinity are clearance cairns and field boundaries with lynchets forming 'Celtic' fields covering at least 4ha (Coggins, 1986, 40).

Crossthwaite Common farmstead is unexcavated and undated but its house is similar in form to that at Forcegarth Pasture North and it belongs to the prehistoric tradition. It seems reasonable to assign it to an Iron Age date failing evidence to the contrary. If the nearby 'Celtic' fields are to be associated with the site, then it is possible to argue that crop cultivation played a part in its basic economy. No doubt stock raising was practised too but there is no proof of this.

To the south-east of the previous site yet another type of settlement is to be found. On Harter Fell is a large, roughly oval, palisaded enclosure (NY 936238) (Coggins, 1986, 100, no.19, fig.23). It measures 180m long north-west to south-east by 80m wide. Its outline can be traced by means of a slight depression with the hint of an inner bank. Two knolls are embraced by it, the most northerly of which has its own sub-rectangular enclosure. This is much smaller being about 45m square and it appears to be intersected by the larger enclosure and is therefore earlier. Within the smaller enclosure are the faint traces of a circular hut position but which of the two enclosures it should belong to is impossible to say. In

the saddle between the two knolls are traces of other circular huts which clearly belong to the larger enclosure.

The function and dating of the Harter Fell palisaded sites are difficult problems in the absence of excavation. Pointing to their defensive position, Coggins has suggested that the smaller of the two enclosures could be regarded as a fortification to be associated with the probable Bronze Age cairn (now destroyed) on the hill top called Kirkcarrion (or Kirk Arran). A barbed and tanged arrowhead recovered by the present writer from a rabbit burrow within the small enclosure may, he suggests, provide a further link with that period (Coggins, 1986, 32, 38). Be that as it may, it may be suggested here that one function of such a site could be to control the minor route from Lunedale into Teesdale proper, now marked by a footpath, which passes between the 'fortified' knoll and that of Kirkcarrion.

The larger enclosure exceeds the size appropriate to a single homestead and, bearing in mind the probable internal hut positions, it seems likely to have contained a small community. As for dating, the occurrence of palisaded sites over a wide chronological range has made this a difficult problem to solve without additional evidence (cf. Jobey, 1979, 104). Coggins has suggested that the Harter Fell enclosures fall into the hill-top variety of sites which Challis and Harding classify as

'stockaded enclosures' and for which they favour a pre-fifth century BC date (1975, Pt.1, 101-104; Pt.2, fig.86). Whatever the date, such palisaded enclosures are likely, as suggested earlier, to belong to a context wherein there were plentiful supplies of timber available. By contrast, stone-based settlements while not necessarily lacking timber are likely to occur where ground cleared of timber has left stones available. Two such stone-based and rather enigmatic sites on Holwick Fell now require notice. These are Bleabeck Washfold (NY 873274), which is situated at 411m (1350ft) O.D. (Coggins, 1986, 85, no.12) and Wool Ingles (NY 882271) situated at 427m (1400ft) O.D. (Coggins, 1986, 124, no.13).

Bleabeck Washfold is a complex of circular and sub-rectangular foundations located on the north-west side of the stream called the Blea Beck. Parts of the site clearly survive from a comparatively modern sheep wash but others seem to represent a much earlier settlement site. This had been established next to a convenient water supply, namely the adjacent stream. Subsequently, no doubt, it provided a most suitable spot for sheep-washing activities as well as a ready supply of building stone for the pens required.

Wool Ingles, about half a mile distant, is very similar in its complexity. It too represents re-use of a site offering a ready supply of water and building materials. Amongst the remains can be identified a large circular

enclosure some 40m in diameter with at least three circular hut positions inside it. This enclosure has a 'funnel' entrance at the north-east. Such an arrangement suggests herding activities of some sort, not necessarily connected only with sheep.

As for dating, as has been noted above, Coggins has tentatively listed both Bleabek Washfold and Wool Ingles amongst Bronze Age sites (Coggins, 1986, 31). At the same time he recognises that considerable doubt attaches to this classification. Indeed in his gazetteer of sites, while describing Bleabek Washfold as 'probably Bronze Age' he lists Wool Ingles as possibly Romano-British (Coggins, 1986). The fact is that any period ranging from the conventional Bronze Age to Romano-British times seems possible for the ancient parts of these two sites.

Turning now to the district between Middleton and the vicinity of Barnard Castle, only a handful of potential sites is at present known.

What is probably the earliest in date is located on the north side of Baldersdale in rough pasture belonging to Briar Dykes farm (Fairless and Coggins, 1987). The site itself (NY 948199) occupies the top of a hill on the edge of Hunderthwaite Moor at 351m (1152ft) O.D. It is a sub-rectangular enclosure (fig.5.8) measuring 87m by 82m (285ft x 269ft), its perimeter being marked by a slight ditch and inner mound which is visible around the entire

circuit except for about two thirds of the steeply sloping southern side. On this side too in the projected line of the perimeter is a cup-marked earth-fast boulder. A narrow gap on the northern side of the enclosure appears to be the only place for an entrance.

Exploratory excavations have established that the shallow ditch had a rectangular slot in the bottom appropriate for a palisade trench. An outer linear feature parallel to the east side resulted from a slight step effect which may have been the result of light fencing fastened to posts set at wider intervals than the excavation trench and therefore not identified. The excavations revealed that the palisade trench on the western side had cut through an earlier site, Mesolithic in date according to the considerable number of worked and waste flints recovered. Excavation of a small portion of the interior revealed five post-holes which could be fitted on to the perimeter of a circle 4m in diameter but there was no occupation material to indicate whether this should in fact be regarded as the site of a hut.

As yet there is no date for the Briar Dykes palisaded enclosure. The cup-marked stone on its perimeter points to some time within the second millenniumⁿ BC, if associated with the site itself. However, this is not necessarily the case and corroborative evidence would be needed to accept such a date. The results of radiocarbon tests are pending and meanwhile the site may be compared to the

large enclosure on Harter Fell discussed above. Their difference in shape may be accounted for by topography. As a stockaded enclosure the date might therefore fall within the first half of the first millenⁿium BC. It seems likely that the palisaded site at Briar Dykes preceded the large embanked and partly ditched site on a neighbouring hill top (unpublished). At its eastern end this has a triple-mound protection. Nothing is known about this site except that it precedes the nineteenth century enclosure walls. A likely context for it, however, would be Iron Age. A hint of late Iron Age or early Roman native activity in the immediate vicinity is provided by the discovery of the topstones of two beehive querns in the garden of Briar Dykes farm (one in the possession of Mr. Beadle of Richmond similar to one held by the writer, pers. comm. Mrs. L. Thwaites). These stones may have no association with either of the hill-top sites, in which case it could well be that the present farmstead is situated close to or even over an earlier settlement.

Another site to be considered is located near the village of Cotherstone but on the opposite side of the river Tees, below Low Shipley farm (NZ 014202) (unpublished). This is an ovaloid site situated on a shelf above the flood plain of the river. About half an acre in area, it is delimited by a deep outer ditch and prominent mound on its southern and eastern sides. The western end is now flanked by a built-up trackway which presumably occupies the former

ditch and mound. Slight traces of a mound but no ditch occur on the uphill side of the enclosure to the north. At the eastern end is an inturned entrance 4.m wide at its narrowest. One probable hut position can be discerned inside, represented now by a slightly raised circular platform, 8m in diameter. Outside the enclosure, to the west, are the foundations of a small sub-circular structure attached to which is a small enclosure, perhaps a yard. Whether these two sites are in any way connected is impossible to say but the ditched enclosure at least would fall more easily into place as belonging to the conventional Iron Age. Such a site would control or take advantage of movement across the river where there is a fording point at the junction of the rivers Balder and Tees.

A little over half a mile further downstream is Baxton Gill, Marwood (NZ 025195), situated at a height of 183m (600ft) O.D. on a promontory 30m (100ft) above the river Tees which flows on its south-western side (SMR. NZ01 NW1). On its southern and eastern sides it is flanked by the deep ravine of Baxton Gill, a northern tributary of the Tees. The site is enclosed by a ditch marking out a near-circular enclosure of some 0.5ha (1.3ac) in extent. An inner rampart is to be seen on the north and west but appears as only a slight rise on the eastern side. A counter-scarp mound is also evident on the western side. The main entrance may be on the east where ditch and mound

peter out; there is, however, a narrow gap on the north which may have been an entrance. In the interior is an oval depression which may mark the position of a hut. The building of the modern boundary wall across the southern part of the site and ploughing of the interior as evidenced by the signs of ridge and furrow have probably contributed to the virtual disappearance of much of the inner rampart and perhaps of interior features. A hillock beyond the northern boundary of the site has traces of mounds on it which though indeterminate may represent some structure, connected perhaps with guarding the entrance to the main site.

Like the site at Low Shipley, Baxton Gill controls a crossing point over the river Tees but it is much more obviously placed in a defensive position and is in effect a promontory fort. As to date, there is no direct evidence but it seems reasonable to assign it to the Iron Age.

The final two sites for consideration in this discussion of Teesdale settlement are both rectilinear. One, Penny Hill Camp is in Langleydale to the north of Barnard Castle, the other, Tees Bank Plantation is situated just below Barnard Castle on the left bank of the river.

Penny Hill Camp (NZ 080235 is a small rectangular enclosure, measuring some 45m by 55m with rounded corners and a single entrance on the east side, 4.3m wide (HBMC

SAM. Durham 95). It is surrounded by an inner mound, outer ditch and counter-scarp mound. The only visible interior feature is a low mound running in an east-west direction from the perimeter next to the entrance for about half the width of the enclosure. The site's location near the top of a ridge provides wide views to the south, east and north-east.

Penny Hill Camp is unexcavated and its date and purpose are unknown. It is comparable in size and shape to the rectilinear twin-stockyard type known in Northumberland referred to earlier (Jobey, 1960, 1-38). It is possible that the internal mound is serving to divide the interior into two parts in the same fashion as the dividing wall at the Northumberland site of Woolaw (Charlton and Day, 1978). However, the absence of hut circles is a difficulty in this interpretation of Penny Hill as a native site, although it is possible that they have either been destroyed or else were originally of timber. Only excavation seems able to offer a solution.

Tees Bank Plantation (NZ 069150) was revealed during aerial survey (Selkirk colln.) as a crop mark on the left bank of the river Tees (fig.5.9). It is a five-sided ditched enclosure with an entrance at about the middle of the south side, and another possible entrance in the north side. Various features inside include an oval enclosure as well as three or four hut circles. Outside the enclosure, field boundaries are attached to the north side

and part of an apparently narrow unattached enclosure can be detected a few metres beyond the southern side. There is little doubt that the site at Tees Bank Plantation should be classified amongst the ditched rectilinear settlements of later prehistoric or Roman period which occur in considerable numbers further east. The external partly enclosed feature cannot be identified but the field boundaries show that the main site was part of a farming landscape.

To sum up the evidence for the region south of the Tyne Corridor, it is clear that settlement is sparse as far as Weardale. The excavated site of Apperley Dene on the eastern fringe of the region shows Roman period native occupation. More fieldwork, however, might change this view of the situation. Yet, even in Weardale itself despite more intensive fieldwork, settlement of the later prehistoric to Roman periods is comparatively slight. This contrasts with Teesdale where many more potential sites are known. Selective excavation in Teesdale has contributed to an understanding of the settlement in the region. A framework of settlement sites in the Bronze Age, Later Iron Age and Roman native periods has been established with indications of activity earlier in the Iron Age too. Palynological evidence adds support for this interpretation. The findings from these two lines of enquiry provide the background against which a considerable number of otherwise undated settlement sites

may be placed. There is a variety of types enclosed and unenclosed, palisaded, ditched and banked, isolated hut circles, single homesteads consisting of hut and attached yard, and larger settlement. Such a variety is probably in part the result of different periods and in part the consequence of different functions. The attribution of sites to their proper chronological context is difficult without more information such as might be produced by excavation. There may well be more stone-based Bronze Age huts like that at Bracken Rigg, as Coggins suggests. If timber-built huts of the later pre-Roman period exist they have not yet been found. The two palisaded enclosures discovered may belong to the transitional phase between the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age, during the first half of the first millennium BC. It seems not unlikely that other similar sites lie within the dales, as yet undiscovered. The few isolated circular huts that are known could have served various functions and belonged to different later prehistoric periods. One at least seems likely to have been later Iron Age or early Roman period. The single farmstead type consisting of sub-circular hut and attached yard seems able to be tentatively placed within the Iron Age. Other larger settlements exist but even these are small, entitled to be assigned to no more than hamlet status. Fortified sites, as distinct from defended examples, are virtually non-existent, two only being candidates and occurring in the riverine stretch below Middleton. The curvilinear tradition both in hut

and enclosure shape is dominant. However, settlements exist, both in Weardale and Teesdale which have a mixture of round and rectangular hut types. These probably belong to the Roman period. Open settlements might be expected to have flourished under the Pax Romana and some of the riverine sites in Teesdale could belong to this group and the Weardale sites on Bollihope Common almost certainly do so. Other sites in Teesdale more remote from the river are less easy to classify for an inward looking hut with attached yard or huts set within a complex of small enclosures is perhaps just as 'enclosed' from the point of view of protection - against raiders and wild animals - as the more formally encompassed settlement. The latter are perhaps merely variants of the former. Of the more formal type of enclosure, however, Teesdale has provided examples arising from the excavations at Forcegarth Pasture. The South site is one certain enclosed example assignable to the Roman period. With this in mind, other similar riverine sites should probably be so regarded but the findings from the North site at Forcegarth Pasture warn against dogmatism in the matter. Whilst there were settlements belonging to the Roman period within the region of the Northern Pennines there is nothing approaching the status of a villa and if the South site at Forcegarth Pasture is anything to go by Roman influence was only slight. That need not mean that the Roman presence was not felt for surplus produce channelled towards Roman needs may indeed have been instrumental

in helping to depress the standard of living. The inhabitants of some of the settlements in the Durham dales such as Wool Ingles high up the valley sides may have been responding to Roman military requirements by raising stock, whether sheep, cattle or horses. Equally, however, they could belong to another period and be reacting to different economic and social influences. Even if, however, all such doubtful sites as these were assigned to the Roman period it would not provide evidence of massive Roman impact. In the region of the northern Pennines the vast majority of settlements would seem to represent a way of life that was largely unromanised.

CHAPTER SIX

RURAL SETTLEMENT: CENTRAL PENNINES, NORTHERN PART.

The Stainmore Pass, which is followed by the river Greta (a tributary of the Tees), marks the division between the northern and the central Pennines. This is a natural route across the Pennines now followed by the busy A66 road. The southern edge of the eastern approaches to the crossing is formed by the foothills of the Pennine range. Here early remains are known on Gayles and Barningham Moors (fig.1.6).

On Gayles Moor at 244m (800ft) O.D. is the fortified site of Castlesteads (Elgee and Elgee, 1932, 119, Gaz.246; HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks 220)(NZ 112075) which occupies a steep-sided promontory between two streams. A well-defined rampart and outer ditch cut off the promontory enclosing an area of about 1.5ha (3.75ac) and in addition have originally encircled the site. Parts of these encircling earthworks have succumbed to erosion on the steep eastern and western sides. On the south side is an entrance through a counterscarp mound but no way directly through the main rampart on this side. There are, however, two openings in the main rampart on the north side and entry must have been effected by passing through the counterscarp mound into the ditch, then by following the ditch around to the opposite side on the north and thence through one of the openings there into the interior. Some

300m south of the fort proper a further length of rampart and southern ditch extends for 300m between two streams. The area additionally enclosed in this manner is about 3.45ha (8.5ac). Castlesteads is unexcavated and there is no date or evidence of settlement in the form of circular structures. It may be that the remains of habitation sites lie concealed beneath the rough ground in the interior. If so they have yet to be identified. Sub-rectangular structures, however, can be recognised in the north-east part of the site, against the inner side of the rampart, as well as traces of a stone wall running east-west in the southern part. These features seem likely to be later additions perhaps representing re-occupation possibly in the Roman or sub-Roman period. However that may be, the actual site is probably pre-Roman, and seems best regarded as Iron Age failing evidence to the contrary. The additional enclosed area to the south of the site itself is suggestive of a stock enclosure.

Such a fortified site as Castlesteads may have been a power centre suitable for a petty chieftain. If so, the habitation sites of a local population are not in evidence on the moor. Only one round house foundation and a small field system with a few small cairns have been recorded from Gayles Moor (Laurie, 1985, 150). If the houses were of timber then identification would be difficult if not impossible in the normal course of investigation. Alternatively, the area may in fact be virtually

unoccupied. Habitation sites related to it may lie at lower elevations in country more suited to arable farming. Subsequent farming activity will have destroyed surface indications for the most part and the best hope of recovery of such evidence lies in aerial survey. That this may not be a vain expectation can be seen in the considerable numbers of sites identified by such means in recent years in the vicinity of Stanwick St. John, only five miles distant.

Three miles west of Gayles Moor there is evidence of early activity on Barningham Moor (Laurie, 1985). This includes cairns, cup-marked stones, stone circles as well as potential settlement sites. Bronze Age activity is attested by the contents of How Tallon cairn (NZ 05750745) (Coggins and Clews, 1980) which included a Beaker, a Food Vessel and barbed and tanged arrowheads. Other cairns, stone circles and cup-marked stones indicate further such activity on the moor. It may well be that some of the enclosures, and habitation sites should be assigned to this context. Of the settlement sites, a few isolated hut circles are known. Examples of these have been noted near Hope Plantation (NZ 05000945) at 240m (787ft) O.D., near Haythwaite (NZ 05500945) at 260m (853ft) O.D. and near Snaiza (NZ 08050590) at 320m (1050ft) O.D. The latter has an outer ring ditch (Laurie, 1977). Besides these a number of isolated curvilinear enclosures are reported, as well as more extensive field boundary banks sometimes

accompanied by stone clearance cairns, for example at Brown Hill (NZ 07450970)(Laurie, 1977; 1985, 149). It may be that such open settlements belong to a context prior to about the fifth century BC as has been suggested for unenclosed settlements in the Cheviots to the north (Jobey, 1985), as well as elsewhere. However, even if accepted as a general rule exceptions are likely as has been seen in the discussion above of this question in relation to Teesdale. Open settlement is likely to give an indication of the social and economic conditions prevailing at the time. The kind of conditions encouraging open settlement might well recur at different periods and so it would be unwise to be too dogmatic without corroborative evidence.

The most notable habitation site on Barningham Moor is situated on a terrace below How Tallon ridge at 430m (1411ft) O.D. Here five large curvilinear enclosures contain hut circles. Three of these are in the form of double hut with attached yard. In addition, there are two enclosures without huts, and part of an enclosure with a circular hut attached to the outside. Furthermore, there are two groups of unenclosed huts; one comprising eight huts set in a line, one of which is rectangular, measuring 16m by 4m, while the remainder are circular; the other group consists of three connected circular huts running in a line at right angles to the base of the scar and in effect serving to close off the terrace (Laurie, 1977,

11-13; 1985, 149). As a result, it is perhaps a moot point whether the 'unenclosed' portion of the settlement should in truth be regarded as an 'open settlement'.

With over a score of huts, the How Tallon settlement is clearly to be regarded as a village community. The five enclosure-and-hut-circle sites may well represent five family groups and the rows of unenclosed huts would no doubt indicate yet more. It seems probable that the settlement represents development over a period of time. On present evidence it is unclear which came first, the unenclosed huts or the enclosed examples. It may be surmised however that a small homestead, perhaps of the twin-hut and yard type, came first and that this was then followed by other enclosed huts. With the security offered by the presence of these homesteads, it was finally felt possible to establish more open type huts, namely, the unenclosed examples. Even then, however, they were so arranged as to afford protection.

With regard to the economic basis of the settlement, there is no direct evidence, nor are there any fields nearby to be associated with it. However, two sunken ways lead from both the west and east ends of the terrace up to the area of moorland above (Laurie, 1977). These might well indicate droveways used for moving animals to the higher pastures. No doubt they would be mostly for summer use. At such an elevation combined with the northerly aspect it might indeed be expected that the main, if not the sole,

farming activity of the settlement would be that of pastoralism and such evidence as has been adduced would seem to support this supposition.

As to period of occupation, direct evidence is once more absent. The circular huts leave no doubt about the general prehistoric to Romano-British range of time. The size of the settlement, however, suggests a later date in this time range and the rectangular hut, which on the ground does not appear to be a much later insertion, perhaps favours a Romano-British context.

Moving further west, as far as habitation sites are concerned, there would appear to be blank areas, such as Scargill Moor, just south of Bowes. Settlement on Stainmore is sparse nowadays on the high bleak moors west of the village of Bowes at the head of the eastern end of the pass. However, an enclosed settlement of early date is known near East Mellwaters farm (NY 96851245) some 1.5 miles south-west of Bowes (Laurie, 1984, 35-39). It is situated at 289m (950ft) O.D. on level ground south of the Sleighthome Beck above its confluence with the river Greta. The enclosure now in ruins and much robbed was oval in shape, measuring 45m by 38m and surrounded by a substantial stone wall the original thickness of which was 3.5m. The main entrance had probably been on the east side of the enclosure which in this part has been robbed to make a sheep enclosure. Subsidiary entrances occurred on the north and south parts of the enclosure wall.

A complex of three hut circles is located on the western side of the interior, leaving an open space or yard in front. The largest circle measuring 9.5m in diameter internally is flanked by the other two measuring internally 6.0m and 6.5m respectively. They are so arranged as to enclose a small space adjacent to the perimeter wall on the west. This space is subdivided by low walls and access is gained to it from the south. Along the inner side of the perimeter wall on the south are the remains of at least one sub-circular hut, with the probability of another adjoining it. Outside the main enclosure, on the east, is a small sub-rectangular enclosure containing small sub-circular huts within three of its corners, only the north-east corner being unoccupied.

East Mellwaters is similar to the two Forecegarth Pasture sites in Upper Teesdale discussed above and although not excavated might be expected to belong to a similar period and to have had the same economic basis. In other words it is probably a late Iron Age or Roman native settlement site given over to mixed farming. Indeed, traces of an early field system survive in a small area near the modern farm of East Mellwaters but not elsewhere. However, it seems very likely that the area of better land between the Greta and the Sleightholme Beck was exploited in early times but that subsequent farming activity has removed virtually all the visible evidence. It is tempting to

suppose that such a site as East Mellwaters came under the influence of the nearby Roman fort at Bowes for it would have been ideally placed for supplying produce to the garrison. However, in the present state of knowledge it is impossible to do more than speculate on their contemporaneity. What does seem strange is the fact that East Mellwaters seems to stand alone in this district south of Bowes. Further fieldwork may change this picture. If not, the explanation may lie in unfavourable conditions or perhaps be connected with Roman military regulations. North-west of Bowes neither of these inhibitions applied for here is an area of early farming activity. Near Ravock Castle, at a point about half a mile north of the A66 which follows the line of the Roman road is the beginning of an extensive early field system which extends northwards as far as Ravock Mire on the right bank of the Deepdale Beck (NY 958138 - NY 957147). The indications of the system are in the form of field wall foundations, and clearance cairns. One probable burial mound has been recorded as well as one unenclosed circular hut (Laurie, 1985, 150). The area has not yet been surveyed but further inspection has revealed a few more circular huts (D. Coggins, pers.comm.). Laurie favours the Bronze Age as the time for this occupation but all that is certain is that it precedes the Roman aqueduct which crosses the area (Tomlin, 1973) for the latter cuts through the ancient field walls.

Some 3.5 miles along the line of the Roman road to the west, in the vicinity of Rey Cross Roman camp is another settlement area, different from the Ravock example in that more hut positions are known.

The area of most extensive remains is situated to the south of Rey Cross (Dunn, 1977; Farrar, 1977). These remains occupy a broad terrace on the north side of the Greta valley and extend for over 200m (NY 90111210 - NY 90341205). They consist of small sub-rectangular enclosures, field walls and significantly several stone-walled circular huts ranging in diameter from 5m to 7m (16ft - 23ft). Some 130m further west (at NY 89961211) are the remains of two or three circular huts and the traces of a sub-rectangular enclosure. Another sub-rectangular enclosure is known at a point located some 200m east of the Roman camp at Rey Cross. It is small, measuring only 28m by 15m (92ft x 49ft), and with a 2m wide entrance flanked by orthostats in the south wall near its east corner. Two trackways lead towards this entrance, one from the east and one from the south. On the south-east are signs of field terraces. Within the enclosure there are no signs of hut positions but these may have been removed by quarrying. If that is so, then this enclosure was probably intended for human occupation, otherwise it is best seen as designed to enclose stock. No doubt pastoral farming was the main activity of the entire settlement just described situated as it was at

442m (1450ft) O.D. Besides the enclosure east of Rey Cross, the small fields to the south could well have served as paddocks. An alternative use of these could have been for small-scale cultivation taking advantage of their southern aspect. In addition, the field terraces mentioned above must surely represent agrarian activity. Thus a mixed farming economy with the emphasis on pastoralism seems quite likely.

With regard to date no evidence is available apart from the fact that circular huts indicate a general prehistoric to Roman native context. The open form of the settlement perhaps favours the Roman period and it is further tempting to connect its prosperity, reflected in its size, to the nearby Roman road. This would provide an easy means of transport to a ready market in the form of the Roman garrison at Bowes, only five miles to the east.

About two miles west of Rey Cross is the Roman fortlet at Maiden Castle (NY 8713), at the head of the Stainmore Pass at its western end. Just south of the fortlet is the site of another extensive settlement. This consists of a series of enclosures and associated hollow-way. In addition, one hut circle and several rectangular platforms have been identified (Clare, 1976). Limited excavations under difficult conditions showed that the enclosure walls were roughly made and had probably resulted from land clearance. The hut circle was terraced into the hillside as was a rectangular structure investigated above it.

A few pieces of Roman coarse pottery and a late mortarium rim were recovered from the hut but were not related to an occupation level and therefore their association with the hut is not beyond doubt. However, its shape is sufficient to betray its early context. By contrast, the rectangular structure had walls of mortared facing stones, which suggested to the excavator that it had been constructed in the post-medieval period although it had been demolished by the early 19th century since it does not appear on the early Ordnance Survey maps. From its rough construction the excavator surmised that it was a shepherd's hut. It seems unlikely, however, that the other rectangular platforms represent a series of shepherds' huts and it may be suggested here that they are in fact sites of ancient rectangular structures. The excavated example may represent the re-furbishing of just such a site in modern times. If this is correct then it seems very likely that the Maiden Castle settlement belongs to the Roman period and has a mixed tradition of native circular and Roman rectangular hut construction. In support of this Roman pottery, both coarse and Samian ware, was found in various places during the excavations, pointing at the least to a phase of Roman activity. As to the economic basis of the community, there is no clear evidence, but the presence of deep loamy soil suggested that there had been arable activity. This is not supported by palynological evidence obtained from the centre of a nearby peat bog (Donaldson, 1977). At a depth ranging between 70-52cm pollen

indications are of a fairly open woodland where birch, alder and hazel trees predominate. The peat level at 51-50cm has been radiocarbon dated to 560 ± 80 b.c. (HAR-2689). At 50cm depth there is a sudden decline in tree pollen with an increase in herbaceous pollen indicating woodland clearance. Once cleared, the landscape remains open. Grass and ribwort plantain pollens rise to a maximum at about 20cm at which point bracken appears, a pattern which could indicate enclosure and grazing. Evidence for crop cultivation is completely absent and the indications are that pastoralism at this stage is predominant. It is clear from this evidence that clearance occurred during the first millennium BC, in conventional archaeological terminology during the Late Bronze Age (see Appendix 3). Thereafter during the remainder of the millenium and probably beyond, any farming activity in this part of the Pennines involved the keeping of stock. Consequently, the Maiden Castle settlement must have been involved in a minimum amount of crop cultivation, if at all, and certainly no more than the cultivation of garden plots. Its main concern was the keeping of animals and whilst cattle and sheep might be expected to have been important parts of such activity, the rearing of draught and transport animals such as oxen, ponies and donkeys is another aspect that deserves consideration. The location of the site at the head of the pass furnishes the motivation for such activity. Indeed, the proximity of the Roman fortlet perhaps provided the reason for the

settlement's existence in the first place. Whether that is correct or not, what is being dealt with at Maiden Castle, Stainmore is in effect a minor vicus, and it is interesting to note the presence in it of the native style of circular hut suggesting the presence of the indigenous population. A similar situation obtains at Bowes where a probable circular hut was found with a Roman period occupation area outside the fort (Mills, Coggins and Gidney, 1980).

To sum up the Stainmore evidence, it is clear that settlement within the region was slight. There is no evidence for timber palisaded sites, although that does not mean that they did not exist. The difficulty in identifying such sites has already been referred to. Of sites that can be identified, close dating is a problem. Some of the settlements may belong to the Bronze Age, especially unenclosed hut circles in the Pennine foothills at the east end of the pass, and near Bowes. At the former, signs of typical Bronze Age activity are present, such as cup and ring marked stones and a Bronze Age cairn, while in the case of the latter, the unenclosed nature of the settlement area is the only clue available, rather too flimsy in itself to generate much confidence. Open settlement might equally well be a feature of the Roman period. With regard to the Iron Age, the fortified site at Castlesteads seems a likely candidate, but here again close dating is not possible. There is here the

probability of re-occupation, perhaps in a sub-Roman context. Settlement sites round about are lacking but some sites further to the west may belong to the Iron Age. The most notable of those sites in the native tradition, however, the village settlement at How Tallon, quite probably should be assigned to the Roman era. Other sites at East Mellwaters, Rey Cross and Maiden Castle also probably belong to the Roman period. The site near Ravock Castle if not Bronze Age is at least Iron Age. All these settlements are larger than the simple homestead. There is no direct evidence regarding their economic basis, but the existence of field enclosures, certain in the case of three of the sites and probable for East Mellwaters, indicates the practice of farming. A mixture of arable and pastoral farming may be thought likely but the emphasis would undoubtedly be on the latter, and this is supported by the palynological evidence, at least at the western end of the Stainmore Pass. Finally, a likely factor in the survival and perhaps the very existence of those sites deemed to be Roman period was the Roman military presence.

South of Stainmore there is evidence of early settlement and land use in both Swaledale and Wensleydale (fig.1.6).

Swaledale

Looking first at Swaledale, there is now a considerable amount of evidence for land division in early times but by contrast few habitation sites are known. On the upper

slopes of the valley sides, above the line of the present-day system of field enclosures, several areas have been identified where, by means of substantial embankments, the landscape has been divided into broad strips about 130m wide. In addition, field systems are known as well as both curvilinear and rectilinear enclosures, stony cairns and occasionally hut circles (Laurie, 1985, 135-162). On the north side of the river one such area is situated west of the Arkle Beck, a tributary of the Swale. This area extends for just over two miles (3.5km) from Cringley Hill along the south-facing slopes of Calver Hill and beyond to Black Hill, near Reeth (NY 997006 - SE 031997) (Laurie, 1985, 141-2, fig.8.3). Linear banks arranged in more or less parallel fashion run uphill from the 366m (1200ft) contour as far as the bottom of the steep upper scars. At the east end of the system, on Black Hill (NZ 028002) parallel banks follow the contours. Groupings of stony cairns presumably indicate field or plot clearance for the purpose of cultivation. These are more frequent on the terrace below Cringley Hill (NZ 00150025, centred).

Of various enclosures identified, a group occurs on a small terrace of Cringley Hill at 411m (1350ft) O.D. These seem to be joined together by a linear earthwork (Laurie, 1985, fig.8.3, D). Isolated sub-circular enclosures also occur. One (NY 99920034) at 396m (1300ft) O.D. encloses five stone cairns and the foundations of a round house (Laurie, 1985, fig.8.3, A). A second example,

however, situated some 200m to the east of site A encloses no obvious archaeological features (Laurie, 1985, fig.8.3, C) but hut circles have been reported nearby (Challis and Harding, 1975, pt.2, fig.93, no.18).

Other enclosures, sub-rectangular in shape, are attached to the main linear embankments. An example occurs about 120m south of enclosure C. Here two such enclosures are formed within the north-east corner of the remnants of an uphill linear bank meeting up with a contour bank set at right angles. Three similar enclosures can be seen some 700m to the south-east where they occupy the lower end of a pair of parallel embankments running uphill (Laurie, 1985, fig.8.3,). Further east along the hillside on Riddings Rigg is situated a circular enclosure (SE 021998) defined by a shallow ditch and a stone bank (Laurie, 1985, 141, fig.8.3, E). Such a structure, by reason of its circumference features, clearly differs from those previously described, as does the ditched rectilinear enclosure located at a point about 0.5 mile further east (SE 029998). Only part of this latter enclosure has survived, the greater part having been destroyed within improved pasture (Laurie, 1985, 141). Such an occurrence is a reminder that much archaeological field evidence must surely have been lost as a result of subsequent occupation.. With regard to the former, curvilinear, enclosure, it is partly overlain by an embankment which is part of a system trending north-south, and indeed it has

been partly robbed out to provide material for the over-riding bank. This north-south system is itself crossed diagonally by another different system of parallel banks running NW-SE (Laurie, 1985, 141, 155). Excavation at a critical junction elucidated the sequence (Fleming and Laurie, 1986, 199). Thus in this sector, some chronological depth is provided, with the enclosure coming first, followed by the NW-SE system of land division, itself followed by the N-S system. What length of time might be involved in this process is of course unknown but it seems unlikely that once such a substantial time-consuming and labour-consuming system of land division had been established it would be lightly replaced. Thus, in the normal course of events, it probably lasted for a long period, one indeed to be measured perhaps in hundreds rather than in scores of years. The fact too that the later system did not rob the earlier one suggests that the latter had been out of use and covered over by humus possibly for many years.

A further conclusion arising from this is that during the interval the landscape was not being utilised or managed in the same way, if at all. That some of this activity probably occurred during the Iron Age is seen by the fact that charcoal obtained from below one of the major linear divisions at SE 008999 (Fleming and Laurie, 1986, 199) yielded a provisional date of about 300 BC

(pers. comm. T. Laurie, full details of C14 date and lab.no. not available).

Further to the east, between the Arkle Beck and the Marske Beck, two considerable areas of territory with similar land divisions have been recorded (Laurie, 1985, 145-9, figs.8.1 and 8.5). These areas are on Marrick Moor and Skelton Moor. Both have embankments trending in the same direction, namely, NNE. It may well be as Laurie suggests that they were once part of the same extensive system embracing the intervening elevated valley known as Stelling Bottom. In the partly enclosed pastures of this valley the main elements of the system are no longer surviving but an irregular complex of fields can be made out, together with a hut circle (centred on NZ 06800070).

In the Marrick Moor section a complex of fields and cairns on Fremington Edge Top (SE 05359970) at 427m (1400ft) O.D. would seem to belong to the main system running over that part of the moor known as Copperthwaite Allotment. In addition, a hut circle of 12m diameter (at SE 05659978) situated about 300m to the east either precedes or is contemporary with the main system since a substantial linear embankment, one of the elements of the system, abuts it. Clearance cairns and the remnants of early field walling occur in the vicinity. If the hut circle and these last features belong together they may well represent settlement and clearance for initial cultivation prior to the setting out of the wider system of land

division. However, it is unlikely that such clearance would have been much earlier otherwise the hut itself would have been in ruin and there would have been no need to respect its presence.

By contrast with these remains located amidst the main system of land division is an isolated settlement (NZ 03750125) situated less than 1.5 miles to the north-west along the line of Fremington Edge Top at 450m (1475ft). It consists of three circular huts and a group of small irregular fields demarcated by low banks, no doubt representing clearance. This settlement is probably quite unconnected with the wider system of land division but whether earlier or later is unknown. Besides this settlement are two isolated sub-circular enclosures (at NZ 05100080 and NZ 05480058) similar to those on Cringley Hill mentioned previously. They may have been stock enclosures. If intended for habitation sites the dwellings must have been such as to leave no obvious trace on the ground.

On Skelton Moor are good examples of smaller rectilinear field systems based on the overall parallel linear bank arrangements. In addition, attached to the linear banks are sub-rectangular enclosures, one of which is ditched. These arrangements suggest that isolated and irregular features are separate from them. A re-aligned subsidiary field boundary has also been identified, implying as Laurie suggests, a considerable period of use. That the

main linear banks, no doubt surmounted by fence or hedge, served to contain stock is shown by the recognition of an offset gateway (at NZ 07920073) where a passageway would serve to channel the animals. Further evidence for stock control is present in the same area where a complex of smaller enclosures based on the linear banks includes double lines of walling. These seem best interpreted as drove-ways. At the same time, in the case of one curvilinear enclosure at least, there seems to be a suggestion of unconformity with the main system indicating that a different phase of development or even a different period of time is involved.

Other smaller areas of early field systems have been recorded on the northern side of the river Swale (Laurie, 1985, 141-3). As for potential habitation sites a small enclosed settlement is known at Rispey Wood (NZ 06180445) in the valley of the Holgate Beck (Laurie, 1985, 149). On the eastern side of Gunnerside Gill a defended promontory (SD 951989) has been reported. This is situated at a height of 343m (1125ft) O.D. near the hamlet of Potting (Welsh, 1977, 3). Evidence of early activity of any kind is sparse in these western parts but hut circles have been reported at Swinnergill (NY 91250090) (Cooper, 1974, 142).

On the south side of the Swale a system of land division by means of parallel linear embankments similar to those already described occurs on Harkerside Moor (Laurie, 1985, 143, fig.8.1, 2). The system extends for a distance of

about 1.25 miles (2km) from the vicinity of the earthwork known as Maiden Castle (SE 022981) to Cogden Gill (SE 048967). Areas of clearance cairns and irregular fields are also known hereabouts. Examples occur on the east bank of Grinton Gill (SE 043975), on Ellerton Moor east of Harkerside Moor (centred on SE 074959) and at Ellerton Scar (SE 088967).

As on the north side of the river habitation evidence is sparse but a settlement has been recorded at a point some 200m north-west of Maiden Castle (SE 019982). There are the remains of at least nine huts and possibly four more standing amidst a cleared area some 30m by 50m in extent. Some huts are oval and others circular and they vary in size from 3m to 6m in diameter, with walls about 1m to 1.5m wide. Nearby are two circular enclosures and there is an outlying oval hut measuring 8m by 6m (Welsh, 1977, 1).

About 0.625 mile (1km) south-east of Maiden Castle at Harker Mires hut circles, enclosures and a small 'henge' have been reported (Cooper, 1974, 142) (SE 033976). Not far away (SE 03529762) is a circular structure of double orthostats measuring 15m in diameter which is probably the foundation of a round house rather than a ring cairn. This feature is situated within an area of field clearance marked out by denuded walls and clearance cairns (Laurie, 1985, 143). At this point some chronological depth is available for here a length of bank and ditch belonging to

the Grinton-Fremington Dyke system appears to interrupt some of the ancient field walls. If that is so, then the Dyke system post-dates the field system.

The Grinton-Fremington Dyke system consists of two parallel linear banks with associated ditches in the vicinity of Reeth. One well-preserved section situated 250m east of Dyke House runs for some 400m from Harkerside Moor down to the flood plain of the river Swale (SE 040979 to SE 043984), descending from a height of 274m (900ft) O.D. to one of 183m (600ft). The bank of the earthwork is about 2.5m (8ft) high and the ditch 1.2m (4ft) deep (HBMC. SAMs. N.Yorks. 1212 and 1213). The banks may originally have been stone-faced if the stone revetment at base level noted by Laurie at Fremington (SE 047993) is anything to go by (Laurie, 1985, 154-5). The component parts of the arrangements can be seen to have been originally formidable obstacles and in combination they must have provided an effective defence in depth on either side of the Swale against attack from down-river. It has been suggested that they were constructed by the Brigantes against the Romans during their conquest of the North in the later First Century AD (Raistrick, 1964, 27). Radley felt that they were probably post-Roman (Radley, 1971). Laurie would place them towards the end of the Bronze Age (1985, 155).

Any of these attributions is possible and each explanation has its own attractions but the fact is that the Swaledale

Dykes are undated. Further research, including excavation, is necessary to seek an answer to the problem. This much is clear, namely that overall planning must have been involved in devising the system and much effort must have been put into constructing it. The motivation was defence involving either co-operation between folk on either side of the Swale or else control or leadership on the part of some higher authority.

Just under one mile behind the Dyke system on the south side of the river is the enclosure called Maiden Castle (SE 022981) referred to previously. An oval area of about 1.75 acres (0.7 ha) is enclosed by an impressive inner stone bank and outer ditch with an entrance on the east approached by a stone-walled avenue some 110m long. There are also remains of an outer bank. A prominent tumulus stands at the east end of the avenue. Within the enclosure are the remains of a rectangular structure against the north side and two hut circles about 6m in diameter in the south-east sector (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks. 46).

Like the Dykes, Maiden Castle is undated but in addition its purpose is in dispute. Some have seen in it a sacred enclosure associated with the nearby barrows (e.g. Elgee and Elgee, 1933, 236). Others have regarded it as a pastoral enclosure for herding animals with the avenue serving as a kind of funnel after the manner of the well-known banjo enclosures found mainly in the south of the

country (Challis and Harding, 1976, Pt.1, 138; Pt.2, fig.93, no.47). This is an attractive theory but the enclosure itself seems too elaborate for the purpose. Observers are reluctant to assign a military function to the site because it is situated on a hill-slope. However, its perimeter arrangements would have been very strong when first constructed and perhaps enough to nullify any uphill advantage in a context involving hand-thrown missiles. If related to the Grinton-Fremington Dyke system its hill-slope position assumes less importance since the intention would be to hold off the attack at the location of the Dykes themselves both lower down the valley and on the higher ground of Harkerside Moor. Maiden Castle in that case might be best seen as a military encampment serving as a base for military personnel defending the Dykes. If that is correct then there is the problem of little internal evidence of occupation, merely two hut circles and the remnants of a rectangular structure. The use of tents or timber huts would readily remove this difficulty. In that case, the stone huts now to be seen could well be a later re-occupation and indeed they have the appearance of being secondary. However, without further evidence it is impossible to be certain and like the Dyke system further progress must await more detailed investigation involving excavation.

Evidence for early settlement and land use is virtually

confined to the moorland above the present line of modern enclosures. It is possible that later activity lower down the hill slopes has destroyed much evidence of earlier occupation. In the valley bottom an enclosed site is known at How Hill (SE 002983). The top of this natural hillock is enclosed on three sides by a ditch and bank, about 1.2m (4ft) high; the fourth side, on the north, is protected by a steep drop to the river flood plain. On the actual summit of the hill are signs of a rectangular structure. This measures 10m by 5m. At the base of the hill are faint traces of a mound and outer ditch running from the west side, along the south as far at least as the south-east sector. The nature and date of this site are unknown. Craster thought that it was probably medieval (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks. 1051). There is a similar earthwork below Grinton Bridge (SE 050984), again undated but probably contemporary with the How Hill example.

Further east, at Whitcliffe Scar (NZ 137019) near Richmond, is a complex site which is virtually unpublished and thus needs more detailed consideration (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks. 565). It is located at 213m (700ft) O.D. on an extensive terrace at the foot of a steep slope. The main part of the site consists of a strongly fortified rectangular enclosure measuring internally some 42m by 45m. The dry-stone walls which in ruin spread between 5m to 10m in width have been very strong and survive to 1.2m in height. In parts, large facing stones are visible

giving a width near the top of the west wall for example of 3.7m (12ft). It does seem possible that such clearly visible narrowing indicates the former presence of a rampart walk with protective parapet. This would not be out of keeping with the strongly fortified nature of this part of the site. Clearly visible on the north side is a splayed opening 1.5m (5ft) wide at its outer edge which gives on to a trackway running between the north wall of the enclosure and the steep slope beyond. A similar entrance now filled with debris occurs in the east wall. This, however, is flanked by oval guard chambers, a single one on the north side and a double one on the south side. The former is completely filled with stone rubble and the latter almost completely filled with soil and modern rubbish. Undergrowth and timber debris inhibit proper inspection but the double chamber consists of two compartments measuring in diameter 2.1m (7ft) and 2.5m (8ft) respectively and joined by a short narrow passage. Although in ruins, enough remains to exhibit corbelling indicating a beehive type of construction for the roof of each compartment. Although little depth remains nowadays an eye-witness report from the nineteenth century indicates that the height of each compartment was more than 1.8m (6ft) (Speight, 1897, 91-2). The interior of the enclosure seems to have been paved, at least in the vicinity of the eastern entrance. In addition, it contains rectangular subdivisions. In its south-east

corner are traces of a circular chamber constructed within the thickness of the enclosure wall.

On a lower shelf to the south of the main enclosure is an annexe about 80m by 30m in extent (262ft by 98ft). This contains traces of a hut circle of about 6m (20ft) internal diameter and, attached to the inner side of the enclosing wall, a small sub-rectangular hut. Molehills near the hut circle produced examples of Roman pottery including a piece of figured Samian ware (Dr 37) indicating activity within the Roman period, probably within the Second Century AD.

Other enclosed areas occupy the terrace both to the west and to the east of the main enclosure already described. Immediately to the west of the main enclosure is a wide ditch or hollow-way, measuring about 16m (52ft) across. This serves both as a defensive feature and as an access way which leads from the annexe to the track running along the foot of the slope on the north side of the terrace. The first enclosure to the west of the ditch-cum-hollow-way is also rectangular, measuring some 61m by 52m (200ft by 171ft) with enclosing wall averaging about 2m in thickness. It is divided internally by a wall, now much ruined, running east-west. North of this cross-wall is an entrance situated in the west wall of the enclosure. Another possible entrance occurs in the north wall of the enclosure near its north-east corner. South of the cross-wall are curvilinear hut positions. A possible two-roomed

sub-circular hut (or perhaps two separate huts) occupies the south-east corner of the enclosure. In the interior nearby has been recorded the site of a hut circle with an overall diameter of about 10.8m. A sub-circular hut measuring some 6m by 4m cut out of the sloping ground to the south of the east-west cross wall, is situated in the western area of the enclosure. Beyond, in the next, adjacent enclosure to the west, is a stony cairn measuring about 4m in diameter and surviving to 0.3m in height. Speight refers to an examination of this in which "it was found to be barren". However, the fact that a thorough examination was not carried out is evident from the off-centre hollow now visible in the top of the mound.

On the east side of the main enclosure the first of several enclosures occupying the terrace to the east measures some 45m by 30m. Its southern boundary is in the form of two elongated hillocks, probably moraines. The break between them has been artificially enhanced to provide a funnelled entrance. The eastern boundary of the enclosure is formed by a substantial cross-wall 2.2m (7ft) wide and surviving to a height of 1.3m (4ft). Within its dry-stone walling it includes massive rectangular stone slabs set on edge. Inside the enclosure close by the entrance on its east side is an oval hollow 0.5m deep and 6m by 4m in size (19.5ft by 13ft). This is stone-edged and has a large sandstone slab at its centre. The purpose of this feature is unknown. The two possibilities that

immediately suggest themselves, namely, hut position and pond, are unconvincing on present evidence. It seems best at present merely to record the feature and to admit the lack of explanation. Besides this feature, lengths of ruined stone walls of comparatively slight construction are visible both within this enclosure and inside others further along the terrace. More thorough investigation than is at present possible would be needed to decide which parts of such walling, if any, should be regarded as contemporary with the settlement proper. Also further along the terrace but on top of the morainic hillock referred to above are the remains in the form of a grass-covered penannular mound of a large hut circle, some 12m (39ft) in diameter.

It would appear from the evidence that the Whitcliffe settlement was a considerable one, with central occupation sites flanked by a series of probable animal enclosures. It was well placed to take advantage of the fertile south-facing land sloping down to the river Swale below. As Speight pointed out almost a century ago, it was situated high enough above the river to be clear of damp and the effects of flooding. He also pointed to the natural defence of the steep slopes on its northern side. This last point might well be amplified, for the sloping land to the south of the site is also in itself a natural means of defence. Added to these natural features is the fact that strong walls surround the central enclosures,

especially the main one, which indeed has been massively fortified. Nor is Whitcliffe Scar settlement strong merely in a tactical sense. Strategically, it is well placed to dominate the valley below. Even more, its position near the valley entrance allows control of movement up and down Swaledale. Thus Whitcliffe Scar site represents no ordinary settlement. Its size, position and strength mark it out as a power centre. One may speculate that it was the headquarters of a local chieftain, in control no doubt of the immediate district and even perhaps of the wider region of Swaledale as a whole. The span of time during which the settlement functioned cannot be known without further investigation but part of that period at least was Roman.

Thus field remains in Swaledale show that in early times parts at least of the landscape were managed by a wide-ranging system of land division. This was designed for pastoral purposes. Some smaller field systems and enclosures based upon the wider system seem to be part and parcel of it. Some of these smaller divisions could conceivably have been utilised for cultivation. Other field systems which are irregular, together with nearby cairns, which probably represent land clearance, are probably not part of the wider system. Some no doubt represent primary and early clearance, others may be subsequent rather than prior to the larger system. As for habitation sites to go with the evidence of land use,

these are few in number, although more are known on the south side of the river than on the north side. A possible explanation for their rarity is that many were located lower down the valley sides or on the valley bottom and that they have for the most part been subsequently destroyed, obscured by later occupation, or not yet recognised. Another possibility is that many of the dwellings were in timber whose traces have not survived or been identified. Some at least of the curvilinear enclosures described might have been designed to encompass such structures thus accounting for their apparent emptiness. Other enclosures no doubt could function equally well as stock pens, not necessarily related to the main rectilinear system.

As for dating, in the absence of published excavations, there is little direct evidence. As has been seen, some chronological depth can be deduced in some areas, where for example some curvilinear enclosures can be seen to have been superseded by major land division, not once but twice thus implying that a considerable period of time is involved. That some of this activity was Iron Age is implied by a single C14 date. Again, if deductions can be made from a single example, stone-based houses comparable to that at Bracken Rigg in Teesdale can be either contemporary with or prior to the wider system of land division. However, other huts may well be subsequent to the main system, sometimes perhaps even utilising the

surviving embankments and fields as happened at Simy Folds in Teesdale. Some chronological depth is also provided by the Grinton-Fremington Dyke system in its relationship to field systems on the southern side of the river at least. The evidence as it stands at present points to land use over a considerable period of time but there is difficulty in interpretation. Laurie has pointed to the occurrence of cup and ring marked stones amongst many of the enclosures and to the similarity of the Swaledale extensive land division to the reave system of Dartmoor. On this basis he would, with good reason, place the major Swaledale system within the second millenium BC. When the system was initiated is not clear and even if a long period of time is involved it is possible that operation of part of it ceased before the first millenium BC. That might not mean that all settlement ceased then but as has been seen there is otherwise little evidence for settlement. It is possible that with a worsening climate (Lamb, 1981), Swaledale was virtually unoccupied during the earlier part of the first millenⁿium BC. Even if, however, most of the stone-based huts were to be assigned to a period after the second millenⁿium BC, on the grounds that earlier examples were either further down the valley sides or else timber constructed, then there remains the problem of whether they belong to pre-Roman or Roman period occupation. Whichever of the two is decided upon as most likely a lacuna is left for the other. The problem seems intractable. More evidence is required,

including that of dating, to arrive at a decision. Whichever solution is favoured, the evidence at present points to slight occupation.

Wensleydale

With regard to Wensleydale, reports of extensive territorial division such as have been described in Swaledale are lacking. The probable explanation for their absence is that fieldworkers have not directed their attention to this aspect of remains, perhaps dismissing those linear mounds that do in fact exist, on Thornton Rust Moor for example, as belonging to a later period. Be that as it may, several settlement sites are known, more in fact than in Swaledale. They may conveniently be considered in the following groups reflecting their broad distribution:

1. North side of the Ure valley.
2. South side of the Ure and west
of the river Bain and Semmerwater.
3. South of the Ure and between
Semmerwater and Bishopdale.
4. South of the Ure and east of Bishopdale.

The sites north of the river are scattered. A settlement has been recorded at Staggsfell in the valley of the Fossdale Gill at SD 867931. It is a complex of large hut circles and enclosures located upon an area of gritstone outcrop below Pike Hill and at a height of 460m (1509ft)

O.D. A short distance away, some 200m to the north-east, is an enclosure under a limestone scar (SD 869932) (Hall, 1974, 144). There is no report of hut circles within this enclosure and it is best seen as intended for stock; quite possibly it is connected with the settlement site. It may be significant that the settlement itself is only about 200m east of Cliff Gate road which is a minor route from Swaledale to Wensleydale.

Some seven miles further downriver at 270m (886ft) O.D. in Ox Close pasture, Carperby (SD 982904) is a settlement site with a field system nearby. This is a settlement consisting of huts and rectangular enclosures or crofts apparently built as a continuous unit (Raistrick, 1929, 355; Raistrick, 1939, 119).

A further six miles downriver, near Leyburn, settlement similar to that at Carperby has been recorded at Preston Scar (SE 082911) (Raistrick, 1939, 119). It has yielded beehive querns (Raistrick, 1939, 131) pointing to a late Iron Age - early Roman period of occupation as well as indicating at least the use of grain if not its cultivation. One mile further east, at Leyburn Shawl, several hut circles on the hillside have yielded coarse pottery, grain rubbers, pot boilers, and worked bone. Above these huts, a small cave has produced the same range of artefacts and in addition Samian ware thus pointing to Roman period activity. A charcoal hearth was also found in the cave as well as numerous animal bones, the species

recorded including red deer, fox, goat, ox, sheep. In addition there were human remains (Raistrick, 1939, 124). There has clearly been settlement here in the native style during the Roman period. Whether all the objects recovered from the cave belong together as an assemblage is more uncertain for details are not provided by Raistrick. A sepulchral function for the cave is evident but of what era is less certain.

South of the river Ure and to the west of the valley of the Bain and of Semmerwater several sites are to be noted. A number of these are either close or quite close to the line of the Roman road, now Cam High Road, which ran from the fort at Brough by Bainbridge towards Ingleton. Mostly these are hut circles with enclosures. At Cam West End (SD 817827) above the line of the Roman road at a point where it begins its descent to Ribblehead is a complex of five enclosures covering an area of about 0.5 acres (0.2ha). One hut circle has survived but others no doubt existed and have been robbed out to build a modern boundary wall (Hall, 1974, 144) or a sheepfold nearby. The enclosures seem best regarded as intended for penning animals. Cairns in the vicinity suggest land clearance, possibly for cultivation though not necessarily so.

Some three miles to the north along Cam High Road is a cluster of sites at Greenside ranging in height from 570 to 580m (1870-1900ft) O.D. One site is a homestead comprising three hut circles and two small enclosures

(SD 862845). It is located only 300m east of the road. A short distance away is another enclosure (SD 857841) probably a stock pen, which should perhaps be associated with the homestead. About 0.25 mile from the Roman road, are two more sites in close proximity to each other. One is a homestead (at SD 864844) consisting of two enclosures one of which contains a hut circle. The other is a settlement (SD 864845) made up of hut circles and enclosures and facing south-east (Hall, 1974, 143-4).

North-east of this concentration of sites is one which is further away from the line of the Roman road, a distance of about 1.25 miles. This site at Close Ing Gill (SD 883858) is situated at 340m (1115ft) O.D. in the valley of the Bardale Back. It consists of two irregularly-shaped enclosures below a limestone scar. No hut circles have been reported but modern enclosures may have robbed them out (Hall, 1974, 143). Otherwise, such a site must be regarded as merely an animal pen with perhaps flimsy and temporary shelter nearby for humans. Alternatively, occupiers of a settlement site such as those already described could quite easily have worked from home base elsewhere as the shepherd of today does.

By contrast with Close Ing Gill is one at Countersett Crag above Semmerwater (SD 907880) for it is located only 0.25 mile from the line of the Roman Road. One hut circle, a small enclosure and a length of embankment occupy a gritstone terrace at 490m (1608ft) O.D. and facing north-

west (Hall, 1974, 143). This site is clearly a small individual homestead.

Finally, in this list of sites close to the line of the Roman road is one downhill at 244m (800ft) O.D. in the valley of the river Bain (at SD 932898) (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.1028). It is a small oval enclosure about 34m (111ft) internal diameter with a slight inner mound, a ditch and more pronounced outer mound. Such a site may not be a habitation site at all. Three circular hollows, however, within the enclosure, measuring 3.6m (12ft), 4.6m (15ft) and 6.4m (21ft) in diameters respectively may represent hut positions. In addition, close by are small rectangular fields or cultivation plots together with an associated hollow way.

Two sites not close to the line of Cam High Road may now be mentioned. Snaizholme High Side (SD 840861) is a rectangular enclosure with rounded corners and measuring 46m by 27m (150ft by 88ft) (Hall, 1974, 144). It is situated at 540m (1772ft) O.D. above the track which branches off from Cam High Road to make its way west of Dod Fell Hill over high ground to Hawes in Wensleydale. Such a route was conceivably followed in early times also. Woldside (SD 883832) is an identically sized enclosure, partly robbed, and situated at 540m (1772ft) on a small terrace at the foot of a limestone crag on the west slope of Raydale Beck. It contains hut circles, of which about four can be made out (Hall, 1974, 144). Here is an

example of an isolated settlement, no doubt engaged in pastoral activities.

Turning now to sites located between Semmerwater and Bishopdale some half dozen sites fall to be considered. In Cragdale (SD 920846) at 420m (1378ft) O.D. open settlement is very evident for above Stake road huts and enclosures are strung out in a long line. Below the road huts are scattered over Shaw Side (Hall, 1964, 163). Above Stalling Busk are two settlements close to one another. The first, Stake Allotments (SD 935849) at 540m (1771ft) O.D. is an extensive complex of irregularly-shaped enclosures and rectangular huts (Hall, 1974, 144). Only 300m distant to the north is Kell Bottom (SD 937852) at 520m (1700ft) O.D. situated at the foot of a limestone scar. Less extensive than its neighbour this settlement also has enclosures and hut positions, but these latter are round not rectangular (Hall, 1974, 144). Such sites as these are best regarded as being mainly concerned with pastoral activities. Without evidence to the contrary, they should probably be assigned to a period of time ranging from the conventional Iron Age to Roman times. Clearly, however, some distinction should be drawn between the two settlements by reason of their different house-building styles.

Various explanations are possible but one choice lies between contemporary occupation but following different traditions or occupation at different times when building

styles have changed. There is no evidence from the sites themselves to decide the matter but on balance the explanation involving difference of period seems more likely especially when the evidence from Greenber Edge, yet to be considered, is taken into account. Even so, other Pennine settlements are known where the circular-house and rectangular-house traditions seem to intermingle. Indeed this is seen at Lockah Beck Springs (SD 939832) situated above Bishopdale and only one mile to the south of Stake Allotments. This settlement at 540m (1772ft) O.D. occupies a hollow among limestones and faces east. It has many hut circles and small enclosures. On a limestone plateau north of these are rectilinear enclosures with two huts, one circular and one rectangular (Hall, 1974, 144). Other high-elevation settlements have been recorded at the head of Bishopdale, almost over into Wharfedale. Such sites are Gilbert Lane (SD 940809) at 480m (Hartley, R. 1964, 165), Kidstones Scar (SD 945809) at 490m O.D. (Hall, 1964, 165) and Bishopdale Head (SD 939819) at 550m O.D. (Raistrick, 1969, 238).

North of Stake Allotments is an area of concentrated settlement in the vicinity of Addlebrough Hill which dominates the area. Around the slopes of Addlebrough itself many dry-stone walls of small enclosures, cultivation plots and field systems can be seen (Elgee and Elgee, 1933, 85). Hut positions too exist, of sub-rectangular and circular form. On Greenber Edge, a

terrace to the south of Addlebrough at 427m (1400ft) O.D. is Stony Raise, a massive Bronze Age cairn. For over 0.5 mile along the terrace to the east are to be seen the remains of enclosures of various kinds, including huts, representing extensive settlement (HBMC.SAM. N.Yorks.103). Closer examination of these remains shows that different types of structure and building techniques are identifiable. Some at least of these differences must represent the traditions of different periods. The remains are too extensive and complex for complete description but some examples may be given.

At the west end of Greenber Edge, close to Stony Raise cairn, are a few conjoined rectangular enclosures partly set into the hillside on the north edge of the terrace. Their walls, only the lower courses of which survive, have been made of stone laid in courses. The most western enclosure may be quoted to give an indication of size. It measures about 10m N.S. by 4m E.W. Attached to it is another, rather larger enclosure which has internal divisions. Such structural arrangements are different from those of enclosures a short distance further along the edge of the terrace where turf covered but stony wall remnants enclose rather irregular but broadly rectilinear fields or plots which are attached to small boat-shaped huts. Some stone slabs set on edge survive in position to illustrate the manner of revetting the inner face of these field walls. One example will suffice to give some idea

of the dimensions of these sites. Its plot or small field measures 14m by 8m and it is attached to a hut measuring 4m by 3m. An entrance to the enclosure is on the east and measures 1.2m wide (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.103)

Still different arrangements can be observed in a small valley on the terrace behind the features just described. The valley is divided up into enclosures by means of lateral walls including in their stone fill large boulders. These walls are continued longitudinally along the upper edges of the valley. Other walls running across the higher ground beyond join up with these valley walls, suggesting that the enclosures beyond, probably fields, should be associated with the valley settlement. Within the valley itself there is further subdivision within the main enclosures, sometimes marked by the remnants of rubble walls sometimes by stone slabs set on edge. Some of these smaller enclosures could be yards, yet others could be huts, whether for human or animal occupation.

One example of a probable hut is a sub-rectangular enclosure set in the corner of a larger enclosure. This hut measures some 5m by 6m internally. Interior divisions are made by stone slabs set on edge. Another probable hut, once more sub-rectangular, is set against one of the valley cross-walls. It measures 5.5m by 3.m and has lateral internal divisions by means of two walls on one side making spaces or slots of about 0.8m in width. An intriguing structure standing within the same enclosure as

the first example just cited is unattached. In plan it is simple boat-shaped but internally measuring only about 1.1m long by 0.9m wide at most. Its inner face is formed by stone slabs set on edge but there is no clear outer face. Instead stone rubble is piled against the slabs to make a rough wall. Such a structure seems more suited to function as a storage or sepulchral chamber than anything else.

Rather different from these enclosures are those which incorporate a 'wall-passage', a term coined by Dr. Raistrick to describe the feature on sites near Malham (Raistrick and Holmes, 1962, 86). One example, some 200m east of the valley site, is a rectangular enclosure with rounded corners and measuring internally some 11m by 8m. An internal wall along the western side makes a passage there, 0.5m wide. At its north end it curves to follow the north wall but its inner side is marked there only by a line of stones. A small sub-circular enclosure is attached to the enclosure at its south-east corner. The entrance to the main enclosure on the south side gives on to what is in effect another passage formed partly from the north wall of a smaller, more irregular, sub-rectangular enclosure on the south whose entrance lies on the north-east. Clear evidence of an earlier phase of construction can be seen towards the western end of the passage between the two enclosures. Exposed to view is a stone-filled trench which is crossed by the south and

north walls respectively of the two enclosures just described. Amidst the tumble of stone and without further clearing and excavation the relationships and sequence cannot fully be worked out. Enough is visible, however, to provide an indication of chronological development. Further east along the terrace other wall passages are to be seen associated with a rectangular structure showing that this example was not an isolated one but only in this case can a stratigraphical relationship be seen.

In contrast to these enclosures are rectangular structures which are more elongated. One example, much disturbed by later walling and a sheepfold, measures about 10m long by 4m wide internally. Similar to this is an example which is 23m by 7m overall with walls 0.8m thick composed of lines of large stones packed with smaller ones. Its entrance is at the east end. There is sub-division internally into two main rooms, the western one of which has a square hearth at the end, whilst the other has benches about 1m wide on either side. A small yard encloses the entranceway and at the western end a small third chamber has apparently been added. There seems little doubt that this structure should be regarded as a dwelling.

Remains of various other sub-rectangular enclosures often with lengths of wall foundation attached can be found on the terrace. They tend to have openings about 1.0m wide flanked by large boulders. Their function would seem to

have been that of stock pens. In addition there are several small rectangular enclosures whose dimensions are in the region of 6m by 7m. These seem best interpreted as huts. A few circular huts are also to be seen.

Thus along Greenber Edge there are different types of structure and settlement. On the hillside are the coursed and conjoined enclosures subdivided internally which are possibly huts, animal pens and cultivation plots. There are also the boat-shaped huts with probable cultivation plots attached. The sub-divided upland valleys with huts and other structures perhaps represent homesteads or even small settlements. Stockyards and stackyards, byres and barns, dwellings and storage structures are all possibilities to explain the various sub-divisions and enclosures within. In addition, there are small rectangular enclosures with attached yards, representing perhaps separate homesteads, as well as the medium-sized enclosures intended possibly for animal pounds. Different again are the rectangular structures with wall passages which have parallels in Malhamdale and Wharfedale. Hut circles too exist, part of a long tradition of early dwelling type, but not necessarily in this case confined to human occupants. Finally the elongated rectangular structures, are more akin to post-Roman habitation types. Larger field divisions too are to be found apparently attached to the valley sites.

With regard to dating, it is not enough to say with Elgee and Elgee (1933, 85) that because the cairn at Stony Raise is Bronze Age then settlement along Greenber Edge is of the same era. Direct connection between the two is not inevitable. Raistrick assigns settlement along Greenber Edge to the Roman period on the grounds of Romano-British finds having been made among the structures (1939, 120). Unfortunately detailed find-spots have not been published. This means that while some of the structures must belong to the Roman period not all necessarily do so. The structures with wall-passages are likely to be, by analogy with examples from Malhamdale, ~~probably~~ second to third century AD. The stratigraphy here indicates an earlier phase of building but provides no dating. Boat-shaped huts might be thought to be late Roman or Dark Age but the Iron Age date for a similar hut from Dubby Sike in Teesdale will be recalled, warning against dogmatism. The elongated rectangular types would fit more naturally into a Medieval context. All of the remaining structures, small rectangular huts, hut circles, valley enclosures, could find a place in a period ranging from the pre-Roman Iron Age to the Roman Iron Age.

It would thus appear that Greenber Edge attracted settlement at different eras and at various times during the one era. Occupation during the Roman period seems assured but the finer details of relationships between settlements and development of settlements are elusive.

More evidence is required to attempt such a study.

East of Bishopdale, on the western slopes of Penhill, is a large settlement (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.1153). Situated on Burton Moor (SE 031860) at 457m (1500ft) O.D. are a minimum of fifteen curvilinear enclosures with at least as many stone-founded huts. The settlement is remarkable for its complexity of enclosures, one attached to another in multiple succession (fig.6.1). Uphill there is a large amount of stone tumble and scatter making it difficult to disentangle the various features and understand the detail but the general pattern is clear, especially from the parts of the site further downhill where there is much less scattered stone. Enclosures average in size about 40m across. They have broad walls containing large, sometimes massive, boulders set on edge and forming trenches so to speak with stone packing. Openings exist between one large enclosure and the next, ranging from 2.40m to 3.8m in width; in addition there is access from beyond to enclosures on the outer edge, at least as far as those on the western, downhill side are concerned. The outside entrances have bulbous-ended walls where large boulders seem to be arranged to form positions or housings to contain massive wooden posts which would be suitable for holding large timber gates. There are many smaller enclosures usually attached to the walls of the larger ones but sometimes set between them and sometimes detached. Among these smaller enclosures are obvious hut

sites which tend to be curvilinear and which occur in varying degrees of complexity. In some cases there are single huts, in others individual huts grouped together, either separately or with adjoining walls; in yet other cases there are multi-roomed complexes.

One house-complex standing in the middle of its own enclosure has a main room, oval in shape, measuring 9.0m by 7.0m internally. Attached to its outer side are four smaller chambers ranging in width from 3.30m to 3.50m and in length from 4.0m to 4.7m. The entrance, 0.8m wide, is on the north-west.

Another house situated further uphill amidst a bewildering mass and scatter of stone is nonetheless itself clearly demarcated. It is slightly oval, measuring 9.7m by 8.7m internally and with an entrance on the south-east, 0.8m wide. An internal bench 1.2m wide by 4m long occupies the east side. Externally, a smaller chamber, 2.4m wide by 2.8m long is attached to the east side.

As a third and final example, a simple hut may be described. It is oval in plan, measuring 6.8m by 4.4m internally, with walls 0.8m wide containing thick stone slabs set on edge, and a probable entrance on the north side, obscured by a large fallen slab. This hut is contained within its own small enclosure formed within the corner of a larger enclosure by means of a cross-wall.

Besides these huts are the other lesser enclosures

mentioned, some of which are possibly also huts. One example, attached to the outside of a larger enclosure, is sub-rectangular and measures 11.8m by 8.6m. It has an inturned entrance 1.5m wide.

On the Burton Moor settlement, although there are variations in matters of detail, it is clear that all the structures belong broadly to the same building tradition. It is equally clear, however, that a sequence of construction is involved, with large enclosure being added to preceding large enclosure. It is conceivable that the entire settlement was planned as a more or less complete unit and that the demonstrable sequence was merely one of constructional convenience. This however seems highly unlikely. A more probable explanation is that there was a gradual agglomeration over a period of time, with one to four enclosures representing initial settlement and that these were subsequently added to. Examination both from the air and on the ground of the plan of the settlement as it now survives reveals that enclosure A towards the south end of the settlement is at the beginning of a long sequence which certainly excludes enclosure M at the north end of the settlement and probably enclosure N. The relationship between A and its neighbour G is not clear, nor that between G and the enclosure or enclosures occupying area P immediately to the north. However, the shape of the enclosures including G surrounding area P suggests that the latter is in fact subsequent. Enclosure

F has been added to A and G and is therefore later. Similarly, enclosure B is later than A and so on as far as J. By elimination only enclosures A, M, N and G are left as contenders for initial settlement. Enclosure M is certainly earlier than enclosures L and K but it has no physical relationship with the others and could have been constructed as late as enclosure J but also at any time before that. Thus initial enclosure could have involved any number from one to four large enclosures. Naturally, this conclusion does not take account of any earlier structures, whether huts or other enclosures which might have been on the site but removed or refashioned in subsequent building activity. Only further investigation, probably involving excavation, will have any chance of recovering such evidence.

With regard to the time taken for the settlement to reach its maximum size it is impossible to determine without more evidence. There is no information about whether the inhabitants of the mature village settlement included newcomers from elsewhere, albeit sharing or adopting the same building techniques, or whether a single family or small group of families began the process and their descendants prospered and increased. If the latter explanation is correct then it might be thought that the process of settlement growth would be a longer one. As for the ultimate size of the population it would perhaps be unwise to hazard an estimate in view of the various

unknown factors but it might be safe to suggest that each enclosure represented the steading of an extended family. In that case the settlement comprised at least fifteen families. With regard to basic economy, there are no systems of 'Celtic' fields to suggest agriculture although some of the smaller enclosures could have served as garden plots. The various steadings with attached medium-sized enclosures and through passageways would suggest stackyards for fodder and pens for animals as well as huts for the latter in addition to human dwellings. Large fields in the vicinity would serve to mark out larger territories for control of animals in grazing. In other words the economic basis of the settlement is that of the stockbreeder. The social organisation of the settlement has already been partly touched upon with the mention of family groups. These groups, whether related by blood or not, must have worked closely together for this is what is implied by the arrangement of the steadings. What form their co-operation actually took is impossible to determine on present evidence. There seems to be no indication on site in the form, for example, of an especially large dwelling house of a controlling element such as a headman. It is always possible that the centre of such control lay elsewhere. Be that as it may, the Burton Moor settlement seems to have been a large, prosperous community based upon pastoral activity. As to the date of this activity there is no direct evidence but in the absence of other evidence a late Iron Age - Romano-

British period seems most likely. A tempting hypothesis would be that such a community is responding to the needs of the Roman forces of occupation in the way of providing cattle and horses. Equally tempting is the thought of a community devoted to the production of ponies needed in Celtic warfare. It is quite impossible to make a choice or even to be sure that such a choice is the right one.

Some six miles to the east of Burton Moor there is further evidence of early settlement in the vicinity of Middleham. First to be noted is the fortified site known as East Witton Camp (SE 120853) (Vict. County Hist. 2 (1912)7, with plan: HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.322). It is situated at 260m (875ft) O.D. on the steep north-facing slope of Braithwaite Banks. A sub-rectangular area is enclosed by strong fortifications consisting of inner mound, outer ditch and counterscarp mound on all sides except the east where the deep ravine of Red Beck Gill provides good protection, and even here there is a length of mound and outer ditch. A further length of outer ditch with inner mound forms additional defence on the north side. The area so enclosed amounts to 2.25ac (0.9ha). Measurements taken on the south side give some idea of the scale of the fortifications. Here the main rampart survives to 6.4m wide and 1m high with the outer ditch at 1m deep. The site has two entrances, one at the north-west corner and the other through the south rampart near the south-west corner.

A sub-rectangular inner enclosure defined by outer ditch and inner rampart is situated near the south-east corner of the larger fortification. It measures some 30m by 40m internally and has an entrance on the west side. Although well-defined on the south side and part of the west side the rampart and ditch fade out elsewhere and can only be traced with difficulty.

Although unexcavated and undated East Witton Camp seems best classified tentatively as a pre-Roman fortified site. It is uncertain whether the two enclosures were contemporary. The inner one may have served as an inner defence or citadel as it were. On the other hand, if they were not contemporary there is the problem of their chronological relationship. It would be tempting to regard the inner one as later, thus representing a re-occupation. But the defences of the outer enclosure are in better order and it may well be that it came later. If that is correct then the process involved might have been either expansion or re-occupation on a larger scale. The evidence currently available does not enable a decision to be arrived at.

Slightly less than one mile to the west of East Witton Camp is the sub-rectangular enclosure of Castle Steads Earthwork (SE 105854) (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.1027). This enclosure occupies a terrace at 290m (950ft) O.D. on a steep north-facing slope overlooking Coverdale. An area measuring internally about 94m by 33m (310ft by 110ft) is

surrounded by a ditch with main outer and slight inner banks. These features are prominent on all sides except the south uphill one where only traces remain; no doubt this is the result of earth slip and silting from the steep hillside. An opening at the west end of the enclosure is probably an original one. Less certain is a break through the perimeter earthworks on the north side. A gap on the east side appears to be a later breakthrough. The outer bank along the north side of the enclosure continues as a less distinct mound with traces of an outer ditch along the terrace edge. This has the effect in conjunction with the steep hillside of creating another enclosure adjacent to the main enclosure on its west side. Access to this western enclosure is obtained by means of a trackway which travels diagonally up the hillside.

What may have been the purpose of Castle Steads is difficult to assess. It is possibly a hill-slope fortification but unlike some fortified sites so situated, for example Maiden Castle in Swaledale, it would be easily attacked from higher ground. In addition, its outer mound is the main one as if its defences are looking inwards. Indeed such may be the case if it has been intended to contain stock rather than serve as a fortification. The presence of the enclosed area on its west side may be thought to add support to this suggestion.

There are no signs of occupation within either East Witton

Camp or Castle Steads Earthwork but if huts were timber-built only excavation will reveal their presence. As for potential settlement in the vicinity, beyond the confines of the two sites themselves, none has been recorded. However, like so much of the Pennine Uplands, it is difficult terrain to explore and it may well be that relevant discoveries will yet be made. Indeed a short distance to the east of Castle Steads the present writer has noted the remnants of a possible field in the form of a linear mound 1.5m wide and 0.3m high which runs almost due north down the slope of the hill for about 70m before petering out. At its upper end it turns at right angles to run along the contour for a short distance before being lost amidst the rough ground. A more thorough investigation of the sloping land hereabouts might well reveal other similar features and indicate whether they should be regarded as parts of former field systems or as other enclosures.

Whether or not there are field systems or occupation sites along the valley sides, settlement is known in the valley bottom below, in the vicinity of Middleham. Here in the triangle of land formed between the rivers Cover and Swale is the site of a probable Roman villa (SE 1387) (Elgee and Elgee, 1933; Topham, 1882; Scott, 1973). The remains that were found were of a room measuring externally 6m by 4.3m (20ft by 14ft) with walls 0.8m (2.5ft) thick. Box tiles were found still in situ in the surviving parts of the

walls and a hypocaust beneath the paved floor. Other finds included the typical tegulae and imbrices of Roman roofing tiles. It is clear that part of a bath-house had been found, 'probably the laconicum' in Scott's estimation. Hardly less certain is the attribution of such a building to a villa complex, the only other candidates being a temple or Roman fort. Also of significance is the beehive quernstone noted by the present writer lying among the ruins of Coverham Abbey (SE 106864). If local, it indicates late Iron Age or Roman native activity hereabouts.

In conclusion, the evidence from Wensleydale as it stands at present shows a lack of extensive large-scale land division although fieldwork may change this picture. The only certain area of large field divisions is that on Burton Moor and they may well exist because of the agglomerated settlement there. Smaller fields and possible garden plots however do exist, significantly perhaps in connection with the concentrated settlement around Addlebrough and on Greenber Edge. Elsewhere there are enclosures, both rectilinear and curvilinear, sometimes isolated sometimes attached to or surrounding huts. Control of stock and protection of farmsteads would readily explain such enclosures. As for the distribution of settlement, it would appear that there were fewer sites on the north side of the valley than on the south side and intervals of about seven miles occur between those on the

north. On the south side of the valley the region bounded by the Widdale Beck on the west and Bishopdale on the east contains most settlement. Several sites may be related to the route across from Wensleydale to Ribblesdale followed by the Roman road from the fort at Bainbridge. Other sites, however, seem more isolated and a few are located at surprisingly high altitudes ranging between 520m and 540m (1700ft - 1770ft). The most highly placed sites, those at Woldside and Greenside Allotments, lie outside this range for they are situated at 580m (1900ft) O.D. All these high altitude sites, especially those that are north-facing, seem hardly likely to have been involved in other than stock raising, and indeed they may well have been part of a system of transhumance in which they were occupied only during the summer months. Be that as it may, areas of more concentrated occupation lower down the valley, namely, those on the slopes of Addlebrough and on Greenber Edge probably represent permanent occupation. As has been seen, the evidence here indicates different periods and various phases of occupation and activity ranging from the Bronze Age (Stony Raise Cairn) through the Romano-British period (for example, 'wall-passage' sites) to medieval times ('long-houses'). Little or no pre-medieval settlement is known in the valley bottom around the Roman fort of Brough by Bainbridge. Further east, on the slopes of Penhill, extensive settlement occurs of the order of a village community (Burton Moor) very probably resulting from agglomeration and based on

stock rearing. Near Middleham, at what may be regarded as the entrance to the dale some probable pre-Roman occupation is implied by the fortified site at East Witton Camp but there is little else apart from a probable stock enclosure and possible field systems. No native settlement has been recorded in the valley bottom but there is the clear evidence of Romanisation and prosperity in the guise of the probable Roman villa at Middleham. The recently discovered Roman fortlet at Wensley (SE 08148925) (Moorhouse, 1977, 7) underlines the importance of this part of the region as do the later medieval fortifications at Middleham Castle. Not only is this a well-watered fertile area enjoying at 122m (400ft) the advantages of a lowland situation but it marks the place where the route through Wensleydale joins with that along Coverdale. The latter travels into Wharfedale and makes for Skipton. Thus the prosperity of Middleham Roman villa may be based on agriculture in the vicinity but also aided by communications. Its prosperity may also owe something to the stock raising capacity of the folk living further up the dale. This situation may well reflect what had gone before and help to explain the location of the fortified site at East Witton. It is interesting to note that no other truly fortified pre-Roman site is known further up Wensleydale and it may be that East Witton Camp represents a power centre controlling the inhabitants of the dale.

CHAPTER SEVEN

RURAL SETTLEMENT: CENTRAL PENNINES, SOUTHERN PART.

South of Wensleydale is that part of the Pennines drained by the upper reaches of the rivers Wharfe and Ribble with Malhamdale (Upper Airedale) between, a region often referred to as Craven. To the east of Craven are the uplands around Nidderdale which form part of the eastern margin of the Pennine range. It will be necessary to consider this area first before looking at Craven itself.

Nidderdale.

Three sites, all rectilinear, are known in the vicinity of Swinton on the edge of the uplands (fig.1.4). On Roomer Common at 122m O.D. (SE 225788) is a five-sided enclosure demarcated by double rampart and medial ditch. The enclosed area is 0.2ha (0.5ac) (Allcroft, 1908, 130-132; HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.274). Less than two miles away to the south-west is another enclosure (SE 198777), with double banks and medial ditch (Challis and Harding, 1975, Pt.2, fig.92, no.41). It is the same size as that on Roomer Common but is much higher at 244m O.D. These two sites lack interior features and are undated. However, by analogy with similar sites in Northumberland and Durham already discussed (see Chapter 5) they may tentatively be placed within the late Iron Age to Roman period. Another, rather different, site is known about one mile south of the Roomer Common enclosure. This is Camp Hill in

Grewelthorpe parish (SE 226774). Although rectangular it is of different proportions to those just described, being internally 100m by 60m in size. Presumably because of its oblong shape and the fact that it is demarcated, at least on three sides, by a prominent rampart and outer ditch it has been described as a 'Roman Camp' (Allcroft, 1908, 306-8; HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.273). The fourth side falls away very steeply and it is not clear whether this side was originally enclosed by rampart or not. If not this would hardly seem to be in keeping with normal Roman practice. Another irregularity is the fact that the entrance, which is 2.5m wide and occurs in the south-east side, is situated near the east corner. There is here the suspicion that a non-Roman enclosure is in question and indeed it is not recorded as a military site on the Ordnance Survey Map of Roman Britain (1978). It is thus possible that Camp Hill should be classified as a native stronghold rather than a Roman one. Certainly at 213m O.D. it occupies a commanding position with a clear view to the south and east. Unfortunately, no interior features are visible which might aid interpretation.

Massive sarcophagi, however, found at Swinton itself (SE 1977) hint at the presence not far away of Roman-style settlement of the order of a villa (Elgee and Elgee, 1933, 166, 249).

Some four miles south of Swinton are two sites near Laverton; Cast Hills (SE 204716) and Fortress Dike Camp

(SE 179732) (fig.7.1). The former is an ill-defined curvilinear enclosure with double rampart situated at 213m (700ft) O.D. (Challis and Harding, 1975, Pt.2, fig.93, no.54) while the latter is rectilinear and situated at 259m (850ft) O.D. (Allcroft, 1908, 132-4; HBM.C. SAM. N.Yorks.1053). Little is known about Cast Hills but Fortress Dike Camp has been partly excavated with the express purpose of gaining ecological information (Tinsley and Smith, 1974, 23-33). It is a sub-rectangular enclosure 0.72ha (1.78ac) in area, originally enclosed by double banks and medial ditch (only three sides survive, the fourth having almost completely vanished). Of several gaps in the ramparts, that on the south side is probably original as suggested by its inturned banks. It is approached from the south by a hollow way. A stream runs through the enclosure close to and parallel with the north ramparts, passing through gaps in the west and east ramparts respectively. This stream is enclosed on the south by a low bank running more or less parallel with it.

The evidence collected for laboratory analysis revealed that a landscape of partially cleared woodland existed prior to the construction of the earthwork. The high percentages of weed pollen suggest pastoral farming activity at this time. Cereal pollens were absent from this phase. There followed a phase which involved expansion of heaths at the expense of woodland. During the early part of this phase the earthwork was

constructed. No date is available but the presumption is that it was Romano-British in period. A period postdating the construction of the earthwork was characterised by an open environment with pastoral land use continuing. There are also indications of a possible control of the heath by burning. In addition the presence of cereal pollen shows that cultivation was carried out in the vicinity. A radiocarbon date was obtained for this episode, namely, a.d. 630₊₉₀ (Gak 385). Thereafter there is evidence for a phase of comparatively short-lived woodland regeneration followed by the re-establishment of heathland, the presence of which has continued to the present day.

It is unfortunate that no archaeological evidence was recovered from the Fortress Dike excavations that might help to indicate its date and affinities. Although assumed to be Romano-British, the only certain chronological fact is that it precedes the time indicated by the radiocarbon date. As to its function, there are no certain indications of hut remains within the enclosure that would help support an argument for its role as a dwelling site. At the same time, as previously noted, timber huts would leave little or no visible trace. Evidence of pastoral activities at the time of construction together with the presence of the stream within the enclosure would suit the idea that it was intended to function as an animal pound. Why in that case it should be so well protected is a puzzle. It was

perhaps designed to contain stock by people living in a society prone to cattle raiding. The hollow way leading up to the entrance is consistent with the suggestion of cattle enclosure for movement of herds would result in the formation of such a trackway. The internal subdivision, if envisaged as a bank surmounted by fence, would have the effect of controlling access to water and of providing an enclave suitable for accommodation of the herdsmen.

That pastoral activities were not the only kind of farming practice that took place on the Nidderdale Moors, however, is seen from seven pollen diagrams obtained from other parts of the district, the nearest pollen site to Fortress Dike Camp being Hambleton Dike (SE 15177342)(Tinsley, 1975, 1-26). The evidence from these pollen sites indicates that cultivation was occurring during a local phase designated 'NE' the start of which is radiocarbon dated to 250 \pm 80 b.c. (GaK-3670). Even so, pastoral activity was dominant during this phase with indications of little woodland and increasing grassland at the expense of heath. In archaeological terminology it would appear that during the later Iron Age the district was used by pastoral farmers who also cultivated cereals. The fewness of settlement sites in the area is a problem here but there is no suggestion of other than small scale cultivation and this could be accounted for by the few hut and croft sites in the area reported by Raistrick (1939, 119). Of possible significance too in this respect is a

site at Middlesmoor (SE 091743)(fig.1.6). This is an oval enclosure marked by a mound and outer ditch but located at a height above sea level of 305m (1000ft). It contains a possible hut circle of some 4.5m (15ft) diameter. No further information is available about this site apart from a report of flint implements having been found in the vicinity. A Bronze Age date has been suggested for it but there is no corroborative evidence to support this idea (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.524).

Five miles south of Middlesmoor an extensive settlement area has been reported in the valley of the Ashfold Side Beck, a tributary of the river Nidd (fig.1.6). This settlement at Stonebeck Down (SE 122664 - SE 127666) consists of hut circles, enclosures and sub-divided contouring fields, with stone-walling much in evidence. A small possible corn-drying kiln is also reported (Calvert and Collins, 1981, 144). These remains indicate a small open community depending upon stock-raising and cultivation for their existence. Although strictly speaking undated such a community would seem to be best assigned to Roman times when the Pax Romana was in operation.

Another, larger settlement reported less than a mile to the west at Tag Baile (SE 054670) on Hebden Moor is virtually within Wharfedale (fig.1.6). It is situated at 381m (1250ft) O.D. on the north side of Grove Gill Beck and consists of eight hut circles which range in size from

2.7m (9ft) to 9m (30ft) in diameter. There is in addition a square enclosure 9m (30ft) across and there are on the south side of the stream very large enclosures forming an extensive spread (Raistrick, 1965, 325). Such an open settlement would also perhaps fit most easily into a Romano-British context. At such an altitude the emphasis must have been on pastoral farming although the south-facing aspect might have aided small-scale cultivation.

It is appropriate now to turn to Wharfedale and the rest of Craven as defined above. By contrast with Nidderdale, settlement sites, not to mention field systems, are so numerous that it would be neither possible nor desirable to deal with each of them in exhaustive detail (fig.1.6). Indeed, it is not necessary and selected sites which seem typical or especially informative should suffice with the emphasis being placed on those which have been the subject of personal inspection. It will be convenient to take Wharfedale, Malhamdale and Ribblesdale in turn.

Wharfedale

Taking Wharfedale first one site calls for immediate comment since it raises the problem of classification. This site is a D-shaped enclosure situated at Heights about 1.5 miles north-west of Threshfield (SD 966643). Challis and Harding have listed it among small rectangular and D-shaped enclosures (1975, Pt.2, fig.92, no.34). As such it appears on the distribution map as an outlier of the group of rectangular enclosures known in the

mid-Wharfedale and mid-Airedale area further to the south-east. Such an impression is probably quite misleading. There is no record of internal structures and it is quite possible that the site should be regarded merely as a stock enclosure, not to be differentiated from many other similar enclosures which belong to open settlements within the Craven region. More information in fact is needed to assess its proper significance. The classification of sites by shape alone may be a useful preliminary where other details are lacking especially in the case of aerial survey, but it can not replace consideration of other aspects where these are available.

A similar difficulty with regard to classification is to be seen at a site near Conistone, south of Bull Scar (SD 989676). This is a small sub-rectangular enclosure measuring 22m by 16m (72ft by 52ft) with a surrounding wall of boulders and small stones and an inturned entrance on the south side, 1.5m wide. Three rather irregular hollows within the enclosure may represent hut positions. If so then the Bull Scar site qualifies as an enclosed settlement. However, the hollows may be the result of natural causes. Attached to the main enclosure on its southern side is another one with slighter walls but measuring 25m by 22m (82ft by 72ft). In a slight natural depression to the east of these enclosures are the grass covered foundations of a large hut, oval in shape and measuring 6m by 4.5m internally, with walls spreading 1.8m

wide and an entrance on the south-east. The hut is attached to the neighbouring limestone scar by a short cross-wall.

If the Bull Scar site is indeed an enclosed settlement then this hut may represent expansion. On the other hand, the exterior hut may have been the dwelling site to which the nearby conjoined enclosures belong, serving perhaps to pen animals. The sub-rectangular form of the enclosures would appear to have no special significance being rather a response to the shape of the knoll on which they were constructed.

By contrast, the rectangular enclosure below Swineber Scar (SD 984693) derives its shape from the rectangular field system within which it is placed. Half of its interior is sub-divided into rectangular huts, and the other half is given over to a rectangular yard (cf. King, 1985, fig.7.7). On either side are other, smaller rectangular enclosures and on one side a track or driveway running southwards along the contour. The Swineber Scar settlement might fairly be regarded as part and parcel of the extensive system of ancient fields which extends for almost 0.75 mile along the valley sides and almost 0.5 mile uphill over the scars into New Close Allotments.

Not so clearly associated with the undoubted ancient field system in its vicinity is the enclosed settlement site at the north end of Lea Green (SD 995660). It consists of a

double complex, that on the west being rectangular, whilst that on the east is roughly triangular. In the case of the rectangular portion an area measuring some 60m north-south by 48m east-west is enclosed by a substantial stone wall, the remains of which now spread 3m wide and survive 0.6m high. Within is a complex of irregular, curvilinear, sub-rectangular and rectangular enclosures, many of which should undoubtedly be classed as huts. The site is even more complex than the plan published by Dr. Raistrick (Raistrick, 1937, fig.1), which for example does not show the two rectangular structures measuring 11m by 2.5m, and 4m by 2m respectively, formed on the outside of the south wall by means of parallel walls, nor the two sub-rectangular enclosures attached to the inner side of the same wall. These two types of enclosure provide contrasting styles of building, strange to find in one apparently composite settlement. Both types occur elsewhere on the same site; the long, narrow rectangular structures are to be found along the north wall, partly along the east wall and in the interior, attached to the north side of a large irregular enclosure. The widths of all are similar, averaging 3m, as is their mode of construction. Besides small sub-rectangular huts comparable to those mentioned, such as that measuring 5m by 4m in the north-east corner of the main site, there are also larger sub-rectangular enclosures which could also have been roofed over to make huts. Such a structure occurs in roughly the middle of the site; it measures

internally about 9m north-south by 6m east-west and has walls 1.3m wide partly laid in courses and surviving to 0.4m in height. An opening 1m wide on the north side gives on to a larger enclosure, an irregular oval in shape, measuring some 17m east-west by 11m north-south. This pair seem best regarded as a yard attached to a large hut. Here again is a further contrast in structural arrangements.

The triangular portion of the settlement is attached to the eastern side of the rectangular part by means of a continuation of the latter's north and south walls. These gradually converge but the south wall continues to travel east in a zig-zag fashion. Within the triangular space so formed are at least seven probable rectangular and sub-circular huts, mostly attached to the inner sides of the demarcating walls. One D-shaped enclosure attached to the inside of the north wall measures about 5m long by 3m wide and could well be a hut. A smaller enclosure, probably a porch, is attached to its western end. The largest enclosure within this eastern complex is roughly oval, measuring some 10m east-west by 4m north-south, large indeed but still perhaps a hut.

The Lea Green settlement has been a large one. Located as it is close to a field system with large fields, and amidst cross walls, driveways and possible stock enclosures, there is every chance that its inhabitants utilised these arrangements at least, even if such

association can not be clearly demonstrated. Whether they initiated the field system is another matter. As for dating, excavations on the site have yielded Roman coarse pottery. That and other objects including a beehive quern, iron knives, an iron sickle, decorated lead spindle whorls, stone spindle whorls, whetstones etcetera point to a Roman-period native site. Raistrick suggested that similar sites could have been occupied as early as the second century BC and as late as the second or third centuries AD ((1939, 169). The variations in building styles noted above may imply additions and alterations over the years and could well point to a long history. The spinning of wool and grinding of corn are attested by the presence of spindle whorls and quern stones respectively while the iron sickle suggests that the corn was grown locally. The basic economy would seem to have been a mixed farming one and the size of the settlement implies prosperity. This prosperity may well be linked with the Roman influence attested by the presence of Roman coarse pottery. It is notable, however, that there were no finds of Roman coins, or even Samian pottery from the site and this suggests that Roman influence was limited.

North of Lea Green and just south of Scot Gate Lane is a settlement which consists of a series of adjacent enclosures with hut circles, situated at the foot of a limestone cliff (SD 993681 to SD 996677)(Pl.IIa). In one case the roughly rectangular stone-walled enclosure

measures approximately 16m by 15m. A hut-circle of about 5m internal diameter and with walls about 1m thickness is attached to its northern wall (Pl.IIb). A short cross-wall enclosure makes a further subdivision some 6m by 7m in size. The main north wall of the enclosure is continued as a low mound westwards and serves as a field wall in the system of rectangular fields which occupies the upland valley to the west of the cliff. These fields average about 32m in width and are about 180m long. The settlement is integral with the field system although there would appear to be later insertions of enclosures in some cases and in addition there is clear evidence of re-alignment of field boundaries. On the plateau above the cliff linear mounds indicate the continuation of the fields there too and indeed an overall aerial view confirms that this is so (cf. King, 1985, fig.7.7). The field-system aligned north-east to south-west is extensive, covering at least 48ha (120ac). Its regularity implies overall planning and this is further confirmed by the fact that such an obstacle as the cliff which shelters the settlement does not interrupt it. The undoubted alterations to the details suggest that a considerable length of time is involved in its use. The most likely period for its existence is within the late Iron Age to Roman period but exactly where it should be placed within that time span is unknown. It is, however, tempting to see the hand of the Roman surveyor in the highly regular system of land division though even if that were to be

correct the native tradition of circular hut is still retained.

As for the economic basis of such a settlement, there seems to be no reason why the fields should not have been used for growing crops. At about 320m (1050ft) O.D. they are at a similar height to the better known field systems to the south known as the Grassington enclosures and which are generally accepted as being the product of agricultural practices. Lanes, however, which are in alignment with the fields occur at intervals. In two cases at least they would permit movement between the territory south-west of the settlement and the higher ground to the east. If used as droveways they would allow the movement of stock from lower to higher pastures through cultivated fields. Whether the known sites and various archaeological remains of the area to the west of the settlement have any relevance in this possible scheme is uncertain. The Bull Scar site has already been mentioned and referred to in the possible context of animal control. Two other sites located on the opposite side of the upland valley to the cliff-base settlement are composed mainly of a series of sub-rectangular enclosures adjoining one another. Smaller inter-scar valleys on the west of these also contain enclosures created by means of cross-walls. Such sites and features might well reflect pastoral activities. It is tempting to see hereabouts the remnants of a well-organised landscape in which both

agrarian and pastoral activities were integrated. However, even if there is truth in such a supposition it does not necessarily mean that all archaeological survivals in the western 'pastoral' area belonged to the same overall scheme. Some sites could belong to a different period. As the evidence stands at present there can be no certainty either way and the problem must remain unresolved.

Just to the north of the present-day village of Grassington are the well known 'enclosures', a network of rectilinear fields associated with lanes and traces of settlement (centred on SE 003653). They extend some 60ha (145ac) at a height above sea level ranging from 229m (800ft) to 305m (1000ft). They provide evidence of considerable agrarian activity but in addition there are indications of pastoral farming if the lanes served as droeways for directing animals through fields under crop. At present, grass-covered mounds and stony banks, some more substantial than others, form the boundaries of the fields. Excavation has shown that they do not consist of coursed stone but are composed of large boulders, smaller stones and soil piled up (Raistrick, 1937, 168). Three main groups of fields can be identified (Raistrick, 1937, 168 and fig.1). First, on the west side of Bank Lane is an irregular group of enclosures of both rectilinear and curvilinear forms including at least six hut circles. A lane enters the complex from the south-west (Raistrick,

1937, Pl.opp.p.168). Such a complex might fairly be called an open settlement. The second group of fields occurs east and north-east of Bank Lane on Sweet Side and High Close. The fields in this group are in general regular, rectangular enclosures, orientated north-east to south-west and averaging 107/122m long by 23m wide (350/400ft by 75ft). The third group of fields is found on the lower slopes of Sweet Side and on Lea Green. The enclosing banks are much slighter and contain less stone than those of the previous group but the fields themselves are larger measuring on average 152m long by 61/91m wide (500ft by 200/300ft). Their orientation too is different, being almost due east to west. Several curvilinear enclosures, ranging from 15m to 30m (50ft to 100ft) in diameter are to be found amongst them. At the north end of Lea Green is the settlement site already discussed. In its vicinity the more regular field system appears to fade somewhat and boundaries not in conformity with the rest are in evidence.

The three groups of field systems seem very likely to represent three different phases of development of the overall block of enclosures at Grassington. Indeed, the Lea Green settlement and some of the features in its immediate vicinity may indicate yet another phase in the pattern of occupation in the area. Second century AD Roman coarse ware and mortaria rims have been recovered from the upper parts of the field banks in the second

group of fields; similar pottery as well as Samian ware has come from one of the fields itself and Roman coarse pottery has come from the Bank Lane settlement too (Raistrick, 1937, 168-9). This points to use within the Roman period and more specifically to a time during the second century AD. As has been seen the Lea Green site is assignable to the same general period. However, no dating material has come either from the core of the field banks or from the surface below them leaving their initial dating uncertain. Over the entire area, but especially on Lea Green, evidence in the form of flint work has been found of Neolithic and Bronze Age activity (Raistrick, 1937, 171-174). There is the beaker burial too on High Close pasture, amidst the field system. It may be that clearance and farming of the area began in Neolithic or Bronze Age times. Raistrick would assign isolated hut circles found in nearby Grass Wood to the Bronze Age. Yet most of the flints are arrow heads indicative of hunting activities suggesting that the territory was that of the hunter not the farmer. Even if there was some farming activity, it seems probable that only after the hunting phase did that of farming develop to any extent. The Bank Lane open settlement in its irregularity would seem to qualify for an early phase of development, prior to the other two types of field system and before the Lea Green settlement. The presence of Roman-period pottery need not preclude a pre-Roman origin.

It has been suggested above that the Lea Green settlement probably had a long history. If it did indeed follow the Bank Lane site chronologically this history might have begun during the second century AD but continued into the third century and beyond. The rectilinear aspects of the settlement would be in keeping with the later dates proposed. It could be that for the Lea Green settlement pastoral activities assumed greater importance than those of the agriculturalist. The fact of the matter is, however, that there is not really sufficient evidence to work out an adequate sequence and to decide whether development took place wholly within the Roman period or otherwise. The further detailed investigation that Raistrick called for in 1937 (Raistrick, 1937, 174) has not taken place and without that only broad conclusions can be drawn and the finer details must remain speculative.

Two sites in nearby Grass Wood require mention at this point. One is a settlement (SD 995651) located at 213m (699ft) O.D. and consisting of a series of adjoining enclosures and including several hut circles (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.677b). Trees and undergrowth have obscured the full extent and nature of the site but it would appear to be similar to that at Bank Lane. It seems quite possible that the occupants of this settlement were also involved in the farming activities connected with the Grassington field system just now discussed.

The other Grass Wood site is located at 274m (899ft) O.D. on an isolated knoll of the ridge known as Gregory. On the summit are the remains of a sub-rectangular enclosure measuring internally 11.8m by 8.5m (39ft by 28ft) with substantial stone walls 1.6m wide. Two smaller conjoined enclosures are attached to the north-east corner (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.677; Raistrick 1939). From the south-west and south-east corners of this triple enclosure-complex massive stone walls extend southwards to the edge of the ridge. Not visible nowadays in the dense woodland but reported by Raistrick in 1939 is the strengthening of the edge on the north-east by rough walling and by the filling in of gaps by packing them with rocks. With its commanding position and space for cattle and the like on the remainder of the summit outside the enclosures, Raistrick saw the position of the 'fort' at Gregory as one suitable for temporary retreat and as a look-out post (Raistrick, 1939, 125-6). He also suggested that along with the Ta Dyke near Kettlewell (SD 986756) and the Grinton-Fremington Dykes in Swaledale, discussed above, Gregory was constructed by the Brigantes against Roman attack (Raistrick, 1964, 26-7). Excavation on the site failed to produce dating or other material which might give support or otherwise to this idea. An alternative suggestion may be offered here, namely, that Gregory was the headquarters or power base of a local chieftain. Whether this suggestion has any validity or not would perhaps depend upon further excavation of the site itself.

Two curvilinear enclosures now need to be considered. One is at Outgang Hill, near Kilnsey (SD 971669) and the other is in Scot Gate Pasture (SD 989683) below Hill Castles Scar near Conistone.

Outgang Hill is an oval enclosure surrounded by a massive bank and measuring 46m by 30m (150ft by 100ft) at a height of 259m (850ft) O.D. on the western side of the river Wharfe. Internally it is divided into enclosures which include four sub-rectangular areas and four hut circles. The latter range in size from 4.6m to 6m (15ft to 20ft). On the north side is another enclosure measuring 18m by 15m (60ft by 50ft) with a hut in one corner. In addition there is a system of large fields linked to the site by a sunken way (Raistrick, 1964, 26).

Scot Gate Pasture site is very similar but rather larger (Pl.IIIa). It is essentially a round enclosure but with one side flattened as it were where it is set against the limestone scar (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.663a). The diameter of the enclosure is about 63m (207ft) and like Outgang Hill the surrounding bank is very substantial. Likewise, its interior is subdivided into enclosures, in this case, about nine. Some of these seem to be circular huts, of which the largest measures about 12m (40ft) in diameter, while others are in the range 6m to 9m (20ft to 30ft). These occur on the south-eastern half of the enclosure where there appear to be narrow passages for communication between them. Details such as this are difficult to

interpret because the entire site is well-grassed over and the contours of the internal enclosures rounded off. However, two rectangular structures can be seen against the scar on the north-west side. The rest of the eastern half must be regarded as something like a yardspace.

Whether the occupants of Outgang Hill settlement initiated the nearby field system is uncertain but it does seem clear that they utilised it for they had access by the sunken way. The same certainty cannot be felt with regard to the Scot Gate Pasture site. In this case, although linear mounds of an ancient rectilinear field system are found nearby, stone-walled sub-rectangular enclosures on the shelf at their head are integral with the fields themselves. They would appear to belong to a different building tradition from the curvilinear settlement and may indeed belong to a different period. The fact that the linear boundaries do not appear to encroach upon the area around the enclosed settlement may mean too that the settlement itself was already in existence before the field boundaries came into being. Unfortunately, no direct physical relationship between the curvilinear settlement and the linear field boundaries can be observed to demonstrate sequence beyond cavil.

However, chronological sequence can be observed in the case of a small rectangular building (SD 988681) measuring overall 9.8m by 5m (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.663b). Inspection shows that it belongs to yet a different building

tradition from those sites just now described. Furthermore, it stands one course high within a field but on a different alignment. The conclusion must be that this structure is a later insertion.

Such chronological depth cannot always be so clearly demonstrated but differences in building technique often strongly suggest differences in period. This applies in the case of a handful of sites located on the high ground above Hill Castles scar. South-east of High Hill Castles a pair of rectangular huts with rounded corners (SD 991685)(HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.664c) has more affinity with the rectangular structure just described than with another sub-rectangular enclosure situated a short distance to the south under the same scar (SD 991685)(HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.664d). The huts measure overall some 8m by 5.4m and 9.2m by 6.1m respectively and are freestanding while the sub-rectangular enclosure measures overall 13m by 7.3m and utilises the scar face as one of its four sides. Furthermore there is a wall-passage along its western side (Pl.IV). As has already been noted wall-passages date from the second to third centuries AD. The rectangular huts are likely to be post-Roman by analogy with rather similar examples found in Malhamdale (Raistrick and Holmes, 1962, 90-91). Another wall-passage enclosure situated about 25m north-east of the one described above is worth noting here because of slight variations in the detail of its plan (Pl.V). As usual, the enclosure is set

against a scar face but it is truly D-shaped rather than sub-rectangular and its wall passage is formed against the scar face itself. This passage measures 5m long by 1m wide and as usual it curves into the interior. However, at its further end on the other side of a rubble wall which marks its termination is a small niche or chamber about 2m square with access from the interior. Adjacent to this are the remnants of another probable chamber of similar size. Both of these chambers, like the passage wall, utilise the vertical face of the scar as a side.

Another different type of site (centred on SD 990685) is found in the vicinity. At High Hill Castles is a complex of adjoining enclosures with low stone walls containing larger boulders (Raistrick, 1965, 320). Sub-rectangular shapes predominate, and some of these could be the remains of huts (Pl.VIb). Such a site must represent a settlement, no doubt concerned mainly with pastoral farming but possibly possessing garden plots. It is undated but could find a place as a native settlement of the late Roman or even early post-Roman period.

Yet another type of site is found in the inter-scar valley below the site just now referred to (SD 989685)(Pl.IIIb). Low grass-covered stony walls mark the positions of three oblong structures adjoining one another end to end. A sub-rectangular enclosure spanning the valley is attached to the most northerly oblong. This northerly oblong and its southern neighbour have additional outer western

walls, apparently forming outer passages. The northern oblong also has an inner passage-chamber on this same western side with a doorway just north of it. This site too is undated. Its position within an inter-scar valley is comparable to many sites throughout Craven usually assigned to the 'Iron Age'. The passages which occur might also be thought to be versions of the wall-passages already described and belonging to native tradition during the Roman period. However, these belong to structures which are free-standing and which employ a different technique of wall building. The shapes and sizes of the three rectangular structures are much more in keeping with those of the medieval long house. Yet it may be that they represent unroofed enclosures in view of their internal width, namely, 8m for two of them, and 9m for the third. The sub-rectangular enclosure with an opening on its north side, can satisfactorily be explained as an unroofed enclosure serving as a yard or animal pound. Such a site as this illustrates further the variety of settlement type in the area and underlines again the need for more firmly-based information, including that of dating.

Wharfedale sites discussed up to this point have been mostly located at around 305m (1000ft) O.D. The Grass Wood settlement, however, situated at 213m (700ft) O.D. shows that there was settlement lower down the valley sides. Lower still, at 198m (650ft) O.D. is a settlement (SD 984643) in Chester Wood and Little Wood (Raistrick,

1964, 26-7). Six hut circles are set within a squarish enclosure amidst a network of fields. Two other hut circles are to be found among the fields. They range in internal diameter from 4.6m to 8.5m (15ft-28ft). Three of the huts are conjoined and their walls are thick, being faced with boulders containing smaller fill. The field walls are strongly made and much the same in size and shape as the hut enclosure, as if the latter were merely a field utilised for the purpose of habitation. It is a moot point whether such a site as this should in fact be regarded as an open or enclosed settlement. It would perhaps be a mistake to be distracted by this question of classification. The important point here would seem to be that a no doubt well-wooded valley bottom has been colonised. In addition, such a settlement is somewhat larger than a single homestead and must represent some kind of community, perhaps the equivalent of two or three extended families. The fields around suggest that arable farming was being practised. As for dating, there is no certain evidence but it seems reasonable to suggest a time early in the Roman period.

Another type of potential settlement is that of the cave. Two such sites are known in Wharfedale, one at Calf Hole, Skyrethorns (SD 9764), near Threshfield, and the other at the more famous Dowkerbottom Cave (SD 952689), near Kilnsey (Raistrick, 1939, 121-4).

Calf Hole is a rock shelter where occupation material has come from the shelf in front of its mouth (Raistrick, 1939, 122-123).

Dowkerbottom Cave is a shaft cave (King, 1974, 199); occupation material has come from the uppermost levels and this indicates long 'occupation' during the Roman period, which apparently ceased towards the latter part of the third century AD. Finds include Romano-British pottery, Samian ware, Romano-British metalwork, including brooches of various types, and Roman coins, ranging in date from Nero to Claudius Gothicus and Tetricus (Haverfield, 1905, 239-240). In the case of each cave there is a nearby settlement consisting of hut circles and fields or crofts (Raistrick, 1939, 121). It is reasonable to associate these sites with the caves, and some have regarded the latter as in general places of shelter superior to the man-made hut circles and consequently exploited as such by local folk (cf. Collingwood and Richmond 1969, 186). However, the comparative richness and nature of the finds illustrates a prosperity that is not so evident from the finds recovered from the open-air settlements. It may be that the chances of survival of such material are less good in the latter sites. If that is the correct explanation for the imbalance, then this factor must be borne in mind when assessing both the extent of Roman contact and the economic success of settlement in the area in general. However, other factors may be involved

and it will be necessary to return to consideration of the problem later.

Little more than one mile south of the Dowkerbottom site is another type of open settlement. This is located on Kilnsey Moor (SD 954666) immediately south of Mastiles Lane. Here is a complex of limestone walls making enclosures of various sizes including sub-circular hut positions. The arrangement of long wall with various enclosures attached on either side lends itself to the description 'linear settlement' (fig.7.2). A hollow way travelling downhill towards the settlement forks into two branches and passes through the site. In the absence of nearby field systems the settlement must have concentrated on stock raising although some of the enclosures might have been used as cultivation plots. Movement of animals through the settlement area would account for the hollow ways. In addition a nearby depression enclosed by limestone scars would be ideal for rounding up animals. Some 100m further downhill a fairly large sub-rectangular enclosure might, if associated with the site, be thought appropriate for a similar purpose. Mastiles Lane a short distance away provides ready communication with Malhamdale to the west and Wharfedale to the east.

By contrast with this open settlement on Kilnsey Moor is the site of Blue Scar (SD 932709) further to the north in Littondale (fig.7.3). The arrangements here consist of a series of conjoined sub-rectangular enclosures or huts

placed around a rectangular courtyard which has a passage entrance on the south-east, 10m long by 2.5m wide (33ft by 8ft). A similar passage on the north-west leads into an attached rectilinear enclosure on the north. The surrounding enclosures or huts range in size from 7m by 3.5m to 8m by 8m (Raistrick, 1939, 119-20; Raistrick, 1929, fig.4).

Although strictly speaking not enclosed, such a site as Blue Scar gives the impression of being strong in its compactness and so perhaps achieving the same result. Notable is the predominance of the rectilinear tradition of construction. That it is no mere homestead seems clear and perhaps it should be classified as a village or at least a hamlet. One might even suspect that such a site represents the abode of a local dignitary or chieftain and his household. However that may be, Blue Scar exhibits yet another variation of habitation type in the region.

A site which Raistrick compared with that at Blue Scar (Raistrick, 1939, 120) is situated far up the Wharfe valley at Deepdale (SD 895807). No doubt the use of stone walls and the presence of rectilinear structures makes such a comparison to some extent valid. However, there are also considerable differences. The Deepdale settlement has curvilinear and irregular structures as well as rectilinear ones and far from being a compact single site, it consists of a series of homesteads set against the foot of the limestone cliff marking the 488m

(1600ft) contour (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.1054). Each steading comprises a hut or huts and attached enclosures. The huts vary in shape, some being circular, some rectangular and others irregular. Although now ruinous, enough remains of the structures to display hut walls with recesses or cupboards in them, passageways between huts and enclosures, and the use of corbelling. One cupboard measures 300mm wide by 300mm high by 600mm deep. Corbelling is seen most clearly in the best preserved structure on site. This is in plan an irregular rectangle with apsidal end (fig.7.4). The apsidal building stands upon a semi-circular platform which has circular hollows around its edges in three places representing no doubt the positions of small huts. These measure 3m by 2.5m (10ft by 8ft) and were not necessarily used for habitation but could have served as storage chambers. Around the platform itself is an enclosure with a stony bank to which are attached other, larger hut circles. To the rear, walls mark out other subsidiary enclosures against the cliff face (fig.7.5).

There is a marked difference in type between the more complete stone-built structures such as the apsidal building and the hut circles attached to the enclosure walls not to mention those hollowed out of the side of the semi-circular platform. This suggests a difference of period or at least of phase in the occupation of the settlement. Support is given to this suggestion by the

presence of stone-filled trenches below the level of the surviving walling and not obviously related to them. Re-building or re-occupation may help to account for the fact that remains appear only as grassed-over mounds further along the scar to the west while in the sector near the Deepdale Beck stone tumble predominates. This would have arisen if only this eastern part of the settlement had continued in use or else experienced re-occupation.

On the terrace above the main settlement are the remnants of two cross walls demarcating a small field or croft, a sub-rectangular enclosure containing two ruined circular huts, and a pair of grass-covered sub-circular huts without an enclosure. The relationship of these features with the main site is unknown but a hollow way leads down diagonally to the lower settlement. This suggests contemporaneous use of the two areas at least, if nothing else.

To the south of the settlement a linear earthwork consisting of bank and ditch runs west from the vicinity of the Deepdale Beck along the edge of the terrace for some 650m. At this point it is joined by a lesser mound running from the north. The main east-west mound continues to travel further westward for about another 150m. Raistrick regarded the ditch and mound feature as possibly a defence for the main Deepdale site (Raistrick, 1939, 121) but its function may have been rather that of marking out a boundary. The north-south mound adjoining

it may indicate the division of the landscape into large allotments. Further exploration is required to ascertain if possible the extent and nature of these linear features.

As for dating the Deepdale settlement, Raistrick placed it within the late first or early second centuries AD on the basis of Samian pottery and Romano-British coarse ware recovered from it. Thus occupation during Roman times is clear. However, if there were various phases of settlement and construction as suggested above, then a long period of occupation seems likely. In any case a settlement of such a size is unlikely to have developed overnight so to speak. It might not seem unreasonable to envisage occupation extending over many years to the later Roman period and even beyond. An alternative explanation might be that occupation in the early years of Roman rule was followed by abandonment and then by re-settlement in late Roman or post-Roman times. Such structures as the apsidal building would seem to fit more easily into later times and either of the alternatives suggested would make allowance for this.

Whatever the case may be, in its heyday the Deepdale settlement has been a large and flourishing one, forming a community wherein the inhabitants lived close together. Presumably this meant close co-operation also. There is no direct evidence of the settlement's economic basis but in the absence of a nearby Celtic field system, and at

such an elevation, a pastoral rather than an agricultural one would seem more probable.

Different again from either Deepdale or Blue Scar are sites identified and partly excavated by Bennett in Littondale (Bennett, 1938, 413-419). These occupy the north-facing terraces on the south side of Penigent Gill (SD 875742). Small homesteads or settlements are represented by embanked enclosures set against limestone scars. Associated with these are circular and rectangular huts, together with small fields made by cross-walls between limestone scars.

There are two groups of settlements, one at Dawson Close and the other about 0.75 mile to the west at Fountains Beck. The simplest sites are to be found in the Fountains Beck group of which one example may be given. This consists of three small sub-rectangular enclosures set against the limestone scarp with a hut circle incorporated in the wall of one of them. Nearby is a sub-rectangular structure whose walls are built in regular courses and with an entrance in the west end facing the other enclosures. This structure seems best interpreted as a hut. Openings through the escarpment edge provide ways through for descending to the stream below.

Another site in this group has a structure interpreted by Raistrick as a grain storage pit (Raistrick, 1939, 131-133, fig.1). This is an almost circular pit, 1.2m (4ft)

in diameter and 0.8m (2.5ft) deep. It was lined with limestone slabs set on edge against a clay backing. Horizontal slabs provided edging and corbelled stones had formed a beehive roof whose centre had collapsed. King denies the existence of or the need for grain storage pits in limestone terrain (King, 1978, 112). Even so, the Penigent Gill pit must have been intended for storage of some kind even if not grain.

The most complex site in the Penigent series is to be found in the Dawson Close group. This settlement occupies a terrace between two escarpments and consists of a set of conjoined sub-rectangular enclosures set against the limestone scar. It includes six hut circles, one of which is set within its own yard, and two rectangular huts. Excavation yielded native pottery and imitation Samian ware, indicating occupation during the Roman period at least. A heap of stones proved to be a rubbish dump of querns, rubbing stones, pot boilers and ox, sheep and horse bones. Such a site as this is clearly more than a simple homestead; it should be classified rather as a hamlet.

Thus the Penigent Gill sites are examples of open settlement, representing for the most part small homesteads, utilizing terraces between limestone scars. Their basic economy is that of the stockbreeder with protective shelter for sheep and cattle and perhaps for ponies. Small fields are present for in-bye pasturage.

It is also possible that some grain was cultivated given the presence of rubbers and quernstones and especially if Raistrick is right about the grain storage pit. However, at these high altitudes (305-366m) on a north-facing slope, agrarian practices must have been severely restricted. This does not preclude the use of quernstones and the like for grain could have been brought in from elsewhere. As to social organisation, most of the Penigent Gill sites must have been occupied by individual farmers and their families. That a larger settlement could exist too has been seen but most of the sites were isolated homesteads. This no doubt led to an independent mode of existence. Even so, two groups of settlements have been distinguished and it is entirely feasible that each of these should represent two loosely organised communities whose members had loyalty to their own group yet giving support to each other when faced, for example, with influence or pressure from further afield.

As for dating, the finds are not very helpful but the piece of imitation Samian ware indicates occupation during the Roman period at least.

Malhamdale

Malhamdale now falls due for consideration (fig.1.6) and an enclosed settlement (SD 901639) east of Malham Cove may be dealt with first. It is situated about 200m north-west of Shorkley Hill and is in the form of a sub-rectangular walled enclosure without a ditch measuring some 30m by 36m

(HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.652b). Inside the enclosure are five hut-circles, four of which are conjoined and run in an irregular line across the enclosure while the fifth is set in the eastern corner. They range in internal diameter from 2.5m to 6.5m and have entrances on the south-east. The enclosure itself is positioned between two parallel linear mounds 30m apart and aligned north-west to south-east. In fact the enclosure is attached to the north side of the most southerly mound. A narrow hollow track runs alongside the other linear mound on its northern side. The fourth side of the enclosure, on the south-east, merges with the top edge of a limestone outcrop and here are two openings, about 1.5m and 3m wide respectively, which lead down to a roughly circular shelf below enclosed by natural outcrop and measuring some 7m in diameter.

A site like this might be thought to be in size suitable for no more than two family groups. Although enclosed it is essentially non-defensive and might be best described as protected, that is, sufficiently enclosed to ward off wild animals and occasional robbers but not fortified. Space within the enclosure would be available for domestic activities and perhaps farming activities too such as milking, and the enclosed shelf below would serve as a stock pen. In the absence of direct evidence from the site itself there can be no certainty. However it is reminiscent of the well-known rectilinear sites from Northumberland, with the twin-depression stockyards

(Jobey, 1960, 1-38) which flourished in the second century AD and which have been interpreted as the farmsteads of dual-family stock farmers (see Chapter 5).

The Shorkley Hill settlement is not an isolated one. The linear mound to which it is attached travels off in a north-west direction and is probably part of a more extensive field system, remnants of which have survived, for example, north-east of Sheriff Hill. Here two parallel mounds about 12m apart mark the track of a lane or droveway which an overall view shows as travelling in a northerly direction (King, 1985, fig.7.6). This track follows the line of Trougate which in Medieval times was to become an old monastic track across Prior Rakes and Malham Lings and thence to the east side of Malham Tarn (cf. Raistrick, 1976, 66). Field boundaries now appearing as lines of stones and slight mounds are set at right angles to the more easterly mound. The dimensions of one field may be given as an example, namely, 16m by 9m. No doubt, this represents a small sub-division of larger fields for further uphill to the north-east occurs another linear mound with the same alignment as the others perhaps demarcating the upper limit of the fields further downhill.

There are other sites too within this area to the east of Malham Cove. On the south side of Sheriff Hill with its Bronze Age burial mound are enclosures set against the rock face (SD 900640). One of these incorporates a wall

passage (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.648b). The enclosure itself measures internally 13m by 12m and the wall passage occurs on its west side. It is about 0.7m wide and terminates in a chamber edged with vertical stones and measuring some 4m by 1.5m. Attached to the main enclosure on its east side is another enclosure measuring internally 9m by 13m whose south side is marked by a line of boulders, some massive. Within this enclosure is a small chamber or hut whose walls are made of large blocks of stone. It is attached to the wall common to the adjoining enclosures and measures internally 6m by 3m.

A few more metres to the west of the previous site and set against the same rock face is an enclosure measuring only 6m by 7m internally, small enough to have been roofed over as a hut in its own right.

These sites are of a size to be regarded as homesteads and there are other similar enclosures hereabouts. In addition, however, there are larger settlements which qualify for hamlet status at least.

One such site (SD 902640) is located about 160m to the east of Sheriff Hill. There are two D-shaped enclosures set against a limestone cliff. The smaller most northerly one is divided into two by an internal wall. The other enclosure measures 26m by 35m internally with an entrance 0.36m wide at its southern end. It has a wall passage along its north wall 1m wide by 11m long with its inner

sides lined with stones set on edge. Excavation revealed that the floor was paved with limestone slabs. Native pottery was obtained from the associated enclosure. Inside this enclosure were also found the rectangular foundations of a medieval structure for it yielded fourteenth century pottery. Raistrick associates this structure with the activities of Bolton Priory when the area was leased as a sheep run (Raistrick and Holmes, 1962, 86 and fig.8). Between the two D-shaped enclosures are the remnants of what appears to be yet another wall passage. The arrangements at this point are far from clear and it seems very likely that there has been re-fashioning of the walls and this may represent different phases of construction. However, the fourteenth century operations may have been responsible for the disturbance.

Next to these D-shaped enclosures is a complex of hut circles and cross-walls merging together in such a way that interpretation is difficult. There are at least seven circles four of which are 3m, two of 4.5m and one of 6.5m in internal diameter.

In addition to these features are three conjoined huts under the cliff face to the south-east. One with an internal diameter of about 6m is circular while the other two are sub-rectangular, measuring about 6m by 5m (19.5ft by 16ft) internally. A stone-lined passageway 3m wide proceeds from these huts following the limestone edge as it changes direction eastwards. The passage continues for

several metres before terminating in a small chamber. Other enclosures occur near this point, as well as a dewpond. These need not be described here but are noted to illustrate the density of early occupation.

Another larger settlement is located some 300m to the south-east near Stridebut Edge (SD 907638) (Raistrick and Holmes, 1962, 86). Raistrick and Holmes have published a plan which gives the layout of the site (1962, fig.7) yet the arrangements are more complex still and there are more hut circles than shown on this plan. Once more there are two enclosures against the outcrop edge, but this time sub-rectangular in shape. Once more each has a wall passage. The westernmost enclosure has two smaller enclosures attached to it and attached to them by walls is a pair of conjoined circular huts measuring internally 6m and 3m respectively. Their walls are substantial and have as facing stones boulders set at intervals. The easternmost rock-face enclosure has been incorporated in a larger enclosure within which are three hut circles constructed in a similar fashion to the other pair just described. The largest of the three circles has an internal diameter of about 5m. The next one is 4m in internal diameter and has a small porch attached. The third one measures 2.5m across internally and is at the junction of the large enclosure wall and an internal cross wall. The western side of the large enclosure is occupied by a double wall forming an elongated enclosure. At its

southern end is a complex of four or five hut positions together with a linear mound incorporating large boulders. This continues southwards to join up with a length of embankment along the edge of the escarpment. Excavation of the westernmost pair of huts near the crag yielded an iron knife, some scraps of iron, a slate hone and fragments of native pottery. One of the wall passages also produced iron fragments and a hone (Raistrick and Holmes, 1962, 86). An extensive field system of rectangular fields is situated nearby and presumably belonged to the site for it is linked to it by a hollow way.

These larger sites are in effect open settlements and appear to have developed piecemeal by having parts added to them, hence their complex irregularity. Such development must mean expansion and this no doubt was based on a successful farming strategy. If the nearby Celtic fields are indeed to be associated with the settlements then the inhabitants were engaged in growing crops as well as rearing animals, although there is no direct evidence for either. Again such settlements would form small communities and the fact that they are open suggests that they were able to co-operate with their neighbours.

To the west of Malham Cove on the southern edge of Ewe Close is a settlement area which contains a variety of sites. Outcrops are much utilised to make enclosures with

the help of cross-walls, or to provide shelter. Walls surviving as lines of orthostats or as grass-covered mounds attest the division of the terrain prior to the modern field enclosures with their dry-stone walls.

One settlement site (SD 886642) occupies a shallow valley at 442m (1450ft) O.D. between limestone outcrops. The south end is blocked off by a cross wall of orthostats. On the south side of this the ground falls away fairly steeply. To the north the valley, in width measuring no more than 20m, travels for about 160m in a north-westerly direction, until it fades out. Some 18m from its termination a boulder filled wall blocks off the valley at its northern end but a gap 1.4m wide provides a way in. Other cross walls divide the valley up into enclosures. In the southernmost enclosure is a large hut which measures 6m internally with walls 1.5m wide as surviving. In the northernmost enclosure the remains of three circular huts of 5m internal diameter can be discerned set in a line on the western side of the valley. Two of them, appearing as hollows, are interconnected. In front of them is an oval-shaped hollow area, perhaps a yard. Here too is an opening some 8m wide in the eastern side of the valley, no doubt the main entrance to the settlement. It is flanked on its northern side by a hollow representing perhaps a hut circle with internal diameter of 4m. Such a settlement as this was probably occupied by one or at the most two family groups and therefore should more

accurately be termed a homestead. The enclosed areas no doubt served as paddocks for stock although the possibility of garden plots must be contemplated too. Failing evidence to the contrary the presence of hut circles makes a date with the Iron Age or Roman native tradition the most likely.

By contrast with the previous site wherein circular huts are to be found are other sites following a rectilinear tradition of hut construction. One such site is to be found further east (SD 887643). Here a roughly circular enclosure some 41m in diameter has as its boundary rock outcrop on its west and north-west sides with the remainder formed by a wall now represented by a grass-covered mound 1.7m wide. The entrance is on the south, through the wall and two small sub-rectangular huts are attached to the inner side of the wall, one on the north-east side and the other on the east. The former measures 5m by 3.5m internally and the latter 1.8m by 2.3m internally; the width of the walling survives as 1.2m. These are small huts and it may be that they represent only temporary habitations connected perhaps with pastoral activities implied by the large enclosure.

Besides sites where huts are clearly associated with larger enclosures, there are others where such association is not evident. Notable is a large free-standing hut circle (SD 887641) sheltering in the lee of outcrops on its north. Its internal diameter is 7m and it has broad

walls 1.7m wide, represented now only by grass-covered foundations. On the south-east is the entrance 1.2m wide. Close dating of such a site is impossible without further evidence but it seems safe at least to assign it to a later prehistoric or Roman native context.

A different mode of construction is to be seen in the 'rock-face shelters' located not far distant (at SD 887639). Three small shelters are known, made out of clefts in the rock face by means of short stone walls providing a fourth side of small four-sided enclosures. The three shelters measure 3.9m by 2m, 3.6m by 3.2m and 3.2m by 2.5m respectively. The walling survives now only as low grass-covered mounds. There is no evidence of dating and such shelters could belong to any period of time. However, small 'huts' like these would appear to be suitable only for temporary accommodation and it is tempting to assign them to medieval times when they would have been used by shepherds looking after the sheep belonging to Malham village (cf. Raistrick, 1976, 20).

These Ewe Close sites well illustrate the difficulty faced when attempting to evaluate the meaning of such an occupation area. In the absence of dating there is the problem of distinguishing between pre-Roman and Roman Iron Age sites. Indeed, there is often the difficulty of establishing whether sites should be assigned to other periods of time, whether earlier or later. There must have been the temptation at all periods to erect when

required shelters and enclosures following similar basic techniques and using the same materials. The resultant structures are consequently rarely closely datable on form alone. Even where material remains recovered from a site indicate its general period, these are rarely sufficiently diagnostic to enable a close date to be placed upon them. Such a site is located about 0.5 mile north of the Ewe Close sites in the pasture opposite Langscar.

The Langscar site (SD 883651) occupies a limestone terrace on an easterly facing hillside (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.706). It is situated at 411m (1350ft) O.D. and is an example of the inter-scar settlement which is common in limestone areas. A long stone-filled bank surviving to a height of 0.5m and to a width of 2.4m runs for most of its length north-west to south-east diagonally across the terrace (fig.7.6). Near the middle of this linear bank is a large sub-rectangular enclosure attached to the west side and measuring internally 21.5m by 22m with an entrance 1m wide in its west wall. At its north-east corner, on the opposite side of the linear mound and attached to it, is a smaller squarish enclosure measuring internally 9m across. At the south end of the linear bank where it merges with outcrop are other sub-rectangular enclosures. At the north end after it has changed direction westwards to join up with outcrop is a complex of curvilinear huts of varying sizes, sometimes conjoined, attached to the linear bank and sheltered by the limestone scar. Next to the

huts is a large 'pond' area of marshy ground extending 20m by 9m. The system so far described is designed to make full use of the parallel outcrop scars as natural walling. The movement of stock along the terrace could be controlled and the animals gathered into pens as required. It may well be too that the site here reported had belonging to it a wider arrangement of land division. Other ancient walls running both along the edges of the terraces and downhill across the contours can be discerned in the same present-day pasture. One field at least measured some 200m north to south. While it is not obligatory to connect the Langscar settlement with this wider system yet it is very tempting to do so. In that case the entire arrangement takes on a more purposeful appearance implying not only as already suggested control of stock movement but also the implementation of a more systematic grazing regime. As for dating, pottery and other objects found in some of the huts place it, according to Raistrick (1976, 62) in the late Iron Age. Unfortunately, further details have not been published but in view of the fact that Raistrick follows the practice of referring to the Roman period as part of the Iron Age it is perfectly possible that the Langscar site was a native one of the Roman period.

Another area of Malhamdale which contains a variety of sites is that situated north of the Cove and south of Malham Tarn. Several of the sites can, with considerable

confidence, be placed in their proper chronological context (Raistrick and Holmes, 1962, 80 and fig.2), although even in these instances very close dating is not usually possible.

A good example of this situation is the site on Prior Rakes west of Trougate (SD 895652) (Raistrick and Holmes, 1962, 88-90 and fig.10). This consists of a sub-rectangular enclosure measuring 30m by 15m (100ft by 50ft) set against the north edge of what is now limestone pavement and in fact its south wall, surviving as a line of boulders, runs along the pavement edge (fig.7.7). The remainder of the enclosure wall has survived as a broad low mound which when excavated proved to have been originally 1.2m (4ft) wide as examination of a portion still uncovered shows. It has been a well-built roughly coursed dry-stone wall. Incorporated into the north-east corner of the enclosure is a circular hut of 7.6m (25ft) internal diameter. A detached hut circle lies outside the north-west corner of the enclosure. It has an internal diameter of 5.8m (19ft). Excavation showed that it had postholes set into its surrounding wall and in this respect it is similar to one of the huts excavated at the site of Middle House Pasture to be described later. As Raistrick and Holmes report, traces of other small enclosures, possibly huts, are to be seen outside the main enclosure at this eastern end. Other similar traces of external enclosures attached to the main north wall can

also be discerned. Within the main enclosure a low, broad mound running from the pavement edge parallel to the west wall for some two-thirds of the width makes an internal subdivision. Another interior enclosure measuring 5m by 2.3m internally and paved is to be found alongside the west wall. The similarity of this feature to 'wall passages' found elsewhere in the Central Pennines was remarked upon by Raistrick and Holmes. Externally, the foundations of an irregular wall run from the north-east hut circle for some 32m to the north-east, then turn east for about 64m curving gradually towards the south-east. Another wall foundation runs from the south-west corner of the enclosure in a westerly direction and at a point some 16m downhill it is joined at right angles by a wall from the south. It seems probable that these walls are the present-day remnants of former field systems. Their relationship to the enclosure itself suggests that they were either contemporary with or subsequent to it. The general dating of the site is indicated by finds resulting from excavations. An iron sickle from the detached hut and fragments of second-third century coarse pottery from both huts show that a native site of the Roman period is in question. Two flint scrapers found on site were regarded as of probable Bronze Age date surviving from a previous unconnected occupation.

That the Prior Rakes site just described should be regarded in its basic form as a homestead intended for a

single family seems clear. Enclosure and large hut were of one design, the equivalent of farmhouse and farmyard. The exterior hut at the north-west corner appears to have been suitable for human habitation and may well represent expansion of the probable family group originally occupying the farmstead. How the other exterior structures fit into this pattern is less clear. Why they have left fainter traces is a problem. It may be that this is because they were originally less substantial or it is possible that they belong to an earlier stage of occupation partly obliterated by the more clearly defined arrangements that can now be seen. On present evidence the former seems more likely and if this conclusion is correct they seem best explained as structures broadly contemporary with the detached hut. Animal pens and shelters, house and barn suggest themselves as possibilities for their function. As for the economic basis of the homestead, there is little or no direct evidence on which to base an estimate. The iron sickle which was found may be taken as evidence of crop cultivation but there is nothing else to corroborate this. Equally, there is no direct evidence for stock rearing. That the homestead depended upon farming seems a fair assumption but where the emphasis lay is uncertain.

Some 200m to the east on the other side of the lower land followed by the Trougate route are other remains probably of the same general period. These are located at Torlery

Edge which consists of two areas of higher ground or flat-topped knolls with a slight valley between. In the lee of the southern edge of the western knoll is a line of six hut circles, five of which are conjoined. Internally, the largest measures 7.4m across and the smallest 5.3m while the rest, including the detached hut, have an internal diameter of 6m. In the case of one hut the entrance cannot now be identified but the remaining five each have their entrance on the south side. These entrances average 0.8m in width. In two of the circles an upright stone 0.65m high stands within the doorway and in one case this is accompanied by a similar stone lying horizontally athwart the entrance (Pl.VII). These features suggest the former presence of a partition within the doorway, possibly to shield a hearth from direct draught. In four of the huts is a shelf or bench on the north side opposite the doorway and averaging 3m by 1m in size. Such a feature might have been intended either for sleeping or for storage. There is no enclosing wall around the huts or incorporating any of them but the foundations of a wall attached to the westernmost hut run off in a south-west direction. In addition, a few metres away at the south-east corner of the knoll is a small rectangular enclosure set against the rock face. It measures internally 13m by 7m and is sub-divided into two parts. Adjoining this enclosure is one measuring internally 4.6m by 2m, small enough to be roofed over as a hut. Nearby are the fainter grassed-over traces of a circular hut having an internal

diameter of 6.7m. Remains of a wall travel northwards from the corner of the small rectangular hut for a short distance. They then become a cross wall which together with a parallel cross-wall serves to enclose a hollow area on top of the knoll. The resulting enclosure measures some 40m by 57m.

Turning now to the eastern knoll, the remains of two separate hut circles survive below the south face of the knoll. One measures 7m across internally and the other 6m. Both have entrances on the south. The foundations of a wall attached to the easternmost hut run off to the south-east for some 70m before terminating in an oval hollow measuring 5.5m by 4m. This hollow is probably the site of a hut. Remains of another wall run down from the top of the knoll above the pair of huts in a westerly direction into the valley between the knolls. The wall stops short of a round pond situated about half way across the valley.

The Torlery Edge circular huts must be regarded as part of a settlement area which had associated with it a field system as the attached walls show. It is not certain whether the other enclosed areas described are to be associated with them but it seems not at all unlikely. If they all belong together then it is interesting to note the presence of a rectangular hut, if that is the correct interpretation, along with circular ones. Such an occurrence would not be an isolated one. Failing

published excavations of this area there is no direct evidence to define more closely the date or economic basis of the settlement or settlements involved. The cutting off of valleys and the making of smaller rectangular enclosures suggest that stock control is involved. The presence of a pond adds support to this idea. Whilst medieval sheep running could account for such arrangements the presence of round houses points to earlier times. A date within the general Iron Age to Romano-British period seems most likely.

Other sites in the area belong to later periods. A good example is the site of the Sheep House on Prior Rakes (SD 905648) situated in the valley between Abbot Hills and Broad Scars. Excavation combined with documentary evidence has identified this as belonging to the time in the later Middle Ages when Bolton Priory leased this part of Malham Moor from Fountains Abbey as a sheep run. The remains of a small house (SD 906647) on a scar nearby is to be dated to the same time for from it were got pieces of fourteenth century pottery. The suggestion that this house was used by shepherds working the flocks is eminently reasonable (Raistrick and Holmes, 1962, 92-4). Two rectangular structures on Malham Lings (SD 902649) are also to be classed as medieval but having an earlier initial date within the late eleventh or early twelfth century by analogy with a similar site on Great Close

(SD 897675) which yielded medieval pottery of that time (Raistrick and Holmes, 1962, 92).

By contrast, a sub-circular hut at Comb Scar (SD 894648) (Pl.VI) has been claimed by Raistrick to belong to the Bronze Age by reason of brown pottery found in it together with two Bronze Age flints (Raistrick and Holmes, 1962, 80, fig.2). Located in a sheltered position and overlooked by crags, it measures 5.8m by 5.5m (19ft by 18ft) internally. Large boulders are incorporated in its drystone walls. The entrance, on the north, is through a paved passage-way. A central posthole indicates the position of a post which would provide support for a timber roof. On the south side of the interior is a paved inner compartment, 3.6m by 1.5m (12ft by 5ft). The single stones marking its inner, northern side are in fact part of a smaller hut circle only 4m in diameter. This smaller circle has been cut across by the main one and is therefore earlier.

Various other small enclosures and huts are to be found in the area; on Prior Rakes, New Pasture and Dean Moor. Many of these are of probable Iron Age-Roman native contexts. Others seem certain to belong at least to the same periods as the medieval sites detailed above. Some upon excavation have provided evidence of re-occupation. Inevitably, there remains an element of uncertainty in respect of a few sites.

Of probable Iron Age-Roman native period are the circular and D-shaped huts associated with small fields on New Close Pasture south of Seaty Hill. The most northerly field surviving (SD 907651) is marked out by two roughly parallel lines of boulders some 50m apart abutting the limestone scar which runs in a north-west to south-east direction. At its north-eastern end the field contains five huts, two sub-circular and three D-shaped, the latter being set against the limestone scar. The sub-circular huts have an internal diameter of 6m whilst the others measure about 5m across at right angles from the scar. The surviving remains do not permit an accurate estimate of the field length to be arrived at but the southernmost boundary wall travels at least 122m to the south-west (unpublished).

Almost certainly medieval is a complicated series of rectilinear enclosures of various sizes on the west side of the valley in which the sheephouse mentioned above is situated. The most northerly of the enclosures in this group is joined by a wall to the sheep master's house adjoining the sheephouse itself. No doubt the enclosures were in use as sheepfolds and the like.

On the other side of the valley, however, from these enclosures, some distance further to the south-east, is another group of scarface enclosures. These are sub-rectangular in shape. Some of them are small enough to have been roofed over as huts, whilst others are too big

for that. The largest enclosure measures 24m by 18m and to the south of this is a pair of probable huts measuring 4m by 5m and 4m by 6m respectively. It is difficult to decide without further evidence in which period such a group as this should be placed. Not far away at the southern end of the Abbot Hills escarpment is a circular hut of 7.4m internal diameter and with a south-east entrance. There is the temptation to associate the enclosures with the hut and to assign them to an Iron Age-Roman native context. In that case this provides another instance of the mixture of curvilinear and rectilinear hut traditions. If this interpretation is correct, then the circular hut seems best regarded in this instance as intended for habitation and the other enclosures for animals. This does not preclude the presence too of a garden plot.

The association, however, of the enclosures in question with the circular hut may be a mistaken one, in which case their chronological contexts are more problematical. The former become easier to regard as post-Roman and the latter as possibly Bronze Age. Certainly, three other large hut circles existed on the eastern side of Abbot Hills. These are partly set into the slope of the hillside and include massive boulders in their perimeter mounds. Such apparently detached huts, whether Bronze Age or later, seem likely to represent separate households and though not widely separated are in contrast to those cases

where hut circles cluster together, as well as to those where enclosures are attached.

To the west of the sites just described are rectangular fields demarcated by the remnants of walls extending over the limestone pavement of Broad Scars. These are based upon a broad bank flanking the north-eastern edge of Broad Scars and they average in size 25m by 33m (82ft by 108ft). Such fields would seem to have been intended for cultivation and when they were laid out there must have been a covering soil. Despite their elevation at 396m (1300ft) O.D., King has pointed out that the cultivation of cereals in the vicinity of Malham Tarn would have been possible (King, 1985, 123). The most likely period for such fields preceding the erosion of the soil is that ranging from the Iron Age into Roman times. This is the view also taken by Raistrick and Holmes who suggest that cultivation, followed by alternating periods of rain and drought, played an important part in bringing about the erosion (cf. Smith, 1986, 20). As has been seen there are settlement sites nearby to which the field systems could have belonged. Rectangular sub-divisions including probable huts at the north-east side within the fields may be contemporary with them. They are more likely, however, to have been later insertions, utilising the building materials ready to hand.

North of that part of Malhamdale so far dealt with lies Malham Moor, a polygonal area almost all of which lies

above 366m (1200ft) O.D. Apart from Fountains Fell and Darnbrook Fell whose upper slopes are made of shales and sandstones capped by Millstone Grit, limestone predominates, with its characteristic terraces, crags and pavements (Raistrick, 1976, 89-91). There are a good many sites on the Moor, sheltering among the limestone scars and as so often in limestone terrain utilising outcrops as walling. Few of these sites are directly datable but it is clear that there was some medieval activity on the Moor. Amongst excavated sites are the remains of two rectangular houses on Highfolds Scar (SD 897674) which are medieval in period. The first yielded abundant thirteenth and fourteenth century pottery while from the second came pottery and brooches of seventh century date, as well as a small amount of later material (Raistrick and Holmes, 1962, 90-92, figs.11-14). However, many of the sites are to be classed as at least pre-medieval as the presence of huts in the curvilinear tradition testifies. As has already been seen elsewhere, the presence of rectangular huts need not preclude a date within the same period. A small settlement (SD 881672) on Knowe Fell north-west of Malham Tarn illustrates this point as well as providing other information (Raistrick, 1968, 113; 1976, 119). Here at 421m (1380ft) O.D. are the remains of several interconnected enclosures together with two circular huts. Upon excavation, these huts yielded fragments of native pottery and in addition, evidence of iron working was obtained from one of the enclosures. Two rectangular huts

on site had been built later. One had been inserted into one of the enclosures, cutting into its walls, while the other had been built across an old bank outside the main enclosure. From both rectangular structures came fragments of third century AD pottery and portions of three querns. Raistrick quite reasonably interprets the sequence as one involving a settlement occupied during the first to second century AD and elaborated in the third century AD by the addition of rectangular huts. He furthermore suggests that Roman influence is to be seen in the rectangular shape of the huts. There are no signs of arable fields in the immediate vicinity but enclosures which would serve as sheep or cattle pens occur nearby. Thus the inhabitants were probably pastoral farmers who carried out enough iron working to supply their domestic needs. The presence of quernstones indicates at least the grinding of corn. As Raistrick suggests this corn could have been obtained from elsewhere, perhaps from the Roman villa site at Gargrave some nine miles further south. However, there seems no reason why a site much nearer to hand could not have been the source, such as one of the native settlements in the neighbourhood of the Cove. It is not clear whether the erection of the rectangular houses meant additions to the settlement or replacements. If the former then they may represent expansion. If the latter, then they indicate perhaps an improvement in living standards. It is possible that the circular structures were retained as barns or byres.

Unfortunately, not sufficient information is available to be certain about such details.

It seems not unlikely that many of the remains on the Moor are assignable to the same general period as the Knowe Fell site, that is, from the later Iron Age to the Roman era. Most of them seem to have been small, usually no more than homestead size. However, there is evidence of more intensive settlement at, for example, a site on Middle House Pasture (SD 901680).

The settlement at Middle House Pasture, north of Malham Tarn, consists of twenty huts, nine of which are incorporated in a boulder-filled wall which encompasses three sides of a promontory (fig.7.8). Other huts occupy two main shelves on different levels of the interior. These huts vary in shape, size and arrangement. Most are oval or circular, but one is sub-rectangular and one D-shaped. In their ruined state it is impossible to be precise but their approximate internal diameters as now surviving range from 2m to 6.5m (6.5ft to 21ft). Raistrick and Holmes for their part identified two main groups, large huts ranging in size from 7.6m to 10.7m (25ft to 35ft) and small huts, ranging in size from 3m to 4.6m (10ft to 15ft). An example of each of these two groups was excavated (Raistrick and Holmes, 1962, 84, fig.5). In the large hut a stony circular bank included in its core limestone slabs so arranged as to be capable of holding timber posts. In the case of the smaller hut,

a well-constructed stone wall base 1.2m (4ft) thick contained a ring of fourteen postholes, each about 0.9m (3ft) apart. The internal diameter of the hut within these postholes was about 3.6m (12ft) and this included an 0.5m (18in) bench formed by the walling around the inner edge of the hut. Such a bench could have served as a storage shelf or, as Raistrick suggests, it could have been a sleeping bench. On the unpaved floor to one side was a hearth, marked by a spread of charcoal and burned stones. The paved entrance was some 0.9m (3ft) wide but its orientation is not given in the plan provided by Raistrick and Holmes (1962, fig.6) nor is it clear from the present-day remains.

Very few finds are reported from the site; some non-diagnostic flints, a bead and some native pottery, the latter being sufficient to place it within the general Iron Age to Roman native category. This is supported by the similarity in house construction between the smaller excavated house and that of second to third century AD date from Prior Rakes (SD 895652) discussed earlier. Whether the Middle House Pasture hut is also more specifically second to third century AD in date is less certain for there is no telling how long the type persisted. In view of the basically curvilinear tradition of house construction throughout the site combined with the absence of Roman pottery an early Roman or even a pre-Roman date might be thought likely. However, the

excavations were too limited to enable firm conclusions to be drawn.

With regard to the economic basis of the settlement the paucity of finds also inhibits conclusions. Absence of nearby systems of Celtic fields suggest a lack of agrarian activity. At a height of 457m (1500ft) O.D. the inhabitants of the settlement would be much more likely to have been involved in pastoral farming. There would seem to be room within the actual enclosure for coralling animals and some of the huts might have been in use as animal shelters. In addition, the remains of a considerable number of enclosures as well as huts exist round about. It is possible that some of these at least are to be connected with the site, representing perhaps animal pens and the like.

As to the social nature of the settlement, Raistrick ventures to call it a village (Raistrick, 1976, 117) and this might seem a reasonable description in view of the score of huts present on site. However, as noted above, all huts need not have been occupied by humans. Some huts could have been used for animals and others for storage. In the case of the two excavated huts, the smaller one, since it possessed a hearth and possible sleeping bench, can be classified as being for human occupation. The larger example was not completely cleared and thus it provided no such evidence as to its function. More extensive excavation of the settlement would have a good

chance of providing the evidence necessary to attempt a solution of the problem. Even without excavation, however, the layout of the settlement might seem to give some indication of its internal organisation. On the lower of the two main shelves are six huts. These can be seen to fall into two groups, each with two large huts accompanied by a smaller one. A similar triple group can be seen on the shelf above for here three huts seem to be set apart somewhat from the single hut with its porch occupying the same shelf. The triple pattern is repeated twice more within the line of the western enclosure wall. If these triple groupings have any significance then it may well be that they represent the steadings of separate families. How the remaining huts fit into the system can only be guessed at but it might not seem unreasonable to argue that Middle House Pasture was occupied by at least five families, no doubt of extended size and probably inter-related. If that is correct then the designation of village if retained would at least need to be qualified by the epithet 'small' and perhaps the description hamlet would be more suitable.

A little over a mile to the north-east of Middle House Pasture is a settlement area which includes a promontory site at Dewbottoms (SD 913695). This is situated on a northward projecting spur at 434m (1425ft) O.D. (fig.7.9). It is not always easy to interpret the layout satisfactorily amidst the bare limestone pavement covering

much of the site but it is rather more complex than shown on the plan provided by Raistrick and Holmes (1962, fig.3). The remains in the form of wall foundations, sometimes partly turf covered, sometimes bare, consist of a group of large enclosures or fields, together with smaller attached enclosures, including huts. The most southerly field is roughly rectangular and measures internally some 40m by 46m. It has massive banks surviving to a height of 0.6m and spreading to a width of 1.5m. Five smaller enclosures, all with less substantial banks, adjoin this one on the north and north-west. Attached to the boundary walls of the enclosures are smaller enclosures of various forms, some circular, some rectilinear and others irregular. The circles at least and some of the others are probably huts.

With regard to the date and economic basis of the site, Raistrick, while admitting that firm evidence is lacking, would see it in a Bronze Age context and regard it as a farmstead (Raistrick and Holmes, 1962, 82-4). It is tempting, however, in view of the mixture of rectangular and circular huts, to suggest that, like the Knowe Fell settlement, it belongs to the Roman period. In addition, the number of huts, even if some were intended for animal shelters, points to a larger settlement than a single farmstead. As to where the emphasis lay between pastoral and arable farming, one might suppose that at this altitude stock rearing was the main activity. This need

not preclude some crop cultivation and it is possible that some at least of the enclosed fields on site were intended to keep animals away from crops. There is no direct evidence to decide the question.

In the area around Dewbottoms are the remains of many huts and enclosures. Remains in the immediate vicinity include stone walls running over the limestone plateau south of the site. These must surely represent remnants of fields. The neighbouring spur to the west of Dewbottoms is occupied by a small homestead, hitherto unrecorded, consisting of two hut circles and an enclosure. Separate from this but on the eastern slope of the same spur is a rectangular structure with porch. These two building traditions belong perhaps to two different periods of time. About 100m to the south of Dewbottoms at the foot of a steep limestone outcrop is a small settlement consisting of four or five hut circles together with three small enclosures (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.660a). This is associated with a massive cross-valley wall which along with another parallel wall further up valley makes a large enclosed area. Such a valley enclosure would have been ideal for coralling herds of horses or cattle or flocks of sheep.

What the relationship might be between the Dewbottoms settlement and the various remains in the vicinity is unknown. Some of the sites are probably broadly contemporary with it whilst others are not. Only further

published investigations from the area will throw light on this problem. Meanwhile it must suffice to note in general terms considerable later prehistoric to Roman period activity on this part of Malham Moor. As so often, owing to lack of information the finer points of detail remain unresolved.

Ribblesdale and the environs of Ingleborough.

Turning now to the western part of Craven (fig.1.6), the district around Settle is notable for its cave sites and these require immediate attention (fig.7.10). Objects recovered from many of the caves show that the latter were used by Man at various times during the prehistoric and Roman eras (Raistrick, 1939, 121-4 and passim; King, 1974a). Six of the caves have yielded from their uppermost levels remains assignable to the Romano-British tradition. Three of these caves are to be found some 1.5 miles north-east of Settle. They are Jubilee Cave (SD 838655), Victoria Cave (SD 838651) and Attermire Cave (SD 841642). The last two, perhaps the most famous of the Settle caves, have also been the most productive in terms of finds. The remaining three caves are situated to the north-west of Settle, the most distant being Sewell's Cave in Common Scar about three miles away. Nearer to Settle are Kinsey Cave (SD 804657) and Kelco Cave (SD 810647) in the Giggleswick Scars.

The Settle caves have produced a wide range of Romano-British artefacts of various kinds. There is domestic

equipment such as scrapers, knives, whetstones and pottery. Items connected with textiles occur, such as weaving combs, loomweights, spindle whorls, needles and bone pins. Some weapons have been found but these do not predominate. They include swords, spear-heads and arrow points. Most notable amongst the finds are brooches of various types: penannular, disc, dragonesque and harp. Other personal ornaments include beads, bracelets, hair combs, fragmentary necklaces. Part of a torc has come from Attermire Cave. Perforated bone spoons, the purpose of which is uncertain, have come from five of the caves under consideration. Only Kelco has failed to produce one. Roman coins too have been found in the caves. In addition, probable interments are known from Sewell's and Jubilee Caves, and a dismantled chariot from Attermire (King, 1970a, 48; 1970b, 114). A similar range of objects as well as interments is known from the Wharfedale cave of Dowkerbottom referred to earlier when Wharfedale sites were under consideration. Further discussion was postponed at that point and it will be convenient now to include Dowkerbottom along with the six Settle caves.

Fields and crofts occur in the vicinity of all the caves, sometimes with huts too. Settlements at Victoria Camp and Attermire Camp East have been partially excavated.

Victoria Camp (SD 842652) is situated virtually on the roof of the cave itself at 457m (1500ft) O.D. It has twelve round huts, two of which are over 9m (30ft) in

diameter, surrounded by a non-defensive bank. Remains of a bowl furnace and some slag were noted within a hollow which also contained a large quantity of barytes and some malachite and azurite. It is reasonable to conclude that these remains are to be connected with copper working (King, 1970a, 65). Erosion of the ground surface may well have removed other evidence indicative of the activities of the site's occupants. King has suggested that the opportunities available for metal-working were sufficiently attractive to outweigh the disadvantages arising from lack of surface water in this limestone terrain. No doubt farming activities played a part in the basic economy of the settlement besides metal working. It may well be that the 'dewponds' which collect water are not all medieval but that some go back to much earlier times.

Attermire Camp East is a farmstead (SD 846641) located on a southern scarp slope at 381m (1250ft) O.D. (King, 1974b, 145). No finds were made in a hut circle of 8m (20ft) diameter but from a lynchet associated with a sub-rectangular enclosure which measured 20m by 12m (66ft by 39ft) was recovered pottery datable to the fourth century AD. Other finds included bronze brooches, a jet button and bead, a glass bead, a portion of a sandstone whetstone, various flints and animal remains, including pig, sheep, bovine and horse. Significantly perhaps, a quantity of galena was found. It seems likely that this

represents activity connected with lead working. This homestead seems to have been involved with pastoral farming at least. The comparatively rich series of finds indicates a prosperity unusual in similar upland sites elsewhere and this prosperity may be connected with metal-working activity.

General dating of the caves is indicated by pottery. Samian ware of the first and second centuries and fine and coarse wares of the third and fourth centuries give the overall range. Metalwork, including coins, supports this general dating but shows a gap in the second half of the second century and the beginning of the third century. The pottery has not been adequately enough studied to provide corroboration of this point (King, 1974a, 196).

With respect to the function of the caves, they have usually been regarded as primarily habitation sites. Some earlier scholars, for example J.R. Green (1881, 67-8), thought that they served as retreats for Romano-British fugitives fleeing from English invaders in the fifth and sixth centuries AD. This was rejected by Haverfield (1905, 241-2) partly on the grounds that the wide range in the dating of the objects found pointed to long use throughout the Roman period. Raistrick also suggested that they were places of shelter and retreat, but for Brigantian tribesmen who had been involved in rebellion against Roman authority, possibly in the early years of the second century AD. Roman objects found amongst native

products could have been plunder from Roman forts (Raistrick, 1972, 17-18). Presumably, on this argument, the caves served as ready-made shelters until the more usual round hut sites could be erected nearby. When this happened, the caves were not abandoned, but continued to be used. In addition to the argument involving refugees, Raistrick has suggested that the caves were an adjunct to the more usual habitation sites and that they would have been used as places of shelter during bad weather. He also saw them as places where craftsmen carried out iron working and bone working, in other words as workshops (Raistrick, 1939, 124). Besides this Raistrick recorded several of the caves as burial sites (Raistrick, 1939, 128). Richmond agreed that the caves were to be associated with the nearby settlements and not to be regarded as remote refuges. However, he saw them as dwelling places equivalent to the usual huts but superior to them in that they were 'drier and more permanent' and 'much warmer in winter and cooler in summer' (Richmond, 1963, 134-5). King, however, doubted that the caves were better as dwellings than a native hut. In addition, he pointed out that access was not always easy. For example, Attermire Cave has its opening 6m up a rock face and Dowkerbottom Cave (as well as caves at Warton Crag and Haverbrack further west) is reached by a shaft. Victoria Cave was in fact sealed up in Roman times. Again, King has argued that such fine objects as gilded and silver brooches as well as coins would not have been left lying

about the floor by the occupants. Finally, he pointed to the human remains found in various caves, including Dowkerbottom, Sewell's and Jubilee of those under present discussion. Whilst admitting that, taken singly, the evidence from the caves is difficult to interpret, King felt that cumulative evidence from the Settle caves along with Dowkerbottom and other caves in north-western England supported a case for regarding the caves as votive sites (King, 1974a, 192-200). The case that King presents is an attractive and persuasive one and would seem to be preferable to the long-held belief that the caves were exclusively or even primarily habitation sites.

Further up the river valley from Settle are other sites. Less than three miles north of Settle on the west side of the valley is a site (SD 806680) which requires notice. This is located at 274m (900ft) O.D. below Smearsett Hill and 0.25 mile west of Leys Barn. The site consists of two rectangular enclosures sub-divided internally into small fields or cultivation plots. Dwellings are in the form of two rectangular huts each measuring about 9m by 3.6m (30ft by 12ft). Running up the hillside are long strip fields, unlyncheted and measuring 97m long by 11m wide (105yds by 12yds). Other fields follow the contour (King, 1970a, 70, photo p.71; King, 1985, 122). King estimates that the site covers overall about 24 acres (9.7ha). He assigns it to the fourth century AD without indicating the evidence on which this is based. However, such an estimate would

seem reasonable taking account of the fact that there is a complete absence of circular hut positions on the site.

About one mile north of Leys Barn is a settlement area (SD 816693) where there are circular hut positions. This is located near Helwith Bridge, at 244m (800ft) O.D. and it comprises two parts (fig.7.11). The eastern part, situated on higher ground, consists of two hut circles of 7.6m (25ft) and 10.6m (35ft) diameter respectively and several small enclosures round about, representing no doubt stock pounds and small cultivation plots. Lower down the slope is a rectilinear enclosure measuring some 55m by 36.5m (60yds by 40yds) and originally composed of a substantial boulder wall. This enclosure is further subdivided with apparent rectangular hut positions in the south-east and south-west corners measuring 7.3m by 5.5m (24ft by 18ft) and 7.3m by 11m (24ft by 36ft) respectively.

At least a dozen rotary quernstones of millstone grit were found hereabouts and this indicates an activity of the inhabitants additional to farming. Using the raw material provided by local grit boulders they made quernstones no doubt for their own use, but also presumably for wider distribution (King, 1970a, 67-8, plan, p.69).

As for dating, King records that the earliest pottery found was second century Samian ware and the latest was coarse pottery assignable to the fourth century AD.

Unfortunately, he does not state which part of the site yielded these pieces, nor for that matter the find-spots of the quernstones. Such information might have been a help in assessing the relationship between the two parts of the site. The difference in their layout and building technique is manifest and it may well be that they were not contemporary. It is interesting to note that the two huts within the eastern site are matched by two huts in the western one, each pair consisting of a large and small hut. The difference is that the eastern pair is circular while the western pair is rectangular. It is tempting, indeed, to suggest successive occupation and indeed to go further and suppose that the western site, constructed in the rectilinear style, was the later of the two.

Further upriver above Selside is a sequence of five settlement areas located on the east side of the valley (King, 1978, 114 and fig.14.3). Near Selside itself, in Top Cow Pasture (SD 775759) at 351m (1151ft) O.D. are the well preserved remains of a nucleated settlement consisting of both circular and rectangular huts together with enclosures (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.694; King 1978, fig.14.3A). The circular huts average 3.6m (12ft) in internal diameter while one of the rectangular huts measuring 10.5m by 8m (34ft by 26ft) is typical of the rest. This complex is not alone. Close by to the north is a rectangular enclosure with hut circle outside it. Some 35m to the east is another rectangular enclosure

which contains two hut circles the smaller one of which is clearer to define and measures about 4.5m (15ft) internally. Attached to the enclosure on the south side are two other conjoined sub-rectangular enclosures, one of which also contains a hut circle. Further east still, are remnants of other rectilinear structures, including huts some of which at least appear to belong to a different building tradition. Less than one mile to the north in Ingman Shaw Pasture is another settlement complex (SD 777774) at 335m (1100ft) O.D. (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.681; King 1978, fig.14.3B). This consists of several rectangular enclosures together with seven circular huts sheltering in the lee of a limestone scar (King 1970a, 62). It seems possible to identify three farmsteads where the huts are arranged in two groups of three and a single one. Chronological depth is indicated by overlapping of enclosures. This suggests extensions and modifications to the original arrangements and may mean occupation lasting some considerable time. A track-way, double banked and 5.5m (18ft) wide, skirts the settlement, before turning eastwards to travel to another site situated some 400m distant. This consists of several enclosures including three rectangular huts averaging in size 20m by 8.5m (66ft by 28ft), and a circular one measuring about 12.5m (41ft) in overall diameter. The next site in this sequence of settlement areas is located at Ashes Shaw Pasture (SD 775780) at 335m (1100ft) O.D. Here there are sub-rectangular enclosures utilising the limestone scar as a

wall. On the side of one enclosure, not far from a spring, are two hut circles, measuring 8.5m and 7.7m in diameter respectively (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.680; King, 1978, fig.14.3C).

Further to the north lies the settlement site of Gauber Cow Pasture Rocks (SD 770785) (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.695; King, 1978, fig.14.3D). There are several enclosures and about six rectangular huts. The approximate internal measurements of the three most clearly defined are 10.5m by 4.5m, 11.5m by 4.5m and 12m by 4.5m respectively (34ft - 39ft by 15ft).

At Ribblehead in Gauber Limekiln Pasture (West) (SD 761788) is a site which contains six hut circles and at least four enclosures but no rectangular huts. There are two groups. The first consists of three circular huts and four irregular enclosures. The largest hut which appears to have a small annexe, perhaps a porch or storeroom, measures 8.2m (27ft) in diameter. The other group comprises three huts linked by a bank; the central hut, which is also the largest, has a diameter of 6m (20ft). Excavation yielded few finds: three flints, half a sandstone rubber and a horse astragalus. The lack of material assignable to the Roman period, despite the fact that a Roman road passes close by, has led the excavators to suggest a pre-Roman date for the settlement (Walker, 1966, 559-560, and fig.1; King, 1978, 109).

King has pointed out that north of Selside in upper Ribblesdale the land was not ploughed in Medieval times thus allowing earlier land holdings to survive in sufficient detail to be calculated with reasonable accuracy (1978, 114, fig.14.3). He assigns 8ha (20ac) to Top Cow Pasture (fig.14.3A), 26ha (64ac) to Ingham Lodge Shaw Pasture (fig.14.3B), 16ha (39ac) to Ashes Shaw Pasture (fig.14.3C), 7ha (17ac) to Gauber Cow Pasture Rocks (fig.14.3D) and 16ha (39ac) to Gauber Limekiln Pasture (fig.14.3E).

In considering these results, there would appear to be anomalies with regard to the relative sizes of the land holdings. For example, the apparently large and complex site of Top Cow Pasture holds only 8ha in comparison with twice that amount of land available for the smaller and simpler site at Ashes Shaw Pasture. It seems probable, however, that the settlements identified were not all contemporary. Some may have gone out of use and been succeeded by others. In that case fewer settlements would have had the use of the land that was available. A clue to this process is perhaps to be seen in the different hut types which have been identified, namely, circular and rectangular. Some settlements contain only circular huts, some only rectangular ones, yet others a mixture of the two. If the excavated settlement at Gauber Limekiln Pasture, with its circular huts, is in fact pre-Roman, then this would indicate the early occurrence of circular

types. Rectangular huts might well be regarded as a later introduction, quite possibly, as suggested for elsewhere, resulting from Roman influence. Settlements containing both types would represent a transitional stage. Thus the general sequence would be that of sites with circular huts coming first, followed by 'mixed' sites and concluding with sites having only rectangular huts. To go further, however, and attempt to disentangle the detailed sequence of settlement sites in this part of upper Ribblesdale, with the requirement of having to take account of component parts of complex sites, seems fruitless in view of the general lack of basic information. To reduce the many permutations possible more information, especially chronological, is needed both from different sites and from different parts of complex sites.

If it is accepted, however, that all the sites were not under occupation at the same time, then it is clear that this conclusion would affect any estimate of population size based on the incidence of sites or size of land holdings. Again, taking account of the probable chronological depth of complex sites, as well as the sequence outlined above, there is every chance of long occupation of the general district involved. Much later settlement, ninth century AD, is known from King's excavations at Gauber Limekiln Pasture (King, 1978, 114) but there is an apparent gap in the Dark Ages. It might not be wide of the mark to envisage pre-Roman settlement,

marked by round-house construction, followed by Roman-period native settlement involving the addition at some stage of rectangular structures. This occupation may have continued throughout the Roman period and even beyond and it is tempting to see the rectangular hut sites as helping to fill the Dark Age gap.

Other sites in the vicinity of Ingleborough Hill may be susceptible to a similar interpretation and it is time to consider some of them. The sites just now discussed are located on the eastern and north-eastern side of Ingleborough Hill. Among several sites along the northern and western flanks of Ingleborough Hill is a settlement at Eller Keld (SD 748782).

Eller Keld settlement is situated on north-west sloping ground at 305m (1000ft) O.D. (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.1197). Close by is the Eller Keld stream and the line of the Roman road down the Greta valley is some 200m distant. Only grass-covered stony foundations now survive to reveal a network of enclosures. Three systems can be discerned. The main one consists of several sub-rectangular and irregular enclosures surrounding a sub-circular yard. Contained within the north end of the system is a sub-circular hut measuring about 5m long by 2m wide (16ft by 6.5ft) and with another enclosure, attached, possibly a yard or hut, measuring some 7m by 4m (23ft by 13ft).

Abutting this system on its northern side are twin

complexes each consisting of a circular enclosure of some 14m (46ft) internal diameter with curvilinear approach passage and entrance on the east where antenna-like walls extend beyond. Flanking each entrance are also two small sub-circular huts and in one case a circular enclosure too. The largest of these huts measuring some 6m by 4m (20ft by 13ft) would be suitable for occupation but the smallest at about 2m internal diameter (6.5ft) would seem to be more appropriate for storage, perhaps of grain.

The arrangements at Eller Keld however give a clear indication that pastoral farming was a major activity. The twin complexes with their funnel-like approaches to enclosures would seem to have been expressly designed for herding animals. The openings at the rear of each of the two circular enclosures or pens lead to hollowed-out trackways, worn away no doubt by animal traffic. One leads towards the drinking water provided by the nearby stream, the other into a miniature valley on the west which could easily be utilised for in-by grazing.

Whether the three parts of the site distinguished above represent three separate homesteads or not is difficult to decide; each has a hut complex. If there were three homesteads then a small settlement is in question, involving close co-operation between folk inhabiting the component parts. One would suppose that they were members of the same extended family. It is possible, however, that the site represents one single homestead with some of

the huts being used for animals and storage. As for dating, there is no direct evidence but in view of the lack of well-formed hut circles some time in the later Romano-British period or even the Dark Ages seems quite likely.

About one mile south of Eller Keld are settlement remains which in themselves provide structural evidence of chronological depth. These remains occupy a shelf (SD 741767) below the Souther Scales Scars some 200m south of the farm known as Souther Scales (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.696). The location is on a north-west facing terrace 320m (1050ft) O.D. overlooking Chapel Beck and Chapel le Dale in the Greta valley below. Rocky scars and outcrops are utilised in combination with drystone walling to make enclosures. At least two periods of settlement seem to be recognisable. The first of these is represented by two walled curvilinear enclosures containing sub-rectangular huts attached to the enclosure walls, mainly on the interior. The second period has more strictly rectangular huts.

The first of the two curvilinear enclosures is somewhat heart-shaped and placed at the base of a cliff. Its entrance, 2m wide, is on the south side. Overall it measures some 37m by 28m (121ft by 92ft), not counting an extension of its east wall along the foot of the cliff. A rectangular enclosure or hut with internal dimensions of approximately 9m by 3m (29.5ft by 10ft) is attached to

this extended wall, outside the enclosure itself. Attached to the inner side of the heart-shaped enclosure wall are three sub-rectangular huts. One at the north end is 7m by 3m (23ft by 10ft), and two others on the west side of the enclosure measure 6m by 3m (20ft by 10ft) and 2m by 1.5m (6.5ft by 5ft) respectively. At the south end of the enclosure occur two conjoined exterior enclosures, which utilise as building blocks massive stone boulders at the base of the cliff. These exterior enclosures measuring 9m by 3m (29.5ft by 10ft) and 4m by 2.5m (13ft by 8ft) respectively, probably represent two huts or perhaps two rooms of a single hut.

The second curvilinear enclosure is ovaloid in shape and set upon a hillock a few metres to the south of the enclosure described. It has had substantial walls made of large facing stones enclosing smaller stone packing. These are 1.3m wide and survive to a height which averages 1.6m. The size of the enclosure is greater than its companion for it measures some 30m by 18m internally (98ft by 59ft). This enclosure too has sub-rectangular huts attached to the inner side of its perimeter wall. These huts are similar in size to those of the first enclosure being 2.5m to 3m wide and ranging in length from 4m to 10m.

The second constructional period, with its characteristic rectangular huts, has at least seven huts which fall into two groups. Four of these huts form the first group and

occupy a natural enclosure, enhanced by short lengths of walling, which is situated on the west side of the elevated oval enclosure described above. This area might well be termed the inner courtyard. The largest of the huts in it measures internally 10m by 3m (33ft by 10ft), not counting an annexe or porch on its west side. The other two huts measure approximately 6m by 3m (20ft by 10ft). The second group of rectangular huts occupies what might be called an outer courtyard immediately to the north of the inner courtyard. Its entrance from outside is on the north. Attached to its west wall on the interior is a rectangular hut with rounded corners; it measures 7m by 3m (23ft by 10ft) and has an entrance through its long side on the east. The other two huts are located next to the enclosure entrance. Two constructional periods or phases are demonstrable here, for the larger of the two huts overlies the corner of the other. The larger hut measuring 15m by 4m (49ft by 13ft) is in plan a very distinctive structure. Its northern end is rectangular but at its southern end the side walls curve inwards to form a passage entrance. This entrance incorporates a length of walling, presumably earlier than the hut itself, although any relationship it may have had with other visible features on site cannot now be determined by surface inspection alone.

The Souther Scales occupation area is clearly the location for at least two settlements having different building

traditions. The likelihood is that these belong to different periods, the sub-rectangular huts being the earlier of the two. In the more strictly rectangular tradition, two phases, if not indeed two periods, are evident. Absolute dates are not available but bearing in mind the discussion above on the sequence of sites near Ribblehead it may be correct, in the absence of circular huts, to assign the sub-rectangular huts to later Roman times, perhaps the later third or fourth centuries AD. In that case it might be thought reasonable to suppose that the rectangular type huts should come later still and it is tempting to place them in the Dark Ages. The distinctive passage-entrance 'long hut' could belong to the same time, merely representing a modification of the rectangular type, or else have been constructed later still. More evidence, however, is needed to arrive at a firm conclusion. As for the economic basis of the respective settlements, there is no direct evidence but the enclosed areas naturally available would suggest pounds for the control of stock. Another possible aspect is perhaps worth noting, namely, that the site with its hillside position was chosen with an eye to defence. The arrangement of inner and outer courtyards which seems to belong to the rectangular hut period might be thought indicative of the intention to ward off attack. This might be another reason for supporting the suggestion that the rectangular hut settlement should be placed in what

might be expected to have been the troubled times of the Dark Ages.

Further down the dale on the west side are two sites at 229m (750ft) O.D. in the vicinity of Twisleton Hall which require notice. They appear now as grass-covered mounds and hollows in pasture.

The first site, Twisleton Hall, 'A' (SD 69857475)), has been a large curvilinear enclosure measuring about 100m (328ft) in diameter (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.1232a). A massive bank without a ditch which marked the perimeter is now partly ploughed out. In the unploughed eastern portion, however, sufficient remains to reveal its original size and to show that the interior has been partly sub-divided into rectangular portions. Some rectangular enclosures including probable huts were also attached to the inner side of the surrounding bank. One of these measures about 9m by 6m (29ft by 20ft) and another about 21m by 3m (69ft by 10ft). A small curvilinear enclosure is visible outside the north side of the main enclosure bank and large rectangular enclosures are attached to the exterior of the same bank on the north east side. About 60m to the north are the faint traces of yet another small circular enclosure. There is no way of deciding from the surface remains what might be the relationship between the small circular enclosures and the large one. It seems quite likely that they were not connected. As for the rectangular enclosures on the north east side, they appear

to be attached to the main enclosure and so subsequent to it. As to the date and function of the main enclosure, there is no direct evidence. It may well be medieval, as Johnson has suggested (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.1232a), and from its size merits the description 'settlement', but further precision is not possible.

About 100m south of site 'A' are the remains of another settlement of a different character (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.1232b). Twisleton Site 'B' (SD 69957460) seems to have consisted of several sub-rectangular and irregular enclosures, loosely joined together. A well-formed hut circle, 12m in internal diameter, can also be discerned and this gives a clue to the site's probable period, namely, Romano-British. Adjacent to this settlement area on the east are ancient fields aligned north-south. They are demarcated by stony banks which include clearance mounds. One field is 14m wide and 35m long (46ft by 115ft), a cross-wall marking its limits between the linear banks. The field next to it on the east is wider, namely, 22m and does not appear to have any cross-wall divisions within its surviving 220m length. These fields are the surviving remnants of a former field system which provides evidence of probable crop growing. Which of the two settlements nearby it should be associated with is uncertain but there is no reason why the postulated Romano-British site should not have been its originator.

Amongst sites to be found south of Ingleborough Hill, two require consideration. The first of these is Yarlsber Camp (SD 710726) situated at 244m (800ft) O.D. on sloping land above the Jenkin Beck (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.218). This is a D-shaped curvilinear enclosure some 94m by 70m (308ft by 230ft) internally, whose double banks and medial ditch have not completely survived medieval ploughing. Enough remains, however, to indicate that the banks and the rock-cut ditch were substantial. The entrance was probably on the south-east side where two large boulders stand on either side of a gap about 3m wide. On the east side of the interior a platform measuring 10m long by 5m wide (33ft by 16ft) is set behind the inner bank. This is possibly the site of an enclosure or even a hut. Ridge and furrow within the interior attest later ploughing which will have removed any other internal features. It is difficult to explain the function or even the date of Yarlsber Camp. It may have served as a stock enclosure, but its perimeter earthworks seem rather formidable for that alone. The hint of internal structures may point to a settlement, which if so would have been strongly defended even though on sloping ground. As for date, it has generally been taken to be Iron Age (Challis and Harding, 1975, Pt.2, fig.93, no.5), but as Raistrick has pointed out no evidence has been found to support this assumption (Raistrick, 1939, 125). Whatever the date and function of Yarlsber Camp, it well illustrates the

destructive effect of medieval ploughing combined with sloping land.

The second site to the south of Ingleborough Hill is a settlement (SD 758686) situated at 152m (499ft) O.D. between Clapham and Austwick (HBMC. SAM. N.Yorks.1193). It consists of two complexes. That on the eastern side is a complete enclosure, kidney-shaped, surrounded by a substantial bank. A similar bank divides the interior into two roughly equal portions, each further sub-divided. It measures in length some 60m by 40m in width (197ft by 131ft). Within the northern portion a circular hollow with a diameter of about 3m (10ft) is presumably the site of a round hut. Other possible huts of similar size but sub-rectangular in shape are attached to the outside of the enclosure bank on its west side.

The western complex has a similar substantial enclosure bank but on the north and east sides only. Several sub-rectangular and irregular enclosures are positioned within the angle so formed. There are also two circular hollows, possibly the sites of round huts. One has a diameter of approximately 12.5m (41ft) and the other of 8.5m (28ft).

South of the main enclosures a double row of large boulders, apparently the foundations of a massive wall, can be seen running in a north-west to south-east alignment. In addition, south of the eastern complex two terraces about 9.5m and 6m wide respectively can be made

out running east west. Exactly what these extra-mural features signify is not clear but they do indicate some kind of activity south of the main settlement.

On the slope above the settlement area are the remains of Celtic fields, ranging from 150m to 200m (490ft-656ft) O.D. and stretching along the hillside for some 700m. There is every likelihood that the Austwick settlement is to be connected with these fields. If so, then the folk of the settlement were engaged upon crop cultivation. No doubt the enclosures within the settlement itself betoken stock pens and indeed the space between the two complexes has very much the appearance of a droveway. It may be that the massive wall, already described, south of the enclosures was connected with stock control and possibly the terraces mentioned above were the equivalent of garden plots. Whatever may be the actual explanation of these details it seems probable that a mixed farming regime was carried out on these lower valley slopes. King has pointed out that the Celtic fields have survived because they were located on the parish boundaries and at the limits of neighbouring medieval townships and thus escaped the plough. He provides another example not far away of the same phenomenon, namely, on the boundaries between Langcliffe and Settle (SD 825634) at 181m (600ft) O.D. (King, 1978, 114 and fig.14.1, no.15). These instances of the survival of Celtic fields show pre-medieval cultivation occurring low down the valley sides. In

addition, they give some indication of the possible loss of other farming and settlement evidence at such altitudes in places which have seen more vigorous subsequent farming activity.

Craven: general survey.

Thus the evidence for Craven makes it clear that there was a considerable concentration of early occupation in the region. A glance at the distribution map gives a broad view of the situation (fig.1.6). This map recording only the most obvious and important settlements shows a spread of sites along either side of the river Wharfe, from Threshfield to Kettlewell, and extending into the tributary valley of Littondale. There is a heavier concentration on the eastern side of the Wharfe valley, no doubt because it is less steep than the western side. However, there is a spread of sites across into Malhamdale. Here sites are concentrated on the uplands around Malham Cove and northwards across Malham Moor to the Tarn and beyond (cf. Raistrick and Holmes, 1962, fig.1). To the west, sites spread up the Ribble valley on both sides from Mearbeck to Helwith Bridge. Thence, as far as Ribblehead is a concentration on the western side of the valley, in effect on the eastern flanks of Ingleborough Hill. On the opposite side of Ingleborough, that is on its western flanks, is a similar grouping of sites. Raistrick's more detailed map of hutment sites shows even more dramatically that the spread of settlement

follows the main river valleys and that it is concentrated north of the geological features known as the Craven faults. As he points out it is the limestone areas that are favoured in this distribution (Raistrick, 1939, fig.8, 145).

Whilst most of the surviving sites occur at around 305m (1000ft) O.D., high up the sides of the valleys, evidence for settlement in the form of both field systems and sites ranges from dale bottoms to 395m (1300ft) O.D. The sites extending over the limestone terrain from Wharfedale to Malhamdale are situated at over 365m (1200ft) O.D. With regard to field systems, there are many small enclosures which could have served equally well as stock enclosures or garden plots. At the same time there is considerable evidence of extensive areas of rectilinear field systems. Within these, however, there is variation. Those near Grassington, for example, exhibit at least three different types which probably represent different phases of development. The evidence from Grassington too indicates that they were in use during the Roman period but that does not preclude their earlier formation. Initial land clearance is likely to be earlier still. It seems quite likely that some highly regular systems, for example, those south of Scot Gate Lane in Wharfedale were planned and established during Roman times. A fourth century AD date has been claimed for other, elongated fields in Ribblesdale. How long the various field systems continued

in use is problematical but post-Roman use need not be ruled out. Here, however, the evidence of the palaeobotanists needs to be taken into account. The indications are that there was a post-Roman abandonment of the land leading to tree regeneration preceding the settlement of the region by Anglian and later Norse farmers (Smith, 1986). The Anglian fields with their characteristic strip lynchets can be seen lower down the valley sides (cf. Raistrick and Chapman, 1929, 173, figs. 5 and 6; Raistrick, 1976, 54 with illust.). Higher up there is evidence of Norse and later occupation, no doubt on what had become marginal lands (cf. Raistrick and Holmes, 1962, 77 and 97).

Returning to the earlier settlement sites, it may well be as some of the evidence suggests that later intensive settlement lower down the valley sides has destroyed traces of these. Even so, as has been seen, many others have survived at higher elevations and there is a considerable variety in types. It is possible to identify some enclosed sites and other unenclosed examples and to specify some of the former as rectilinear and others as curvilinear. But within such classification there is a considerable variation of types.

Of fortified sites, the only candidates are Gregory in Wharfedale and Ingleborough Hill Fort, the former hardly of equal stature with the latter, yet both potential power centres or control points at some period as yet uncertain.

Other sites such as Lea Green and Blue Scar have a compactness which enhances their strength and they may have been the abodes of petty chieftains or the like. Curvilinear enclosures exist with internal huts and other small enclosures; such sites as Scot Gate Pasture in Wharfedale, Middle House Pasture in Malhamdale and Twisleton or Souther Scales in the Ingleborough district. This group well illustrates the possible misleading character of such classification, for even within this one group there is variation that is real and probably significant. In the case of the Wharfedale sites the interior is occupied by interconnected curvilinear huts and smaller enclosed areas. Middle House Pasture contains separate round huts. The Twisleton 'A' site, discounting external features which may represent expansion, contains an interior made up of rectangular subdivisions surrounded by a massive bank while the Souther Scales site in its sub-rectangular hut period consists of two slightly walled enclosures with sub-rectangular chambers attached to the inner walls. Each of these sites seems sufficiently different to belong to a different tradition and perhaps even different period. Similarly, rectangular enclosures occur which vary in their internal arrangements and techniques of construction. Unenclosed settlements too occur. These range from isolated huts through homesteads consisting of one or two huts together with small crofts, to larger settlements which may be designated hamlets or small villages. Many sites occupy small upland valleys or

limestone terraces utilising outcrops as part of their enclosure systems. A distinctive feature that has been identified is that of the 'wall-passage' to be found in Malhamdale and Wharfedale but not in Ribblesdale. No palisaded sites have been identified and the only villa site known is within the Aire Gap on the southern edge of the region. Cave sites are another possible type of occupation site if their use as exclusively ritual sites is denied. House types vary in shape between round and rectangular, with further variations of oval, sub-circular or sub-rectangular. Some settlements contain only circular or sub-circular huts, others have rectangular or sub-rectangular examples; still others have a mixture of the two basic shapes. It has been suggested that the rectangular (or rather sub-rectangular) types represent Roman influence. With regard to construction, some huts have been shown by excavation, as at Middle House Pasture and Malham Lings, to have been a combination of timber posts and at least stone base. Other huts, sometimes surviving to a remarkable degree as at Deepdale, have been predominantly stone-built. The use of corbelling to reduce the roof area is a feature of some such sites. Timber huts without stone base walls would leave little or no trace which may well account for the fact that none have been found. As has been remarked upon previously, such structures might have been common in periods when timber was abundant. Palynological evidence indicates that there was deforestation followed by the spread of

heaths early in the second millenium BC in Malhamdale (Smith, 1986). The fact that intensified cereal production does not occur until the second half of the first millenⁿ_kium BC may well mean that much timber remained available before then. If so, Late Bronze Age to Early Iron Age could have been a period suitable for exploitation of timber in house construction. Be that as it may, Raistrick has claimed a Bronze Age date for the Comb Scar isolated hut. Other isolated huts may well belong to a similar context. The settlement at Gauber Limekiln Pasture in Ribblesdale was probably pre-Roman Iron Age and it seems inconceivable that this was isolated. It seems most likely that other sites throughout the region, as yet unexcavated, should be classified as belonging to the same context. Superficially pre-Roman and Roman period sites using the vernacular type of construction cannot be distinguished. However, the artefacts from the cave sites, whether these represent settlements or not, are enough to indicate that most activity occurred during the Roman period and moreover that it ranged over the whole of that period. This evidence is supplemented by similar, though more meagre evidence from occupation sites such as Lea Green, the Grassington open settlements, Knowe Fell, Prior Rakes, Helwith Bridge and Deepdale.

As for Roman influence, the impact of Roman culture appears to have been slight. Admittedly, it has been

suggested above that rectangular shaped huts and regularly organised rectilinear field systems were Roman inspired. Again Roman contact is seen in the presence of Roman pottery and coins. Yet there are no villas north of the Aire gap and Roman period settlement sites are virtually indistinguishable from those of pre-Roman times. It may be that the Roman occupation stimulated production and the Pax Romana encouraged settlement and population increase. If that is so, then Roman influence was considerable but it was felt in the economic rather than in the cultural sphere, at least as far as the people actually living within the region itself were concerned.

CHAPTER EIGHT

RURAL SETTLEMENT: SOUTHERN PENNINES,
MID-WHARFEDALE AND THE AIRE-CALDER BASIN.

At the southern end of the Central Pennines is the route across the range formed by Airedale and the Aire Gap. The latter situated west of Skipton provides the lowest of all the passes through the Pennines. This district, also known as the Craven Lowlands, contains several sites which require consideration. East of the Craven Lowlands the drainage system of mid-Wharfedale, Airedale and Calderdale constitute a study region. Inclusion of the river Calder involves settlement belonging to the northern part of the southern Pennines. Apart from the Craven Lowlands, the territory covered extends about twenty-five miles from Blubberhouses beyond Ilkley in the north to Meltham beyond Huddersfield in the south, and about twenty miles from Hebden Bridge in the west to Wakefield in the east, an area of some 500 square miles.

It is proposed to make a general survey of the various sites that seem to be relevant to the investigation, discussing more fully those for which information is available. Unfortunately, very little is known about most of the sites within the region. Palynological evidence will also call for examination. This will be followed by general discussion of the settlement evidence including consideration of chronology.

In the general survey, it will be convenient to deal with the site evidence as follows:

1. The Craven Lowlands.
2. The district between the rivers Wharfe and Aire.
3. The district north of the river Wharfe.
4. The district between the rivers Aire and Calder.
5. The district south of the river Calder.

1. The Craven Lowlands

Eight enclosures within this district require notice. (figs.1.6 and 1.7). Six of these enclosures are curvilinear and two are rectilinear. One of the rectilinear enclosures is the site of the Roman villa of Kirk Sink. Apart from Kirk Sink itself and the curvilinear site at Horse Close Farm, little can be said about these sites.

The oval enclosure at Sharp Haw Crag (SD 960546) is the only one of the group that can be regarded as defensive in that it is situated at 274m (900ft) O.D. on a crag edge overlooking the Aire valley (Atkinson, 1963). Three of the others have inner ditches. These are the sub-rectangular site at Steeling Hill (SD 886551) and the curvilinear sites at Park Hill (SD 887587) and Carleton (SD 963491) (Challis and Harding, 1975, pt.2, fig.91, nos. 6, 5 and 8 respectively). A second enclosure at Carleton is a small oval earthwork with bank and outer ditch not designed to be strongly defensive (Challis and Harding,

1975, pt.2, fig.93, no.37). Similar to this last site is an oval enclosure near Swinden (SD 867534) (Challis and Harding, 1975, pt.2, fig.93, no.36). The dates and detailed nature of the six sites listed above are unknown. Excavation, however, has yielded more information about Horse Close Farm and Kirk Sink.

Situated on a prominent spur at 198m (650ft) O.D. Horse Close Scar (SD 997505) is about 0.4ha (1ac) in area. The surrounding wall varies in width from 1.2m to 1.8m (4ft-6ft) and is made of upright stones used as facing to contain stone and boulder rubble. The entrance, on the north is marked by the remains of a stone-built gate-house. At least two phases of occupation were distinguished. The first phase which preceded the enclosure wall included a sub-rectangular hut and an oval one. The second phase included a circular hut, 8.2m (27ft) in diameter, supported by five internal posts. Among the finds was a bronze toggle, a small blue glass bead, stone rubbers, pounders and hones, flint and chert chippings, and rough but hard, sandy pottery. There was no Roman pottery or other finds of Roman period and the site was accordingly assigned to the pre-Roman Iron Age (Challis and Harding, 1975, 135-6).

By contrast with Horse Close Farm, the villa site of Kirk Sink near Gargrave is situated in the fertile lowlands of the Aire Gap at 114m (375ft) O.D. At the site a rectangular ditched enclosure of about 0.9ha (2ac) is set

within a double-ditched rectangular enclosure of about 2ha (5ac). To the north and east of the site an elaborate series of ditches marks out field systems. Excavations conducted by B.R. Hartley have revealed four main periods for the structures on site (Hartley, 1969, 207; 1970, 280-1; 1974, 416-7; 1975, 238; 1976, 317-8). The first period is one of unromanised settlement with native-style round houses dated to about AD 140. Rectilinear half-timber wattle and daub structures were also associated with this period. Three round houses have been identified, one of 5.18m (17ft) diameter, another of 8.4m (28ft) diameter and a third of 9.6m (28ft) diameter. This last round house showed successive phases of occupation which continued into the third century AD.

The second period is represented by the erection in about AD 160 of a large corridor house with projecting wings. Shortly after, a bath-house was added to it.

The early third century (period 3) saw the erection at the west end of the enclosure of two rectangular buildings with tessellated floors and painted wall plaster. This meant that, for a time, at least three Roman-style houses were in occupation simultaneously. By the late third or early fourth century (period 4) various alterations, including extensions, were made to the houses before the earliest house was abandoned. The north-west house then became the principal dwelling. Occupation continued into the later fourth century.

Thus at Kirk Sink there is clear evidence of continuity from native-style occupation to a Romanised living style. This suggests very strongly the presence of a native occupier who was almost certainly the owner. He was perhaps a tribal notable from the district. The elaboration of the structures shows the increasing and continuing prosperity of the site during the Roman period. This was no doubt based largely on the exploitation of the agricultural potential of the fertile land on which the villa was placed.

2. The district between the rivers Wharfe and Aire

In the district between the Wharfe and the Aire extending from Skipton to Guiseley are several sites. Most of this area is known as Rombalds Moor. On the slopes of Counter Hill, near Addingham at 259m to 274m (850-900ft) O.D. is a grouping of enclosures, two curvilinear, Round Dykes (SE 055501) and Woofa Bank (SE 048499), and one rectilinear, Marchup Beck (SE 048498) (Cowling, 1946, 141). Round Dykes at least was a settlement site for it contained nine hut circles together with possible hearths (Keighley, 1981, 127).

The small promontory fort of Castleberg, Nesfield (SE 092494) is located near Ilkley but whether it is to be associated with these enclosed sites or rather with Bronze Age remains in the vicinity is uncertain (Cowling, 1946, 141, fig.65).

Further east, about one mile south of Ilkley are many enclosures and cairns, presumably indicative of initial land clearance for the purpose of cultivation in the vicinity of Green Crag Slack (SE 137457) (Keighley, 1981, 121). The remains include a very large rectilinear enclosure surrounded by a rough stone wall, and with conjoined enclosures (Cowling, 1946, 131 and fig.62).

There is no independent dating evidence for these enclosures but the discovery of many beehive quern stones in the area suggests late Iron Age or early Romano-British activity probably, though not necessarily, involving cultivation of cereals.

A similar situation obtains on the south-east edge of Rombalds Moor, near Shipley. Here, on Baildon Moor, there is evidence which suggests lengthy occupation ranging from the Neolithic through to later times including the Iron Age (Cowling, 1946). The latter seems to be represented by both curvilinear and rectilinear enclosures on Brackenhall Green (SE 130392) and on the edge of the escarpment of Shipley Glen (SE 129390-133385). In Hirst Wood (SE 126382) too several circular hut sites as well as rectilinear enclosures are known. The circular enclosure called Soldier's Trench is said to be associated with an unmapped field system (Jackson, 1970, 42, fig.18). Whilst these sites are unexcavated and undated the circular enclosure at Crossley Wood (SE 1238) has been the subject of excavations. No actual structural evidence indicative

of occupation was recovered and it was concluded by the excavators that the Crossley Wood site was best explained as a stock enclosure. However, dating material was forthcoming in the form of Roman pottery including Samian ware as well as a flanged dish of the later third or early fourth century AD. The latter came from the wall-filling, indicating that this was the period of its construction or at least re-construction. Nearby rectilinear field systems suggest Roman period cultivation and finds of beehive querns from the vicinity lend support to the idea of late Iron Age or early Romano-British activity at least (Keighley, 1981, 131 and map 7). The actual occupation site associated with the fields has not yet been identified. That this area prospered seems likely and evidence of improved life-style in the form of Romanisation is to be recognised at Gawthorpe, near Bingley (SE 1140). This is the site of a probable villa if the tessellated pavement seen there in 1945 is anything to go by (Faull, 1981a, 147).

Beyond Guisely but still in the region between the rivers Wharfe and Aire are several sites, all rectilinear enclosures except that at Danefield Wood (SE 219445). The latter certainly includes enclosures but, along with hut circles, hearths, and a massive wall running north-south for over 91m (300ft), these are probably the remnants of extensive settlement which included field systems (Cowling, 1946, 137 and fig.62; Keighley, 1981, 121).

Two other sites in this group are worth noting because they are strongly defended. Harlow Hill (SE 288361) has a threefold entrenchment (Keighley, 1981, 122) and Camp House, Bramhope (SE 248422) is surrounded by a single mound and ditch (Cowling, 1946, 140-1, fig.65; Keighley, 1981, 123). As so often these sites are undated but if contemporary with other less strongly fortified sites could well belong to persons of greater importance in the district.

3. The district north of the river Wharfe

North of the river Wharfe are several sites which call for mention. These include both curvilinear and rectilinear enclosures. Of the former Crow Well (SE 141521) on Denton Moor and Horne Bank, Rigton (SE 2650) are walled while Briscoe Rigg (SE 258510) has a mound and inner ditch (Cowling, 1946, 133, 139; Challis and Harding, 1975, pt.2, fig.91, no.11). At Horne Bank in addition to the curvilinear enclosure already mentioned there are two square enclosures. Hereabouts were found areas of burning interpreted by Cowling (1946, 139) as hearths for roasting corn. However that may be the recovery of many beehive querns points to a late Iron Age or Romano-British period of occupation with the use and probably the cultivation of cereals. A melon bead from Briscoe Rigg thought by Cowling to indicate pre-Roman occupation is rather to be assigned to the Romano-British period (Guido, 1978, 100; cf. Curle, 1911, 336, Pl.91).

Two miles south of Blubberhouses, at Snowden Carr (SE 176513) is a rectangular enclosure measuring 55m by 46m (180ft by 150ft). The surrounding bank is made of piled-up boulders and there is a shallow internal ditch (Cowling, 1946, 135, fig.63). On the south side is an entrance about 6m (20ft) wide and indications of subdivisions inside. Outside, on the east, is a parallel mound and outer ditch and on the north a short length of mound. On the north-west are remains of walled structures, both linear walls and hut circles, and about thirty stony cairns which seem best regarded as the remains of field clearance. These features beyond those of the immediate enclosure are interpreted by Cowling as evidence of Bronze Age extensive settlement and accepted as such by Challis (Challis and Harding, 1975, Pt.2, fig.84, no.20).

The rectangular enclosure itself at 0.62ac (0.25ha) is reminiscent of the rectilinear ditched enclosures seen to be such a feature of the eastern lowlands. The slight ditch could be interpreted as the remains of a palisade trench which was replaced by a wall. Whether the site was intended for occupation or for pastoral purposes is unclear.

About three miles to the north at Kex Ghyll (SE 1555) is a wall-enclosed settlement containing many hut circles and a few larger enclosures. Cowling and Raistrick agree in

describing the remains as those of a village (Cowling, 1946, 138; Raistrick, 1939, 21).

4. The district between the rivers Aire and Calder.

Moving to south of the Aire, among enclosures to be noted west of Bradford two are curvilinear and one rectilinear. The rectilinear enclosure of Catstones Ring (SE 068381) occupies a commanding position on the south-west edge of Harden Moor. It has a possible annexe attached to its north-east corner and an outwork to the north (Keighley, 1981, 123). Despite the slightness of its ditch such a site as this could perhaps qualify as a power centre within its own district. Some two miles distant is the curvilinear enclosure of Castle Stead Ring (SE 051363). Situated on Cullingworth Moor at 244m (800ft) O.D. an area of 1.75ac (0.71ha) is enclosed by a rampart with outer ditch and slight counterscarping. Iron fragments recovered during excavations by Villey in 1911 indicate its Iron Age or later date. Other finds included coal and lead fragments (Challis and Harding, Pt.2, fig.93, no.43; Elgee and Elgee, 1933, 119; Keighley, 1981, 127). The third curvilinear enclosure is located some four miles to the south-east, at Lower Swain Royd Farm (SE 101357) near Wilsden. Little can be said about it except that, despite its inner and outer mounds with medial ditch, it is sited in a non-defensive position. Thus it must be regarded as a protected rather than a fortified site.

Further south a group of sites in the vicinity of Halifax belongs to the Calder valley.

Near Brookhouse are two rectilinear sites situated close together at 350m (1150ft) O.D. The Round Ring (SE 05522941) and Ovenden (SE 05542993) are both sub-rectangular earthworks (Challis and Harding, 1975, Pt.2, fig.92, nos.36 and 37). The former has been mostly destroyed by quarrying and only the south angle survives (Keighley, 1981, 126). With regard to the latter, excavations by the Halifax Archaeological Society produced no evidence of substantial fortifications and the conclusion was that it probably served a pastoral purpose (Keighley, 1981, 126).

Nearer to the river are three curvilinear enclosures; at Moor End (SE 052279), Tower Hill (SE 055260) and Midgley (SE 023267) (Challis and Harding, 1975, Pt.2, fig.93, nos.41 and 42; Keighley, 1981, 127-8). The first of these has an inner ditch and has been compared to the site at Briscoe Rigg discussed above. Excavations at Tower Hill revealed a stone wall surrounding the site but yielded no finds.

That there was occupation towards the bottom of the river valley is seen by the existence of a site on the south side of the river. This is the rectilinear site of Holmes Road (SE 066235) which at 107m (350ft) O.D. occupies a promontory close to the river. Also towards the valley

bottom is the site at Kirklees Park (SE 173217) further downriver close to the junction of the Calder and the Colne. This is a six-sided enclosure surrounded by a rampart of stone rubble and a ditch. Although excavated, in 1906, no finds were made in the interior (Richmond, 1925, 24, fig.12; cf. Toomey, 1966, fig.4).

North of Kirklees, still in the district between the rivers Calder and Aire, there is little to remark upon. Kit Wood, Tong (SE 207305) is a curvilinear enclosure set into the hillside with traces of a slight earth and stone bank visible on the south-east side (Keighley, 1981, 127). Otherwise, apart from the probable villa site at Birstall (SE 224263) the distribution map is a virtual blank. It seems certain that this is the result of modern urban development. This indeed is well illustrated by the fate of Birstall which is now covered by a housing estate not, however, before the clue to its former significance, namely, the presence of a tessellated pavement, had been noted. The same fate befell the site of another probable villa further down the Calder valley near Snapethorpe Hall (c.SE 306200); the clue to its nature in the form of tesserae was similar (Faull, 1981, 147). It is a pity that more information was not gleaned from these sites before they were covered over. If they were indeed villas they show that Romanisation had gone ahead in this part of the mid-Aire-Calder valley.

5. The district south of the river Calder

South of the river Calder both curvilinear and rectilinear enclosures are recorded.

North-west of Huddersfield is Lee Hill (SE 091184) a circular enclosure of about 0.6ha (1.5ac) protected by a rampart and outer ditch and situated at 282m (925ft) O.D. on a spur of land affording good general protection (Keighley, 1981, 127). Lee Hill is located only one mile from the site of the Roman fort at Slack. About three miles south-east of Lee Hill, on Crosland Moor, an oval earthwork is known from aerial survey. However, early records reveal that two enclosures, not one, originally existed here; one measured 70.4m by 58.5m (77yds by 64yds) and the other 89.6m by 79.6m (98yds by 87yds) (Keighley, 1981, 127). At one acre (0.4ha) and 1.75 acres (0.7ha) respectively these are reasonably sized enclosures suitable for settlement or for pastoral use. However, nothing more is known about them.

More is known about three rectilinear enclosures which now require notice: Meg Dyke (SE 050174), Oldfield Hill (SE 087310) and Royd Edge (SE 091097)

Meg Dyke, three miles west of the Roman fort at Slack, is a sub-rectangular enclosure with double rampart and ditches enclosing about 0.5ha (1.2ac). Excavations in 1976 yielded iron fragments, indicating a date in the Iron Age or later. Although the site is overlooked by higher

ground the depth of its ditches, namely, 2.43m (8ft) and 3.05m (10ft) respectively, revealed in the 1976 excavations, makes it a very strongly defended one.

Oldfield Hill, Meltham, is situated four miles south of Slack Roman fort. Like Meg Dyke it is a sub-rectangular enclosure but it is slightly smaller, being in area about 0.4ha (1ac). With its stone box-rampart, and outer ditch on three sides, it too is a strongly defended site (Richmond, 1925, 21-24, fig.9; Toomey, 1966, 4-6, figs. 3 and 4). Richmond classified Oldfield Hill as Roman but more recent excavations enable a non-Roman origin to be postulated. Two phases have been identified. The first involved a smaller enclosure, about 0.2ha (0.5ac) surrounded by a palisade. The second phase is represented by the surviving site, with its entrance on the east. It was here that Richmond recovered evidence for a timber double-gate. Finds from the site have included the upper half of a beehive quern from the rampart and from the interior evidence of iron working (Keighley, 1981, 124). Although not indisputable proof of period such evidence favours a late Iron Age date. Toomey, pointing to the demolition of the rampart, has suggested that this was probably the result of Roman action.

Royd Edge, Meltham, less than one mile south of Oldfield Hill is similar to that site and to Meg Dyke except that it has an internal ditch (fig.8.1). It is a larger enclosure than the other two being 0.6ha (1.5ac) in area.

Excavations showed that like Oldfield Hill it had an earlier palisaded phase and a later stone box-ramparted phase. Again, like Oldfield Hill it had a timber gate on the east. In addition it had another entrance on its west side. Finds from excavations included flint chips, clinker, baked clay, a lead spindle whorl and a beehive quern but no Roman pottery thus suggesting occupation in the later pre-Roman Iron Age (Challis and Harding, 1975, 134; Keighley, 1981, 125). That the location at Royd Edge had an extended history of occupation is suggested by the fact that prior to the palisaded phase there was at least one circular hut. What the function of the later enclosure with rampart and internal ditch was is open to some doubt, and the question arises why an otherwise strongly defended site should possess an internal ditch. It seems entirely possible that it was a dual purpose enclosure intended not only to keep out potential foes, whether human or animal, but also at the same time to contain livestock.

Palynological evidence

Before considering the site evidence further it will be appropriate to take account of the work of the palaeobotanists. There are pollen diagrams from seven upland sites and this evidence has been reviewed by Yarwood in the West Yorkshire Archaeological Survey (1982, 47-53).

At the south end of the region are Cooks Study (SE 133040), Meltham Moor (SE 0708) and Warcock Hill (SE 0411), all located south of the river Calder. Also south of the Calder is Rishworth Moor (SD 988173). On the Calder itself near Elland is Cromwell Bottom (SE 122222), the only site in a valley bottom. North of the Calder is the site at Oxenhope Moor (SE 035325). The most northerly site in this series is that at Crawshaw Moss (SE 090460) on Rombalds Moor.

At a preliminary examination, these sites would appear to provide a useful coverage of the region but there are deficiencies. As stated, the sites are upland examples and districts to the east are not covered. Again, the sites themselves have not yielded results of equal value. The results from Oxenhope Moor and Warcock Hill, the former published in 1933 and the latter in 1926, are not sufficiently detailed (Yarwood, 1981, 48) and therefore have to be omitted from present consideration. Not all sites have the benefit of radiocarbon-dated layers making correlation with other information uncertain. In the case of Cromwell Bottom for example there is difficulty in assigning the results to the correct pollen zones (Yarwood, 1981, 52). Another drawback, perhaps even more serious for students of the Iron Age to Roman period is the fact that, in the case of the Crawshaw Moss diagrams, the results do not include the sub-Atlantic climatic period, that is pollen zone VIII. Finally, the cautionary

words of Turner, already referred to elsewhere in this study, must be borne in mind. The catchment area of a pollen diagram extends to no more than a radius of ten miles in the most favourable conditions and to only a few hundred metres in less favourable conditions (Turner, 1978; 1979, 285; see Chapter 1).

The most useful diagram of the series is that from Rishworth Moor, situated at 410m (1345ft) O.D., because of the application of radiocarbon dating (Yarwood, 1981, 48 and 51) and because of the chronological range which includes both Iron Age and Roman periods. The pollen record from this site shows that peat formation began during the Atlantic climatic period, presumably as a result of wetter conditions, and continued until the Middle Ages. Following the Elm decline towards the end of the Atlantic period, the record has been interpreted as indicating an environment of open grassy woodland or alternatively of open grass heath with woodland on the lower slopes. Oak, alder, hazel and, to a lesser degree, birch were the dominant species. This was the situation until a level dated to 2060 \pm 100 b.c. (GaK 2823). Thereafter, there is a decline in oak and an increase in birch pollens as well as the appearance of weeds associated with pasture. This is interpreted as indicating slight forest clearance together with some pastoral activity. The end of this phase, the Bronze Age in conventional archaeological terminology, comes at a

level radiocarbon-dated to 470 ± 100 b.c. (GaK 2824). Next comes a sharp decrease in tree pollen and an increase in grasses and weeds, reaching a peak which is radiocarbon-dated to a.d. 30 ± 80 (AD 77). This phase, covering the period of the conventional Iron Age, is interpreted as one of large-scale clearance of woodlands, together with the establishment of pasture land. This is followed by the introduction of crops as revealed by the presence of cereal pollen. Following this episode, the pollen indications are of a dramatic decline in farming activity and a return of woodlands which were not cleared again until a time probably late in the Anglo-Saxon period. It is not until then that farming activity, both pastoral and arable, began to flourish again (Yarwood, 1981, 51).

The evidence from Meltham Moor, seven miles to the south-east is similar. Following the elm decline came a decrease in oak pollen and an increase in birch pointing to woodland clearances. This was followed by two peaks of activity involving farming as evidenced by the presence of pollens belonging to grasses and weeds. The first peak came about a.d. 30, that is during the later stages of the Iron Age, the second in the post-Roman era, during Anglo-Saxon times (Yarwood, 1981, 51).

Two profiles from Cooks Study are less relevant being further south but they are generally similar to the previous two examples. They show wholesale deforestation during the sub-Atlantic climatic phase, that is during the

Iron Age. Cereal and weed pollens persist throughout the period and indicate arable farming during the Iron Age continuing possibly into the Roman period (Yarwood, 1981, 50).

Within Calderdale, Cromwell Bottom has potential importance as indicating the state of affairs within a river valley. Unfortunately there is difficulty in zoning the findings. The later levels contain non-arboreal pollens, including ribwort plantain and cereals, pointing to pastoral and arable farming. This activity is tentatively assigned to the sub-Boreal climatic phase, in which case there is no guide to the situation during Iron Age and Roman times (Yarwood, 1981, 52).

Another disappointing sequence from the present point of view is the evidence from Crawshaw Moss. There are two diagrams both terminating before the sub-Atlantic climatic phase. Thus information regarding the Iron Age and Roman periods is absent. However, the pollen frequencies point to major woodland clearance during the Bronze Age as well as the presence of pastoral farming (Yarwood, 1981, 51).

From this evidence it seems clear that in the southern part of the region during the later Neolithic and Bronze Age there was clearance of woodlands followed by the establishment of pastoral farming. Major clearances, however, occurred during the Iron Age and, in addition, there was both pastoral and arable farming activity.

In the north Rombalds Moor saw widespread clearance earlier, during the Bronze Age, with the establishment of pastoral farming.

Following these conclusions one would expect to find settlement sites belonging to the Bronze Age throughout the region but especially on Rombalds Moor. Many of these, utilising the timber supplies made available by woodland clearance, might well have been wholly timber-built, with the use of palisading for enclosures and corrals. However, more intensive settlement would come during the Iron Age with the use of timber being supplemented by stone as woodlands were increasingly cleared and land given over to farming following stone clearance. In districts such as Rombalds Moor where such a sequence occurred earlier, in the Bronze Age, stone might be expected to have featured correspondingly earlier more prominently in structural techniques. The sequence during Roman times is not clear apart from the area in the vicinity of Rishworth Moor where there should be a decrease in the number of settlements.

General discussion

Returning now to the sites themselves, it can be seen that enclosed sites far exceed unenclosed examples. However, it is not certain that all the enclosures known were occupation sites so that the imbalance may not be quite as great as the present uncertain information might lead one to conclude. Even so, however, the number of enclosed as

compared with unenclosed sites is considerable. Unenclosed sites moreover seem to be confined to the northern part of the region - settlements such as Kex Ghyll, Snowden Carr and Danefield Wood which are extensive enough to be classed as 'villages'.

With regard to enclosed sites, overall rectilinear types outnumber curvilinear examples but not by a wide margin. If, however, the occurrence of such sites is analysed area by area, it can be seen that within the Craven Lowlands at the north-west corner of the region, curvilinear sites exceed rectilinear enclosures by exactly six to one. Upon moving down-valley, however, in an eastward direction, the balance shifts. On Rombalds Moor, the types are evenly balanced. Beyond, however, east of Guisely, rectilinear sites outnumber those that are curvilinear by exactly six to one. This is the reverse situation to that which obtains in the Craven lowlands. It seems quite likely that the rectilinear sites represent a spread of this tradition from the eastern lowlands whilst in the Craven Lowlands another, perhaps upland, tradition of enclosure shape was being adhered to. However, elsewhere within the study area the numbers representing each basic type are virtually evenly balanced. Here at least on shape alone distinctions cannot be drawn. If, however, defence capability is examined points of possible significance emerge. To some extent all enclosed sites are defensive but within the region certain examples more strongly

defended than the rest can be identified. Only three curvilinear sites can be so designated, namely, Sharp Haw Crag in the Craven Lowlands, Castleberg near Ilkley and Lee Hill, near the Roman fort at Slack. By contrast there are six or seven rectilinear sites of this order. Between the Wharfe and the Aire are Harlow Hill and Camp House, Bramhope. In Airedale is Catstones Ring, a large site in a commanding position. Kirklees Park in the valley of the Calder controls the trans-Pennine route crossing to Manchester via the river Colne. South of the Calder is the trio of strongly defended enclosures at Meg Dyke, Oldfield Hill and Royd Edge. The last, despite its inner ditch, is sufficiently well defended to be included in the list.

One explanation for such strongly defended sites might be that they represent centres of control within their own district. This could be more easily accepted where other sites in the vicinity were seen to be of a lesser order with regard to their defences. Sharp Haw Crag and Catstones Ring seem able to be placed in this category. Another explanation might be that a site was provided with strong defences in response to potential hostility. A possible reason for this has been suggested by Keighley (1981, 124), namely, land pressure involving competition for sheltered locations. Such territorial disputes would be understandable in the unfavourable terrain of the gritstone moors. The sites listed south of the Calder may

well fall into this category. The strategic location of Kirklees Park at a junction of rivers and routes supplies in itself another reason for strong defence. Such explanations seem required to account for what would otherwise appear to be unnecessary effort involved in constructing strong defences for ordinary farming sites. Before leaving this question, further reference may be made to the problem of Royd Edge with its inner ditch. It has been tentatively suggested above not only that Royd Edge should be included in a list of strongly defended sites but also that it may have had a dual purpose, namely to contain livestock. A site of this kind would be intended both to keep animals in and also to prevent folk outside from removing them without permission. Such an arrangement would be appropriate within a society wherein neighbours not only attacked each other but also raided with the intention of stealing livestock, perhaps horses or cattle. The fortified cattle or horse enclosure would be intended to frustrate that intention.

That palisaded sites existed too is seen from the excavational evidence at Oldfield Hill and Royd Edge. No doubt these predecessors of the banked and ditched enclosures represent primary settlement resulting in the clearance of woodland. An appropriate time for this could be as early as the middle of the first millenium BC taking the pollen record from Rishworth Moor as a guide. Rectilinear palisaded sites perhaps represent a colonising

movement emanating from places further east. No doubt other palisaded sites remain to be discovered; the difficulty of identifying them has been remarked upon more than once in this study. Furthermore, it seems unlikely that only rectilinear types existed within the region under present consideration but as yet proof has not been forthcoming, only the tentative suggestion made above that one existed at Snowden Carr.

With regard to chronology, there is, as so often, considerable difficulty. Most of the sites have not been dated. For some of them, assignment to Bronze Age or alternatively to post-Roman times remains a definite possibility. For the rest, only a few can be dated and then only in the most general terms. Horse Close Farm has been assigned to the Iron Age while the site at Crossley Wood belongs to late Roman times. Beehive querns on Rombalds Moor generally point to late Iron Age to early Roman times. Similarly, beehive querns from the district around Horne Bank and Briscoe Rigg indicate a comparable date range of activity while the melon bead from the latter site suggests occupation during the second century AD. Castlestead Ring, yielding as it did fragments of ironwork, is assignable to the Iron Age or later. Of the three rectilinear enclosures south of the Calder, Meg Dyke, Oldfield Hill and Royd Edge the finds enable a late Iron Age date to be postulated. This is in keeping with the indications afforded by palynological evidence. As

for Roman villas, only Kirk Sink has provided evidence for a dating sequence. A second century AD settlement preceded the Romanised farmstead or villa, established in the 160s. Elaboration and modification continued during the third and fourth centuries, with occupation continuing until the end of the fourth century.

Any estimate of the economic basis of the settlements must be a generalised one. This is attempted in Chapter 11. The lack of firm chronological framework is sufficient in itself to prevent any detailed assessment. Additional pollen diagrams, coupled with further excavation of key sites, should help to overcome the present difficulties of interpretation.

CHAPTER NINE

TWO POWER CENTRES: STANWICK AND ALDBOROUGH

The complex of earthworks known as Stanwick Camp (centred on NZ 184116) occupies undulating farmland, both arable and pasture, between the rivers Tees and Swale and is located about eight miles north of Richmond, North Yorkshire. The earthworks are impressive, surviving in parts as ramparts averaging 3m (10ft) high and ditches averaging 2.3m (7.5ft) deep. The size of the enclosures formed by the earthworks is also remarkable, for the mounds with their ditches, extending as they do for over six miles, enclose as already described (Chapter 3) some 850 acres (344ha) (Wheeler, 1954). John Leland visiting the site in the reign of Henry VIII described the remains as being either the 'ruines of sum old towne' or 'a campe of men of warre' and of these he favoured the latter view (Leland, 1769, 118). In the nineteenth century, Henry MacLauchlan, with his usual expertise, surveyed the remains for the Duke of Northumberland (1849; Wheeler, 1954, Pl.II). Wooler, the Darlington antiquary, was in no doubt about the military purpose of the complex of earthworks (Wooler, 1915, 401-404). Referring to the presence of a deep ditch and broad rampart extending for miles, he suggested that the earthworks had been erected by the Brigantes in 'a vain attempt to repel the Roman invasion'. This idea that the earthworks were not only mainly military in character but also that they formed a

centre of resistance by the Brigantes to the power of Rome was shared by R.G. Collingwood (1937, 110) who conjectured that it was a 'fit capital' for the Brigantes whom he described as a 'warrior state embracing in its dominion all northern England' (1937, 67).

Before Sir Mortimer Wheeler carried out his investigations of 1951 and 1952 the site had not been excavated (Wheeler, 1954, 1-2). He directed his efforts mainly towards examining the lines of defence by putting in sections across them, and in fact he carried out only one area excavation within the interior of the complex (Wheeler, 1954). The areas excavated are shown in a schematic general plan (his fig.1 reproduced here as fig.9.1). Wheeler reduced the structural relationships of the complex of enclosures to four phases (his fig.2 reproduced here as fig.9.2). Phase I which formed the nucleus of the complex was the low hill south of Stanwick Church known as 'the Tofts'. This was regarded as a fortified enclosure akin to a 'hill-fort' and covering 17 acres (6.9ha). The fortifications around the Tofts do not survive as a continuous line. They are well-preserved on the west side as a prominent bank and outer ditch along a stretch known as the 'Duchess Walk'. Sections across this stretch revealed an unrevetted bank 1.5-2.3m (5-7.5ft) high as surviving accompanied by a V-shaped ditch measuring 12.8m (42ft) wide at old ground level and 5m (16.5ft) deep from that level (Wheeler, 1954, 6-7, Pl.VII). This line of

defence fades out at the south-west corner but faint traces of a ditch could be discerned on the south side. A short stretch of mound exists on the east side next to the road running south from Stanwick church but no ditch is visible. Wheeler supposed that the rest of the defences on the east side had been demolished in making the road (Wheeler, 1954, 3). Along the north side the line of fortification seemed to Wheeler to be marked by a flattened rampart, filled-in ditch and counterscarp bank. A section cut here (Wheeler, 1954, section 6) revealed a flat-bottomed ditch which Wheeler argued represented uncompleted work on account of the high water table (Wheeler, 1954, 7, Pl.VII).

On the Tofts within the Phase I defences an area excavation (site F) uncovered a complex of gulleys and ditches and a gravel-paved area. That these were not all belonging to the same period or phase is evident from perusal of the site plan. Amongst an apparent jumble of features the most obvious is a penannular gully enclosing a patch of ground about 8.5m (28ft) in diameter. This was presumed to be the site of a round timber hut though the postholes, found with difficulty, did not easily match the circle implied by the gully. A gap in this gully, 3.5m (11.5ft) wide, marked the hut entrance on the north-east (Wheeler, 1954, site F, 7-9, fig.3).

Phase II was a new line of fortification consisting of massive revetted bank fronted by a formidable ditch.

A section across this on its north-west side revealed a rampart 12.2m (40ft) wide surviving to some 3m (10ft) high. Remnants of a vertical stone-wall revetment were found on its outer side. The ditch in front was some 3.9m (13ft) deep below the old ground level. This line of defence, looping northwards and extending for a distance of two miles enclosed over 130 acres (53ha) of land. At its east end the earthworks curved inwards around the west side of Henah Hill, the most prominent high land hereabouts. They thus excluded it from the enclosure. Wheeler saw the line as terminating on this eastern side just short of the Mary Wild Beck. On its southern side Wheeler's Phase II line cut off the northern tip of Phase I enclosure but ceased at the Mary Wild Beck. This left a gap of some 366m (300yds) at the south-east end of Phase II enclosure. Wheeler supposed that the marshy course of the brook in this sector was sufficient obstacle to would-be attackers, although he did not rule out the possibility of a palisade too (Wheeler, 1954, 3-8, 9-10).

Phase III was represented in the Wheeler system by a similar line of fortifications, namely revetted bank and outer ditch, enclosing land to the south of Phase II by being added to that phase. The area so enclosed was a further 600 acres (242ha). On this occasion, Henah Hill was included in the circuit of the fortifications (Wheeler, 1954, 5-6).

Phase IV was a large rectangular enclosure some 100 acres

(40ha) in area formed by less substantial earthworks added to the line of Phase III defences, and subdivided by a double bank running north-south.

Dating of the various phases hinged on the material recovered from site A, and from here the most significant evidence came from the primary silt of the ditch. This evidence was in the shape of two potsherds, one from a Samian bowl of form 29, which is first century in date, the other from the base of a butt-beaker. Wheeler argued that the Samian pottery must have arrived on site after AD 43, the occasion of the Roman invasion of Britain. As for the butt-beaker, he pointed out that it belonged to a type which occurred at North Ferriby (Humberside) in association with 'Belgic plates' during the first half of the first century AD. However, no Belgic plate had been found at Stanwick and since this type of ware was going out of currency by about AD 50, Wheeler argued that the butt-beaker ware at Stanwick must have arrived subsequent to a time about the middle of the century. Taking account of other material from relevant layers above the silt and pointing out that butt-beakers were absent from the military sites established by the governor Frontinus (AD 74-78) and his successor Agricola, Wheeler suggested a date bracket for Phase II material as AD 50-70.

With regard to Phase I, the material from the area excavation on the Tofts (site F) was called upon to provide dating evidence. Vertical stratification was

largely non-existent but a large gully or ditch (site F, fig.3, ditch A) contained in its lowest fill pottery fragments similar to those produced by the primary silt of Site A discussed above; namely, a Samian sherd of form 29 and fragments of a butt-beaker (Wheeler, 1954, 9, fig.8, and fig.9, no.1). Wheeler suggested a date bracket of AD 45-65 for the occupation of the Tofts.

Phase III produced no independent dating evidence. Only two pottery sherds were recovered, from relatively high in the ditch fill of site D. These were dated to the third and fourth centuries respectively (Wheeler, 1954, 14, 32 and 38, Pl.xvii). Wheeler argued that since Phase III impinged upon Phase II, the former was later in date and that date he defined as about AD 72 (Wheeler, 1954, 5) on the grounds of historical probability. He argued that a zig-zag part of the southern line of Phase III fortifications represented an unfinished gateway hurriedly supplied with a ditch to meet sudden attack (Wheeler, 1954, 15-17, site H, Pl.s xviii-xxii). That attack, Wheeler argued, must have been mounted by the Roman general Petillius Cerialis in about AD 72 (Wheeler, 1954, 21 and 26).

Phase IV was not excavated by Wheeler but he considered its earthworks as being of a different character from those of Phases I-III and suggested that they had been added at some subsequent unknown period, possibly Anglo-Saxon (Wheeler, 1954, 6).

Wheeler boldly interpreted the Stanwick fortifications in the historical context as provided by Tacitus. The events of the years from the intervention of Ostorius Scapula about AD 47-48 in the affairs of the Brigantes until the rescue by the Romans of Queen Cartimandua in AD 69-70 have already been outlined (Chapter 2). It is this period together with the activities of Cerialis referred to above that forms the background for the Wheeler explanation of the Stanwick complex (Wheeler, 1954, 17-23).

Wheeler suggested that his Phase I of Stanwick, the Tofts earthwork, might well have been built at the time of Venutius' break with Queen Cartimandua, following her surrender of Caratacus, in about AD 51. Phase II, the northern extension he suggested, came shortly after, during the 50s, when Cartimandua and Venutius were in open conflict. Aware of Roman support for the queen, Venutius prepared his fortress to hold a garrison with herds and flocks. He made sure that he controlled an extensive water supply in the form of the Mary Wild Beck. The intention was to withstand a siege. Phase III Wheeler suggested, was an expansion of this intention in further preparation for a siege. Work on this final expansion was actually in progress when Roman forces arrived causing the hurried fortification of the uncompleted south gateway by means of the digging of a ditch across the intended causeway.

Wheeler made the additional point that Stanwick was

strategically placed at a route junction where the choice occurred on the journey north of continuing the journey along the route followed by what became the Roman Dere Street or of crossing the Pennines by means of Stainmore. Such a geographical focus would be the natural location where Venutius' followers and allies, the latter presumably from south-west Scotland, could assemble on his behalf. Here would be a place suitable for the - 'culminating rally of his (Venutius') tribesmen and allies' (Wheeler, 1954, iv), a place where Venutius might make 'his last stand' (Wheeler, 1954, 26).

Victory followed the Roman attack and the material evidence of their success can be seen in the form of the cascade of stones uncovered in the ditch at Site A. This represented the systematic dismantling of the defences (Wheeler, 1954, 23).

This hypothesis of Wheeler's, presented with his usual flair and brilliance, was plausible and became the accepted explanation for the existence, expansion and demise of the Stanwick earthwork complex. In other words, Stanwick was accepted as a military response to the Roman threat.

However, doubts have been expressed from time to time, often verbally and occasionally in print. Dobson pointed out that Wheeler's Phases I and II were chronologically indistinguishable on ceramic evidence and that Phase III

was undated by the same criterion. He suggested on the basis of examination on the ground and consideration of Wheeler's own plan, that Phase II could represent a reduction in size of Phase III. Furthermore, he raised the doubt that the 'south gateway' of Phase III had ever in fact been intended to be a gateway (Dobson, 1970, 40). If either suggestion should prove to be correct, then the case for Roman attack and Brigantian response under the leadership of Venutius is weakened.

In 1975 Challis and Harding discussed the Stanwick complex and accepted Wheeler's general dating for Phases II and III fortifications with some slight reservation. They pointed out that, although plausible, the chronological priority of Phase II over Phase III was not established beyond doubt by excavation. The dating for Phase I, however, they felt was less satisfactory and could be much earlier than suggested by Wheeler. The published plan of the Tofts area excavation (site F) showed three superimposed occupation phases. There was need for further investigation (Challis and Harding, 1975, 114-115).

By 1977 Hartley and Fitts had re-examined material from Wheeler's Stanwick excavations. They noted the presence of dishes of 'Pompeian Red' fabric from the Tofts (site F) of a type which belonged to a Neronian-Vespasianic date range. This led them to suggest the presence of Roman troops in the vicinity. In addition they noted the

occurrence of Roman tiles from which they deduced a Roman-style building nearby, perhaps a shrine. A fourth century date was suggested for this. Most important, however, for the chronology of the site was the identification of two Samian sherds from site A as being from pots which belonged to a date 'not much after AD 40'. One, from layer 4a had been tentatively classified as form 22, thus dating to the third quarter of the first century AD (Wheeler, 1954, Pl.23a.no.10). The new identification made it the wall of a dish of Dragendorff form 17, with a floruit under Tiberius. The other sherd was that from the primary silt (fig.10, layer 7, Pl.xxiiiA, 5) identified by Wheeler as derived from a bowl of form 29 (Wheeler 1954, 31, no.5). This was now more closely identified as either from a bowl of form 29 decorated in a fashion confined to bowls of Tiberian or Tiberio-Claudian periods or more probably from a large pedestalled crater of Dragendorff 11. In either case the pot was unlikely to have been made after AD 40. Such early pieces as these, if not survivals, could push back the silting up of Wheeler's Phase II ditch to an earlier time than that postulated by him. Accordingly, following Wheeler's sequence, Phase I would be earlier still (Hartley and Fitts, 1977, 93-94).

In 1981 a new programme of investigation including excavations (Turnbull 1982; Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1983 and 1984) led to new interpretations.

Geophysical survey on the Tofts revealed the presence of

at least two ditched enclosures, one roughly square with an opening on the north-east, the other a rather larger oval one possibly containing huts (Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1983, 9, 16-17, fig.5). In addition an important discovery was the defining of an apparent double ditch parallel to the eastern rampart of the Tofts, located however not on the eastern side but on the western side of the rampart (Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1983, 16, fig.5). Excavation of the north-west corner of the Tofts field as a follow-up to the geophysical survey led to the identification of three superimposed levels (Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1983, 8, Trench 1981-24). The lowest level, Period 1, which is undated, revealed a series of ditches and pits which yielded animal bones but no pottery.

The next level, Period 2, was a black deposit containing animal bones and pottery, the latter not significantly different from pottery found in the layer above. In addition, quantities of Roman tiles and masonry rubble pointed to the former presence nearby of a Romanised building (Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1983, 9 and 11).

The top level, Period 3, consisted of a native style round house some 10m (35ft) in diameter, and containing a central hearth (Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1983, 10-11, fig.2). Among finds from this level to be associated with the round house was a high proportion of Roman fine ware of pre-Flavian date (Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1983, 11, fig.3).

Further examination of the Tofts field was carried out in 1984 (Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1984, 13-16, trench SW84-II). The stone house previously uncovered in 1981 was re-excavated. A level associated with it yielded pottery and animal bone. This level overlay another building which had been almost completely dismantled presumably for the building of the later round house. Below the dismantled house itself was a burnt level some 25cm thick from which came quantities of slag. This area might have been devoted to either industrial activities or to domestic cooking. The black earth deposit noted in 1981 (Period 2) was recognised again, and seemed to represent an episode involving dumping of material containing domestic rubbish to level up the site for the purpose of constructing stone buildings. Beneath the dumped material was a length of walling, the full significance of which was not clear. The lowest features to be found were, as in 1981 (Period 1) a complex of incutting gullies^s and pits. These produced no pottery. This is in contrast to the higher levels on site from which came a large quantity of native ware as well as much imported fine ware, the latter all pre-Flavian in period.

Beyond the Tofts field, two excavations were carried out at the north-west side of the fortifications near Forcett (Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1983, 5-6; 1984, 3-12, fig.5). In addition, fieldwork by Amanda Chadburn involving detailed survey was carried out in the field wherein these

excavations took place (Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1983, 19-24, figs. 6 and 7). Amongst other things Chadburn concluded that the 'marking out' bank and ditch discovered by Wheeler in his section across the Phase III rampart here (Wheeler, site D, 14, Pl.XVIII) belong to a different set of earthworks than the main Phase III rampart which follows a different alignment. Since these early earthworks underlie the main rampart they are earlier (Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1983, 20-21, fig.6).

The first of the two excavations involved investigation of an area immediately to the south of the junction of Wheeler's Phases II and III. At the gap here an entrance was suspected. However, much post-Roman activity such as the insertion of field drains, stone-built culverts and the formation of ridge and furrow had apparently removed any evidence of Iron Age features. Similar disturbances occurred in the upper levels of the ditch associated with Phase II rampart (Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1983).

The second excavation examined the north-west entrance of Phase II in the vicinity of Wheeler's site B, where he had concentrated on the north terminal of the ditch (Wheeler, 1954, 14, site B, Pls.15b and XVII). The 1984 investigation was directed to the entranceway and the end of the ditch and rampart on its southern side (Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1984). Work on the ditch terminal confirmed Wheeler's stratification but no artefacts were recovered. The entranceway and rampart proved extremely difficult to

evaluate because of considerable medieval and post-medieval activity not to mention erosion and extensive trial trenching carried out by Wheeler. However, a complex series of events was worked out. Noteworthy is the conclusion that there had been two periods of rampart construction, the first one represented by a rampart at least 6m wide. This in turn had been preceded by a low bank on a different alignment and measuring at least 2.5m wide and 0.25m high. A dual-phase entrance was also identified presumed to match the dual-phase rampart. The earlier entrance was represented by a pebble surface which exhibited wheel ruts occurring in pairs spaced 1.4m or 1.5m wide. The later entrance resulted from a drastic remodelling of the earlier one to give an entirely new axis (Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1984).

Besides these excavations on the north-west part of the circuit at Stanwick, Henah Hill was investigated as well as Wheeler's Phase IV enclosure south of the main complex.

On Henah Hill, two areas were examined by excavation, one on the northern side of the hill and one near the summit (Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1983, 25-33, fig.8 and 9).

The excavation near the summit (Area 1983-2) was intended to investigate a circular feature recorded on MacLauchlan's map and noted on air photographs (e.g. McCord, 1971, fig.2b). No evidence for settlement was found and in regard to the circular feature it was

concluded that it was modern having been built as a boundary to a copse on the hill top.

The excavation on the northern side of Henah Hill recovered evidence of a lynchet 1.5m deep, thus indicating long-lasting agricultural activity. Over-riding this lynchet was a boundary line of which several phases were identified including that represented by a hedge. This evidence points to pastoral activity succeeding the agricultural phase on the hill-slope. Also found was a bank some 0.3m high with a small outer ditch. This bank which is similar to Wheeler's 'marking-out' banks had presumably caused the formation of the lynchet. The bank itself seemed to have been enlarged by extension to its rear or alternatively this extension represented a second, parallel bank. North of the lynchet a considerable ditch, about 1.5m in depth, was found but in the absence of a rampart it was concluded that its purpose had been one of drainage.

With regard to Phase IV enclosure, two sections were cut across the supposed western side, one in 1981 (Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1983, 7, Trench, 1981-21) and one in 1984 (Haselgrove and Turnbull 1984, 17, Trench SW 84-III). In the first trench there was no trace of an ancient ditch or bank and in the second the excavators concluded that drainage ditches combined with ploughing had created the illusion of a bank.

Thus at its west side at least Phase IV enclosure would appear to be non-existent. This must throw doubt upon the existence of the entire system designated by Wheeler as Phase IV and clearly more investigation is required here to establish whether the concept of a Phase IV enclosure has any validity at all.

New interpretations which have emerged from the work begun in 1981 include a re-assessment of the Wheeler triple-phase sequence and involve the rejection of the concept of Roman attack on Venutius' fortress. At the same time they seek fresh explanations for the genesis, development and termination of the Stanwick earthworks.

Turnbull has argued that the chronological range of fine ware pottery from the Tofts and from site A indicates the presence of a flourishing community at Stanwick prior to the initial quarrel of Cartimandua and Venutius. Again, he takes up Dobson's doubt about the unfinished south gateway (Wheeler's site H) and argues that it had in fact never been intended as such. The largest stones in the ditch could be re-interpreted as material which had fallen back in. The zig-zag or 'elbow-shape' as he calls it of the rampart could be explained as either the result of inaccurate work on the part of different labour gangs or else as deliberately contrived to provide a false gateway to deceive an enemy. The fact that Wheeler found neither causeway nor gateway at this location was because they had never existed. What is more the recognition of a genuine

opening some 150m (492ft) to the east must increase the doubts concerning the 'unfinished' example. Another point that Turnbull makes relates to the 'slighting' of the ramparts as evidenced by the stone cascade found within the ditch fill of Site A. Such material could be simply the result of wall collapse. That this collapse was in any case only a local one is indicated, he suggests, by the fact that the revetment wall was still surviving in the Middle Ages. The name Stanwick (in the form 'steinvegge') meaning 'stone wall' occurs in the Domesday Book and the fact that parts of the parish boundary follow the stone facing provide evidence for this. Without the unfinished south gate and the deliberate dismantling of the defences Turnbull suggests that the evidence for a violent end to Stanwick is non-existent (Turnbull, 1984).

Hanson and Campbell have rejected Turnbull's explanation of the south gate situation while pointing out that even an unfinished gateway is no proof of Roman attack especially since the cutting of a deep ditch could hardly be regarded as a hurried affair. They share Turnbull's objections, however, to the Wheeler explanation for the stone cascade at Site A and feel that the Romans would surely have been more systematic in their demolition of the defences than the evidence would imply (Hanson and Campbell, 1986, 85-86). In addition they point to the complete absence of remains which could be interpreted as resulting from a battle. This last point seems to the

present writer the strongest element in the case against the Wheeler hypothesis. Another possible objection is worth noting. Hanson and Campbell have also argued that the two accounts by Tacitus in the *Annals* and *Histories* relating the quarrel and civil war between Cartimandua and Venutius do not represent two different series of similar events, one series in the 50s, the other in AD 69, but rather that Tacitus has mistakenly assigned a single set of events to two different occasions. They choose the context of the Year of the Four Emperors, that is, AD 69, as the most likely occasion for the events described (Hanson and Campbell, 1986, 77-80). If this conclusion is correct, then Stanwick can hardly be regarded as a stronghold which owed its origin and development to the scheming of one man bent on opposing Roman expansion. Such a conclusion would strengthen the case for seeking alternative causes behind Stanwick's existence and development.

To return to Turnbull's discussion, he questions, too, the phasing sequence of the earthworks (Turnbull, 1984, 43-45). The structural similarity of phases II and III is such as to encourage the view that they form parts of an overall scheme with the southern line of Wheeler's Phase II serving only to divide the enclosed area into two portions. A functional rather than a chronological difference is postulated for these. Again, the very existence of Wheeler's Phase I 'hillfort' on the Tofts is

seriously called into question. The north side, with its inner bank, flat-bottomed ditch and counterscarp bank, it will be remembered, was explained by Wheeler as having been slighted in antiquity on the occasion of the Phase II extension. Turnbull now suggests that a more satisfactory explanation would be that these features are the result of early canalisation of the Mary Wild Beck, the ditch being such as would result from water deposition (Turnbull, 1984, 45). He would also reject the view that the earthworks which Wheeler regarded as the southern line of Phase II intersecting the Tofts' defences are ancient. Quarrying, a possible hollow-way and modern drainage works have complicated the situation and led, he suggests, to a wrong interpretation (Turnbull, 1984, 45). In addition, the incomplete eastern rampart is facing the wrong way since according to the geophysical survey it has its ditches on the west. It cannot therefore be a rampart for a Tofts hillfort. Turnbull suggests that this length of mound may belong to a medieval complex or else represent a subdivision within the Iron Age system. He would explain the undoubted rampart with ditch of the Duchess' Walk section on the west side of the Tofts as a continuation of Wheeler's Phase II rampart. Along the south side of the Tofts he would adhere to the Wheeler line but instead of the earthworks turning north at Church Lodge he would have them passing south of that location. Thereafter traces of earthworks indicate the main line which travels eastwards to join up with the known termination of Wheeler's Phase

II fortifications at the foot of Henah Hill (Turnbull, 1984, 45, fig.2). Haselgrove too dismisses the concept of a hillfort on the Tofts (Haselgrove, 1982, 74-75, fig.12). However, he retains Wheeler's Phase II rampart on the north side of the Tofts in conjunction with the westward facing rampart on the east side of the Tofts (Haselgrove, 1982, 74, fig.12B). He would see the Duchess Walk fortification together with its southern prolongation as a later modification to the scheme (Haselgrove, 1982, 74, fig.12C). Haselgrove would assign the ditched enclosures identified by air and magnetometer survey to a pre-fortification period. Also assignable to such a period are the low clay banks preceding the ramparts and much of the activity recognised in excavations on the Tofts. A pre-fortification period need not have been of short duration and there is the likelihood of development from enclosed settlement to open unenclosed settlement against the general background of a landscape subdivided by field boundaries (Haselgrove, 1982, 74, fig.12A; Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1983, 35-36, fig.10).

It is evident that the explanation of the Stanwick earthworks as offered by Sir Mortimer Wheeler is now difficult to sustain and that alternative hypotheses must be taken seriously. The discovery in 1984 of a probable rampart underlying and therefore earlier than the present surviving one adds further complexity to the picture. In attempting to incorporate this into a scheme of

development various possibilities suggest themselves. One such possibility would involve a modified re-instatement of Wheeler's Phase II enclosure but with the earlier, smaller rampart serving as the enceinte (Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1984, 10). Wheeler's marking-out bank at Site A as well as the bank, possibly enlarged, which was found on the north side of Henah Hill in 1983 could well represent remnants of the same system. Whether this should be associated with an earlier ditch, evidence of which would have been removed when the later ditch was dug, is uncertain. Certainly, the Duchess Walk section of rampart which is included in this scheme by Haselgrove and Turnbull has a ditch associated with it. The present writer, however, would prefer to see this section as a later modification of the scheme. A possible sequence then would be as follows (fig.9.3):

Stage 1. A pre-rampart stage including ditched enclosures and a landscape sub-divided by field systems. Mid-Iron Age.

Stage 2. Primary rampart stage, comprising the line of Wheeler's Phase II enclosure but excluding the Tofts and including Henah Hill. Late Iron Age.

Stage 3. Revetted rampart stage. Addition of Wheeler's Phase III and simultaneous remodelling of Stage 2 (primary rampart). Mid first century AD.

Stage 4. Enclosure of west and south sides of the Tofts. Later first century AD.

(The word 'stage' instead of 'phase' is employed in this scheme in order to avoid confusion with the Wheeler model).

Such a scheme as this would re-instate that part of Wheeler's Phase II earthworks dismissed by Turnbull, which cut across the northern end of the Tofts. It would combine this sector with the westward-facing rampart on the east side of the Tofts. The Duchess Walk sector would then be regarded as a later modification designed to embrace the Tofts within the fortifications. This may have taken place at the primary rampart stage or have come much later after Roman objects were reaching the site. The latter explanation would account for the fact that in the north-west corner at least the rampart seems to overlie a layer containing such Roman material (Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1984, 16).

The scheme of development offered here must be regarded as tentative and much more work needs to be done at Stanwick both on the perimeter earthworks and in the interior before the sequence can be regarded as properly understood. However, if the pattern of development postulated approximates to the truth and the purely military explanation is rejected then a different approach to Stanwick's existence can be made.

Stage 1 illustrates a period before the existence of fortified enclosures. The landscape was one which had

been subdivided by boundaries and within which ditched enclosures were located. This brings the territory into line with the situation that has been revealed in the region largely by aerial photography during the last fifteen years or so (fig.1.3, and Chapter 4). There is likely to have been development over a period of time within the compass of this stage in itself. It seems quite likely that based on economic success open settlement superseded enclosed sites as at Thorpe Thewles (Chapter 4). The intensity of settlement on the Tofts would suggest this. However, unlike Thorpe Thewles, further development occurred. This is Stage 2 during which a large extent of terrain was enclosed by the primary rampart. The dates of these two stages are strictly speaking unknown. All that can be said is that they preceded the revetted rampart stage (Stage 3) which may be dated to about AD 45-55. If Stage 2 is to be placed within the Late Iron Age bracket, say from about 100 BC, then Stage 1, as a multi-period stage preceding it, might reasonably fall into a mid-Iron Age bracket, say from about 300-100 BC. With the revetted-rampart stage, that is, Stage 3 dated to the middle of the first century AD, Stage 4 would fall within the date bracket ranging from the 50s to about AD 70.

The primary rampart stage (Stage 2) enclosing over 50ha must represent the establishment of a site of outstanding importance for there is nothing comparable within the

region. The economic basis of this importance is no doubt partly to be seen in the habitation sites now known to have existed in the surrounding countryside. Most of these were probably farming settlements engaged in mixed farming but one cannot rule out the possibility of specialisation. Stanwick's strategic location, controlling routes and with the possibility of wide-reaching contacts, both commercial and political, must also have played a major part in the establishment of its importance. The discovery of the existence of the primary rampart enclosure has also demonstrated an important point. Stanwick, in its final major stage, did not suddenly emerge from open settlement in response to some outside stimulus. It was grafted on, as it were, to an already existing power base which had no doubt evolved as a political and market centre for surrounding settlements, and beyond. Excavations have yielded bones of cattle, sheep and to a lesser extent pigs. These finds may be taken as evidence of local produce and of the kind of food consumed at Stanwick. Excavations on Henah Hill have shown that crop growing too played a part in the local economy. The nature and extent of the final major fortifications (Stage 3) represent a significant aggrandisement of the site. They show too control of a large labour force and the support of skilled military engineers. The fortifications that resulted would be most impressive to look upon, not to mention their value as defences. They are an example of planning on the grand

scale to provide a base fit for a king (or queen).

In seeking to explain what brought about this ultimate expansion the early Roman material found on site provides a clue. Turnbull is surely right in pointing to southern Britain after the Roman conquest in AD 43 (Turnbull, 1984, 4). The Roman fine pottery and glass represent in themselves prestige objects obtained from that source. The amphorae are important for what they contained; one may suppose that the main import by this means was wine. In addition, the presence of Roman buildings on site at an early stage may be deduced from the finds of roofing tiles, both on the Tofts and on Wheeler's Site A in the northern part of the complex. Roofing tiles in themselves need not imply Roman tile makers working locally. Such tiles could have been brought in from elsewhere, whether from southern Britain or directly from the continent via the Humber or indeed the Tees. Even so, Roman buildings undoubtedly do imply a Roman presence for Roman craftsmen and builders at least would be required for such work. In the light of this situation Stanwick seems best interpreted as the base of the pro-Roman Cartimandua. Roman support, whether in the form of money payments enabling the purchase of goods, or as direct gifts and services, would provide Stanwick with the trappings of civilisation. These in turn would enhance the status of the queen. This approach is very much in accord with what is known about Roman diplomatic policy in dealing with

frontier states (Thompson, 1965; Braund, 1984). Whether there was an exchange of goods at this stage of contact is uncertain. One might expect that if so, cattle, horses and slaves would be likely to form a part of this. In a sense, however, this is immaterial for the response that the Romans required was the support, both moral and practical, that a pro-Roman ruler could give to ensure a secure northern frontier for the Roman province.

In some ways, as Turnbull has pointed out, Stanwick is comparable to those proto-urban sites elsewhere in the Celtic world termed 'oppida' by some scholars (Turnbull, 1984, 47; cf. Collis, 1984, 21-22, Cunliffe, 1976). Stanwick was an enclosed, ostentatiously fortified site well situated to control routes and to function as a centralised market. It is not yet known how heavily occupied it was but the investigations to date suggest that there was considerable settlement on the Tofts at least. In addition, the finds from Wheeler's site A point to settlement in the vicinity. Industrial activity on site is also indicated by the identification of pottery fragments recovered from Wheeler's excavation as being connected with metalworking (Spratling, 1981). Further indications of metalworking activity can be seen in the metalwork hoard found at a spot (NZ 199102) south-east of the fortifications (MacGregor, 1962). In addition, similar activity is perhaps to be seen in the burnt area which yielded slag underlying structures on the Tofts. As

already described this was excavated in 1984. These are only hints and no doubt more extensive interior investigation will provide more evidence. The absence of a money economy, however, marks a difference from sites further south. In common with all native communities north of the river Humber, there is no native coinage. In this respect, Stanwick has more in common with such sites as Traprain Law and Eildon Hill North (Feachem, 1963, 120-121; 1966, 77-79).

Besides being an economic centre it has been argued that as the power base of Cartimandua, Stanwick was a political centre. As such it might be designated as an administrative centre but the use of this term implies a bureaucracy that would be alien to the Celtic system. Control over subordinates would be exercised by means of the practice of clientship operating within a hierarchical arrangement. As part of this system, the custom of fosterage provided in effect hostages to the superior party (Jackson, 1964, 9-10).

Evidence for one aspect that might be expected to be present, namely, that of religious centre, has not as yet been forthcoming. The Stanwick metalwork hoard is, as has already been noted, best regarded as belonging to a smith rather than as being ritual. Again, the human skull found in the ditch terminal by Wheeler (Wheeler, 1954, 53, ditch B), should be regarded as reflecting the head-hunting proclivities of the warrior element in Stanwick society

(Jackson, 1964, 19; Strabo, IV, iv, 5, Tierney, 1960, 269). The skull together with the sword and scabbard found nearby (Wheeler, 1954, 14) had probably been set up as a trophy at the gateway. No doubt this has religious overtones but in itself it need not bear any specifically religious connotation. Thus there is virtually no evidence to point to a religious focus at Stanwick. Yet it would be unwise to state that such a focus did not exist. Only a small portion of the interior of Stanwick has been investigated and there remains every chance that the evidence required is there to be uncovered. It is also tempting to suspect that the circular churchyard at Stanwick church might perpetuate an older religious tradition.

The chronological range of the pottery at Stanwick does not extend beyond Flavian times (Wheeler, 1954; Haselgrove and Turnbull, 1983, 14). In seeking a reason for the failure of Stanwick to continue, Turnbull has suggested that with absorption into the Roman province Stanwick's control and monopoly of routes and markets ceased. The privileged position of the aristocracy in charge was thereby undermined (Turnbull, 1984, 48). He suggests that the vicus at Catterick may have replaced Stanwick as an economic centre. Yet this may be only part of the explanation. Even if the original reason for Stanwick's development was mainly economic, the continued economic viability may have depended upon the presence and

patronage of the Queen and her ruling aristocracy. After her departure and following the Roman conquest the political centre of gravity moved elsewhere - at some point of time as yet unknown to Aldborough, near Boroughbridge. Without the ruling élite, the impetus for economic activity may have been weakened. Without political, military and economic influence Stanwick's role as a multi-function power centre had vanished.

What happened to the tribal aristocracy and their followers after the demise of Stanwick is unknown. It seems very probable that some of them were already living in the vicinity of Stanwick. A proportion of the ditched enclosed sites round about detected from the air (see Chapter 4) could well have been occupied by such people. The villa site of Holme House is a likely candidate for being the centre of an estate in the hands of a native owner at least and, in view of its rapid development, one of prestige and resources. Some of the other rectilinear sites may turn out to have been villas also or at least flourishing Roman-period native farmsteads with a pre-Roman ancestry. Only excavation has a chance of deciding the question.

Other members of the tribal aristocracy no doubt had their permanent homes further away centred upon other settlement areas. Such personages may have been clan leaders or rulers in their own right of subordinate tribal groups.

The type of settlement site referred to is rural but there is evidence for more concentrated settlement only three miles away from Stanwick, at Piercebridge, where early second century AD occupation at least is attested (Scott, 1977; 1982). There is no evidence, however, of the ethnic composition of the folk living there at that time. No first century fort has as yet been discovered at Piercebridge although it is unlikely that such a potentially important river crossing on Dere Street would be left unguarded. Any fort here would be expected to have had some form of extra-mural settlement. Such a settlement might well have attracted surplus population from the Stanwick site.

Another possible magnet as it were for former occupants of Stanwick was Catterick, situated some nine miles to the south of Stanwick where there is evidence of an Agricolan fort (Wacher, 1971, 167). Certainly, by the second century AD a vicus was flourishing there. The find of a large quantity of leatherwork at Catterick suggests the presence of a tannery (Wacher, 1960, 217-218). This in turn implies the collection of hides, no doubt obtained from animals brought in from further afield, perhaps even from the neighbouring dales. Catterick was well situated to collect herds and produce from such areas and to act as an entrepôt, for it was based on Dere Street and had access to water communications by means of the river Swale which would be navigable at that point by shallow draught

vessels (cf. Wilson, 1984). Heavy material such as lead from Swaledale would be likely to find its way to Catterick for despatch to other places (Raistrick & Jennings, 1965, 7). Catterick's importance as a communication and commercial centre is underlined too by the presence of a government official based there (RIB. 725, 726).

Yet neither Piercebridge nor Catterick became the capital of the Roman civitas Brigantum. That, as has been seen, was Isurium, identified with the village of Aldborough (SE 4066), thirty miles south of Stanwick. Why it should have been located so far from the original tribal centre - if that is the correct explanation - is a problem. It is possible that the Romans wished to keep a close eye on the tribal leaders by establishing their capital near the legionary fortress at York. After all there had been an anti-Roman faction amongst the Brigantes. However, a more likely reason may have been that the location of the new tribal centre was a compromise between areas of concentrated population to the north, around Stanwick, and those to the south, in the vicinity of Leeds, possibly centred upon Barwick in Elmet. At the same time, the new capital could be in touch with the population occupying the western edge of the Vale of York and the Pennine dales.

When the civitas Brigantum was constituted and Isurium founded as its capital is unknown. Wachter has suggested

that the most likely time for these events was the reign of Hadrian (AD 117-138). He points out that this was a time of restored confidence accompanied by stimulation of building activity. At the same time the withdrawal of military units from eastern Brigantia to man the new linear frontier between Tyne and Solway opened the way for local self-government. This hypothesis would imply that for some thirty years Brigantia had to be administered directly by the Romans. It is usually assumed that the military commanders of the various forts carried this burden. Another possibility is that the region was administered by a specially appointed Roman commissioner, a praefectus regionis, or a praefectus civitatis. No doubt such an official would have been based upon York. However, no evidence for the existence of such an official in the region has survived. In addition, Salway has pointed out that the transfer of responsibility for local government would normally have been carried out as soon as possible (1981, 187). Bearing this in mind, a thirty year interval seems excessive and it may well be that the civitas was in fact constituted earlier than the time of Hadrian. As will be seen there is evidence for Flavian occupation at Aldborough although little else is known about this early period. It does mean, however, that as an occupied site one may envisage Aldborough as qualifying for the status of civitas capital earlier than the reign of Hadrian.

As for the extent of territory attributed to the civitas Brigantum, there is no certainty. The identification of such boundaries is, as Collingwood noted, a matter of guesswork (1937, 168). However, if the suggestion that Isurium was so placed as to have contact with the major areas of population has any validity, then it seems reasonable to conclude that the Vale of York together with the centres of population at its north end around Stanwick and towards its southern end, in the vicinity of Barwick in Elmet would be included within the civitas borders. Certainly, the newly formed civitas, whenever constituted, would include the nucleus of the tribe and probably also those communities which owing to their proximity had been most securely under the dominance of the tribe. Communities occupying the eastern Pennine dales should probably be regarded as falling within this classification. Such a civitas would have been a large one but the distribution of the altars dedicated to the goddess Brigantia carries the implication that during the early third century AD control of the civitas extended further still. Indeed, bearing in mind the presence of a pro-Roman element amongst the Brigantian aristocracy there need be no reason why the Roman civitas Brigantum should not have matched Brigantian tribal control exercised or claimed before the Roman conquest. Yet such an arrangement would have resulted in the largest civitas in Roman Britain, comparable to examples in Gaul. The potential for fragmentation discussed earlier in respect

of the pre-Roman situation still existed and such a territory might well have proved difficult to administer. In such circumstances it is only to be expected that it should be sub-divided into pagi, or districts of local government. As has been seen in previous discussion (Chapter 2) such units seem to have existed based upon pre-Roman communities - for example the Textoverdi, the Lopocares(?) and the Carvetii. By the later third century the Carvetii at least had attained the status of independent civitas with their probable capital at Carlisle. It is tempting to suppose that the Lopocares(?) also represent a civitas centred upon the flourishing town of Corbridge. Other civitates may have been established in due course within Central Britain but if so the evidence has not come to light. In addition, a separate territory centred upon Ribchester was, during the third century, set aside for the Sarmatians under the control of a praepositus regionis (RIB. 583, 587; Richmond, 1945). This would not be under the jurisdiction of the civitas Brigantum. It is possible that there were other districts like this under imperial control, such as lead mining areas. A further complication in this matter is the possibility of territorium assigned to the Colonia at York which was in existence by at least AD 237 (JRS. 11.102; RCHM. York, xxxvi). This would no doubt have taken in part of the Vale of York including woodland and grazing lands in the lower-lying parts and perhaps richer cultivable terrain on the western edges of the Vale. The

per strigas division of land imposed upon an existing farming landscape in the vicinity of Kirk Deighton (Ramm, 1980, 33-35, fig.4.4; see Chapter 4) would seem to belong to an earlier stage of Roman land acquisition. Nevertheless, amid the wealth of evidence for regular land division revealed by Riley's programme of aerial survey (see Chapter 4) there is room for future recognition of field systems relevant to York. At the same time, it must be recognised that the problem is still unsolved. Neither the extent nor even the existence of a territorium for the colonia at York has been established.

An additional factor to be taken into account in Central Britain is the presence of so many civil settlements or vici outside forts. Far from creating a sterile military zone within the region, the continued existence of forts encouraged the development of urban life in the form of these vici. The vici served as markets and magnets for the surrounding districts. It also seems probable that most, if not all, enjoyed a certain measure of self-government. The existence of communal organisation in references to vicani is provided by inscriptions from Carriden, on the Antonine Wall (JRS.47, 229, no.18), Chesterholm and Housesteads on Hadrian's Wall (RIB. 1700, 1616), and Old Carlisle in Cumbria (RIB. 899). Exactly how the vici of Central Britain related to the civil and military authorities in turn is unknown. Salway, however, is of the opinion that constitutionally

the vici answered to the nearest civil authority (1967, 180-181; 1980, 13). That would mean that once the civitas Brigantum was formally constituted all the civil settlements within its boundaries would answer to the ordo based at Isurium. When other civitates were established, as for example the Carvetii, then they would become responsible for the vici within their own particular boundaries.

The establishment of another civitas within the region administered by the Brigantes represented a reduction of their territorial control and by implication their prestige. A possible major reduction of tribal territory and influence occurred during the reign of Antoninus Pius (AD 138-161). In a much disputed passage, referred to in Chapter 2, Pausanias records that the emperor took away from the Brigantes the greater part of their territory as a punishment for their attacking the Genounian district (Description of Greece, VIII, 43). As has been seen the Genounian district probably did not exist in Britain. However, that does not rule out the fact that trouble of some kind did occur. Taken at its face value, it was the Brigantes who caused the trouble and who suffered the consequences of their temerity. If that is correct than it appears that by the time of the emperor Severus the decision had been reversed if the dedications to the goddess Brigantia discussed earlier (see Chapter 2) have any meaning with regard to extent of territory under the

control of the tribal council based at Isurium. However, Breeze and Dobson have suggested that Pausanias was using the term 'Brigantes' loosely to mean north British tribes in general and that the territory removed was the land between the Tyne-Solway isthmus and that of the Clyde-Forth (Breeze and Dobson, 1978, 79). If that is correct then no loss of territory on the part of the Brigantes is in question.

How the tribal notables on whom fell the burden and privilege of local government obtained the wealth necessary to maintain their status and carry out their duties is not properly known. It may be presumed that they became landowners within those districts where they exercised influence as clan or pagus leaders. The documentary evidence for this is not available. Again there is no information concerning how they organised their lives, whether they spent all their time at the civitas capital, leaving bailiffs to run their estates or divided their time between town and country. The way government of a pagus was related to that of the capital is not understood but if it involved the meeting of a separate council locally then it would presumably have been necessary for a local member of the tribal council to have attended. More information about the vicissitudes of rural settlements especially the villas might contribute to an understanding of the basis of prosperity or otherwise and the mode of life of tribal leaders.

Certainly a detailed history of the tribal capital would assist in this. However, not enough is yet known about rural settlement nor about Isurium itself to attempt to answer these questions much less try to document any changes in the practices of the tribal leaders that may have occurred over the long years of Roman rule. Examination in previous pages of settlement evidence has demonstrated the shortcomings in present knowledge about them. As will be seen, information about the history of Isurium is similarly deficient. However, it is necessary at this point to assemble and assess what little is known about the civitas capital of the Brigantes situated at what is now the village of Aldborough.

Aldborough is located on Dere Street, the main Roman road running north from York into Scotland, at a crossing of the river Ure. It was also the location of a road junction in that a Roman road provided a link with Ilkley in Wharfedale. A road to the east to join up with the Roman road travelling northwards from Stamford Bridge parallel to Dere Street might have been expected but this does not appear to have been the case (Ordnance Survey map 1978, Roman Britain; Margary, 1973, maps 14 and 17).

The extent of settlement (fig.9.4) covered some 55 acres (22.3ha), if the area enclosed by the third century town walls is any guide, and perhaps more since evidence of earlier timber buildings has been found outside the walls (Charlesworth, 1971, 156; Lawson-Tancred, 1948, 14).

Virtually nothing is known about the internal street plan but the division of the town by two main cross roads, partly perpetuated in the present-day roads, would suggest a formal lay-out involving a grid pattern. The alignment of several internal buildings would support this idea. The almost rectangular plan of the town defences with four gates, one almost centrally placed in each of the four sides, suggests further not only a formal lay-out but that this was the work of military surveyors (Charlesworth, 1971, 155). At the same time, some buildings are not in alignment and it may be that these represent development before the imposition of a formal grid at a later stage in the manner of Silchester (Charlesworth, 1970, plan; Wachter 1974; Boon 1974).

Most recent excavation in Aldborough has been on the defences of the Roman town. The first defence was a bank and outer ditch dated to the later second century. With regard to the gates, there is no evidence for this period. One might have expected them to be timber, as at Brough on Humber but only stone gates have been found. The first stone gates may have been contemporary with the earthen rampart (Charlesworth, 1971, 156-158; Wachter, 1966, 60). At a time not earlier than the middle of the third century the defences were strengthened by the erection of a stone wall, averaging 2.7m (9ft) thick, in front of the bank. At the same time the bank itself was heightened. Remodelling of the gates, deduced from evidence recovered

during excavation of the north gate also took place in the third century. That this was contemporary with or later than the reign of Severus Alexander (AD 222-235) is indicated by the discovery on the contemporary road surface of a coin of that emperor. Thus the strengthening of the defences and remodelling of the gates may have been part of the same building programme, although a considerable time may have elapsed from the start to the finish of the operation (Charlesworth, 1971, 162). A series of internal towers, including angle turrets in the southern corners, may reasonably be assumed to be contemporaneous with the third century masonry wall, going by the evidence recovered from excavations of the south-east angle tower (Charlesworth, 1971, 160). Projecting stone bastions were added not earlier than the mid-fourth century (Charlesworth, 1971, 162).

With regard to the interior of the town, knowledge of structures is very incomplete. Most of those known belonged to the third and fourth centuries (Charlesworth, 1970, 13). The only major public building known is represented by the stone walls of a range of rooms found in 1770 north of the present-day church. This range extends at least 67m (220ft). It probably represents the north side of the forum (Smith, 1852, 47, Pl.13, site K; Charlesworth, 1970, 6).

On the west side of the town, south of the site of the west gate, are the remains of a bath-house

(Smith, 1852, 42, Pl.3, site G). This has yielded the remains of two mosaic pavements and remnants of wall paintings (Smith, 1852, Pl.18, figs. 1 and 2 and Pl.4). Although not of the size appropriate to a public baths, this building is larger than normal for a private house and Wachter has suggested that it belonged to a 'mansio' (Wachter, 1974, 401).

In other parts of this south-west portion of the town other remains have been found, representing what had been substantial houses. One, excavated in 1849, is in the form of a long rectangular structure subdivided into rooms and with a corridor along one side. Two of the rooms are apsidal (Smith, 1852, Pl.3, site H; 17, Pl.5). Smith regarded this building as a barrack block because of its proximity to the town wall but it is best interpreted as a private dwelling. Its walls were decorated with paintings imitating marble (Smith, 1852, 17-18, Pl.6). As Wachter remarks (1974, 402) the plan indicates more than one structural phase. At some stage after its initial construction, the corridor has been subdivided into rooms and an apsidal room added to the south end of the complex. It seems significant that this corridor house, unlike the bath-house mentioned above and several other buildings, is not aligned with the defences, implying perhaps an origin preceding them.

Some 42.7m (320ft) to the east of the corridor house are the remains of another house. The north-west corner of

this house has been uncovered to reveal rooms containing two tessellated pavements and a hypocaust system (Smith, 1852, 36-41, Pl.3, site I). One of the mosaics, damaged by 'tessera collectors' after its discovery in 1832, depicted a lion (?) under a tree (Smith, 1852, 37-39, Pl.16). The other pavement was composed of geometrical designs with a double star in the centre (Smith, 1852, 39-40, Pl.17). These remains are evidently part of a well-appointed courtyard house. Some 12.2m (40ft) to the south of these remains are the foundations of a long apsidal room, subdivided into three chambers, each containing remnants of tessellated paving (Smith, 1852, 41-42, Pl.3, site J; and Pl.18). That from the apse depicted the nine muses according to the inscription 'Helicon' in Greek and the surviving fragments of figures. This apsidal room had evidently been a spacious dining room belonging either to the courtyard house mentioned above, or else part of another house near it. A human skeleton, incomplete but including the skull, was found within a cist set at the west corner of the room next to the commencement of the apse (Smith, 1852, 41). The relationship with the structure is not recorded but re-excavation in 1974 shows that it was a later insertion (Charlesworth, 1975, 237), probably after the ruin of the building and presumably of post-Roman date since according to Roman law internal burial was illegal.

North of the courtyard house already described other building foundations including a hypocaust found in 1851 indicate the presence of other structures, no doubt private houses, within this south-east sector (Smith, 1852, Pl.3). These structures, together with the courtyard house and dining room are all aligned with the town defences in contrast to the corridor house described earlier.

Other pavements and foundations provide evidence of more structures within the area enclosed by Aldborough's walls. Near the town centre a pavement whose design is unrecorded is known to exist under the vicarage (Smith, 1852, 43). North of the village street a long corridor is recorded as well as a mosaic (Smith, 1852, 43). Early interested visitors to the site also reported tessellated pavements which have since disappeared (Smith, 1852, 43). Near the west gate were several mosaics as well as part of a corridor and column bases (Smith, 1852, Pl.3). From the vicinity of the east gate has come a mosaic panel showing the Roman mythological scene of the wolf nurturing Romulus and Remus (Smith, 1852, supplementary plate; Toynbee, 1963, Pl.220, cat.184). This last figured pavement, in the opinion of Toynbee, is similar in style to that depicting a lion (?) from the courtyard house found in the south-west quarter of the town and already described. She has in fact suggested that both were the work of a local workshop and perhaps of a single craftsman

(Toynbee, 1964, 284). The standard of artistry of these pavements is not of a high order.

In the centre of the town an elevated area known as Borough Hill was investigated in the eighteenth century and a considerable amount of evidence of occupation was recovered. This was recorded by Drake, the historian of York (Drake, 1736, 24-25 and Appendix; Smith, 1852, 42-43, Pls.19 and 20). The foundations of a considerable building were found as well as some mosaic pavements, two pillar bases, box flue-tiles and metal objects. In addition, there were animal bones and horns, mainly those of stags. Amongst the bronze objects which have survived is a small lamp or oil-flask representing a sleeping slave boy. Toynbee has assessed this as a continental import made in the second century AD (Toynbee, 1963, Pl.63, cat.55; 1964, 120). Drake supposed that these remains on Borough Hill provided evidence for a temple but Charlesworth felt that the presence of flue-tiles, indicative of a hypocaust, militated against this idea. She suggested instead the former presence of a private house or a bath-house. However, the temple hypothesis has much to recommend it bearing in mind especially the elevated and central nature of the site as well as the recovery of stags antlers which could be seen as connected with the worship of a deity concerned with hunting, most appropriate in the civitas capital of the Brigantes (see Chapter 10). The presence of flue tiles need not prove an

insuperable objection. The early excavations have left no full and detailed account of the standard we would expect today. It seems possible that more than one building was involved. The fact is, however, that not enough is known about the Borough Hill site and more evidence would be needed than is at present available to arrive at a firmer conclusion.

Turning now to consider the origins of Aldborough, there is no certain evidence of late pre-Roman occupation. No structural remains have been found which might give support to the idea of a native settlement there. It seems likely that a fortified site of any pretensions would have left some signs of its former presence. At the same time, if lesser structures are in question, for example a religious shrine, there is every chance that such evidence has not been recognised in those excavations which have been carried out in the interior. The limited extent of such excavations, their early date and the difficulty at the best of times of recognising non-Roman remains within a Romanised setting would militate against their identification. Celtic metalwork, however, notably a terret depicting a horned god (Smith, 1852, Pl.25a, no.10; MacGregor, 1976, nos.30, 39, 61 and 311) could well belong to a pre-Roman phase. Beehive querns too would easily find a place in such a context. Equally, however, they could belong to the earliest Roman phase for which there is some evidence.

The earliest Roman structural remains which have been found belong to Flavian buildings recognised outside the north-west corner of the defences and near the north gate (Charlesworth, 1971, 155; Myres et al, 1959, 9). On the interior, post holes of a timber structure of pre-Antonine date have been found just south of the presumed east gate (Charlesworth, 1962, 166). In addition first-century pottery has been found near the town centre (Myres et al, 1959, 18). The coins assignable to the first Flavian emperor Vespasian (AD 69-79) may also suggest occupation at or shortly after the campaigns of Cerialis (Charlesworth, 1970, 12). First century occupation is clear enough even from the scanty evidence available. There is little indication, however, to show the nature of this settlement; painted plaster from the building outside the north gate suggests civilian occupation (Myres et al, 1959, 9). It has been argued that considerations of spacing and the location of the river crossing require the presence of a Roman fort at Aldborough (Myres et al, 1959, 9; Hartley, 1971, 57; Wachter, 1974, 399), yet there is no evidence of military structures from the site of the later town. In addition, there is little artefactual evidence: a stamped tile of legio IX Hispana (Smith, 1852, Pl.28, no.10), a leaf-shaped spear-head (Smith, 1852, Pl.26, no.4), an iron entrenching tool (Smith, 1852, Pl.27) and a military badge. As Charlesworth points out these are not adequate evidence to attest permanent military occupation (Charlesworth, 1970,

12; 1971, 156). It may well be that an actual fort site remains to be discovered not far away, however, either north of the town proper, at the river crossing, or else further to the south on higher ground, a less likely proposition. If that is so, the town of Aldborough may have started life as a vicus dependent upon the Roman fort. Some support for the theory of a fort to the north is provided by the discovery of settlement remains beyond the town walls to the north-east (Jones and Jones, 1965, 204).

In considering economic aspects of the town's existence, there is little direct evidence of commerce or industry. The occurrence of first century AD bronze objects (Smith, 1852, 49-50, Pls.25 and 25a) showing Celtic influence (MacGregor, 1976) possibly indicates the presence of craftsmen in bronze at an early stage in the settlement's history. Similarly, personal ornaments of later date (Smith, 1852, Pl.25, 6 and 9), such as trumpet and head-stud brooches which illustrate the fusion of Celtic and Roman styles (Collingwood and Richmond, 1969, 296-297) may indicate the continuation of a local bronze-working tradition. Actual manufacturing evidence, however, is lacking and small objects such as brooches and trinkets could have been brought in from elsewhere. Both types of brooch referred to were common in the region during the second century AD (Collingwood and Richmond, 1969, 296-297; MacGregor, 1976, 123-124). They have been found in

quantity at Brough and Kirkby Thore and in addition lumps of fused ore have been recovered from the latter site. For these reasons it has been supposed that these places were manufacturing locations (RCHM., Westmorland, 1936, xxxviii-xli). More evidence would be needed from Aldborough to designate the town as a manufacturing centre of the bronze items found there and not just the recipient of such objects.

The case with iron objects is rather different. Large numbers of these have been found at Aldborough (Smith, 1852, 50, Pls.26 and 27; Jones, 1971, 74) and being heavier to transport and more utilitarian they are much more likely to have been manufactured locally. Amongst the tools illustrated by Smith, those of a farrier have been recognised by Wachter (1974, 403). Shears may well have been part of this equipment but equally they may have been used in weaving. As for the presence of animals, the discovery on Borough Hill of quantities of animal bones and horns, mostly those of stags, has been referred to above. Whether these included sheep and cattle is not specified in the record made by Drake (1736, 24-25; Smith, 1852, 42). It is possible that these remains are indicative of activity involving the marketing and slaughter of animals with subsequent utilisation of the meat, hides and other products. As Smith suggests animals of the chase would have been available for exploitation in the woodland region close by later known as the Forest of

Galtres (Smith, 1852, 48). Such sport would no doubt have attracted tribal aristocrats residing at Aldborough. As for domestic animals it may be that they were reared in the district around Aldborough which, within a radius of six miles, is devoid of contemporary settlement, whether native or villa site (Chapter 4 and fig.1.4), implying perhaps that the farmers lived in Aldborough itself. It seems very likely, however, that even if the environs of Aldborough provided the fattening pastures for such animals that they were reared elsewhere and brought in on the hoof from more distant locations. Direct evidence is lacking. A supposed butcher's shop was found during excavations behind the Ship Inn in 1966 (Stephens, 1967, 179). As Wachter has pointed out, the bones found need be no more than normal domestic rubbish (Wachter, 1974, 403). Even so, the remains are enough to show that livestock were part of the diet. Quernstones, both native beehive types and flat Roman examples (Smith, 1852, Pl.5) point to the grinding of corn on a domestic scale, whether imported from elsewhere or not. Amphorae (Smith, 1852, Pl.35) indicate the import of wine and perhaps oil. Objects of bone and horn (Smith, 1852, 48, Pl.23) - needles, pins, combs, spoons - quite probably were made locally but they too could have come in from other sites. The presence of a horn shuttle (Smith, 1852, Pl.23, no.9), whether local or not, indicates the occurrence of weaving although probably only on a domestic scale. Jet objects (Smith, 1852, 48, Pl.24, nos.1-4) probably came from the workshops

at York which derived their raw material from the Whitby district of north-east Yorkshire (RCHM, York, 141-144).

As for pottery, M.U. Jones reported the finding of large quantities of pottery in trenches for sewerage extensions outside the town on its east side. Much of the pottery was unused and there were many examples of few types. Pieces of fired clay and distorted sherds were also found. Although the actual kilns were not recovered, not surprising in the circumstances, these finds led to the suggestion that this area had been the location for pottery manufacture (Jones, 1971, 53-54). Within this same area, indeed called by Smith variously 'Red Hills' and 'Red Graves', Wachter suspected that Smith unwittingly described a pottery kiln (Smith, 1852, 25-26; Wachter, 1974, 403). Even if, however, pottery was made at Roman Aldborough it is clear that the bulk of the pottery found there came from elsewhere, the coarse wares mostly from the east Yorkshire kilns and the fine wares from Gaul and the Rhineland (Wachter, 1974, 403; Charlesworth, 1970, 18-19). Like the fine wares, glassware (Smith, 1852, Pls. 25 and 35) came from more distant parts, either from the Rhineland (cf. RCHM, York, 136-141 for parallels) or even from Egypt (Myres et al, 1959, 77).

A probable local craft was that of the mosaicist as suggested by Toynbee (1964, 283-285) and no doubt local workers quarried the stone and prepared the timbers

required to build and repair public buildings and private houses.

All of this activity shows a flourishing town with trading links both within the region and also much further afield. The position of Aldborough with easy communication both by water and by road with York will help to account for the fact that the Brigantian capital was clearly part of the wider economic and cultural Roman world. Even though the indications are not those of a major economic centre it was a town that contained large, well-appointed houses, with bath-suites, hypocausts and mosaics. Certainly by later Roman times, those who dwelt in these houses were sufficiently prosperous and Romanised to commission mosaics whose subject matter reflected not only the style of Graeco-Roman civilisation but also its traditions. It seems reasonable to suppose that in the administrative capital these big houses were not the dwellings of nouveau riche merchants but of tribal notables. Assuming that they had tribal estates, such wealth as they had which was reflected in their lifestyle, may be presumed to have come from those estates. On present evidence how they organised their time and their estates can only be guessed at. Part of their time may have been spent at the tribal capital and part on these estates. Among the few villas known in Brigantian territory most could perhaps qualify as the country dwellings of native landowners. What extent of territorial control the tribal aristocracy might

have exercised in Roman times is not adequately known. Perhaps part of their wealth came from less Romanised communities further afield. Like the great monasteries of medieval times, such people may have controlled the flocks and herds, fields and forests, not to mention the manpower, to be found in the Pennine dales.

With regard to religious life, no certain evidence of temples has been found although, as has been seen, there is the possibility of one situated on Borough Hill. Of several altars found only one bears an inscription. This is the upper portion of a limestone altar inscribed 'I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo) et /Matrib(us)/V ... ', 'to Jupiter Optimus Maximus and to the Mother Goddesses.' (RIB. 708; Smith, 1852, 45, Pl.21, no.3). It is surprising to find a dedication to the chief god of the Roman State Religion in a civitas capital. Significantly, perhaps, he is coupled with the Matres, imported Celtic deities, reflecting in religious terms the blending of Roman and Celtic traditions. With regard to the indigenous tradition no dedication to the goddess Brigantia has as yet come to light. However, the native element can be observed in the guise of the classical Mercury. Two sculptured reliefs of Mercury have been recovered, one found in the vicinity of the east gateway, the other kept in the parish church (Smith, 1852, 28, Pl.11). Both are much worn, but the first is identifiable by the presence of the cockerel standing by his right

foot, the other by the remains of his caduceus. The second figure was mistaken by some antiquaries for Pan or Silvanus (Gough, 1789, III, 59; Smith, 1852, 27) and the reason is clear to understand. Instead of the 'petasus' the second figure has twin horns. He is therefore a conflation of the classical Mercury and a native horned god. That a shrine dedicated to this native Mercury existed at Aldborough must be regarded as highly probable. The site on Borough Hill with its finds of stags horns must be a prime candidate for such a shrine. Other evidence hinting at the worship of a horned god takes on fresh significance when considered in the light of this horned Mercury. Many of the bronze objects found in the town would be suitable as votive items and amongst them is a representation of a stag's head (Smith, 1852, Pl.25, no.3), most appropriate as an offering to a horned deity. Indeed, in respect of this piece, Toynbee has suggested that it would have been the kind of image dedicated by a hunter to a Hunter God (Toynbee, 1964, 124). One may suggest in addition that among the other bronzes found at Aldborough, that depicting the fore parts of a boar may well fall into the same category (Smith, 1852, Pl.25, no.16). Not to be forgotten too in such a context is the bronze horned terret referred to above and belonging to an early period in the town's existence. Proof of course is lacking but this early piece raises the possibility already noted above of the presence of a shrine prior to the existence of the town itself. Such a shrine could

provide another reason for the establishment at Aldborough of the civitas capital.

Burial practice is another aspect of spiritual activity. Unfortunately, the evidence surviving from Aldborough is not sufficiently detailed to permit adequate analysis and only a few general observations may be made.

Burial outside the town walls following Roman practice is well attested. Smith refers to a burial place where cinerary urns were found outside the west entrance (1852, 19), cremation sites outside the south-western corner (1852, 19, Pl.7), both cinerary urns and skeletons beyond the south gate (1852, 21) and cremations outside the south-eastern side (1852, 25, Pl.10). Deviations from normal Roman practices are noted, namely, skeletons found close to the south wall (Smith, 1852, 21) and the skull with incomplete skeleton inserted in the Helicon pavement inside the town, referred to earlier. These are very much in the minority, and the latter is in the native tradition, that is, crouched, head orientated to the north and placed within a cist (cf. Ramm, 1958, 407; Faull, 1977, 5). Also probably in the native tradition were burial mounds from the south-east side of the town; only two survived but others had probably been ploughed away. Burial chambers found under these two mounds were designed to take inhumations, one made of clay and the other of stone slabs. Both were capped with slabs. Both contained ashes mixed with bones and one contained broken pottery.

If this material is not indicative of re-use as a pottery kiln, as Wachter suspected, but is in fact evidence of cremation burials, it is possible that the rite of cremation introduced by the Romans into Britain was being used in a situation originally intended for inhumation. In other words, the Roman custom was prevailing. However, the possibility of interference and secondary use of these chambers, makes for uncertainty. There is no uncertainty about the two Roman-style tombstones from the town (RIB, 709, 710), even though one is fragmentary. The presence of coins too associated with burials is in accord with Roman custom. A coin of Trajan occurred near a cinerary urn found outside the south-west corner of the town and may well have come from the funerary deposit (Smith, 1852, 19). Coins were recovered along with burials outside the south gate (Smith, 1852, 21). Thus on the incomplete evidence available, it would appear that two traditions, native and Roman are present at Aldborough but that the Roman one was by far the most dominant.

With regard to the later history of the town, judging by the evidence of mosaic pavements the town was flourishing during the first half of the fourth century. After the addition of bastions about the middle of the century, as already noted, there came a time when the town wall needed repair, or at least a portion of its east side near the south-east corner (Myres et al, 1959, 47-49; Charlesworth, 1971, 162). The fact that material from the

nearby angle bastion was used in this repair implies that the bastion was no longer operational. Faull (1974, 122) sees the use of material from the bastion for wall repair as evidence of deteriorating standards and likewise the presence of burials close by the walls (Smith, 1852, 22). Nevertheless, repair of the town walls shows a determination to maintain the town's security. Late coinage, including coins of Theodosius (AD 379-395), Arcadius (AD 395-408) and one coin of Honorius (AD 395-402) shows occupation and peaceful trading until the end of the century and beyond (Charlesworth, 1971, 163). Several Anglian objects kept in the Aldborough Museum, including a small bronze thread box, a pair of bronze girdle hangers, two brooches and fragments of three bone combs, probably came from an unlocated cemetery nearby (Faull, 1974, 4; Charlesworth, 1971, 163). This in turn implies Anglian settlement in the vicinity. However, although Smith refers to dislodgement of a portion of the southern stretch of the town wall there is to date no evidence of general, violent destruction (Smith, 1852, 22). Burials within the town must have taken place after the town was deserted or at least when it ceased to function as a Romanised urban centre. Once the Roman system of control and administration ceased to operate, the 'raison d'etre' of Roman Aldborough disappeared and the town fell into decay.

Thus Stanwick and Aldborough were two centres exercising

power amongst the Brigantes, the first in pre-Roman times, the second under Roman rule. Although there is no direct proof it has been possible to argue that Stanwick has a powerful claim to be regarded as the main power centre of the pre-Roman Brigantes, with wide-ranging control. Its origins are able to be traced back to a period earlier than the mid-first century AD, perhaps for one hundred years or more. With the establishment of a Roman province in southern Britain following the Roman invasion of AD 43, Stanwick as the base of the pro-Roman faction among the Brigantes gained in importance. Basically a native settlement functioning as an economic, political and probably social centre Roman influence and support boosted it to what may be termed grandeur. As the headquarters of a 'friendly queen' (cf. Braund, 1984) it reached its apogee. Yet its indigenous character still remained. When the Brigantes fell under Roman rule, Stanwick did not survive to become the administrative capital of a civitas Brigantum. It has been suggested here that its demise was partly due to the absence of the queen and those of the aristocracy who had given support in her philo-Roman stance. No doubt for a time after their northern conquests the Romans exercised direct military rule. When the time came for setting up the civitas the new centre was established at Aldborough, perhaps at a vicus already existing outside a Roman fort guarding the Ure crossing on the road to the north from York. There is the possibility that the site possessed added significance for the

Brigantes as a religious focus. The new centre, however, was essentially Roman in its character with its regular lay-out, public buildings and Roman-style dwellings. The native element is detectable in the metalwork, religion and burial practice but there is a blending of Roman and native in these aspects. The overall impression is that the inhabitants of Aldborough, many of whom may be presumed to have been tribal notables, had been Romanised. The result may have been provincial; nonetheless, the balance had shifted, at least in material things, from native to Roman. The contrast with Stanwick is striking. The inhabitants of Stanwick were native tribesmen, beguiled and elevated in importance by Roman influence. Those who dwelt in Aldborough followed a Roman style of life and to that extent at least Roman civilisation had taken root amongst the Brigantes.

