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Editor’s Foreword

In January, 1965, a three-day Conference on “The Pattern of Rural Settlement in Roman Britain”, organised by the Council for British Archaeology, was held at St. Hugh’s College, Oxford. The conference was well attended and, as had been hoped by the organisers, much new and useful material was presented, both by the speakers and in discussion. Arrangements had already been made, before the conference, to publish the papers in the form of a symposium volume, and the writer was invited to edit this.

The contributions which follow have been revised by their respective authors, not only to take into account points raised in discussion, but also to include (in both references and text) material published or discoveries made during 1965. The symposium is therefore a reflection of current thought on this general topic, not as at January of 1965, but as at January, 1966. The value of any such conference report obviously tends to decrease as the time-gap between the publication of the report and the original conference widens, and every effort has thus been made to present a volume which is as up-to-date as possible.

The individual papers have been slightly re-arranged. Those dealing with specific regions of Roman Britain are given in an order reading approximately from north-east to south-west, commencing with Northumbria and ending with Devon and Cornwall. The two major discursive essays, by Dr. Applebaum and Mr. C. E. Stevens, which conclude the volume have been printed just as they were given, no attempt having been made to “de-personalize” the distinctive style of either writer. Textual references (in the form of footnotes) and the general bibliography (p. 129) follow, as far as possible, the styles of abbreviation laid down in the Council for British Archaeology’s annual Archaeological Bibliography.

The editor would like to take this opportunity of thanking all the contributors for their willing co-operation and help, without which it would have been impossible to produce this book so comparatively quickly. Warm thanks must also be given to Miss Beatrice de Cardi and the staff of the C.B.A. for the usual faultless organisation of the Conference itself, not forgetting Dr. Graham Webster who, though largely responsible for the whole idea, was unfortunately unable to be present through absence in the United States; to Dr. Kathleen Kenyon, her colleagues and staff, who so kindly acted as hosts; and to Mr. M. W. Barley, Mr. H. C. Bowen, Lady Fox, Professor C. F. C. Hawkes, Mr. A. L. F. Rivet, the late Professor Sir Ian Richmond, and Dr. St. Joseph, who variously acted as chairman, introduced speakers, and led the discussions (Dr. St. Joseph also gave valuable accounts of a series of his recent aerial photographs). A further, but special, word of gratitude, on behalf of all the contributors, goes to the many friends—acknowledged further in the individual contributions below—who so readily made available their own results of recent discoveries and unpublished work in various areas of the British Isles, and who must be regarded (as Pope remarked of Dr. William Borlase) as “in the shade, but shining”.
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Homesteads and settlements of the frontier area

GEORGE JOBEY

The northern military zone, though primarily a highland area, is not uniformly so. Some spacious valleys and varying expanses of coastal plain lend themselves to intensive modern land usage, thereby presenting a bias in favour of the uplands in the survival pattern of early settlements. In addition, certain inequalities in the amount of field work carried out in the various localities have yet to be remedied. During the Roman period it comprised the territories of a number of tribes, well attested historically, if not always capable of being defined archaeologically within strict geographical limits. These were tribes, moreover, whose individual attitudes towards Rome and subsequent treatment by Imperial authority may well have varied, and whose status may have altered with the vicissitudes of the frontier. Circumstances then would seem to require an examination of what is known about the pattern of rural settlement by regions.

The first and most comprehensively surveyed area is that between the Tyne and the Forth, comprising the eastern parts of the intra-mural zone. Hereabouts, enclosed but non-defensive settlements of round, stone-built huts appear to be indicative of the pax Romana. In many instances such settlements can be placed in general context by their direct physical relationship with earlier, pre-Roman sites. Frequently they can be seen to overlie the abandoned multivallate defences representative of the final flourishing of the pre-Roman Iron Age forts of the Border country. In Northumberland alone there are some twenty clear examples of this phenomenon and a further dozen possibilities. On the other hand, there is only one known instance in the area, this at Alnham, Northumberland, where a settlement of this order partly overlies an earlier palisaded settlement of the type which is known to form the earliest phase on some hill-fort sites, and here the location is probably fortuitous. There are occasions admittedly, when stone-built huts and compound walls occupy the interiors of typical pre-Roman forts and it is difficult to demonstrate a late context for such buildings, short of excavation. Nevertheless, it is evident, both from observation and excavation, that the normal dwellings within the pre-Roman settlements of the area were of timber construction. Moreover, at such forts as Brough Law or Ring Chesters, Northumberland, where the sites of both timber-built and stone-built huts are visible, the latter are almost certainly secondary and at Brough Law doubtless provide the occasion for the discovery of a sherd of Romano-British pottery a century ago. The situation on the Romano-British settlement at Huckhoe, Northumberland, also demonstrates how the abandoned defences of a pre-Roman site could be only partly utilised in the general scheme of the later stone-built settlement, without any clear intention to fortify. When abandoned hill-forts and stone-built settlements of round huts occur in close proximity to each other, as at Jenny’s Lantern, Northumberland, it is reasonable to assume a similar

1 e.g. Steer, K. A. in Roman and Native in North Britain, ed. I. A. Richmond (1958), 98.
3 Unpublished, excavation report forthcoming. Now add Hillside Knowe, Peeblesshire; information, R.C.A.M.
sequence. Consequently, whilst the rehabilitation of hill-fort defences to the north of the Hadrianic frontier line on the east cannot be entirely discounted, at self evident times in the Roman period, the case for such is not strong.

Seldom does any other form of settlement, except in a demonstrably much more recent context, lie in direct physical contact with the early hill-forts of the area. However, two exceptions merit passing reference. In the first place there are the mere handful of brochs that penetrate into the area, at least as far south as Tweeddale on the east, but certainly no further. They are clearly secondary to the multivallate hill-fort where the two occur in physical contact, as at Torwoodlee, Selkirkshire, and both at Torwoodlee and Bow, Midlothian, there is evidence to suggest a short occupation in the second century A.D. 7 To the east, and well within the tribal area of the Votadini, the broch at Edinshall, Berwickshire, possesses unique interest in the present context, in that it appears to be interposed in sequence between a hill-fort and a stone-built settlement of Romano-British type 8. A brief occupation was envisaged at the Torwoodlee broch between the end of the first century A.D. and the Antonine advance of c.140 A.D. This was taken to be indicative of a southern penetration of the broch builders, during the period of Roman retrenchment, into the assumed territory of the Selgovae, who may be conjectured to have fallen previously under Imperial disfavour 9. A suggestion that these southern brochs may represent a deliberate introduction of mercenary bands by the Votadini in defence of key points, perhaps with the cognizance of the Roman Command at the time of this first withdrawal from Scotland, has less to commend it. And it is stretching the evidence beyond limits to see in this southern penetration reason for a tribal sub-division of the Votadini on the Tweed, already present by the second century 10.

More important in the present consideration than the limited number of alien brochs, is the context of the so-called scooped enclosures or settlements, for which a medieval date was proposed on the evidence of earlier excavations in Peebleshire. Such an attribution in all cases is at least open to question. These settlements have been defined as walled enclosures, the interiors of which are not level but contain a varying number of scooped floors, sometimes separated by unexcavated ridges 12. It is seldom that a scooped settlement has been recorded in direct relationship with a hill-fort. On the multivallate fort at Kirkton Hill, Roxburghshire, an overlying scooped enclosure, on the evidence then available, was assumed to be later than the settlement of round, stone-built huts also overlying the fort, but there would seem to be no over-riding reason to regard this as being so 13. More recently a similar situation has been found on the hill-fort at Chester Rig Glen, Peebleshire, where a scooped settlement is in fact partly overlain by a settlement of round stone-built huts 14. In Northumberland, scooped settlements such as that at Coldsmouth Hill show traces of round, timber-built huts, whilst others contain intrusive round, stone-built huts, giving a final appearance not very dissimilar from that of the stone-built settlements 15. Moreover, recent excavations on a scooped settlement at Mossfennan, Peebleshire, have yielded a rotary quern of a type assigned to the first or second century A.D. and at least one
There would seem to be a strong case for regarding the scooped settlement as a forerunner or, perhaps in some areas, even a contemporary of the settlements of stone-built huts, though this is not to deny later re-occupation of upland sites of this order in places where suitable locations are sometimes at a premium. It is a question of some importance in the present consideration, since the distribution of scooped settlements is not only coincident in Tweeddale and Northumberland with that of stone-built settlements, but it is also probable that similar enclosures may appear in numbers in east Dumfriesshire, to which we shall turn later.

In the meantime, however, it is in the distribution and nature of the enclosed settlement of round, stone-built huts, whether overlying hill-forts or not, that the main pattern of Romano-British rural settlement in the Tyne-Forth province must be seen. Datable evidence from excavations, though never prolific, ranges from the second to the fourth century A.D. The initial material from some sites lies early in the second century, perhaps following quickly on the abandonment of the hill-forts, whereas other settlements in their present form may not have been established until the third century A.D. The presence of fourth century material from Huckhoe, Northumberland, and relics from Crock Cleuch, Roxburghshire, may be taken to suggest that some form of occupation could have continued into the post-Roman period in some cases. Although analysis of the material from the large centre at Traprain Law, East Lothian, shows not only strong relationships with Roman Britain from the beginning of the second century, but also reflects a possible break in such contacts at the time of the frontier disasters at the end of the second century, it is not possible at present to infer similar fortunes related to frontier history on the mass of the smaller rural settlements.

In location these settlements may attain altitudes of over one thousand feet, but they are seldom situated in positions of natural defence and, where they overlie hill-forts, are often tucked into the sheltered lee slopes. Moreover, they are also to be found on the gravel haughs bordering the upper reaches of the rivers or on the littoral headlands. The isolated enclosed homestead, consisting of no more than one or two huts, is not frequent, though as units such homesteads may form parts of larger groups. The larger settlement arises by physical additions to an original nucleus, often of homestead size, or by a looser collection of small units not in physical contact with one another. If these larger settlements in fact represent expansion over a period of time, as some almost certainly do, then it is possible that in the small size of the basic unit one may be witnessing a temporary and slight fragmentation of the social group inhabiting the earlier Iron Age hill-forts and defended settlements of the area, once the compelling conditions of the times had changed. Even so, it is as well to remember that, excluding the few so-called oppida of the area, the large number of small hill-forts in themselves probably illustrate a marked lack of social centralization in the pre-Roman period. In Northumberland alone, over eighty per cent of these forts possess an internal area of no more than one acre. In final form, and the evidence does not allow us to say when this may have been attained, the largest stone-built settlement of Romano-British type known in the area is that at Greaves Ash, Northumberland, in the Cheviot foothills, where there are forty extant stone-built huts in all. Although many settle-
ments have never consisted of more than half a dozen huts, there are areas in the Cheviot Hills where considerable numbers may be found in a short compass. At Brands Hill, Northumberland, there are some dozen settlements scattered along one mile of hill slope and, in a two mile stretch of the Breamish Valley, there is a total of some one hundred and fifty huts within the numerous enclosures. It is impossible on present evidence to estimate a rate of growth for individual settlements which no doubt varied considerably. But if the original Antonine date be allowed for the small settlement at Milking Gap24, situated within the Hadrianic frontier zone between Wall and Vallum, then it is possible to envisage, within the course of a generation, a homestead of one original hut expanding to five huts, assuming all to have been in final use.

The basic form of the settlements in the Cheviot foothills and to the north consists of a stone walled enclosure of oval or circular form. This contains a varying number of huts fronting on to a yard which may be so scooped below the level of the dwelling area that steps become necessary between the two (fig. 2). Occasionally the yard or forecourt walls spring from the huts themselves which are therefore not completely enclosed; but both types may occur within the larger settlements and the distinction does not appear to be significant. The yards are sometimes roughly paved and in their hollowed nature resemble more recent stockyards that have seen long use. In general though not specific form, these settlements resemble many of the enclosed upland sites of the Pennines and North Wales25.

The round, stone-built huts average some twenty feet in diameter and give little indication of social distinctions, although at times they may be grouped in pairs of one large and one small hut. Empty hut-platforms in some settlements, where differential stone-robbing does not appear to offer an explanation, may indicate a transition from timber to stone buildings. Internal arrangements as seen in excavation were sometimes basic and minimal and are not always culturally significant26. They consisted of a slightly raised threshold sometimes accompanied by a pivot stone at the doorway, an edged hearth, and the raised segment of a bench or the arc of a simple wooden screen. A small stone-lined basin and occasionally the bottom stone of a rotary quern were sunk into the partly paved floor. Better constructed examples, as at Edgerston Roxburghshire, or Milking Gap28, Northumberland, had a ring of internal timber uprights against the inner face of the hut wall to support the roofing spars. At Huckhoe29, Northumberland, the roofing spars most probably had been nailed. Here too, within individual huts of some twenty five feet in diameter, were a number of internal wattle partitions and, in one instance, the half circle of a screen placed against the inside face of the hut wall. The arrangements at the doorways also suggested substantial, if not double leaved, doors. In surroundings of such comparative comfort it is perhaps easier to envisage the use of some of the door-fittings and hearth furniture of the nearby metal-work hoards of southern Scotland30 and to see the glint of the occasional harness ring or the dull glow of the rarely acquired Samian bowl, cracked and riveted though it may be.

Expansion apart, these smaller settlements appear to have ended their life in much the same architectural form as they began, and a transition from circular to rectangular stone buildings cannot be observed with certainty hereabouts, whatever may prove to

25 But this in itself is not firm evidence to support the suggestion of a transference of population from between the two Walls to North Wales as early as the Antonine period (Antiquity, XVIII (1944), 138 ff. and XIX (1945), 80 ff).
26 From a comparison with some two hundred examples of varying context and widely scattered throughout the British Isles.
be the case on larger native centres 31. Where rectangular stone buildings do occur on the same sites, they appear to represent new foundations, many of them clearly of much later date 32. In some areas of the Cheviots, approaching the one thousand foot contour, where even the timber-built settlements of an earlier period can be seen, these stone-built settlements appear to represent the last form of permanent occupation for some considerable time.

Although there is a scattering of enclosed settlements of rectangular form north of the Roman road drawn across between the forts at High Rochester on Dere Street and Low Learchild by the Devil’s Causeway, rectilinear settlements are clearly the rule to the south of this, between the stark cuesta of the Simonside Hills and the Hadrianic frontier line 33. Here they stretch from the low, riverine spurs on the right bank of the North Tyne in the west, to the coastal plain near Stannington and Tynemouth in the east (fig. 1).

The rectilinear enclosure walls, which contain an area of one third to half an acre, are generally stone-built, sometimes with an outer ditch of no great proportions (fig. 2). The latter is an addition which may be adequately accounted for by the clear correlation that exists between the ditched enclosures and areas of boulder clay or poorer drainage, since, once again, natural defence does not appear to be a primary consideration in location. Homesteads of a single hut are infrequent. Almost invariably the uniform internal arrangements consist of four or five round, stone-built huts fronting on to two cobbled yards, separated by a paved causeway leading up to the dwelling area. It may happen that examples on the coastal plain, as at Marden, near to the mouth of the Tyne, possess minor and accountable differences, one of which may be timber-built rather than stone-built huts 34. In addition, there are a number of strictly rectangular enclosures and homesteads of uncertain context, coming to light as crop-marks on air photographs especially in the valleys of Wansbeck and Blyth in southeast Northumberland 35. Some of these consist of two fairly widely spaced perimeters, as on the site at Burradon (fig. 2). Such settlements, no doubt, are to be included in the rash of “camps” noted by Hodgson in the early nineteenth century. His supposition that the Romans might have developed the plain “for agricultural purposes” could eventually prove to be the case 36.

In the zone some fifteen to twenty miles deep beyond the Hadrianic frontier line, there are now forty known settlements of this order with at least as many possibilities. Datable evidence is slender, but apart from one or two pieces that may be of first century origin the majority are of second century date and mainly Antonine. A stimulus for the foundation of such settlements could be sought therefore in the Antonine advance of c.140 A.D. and the establishment of the frontier in Scotland. There is seldom any sign of expansion beyond the original perimeters on individual rectilinear settlements, and certainly not the extent of organic growth that may be witnessed on some of the settlements to the north. On the other hand, the incidence of the establishment of new settlements is not known. Where a fairly complete picture of original distribution is assured, as in the area of Birtley on the North Tyne, the settlements are located at fairly regularly spaced intervals of a quarter of a mile or so from each other. The whole scene is at times more formal and uniform than with the sites of north 37.

---

31 e.g. two sub-rectangular buildings have been excavated on Yeavering Bell, Northumberland (information, Dr. B. Hope-Taylor) and there are the rectangular shaped platforms on the west end of Traprain Law (e.g. Feachem, R. W., The Fortifications on Traprain Law, P.S.A.S. LXXXIX (1955-6), 284 ff.
33 Jobey, G., ‘Rectilinear Settlements of the Roman Period in Northumberland’.
34 Jobey, G., ‘Excavation of a Native Settlement at Marden, Tynemouth’.
35 Air-photographs taken by Dr. N. McCord, University of Newcastle upon Tyne. Report forthcoming.
Northumberland and south-east Scotland, and perhaps more so than might be accounted for simply by the example of Roman military regularity close at hand. This fact, coupled with their fairly compact distribution in an area where there is a reduction in the number of known pre-Roman forts and settlements, as compared with territories
to the north, tempts the thought of settlement by Imperial precept on land that was capable of further development. If this were so, the cultural assemblage such as it exists at the moment, the native hand-built pottery, and the general similarity in the internal arrangements of the settlements with those to the north, would hardly allow us to look too far afield for a source of transference of population. But there may be no need to do so, since the hills to the north have in fact their ample quota of pre-Roman forts and settlements. However, it is as well to remember in such contemplations, that the sample of datable material from these sites is small, and the manner of its acquisition uncertain. The present absence of third century material from the rectilinear settlements is hardly sufficient evidence, in the circumstances, to indicate any disruption in occupation during the frontier disaster of the late second century, or a subsequent drift to the later civil settlements of the frontier forts; and settlements elsewhere go on.

No doubt the hardy, upland people of these settlements did not escape the keen eyes of the military recruiting officers. A further problem concerning Roman military logistics, the contribution that native agriculture in the area might have made to the commissariat, has received recent consideration elsewhere. The rotary quernstone in its various forms is ubiquitous and early agricultural equipment is attested. On the other hand, although occasionally one may catch a glimpse of possible areas of land holding, as at Birtley, Northumberland, developed field systems unequivocally associated with the rural settlements of the Tyne-Forth area have been difficult to find. To some extent this may be due to erasure by later ploughing and it would be unwise to regard the area as one given over solely to stock-raising and primitive hoe-cultivation. In addition to the associated cultivation system recorded at the settlement at Crock Cleuch, Roxburgh, and the thirty one acres of rectangular, walled enclosures, some with internal strips, attached to the settlement at Tamshiel Rig in the same county, one must now add the unpublished series of field boundaries and terraces at Glen Rath and Dreva Craig, Peebleshire. Whilst the precise function of such fields may not always be apparent and though they may not be as extensive as some in Yorkshire to the south, they compare favourably with those recorded in Cumberland and Westmorland. Moreover, there are examples less capable of resolution at the moment, as at Brands Hill and Lordenshaws, Northumberland, and continuous plough marks show beneath the Military Way in the east end of Newcastle. No doubt the multitude of small stock-yards also provided their quota of hides for military purposes, and already the potentials of the area for sheep-breeding may have been realized. Of other resources little can be said. The Corbridge iron bloom provides evidence for the contribution of native hearths, but excavations on native settlements close to one possible and immediate source of supply in Redesdale, Northumberland, has failed so far to produce the necessary confirmation. Evidence for the manufacture of the various articles of copper alloy of the period is, by and large, confined to such centres as Traiprain Law and the civil settlements in the hinterland of the frontier. The technical and economic sides of this activity hereabouts still remain somewhat obscure.

Footnotes:
38 For transference of population as an instrument of Imperial policy cf. e.g. Collingwood, Roman Britain (2nd ed. 1937), 146; Macdonald, Roman Wall in Scotland (1934), 48; Piggott, S., P.S.A.S., LXXXVII (1952-3), 19.
39 The argument for Rhaetian settlers (Antiquity, XVII (1943), 145) does not apply.
40 Richmond, I. A., Romans in Redesdale, History of Northumberland XV, 80.
41 Piggott, S., in Roman and Native in N. Britain, ed. I.A. Richmond (1958), 1-27.
42 e.g. Piggott, S., P.S.A.S., LXXXVII (1952-3), 19.
45 I am indebted to officers of the R.C.A.M. (Scotland) for this information in advance of publication.
46 Arch. Ael., XLIII (1965), forthcoming.
47 Piggott, S., in Roman and Native in N. Britain, 27.
49 Gillam, J. P., in Roman and Native in N. Britain, 86.
although, to the south, Alston lead may have been worked, small local veins do not account for the sporadic finds of the metal on these settlements. Likewise, whilst there is evidence from two native settlements in south Northumberland for the use of coal from local outcrops, it would have little part to play in the resources at this stage, despite its well attested presence on a number of military sites. The main economy of the small settlement remains that of the farmer and the herdsman.

The overall distribution of the stone-built settlements, when taken in conjunction with that of the pre-Roman forts and settlements of the Tyne-Forth area, presents a clear indication of those areas never attractive to settlement, such as the Tweedsmuir Hills and parts of Ettrick, the Cheviot massif itself, the acid soils behind the Fell Sandstone scarps in Northumberland and the later “wastes” of Camden beyond the North Tyne. Attention has been directed already to the possible development of the southern parts of Northumberland in the Roman period, but other localities maintain their early attraction throughout. Particularly is this so of the Cheviot foothills and the lands bordering the Tweed and its tributaries. Of more than usual interest, in view of the siting of the later local seats of the Anglo-Saxon kings, is the concentration found above the valleys of the Till and Bowmont and around Yeavering.

Neither the distribution nor the nature of the pre-Roman forts allow us to differentiate more distinctly than is historically attested between the tribal territories of the Votadini and Selgovae, though the subsequent history of Traprain Law on the one hand, and Eildon Hill North on the other, points to differences in tribal attitude and subsequent Imperial treatment. Romano-British settlements cluster thickly in what may be regarded as Votadinian territory, but recent work done by the Royal Commission on Ancient Monuments in Scotland now shows that they also extend well beyond this to the west of Dere Street, into territory that must be considered previously to have held the hill-forts of the Selgovae. There is a general extension of such settlements into upper Teviotdale and into Upper Tweeddale approaching the Biggar Gap, so leading towards Upper Clydesdale and the presumed territory of the Damnonii. The comparative date of such settlements is not known, so that to postulate a later penetration from the east into Tacitean “deserts” that may or may not have been created in the territory of the recalcitrant Selgovae, would be no more than conjectural.

When we turn to south-west Scotland however, there is a virtual absence of settlements of round, stone-built huts. Yet this is an area well provided both with native forts of various orders and Roman military stations. The question then arises as to where the initial field evidence for the pattern of rural population in the Roman period may lie. Admittedly there are the homestead enclosures with single huts recorded at Mull Glen Wigtownshire, and Arkland, Kirkcudbrightshire, which bear some resemblance to the eastern settlements, but such records are few and far between and their context unknown. More frequently recorded in the early Inventories of Dumfriesshire and Galloway are the free-standing, stone “hut-circles”, but many of these, and particularly those occurring by or within cairnfields, must be suspect as dwellings. Some are doubtless robbed-out cairns or have served as sepulchral enclosures in their own right, comparable with the known enclosed cemeteries of early date both here and in neighbouring counties to the east.

52 e.g. Steer, K. A., Arch. Ael., XLII (1964).
53 Ibid.
55 R.C.A.M., Galloway(I), no. 147.
On the assumption that the distinctive stone-built huts may not have developed within enclosure walls in the south-west, but that huts of timber construction remained in vogue, then a re-examination of the many small “enclosures” and so-called “birrens” of east Dumfriesshire may be called for. These are recorded in numbers mainly to the east of Nithsdale, in Annandale, Eskdale and Ewesdale, where a total of eight appear in the Inventory. Their location is not without interest, lying mainly to the north but within policing distance from the original outpost forts of the Hadrianic line at Birrens and Netherby (fig. 1). They are described as being enclosed by a single wall and at times a ditch, with an entrance giving into an excavated hollow or an interior sometimes at two levels. At least some of them would seem to resemble the scooped settlements, to which reference has already been made, or even approach in general form the Romano-British settlements of the eastern province. The fact that a few are recorded as having contained the foundations of small rectangular huts need not deter, since there are others, such as Brieryshaw Hill in Ewes, that may well have had circular floors.

Further to the west lie the southernmost of the south-western series of crannogs. Some are clearly post-Roman in date, both within and without the area in question, but evidence from others suggests more than one period of use, and there are a dozen or so for which occupation from the Early Iron Age into the Roman period can be ventured (fig. 1). Moreover, it is worth recalling that thirty odd crannogs have been recorded in Wigtownshire and a further fourteen in Kirkcudbrightshire and Dumfriesshire. Whereas the occupation of crannogs such as Milton Loch, Kirkcudbrightshire, may reflect the tribal bickerings and the insecurity of the troublesome times between the two Walls in the early Roman period, the finds from the sites in question, on face value, hardly take us further than the second century. Nor do these sites solve the problem of the form taken by contemporary settlements on the mainland. The rather limited southward extension of the so-called duns of various orders, at present provide an additional complication rather than an answer. As a class of monument they possess a generally wide distribution, their area of concentration being largely coincident with the territory normally assigned to the Damnonii and their neighbours to the north. Many were doubtless occupied before the arrival of the Romans in the last quarter of the first century A.D., but from the slight datable evidence others, as at Castlehill Wood, Stirlingshire, could have continued in use as fortified homesteads into the second century A.D. As such they merit passing reference in view of the group of simple duns in the south-west, particularly in the Chang area of Wigtownshire (fig. 1).

Once again the answer may be found to lie eventually in a re-examination of the indiscriminate list of “forts” and “enclosures” of the interior. An early occupation is not impossible at some time in the Roman period on a site such as Mote of Mark Kirkcudbrightshire, and the earlier phases on the suggested post-Roman Trusty’s Hill Kirkcudbright, are not without significance in this respect. A re-occupation of some nature on the large native centre at Burnswark, Dumfriesshire, is also not entirely ruled out. To the north, in Ayrshire, the recent discovery within the fortified enclosure...
at Bankhead, Darvell, of a second phase, timber-built house associated with occupation of second century date, is a further reminder that fortified sites should not be left out of consideration. That the main weight of Roman-military dispositions can at times be seen to lie firmly in the west may in fact not be unrelated to the type of native settlement that is to be looked for in the western hills.

Attention has been focused recently on the extent to which the establishment of the Hadrianic frontier may have led to the creation of a prosperous hinterland. The comparatively vigorous nature of the development on some of the civil settlements, that eventually grew up by the Roman forts, has been amply illustrated elsewhere. Our brief concern here must be with the rural homesteads and settlements of the northern septs of Brigantia, as they are known, in Cumberland, Westmorland and Durham.

The reduced number of early forts and known pre-Roman settlements in the area makes any comparison with the extent of Romano-British settlement difficult, if not impossible. The representative series of stone-built settlements in the uplands of Cumberland and Westmorland are seldom recorded in physical contact with earlier sites. Exceptions may be suspected in the case of the stone-founded huts within the defensive enclosure at Castle Hill, Dufton, or the “settlement” overlying the multivallate fort at Castlegate, Yanwath. Again in Westmorland, the recently excavated Romano-British settlement at Eller Beck, in the Lune Valley, is located opposite to what may have been its predecessor on Castle Hill. At Wolstey Hall, on the raised beach of the Solway, a small enclosure of Hadrianic date has been shown to overlie a palisaded and ditched homestead of the pre-Roman Iron Age, and is situated hard by a rectangular farm enclosure of later Roman context. However, such examples of possible continuity in occupation, or re-occupation of suitable locations, are at the moment rare.

In situation and form the stone-built settlements of Westmorland are, not unexpectedly, similar to those of the Yorkshire Pennines. Both the homestead consisting of no more than one or two round huts, as at Borrens or Town Bank, and the large settlement, as at Ewe Close or Wickerslack Moor, are present. And surely the irregularity in final form on some of the larger settlements is the result of expansion over a period of time, as already observed on some of the Cheviot settlements. The argument that the huts of the Westmorland settlements on occasions melt into the enclosure walls, in a manner distinctly different from the settlements of the Tyne-Forth area, is not altogether valid. On the other hand, the rectilinear form adopted by some of the enclosures, where not dictated by topography, lacks the uniformity of the rectilinear settlements in Northumberland. The twenty acres of field system possibly denoting mixed farming, recently recorded at Eller Beck, or others of long standing, as at Crosby, are similar to some of the Yorkshire systems, but no longer provide such a notable distinction when compared with the Tyne-Forth sites to which reference has been made. If there is one fundamental difference to be observed between these settlements and those of the Tyne-Forth area it may be in the greater frequency with which

64 Discovery and Excavation in Scotland: 1963, 22.
65 e.g. Birley, E., Research on Hadrian’s Wall (1961). 27ff.
70 Raistrick, A. Iron Age Settlement in W. Yorkshire, Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, XXXIV (1939), 115 ff (Some of the so-called Iron Age pottery is Romano-British and there is a representative series of Romano-British pottery with a good number of fourth century sherds present).
72 Lowndes, R. A. C., T.C. & W., LXIII (1963), 94. fig. 2. Miss Clare Fell informs me that there is evidence from a recent pollen analysis for increased grain growing in the area of the Heaves Fell settlement in late Roman times (R.C.H.M. Westmorland, 157 no. 17).
73 R.C.H.M. Westmorland, 74 no.
rectangular buildings appear on the Westmorland sites; but again, some of these are clearly later in date and more evidence would be required, than is available at the moment, to determine the extent to which such buildings have a Romano-British context. Whereas a case has been advanced for the settlement at Ewe Close to pre-date the Roman road, the small harvest of Roman finds from this and similar sites ranges from the second to the fourth centuries, and compares in its scarcity with the small yield from the Tyne-Forth settlements.

The only available distribution of possible Romano-British settlements on the Solway plain, in the Eden Valley, and in areas adjacent to the Wall, is compiled mainly from air-photographs and must be treated with reserve in view of the uncertain context of some of the sites (fig. 1). Moreover, the present concentration showing around the forts at Old Carlisle and Brampton Old Church, or the linear distribution along the coastal strip, may arise from selective flying. Even so, it is only to be expected that an extensive civil settlement such as that at Old Carlisle would have its quota of outlying farms. There is a variety in the shape of the enclosures of these lowland sites, ranging through circular, rectangular or even “banjo-like” at Risehow, but this in itself is no guide to different datable contexts at the moment. Similarly the differences in the structural form of the perimeters may be due in part to topographical situation, as experienced on the Northumberland plain. To attempt to fit individual sites securely into frontier history on the present evidence is to chase shadows. Although we may perceive a degree of Romanization in structural form in the suggested late Roman rectangular farm buildings at Old Brampton, Risehow near Maryport and the third site at Wolsty Hall, there is no real indication of a fully Romanized farm, even of the order of the villa at Old Durham to the east, unless by chance the earlier recorded finds from the Hawkhirst ridge, near Brampton Old Church, are indicative of the presence of something more substantial.

Across the Pennines to the east, in County Durham, the paradox of the presence of forts and their civil settlements, but few field remains of rural settlements, is at present most marked. Certainly a good proportion of the western third of the county lies mainly at altitudes of over one thousand feet, where habitation at any time is minimal, and the east has areas of extensive land usage. Loose finds of the Roman period extend up the valleys of the Tees, Wear and Derwent and presumably there is no overriding reason to regard the late Roman pottery from various places on the Durham coast as necessarily indicative of military installations of signal-station type, rather than of coastal settlements of the order of Tynemouth, Dunstanburg, Barnburgh, or Earn’s Heugh to the north. The recently discovered settlement at Catcote near West Hartlepool, with its range of pottery from the Early Iron Age to the late Roman period, can only point to the potentials of the area and the need for air-photography. This apart however, the only rural settlement of substance remains the villa and earlier

75 R.C.H.M. Westmorland, 83 no. 25 for earlier references.
76 e.g. Bampton Towtop, T.C. & W., III (1903), 265f.; Sealford, Kirkby Lonsdale (T.C. & W., XLV (1945), 192f.). The small Bronze Bull’s head escutcheon recorded as coming from this site (Ibid. J.V (1935), 79) is from Overburrow Roman fort (T.C. & W., LXV (1954). 101f.): Eller Beck (Ibid. LXV (1964) 6 ff).
78 Ibid. where the parallel ditches of the linear approach are related to a cattle drive.
81 Richmond, I. A., Roman and Native in N. Britain, 128.
83 Hope-Taylor, B., University of Durham Gazette, VIII, No. 2 (1960-61).
85 I am indebted to Mr. C. Long, B.A., University of Durham, for this information in advance of publication.
agricultural ditches at Old Durham, a comparatively late flourishing to compare with the Yorkshire villas to the south.

It may be, as has been tentatively suggested, that the apparent lack of substantial farms in the immediate hinterland meant that farmers chose to live in compact and growing communities in the environs of the forts, and to cultivate their fields at a distance. It is not beyond possibility, also, that for some hill-folk such communities may have held the attraction of streets metaphorically paved with gold. Even so, where a comparison can be made, for the countryman and particularly the hill-farmer, the immediate hinterland of the Hadrianic and later frontier line presents a picture little different from that prevailing in the philo-Roman and later federate kingdom of the Votadini to the north. Expansion occurs on some hill-settlements and new areas may be developed within the security of the Roman peace. But the strength of identity of interest with Roman authority would lie in personal economics as well as immediate security and, at the moment, any exploitation of the countryside’s resources is not reflected strongly in the personal possessions of these small farmers. One wonders at times, in such a liberally garrisoned area, how effectively an identity of interest may have been cultivated amongst the hill-folk. On the other hand, the paucity of Roman material acquired by the peasant farmer in the frontier area is a situation not without parallel in similar communities much further to the south, and the growing numbers of huts, rather than the presence of the Samian bowl or Romano-British coarse pottery, may prove a better criterion of prosperity. Certainly when the end came no rapid breakdown occurred; and there was vigour enough in Manau at least.

---
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Romano-British settlement on the Welland Gravels

W. G. SIMPSON

East of Stamford, Lincolnshire, the River Welland flows for six miles through a broad spread of Fen-edge gravel, extending from Peterborough to Bourne. It was laid down in post-glacial times in the deltas of rivers flowing into a gulf of the sea now occupied by the Fenland silt and peat. Aerial observation of the area since the last War has revealed ancient monuments of all periods showing as crop marks in the arable fields. The greatest concentration is beside the Welland in the parishes of Tallington, West Deeping, Barnack, Bainton, Helpston and Maxey, and beside the River Glen in the parishes of Barholm and Greatford.

The archaeological survey A Matter of Time includes a section illustrated by plans and photographs on the monuments of these areas and the site numbers given in that publication are used wherever possible here. Three types of monument—ditched drove-ways, rectilinear enclosures and boundary works of various kinds—are particularly common and a number have been shown by excavation to have been in use in the Roman period.

Four rectilinear, ditched enclosures containing farmsteads of late Iron Age and early Roman date have been excavated. Together they give a good picture of the economy.

At Tallington, in one corner of a large, rectangular enclosure measuring 480 by 320 feet (which is the largest single enclosure in the Welland Valley, see pl. I and fig. 1, 35) was an Iron Age hut 20 feet in diameter (fig. 2). Its walls were constructed of withies woven between upright stakes set in a shallow foundation trench and the whole framework was covered in daub to keep out the weather. The foundations of a similar hut, 43 feet in diameter, were found beside King Street. It was earlier than a late Roman enclosure and was probably of Iron Age or Early Roman date.

About a hundred yards South of Site 35 is a small farm, perhaps its successor, contained in an enclosure measuring 250 by 150 feet (fig. 1, 37). Three-quarters of the area were excavated and postholes of a square granary and of racks for drying straw, and two working hollows for threshing, milling or cooking, were identified (fig. 3). Fragments of fired clay found in the rubbish pits probably came from clay ovens for drying grain; and clay loomweights indicate that weaving was practised. No living hut was found, but there are faint indications on air photographs (pl. I) that this occupied the northwest quarter of the enclosure which was destroyed by a modern gravel quarry, and that it was similar to those already described. The farm cannot have been occupied for more than thirty years for ‘finds’ were not plentiful and none of the posts of the timber structures had been renewed. Potsherds found in the larger of the two working hollows were mostly of handmade, scratchmarked vessels of Trent Valley type, but included a few fragments from wheelmade Romano-British vessels. Samian sherds from

1 Peacock, D. S. P. ‘A Roman Site at Tallington, Lincolnshire’. Lincolnshire Architectural and Archaeological Society Papers, 9. Pt. iii (1962), Fig. 3.
2 Professor Frere found evidence at St. Albans that timbers set in gravel required renewing after 25 years on average. Frere, S. S., ‘Verulamium, Three Roman Cities’, Antiquity XXXVIII (1964), 107.
the upper fill of the ditches suggested that the farm was abandoned about 80/90 A.D. The first occupation of the farm was therefore c.50/60 A.D. It is very probable that Site 49 (see fig. 1) another single enclosure farmstead 150 yards East of Site 37, was constructed at about the same time for both are linked to the Roman ‘King Street’ by a common droveway.

3 All the Samian and Romano-British coarse pottery has been examined by Mr. B. R. Hartley F.S.A.
TALLINGTON
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Fig. 2
None of these three farms at Tallington seems to have been occupied for very long. In contrast Site 17 at Maxey was occupied in the Iron Age and throughout the Roman period. An Iron Age farm of about the same size as Tallington, Site 37 was succeeded by another Iron Age enclosure and two early Roman. Abundant pottery provides evidence of continued occupation thereafter, but the later farms do not seem to have been contained within enclosures.

It is clear from the excavation of these farms that the later Iron Age and early Roman economy was of a Little Woodbury type. The farms were occupied by a small social unit, probably a single family. All the Little Woodbury structures are represented at Tallington Sites 35 and 37 except grain storage pits. Their absence is probably to be explained by the high water table during winter months and the gravel allowing free circulation of water. Grain for consumption was probably stored in large jars. The analysis of the pollen content of soil from a late Iron Age or early Roman pit by Professor G. W. Dimbleby has demonstrated the importance of agriculture and the open appearance of the countryside. Tree and shrub pollens represented only 7% of the total count, grass pollens are nearly half (47%) and pollens of cereals and weeds of cultivation are relatively high (see fig. 4). The bones of domestic animals are plentiful in rubbish deposits and stock-breeding must have been economically important. Slag and refractory material from the ditches of an 80 foot square enclosure at Maxey (Site 60) are indications of bronze and iron working on a small scale and suggest that in this respect, as in others, the farming community was self-sufficient.

Ancient boundary works, the second type of monument to be considered, are easily picked out on air photographs, but it is difficult to make out clear and complete systems of ancient land division from them. This is presumably because former boundaries, such as ditches, which do show up as crop-marks, were once continued by hedges, banks or even fences, which do not. However, there are two instances where pit alignments, the most easily recognisable of all boundary works, do seem to define the boundaries of farm properties almost completely. Site 27, at Tallington, is probably an Iron Age farmstead and is bounded by pit alignments to North, East and West and by the River to the South (see fig. 5). It seems likely that the farmstead and the pit alignments are contemporary and the area farmed was about 55 acres. At Maxey, Site 17 is situated at the North-East corner of an area bounded by pit alignments to the East and South, by the River to the North and marshy ground (alluvium) to the West. The area thus defined is about 140 acres.

It has been shown by excavation in the Welland Valley that the pit alignment boundaries were introduced in the Iron Age. In other parts of the country, however, they seem to have been constructed early in the Roman period also. Pit alignments at Shenstone, Staffordshire and Langford, Oxfordshire, are probably of late first or early second century date. The pits themselves seem to have been merely quarries to provide material for a continuous bank defining the boundary and on completion of the work they were left to silt up naturally. In the absence of archaeological evidence one can only give a rational explanation for this laborious method of construction. It would have been so much easier to dig a ditch. The separate pits and differences in their size and shape in the same alignment suggest that the boundaries are the work of many.

---

4 R.C.H.M. A Matter of time (H.M.S.O., 1960), 37, fig. 6, and pl. IVa A search over the field immediately West of this site after ploughing in 1965 has shown that much of it was occupied in the fourth century. The area of the settlement at this time was therefore at least 15 acres, and so comparable in extent to that around Maxey Church (see below p. 21). It is perhaps significant therefore that recent field work has located the site of the medieval village of Lolham beside King Street, less than 300 yards West of the Settlement.

5 Op. cit. fig. 6. Whitehouse, D. B., ‘A Note on the Pit Alignments at Shenstone and Wall, Staffordshire’, Transactions of the Birmingham Archaeological Society. 79 (1964), 109 ff. Mr. David Whitehouse informs me that the sherd of wheelmade pottery was found near the bottom of one of the pits of the alignment.

6 Williams, A., ‘Excavations at Langford Downs, Oxo., near Lechlade, in 1943’, Oxoniensia. 11-12 (1946-7), 44 ff.
people. Perhaps each person had to construct a standard length, say five pits, the diameter of each being the width of outstretched arms. Each person could then construct his stretch of the boundary in his own time starting from the last pit dug and following the shallow ditch marking the line the boundary was to take.

Pit alignment 36 at Tallington has been shown to be slightly earlier than droveway 48 which was more or less contemporary with Site 37 (50/60—80/90 A.D.) discussed above (see fig. 1). The enclosure may be slightly later than the droveway for a number of pits 8-12 feet in diameter and earlier than the enclosure ditches, were possibly quarries dug to provide metal for the road surface (see fig. 3; the pits are cut by the West ditch). The road ditches were not actually dug across the pit alignment but were brought up to it on either side (pl. II). Presumably it was still recognised as a boundary and different gangs were responsible for the work on either side of it 8. The droveway ditches after being recut twice had become filled with silt and Flavian samian from the upper filling suggests that this process was complete by the end of the first century A.D. So the droveway and King Street, the road from the fort at Water Newton (Durobrivae) to the

---

8 A pre-Roman boundary adjoining Site 60 at Maxey has also been shown to have continued in use at least until the early second century.
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**Iron Age or Early Roman Pit**

pollen analysis by G.W. Dimbleby
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legionary fortress at Lincoln, which it joins, cannot have been constructed much later than the middle of that century. Another indication of the early date of King Street is a legionary tile stamped \textit{LEG IX HISP(ania)} found beside the road at Bainton (TF/111045). This is now in the Peterborough Museum. It probably antedates the departure of the Legion from Lincoln in the early seventies A.D. and is the only indication of the presence of military forces on the Welland gravels.

Immediately North of West Deeping village are many droveways (fig. 5), at least six of which join King Street and so must be contemporary with its use. One was associated with a late Roman rectangular enclosure \footnote{Peacock, \textit{Lincs. Arch. and Archaeol. Soc. Papers}, 9, pt. ii, (1962), 113.}. The writer and D. S. P. Peacock have observed rectangular quarry pits beside King Street and some of the droveways. They were about 16 feet long and were dug to provide road metal. Once abandoned they became ponds or were filled with rubbish \footnote{Op. cit. p.113.}.

All the droveways that have been securely dated, a few of which are described above, have been Roman and generally not later than the early second century A.D. It seems reasonable to assume, therefore, that wherever it appears from air photographs that a settlement site is associated with a ditched droveway, then both are of Roman, probably early Roman, date. Many of the settlements marked thus on Fig. 5 have been identified in this way, but it must be emphasised that in only a few instances have these suppositions been checked by the collection of surface pottery.

The map of the distribution of Iron Age and Roman settlements suggests that the pre-Roman settlement pattern was one of small scattered farms, while in the Roman period the farms tend to be more closely grouped, particularly on the northern edge of the clayey alluvium along King Street which is the focus of the settlement.

Other significant settlement patterns have been observed at Maxey. Site 44 is the largest area of Roman settlement on the gravels \footnote{R.C.H.M., \textit{A Matter of Time}, Fig. 6.}. It covers an area of nearly 20 acres around the Norman Church and air photographs show a bewildering tangle of boundary ditches, pits and enclosures of various sizes, which have been dated by surface pottery between the first and fourth centuries A.D. (pl. III). Three droveways radiate from this complex; one North-West towards Site 17 which was continually occupied from the Iron Age until the late 4th century, one northwards terminating on the edge of a modern gravel quarry and one eastwards to three farmsteads, one, probably all, occupied in the late first and early second centuries A.D. The size of this settlement and its relationship to the road system and to the outlying farmsteads, suggests that it may have been a village, or at least the centre of an estate occupied over a considerable period. A short distance East of it was the middle Saxon settlement excavated by Mr. Peter Addyman and Dr. K. R. Fennell in 1959/60 \footnote{Addyman, P. V., and Fennell, K. R., ‘A Dark-Age Settlement at Maxey, Northants’. \textit{Med. Arch.} VIII (1964), 20 ff.}. There were indications of earlier Saxon settlement to the West of it and it extended eastwards to the limits of the present village which it is known from excavations occupied the site at least by Norman times. There is an Anglo-Saxon Charter giving a list of tithes ‘as of old’ from two manors at Maxey which Bishop Aethelwold gave to the Monastery at \textit{Medeshamstede} (Peterborough) \footnote{Op. cit. pp. 22, 40-42.} circa 963 and the centre of one of these estates may have been on the site of the present village \footnote{Op. cit. pp. 22, 40-42.}. It seems very probable that the area between the church and modern Maxey has been continually occupied since at least the first century A.D. and that the centre of settlement has shifted gradually eastwards.

On two large settlements at Barnack and Helpston there are indications of substantial stone buildings which, in view of the general lack of evidence for the use of stone on
the gravels, suggests that they were important. They were probably villas and so likely to have been the centres of sizeable estates. That at Barnack (TF/083068) covers an area of about 5 acres one mile North of the present village and was occupied from the second until the late fourth centuries. Air photographs revealed a droveway leading to the
site from the East and to the North of it is a compact group of five small rectangular enclosures, perhaps cattle corrals, and the massive postholes of a basilican building. Examination of the field after ploughing has indicated the position of a large stone building decorated with painted wall-plaster to the North-West of these structures.

The basilican building is at present being excavated and so the conclusions about it must be regarded as provisional. It seems to have been first constructed in the mid-third century and was 140 feet long and 29 feet wide. The side walls were lightly built of stone, but the gable ends were more substantially constructed. The nave was 19 ft. wide and defined by timber colonnades. This building was demolished towards the end of the third century and was replaced by another on the same site, of the same width and 113 feet long with colonnades of more massive timbers. It was demolished circa 370, and shallow ditches defining small enclosures were cut across the site. Each building contained stone and perhaps earth corn-drying ovens. There was evidence of activity on the site before the buildings were constructed. A rectangular gravel pit 20 feet long and 5 feet wide was partly filled by ash and slag, waste products of a small iron smelting furnace; the grave of a woman of over 50 was cut into one of a series of earlier ditches. Examination of the skeleton 14 has revealed that she suffered from osteo-arthritis, dental decay and possibly vitamin or mineral deficiency.

Postholes of another basilican building, at Barholm, have been revealed by aerial photography 15. It is situated in an angle of a pentagonal enclosure which is about 200 feet across and approached by a droveway (P1. IV). Pottery collected from the surface is mostly of the early fourth century, but there are also earlier Roman sherds. Unlike those at Barnack this basilican building seems to have been the principal building of the farm. And so presumably the farmer and his family lived there, although part of the building may have been used as a byre, for storage or industrial working. It seems unlikely, on the other hand, that the Barnack building was the main residential building of the farm. It was not the residence of the farmer or bailiff, but it might have been used to accommodate farmhands and there is positive evidence of its use for agricultural and industrial purposes.

Not much is known about the building at Helpston (TF/l23042). It lies on the fringe of the limestone uplands about a mile South of the village. Artis illustrates 16 a mosaic floor found there which is composed of red, white, dark blue and yellow tesserae, arranged in geometric patterns. It must have come from a building of local importance, perhaps a temple, but more probably a villa.

Although good building stone could be quarried nearby, the majority of buildings seem to have been constructed of timber, sometimes with stone footings. Quarries at Barnack for ragstone and higher up the valley at Ketton for freestone and at Collyweston for slates, were in operation by the late first century and the stone was used by builders and masons as far South as London, St. Albans, Cambridge 17 and Godmanchester 18. Probably, as in medieval times, it was transported by water via the Cardyke and Fenland rivers. It was also burnt for lime and a substantially built third-century kiln beside King Street, Helpston, was excavated by the Peterborough Archaeological Group in 1960 19.

Evidence of small iron smelting industries has been found at Barnack and at Maxey. The output was probably sufficient only to satisfy the requirements of local blacksmiths.

14 By C. B. Denston of the Duckworth Laboratory, Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology, Cambridge.
15 R.C.H.M., A Matter of Time, Fig. 10, Site 11.
16 Artis, E.T., The Durobrivae of Antonius Identified and Illustrated (1828), pl. xxiv.
17 Fell, C., Roman Burials found at Arbury Road, Cambridge, 1952, P. Camb. AS., 49 (1955), 17.
The nearest source of ironstone is an outcrop two miles East of Barnack in Burghley Park, Stamford, but nodules may have been extracted from the gravel. On the Jurassic uplands to the East about eight Roman iron working sites have been identified by the scatter of slag over ploughed fields. A late first century A.D. smelting hearth was found in the Roman town at Great Casterton. More elaborate furnaces of late second century date have been excavated at Pickworth and at Wansford. There is also evidence for workings at Kings Cliffe, Bulwick, Oundle and Clipsham. At these places the ore was quarried and smelted on the spot.

The archaeological evidence does not suggest that the Welland Valley farmers were very highly romanized before the third century. Not until then is there any evidence of stone buildings of rectilinear plan, neither does wheelmade pottery become abundant until the potteries of the Middle Nene Valley come into operation towards the end of the second century. Samian pottery and objects of metal, other than iron, are rare, nor are coins common. Five months’ excavation on a farm at Maxey (Site 17), occupied throughout the Roman period, yielded only seven coins, none earlier than the mid-third century. This suggests that up to that time at least the inhabitants had no use for a money economy, but were largely self-sufficient and obtained the few requirements that they could not produce themselves by barter.

The Roman authorities seem to have been satisfied with the efficiency of native farming for the early Roman farms were constructed in the same manner and contain similar structures as the pre-Roman. The occupation of some farms continued uninterrupted. Some new farms were established on sites previously unoccupied, but this need not necessarily indicate a deliberate resettlement policy. Former property boundaries—pit alignments, ditches and banks and, presumably, hedgerows—continued in use suggesting that there were no major alterations in land division or tenure.

The system of ditched droveways is the one striking innovation. First King Street was laid out in a series of straight alignments that denote the skill of military surveyors. Then the farmers, using local labour, constructed ditched droveways to their farms. This perhaps implies that heavier vehicles would now go to the farms and so it was anticipated that well constructed and better drained access was required. These might have been heavy carts sent to collect the annual levy of grain. Whatever the explanation, the side-ditches do not seem to have proved necessary for few ditched droveways can be shown to have been constructed after the early second century and the ditches of those constructed earlier were not kept clear of silt.

Some of the early Roman farms along these droveways seem to have been more closely grouped than those of the Iron Age, particularly beside King Street. At first there were one to three acre farms of Little Woodbury type, but not much is yet known about how these native farms on the gravels developed from the late second century onwards. Further work on Site 17 at Maxey should provide the answer. It is sufficient for the moment to note that they no longer seem to be contained in contemporaneous enclosures, although small enclosures were constructed for special purposes, perhaps for cattle corrals and to assume that the structures that comprised the farmsteads were better constructed.

Apart from these small farms, two villas have been recognised and there may be others awaiting discovery around the fringes of the gravel areas. They show signs of a

20 Ordnance Survey, Stamford (Solid and Drift), 1:63360, Geological Survey (Sheet) 157 (1957).
21 Corder, P. (Ed.), The Roman Town and Villa at Great Casterton, Rutland: 3 (Nottingham, 1961), 36-37.
23 Artis, Durobrivac, xxv.
25 Information from Mr. W. Stephenson of Stamford, who has shown me samples of slag found there.
26 Dr. R. Butler of the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments has kindly identified the coins.
comparatively more romanized way of life. But perhaps the most remarkable of all the settlements is the large and long-occupied one around Maxey Church from which it seems the Saxon and Medieval Settlements developed.

There are clearly various types of settlement represented on the Welland Gravels, but the small farms of which Tallington, Site 37, or Maxey, Site 17, are typical examples are the most common. These should be compared with such farms as that at Woodcuts in Dorset or Huckhoe in Northumberland. The differences are largely regional ones; for example geological and geographical factors result in greater emphasis on stock-breeding in the Highlands and on crop-growing in the Lowlands and the availability of raw materials will affect building techniques. The extent to which the inhabitants came into contact with more romanized communities is another variable factor. But these differences should not be allowed to obscure the basic similarities. The farming techniques were a continuation and adaptation of pre-Roman methods and, perhaps more important, the farms are of a similar size which suggests they were occupied by a similar number of people of similar social status.
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The Roman Fenland

PETER SALWAY

In 1951 Mr. C. W. P. Hillips wrote that the obstacle in the way of dealing with the problems of the Roman occupation of the Fens was the sheer magnitude of the task. Fourteen years later I am able to report that the back of this task has been broken. That this should be so at this time is due to the initiative of the Royal Geographical Society in 1960 in deciding to sponsor Fenland research. Very substantial expenditure on the work was undertaken by the Society itself, by the Marc Fitch Fund and by the Leverhulme Trust, with support from Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, the British Academy and the Society of Antiquaries. However the work on which the present position is based started long before, and the fact that a major research report is now in the offing has only become possible because the two chief workers in the Roman Fenland field, Mrs. Sylvia Hallam and Mr. John Bromwich, have brought the fruits of many years research to the point of publication. Mr. Bromwich has concentrated in great detail on an area north of Cambridge and in recent years Mrs. Hallam has limited herself to the northern Fenland—the silt lands around the Wash—while my own task has been co-ordination and the filling-in of gaps in the coverage of the region.

Throughout the work we have received the willing assistance of a large number of local workers and other interested persons, without whom the complete gazetteer of the region, on which the rest of the work depends, could not have been compiled. This entirely informal co-operation which permitted an almost complete coverage of the region supplementing our own fieldwork was one of the most pleasing features of the whole operation. The information collected from these various sources into the Gazetteer will be supplemented by an extensive series of maps at the scale of 1:25,000, on which the quite extraordinary amount of detail which can be plotted from air photographs of the Roman Fenland has been combined with information from the ground in a system of coloured overprints on to a base derived from the Ordnance Survey 2½-inch Outline Edition.

In the article cited above Mr. Phillips, talking of the work of the pre-war Fenland Research Committee in elucidating the prehistory of the Fenland, emphasized that an understanding of the problems depended essentially on interpretation of the stratigraphy of the post-glacial geological deposits laid down by successive phases of marine transgression and regression. Precisely the same situation (plus some freshwater flooding) applies to understanding the Roman occupation. Progress in this field has been made in two ways. The distribution of Roman occupation at different periods has been studied in relation to the geology over the whole region by all the main contributors to the survey and in close detail in the sample area near Cambridge by Mr. Bromwich and Mr. S. C. Holmes. It was most fortunate that the latter was engaged in a primary 6-inch survey of the district for the Geological Survey. By kind permission of the Director of the Geological Survey we are able to include both a contribution from Mr. Holmes

and extracts from their new maps which embody considerable advances in knowledge of great significance for distribution studies.

Also concurrently with our studies of the archaeology of the region its stratigraphy has been under investigation by Dr. David Churchill of the Cambridge Botany School, following on the pioneer work of Professor Godwin on the development of vegetation in the pre-Roman periods. A contribution to the Fenland volume by Dr. Churchill will describe how new dates obtained from the peat beds below water-laid layers enable us to relate those deposits—and therefore the physical appearance of the landscape—to historical periods and events. A further contribution, by Alan Smith of Belfast, will relate Mrs. Hallam’s work to the stratigraphy of the Silts. Some of the information has come from new sites such as the excavations at the exceptionally large Fenland site at Hockwold by the then Ministry of Works in 1961 and 1962. From all these sites and from surface finds and museum collections throughout the region the archaeological information, which complements the geological and botanical data in constructing a firm framework for dating and interpreting the phases in its occupation, has been freshly reviewed in a large-scale examination of the pottery by Mr. Brian Hartley. The impressive results of this study are incorporated in the Gazetteer and form the basis for our historical interpretation.

In the absence of literary references or informative inscriptions detailed historical interpretation becomes largely speculative, but our dating evidence is now sufficiently firm that it has been possible to advance some views on the probable historical development of the Fenland with a certain amount of confidence. In particular it is now clear that large-scale exploitation of the Fenland began in the first half of the second century A.D. and did not follow immediately after the Boudiccan rebellion. Similarly our picture of the landscape is so complete that it is possible to make some deductions about the social and political situation at different periods and it has become clear that there is considerable complexity and a lack of uniformity throughout the region. There is no evidence for a comprehensive settlement of citizens on regular lines, but rather a wide variety of types of settlement and field layout. The picture given by air photographs and ground survey is sufficiently detailed and extends over a large enough area to permit the use of statistical methods by Mrs. Hallam in her analysis of the silt Fens. Of her results, perhaps the most interesting is the dominance of the village-like settlement over the single farm as the most common form of community. For the economy of the settlements our evidence has come chiefly from study of field patterns, animal bone analysis and widespread discovery of industrial debris. Our conclusions shed considerable doubt upon the theory that the region was primarily engaged in the production of cereals and make it unlikely that it was a major exporter of grain.

The forthcoming report on the Roman Fenland does not in any sense lay claim to finality. It is chiefly intended to present in organised form the evidence at present available and to act as a guide through the almost overwhelming mass of material. In particular it is hoped that it will act as a spur to action, by presenting hypotheses on which future work can proceed and by indicating critical points on which fieldwork, especially excavation, might most profitably concentrate.

The original arrangement of the material for the proposed report was done by myself and the editing was later taken on by Mr. Bromwich. The task of final editing for publication was assumed by the late Professor Sir Ian Richmond in the summer of 1965 and he was working on it at the time of his death. Mr. C. W. Phillips has subsequently taken up the burden where it was left by Professor Richmond.
Although the present boundaries of Wales delimit a fairly well-defined section of the Highland Zone, they include several regions with very different archaeological characteristics. These differences are recognisable even as far back as the Bronze Age, but they become marked during the Roman period. Over the greater part of the country, however, the remains corresponding to civil occupation at that time are only discoverable by excavation, and very few have in fact been excavated. These are indicated on the map (fig. 1) which also shows roughly the boundaries of the regions characterised by the different types of land use. It will be clear from a consideration of this map that although for the sake of completeness all six regions are discussed here the discussions are for the most part based on extremely slender and inadequate evidence and must be correspondingly brief. The boundaries shown, also, are very far from being precisely established though here the distribution of small finds (as shown on the O.S. map of Roman Britain) gives some guidance.

One region is exceptional. In north-west Wales there are well over a hundred examples of homesteads of distinctive character; they were walled with stone, and their remains have therefore been preserved. They are associated, also, with terraced fields which have resisted destruction even more strongly than the homesteads themselves. Further, sufficient sites have been excavated to justify the presumption that the majority, if not all, are of the Roman period.

In this region alone, then, there is a sufficient basis for some generalisation as to the character of rural settlement, but even here there are many uncertainties, particularly as to the origins of this agricultural development.

It should, therefore, be self-evident that throughout what follows almost every statement needs to be qualified by the warning that it is based on inadequate evidence and may be upset by future work.

The six regions will be considered in order from south to north, leaving until last the north-west, where, as noted above, the information is less restricted.

The South-East. This area was fully integrated into the system characteristic of most of the Lowland Zone of Britain, though it would seem that the majority of the farms were unpretentious, the large and luxurious dwellings being relatively few. There is no reason to suppose that land-use in the area showed any exceptional features. There are, however, enough defended sites of pre-Roman character which have produced 1st or 2nd-century pottery to suggest that the villa system may have developed fairly late.

There are also a few sites where 3rd or 4th-century remains have been found in pre-Roman forts, but this need not imply any continuity of tenure, since in a fairly thickly settled area some farms are almost certain to be placed near earlier forts by chance alone. In this region, therefore, there is nothing to suggest the development of a distinctive “native” type of rural settlement.

1 Bishopston; 15, High Penard; 17, Castle Ditches, Llancarfan; 18, Llanmelin; 23, Mynydd Bychan; 27, Sudbrook. The numbers refer to the list by Dr. Grace Simpson, in Gardner, W. and Savory, H. N. Dinorben (Cardiff 1964) 215-8. This provides a convenient summary of the evidence based on a fresh study of the material.

2 Ibid.: 16, Llanblethian; 17, Castle Ditches, Llancarfan; 18, Llanmelin; 27, Sudbrook.
The South-West. Two sites of the Roman period have been excavated in sufficient detail to give a good idea of their character. Each was superficially a ring-work, but excavation demonstrated the presence of a simple Roman building within the enclosure. At Cwmbwrwyn the enclosure was roughly trapezoidal with very rounded corners, about 140 ft. across, surrounded by a ditch 8 ft. deep with an accompanying bank, the defences measuring 35 ft. overall; the building was 108 ft. by 25 ft., and there were indications of wooden sheds also. At Trelissey defences of similar width but with a counterscarp bank protected a circular enclosure 240 ft. in diameter, within which was a building 60 ft. by 27 ft.; excavation at this site was unfortunately interrupted.

Both were occupied during the 2nd and 3rd centuries, but there is some doubt as to their character: they may have been small official military posts, or farms; and it is uncertain whether the buildings were contemporary with the defences, or were erected within an earlier structure.

Roman pottery of similar date has also been found in three fortified sites, Bosherston, and Crocksydam and Buckspool nearby. None of these seems likely to have contained a building like those at Cwmbwryn and Trelissey. The earthwork at Bosherston is almost certainly pre-Roman, as it has produced a pin of early type.

There is also a record of a Roman building close to a small earthwork at Ford.

Finally, there is the very remarkable settlement on Gateholm, a tidal islet on the summit of which there are long rows of rectangular buildings; they probably date from the Roman period, at least initially. At Sheep Island, also, there are numerous similar huts which are probably of the same date though not generally set in rows.

Such as they are, then, the remains suggest a mainly non-Roman type of settlement in small defended enclosures, but with Roman influence moving into the region, as indicated by the rectangular huts at Gateholm and Sheep Island, and the stone buildings at Cwmbwryn and Trelissey. On this interpretation, these two latter sites are farms, and the buildings should be regarded as probably having been Romanizing improvements replacing a more primitive house in the enclosure. In this area, the absence of older relics would not be surprising.

There are ancient field-systems in the west of the region, though they are infrequent and have produced no certain evidence of date. Those at Stackpole Warren (SR985945) not far from the forts of Buckspool and Bosherston, have some resemblance to those in north-west Wales, but those near St. David’s (SM730282) seem to be of different character.

West and Central Wales. Between the Teifi and the Dyfi, the land facing Cardigan Bay and extending far back into the mountains seems barren. The apparent absence of civil settlement in the Roman period contrasts strongly with the frequency of hill-forts; it may of course arise merely from inadequate field-work and excavation, but is to some extent confirmed by the scarcity of casual finds. A possible explanation could be the punitive action of the Romans in revenge for the continued resistance of the Ordovices.

The North Marches. A single farm of “native” type, with fields similar to those in the north-west, has been identified and partly excavated close to the Breiddin hill-fort. It consisted of a banked and ditched enclosure, D-shaped, of rather more than half an acre, with a slighter outer wall round three quarters of the circumference, enclosing about the same additional area. The occupation seems to have been mainly of the latter half of the Roman period. There was evidence of iron-working, and at least one round wooden hut.

The discovery of two styluses would seem to imply that the inhabitants were literate. The surviving traces of the associated fields cover about 20 acres, but their limits are not clearly defined.

Topography suggests that this site would fall within the canton of the Cornovii, whose fully Romanized capital at Wroxeter would suggest that villas should be the characteristic type of farm. These, however, are scarce in this region, and it may...
well be that more homesteads of the type found at Breiddin await discovery.

The North-East. Here again a single excavated site is the only clue to the nature of rural settlement. Soon after the middle of the 3rd century, a prosperous landowner set up his establishment in the derelict fortress of Dinorben. The organisation seems to have been that associated with villas, the main part of the work being done by a force of labourers. The owner’s house, however, was purely “native” in character, being a circular building 65 ft. in diameter.

There are no field-systems recorded in this area, and it is impossible to say whether this large round house was an isolated freak or was characteristic. There is one very large hut-platform at Moel Fenlli, among others of more normal size, but its date is unknown; Roman coins have been found in the fort.

The North-West (Fig. 2). It is a relief to turn to the relatively plentiful evidence in this last region, although many uncertainties remain. Much attention has recently been given to these structures, so there is no need here for a minute discussion of points of detail or for a consideration of any but the most characteristic types of hut group; the remainder, though individually interesting, are numerically unimportant, and their omission does not falsify the general picture.

The essential characteristic of land use in the region is the association of stone-built dwellings with strongly terraced fields. The huts are usually grouped into an enclosure, forming an “Enclosed Homestead” representing a single farm. There are, however, some settlements, apparently of the same date and general culture, where the huts are scattered among the fields, and occasional isolated huts occur. Some enclosed homesteads, also, are found without associated field-systems, though they are of similar types to those which stand among the early fields.

Taking all these sites into account, but neglecting the isolated huts, there appear to be about 28 known in Anglesey, 135 in Caernarvonshire, and 18 or 20 in Merioneth.

At the same time, occupation seems to have continued or to have been resumed in three or four hillforts; if Tre’r Ceiri is typical, these were much more intensivelly occupied than in the preceding Iron Age.

The amount of information justifies an attempt at a very rough estimate of the population: allowing 10 to each hut-group and on the evidence from Tre’r Ceiri 500 to each hill-fort, this gives a total of about 4000, fairly evenly divided between the forts and the farms. This of course, is no more than an indication of the order of magnitude, but even so it is of some interest. The Roman fort at Segontium probably contained as garrison a cohort 500 strong.

The homesteads can be divided into several types, as discussed below, but the system of farming seems to have been essentially the same for all. The farm itself was the house of a single family group—though there may have been a few unrelated labourers also, perhaps living in the isolated huts which sometimes occur among the fields. The main homestead usually stood within a block of arable, which was divided up into small squarish terraced fields of various sizes, but the fields belonging to a particular farm seem to have formed a single group round it, not to have been intermingled with...
others as in the medieval period. The amount of arable associated with a single farm, when this can be estimated, ranged from 4 acres up to 20 acres, but the most usual figure is about 15 acres. The level favoured was in the region of 600 to 800 ft. above O.D., but the farms could all have had access to an almost unlimited range of mountain pasture. At most sites, the soil is too acid for bone to survive, but at Din Lligwy (which is, however, exceptional in many ways), teeth of "bos", sheep, horse and pig were plentiful.

Most of the excavated sites produced evidence for metal-working, both in bronze and iron. Traces were particularly plentiful in the huts among the fields at Ty Mawr, Holy Island, and in the polygonal groups.

The standard of material prosperity, as indicated by the evidence of excavation, was far below that of all but the very poorest "villa", though Din Lligwy is again an exception. Cae’r Mynydd, for example, yielded a total of 121 potsherds, representing rather more than 15 vessels, and a single quern-stone.
Hafoty-wern-las was rather richer, but the second period at Graeanog yielded practically nothing, so there seems to be no general relation between prosperity and shape.

The area of roofed living and working space at Cae’r Mynydd was about 1450 sq.ft., but may have originally amounted to 1900; at Hafoty-wern-las it was 1850 sq.ft., and nearly 2400 sq.ft., at Din Lligwy. The round huts are of fairly uniform size, about 20 to 25 ft. in diameter; the long buildings are more variable, but about 20 ft. by 40 ft. would be normal.

The great majority of the enclosed homesteads, about 90% of those in Caernarvonshire for which the plan is still recognisable, can be assigned to one of three types (Fig. 3). The most distinctive is the polygonal group, in which the enclosing wall is set out in straight lengths with sharp angles almost always forming a quadrilateral or a pentagon. Within the enclosure are round and rectangular buildings, the latter usually set against the wall. Almost invariably, the entrance leads through one of the rectangular buildings, which thus forms a “porter’s lodge”.

Din Lligwy is probably the best known and finest example, but Hafoty-wern-las (P1. V) and Graeanog are perhaps more typical.

The other two main classes are both oval, and may be indistinguishable when the internal structures have been destroyed, but enough survive in good condition to justify the inference that there are two distinct types. One is thin-walled, and the enclosed huts are almost always circular and mostly free-standing. Bodsilin, Foel Dduarth and Pant-y-Saer are representative examples: the last has been excavated. The other type is thick-walled, with the huts partly embedded in the enclosing wall, which may be 10 ft. or more in thickness; Cae’r Mynydd, Llain-Llan and Cwm Ceiliog are typical. The huts are mostly round, but may include a few which are rectangular. All three types are generally well-built, the polygonal sites being the best, with a high proportion of large orthostatic masonry, and the thin-walled type the poorest. There are at least two other distinguishable types, but numerically they are relatively unimportant.

It remains to consider the origins and date of these settlements. This is a problem which cannot at present be settled finally. There seem to be three possible hypotheses: either the enclosed homesteads and fields represent a deliberate resettlement of an empty area, possibly one devastated by punitive action; or the whole system can be explained as a natural evolution, under Roman guidance, from the pre-Roman settlements characteristic of the area; or some proportion of the enclosed homesteads represent officially encouraged new settlement superimposed on relatively sparse occupation which had persisted from before the Roman conquest, possibly enfeebled by punitive measures. In the writer’s view, the arguments strongly favour the last of these theories, but they are not conclusive.

The north-western region considered here forms the major part of a district within which a high proportion of the hillforts contain stone-built round dwellings. If the enclosed homesteads were introduced from elsewhere, it is a surprising coincidence that they should have been placed in the same area, and this favours the theory of continuous local evolution. Outside the hillforts, though, there are no certain pre-Roman stone huts; but the extreme scarcity of identifiable pre-Roman relics anywhere in the region makes it unlikely that any would be found in the huts. There are, moreover, some local sites of a distinct type which, in the writer’s view, are probably pre-Roman. These are the so-called “Concentrics”, consisting of a fairly large free-standing round hut near the centre of a slightly levelled round enclosure; there are sometimes two roughly concentric enclosing walls with a wide space between them. Llwyndu-bach is an example of the last type, but its excavation produced no certain dating evidence. It would be possible to
Fig. 3 Typical Enclosed Homesteads
produce a typological series showing the evolution of the thin-walled oval enclosed homesteads from the Concentrics, but the fact that the thin-walled ovals are almost invariably associated with terraced fields, whereas the Concentrics are not, is against this interpretation of their development. Further, Pant-y-Saer is a fairly typical thin-walled oval site, and if these were the progenitors of the thick-walled or polygonal homesteads it is surprising that this late site shows few or none of the features which characterise them. It seems more probable, then, that the thin-walled ovals arose independently but as a result of the same circumstances as the other two types.

The assumption that all three main types of enclosed homestead developed locally can only be maintained either by concentrating on the broad similarities, that the structures are stone built and incorporate round huts, and rejecting the substantial differences in detail, or by assuming that by some unfortunate accident all the intermediate typological stages have been destroyed. Moreover, it fails to account for the different distributions of the various types. On present evidence, therefore, it should be rejected.

Only two sites have been adequately and scientifically excavated. Of these, Pant-y-Saer is a fairly typical “thin-walled oval”—one of the rectangular structures at least seems to be a later addition—but it would seem, at earliest, to belong to the very end of the Roman period. This evidence can be interpreted in various ways, but perhaps the most probable explanation is that there was no great change in the arrangement of at least this type of enclosed homestead during the whole period of their use, so that apart from the associated relics there would be little to distinguish one built in A.D. 400 from one two centuries older.

Cae’r Mynydd, however, is more informative. There a very typical “thick-walled oval” had been built over an earlier settlement of different, but unknown, plan. There was apparently some cultivation associated with the earlier period, as well as with the later. The thick-walled oval had been occupied during the 3rd and 4th centuries, and had been rebuilt later on the same plan, but neither the latest nor the earliest periods produced any independent evidence for their dates.

The presence of an earlier settlement of different plan is known also at three of the polygonal groups — Din Lligwy, Graeanog, and probably Hafoty-wern-las; all of which seem to have been established during the third century. In each case the earlier remains seem to have been more diffuse, perhaps unenclosed. The fact of rebuilding on the same sites would seem to imply that there was no radical re-division of land, rather that the conditions of tenure were unaltered. The appearance of the new types of enclosed homestead, however, suggests that the farms passed into new ownership, and if homesteads of these new types did in fact all make their appearance at about the same time the implication is surely that a plantation of new settlers was taking place, the former owner having been evicted, at least in some cases. This assumption would carry with it the probability that new land would also be brought under cultivation. Lacking any regular type of subdivision, such as centuriation, land-grants are not likely to leave any clear archaeological traces. But there is a group of terraced fields at Casronwy-uchaf near Nantlle where five dwelling-sites are strung out along an old leat in such a way as to suggest that it served as their common water-supply. It seems a reasonable inference that the dwellings there were all built at the same time, on sites allocated to them by some governing authority. Unfortunately, the hut-groups are too damaged for their plan to be recoverable without excavation; they are oval in outline, but the interior is obscured.

Taken as a whole, therefore, the evidence seems to favour the hypothesis of a deliberate official plantation of new farmers in the area, some time early in the third century. There is, however, evidence for some earlier farming as mentioned above, and this may
account for the apparent earlier dates indicated at Caerau and at Cors y Gedol. It is important to note, though, that even by comparison with the few relics from such a site as Cae’r Mynydd the amount of second-century or earlier material is minimal, consisting of two fragments of mortarium-rim at Caerau and fragments from a single pot at Cors-y-Gedol, but it is impossible to decide whether these should be dismissed as “survivals” or should be regarded as highly significant because pottery of that date is likely to be rare in this district. It seems arguable, though, that if there had been active and extensive farming then, the pottery would be more plentiful.

The argument set out above leads to the conclusion that the “polygonal” and “thick-walled oval” types were new introductions, so it might be hoped that their origins could be located; but this cannot be done. It is fairly certain, though, that they did not come from Northumberland, Westmorland, or Cornwall. The writer has some personal knowledge of the homesteads in those areas, and although there is a superficial similarity the differences are considerable — much greater, for example, than the subtle variations which are detected between the coarse pottery of the Iron Age in different regions. Neither, with one exception, have any close parallels been published. That exception is in Spain, where the castros of the north-west contain mixed round and rectangular buildings, with other features such as carefully rounded corners, which appear in the polygonal groups. There is nothing inherently impossible in such a transfer; movement of less than a hundred people could account for all the polygonal groups known. But it needs to be kept in mind that even in Britain it is only in the last decade or so that structures of this kind have begun to receive any really comprehensive study, and there are still large areas not fully investigated. So it would be premature to claim this suggested transfer of population as more than an interesting and reasonably probable hypothesis.

\[19\] This statement has been left as written, but the evidence on Cornish courtyard houses presented at the meeting (p. 80) suggests that the ‘thick-walled ovals’ may be more closely related to them than the writer formerly supposed, possibly even by direct descent.
APPENDIX
Sites in N.W. Wales mentioned in text.

This is not a complete bibliography of all excavated sites; it gives brief descriptions, together with the locations and principal references, for those remains referred to in the text. Unless otherwise noted, the huts are round, 20 to 25 ft. in diameter, and the homesteads are associated with areas of terraced fields among which there are other groups of huts. The plans given (Fig. 3) are diagrammatic, restoring, so far as can be judged, the original outlines by eliminating the effects of modern damage. (Caerns. = R.C.A.H.M. Caernarvonshire).

**Bodsin** (Fig. 3) SH 677716. Caerns. (I), No. 32. Unexcavated.

**Caerau** SH 469489. Caerns. (II), No. 827. Excavated by B. H. St. J. O’Neil, *Ant. J.* (1936), 295. Oval, 100 ft. by 80 ft., apparently thick-walled, but badly ruined. Plan may have resembled Cae’r Mynydd, but only two round huts remain, and the whole was more lightly built. Pottery mostly 3rd-century, but embedded in the paving of the courtyard were two mortarium rims probably late 1st or early 2nd century.

**Cae’r Mynydd** (Fig. 3) SH 572646. Caerns. (II), No. 1173. Excavated by W. E. Griffiths, *Ant. J.* XXXIX (1959), 33-60. Pottery mainly of 3rd-4th centuries. Indications of later repair or rebuilding on same plan and of earlier building of different plan, neither with any associated objects. The thick-walled enclosure illustrated seems to have been built over an earlier terrace, but cultivation continued; the thin outer wall may have been added to protect the base of the main wall from undermining by the plough.

**Cefngraeanog** (Fig. 3) SH 458487. Caerns. (III), A 852 (p. 115). Salvage excavation by A. H. A. Hogg, 1959; publication forthcoming. The enclosure illustrated, now destroyed, had been badly damaged before excavation. It may have contained one or two more buildings on its S. side. The masonry, particularly that of the aisled building on the north, was of much poorer quality than at Din Lligwy or Hafoty-wern-las. No datable relics were associated with this structure, but it had been built over the burnt remains of a group of timber buildings associated with iron-working, among which was a second-century *olla*. The adjacent terracing was not extensive.

**Cors y Gedol**. SH 603231. Excavated by W. E. Griffiths, *B.B.C.S.* 17 (Nov. 1958), 119-129. One trapezoidal and two round huts are connected by walls about 3 ft. thick to form an irregularly oval enclosure about 110 ft. by 80 ft., one side being against the foot of a terrace. Seventeen sherds of pottery were found, representing about five vessels; the only one datable was mid-2nd-century. The method of forming an oval enclosure by walls joining up the huts is unusual in Caernarvonshire, but may occur elsewhere in Merioneth.

**Cwm Ceiliog** (Fig. 3) SH 422451. Caerns. (II). No. 1064. Unexcavated. Stands near the middle of an isolated group of fields, area about 6 acres, with no other associated huts.

**Din Lligwy** (Fig. 3) SH 497861. R.C.A.H.M. Anglesey, 133, No. 6. Excavated 1905 and later by E. N. Baynes, *Arch. Camb.* (1908), 183; 1930, 375. The masonry of all the buildings is exceptionally good. Pottery and coins were unusually plentiful, and indicate occupation mainly in the 4th century. There was much evidence for metal-working. One of the round buildings seems to be a later modification. There are traces of an earlier settlement of different plan, unexcavated. Very massive field-walls near-by, still in use, may be ancient, but there is no indisputable evidence for an associated field-system.

**Foel Dduarth** (Fig. 3) SH 677716. Caerns. (I), No. 34. Slight trial excavations inadequately recorded.

**Hafoty-wern-las** (Fig. 3) SH 501583. Caerns. (II), No. 1340 (i). Excavated by H. Williams, *Arch. Camb.* (1923), 87-113. The masonry is good, though inferior to that of Din Lligwy. Pottery and other finds were fairly plentiful, of the 2nd to 4th centuries. There was much evidence for metal-working including probably smithing hearths in the rectangular building in the W. angle. A group of four huts to the N. seems unrelated to the homestead and may be earlier. The associated terrace fields incorporate what appears to be a “Concentric Circle” site with two enclosing walls: but with the central hut removed. (See P1. V. The small
ring of lighter vegetation in the centre of the enclosure suggests that traces of the hut remain below ground.)


**Llwyndu-bach** SH 479540. *Caerns. (II)*, No. 1285. Excavated by G. Bersu and W. E. Griffiths. *Arch. Camb.* (1949), 178-206. A typical “Concentric circles” site: a hut 29 ft. in diameter, with roughly concentric enclosing walls 85 ft. and 200 ft. in diameter. No evidence for date was found, and there are no associated terraces.

**Nantile** SH 520540. *Caerns. (II)*, Nos. 1223-1227. Unexcavated. An extensive group of fields associated with four or five hut-groups, oval but of uncertain type, connected by an old teat.

**Pant y Saer** (Fig. 3) SW 513824. R.C.A.H.M. *Anglesey* 72, No. 3. Excavated by C. W. Phillips. *Arch. Camb.* (1934), pp. 1-36. The smaller rectangular addition is probably later as the walls contained occupation rubbish. The site was dated to the 5th century or later by a silver penannular brooch (on its date see L. Alcock, in *Culture and Environment*, p. 284, n. 1). Terraces occur near the site, but are not extensive.

**Ty Mawr, Holyhead** SH 211820. R.C.A.H.M. *Anglesey*, 24, No. 16. Excavated by W. O. Stanley. *Arch. J.* XXIV, 229; XXVI, 301. A large group, formerly about 50, of round and oval huts scattered among terraced fields, without enclosures. Pottery and coins of the 3rd and 4th century were found, with much evidence for metal-working.
Some recent discoveries in Hampshire

B. T. PERRY

The purpose of this short note is to draw attention to what appears to be a distinctive type of small enclosure, several examples of which have recently come to light in Hampshire, and to which parallels can be found in other parts of Wessex.

From their general appearance, they have been given the name of “banjo” enclosures, perhaps an unsatisfactory name, but one which, in the absence of an all-embracing geometric term, or clear proof of their date or function was considered to be reasonably appropriate.

The map (fig. 1) shows the distribution in Wessex of sites which seem to belong to this type, but it seems likely that further analogous sites await recognition especially in Dorset and Wiltshire. The essential features of the sites have been tabulated for

---

Fig. 1

---

1 I should like to express my gratitude to Mr. John Boyden for drawing my attention to this type, and for putting a large collection of his aerial photographs at my disposal. It appears that he and Mr. Collin Bowen both recognised the existence of these sites as a type, simultaneously, and to the latter I should like to express my gratitude for many helpful suggestions.
purposes of comparison, and one of the Hampshire examples has been illustrated by means of a simple sketch-plan (fig. 2).

Taking the group as a whole the enclosures are essentially small, ranging from 150 to about 300 feet in diameter, or from just under half an acre to just over 1½ acres, and apart from other important differences it is therefore clear that they are considerably smaller than, for example, Little Woodbury.

They are normally circular, or sub-circular or sub-rectangular, with a long entrance-way which in the majority of cases is distinctly funnel-shaped. Frequently the enclosure with its entranceway forms only part of a larger and more elaborate earthwork scheme.

One probable example of a site of "banjo" type - the only known one in Hampshire for which earthwork remains are still extant-was recently partly excavated by Dr. Jan Stead of the Ministry of Public Building and Works at Blagden Copse, Hurstbourne...
Tarrant. A small sub-rectangular enclosure was joined by means of a ditched causeway to a long linear ditch of “ranch boundary” type. The linear ditch and ditched causeway were proved by excavation to be contemporary, and were dated by two well stratified groups of Iron Age pottery which were designated by the excavator as “Southern Second B” and “Southern Second C”. Although the enclosure itself was not excavated there was no reason to doubt its contemporaneity with the causeway and ditch.

One of the features of the enclosure noted at Blagden was the presence of an inner ditch and outer bank. This seems to be significant as it was also noted in two of the three sites in Dorset and Wiltshire which are thought to belong to this group, namely Church End Ring and Gussage Cowdown. This feature seems to be designed to retain rather than to defend, and led Crawford at Gussage and Stead at Blagden to suggest that the enclosure was intended to serve as a cattle pen. The long funnel shaped entranceway found on many of the Hampshire sites accords well with this idea.

Church End Ring also afforded excavated evidence of an Iron Age date. Two of the Hampshire examples, namely Bramdean and Woodhams Farm, lie immediately adjacent to Roman Buildings, and whilst it is not possible to tell with certainty the relationship between the enclosure and the buildings, it seems most likely that the enclosures are earlier.

The rather limited evidence therefore seems to point to an Iron Age origin, but surface finds of Romano-British pottery are a marked feature of the Hampshire sites when under plough, and seem to point to continuity in the Romano-British period.

---

2 I am very grateful to Dr. Stead for allowing me to make use of his report on the excavations at Blagden Copse prior to its publication.
4 Crawford and Keiller, *Wessex*, 112, Pl. XV and XVI, fig. 21.
5 Since this note was written, excavations begun at Bramdean in 1965 have confirmed an initial Iron Age date for the enclosure. A further season, which it is hoped will throw more light on its purpose, is planned for 1966.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>N.G.R.</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Approx. Diameter</th>
<th>Approx. Entrance Way</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRAMDEAN</td>
<td>SU/628 282</td>
<td>Bramdean</td>
<td>A/P by Mr. J. R. Boyden</td>
<td>180’</td>
<td>75’</td>
<td>&gt; ½ acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESHAW HOUSE</td>
<td>SU/573 226</td>
<td>Exton</td>
<td>A/P by Mr. J. R. Boyden</td>
<td>280’</td>
<td>330’</td>
<td>&lt; 1½ acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPPER CRANBOURNE FARM WORTING</td>
<td>SU/492 424</td>
<td>Wonston</td>
<td>A/P by Mr. J. R. Boyden</td>
<td>150’</td>
<td>200’</td>
<td>&lt; ½ acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODHAMS FARM</td>
<td>SU/600 514</td>
<td>Basingstoke</td>
<td>A/P by Mr. J. R. Boyden</td>
<td>200’</td>
<td>150’</td>
<td>¾ acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARREN FARM</td>
<td>SU/488 334</td>
<td>Kings Worthy</td>
<td>A/P by Mr. W. H. C. Blake</td>
<td>150’</td>
<td>150’</td>
<td>&lt; ½ acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERNHAM DEAN</td>
<td>SU/340 570</td>
<td>Vernham Dean</td>
<td>A/P by Mr. J. R. Boyden</td>
<td>150’</td>
<td>90’</td>
<td>&lt; ½ acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUSSAGE COWDOWN</td>
<td>ST/993 141</td>
<td>Gussage St. Michael</td>
<td>‘Wessex from the Air’. Pl. XV &amp; XVI</td>
<td>200’</td>
<td>100’</td>
<td>¾ acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMS HILL DITCHES</td>
<td>SU/060 332</td>
<td>Barford St. Martin</td>
<td>‘Wessex from the Air’. Pl. XI b.</td>
<td>150’</td>
<td>100’</td>
<td>&lt; ½ acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH END RING</td>
<td>SU/1012 357</td>
<td>Steeple Langford and Wylye</td>
<td>‘Wessex from the Air’. Pl. XVII</td>
<td>300’</td>
<td>180’</td>
<td>&gt; 1½ acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Romano-British rural settlements in Dorset and Wiltshire

H. C. Bowen
and
P. J. Fowler

I. ORIGINS AND TYPES OF SETTLEMENT

Dorset and Wiltshire contain some of the most famous Iron Age and Romano-British rural settlements, yet knowledge is still so incomplete that the nature even of these is not clear. There is ample scope for interpretation and in the last thirty years very diverse opinions have been expressed. Though uncertainty in the matter is better than incorrect dogma, recent work has encouraged the following very tentative re-statement.

One of the main problems concerns the extent to which Romano-British conditions affected existing settlement types and patterns. It is therefore necessary to reconsider, though briefly and arbitrarily, some Iron Age settlement types. Inevitably reconsideration must start with Little Woodbury, not only because its brilliant excavation by the late Professor Gerhard Bersu makes it fundamental to the subject, but also because the use of its name for both a type of site and a type of economy might obscure a distinction which must surely be drawn. As a type of site-and that is our concern here-Little Woodbury is only one of a number concentrated, so present information suggests, in Wessex. The type probably represents a farmstead of a particular and pre-eminent form. There were, of course, other, lesser farmsteads, as well as “community settlements”. Similarly, in the Romano-British period the evidence now points to the existence of both single steads and “community settlements”, the latter occasionally meriting consideration as villages.

Before Professor Bersu published Little Woodbury, it was commonly thought that there were “British villages” in Wessex because certain settlement sites, like that on Swallowcliffe Down, could be seen from surface indications to consist largely of circular depressions. Excavation showed that these were pits but excavators usually found them acceptable as pit-dwellings. As is well known, Bersu demolished this view. He estimated that within the 4 acres of the Little Woodbury enclosure there were some 360 pits about 5 ft. deep and 5 ft. across, usually of a truncated-cone, “barrel” or cylindrical shape, which he convincingly showed to be for storage. There was only one major house within the third of the interior he excavated. It was round, like all Iron Age houses in this area, but twice or three times the size of most Iron Age houses which have been found in groups (cf, fig. 1). The long, irregular, working area behind it considerably reduces the space for any other houses. Though this is not the place to argue the case, I believe that Little Woodbury was the establishment of a relatively pre-eminent person. The characteristics whose repetition elsewhere make it a distinctive type include a roughly circular enclosure taking in an interior area of, say, three to six acres; a single gap entrance, normally in the east, sometimes with ditches springing away from the earthwork to form a sort of funnel approach; a situation always suitable for a farm, though there may be hill-fort type defences; and pits.

1 This joint paper benefits from the results of work done for the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England) on the nature and condition of Romano-British rural settlements in Dorset and Wiltshire. The writers are grateful to the Commission for permission to make use of relevant material; the opinions expressed are their own. In general, because evidence obtained from excavations is minimal, no attempt is made here to date the phases of settlements within the Romano-British period. A table with references for the main sites discussed, numbered as on a location map (fig. 12), appears at the end of art 11 (p. 64). The twenty-eight sites so distinguished are italicised in the text, where they are not given footnotes other than for references to specific points in their literature.
SOME IRON AGE SETTLEMENTS AND ENCLOSURES IN S. ENGLAND

Fig. 1
Bersu used the assumed capacity of the assumed corn-storage pits to postulate occupation by a family group. Recent preliminary experiments in corn storage underground conducted by the C.B.A. Research Committee on Ancient Fields have incidently shown that the storage capacity of the average pit, basket-lined, is about 9 times that mentioned by Bersu. Instead of holding 4½ bushels it holds over 40 bushels. The corn in the experiment was threshed, but it is fairly sure that in the Iron Age some at least would be stored in the ear, reducing the actual grain capacity to, say, one third. That still leaves the potential more than three times as great as Bersu allowed. Are we to consider, then, that Little Woodbury accommodated three or more family groups? I think we must consider bigger populations in general, though it is clearly dangerous to make firm calculations based on pit capacity. All the suitable pits, for example, were certainly not used for corn storage, and Little Woodbury was perhaps a lordly establishment which took tribute corn or just stored the grain of people living outside. Although we are not considering data, however, we are justified in taking note of orders of magnitude, and in this context I find it very interesting to see, according to my calculations, that while there were 360 (or perhaps 180, if we allow the second house) pits per house at Little Woodbury, there were on average only two-at most three-pits per hut in Hod Hill, a major occupied hill-fort. The implications of this are more diverse than clear but are worth pondering. I also think that we can expect a much bigger acreage of “Celtic” fields than the 20 acres maximum postulated by Bersu for Little Woodbury.

Some support for this assumption may be found by Farley Mount, just west of Winchester. The earthwork enclosure here is six acres in area and I think it is reasonably compared with Little Woodbury (fig. 1). Although it had a formidable bank and external ditch of hill-fort proportions, its contemporary association with at least 60 acres of “Celtic” fields is especially clear on R.A.F. vertical air photographs (Pl. VI). There is some sort of “funnel”, disturbed by quarrying, outside the entrance, and beyond that and as far as the prominent linear ditch there is a large area without “Celtic” fields, presumably permanent pasture.

Having sought to isolate Little Woodbury as just one type of Iron Age site, however important, it is necessary to note that, apart from the bigger hill-forts, there are other, quite different, types of Iron Age enclosures and settlements. A few are shown diagrammatically, but to scale, on fig. 1. The enclosures are all rounded. At the lower end of the size scale is the settlement enclosure of under one acre in area. Outside our area Draughton in Northants., excavated by Professor Grimes, comes to mind; and in 1964 one on Mancombe Down near Warminster was shown to belong to Iron Age A. There are also the small banjo-shaped enclosures with long parallel-sided entrances, presumably for stock, which are discussed by Brian Perry (above, p. 39), and of which I illustrate an example at Blagden Copse, near Hurstbourne Tarrant, Hants., dated to Iron Age B by Dr. I. M. Stead. On Hog Cliff Hill, west of Dorchester, at the other end of the scale, Mr. Rahtz has proved an Iron Age A attribution for a 26 acre enclosure, not a hill-fort, inside which was at least a dozen small huts. This suggests a community settlement bigger than a homestead. Even more striking is the area of 16 acres or more, not apparently enclosed, covered with Iron Age pits, which Miss K. M. Richardson designated site Q on Boscombe Down West near Salisbury. These sites alone show clearly enough that there is a diversity of settlement type in the Iron Age; that this includes settlements, still perhaps to be regarded as homesteads, in enclosures small and large; that Little Woodbury is a distinct type, perhaps socially eminent; but that also there is

---

2 For these calculations see especially Bersu, *P.P.S.* VI (1940), 64 & 104-5.
3 A first report on the experiments has been prepared for publication.
evidence for community settlements larger than simple farmsteads, occasionally un-
enclosed by any traceable ditch.

We know all too little about developments in the later pre-Roman Iron Age, how long
any of these types lasted as such or individually, how much regional variation existed
even within our area, or how far Belgic influence affected the settlement pattern. Where
finds are few it is difficult to be sure whether a site antedates the Conquest or not. An
almost square enclosure of c.¼ acre in Owermoigne, near Dorchester, for example, has
recently been shown to be Durotrigian and it is perhaps safest to leave it at that.

I shall now look at selected Romano-British settlements in our area, and try to see
to what extent native traditions, marked by rounded enclosures and pits and so on,
survive, and what is new, remembering again that the duration of the period itself
allows of great development and change.

Rotherley and Woodcuts are so well-known and have been so brilliantly dissected
(providing unique information about sequence) that it needs to be said straightawa
that, though they may typify a number of sites, they cannot be taken as a standard
pattern for all. Both are different from single enclosure settlements, the total area
of all the compounds in each settlement eventually reaching a similar acreage to
Little Woodbury. Both retain many native features though both also have structures not yet
found before the Roman period: wells at Woodcuts, and a rectangular building at Rotherley.

In Rotherley, for instance, a settlement occupied through most of the Roman period,
the most prominent feature is a round enclosure of 1¾ acres. Professor Hawkes has
shown that this, like much of the rest of the pattern, including the roadway, was laid
out in Iron Age C. Some angular and irregular enclosures were added but there was
relatively little change. Storage pits were used in the Iron Age and, in lesser numbers, in
the Roman period. Square arrangements of post-holes indicated surface granaries, as
at Little Woodbury, but there is no sure sign of what the main houses were like or how
many there were. The settlement was not enclosed by anything massive enough to
leave a trace. This lack of overall enclosure is general in the Roman period. Some more
examples will help to illustrate the point.

On Berwick Down, Tollard Royal, ½ mile west of Rotherley, three settlements lie on
the same downland spur (fig. 2). To the north, unexcavated but clearly visible on the
ground, a concentration of storage pits, a large round house marked by a penannular
palisade groove, and a cross-dyke, all indicate Iron Age settlement. To the south, a
U-shaped bank and ditch partly surrounds a small oblong enclosure which has pro-
duced evidence of occupation in the 1st century A.D. Between these two sites, a circular
enclosure, 2½ acres in extent, was apparently abandoned as such within the Roman-
British period, for a contemporary road runs right through it and its east side was
overlaid by Romano-British building platforms. Others, undated, extend down the
slope to the east. Outside Wessex, Thundersbarrow Hill, Sussex, provides a sort of
parallel for this: there, an Iron Age, “camp” intermediate in size between the
Berwick Down enclosure and Little Woodbury was ignored by Romano-British settlement which
again extended downhill on its eastern, sheltered, side. The Berwick Down enclosure is
not, of course, necessarily Iron Age in date but in its original form it clearly belongs to

(1959), 102-3. Plan in R.C.H.M. Dorset South East. forthcoming. It is interesting to note that an almost rectangular enclosure on
Shearplace Hill, near Dorchester, has been proved to be Bronze Age, therefore, an associated system of roads. Rahtz, P.A.,
6 A shaft near Stonehenge, 100 ft. deep into the Chalk, recently shown to be Bronze Age, indicates a remarkable capacity to dig such
7 It is curious that rectangular buildings are so common in arts of Denmark and Holland, especially in the pre-Roman Iron Age.
8 An apparent notable exception to this is within the hill-fort of Bilbury, 12 miles W. of Salisbury, being excavated by Rev. E. H.
SETTLEMENTS ON BERWICK DOWN, TOLLARD ROYAL, WILTS

Fig. 2 (Plan by R.C.H.M. [England], Crown Copyright)
the pre-Roman tradition. The same tradition was also abandoned within the Romano-British period on, for example, Meriden Down (fig. 3) and Ebsbury (Pl. IX).

The Berwick Down complex, covering some 16 acres, additionally illustrates the fact that in many instances the same settlement areas continued to be used from the Iron Age long into, if not throughout, the Roman period. The same situation appears, for example, on Overton Down (fig. 10). But of Little Woodbury or other Iron Age settlement types surviving unchanged there is no sign.

Some support for this dictum may be seen on Dr. St. Joseph’s photograph of a settlement area on Winterbourne Down by the Winterbourne/Pitton parish boundary, east of Salisbury, where a ditched circle ((a) on Pl. VII), 1 1/3 acres in area, is overlaid by Romano-British settlement platforms. To the north ((b) on Pl. VII, where dissected by excavation trenches, is a small ‘U’-shaped embanked enclosure, open to the east and overlying an Iron Age ditch. The area within, 40 ft. across, was a cemetery containing both cremations and inhumations of the Roman period. The remains of closely packed platforms, although in the final stages of destruction by ploughing which has turned up abundant pottery including Samian and New Forest ware, are visible over some 4 acres of the eastern shoulder of the chalk ridge at about 420 ft. above O.D. A contemporary road, traceable along the ridge for a half mile to the north-west, runs past the cemetery and then through the settlement.

---

Fig. 3 (Plan by R.C.H.M. [England], Crown Copyright)

---

10 On Boscombe Down West 76 acres of contiguous settlement ranged from Iron Age A to late Roman.
An unploughed settlement, undated but of a form to match the last, has recently been identified at *Plush*, Piddletrenthide, north of Dorchester (Pl. VIII). It again faces east and covers at least 4 acres. The terraces which lie below the settlement are actually strip lynchets, part of the open fields of Plush. They lie over part of the settlement whose platform scarps must have been levelled before ploughing could begin. The road, (r), running into the settlement from the south (left of Pl. VIII) is an insertion amongst “Celtic” fields which continued in use, as can be seen by the lynchets formed against its uphill side. This track runs to an open space (a) of about half an acre on the north-west side of the settlement. Here we may note again, that Romano-British settlements are almost always associated with roads which run through or by them, and add that these roads often funnel into an open space of a half-acre or so at one end or side of the settlement. These spaces are ridiculously small compared with most medieval greens but might be plausibly thought to serve a communal function, whether for assembly of animals or people.

Such an open space is a marked feature, clearer on the ground than on the plan, of a remarkably well-preserved settlement on *Meriden Down*, Winterbourne Houghton, 7 miles N.W. of Blandford Forum and 4 miles south of *Hod Hill* (fig. 3). The open space is immediately west of an incomplete enclosure of some 3½ acres regarded as the nucleus of the settlement. This latter could be compared with other abandoned enclosures but the three prominent “lobes” on the south make its form distinctive. South of it are platforms and surface irregularities indicating occupation on former “Celtic” fields and increasing the total area of the settlement to some 6 acres. Four roads approach the open space. Of these, (b) has been partly obliterated by an early medieval park pale, which also cuts across the settlement, and (d), like the track at *Plush* already noted, was laid out after the “Celtic” fields had been cultivated for some time but long before they went out of use. (a) and (c) almost certainly joined a ridge road linking *Meriden* to another settlement half a mile south and to others on the ridge to the north. The roads show that the 30 acres of perfectly preserved fields (only a small part of the former total) are contemporary with the settlement and, incidentally, that there is nothing to distinguish them here from prehistoric ones. The dating of the settlement in its final form depends on cumulative factors: a total lack of pits (generally obvious on unploughed sites), the elaborate road system, the open space, the unenclosed nature of the site, a single sherd of flanged-rim bowl and, lastly, rectangular platforms.

It must be my assumption that rectangular platforms—clearer on the plan of *Chisenbury* (fig. 5)—were constructed to take rectangular buildings. This was the case in Pitt Rivers’ site at Iwerne, north of Blandford, though the platform there was 150 ft. long, over twice as big as any I shall show, and at Park Brow, Sussex, where a group of five platforms, each, like many in our area, about 40 ft. long, were thought to have taken timber-framed houses—cottages is perhaps a better word—equipped with roof tiles, keyed doors, window glass and coloured plaster.

We must suggest, then, that rectangular buildings, some of them surely dwellings, can occur in numbers in settlements of the Romano-British period. They may be found far distant from the Cranborne Chase/Salisbury Plain area, as in the area of *Town Hill*, Frampton, 6 miles west of Dorchester. Here, north of the ridge-top main Roman road are two settlements a half mile apart and joined to it and to each other by an intricate local road system. The roads pass between 900 acres of “Celtic” fields amongst which there are some small earthwork enclosures but no further surviving traces of settlements.

---


Fig. 4 (Plan by R.C.H.M. [England], Crown Copyright)
Each of the settlements, now much disturbed, covers at least 6 acres. Occupation in the Romano-British period is attested by Roman pottery. The southernmost had rectangular platforms loosely grouped about a road which entered a half-acre open space, the focus of three other roads, immediately north of it. The northern settlement, clearly contemporary, was of irregular-platform type, like *Plush*, but again had a triangular open space of half-acre just north of it. Once more there is no detectable change in the “Celtic” fields though much alteration and obliteration had been caused by strip ploughing which had left broad plough ridges of a sort common over large areas of chalk downland in Wessex 13, and dated, with reasonable certainty, on *Fyfield Down*, N. Wilts., to the 13th century A.D. (below, p. 57). The “broad-rig” should not be confused with elongated “Celtic” long fields which the writer has discussed elsewhere 14.

A new feature very occasionally found is a “broad way”, 30 ft. to 100 ft. wide and bounded by slight banks, usually beginning near a settlement. It is of particular interest because it is found also amongst Romano-British development in the Highland Zone e.g. north of the Bank Lane settlement on Lea Green, Grassington 15. The best example in our area is on *Ebsbury Hill*, part of the Grovely ridge running west from Wilton (Pl. IX). Here, about 500 ft. above O.D., where the ridge begins to fall gently east from an enclosure of 50 acres, in places levelled and crossed by “Celtic” fields, is a Romano-British settlement. At its core is an enclosure (a) on Pl. IX), of the same size as that on Berwick Down and apparently breached in a similar way. The broad way (b) runs east for at least 300 yds. from this, flanked by small closes on the north. Once more there is an elaborate track system running through “Celtic” fields into and past the settlement area. It serves to emphasise that the downland was fully settled for at least a large part of the Roman period, supporting a closely knit web of settlements, roads and fields. That there was settlement in the valleys 16 as well I have no doubt, but our knowledge of it is as yet very limited (below, p. 55).

The most remarkable of all settlements are those which re-establish the “village” as an entity in Wessex. It is necessary to say “re-establish” because the British villages talked about by R. G. Collingwood 16 were really little more than concentrations of storage pits, as Bersu showed—and so destroyed their existence. Collingwood’s own village description was significant, not least because it provided a very low view of the British way of life: “a group of huts, not houses: one roomed . . . never neatly aligned on streets . . . but clustered shapelessly”. Some settlements that can now be shown, though only a few survive, could be described by writing the exact opposite. The settlement area on *Chisenbury Warren*, Enford, on the north-east of Salisbury Plain (figs. 4, 5), though perhaps in two parts, might even be described as a “street village”. Sited on the gentle north slope of a shallow valley, it covers 14½ acres. Its street runs for c.700 yds. with some eighty rectangular platforms, a few 60 ft., most 40 ft., long, on either side of it. There is a junction of roads towards the east end where existing building sites may well have filled in a former small open space; and at the west end two, probably three, terraced tracks skirt a markedly triangular open space. Visible “Celtic” fields to the north-west, and possibly others, now destroyed, due north, are notably regular and, although some traverses have been ploughed out, appear to be of the ‘long’ type, adding to the impression that they were laid out in the Roman period 17. They cover at least 124 acres, but not more than c.200 acres. Adjacent to the settlement area on the

17 Cf. ‘long fields’ on Totterdown, Fyfield Down, below p. 60. fig. 9 and Pl. XI.
Fig. 5 (Plan by R.C.H.M. [England], Crown Copyright)
south, south-east and east, is a great but indefinable extent of badly damaged “Celtic” fields of the more usual, less regular appearance.

On the other, south-west, side of Salisbury Plain, on Knook Down, near Warminster, are two other settlements arranged around streets. Their setting is shown in Colt Hoare’s diagram, reproduced as Pl. X. The road joining the two settlements is part of a ridge-way just north of the “old ditch”, which is later than it. Another road followed part of the narrow valley floor north-east of the western settlement. This western settlement covered about 20 acres. It has never been ploughed. There are a relatively large number of rectangular platforms particularly north of (a), which has been added to Hoare’s plan to show the position of the open space, here set in a gully head and very clearly defined by high scarps. South of it the road becomes a broad way 30 ft. across for a short distance. There are a number of sharply rectangular ditched closes further south. Apart from Knook Castle, a curious, presumably Iron Age, defensive enclosure of 2 acres, there are fragments of other, lesser enclosures overlaid either by this settlement or by fields just north of the Castle.

The eastern settlement, of 8 acres, has fewer houses more widely spaced, mostly in large rectangular ditched compounds, but all arranged on either side of a sunken street running north to south.

Both settlements were occupied in the Roman period, as is shown by copious surface finds. Coal has been found in the western one. “Celtic” fields formerly covered the 200 acres between the two settlements and probably much more beside.

Since some points made above are tentative and need checking wherever possible it may be found convenient to have them summarised, as follows:

1. In the pre-Roman Iron Age there were considerable changes and developments about which all too little is known, especially in the last 100 years or so before the Conquest. It is clear, however, that there was a variety of settlements, some with pronounced characteristics. Amongst these was Little Woodbury, a type whose relatively large size (and perhaps big houses) and kinship to small hill-forts suggest pre-eminence. There were also much smaller single steads–of about an acre or under. There were, too, community settlements in hill-forts, in other enclosures and, perhaps, unenclosed.

2. Revised calculations of pit capacity suggest the possibility of considerably bigger populations in general.

3. In the Romano-British period, although some settlements retained native features, girdling earthworks were generally abandoned and in particular there is no sign of an unchanged Little Woodbury-type.

4. There is frequently continuity, or re-use, of settlement sites.

5. There is a notable increase in local roads and almost all Romano-British settlements are associated with such roads. These often run into open spaces of about half an acre area, on the fringes of settlements. An apparently new form of broad way is also found.

6. Rectangular platforms appear in considerable numbers in settlements, suggesting the existence of rectangular houses and other buildings.

7. The downland was fully settled for at least most of the Romano-British period with a mass of settlements connected by roads generally running through “Celtic” fields.

8. Some of these settlements are of a size and have sufficient platforms for structures to be fairly called “villages”. Their plans are nearer to those of some medieval villages than anything recognised as prehistoric in our area, but their associated fields are in the so-called “Celtic” tradition.

\[18\] The nature of probable and possible settlement areas within the ‘impact zones’ of W. D. ranges on the Plain is for the moment being investigated by aerial photography, the Army Air Corps having agreed to photograph “targets” supplied by R.C.H.M.
II. THE DISTRIBUTION OF SETTLEMENT

The origins and types of Romano-British settlements in Dorset and Wiltshire have been briefly discussed. It remains to make some points about their distribution in both a local and a more general context. My main thesis is that our existing knowledge of the Romano-British rural settlement pattern in the Chalk country is deficient and misleading, and that it is now too late to recover more than glimpses of the actual state of affairs in the Wessex countryside. Even so, I would argue that the apparent dichotomy between the Romano-British and Saxon settlement patterns demonstrated by Crawford's hypothesis of a complete break of continuity and of downland desertion as a result of the Saxon settlement. My point is simply that the downland settlement pattern is only part of the whole and that, in any case, it was already abandoned before any large-scale Saxon settlement.


Cf. the contrasting views on the extent of present knowledge in Alcock, L., and Jones, G.R.J., ‘Settlement Patterns in Celtic Britain’, Agric. Hist. Rev., XI (1963), 1, and the realistic approach of S. Applebaum, ‘The Pattern of Settlement in Roman Britain’, Antiquity II (1928), 173-88. It was chance, however, which took me to live in the Nadder Valley, and thus to become familiar with an area crucial to Crawford’s hypothesis of a complete break of continuity and of downland desertion, as a result of the Saxon settlement. My point is simply that the downland settlement pattern is only part of the whole and that, in any case, it was already abandoned before any large-scale Saxon settlement.


Cf. the contrasting views on the extent of present knowledge in Alcock, L., and Jones, G.R.J., ‘Settlement Patterns in Celtic Britain’, Agric. Hist. Rev., XI (1963), 1, and the realistic approach of S. Applebaum, ‘The Pattern of Settlement in Roman Britain’, Antiquity II (1928), 173-88. It was chance, however, which took me to live in the Nadder Valley, and thus to become familiar with an area crucial to Crawford’s hypothesis of a complete break of continuity and of downland desertion, as a result of the Saxon settlement. My point is simply that the downland settlement pattern is only part of the whole and that, in any case, it was already abandoned before any large-scale Saxon settlement.


Cf. the contrasting views on the extent of present knowledge in Alcock, L., and Jones, G.R.J., ‘Settlement Patterns in Celtic Britain’, Agric. Hist. Rev., XI (1963), 1, and the realistic approach of S. Applebaum, ‘The Pattern of Settlement in Roman Britain’, Antiquity II (1928), 173-88. It was chance, however, which took me to live in the Nadder Valley, and thus to become familiar with an area crucial to Crawford’s hypothesis of a complete break of continuity and of downland desertion, as a result of the Saxon settlement. My point is simply that the downland settlement pattern is only part of the whole and that, in any case, it was already abandoned before any large-scale Saxon settlement.


Cf. the contrasting views on the extent of present knowledge in Alcock, L., and Jones, G.R.J., ‘Settlement Patterns in Celtic Britain’, Agric. Hist. Rev., XI (1963), 1, and the realistic approach of S. Applebaum, ‘The Pattern of Settlement in Roman Britain’, Antiquity II (1928), 173-88. It was chance, however, which took me to live in the Nadder Valley, and thus to become familiar with an area crucial to Crawford’s hypothesis of a complete break of continuity and of downland desertion, as a result of the Saxon settlement. My point is simply that the downland settlement pattern is only part of the whole and that, in any case, it was already abandoned before any large-scale Saxon settlement.
the scarps of the ridge are obliquely climbed by numerous terrace-ways, some of which are almost certainly of Iron Age/Romano-British date. Presumably these terrace-ways led to and from fields and settlements, and since the latter do not appear to be on the ridge-top, for local reasons alone it would seem justifiable to suggest that they lay down below.

Secondly, excavated evidence in Wessex independently and increasingly hints at a valley settlement pattern, though Romano-British occupation conclusively sited beneath a modern village is still wanting in this area. It will, however, surely be found in time, as is indicated by the Romano-British ditches, burial and pottery beneath recently demolished cottages at Broadchalke, Roman finds from Tisbury, and the Romano-British cemetery at Fovant. Furthermore, fragments of “Celtic” fields exist immediately above the flood-plain of the R. Nadder near Wallmead Farm, Tisbury, and, more significantly perhaps, immediately north of the existing village of Barford St. Martin in the very area which Crawford chose to demonstrate the exclusive “Celtic” and “Saxon” settlement patterns and, in particular, the distinct and separate distributions of “Celtic” and medieval fields. Here, as elsewhere, the two types of field system overlap. It can at least be argued that, since the medieval fields are associated with a valley settlement, then the “Celtic” fields they have almost obliterated may be similarly associated with a valley settlement rather than with Hamshill, a Romano-British downland settlement 1 mile to the north on the edge of Grovely Forest.

Thirdly, the place-name evidence from this area could be more significant than has been allowed. The existing villages are assumed, largely on such evidence, to be of Saxon origin, yet a noticeable earlier sub-stratum has persisted, along the Nadder valley in particular where at least two river names, three villages, a hamlet, and a large wood, all contain in their names pre-Saxon elements. This is not, of course, to ignore that the great majority of the place-names are Saxon or later, but simply to quér whether, on the basis of that evidence, an assumption that the settlements appeared de novo in the early medieval centuries is necessarily justified: in this context, after all, the first documentary evidence of a place-name gives only a terminus ante quem, and even earlier elements in it need not necessarily reflect previous activity on the site. It may perhaps be significant that whereas the Ebble, Avon and Bourne valleys have produced pagan Saxon cemeteries, none have so far been found in the Nadder and Wylye valleys.

None of the above evidence denies the difference, so often stressed, in the distribution of known prehistoric and medieval settlements: it has simply been used to suggest that the difference began to develop within the Romano-British period and not, as is usually implied if not actually stated, as a direct result of the Saxon settlement. In this particular instance of the Ebble-Nadder ridge and its flanking valleys, it can legitimately be

---

26 It is difficult in any case to believe that the valleys of the Chalk country are archaeologically so different from their counterparts in the Severn Basin and the Midlands. The difference lies in their subsequent treatment, as normal is surely pointed for both prehistoric and Romano-British times by the relatively large-scale excavations beside the R. Avon at Downton, near Salisbury, Wilts., for which see Higgs, E. S., ‘The Excavation of a Late Mesolithic Site’, P.P.S. XXV (1959), 209-32; and Rahatz, P. A., ‘Neolithic and Beaker Sites...’, W.A.M. 58 (1962), 116-41, and CA Romano-British Villas...’, W.A.M. 58 (1963), 303-41; and by two excavations recently carried out by the Salisbury Museum Research Committee, one at Armsley beside the R. Avon nr. Fordingbridge, Hants., which produced evidence of Iron Age Romano-British occupation, the other on a deserted part of the existing village of Upton Scudamore, Wilts., which produced much Iron Age A and Romano-British material, see W.A.M. 57 (1960); 397, 58 (1961), 33-6; and 58 (1963), 469.

27 Excavation and Fieldwork In Wiltshire, 1961, W.A.M. 58 (1962), 246


29 V.C.H. Wilts., 71.

30 ST58282

31 Around SU/056317.

32 Crawford, Antiquity II (1928), map opp. p. 184.

33 Crawford, ibid., 178.

34 Contra Crawford, ibid., 178.

35 Much of the evidence, interpreted differently from here, is set out in Crawford, ibid., 182. For more recent and detailed information see Gover, Mawer and Stenton, The Place-Names of Wiltshire (1939), esp. p. xv-xvii.

36 Crawford, ibid., 179.

37 Dr. J. N. L. Myres’ views on the historical usefulness of place-names in Collingwood and Myres, Roman Britain and the English Settlements (1937), 427; and cf. also Wainwright, F. T., ‘Archaeology and Place-Names and History (1962), 10: ‘the only direct information (place-names) can supply is linguistic information’.

38 V.C.H. Wilts., Map IX, W.A.M. 59 (1964), 87, fig. 2.
suggested that the lack of Romano-British settlements on the downs is a fair reflection of the actuality and that it is therefore probable that some settlements were in the valleys. As there are no known villas or similar establishments in the area, the suggestion, if valid, should seemingly apply to a Celtic population and its native-type settlements.
Turning now to the Marlborough Downs, an area with a topography similar to that of central Dorset and south Wiltshire, one might expect more effective Romanisation if only because the area is more closely related than the first two examples to the urban centres and the main road system of the heart of the Province. In fact, there is little sign that such is the case, and, for such a supposedly well-known area, the evidence is surprisingly scant.

Apart from the possible fort and certain town at Cunetio and the probable town at Wanborough, there is in the area only one certain villa, two “other buildings” and two “settlements of native type” according to one recent source, and only two “other substantial buildings” and no settlements whatsoever according to another. It would seem in order, therefore, to begin with one small part of the whole area, based on the parishes of West Overton and Fyfield, and to look at some of the thirteen settlements, certain or probable, that it contained during the Romano-British period. None, incidentally, had been recorded until recently.

The largest settlement, Overton Down S.E. (fig. 6), is a good example, about 50% unploughed, of a type consisting basically of conjoined enclosures intersected in places by tracks. The ground evidence indicates that the enclosures contained probably rectangular buildings, though here, as elsewhere in Wessex, this remains to be tested by excavation. Although the settlement stops short of a slight re-entrant on its east, its shape is not dictated by the local relief though is perhaps influenced by probably earlier and certainly contiguous “Celtic” fields. Clearly it would be unwise to regard this site, c.450 yds. long and c.100 yds. wide, as that of a single homestead.

Close beside it on the north-west is what appears to be a very different sort of settlement (fig. 7). It consists at most of four possible circular hut sites, perhaps using the local sarsen stone, tucked in at the side of earlier “Celtic” fields. Such a small and inconspicuous site is probably typical of many now destroyed: the ease with which this can happen to settlements consisting of little more than depressions in the ground is obvious, and it is doubtful whether, once ploughed, they would produce any, let alone meaningful, crop or soil marks.

About 650 yds. to the north beside an Iron Age A settlement and enclosure is another but less compact Romano-British settlement photographed and published though not actually recognised nearly 40 years ago. A track runs between it and an associated enclosure immediately to the east. Here were possibly both circular and rectangular buildings, the latter producing Romano-British pottery. Indeed, although such pottery has been found on most of these settlements, this site is relatively prolific. “Celtic” fields adjacent on the west are covered, not with contemporary “lands”, as Crawford called them, but ridge-and-furrow of medieval type, here, as on the neighbouring Fyfield Down, almost certainly of 13th century date.

On Fyfield Down itself, ¾ mile to the north-east, is another small settlement (fig. 8), tucked into a familiar position at the junction of tracks leading into a small “open space”, and partly flattened by medieval ploughing. Again the rectangularity of the earthworks, including probable building platforms, is clear, though the most obvious

---

37 V.C.H. Wilts., Map VIII.
38 O.S. Map of Roman Britain (1956).
39 Since 1959 fieldwork and excavation in this area has been carried out with a happy combination of ‘official’ encouragement from the Society of Antiquaries, the Royal Archaeological Institute, the Marc Fitch Fund, and the Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Society. The main report for present purposes is Bowen, H. C. and Fowler, P. J., The Archaeology of Fyfield and Overton Downs, W.A.M. 58 (1962), 98-113. The four plans here produced were surveyed, together with other sites, during a week in August, 1964, with the help of three schoolboys, D. Clarke, N. Bradford and P. Drewett, whose help I would like to acknowledge.
40 Crawford and Keiller, Wessex from the Air (1928), Pl. XIX. The Iron Age A settlement enclosure, partly visible bottom right, was excavated in 1963-4, see W.A.M. 60 (1965), forthcoming.
feature is an apparently contemporary oval earthwork, in size and in plan not unlike Church Barrow near Woodcuts.

North of the last two settlements on Totterdown, a stretch of downland rising up to and above the 800 ft. contour, is a field system, apparently self-contained and markedly different from the surrounding and characteristic “Celtic” fields on which it impinges (Pl. XI, fig. 9). The fields are laid off from a double-lynchet track, and are very obviously rectangular and straightsided. They are not, however, “strip” fields in the proper sense of the phrase as applied to the areas of medieval ridge-and-furrow on Over-

42 Pitt-Rivers, Excavations in Cranborne Chase I (privately printed, 1887), 23.
ton and Fyfield Downs. Two basic sizes, probably successive, are visible: both are about 100 ft. wide, but one is under c.200 ft. long, the other is c.500 ft. long. Clearly the original layout has been altered—fields have been thrown together, for example—and perhaps the straight bank bisecting the whole system represents the last major change.

These facts suggested we might have here, on a stretch of marginal downland which has escaped medieval and modern cultivation, a distinctively Romano-British field system, laid out under Roman influence, fossilized as earthworks when abandoned, and not disturbed since. Excavation based on this hypothesis indicated, as far as is possible, its worth: in all six cuttings Romano-British pottery, presumably from manure, was found in the former ploughsoil. A few prehistoric sherds also occurred, but in the present context are insignificant. The Romano-British pottery as a group is contained within a dating bracket of late 1st-early 2nd century A.D., indicating that the fields had a short life, perhaps as a marginal intake to meet a temporary need.

44 I am much indebted to K. Annable Esq., Curator, Devizes Museum, for his views on the pottery.
The most challenging settlement in the area from several points of view (Pl. XII) lies in modern arable in the former North Field of the West Overton open field system. The tantalising implications of the proximity of a "Little Woodbury" type of site and a Romano-British settlement apparently represented by the serried ranks of rectangular crop-marks must remain unexplored here, though the position of these sites, on a gentle south-facing slope rising from the Roman road to Bath not far above the valley floor and the existing village, is noteworthy.

45 Repeating the pattern further north on Overton Down (above p. 57), on a point already made by H. C. Bowen (above p. 53).
(Pl. IX) are far and away the best-preserved even in this select company, and their great worth, long recognised if uncritically appreciated, is now enhanced beyond measure by the continuing destruction of their contemporaries.
Fig. 12 Main sites mentioned in the text, numbered as in the Appendix
**APPENDIX**

Main sites mentioned in the text, numbered as on fig. 12 from west to east. For Wiltshire sites, reference is made wherever possible to *V.C.H. Wilts.* which gives full bibliography up to 1951.

**DORSET**

4. Meriden Down, Winterbourne Houghton (fig. 3). ST862049. R.C.H.M., *Central Dorset,* forthcoming. The owner, Capt. W. P. Browne of Higher Houghton, nr. Blandford, is not only ensuring the area’s permanent preservation and good condition, but also welcomes *bona fide* visitors. The approach is from the road W. of the site at ST797047. The original of fig. 3 is displayed on the site.

**WILTSHIRE**


**DORSET**


**WILTSHIRE**


**DORSET**

13. Gussage All Saints (fig. 1). ST999102. Discovered by Dr. J. K. S. St. Joseph (air photographs GE 0062-3); crop-mark planned by R.C.H.M.

**WILTSHIRE**

19. Overton Down, West Overton (figs. 6, 7, 10, 11; Pl. XII),SU125700. *V.C.H. Wilts.*, 120-1.
20. Fyfield Down, Fyfield (figs. 8, 9; Pl. XI). SU140710. *V.C.H. Wilts.*, 72. Interim reports on field-work and excavation, 1959-64, on Overton and Fyfield Downs have been published principally in *W.A.M.* 57-60 (1959-65) *passim.* Much of the basic material is in Bowen and Fowler, *W.A.M.* 58 (1962), 98-115, though it can now be supplemented. For ecological etc. studies of the area, see P. Jewell (ed.). *The Experimental Earthwork on Overton Down, Wiltshire* (Brit. Ass. Adv. Sc., 1963).
25. Cunetio, Mildenhall. SU216695. *V.C.H. Wilts.*, 88. Interim reports on current...
ADDENDA

1. The discussion of the “Celtic” field distribution and the argument for a valley settlement pattern in the Nadder Valley (p. 55) can now be supplemented by the recognition (September, 1965) of “Celtic” fields on the lower part of the steep, north-facing scarp of the chalk ridge which forms the S. side of the valley. Though only clearly visible in oblique sunlight, the fields are well-preserved, especially around ST 969258 and westwards, immediately N. of but some 200 ft. below the Swallowcliffe Down settlement. The steepness (approx. 20°) and aspect of the slope here, plus the fact that neither medieval nor modern ploughing has climbed it, indicate the marginal nature of this land and imply that the field system of which these fields were a part was fully utilising the available cultivable land.

Physically, the important point about these fields is that they occupy only the lower third of the scar-p. They do not continue up to the top of the slope, and the y fields on top of the downs. Everything about them suggests that they are the outer surviving remnants of a field system formerly extensively spread over the fertile Greensand Plateau intervening between the Chalk ridge to the S. and the valley floor to the N. The implication of this would be that the associated settlement or settlements would also be on this lower ground, an implication virtually proved for the Roman period on top of the nearby Buxbury Hill where fragments of limestone and greensand from the valley occurred with manure-deposited sherds associated with Romano-British cultivation (W.A.M. 60 (1965), 47-51).
On the other hand, it is only fair to say (cf. p. 55) that no Romano-British sherds were found in a systematic search when a small field actually in the village of Barford St. Martin was broken up (November, 1965); but neither were sherds of Saxon or late-medieval times, when the village certainly existed.

2. Settlement Overton Down S.E. (p. 57) is one of the last, if not the last, example of a particular type of Romano-British settlement to survive in Wiltshire. Other sites of similar appearance on 1946 R.A.F. air photographs were found to have been destroyed when ground-checked. Its *terraced form*, however, is comparable with the well-preserved *South Down, Winterbourne Stoke*, Romano-British settlement.

3. Some additions to the Appendix (p. 65):

Site no. 7: the inner enclosure of the southernmost site was completely stripped and other features examined in a major excavation by Dr. G. J. Wainwright for M.O.P.B.W. in August-September, 1965.

10: a bronze strip brooch, probably first century A.D., was ploughed up in the northern part of the eastern settlement and examined by Mrs. E. Fowler. A similar example is recorded from the Romano-British settlement on Rushall Down (*V.C.H. Wilts.*, 132, no. 8, incorrectly referenced and described on p. 100).

16: ground examination when the vegetation was low in early 1965 confirmed that this site is more complex than indicated on the published air photograph. The small circular enclosure (F on Crawford’s plan) is linked to a similar one inside Himsel Copse. West of F are well-preserved *rectangular* building platforms c. 40 ft. long; east of it are *circular* hut platforms—a rare combination on the same site.

17: the extensive complex of earthworks on Ebsbury Hill was surveyed early in 1965 by R.C.H.M. in advance of land reclamation. Though many earthworks were destroyed by this development, the Iron Age/Romano-British settlement area itself was eventually not affected, thanks to the forbearance of the tenant farmer Mr. Helyer and his sons, who readily appreciated that the site should be preserved once its scientific value and rarity had been explained to them.
The Somerset Levels in the Roman Period

BARRY CUNLIFFE

I

The purpose of this paper is to summarize briefly what is known of the Romano-British communities living on the Somerset Levels, and to consider the effects of environmental change upon them. Although a considerable quantity of archaeological information is available, much of it derives from rescue work and chance finds made during the last 50 years and there has been little systematic excavation with the problems discussed here in mind. In recent years, however, the work of the North Somerset Archaeological Research Group and the Bridgwater and District Archaeological Society has done much to fill the gaps.1

The coastal plain of North Somerset is divided into three separate regions by westerly projecting ridges of high ground (fig. 1). In the north the Failand Ridge separates the Gordano valley and the Gloucestershire littoral zone from the moors and flats around Weston-Super-Mare, which are in turn delineated on their southern side by the Mendip hills. To the south of the Mendips and between them and the Polden hills lies the third more extensive expanse of low ground. Further to the south, the river Parrett, flowing in a wide valley between Sedgemoor on the east and the foot-hills of the Quantocks on the west, forms a separate zone which lies beyond the scope of the present study. The inland limit of the three main areas is fringed with peat moors, which gradually give way to undulating triassic and carboniferous hills further east. The flats themselves consist of great sheets of alluvial silts, seldom rising to more than 20 feet above the present ordnance datum. It is with the relationship of Roman occupation to this alluvium that we are here concerned.

In the northern zone, at Lawrence Weston in the west suburbs of Bristol, Clevedon Brown found a single sherd of Roman coarse-ware at the junction between the alluvium and the red marl subsoil constituting the lower slope of the adjacent triassic hill.2 As a result of this, and evidence obtained from a number of borings, he was able to conclude that “the present day 20-25 ft. contour represents the lower edge of the dry hill slope occupied by the Roman-British settlement”.3

South of the Mendips Roman material has been known for some time to lie beneath the alluvium, but exact details of the finds are usually wanting. A site of some significance, however, was examined recently by Mr. Trevor Miles in a brick pit at Highbridge.4 Here the excavator discovered a Roman ground surface dating to the middle of the second century. Immediately above the Roman level were layers of silts, indicating that the site had become rapidly waterlogged and remained more or less so for a considerable period, during which 7 feet of alluvium was deposited. During building operations in Highbridge in 1960 Nash and Smiths recovered evidence of a building with a limestone floor, associated with samian and other pottery, at a depth of about 5½ feet below

I am indebted to Mr. Gray Usher, of the North Somerset Archaeological Research Group, and Mr. Trevor Miles, of the Bridgwater and District Archaeological Society, for discussing the problems with me and for allowing me to refer to their unpublished work.2 Clevedon Brown, J., “The Roman Settlement at Lawrence Weston”, J.R.S. 8, 2 (1958), 119-123.3 Ibid., 121.4 Excavated 1957. Information from Mr. Miles.5 Nash, S. G. and Smith, V. C. R., ‘A Roman Structure at Highbridge’, Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries, XXVIII (1961), 43-4
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Fig. 1 (No attempt has been made to include on the plan all the known finds of Roman material)

the top of the alluvium. Other measurements in the Highbridge area have produced similar results: at Bason Bridge, for example, Roman pottery was found beneath 12 feet of silt, and at Highbridge in 1804 drainage work brought to light Roman remains, including coin moulds, lying on the peat surface below 7 feet of alluvium.

Further inland, records made by Mr. H. S. L. Dewar during the digging of the Huntspill Cut showed that the Roman ground-surface, on top of a peat layer, lay beneath 9 feet of alluvial clay at the west end, but that the clay gradually diminished in thickness further east until it disappeared altogether. It is therefore clear that at some period the Roman ground-surface suffered a severe and lengthy inundation.

To date the inundation is a difficult matter. The Highbridge brick pit evidence suggests that here, at least, occupation had ceased in the face of rising water by the end of the second century. "On the South Welsh coast—an area susceptible to the

7 Dewar, H. S. L. 'The Pottery Mounds of the Brue Valley', Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries, XXV (1949), 201.
8 Mr. G. Dannel has examined the samian discovered here and is of the opinion that it dates to the second half of the second century.
same fluctuations—similar evidence has been found. At Uskmouth 9, Antonine pottery was discovered at 10 feet O.D. beneath 14 feet of estuarine clay, and at Goldcliff and Redwick10 pottery of the same date was recovered from similar positions, thoughless satisfactorily sealed. This evidence suggests, but by no means proves, that the coastal areas may have become flooded by the end of the second or the beginning of the third century.

At various times during the nineteenth century the area north of the Polden Ridge has yielded quantities of baked clay coin moulds copying coins minted in the period 193 to 235 A.D. 11 Although the exact find spots are not known, and the relationship of the material to the alluvium was not recorded, it is quite possible that these sites were inundated during the period of flooding. Some support for this view is afforded by the discovery of coin moulds beneath the alluvium at Highbridge in 1804. 12 Further inland, north of Chilton Polden, Bulleid examined and planned a series of mounds, composed largely of pottery and briquetage, situated on “dry land” beyond the inland limit of the alluvial sheet. 13 Good dating evidence was not forthcoming, but certain features of the coarse-ware suggest a fourth century date rather than an earlier one. Similar mounds, examined by Dewar in 1941 14 during the construction of the Huntspill Cut between Witchey Bridge and Puriton Drove, were sealed beneath alluvium and the pottery recovered from them was thought to be of third or fourth century date by the excavator. Thus, although the dating evidence is not entirely satisfactory, the picture which begins to emerge suggests that floods of increasing severity and extent gradually drove the local inhabitants further inland during the course of the third century.

How much of the alluvium was deposited by high tides and to what extent the inland deposits were laid down by fresh water ponded up behind the coastal silts is a matter for further geological examination. 15 We know little, too, of the extent of the flooding in the post-Roman period, but recent researches in the area to the south of the Failand Ridge are beginning to throw some light on the problem. In this area the North Somerset Archaeological Research Group have discovered a number of fourth century sites actually on top of the alluvium, around the fringes of higher ground. 16 Since there is no reason to believe other than that the silts here are the same as those south of Mendip, we must assume that during the fourth century some re-colonization of the previously waterlogged fringe lands was possible. The nature of the archaeological deposits at Combwich suggests that here also just such a re-colonization was attempted.

Practically nothing is known of sites below the silts in the area between the Failand Ridge and the Mendips. The villa at Wemberham 18, however, may have been flooded at the beginning of the fourth century, since the coin series appears to end then, but the silty soil sealing the building need not be of late Roman date. It could have resulted from much later local floodings of the adjacent river Yeo. Clearly re-excavation is needed.

10 Ibid. 12 and 13. I am grateful to Mr. J. K. Knight for drawing my attention to this reference.
11 The various references to these finds are summarized and discussed by Haverfield in the V.C.H. Somerset I, (1906), 352-3.
12 Phelps, W., op. cit., 103-4.
15 Godwin, H., Phil. Trans. R.S., (1948), series B, 233, 279 and figs. 1 and 2.
16 Mr. Gray Usher, of the North Somerset Archaeological Research Group, kindly discussed his findings with me and has allowed me to map them in fig. 1.

Reade, R. C., Ibid., 64-73.
There is, then, evidence of widespread flooding in the Somerset Levels during the third and fourth centuries, but what effect this had on the economy is difficult to demonstrate at present as practically nothing is known of first and second century settlements in the area. In the surrounding hills, however, normal agricultural activities appear to have been practised from the earliest times. Well developed field systems occur and several of the excavated villas can be traced back to early beginnings. The Basilican house at Locking, for example, overlies a first century timber structure; first century occupation has been found near the Chew Park villa and at Star a building dating from the first century has been partially examined. In addition to the farming activities centred upon the villas, specialized lead mining centres were set up in the first century at Charterhouse and Green Ore, probably under military control.

At the time when the sea began to encroach upon the lowlying peat-covered plain conditions would have become unfavorable for farming; indeed Godwin was able to demonstrate an increase in the percentage of Chenopodiaceous pollen at the time, indicating a change to salt marsh conditions. It was no doubt as a result of the changing environment that the industrial sites of the Brue valley began to develop. Mention has already been made of the pottery and briquetage mounds found particularly in the upper reaches of the valley. Their position near the encroaching sea shore, and the occurrence of briquetage, strongly suggest that salt extraction was carried out, but the enormous quantities of pottery, usually consisting of a restricted range of forms among which the everted rimmed jar was prominent, may indicate the existence of an active pottery industry as well. Another fourth century pottery producing site has recently been discovered at Congresbury north of the Mendip hills.

In the early third century the production of coins must have formed an important part of the activities of communities living on the lower slopes of the Polden Ridge, to judge by the number of moulds discovered. Whether such production was official or not is unknown. It could have been carried out under official contract to supply the province in time of coin shortage, on the other hand it might well have been of purely local inspiration intended to help sustain the population forced by flooding from their homes. Coin moulds have also been found at Whitchurch, south of Bristol, and a recent discovery of a coin mould of Tetricus from a site near Clevedon shows that “money-making” was widespread both geographically and chronologically.

The third and fourth centuries also saw the spread of metallurgical activities to a large number of sites in North Somerset. Iron smelting is attested at Chew Park and Herriotts Bridge in the Chew valley and at several of the Mendip villas, whilst the production of pewter vessels was carried out on a large scale at Camerton and Lansdown.

---

20 J.R.S. XLV (1955), 139-40.
22 The best summary of the Charterhouse sites is in *V.C.H. Somerset*, 1 (1906), 334-344.
24 Godwin, H., 'Botanical and Geological History of the Somerset Levels', *Brit. Ass. Adv. Sc.*, December 1955, 319. The article also contains Professor Godwin's views on the nature of the flooding of the upper reaches of the Axe valley. This information has been included on the map, fig. 1.
25 Information from Mr. Gray Usher, who allowed me to examine the pottery recovered from his excavation.
28 Information and a photograph from Mr. Gray Usher.
29 J. R. S. XLIV (1955), 139-40.
Although more detailed evidence is required, it would appear that the worsening of conditions throughout the third and fourth centuries was accompanied by a greater reliance on industrial activity. Whether these events were directly related remains to be seen, but an inundation on the scale of that experienced by the inhabitants of Somerset would undoubtedly have caused a considerable displacement of population and may well have led to new economic specializations determined by the varied natural resources. Population movement might also account, in part at least, for the intensified habitation of the Mendip caves and for the growth of the large walled settlement at Gatcombe on the south flank of the Failand Ridge.

III

The inundation of the Somerset Levels and the south Welsh coast could have been caused by an overall rise in sea level of 10-20 feet. Evidence for a similar rise elsewhere in Britain is plentiful, although precise details of the actual figure are seldom given. In the Fenland area surrounding the Wash, Mrs. Hallam has drawn attention to a deterioration in the Roman drainage system beginning about 300 A.D., and more recently Dr. Salway has demonstrated that the settlement at Hockwold experienced serious flooding in the late second century and was finally abandoned by c.200 A.D. In the Thames estuary clear evidence of late or post-Roman subsidence has come to light at Southchurch.

The relationship of the sea level to the North Kentish marshes has been the subject of a number of detailed studies. Evans has shown that a marked rise in sea level occurred, probably at the beginning of the post-Roman period. However, an examination of the pottery from the Upchurch Marshes shows that the large-scale settlement, connected with salt extraction and pottery production, was at an end by the early third century and although a few examples of fourth century wares have been found the quantity is almost negligible when compared with the earlier assemblages. A gradual rise in sea level during the third century with a few inhabitants continuing to live on the slightly higher areas would explain all the observed facts. Further east, at Richborough, there is some evidence of a rise in water level, depositing silts over the road leading to the site, but it is impossible to suggest a date for this.

Little evidence is yet available from the south coast. The barnacle-encrusted second century altar incorporated in the east gate of the Roman fort at Lympne is suggestive of an earlier naval base, since flooded, from which came the tiles of the Classis Britannica reused in the stone fort. The position of such a base and its relationship to the sea level are, however, unknown. Recently, at Fishbourne, excavation has shown that water-laid silts were deposited both to the north and to the south of the masonry building. The exact date of this deposition has not yet been established, but it seems likely that it had begun by the third century.

---

41 Mr. Frank Jenkins, with whom I have discussed this matter, is firmly of the opinion that the marine transgression began early in the third century.
42 Smith, Charles Roach, The Roman Castrum at Lympne, (London 1852), 24-7, pl. VII.
There is, then, evidence of a widespread rise in sea level around the coasts of southern Britain beginning in the third century and continuing into the post-Roman period, and there can be little doubt that these fluctuations are part of the far more extensive changes in sea level experienced by many parts of the adjacent North European coasts at this time.

IV

To summarise: the alluvial levels of North Somerset were deposited in the late Roman to post-Roman period as the result of a gradual rise in sea level, beginning in the third century. More than 100 square miles of inhabited land was inundated, giving rise to a massive movement of population and an apparent reorientation of the economy. The examination of this environmental change lies with the geologist and botanist, the nature of the social and economic developments is a study for the archaeologist. It is hoped in the next few years to approach the problem on a wide front.

43 Mid-Late second century pottery scaled by alluvial deposits has recently been reported from Widemouth, south of Bude (Cornwall); cf. Wood, P., 'A find of the Roman period in North-East Cornwall', *Cornish Arch.* 4 (1965), 88.
The character and origins of Roman Dumnonia

CHARLES THOMAS

General

In his summary of the Conference, Mr. A. L. F. Rivet described the contribution which follows as “the clearest account of the Early Iron Age in the south-west that we have yet heard”: On the face of it, this was a pretty compliment; the writer, however, long acquainted with Mr. Rivet’s elegant style, sensed the reproof lurking behind the words. What business had such a paper in a Conference allegedly devoted to Roman settlement? It is to be hoped that the essay itself will provide an exculpatory answer to this charge. In preparing the material, I had two interlocking themes well to the fore; the concept of the Early Iron Age (sensu stricto) and the Roman period in the south-west as a continuous process, scarcely divisible at all, certainly not at any such clear-cut horizon as A.D. 43 (or 49, or 53); and, in a negative mood, the current attribution to the Roman centuries of many monuments which, it now seems, should really be dated—if “date” implies construction as well as use—to the preceding era.

The lengthy south-west peninsula is immediately distinguishable from southern England through its (largely igneous) upland blocks—Exmoor, Dartmoor, Bodmin Moor, Hensbarrow, the Wendron moors, and the Land’s End. The effect of physical geography upon human settlement and activity at all periods has been, and is, radical and primarily. The coastal emphasis of almost all archaeological distribution maps in the region is not mainly due, as the cynic might suppose, to the ease with which material can be discovered in sand-dunes, neither to the Victorian concentration of a leisureed class in such spas as Torquay or Penzance. It reflects a constant, repetitive series of settlement-patterns, partly because external communications were until very recently based on the long and accessible coastline, partly because the best (less acid, better-drained) lands form broad littoral fringes to the irregular highland spine of the peninsula.

There is a long and productive tradition of field-work in the region, most obviously reflected in the local societies of considerable age; but neither Cornwall nor Devon has been the subject of a Royal Commission inventory, and the relevant volumes in the Victoria County History series are now, save as source-books, archaeologically obsolete. It would be fair to say that, while a great deal may be known about a few restricted and heavily-excavated areas, any broader picture of the region as a region has become a possibility only within the last decade.

1 E.g., in particular courtyard houses and fogous (see p. 80).
2 This is very well discussed in Fox (1964) (see note 4), chap. 1; see especially the map, fig. 1. ibid.
4 Most recent summaries: Cornwall, Proc. West Cwll. F.C. 11/2 (1958), symposium, whole issue; Cornwall, Devon, part of Somerset, A. Fox, South West England (Thames & Hudson, 1964, cited here as Fox (1964)); and see also Devon, C. A. R. Radford’s brief overall conspexus, Arch. J. CXIV (1957), 128-35, with selective bibliography. Towards such an eventual picture, a Cumulative index to all aspects of the Cornish past (1932 to date) appears annually in Proc. West Cwll. F.C. (up to 1961) and its successor Cornish Archaeology (1962-).
The Iron Age Background

The local transition, probably not before the 4th century B.C., from an Ultimate Bronze Age to an Early Iron Age inevitably lacks clear definition. The advent of Celtic-speaking, iron-using newcomers may have been roughly coeval with a noticeable increase of an external (sea-borne) trade in alluvially-won tin, a trade initiated certainly as early as the Late Wessex, or Early Bronze 2, phase, but not always apparent at all intervening stages. This increase is demonstrated, inferentially, and quite apart from any literary clues, by a scatter of imported coins, brooches, and even pottery, nearly all found in south Devon or on the Cornish coast. Distributionally uninformative, the coins appear to reach a peak in the later 2nd and the 1st centuries B.C.

Despite this, and other criteria, it is probably still too early to talk with confidence of “First (and Second) A” in the Iron Age of the south-west. It may be more helpful to envisage a process of continuous (or discontinuous) arrivals, at first from the Continent, later and more specifically from north-west France, and of course at all periods conceivably overland from southern England. If this process of arrivals is depicted as a wave, with pronounced, albeit uneven, crests and troughs, then certain crests can tentatively be referred to recorded happenings on the European mainland.

The earliest Iron Age newcomers reveal themselves through new pottery shapes—shouldered jars and bowls—the univallate cliff-castle at Maen (by the Land’s End), and a series of simple hut settlements like Bodrifty and Wicca Round in west Cornwall, Garrow on Bodmin Moor, Kestor and perhaps Dainton in Devon. If univallate hill forts—other than Blackbury in east Devon, which might be regarded as a westward extension of the Wiltshire-Dorset region—occur, they remain to be located and defined. Small enclosed, terraced, or lyncheted fields, and saddle-querns, imply ard- or hoe-cultivation. Unfortunately animal bones seldom survive the acid soils of the region. Save for new shapes in pottery, occasional beads, and the evidence for iron-working as at Kestor, these sites yield nothing, house-forms and agriculture included, which cannot be derived from the local Bronze Age continuum. Indeed, apart from chronological conventions, many of these sites are simply delayed Bronze Age peasant homes. The pottery fabrics (as opposed to forms), the abundant if seldom-published stone tools, the circular huts with double-faced stone walls and internal post settings, the querns, even the field-systems, are all seen in the local Middle Bronze Age; indeed, on the evidence from Gwithian alone, much of this may have been present in the south-west in late Wessex times.

The Iron Age introductions of the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C. may have involved only the arrival of comparatively few groups, by sea and land, into a static and not very extensive population. They bear, in Hawkes’ terms, an “A-culture” aspect. Subsequent introductions in the late 3rd and the earlier 2nd centuries not only seem more plentiful, and thus are more easily defined, but also share in certain facets of the

---


8 Sites so mentioned, merely *exempi causa*, and not individually referenced here, can be found in the indices to Hencken (1932) or to Fox (1946).


10 Such (few) honourable exceptions as P. J. Fowler, *Cornish Arch.* 1 (1962), 54-58 illus. (Porth Godrevy, actually within the Roman period) stress the necessity for including such evidence.

11 T. V. S. Megaw, A. C. Thomas, B. Wailes, in *Proc. West Cwll. F. C.* II.5 (1961), 200, cross-ploughing, small rectangular fields with lynchetts, clearance banks, built terraces, and evidence for manuring at a date which is probably Early Bronze 2/Middle Bronze 1.
portmanteau grouping which Dr. Hodson wishes to call his “Woodbury culture”. It now becomes possible, if only now, to isolate regional features. Such a process has perforce to be effected in cultural rather than chronological terms, because of a feature which marks off the south-west peninsula during many centuries of pre- and proto-history; sheer material poverty (fig. 1). The metalwork adjuncts to other British regional schemes simply do not occur in the south-west save, very occasionally, on sites whose general character and cultural positions are already apparent from other, more plentiful and probably less diagnostic, data. A “brooch chronology” for the south-west, for instance, seems hardly possible. On the credit side, both pottery types and field-monuments do permit certain regional distinctions. Multivallate forts, for the most part comparatively small, and none likely to be much (if at all) older than the 2nd century B.C., display a distinct Dumnonian class involving widely-spaced ramparts, additional enclosures or annexes, and such sitings as hill-slopes or spurs, sometimes with additional and separate cross-banks. Lady Fox’s isolation of this group is wholly convincing. The absence of any contemporary coin economy, the recorded tradition of barter, and the interpretation of the intervalla and the outwork enclosures as cattle kraals, all hint that, for these south-west chieftains, cattle may not only have been a source of food and hide, but may have constituted pecunia in the strict, original, sense.

12 F. R. Hodson, ‘Cultural grouping within the British pre-Roman Iron Age’ P.P.S. XXX (1964), 99-110.
13 Cf. now also D. Dudley and E. M. Jope, ‘An Iron Age cist-burial with two brooches from Trevone, N. Cornwall’ Cornish Arch. 4 (1965), 18-21, discussion, and map, ibid. fig. 6.
15 Solinus, Collectanea rerum memorabilium, xxii (early 3rd cent. AD.; this passage, which states that the Dumnonii insist on barter, and refuse coinage, may be based on Diodorus Siculus, Pliny (Nat. Hist. iv, 16—so Rice Holmes! Ancient Britain, etc. (1907). 359 n. 12) or even, ultimately, on Pytheas (Radford, Trans. Devon Ass. LXXIX (1947), 16). There is no reason to doubt it.)
An Atlantic-European origin for these widely-spaced forts has, rather tentatively, been proposed, with specific analogies cited from Galicia (north-west Spain and Portugal). Some ultimate connection may prove to exist; though the well-known “duck-stamped” pottery of the Severn region, strays from which are known in Cornwall, is only marginally relevant here, and parallels between the Iberian castros and those few south-west forts like Chun Castle which are, of necessity, built with massive surface-gathered stone walls rather than from quarried ditch material really amount, constructionally, to very little. Nor should it be forgotten that the internal structures at Chun, like the celebrated three-hole furnace, may be post-Roman insertions.

One likely point of origin, on pottery evidence, is north-west France. The well-known distribution map of pots with counter-sunk handles and internal rim-grooves, if brought up to date, exhibits a far greater affection of mid- and west Cornwall than was apparent at the time of the Maiden Castle report. Again, if one seeks (as one must) outside south-west England for a source for the mass inhumation cemeteries of Harlyn Bay type which appear in the region at this period, the occurrence of similar cemeteries in the Armorican Iron Age comes at once to mind.

The regional pottery tradition from (probably) early in the 2nd century B.C. is still misleadingly labelled, after a late and atypical outpost of the style, “Glastonbury”. If this term be used at all, it must include the whole field of south-west pottery with milled or slashed neck-bands, rouletted lines, and rectilinear patterns of grooves, evolving finally into mature wheel-finished or wheel-made forms with “metallic” finish and the filled curvilinear ornament related to contemporary fine metalwork. These later, surely professionally-made, pots are of interest as being, apart from tin, one of the few detectable exports from the region. While one still has the impression that “Glastonbury” pottery originates in an exotic style, probably north or north-west French, and can be seen in an early stage at, e.g. the first phase of Castle Dore, a full study of the tradition has yet to be undertaken.

The Dumnonii

On the analogy of the rest of southern Britain, it is only at this 2nd century B.C. stage of widely-spaced forts and the earliest Glastonbury pottery—that application of the regional name Dumnonia becomes either meaningful or permissible. The corresponding group-name, Damnonii or Dumnonii, is Celtic, and so presumably intranational—that is, what the Dumnonii called themselves—as well as extra-national, what others called them. It may possibly mean something like “We of the World” or “We of (this) Land”. In settlement terms, the Dumnonii, farmers or stockbreeders, inhabited fortified hill-top or hill-slope villages like Blackbury, Hembury, Tregear

---

17 K. M. Kenyon, Arch. J. CX (1953), 1-87 (Sutton Walls).
18 E.g. the (now ruined) Castle-an-Dinas, Ludgvan (SW/485350); ‘Castle Pencar’ on Tregonning Hill, Breage (SW/600300); and to some extent St. Dennis (SW/951583); q.v. now Cornish Arch. 4 (1965), 31-35, trial excavations.
20 Originally in Wheeler, Maiden Castle, Dorset (1943), fig. 17; see also Sir Mörumer Wheeler and K. M. Richardson, Hill-Forts of Northern France (1957), fig. 12.
21 Additional sites, information on which was kindly supplied by various friends (see Acknowledgements): c.-sunk handles, Castle Gotha, Kynance Gate, Porth Godrevy, Nor’nor (Scilly), all Cornwall; rim-grooves, Stoke Gabriel, Devon; Castle Gotha, Carwynnen (Camborne), Porth Godrevy, Kynance, Nor’nor, Cornwall.
22 P. R. Giot, Brittany (Dames and Hudson, 1960), 184-6, 4, 60.
23 See map, Fox (1964). 119, fig. 36.
25 Because it is no more than an assumption (see note 15) that Solinus gens Brittana Dumnonii derives from as far back as Pytheas (tempore the local ‘Iron A’ culture); because to postulate a 4th, or even 3rd, cent. B.C. date for the name Dumnonii is to raise certain unwarranted linguistic assumptions: and because there is some evidence of large-scale additions to, perhaps even replacements of, the local population in the broad period 250-150 B.C.
26 Acknowledgements): c.-sunk handles, Castle Gotha, Kynance Gate, Porth Godrevy, Nor’nor (Scilly), all Cornwall; rim-grooves, Stoke Gabriel, Devon; Castle Gotha, Carwynnen (Camborne), Porth Godrevy, Kynance, Nor’nor, Cornwall.
27 P. R. Giot, Brittany (Dames and Hudson, 1960), 184-6, 4, 60.
28 See map, Fox (1964). 119, fig. 36.
30 Because it is no more than an assumption (see note 15) that Solinus gens Brittana Dumnonii derives from as far back as Pytheas (tempore the local ‘Iron A’ culture); because to postulate a 4th, or even 3rd, cent. B.C. date for the name Dumnonii is to raise certain unwarranted linguistic assumptions: and because there is some evidence of large-scale additions to, perhaps even replacements of, the local population in the broad period 250-150 B.C.
31 Common Celtic *dumno- (a noun) ‘world, land, territory’: cf. Radford, op. cit. note 15, 15-16, quoting Sir Ifor Williams, See Arch. XCIII (1949) ‘Richardson and Crawford on the Ravenna list’, 30, s.v. Dumnonii: but the suggestion that the 9) Dumnonii, as tin-miners, took their name from the adjectival form *dumnus (‘deep, hidden (ahead of all evidence) that shaft-mining in the peninsula was practised prior to its generally supposed late-medieval introduction from the Continent see, passim, G. R. Lewis, The Stannaries: a study of the English Tin Miner (Cambridge, Mass., 1924: Harvard Econ. Stud. III)).
Rounds, Castle Dore, and Cam Brea; some cliff-castles, notably Trevelgue 27 and Gurnard’s Head; and a good many fully-contemporary open hut-groups or even isolated steadings (some of the former, like Bodrifty, represent continuations of villages several centuries older). Surprisingly few hill-forts or promontory-forts (cliff-castles) in the peninsula fall into the potential oppidum class.28 The material culture, as revealed through excavation, remains much the same as in preceding centuries.

Cliff-castles and Cordoned Ware

At a point which, on our present very imperfect reckoning, cannot be much before 100 B.C., a complex of new cultural phenomena appears in the south-west; and these phenomena, unlike multivallation of hill-forts, circular hut-types, and Glastonbury pottery, seem to stand apart from the broad cultural development of southern England from now onwards. The most striking feature may, when more of the requisite excavations have been carried out, prove to be the multiplicity of cliff-castles; most of which are multivallate and many of these, superficially, multi-period as well.29 From north Devon, right around the Cornish coast (and including Stilly), then eastward again to the great bulge of south Devon, these cliff-castles are found (fig. 2). Many of them are unmapped and unsurveyed, and nearly all as yet unexcavated. Those which have been dug can, by and large, be shown to have been inhabited centres and not mere points de refuge.

Recent work in both Cornwall and Devon suggests that the introduction of a new pottery tradition, exhibiting forms clearly related to what in north-west France would be called La Tène II/III or III, should be placed in this century as well. These pots, whose primary characteristic resides in horizontal cordons of a rounded section, tooled out from the body of the vessel, are generally called “Cordoned Ware”. Representative groups have now been published from Castle Dore, 30 Carloggas, 31 and Mulfra Vean. 32 The south-west (virtually, Cornish) distribution of cordoned ware forms a suitable parallel to that of the cliff-castles (fig. 2). Without a disproportionate amount of immediate research, it is impossible to do more here than indicate the general French

27 Trevelgue (excavated by C. K. Croft Andrew, 1939) remains wholly unavailable for evident; see brief notes, 254, J.R.S. 30 (1940), 175, and (valuable short account) Nigel Tangye, The Story of Glendorgal (D. B. Barton Ltd., Truro, 1962).
28 i.e., over 15 acres internal area; see Ordinance Survey Map of Southern Britain in the Iron Age (1962).
background of this pottery; the point of departure for Dumnonia was presumably the modern Brittany.  

Another facet of this cultural innovation is the souterrain, in Cornwall generally called fogou. The idea, expressed by both the late Professor S. P. O Riordain and (more recently) Mrs. E. V. Clark, that the Cornish fogous are derived from Ireland, is not really supported by any firm evidence; it merely evades the question since (discounting, as one surely must, the site at Cush, Co. Limerick) Irish souterrains cannot convincingly be shown to appear in Ireland before some local Early Iron Age. A common source, external to both areas, indeed to the east Scottish “earth-house” province as well, might be thought a less improbable solution.

The Cornish fogous find their closest counterparts in Brittany. The former are admittedly larger than the Gaulish souterrains, taken as a class. This maybe linked with the mode of construction, in a stone-lined trench of some size, rather than by being tunnelled-out in subsoils; though side-passages at both Treveneage and Pendeen Vau are tunnelled-out in Armorican style. The basic range of plans is strikingly similar (see fig. 3), and one group of Breton souterrains—at La Trinité-sur-Mer, Morbihan—are not only built like the Cornish ones, stone-walled, but are also integrated into hut-complexes, as some of the Cornish fogous are. Again, an aspect of the Cornish
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Fig. 3 Comparative Plans of Cornish fogous and Breton souterrains

33 Cf. instances in Wheeler and Richardson (1957), op. cit. note 20.
34 Commonly, fogou or fougou; Mrs. Clark (note 36) cites, rather curiously (p. 1), the nonsense etymologies of Wm. Borlase (1754) and Williams (1865). The word, which has even further dialect variants (vaw, vag, vugga, etc.) is Cornish (f)ogo, gogo “cave”, Welsh ogo, gogof.
35 In his Antiquities of the Irish Countryside (3rd edn., 1953), 34.
36 E. V. Clark, Cornish Fogous (Methuen, 1961), 142.
37 O'Riordain, “Excavations at Cush, Co. Limerick, 1934 and 1935”, Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad. 45 C (1940), 83 ff.; the question hinges on whether the (admittedly) Bronze Age burials were not already there when the fort, and souterrain, were constructed. For discussion of souterrain dates, see Mohige, J. Roy. Soc. Ant. Ireland 69 (1929), 162 ff.
38 I am greatly indebted to Etienne Rynne, not only for discussion, but for the loan of his notes on souterrains in general. The intrusive Iron Age element so brilliantly argued by Mr. Rynne himself (Bericht V Internat. Kongr. Vor-und Frühgesch., Hamburg 1958 (1961), 708-9) provides a conceivable setting for them Continental introduction.
40 Clark, op. cit. note 36, pp. 3, 6; report, J. T. Blight, “Subterranean Chambers at Trevenemegue... etc.” (Penzance, 1867), summarised with illus. in Hencken (1932), 143-5, fig. 41.
41 Clark, op. cit., chap. 3, with excellent plan (fig. 2).
42 This is still visible, or can be assumed on good evidence, in nine instances, not all discussed by Mrs. Clark.
sittings—within an earthwork, one entrance in the interior, the other sally-port-wise in a ditch finds Breton counterparts, and may also afford a clue to the problem of Ireland, where souterrains, promontory forts, cashels and raths are all somehow linked in a general, though ill-defined, complex.

Finally, from the 1st century B.C., the restricted area of the twenty-mile-long Land’s End peninsula exhibits a specific sort of hut group, which has basic parallels over most of Atlantic Britain, notably in north Wales. The “Courtyard House”, as it is called, best-known from the type-sites of Chysauster and Porthmeor, is with one known exception confined to high ground in the Land’s End peninsula. The unit is cellular, with living- and store-rooms opening onto an unroofed, but paved, central courtyard, the whole being enclosed in a massively thick enceinte, and the lay-out—general plan and individual rooms—being expressed in oval or sub-circular form. Courtyard houses occur singly, in pairs, or in clusters; they can constitute open sites or, more rarely, be enclosed in a kind of cashel. In the villages, if one may so term the larger clusters, smaller conventional circular huts, apparently contemporary, are also found. All courtyard houses stand, or appear once to have stood, in or next to field-systems; the material culture revealed from the excavated examples is of an agricultural and rather conservative nature. It is still an open question whether this house-form was locally evolved (presumably as a response to worsening climate, or hostile neighbours, or predatory animals), or whether it owes something to external models. If the former, it seems curious that, within the south-west, the type is so excessively localised if the latter, convincing external prototypes remain to be found.

Now these supposedly first-century B.C. features are all interconnected, with each other, and with yet another class of field-monument, the “round”, ker, or embanked homestead, which will be considered in a moment (p. 87). Cordoned ware has been found in rounds, in fogous, in cliff-castles, and in courtyard houses. Fogous are connected with rounds and courtyard houses, though curiously not with cliff-castles. Apart from the rounds, which have a very wide distribution over Cornwall and parts of Devon, there are two distributional foci of this general complex; the Land’s End peninsula, and the (now agricultural) shelf along the north Cornish coast. These foci seem to be real, and by no means due to an uneven emphasis of local research. The relative cultural status of the complex is mainly afforded by cordoned ware, which is secondary to ‘Glastonbury’ wares at Castle Dore, and at other sites is earlier than forms which imitate, or are found in association with, Roman coarse pottery. Where any kind of external parallels exist to this complex, they exist, as with the preceding Glastonbury-ware innovations, in north-west France; and if one narrows this to Armorica, there are already hints that the closest analogies so far lie in what was Venetic territory, the southern fringe of Brittany.

44 Boleigh, Treveneage, Halligey, Trewardreva; Clark, op. cit.
45 Cf. (for a density recalling south-west England, though some are admittedly later than the Iron Age) the map of cliff-castles in Ireland, by V. B. Proudfoot; U.J.A. 24:25 (1961-2), 109, fig. 11.
48 In this respect they resemble (‘tortuously’) the ground plans of the Scottish broch/wheel-house complex, and, more relevantly, A. H. A. Hogg’s homestead of Class IV (b)—enclosed homesteads of oval plan—in N.W. Wales (R.C.A.H.M. Caernarvon, III (1964), p. xcix and fig. 21).
50 E.g. Porthmeor and Chysauster reports, opp. cit.; saddle-querns, stone tools, general impression of near-poverty.
51 Cf. (for a density recalling south-west England, though some are admittedly later than the Iron Age) the map of cliff-castles in Ireland, by V. B. Proudfoot; U.J.A. 24:25 (1961-2), 109, fig. 11.
52 E.g. in southern Armorica? cf. ORiordáin, op. cit. note 35, p. 30.
Venetic Traders in South-West Britain?

The hypothesis which comes to mind is that the cultural complex described above was introduced into what is now Cornwall and west Devon, from Armorica, by the Veneti, by sea, and as traders and colonists, not as refugees. One might suspect that this “invasion” differed from those hypothesized to explain Hawkes’ “A” and “B” in the south-west, both in the intensity of cultural innovations, and the time taken for their ultimate local absorption (“absorption” here = the stage at which such elements can no longer be distinguished or isolated by archaeological method). This is, in other words, a crest in the continuous if irregular wave of intrusions.

Economic reasons may, partly, underlie this event. The extent, even the existence, of Cornish tin production in the 1st century B.C. is quite uncertain, but the Armorican tribes lay, as their predecessors had lain, directly athwart the traditional trade routes—either the long sea passage, or the route which may have gone overland from Corbilo to Massilia. The Veneti, with their large fleet, clearly controlled some trade with south-west England—tin, slaves, hides, and corn are all possibilities—even if this still involved barter instead of coinage. It was a trade that justified the maintenance of a fleet of several hundred vessels, leading to effective control of the Western Approaches; and it meant enough to the Armorican leaders, mercurial Gaulish temperament or not, to risk, deliberately, a direct clash with Roman arms.

We should not forget Strabo’s story of Publius Crassus, who sailed to the Cassiterides, found where tin was being obtained from near the surface of the ground—i.e. the working-trenches in the tin-gravels where the valleys debouch toward the coast line—and brought back both this information, and the details of the route. It is tempting—and not unreasonable—to follow both Mommsen and Rice Holmes in identifying Publius Crassus as Caesar’s legatus of that name. If so, the context of his visit was presumably as a passenger in a Venetic boat, some time during 57 B.C., when he was visiting the Veneti (apparently in a peaceful context) with a legion, in order to show the flag in the extreme west. Can it be that this individual visit, which may after all have been arranged through bribing some Venetic ship-owner, was partly responsible for the Venetic revolt of 56 B.C.? Strabo expressly states that the Veneti decided to fight Caesar in order to prevent his invasion of Britain, and the disruption of their trade; Caesar describes how tribunes, sent to the Veneti (as well as to other tribes) to obtain corn for the VII Legion, were detained as hostages against Venetic hostages given to Crassus, and how Crassus and his staff were instructed, against Caesar’s return (from Illyria), to prepare a fleet on the Loire. These two version may amount to the same thing; for the Veneti, apart from realising that the Romans were now aware of the Dumnonian tin entrepôts, would have seen the Roman fleet not only as the inevitable fore-runner of an invasion of Britain and the disruption of their market, but as a direct threat to their local naval supremacy.

Caesar further states, and this is of considerable importance to our theme, that the Armoricans summoned reinforcements from Britain, which faces that part of Gaul;

54 Hencken (1932), 173-5, and map, fig. 46.
55 Strabo, Geogr. III.5, 11.
56 Mommsen, Röm. Gesch. III (1889), 269. T. Rice Holmes, Ancient Britain, etc. (1907), 483-498, still (like practically all his writings) an indispensable discussion. The alternative P. Crassus is the consul of 95 B.C. (Rice Holmes, op. cit., 494 and n.3).
57 The text is ambiguously terse (B. G. III, 6) but implies no more than that Crassus and his legion had obtained the formal submission (with hostages, etc.) of the Armorican tribes; actual fighting is not mentioned and Caesar’s next sentences imply that tribes elsewhere, impressed by his victories, were falling over each other to make submissions.
58 Geogr. IV. 4. 1.
59 Caesar, B. G. III. 7-10.
60 Since they had, by now, every reason to appreciate that a southern Britain occupied by Roman forces would be scarcely likely to export corn, let alone other commodities.
i.e. the south-west. 61 As the only bond with the British would have been a commercial one, this statement can scarcely refer to anything except other Veneti, or Armorici in general, actually settled in Dumnonia. It implies substantial colonies, which in turn implies a preceding period from the era of the first trading-posts, which again takes us back rather before 56 B.C. And it is further relevant to digest Caesar’s statement 62 that “most of the strongholds of the Veneti” were sited on promontories or tidal islets; and that their large shallow-draught boats were, as an additional refuge, always close to hand. It suggests that the hypothetical increase in the number of cliff-castles on the Cornish coast in the 1st century B.C. reflects neither the bridgeheads of armed invaders, nor the last-ditch strongholds of desperate indigènes; merely a preference on the part of settled traders for a mode of dwelling favoured in their own homeland with a stout barrier to landward, and one foot always in the boat to seaward.

Hawkes has suggested 63 that such trading-posts, the related increase in trade, and any actual colonisation, were only made possible by the adoption of large plank-built vessels 64: and that the appearance of such vessels in Gaul resulted ultimately from steadier communications and trading conditions following the Roman conquests in southern Gaul at the end of the 2nd century B.C. This may provide a partial background to the appearance of the “Cordoned Ware” complex in Dumnonia. A sharp horizon must presumably be drawn across the record at 56 B.C., 65 since the former picture of a flood of refugees from Caesar’s wars, streaming across the Channel to Wessex and the south-west, has generally been abandoned in favour of the view that the destruction of the Venetic fleet 66 largely de-populated the Channel, thus terminating one intrusive phase, rather than initiating another. It is possible that some pre-56 B.C. pottery horizon, marked by the wide adoption of the fast wheel in place of the older tournette or revolving slab, will eventually be detected in both Armorica and Dumnonia; even in the latter area, it is clear that distinctions in colour, fabric, and manufacture exist within cordoned ware itself, and presumably have a potential dating significance. On the other hand, we do not know that all the postulated colonists in south-west England returned to the fray in Gaul, and presumably their (pottery-making?) wives and children remained behind in any case.

South-Western “Third C”?

A final pre-Roman phase, within the first century A.D., can be faintly detected in south-west England. Again, maps re-inforce the fact that this is difficult to define in acceptable terms (fig. 4). The coinage of the Durotriges and the Dobunni, and the iron currency-bars attributable to the latter, scarcely touch Dumnonia at all. When we find late “Glastonbury” pottery beyond Dumnonia, in Durotrigan territory, 67 and when we note the occurrence of a slab of tin and copper alloy, together with a piece of Breton mica-schist, in level IIIb at Bagendon, 68 it must be assumed that these represent trade by barter. Similarly, the known western limit of “storage pit” agriculture shows well the innate conservatism of south-western farming methods at this time. Like the less well-defined western limit of Belgic cremation burial, 69 it confirms the
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61 B.G. III, 9.
62 B.G. III, 11.
63 As cited by M. A. Cotton, Cornish Arch. 3 (1964), 30.
64 Cf. Grot, op. cit. note 22, 202-3; his ref. no. 14 lists the authorities for siting the actual naval battle off S.Gildas-de-Rhuys (Morbihan), cf. Rice Holmes, Caesar’s Conquest of Gaul (2nd edn., 1911), 879-85.
66 Caesar, S.G. III, 12-14; the Veneti and their allies had mustered some 220 vessels.
67 See map, Fox (1964), 119, fig. 36; the extent of “extra-Dumnonian” distribution is given, also by A. Fox, in Appendix III (59-60) of her South-Western Hill-Forts, Problems of the Iron Age in Southern Britain (ed. Frere), London (1961).
70 Radford, op. cit. (previous note), figs. 2 and 3, Appendix 2.
non-Belgicization (if one can use such a word) of Dumnonia. Nevertheless, a trickle of pottery, which should belong to (or which fairly closely copies) Mr. Brailsford’s “Wessex Third C”, found its way westward, in east Devon, ribbed and bead-rim bowls, both wheel-made (Durotrigan?) imports and local copies, have been discussed by the Foxes. Further bead-rim bowls, wheel-made or wheel-finished in thin hard reddish fabrics, together with the trick of using little iron rivets to mend favourite pots, are found sparsely down the north coast of Cornwall, as far west as the Gwithian area. And despite the fact that the cordoned-ware site of Carloggas (Mawgan-in-Pydar) must really start a good 75 years earlier than the report suggested, some of the brooches here should belong to this phase as well.

In classificatory terms this is not a Hawkes’ “B” culture; indeed, it does not really constitute more than a shadowy phase during which certain imported pottery and metal styles (reflecting commercial and social contact eastward) appear in Dumnonia, styles elsewhere proper to a very late (or post-) “B” horizon, or even culturally “C” (Belgic). In 1958, Lady Fox rightly stressed that cordoned ware could not be culturally sub-grouped with the contemporary decorated and incised Glastonbury pottery (once part of Hawkes’ “Third B”, as it represents the later stage of the whole B complex in the south-west); she proposed a term “South-Western Third C” for, by implication, both cordoned ware and the final post-Roman phase just discussed. This idea has been repeated (with further complications) by Hawkes and Dr. M. A. Cotton in a preliminary discussion of the cordoned and other wares from the great cliff-oppidum at The Rumps, North Cornwall. The writer prefers for the moment to stand aside from this, merely whispering that if we must have a local “Third C”, this label is best reserved exclusively for the bead-rim bowl and other imports—perhaps circa A.D. 25-55—and that the intrusive complex associated with cordoned ware can only be linked as yet with the Armorican tribes. Whatever the latter may have been, the y were not Belgic, and willy-nilly the cultural label “C” has become broadly equated with the full Belgic settlement of southern England.

Civitas Dumnoniorum

It is at this stage, a decade or so either side of the Roman conquest, that the physical frontier of Dumnonia, probably also the frontier accepted by the Romans, as constituting the land boundary of the civitas Dumnoniorum, becomes apparent. The various distribution maps shown earlier (figs. 1, 4) hint that a definite frontier region already existed in the 1st, if not the 2nd, centuries B.C.

The southern hinge is the outflow of the (Dorset) Axe at Seaton. North of this, over a small area of broken country, lies the great basin of the Somerset Levels, marshland with ridges and islands like the Poldens, Burrow, Athelney, Wedmore and Brent Knoll. If one has to pin-point any line across the Levels, the water-system of the river Parrett (supposing it still to represent approximately its Iron Age course) is indicated. The only justification for assuming a more easterly frontier, along the (Somerset) Axe which flows past the foot of Mendip, is the very questionable linking of Ptolemy’s river Uxella, possibly this Axe, with the polis of the same name which he allots to the

71 J. W. Brailsford, “Early Iron Age ‘C’ in Wessex”, P.P.S. XXIV (1958), 101-119, esp. 114, fig. 6, and Appendix passim.
72 A. Fox, Roman Exeter (1952), 80-85 with map (fig. 15) and catalogue.
73 A. C. Thomas, ‘Minor Sites in the Gwithian Area (Iron Age to recent times)’, Cornish Arch. 3 (1964), 60-61 and fig. 21.
74 See note 31.
75 As Hawkes pointed out some time ago: Antiquity XXXIII (1958), 182, n. 48: ‘This (cordoned pottery) will then start earlier... than Mrs. Murray-Threipland has suggested in reporting on the St. Mawgan-in-Pydar excavations’.
77 Cornish Arch. 3 (1964), 30.
79 So. e.g. A. L. F. Rivet, Town and Country in Roman Britain (1958), 153-4.
Dumnonii. But the name, which means merely “high”, is of too general occurrence to permit this association, and on Ptolemy’s own co-ordinates the town of Uxella should be very much further west. C. E. Stevens’ ingenious demonstration \(^{80}\) that Ilchester, which lies just east of the Parrett, is the Lindinis of a potential second, northern, civitas of the Durotriges tends to confirm that the Parrett system did form the frontier in Roman times. The southern bound, the Dorset Axe, is acceptable if one identifies the Dumnonian polis of Moridunum with Seaton, curiously a direct translation of the former name, which lies immediately west of this river.

The nature of the relationship between the Remans and the Dumnonii is difficult to define. There is no real evidence that the region’s formal incorporation into Roman Britain was marked by the strife that one associates with the neighboring Durotriges, no local Battle of Maiden Castle. Roman military activity in Dumnonia, apart from an identified handful of minor and early works like the little camp at Tregear, Bodmin, seems to have been reflected in possible practice camps, \(^{83}\) and in sites concerned with the watch over the Silures and perhaps the Channel, as Lady Fox’s work of recent years\(^ {84}\) has demonstrated. West of Isca, a centre whose siting must be related to the navigable river Exe \(^ {85}\) rather than to any pre-existing major native stronghold, and whose overall regional irrelevance is shown by its abandonment in late or sub-Roman times, \(^ {86}\) some kind of road system no doubt existed. \(^ {88}\) These are roads or tracks to which the label “Roman” can just be applied, in the sense that they may have been recognised in Itineraries, \(^ {89}\) have been the target of regular upkeep, and in later centuries distinguished by milestones; \(^ {90}\) but the very few likely stretches so far identified cannot be, physically, compared with the great metalled roads in lowland England.

\(^{80}\) In P. Som. A.N.H.S. XCVI (1952), 188 ff.
\(^{81}\) Accepting from Iter XV of the Antonine Itinerary that MORIDVNVM is XXXVI millia ( = 51 kms., the correct distance by Roman roads from Dorchester to Seaton) from DURNONOVARIA (or Durnovaria, Dorchester), and regarding the XV millia from Moridunum to Isca (Exeter) as an error, probably for XXXV ( = 37 kms., approximately correct distance). Cf. Trans. Devon Ass. XVII, 280; LIV, 66: and Proc. Devon A.E.S. 21 (1963), 31-32.
\(^{82}\) Now being excavated by Lady Fox: preliminary report, Cornish Arch. 5 (1966).
\(^{84}\) E.g. Martinhoe, Old Barrow, Stoke Hill: summary and discussion by her, Antiquity (forthcoming).
\(^{86}\) One such has long been popularly claimed: cf. W. G. Hoskins, ‘Two Thousand Years in Exeter’ (Exeter, 1960), 3 ff., map I. Contra this, A. Fox, note in Trans. Devon Ass. XCIII (1961), 73-5.
\(^{87}\) Hoskins, op. cit. previous note, 11-12; and N. Tolstov ("unlike most . . . Roman cities, (Exeter) was occupied continuously until the tenth century''), Bull. B. Coll. Stud. (Cardiff), XIX (1961), a paper which it is difficult to take seriously. I think otherwise. Neither advances any evidence in support.
\(^{88}\) Fox (1964), 140, 144-5, summary, cf. O.S., Map of Roman Britain (3rd edn., 1956), and see earlier Hencken (1932), 195-8, with refs.
\(^{89}\) See below, p. 87, for discussion of a possible instance.
If we accept a provisional picture of peaceful submission, the material benefits of Romanitas, which might be regarded as the natural consequence, are singularly lacking. Bearing in mind the size of the civitas—it is 140 miles from the Parrett to the Land’s End—and the attention paid by local excavators to sites of the Early (and later) Iron Age, finds of actual Roman glass, pottery, and metalwork are (outside Exeter) startlingly few and far between. The supposed frontier of Dumnonia marks, in one sense, the limit of full Romanisation; small finds apart, this is best shown by the limit of the “villa belt” of Wessex and the Cotswolds, distribution of a type represented in westerly Dumnonia solely by the semi-native structure at Magor, Illogan.

Is it possible that, with the natural tendency of a mercantile people to come to terms with circumstances, and with the lesson of the Venetic disaster still prominent in tribal memory, the chieftains of Dumnonia hastened (in the early 50’s) to acquiesce in any arrangements put before them? Is it further possible that any such Roman arrangements, including no doubt a demand for formal submission and the supply of upper-class hostages, were based on an over-optimistic estimate of the peninsula’s natural resources? Roman interest in assuming Imperial control of mineral output led, as we know, to the acquisition of the Mendip lead sources as early as A.D. 49. Dumnonian tin, supplied either as grain cassiterite or in smelted ingots, was won from scattered and haphazard family streamwork concerns; this source would have been known to the Romans from the tradition of trade, from Crassus’ visit (if it took place), and from whatever the Veneti may have chosen to retail, prior to their uprising. The production cannot have approached that of the Spanish mines—streaming, as compared with lode-mining, was in the pre-mechanical era an uneconomic and relatively negligible source of the metal supply, permanently wedded to the “two men and a boy” team level—and it is significant that no real increase in Dumnonian output can be inferred from coin distribution (fig. 10) until the later 3rd century, when the Spanish sources ceased to be readily available. The Dumnonii, then, unused to the concept of money, hardly able to compete with the cornbelt further east, slow even in tin output, may just have been left to their own harmless devices. It is also perhaps significant that, as one would expect under these circumstances, the native Celtic language and a strong native pottery tradition, ultimately rooted in the local Iron Age, were both preserved throughout the first millenium A.D. Still further; for there are grounds for thinking that the six original “hundreds” of Cornwall, divisions far larger than the later Saxon hundreds, represented, and still represent, recognised pagi within the civitas. These are all pointers to an intensely “conserving” society, one little changed by the Roman occupation of Britain.

The Romans in the South-West

Rural settlement in Roman-period Dumnonia must then imply, broadly, all settlement. Apart from the cantonal capital at Exeter, the only Roman sites yet identifiable are coastal; perhaps a port at Moridunum/Seaton, another which may have been a Channel naval base at Topsham near Exeter, and some large but uncertain settlement at Plymouth. The last-named, which may have commenced as a Dumnonian entrepôt

91 This is best shown by O.S. Map of Roman Britain (3rd edn., 1956); cf. also Fox (1964), 139, map, fig. 43.
94 See above, p. 91.
96 The two largest (eastern) ‘hundreds’, Trigg and ‘Wivel’, were trisected and bisected respectively in late Saxon or Norman times: see next note.
98 As opposed to ‘innovating’; for this useful model see S. Piggott, Ancient Europe (Edinburgh, 1965), 17-22.
at the mouth of the Tamar and was presumably responsible for the inhumation cemetery at Mount Batte which has produced coins covering most of the Roman centuries. Though physically the settlement must now be irrecoverable below the modern city.

One suspects that the three poleis listed by Ptolemy—Tamara, Uxella, Voliba—are not all, as elsewhere in Britain, Roman, but may be native settlements. The only other early source, the 7th century A.D. Cosmography of the anonymous cleric of Ravenna, takes us back at once to the problem of the Veneti. For it includes a place-name Purocoronavis, acceptably amended to Durocornavis and apparently the same word as the Durocornovio of the Antonine Itinerary. This reminds us that, submerged in the Dumnonii, were the people whose group-name survives in the modern Cornwall, as that of the Dumnonii does in the modern Devon. "Cornwall" comes from Cornewalas (12th century), on Cornwealum (A.D. 997) and on Cornwallum (A.D. 981), group-names involving Anglo-Saxon wealas, "strangers, Welsh". The first element is seen in the archaic, if still current, doublet Cornubia, first recorded about A.D. 700, implying a local 6th-7th century *Cornuia and a still older *Cornuia, *Cornuia, formed from a tribal appellation which, Latinised, would be Cornovii. Who were these? On archaeological grounds alone it would be difficult to connect them with the Cornovii of the north-west Midlands, still less the Cornavii of Caithness. Taking *corn, "promontory" rather than *corn-, "horn (of an animal)", the Cornovii would be the "promontory folk", and the Ravenna place-name amended as Durocornavis, "fortress of the promontory folk". A fairly obvious deduction from all this is that the south-western Cornovii were given this, their extra-national name, by the Dumnonii; that it meant originally "dwellers in promontories (i.e. cliff-castles)"; and that it referred to the Venetic trader-colonists of the 1st century B.C., makers of cordoned ware and builders of various novel structures. That the relevant area-name *Cornouia was later extended by the Dumnonii of Devon to refer to the whole of Cornwall, or Dumnonia west of the Tamar, is in accord with the distribution of cordoned ware and the bulk of the cliff-castles; indeed, Cornwall may already have been loosely known as *Cornouia before the Claudian conquest.

Durocornavis is thus presumably a fortress of some size, and quite possibly a cliff-...
going west, and this is the Taw, just west of North Tawton. The name Taw is generally
taken as the same as the Scottish Tay (Tavus in Tacitus, probably the Ravenna Tabā)
and to come from British *tauos, “strong, powerful”, which, as *Tavos, *Tabos, would
be correct here. 110 Nemeto [s] tatio is now tentatively identified as a small earthwork
of Roman appearance by a stretch of supposed Roman road just near North Tawton.
Whether Tamaris can or cannot be linked with Ptolemy’s polis of the Dumnonii called
Tamara, it presumably indicates a crossing of the Tamar into north Cornwall. There
remains a suspicion that any such route from here onwards skirted around the north
of Bodmin Moor, and down the coast past Boscastle and Tintagel, where two of the five
Roman milestones in Cornwall have occurred. 112 Durocornavis should then be sought
on this general area of the north Cornish coast; and the massive cliff-castle called The
Rumps, some fifteen miles beyond Tintagel, rich in the cordoned ware one would asso-
ate with the incoming Cornovii, is the obvious candidate.

It therefore seems that, neither from the handful of names quoted by Ptolemy, nor
from anything that can be reconstructed, ultimately from some forgotten iter of the
Roman period, from the corrupt text of the Ravenna Cosmography, can one detect
anything bar Exeter, Seaton, Topsham and Plymouth which is not a continuing native
settlement. So much for the Dumnonian equivalent of the town; what of the country-
side? Here one encounters a vast mass of most inadequately known sites, in particular
the variety known as “rounds”.

From the 1st century B.C. until perhaps late Roman (or even sub-Roman) times,
one basic settlement-type dominates most of Cornwall and part of Devon. This is the
enclosed agricultural homestead widely, if not always accurately, called a “round”.
What was almost certainly the Dumnonian name for such a homestead survives in the
Cornish ker, Old Cornish caer. This is not derived from Latin castrum,114 still less
from Latin quadrā,115 and though its etymology is disputable, it may be connected
with the root seen in Welsh cae, Cornish ke, “bank or hedge”.116 The round is agri-
cultural, not militarily defensive, and despite subsequent blurring of usage, hill-forts
and cliff-castles in Dumnonia seem originally (i.e. using the earliest detectable forms)
to have borne names involving derivatives (din-, dinas) of the British *dunon, Latinised
dunum, “fortress, stronghold”.

Rounds, which come in all shapes and are very rarely truly circular, are univallate
enclosures, the vast majority well under three acres internal extent, containing a varying
number of huts or similar structures which tend to be sited, for shelter, against an
inner bank face rather than in the central area (fig. 5). The bank and ditch, which are
often of some size, must have been designed to keep children and livestock in, and to
keep would-be marauders and wild animals out. The favourite situation is on the
upper edges of valleys, very rarely in the valleys themselves, but taking no account
at all of any immediately nearby dominating ground. Where subsequent medieval and
modern agriculture has not destroyed all traces, field-systems may be found directl y
attached to rounds.

The absence of sufficient detailed fieldwork has so far precluded proper recognition
of this class of monument, or of the formidable density-of the rounds in the region.

\[^{110}\] Ibidem, 394-5. I am grateful to Professor Jackson for confirming this.
\[^{112}\] XC1 (1959) 74.
\[^{113}\] See note 90.
\[^{114}\] See note 78; earlier forms of the name are uninformative.
\[^{115}\] This (often-expressed) view is untenable because the Latin group–str–is preserved in British; Jackson, op. cit. note 105.
\[^{116}\] Apart from sheer improbability, this suggestion (Pokorny, Journ. Celt. Stud. 1 (1950), 29-135) is contradicted by such forms as
M. Bret. coazrell (from quadrēllum); Fleuriot, Dictionnaire des gloses en vieux breton (Paris, 1964), 93; Jackson, op. cit. note 105.
\[^{87}\]
Very few have been mapped on any scale of Ordnance Survey sheets in the past, though a much larger number appear on the Tithe Apportionment surveys (mostly circa 1838-42). From such Tithe and estate maps, from ordinary ground-based fieldwork, from air photographs, and even (with care) from place-names and medieval documentary sources, very large numbers of rounds can be, and are now being, detected.

To give an idea of the density, sketch maps of four sample areas are shown (fig. 6). These are taken from field-surveys executed and published by Miss Vivien Russell, Mr. R. B. Warner, Dr. and Mrs. Bousfield, 117 and (to a lesser extent) the writer, part of the all-county survey on a parochial basis being carried out by the Cornwall Archaeological Society. 118 Allowing for the fact that rounds seem less common in Devonshire, and subtracting the high granite moorland regions of Cornwall which, if they were settled at this period, were not settled with rounds, the total number of admissible rounds in Cornwall and south and west Devon should be between 750 and a thousand. Random checks, on the O.S. 6-inch sheets, of parishes in both north and east Cornwall confirm that this is a not unlikely estimate.

Fig. 5 “Rounds” in Cornwall: outline plans (the internal circles, where shown, represent hut- or house-sites revealed by excavation)

Are these, then, the homesteads of presumably independent Dumnonian farmers during the Roman period? It would seem so. Only a handful of them have been ex-

---

117 Previously published in J.R.I.C. n.s. 1, 2 (1952), 141 ff.
118 These lists (‘Parochial Check-lists’) appear annually in Proc. West Cwll. F.C. (from 1959-61) and Cornish Arch. (1962).
Fig. 6 Area-distributions of Rounds (black dots); hill-forts proper are shown as black squares

cavated, and on this basis none can be shown securely to antedate the 1st centur y B.C. Several have produced evidence of occupation during the succeeding cen-
turies. An enclosed homestead of so widespread a type can hardly represent a mass spontaneous innovation, but the origin of the round is admittedly uncertain. The idea of small-scale circumvallation presumably owes something to local hill-fort construc-
tion in the previous “B” phase, though it must be stressed again that rounds are not hill-forts, are nearly always sited with regard to land-usage and not military advantage, and often occur in pairs or groups closely proximate (see fig. 6; this could clearly relate to tenure or inheritance).

119 Cf. Crane Godrevy, Gwithian, Cornish Arch. 3 (1964), 41-43, 60-61, with cordoned ware and ‘Third C’ pottery.
Fig. 7 Location of areas shown in Fig. 6

Fig. 8 Courtyard-House Enclosures in west Cornwall
Rounds have produced cordoned ware; at least four contained fogous; and some courtyard houses (fig. 8) are surrounded by (allowing for the situation on granite country) dry-stone equivalents of rounds, related to rounds as the Irish cashel (stone-work) is to the Irish rath (earth-work). The whole tradition may well have been reinforced, though one would not suppose wholly introduced, along with other aspects of Venetic colonisation in the cordoned-ware phase of the 1st century B.C. M. Jacques Andre’s useful surveys in Morbihan reveal that very similar small enceintes occur widely there, generally attributed to a late Iron Age or Gallo-Roman date.

There is a detectable strain of influence from Roman patterns of architecture and field-engineering, essentially rectilinear as opposed to the basically curvilinear native tradition. Not surprisingly, this is best seen in Devon, closer to the cantonal capital at Exeter. Rounds of rectangular or sub-rectangular form are known, notably Down Castle and Stoke Gabriel. There may be some unexcavated instances in Cornwall and one might expect them in those areas most likely to have been in contact with Roman officialdom; i.e., the south coast harbours and the west Cornish tin-streams.

The idea that such “rectilinear rounds” not only owe something to Roman ideas, but are basically more elaborate in lay-out, is permitted by Mr. Masson Phillips’ work at Stoke Gabriel, and perhaps paralleled by M. André’s at Bodan, Morbihan.

If, as Lady Fox rightly suggests, a round is “. . . thus more like a defended hamlet or homestead built by a kin-group rather than a hill-fort built by a tribe”, contemporary open hut-settlement may reflect a different social category; the peasant rather than the substantial farmer. Such settlements can be shown, from excavations, to comprise examples which must be contemporary with rounds; though, being far more readily destructible through later agriculture or stone-robbing, one cannot be sure proportionately how numerous these may have been. There may well prove to be distinctly local groups of open settlement, stemming possibly from divergent traditions already formulated before the Roman conquest. The Land’s End courtyard houses, occupation of which certainly continued throughout the Roman centuries, suggest the existence of conservatively-minded groups of un-Romanised Dumnonians, practising scratch-agriculture on the high granite moors favoured in the “B-culture” hill-fort phase, but entirely abandoned by the majority of round-dwellers in favour of better and lighter soils between the 200 ft. and 400 ft. contours. Any lingering idea that courtyard houses contained a specialist caste of tin-streamers can be dismissed easily with a simple map; courtyard houses and the tin-gravels, the latter to be found in the widening of valleys well below the parent lodes, are almost distributionally exclusive.

A more detailed map of East Penwith, the dozen or so parishes immediately east of the actual Land’s End peninsula and one of the richest tin-streaming areas of recent centuries, indicates that tin-streaming in Roman times may have been carried out as much by round-dwelling farmers (as a sideline?) as by any specially-located group (fig. 9). The later 3rd century A.D. revival of tin-streaming, which may well have involved resident Imperial agents and the re-furbishing of roads and harbours, is clearly shown by a simple coin map (fig. 10).

The numerous hoards, secreted in the
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124 Fox (1964), 148: and privately-circulated interim reports from the excavator, Mr. E. N. Masson Phillips.
125 Cf. note 83 supra, especially those listed by Miss Dudley (1954).
126 E.g., the now-vanished small rectangular Castle Maenick, St. Erth (Henderson MSS. Antiquités, R.I.C., Truro).
128 Fox (1964), 125.
129 Cf. Chysauster, Porthmeor, and Mulfrá Vean reports, notes 32, 46 and 47 supra; Porthmeor, on the strength of (unpublished) pottery, may have been occupied as late as circa A.D. 500.
130 Based on V.C.H. Cornwall, IV.S (1924), with numerous subsequent finds (personal research) added.
ground rather than put into general circulation, suggest that these were regarded as mere bullion in payment for "white tin" (smelted ingots), and hint at a continued non-coinage basis for Dumnonian economy; if not everywhere in the civitas, then probably here, a hundred miles away from Isca. The map (fig. 9) also locates the isolated and lop-sided little "villa" at Magor, perhaps the sunset home of a retired Dumnonian once in official service. Present-day Cornwall, having sent her sons all over the world in the last century or so to open up deep mines and alluvial concerns, still boasts many curious sunset homes of the hacienda or hill-station variety, appro-
appropriately named ("Kuala Lumpur" or "Santa Gertruda"). The relationship between the owners of the Magor villa, and the contemporary native open homestead on the shore at Porth Godrevy, three miles downstream, has been clarified by Mr. P. J. Fowler’s excavations, \(^{131}\) and may serve as an example. Such useful commodities as sand-rock

\(^{131}\) Cornish Arch. 1 (1962), 17-60.
building stone, slate pot-lids or stands, oysters, limpets and mussels were sent up to the villa; at least one buff amphora, iron nails for roofing-timbers or the door, possibly a samian dish and a handful of barbarous radiates, found their way to the peasantry.

Agriculture, the bedrock occupation, is represented by the expansion of (and changes within) the immensely old south-western tradition of the homestead and its surrounding plots. Until the putative introduction of an improved Roman-period plough (see p. 96), this may have owned comparatively little to either intrusive Iron Age or Roman influences. From the Bronze Age terraced or lynchetted field-systems of Gwithian and the contemporary Dartmoor farm s we pass naturally to the high upland field-systems of Dartmoor early in the Iron Age. As on the Cornish moors, individual huts tend to be dotted around an irregular checkerboard of small rectilinear plots. Larger rectangular fields, with the homestead forming a nucleus, may characterise rather later Iron Age farms in the region. Porthmeor and Goldherring typify the ‘courtyard house’ version of this on the granite upland, and should be compared with better-known systems such as those on Bathampton and Martin Down (fig. 11).

The widespread clearance of furze, brambles, and a scrubby deciduous vegetation, from lower ground—roughly, between 150 and 450 feet O.D.—must be linked with the spread of round-construction from the 1st century B.C. onwards, incidentally setting the pattern for the vast bulk of the comparatively small mixed-farming tenements ever since. It must be emphasised, even at the risk of causing red faces amongst present-day Dumnonian archaeologists, that the study of ancient agriculture and field-systems in the south-west is, by comparison with such areas as Wessex, in its infancy, and (apart from the

---

Fig. 11 Field-systems, late pre-Roman and Roman-period, in west Cornwall, with comparanda (the square in each case equals one acre)
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132 Cf. note 11.  
134 Fox, ibidem, 88, map, fig. 1.  
135 Report forthcoming, Cornish Arch.  
136 Cf. H. C. Bowen, Ancient Fields (1960), 23, fig. 3; O. G. S. Crawford and A. Keiller, Wessex from the Air (1928), pl. xxiii.
Fig. 12 Early field-systems in West Penwith (the Land’s End peninsula); based on surveys by Miss V. Russell. Hatched areas—field-systems: black circles—hut-sites: open circles—Courtyard-House sites

from some preliminary linguistic studies) that of local settlement-history has hardl begun. A rich field lies waiting here. The current parochial survey of Cornwall, notably through Miss Russell’s work in the Land’s End peninsula, has revealed numerous field-systems of obviously Iron Age or pre-medieval character, most of them around the 250 ft. contour to be linked with rounds, and many higher ones with hut groups, conventional or Courtyard House (fig. 12).

Very approximate estimates of land usage may be attempted, based on the assumed density of rounds in Roman Cornwall alone. A round, like a courtyard house hamlet, must have housed more than an immediate family—say anything from six to twelve people. On a mean of nine, and (say) 750 rounds, with half this total again added to represent dwellers in other forms of homestead, this gives something over ten thousand,

137 Cf. note 117 supra.
a safe figure as a minimum, for the population in Cornwall during the Roman period. This does not conflict too wildly with the estimated 11th-century population of about 15,000, allowing for two counterbalancing intervening factors; some considerable decrease in the 6th and 7th centuries through migration to Armorica, and a (possibly greater) natural rate of increase accompanying an agricultural population in a developing area. The total potential (i.e., taxable) arable of Domesday Cornwall has been estimated at about 300,000 acres, or 20 potential acres per head (of which one would guess that only a small proportion was, at any given moment, under plough). One might contrast this with Cornwall in A.D. 1900, when the total acreage actually under plough was 350,000 and the county’s population roughly 300,000.

The assumed density of rounds in the Roman era allows rather over one square mile per round—of croft, rough grazing, and (potential) potential arable. What proportion of this was normally cultivated? Detailed preliminary study of those few sites where any kind of estimate is permissible—i.e. with a known finite field-system and an ascertained number of huts—suggest that the appropriate figures may be upward of 10 acres for an individual homestead (one, two or three continuous small unenclosed huts), and upwards of 40 or more for a round or a courtyard house hamlet.

These figures, which are likely to approach more closely to reality than older estimates of 2 to 3 acres, suggest that it may have taken several acres of arable (cereal) per person to support a family annually. If one transfers a similar allotment to the Domesday figures, it would point to about a fifth of the Domesday potential arable being actual arable at any one time, surely a conservative estimate. The trouble is, of course, that certain factors—the type of crop grown and the (probably low) yield per acre, despite a long local tradition of manuring—remain unknown, as does the extent to which Dumnonians relied on meat rather than cereals. But the minimum estimates of acreage-per-round, or acreage-per-Courtyard House hamlet, given above, are in accord with an analogous area, pre-medieval County Down; here, V. B. Proufoot would see from 40 to 80 acres attached to each rath, and the proliferation of raths in County Down is almost exactly parallel to that of the Cornish rounds.

The considerable additional breakage of ground during the Roman centuries that is implied by these estimates could hardly have been accomplished without improved methods—iron blades or shares, curved iron sickles, and very probably (for the lighter soils of the coastal belts) some form of mould-board plough. As was pointed out earlier, iron objects so seldom survive in recognisable form in the soils of south-west England that it will always be difficult to demonstrate this factually. Tips and other fragments of iron sickles have, however, been found at site I, Gwithian, a sub- and post-Roman peasant home on a sand-spit, and (like the basic material culture of this site) were presumably carried over from Roman times. Even more surprising, traces of actual turned furrows have been recovered, and photographed, from the basal levels of a sandy field at Gwithian (site XX) whose use can be dated to approximately the mid-6th to mid-9th centuries A.D. Like the very narrow rig-and-furrow (narrow "narrow-rig" of Bowe) of a slightly later, but still pre-Norman field close by
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139 F. W. Maitland, Domesday Book and Beyond (C.U.P., 1897), essay III.2 (‘Domesday Statistics’); L. F. Salzmann and T. Taylor, V.C.H. Cornwall II, 8. Cornwall Domesday (1924), 53. This is of course a minimum figure.
140 Jackson, op. cit. note 105, chapter I.
141 Salzmann and Taylor, op. cit. note 139.
142 Which must have included the low-yielding piläs (‘naked barley, Hordeum polystichum), grown until recently and still current (wild) in the Land’s End peninsula.
143 Cf. note 11 supra.
147 Bowen, op. cit. note 136, 47; ‘narrow-rig’ in the late sense also occurs widely (unrecognised) in Cornwall.
(site XXI), they imply the use of a plough with a fixed mould-board, and it may be thought more probable that this novelty was introduced during Roman, rather than sub-Roman, times.

The final stages

The foregoing emphasis on the round, with its agricultural appendages, as the predominant (though not the only) type of settlement-unit in Roman Dumnonia, should not be taken as implying that these monuments are mysteriously unique. Very similar structures do of course exist elsewhere, particularly in Highland Britain. The Irish rath is an almost exact parallel, on a much larger scale–raths still visible in Ireland alone run into many thousands–and, one might suppose, shares the same potential Iron Age ancestry. Even the almost invariable Cornish place-name for any round (initially Car-, Ker- or (presupposing a leniting definite article) Gear-, terminally -gar or -gear, plural forms Kerrow, Garrow, -carrow) is matched elsewhere in Britain. In Wales, admittedly, caer has a broader meaning, is commonly used for Roman fortified towns or camps (an application scarcely feasible in Dumnonia) and for many hill-forts which, in Dumnonia, would be more probably labelled din- or dinas. But in Cumberland, where the P-Celtic dialect known as “Cumbriic” or Cumbrian survived quite late in the first millenium A.D., car- occurs in the Dumnonian sense. Jackson, discussing this recently, 148 writes that “It looks very much as though the word Car-developed in Cumbriic the same secondary meaning that it did in Breton–simply a small hamlet or a manor-house and farm, originally protected by some kind of stockade.” W. Nicolaissen has also noted (discussing the distribution of cair names in Scotland149) that “undoubtedly this (i.e., Jackson’s secondary meaning) also applies to the majority of Car-names in Southern Scotland.” I mention all this because, like the undoubted generic resemblance between the courtyard house and other complex hut types of Dumnonia, and the various developed forms of hut-group in North Wales, it is obvious that a broad cultural sub-strate of Iron Age, perhaps Late Iron Age, date unites many basic settlement types in Atlantic Britain. A final problem, which can only be touched on here, is the replacement of the Dumnonian ker—one would suppose during the period 4th-6th centuries A.D.—by the very similar, but open, settlement known as a tref, instances of which are practically every large farm in Cornwall older than the 14th century. 151 The end-product of this replacement is already visible in the Cornwall Domesday (Exchequer and Exeter) lists, where vills whose names commence with Tre-, Tref-, Trev- constitute 31% of the total named, and where there are only eight certain names in Car- or Caer-left. Yet the possibility that *caer still meant, roughly, “enclosed farm” in sub- and early post-Roman times is suggested by the toponomy of Brittany. Here, ker has occupied much the same semantic area as tre(f) in Dumnonia, right down to the modern idiom e ger, “at home, chez-“, yn tre in Late Cornish. Breton Treo, Treu on the other hand now has a restricted and rather specialised meaning. It looks as if, even during the secondary stage of the migrations to Armorica which especially affected our south-west, in the early 6th rather than in the 5th century A.D., 153 ker or caer was still the Dumnonian word for the primary agricultural unit. That it differed somehow prima facie from a tref is clear from the not uncommon Cornish place-name Tregear, applied to existing farms sited in

148 In Angles and Britons: O’Donnell Lectures (Cardiff, 1963), 80-81 (‘Angles and Britons in Northumbria and Cumbria’).
149 ‘Celts and Anglo-Saxons in the Scottish Border Counties; the place-name evidence’, Scottish Studies 8.2 (Edinburgh, 1964) 152.
150 A. H. A. Hogg’s discussion, op. cit. note 48 supra.
151 It must be remembered that, including A-S. charters and wills, the two versions of Domesday, and the huge mass of medieval records (e.g. Henderson collection, R.I.C., Truro: County Archives, Truro), Cornwall is the most fully documented region of ‘Celtic’ Britain; also the least explored from this aspect.
152 The largest proportion being geographically-descriptive names (50 %), and ecclesiastical holdings in Lan- (14 %).
153 On linguistic grounds: Jackson, op. cit. note 140 supra.
or over rounds (the round usually forms part of the mowhay or rickyard behind the house). On the other hand, no excavated round has yet produced evidence for post-Roman occupation.

Conclusion
In summary, then, rural settlement in south-west England in the Roman period was to a large extent *sui generis*, a product of the local Late Iron Age rather than of Roman influence, and to such a degree that the term “Romano-British” seems scarcely applicable west of the Exe. In order to explain this Iron Age ancestry it has been necessary to skirmish at some length through the final phases of local prehistory. Unless detailed research on the actual Roman activities in the peninsula, research which (thanks mainly to Lady Fox) is now at last under way, produces strong evidence against this view, Roman-period Dumnonia must, like north Britain between and beyond the *limites* and like the wilder parts of Wales, be regarded as scarcely within the “civil zone”, even if there is no evidence for seeing it as outside some militarised frontier. Its possibilities as an arena for future research, particularly in the field of settlement-history, seem boundless, and though such research has only started in earnest in the last decade, the general directions and conclusions are becoming a little more apparent.
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Peasant economy and types of agriculture

SHIMON APPLEBAUM

With the consent of the organizers of this conference, I selected as my subject, the Roman villa as a farm. I see from the programme of the conference that my theme is called “The peasant economy and types of agriculture”. This raises three questions: First, am I meant to omit the villas? Secondly, Was there in Roman Britain a peasant economy as opposed to what might be called a model farm-estate economy of big landlords? Thirdly: What has this to do with the pattern of rural settlement?

Now there are villas with so-called “Celtic” or square-field systems and I believe that many villas grew organically out of native farms, and that in many cases the general lines of their farming remained Early Iron Age. Therefore I do not think one can always separate villas and peasant communities either agriculturally or socially; like introvert and extrovert in psychology, the phenomena represent not distinct classes but polarized extremes. As regards the connection of the theme of farming with settlement pattern, I hope to demonstrate this by practical instances.

Another preliminary remark: The field is very wide, and knowledge is being extended so rapidly that no paper can hope to be up-to-date, least of all if it is read by one who has been away from England over two years. I hope my listeners will fill up the gaps and correct the errors which are bound to occur in a sketch of forty minutes.

Precisely because I see no well-defined line between pre-Roman late Early Iron Age farming, and the villa economy, I must begin with the first to describe the second. I have tried to show elsewhere that the big change in the later pre-Roman period is the move from the growing of purely summer to the growing of both summer and winter grains under the impact of an increasingly moist climate. The new cropping scheme can be demonstrated at Figheldean Down, Wiltshire; this is the field-system of a village community where the winter-crop enclosure can be clearly made out amid the network of square fields, which were presumably devoted to summer cereals. The cultivated area is closed off from the downland pasture by dyked droveways which converge upon the local Early Iron Age bivallate hillfort of Sidbury Hill. The summer fields are closely associated with a large sheep-paddock. Evidently the livestock grazed the down in the summer and moved on to the stubble of the summer fields in the winter, hence the enclosing of the winter crop area. This is cereal raising closely dependent on winter-manuring, and the winter-field has its own small pen whose manure could be “mucked out” in the spring. We do not know what the dwellings of this community looked like or their distribution, nor are we certain of the date of the complex, but the connection with the hillfort is clear. Discoveries elsewhere suggest a corn-beans-fallow rotation. The difficulty with the Figheldean Down analysis is to find parallels or to identify its principles among field-systems elsewhere. It is clear to me that this complex

1 Eastfield, near Andover; Micheldever, Hants.; Little Milton, Oxon.; Lechlade, Oxon.
3 P.P.S., XX (1954), 103-105.
4 P.P.S., XX (1954), 107 ff.
5 Ibid., 105-106.
represents a community with established agricultural patterns and rhythms based on common customs, and we would expect its dwellings to be either nucleated or situated at no great distance from one another.

Something of what could happen to an Early Iron Age farm in the Roman period may be deduced from Professor Hawkes’ re-analysis of the Cranbourne Chase sites—(Woodcuts, Rotherley) 6. Here the chief features are the digging of wells, the addition of enclosures for threshing and livestock, and the introduction of more efficient corn-dryers. The new water-supply enabled the wintering of cattle on the farm, the increase of farmyard manure and the consequent rise in cereal yields.

The evolution of what may be closely allied types of farmstead in the Roman period is perhaps to be traced in the Fenlands, and here I speak with every reservation, because I have been able to study only a very limited number of air-photographs 7. Three types of economy seem to be traceable. One expresses itself in a close knit fairly regular pattern of smallish plots which appear to be unassociated with internal droveways 8. Outside the Fens, is not the pattern paralleled at the St. Ives farmstead dug by Mr. J. G. Wilson 9? I take this to represent a purely arable economy, and wonder whether it will be shown to be linked with the nucleated settlements demonstrated by Mrs. Hallam in this region 10.

The second Fenland type is centred on small farmsteads enclosed by double concentric banks, associated with ditched droveways and a chaotic square-field pattern. In one case the droveway can actually be seen leading into the area between the inner and outer enclosures of such a farmstead 11. A parallel is the double enclosure dug by Mr. B. Blake at Risehow in Cumberland, where the ditched avenue can be seen leading from the nearby water-point to the entrance where the concentric enclosures intersect. Clearly some of the stock was housed between the banks or walls at night. A parallel economy may well be represented at the Wyboston Farm, which combined corn-growing with stock-rearing 14. This is the meaning of the Fen droveways, and plainly there cattle were involved, since sheep needed dryer pasture. I think the cattle too were grazed far afield outside the fens in winter, and brought home periodically, involving a corresponding loss of manure. The sort of site where they might have grazed inland is perhaps the Little Paxton settlement, Hunts., which was thought to show seasonal occupation 5. Two of the Fenland cereal and cattle-raising farmsteads are seen at Holbeach Drove in association not only with droveways but with grouped strip-fields of considerable length 16. It looks then as if the beginning of this form of field is to be connected with the presence of ample draught-oxen which could draw the heavy plough needed for producing the acre-strip. In this connection we may note the find of a heavy coulter and two-hand scythe at Abington Piggots, Cambridgeshire, implying a heavy plough and the winter feeding of draught-stock 17.

Of the third type of farm in the Fens I do not feel qualified to speak as yet, but I suspect it will be found to resemble the enclosed steadings visible on the gravels near West Deeping 18, for instance, and typified by Ditchley I 19 and the first phase at Cromwell, Nottinghamshire, which had a timber dwelling inside a double fenced
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6 Arch. J., CIV (1947), 42 ff.
7 I owe the opportunity to examine them to Mr. Humphrey Case of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, and gratefully record his assistance.
8 Eg. at Allan’s Bridge, Throcken Holt, Cambridgeshire—Ashmolean Museum 1204 (16), 65 E 3.
9 J.R.S., 49 (1959), 118.
10 Ant. J., XLIV (1964), 19 (‘Villages in Roman Britain’).
12 Ashm. Mus. 1207 (10), 63F3.
13 T.C. & W., 2nd ser., 59 (1960), 10 sqq.
14 Camb. AS., 50 (1956), 75 sqq.
15 J.R.S., 49 (1959), 118.
16 Crawford, O.G.S., Archaeology in the Field (1953), 206, fig. 37.
17 Cambridge Museum of Ethnology and Archaeology.
19 Oxon., 1 (1936).
I do not know what sort of farming this represents, but suggest we should study closely in this connection the work of Professor Van Giffen in the Netherlands at such sites as Rhee and Fochtelo. I would add in parenthesis that the Fens and gravels probably afford us the first clear glimpse of the Roman-British smallholder and medium farmer, and help us to follow him on his evolution to the status of “villa” owner.

The farm dwellings and enclosed yards of Professor Van Giffen are those of devoted cattle breeders, and they lived in aisled houses whose successors exhibit two systems of internal arrangement and dimensions, corresponding respectively to the pure livestock farm and the mixed livestock and cereal farm. In the first, the cattle are housed in the aisles with head outward, hay is stored in the nave and corn in a room in one aisle. In the second, the cattle are stalled with head inward to stop them fouling the crop which is threshed in the nave, while the hay is stored over the aisles and the grain in a loft over the nave. The latter type is of necessity broader than the former, and comparison of dimensions shows that the Romano-British type, in so far as it is an independent self-contained farmhouse, represents the mixed economy. There is no question but that their aisles were in some cases used to house cattle, and sometimes they were purely stock buildings in the farmyards of romanized residences. At Bignor and Hartlip they combined the function of stalls and barns. Sometimes they became purely residential and their economic functions were devolved upon the buildings in the adjacent farmyard. More problematic is their character when they are a feature of the courtyard of winged or courtyard villas. In such cases they certainly housed working hands; the problem is, who were they?

The importance of stock accommodation is that it means the wintering of a part of the animals, which implies a satisfactory grain surplus for feeding, efficient hay accumulation thanks to the introduction of the low-cutting scythe (absent from pre-Roman Britain and not, incidentally, usable on a ridge and furrow field), and possibly to the use of turnip and rape as winter-feed. Such use is recorded in Gaul. An investigation of the livestock accommodation at Bignor suggested that the farm could dispose of some 5,175 Roman loads of farmyard manure per year, possibly over 200 tons. I think that the Bignor arable was in the neighbourhood of 400-450 acres, so that on a two-field system the proprietor could manure at a ton an acre, but he might have penned his stock on his arable and also disposed of human manure, which the Romans were never afraid to use. His supply of farmyard manure, therefore, and the fact that he wintered some 80 head of cattle and 200 sheep, suggests that he may well have grown roots. But the sheep would spend much of the summer on the downs, where there was a large enclosure formed by travelling dykes of pre-Roman date, still used in the Roman period; its area is just right for a flock of 200. All this implies that the owner enclosed his home-fields—otherwise he could not have grown root, and that he held rights on the downland which was the traditional reserve of native farming. Finds suggest that

\[20\] J.R.S., 57 (1961), 133, and pl. XI. 3.
\[21\] Germania, 36 (1958), 48, 51, 54.
\[22\] Ibid., 68-69.
\[23\] Herbert, G., MS. Notes on the Roman Villa at Bignor (1949), Haverfield Library, Oxford; Building 70-74.
\[24\] V.C.H. Kent, III (1932), 117, no. 28.
\[26\] The estimate here is based on the apparent livestock accommodation, and takes account of the seasonal movement of the animals. I assume that the Romano-British cow produced half the amount of dung produced by her modern counterpart. The problem is, what was the Roman vehes (load)? A. Dickson’s estimate (Agriculture of the Ancients (1798) I, p. 289) of 82 pecks = 11 cwt. is much too high, implying an annual output per head of 66 tons! If we halve an average modern figure (9 tons), the vehes would be more like 83 lb. This is indeed suggested by the stretchers on which dung was carried between two men both at St. Romain en Gal (Rostovtzeff, Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire (1957), pl. xxxvi) and in the Rhineland (model tools–Bonner Jahrbucher, 149 (1949), 98, Abb. 22 and 30, cf. p. 99).
\[27\] This estimate is based on the estate’s natural boundaries, the accommodation for draft-oxen and the granary capacity in Building 70-74.
\[28\] Cf. note 25.
\[29\] Sussex A. C., 59 (1951), 58.
the west part of his estate was farmed by tenants 30. I assume that the pattern I have described belongs to the 4th century.

The Pitney villa, Somerset, has a long undivided wing on the north of the yard which might have been slaves’ quarters, but it had a second storey, and the hands’ accommodation is so plainly in the villa’s south wing that I think it was a pigsty with grain-storage over it, in which it might have resembled a modern Swedish arrangement 31. The east wing shows a tower-granary, cowhouse, pigsty and barn for hay and other produce, all closely set together in one block. There is very little doubt that we have here evidence of the grain-fattening of pigs and the winter maintenance of cattle with grain and hay. To the north of Pitney, Somerton Moor, which is part of the Somerset Levels, would have provided excellent summer pasture for the herd. Pitney itself is one of twelve out of 28 Roman dwellings in this district which occupy the calcareous silty clay of the Somerton series; today wheat-beans-oats is the normal rotation on these soils, which are poor pasture 32. Large-scale stalling of cattle is evident also at Thistleton Dyer, Rutland, where two long cowhouses were added or adapted in the later 4th century; here thousands of bones of cattle, sheep and pigs were found 33.

It is reasonable to believe that both sheep and cattle-breeding were intensified in the late Roman period. Cattle breeding was assisted by the introduction of the scythe, by the spread of roots and by the digging of wells enabling maintenance of stock in the farmyard. On the other hand the finding of numerous horsebones associated with cattlebones at such villas as Appleton, Norfolk 34, Hambleden, Bucks 35 and Rockbourne Down, Dorset 36, indicates free-ranging herds run for meat and hides. There was something similar just outside Chesterton-Durobrivae 37. The evidence from animal bones as to how far winter maintenance was practised is not yet abundant: but it was in favour of winter-feeding at Stanwix earthworks 38, also at Great Witcomb villa 39, at Bittern 40 and at the Scottish fort of Mumrills 41. But I should like to utter a word of warning to those who hold that these branches existed independently of the cereals branch. The farmer had to eat, and certainly got no supplies from outside. In the lowland zone he had to supply others-chiefly the government, and numerous corn-dryers, confined to no one part of the civil zone (I have counted not less than 45 in the south and west of England), show ample if not intensive corn-growing. Instructive is West Blatchington, Sussex, an aised barnhouse with numerous corn-dryers, the successor of a Cranbourne Chase type of farmstead and set in an area of planned fields squared off more colonico 42. The find of a pilum-head here adds interest and reminds us of the 62 ovens at the villa of Thistleton, Rutland, where a pilum and shield boss were also recovered 43. May we mention in this connection the tiles of the VI Legion at Gayton Thorpe 44 and Collingham villas 45, and the tiles of the Classis Britannica at the villa of Folkestone? 46 Or recall the 70 stili found at the villa of Hambleden, Bucks., with...
its numerous corn dryers and its evidence of pig-fattening and cattle run free-range for meat? Surely these features mean farming for army-supply, possibly forced requisitions, and the stili point to bureaucratic checking of the produce. At Stroud near Petersfield we see a big aisled barn house with ample room for hands and its own polygonal shrine near by. It has a double bath-range quite out of proportion to the needs of its own inhabitants, clearly marked accommodation for only three yokes of oxen, and a small tower granary holding about 1,500 bushels. Many more people lived at this villa than worked the land represented by the ox-stalls and granary, and still more from the neighbourhood used the baths. The produce of this surplus population must have gone elsewhere, yet they were somehow bound up with this local centre. It looks very much as if Stroud was part of a larger estate, whose headquarters was elsewhere. At Ditchley, the intensive grain production of the 4th century coupled with the neglect of the residence and the absence of corn dryers, suggest not only that the farm had been absorbed into another estate, but that the grain was dried at surrounding tenant farms.

It has been mentioned that Bignor villa almost certainly ran a flock on the chalk downs to its south, and the relation of the developed villa estates with the downland communities requires study. British climate had been growing steadily wetter and cooler since about 500 B.C. and this trend reached its culmination about A.D. 500. It was not favourable to the continued spread of cultivation on to the heavier clays and loams, but favoured winter crops on lighter soils and the extension of stockraising. Logically, therefore, the cultivation of the chalks and light soil areas should have been intensified. Actually, the downs were deserted in the course of the second half of the 1st millennium of the present era. The outfield pastures which carried the native stock in summer were encroached upon by the government and the estate-owners with their flocks and herds while the native communities were compelled by government demands to enlarge their areas of winter wheat at the expense of their traditional summer grains. I need not add that wheat stands up to wet and cold better than barley, emmer and similar cereals. In consequence of these changes, the native livestock lost both their summer and their winter grazing, with the result that a deficiency began both of cattle-food and manure, resulting in a degeneration both of the stock and the crops. The position might become very similar to what has occurred on the Bantu reserves of South Africa, and could have been one of the main factors behind the peasant unrest of the 4th century, creating a harsh antagonism between the highly developed lowland villa economy and the downland areas of traditional native farming. Let me quote the finding of three headless skeletons near Ludgershall not far from Andover, in company with Romano-British pottery; this discovery becomes more comprehensible if we recall the Sawbridge north skeleton cemetery, Hertfordshire, with 24 burials, some of the 4th century, many ill-nourished and one decapitated; and the 96 inhumations from Cassington, of which 15 were decapitated.
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47 Archaeologia, 71 (1921): Yewden Museum. The accessibility of Pitney and Woollaston Pill villas, both producing Brain and pork, to Caerleon, may here be noted.
49 Dr. C. A. Raleigh Radford believed that the slave population of Ditchley had been settled out on holdings round the villa in the 4th century.
50 Godwin, H., History of the British Flora (1956), 58 sqq. Cf. Clapham and Godwin Philosophical Transactions, 233B pp. 233 sqq. The date of the culmination of the British Sub-Atlantic phase has been demonstrated by the C14 testing of numerous specimens of peat; as a characteristic example of these may be cited Hatfield Moors, Radiocarbon, 4 (1962), 577-80 (Q 483-6). I am indebted to Professor H. Godwin for assistance on this subject.
51 The cultivation of heavy soils in the Roman period has perhaps been underestimated. In Essex, the heavy boulder-clay loams, which constitute 12 percent. of the county, contain 12.5 percent. of the known occupation sites, and the medium loams (15 percent. of the county) contain 23.89 percent. Of 14 villas in the county, eight were sited on heavy soils, or in their proximity. Mr. E. I. Moore has noted the proximity of later villas in Suffolk to heavy clays. (P. Suffolk I.A., 24, 1946-8, 178). Mr. A. Kosse (ref., see note 32) has pointed out that in the Ilchester district of Somerset, 16 of 28 Roman sites stand on calcareous silty clay, and four on calcareous sandy loam and clay.
52 W.A.M., 45 (1930-2), 196, no. 112a.
53 J.R.S., 27 (1937), 239.
54 Ib., 237.
I am prepared to believe, as has been suggested, that the fully-fledged big estate villa with several courtyards of the type of Woodchester, Bignor, Litlington and Spoonle Wood, is a 4th century phenomenon, and I believe it may have been connected, then or earlier, with the immigration of ambitious and able businessmen from Gaul and the Rhineland. There is some evidence of this in the cults of Gloucestershire and East Anglia, and the history of the movement has still to be traced. How far it was connected with the colonate must also be investigated. The latest Ditchley residence looks so like the villa of Houdeng-Goegnis in Belgium, that the same architect, if not the same proprietor, might have built it. Near the latter is a granary with a capacity of about 15,000 bushels.

I shall now attempt to sketch a reconstruction of the fully-developed villa estate from the farming point of view. The picture will be a composite one, pieced together from the information of various sites. The dwelling is placed near light calcareous or medium loamy soils, but not far from the heavier loams or clays, whose wooded margin has been pushed back to clear part of them for arable. A stream flows not far away. The dwelling house is sheltered on three sides by slopes, itself standing on a southward facing swell to catch the maximum sunlight, and facing eastward away from the prevalent west wind. It is joined by a dirt track to the main road a few miles away; this track is older than the villa, but has in sectors been straightened and improved by the owner to facilitate getting his produce to market. The residence is closed off by a wall from the farmyard. In the close is a garden planted with vine, fig and box, on the west side sycamore, walnut, sweet chestnut and holm oak have been set to form a windbreak. In the garden are beds of flowers amongst which are seen the pansy, rose, poppy and lily, and various useful pot-herbs. Part is devoted to market-gardening, and here are planted the cabbage, carrot, parsnip, and celer. The residence is sheltered on three sides by slopes, itself standing on a southward facing swell to catch the maximum sunlight, and facing eastward away from the prevalent west wind.

On the south side of the yard is an aisled building for the farmhands and bailiff; the latter lives in a heated room at the west end. In the same part the women of the household live and work at spinning and weaving. The hands inhabit the aisles and nave. Originally livestock was housed in the aisles, but these have been shifted elsewhere and the aisles divided off into rooms. Threshing also was originally done here in wet weather, but now a circular threshing floor has been made in the yard, and a roomy barn has been built near it where the unthreshed grain can be stored if rain comes. In the yard poultry and geese are kept, the latter both for their plumage and for their meat. On the east side of the yard is a composite block in which byre and pigsty are ranged each side of a central barn where fodder and grain are stored for food. Against one wall is a tower granary, with carefully raised floor. The pigs are grain-fed for fattening, and the oxen get oats and barley in seasons of heavy labour, but also bean straw, vetch, turnips, hay and leaves. Besides the working oxen, twenty or so cows and heifers are wintered on turnips, vetch and hay scythed from the meadow. Some of the farms in

---

55 Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, 7 (1873), 69; Ephemeris Epigraphica, 9, 975, 1009; Arch., 69 (1917-18), 187; T. Bristol & Glos. A.S., 60, (1938), 301-2; J.R.S., 24 (1934), 198; 39 (1949), 114.
57 de Magyery, R., De Romeinsche Villa's in Belgie (1937), 53, figs. 19a and 19b.
58 Great Wymondley; Balcheste (Hants); Bignor; numerous villas along the Harroway and the White Way (Gloucestershire).
59 Evidence of vines is known at at least four Roman sites, of figs at three, of box at five: see Godwin, De Romeinsche Villa's in Belgie (1937), 53, figs. 19a and 19b.
60 For the sycamore, chestnut and walnut cf. Corder, P., and Kirk, J. L., A Roman Villa at Langton (1932), 175; also Godwin, op. cit.; the holm oak, Arch., 62 (1912), 448.
61 The rose, Godwin, ibid., 119; pansy, ib., 88; violet, ib., 87; poppy, ib., 131. Potherbs, Godwin, ib., ad voc. They included coriander, garlic, mustard, fennel, dill and Alexanders.
62 Cabassa-Corder, P. The Roman Farm and Villa at Great Casterton (1951), 19; carrot—Reading Museum; parsnip—ib; Celer, Arch., 37 (1903, 253).
63 North Warnborough—D. Liddell, P. Hants. F.C., 10 (1931), 225 sqq.; J.R.S., 19 (1929); 21 (1931).
64 E.g. Clanville, Hants.
65 Ditchley, Bedmore Barn, Norton Disney, Old Durham, Langton.
67 Pitney (above); tower granaries: Stroud, Iwerne, Pitney.
69 Two-handed scythes: Great Chesterford, Abington Pigotts, Rushall Down (Wilts.), Corbridge, Newstead, Cirencester.
the neighbourhood run large herds of cattle in the woodland and the downs, driving
them from pasture to pasture under charge of mounted herdsmen. In the winter the
breeding stock picks up a living on the forest-rides, and is confined in enclosures next to
water, sometimes near to a highway along which those to be sold are driven to market.

The pigs graze the forest, but the sows are brought into the sty for farrowing and
selected young pigs are housed for fattening. The dung is cleared into a pit, and taken
to the fields in autumn and winter on stretchers for manuring. This is light by
modern standards (not much over a ton an acre), but the heavy land is chalked periodi-
cally and the lighter loams are marled to improve the texture. A good deal of the
farmyard manure, and the clearings from the latrines also, are kept for the roots. The
farm is first and foremost a corn farm; wheat, spelt, emmer and barley are the main
crops, but the owner is experimenting with oats, which he finds stand up well to the
series of cold wet years which seem to be becoming increasingly common. He finds
that oat straw gives better bedding and manure than bracken, and the beasts relish the
grain. He would generally prefer to expand his summer crops on the chalk soils above
his main estate, in spite of their distance, which hampers working—but these are more
favourable to autumn-sown grains in wet seasons. Further, rainy autumns have been
spoiling his wheats on the heavy lands and making it hard to get the autumn seed in.
But the government presses him for wheat, which it wants in easily ground grist. To
meet the situation he reduces his fallow to a third, and adopts a three course scheme, in
order to have equal summer and winter grains, and constructs several grain-drying
furnaces to leeward of the farm. Later, when bad times make him retire, leaving the
estate to a bailiff, he allows some of these to be built in the hands’ building and even in
the corridor of the residence.

The fields are hedged, for both the winter crops and roots must be protected against
the stock which are grazing the fallow; some are even walled. The estate originally
consisted of a conglomeration of small square plots, but the owners, many of them
relatives of the proprietor, have been driven into dependence on him by taxation,
occasional bad harvests and the inability to compete with superior equipment provided
with the help of loans from Roman capitalists. Ultimately many of them gave up
their holdings and came to live on the farm as labourers, and the proprietor, encouraged
by the administration, modified certain of the field-boundaries to form broad strips
better adapted to the big coulter plough. Under the pressure of the climatic situation
which favours light soil tillage, he has now turned over some of the more distant upland
tracts to tenants to work communally as consolidated ploughlands, using them as
experimental areas on which to try out a ridge and furrow technique thought to drain
better in wet winters.0
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72 Plin., XVII, 5-8.
73 Colum., II, 10.
75 The differing views on oats found in Pliny, Nat. Hist., XVIII, 182, and Colum. II, 10, suggest that Roman opinion was turning in
favour of this crop in the later 1st century A.D.
76 Reid (Arch., 57, 1903, 224) conjectured that bracken had been used for bedding animals at Silchester, but straw was certainly used to
bed horses at Halton (Archaeologia Aeliana, ser. 4, 14, 1937, 164). Oat-straw absorbs 15-20 per cent. more liquid than wheat-straw—
corridor—Brading, I.O.W., or elsewhere inscrivestive, Hambleden (Bucks.), Great Witcomb, etc.
78 Enclosures must be inferred from the growing of roots and fodder crops. For brick field-walls at Holmstreet, Pulborough, Sussex
79 Cf. the loans made by Claudius and Seneca to British notables some time before the commencement of urban development—
Dio., LXII, 2.
80 Longstrip fields distributed among Romano-British ‘square’ fields; Twyford Down, Hants., Bathampton Down, Crawford and Keiller,
op. cit., pl. xxiii and p. 144; Jevington, Sussex, Sussex A.C., 64 (1923), 51. fig. 3; and
elsewhere. Ridge and furrow cultivation: Coombe Down, Crawford and Keiller, op. cit., pl. xxii; Oakley Down, ibid., pl.xxxi;
Division by chiefs of undeveloped land among tenants, Venedotian Code, II, 12, 6; 18, 7 (Ancient Laws of Wales, Records
Commission, 1865).
There is an earthworked fold in a sheltered re-entrant of the downland where flocks are kept during the winter, but the ewes are brought down to lamb in a fold in the yard, and when the winter is severe, so are the tegs. The function of this branch is to supply wool and milk; also some manure in the autumn and winter months. Near the farmyard is an enclosed orchard, where apples, plums, medlars and cherries are grown.

It seems right to round off this sketch by summarizing what light agricultural considerations throw on settlement patterns.

We note that Stroud is part of a larger unit, and its excess of bathing accommodation over needs is paralleled at East Grimstead, Wiltshire. The late phase at Ditchley also implies absorption in a larger estate and the existence of surrounding tenancies. An examination of the plan of North Wraxhall villa, Wiltshire, suggests that an auxiliary aisled building for cattle was converted for hands during the 2nd century and another stock building erected to its west. Still later, probably in the Constantinian period, this accommodation was drastically reduced, but a cemetery was laid out near it, and this may be interpreted to mean that the farmhands had been settled in tenancies but the villa remained their centre. West Blatchington’s land system implies tenancies, if this form of land-division is to have any rhyme or reason, and the same would apply to Frindsbury, Kent, and I believe to Great Wymondley, Hertfordshire. Frindsbury grew cereals on its centuriated tenancies in the Cliffe region, but also manufactured woollen stuffs, implying perhaps a flock in the North Kent salt-marshes and possibly winter transhumance inland, as still practised in Kent. We have noted that at some phase Fenland farmsteads grazed cattle well inland to their west, and such farms as Appleton, Norfolk, and Rockbourne Down, commanded freerange cattle ranches. Bignor encroached with its flock on the downland field areas, and the finding of loom-shuttles at North Warnborough, Hampshire, a farmhouse on a very damp site, might have the same implication. Here it should be mentioned that while spindlewhorls are fairly common on Romano-British sites, loomweights and shuttles are not, which suggests that weaving was often carried on at special centres. Professor Hawkes noted that at Thealby, Lincolnshire, where loomweights occurred, the iron workings were divided up in a way which suggested renting by "coli". I would add that payment of woven stuffs by tenants of estates is a feature of some Carolingian villas, and that the quarries at Andernach were squared off into allotments by mathematical surveying. In view of all this, the presence of loomweights on an iron-working site at Westbury, Wilts., and of others at a habitation site close to Wiggonholt villa, Sussex, becomes significant. Just one other observation in the problem of mathematical land-division, the problem of whose existence always raises such prejudices and suspicions. Whether or not the famous parallel roads of Central Essex represent "limitatio", it has been pointed out by Mr. John Morris that the Roman road running south-east from Great Chesterford falls at right angles to them. I would add that the middle limb of the Sussex Stane Street is orientated with the same parallel roads of Essex, and the line of the road entering Rochester from the south, which is the "cardo" of Mr. Nightingale’s Cliffe land-divisions, if produced northward, hits Caesaromagus, Essex, which stands in direct communication with Great Chesterford by the eastern Essex parallel.
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81 Egg Bottom, south of Bignor, a typical ‘kite’ enclosure.
82 On these fruits see Godwin, op. cit., ad voc. 109 sqq.; for the cherry, see also Plin., XV, 102.
83 W. A. M., 7 (1862), 59 sqq.
84 Nightingale, M., Arch. Cant., 65 (1952), 150 sqq.
86 The Frindsbury ploughshare, Arch. Cant., 18 (1889), pl. ii, 190, fig. 1; loomweights from the villa: Arch. Cant., 17, 191.
Finally, the Figheldean Down pattern of infield and outfield grazing adjusted to a summer and winter crop sequence, and centred on a hillfort—if it is accepted, raises the question, what occurred to it in the Roman period, since its structure implies both a controlling authority and co-operative practices involving, I venture to suggest, some sort of topographical nucleation.

Most of the cases I have mentioned point to the farmsteads having tenurial and customary ramifications beyond the range of their home-fields, and that is what this conference should take note of.
Mr. Rivet, summing up the results of the Conference, quoted a remark of mine uttered many years ago during the course of a similar Conference: “You can dig up a villa but you cannot dig up its land-tenure”. Here it must be literary evidence or nothing. At the turn of the century writers of the school of Seebohm and Vinogradoff had hopes of relating tenurial doctrines from Wales with a “villa system” of Roman Britain, and Welsh phrases, if not “familiar on their lips as household words”, could be written down as counters for a game of tenurial discussion played with somewhat a priori rules: I trust that I shall not offend Welsh susceptibilities in speaking with Vinogradoff of tir gwelyawg and tir cyfrif.

Haverfield’s thinly concealed scepticism over the value of such knowledge communicated itself to succeeding writers on Roman Britain. Recently, however, a school, mainly of Welsh experts, of which Mr. Glanville Jones is a conspicuous name, have been suggesting a reconsideration of the Welsh legal evidence and have hinted at its relevance to the archaeological record. This paper proposes to follow them, indeed, to risk a charge of rashness in taking their thinking into regions where they might not consider it proper—or even possible—to go.

Celtic Law in Roman Britain

Only one region of the Western Roman Empire has produced a code of laws in the vernacular and that is Wales. It is present to us in the codification of Hywel Dda, made at the end of the tenth century, more than five hundred years after the last Roman soldier and administrator had left the country. Nevertheless many details, notably in the liability of relatives on the male side (agnates) in the matter of compensation for murder, bring us close to the Brehon Laws of an Ireland that was never in the Empire at all. Moreover certain provisions of its own, not least the tir gwelyawg and the tir cyfrif that we shall principally examine, have a primitive look which invites the suspicion that they were part of Welsh law, when Wales was under Roman rule. That an indigenous Law could exist in distant and backward parts of the Empire was recognised by Bishop Theodoret of Cyrrha in the fifth century. There were parts of it, he stated, where the “Fisherman’s Law” had penetrated and Roman Law had not \(^1\). As an easterner he picked his examples (Lazica, Nubia) from the east: a western Theodoret would surely have thought of Wales.

The Celtic provinces of the Roman Empire were civilised enough to have codes of law, even if unwritten, when they were conquered. It was Roman practice not to force its own laws on its subjects (indeed a conveyance or a will executed by a peregrinus—without the Roman citizenship—was only validated by lawyers’ fictions). The fate of Varus in 9 A.D. would be a reminder to a governor not to force Roman law on the conquered. Indeed in the period when few Britons were Roman citizens there are actual hints of practices valid in Celtic but not in Roman law. Tertullian at the end of

---

2 Velleius Paterculus, ii. 117, 4.
the second century speaks of Gauls (and therefore, as one can surely presume, Britons) still killing off their old people; and about this time a woman was ceremonially buried under the enclosure wall at Lowbury Hill, very probably a place of assembly on an imperial estate and thus, one would have supposed, coming under the eye of its procurator. The jurist Gaius noted that the extreme parental power (patria potestas) of Roman law existed also in his day among Galatians, and Mommsen suggested that he had in mind a contemporary practice of selling one’s children in slavery. Surely it was in these circumstances that Barates, the standard-maker of Corbridge and South Shields, acquired that woman “of the Catuvelaunian nation” whom he first freed from slavery and then made his wife.

Nevertheless the forms of Roman Law were always a magnet and it is possible that we can see the magnet in operation. There seems to have been an early example of Roman agricultural settlement (what we shall call, from a German phrase, “Inner Colonisation”) in north Somerset, in the Chew valley. This is close to the north-western end of the great Wessex triangle of native sites and close to Combe Down, where there was an office of procurators who are appropriate administrators of an imperial estate, a saltus. The suggestion that an imperial estate is truly in question is an attractive one; and Africa offers us an interesting example of “Inner colonisation” on the edge of a saitus. Its cultivators held their land under what was called the “Mancian condition”, by which, though not strictly full land-owners, they could make conveyances valid according to Roman law. I will only assert that the Chew Stoke tablet recording such a conveyance according, like the African conveyances, to the pure forms of Roman law, is very appropriate found where it was. And there may be other examples of this “Mancian condition” elsewhere to be recorded.

Strictly speaking, Caracalla’s edict of 212 A.D., giving citizenship to virtually all the Empire, should have brought the Roman ius civile into everyone’s life. Yet in 224 A.D. what we may call a “Regulating Act” was passed, prescribing that a governor might try cases at his own discretion under local law and in any event should be prudent in tampering with it. But the process of simplifying Roman law for the common man into what moderns have called a “Vulgar Law” should have made it virtually superfluous—on the continent of western Europe. “Men of rustic and rascally dispositions” were using it, we learn in fifth-century Gaul. On the continent the Latin language was being used from top to bottom of society: it was the same with Roman law.

Yet for language Jackson has reminded us that Britain was not like this: in Britain Latin was spoken by the upper classes alone (and not by them everywhere, as I shall argue). There is evidence that it was the same with the Law—as we should expect it to be, so that the “Regulating Act” applied in Britain as it should have ceased to apply in Gaul. I argued some time ago that it was necessary to take up to the emperor’s court the question of how far Celtic Law could be applied when it conflicted with Roman principles. This is one piece of evidence for Celtic Law in late Roman Britain. The other is the outright statement of Zosimus that the Britons, in ejecting the Roman adminis-
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3 Apologeticum, 9.
5 Institutions, i. 35.
6 Gesammelte Schriften, iii, 15.
7 R.I.B. i. 1065.
8 Journal of Roman Studies 45 (1955), 139.
9 R.I.B. i. 1790.
10 Tabletes Albertini (116-141).
11 J.R.S. 46 (1956), 115-8. I do not entirely agree with Turner’s law, but it would take too long to argue the matter here.
15 J.R.S. 37 (1947), 132-4. I argue later that this is likely to have been a test Case. Only a question of principle, involving the well-to-do the homestories, could have been taken to the Emperor’s court.
trators in 410 A.D., ejected the “Laws of the Remans” with them; and contemporary evidence from Armorica (perhaps already in course of colonisation from Britain) puts Zosimus into perspective. The revolting peasantry of the Loire, we are told, have their courts “under the greenwood tree” where a law that is not the civil law is dispensed; and the eventual restoration of Roman government is described with a technical term for restoration after captivity into Roman legal status (post-liminium). But in Britain the government was not restored. On the continent there were practitioners to draft codes of law for barbarian tribes along the Roman lines and in the Latin language. But in Britain there were no practitioners of Roman Law and—above all in eastern England, as we are going to see—few speakers of the Latin language. Anglo-Saxon laws are unique among barbarian law codes both as written in the vernacular and as owing nothing to Roman law.

**The Relevance of Welsh Law**

As we have said, it must ultimately be a guess how much of Hywel Dda’s Law was law for Wales when it was part of the Roman empire. Nevertheless the arrangements for land settlement and tenure have such a primitive look that one wants to follow Seebohm and Vinogradoff in transporting tenth-century legislation to the conditions of the fourth. The questions bristle with difficulties—and hence with controversies; and the very flexibility of Welsh life in the tenth century and before provides one series of problems, while another is implicit in the fact that it is not until the epoch of the Anglo-Norman extents, some four hundred years later, that the doctrine of the laws is in any way controllable by facts of life on the ground.

Broadly speaking, one can say that Welsh society differed in a radical respect from that of Germanic barbarians or of Remans. The Remans had and the barbarians are seen to have acquired (in what way is another very controversial matter) a normal tenurial distinction of dominus and coloni on an estate or of Lords of the Manor and villeins, both superiors depending themselves mediately or immediately on a ruler. In Wales it was rather different. A Free Welshman of superior grade might have taeogs under him (a word which has sometimes the significant synonym of bilain=villein) who held their land by much the same tenurial practice as the ruler. But there was a type of taeog who depended through the intermediary of a royal official, the maer, from the ruler himself. He is what is known in the Extents (and hence the word is used as more or less English-sounding by Vinogradoff) as a tenant in tir cyfrif. This type of tenure was declining at the time of the Extents, but it has been claimed—and we might expect it—that it was far more common in earlier days.

The principal feature of a tenure in tir cyfrif was that not only was the land held in common but the portion of the common land tilled or the common grazed stock of cattle owned varied with changes in the population of all the group instead of the families in it. When any member of it died or a youth attained the age of fourteen, the common stock of plough-land and cattle was re-allotted, though in the Laws, at least, there was no “general post” of the actual domicile. The settlement units, called trevs, had their arrangements handled by the maer of a group of them, though one of them, close to his residence, was specially responsible for services to him. Glanville Jones has made the attractive suggestion that a maer of ancient days may sometimes have resided in a hill-fort (e.g. Dinorben). Both Laws and extents give hints that all
such holders in *tir cyfrif* tended to live in nucleated units; and a favourite number of households was nine 22.

The tenurial arrangements of the Free Welshmen and the *taeogs* living after their manner are more obscure since the Laws tended to be less interested in matters which did not directly concern the king. Vinogradoff borrows from the Extents for them the tenurial word *treweloghe*. A *gwely*, a word which carries the overtones of a “stake in the land”, was a kinship group for which the Laws provide a peculiar principle of succession. On the death of its founder, the land was divided equally among his children, then equally among cousins and then second cousins. At this point each sharer started a new *gwely* of his own. At any moment, however, a member might, as it were, contract out of the system and start a *gwely* of his own there and then. Indeed, it appears that by the time of the Extents, only these swarmers-off applied the “general post down to second cousins” principle 23. Again at the period of the Laws the domicile was not “general posted”. The tendency, therefore, for land held in *tir gwelyawg* was to be settled, as Lloyd puts it, not in nucleations, but “scattered here and there over the face of the country” 24. As Archbishop Peckham wrote to Edward I, “il ne habitent pas en semble, mes meinteins meint chescun loinz de autre” 25.

Arrangements for *tir cyfrif taeogs* in the Laws pre-suppose a heavy plough with four oxen26, but we know that (contrary to what is often believed) the freemen, too, in the middle ages often had common fields treated after this fashion 27. The heavy-plough is an impossible concept for the Iron Age, but the common fields and even the strips if worked by something like a *caschrom* or a *loy* must not be considered out of the question, though they would be more likely to appear in *tir cyfrif* holdings, if we can guess the existence of something like them at this time.

**Celtic Practice in Ireland and Scotland**

With the decay of *tir cyfrif* at an early date, the pattern of settlement in Wales of tenure in *tir gwelyawg* having the *gwelygordd* (the separate *gwely* holding) as the dominant settlement unit does not differ so much from that of modern Wales for the works of outside observers to be of great assistance. For Ireland and Celtic Scotland indigenous sources of legislation are either lacking or (with the Irish Brehon Laws) less interested than the Welsh in matters of settlement and tenure. On the other hand areas of them tended to maintain primitive customs less affected by English influence than Wales, so that the remarks of observers, even as late as in the nineteenth century, can have value.

The dominant unit of rural habitation in pre-conquest Ireland was the *Rath*, a normally circular defended enclosure about 100 feet across 28. They are evidently family farms and usually show on excavation two or three huts inside them. Far less than one per cent of the many thousand *raths* have been excavated, but for two at Cush and Feerwore, Co. Limerick, a date has been claimed about the beginning of the Iron Age 29. Moreover at Cush small square fields were claimed as in original association with the *rath*.

The *rath* will remind us of those separate *gwely* holdings which shocked Archbishop Peckham; but Ireland also had its nucleated settlements, the *clachans*, the normal
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22 Ibid., 120.
23 T. P. Ellis, *Tribal Law*, i. 227; G. R. Jones, *Welsh Hist. Rev.*, 1 2 (1961), 122-3. I need to plead that the ‘Law of Succession’ had more vitality under the Roman Empire and hope that the plea is reasonable.
25 Epist. Johannis Peckham, DLXV.
26 T. P. Ellis, ibid., 120.
27 *Chrons and Memorials of Great Britan and Ireland*, 77.3 (1855), 776. Epist. Johannis Peckham, DLXV.
28 J. E. Lloyd, *History of Wales*, 1 (1912), 295, says eight and must be presumed to speak with authority; T. P. Ellis, *Tribal Law and Custom*, II (1926), 59, of ‘four or eight’, Venedotian Code, iii, 24, 3, seems to imply four—but a heavy plough anyway.
settlement pattern, in fact, for Ireland from the 17th century to the Famine. Our evidence for pulling back the **clachan** as a settlement unit is even scantier than for the **rath**. Yet Davies dug one, possibly with strip terraces too, at Two Mile Stone, Co. Donegal, and dated it to "the end of the pagan period". Moreover Proudfoot noticed that in County Down **raths** are not as evenly distributed as circumstances of soil, etc., might lead us to expect and conjectured that where they are few, there were once **clachans** in the **rath** period. We are reminded of the nucleated unit of those royal **taeogs** named in contrast to the **gwelygordd** the **trefgordd**.

And we are taken to the **tir cyfrif** tenure of the Laws and perhaps behind it by the observations of His Majesty's Attorney General for Ireland under James I, Sir John Davies. "The inferior tenantries were partible among all the males of the sept" (a term which unfortunately he does not define) "and after partition made, if any one of the sept had died, his portion was not divided among his sons, but the chiefs of the sept made a new partition of all the lands belonging to that sept and gave every one his part according to his antiquity".

Other practices of Celtic land-tenure, more clearly observable in Scotland than in Ireland, are not documented even so relatively early as the days of Norman barons or Jacobean lawyers: we must use the evidence of eighteenth and even nineteenth century observers.

1) Most clearly in Scotland, but documented to some extent in Ireland (and there are some hints for Wales) is the practice of Infield and Outfield cultivation. A typical picture is that of Anderson for Aberdeenshire in 1794. The Infield usually consists of about one fifth of the whole arable ground of the farm, and it is kept in perpetual tillage. The Outfield was cultivated in different portions each year. A part of it was sometimes temporarily enclosed to provide occasional manure, but this was not universal, and the Outfield might not receive any planned manure at all. This division of Infield and Outfield is, of course, not inconsistent with common-field agriculture, but is peculiarly appropriate to the separate family farm, with which it is often associated by the observers.

2) Both Scottish and Irish observers noted the practice of holding land in widely separated parcels, usually of strips. It was normal in Scotland (though dying out in Ireland) to shift them by allocation every year. The system ("Runrig" in Scotland, "Rundale" or—with annual rotation—"Changedale" in Ireland) was normally practised by sub-tenants of a farm. Whereas in Scotland, especially in the Hebrides, it operated within a large area of common cultivation, in Ireland the pressure of population and the growth of sub-letting made it appear normally inside the small fields which we associate with the **rath**. Yet it seems in the main a lower class phenomenon, which we might associate with the **clachan** and possibly with **tir cyfrif**.

The pattern of Celtic land-settlement, of course, has had centuries to develop before the evidence of legislators, let alone Barons, Attorney-Generals and Agricultural Experts. All manner of permutations are possible and most can be documented. Yet we seem to see at the back of it two types which I shall call the "**Rath idea**" and the "**Clachan idea**". They should (but it does not follow that they will) have each its characteristics.
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30 On Clachans, see too Proudfoot, Gwerin, 2 (1958-9), 110-122.
31 Davies, J.R.S.A.I. 72 (1942) 98-105.
33 Gray, English Field Systems (1915) 158-80.
“Rath idea”
Family farm.
Infield of small plots.
Infield and Outfield Land Division.
Succession by *tir gwelyawg* type of tenure eventually applicable perhaps to movables.

“Clachan idea”
Nucleated settlement.
Common field.
“Runrig” type of holding.
*Tir cyfrif* type of tenure.

It is worth while thinking how the two “ideas” will appear to the field archaeologist. He can find *raths* or their equivalents and small plots (there seems to have been an Irish term for them, *ceapach*) close to them. For the Outfield he will not normally have any archaeology at all. For the “Clachan idea” he will have the nucleated settlements themselves, but unless cultivation ascends or descends a slope to produce lynchets or deliberately formed terraces, he will have, with the case excepted that strips have been divided by unploughed balks (no common phenomenon), again no archaeology at all. A heavy plough will normally produce strips and if a coulter appears in an early context (as has happened, for instance, in Ireland), strips may be presupposed; but, as we have said, they are possible without one. We should watch for lynchets or terraces in pre-medieval contexts without being warned off the possibility of common-field agriculture if we do not find them.

**Conditions in Roman Wales**

Pressure of time alone would justify sampling the Welsh archaeological evidence and sampling is virtually imposed. For only Anglesey and Caernarvonshire, which have benefited from the magnificent surveys of the revived Welsh Commision, give anything like a quickly analysable picture of the numerous and varied phenomena. We may suspect that conditions were not altogether the same elsewhere but they are not likely to be so different as to upset our conclusions seriously. After all, though medieval Extents are rare, for that matter, outside North Wales, the picture of Free Welshmen and *taeogs* is offered in much the same manner by all the three Welsh Codes, for northern, central and southern Wales.

Anglesey offers groups of isolated settlements, of which that of Mynydd Lwydiarth (Pentraeth 7-15) seems the best preserved; and of the settlements themselves we can note that Din Llygwy (Penrhos Llygwy 6) with its rectangular enclosure makes us think of Roman “Inner Colonisation”. But nucleated settlements are not lacking; and we must remember that hill-forts may well be relevant to our thinking. The inhabitant of a hut inside one, Tre’r Ceiri, for instance, on the mainland, might classify himself on a sociological rather than an archaeological basis and see himself as part of a nucleated settlement and a tenant in *tir cyfrif* Anglesey certainly gives us examples of nucleated settlements not to be classified as hill-forts. Ty Mawr (Holyhead Rural 16) with fifty or more huts is something exceptional for the whole of Wales and may conceivably be the reflection of some Roman plan; but there were more than twenty huts in the now virtually destroyed site of Castellor (Llechylched 2) and Llangode 5 with nine huts reminds us of Glanville Jones’ ideal *trefgordd*. And we can be at least interested in the surveyor’s statement of “terraces forming in some places narrow strip fields”. It would certainly appear that the Ty Mawr settlement had something like them, Though such a scatter of sites as is presented in Penmon Deer Park and adjacent properties (Penmon
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36 They have been described at Portland by Drew, *Antiquity* XXII (1948), 79-91.
37 See Duignan, *J.R.S.A.I.* 74 (1944), 133-7.
38 Sites from the *Inventories* of the English, or Welsh (with Monmouth), Royal Commissions are cited (via the appropriate County inventory) with parish and inventory number.
9-15) is difficult to classify with its mixture—on the plan—of square and strip fields, we can say that the archaeology of native settlements in Anglesey does seem to show something like an archaeological concomitant to *tir gwelyawg* and *tir cyfrif*.

It is not so easy on the mainland, where numerous settlements on the rugged foothills of Snowdonia have no real counterpart in Anglesey. Here we may have, however, another test for superior and inferior types of settlement which the actual recording in Anglesey makes it impracticable to use. Hemp and Gresham noted a distinction between enclosed and unenclosed settlement. 39 It is, of course, somewhat of a guess to make them correspond to *tir gwelyawg* and *tir cyfrif* though it would be reasonable to suppose that men would naturally throw up defences, against wolves not less, unless they were refused permission to do so by superiors. Moreover though the inference from the published plans is confessedly a bit subjective, it would seem that while squarish fields are the norm on the mainland for both the Gresham types, they seem often to be larger and to present, as it were, a looser general system in association with unenclosed than with enclosed sites.

Caerau (Clynnog 826-832) and Gaerwen (Llanwnda 1336, 1339-41, 1354) at one end are a satisfactory combination of almost entirely enclosed settlements with squarish fields. One would hardly deem them members of the same tenurial group as, for instance, Pant y Griafoelen (Caerhun 115) or Moel Eilio (Dolgarrog 211). Moreover while the enclosures seldom contain more than four huts (and four is not common—eight at Caecorniog (Llanddiniolen 1180) if it is an enclosed site—is quite abnormal), Parc Gelli and Gerlan (Llandegai 347, 348) give us seven each. Meanwhile what one might call “closely dispersed huts”, all unenclosed. give us Glanville Jones’s nine at Moel Eilio (Dolgarrog 211). Gwern y Plas (Llanfairfechan 399). Muriau’r Dre (Betws-y-Coed 745) and Gilfach (Dolbenmaen 943).

The surveyors of the Commission are convinced, and probably in most cases rightly, that traces of strip cultivation are medieval and sometimes connect them with “Long Houses” which they suppose. perhaps a trifle rashly 40 to be of necessity medieval too. But it is surely special pleading to assume that strip-lynchets have lost their cross-contour boundaries by robbery for modern field-walls at Cwm-corun (Llanaelhaearn 1058-1062); and similar arguments are used over Maes-y-Cwm (Llanaelhaearn 1067). Moreover the polygonal enclosure with a smithy at Coed-y-Brain (Llandwrog 1213) is planned for the Commission but without the adjoining strip-lynchets which are on the plan of Howel Williams 41. The two Llanaelhaearn sites are associated with enclosed huts as is that of Coed-y-Brain, for which we might remember that a *taeog* was forbidden in the Laws to operate a smith 42 (there seems no example of an unenclosed smithy). But, as we have said, strip cultivation need not necessarily go with *tir cyfrif* because it only seems to be implied for *tir cyfrif* in the Laws. Free Welshmen too were using strip cultivation at this time; and it does not necessarily presume common fields at all. Coed-y-Brain looks like Roman “Inner Colonisation”, and we can believe that a Free Welshman of those days might experiment with Roman ideas of terracing strips on a hill-side. Much must remain unknown: stock farming was probably more important than cereal agriculture in these regions, but it does not seem possible to say with reference to the archaeological record any more than that. Yet on the whole, bearing in mind that we seem to be dealing with two settlement types and perhaps two different pictures of field arrangements. I would venture to claim that certain principles
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39 Antiquity XVIII (1944), 183-196.
40 The rectangular building inside the enclosure at Cwmbrwyn ought to be Roman from the finds (Arch. Cambr. (1907), 175-209). Dinas Noddfa (ibid., 92 (1937), 247-68) could not be dated.
41 Ibid., 78 (1923), 293-5.
42 Venedotian Code, i.43, 11; Dinettian Code, ii.8, 7, cf. Anonymous Laws, x t. 7, 1.
suggesting *tir gwelyawg* and *tir cyfrif* seem to emerge from close study of the evidence which has been offered to us in such admirable profusion by the Royal Commission in North Wales.

We can legitimately imagine that *tir gwelyawg* and *tir cyfrif*, even though not quite covering in the medieval Extents the categories of Free and Unfree Welshmen, nevertheless go back to a differentiation between them that we may truly consider as something like a *caste* division. We can perhaps risk taking it back, far though we have to do, to the coming of Iron Age invaders. Yet with that we must always keep in mind that the difference between the two is for us, as a matter of knowledge, a difference of succession law. It is not necessarily, whatever modern commentators have thought, a difference in manner of working the land nor necessarily a difference in settlement-plan. These differences are—legitimately or not—our guess-work. Conditions outside Wales with perhaps a different Law may not be quite the same. Yet there is another area where Celtic speech and even a Celtic Law of which we know next to nothing had a long survival and which has archaeological evidence somewhat like the Welsh: it is that part of the Roman Province which lies in north-west England.

**North-West England**

Many years ago the great student of native settlements in the north-west, Charles Dymond, suggested, anticipating the Welsh suggestion of Hemp and Gresham, a radical distinction between enclosed and unenclosed settlements. It looks, however, as though we should rather speak of “total” or “partial” enclosure; and though the postulate may seem to weaken the distinction almost out of existence, it certainly looks as though there is some sociological difference between such sites as Crosby Garret 8 on the one hand and Urswick Stone Walls on the other. Neither would be altogether at home in Wales and perhaps only Moor Divock, with some seven huts in “close dispersion” really offers a parallel to Moel Eilio. The north-west again differs from Wales in that an enclosed site has seldom more than one hut inside its enclosure, and the rule seems to persist when Roman “Inner Colonisation” should be in question, with the sites investigated by Brian Blake, where the one hut may be rectangular. Kentmere 18, enclosing six or seven huts and Burwens (Crosby Ravensworth 28) with even more are as abnormal for their district as Caecorniog for its. Lowndes’s study of the Ellerbeck and Castle Hill group, while leading us perhaps to more “Inner Colonisation”, could also lead us towards a Welsh *tir gwelyawg* group (on our reasoning) like Caerau. It produces what look like the small fields of In-field accompanied by an Outfield hardly recognisable archaeologically—which is as it should be. On the other hand the much larger fields associated with “partial enclosure” at Crosby Garret 8 might well be common fields of the settlement, permanently enclosed for stock to graze on the fallows of a spring crop (they are rather reminiscent of Cwm Caseg (Llanllechyd 492) where structures could not, in fact, be definitely planned). Strip-lynchets adjacent to the Skirsgill Hill group (Askham 44) should have been worked by its inhabitants, and Spence, another highly skilled local worker, regarded them as earlier than “the rigs and furrows of modern ploughing”.

If the settlements of the group are enclosed, of the type that is, that we are wanting to connect in Wales with *tir gwelyawg*, we can remember from Wales Cwm-corun, Maes-y-Cwm and Coed-y-Brain.
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43 Kenneth Jackson, *Language and History in Early Britain* (1953), 9-10
Ewe Close (Crosby Ravensworth 25) 51 the most famous north-western site of all, has aspects all its own. A virtually square enclosure with one very large and some eight small huts was associated in the original planning with a “partially enclosed area” of small fields and huts difficult to count. If we are allowed to think in Welsh terms, we might consider the square enclosure as a kind of honorary hill-fort, an honorary Dinorben (hill-forts are very rare in this region) for a maerdref in the large hut and his direct dependents around him. The remaining “partial enclosure” would then be something like a tir cyfrif nucleation, though with squarish fields. It does break our rules, we cannot deny; but we pleaded that they should not be absolute, and Ewe Close is not in Wales. Nevertheless these traces of Strathclyde Britons (as they will become) do not seem to behave altogether differently from their brothers in Wales.

North-East England

A. H. A. Hogg has given us a check-list of native sites in Northumberland 52, but to find a sample of plans which we can use as a standard of comparison we must cross the Cheviots to Roxburghshire with a Royal Commission. A feature of the north-east is the extreme rarity of unenclosed or even “partially enclosed” settlements. Of sixty sites planned by the Commission’s surveyors, only four can possibly be put in this category, and it seems no less rare in Northumberland. Nor are large enclosed agglomerations like Northumberland’s Greaves Ash with its twenty-seven odd huts at all common and it is interesting that Morebattle 665 (Hayhope Knowe) seems to have been abandoned early. More often than not the large agglomerations seem to represent a second period following one which is that of a hill-fort, so that we are offered a challenge which I must again with cowardice decline, the challenge of an occupational census of hill-fort inhabitants. If there were 150 huts at Tre’r Ceiri, there were 155 at Hownam Law and nearly twice as many at Eildon Hill North. In Westmorland, Moor Divock, we thought, had Welsh parallels and we are reminded of it by Brand’s Hill, where George Jobey, virtually a Commission in himself, speaks of twelve or more huts “at intervals of not more than three hundred yards between one and another . . .” 54 One thinks of the tir cyfif of Moel Eilio and its fellows.

Yet the enclosure with one, two or three huts inside it, is very much the dominant type here (36 of the Commission’s 60 plans are plans of these) and the type is copied, with the rectangular enclosure of civilised surveying, by Roman “Inner Colonisation” immediately north of Hadrian’s Wall. Jobey’s collection of plans 55 deserves comparison with Blake’s. Roman procedures in Northumberland and Cumberland are different because their traditions are different too.

Meanwhile neither the surveyors of the Commission nor Jobey has much to offer on fields, even the respectable square ones. For strip-lynchets of this period they must, of course, perform the ritual averting of eyes; and I am prepared to believe that the strip-lynchets below Housesteads Fort are not as certainly Roman as the excavators declared 56. Yet the Commission is almost persuaded into heresy at Tamshiel Rig (Southdean 943), where six huts suggest nucleation—and conceivably tir cyfrif. And we are close to Graham’s famous “terraces” of Lowland Scotland, Romanno, Dunsyre and the like 57. Before we blame it all on the Angles, we should remember that Gray un-
earthed a mention of Runrig as a thing of the past in the Reports from Berwickshire to the Board of Agriculture in 1794\(^\text{58}\). In Northumberland he could find In and Out-field cultivation\(^\text{59}\), and he could find Runrig.

A little excursion into Yorkshire will complete our sampling of the Highland Zone. Elgee offers us tiny digging-stick fields from the Whitby hinterland and is prepared to see them in a Bronze Age context\(^\text{60}\), a doctrine which would commend itself to experts in south-west England; and Penigent in Upper Wharfedale is a normal enclosed group of two or three huts with the normal squarish fields, small though larger than Elgee’s. But at Grassington in Wharfedale things are rather different. Indeed Grassington should be appended to an attempt to sum things up as far as we have gone.

**Summary of Highland Zone—with Grassington**

Ireland had taught us to isolate the “Rath” and the “Clachan” ideas and we had hopes, with the aid of modern Scottish evidence, to attach concomitants to them which might allow us to take tir gwelyawg and tir cyfrif, Free and Unfree Welshmen, back in time and outside Wales. If we are allowed the distinction advanced by Hemp and Gresham of “Enclosed and Unenclosed” hut-groups with my own addition of “close dispersion” of the latter, it seems that the archaeology does not fit tir gwelyawg and tir cyfrif badly in their own home. Our notion of an essentially common-field agriculture accompanying the “Clachan idea” might allow an occasional pre-Roman terracing as archaeological material for it, but we are prepared also to believe that the coming of a plough with coulter might induce the inhabitant of an “enclosed settlement” also to experiment with a long furrow and a strip-lynchet (especially if the Romans had put him there, like the smith at Coed-y-Brain).

In the north-east the small enclosed settlement is very much the dominant, and examples of the “clachan idea” are, it seems, often the result of Roman policy in breaking up a hill-fort community (whatever agriculture it had). If any sort of field-system to accompany the dominants is rare, we might be allowed to imagine that such agriculture as they had (and they did not have much)\(^\text{62}\) was that, if we might so put it, of an Outfield without an Infield and thus archaeologically negative. There is special pleading here, I admit. If Northumberland had been crowded with “clachans” like Hayhope Knowe or Greaves Ash, we should be insisting on the archaeological negative of commonfield agriculture and would be a-babbling of tir cyfrif. Of course it is having things both ways, yet I hope that it will be seen to be legitimate so to do. Strip-lynchets, if we can ever admit them, can be Roman or even—dare we suggest it for Tamshiel Rig?—pre-Roman, worked with caschrom or spade.

In the north-west, our settlement-distinction will have to be that of “full” or “partial” enclosure, which not all may see as satisfactory. Lowndes’s fully enclosed group allows us to think of Infield and Outfield—and tir gwelyawg; and if fields do not turn up at all, we will again plead for having it both ways: at Urswick Stone Walls or Kentmere—and at Moor Divock. And the strips at Skirsgill Hill shall be Roman for us. Ewe Close indeed remains Ewe Close, though we must not forget that other “partially enclosed” settlements have what seem to be small squarish fields\(^\text{63}\). If Wales presents us with Iron Age invaders living side by side with the conquerors and using different systems of settlement and tenure, Northumberland seems to argue a larger influx of invaders with scantier early survivals, while the north-western phenomena suggest rather a fusion of
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59 Ibid., 222-7.
the two “ideas”, so that one hardly imagines a real invasion at all. And I think that the prehistorians might see things much this way.

And Grassington? Here Raistrick offered three types of fields. His first type are strip-lynchets, whatever anyone may say, and the finds from them were Roman. I suggest that here we have agricultural improvement as a concomitant of Romanisation: out-field has been turned into properly farmed land on which a coulted plough can work in a field shaped appropriately for it. We shall find our parallel in Wessex. Rai-

strick’s second group are his small “nearly square” fields, and they seem to be associated with a series of circular enclosures, each with its hut. The third consists of “fields far larger”, associated with the Lea Green site that may be pre-Roman. This site is very reminiscent of our “partially enclosed sites” of the north-west: in fact it is a nucleation of half a dozen huts or more. This should take us to Crosby Garret 8—and to tir cyfrif. Grassington, in fact, sums up a lot of problems in one place. Not Roman “inner Colonisation” but Roman agricultural improvement (there are Roman forts not far away): and the natives have their two appropriate types of native settlements and fields.

I trust that a case has been made for moving tir gwelyawg and tir cyfrif both out of Welsh medievalism and out of Wales. If Celtic Law did operate in Roman Britain as a whole, we might keep an eye on their contexts in the Lowland Zone. Here it is sensible to start with areas which have in common with the Highland Zone a scarcity or absence of Roman villas. Scholars, as we have hinted, think of imperial estates, of saltus, as the Romans called them; and though the matter deserves detailed proof, I shall assume that they are right.

The saltus of Wessex

The areas where villas, except in river valleys such as the Kennet, are notably absent can be described as of roughly triangular shape with its base vertices in the region of Bath (including thus the well-studied Little Lansdowne and Charmey Down areas) and in northern Berkshire and with its apex on the sea-coast in the region of Purbeck. Surveys of “British villages” have been conducted and excavations made since the time of Colt Hoare with the assumption that “British villages” was the right word and that a count of pits might be directly relevant to the population. But the work of our mentor Bersu at Little Woodbury has shown us many pits may connote but a single house. Shearplace Hill and Little Woodbury itself take the tradition of enclosed family farms from the Later Bronze Age into the Iron Age and Hawkes proved that we have the same thing, running from the Iron Age through the Roman period, at Pitt-Rivers’ alleged “villages” in Cranborne Chase. We have no right, indeed, to say that we have any nucleated sites that would stand comparison with Ty Mawr or even Ewe Close. Sites normally seem to have “defences”, rather against animals than human enemies, and their fields are usually of the small, squarish type, dubbed excitedly but somewhat unhappily “Celtic” when aerial photography revealed them in the “20’s (I have the name of Estyn Evans with me in regretting the term). Even I would not dare to press the claims of strips under the Roman “Wuduburh” enclosure (yet how did the Iron Age sherds really get there?) or what looks like a “Common field” at Combe Bissett Down, where it would pay to examine the square enclosure in the middle of it. Sites when dug under modern conditions do not seem to offer us the Roman material with nothing earlier that is so fre-

64 This was how R. G. Collingwood saw it. Trans. Cumb. & Westmorl. Arch. Soc. 33 (1933), 188-9.
66 Raistrick does not perhaps make it quite clear whether his huts were enclosed.
67 The procurators of Combe Down have been mentioned already. On the edge of the Fen area was found—at Sawtry—an inscription suggesting that here was the boundary of the Respublica (Coritanorum) with it, R.I.B. 220. In Gaul it would appear that the hamlets of the Vassae were imperial property, Rev. arch. (1937), 35.
68 P.P.S. XI.VIII (1842), 289-328.
69 P.P.S. VI (1940), 30-121.
70 O.G.S. Crawford, Wessex from the air (1918), 128-37.
quent in the north and in Wales, except as a notable rarity (Upper Upham, near Aldbourne) might be quoted and there is Rockbourne Down (71). We are not dealing with Roman “Inner Colonisation.” What we do have, however, is an extension in Roman times of the area with fields. Rhodes’s statement on pottery scatter is of vital importance here. Sampling a selection of Berkshire fields he found Roman pottery alone on 68% of them (72). The Iron Age has improved on the Bronze Age and the Romano-British on the Iron Age as a comparison between his figs. 8 and 6 very neatly shows. On the edge of a regular picture of square fields at the Knighton Bushes site appear something like half a dozen strip-lynchets, separated in fact from the square group. It is difficult not to believe that the heavy plough with its coulter has come in and that cultivation according to its possibilities is being attempted. Now that the idea of a Belgic coulter for a Belgic heavy plough has lost the evidence for it (73), we may keep the long strip-lynchet at Twyford Down, Hants., if we are willing to call it Roman (75). Thus Romanisation has secured more efficient farming: it is Grassington all over. No doubt such Roman contributions to agriculture as the scythe and the well, perhaps more use of wheeled carts (field roads often seem to be Roman), improved techniques in farming, more satisfactory manuring and crop rotation (74), it may be, have played their part in the increased efficiency of which the part visible to the field-archaeologist is the progressive extinction of the in-field. Population of the saltus with more, apparently and superior huts, e.g. at Studland (76) and perhaps more huts too (if it had been excavated with the Bersu doctrine), at Casterley (77), but there is no deliberate “colonisation”.

A word on the administration of the saltus should be relevant at this point. We have the procurators already noted at Combe Down and Hawkes has made a case for an official in Old Sarum (Sorviodunum). With eastern parallels, one thinks of sacred sites as official meeting places for directives and judgments: Lowbury Hill and Cold Kitchen Hill (78) should come in here. Moreover, in his analysis of the Basilican House, J. T. Smith without losing sight of its possibilities as a residence or as a grain storage space, has suggested that it sometimes served as something like a medieval Hall for a court-lest (79). This would fit the site at Iwerne (80) beautifully and we can remember that in the central Hants. outlier of the square field complex, Applebaum has noted a Basilican House inside the hill-fort at Tidbury (81).

Indeed there may be another rather unexpected unit in administration, the isolated bath-building. Ritual bathing plays a large part in primitive religion and for primitive man (and the inhabitants of a saltus were still primitive) religion and administration are closely coupled (82). We have indeed an inscription concerning a “bath” which seems to have been a kind of centre (a locus, it is called) for an official group, a pagus in Narbonensian Gaul (83). Perhaps the three bath-houses at East Grimstead (84) may be relevant here, not least if they took the place of an original Basilican House of court-lest purpose (85).

The saltus of the Upper Thames Gravels

A beneficiarius at Dorchester (Oxon) — something like a man-of-all-work in the bureaucracy of the third century—should lead us to another saltus. Like Wessex we have our settlements which seem to be family holdings, usually ditched, and we have our fields. We have indeed, such a muddle, seemingly, that one begins to wish that the aeroplane had never been invented. But we must keep our heads, and start from a simple example which shall be Mounts Farm. Here we have a family settlement running from Iron Age A to Roman. Its ditched enclosures are confused but rather less so than at most of the sites in the district. We seem to detect periodical re-digging of ditches for a field of about an acre or even less; and might think of the Infield of a family farm with its Outfield cultivated now and then in the Scottish style. The contrast with Wessex lies in the agronomic backwardness of these gravels. In Wessex the Out-field is steadily diminished, while here the Romans decided to let things be. These ditches silting up and being redug more or less on the same lines when they are not being dug somewhere else make us think not so much of redistributions in Wales, even tir cyfrif redistribution, as of what Davies saw in Ireland. I cannot resist quoting his Norman French (among the latest examples of its use in a court of law): he is extinguishing Irish gavelkind and we have already seen his description of what it was; here he notices its effect on the settlement pattern.

“et issint per reason de ceux frequent partitions et removentes ou translation des tenants del un point al auter, touts les possessions fueront uncertaine, et le uncertainity des possessions fuit la very cause que nul civil habitations fueront erected, nul enclosure ou improvement fuit fait des terres.”

Looking at Grimes’s skilful handling of the site at Linch Hill, where an enclosed settlement was deserted and reoccupied three times over in a century, we can be sure that Sir John Davies would have found his way around Stanton Harcourt and Dorchester. Nor if we find the site at Wally Corner, Dorchester, first occupied in the fourth century, need we think of “Inner Colonisation”. No doubt its inhabitants had simply been somewhere else in the district before they settled here to provide the excavator with the usual examples of ditches dug, silting up and being redug again. Neither Wessex nor the Upper Thames reveal “Inner Colonisation” on the Jobey scale of the north. For that we must go to the Fens with their deliberate Roman drainage. Settlement patterns and fields have the heterogeneous quality that we might expect and make us wonder whence the colonisers came. But Fen problems can be left in the competent hands of Dr. Salway. And the exciting evidence from the Ouse and Welland gravels is best left too— to Mr. Gavin Simpson. We must be approaching the “villa system”, whatever it is, at last. But special cases of it must first be cleared out of the way, and we look at the problem of Sussex.

Sussex and the Cogidumnus kingdom

The coastal strip of Sussex below the downs has a succession of Roman villas, all seemingly early, all large and more or less sumptuous, their owners able to accumulate capital so as to afford patterned mosaic pavements. Clearly one should study them in connexion with the Downs behind them. On the whole the Sussex picture is the Wessex picture. We are back there too in the Later Bronze Age; indeed the three contiguous sites of Plumpton Plain each with its enclosed single hut almost leads the mind to a

primitive *tir gwelyawg*. But the Later Bronze Age may also claim its "clachan idea" for the eight huts at Itford Hill 92, possibly even the five rectangular Roman huts at Park Brow, where there has been seemingly continuous occupation (or at least only slightly shifting) since the Later Bronze Age 93. But the fields are virtually all squarish (indeed, Curwen, their discoverer, is a father of "Celtic fields" as an appellative). We may only perhaps suspect our usual Roman influence at Jevington Down 94.

Curwen suggested for the later period of the Iron Age hill-forts controlling relatively small areas of the cultivated downs—Castle Hill above Eastbourne, Caburn, Cissbury, Trundle (though here we must substitute a plain site, perhaps Selsey as predecessor of Roman Chichester) and maybe the ill-explored Torberr 95. Remembering how in Caesar’s day, a Gallic chief could be regarded as virtually owning a hill-fort 96, we might see the owners of Fishbourne, Bignor (on the other side of the Downs, in fact) Angmering and Southwick as heirs of chiefs once living and lording in the respective native "capitals". Roman practice of public law would suggest that when the Cogidumnus kingdom was finally incorporated into the province (and possibly this did not happen until Hadrian 97), these down-lands should have escheated to the emperor for leasing to the villa-owners, who now become "coductores" 98. Mr. Margary’s Roman roads running parallel (in their final stretches) from London up to the Downs 99 may suggest that the land, as leased land, had what lawyers would call a “servitude”, the obligation to provide London with corn. There are parallels of a kind for this 100.

Meanwhile such a leased *saltus* (for that is what it legally should be) permits on African analogies that equivalent to the “Mancian lease” which we have already inferred in Somerset. Very regularly laid out fields at West Blatchington have already attracted Applebaum’s attention 101: we can observe its Basilican House 103, and remember that Chew Stoke has one as well 103. Margary’s alleged centuriation at Ripe, under the Downs, will fit a type of “Mancian Lease” far better than field lay-out for some Roman tow n 104.

We should therefore be able to understand Sussex if we understand what should have been Roman treatment of the “Regnum”. Perhaps we might explain as part of the “Regnum” the sumptuous villas with patterned pavements of the Isle of Wight. Square fields do not normally appear in the context of sumptuous villas (an important point for us at a later stage), but we need not be surprised to find them, according to Bowen, at Brading 106. And on the mainland we might imagine a chief of Old Winchester Hill holding court at Stroud with his residence, it may be, at Bramdean 107.

East Anglia

“Inner Colonisation” of the Fens seems to be a public operation. but it could be effected by private persons under the system of *emphyteusis* or beneficial leases. Under this type of tenure, land, especially imperial land, is assigned on easy terms with the
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92 P.P.S. XXIII (1957), 167-212.
93 Archaeologia 76 (1926-7), 140.
94 Sussex Arch. Colls. 64 (1923), 50-1.
95 Curwen, Arch. of Sussex (2nd ed. 1954), 235-7.
96 B.G., vii, 32.
97 There is nothing in Tacitus *Agr.,* 14, 2, against this. Might we not connect two unique phenomena in north-west Europe?—The *Regnum* in Sussex and the maintenance of local coinage until Hadrian at Hengistbury Head (Report) and ‘Southants’ (Num. Chron., 4th ser., 11 (1911), 42-56).
98 Even now no scholar has studied the matter more sensitively than Rostovtzeff, *Geschichte des römischen Kolonaten* 315-402.
100 Obligation to repair roads and aqueducts are well known. The *navicularia functio*, A. H. M. Jones. *Later Roman Empire*, II (1964 127, is a kind of parallel. I have no better.
102 Sussex Arch. Colls. 89 (1950), 1-56.
103 The Bath at High Down (Sussex Arch. Colls. 80 (1939), 63-88) would be relevant, if really ‘isolated’.
104 I. D. Margary., *Roman Ways in the Weald* (1918), 204-7.
106 H.C. Bowen, Ancient Fields (British Assoc. for Advancement of Science, 1961), 44.
107 The Stroud site has a small house intruded into the Basilica. There is also a large bath-building and a polygonal building which should be a temple (Arch. J., LXIV (1909), 33-52). On Bramdean, see V.C.H. Hants. 1 (1900), 307-8.
condition of its development of regeneration, and the home of *emphyteusis* seems to be above all East Anglia and Essex 108. Before the conquest there had obviously been individual palaces (as well as Belgic civilisation could produce them) of the Trinovantian *noblesse*. The finds prove it, at sites like Mount Bures 109, though the individual palaces are a dramatic discovery that awaits us. Presumably they and the Icenian nobility with them paid the penalty of defeat with confiscation. At a lower level remains seem to obey the “Rath idea”, with small family holdings like the three adjacent huts at East Tilbury 110 or the two at West Harling 111. Of anything like nucleated settlements there is not a hint until the Roman period. Now, however, there are plenty. Chadwell in south-east Essex may have developed from something pre-Roman 112, but there is nothing earlier, it seems, at neighboring Norsey Wood, Billericay 113. The sites may be on Roman roads, as at Brettenham (which is likely to have been the successor of West Harling), Needham 114, Gestingthorpe 115 and Scole 116, while Rivenhall is very close to one 117. Only the last has certainly produced a villa site in immediate proximity, though the Roman name, *Villa Faustini*, shows that there is one to be found at Scole 118. The village cottages would be *mansi*, if we were in the France of the polyptychs, and we can compare the archaeology of such a villa as Anthée 119. A village may even be created for industrial purposes, as at Wattisfield (Suffolk) seemingly for pottery 120. In an area where confiscation must have increased the extent of imperial property, such settlement patterns lead us indeed to think of *emphyteusis* 121. It would not be surprising to find hints of such private “Inner Colonisation” on the edge of the Fens. Native sites seem to depend on Gayton Thorpe in north-east Norfolk 122; and with memories of Chew Stoke and West Blatchington, we shall not be surprised that we have evidence of native settlement on the Fen borders close, at Exning, to a Basilican House 123; and there is an isolated bath-house in an analogous position at Feltwell 124.

“Inner Colonisation” shows itself in its most exciting aspect, perhaps, rather further to the west. At Thistleton Dyer (Rutland), we have a large Roman settlement and a *villa*, the complex reminding us of Rivenhall. But we have also a sacred site, and it has been succeeded, of all things, by a *Basilican House* with religious connotations 125. We seem to have virtually all the ingredients of “Inner Colonisation” in one dish! One yearns for a full report.

**Thames Basin, Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire, etc.**

Here again the prehistoric settlement is the single family farm, and it is merely for the sake of a constant definition that I speak of the “Rath idea”. Sometimes, as at
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111 P. P. S. E. A. VII (1932), 111-12; P. P. S. XIX (1953), 140.
113 Ibid., 49.
116 P. Suffolk Inst. Arch., 22 (1934-36), 263-86, 23 (1937-39), 24-30. There was an early fort here, it seems.
117 *V.C.H. Essex*, 3 (1963), 171-4. It is curious that Rivenhall, like the analogous village site of Kershawton (V.C.H. Norfolks., I, 197-8) has produced moulds for late Empire coins (Sutherland, *Coinage and Currency in Roman Britain*, (1937), 80). Egyptian landowners could private money.
118 Murgav, *Roman roads in Britain*, 2 (1957), 245, places *Villa Faustini* of L. Ant. V at Scole. If one thinks it out, this name, unique in the *Itinerary*, should imply that Faustinus had owned the villa, which had been confiscated (compare *Gildoicum patronium*. Not. Dig. Occ., 3). Dare one think of Faustinus, pretender against Tetricus?
121 *Emphyteusis* is also possible on the edge of an already cultivated area and the large villa at West Dean (Hants.-Wilts. border) could illustrate it. (V.C.H. Hants., 1 (1900), 31-2).
122 Clarke in *Norfolk Arch.* 31 (1953-57), 403; on the villa (a small one with a patterned pavement), *ibid.*, 23 (1926-28), 209.
124 *J.R.S.* 53 (1963), 137.
Lockley’s 126 and Park Street 127, such farms may develop into Roman villas. On the other hand, Wyboston 128 stayed virtually as it was for a time in the Romano-British period, while Puddle Hill (Beds.) seems to have been sacked by the conquering troops. The last site, excavated with admirable care by a local amateur group, gives evidence, clearer than at most, of associated squarish fields 129. Of different structural type but family farms no less are a group of settlements recently studied by Dr. M. A. Cotton, especially in northern Berkshire. Like the others, they may develop into Roman villas (Cox Green, Maidenhead, is clearly the successor of Robin Hood’s Bower); sometimes they may continue into the Roman period as they are 130.

Kent

There are sumptuous villas in Kent, but they seem to respond to particular circumstances; there is no reason, for instance, why Winbolt should not have been right in connecting Folkestone with the classis Britannica 131. Darenth is a remarkable case. On plan it looks sumptuous indeed; yet careful reading of the report shows that no room had a decorated pavement 132. If Fox was right in detecting evidence for fulling 133, one would see it as one of the baphia mentioned in the Notitia Dignitatum as under the control of procurators 134. It seems to have been abandoned as such early in the fourth century, which would explain why it is not in the notitia list. One would be tempted to locate the procurator at Lullingstone and perhaps another member of the staff at what seems to be an important villa at Farningham 135.

We have literary evidence for the settlement type of Kent in B.C. 54, for Caesar’s aedificia ought to connote exponents of the “Rath idea” 136. But one cannot say that Kentish archaeologists have been particularly successful in finding them 137. Jessup could point to no excavated site, and one can only suspect, against the excavator’s belief, that the Joyden’s Wood site really ran on from the Iron Age into and through Roman Britain 138. Meanwhile the Charlton site 139 is thoroughly curious and might be parallel to those villages across the Thames which we associate with “Inner Colonisation” and emphyteusis. Moreover Kent is certainly the home of the isolated bath-house. We have Boughton Monchelsea, Little Chart and North Cray with the probability of a fourth in connexion with iron-working for the classis Britannica at Cranbrook 140. Indeed the site at Eccles, as it comes out, seems to have more bath space than is good for a normal villa 141. And two villas close together seem to be a Kentish speciality which I, at least, cannot yet explain. Clearly Kent will hurt or harm our synthesis a lot—some day.

Pavements—Yes or No

Mr. Rivet, summing up the Conference, compared my paper to a “strip-tease act”, and I do not rebuff the comparison. What he means is that, if we strip south-east England of the London and Colchester environs, of the Cogidumnus kingdom and of “Inner Colonisation”, it is the norm that villas very roughly from Hengistbury Head to the Wash, rarely produce patterned pavements. The occupiers, in fact, do not seem to

126 Ant. J. XVIII (1938), 339-76.
127 Arch. J. CII (1945), 21-110.
128 P. Combs. Ant. Soc. 50 (1957), 75-84.
129 Matthews, Ancient Dunstable (Manshead Arch. Soc. of Dunstable, Beds., 1963), 40-6; 55.
130 Compare Lowther’s Ashtead group, Surrey Arch. Colls. 37 (1927), 144-63; 38 (1930), 152-47, 197-202; 42 (1934), 77-84.
131 S. E. Winbolt, Roman Folkestone (1928); V.C.H. Kent, 3 (1932), 114.
132 V.C.H. Kent, 3 (1932), 113; but the absence of patterned pavements must be discovered from the full report, Arch. Cant., 22.
133 Archaeologia, 59 (1905), 218-32.
134 Not. Dig. Occ., xi, 64-73.
135 G. W. Meates, Lullingstone Roman Villa (1951); V.C.H. Kent, 3 (1932), 113.
136 Caeser, B. G., v, 12, 3; compare 14, 1.
137 Fawkham looks promising; Arch. Cant. 54 (1941), 74.
138 Arch. Cant. 68 (1954), 167-83.
139 J.B.A.A. 22 (1916), 123-91.
have had the power of capital accumulation sufficient to place an order for them. On the other hand, the normal villa from Holcombe in Devon to Rudstone in Yorkshire will not fail to produce them. There are exceptions both ways, and we should expect that there would be. We have patterned pavements, for instance, at Itchen Abbas (central Hants) and High Wycombe (Bucks.) 142. Critics might find one or two more, but not many, I feel confident. Again we have a “poor man’s villa” at Catsgore and it is not alone.

Our “pavement area” can produce “Inner Colonisation”; the Andoversford site, a Romano-British nucleation as it seems, has in close attendance, the very curious bath-building of Whittington Court with its decorated pavements 144. And if Mrs. O’Neil, discussing the “reception hall” of its final period, could not resist speaking of a “Country Club”, I am afraid that we must tell her that it was something like a “Segregated Country Club”.

How do we explain the contrast, which we can put in the most striking way by noticing that, whereas the Belgic huts under Lockley’s, Park Street or Ashstead never sired anything but a small villa, a native site under Littleton villa (Somerset) sired something very large 145? Certainly Cotswold wool and perhaps an eventual interest in Mendip mining can explain a lot; and yet they do not seem quite satisfactory, and we remember that it is the “strip-tease act” which has produced the notion of an area of “poor men’s villas”. With our indications of Celtic Law all over Britain, could we dare to bring tir gwelyawg and tir cyfrif out of their adventures with the Royal Commission and Mr. Jobey to solve our problem? It must be confessed that an archaeological distinction between them is rather blurred, even in their homeland of Wales. But it should be legitimate to suggest that it ought to be sharper in the “Lowland Zone”, where civilised local authorities and even local archives 147 might be expected to keep tenurial distinctions sharper.

Our square fields of the Roman period and earlier are a reality; but it is another matter to imply by the name of “Celtic fields” that they are a common denominator of Celtic agriculture. The common field ploughed in strips is the norm of cultivation in France north of the Loire, as Marc Bloch explained 148; and whatever we may think of Anglo-Saxons, one would hesitate to father a revolution of field-pattern on Franks, hesitate to suppose it in Alderney, which kept its one open field down to the German occupation 149. Moreover in the Vosges, fields of the Mediomatrici (as good a Celtic word as any), associated with Gallo-Roman farms and reverting to forest when these were abandoned, have as good strip-terraces as one could wish—and not a sign of square fields in the Sussex and Wessex style 150. Indeed Denmark has produced strip fields and square fields side by side from the Iron Age; the plan vies with Grassington. We can remember Ralegh Radford’s suggestion that “Celtic fields” had not been found on the Cotswolds—because they were never there 152.

That area which has as its backbone the Jurassic ridge is, then, the home of the large villa with patterned pavements, the area where capital accumulation was easy, and we are prepared to call it the area of “Lowland Zone tir cyfrif” and it would, of course, be necessary to ask the prehistorians what they think of the idea that a virtually uniform servile system existed here: in contrast with tir gwelyawg. The cousin, if we might so put it, of the maerdrev at Dinorben would be something like a maerdrev in a Glouceshires
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142 V.C.H. Hants., 1 (1900), 307; Records of Bucks. 16 (1953-60), 249-54.
144 T. Bristol & Glos. AS. 71 (1952), 13-87.
146 Sir Arthur Evans explained the Late Roman silver hoards of Somerset along these lines, Num. Chron., 4th ser., 15 (1915), 498-501.
147 On Archives, see Kühler in Dizionario Epigraphico. ii 27.
148 Marc Bloch, Les Caractères rigoureux de l'histoire rurale française (1931).
149 S. Harris, Sociological Review (1927), 1.
150 J.R.S. 43 (1953), 123-4.
151 Acta Archaeologica II, pls. viii, ix.
152 Oxon. 1 (1936), 32.
or Somerset hillfort and his descendants will be the owners of a Chedworth or a Woodchester, a Wellow or a Low Ham. And their taegs will be lodged normally in the same unit, like the slaves of a plantation owner (and that includes George Washington at Mount Vernon) \(^{153}\). Such a tenure, though of Celtic origin, would seem to a Roman administrator like enough to the dominus/colonus relationship which he knew well.

But tenurial conditions in the south-east should have been different. Indeed it is dramatically appropriate that the 1958 C.B.A. Conference should have given us two plans of native settlements, one from Northamptonshire, the other from Lincolnshire. The three huts inside an enclosure from Draughton would delight George Jobey and lead us to sites like Caerau. But Colsterworth, Lincs., has all the look of Crossley Ravensworth 31 and even of Ewe Close in that quarter of it which we have called the maerdrev’s. It is tempting to contrast tir cyfrif at the latter with tir gwelyawg at the former and to their Roman developments at Scampton, for instance, and Horkstour—but it must be confessed that the nearest “small” Roman villa is some way from Draughton \(^{155}\).

We are presuming, therefore, tir gwelyawg in the south-east, presuming that the sites which we studied around Dorchester and Stanton Harcourt are, as it were, tir gwelyawg gone wild. And we can remind the prehistorian with eyes on invasion from Belgium or the Low Countries of “Celtic Fields” in Holland and of “hedge-hopping” by Caesar’s soldiers among the Nervii—which should imply a field-system much the same. But this is not a prehistoric conference!

Tir gwelyawg in the south-east would explain much. Its principles connoted the possibility that some unexpected claimant might “cry across the abyss” with the proof that he had an ancestral title never extinguished. I suggested that this was the foundation of a case heard before the Emperor. It might well have been a “test case” and one would give much to know how (and, for that matter, when) it was decided \(^{158}\). And there was the Law of Successions permitting division among second cousin collaterals. We thought that it might even apply to the dwelling on the Thames gravels; but even if it limited itself to movables, to stock in cattle, a land-owner under tir gwelyawg must have lacked incentive for capital accumulation, lacked incentive to create the cash reserve to place an order for “Dido and Aeneas”, “The Races” or the “Trout-Stream” for his dining-room. Such a land-owner must have cursed the “Regulating Act of 224”.

Unless he could escape by emphyteusis, he was bound in the iron ring of tir gwelyawg. He should not have been the man to talk Ciceronian Latin at a dinner-party.

The Results of Tir Gwelyawg

And it does not look as though he was. Jackson has noticed with some surprise what seems like a “Romanisation of the Highland Zone” in the fifth century \(^{160}\). We can learn from him that numerous Latin words have entered Welsh. But we can also learn
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153 I refer to the admirable plan sold on the site. Does it not take us straight to one of our “Large Villas”? 154 Problems of the Iron Age in Southern Britain (ed. S. S. Freere), Inst. of Arch. (London) Occ. Pap. 11 (1961), 21-25. 155 I must confess that on the east edge of the Jurassic crest it is rather an outlier. Great Staughton (J.R.S. 49 (1959), 118; 50 (1960) 225) about 12 miles to the east. 156 Antiquity II (1928), 85-7. 157 Caesar, B. G., ii. 17, 4. 158 J.R.S. 37 (1947), 132-4. At Great Staughton there are two small villas both (exceptionally) with patterned pavements. One of them, had taken the place of something larger, producing for itself coins of Constantine I to Valentinian II. I will only say that a successful ‘cry across the abyss’ could have given just this archaeological result: The ‘test case’ behind Cod. Theod., xi. 7, 2, should not have been cited long after 319, and the coins of Constantine I (306-337) are a pretty coincidence. Dare one guess that the ‘test case’ re-asserted the “Regulating Act” and Celtic Law? 159 Low Ham (P. Som. A. N. H. S. 92 (1946), 25-8); Horkstow (Samuel Lysons, Reliquiae Britannico-Romanae, 1 (1817); Rudston (Sir Ian Richmond, The Roman Pavements from Rudston, East Riding: Hull Museum publications, No. 215 (1963)), respectively. ’Trout Stream’ is not quite veracious but I use the phrase for the sake of the note to follow. 160 Kenneth Jackson, Language and History in Early Britain (1953), 117-121. 161 A list in Jackson, Loc. cit., 78-80. I wonder whether master, throwing a dry-fly (which Romans could do (William Radcliffe, Fishing from the Earliest Times (1921)), gave the Latin word for ‘fish’ to the Celtic-speaking taeg. A curious example of ascendency culture-transmission.
Fig. 1. Distribution of Villas with Patterned Pavements (Villas with villages depending on them—including, by inference from name, 'Villa Faustini'—are denoted by the concentric circle-and-dot symbol. I have risked it for the Arbury Road (Cambridge) site, P, Camb. AS. XLVIII (1955), 10-44, and XLIX (1956), 13-28, by reason of the fine stone sarcophagi closely adjacent).

NOTE ON THE MAPS (FIGS. 1 AND 2)

It must be recognised that these maps cannot claim complete objective validity. The data of Fig. 1 may be over-weighted, because early investigators were often only interested in a Patterned Pavement (as at Medbourne, V.C.H. Leics. 1, 214-5), and early excavations can only be safely entered on Fig. 2 if conducted and planned with the precision of, e.g., Lysons at Rodmarton, Gloucs. (Arch. XVIII (1817), 113-7). Moreover the statement of an excavator that he has found tesserae, even variously coloured tesserae, can seldom be safely used unless he reproduces or gives a clear verbal description of a Pattern. On the other hand, a Patterned Pavement suitable for Fig. 1 may have been wrecked; on the other, most villas marked on Fig. 2 had some sort of tessellated floors. Of course a ‘small’ villa can have a Patterned Pavement, as at Gayton Thorpe, Norfolk (Norfolk Arch. XXIII (1929), 166-209), just as a ‘large’ villa can be without one, as (quite apart from the special case of Darenth, Kent) at Atworth, Wilts. (W.A.M. 49 (1940, 46-95).
Fig. 2. Distribution of Villas without Patterned Pavements (Also included are symbols for two types of rural settlement which may be relevant to our problem; the Basilican house (shown as ‘X’) and the isolated bath-building (shown as ‘+’).)

I have tried to construct the two maps fairly, pressing the evidence from excavations, if I press it, against my thesis of two tenurial patterns. I doubt, for instance, whether I need have given Bedfordshire its one entry in Fig. 1 for Totternhoe (Ancient Dunstable (1963), 61-4); it could be another Atworth. I know, of course, that, as things stand, only a minority of Patterned Pavements in Britain can be taken behind the fourth century. I merely claim that at some time the occupier of a villa felt able to afford the capital outlay for a Patterned Pavement, and that tenurial patterns give an important clue as why he did so, I would not be so foolish as to claim that it is the only reason; we cannot be determinists over villa-occupiers.
that the English “probably met very few people who talked any sort of Latin at all
during the course of the occupation of Britain”162. This need not surprise us; and it
need not surprise us that a Roman, Candidianus (he has two partners with Welsh names,
as I shall not deny), defends the Severn, as late as 577 while Goyrangconus and
Vortimer165 (and there is Vortigern himself) 165 are fighting in Kent.

The Anglo-Saxons are here!

Indeed our analysis might throw light of its own on the Dark Century. We can note
the contrast with Gaul. In its fifth century, the barbarians broke in and “All Gaul
smoked in one funeral pyre” 166; and it was not long before a Gallic chronicler was
saying that “all the slaves of Gaul joined the Bacaudeae, the brigands” 167. At first the
barbarians helped them, but they soon realised that it was better to join the land-
owners—for a price. With us it is rather different. Our Bacaudeae seem to have appeared
before our barbarians; and Nennius preserves a clear tradition of war between “Brit-
tones” and “Romani”, mentioning Vortigern’s “fear of Ambrosius” 168, Gildas’ “last
of the Romans” 169. How one would like to make this Aurelius Ambrosius a man with
the personality to lead the men of the Wiltshire saltus against their fellow-Britons,
perhaps to the victory of the Wallop stream 170! Perhaps we shall find his home (looking
like West Dean) some day near Amesbury (the equation is now becoming respectable).
And we can imagine many an owner of a “poor man’s villa” joining in envy the Saxons
when they came. Perhaps one was called Cerdic 171.

And our magic pair, tir gwelyawg and tir cyfrif, may have their say with Angles,
Saxons and Jutes. The Saxons, as we now know (to stress the unhappiness of the
nomenclature) were cultivating in their continental home—“Celtic fields” 172. In the
Midlands, therefore, we can see them not changing the agriculture by efforts of their
own—that was not the barbarians’ way 173, but walking into the Open-Field system
of tir cyfrif. But in Kent an eighteenth-century observer could say that “there are no
common fields in this country,” in Kent there are no Enclosure Acts: and we may
suspect that Gray (and Gordon Ward) were right in believing that the “yoke”, the
“iugum”, Kent’s unit of land-measurement, was in fact the “iugum” of the Roman
Empire 174. The Jutes in Kent have walked into tir gwelyawg. And perhaps it is not only
Kent, for Gray claimed to see traces of the Kentish system, “iuga” and all, behind the
medieval arrangements of East Anglia—and Surrey, areas where we have been seeing
“poor man’s villas” 175.

Tir gwelyawg and tir cyfrif—will these “dark horses” of tenth-century legislation and
thirteenth-century Extents really draw Clio’s Wain to a solution of the “Villa System”—
or into a mare’s nest? The reader must decide.

162 Jackson, loc. cit., 261.
163 A. S. Chronicle, 577 (Coinmail et Candidan et Farinmail).
164 Nennius, 37, 43-5.
165 Jackson, loc. cit., 116, note 4: ‘one suspects that Vortigern . . . was a lowlander’.
166 Orientius, ii, 101-4.
167 Chronica Gallica a.ccclii, 117, in Mommsen’s Chronica Minora, i, 660.
168 Nennius, 30, 31.
169 De Excidio, 25.
171 But there are philological difficulties (Jackson, loc. cit., 613) and compare H. M. Chadwick, 128
172 Zoller, Nachrichter aus Nieder-sachsens Urgeschichte, 31-57.
173 Compare Tacitus, Germany, 14, 4.
174 On all this, see H. L. Gray, English Field Systems (1915), 272-304. There is some sort of correlation between the varying sizes
(according to land-fertility) of the Syria Law-Book (cited in A. H. M. Jones, Later Roman Empire, 1 (1964), 62).
175 Gray, loc. cit., 415-8.
Abbreviations and Bibliography

The abbreviations used in the footnotes to the various papers are, as far as possible, self-explanatory and many of them are so widely known that it may seem unnecessary to expand them here. This has none the less been done, partly for the sake of accuracy, partly for the sake of users of this volume (for example, in schools, or abroad) who will not be familiar with all the County periodicals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agric. Hist. R.</td>
<td>The Agricultural History Review (published by the British Agricultural History Society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.N.L.</td>
<td>The Archaeological News Letter (London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ant. J.</td>
<td>The Antiquaries’ Journal (Society of Antiquaries of London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch.</td>
<td>Archaeologia (Society of Antiquaries of London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch. Ael.</td>
<td>Archaeologia Aeliana (fourth (current) series) (Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle upon Tyne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch. Cant.</td>
<td>Archaeologia Cantiana (Kent Archaeological Society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch. J. (Journ.)</td>
<td>The Archaeological Journal (Royal Archaeological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brit. Ass. Adv. Sc.</td>
<td>Advancement of Science (British Association for the Advancement of Science)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.B.C.S.</td>
<td>Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies (Cardiff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornish Arch.</td>
<td>Devon and Cornwall Notes and Queries (Tiverton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon &amp; Cwll. N. &amp; Q.</td>
<td>Journal of the British Archaeological Association (London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.B.A.A.</td>
<td>Journal of the Royal Institution of Cornwall (Truro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R.I.C.</td>
<td>Journal of Roman Studies (Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R.S.</td>
<td>Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland (Dublin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R.S.A.I.</td>
<td>Medieval Archaeology (Society for Medieval Archaeology, London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monm. Ant.</td>
<td>Ministry of Public Building and Works (formerly ‘Ministry of Works’), London and regional offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.O.P.B.W.</td>
<td>Norfolk Archaeology (Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Arch.</td>
<td>The Numismatic Chronicle (Royal Numismatic Society, London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. Chron.</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.S.</td>
<td>Oxoniensia (Journal of the Oxford Architectural and Historical Society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxon.</td>
<td>Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Camb. AS.</td>
<td>Proceedings of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society (Dorchester)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Hants F.C.</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phil. Trans. R.S.  
Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society.

P.P.S.E.A.  
Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society of East Anglia (fore-runner of P.P.S.)

P.P.S.  
Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society (Cambridge)

P.R.I.A.  
Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy (Dublin; in this case, Section C, Archaeology, Linguistic, and Literature)

Proc. Devon A.E.S.  
Proceedings of the Devon Archaeological Exploration Society

Proc. West Cwll. F.C.  
Proceedings of the West Cornwall Field Club (1953-61; replaced by Cornish Arch.)

P.S.A.S.  
Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland (Edinburgh)

P. Som. A.N.H.S.  
Proceedings of the Somersetshire Archaeological and Natural History Society (Taunton)

P. Suffolk I.A.  
Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and Natural History

P. U.B.S.S.  
Proceedings of the University of Bristol Spelaeological Society

Rev. arch.  
Revue archéologique (Paris)

Rev. Celt.  
Revue Celtique (Paris)

R.I.B  

Royal Commissions:

R.C.A.H.M.  
Royal Commission on Ancient and Historical Monuments in Wales and Monmouthshire (Aberystwyth)

R.C.A.M.  
Royal Commission on Ancient Monuments (Scotland)

R.C.H.M.  
Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England)

Sussex A.C.  
Sussex Archaeological Collections (Sussex Archaeological Society, Lewes)

T. Bristol & Glos. A.S.  
Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society

T.C. & W.  
Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society

T. Dumf. & Gall. N.H.A.S.  
Transactions of the Dumfries and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society

T. Durham A.A.S.  
Transactions of the Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham & Northumberland

Transactions of the Anglesey Antiquarian Society and Field Club

Trans. Devon Ass.  
Report and Transactions of the Devonshire Association for the Advancement of Science, Literature, and Art

W.A.M.  
The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine (Devizes)

Y.A.J.  
The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal (Yorkshire Archaeological Society, York)
I TALLINGTON, SITES 35-37 AND 48. Top (35): rectangular pre-Roman Iron Age enclosure, 480 ft. by 320 ft., with small hut-circle in one corner. Left (36): pit alignment of late 1st cent. B.C.-early 1st cent. A. D. Centre (37): small rectangular farm enclosure occupied between about 50-60 to 80-90 A. D., and (48): droveway, joining 'King Street', passing immediately south of the enclosure.
II  TALLINGTON, SITES 36 AND 48. The ditches of an early Roman droveway (48) cross the line of a late Iron Age pit alignment (36). Note how the droveway ditches nearest the camera have been brought up to the pit alignment on either side. This photograph was taken after the area had been mechanically stripped of topsoil in preparation for gravel quarrying.
III MAXEY, SITE 44. A vertical photograph of part of the Roman settlement east of Maxey church. The Late Saxon settlement (excavated by P. V. Addyman) was in the area of the gravel-pit in the top left corner.

IV GREATFORD, SITE 11. A pentagonal enclosure with a droveway, leading to it from the west. The post-holes of a basilican building show up clearly in the south-west angle. Pottery collected over the area is mostly early 4th century A.D. but there are also earlier pieces.
V HAFOTY-WERN-LAS Homestead and ‘Concentric Circles’, with early fields.
VI FARLEY MOUNT, HANTS. Enclosed settlements, left of the modern 'Mount', with 'Celtic' fields (p. 45)

VII WINTERBOURNE, WILTS. Settlement site, looking south (p. 48)
VIII  PLUSH, DORSET. Settlement cut by strip lynches (p. 49)

IX  EBSURY, WILTS. Eastern parts, looking west (p. 51)
X KNOOK DOWN, WILTS. Plan of settlements, by Sir Richard Colt-Hoare (p. 53)
XI TOTTERDOWN, FYFIELD DOWN, WILTS. Romano-British fields, looking north-east (p. 58)

XII NORTH FIELD, WEST OVERTON, WILTS. Crop-marks of Iron Age and Romano-British settlement area, looking east (p. 61)