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ABSTRACT

‘Later Prehistoric Settlement Evidence of Southern Scotland’ studies the enclosed sites of Peeblesshire, Berwickshire and selected sites from E Dumfriesshire. This area has seen very little interest in archaeological research in the past. The aim of this thesis was to examine the later prehistoric enclosed sites and to look at their landscape settings. At the beginning, detailed lists of the sites needed to be made. I present these in the Appendices of the thesis. From them, two main subjects occur: firstly, the interpretation of components of enclosed sites (e.g. ramparts, roundhouses), which were studied in relation to one another; and secondly, the settings of the sites within the landscape.

Lists of enclosed sites are based on my own critical assessment of the data gathered in the RCAHMS Inventories, supported by visits to certain sites and observation of aerial photographs. The core text of this thesis aims to detect new information by using different perspectives on the enclosed sites from those used before. This has been done by overlooking previously set and broadly used categorisations of sites. The RCAHMS ‘neat’ categories of hill-forts, enclosures etc. are ignored in this study. Instead, all the enclosed sites are observed initially as one single broad category. As a result, a new possible categorisation of sites according to the size of their internal areas, entrance appearance and orientation, and landscape position occurred. This provided an opportunity for further discussion on a number of topics, including a critique of cosmological interpretations of entrance orientations.

From this data, possible settlement patterns can be observed, at both regional and local levels. Several different forms of landscape organisation occur. This is particularly well seen in a cluster of sites with multiple ramparts. Another example is a cluster of sites which are almost identical to one another (Orchard Rig, Peeblesshire). There are also clusters of different sites which occupy areas with well-established natural boundaries (e.g. Meldon Burn valley).

With the establishment of settlement patterns, observation of enclosed sites together with their immediate terrain and archaeological features nearby, an organised archaeological landscape can be seen, although it is a cumulative rather than a contemporary picture (i.e. living ancestor). Many earlier monuments were incorporated in the later site patterns. The patterns of remains in the landscape therefore appear ‘neat’ although they were not
contemporary built or actively used. This topic was a reoccurring factor in a number of the analyses and merits some observations and short focused discussions, which can serve as an introduction for any more thorough studies in the future.

Moreover, this thesis shows that certain ‘anomalies’ in the S Scottish settlement record (such as brochs/ duns and rectilinear sites), were incorporated into this settlement pattern and followed the ‘rules’ of positioning a site within the later prehistoric landscape.

When viewing the results from this thesis, a major boundary between two different enclosed site patterns can be detected, one including Berwickshire, Selkirkshire, Peeblesshire and far N – NW part of E Dumfriesshire, and the other one including the rest of E Dumfriesshire. This boundary differs from previously suggested ones and forms a firm basis for further studies on more than one level.

With the analyses made in this thesis, it is clear that there is much more to obtain from the known settlement record. A great potential for new data is there as long as we are not afraid to start questioning previous ‘neat’ categorisations.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

"If space allows movement, place is pause."

(Taun 1977, 6)

The later prehistoric archaeology of Peeblesshire and Berwickshire has seen little sustained research, despite the quality of the settlement archaeology as revealed by the surveys of the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland\(^1\). By contrast, E Dumfriesshire has been studied thoroughly; the results of which are published in several recent publications (e.g. RCAHMS 1997; Halliday 2002). E Dumfriesshire is therefore a good candidate for such a comparative approach and across the selected border counties will be made throughout the thesis. This study will try to reveal the untapped potential of Peeblesshire and Berwickshire as areas, which only rarely occur even in the most general studies of the later prehistoric\(^2\) enclosed sites. One of the main purposes of this thesis are to show that these ‘blank’ areas in publications are the result of almost no interest in the later prehistoric settlement archaeology of some parts of the country; rather than the lack of later prehistoric enclosed sites and the preservation of them. During the course of this thesis, I will show that enough quality data exist to be able to make extensive studies of the enclosed sites and other archaeological features in their landscape.

This thesis will emphasize the importance of taking a broad approach to later prehistoric landscape. Studies of individual sites or site-types are too narrow. They cannot provide the broader picture needed to recognise settlement patterns in the landscape. The basis that forms this research is therefore to look at the archaeological data from a wider perspective. The key concerns will be the enclosed sites, which have been broadly dated to later prehistory by the RCAHMS (CANMORE\(^3\); RCAHMS 1915; 1920; 1967, vol.1; 1967, vol. 2; 1980a; 1980b; 1997). It focuses on certain areas of S Scotland (Peeblesshire, Berwickshire and E Dumfriesshire) (Illus. 2). The study area follows former county divisions as this allows correlation with modern survey regions (e.g. surveys made by the RCAHMS). The danger of imposing these modern boundaries to the studies of the past exists and I have been

---

\(^1\) Referred as RCAHMS from this point on (RCAHMS 1915; 1920; 1967, vol.1; 1967, vol. 2; 1980a; 1980b; 1997).

\(^2\) The term ‘later prehistory’, as used in this thesis, includes later 2\(^{nd}\) millennium BC, first millennium BC and the very start of the first millennium AD (see also p. 5).

\(^3\) A name given to the RCAHMS database of archaeological sites, monuments, buildings and maritime sites in Scotland, which is accessible online. It includes description of each site, together with its location on the map and index of drawings, photographs and bibliography.
aware of this throughout the whole process of the research. However, in the Conclusions of this thesis (Chapter 9) I will consider the question of possible detectable regions or distribution areas in later prehistory.

Illus. 2: Study area (marked in black)

The main issue of this thesis is the analysis of later prehistoric settlement evidence in SE Scotland. This thesis brings together several studies concerning site specifics and settlement patterns of the areas chosen. The core theme of the analysis is that no particular form of
enclosure should be isolated from the wider picture in order to get a better understanding of society in the period studied.

"The alternative view starts from regarding space as a medium rather that a container for action, something that is involved in action and cannot be divorced from it."

(Tilley 1994, 10)

It is not possible to separate the archaeological sites from the landscape itself. Once people inhabit a landscape, they perceive it as a part of them. We build settlements according to the landscape surrounding us, with every part of the settlement being tied to the landscape.

1.1. Why Peeblesshire, Berwickshire and E Dumfriesshire?

The later prehistoric settlement evidence of Peeblesshire and Berwickshire has seen very limited study for many years, and this was the main reason why these areas were chosen. On the other hand, an extensive analysis and interpretation of the prehistoric and early historic remains of E Dumfriesshire was published in 1997 (RCAHMS 1997). This publication shows current trends in the research of the settlement evidence, and is a wide-ranging study that should be adopted for the studies of other areas, although some criticisms can be applied (section 1.7.1.).

There were more than 800 later prehistoric enclosed sites recorded in the three counties researched. Despite this, the area has received little attention and general or detailed studies have been extremely few. Only about 1% of all sites have been excavated. General surveys have been done (RCAHMS 1915; 1920; 1967a; 1967b; 1980a; 1980b; 1997). From Peeblesshire and Berwickshire, nothing more than very general and out of date discussions were produced based on the data available; there are some discussions based on individual sites or features within sites (e.g. Halliday 2002; Dunwell 1999), but they observe only crumbs in the vast amount of information obtainable. There is a big unfilled gap in the study of the area: it has seen very little analysis of later prehistoric sites and forms a big "unsorted" region in the presentation of settlement evidence (Haselgrove et al. 2001, 25, Table 3).

This thesis takes advantage of the sheer amount of the data available and tries to find their place in studies of later prehistory.
1.2. Questions and aims of the research

This study will try to answer the questions of how settlement patterns occur within a landscape and why they occur the way they do. I started the research as someone that had never visited SE Scotland before and was not familiar with the settlement record here. Therefore, no doubt some flaws are present in the detailed observation of the landscape. My knowledge and discussion of the landscape and the later prehistoric enclosed sites is a product of a four-year observation of maps, aerial photos and visits to the sites. I am aware I do not have the same experience of these landscapes and sites as someone living and experiencing the areas over a long period of time. However, this is not necessarily a disadvantage as I am able to observe the areas objectively and apply a fresh view and different knowledge to the landscape. Moreover, I am not restricted to the models applied and orthodoxy used in the archaeological research of S Scotland (e.g. the work and classification of the sites made by the RCAHMS).

The main questions of this thesis are:

- What was the character of later prehistoric settlement patterns in the case study areas of S Scotland?
  The question follows the core theme of this thesis (p. 2), which is to present the later prehistoric settlement patterns as a whole on a regional basis, without taking any particular form of enclosed settlement evidence out of context. The approach is based on a classification and analysis of sites, site morphology and topography, with the aim of discovering general trends, groupings, and differences in the areas studied.

- What was the role of hillforts?
  Most of the enclosed sites of the area studied were not strongly defended and so the ramparts present cannot be seen purely from a defensive point of view (e.g. Bowden, McOmish 1987; Dempsey 1996; Ralston 2004). Additionally, some of the enclosed sites were overlooked by higher ground or were located on almost levelled ground. It is therefore not possible to specify hillforts as one single category and it is likely that their roles were different. This will be explored.

- Does the later prehistoric settlement pattern follow the same trend in the area researched, or can regional patterns be identified?
Settlement evidence of different parts of Peeblesshire will be discussed in two detailed case studies in order to detect possible sub-regional variation. The first case study is in Meldon Burn valley which covers an area where landscape boundaries are clear (section 6.3.1.). The second case study is at Orchard Rig where natural boundaries are not so well defined (section 6.3.2.).

Peeblesshire settlement evidence will then be compared to Berwickshire and E Dumfriesshire in order to see if all the regions follow the same trend in their later prehistoric settlement patterns or if the settlement patterns differ from one another.

- Are brochs and duns an alien building form introduced from the N, or do they have their origin in the settlement tradition of SE Scotland?
- Lowland brochs and duns are generally linked to the architectural tradition of the Atlantic Zone, but do show some similarities with the settlement tradition of the SE Scotland. A detailed study will consider how they fit into the local settlement pattern.

Scotland’s settlement evidence does not provide a fixed chronology in the absence of excavation; even relative chronology is questionable at times. There are only broad definitions, such as Late Bronze Age, Early Iron Age, Middle Iron Age, Roman Iron Age, but the limits are often imprecise. The term ‘later prehistory’ is therefore used throughout the thesis, as it incorporates all of the periods mentioned above. The aim of the research is to look at the enclosed settlement evidence over a long period of time and therefore the question of precise dates is avoidable.

The aims of this thesis are:

- To look at the landscape settings of the sites, their morphology, defensive/non-defensive features (e.g. enclosed site ramparts, easiest lines of approach vs. entrances through the ramparts, visibility from/to the enclosed sites (where applicable)), number of roundhouses and their sizes.

- To look at all of the later prehistoric enclosed settlement evidence as one single category and observe all the sites on an equal footing. Too much focus has been given to observation of one single category of sites (e.g. hillforts) or one single topic (e.g. roundhouse entrances) and interpretations of these can be misleading if the
bigger picture is not observed (e.g. sections 4.5., 6.3.1.).

- Peeblesshire and parts of E Dumfriesshire are hilly areas and contrast sharply with the flat, often boggy country of Berwickshire and southern parts of E Dumfriesshire. Therefore, the comparison of archaeological landscapes that are placed in close proximity, but that greatly differ in terms of their geographical features, can be an interesting one. Such comparisons will be done on several occasions throughout this study; the main discussion is presented in the Conclusions of the thesis (Chapter 9).

- To consider if the boundaries between enclosed sites were set and if so, how were they portrayed (e.g. possibility of built artificial boundaries, natural boundaries).

- To show there are interesting discoveries and some new questions that come out of the observation and analysis of the enclosed sites and settlement patterns in the area researched, despite being a poor focus of research for decades. This should encourage similar analyses in other areas which have been labelled as "blank" or "unsorted" (see Haselgrove et al. 2001, 25, Table 3).

1.3. General problems of typology in S Scotland and lack of excavation

Typological sequences of enclosure types and settlement evidence have been a key part of past studies, but have now been proved to be flawed. Three examples which form a big part of past discussions of settlement evidence in S Scotland are illustrated here. These are the Hownam sequence, the dating of palisades and the sequence of roundhouse types.

Publication of the excavations at Hownam Rings, Roxburghshire, supported a model of the later prehistoric settlement development (Piggott 1948). The structural sequence discovered at this site showed a simple development of the settlement through time:

1) unenclosed settlement
2) palisaded rampart
3) univallate rampart
4) multivallate rampart
5) non-defensive settlement
Under the influence of this so-called Hownam sequence, all the enclosure types of the area were neatly put in the time sequence according to their building style. The sequence laid the mainstay of the settlement archaeology in S Scotland for decades (e.g. Megaw, Simpson 1979, 449-452). Some studies of the hillforts of other areas of Britain also adopted this model. S.C. Stanford for example, supported the Hownam sequence with radiocarbon dates from hillforts in Sussex and Yorkshire (Stanford 1971, 41-42, 45). However, this sequence has not been sustained by new discoveries (e.g. Broxmouth, E Lothian (Hill 1979; 1982b, 141-189); Kirk Hill, Berwickshire (Alcock, Alcock 1980); more generally Armit 1999; see also Chapter 3). A good example is palisaded ramparts, which were thought to be dated early in later prehistory with earth and/ or stone built ramparts succeeding them (Ritchie 1970). New discoveries date the palisaded sites to a much wider time scale, over the whole of the later prehistory and beyond (Davies 2007, 275, Table 1; Hill 1982a, 40, fig.7; RCAHMS 1997, 154). For example, radiocarbon dates for comparable excavated sites of S Scotland and N England (e.g. Ingram Hill, Northumberland) have produced dates for palisaded sites, which are subsequently being replaced with an earth bank and which are dated from between the Later Bronze/ Early Iron Age (Burnswark, E Dumfriesshire; Broxmouth, E Lothian), Iron Age (Ingram Hill, Northumberland) and the Anglian period (Kirk Hill and St. Abbs Hill, both in Berwickshire) (Alcock, Alcock 1980; Hill 1982a, 6).

The same can be said for the presence/ absence of ramparts (RCAHMS 1997, 154). Relative chronology of the sites in the area studied is discussed later in the text (Chapter 3).

Roundhouse typologies are also thought to be flawed. P.H. Hill (1982a) suggested a clear dating sequence of house types:

1) ring-groove roundhouses
2) ring-ditch roundhouses
3) stone-walled roundhouses (also named 'Votadinian' (Hill 1982a, 8-12))

With the evidence from the excavations, this sequence has now proved to be incorrect (section 3.3.); for instance, ring-ditch roundhouses appear in a much wider time scale than previously thought (e.g. Kintore, Aberdeenshire, in: Alexander 2000b; also Illus. 87).

As noted in the paragraphs above, old sequences and relative dating are inconsistent from site to site. It is therefore necessary to find a tool that would help us tackle the question of
settlement patterns from a different perspective. In discussing the issues of settlement patterns in later prehistory, I am aware of the lack of excavations and radiocarbon dating in the areas studied. However, that should not be a fatal dilemma for the research. Moreover, recent studies have moved away from the question of tightly set chronologies. They show the dynamic of archaeological data when they free themselves from the static of later prehistoric chronology (e.g. Gerritsen 1999; Pope 2003).

Less than 15 later prehistoric sites in the area studied have been excavated, and radiocarbon dates, while valuable, are not available for most of the excavated sites. However, we cannot ignore these areas. The lack of archaeological interest brings forward a requirement for using broad pictures and relative chronologies (Chapter 3). Detailed research of the settlements on a regional level enables us to get to know the settlement pattern in the area and gives us a tool for comparisons with broader areas.

1.4. General geographical review

Peeblesshire (89 315 ha) is bordered by the Lothians to the N and NE, Selkirkshire to the E and SE, Dumfriesshire to the S and Lanarkshire to the W. Geographically, the area belongs to the Southern Uplands, and differs from the other study areas as the main features are hills, a lot of them higher than 350m OD. The highest one is Dollar Law, which rises up to 817m OD, while more than 60% of the county lies higher than 310m OD. The other dominant feature is the Tweed valley, cutting through the area and cutting the hills, as do numerous narrow valleys of smaller streams.

Coal and lead mines exist in the N area of the county (RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, 3), but Peeblesshire’s main wealth historically is its endless pasture land. The area is still pastoral and unspoilt today. Sheep breeding is the main source of the agricultural economy. Only one-fifth of the total area is under cultivation.
Berwickshire (117 615 ha) is bordered by the Lothians to the N and the NW, Selkirkshire to the W, Roxburghshire to the SW, Northumberland to the SE and the North Sea on the E. Almost the entire coast is very steep and rocky and is accessible by sea only at Eyemouth, Burnmouth, Coldingham and Cove. As with Peeblesshire, the county of Berwickshire belongs to the Southern Uplands, but the landscape could not be more different. The Lammermuir Hills, which lie on the N and the W side of the county, are the upland region, the highest hill being Seenes Law (521m OD). Progressing southwards, the land gets gradually lower. The Plain of the Merse is a lowland area with some rounded hills, stretching from the foot of the Lammermuir Hills to the River Tweed. This plain is used today for arable land, and the foothills for pasture. The Plain of the Merse is an extension of the Northumberland Plain and should be seen as such also in the observation of archaeological remains (Smith 1990, XIX).
During later prehistory, most of the county of Berwickshire was moorland, the exception being only the Lammermuir Hills and the knolls in the landscape. The peat bogs were the main source of fuel before the 19th century. Less than five authentic moors remain today in the E Borders (Badenoch 1994, 115).

Sources of copper have been found in Longformacus and Bunkle, with the most archaeologically interesting source being the one close to Edin’s Hall. These copper workings probably date to the 18th and 19th century AD (Pringle 1948, 86), but were probably worked much earlier; for instance, a copper ingot was found in the broch of Edin’s Hall (Dunwell 1999, 338-340; Tylecote 1986, 22-24). Iron stone can be found in nearby Ayton and Mordington (Crockett 1926, 81).

The leading feature of the areas of Peeblesshire and Berwickshire is the River Tweed, a river of great importance throughout history. From its spring at Tweed Well in Peeblesshire, it flows through the counties of Selkirkshire and Roxburghshire, and represents the S border of Berwickshire, which is also the border between Scotland and England. The river Tweed is known for its sudden spates (RCAHMS 1915, XIII). The importance of watercourses in later prehistory will be discussed throughout this thesis.
E Dumfriesshire (155 800 ha) is bordered by Peeblesshire to the N, W Dumfriesshire to the W, the Solway Firth to the S and Roxburghshire to the E. The relief of the area is descending gradually from the S Uplands towards the S. The southernmost parts are particularly wet and mostly at around 10m OD. Landscape is dominated by forestry plantations, which first began in the late 18th century. Other areas are under pasture and modern agriculture. Drainage, which was most extensive in the 18th century during the agricultural revolution, changed the landscape. As with Berwickshire, the landscape of E Dumfriesshire was severely modified. Peat cutting, drainage, dumping, marl digging and other similar practices changed both areas significantly (RCAHMS 1997, 26-29).

Illus. 5: Landscape of E Dumfriesshire
1.5. A note on discussions of possible diversities in the area studied, according to assumptions of later prehistoric tribal boundaries

It is not the intention of this thesis to go into detailed discussions on the question of S Scottish tribes. It is not important at this point to make a thorough study on how the tribes interact within themselves (e.g. question of hierarchy) or how one tribe differentiates itself from the others. The purpose of this short discussion is to look at several propositions of different tribes settling in S Scotland. Tribes, if there were any, are not focuses here, what is of the only importance, are proposed boundaries within the area researched. This will be a useful comparison to have while settlement record is studied and possible settlement patterns are observed.

With the word tribe, we describe people, who share the same traditions and values. People within one tribe are not necessarily in contact on a day-to-day basis, but they are aware that they belong to one tribe. In archaeological record they can for example be detected by using different types of artefacts, using different pottery ornaments or burying their dead in a different way or with different artefacts. With plotting these finds, clusters within the landscape usually form, which tells us roughly the locations of tribes. This has proved to be successful in some parts of Europe and Britain previously (e.g. Davies, Williamson 1999), but not yet in Scotland. Similar could be done with studying differences and similarities in the settlement record, as different tribes would perhaps use different ‘rules’ in building or using the sites themselves.

The only piece of evidence that exists for S Scotland is Ptolemy’s Geography and his map of tribes settling Scotland. This results in possible locations of the tribe territories being extremely vague and not supported by artefact or settlement evidence (but see section 6.2.1.). However, more out of interest than anything else, the results of the study of settlement patterns will later be projected on the proposed boundary areas mentioned below (section 9.6.; Illus. 141, 142). This will perhaps give some attractive results, which could form a basis for further discussions of similarities/ differences between different areas of S Scotland.
The disposition of tribes in S Scotland has been extensively argued about. The basis for all discussions is Ptolemy’s map of Scotland, shown on the Illus. 6. From it, several interpretations have been suggested. Illus. 7 is a map of tribes based on Ptolemy’s map as interpreted by R. Feachem (Feachem 1963, 22; 1965, 18, 19). It shows the suggested locations of tribal territories in the first century AD with the *Votadini* occupying Berwickshire, the Lothians and E Northumberland and the *Selgovae* living in Peeblesshire. There is a blank area over E Dumfriesshire and over much of Northumberland.
J.C. Mann and D.J. Breeze suggested a somewhat different explanation of Ptolemy's tribal areas (Illus. 8). According to their interpretation, the Selgovae occupied either Tweedale (Peeblesshire) or, more probably Annandale and Nithdale in Dumfriesshire (Mann, Breeze 1987, 89). Dumfriesshire was, according to their interpretation of Ptolemy's Geography, a boundary area of at least three tribes; the Novantae to the W (Jobey suggested Burnswark as the capital of the Novantae (Jobey 1966; 1967; 1968)), the Selgovae to the N and the Carvetii to the S and E. As with a lot of other sources, Mann and Breeze place the Votadini to the area from N Northumberland to the Forth and beyond (Mann, Breeze 1987, 89).
Another different map, however, was presented by I.M. Smith (1990). In his PhD thesis, he established an interesting proposition of political geography of S Scotland from the first to the seventh century AD. The earliest maps he presents (c. 120 AD and c. 142 AD) are appealing ones for the present study. The earlier of the two (ibid., Fig. 8.3.; see Illus. 9) places Berwickshire and E Dumfriesshire in the area of the Brigantes, while Peeblesshire falls under the Selgovae rule, while the later map (ibid., Fig. 8.4.; see Illus. 10) is almost identical to Ptolemy's map of N Britain. As said before (p.12), it is not the names of the tribes that are important for this study (e.g. see discussion on the Brigantes in Wilson 2003, 106 and Harding 2004, 23), but the proposed locations and boundaries between different tribes.
Illus. 9: Proposed reconstruction of political geography of S Scotland in approximately 120 AD (After: Smith 1990, Fig. 8.3.)

Illus. 10: Proposed reconstruction of political geography of S Scotland in approximately 142 AD (After: Smith 1990, Fig. 8.4.)
1.6. Past environmental conditions of the area studied

"The climate is miserable, with frequent rain and mists."

(Tacitus, *Agricola* 12,3.)

Most of Berwickshire and the S part of E Dumfriesshire was moorland in later prehistory. In contrast, most of the Peebleshire area and the far N of E Dumfriesshire were characterized by a very vibrant landscape with numerous hills of different heights and valleys cutting them. In addition, the North Sea and the Solway Firth had an important role in creating the weather conditions of E Berwickshire and SE Dumfriesshire. Different landscapes formed different environmental conditions and this could possibly show in the past settlement patterns.

The sub-regional variations in the climate of the areas studied were enormous. The land rises from the sea level to more than 800 m OD. The living conditions were not unproblematic for the native population. Analyses show that the climate optimum, where cultivation of the Southern Uplands was possible up to 400 m OD, was in 1250-1000 BC (Cunliffe 2005, 58; Lamb 1981, 55; but see p.22). Following this were centuries of extremely poor weather where the maximum altitude for successful cultivation was approximately 250 m OD (*ibid.*). From approximately 600 BC and to the end of the later prehistoric period, the climatic conditions were not settled. Periods of cloudy and cold summers and mild winters were substituted with very warm summers and ruthless winters on a regular basis (Taylor 1975, 12). Evidence from Central England shows rapid cooling in the time of the Roman Iron Age (Taylor 1975, 12, Figs. 4 and 5). There is evidence that shows that this climatic change was also taking place in the S Scotland. For example, pollen analysis from Talla Moss, Peebleshire, revealed a change in climate and the start of a particularly wet era dated to 1930 BP (Chambers *et al.* 1997, 391-399).
More detailed pollen analyses have been carried out in S Scotland and N England. Fellend Moss, Fozy Moss and Muckle Moss are all in the vicinity of Hadrian’s Wall. However, tree clearance seen in these profiles cannot be associated with the Roman intervention and building of the Wall (e.g. Moores 1998, 243) as a major indigenous contribution to the clearance can in most cases be shown to predate the Roman period (Hanson 1996; Manning et al. 1997; McCarthy 1995; 1997; Moores 1998, 235-239; Tipping 1
in the analysis of data that came from a bog at the base of the NE side of Burnswark Hill. The pollen analysis showed that forest clearance started at about 2400 BC. At about 500 BC there were almost no trees left in the area, and it is not until the middle of the 5th century AD that the regeneration of woodland started again (Squires 1978, 99-103). In contrast, evidence from Bolton Fell Moss indicates regeneration of forest just after 140 AD (Barber 1981, 114).

Illus. 12: Pollen diagram from Burnswark Hill (From: Squires 1978, Fig. 18)

The evidence from Long Knowe (N of Over Rig) shows that the area was cleared of trees before the end of the first millennium BC (Munro 1981). The pollen analyses from the Dunion show that the area was dominated by open heath land of ling, grasses and fern during the times when the ramparts were constructed (probably in the last centuries BC; Butler 1992b, 105, 114). Pollen samples from beneath the ramparts at the Eildon Hill North suggest that the surrounding land was composed of light open woodland, grassland and heath (Butler 1992c, 51-63). Data from Blackpool Moss, which lies SW of Eildon Hill North, does not show any major landscape change from the mid first millennium BC onwards (Butler 1992a, 14). The chronology of the pollen data from the Blackpool Moss is insecure, but the data show increased woodland clearance in the early first millennium BC.

L. Dumayne analysed samples from S Scotland and N England (Badenoch 1994; Dumayne 1992; 1993a; 1993b; 1994). Among these samples, two of the Berwickshire moorlands, Threepwood Moss and Dogdean Moss, were studied. The evidence shows that the E
Lammermuir Hills were cleared in the middle of the first millennium BC, while the other sites were cleared between 200 BC and 50 BC (Tipping 1997a, 20-21). Yetholm Loch, in N Northumberland, shows evidence of intense forest clearing in the second part of the first millennium BC (Mercer, Tipping 1994). Camp Hill Moss and Steng Moss, both in Northumberland, show the start of deforestation in the first half of the first millennium BC, with gradual increase of intensity until the late Iron Age (Wilson 1983, 32).

First millennium BC forest clearance is supported with studies of arable farming and field patterns (Frodsham, Waddington 2004, 179-184; Gates 1982; Halliday 1982), which show the intensification of arable farming and major improvements in agricultural tools in the Iron Age (Rees 1979, 472). In contrast, the radiocarbon dates from Catharine Hill in E Dumfriesshire suggest a major forest clearance in the Roman Iron Age period (Tipping 1997a, 21). The same was suggested for Glasson Moss and Walton Moss (Cumbria) (Dumayne, Barber 1994, 167, 171; Young 2004, 166-167).

Data from Broad Moss, Drowning Flow, Sells Burn and Bloody Moss, all located in Northumberland National Park, do not show any major changes during later prehistory. All of these areas were used as pastureland since early prehistory (Davies, Turner 1979; Moores 1998, 230; Young 2004, 166).

M. van der Veen’s study of charred plant macro remains in NE England showed striking results (van der Veen 1989; 1992). She identified two areas of different agricultural intensity. The area north of the Tyne showed intensive but small-scale crop husbandry. Contrastingly, the area of the Tees lowlands demonstrated a system of less intense but more widespread fields. R. Tipping (1997b) discussed the possibility of extensive field systems also in the area north of the river Tyne. These differences most probably represent different cultivation methods and not different environmental parameters (Huntley 1996, 85). This is important while discussing settlement patterns, as it helps with the discussion on the groups and social systems within the area.4

Several analyses of remains of cultivated plants and animal bones from Northumberland sites of all eras were made by J.P. Huntley. She also published some broad scale results,

4 Group in this thesis means people who do not necessarily live in the same roundhouse/settlement, but interact with each other on a regular basis and are possibly dependent on one another for example in times of crisis or some of them have special skills which others employ. Several groups would form one tribe.
However, she emphasized that much more work awaits to be done on this topic (see e.g. Huntley 1996 and there cited bibliography). Review and study of these remains were therefore not used in this study.

"Yet we are still almost totally ignorant of the pre-existing Iron Age economies and faunal environments for the region."

(Hunley, Stallibrass 1995, 131)

Another possible indication of later prehistoric land use is so-called cord rig, which was firstly recognised in E Dumfriesshire in 1981 (e.g. Halliday 1986, 584-585; RCAHMS 1997, 44; Topping 1989, 161). This type of cultivation is present at heights up to 420 m (e.g. Cavarra Hill, Peeblesshire), but rarely recognised in low-lying areas due to destruction with medieval or later ploughing. Cord rig is usually located close to enclosed sites, often near palisaded enclosures (e.g. Gibb’s Hill, E Dumfriesshire) or settlements containing ring-ditch roundhouses (RCAHMS 1997, 45). Radiocarbon dates from show that cord rig was widely spread over later prehistory, with its end in the second century AD (Topping 1989, 168–171; RCAHMS 1997 with references; for different possible end date see Carter 1995, cf. RCAHMS 1997, 47). Relative sequence between cord rig and enclosed sites can sometimes be seen, for example at Orchard Rig, Peeblesshire, where cord rig is overlaying enclosed settlements. Although cord rig cultivation has been recognised as widespread in S Scotland (there are more than 10 locations known from Peeblesshire, two from Berwickshire and more than 40 from E Dumfriesshire (for list of sites see CANMORE; RCAHMS 1997, 307–308 and Topping 1986, 177)) and it does form part of later prehistoric landscape patterns, it is not discussed in detail in this thesis.

Paleoenvironmental analyses and studies of land use show a local, rather than a regional picture. Moreover, vegetation changes, caused by human activity, were a long-term event. As suggested by L. Dumayne-Peaty (1998, 320), there was a mosaic of landscapes in later prehistory, comprising of forests, grassland, pasture, heathland and arable field. There is no consistent pattern of environmental change over N England and S Scotland. There is also no consistent pattern in the use of arable land over wide areas (van der Veen 1989, 1992). This requires a need to look at landscapes, settlement patterns within them and the use of the land on a small, local scale, as opposed to wider geographical areas.

Different landscapes allowed people to be less affected by environmental changes (when for example their fields would not produce enough food) as they had a variety of supplementary
sources. Forest clearance, in most cases, is associated with the cultivation of barley, oats, wheat (Tipping 1997a, 21) and rye (Mercer, Tipping 1994) in lower areas, as well as with providing space for pasture (e.g. Uppercleuch, in: Terry et al. 1993; Broxmouth, in: Barnetson 1982). Cleared areas at c. 300 m OD and above were, perhaps, only used for animal husbandry (RCAHMS 1997, 165-167) and some of them probably for transhumance purposes (Macinnes 1984b, 190, 193; Mercer 1981). In addition, evidence from Over Rig shows a very large assemblage of apple, cherry and currant bushes (Boyd 1988). The fruit was probably harvested from all these. However, despite the fact that a lot of later prehistoric sites lay in the vicinity of sea, there is minimal evidence for using it as a source of food (e.g. Broxmouth in: Barnetson 1982, 104). The animal remains from excavated sites show almost no evidence of hunting (e.g. Broxmouth, in: Barnetson 1982, 104).

It has been suggested that during later prehistory, people cultivated land in lower areas, which was more fertile (Wilson 1983, 46). Settlements were many times located on areas where they could access lower lying arable land and higher ground was maybe used for pastures. This could have resulted in more permanent settlements and, therefore, more recognisable settlement patterns (ibid.). However, the information on the past environmental evidence listed above shows that we probably could not make general conclusions on the surroundings of the enclosed sites without extensive palaeoenvironmental work.

But what it is possible to conclude from the analyses mentioned above, is the intensity of human activity in the areas studied. The early forest clearance and very late regeneration of woodland around Burnswark Hill, E Dumfriesshire for example shows that the area was intensely used for a long period of time. This can be confirmed with the great wealth of archaeological finds in the area, which extend from the Neolithic to, perhaps, the Early Christian period (Jobey 1978a, 79; RCAHMS 1997 and cited bibliography). On the other hand, the environs of Catharine Hill, E Dumfriesshire, with major forest clearance dating to the Roman Iron Age (Tipping 1997a, 21), do not show such an intense use during the earlier periods. There are standing stones, some burnt mounds and possible enclosures close by (see CANMORE and RCAHMS 1997) but the evidence is not nearly as rich as at Burnswark.

From this discussion, it is noticeable that different patterns occur in different areas. It is therefore, not possible to come to large-scale conclusions. Instead, each small area (e.g. site) needs to be observed separately and regional patterns need to be sought. Similar conclusions
were suggested while studying a series of sites in the Cheviots (Huntley 2007, 136, 138; Tipping 1992).

1.7. History of research

"Settlement archaeology has long dominated the interpretation of the Scottish Iron Age. Artefact studies have played a minor role in all but the Atlantic regions, and even there they have been marginal to considerations of the settlement evidence."

(Armit, Ralston 2003, 170)

It is not easy to make a critique of previous models of settlement evidence in the study area published so far. The reason for this is that it is not possible to find whole studies and hard to find parts of studies, which would contain similar aims to this thesis (p. 5-6). Studies published so far do not observe the surrounding landscape, observe only a particular form of an archaeological site/only one site but are in most cases combination of the two. Some of the past researches are considered below.

In 1893 the first book which analysed the whole of the Borders was published (Veitch 1893). It presented geology of S Scotland, its prehistoric and historic sites, local myths, legends and poetry. At that time, it was suggested that the later prehistoric enclosures could be built under the influence of the Roman camps, which was a typical thought of the 19th century antiquarian tradition (Veitch 1893, 27).

R. Feachem’s publication on the N Britons (1965) is a presentation of prehistory of the Broders region with comparisons with N England. His book mainly represents data from the RCAHMS Inventories with valuable comparisons between the sites. The section on the later prehistoric settlement evidence (ibid., 103-202) is, although outdated, an important starting point for this thesis, as it includes wide areas and discusses the questions such as roles of settlements (ibid., 139-140) and others.

Most other studies have been more area or site specific.

"Gin ye dinnae ken whaur ye’ve been, hou can ye tell whaur ye’re gangin?"

(Scottish saying)
1.7.1. Royal Commission’s survey

Since the RCAHMS surveys form the basis for this study, it is appropriate to consider them first of all.

D. Christison’s research (1887; 1888; 1891; 1895) of the forts in Peeblesshire, Berwickshire and E Dumfriesshire was the base for the Royal Commission’s surveys in these areas. His study is still very valuable and useful today as he made thorough descriptions of the sites, including drawings and observed landscape locations of the sites.

RCAHMS published its first survey results of Berwickshire in 1915 (RCAHMS 1915), one of the first areas they surveyed. The Inventory of the sites was a descriptive one. All of the enclosed sites were described as defensive but landscape locations, rampart constructions, entrance orientations and internal features were observed. Also, many plans were drawn. In 1920, RCAHMS published their first Inventory of Dumfriesshire (RCAHMS 1920). This Inventory is, like the first Inventory of Berwickshire, a descriptive one.

Piggott’s excavation of the Hownam Law formed part of the RCHAMS survey. With the establishment of the Hownam sequence in 1948 (Piggott 1948), the RCAHMS tried to mould later prehistoric sites to this sequence. This single intellectual mindset can be seen in the Commission’s work in Roxburghshire (RCAHMS 1956) and Selkirkshire (RCAHMS 1957), but it is the Peeblesshire’ Inventory where the types of the sites are firmly established (RCAHMS 1967). With this typology, a rapid survey of Berwickshire, published in 1980 (RCAHMS 1980a) and surveys of Eskdale at the beginning of the 1980s (RCAHMS 1980b, 1981) and of the parish of Kirkpatrick-Fleming were made (Mercer 1997). In all of these surveys, sites are put into neat catego
publication is not very useful for the study of roundhouses present within enclosed settlements. As the RCAHMS catalogues are a basis for studies of sites in Scotland, their typology is used by a majority of other researches (e.g. Harding 1982). It is only in the last 15 years that their unclear categorisation of the sites has been questioned. The pioneer in this work was I.M. Smith (1990). The request of observing archaeological sites from a fresh perspective with ignoring old (or outdated) typology has been an inspiration for this thesis.

1.7.2. Other research

PEEBLESHIRE

The later prehistoric sites of Peeblesshire have been the focus of interest since the beginning of the 18th century. The first book on the history of Peeblesshire to include some short notes on the ancient sites was published in 1715. It was written by Dr. Alexander Pennicuik with the title Description of Tweeddale (Pennicuik 1715). The book was re-issued in 1815 with the addition of the notes by R. Brown (Pennicuik, Brown 1815). In 1864 W. Chambers published A History of Peeblesshire (Chambers 1864), which included a short study of local hillforts. Sir George Douglas published A history of the Border Counties (Roxburgh, Selkirk, Peebles) in 1899 (Douglas 1899), again, with short notes on the prehistoric sites. These are some of the first publications on the local later prehistoric enclosed sites. They are not very valuable in terms of recent research trends but do provide interesting insights on how people perceived these ancient monuments.

But it is the study of D. Christison that made a big contribution to the awareness of the wealth of the later prehistoric sites in Peeblesshire (Christison 1887; 1888; see section 1.7.1.). His publications present detailed descriptions and drawings of Peeblesshire’s hillforts and mark the beginning of the inventory of the prehistoric sites. They are still very valuable today. He was also one of very few people who included some description (or at least drawings) of nearby landscapes. This has not been done in earlier or later studies.

After Christison’s study, a long gap appears. It is not until the RCAHMS survey in 1967 that the next publication on Peeblesshire’s settlement record appears (RCAHMS 1967). As a part
of preparation for establishing the Inventory (RCAHMS 1967), the RCAHMS carried out a few excavations. These represent the bulk of the excavation carried out in the area (see Illus. 13).

Another long gap in the interest of later prehistoric enclosed sites occurred after the RCAHMS Inventory was published. It is not until 1990 when a new study of a wider part of Peeblesshire occurs. I.M. Smith’s PhD thesis on the emergent kingdoms is an interesting view on the later prehistoric/early historic events of the Tweed basin. In his work, not only did he try to date some of the sites differently from previously thought, but he also made an attempt at a different categorisation of the settlements based on the shape of the enclosure and the appearance of the structures within (Smith 1990). Unfortunately, this work was never published.

To summarise, Peeblesshire has not seen much archaeological interest over the years. Only four studies, which observe more than a single enclosed site exist: two papers were published by Christison (Christison 1887; 1888), the general RCAHMS Inventory (RCAHMS 1967) and Smith’s PhD (Smith 1990). In addition, less than ten excavations of particular later prehistoric enclosed sites have been published (see Illus. 13). The lack of the interest in the area is connected with the fact that it did not have a local archaeological society until recently. Peeblesshire Archaeological Society was established in 1994 and it has already produced archaeological information on the unrecorded sites in the area. It has also completed a series of excavations of the sites, dating from the Mesolithic to the Dark Ages (Cowie 2000; http://www.peeblesarchsoc.org.uk/).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Publication of excavation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candyburn Lane</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Hill, Hundlehope Keef</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenachan Rig Feachem</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harehope Feachem</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helm End RCAHMS</td>
<td>1967, vol.1, 120-121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lour Dunbar, Hay</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossfennan Steer</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanhope MacLaren</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illus. 13: Peeblesshire, excavated later prehistoric enclosed sites
BERWICKSHIRE

The curiosity about the later prehistoric sites of Berwickshire started somewhat later than in Peeblesshire. The first (and most unusual) view on the ancient sites of Berwickshire was given by G. Henderson in 1856. In his book of rhymes and sayings, Henderson included the names of the sites, their descriptions and views from them and also added notes of local knowledge of the sites (Henderson 1856). This was, in a way, the first study of later prehistoric sites with nearby landscape taken into an account.

The Berwickshire Naturalists' Club had its first meeting in 1831. For more than 170 years, its members have been observing the later prehistoric sites (and other antiquities, as well as natural history) in the area and publishing notes in the History of the Berwickshire Naturalists' Club. These proceedings are an invaluable source of basic information on data for sites, which are now not available due to stone robbing and other deteriorating conditions. The Berwickshire Naturalists' Club is also one of the oldest associations, which were, already in the middle of the 19th century, calling for the preservation of the sites (HBNC 1863, 168-169). Under their initiative, the broch at Edin's Hall was taken into state care in 1887 and the structure was partly restored at that time (Dunwell 1999, 306).

At the end of the 19th century, there was an increase of interest in the later prehistoric sites. F. Lynn wrote an interesting paper on Bunkle Edge enclosures (Lynn 1895), which is still useful today. D. Christison studied the hillforts of the whole of Berwickshire in 1895 (Christison 1895, 108-179). As in his previous studies on Peeblesshire hillforts (Christison 1887; 1888), he provided a valuable list of sites, with description and drawings, together with some notes and drawings of the surrounding landscape. A few years later, A. Allan took a great interest in Christison's study of hillforts when publishing the History of Channelkirk in 1900 (Allan 1900). Before that, G. Chalmers was one of the first people interested in the later prehistoric sites (not just hillforts) of Berwickshire (Allan 1900, 644). Some of the enclosed sites, which were not included these catalogues, were published by R. Kinghorn in 1935.

Berwickshire has seen very little excavations on the later prehistoric sites. The three excavations carried out in the county are listed on Illus. 14.
Illus. 14: Berwickshire, excavated later prehistoric enclosed sites

E DUMFRIESHIRE

E Dumfriesshire is an area with several well preserved Roman sites (e.g. Birrens, Burnswark, Raeburnfoot) and archaeological interest was in the past focused mostly on the Roman remains. A. Gordon (1726) was the first person that noted some archaeological sites, but he was only interested in the Roman remains. Later on, General W. Roy made some notes on native sites while working on the Military Survey of Scotland in 1747-1755 (Roy 1747-1755), although his focus was on Roman sites (Roy 1793). These early authors recorded sites before the removal of large quantities of stones during agricultural improvement. This subsequently led to the loss of, or damage to, many sites (e.g. Allan 1900, 646; RCAHMS 1997, 5).

The first accurate survey of E Dumfriesshire’s prehistoric sites was made in the later 19th century: the Ordnance Survey edition of 6-inch and 25-inch maps noted 175 prehistoric and historic sites in the area, while survey of the upper Annadale earthworks was carried out by D. Christison (1891) and linear earthworks were recorded by R. Bell (Bell 1905). In the same period, in 1862, the Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society was established. The Society, which is still active and publishes the Transactions of the Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society, takes an interest in local prehistoric remains. It is, therefore, indispensable reading for research of all archaeological eras.

The imbalance between the study of Roman and prehistoric sites was emphasized by E. Birley (1948, 144-145). R. Feachem published an article on Iron Age and early Medieval sites in Dumfries and Galloway in 1956 (Feachem 1956) where he reclassified some of the sites published in the RCAHMS catalogue (RCAHMS 1920) and added some new sites or details of the sites in E Dumfriesshire. However, it was George Jobey who first concentrated on the later prehistoric sites of the area (e.g. Jobey 1966; 1967; 1968; 1971; 1975; 1978a),

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Publication of excavations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earn's Heugh</td>
<td>Childe, Forde 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edin's Hall</td>
<td>Turnbull 1882; Dunwell 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spottiswoode</td>
<td>HBNC 1904, 105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
comparing them with the later prehistoric sites in N Northumberland. It was there where he started his work (Jobey 1960; 1962; 1965; 1973; 1977; 1978b) and the study of E Dumfriesshire was an extension of his study.

The area has not seen much excavation (Illus. 15, 16). However, the sites from E Dumfriesshire are frequently mentioned in general studies of the later prehistoric settlement record (e.g. Halliday 2002; Jobey 1966; 1967; 1968; 1971; 1975; 1978a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Publication of excavations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boonies</td>
<td>Jobey 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnswark</td>
<td>Christison et al. 1899; Jobey 1966; 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle O'Er</td>
<td>Bell 1895; Christison 1898; Mercer, not published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uppercleuch</td>
<td>Terry et al. 1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illus. 15: E Dumfriesshire, excavated later prehistoric enclosed sites used in this thesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Publication of excavations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albie Hill</td>
<td>Strachan 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayknowes</td>
<td>Gregory 1998; 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Knowe</td>
<td>Mercer 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>Banks 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illus. 16: E Dumfriesshire, other excavated later prehistoric sites

**STUDIES OF SPECIFIC FEATURES OF THE SETTLEMENT RECORD AND OTHER GENERAL STUDIES**

Having looked at the record history of the study areas, it is worth taking a broader view of settlement studies.

When R. Hingley published his study on later prehistoric society in Scotland in 1992 he requested a range of new, original models for the study of Scottish prehistory (Hingley 1992, 7), but little has been done since then. In fact, it is only recently that S Scotland has seen a bit more work done on its later prehistoric archaeological landscape (e.g. Harding 2004; The Newstead Research Project, University of Bradford; The Traprain Law Environ Project,
University of Durham). Hingley’s study presents some convincing arguments, which are followed throughout this thesis. He argues for more locally based studies, which would observe changes in settlement patterns through time as well as in broader areas (Hingley 1992, 25): although in his own study he did not observe small areas but instead opted for a synthesis of the data from the whole of Scotland (Hingley 1992).

Although the current study areas have not seen detailed regional syntheses, there have been various studies concentrating on specific ‘types’ of later prehistoric sites of SE Scotland over the past 40 years, which have drawn on this data.

The analyses of the lowland brochs (e.g. Macinnes 1984a; MacKie 1982) and native-Roman interaction regularly mention Edin’s Hall (e.g. Armit 2003; Macinnes 1984a) and Burnswark (Jobey 1978a). Other studies mention sites in the area in studies of palisaded sites (Ritchie 1970), chevaux de frise (Harbison 1971, 195-225), prehistoric timber construction (Halliday 1982; 1985; Hill 1982a; Reynolds 1982) or the functions of hillfort defences (Bowden, McOmish 1987; 1989). Even in these instances, Peeblesshire sites were only mentioned as examples, and no detailed analyses were made. Other areas have seen major conceptual advance, for instance in the interpretation of hillforts, but little of this new thinking has yet imparted in the area (thus see Hingley 1992). Studies, mentioned above, are few and only focus on a handful of sites. They greatly under-represent a true amount of the data available from SE Scotland.

Interestingly, later prehistoric sites are frequently connected to local legends. They tell us how people understood abandoned enclosures once the knowledge of what the enclosures were used for was lost. Most commonly, later prehistoric enclosures are associated with fairies (e.g. Burnswark, the valley of Corriewater in E Dumfriesshire) and legends of King Arthur and Merlin (e.g. Cademuir; Drumelzier Ford; Lour; Lyne; Stobo, all in Peeblesshire) (Moffat 2001; Randall 1987; Scottish Fairy Tales 1994).
The contribution of the landscape archaeologist is being aware of the whole, integrated, picture, even if it is necessary to seek specialist advice in respect of some of its details.”

(Tolan-Smith 1997, 2)

The beginnings of combining geographical studies with archaeology can be traced back to the start of the 20th century (e.g. Childe 1925; 1936; Crawford 1921; Fox 1932; MacKinder 1907). The first proto-phenomenological thoughts appeared early. H.J. Massingham (1925) was the first author who presented the idea of experiencing the landscape from the basic level, walking across it and trying to observe it in a way prehistoric people perceived it. R.G. Collingwood and J.N.L. Myres (1937) came to the same conclusion. Cyril Fox (1932) discussed how important was the immediate landscape for the people and how it shaped their lives. He also developed the highland: lowland scheme for Britain, or, as he referred to it, “areas of Easy and Difficult settlement”. This scheme has influenced all subsequent work and has led to the division of Britain in two parts, which may be caricatured as an active, interesting S Britain and a passive, dull North. Even today’s publications and excavations show the division of studies between the areas. The published sources show a ratio of at least 4 : 1 in favour of the S Britain (see for example the recently published two volumes of discussion of the Iron Age Britain and the Continent (Haselgrove, Pope 2007; Haselgrove, Moore 2007).

In the post-war period, studies of medieval landscapes became significant (e.g. Aston and Rowley 1974; Beresford 1954; Hoskins 1955; Taylor 1975; Williams 1963; 1973). Authors wanted to “turn away and contemplate the past before all is lost to the vandals” (Hoskins 1955, 299). They mapped cultural features in the landscape (e.g. boundaries, deserted villages and others), which, together with excavations, illustrated a more detailed picture than that known from the written sources.

In post-war geographical studies links between landscape, environment and human behaviour were being sought. Site catchment and central-place theory developed. Ideas that were developed by I.L. Foster, L. Alcock (1963), P. Haggett (1965) to name a few, were very well accepted in archaeological studies as part of the New Archaeology. David Clarke’s Analytical Archaeology (Clarke 1968) is one of the pivotal studies which took the ideas from geographical studies mentioned above and transferred them to archaeology.
The term landscape archaeology emerged in Great Britain in the 1970s (Aston, Rowley 1974). It developed from the combination of geography, local history, place-name studies and field archaeology. At first, it became a common element in papers on field archaeology (e.g. Aston 1985; Aston, Rowley 1974; Fowler 1972, Roberts 1987). Landscape archaeology soon separated from field archaeology because it required observation of different (bigger) scales of the landscape surrounding the archaeological sites. Landscape archaeology now provides a method of observing people of the past in their environment and looking at the relationship of the people with the landscape, which is a palimpsest of human activity. It combines studies of aerial photographs, geophysics, spatial analyses and environmental research (Hodges 1987). One of the many positive things of landscape archaeology is that it is a non-destructive method. But what is in contrary with the definitions of this approach is that even landscape archaeology does not often observe the nearby landscape of the sites.

In the eighties and the nineties of the past century more branches of landscape archaeology developed, each of them perceiving the world around us from a different perspective; embodiment experience (e.g. Biddick 1993; Csordas 1994; Nast, Pile 1998; Teather 1999), feminist (e.g. Ardener 1993; Bell, Valentine 1995; Ford 1991), ritual and symbolic landscape (Bradley 1984; Burl 1987) archaeologies to name but a few, developed. Also, GIS studies are becoming more and more popular and useful in getting to know the landscape. However, modern computer technology cannot become a substitute for physically being in the archaeological landscape. GIS can only be a part of the study of the landscape of the past. It cannot give the same perception of landscape as standing in the landscape itself and trying to consider it from the perspective of the people of the past.

An influential approach to landscape in recent years has centred on phenomenology, as seen in Tilley’s A Phenomenology of Landscape (1994). The basic element of the landscape, according to Tilley, is a visualisation of how people perceived it. This should be studied from the same perspective as the people of the past had, with walking from one place to another and observing the surroundings. Tilley rejects the use of maps and aerial photography in the study of a phenomenology (Tilley 1994, 75). Yet, this raises practical issues. The use of aerial photography forms an essential part of the studies of site patterns. A lot of the sites or parts of them cannot be seen on the ground anymore. This can be seen especially well at for example, palisaded ramparts, sites that have been ploughed away or ditches that have been filled. It is the aerial surveys that detect those structures that would never been discovered from ground-based visits to the sites. A very good example here is the
aerial survey of Berwickshire, where new sites and more information on previously known sites have been identified from the air (RCAHMS 1980; cf. RCAHMS 1915).

Maps and aerial photographs give us other information that is hard to detect purely from visits to sites. We must keep in mind that people that built a site knew what they were building and knew in what kind of landscape they positioned their sites. We are not embedded in a landscape as they were and the landscapes are now very different. If we go to see one site today, it is much easier to visualize nearby landscape, easiest access, water resources and access to fertile land with the help of a map. As a result, the combination of site visits, studying the maps and aerial photographs was used for the purpose of this thesis.

We cannot claim that any of these approaches is right or wrong. People of the past most likely perceived their nearby land on many different levels and the view doubtless varied from person to person and through time. Just as it is not possible to say that the ramparts of enclosed sites were purely defensive or purely for show (e.g. Bowden, McOmish 1987; 1989), or that the activities of people of the past were purely symbolic or purely functional (e.g. Parker Pearson 1996; Parker Pearson, Richards 1994), the perception of the landscape was probably a mixture of many different visions.

With the observation of the accumulation of archaeological sites over time, two ideas were suggested. Firstly, while looking at the palimpsest of landscapes one has to be aware that landscapes are formed again and again over time according to how people perceive their surroundings and earlier monuments (Bender 1998; Ingold 2000). And secondly, the Longue durée (Braudel 1980) of the landscape does not reveal fine and easy to notice layers of human behaviour (ibid.). These are suggestions that I have tried to follow in my thesis, but with unexpected results apparent throughout my work (e.g. section 9.3. and Chapter 5).
1.9. Approach used for this study of the settlement evidence

"Archaeology is an evolving discipline with constantly changing scales of study, analysis, and interpretation."

(Darvill 2001, 34)

My methodological approach to the landscape in the analysis of enclosures and settlement patterns is a simple one. I observed the sites in the way they were observed before the RCAHMS typology was established. Also, a long time scale (later prehistory) was chosen for reasons mentioned earlier (p. 5-8). Time and lack of experience did not allow me to do an extensive GIS analysis. Instead, detailed maps and site visits allowed me to observe sites in their settings. I also used aerial photographs, stored at the RCAHMS in Edinburgh to observe the site plans and see the sites in different times of the year. Looking from within the sites, I observed the near topography, close water resources and other later prehistoric sites near by. This kind of analysis allowed me to assess why people of the past perhaps chose a certain location for a site rather than any other locations. Also, the results of the analysis show how sites were interacting with one another, and how settlement patterns were possibly organised in the landscape. Moreover, with the results of the study it is possible to contrast and compare how settlement patterns occur in the different landscapes. All of the sites that are listed in the Appendices 1-4 are used in the general analysis but only approximately half of the sites are in a good enough condition to be used in further detailed analyses (e.g. enclosed site interior, entrance orientations).

"Landscape just "is", is something "out there", or something almost self-evident.

(Chadwick 2004, 2)

I observe the landscape with an ‘anti-essentialist’ approach, following the steps of A. Baines, who explores landscape archaeology with the view that every feature derives from its relationship to the other features (Baines 2004, 1). With this vision, I offer some new explanations, especially on fields that seem to be stuck at a dead end with discussions that do not move us forward anymore (e.g. entrance orientations, roles of ramparts). It may be that some of the views offered in this thesis are only hints in the development of new arguments, yet they are necessary in order to move the archaeological thought to another direction. Some of the views still need a lot of work, but they are all based on the data available in the later prehistoric settlement record and they show how it is possible to create new narratives when we free ourselves from the conventional site types. Narratives that I present in this
thesis are only one view on the possible explanations and understanding of the later prehistoric enclosed sites. There are other explanations available and these are regularly quoted in the text.

It is necessary to stress that I am observing only cropmark/visible enclosed site remains in this thesis, with the majority of them not having any clear dating evidence. This gives me a great amount of evidence but sometimes only general remarks can be made. Therefore, some of the hypotheses are based on slim evidence and they need to be tested on wider areas. However, some patterns that occur show great potential for further archaeological research in Peebleshire, Berwickshire and E Dumfriesshire. They also give great validity to case studies of particular features within the enclosed site record, which no doubt can bring great results when replicated in wider areas.

I based the present analysis on a theme of particular importance in Iron Age studies. The general significant themes noted in a recent research agenda were as follows:

- chronological frameworks
- settlement patterns and landscape history
- material culture studies
- regionality
- socio-economic changes during the period

(Haselgrove et al. 2001, 2).

The theme which inspired this thesis was that of settlement patterns and landscape history (ibid., 7-12). From it, the following guidelines for the present research have been derived:

- Sites need to be looked at as one single category. Rather than using the subjective RCAHMS categories, e.g. hillfort or homestead, a new approach has been adopted. It is based on descriptive categories, looking at the sizes and forms of enclosures, defences and circular structures. A new, morphologically-based categorisation, could derive from this approach.

- Landscape settings of different morphological types are looked at in order to see if there are any variations by morphological classes.
Morphological details are looked at in order to make more observations about defensive/non-defensive features of the enclosures, their inner organization and subsequently their role in the later prehistoric settlement pattern. Distribution maps are used to determine if there are any varieties in the areas themselves.

1.10. Structure of the thesis

The thesis consists of nine chapters and four appendices. The appendices (Volume Two of this thesis) are the base of all the analyses and the discussions presented in the thesis and should be used together with the main text.

Appendices 1, 2 and 3 form lists of all the sites used in this thesis; each one was created for a different area. Appendix 1 presents enclosed sites from Peeblesshire, Appendix 2 from Berwickshire and Appendix 3 from E Dumfriesshire. Apart from listing sites included in the study, they also show a number of details for each site, such as size, rampart appearance, entrance location, possible roundhouse evidence within and the altitude of each site. More detailed lists of different types of roundhouses are also attached.

Appendix 4 forms an expansion of the first three. It demonstrates a more detailed description of each individual site, with a drawing or a photograph of each site and its location on the map, with nearby landscape visible, attached. It also gives information on the published sources on the site construction (but not discussions on artefacts found at the sites). Detailed explanations of abbreviations, which I use throughout the appendices is explained in section 1.12.3. and a short list of abbreviations is attached to Volume Two.

The opening chapter presents an introduction of the study area together with the main questions and aims of this thesis and a list of possible comparable studies (Chapter 1). Moreover, methodology, the categorisation and explanation on some terms that are used throughout this thesis are explained in the first chapter. Then, the thesis is divided into three parts.

Part One focuses on an evaluation of the data available. It contains four chapters (Chapters 2 - 5) where the data from each of the three main areas (Peeblesshire, Berwickshire, E Dumfriesshire) are presented. Each chapter includes sections on particular topics of interest:
the internal areas of the enclosed sites, types of rampart construction, site/ roundhouse entrances etc.

Chapter 2 is based on a general analysis of later prehistoric enclosed sites, focusing only on sites and their construction. All the enclosed sites are observed as a single category. I present each county separately, analysing internal areas of enclosed sites, material used for building the ramparts, roundhouse types, their sizes and entrances. Moreover, the popular idea of symbolism in the orientation of the roundhouse entrances is questioned.

In Chapter 3 radiocarbon dates from enclosed sites of S Scotland and NE England are presented. I also examine relative chronology and sequences of the sites and roundhouses used in this thesis.

In Chapter 4 enclosed sites are put back into the landscape surrounding them. It considers the question of how the sites and the possible internal roundhouses were built to achieve as much as possible from their surroundings. Enclosed site entrance orientations are also observed, with special attention given to their connection with the nearby landscape.

Chapter 5 focuses on the enclosed site entrance appearances. The question of possible roles of chevaux de frise is raised, as well as the possibility of impressive entrances. Multiple entrances of enclosed sites are also discussed.

After the assessment of the data from the studied areas, a series of studies of particular parts of the settlement record within the area examined are presented. These comprise Part Two of this thesis. Part Two consists of three chapters which discuss possible detection of the site patterns within the landscape, planning of the settlement interiors, linear earthworks, which are possibly connected to the enclosed sites nearby and the ‘anomalies’ which occur in the settlement record.

Chapter 6 analyses patterned settlement interiors, which can possibly be detected over wide areas. It also presents two case studies, of the Meldon Burn Valley and the area of Orchard Rig. These two case studies are set in very different landscapes and the idea of possible differences in the organisation of the settlement patterns according to their surrounding landscape is tested here.
Chapter 7 is an observation of the linear earthworks, which are set close to the enclosed sites. Although the dating or the possible contemporary connection between the two is not clear, one was visible when the other one was constructed and the latter one was therefore not autonomous from the first.

Chapter 8 presents a series of possible anomalies, which occur in the enclosed site record of the area studied. At the beginning, the possible unfinished enclosed sites will be discussed. The second anomaly is the construction of massive-walled structures. Brochs and duns are set into the nearby landscape and settlement patterns. Moreover, rectilinear sites are considered as parts of local traditions. The minor oppidum at Hirsel Law, Berwickshire is also discussed as part of the question of big enclosed sites in SE Scotland and NE England.

Part Three forms only one chapter. Chapter 9 is a discussion based on new suggestions, which arise in the analyses made in previous chapters. This final chapter also brings forward a series of propositions for future work.

1.11. Comparable studies

This work stands in a growing tradition of regional settlement studies. Similar work has been started by I.M. Smith on the area of the Tweed Basin (Smith 1990) and by D. Alexander and D. Cowley in parts of W-Central Scotland (Alexander 2000a; Cowley 2000). Later prehistoric settlement evidence forms part of the study of E Lothian, N Forth and Angus, carried out by L. Macinnes (1982b; 1983). Geophysical research and small-scale excavations of the archaeological sites of the Upper Clyde Valley are being carried out by the University of Glasgow, its aim being to investigate the development of this valley through time (Hanson, Sharpe 2001; Sharpe 2004). Similar study has been done by the University of Bradford. In the course of the Newstead Research Project in Selkirkshire, an area of 25 x 25 km around the Roman fort of Newstead was examined (and small scale excavations have been completed) in order to get more information on the development of the settlements between the first millennium BC and the first millennium AD (Jones 1990). Analysis of an important survey of the settlement pattern of the Bowmont Valley is being prepared by R. Mercer (Mercer 1984; 1985a; 1986; 1987; Mercer, Tipping 1988). The Traprain Law Environ Project, directed by the University of Durham and Dickinson College,
Pennsylvania, USA (Carne et al. 2003; Hale et al. 2001; 2003) will soon complete their survey.

Geographically, N England also provides useful comparison. In Northumberland, the study of the settlement evidence was first started by G. Jobey (Jobey 1960; 1965; 1973; 1977; 1978b). More recently research of Northumberland’s Breamish Valley (1994-2002) also covered later prehistory and was reported in 2004 (Frodsham et al. 2004); full publication is awaited. In Cumbria (Glencoyne Archaeological Project, Matterdale Archaeological Project) a continuing research on the Bronze and Iron Age settlement, environment, economy and societal development is carried out by the University of Glasgow (http://www.cc.gla.ac.uk:443/archres/description1.htm; Hoaen, Loney 2003). G. Ferrell’s research on the later prehistory of NE England uses new techniques of analyses in order to get more data on the social archaeology (Ferrell 1997, 228). She uses various mathematical formulae in approaching spatial patterning.

Looking even broader, the most recent comparable studies are D. Jackson’s study of the Welsh Marshes (Jackson 1999), G. Makepeace’s study of SE Wales and the Borders (Makepeace 2006) and T. Moore’s analysis of settlements of Severn-Cotswolds (Moore 2006). However, all of the studies mentioned only partly cover the topics analysed in this thesis.

All of the projects mentioned above deal with the later prehistoric settlement patterns (with the exception of I.M. Smith who mostly concentrated on the early historic period). Therefore, the analysis of the later prehistoric settlement evidence of SE Scotland, presented in this thesis, fits into current prehistoric research of Southern Scotland and Northern England. However, much has still to reach publication.

More comparisons can be made on narrower topics of later prehistoric studies, such as studies of particular enclosed sites or parts of them (e.g. Pope 2003), linear earthworks (Barber 1999), chevaux de frise (Harbison 1971) and others.

It was not my intention to make detailed critiques of studies mentioned but throughout the thesis I do highlight some of the problems, which occur when trying to transfer the views of existing approaches to areas studied in this thesis. Broader discussion on comparisons with the studies mentioned above and wider areas of Britain is presented in Chapter 9.
1.12. Methodology, categorisation and the database

"...unless the term is defined exactly any discussion becomes too diffuse to be constructive."  
(MacKie 1984, 108)

This research is based mostly on the RCAHMS catalogues of sites. Only enclosed sites are included in the study. Internal features of the enclosed sites were analysed, and linear earthworks nearby these sites were noted and discussed as a part of settlement patterns. Sites and their construction were observed based on D. Clarke’s macro (between settlements) and semi-micro (within settlements) levels (Clarke 1977). In order to do so, several approaches had to be adopted.

The major limitations of the analysis of the enclosed sites in the areas chosen were discussed in the previous chapter. To avoid these and make as much as possible from the data available, a general approach has been adopted in order to outline wider trends. This general approach does not observe particular sites. Instead, the results from many sites are studied and trends across wider areas are discussed.

The study involved desk-based research and visits to the key sites. Desk-based research included detailed observations of aerial photographs and plans stored at the RCAHMS, and maps of the areas researched, finding all the documentary sources available on the topic and consulting specialists. All this produced the databases included as appendices to this thesis (Appendices 1-4) and gave a basis for the results presented.
1.12.1. Methodology

In light of the lack of modern analyses, I decided to use near forgotten, yet good quality, plans and data of the sites in Peeblesshire and Berwickshire. However, due to the small number of (old) excavations, dense growth that obscured the majority of the remains, and a general lack of interest in the areas, the extent of the research is limited. Thus, this study adopts a more general approach to the sites in order to outline broader trends. The later prehistoric settlement patterns of Peeblesshire and Berwickshire are therefore compared with a selection of enclosed sites from E Dumfriesshire, which have recently been thoroughly studied (RCAHMS 1997).

In 1967, the RCAHMS published a catalogue of sites of Peeblesshire (RCAHMS 1967) with approximately 180 later prehistoric enclosed sites in the area (around 35 of them being multi-period). Many of the sites were reportedly in very poor condition, with nothing more than a note as to where the enclosed site was once was located. Many of the enclosed sites are now quarried away, or have disappeared under many years of agricultural use (e.g. Candyburn Castle, Manor Sware, both in Peeblesshire). Since 1967, approximately 100 new sites have been discovered by aerial photography, most of them being classified as possible later prehistoric enclosed sites or cropmarks (see CANMORE).

Similarly, Berwickshire is not an area of strong archaeological research. An intense survey was done and the results published at the beginning of the 20th century (RCAHMS 1915). It notes 96 later prehistoric sites (approximately ten of them being multi-period). A survey, completed in 1980, concentrating on some parts of Berwickshire (RCAHMS 1980a), noted 91 enclosed probable later prehistoric sites, including 38 newly discovered sites (approximately five of them being multi-period). It also includes 66 miscellaneous works and enclosed sites which, due to lack of preservation, were not included in this study.

E Dumfriesshire is an area where good quality research was published by the RCAHMS in 1997 (RCAHMS 1997). The catalogue lists 444 later prehistoric enclosed sites (at least 21 of them being multi-period) discovered over years of aerial photography, field survey and researching of the older sources. The RCAHMS catalogue also includes 46 miscellaneous earthworks and enclosed sites. For the purpose of this thesis, I have randomly chosen 150 later prehistoric sites for comparison.
Although the focus is on enclosed sites, some randomly-chosen unenclosed sites are included in discussions on roundhouses (e.g. section 2.2.2.) due to the lack of data from within the enclosed settlements. I critically assessed each site and its published data, which resulted in some new information (e.g. detailed measurements showed that White Meldon is not the biggest enclosed site in Peeblesshire). The detailed information is listed in the Appendices (1-4).

Many sites in the area are in bad condition and sometimes only parts survive (e.g. Carfrae, Berwickshire). Some of the enclosed sites have only the ditches surrounding them still visible. This means either that the enclosed site was surrounded only by a ditch (e.g. Stevenson Mains, West Bearsford, both E Lothian; see Hale et al. 2001, 67-68) or more likely that the rampart evidence has been lost due to intensive land use. Such sites could have a smaller internal diameter because the inner ramparts are not visible anymore. It is not possible to distinguish between the two without excavations. Therefore, the enclosed sites with only a visible surrounding ditch need to be used carefully.

Areas of enclosed sites were measured with using the UTHSCA Image Tool (ddsdx.uthscsa.edu/dig/itdesc.html), which was primarily designed to be used in molecular biology and medicine, but works perfectly in exact measurements of areas of enclosed sites. ‘Area’ here means the internal area of the enclosed site, that is, area which could be used for activities in the inside space of the enclosed areas. The measurements were therefore taken from the inner edge of the internal feature, which is either a rampart or a ditch. Areas of annexes were measured separately from areas of enclosed sites. All the measurements are stated in hectares to two decimal places. The possible margin of error in measurements of areas is ±100 m$^2$ (0.01 ha).

Information on the sizes of the roundhouses was mostly taken from published sources (e.g. Feachem 1960; Jobey 1971; RCAHMS 1915; 1920; 1967; 1980a; 1980b; 1997) or measured on the basis of published drawings using the UTHSCSA Image Tool. Measurements were taken at the outer and inner edge of the roundhouse. Measurements for walls and ring-ditches were taken at the outer and inner edge of the feature. Widths were never measured at the narrowest or the widest point of the features. The measurements of the widths are stated in metres to one decimal place. The possible margin of error is ±0.1 m. Sometimes only the internal or external diameters could be measured; it is always noted in the text which diameter is used for the study.
In the study of Berwickshire, data on the sizes was also sometimes taken from the RCAHMS’ CANMORE database. Because of the lack of detailed plans of some of the sites, the possible margin of error in measurements of areas of enclosed sites in Berwickshire is ± 200 m² (0.02 ha). Detailed study of E Dumfriesshire, carried out by the RCAHMS in 1997 (RCAHMS 1997) often noted the size of the internal area of enclosed sites (e.g. Castle O’Er) To save time, this data was used for most of the sites studied. The possible margin of error here is ±100m² (0.01ha).

If the circuit of the enclosure is visible, but there are only sings of ditches (cropmarks), the area measured was noted as: smaller as (<). The reason for this is that it is not possible to tell how broad the ditches were because of ploughing (or similar destruction)- the soil from the ditches moved and can now be well inside its original position. Also, it is not possible to tell if an internal rampart existed. In Selkirkshire, ditched enclosures with no ramparts inside are known, but that has not yet been proven for Berwickshire.

Illus. 17: Measurements of enclosed sites and roundhouses

The study of the topography of the region and the terrain/ water resources in close proximity to the sites was made using OS maps (at a scale of 1: 25 000) and selected field visits were used. These maps were used also to identify locations of the closest water resources where rivers, streams and springs were observed. Water resources were therefore observed from the modern point of view. However, it is not certain how far these locations had changed since later prehistory and it was not possible to research this further.
Enclosed site and roundhouse entrance orientations were measured with a compass. 16 different orientations were used (N, NNE, NE, ENE, E, ESE, SE, SSE, S, SSW, SW, WSW, W, WNW, NW and NNW) with an error of ± 5.6°.

All drawings/photos/tables used in the present thesis are classified as illustrations and numbered correspondingly. There are several maps included in the thesis.

1.12.2. Categorisation

“Rigid adherence to typological classification can often lead to the discussion becoming too specific to be constructive, with classification introduced to rationalise interpretations rather than as tools of study.”

(Armit 1992, 16)

With the exception of the basic study of the roundhouses, all enclosed sites are observed as one single category. The aim is to break away from the RCAHMS’ unclear and outdated site categories, which confuse description and interpretation. Their categorisation is generally imprecise, mostly based on poorly-defined criteria of location, structure of the site, or assumed function, and therefore needs to be re-evaluated. My critical review on the RCAHMS’ categorisation is a long one. Firstly, in the case of so-called scooped settlements we cannot speak of a ‘type’ of settlement. It was simply a way of building to accommodate the unsuitable terrain: the settlement could be the same as one on a hilltop or in valleys. These settlements, therefore, need to be looked at together with the other later prehistoric sites and be compared and contrasted with them, rather than being looked upon as an isolated group. Also, the RCAHMS term fort has to be replaced, or a clearer definition of it has to be made. Hillfort is an awkward term because some of the enclosed sites do not differ from the so-called hillforts in anything else except that they are positioned in the flat valley grounds (e.g. Quaw Plantation, Peebleshire). Problems with classification can be seen in several studies (e.g. Harding 2004, 58). When I. Ralston is discussing Broxmouth, E Lothian, for example, he uses the expression “low lying hillfort, which occupied a slight knoll” (Ralston 1995, 141). Instead, I use the term enclosed sites for all of the sites. They are then divided further into the enclosures (enclosed sites with no visible internal settlement record) and enclosed settlements (enclosed sites with visible internal settlement record). However, the lack of internal settlement evidence is unconvincing (Harding 2004, 294). Enclosures could have internal settlement evidence, but remains undetectable by conventional survey methods
(see Burnswark, E Dumfriesshire pre- and post- excavation, in: Jobey 1978a; also Hayknowes Farm, E Dumfriesshire, whose internal roundhouse was not visible until excavation: Gregory 2001). Sites were therefore not differentiated in analysis on the basis of settlement evidence (or lack of it) within them. Some of the sites do show possible signs of settlement evidence but they are too slight to say for certain at this stage (e.g. South Hill Head 2, Peeblesshire). Also, because of heather and turf covering the interiors of enclosed sites, they are often difficult to examine.

Moreover, the term defences has been abandoned. A lot of ramparts were not built primarily or solely for defence as this term presumes. The term rampart is used throughout this thesis. Ramparts are generally seen as one category, with more detailed division based on their building material discussed in Chapter 2.

In addition, clearer definitions were set in using terms such as annexe. The term annexe is used in this research only for enclosed spaces that are clear additions to enclosed settlements and not as noted in RCAHMS Inventories (e.g. 1967, vol. 1: see Caerlee, no. 214 for example), where the term is used for space between the two ramparts which both completely enclose the site as this could be evidence for multi-period use of the site. Moreover, the term minor oppidum as traditionally used for some of the S Scottish enclosed sites, is not clear. Oppida are usually explained as defended towns with semi-industrialised manufacturing and trade, dating mostly to the first century BC and are predominant features of parts of Continental Europe (Avery 1976, 41). However, I. Ralston proposed somewhat different definition of a term oppidum. He sees them as “large (generally over 25 ha) enclosed sites of Late Iron Age date, sometimes with evidence of elaborate, even proto-urban, occupation” (Ralston 2006, 195). His definition states that it is not necessary for the oppida to have a complex interior. Moreover, his definition keeps the Late Iron Age date and does not include all of the later prehistory. This term is not appropriate for the minor oppida of S Scotland, as most of them are just big enclosed sites with an area of 2.4 ha (6 acres) or more (Feachem 1966, 77-79) and they do not show any complex interior. Their interior is not dissimilar to the interiors of much smaller sites (for comparison see Appendix 4). The term has been used in S Scotland to describe sites purely on a basis of their size (Avery 1976, 41).

The term minor oppida is, in this thesis, used more because of a convenience. The term is well known to archaeologists and a new term could bring some confusion. What is different, however, is a clear definition of what minor oppidum as used in this thesis means; i.e.
enclosed site in SE Scotland with an internal area of 2 ha or more, apparently dated to later prehistory.

As stated above, morphological groups are not defined at the start of the study. The reason for this is the division of enclosed sites into neat categories, which is a problematic one. Classification on the basis of shapes, sizes, and material used for building and other is only an attempt to categorise sites on the basis of modern view. These classifications did not necessarily exist in the past (Moore 2006, 43). Also, a lot of times it is not possible to categorise the sites due to their poor preservation. For example, a cropmark with only signs of ditches visible and a well-preserved site with standing ramparts and ditches would almost certainly fall into two different categories, yet this would be based solely on preservation and would not show adequate categories. Therefore all enclosed sites are observed as one single category and possible similarities/ differences between them are discussed during the course of study.

Because of clear differences in construction, roundhouses are primarily observed in three different categories (ring-groove, ring-ditch and stone-walled roundhouses) (sections 2.2.2. and 2.4.2.). This was done in order to observe any possible differences/developments within one particular type of a roundhouse and to compare the different types with one another. The interiors of the enclosed settlements are then looked at as one category in order to see similarities and possible differences between the interiors that contain different settlement evidence within (e.g. sections 2.5. and 6.2.).

There have not yet been enough excavations in the areas studied to hypothesise about the purpose of the roundhouses. Therefore, I made the decision to use the term roundhouse without assumptions that all the structures were used as a living space.

There is no ‘special handling’ of the sites that were treated as more important ones in previous studies (e.g. Burnswark, E Dumfriesshire; Edin’s Hall, Berwickshire). Ignoring neat categories of enclosed sites, it is possible to observe them and their relationship in a somewhat freer perspective, which could result in fresh narratives of later prehistoric settlement patterns. A new possible classification of sites emerged during the study (sections 2.6., 4.2.; Chapter 5 and Chapter 9). This classification is based on observation of the enclosed sites within the landscape, the proximity of water resources, the sizes of the enclosed sites, the orientation of their entrances and the manifestation of the entrances.
1.12.3. The Database

To be able to deal with the vast amount of data, I have prepared four Appendices, which are to be used together with the main text of the study.

Appendices 1, 2 and 3 provide an index of sites, which were used in this study and are the basis for this thesis. Each appendix was created for one former county (Appendix 1- Peeblesshire, Appendix 2- Berwickshire, Appendix 3- Selected sites from E Dumfriesshire). Each appendix consists of four databases; 1. The database of the sites, 2. Ring-groove roundhouses, 3. Ring-ditch roundhouses, 4. Stone-walled roundhouses. If the type of the roundhouse cannot be assigned, then a list of timber roundhouses is added (5). The sites in the databases are listed alphabetically.

The Databases of sites includes all the enclosed sites used in this thesis. They were prepared in order to avoid any misunderstandings of which site was which. They were produced using Microsoft Excel Worksheets, and each of the databases consists of several fields: name of the site (Site); national grid number (NGR); enclosed site appearance, i.e. number of ramparts and presence of ditches (Ramparts); rampart construction (Rm. constr.); entrance location (Entrance); type of roundhouses within the enclosed site (Roundhouse); size of the enclosed site (where possible to measure), measured in hectares (Size (ha)); size of annexes, when they are attached to the enclosed sites, measured in hectares (Annexe (ha)); altitude, measured in metres (OD (m)); and the note of the other possible features, such as chevaux de frise (Other). The explanations of abbreviations used in the databases can be found in the appendices.

More detailed data are provided on different types of roundhouses. These databases consist of: the name of the site (Site); number of roundhouses within the settlement (No. of RH.); external diameter of roundhouses, measured in metres (Ext. Dia. (m)); internal diameter of roundhouses, measured in metres (Int. Dia. (m)); wall width, measured in metres (Wall width (m)); width of the ring-ditch, measured in metres (Ditch width (m)); entrance location (Entrance) and other possible features, such as porches or scatters of stones, which are sometimes present at the roundhouses (Other). Not all of the mentioned categories appear in all databases of the roundhouse types. If the data is absent/ not visible or in such a poor condition that it cannot be used without major restrictions, a question mark (?) has been used in each database.
Working mostly with sites from the RCAHMS Inventories (1915; 1920; 1967, vol. 1; 1967, vol. 2; 1980a, 1980b; 1981; 1997) with subsequent additions, I decided to keep to the names used in the Inventories as much as possible. Some sites with the same names have a number/letter added to them in the RCAHMS Inventories already (such as Cademuir 1; Cademuir 2; Dreva x; Dreva y; Dreva z, all Peeblesshire (RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1)). This was extended where required for the study of multi-period sites (for example, the earlier enclosed site at Easter Dawyck, Peeblesshire was named Easter Dawyck 1, the later enclosed site, located on top and inside of it, was named Easter Dawyck 2). Sometimes it was necessary for letters to be added as well (e.g. Cademuir 2a; Cademuir 2b; Cademuir 2c, all Peeblesshire). When it was not possible to distinguish between phases for certain, the enclosed site is noted as a single phased one, with detailed discussions in the text (e.g. Dead Side, Peeblesshire). Some parts of this thesis were not possible to complete with only the knowledge of the sites from the RCAHMS Inventories, an example being the study of the roundhouses of Peeblesshire (RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1). To supplement the data from the RCAHMS Inventory site, some data from the newly discovered sites were used for these purposes (e.g. Laigh Hill; Orchard Rig 4, 5, 6, all Peeblesshire) (section 2.2.2.).

APPENDIX 1 is based on the analysis of the later prehistoric sites of Peeblesshire. It consists of 293 sites in the area, representing a variety of landscape positions and heights. Of these, 12 sites show traces of ring-groove roundhouses, 29 have ring-ditch roundhouses, 21 have evidence of stone-walled roundhouses, one enclosed site contains a dun, and 105 show traces of timber roundhouses, or signs only of scoops where roundhouses possibly used to be. It is not possible to observe particular structure types in the last two categories.

APPENDIX 2 is an index of the sites from the county of Berwickshire. It is based on 160 sites. Of these, one/possibly two sites show signs of ring-groove roundhouses, one site includes ring-ditch roundhouses, 17 sites have internal stone-walled roundhouses and one enclosed site contains a broch. 45 enclosed sites contain traces of non-specific timber built roundhouses.

APPENDIX 3 is a list of 150 randomly chosen sites from E Dumfriesshire. Although all 444 sites, noted in the RCAHMS catalogue (1997) are used for a wide scale study and are included on the maps of general patterns, only 150 sites are for a small-scale study. Of these, nine sites show evidence of ring-groove roundhouses, 11 sites contain traces of ring-ditch roundhouses and three sites contain evidence of stone-walled roundhouses. A further 54 sites
show traces of possible timber roundhouses or platforms where roundhouses could have been constructed, but the detailed structural type cannot be distinguished without excavation.

In addition to the databases made in Excel Worksheets, I also attached detailed descriptions and plans of the sites, which are presented in Appendix 4. Each site description takes up one page where the name of the site (Site); National Grid Number (NGR); County; altitude (OD (m)); size of enclosed site (where possible to measure), measured in hectares (Size (ha)); additional features, Comments and References are noted, and plans of the sites and their landscape locations are added.

This extensive presentation of data has been necessary so that the enclosed sites studied in the thesis are collected in one database and are presented on the same principle so that comparison is possible. All the discussion and conclusions in the main text are the outcome of the interpretation of the analysis of particular sites presented in the Appendices.

1.13. A note on the use of the term ‘multi-period’

The term ‘multi-period’ is used in this thesis only to describe those enclosed sites with more than one phase of ramparts. Some sites show more than one phase of roundhouses built within. This can be seen when roundhouses are built on top or intersecting one another. This has been noted and discussed (e.g. Illus. 138) but the site has not been labelled as multi-period in the Appendices 1-3. The multiple phases of the roundhouses could arise from gradual development over time, while ramparts would require more preparation and work and were usually built over a longer time-span (e.g. Broxmouth, East Lothian: Hill 1982b).


Throughout this thesis I use several different terms to describe roundhouses or possible roundhouses. These are:

a) platform – a stance on which a timber roundhouse could have been constructed.
b) scoop- could represent remains of timber roundhouse set into the hillside, although it could be a sign of later quarrying or a natural depression.

Scoops and platforms often occur in sites of the second millennium BC (e.g. Green Knowe, Peebleshire, in: Jobey 1981; see also RCAHMS 1997, 100).

c) timber- vague remains of a roundhouse are visible but it is not possible to tell of what type the roundhouse is.

d) ring-groove roundhouse- appears on the surface as a thin annular or penannular (on slopes) depression (groove) where timbers were placed in shallow trenches. It is sometimes accompanied with one or two more similar grooves in the interior (e.g. roundhouses L and M at Castle O'Er, E Dumfriesshire, see Appendix 4).

Illus. 18: Ring-groove roundhouse after excavation at Uppercleuch, E Dumfriesshire (From: Terry et al. 1993, Fig. 4)
e) Ring-ditch roundhouse appear on the surface as a wide annular or, most often pennanular ditch, which was sometimes paved. When excavated, it often has a ring of post-holes on the inner lip of the ditch. The ring-ditch forms a part of internal space and it is not an external feature.
The role of the ring-ditch is not known. It is also not yet clear if the ring-ditches were purposely built or if they are a consequence of constant use of the internal circuit of the roundhouse. Illus. 21 shows a speculative reconstruction of a ring-ditch roundhouse and it shows one of possibilities of use of the ring-ditch. It was suggested that ring-ditches could have been a result of cattle being kept there (e.g. Jobey, Tait 1966, 14; Reynolds 1982, 53). Ring ditches could therefore be created by cattle and not necessarily been deliberately made when the roundhouse was built.

However, some of the ring-ditches are too deep and have too uneven surface to be created by cattle. Excavations at Douglasmuir, Angus, produced ring-ditch roundhouses with ditches up to 3 m wide and 0.45 m deep. The excavators noted that none of the six roundhouses had a ring-ditch with an even surface. Instead, ditches resembled a series of shallow scooped pits (Kendrick 1995, 43 – 44). J. Kendrick suggested possible use of these deep ring-ditches as storage space and perhaps as shallow cellars (ibid. 63 - 64).

f) Stone-walled roundhouse- walls of the roundhouse were built of stone.
Illus. 22: Stone-walled roundhouse after excavation (several phases visible) at Broxmouth, E Lothian (From: Hill 1982b, Fig. 9)

Illus. 23. Reconstruction of a stone-walled roundhouse at the Brigantium Archaeology Centre at Rochester, Northumberland (From: Frodsham, Hedley 2005, Fig. 5.3.)
1.15. Radiocarbon dates

All the radiocarbon dates mentioned in the thesis have been taken from the Historic Scotland Radiocarbon Database (http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/wwd_carbondatingsearch) and the Archaeological Site Index to Radiocarbon Dates from Great Britain and Ireland (http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/specColl/c14_cba/query.cfm) if not stated otherwise. The radiocarbon dates are always quoted together with a lab number of samples dated.
PART ONE:

ENCLOSED SITE EVIDENCE OF PEEBLESHIRE, BERWICKSHIRE AND E DUMFRIESSHIRE

I approach the enclosed site evidence with the following questions in mind:

- How did the enclosed sites look?
- What was the role of ramparts?
- Were landscape/immediate terrain and closeness of water resources important in choosing a location for building an enclosed site? Would it be possible to distinguish different types of enclosed sites in this way?
- Is there any difference in landscape locations of enclosures and enclosed settlements?
- Is there any diversity in enclosed settlements with different types of roundhouses within?
- What were the most important factors in choosing entrance position?
- Was the enclosed settlement interior patterned? If so, is it possible to distinguish different types of planning of the interior? Is the interior patterned differently if different types of roundhouses occur within?
CHAPTER 2: THE EVIDENCE FROM PEEBLES SHIRE, BERWICKSHIRE AND E DUMFRIESSHIRE

2.1. Introduction

The following chapter presents enclosed site evidence, analysed mostly with no consideration of the landscape surrounding it; this aspect is considered in later chapters. I will present the data collected in the Appendices and offer some general studies of enclosed sites, such as areas they enclose, rampart construction and internal settlement evidence. Chapter 2 is divided into three parts, each of them representing the enclosed site evidence of a different area (section 2.2. Peebleshire, section 2.3. Berwickshire, section 2.4. E Dumfriesshire). The aim of each part is to detect the similarities and differences in the construction of enclosed sites themselves. The key element in each analysis is spotting possible patterns. I will concentrate on identifying patterns in the data with the discussion on what these patterns mean, presented at the end of the chapter (section 2.6.).

However, some levels of analysis cannot be productive without taking into account the surrounding landscape. For example, settings of ramparts must be considered with the picture of immediate terrain in mind. This is especially important while discussing the possible roles of ramparts, such as defence or prestige. Also, roundhouse entrances need to be observed together with their surrounding landscape (section 2.5.).

With this analysis, I will show how sites can be compared on levels different from the widely accepted terminology such as hillforts, scooped settlements and others (for critique of this terminology see section 1.12.2.). This chapter, combined with Chapters 3 and 4, offers the basis for a new view on the later prehistoric enclosed site evidence.
2.2. Peebleshire

(see Appendices 1 and 4)

2.2.1. Enclosed sites and their ramparts

"How many more variations may be lying unnoticed in the hillfort box remains to be seen."

(Bowden, McOmish 1989, 15)
There are 225 enclosed sites in good enough condition to measure their area within ramparts. Of them 210 (93% of the total assemblage) are smaller than 0.5 ha. This group has a very homogeneous appearance; there is no indication of any size clusters within. Only 15 enclosed sites (7% of the total assemblage) are bigger than 0.5 ha. Out of them, six are bigger than 1 ha. Three of these are bigger than 2 ha (Cademuir 1, White Meldon and Whiteside Rig).

Illus. 26 and 27 represent area charts. The rank size plot shows two clear area boundaries, at 0.5 ha and 0.7 ha. More detailed examination of the area group, smaller than 0.5 ha shows that most of the enclosed sites in this group are smaller than 0.2 ha (Illus. 27).
Illus. 26: Peeblesshire, rank size plot of the areas of enclosed sites
RAMPART CONSTRUCTION

There are 270 enclosed sites with ramparts in good enough condition to be included in this research. Of them, 176 are enclosed by one rampart; of these, 25 show signs of one or two ditches. 68 enclosed sites had two ramparts; of these, 38 show signs of one or two ditches. Three ramparts can be detected at 20 enclosed sites; of these, six show signs of one, two or three ditches. Five enclosed sites consisted of four ramparts; of these, two show signs of ditches. One enclosed site had five ramparts.

Illus. 28 includes all enclosed sites where the number of ramparts enclosing them is clear. Observing areas of enclosed sites and the number of ramparts shows the area 0.5 ha as a noticeable margin. Only single and double lines of ramparts are present at sites bigger than 0.5 ha. More detailed margins in the enclosed sites, which are smaller than 0.5 ha can be seen from Illus. 28. Four and five ramparts only occur at sites with areas between 0.2 and 0.3 ha.

Another noticeable margin is visible at 0.7 ha. With the exception of Cademuir 1, only single ramparts enclosed sites bigger than 0.7 ha. At Cademuir 1 however, the second line of rampart is only slightly visible on one side of the enclosed site and it appears to be unfinished (Section 9.2.).
Illus. 28: Peeblesshire, areas of enclosed sites vs. the number of ramparts
Illus. 29: Peeblesshire, bar chart of areas of enclosed sites vs. the number of ramparts
Rampart construction can be defined for 188 enclosed sites (Illus. 30). Out of these, 129 have ramparts made of stone, 29 of earth/stone, 17 ramparts have timber palisades, eight had ramparts of earth, and five had an earth bank with a timber palisade.

Illus. 30: Peeblesshire, rampart construction

Observing rampart construction and areas of enclosed sites (Illus. 31), shows a possible area margin at 1 ha. Stone and earth/timber built ramparts are not dependent on the size of the enclosed area. All the other ways of rampart construction were used only for enclosed sites that are smaller than 1 ha.

Illus. 31: Peeblesshire, area vs. rampart construction
RAMPART SETTINGS

Cademuir 1, Whiteside Rig and White Meldon are the only enclosed sites in the county that are bigger than 2 ha. Located in the height of 400 - 427 m OD, they are close to equidistant (approx. 9 km from one another). They seem to be located where they could monitor Manor Valley (Cademuir 1), Upper Tweed Valley (White Meldon) and Lower Tweed Valley (Whiteside Rig). The ramparts of all three are located in such a way that it is possible to see their interior from a distance. The ramparts are built approximately 17 m below the highest point of their interior. These ramparts have not been set in the most defensively advantageous position and it seems unlikely that they were built primarily/solely for defence. It was suggested that ramparts constructed so low down on the slope were built to separate activities inside the enclosed site from the outside (Collis 1996).

This issue of visibility can be applied more generally. All the enclosed sites bigger than 0.5 ha show a desire to display in one of three ways: they had their ramparts located in such a way that it was possible to see their interior while approaching them from the valleys; they could be looked into from higher grounds; or they had impressive entrances (for more on this see Chapter 6).

2.2.2. Roundhouses

Roundhouses are most commonly compared and contrasted to one another purely on the basis of their architectural style (e.g. Hill 1982; Oswald 1997; Pope 2003; Reynolds 1982). Some studies have also focused on roundhouse entrance locations and sought ritualistic interpretations in the everyday lives of those who lived there (e.g. Guilbert 1975; Oswald 1997; Parker Pearson 1996; Parker Pearson, Richards 1994; see also section 2.5.). The aim of the analysis of roundhouses in this work is to get enough data for a broader analysis, to compare different types of roundhouses in terms of constructional style (section 1.14.), size (ibid.), entrance locations and, in later chapters, their settings within the enclosed settlements (Chapter 6).
RING-GROOVE ROUNDHouses

There are 126 ring-groove roundhouses from 13 enclosed settlements included in the analysis. Wherever possible, the diameter was measured (56 roundhouses) and the location of the entrance was noted (three roundhouses). Between one and 35 roundhouses are still visible within enclosed settlements, but there is usually space for many more.

Illus. 32: Peebleshire, bar chart of external diameters of ring-groove roundhouses

Illus. 32 indicates several groups of roundhouse sizes. The first size group is represented by roundhouses with less than 5 m in external diameter, the second one had roundhouses between 6-8 m in external diameter and the last group had diameters between 9-12 m. Bigger roundhouses are rare but also present, with an external diameter of up to a maximum of 13.9 m.

Some enclosed settlements consist of roundhouses all of the same size, which makes validity of size groups, mentioned above, questionable. The data for the group of the smallest roundhouses, for example, comes only from Cademuir 1, where 15 roundhouses have approximate external diameter of 4.7 m. Therefore, the question of ring-groove roundhouse size is more valid on the level of one site (e.g. were the small roundhouses at Cademuir 1 broadly contemporary, built on a basis of the same plan?). However, in most cases,
roundhouses within one enclosed settlement are different sizes (At Cademuir 1, for example, ring-groove roundhouses measure 4.7 – 11.2 m in diameter). Differences in roundhouse sizes could be connected to social status of inhabitants, size of families, different function of roundhouses and could also suggest more chronological phases. This, however, cannot be certain from observing survey data alone and the excavations are lacking.

Only three roundhouses have entrance locations still visible (Illus. 32), one facing S and two SSW.

Illus. 33: Peeblesshire, ring-groove roundhouse entrance orientations

RING-DITCH ROUNDHOUSES

There are 15 enclosed settlements which contain ring-ditch roundhouses noted in the RCAHMS (1967, vol.1) catalogue of Peeblesshire. Since then, several other roundhouses have been discovered, some within already known enclosed settlements, and some newly discovered sites.

I have examined 107 ring-ditch roundhouses. Wherever possible, external diameter (38 roundhouses), width of the ditch (23 roundhouses) and internal diameter (23 roundhouses) were measured, and entrance locations were noted (22 roundhouses).
Illus. 34: Peeblesshire, bar chart of external diameters of ring-ditch roundhouses

Illus. 34 shows the external diameter of all ring-ditch roundhouses where this could be measured. Although there is a big size difference between roundhouses, there are not any distinguishable size groups; there is a continuum from 9 - 14 m in external diameter, with a very few roundhouses with diameters of 7 - 8 m. Some enclosed settlements consist of roundhouses all of approximately the same size (e.g. at Waddenshope where all roundhouses are approximately 12.4 m in external diameter). In some enclosed settlements roundhouse sizes vary markedly (for example at Cardon, where roundhouse sizes vary from approximately 7.8 to 12.4 m in external diameter). Ring-ditch roundhouses are in general bigger than ring-groove roundhouses.

There are 23 roundhouses in good enough condition to measure the ring-ditch width (Illus. 12). Most (79%) of the ring-ditches are 1 - 2 m wide, 17% are between 2.2 - 2.5 m wide, while one roundhouse (Laigh Hill 2) had an abnormally wide ring-ditch of 3.8 m.
Comparison between ring-ditch roundhouses and the width of ring-ditches suggests a possible relationship between the two (Illus. 36). In the roundhouses with an internal diameter smaller than 9 m, the width of ring-ditches varies considerably. On the other hand,
roundhouses bigger than 9 m have a visible pattern: the wider the ring-ditch, the smaller the interior of the roundhouse (for more on possible different types of ring-ditch roundhouses see section 3.4.1.)

Entrance orientation can be discerned for 22 ring-ditch roundhouses (Illus. 37). They show a broad spread from the E through the S to the NW. There are no entrances pointing towards N or NE, but there is a high proportion of entrances pointing towards the W.

**Illus. 37: Peeblesshire, ring-ditch roundhouse entrance orientations**

**STONE-WALLED ROUNDHOUSES**

(see Appendix 1.4)

Analysis was made on the basis of 78 stone-walled roundhouses. Whenever possible, the internal diameter (78 roundhouses) and the width of the stone-wall (27 roundhouses) were measured, and the location of the entrance was noted (33 roundhouses).

The results of the internal diameters of roundhouses are shown on Illus. 38. Most of the roundhouses (82%) are 5.3 - 9.3 m in internal diameter. There are a few roundhouses where the internal diameter is smaller than 4 m and a group where the internal diameter is bigger than 10 m (up to 11.6 m).
Internal diameter of stone-walled roundhouses (m)

Illus. 38: Peeblesshire, bar chart of internal diameters of stone-walled roundhouses

At some enclosed settlements, all the stone-walled roundhouses are the same size (for example at Chester Rig, Cardon, where all the roundhouses measure c. 9.3 m in internal diameter; and at Helm End, where all the roundhouses measure c. 6.5 m in internal diameter). At others, roundhouse sizes vary, for example at Hog’s Knowe, where the internal diameter of roundhouses varies from 3 - 10.5 m. Very small roundhouses were probably not used as living space but are more likely to be stores or perhaps shelters for small animals, such as sheep.

From Illus. 38 it is possible to see two groups of sizes, one with internal diameters from 5-8 m and the other one from 9 - 10 m (for different types of stone-walled roundhouses see section 6.2.).

Illus. 39: Peeblesshire, bar chart of widths of walls of stone-walled roundhouses
With exceptions of two enclosed settlements, walls of stone-walled roundhouses in enclosed settlements at Peeblesshire were c. 1.1 - 1.2 m thick (Illus. 39). The enclosed settlement at Helm End shows signs of six stone-walled roundhouses with walls 1.9 m thick, while the wall of the dun at Stanhope was 3.7 - 4.7 m thick.

Illus. 39: Peeblesshire, internal and external diameters of best-preserved stone-walled roundhouses vs. the width of the walls

Observation of internal and external diameters of stone-walled roundhouses and widths of their walls (Illus. 40) highlights an interesting conclusion. Roundhouses within each settlement all have the same wall width, which is 1 m, 1.2 m or 1.9 m. It seems that here the width of the wall was standard and in some settlements also the internal (and, therefore also external) diameters at all roundhouses were also the same. It appears that a standard model of building a stone-walled roundhouse may have existed at certain sites (see Chester Rig, Cardon; Helm End; Green Hill).

Some settlements included roundhouses of different sizes, although the width of the wall remained standard (e.g. Hog’s Knowe). Here, roundhouses were probably built according the purpose of the building.
The only stone-walled roundhouse which distinctly differs from the others is the one at Stanhope (dun), where the wall is much wider. This dun is discussed in greater detail in the chapter on the anomalies in the settlement record (section 9.3.).

Entrances to the stone-walled roundhouses are in most cases easily distinguishable (Illus. 41). There are no entrances pointing towards the N or the S. Otherwise, all other directions are present, the most common being the entrance locations from the ENE, through to E to the SE and from the NNW, through to W to the SW.

![Diagram showing entrance locations in relation to cardinal directions.](image)

Illus. 41: Peeblesshire, entrances to the stone-walled roundhouses

2.3. Berwickshire

(see Appendices 2 and 4)

![Image of ramparts at Habchester](image)

Illus. 42: Berwickshire, ramparts at Habchester (From: RCAHMS 1915, 154)
“Entirely destroyed by the present tenant;...”
(Christison 1895, 150)

Later prehistoric enclosed sites from Berwickshire are generally not well preserved. Detailed analysis is therefore not possible. Apart from a few very well preserved enclosed sites, only basic data can be noted for most of the others.

2.3.1. Enclosed sites and their ramparts

“I am informed by Mr H. Craw, F.S.A. Scot., that his father demolished more that one fort on a farm in this neighbourhood;...”
(Christison 1895, 139)

AREA

It was possible to measure the area for 71 sites (Illus. 43). At 29 of them only bits of ramparts still exist; there I measured the size and noted it down as approximate size, including it in this analysis, if more than 85% of the likely circuit of rampart is still visible.

Illus. 43: Berwickshire, rank size plot of the areas of enclosed sites
There are 47 enclosed sites that were smaller than 0.5 ha, 15 had an internal area between 0.5 ha and 1 ha, four between 1 and 1.5 ha, two had an area between 1.5 ha and 2 ha and three were bigger than 2 ha. Within the last group, one site encloses 4.1 ha. This site forms an anomaly in the enclosed site record as it is much bigger than all the other sites. Hirsel Law will therefore not be discussed in this chapter but will be observed in more detail in the chapter on oddities in the later prehistoric enclosed site record (section 8.4.).

Several uncertain area boundaries can be seen from Illus. 43. Clearer area boundaries can be seen from the bar chart (Illus. 44). From it, a noticeable area boundary of 0.7 ha can be seen.

Illus. 45 shows sizes of enclosed sites that only have ditches surrounding them. Ramparts perhaps did not exist or they are not visible anymore. As these enclosed sites were detected by cropmark data, the latter is more probable. If these sites were enclosed also by ramparts, the internal areas would be somewhat smaller. This is the reason why ditched sites are observed separately. The results show margins at c. 0.4 ha and 0.7 ha.
There are 119 enclosed sites that have ramparts in good enough condition to include them in this study. Of them, 63 enclosed sites had one rampart; 21 were additionally enclosed by an external ditch. Signs of one rampart with an additional rampart in places can be seen at two of the enclosed sites, while one site had one rampart with the addition of two ramparts in places. Furthermore, 32 sites were enclosed with two ramparts; of them, 12 show signs of a medial ditch, nine of a medial and an external ditch. One enclosure has been enclosed by two ramparts with an extra rampart in places. Two sites have been enclosed by two ramparts and a medial ditch, with an additional external rampart in places. Three ramparts enclosed 14 sites; of them, one show signs of one medial ditch and ten of two medial ditches. Three ramparts and two ditches were surrounding one site; they had an additional two ramparts and a ditch in places. One site was surrounded by three ramparts with an additional two ramparts in places.
Illus. 46: Berwickshire, areas of enclosed sites vs. the number of ramparts

Illus. 46 and 47 include all enclosed sites where size was possible to measure and the number of ramparts is clear. Observing the relationship between the two factors, two area margins are visible. Single ramparts enclosed sites smaller than 1.6 ha. Two lines of ramparts were used to enclose sites of all sizes, including the two biggest. Three ramparts were used only to enclose areas between 0.2 and 0.7 ha (Illus. 47).

Illus. 47: Berwickshire, bar chart of areas of enclosed sites vs. the number of ramparts
Rampart construction could be determined for 89 enclosed sites (Illus. 48). Of them, 35 have earth/stone ramparts, 28 have stone ramparts, 20 sites were built with earthen ramparts, three with palisades, one with an earthen rampart with palisade on top and one with earth/stone rampart with palisade on top. It is possible that there were more palisades on top of earth and earth/stone ramparts, but the evidence cannot now be seen.

Illus. 48: Berwickshire, rampart construction

Areas and rampart construction could be determined for 57 settlement sites. Results of this comparison are shown on Illus. 49. Earth and earth/stone ramparts were used to build enclosed sites of all sizes. Stone construction was used only to enclose areas smaller than 0.7 ha. Earth/stone/timber ramparts and palisades were used only for ramparts which enclosed areas smaller than 0.4 ha.

Illus. 49: Berwickshire, areas of enclosed sites vs. rampart construction
RAMPART SETTINGS

"Nothing is visible of this enclosure."
(CANMORE, information for Butterdean and many more)

As most of Berwickshire is flat and marshy with higher ground only on the N and NW of the county, it is not unusual that most of the enclosed sites are located on ground raised only a few metres above the surrounding landscape.

Some of the interiors of enclosed sites were possibly visible from higher grounds (Fermy Knowe; Prestoncleuch; Stuartlaw; Wallace's Knowe). Only a few enclosed sites were built in such a way that it would be possible to see the interior from distance/lower grounds (Fosterland Burn; Hillhouse; Hirsel Law). All these sites were bigger than 0.5 ha or were enclosed by multiple ramparts.

2.3.2. Roundhouses

Roundhouses in Berwickshire are generally not so well preserved as the ones in Peebleshire. In addition, different types of roundhouses and their sizes are hard to determine due to preservation. Old sources, where roundhouses were possibly preserved better than today, do not give accurate plans. Because of these issues, this part of the chapter is divided in only two parts, one observing timber built and the second stone-walled roundhouses.

TIMBER-BUILT ROUNDHOUSES

At least 38 enclosed sites have visible evidence of timber-built roundhouses within.

Numbers of roundhouses within enclosed settlements vary from one to 20 (e.g. Harefaulds).

Type of roundhouses can be securely determined only on two sites. At Knock Hill, four ring-groove roundhouses are preserved, while Ewieside Hill shows signs of at least two ring-ditch roundhouses. However, most of the roundhouses can be identified only as slight traces on the ground and it is not possible to determine their size or type. Only nine timber-built roundhouses are in good enough condition to measure their size (Illus. 50). External diameters vary from 5.8 m (Blythe) to 11 m (Catch-a-penny).
Four enclosed sites show signs of platforms within. Although it can be assumed they are remains of timber-built roundhouses, this is not definite. They could represent the residue of stone-walled roundhouses and on some occasions could be natural. Enclosed sites with platforms within are: Knock Hill, which includes four ring-groove roundhouse and one platform, Westloch House, with one timber roundhouse and four platforms, Hareheugh Craigs with around ten platforms and Hillhouse with 34.

[Diagram showing external diameter of roundhouses with each diamond representing one roundhouse.]

Illus. 50: Berwickshire, external diameter of timber built roundhouses

**STONE-WALLED ROUNDHOUSES**  
(see Appendix 2.5)

16 enclosed settlements contain stone-walled roundhouses within. Their numbers vary from one (e.g. Westloch House 3) to 13 (Edin’s Hall 3).

26 stone-walled roundhouses are in good enough condition to measure their internal diameter (Illus. 51). They had between 4 m and 11 m in diameter, with the most common diameter between 5 m and 6 m. One roundhouse had 14.3 - 14.6 m (Edin’s Hall 3) in internal diameter and one 16.2 - 18 m (Edin’s Hall broch).
Illus. 51: Berwickshire, bar chart of internal diameter of stone-walled roundhouses

Edin’s Hall 3 shows evidence of 13 stone-walled roundhouses within. Their internal diameters are shown in more detail on Illus. 52.

Illus. 52: Berwickshire, Edin’s Hall 3, internal diameters of stone-walled roundhouses

These roundhouses have 4 - 8 m in internal diameter and were not all the same size (similar was seen in Peebleshire, see section 2.2.2.). There is one roundhouse, however, that is much
bigger than all the others. This could indicate a different date or different function (Dunwell 1999, 349). Observing evidence from other enclosed settlements in Berwickshire (see Appendix 2.3) Edin’s Hall 3 is the only example with such a big size difference in stone-walled roundhouses.

Widths of the roundhouse walls can from the whole of Berwickshire’s data, only be determined for five stone-walled roundhouses (Illus. 53). These vary from 1.2 - 2.2 m in width, apart from Edin’s Hall broch (4.8 - 6.4 m thick).

![Berwickshire, bar chart of widths of walls of stone-walled roundhouses](image)

Illus. 53: Berwickshire, bar chart of widths of walls of stone-walled roundhouses

Because of the small number of well-preserved stone-walled roundhouses, reliable conclusions cannot be made. We can notice that the widths of the walls are not as consistent as seen in Peeblesshire (Illus. 40). However, there are too few examples to claim this reliably. Moreover, there are two structures, which are distinctly differ from the others: the broch at Edin’s Hall 2, and a roundhouse at Edin’s Hall 3. Both will be discussed in the chapter on anomalies in the later prehistoric enclosed site record (section 8.3.).

Entrance locations can be determined for 16 roundhouses (Illus. 54). They generally point from the NE through to the S. One entrance points towards the NW.
2.4. E Dumfriesshire

The study of E Dumfriesshire comprises 150 randomly chosen (see p. 49) later prehistoric enclosed sites. The only rule in choosing sites for this study was that at least one of the features analysed is still in good condition.

2.4.1. Enclosed sites and their ramparts

AREA

There are 119 enclosed sites in good enough condition to measure their internal area (see Illus. 55 and 56). Of them, 115 enclosed sites (97% of the total assemblage) have their internal area smaller than 0.5 ha. Internal areas of two enclosed sites (1.5% of the total assemblage) measure between 0.5 ha and 1 ha and two enclosed sites are bigger than 1 ha (1.5% of the total assemblage). Illus. 31 shows size boundaries at 0.5 ha and 0.7 ha.

Illus. 57 includes those enclosed sites where areas can be measured only approximately. As these are the sites seen only as cropmarks most of them only show signs of ditches. Possible internal ramparts cannot be seen anymore, possibly due to ploughing and other human interactions. Some enclosed sites may have had palisades on the inner side of ditches. It is also possible that some of these enclosed sites may have been surrounded only by ditches.
(see also 2.3.1.). This cannot be confirmed without excavations. Again, clear size margins of 0.5 ha and 0.7 ha are noticeable from the Illustration (Illus. 57).

Illus. 55: E Dumfriesshire, rank size plot of the areas of enclosed sites
RAMPART CONSTRUCTION

There are 94 enclosed sites that are enclosed by one rampart; of these, 64 are surrounded by one rampart, 28 with one rampart and one ditch, two with one rampart and two ditches and one by one rampart and four ditches. Signs of one rampart with an additional rampart on one
side can be seen at three enclosed sites; two of these are additionally enclosed with one ditch. Two ramparts can be seen at 30 enclosed sites; of these, 16 are enclosed with two ramparts and one ditch, seven with two ramparts and two ditches and four are enclosed only with two ramparts. One enclosed site is enclosed by two ramparts and one ditch, with an additional rampart on one side. Only one enclosed site was enclosed by three ramparts and one ditch. At 24 enclosed sites only ditches survived and possible ramparts are not visible anymore. Of these, 20 have one ditch, three have two ditches and one was enclosed by one ditch with signs of a second ditch in places.

Illus. 58: E Dumfriesshire, areas of enclosed sites vs. the number of ramparts

Comparison of the sizes of enclosed sites and number of ramparts enclosing them (Illus. 59) shows that only single and double ramparts have been used for enclosed sites bigger than 0.5 ha. Multiple ramparts have been used only to enclose sites with areas between 0.2 and 0.5 ha.
Rampart construction can be defined for 123 enclosed sites. Of them, 37 have stone ramparts, 65 were built with earth/stone ramparts, 12 were enclosed by palisades, eight had earthen ramparts and one site had an earth/stone rampart with palisade on top.
Size and rampart construction could be determined for 113 sites. The results are shown on Illus. 61. With the exception of earth/stone and earth/stone/timber ramparts, all of the other construction types enclose areas smaller than 0.5 ha. Only earth/stone ramparts enclose areas bigger than 0.7 ha.

RAMPART SETTINGS

There are only a few enclosed sites in E Dumfriesshire where it would be possible to see the interior while approaching the enclosed sites (Castle O’er and Moss Castle for example). All these enclosed sites are bigger than 0.5 ha or have an impressive entrance (for more on this see Chapter 5).

2.4.2. Roundhouses

59 enclosed sites show signs of roundhouses within. An additional 17 enclosed sites show possible settlement evidence within.
RING-GROOVE ROUNDHOUSES

(see Appendix 3.2)

Ten enclosed sites show signs of ring-groove roundhouses within, varying from 1-29 roundhouses.

The most roundhouses are visible at Castle O’Er. This contains at least 29 ring-groove roundhouses, which form several phases. Only up to ten ring-groove roundhouses could exist in a single phase. The earliest roundhouses are 8 - 10 m in external diameter. They are overlaid by much bigger roundhouses (at least four) up to 16 m in external diameter. Some of the roundhouses have been rebuilt on the same spot at least three times (roundhouse L for example- see plan in Appendix 4).

Another site, where ring-groove roundhouses cannot be assigned to rampart phase, is Bailiehill, Camp Hill. This multi-period enclosed settlement shows evidence of at least four ring-groove roundhouses with external diameters of 7 - 9 m. Tanlawhill shows signs of at least 25 ring-groove roundhouses, built in at least three phases. External diameters of roundhouses are 7 - 9 m. Peat Hill has at least two ring-groove roundhouses and they both have approx. 10 m in external diameter. Loch Hill shows at least three phases in roundhouses, where at least 15 roundhouses are visible. At least two of them are of a ring-groove type with external diameter of 9 m and 10 m.

Excavations at Boonies (Jobey 1975) found probably 13 ring-groove roundhouses, which show at least seven separate periods of construction. Early roundhouses measure 9.5 - 11 m in external diameter. The last phase of the site shows that there were probably four or five contemporary roundhouses inside the enclosed settlement. These later roundhouses were smaller than the earlier ones, measuring from 5.5 - 8 m.

As it is possible to see from Illus. 62, the most common size of ring-groove roundhouses was 9 - 11 m and less than 8 m but bigger roundhouses also occur.
Entrance locations are only known from the excavated site at Boonies (Jobey 1975). Four ring-groove roundhouses had entrances located towards the SE and two towards the E (Illus. 63).

RING-DITCH ROUNDHOUSES

(see Appendix 3.3)

Ten enclosed sites show signs of ring-ditch roundhouses within. There are one to three probable contemporary roundhouses visible within each enclosure, while many enclosures
show signs of multi-period building. Ring-ditch roundhouses were generally 8 - 11.7 m in external diameter (Illus. 64).

![Bar chart of external diameter of ring-ditch roundhouses](Illus. 64: E Dumfriesshire, bar chart of external diameter of ring-ditch roundhouses)

Only six examples are in good enough condition to be able to measure the width of the ring-ditch (Illus. 65). Two have a ring-ditch less than 2m wide, three have a ring-ditch between 2 and 2.5 m wide and one ring-ditch is 2.8 m wide.

The internal diameters of all ring-ditch roundhouses included in this study are less than 9 m. Illus. 66a shows how the width of ring-ditches varies with the diameter. A similar pattern was shown in the analysis of ring-ditch roundhouses from Peeblesshire (Illus. 36; see also section 2.6.).

Entrances to the roundhouses are known at four structures. Three roundhouses had an entrance located towards the W and one towards the E (Illus. 66b).
Illus. 65: E Dumfriesshire, bar chart of width of roundhouse ring-ditches

Illus. 66a: E Dumfriesshire, diameters of best preserved ring-ditch roundhouses vs. the width of ring-ditches

Illus. 66b: E Dumfriesshire, ring-ditch roundhouse entrance orientations
TIMBER- BUILT ROUNDHOUSES

Timber roundhouses are present in 40 enclosed settlements, with a further 20 sites showing possible traces. 34 of these show signs of only timber roundhouses; in three cases they co-occurs with ring-ditch roundhouses, two with ring-groove roundhouses, and one with ring-groove and ring-ditch roundhouses. There are from one to at least 16 timber roundhouses within enclosures.

Because of bad preservation or several overlying phases, the diameters can generally not be measured with certainty.

STONE-WALLED ROUNDHOUSES

Only three enclosed sites show stone-walled roundhouses. Therefore, I extended my study to cover all stone-walled roundhouses in E Dumfriesshire. There are very few: only seven sites have evidence of such roundhouses, with a further two possible examples.

Only one stone-walled roundhouse is visible within each enclosed settlement. A possible exception here is Chapel, where there could be three, but this is not definite due to poor preservation of the site. The roundhouses are generally not in a good condition. Wall thickness can only be determined accurately for three roundhouses. In two cases, the wall was 1.4 m wide, while in the third it was 1 m wide.

Illus. 67: E Dumfriesshire, external diameters of stone-walled roundhouses
The external diameters of stone-walled roundhouses vary from 8 m-12.2 m (Illus. 67). Only two roundhouses are less than 10 m in diameter. All stone-walled roundhouses were built inside or on top of earlier enclosed sites. Entrances could only be determined with certainty for four stone-walled roundhouses (Illus. 68). Two entrances were pointing E, one was pointing N and one SE.

Illus. 68: E Dumfriesshire, entrances to the stone-walled roundhouses

2.5. House of the rising sun

"We may no longer face east, but we know where to look for the bathroom."

(Parker Pearson, Richards 1994, 58)

A lot has been said on the topic of the symbolism (namely cosmology; see Oswald 1991; 1997) in choosing roundhouse entrance orientations (e.g. Fitzpatrick 1994; Hill 1996; Jackson 1999; Oswald 1997; Parker Pearson, Richards 1994). This topic developed as a consequence of studies of roundhouse entrance orientations and the phenomenon of easterly and south-easterly positions of doorways. Standard orientation was widely recognised in S Britain (ibid.) and this "relates more to symbolic or ritual considerations than to the straightforward environmental factors" (Oswald 1997, 87). Apart from symbolic considerations, some work has been done on practical explanations as well. Some explained that the entrances were positioned in a way to avoid the prevailing winds (e.g. Hingley, Miles 1984, 63) and some entrances were supposed to be orientated in a way to get the most sunlight through the entrance into the interior of the roundhouse (e.g. Fitzpatrick 1997, 77-78; see also Illus. 71).
Another often-quoted example on cosmology is A. Oswald’s study of British roundhouse entrance orientations (Oswald 1991; 1997). He claims that British examples clearly show preference in the orientations (see Illus. 69). At the same time, however, almost 70% of his data comes from S England (Pope 2007, 211) and he notices himself that the E-SE orientation is not confirmed by the data from other parts of Britain (Oswald 1991, 21). However, most S English later prehistoric roundhouse entrances do point towards E-SE (Illus. 69). What needs to be borne in mind here is that most of the studies of entrance orientations were made in lowland areas and on enclosed sites placed on S parts of hills.

Illus. 69: Doorway orientation of Iron Age roundhouses (From: Oswald 1997, Fig. 10.4.)

Studies of entrance orientations concentrate purely on roundhouses and do not discuss other features of enclosed sites or nearby roundhouses. They also ignore the landscape surrounding the roundhouses. The only paper which mentions the landscape is M. Parker Pearson’s and C. Richard’s study on the architecture and order (1994); the authors point out that some of the roundhouses “tend to be located on south-facing hillsides. The entrances of these houses are oriented to the south and south-south-east...” (Parker Pearson, Richards 1994, 49). This influential claim is made in the first third of the text, but they choose to ignore it and later on discuss symbolic meaning for S and SE orientations instead.

Most studies of entrance orientations focus purely on the E and SE orientations (and in the case of brochs on the W orientation (Sharples, Parker Pearson 1997, 264)) and do not
acknowledge and study other orientations. However, there is one exception. In another of Parker Pearson’s papers he goes even further with the symbolic explanations. Observing entrance orientation of enclosed sites, he claims that cosmology is the main reason of E and W entrances (Parker Pearson 1996). This is taken for granted. However, roundhouses with entrances pointing to other directions than those that could be connected to sun movement are called “unusual” and “houses back to front” (ibid., 127). This is a very bold claim to make, especially after he claims that most of the roundhouse entrances point towards the E, S, SE, N, NE and some of them are pointing W (ibid.).

Studies of roundhouse entrances concentrate purely on roundhouses and do not combine roundhouses within one settlement and with rampart entrances. A good example here is the enclosed settlement at Moel Y Gaer, Wales. G.C. Guilbert first connected roundhouse entrance orientations with symbolism. He also suggested that it may be possible to determine the time of year when roundhouses were built with observation of their entrance orientations (Guilbert 1975, 205).

The interior of Moel Y Gaer is an almost flat surface, and roundhouse entrances are orientated SE and E, as in most areas with level ground. The entrance to the enclosed settlement is positioned to point towards the easiest access route (for more on the easiest access to the enclosed sites see Chapter 4).

R. Pope agrees with Oswald’s collection of the meteorological data on prevailing winds in Britain, which shows the dominant wind comes from the WSW (Oswald 1991; Pope 2007,
If roundhouse entrances wanted to be sheltered from this wind, they would have to be oriented between N and SE, which are the orientations confirmed by the archaeological evidence (Pope 2007, 213). Moreover, it has been suggested that the orientations of entrances within this span could be connected to the seasonal use of the roundhouses to maximise the use of sunlight within the interior (Pope 2003, 212-213; 2007).

The cosmological model of activities in the roundhouse interior has also been questioned by R. Pope (2007). She proposed a new model of usage of sunlight in the interior of roundhouses, which is based on her study of British later prehistoric roundhouses and comparisons with anthropological data from Africa (ibid.). Her model suggests that the main activities were taking place at the front of the roundhouse, while the back of it was used for sleeping and storage (ibid., 215-221, 223; see Illus. 73).

Critiques of symbolic orientations of roundhouse entrances have recently been further supported by studies of roundhouse interiors, which is something that this thesis does not discuss. L. Webley completed a study on the positions of artefacts within several roundhouses in S England dating to the first millennium BC (Webley 2007) and questioned the division living/sleeping model of the roundhouse interior (Illus. 71). The study revealed that most of the domestic activity was concentrated on the left side of the roundhouses (looking from the inside towards the entrance), which contradicts the model of orientation towards the sun and making the most of the sunlight (ibid., 142; see Illus 71 and 72).

Illus. 71: The cosmological model of the roundhouse interior (From: Parker Pearson 1999, Figure 7)
Analysis of roundhouse and enclosed site entrance orientations (which are discussed in Chapter 4) of the study areas of S Scotland does not support these arguments for symbolic motives behind entrance orientations. Instead, it shows that the structures depended on local topography and nearby structural features more than previously thought. Hints of entrances being connected to local topography and nearby structures can be found at other British sites as well (e.g. Hamilton, Manley 2001, Figures 3, 4, 7; Hill 1995, Fig. 1). Parker Pearson
himself mentions roundhouse entrances which point towards entrances of the enclosed settlement (Parker Pearson 1996, 121), but this statement is ignored in his later discussions.

In windy Peeblesshire, one can notice that, no matter what time of year, the wind direction varies between different locations. Moreover, vibrant hilly landscapes form local 'wind funnels' and settlements were built on slopes facing all the orientations; it is therefore not possible to claim that the dominant wind direction was the same one in the whole county. This could perhaps form one of the reasons for such different orientations of the roundhouses (i.e. entrances built according to dominant wind direction in that particular area). The sloping terrain and dominant wind are just two of the reasons for the orientation of the roundhouse entrances (Illus. 33).

If orientation of the sunrise was the most important feature in positioning roundhouse entrance orientation in British later prehistory, then upland areas would not show such a different picture as they do (summarised in Illus. 74). In addition, new studies do not validate this theory (e.g. Pope 2007; Webley 2007). Moreover, the study made in this chapter shows that the upland areas do not support cosmological hypothesis as a main reason for the orientation of entrances to roundhouses (Illus. 74). Therefore, I will, later on, observe another possible cause for the orientations, the roundhouse landscape position and their settings within the enclosed sites (Chapter 4).

![Illus. 74: Roundhouse entrances in the studied areas](image-url)
2.6. Discussion

“...Its W half has been levelled by the plough and since the last report the E half has been quarried by the farmer, who was unaware of the nature of the site.”

(note on CANMORE for Fans, Berwickshire)

Analysing enclosed sites on a broad scale and observing many different aspects looks promising. It means that despite the bad preservation of many sites, general conclusions can still be drawn, as almost every site can be used for at least one part of this study.

In this chapter, I have observed outputs of sites in three areas. This now enables me to compare the enclosed areas, rampart and roundhouse construction between these areas. In addition, the results can form part of discussions on the relative chronology of sites. This will be done in more detail in Chapters 3 and 9, where I will compare the results with other areas of Britain.

SIZE GROUPINGS AND RAMPART SETTINGS

Several noticeable groupings common to all three areas can be seen from analyses of the enclosed areas. The distribution shows groupings with boundaries at approximately 0.5 ha and 0.7 ha. Three size groups are therefore visible; < 0.5 ha, 0.5 – 0.7 ha and > 0.7 ha. The size boundaries between them are even clearer if we only observe areas of sites of 1 ha and smaller (Illus. 75).

Within the group of small sites (i.e. < 0.5 ha), more than half of the sites are smaller than 0.2 ha (Illus. 27, 44, 56 and 75). There is some indication, that this could form another boundary group. For example, sites with multiple ramparts in E Dumfriesshire enclosed 0.2 – 0.5 ha, sites enclosed with three ramparts in Peeblesshire enclose areas between 0.1 – 0.5 ha, four and five ramparts in Peeblesshire all enclose areas between 0.2 and 0.3 ha, multiple ramparts enclose sites bigger than 0.2 ha in Berwickshire and earth/stone/timber ramparts and palisades are, in Berwickshire, used only for sites of areas between 0.2 and 0.4 ha. The evidence for this area boundary is too slight to conclude that this is a certainty without further research.
Illus. 75: Enclosed sites with internal area of 1 ha or smaller with red lines indicating size boundaries of 0.5 and just above 0.7 ha
The boundary at 0.7 ha may be misleading, due to the small amount of sites bigger than this, and the gap that occurs may not be significant. On the other hand, there is other evidence to support the boundary at 0.5 ha. Moreover, only enclosed sites with an area bigger than 0.5 ha, with multiple ramparts or impressive entrances, have their ramparts built in such a way that it would be possible to see the interior from either higher ground or from a distance (see landscape locations of these sites in Appendix 4). These sites rarely show visible settlement evidence within. If they do, they always include ring-groove roundhouses, with the exception of multivallate sites, which show evidence of ring-ditch or timber roundhouses. This could imply a particular use of the ring-groove roundhouses, which could differ from use of the other types (for more on this see p. 107). All this evidence, could suggest different use of sites bigger than 0.5 ha, to the ones smaller than 0.5 ha. This will further be tested in forthcoming chapters (Chapters 4 and 5, section 9.2.).

Although there are many much bigger enclosed sites in England than in the study areas presented in this thesis, some similarities in area boundaries still exist. Southern Warwickshire for example, where some enclosed sites are 10 ha and bigger, show clear area boundaries at c. 0.4 ha (Hingley 1989, Table 9:2). Probable area boundaries of 0.4 - 0.5 ha, 0.65 - 0.7 ha and 0.9 - 1 ha are also noticeable at the Severn-Cotswolds (Moore 2006, Figs. 4.24, 4.25 and 4.26). Observing areas closer to the area studied in this thesis, more than 80% of enclosed sites in Northumberland are smaller than c. 0.4 ha (Jobey 1965, 60-62).

Only six enclosed sites are bigger than 2 ha, which has been seen as an important boundary in the enclosures of N Britain, set by R. Feachem (1966) and again by I.Ralston (1979). However, as this study suggests, such a boundary is arbitrary; it does not show in the analysis in this thesis. Moreover, P. Frodsham et al. set a size boundary at 1.2 ha (Frodsham et al. 2007, 259, Fig. 6a, 6b), which is again an arbitrary margin and the data researched in this thesis does not support it. This thesis clearly shows area margins at 0.5 ha and 0.7 ha.

There is not a lot of evidence on which we could date enclosed sites on the basis of their rampart construction. The Hownam sequence, which suggested palisades were the earliest form of ramparts and univallate sites predated multivallate, is not valid anymore (see p. 6-7). Observing only the part of an argument, which predates palisades from other forms of rampart construction, some comments can be made. While visiting the sites and observing the landscape close by, one cannot help suggesting that rampart construction depended on the local availability of materials, such as stone, earth, and perhaps even wood. This can be
supported with studies of past environmental conditions of the areas nearby enclosed sites, using the evidence from the ditches or beneath the ramparts. For example, analysis at Edin’s Hall has shown that the landscape around the site was cleared of woodland before the rampart was built (see p. 19). That is maybe why they used earth and stone, the material that was available locally.

**RAMPARTS AND LACK OF MULTIVALLATION**

Ramparts, especially multivallation, were for a long time seen as a sign of defence (e.g. Avery 1993). Bowden and McOmish’s paper published in 1987 changed this perspective. They emphasize the possible prestige and symbolic role of multivallation (Bowden, McOmish 1987). Prestige, defence and a symbolic boundary between the activities outside and the inside are now generally accepted as the main roles of ramparts (e.g. Cripps 2007; Hill 1995 and others; see below)

Sites with three or more ramparts are not a very common feature in the study areas. Discussion on these is therefore even more appealing, as they form an anomaly in the enclosure evidence.

Enclosed sites with three or more ramparts are not present over the whole of the area researched. They seem to occur in several big clusters (Illus. 76) with some individual sites scattered around them (see Illus. 76). There are only two multivallate enclosed sites in E Dumfriesshire. The multivallate enclosed sites are all smaller than 0.7 ha.

Clusters of multivallate sites have been noticed in parts of Wales (Driver 1995), the Welsh Marches (Whimster 1989) and Severn-Cotswolds (Moore 2006). There, multivallation has been explained as a status symbol (Wigley 2007) or as complex inter-group relationship which was reflected in a need of exaggerated enclosures (Moore 2006, 73).
With so little evidence of multivallate enclosed sites, study of these clusters might prove interesting. In an attempt to interpret them, it is possible to look at several different views on multivallation:

- **multivallation as defence**

  Ramparts and ditches can be seen as defensive structures against human aggression, usually following an argument that ramparts and ditches were unnecessarily large obstacles if they were intended only to keep away wild animals and keep inside domestic animals.

However, most multivallate sites exceeded what would seem necessary solely for defence (Hill 1999, 192); this does not seem a good explanation for multivallation.
multivallation as a sign of prestige and symbolism
Many academics (Gwilt 1997; Hill 1995; Parker Pearson 1996 and others) have argued against the defensive role of ramparts. Instead, they present ideas of the prestige/wealth, ritual and symbolic value of multiple ramparts. However, tying these ideas in the areas studied in this thesis brings several questions. If multiple ramparts are a sign of prestige/wealth and they have symbolic value, why are they not more evenly distributed across the area? If this prestige/wealth is connected to groups, why would wealthy groups be living in clusters? Would it even be possible that prestigious sites would survive in such small areas without rivalry between them?

All the multivallate sites are almost certainly not contemporary, but some could be. With a smaller number of multivallate sites in use at one time, could such prestige display be set aside only for specific groups living in SE Scotland? Alternatively, could it be that specific areas in the landscape were retained for these sites?

It could be that higher populations in these areas created more need to show social differences between people. This could be supported by observing areas with less dense enclosed site evidence as they very rarely contain multivallate sites (compare Illus. 24 and 76).

‘wandering’ sites
The term “wandering” settlement was first used by F. Gerritsen (1999) and J.D. Hill (1999, 193). They used it to describe settlements of E England, the Netherlands, Belgium and S Scandinavia, which show one or two phases of rebuilding and were then abandoned. They connect this movement of settlements with the nature of agriculture and landscape, which was not densely occupied and did not have permanently set boundaries (Hill 1999, 194; for contrary view see ‘multivallation as a sign of prestige and symbolism’ above). This claim is sometimes backed up with the expected life span of a roundhouse, which means that the settlements would move every 25-40 years (Bradley 2002, 58-72; Gerritsen 1999; Halliday 1999, 60; Reynolds 1995; see also section 6.2.).

If we apply this theory to multivallate enclosed sites, it could be that multivallate sites moved their locations frequently, leaving signs of clusters within the later prehistoric enclosed site pattern.
• multivallation as a sign of specific groups occupying the landscape

As multivallate sites occupy restricted areas, it could be that they are a sign of specific groups living in the area. These groups differ from others in their style of building enclosed sites, e.g. they were building multivallate sites as opposed to others, who built single or double ramparts.

There is, however, a methodological problem in how to tackle multi-period sites and their ramparts. In this study, only multivallate sites, where it is possible to assume a single phase of reconstruction of the ramparts were analysed. However, at some enclosed sites it is clear that a later phase of the site was built there because of the material available from the earlier ramparts. But some of the enclosures, particularly the ones with later enclosures built inside earlier ones with no interference with the earlier ramparts, raise a question: were those ramparts still used in later phases? For example, excavations at Castle O’Er, E Dumfriesshire, showed that the older ramparts were still in use during the first centuries AD (Mercer in prep.). Should we observe these as sites with multiple ramparts, or were earlier ramparts degraded with only the newly-built rampart being used? There is however, another possible explanation of multivallate sites in the area studied:

• Multiple ramparts as an indicator of chronology

Multivallate enclosed sites in Cornwall and Devon are all small, with excavated examples dated from the fourth-century BC to the first century AD (Cripps 2007, 145; she does not state the exact size). In Devon they usually form clusters in the landscape (ibid.). The lack of excavation in my study area and consequently, the data gathered from it, does unfortunately not allow dating. However, the dates available from S Central Scotland show that the multivallate sites were extensively used from the ninth to the fifth century BC and some of them were reoccupied in the later stages (section 3.2.; Illus. 81).

Some pros and cons for each of the possible explanations of sites enclosed with multiple ramparts were noted above. Only one probable role of multivallate sites cannot be claimed as the role perhaps varied from site to site and ramparts had more than one role at particular sites (section 2.6.). Moreover, more excavation has to be done on these sites in order to establish possible sequences and see just how many of the sites, which appear multivallate, are a consequence of several phases of building of these sites.
This study offered some possible explanations of the multivallate sites. A lot of work is still needed in order to establish most probable theories of the use of these sites. However, the analysis presented in this thesis shows that these sites show some similarity between them and a lot of them form clusters in the prehistoric landscape. This is an important observation in order to be able to discuss possible settlement patterns in S Scotland (section 6.3.).

ROUNDHOUSES

Details of many roundhouses cannot be identified from surface remains or aerial photos. Most of the analysed roundhouses can only be categorised as timber-built or stone-walled. Despite the difficulties in defining types of roundhouses, I used the typology stated in RCAHMS catalogues as much as possible. The broad view of roundhouses has shown some issues which will be shortly listed below. The main discussion, however, will be presented in the next chapter, where more of the excavated data from other areas of S Scotland and NE England will be added.

Ring-groove roundhouses
At Castle O’Er, E Dumfriesshire, earlier ring-groove roundhouses are smaller than those of later phases. The same pattern may be visible at Cademuir 1, Peeblesshire. There, ring-groove roundhouses do not overlap each other but could form several different chronological phases. At Boonies, E Dumfriesshire, a somewhat different picture can be seen. There bigger roundhouses preceded the smaller ones. The external diameter of ring-groove roundhouses ranges from c. 4.7 m to 11.2 m. Here, as well as some chronological depth, we can assume different usage of different roundhouses or different size of families living within.

If we consider ideas of transhumance (Hill 1999, 196 with references) and seasonal usage of ring-groove roundhouses (Pope 2003), then a small roundhouse of 4.7 m would be big enough to provide shelter for a few people to live there over the summer. Animals would stay in the open during those months.

The increasing size of such roundhouses may indicate that these sites were used the whole year round, and roundhouses would therefore need more internal space for animals and storage of goods over winter months. It appears that ramparts were built over some of the smallest ring-groove roundhouses at Cademuir 1 (NW side of the enclosed settlement). This
could be a sign that ramparts were built in times when this site was used permanently throughout the year, while this site was used seasonally, long-lasting ramparts were not needed.

**Ring-ditch roundhouses**

From Illus. 36 and 66 it is noticeable that the internal diameter (diameter, excluding the ditch, see Illus. 17) was the most important dimension while building a ring-ditch roundhouse. Interior was the first consideration while building the structure. Moreover, looking at the data of internal, external diameter and width of ring-ditches, two groups can be noticed:

- the first group is the one where the roundhouses have less than 9 m in internal diameter.

The internal diameters of several roundhouses raise proportionately, but the external diameter shows a lot of variation and it is dependent on the width of the ring-ditch and not the internal diameter of the roundhouse itself. It could be concluded that the internal diameter was set first and the width of the ring-ditch was later set according to the needs of inhabitants.

- the second group is the one where the roundhouses have more than 9 m in internal diameter.

Here similarities between internal and external diameters are noticeable, as well as that the ring-ditch is somehow connected to the two. It could be said that the internal and external diameters were equally important here or even that all three components were of the same importance. This could mean that the patterned interior of the enclosed settlement existed and that perhaps even plans on how to construct a ring-ditch roundhouse were available.

The two groups of ring-ditch roundhouses show such a different way of planning the roundhouses themselves that one could presume difference in usage and purpose of the different roundhouses.

A few ring-ditch roundhouses have ditches wider than 2 m. These ditches can be compared to the ring-ditch roundhouse at Broxmouth, E Lothian, where the ditch was 3.5 m wide. This had an entrance, which was 2.4 m wide, suggested to allow access for animals (Jobey, Tait 1966, 14; Reynolds 1982, 53). Entrance widths cannot readily be determined without
excavation. The ring-ditch roundhouse at Cardon, Peeblesshire, is one rare example where the width of the entrance is well preserved. It was approximately 2 m wide, which might also suggest animal husbandry within the roundhouse (ibid.). However, other types of roundhouses have wide entrances. Ring-groove roundhouse no. 11 at Boonies, for example, had an entrance 1.8 m wide (Jobey 1974; Illus. 88). There is no evidence to suggest internal animal husbandry for this type of roundhouses. The reason perhaps needs to be sought elsewhere (see section 1.14.).

At Waddenshope, Peeblesshire, the roundhouses are all the same size with the same width of ring-ditch around them. Unfortunately, the entrances cannot be identified without excavations. Such identical sizes are a clue that the structures were probably contemporary, built in a single phase; the builders had some sort of a plan of how to build a roundhouse.

By contrast, ring-ditch roundhouse diameters at Cardon, Peeblesshire vary; this is also the case with the width of the ditches. This could indicate different phases or different usage of the roundhouses. At the multi-period site of Huskie Rig, Peeblesshire, P. Hill suggested different chronological stages on the basis of sizes of ring-ditch roundhouses (Hill 1982, 32): here, the smaller ring-ditch roundhouses at Huskie Rig are overlaid by bigger ones.

The variety of ring-ditch roundhouses can be compared to information from excavated sites, especially the site of Kintore, Aberdeenshire (Cook 2001). Radiocarbon dating of ring-ditch roundhouses produced a noticeable pattern in their sizes. Comparing the external diameter, it is possible to see increasing size through time: ring-ditch roundhouses dated to c. 1800-800 BC were approximately 9 m in external diameter; those dated to c. 800 - 400 BC were approximately 11 m in external diameter; while those dated to c. 400 – 50 BC were the biggest ones, measuring approximately 14 m in external diameter. More discussion on chronology and relative sequences will be made in Chapter 3.
Stone-walled roundhouses
Analysis of stone-walled roundhouses showed that the width of stone walls was fairly consistent, with internal (and therefore external) diameters possibly decided according to the usage of the roundhouse. This all shows that the roundhouses were probably built according to plan, which suggests skilled builders. The only anomaly here is Edin’s Hall 3 in Berwickshire, which does not show a consistent width of stone walls. There, early roundhouses have walls, which are more than 2m wide.

Two main types of enclosed settlements with stone-walled roundhouses occur. One type, which is typical for the whole area of this study, has stone-walled houses with generally similar proportions to earlier ring-groove and ring-ditch roundhouses. These enclosed settlements are mostly located late in the sequence on multi-period locations (Chapters 3 and 4).

The second type, which is present only in Peebleshire, consists of a cluster of ‘normal’ sized stone-walled roundhouses with additional very small stone-walled roundhouses, usually not more than 2.5 m in internal diameter. All these roundhouses were probably contemporary as they show signs of yards. One big and one extremely small roundhouse usually occupy one
yard. Small stone-walled roundhouses could be explained as storage space or shelter for animals, with the bigger ones presenting living space.

Clusters of enclosed settlements with stone-walled roundhouses are visible (Illus. 78). These cannot be due to availability of stone as the enclosed sites with stone ramparts are more widespread (see Illus. 24). Moreover, there is an interesting similarity in the distribution of enclosed settlements with stone-walled roundhouses and enclosed sites with multiple ramparts.

Illus. 78: Distribution of enclosed settlements containing stone-walled roundhouses

Two major anomalies in the enclosed site evidence were noticed. The enclosed site at Hirsel Law, Berwickshire, with its 4.1 ha, is much larger than the other sites in the study area, while the broch at Edin’s Hall, Berwickshire and Stanhope dun, Peeblesshire, show the construction of stone-walled roundhouse types which are otherwise unknown in the study area. These two anomalies will be discussed in greater detail in section 8.3.).
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SUMMARY

In this chapter, the enclosed site evidence was analysed on the basis of construction style of enclosed sites and their roundhouses. There are indications of marked boundaries in the distribution at c. 0.2, c. 0.5 and 0.7 ha. Differences in sizes could represent different functions of enclosed sites. Furthermore, several possible subcategories within roundhouse types were noticed. All this will be tested in the following chapters, where enclosed site evidence will be observed within its landscape and relative sequences and radiocarbon dates from excavated sites in S Scotland and NE England will be included.
CHAPTER 3: CHRONOLOGY OF THE ENCLOSED SITES AND ROUNDHouses

3.1. Introduction

The problem of establishing the chronology of survey data has already been mentioned. As discussed before, the Hownam sequence was proved to be flawed as a general model, as it is not supported by new discoveries (p. 6-7). Therefore, discussions on the relative chronology of the enclosed sites need to be set on different criteria. In order to do so, this chapter is divided into three sections. The first one (3.2.) will present dates that are available from the excavated sites, which are crucial for the understanding of the enclosed sites analysed in this thesis. In the second section (3.3.) a relative sequence at multi-period sites from the studied area will be considered. Lastly, I will observe the local sequences of roundhouses (3.4.).

3.2. Radiocarbon dates from enclosed sites and roundhouses in SE Scotland and NE England

Before listing some of the most important radiocarbon dates from SE Scotland, a short history and some of the problems in the radiocarbon dating of Scottish sites have to be considered. E. MacKie was one of the first scholars, using radiocarbon dating in his studies of Scotland’s past (e.g. MacKie 1969). Others soon followed (e.g. Harding 1974; Jobey 1978a; Mercer 1976).

Unfortunately, most of the dates are not as precise as we would like. In P.J. Ashmore words, they are “each somewhere between excellent and awful” (Ralston, Ashmore 2007, 237). Just one of a large series of dubious examples is Burnswark, E Dumfriesshire, where one of the dates from has produced a date of 808 – 263 cal BC (GaK-2203). Although the first techniques of radiocarbon dating were not precise (GaK dates show a lot more errors than other laboratories; in: Ashmore et al. 2000, 46), this wide time span, which was assigned to most of the early radiocarbon dates, is also a result of poor sampling on the sites and, consequently submission of mixed examples (Ashmore 1999; Ashmore et al. 2000, 43). However, much has changed since P.J. Ashmore’s analyses of radiocarbon dates and his
advice on how to take good samples on sites (e.g. Ashmore 1999; Ashmore et al. 2000; Ashmore, Hill 1983; Ralston, Ashmore 2007). With his studies, methodological improvements of radiocarbon dating are immense.

Radiocarbon dating has shown that some of the hillforts were used already in the late Bronze Age (MacKie 1969; Owen 1992, 63, 64; Ralston, Ashmore 2007, 230). It has been almost forty years since E. MacKie’s publication on radiocarbon dates in N Scotland (MacKie 1969). However, not much has changed in dating of the gradual abandonment of hillforts from about 250 BC onwards (Ralston 1996, 137).

But not all the sites show the hiatus, which was detected at Eildon Hill North and Traprain Law. Some of the excavated sites, which have radiocarbon dates available, produced later prehistoric dates. Gillies Hill, Stirlingshire, for example, was continuously or intermittently used from the middle of the first millennium BC (GU-1909, GU-1911) to the very end of that millennium (GU- 1910) (Owen 1992, 66). Moreover, the site at the Dunion, Roxburghshire produced datable material from the last three centuries BC to at least the first century AD (GU- 1271, GU-1272, GU-1273, GU-1274, GU-1275, GU-1276, GU-1278) (ibid.).

Some of the hillforts also show evidence of later activities within. Eildon Hill North, Selkirkshire and Traprain Law, E Lothian for example, appear to show a hiatus from the late Bronze to the Roman Iron Age (Owen 1992, 66; Rideout et al. 1992, 139; Stevenson 1966). However, only small parts of these big enclosed sites have been excavated so far and there is a great possibility that more evidence on use of the interiors during what now seems a hiatus will soon become available (Owen 1992, 66; Ralston 1996, 137). I. Ralston emphasized that this hiatus could only be a product of excavation strategies as dating of vitrified forts has shown a variety of dates, some of them later than 250 BC (ibid.). Moreover, the Iron Age material culture is mostly problematic and undiagnostic and it is therefore not easy to date. However, some of the probable Iron Age roundhouses and other later prehistoric material were discovered at the Traprain Law excavation in 2004 (Armit et al. 2005, 3) and this will help much with getting the information from what was thought to be a hiatus.

From general dates of enclosed sites, the focus will now be turned to specific constructional types of sites. These are sites, which, with their construction technique, differ from the majority of the enclosed site record. Some of them were for a long time thought to be
diagnostic for particular periods in the past. These are palisaded sites, multivallate and rectilinear sites.

Palisaded sites were usually considered as being used only in the very early stages of later prehistory (e.g. Piggott 1948; Stanford 1971). However, the radiocarbon dates now available do not support this (e.g. Ritchie 1970; Harding 1976b, 24; 2001, 356 – 35; also Illus. 79). Excavations confirm that construction of palisades lasts over the whole of the later prehistory and even stretches beyond that. Some radiocarbon dates of palisaded sites are listed on Illus. 79. Fenton Hill, Northumberland for example, produces a very early date, while a much later date was produced at Murton High Crags, Northumberland (Illus. 79).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date (cal BC)</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fenton Hill, Northumberland</td>
<td>994 - 427</td>
<td>HAR-825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnswark, E Dumfriesshire</td>
<td>809 - 382</td>
<td>I-5314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craigmorlach Wood, Renfrewshire</td>
<td>802 - 524</td>
<td>GaK-895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnswark, E Dumfriesshire</td>
<td>808 - 263</td>
<td>GaK-2203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huchoe, Northumberland</td>
<td>775 - 402</td>
<td>GaK-1388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNaughton's Fort, Kircudbright</td>
<td>484 - 9</td>
<td>GaK-808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingram Hill, Northumberland</td>
<td>397 - 20 cal AD</td>
<td>I-5316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murton High Crags, Northumberland</td>
<td>369 - 141 cal AD</td>
<td>HAR-6202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illus. 79: A selection of the radiocarbon dates from palisaded sites

Illus. 80. Double palisade at Hownam Rings, Roxburghshire (From: Piggott 1948, Plate XXXVIII b)
As for multivallate sites, most of the radiocarbon dates from Perthshire and Angus in central Scotland (Illus. 81) show extensive use between 800 – 400 cal BC. Some of these sites were in continuous use or were reoccupied in later phases (Davies 2007, 273; see Illus. 81).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>GU-1543</th>
<th>2020 ± 90 BP</th>
<th>GU-4372</th>
<th>1870 ± 50 BP</th>
<th>GU-4375</th>
<th>1850 ± 50 BP</th>
<th>Beta-168226</th>
<th>1840 ± 40 BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldclune Site 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Coldoch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Mains</td>
<td>GU-2681</td>
<td>2200 ± 50 BP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mains of Edzell</td>
<td>GU-9616</td>
<td>2340 ± 55 BP</td>
<td>GU-9617</td>
<td>2335 ± 50 BP</td>
<td>GU-9618</td>
<td>2415 ± 45 BP</td>
<td>GU-9619</td>
<td>2365 ± 45 BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Castle</td>
<td>N-1376</td>
<td>2490 ± 95 BP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee Law</td>
<td>GU-3920</td>
<td>2380 ± 50 BP</td>
<td>GU-3921</td>
<td>1930 ± 50 BP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Caterthun</td>
<td>AA-21926</td>
<td>2140 ± 45 BP</td>
<td>GU-4599</td>
<td>2370 ± 50 BP</td>
<td>GU-4600</td>
<td>2360 ± 60 BP</td>
<td>GU-4602</td>
<td>2450 ± 50 BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GU-4603</td>
<td>2440 ± 50 BP</td>
<td>GU-4604</td>
<td>2480 ± 50 BP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illus. 81: Perthshire and Angus, radiocarbon dates of the enclosed sites with multiple ramparts (From: Davies 2007, Fig. 7)

A double-ditched enclosed site with possible internal palisade at Hayknowes Farm, E Dumfriesshire, was dated to 165 cal BC – 120 cal AD from the base of the inner ditch, while a somewhat different date of 415 - 45 cal BC was produced for the S gatepost (Gregory 2001, 42, Table 1). Although these dates differ from one another (due to two phases of the site or possible dating of the old wood, this is important evidence towards dating of the big enclosed sites to which Hayknowes Farm, with its area of 0.7 ha, belongs (for discussions on the size boundaries see section 2.6.).
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Approximately 200 m SE of this site, a rectilinear enclosed site was excavated and dated. The base fill of the single enclosing ditch was dated to 50 cal BC – 140 cal AD (Gregory 2001, 42, Table 1).

The data presented above show a degree of complexity and diversity from site to site. Similar sites do not belong to a single chronological period and frequently a single site produces more than one dating horizon (see also Ralston, Ashmore 2007, 234-235). This indicates that instead of looking for a model of the development of later prehistoric enclosed sites (e.g. the Howman sequence: Piggott 1948; see p. 6, 7) we must observe how the sites evolved on a site-to-site basis.

Unfortunately, even excavating does not always produce clear results on the contemporary use of the ramparts and the interior. Excavations at Albie Hill, E Dumfriessshire for example, show only one period of the site, enclosed with a ditch with a possible palisade. However, finds and other evidence discovered date the site from early prehistory to Roman Iron Age (Strachan 1999). This indicates that the site was used for a long period of time and its location was important in prehistory. Unfortunately it is not known at what period in time the enclosure was built. A similar issue can be seen at Boonies, E Dumfriesshire (Jobey 1975; see section 3.4.1.).

Ramparts with evidence of long-term use of the interior can indicate either that the enclosure was built early and usage of its interior continued over a long period of time, or that people used a place which was at some stage enclosed. At Albie Hill, the latter is more probable as the excavation did not reveal any cleaning of the ditch, which was backfilled rapidly (Strachan 1999, 9; for more on this see section 9.2.). Similar rapid backfill of the ditches can be seen at Hayknowes Farm and Uppercleuch, both E Dumfriesshire (section 10.2.), implying a short life for this enclosure. Moreover, the post-holes and pits do not respect the position of the enclosure. However, examples of usage of the area outside of the enclosures, although rare, are known (Lambrick 1983; see also section 6.3.2.).

3.2.1. Broxmouth, E Lothian

Excavations at Broxmouth, E Lothian showed six periods of rampart construction. One or two ramparts in each of these periods enclosed the site, with an unenclosed settlement before
and after the rampart construction (Hill 1982b). These ramparts were not just rebuilt, repaired or added to the earlier ones. Instead each period represented a settlement separate from the earlier one; the earlier features were not respected in building the new ones (see Illus. 83). This shows that the landscape location was important, but not the structures already built on it (for more on this see sections 6.3.3. and 6.4.). Moreover, identifiable roundhouses were present only in the last two periods (VI and VII) with ramparts, a pre- (ring-ditch roundhouses) and post- (stone-walled roundhouses) rampart period (Illus. 83). The dates suggest the enclosed site was used over much of later prehistory with roundhouses (of a ring-groove type) being present from the late second half of the first millennium BC (Illus. 82). Stone-walled roundhouses were only built once the ramparts had fallen out of use, with material from the ramparts used to built them (Hill 1982b, 150).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date (cal BC)</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>800 - 200</td>
<td>GU-1358</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850 - 250</td>
<td>GU-1201</td>
<td>II/ III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 - 200</td>
<td>GU-1359</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 - 390</td>
<td>GU-1502</td>
<td>III/ IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 - 80</td>
<td>GU-1357</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850 - 150</td>
<td>GU-1500</td>
<td>IV/ V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 - 200</td>
<td>GU-1501</td>
<td>IV/ V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450 - 250</td>
<td>GU-1360</td>
<td>IV/ V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 - 350</td>
<td>GU-1202</td>
<td>VI/ VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 - 100</td>
<td>GU-1197</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 - 50</td>
<td>GU-1205</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 - 0</td>
<td>GU-1225</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 - 900 AD</td>
<td>GU-1227</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 100 AD</td>
<td>GU-1070</td>
<td>VI/ VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 - 70 AD</td>
<td>GU-1226</td>
<td>VI/ VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 - 150 AD</td>
<td>GU-1199</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 - 250 AD</td>
<td>GU-1506</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 - 350 AD</td>
<td>GU-1504</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 - 250 AD</td>
<td>GU-1499</td>
<td>VII/ VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 - 250 AD</td>
<td>GU-1503</td>
<td>VII/ VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850 - 100</td>
<td>GU-1206</td>
<td>VIII, stone-walled roundhouse 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 - 350 AD</td>
<td>GU-1497</td>
<td>VIII, stone-walled roundhouse 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 - 350 AD</td>
<td>GU-1498</td>
<td>VIII, stone-walled roundhouse 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 550 AD</td>
<td>GU-1068</td>
<td>VIII, House 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illus. 82: Radiocarbon dates from Broxmouth, E Lothian
Illus. 83: Broxmouth, E Lothian, enclosed site sequence (From: Hill 1982b, Fig. 3)
3.3. Local rampart sequences and more

Evidence of multi-period activity is shown at 72 later prehistoric enclosed sites (see Illus. 84).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>OD (m)</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Meldon</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blyth Bank Hill</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td>multiple ramparts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonny Craig</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cademuir</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>326</td>
<td></td>
<td>chevaux de frise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cademuir</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerlee</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Law Plantation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
<td>multiple ramparts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Hill</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>326</td>
<td></td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge Law Plantation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
<td>big, multiple ramparts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Hill, Hundlehope</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Rig, Cardon</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Rig, Glen</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>379</td>
<td></td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead Side</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derva</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
<td>chevaux de frise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter Dawyck</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallmanor</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammer Knowe</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harehope</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helm End</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderland Hill</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside Knowe</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkton Burn</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowe Kniffling</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langlaw Hill</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td>linear earthworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langhaugh</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyne Burn, Harehope</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meldon Burn 3, 4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milkieston Rings</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>344</td>
<td></td>
<td>multiple ramparts, linear earthwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchelhill Rings</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulburn</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northshield Rings</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Rig 1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirn Wood</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td>possible multiple ramparts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purvis Hill</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding Hill, Penveny</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill Head</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bank</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hill</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>405</td>
<td></td>
<td>monumental entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Meldon</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>427</td>
<td></td>
<td>big, monumental entrance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteside Hill</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>372</td>
<td></td>
<td>big, linear earthwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteside Rig</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td>big, monumental entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Hill</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
<td>multiple ramparts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worm Hill</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
<td>multiple ramparts, linear earthwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Chesters, Bowshiel</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackchester</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>OD (m)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockburn East</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldingham Loch</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>multiple ramparts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duns Law</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earn’s Haugh</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>multiple ramparts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edlin’s Haugh</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>big, broch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebweside Hill</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>big, multiple ramparts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelhope Burn</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>multiple ramparts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longcroft</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marygoldhill Plantaon</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mire Loch</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>rectilinear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raecleughhead</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westloch House</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Burn</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiehill, Camp Hill</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bittleston Wood</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackford</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braehill</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>big, possible multiple ramparts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomhillbank Hill</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle O’Er</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>big, monumental entrance, linear earthwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Hill</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenton Heights</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibb’s Hill</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peat Hill</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw Hill, Calkin</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>linear earthworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stidriggs</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hill</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - no. of phases
2 - smaller site over larger
3 - larger site over smaller
4 - annexe
5 - any phase larger than 0.4 ha
6 - more phases of RH within
7 - other

Illus. 84: Multi-period sites with clear relative sequence

Different phases can be seen where later ramparts are built around, on top of or inside earlier ones. Generally, later enclosed sites either completely or partly follow shapes defined by earlier ramparts. It is very rarely that later phases are of a completely different shape to the earlier ones. This can be noticed only when the size difference between the sites is immense (e.g. Caerlee and Henderland Hill, both in Peeblesshire) or if the later phase is represented by a group of small enclosed areas built with insubstantial partition walls (e.g. Upper Kidston and The Bank, both in Peeblesshire). A few enclosed sites show evidence of annexes added in later phases (e.g. Cademuir Hill 2 and Easter Dawyck, both in Peeblesshire).
Timber palisades are present in early phases of enclosed sites. Later phases either use the same material (e.g. Gibb's Hill, E Dumfriesshire), earth/stone (e.g. Castle Hill, Peeblesshire) or stone ramparts (e.g. Dead Side, Peeblesshire). Stone ramparts in later phases often replace earth/stone ramparts. In one third of the multi-period enclosed sites with earth/stone ramparts, all the phases use the same building material, while all multi-period sites with stone ramparts use stone for building of all phases of the enclosed site. Entrances to later enclosed sites usually follow the orientation of earlier entrances. The few exceptions are Ewieside Hill and Mire Loch, both in Berwickshire, where earlier ramparts were breached to form the new entrance location.

Some of the sites had later roundhouses with no contemporary ramparts built within (e.g. Cockburn East 2, Coldingham Loch 3 and Earn’s Heugh 4, all in Berwickshire; Dreva, Peeblesshire). At those sites older ramparts were possibly used as a feature of new settlements, as roundhouses usually respected the position of the earlier ramparts (but see Broxmouth, E Lothian, section 3.2.1.). All these late roundhouses were stone-walled.

From the study of ramparts of multi-period sites, it is not possible to draw a unique relative sequence of the enclosed sites of S Scotland. A few general sequences can be observed, but chronological sequences mostly need to be observed on a site-to-site level. General sequences show that palisades usually predate earth/stone or stone ramparts (see above), stone ramparts often replace earth/stone ramparts and stone-walled roundhouses occur in the latest phases of the enclosed sites. However, a critique of obsession with the rampart sequences and not observing sites in more details has been published before (Clarke 2001, 295-296). It is necessary to observe ramparts as parts of enclosed sites, within their landscape, and not as the main or the only tool for the exploration of particular sites.

Illus. 84 presents all the multi-period sites where the sequence is clear. On this basis several conclusions can be made. The most obvious one is that the earlier phases are generally bigger that the later ones. Moreover, these sites were always positioned in areas high above the average altitudes of the later prehistoric enclosed sites. A study of natural resources will not be done in this thesis, but it would be interesting to see if multi-period sites were perhaps built close to the best land for high pastures or similar. Moreover, more than half of multi-period sites include additional features in their early phase. These are rare at other sites, e.g. both examples of chevaux de frise are at multi-period sites, these sites are the biggest ones in the studied area, a lot of them have linear earthworks close to them or they have monumental
entrances (Chapter 5). These could be focal sites in the later prehistoric society and people were returning to them again and again. The question, which remains here unanswered, is: were the locations of these sites special and therefore built differently and did people rebuild on the same location again and again? Or were unusual earlier sites initiatives for later structures on the same location?

3.4. Local roundhouse sequences

For a long time roundhouse typologies suggested a relative sequence of house types (e.g. Hill 1982a):

1) ring-groove roundhouses
2) ring-ditch roundhouses
3) stone-walled roundhouses (also named ‘Votadinian’ (ibid., 8-12) (Hill 1982a)

This sequence was already questioned more than 20 years ago, when it was suggested that roundhouse types represent different construction techniques rather than different dating sequences (Macinnes 1982b).

Illus. 85 presents all the enclosed sites that clearly show more than one phase of roundhouses within the interior. Roundhouses of the same type are sometimes built in several phases (Boonies, Castle O’Er and Tanlaw Hill, all in E Dumfriesshire; Cademuir, Orchard Rig and White Meldon, all in Peeblesshire; Mire Loch and West Addiston, both in Berwickshire). Ring-groove roundhouses predate ring-ditch roundhouses at Harehope, Peeblesshire and Loch Hill, E Dumfriesshire. At Castle Hill, Peeblesshire, ring-ditch roundhouses predate ring-groove roundhouses. The same was noted at Broxmouth, E Lothian (Hill 1982a, 15; 1982b). Timber-built roundhouses always predate stone-walled roundhouses.

The evidence from E Dumfriesshire is somewhat different from the other two counties. There are more enclosed sites, which do not show more than one, or possibly two phases in the rampart sequence, but show multiple phases in the roundhouse construction. Also, multi-period settlements from E Dumfriesshire often include evidence of more roundhouses than
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>No. of phases</th>
<th>First phase</th>
<th>Second Phase</th>
<th>Third Phase</th>
<th>Fourth Phase</th>
<th>Fifth Phase</th>
<th>Sixth Phase</th>
<th>Seventh Phase</th>
<th>Multiple phases seen in ramparts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back Burn</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>platform</td>
<td>platform</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beathach Hill</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>more than 3</td>
<td>platform</td>
<td>ring-ditch</td>
<td>platform</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beattock Hill 2</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>timber</td>
<td>ring-ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bittleton Wood</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>timber</td>
<td>timber</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Meldon</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>timber</td>
<td>timber</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackchester</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>timber</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boonies</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>at least 7</td>
<td>ring-ditch</td>
<td>ring-ditch</td>
<td>ring-ditch</td>
<td>ring-ditch</td>
<td>ring-ditch</td>
<td>ring-ditch</td>
<td>ring-ditch</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brieryshaw Hill</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>at least 2</td>
<td>timber</td>
<td>timber</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadenmuir</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 (?),</td>
<td>ring-groove</td>
<td>ring-groove</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadenmuir Hill</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>timber</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Hill</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ring-ditch</td>
<td>ring-groove</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle O'Eir</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>3 (?),</td>
<td>ring-groove</td>
<td>ring-groove</td>
<td>platform</td>
<td>(over rampart)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyne Law Plantation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ring-ditch</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Rig, Glen</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>timber</td>
<td>platform</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duns Law</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>scoops</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden's Hill</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>beech</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gib's Hill</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>possibly 4</td>
<td>ring-ditch</td>
<td>ring-groove</td>
<td>ring-groove</td>
<td>platform</td>
<td>(over rampart)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallmanor</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>timber</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harehope</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>timber</td>
<td>(pre-rampart)</td>
<td>ring-groove</td>
<td>ring-ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkton Burn</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>platform</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knock Hill 1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2 (?),</td>
<td>platform</td>
<td>ring-groove</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Hill</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>at least 2</td>
<td>timber</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loch Hill</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>at least 2</td>
<td>ring-groove</td>
<td>ring-ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longcroft</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>platform</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryfield Plantation</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>platform</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mie Loch</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motspeebie</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>at least 3</td>
<td>ring-ditch</td>
<td>timber</td>
<td>platform</td>
<td>(over rampart)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Rig</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ring-ditch</td>
<td>ring-ditch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poatholin Hill</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>at least 2</td>
<td>ring-groove</td>
<td>ring-groove</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>platform</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw Hill, Callan</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>timber</td>
<td>timber</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanawhills</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>at least 3</td>
<td>ring-groove</td>
<td>ring-groove</td>
<td>ring-groove</td>
<td>(over rampart)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bank</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>platform</td>
<td>platform</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kidston</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>platform</td>
<td>scoops</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westloch House</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>platform</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehill</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>timber</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Meldon</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3 (?),</td>
<td>ring-groove</td>
<td>ring-groove</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>ring-groove</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>ring-groove</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worrn Hill</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ring-ditch</td>
<td>timber</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ill. 8.5: Roundhouse sequences for discussion on these differences see section 9.4.)
3.4.1. Roundhouse sequences from other sites and some radiocarbon dates

Upon excavation of part of the interior at Burnswark, E Dumfriesshire, three superimposed roundhouses were discovered (Jobey 1978; Illus. 86). The earliest timber-built roundhouse was approximately 12 m in external diameter. On top of it was another similar roundhouse, 6.5 m in external diameter. A ring-groove roundhouse was positioned on top of it and it had 11 m in external diameter. On top were ring-groove roundhouses with 13.5 m and 11.5 m in external diameter (Jobey 1978, 77-78). The relative sequence of them is not clear. Some possible evidence that at least one of the roundhouses was occupied during the 2nd century AD was found (ibid., 78).

Illus. 86. E Dumfriesshire, Burnswark, roundhouse sequence (From: Jobey 1978, Plate VII)

Some of the dates available for the ring-groove roundhouses are listed on the Illus. 87. Another settlement with a sequence of ring-groove roundhouses was excavated at Long Knowe, E Dumfriesshire (Mercer 1981; the site is not included in detailed analyses of this thesis). Long Knowe was enclosed by a bank and a ditch with additional palisade on the W and NW side. Within ten roundhouses were discovered (Illus. 90). No dates are available directly from the roundhouses but two radiocarbon dates derived from the ditch enclosing the site. Primary silts within the ditch were dated to 1200 – 1000 cal BC (GU-1130) and 800 cal BC – 50 cal AD (GU-1131) (Mercer 1981, 71).
Ring-groove roundhouses at Long Knowe show probably seven phases of construction and also some repair of the roundhouses themselves. Two roundhouses may have co-existed at any one time (with up to 7.5 m in diameter), with the last phase of possibly five roundhouses, which were smaller than the earlier ones (with 4 – 6 m in diameter), being contemporary (Mercer 1981).

There are no direct dates available for the ring-groove roundhouses at Boonies, E Dumfriesshire but the rampart enclosing them was dated to 100 – 450 cal AD (SRR-300), while the ring-groove roundhouses in the interior show at least five phases of construction (Illus. 88, 89 and below). At least some of them, if not all, can probably be dated to this period. The roundhouse sequence at Boonies (Illus. 88, 89) shows that the earliest roundhouses were from 8.5 – 9.5 m in external diameter, with later, bigger roundhouses approx. 10.5 m in external diameter. The latest phase is probably represented by several smaller roundhouses, 7 – 8 in external diameter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date BC (cal)</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Knowe, Peeblesshire</td>
<td>1800 - 1100 BC</td>
<td>GU-1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1550 - 900 BC</td>
<td>GU-1012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1450 - 800 BC</td>
<td>GU-1011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1300 - 500 BC</td>
<td>GU-1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rispain Camp, Wigtownshire</td>
<td>100 - 550 BC</td>
<td>GU-1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>360 - 80 BC</td>
<td>GU-1627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>790 - 390 BC</td>
<td>GU-1628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200 - 800 BC</td>
<td>GU-1166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illus. 87. Radiocarbon dates of some of the sites with the ring-groove roundhouses (dates for Broxmouth, periods VI and VII see Illus. 82; dates for Boonies and Long Knowe, see above)
Illus. 88: E Dumfriesshire, Boonies, ring-groove roundhouse sequence, the last period of occupation is coloured brown (From: RCAHMS 1997, Fig. 148)

Illus. 89: E Dumfriesshire, Boonies, ring-groove roundhouse sequence (From: Jobey 1974, Fig. 6)
Another type of roundhouse that shows a long time span is the ring-ditch roundhouse. This type is, therefore, similar to the ring-groove roundhouse, not chronologically distinctive of the roundhouses but probably only representing an architecturally different style of building. There are some indications of different styles in the group of the ring-ditch roundhouses, which could be more chronologically isolated from the others (see below and section 2.6.).

It has been noted by L. Macinnes that there could be more different types of ring-ditch roundhouses, which may imply different dates (Macinnes 1982b, 32). Different types of ring-ditches (which are not the same as types detected in this thesis, see section 2.6.) have been identified at the excavations of the multi-period unenclosed site at Kintore, Aberdeenshire (Alexander 2000b; Cook 2001a, 12). These have been categorised in two groups, one having post-holes outside the ring-ditch and the other one in the interior, the first
group being dated to c. 1800-800 BC and the second one to 800-50 BC (Cook 2001b, 2). Unfortunately the lack of excavations in the studied area does not allow a categorisation of ring-ditch structures in this way. Only one ring-ditch structure at Glenachan Rig, Peebleshire was excavated; this had post-holes within the ring-ditch. Ring-ditch roundhouses from Broxmouth, E Lothian, have post-rings within the ring-ditches and an outer wall line (Reynolds 1982, 49). They all have almost 17 m in external diameter and the ditches are 2-3.5 m wide.

Moreover, Kintore shows two distinctly different groups of ring-ditch roundhouses, which could indicate different uses. There, only smaller ring-ditch roundhouses with post-holes outside the ring-ditch show signs of hearths (e.g. Structure 77 in Cook 2001). Other excavated examples of ring-ditch roundhouses throughout Scotland show most of the paving at the entrances and within the ring-ditch, while inside space rarely includes a hearth and usually does not show any signs of paving. Very similar occurrence is present at ring-groove roundhouses (Long Knowe, E Dumfriesshire for example, in: Mercer 1981).

As mentioned before, some indication of possible different types of ring-ditch roundhouses can in fact be seen in the studied areas and possible subcategories of ring-ditch roundhouses were already discussed (sections 2.2.2., 2.4.2. and 2.6.; see also Chapter 9).

It is only at Mire Loch, Berwickshire, where it is possible to observe multiple phases of stone-walled roundhouses. Earlier stone-walled roundhouses are up to 2 m bigger than the later one. A similar picture can be seen at roundhouse 4 at Broxmouth (Hill 1982b, 173, Fig. 9).

3.5. Discussion

It was shown in this chapter that sites of similar shapes or construction techniques and particular types of roundhouses do not belong to a single dating horizon. Instead, their time span is much longer and the relative sequences differ from site to site. Attempting broad chronological patterns does therefore not bring much success and still comes to the same conclusions as the Hownam sequence 60 years ago. Hence, the critique of obsession with the rampart sequences and not observing sites in more details (Clarke 2001, 295-296). It is necessary to observe local chronologies, perhaps on a site-to-site basis. These indicate that
CHAPTER 4: THE ENCLOSED EXPERIENCE

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter, enclosed sites will be observed within the landscape surrounding them. It will investigate some of the possible roles of enclosed sites, which were considered in previous studies of hillforts, such as their defensiveness and the factor of prestige. Additionally, this chapter will study how later prehistoric enclosed sites were built in a way to achieve the most from their surroundings. The importance of landscape, as defined by the people settling it, will be emphasized throughout the chapter.

Illus. 91: The landscape of Peebleshire (chevaux de frise from Cademuir 2b visible in foreground)

Once one creates a classification of a certain feature, there is a presumption that sites combined in one type have similar functions. This study of the enclosed sites is an attempt to observe sites from a different perspective; one that does not follow previously set typologies and, therefore, creates a space to observe later prehistoric sites from a freer, and consequently, wider perspective. The typology of enclosed sites based purely on shape, area and altitude, as created by the RCAHMS, does not provide a full picture, given the variety of different landscapes present in S Scotland. In an attempt to find a fresh view on the problem of later prehistoric settlement patterns, it seems more appropriate to consider features such as the areas of enclosed sites, their rampart appearance, entrance locations and the internal settlement evidence, together with landscape features in their vicinity.
The importance of the immediate topography of enclosed sites cannot be emphasized enough. Yet, this is rarely considered RCAHMS Inventories very rarely produce drawings with contours. The most frequently referred work on later prehistoric settlement patterns in S Scotland (Harding 1982) produced only one site plan with contours (Halliday 1982, 81, fig. 4). Other studies are not even that generous. Even the two recently-published volumes on the Iron Age in Britain do not provide many plans with contours or discussions of the landscape near the enclosed sites (Haselgrove, Moore 2007; Haselgrove, Pope 2007).

Apart from the enclosed sites themselves, I will also consider parts of them and their possible connection to the nearby landscape. The first analysis is of the entrances of enclosed sites. This is based on the results of A. Fox’s study of the enclosed sites of S Britain. She clearly noted the importance of entrance locations when she stated that some of them “provide an approach of dignity to the principal enclosure” (Fox 1961, 45). Although this thought is a very attractive one, it was never developed further. Three decades later M. Parker Pearson, A. Oswald and others started to explain orientations of entrances to enclosed sites as well as roundhouse entrances as a result of cosmological and symbolic practices (Oswald 1997; Parker Pearson 1996; Parker Pearson, Richards 1994). Many publications still quote this hypothesis (e.g. Hamilton, Manley 2001; Hill 1995) without any mention of the nearby landscape. It is only recently that this has been questioned and different possible explanations have been suggested (sections 2.5. and 4.5.)

Entrance orientations are not widely considered in studies of settlement evidence. Where the entrance orientation is considered it is with almost no exception accepted that:

a) entrances point towards what in the past were thought to be important mountains (Ralston 2006, 41-42)

b) entrances point towards other hillforts (Ralston 2006, 40-41) or

c) cosmological/ symbolic practices are the motive for the particular orientation.

More than one answer is possible while questioning the orientations. Therefore I explore another possibility in this chapter, where I look for functional explanations as to why entrances were positioned where they were, how they looked and why they looked the way they did. I consider the entrances of enclosed sites and roundhouses within, trying to connect the two with each other and with the surrounding landscape. I also observe monumental/impressive entrances (Chapter 5) of enclosed sites and attempt to find
explanations for their construction. It is expected that this will give some information for consideration of the landscape surrounding later prehistoric enclosed sites in future studies.

In order to find answers to the subjects mentioned above, Chapter 4 is divided into several sections. The first section (4.2.) deals with enclosed site entrance orientations in order to recognise any possible patterns. After that, I look at entrances within their immediate landscape (section 4.3.) and consider the approach to the sites and nearest water resources as possible reasons for the entrance orientations. I then continue with the observation of entrance locations of settlement evidence within the sites (section 4.4.) and their connection to the surrounding landscape and entrances of the enclosed sites.

4.2. Enclosed site entrance orientation

Here, the whole of the enclosed site evidence is observed, regardless of the landscape setting. Data examined and presented here are based on Appendices 1-3. There, detailed tables of the data interpreted are presented for each individual site. The purpose of this study is to determine if any preferred orientations exist in particular areas, to compare the areas between themselves and with other similar studies which have been done in other regions of Britain (Hamilton, Manley 2001; Hill 1995; Moore 2006).

4.2.1. Peeblesshire

The exact number of entrances and entrance orientations could be determined for 190 enclosed sites. Out of these, 155 (81.6 %) had one entrance, 32 had two entrances (16.8 %) and three had three entrances (1.6 %). The number of entrances was not dependent on the enclosed areas, the rampart construction or the presence of settlement evidence (see Appendix 1.1). However, most of the enclosed sites with one entrance occur in somewhat lower areas (range of 171 - 427 m OD, average 296 m OD) than enclosed sites with two (range of 217 - 432 m OD, average 327 m OD) or three (range of 310 - 365 m OD, average 347 m OD) entrances (Illus. 92).

5 Multiple entrances are considered in section 5.3.
Illus. 92: Peeblesshire, number of entrances vs. the altitudes of the enclosed sites

**ORIENTATION**

Entrances point in all directions, with most pointing towards the NE, E, SW and the W.

Illus. 93: Peeblesshire, enclosed site entrance orientations
4.2.2. Berwickshire

It was possible to determine the number of entrances and entrance orientations for 70 enclosed sites. Of these, 52 (74.3 %) had one entrance, 15 (21.4 %) had two entrances, two (2.9 %) had three entrances and one (1.4 %) four entrances.

The number of entrances does not seem to be dependent on the rampart construction or the presence of settlement evidence. One entrance occurs at altitudes in range of 40 - 326 m OD, with the average being 196 m OD. Two entrances occur in altitudes in range of 105 - 372 m, with the average of 226 m OD. Three ramparts occur at 174 m OD and 210 m OD and four ramparts occur at 331 m OD.

More than one entrance can be seen at 18 sites (Illus. 94). Of these, 15 have ramparts in good enough condition to be able to measure the internal area and nine of these are bigger than 0.4 ha (60 % of the total assemblage). Out of 18 sites with more than one entrance, 12 are enclosed with two or more ramparts (66.7 %) (see Appendix 2.1).
**ORIENTATION**

Entrances to enclosed sites point in all directions, with most of them orientated towards the E, SE, SW and the W.

![Diagram showing entrance orientations](image)

Illus. 95: Berwickshire, enclosed site entrance orientations

### 4.2.3. E Dumfriesshire

There are 105 enclosed sites in the sample with preserved entrance locations. Out of these, 91 (87%) had one entrance and 14 (13%) had two entrances.

Enclosed sites with two entrances are located on higher locations than those showing only one entrance; the average altitude of enclosed sites with one entrance is 194 m (range of 20 - 330 m OD) compared to an average for enclosed sites with two entrances of 229 m OD (range of 100 - 300 m OD) (Illus. 96). The number of entrances is not dependent on the ramparts, appearance or on the internal settlement evidence. Two entrances occur at five sites (35.7% of all sites with more than one entrance) enclosing areas of 0.4 ha or more.
Illus. 96: E Dumfriesshire, number of entrances vs. the altitudes of the enclosed sites

**ORIENTATION**

Entrances point in all directions, with most of them facing towards the E, SE, SW and the W.

Illus. 97: E Dumfriesshire, enclosed site entrance orientations
4.2.4. A comparison of the evidence

The analysis presented here intentionally ignores the landscape positions of the enclosed sites. Instead, only entrance locations are observed. With this, I deliberately follow the type of study of entrance orientations, made by Oswald (1997) and Parker Pearson (1996), which is so often quoted without questioning it.

COMPARISON OF THE ENCLOSED SITE ENTRANCES FROM PEEBLESShIRE, BERWICKSHIRE AND E DUMFRIESShIRE

Illus. 98 shows the percentage of enclosed site entrance orientation in each of the counties researched. The five most commonly used and the least used orientation in each county are highlighted. A great similarity between the counties exists in preferable orientations. Data from Berwickshire and E Dumfriesshire are identical and Peeblesshire shows some variation. It is possible that this dissimilarity is due to Peeblesshire's undulating terrain, which is more dynamic than the other two areas (see Illus. 3-5). This will be tested later. A bigger difference can be seen with observing the least used orientation. This is the NNW in Peeblesshire, the WNW and SSW in Berwickshire and the NNE in E Dumfriesshire.
This study of entrance locations considers sites whose geographically undulating landscape could play an important role in approaching/leaving the enclosed site. The main question of this study is to observe if the immediate terrain and water resources (burns, rivers, lochs) nearby had any important role in choosing the entrance position. I will also consider other potential variables which could be important in choosing the entrance orientation, such as other sites in the vicinity and significant peaks. Only enclosed sites with clearly visible entrances are included in this study.

Multi-period sites are not a great help. Successive phases almost without exception respect the entrance location/access route of the earliest phase and follow the same or a very similar line of approach (Chapter 2). The perfect study case for this is Gibb’s Hill, E Dumfriesshire, where at least six successive phases of enclosed site are present. Although all phases show
different rampart construction, enclosed areas of different sizes and are not set directly above one another, the great majority maintain the entrance position of the earliest enclosed site. It is not known if this is because of convenience; early entrances were connected to the paths coming towards the enclosed sites and the ground for the entrance was already prepared there, or because the same orientation was important and all the phases indicate a significant continuity in concept. The answer to this is not clear and therefore, only the earliest phase of the multi-period enclosed sites with a visible entrance location was used for this analysis.

There are 157 enclosed sites (68 from Peeblesshire, 37 from Berwickshire, 52 from E Dumfriesshire) in the research area where topography could play an important role in choosing the location of the entrances. Other sites were built on a fairly flat terrain, where access to the site or to the water would be easy from any direction. These were not included in this analysis.

These 157 sites were examined, observing local topography and closest water resources, as well as enclosed sites near by. The results enabled me to put enclosed sites in several different groups according to the locations of their entrances. If there are multiple entrances visible at one site, the site is put in a group where at least one of the entrances points towards water or the easiest approach/flat area. The sites listed for each group are those where the entrance orientation most obviously points towards water/easy approach/unknown. The entrances usually do not point towards water and easy approach, but when they do, the site is classed in a group towards water. This is due to several discussions on easy approach later on in the text (Chapters 7-10) and the sites which do not obviously point towards the easiest approach could spoil the accuracy of those discussions.

**GROUP 1- ENCLOSED SITES WITH ENTRANCES ORIENTATED TOWARDS THE CLOSEST WATER RESOURCE**

Enclosures forming Group 1:

- Peeblesshire: Black Meldon 1; Burnetland; Canada Hill; Candyburn; Cardon; Chester Rig, Cardon 1; Chester Rig, Glen 1; Clashpock Rig; Drochil Hill; Gallowberry Wood; Glenachan Rig; Goseland Hill; Green Hill; Highland Shiel; Hog Hill; Janet’s Brae 2;

---

6 Streams, rivers, springs.
Enclosed sites with at least one of the entrances orientated towards the closest water resource sometimes (38%) include signs of internal settlement evidence (see Illus. 99). The positions of these enclosed sites are mostly set on grounds, which are easily accessible; defensive position (e.g. controlled access to the site, which is usually not possible from all directions) was not the most important factor in choosing locations for these sites. Water resources of all enclosed sites in this group are not more than 300 m away from enclosed settlements, with the average being 210 m. If enclosed sites are located close to each other, it is noticeable that they did not use the same water resource if possible (e.g. Orchard Rig 1; Orchard Rig 2; Orchard Rig 3; see section 7.3.3.). If these enclosed sites were contemporary, this could indicate the arrangement of space around them. If not, it seems that the memory of locations of earlier enclosed sites was present while building a new enclosed site (see living ancestor in section 10.3.; also Brück 1999).

GROUP 2- ENCLOSED SITES WITH ENTRANCES ORIENTATED TOWARDS THE EASIEST APPROACH/FLAT AREA (58 sites)

Enclosed sites forming Group 2:

- Peeblesshire: Blyth Bank Hill 1; Blyth Hill; Cademuir Hill 1; Caerlee 1; Callands; Cardrona; Dead Side 1; Drea 1; Easter Dawyck 1; Glenwhappen Rig; Hamildean Hill; Hammer Knowe 2; Helm End 1; Hillsdie Knowe 2; Kerr’s Knowe; Kingeddoors 2; Kittlegairly Burn; Law Park Plantation; Lour; Milkieston Rings 1; Muirburn 1; Northshield Rings 1; Quarter Wood Side; Rachan Hill; Ring Knowe; Stanhope 1; Syke Hill; Tor Hill, Kailzie; Tripans Knowe; Whiteside Rig 1
Enclosed sites with the entrance orientated towards the easiest approach sometimes (61%) show internal settlement evidence (see Illus. 99). They were mostly located on higher areas than the enclosures forming Group 1. The average distance of this group of enclosures from the closest water resource is 420m.

Although these enclosed sites sometimes have streams nearby, the entrances do not seem to be connected with water resources. Instead, they point towards a flat area in front of the enclosed site. This brings two possible explanations:

- **looking from within the enclosed site**
  There was a flat area in front of the enclosed site, which could potentially be used in the same way as a space within the enclosed site if necessary, *e.g.* gatherings or similar.

- **coming towards the enclosed site**
  Approach to the enclosed site was easy. This suggests that the enclosed site probably did not have a primary defensive role but was intended to allow people to come to and from it as easily as possible. These enclosed sites were provided with an "approach of dignity" (Fox 1961, 45; Chapter 6).

Enclosed sites forming Group 2 have, generally, more lines of ramparts around them and more entrances (see Appendices for details of individual sites). These features make them look more impressive than the other enclosed sites.

This group contains some of the biggest enclosed sites in the study areas, such as Cademuir 1 and Whiteside Rig 1, both in Peeblesshire, Duns Law 1 and Kirktonhill, both in Berwickshire. In addition, most of the enclosed sites of this group have ramparts built in a way that made it possible to see the interior from a distance.
Enclosed sites forming Group 3:

- Peeblesshire: Castle Hill; Hallmanor 1; Harehope 1; Harehope 3; Harehope Rings; Henderland Hill 1; Henry’s Brae; Lady Blair Plantation; Mill Rings;
- Berwickshire: Big Chesters, Bowshiel 2; Blackchester 1; Blythe; Bowerhouse; Bowshiel 2; Cockburn East 2; Cockburn Law 3; Fernycastle; Edin’s Hall 1; Marygoldhill Plantation 1; Marygoldhill Plantation 3; Millars Moss Reservoir; Pilmuir; Tollishill Dod; Trabrown; Westloch House
- E Dumfriesshire: Auchendona Hill; Beattock Hill 1; Beattock Hill 2; Beattock Hill 3; Beattock Hill 4; Benpath; Bessie’s Hill 2; Boreland of Dryfe; Gibb’s Hill 1; Granton; Haw Birren; Knock Hill 1; Mid Hill; Peat Hill 2; Potholm Hill; Saucie Sike; Stidriggs 1; Whitstone Hill; Yards Rig

Entrances to these enclosed sites are positioned in a way which is hard to explain by considering the surrounding landscape. Entrances were not orientated towards easiest access nor turned towards the closest water resource. The best example here is the enclosed site at Henry’s Brae, Peeblesshire, where the only entrance to the enclosed settlement is on the steep W side of the hill, although there is a water resource close by and a much easier approach on the N and S side.

There is no consistent pattern to be seen in the compass orientation of enclosed site entrances within this group. Most of the enclosed sites which belong to this group have their entrances orientated down the hill, but some have their entrances facing up the hill. This can be particularly well seen in E Dumfriesshire (e.g. Boreland of Dryfe; one of the entrances at Mosspebble).

There are 42% of enclosed sites from this group that are enclosed settlements (Illus. 99).

Ralston’s idea on the orientation of entrances towards other important sites in the vicinity (Ralston 2006, 40-41) does not seem to fit here. The only possible enclosed sites which follow this are Hallmanor in Peeblesshire, where one of the entrances is orientated towards Ring Knowe, and Edin’s Hall 1 in Berwickshire, where the entrance is turned towards the enclosed site at Cockburn Law 1.
The question of intervisibility is in any case problematic. Although other sites near by can be seen today, it is not known what the environment surrounding the enclosed sites looked like in the past. It could be that the trees did not allow a view to the other sites. Moreover, it is not certain that the sites were contemporary. We could also argue that some of the entrances were positioned towards the older enclosed sites to allow the link to the ancestral site. However, there is no evidence as to which site was earlier and which one later, so the orientation towards the older enclosed site cannot be demonstrated due to the lack of chronology.

Moreover, it is sometimes clear that entrances of some of the enclosed sites intentionally point away from other enclosed sites near by (e.g. Beattock Hill 1, Beattock Hill 2, Beattock Hill 3, Beattock Hill 4; Bessie’s Hill 1, Bessie’s Hill 2; Brieryshaw Hill 1, Brieryshaw Hill, all examples taken from E Dumfriesshire, but see section 6.3.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of roundhouse</th>
<th>Percentage of enclosed settlements within the group (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber-built</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-groove</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-ditch</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone-walled</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illus. 99: Percentage of visible settlement evidence within the three groups of enclosed sites

Illus. 99 shows the percentage of enclosed settlements with different types of roundhouses within each group. Some interesting observations can be made on the basis of it. While making this analysis I expected enclosed sites with water resources near by (Group 1) to be permanent settlements. Results show that 62% of enclosed sites from this group do not show any internal settlement evidence. This could be because they were settled perhaps on a temporary or seasonal basis, maybe with roundhouses built so that did not leave any surface traces (Harding 2004, 294). Another possible explanation could be that the entrance
orientation towards the nearest water resource is linked to the symbolic practices of later prehistory and the sites were visited occasionally and not lived in. However, it would be hard to ignore the fact that the proximity of water would not be one of the most important factors in choosing a location for settlement.

In contrast, most of the enclosed sites forming Group 2 were at first thought to be sites which were maybe used for gatherings (Ralston 2006, 19). But only 39 % are shown as ‘empty’, with no visible internal settlement evidence, which shows that activity within these sites was much more intense than previously thought.

Entrances of enclosed sites forming Group 3 do not show any obvious pattern in choosing the locations of entrances. There are 58 % of the enclosed sites from Group 3 which do not show signs of internal settlement evidence. This maybe shows that less than half of them were more permanently occupied. The others could be occupied on a temporary basis or were not used as settlements at all. Moreover, 15 % of Group 3 shows signs of ring-groove roundhouses within them, which is considerably more that the other two groups. This could be an indication that some of these sites are earlier than the sites forming Group 1 and Group 2 (based on the radiocarbon dates for ring-groove roundhouses Chapter 4). Some of the features in the landscape, where entrances of these enclosed sites were pointing towards (e.g. places important to the later prehistoric people), cannot be seen or recognised anymore. It is also possible that important features to which entrances were oriented were different in later periods.

4.4. Being inside the enclosed site

In this part of the thesis, I consider enclosed settlements and the contained roundhouses as one unit, connected with the surrounding landscape and other enclosed sites near by. Only enclosed settlements and roundhouses with clear entrance positions were used for this study (22 sites). Possible patterned \textsuperscript{7} interior of enclosed settlements will be observed in Chapter 7.

Enclosed settlement interiors show several different types of patterning:

\textsuperscript{7} The term ‘patterned’ in this thesis means that the interior of enclosed settlements was consciously patterned. This does not necessarily mean that the structures were contemporary but that other features near by were considered while building them.
• Entrances of roundhouses are orientated towards the entrances of the enclosed settlement (Illus. 100, 101)

Sites forming this category (7 sites):

Peeblesshire: Easter Dawyck 2; Orchard Rig 2; Tor Hill, Kailzie; Stanhope dun
Berwickshire: Edin’s Hall 2
E Dumfriesshire: Beattock Hill 2; Broomhillbank Hill 3; Stanshiel Rig

Illus. 100: E Dumfriesshire, Stanshiel Rig (From: RCAHMS 1997, Fig. 58), orientation of roundhouse entrance towards the entrance of the enclosed settlement
Entrances to roundhouses were located pointing down the hill (Illus. 102-105) irrespectively of the location of the settlement entrances.

Sites forming this category (8 sites):

Peeblesshire: Black Meldon 2; Black Meldon 3; Cardon; Drumelzier Ford; Easter Dawyck 2; Glenachan Rig; Hartree Hills
Berwickshire: West Addiston.
E Dumfriesshire: /

This type is present within enclosed settlements that are not densely settled. It is also present where roundhouses were unenclosed (e.g. Huskie Rig, Green Knowe). As a good-quality example, the excavated enclosed settlement at Glenachan Rig may be mentioned (Feachem 1959, 15-24). Here the entrance of the excavated roundhouse (a post-built ring-ditch house) is located down the hill, towards NW. This would presumably make drainage easier. The entrance to the enclosed settlement is located on the E side, towards the closest water resource.
Illus. 102: Peeblesshire, Glenachan Rig (From: RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, fig. 16): orientation of roundhouse entrances down the hill

Illus. 103: Peeblesshire, landscape position of Glenachan Rig (From: PASTMAP)
Another good example is the multi-period enclosed settlement at Easter Dawyck 2 with stone-walled roundhouses. The enclosed settlement entrance is located on the site of the entrance to the earlier enclosed site (towards the WSW), and orientated towards the closest water resource. Entrances to roundhouses are all orientated down the hill, towards the W.

Illus. 104: Peeblesshire, Easter Dawyck 2 (From: RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, fig. 94), orientation of roundhouse entrances down the hill.

Illus. 105: Peeblesshire, landscape position of Easter Dawyck (From: PASTMAP)
• If the interior was densely settled and levelled than roundhouses were usually placed in rows. Most commonly, they would be located on either side of the access route (Illus. 106-109).

Sites forming this category (three sites):

Peeblesshire: Black Meldon 1; Chester Rig, Cardon 2; Charge Law Plantation 2
Berwickshire: /
E Dumfriesshire: /

This is especially noticeable in those cases where it is likely that all the roundhouses were contemporary and no roundhouses of other possible phases disrupt the pattern. It is also possible that the enclosed settlements were long-lived, with the memory of a 'living house', a term defined by D.W. Bailey (1990). He suggests that the roundhouse needs to be observed as an active participant in the community, just like any human being.

Roundhouses had a variety of different roles while used, and are argued to have a lifecycle (ibid. 28). When the roundhouse was either abandoned or burnt, its position was remembered (ibid.) and therefore newly built roundhouses respected the positions of older ones.

The interior of the enclosed settlement at Black Meldon 1 is almost flat, and entrances to the roundhouses are not dependent on slopes. The enclosed settlement entrance is orientated towards the nearest water resource, and the access route can be followed from the entrance to the interior. The entrances of the roundhouses are dependent on the access route and roundhouses are located in equal distances from one another and from the access route in two lines on either side of it. The route runs line SSW-NNE, while the entrances to roundhouses are located on their S/SSW side. This means entering the roundhouse from the access route was easy but at the same time roundhouses had some privacy as their interior could not be seen while walking on the path. Roundhouses also had some private space in front of them.
Illus. 106: Peeblesshire, Black Meldon 1 (From: RCAHMS 1967, vol.1, fig. 76), orientation of roundhouse entrances towards a path with some private space left in front of each roundhouse.

Illus. 107: Peeblesshire, landscape position of Black Meldon 1 (From: PASTMAP)
The land of the interior of the enclosed settlement at Chester Rig, Cardon 3 falls slightly from SE towards NW. The access route follows this; a second access route runs from E towards NW and joins the first by the entrance, which is located on the side of easiest access. The entrances to roundhouses are positioned towards these routes. Again, it is possible to notice that one roundhouse has its entrance placed slightly away from the path. The other two roundhouses have their entrances placed towards the street.

Illus. 108: Peeblesshire, Chester Rig, Cardon 3 (From: RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, fig. 88), orientation of roundhouse entrances towards a path

Illus. 109: Peeblesshire, landscape position of Chester Rig, Cardon (From: PASTMAP)
More possible examples of this type of patterning can be listed here. For example, the land in the interior of the enclosed settlement at Worm Hill falls slightly in the direction from NNE towards SSW. The access route runs roughly vertical to this, in the direction from W towards NE, and has roundhouses located on either side. A second path runs to the S of the first one, almost parallel to it. Roundhouses are located only on one side; the other was taken up by a rampart. Another good example are timber-built roundhouses at Glenrath 1, Peeblesshire, which are all positioned on both sides of the access route. Similar patterns can be seen at Hopetterick Burn, Caerlee 1 and Torykneis, The Common, all in Peeblesshire. Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine the entrance locations of the roundhouses within without excavations.

- There is a small group of sites (five sites), which show clearly-defined space that each roundhouse/group of roundhouses utilized within the enclosed settlement.

Sites forming this group:

Peeblesshire: Chester Rig, Glen 3; Glenrath Hope; Hog's Knowe; Meldon Burn 2
Berwickshire: Edin's Hall 3
E Dumfriesshire: /

All these enclosed settlements contained stone-walled roundhouses. The area of each roundhouse/group of roundhouses was determined either by yards or by slight partition walls (Illus. 110-113) within the enclosed settlement. Sometimes partition walls stand on their own and more substantial ramparts around the settlement were not necessary.

Illus. 110: Peeblesshire, Glenrath Hope (From: RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, fig.174)
Yards in front of each roundhouse/group of roundhouses are clear at the enclosed settlement at Hog’s Knowe. Here, one clear group of roundhouses, sharing one yard is clearly visible.
Illus. 112: Peeblesshire, Hog's Knowe (From: RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, fig. 176), entrance orientations of a group of roundhouses, sharing a yard

Illus. 113: Peeblesshire, landscape position of Hog's Knowe (From: PASTMAP)
4.5. Discussion

**APPRAOCH TO THE ENCLOSED SITE**

Enclosed site entrance orientations show a significant connection with the surrounding landscape. There are 157 sites, where the topography could play an important role in their approach. Other sites were positioned on a terrain where the access was easy from any direction; these were not included in the analysis. On the basis of the study of the sites approach it is possible to assume at least two different roles for enclosed sites.

Group 1 is based on enclosed sites that were located close to water resources. These were perhaps used for everyday agricultural activities.

The main concern for the location of enclosed sites, which form Group 2, was prominent locations and easy access to them. A prominent location is seen as one which would be easy to remember. This can be especially well observed in flatter Berwickshire, where most of the enclosed sites forming Group 2 are set close to confluences of rivers, big river bends or other distinctive positions such as peaks in the landscape (see section 4.3. for list of sites and Appendix 4 for their landscape positions). These sites usually show entrance features which were not necessary from a functional point of view (Chapters 5 and 7). Instead, they form part of an impressive approaching experience (*ibid.*).

From this we might expect that enclosed sites forming Group 1 would show more internal settlement evidence. Instead, 62% of them appear 'empty'. Yet this need not be an indication that there were no roundhouses within, as it is not hard to build a roundhouse that leaves only little marks on the ground (Harding 2004, 294). This percentage may only be a sign that enclosed sites forming Group 1 were short-lived and therefore indications of roundhouses are scarce.

Sites forming Group 2, on the other hand, show a higher percentage of internal settlement evidence, which perhaps argues against usage of the sites only for gatherings. Most of these enclosed sites were perhaps permanently occupied.
“Crucially there can be no single correct interpretation of the meaning and function of hillforts or enclosures. Rather they should perhaps be seen as elements of a vocabulary that could be used to express a variety of ideological statements.... We can be fairly sure that hillforts... meant many different things to many different people.”

(Armit 1999, 73-74)

Ramparts must have played an important role throughout the later prehistory. J. Collis emphasized the multiple roles of enclosed sites (Collis 1996) and this chapter supports his hypothesis. A. Fox already noticed that most of the enclosed sites in SW England were not placed on the naturally most defensive positions (Fox 1961). Instead, they were built on places which were easier to get to and sometimes on slopes which would allow the interior of enclosed sites to be seen from a distance, from either lower or higher ground. Interiors of these enclosed sites were not cut off from the outside with ramparts. Instead, they interacted with their surroundings and with the ramparts defined space for different activities, some of them practised inside and some of them outside the enclosed sites.

ENCLOSED SITE/ ROUNDHOUSE ENTRANCE ORIENTATION

The results of the analysis show that the entrances to the enclosed site point to all directions. Most common are orientations towards the E, W, SE, NE and the SW. However, these ‘favourite’ orientations only form 65.2 % of the whole assemblage. The percentage is shown on Illus. 114.

Studies of the hillforts of SE England produced similar results. The preference of entrance orientations there towards the NE – E, the SE, the SW and the W (Hamilton, Manley 2001, Fig. 2; Illus. 117) is identical to the results from areas studied in this thesis.
### Table: Enclosed site entrance orientation and percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSE</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSW</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNW</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNW</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNE</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENE</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **E**: first most commonly used orientation
- **ESE**: second most commonly used orientation
- **SE**: third most commonly used orientation
- **SSE**: fourth most commonly used orientation
- **S**: fifth most commonly used orientation
- **SSW**: least used orientation

**Illus. 114**: Percentage of entrance orientation of all enclosed sites discussed in this thesis

**Illus. 115**: Enclosed site entrance orientations of all sites in Peeblesshire, Berwickshire and E Dumfriesshire
Illus 116: Preferred entrance orientations

Comparing all the areas where studies of entrance locations have been done, we can see that the preferred orientations are the E and the SE. These orientations would fit into the pattern of symbolic orientations (e.g. Hamilton, Manley 2001). There are however variations in the third preferred orientation as well as a big difference in the least preferred orientation. This could perhaps be explained through observation of the landscape characteristics nearby the enclosed sites.

However, even if results of a quick general study of entrance locations look very similar, the preferred entrance orientations are not so clear as it might seem at first. Observing Hill’s presentation of the entrances, we can see that there are 70 entrances (50.4%) that do point towards E-SE; but why do 49.6% of the entrances (69 entrances) point in other directions (Hill 1995, Fig. 27)? This is not discussed in his study. A similar problem can be seen at Hamilton and Manley’s discussion of the entrances. Here, claims of symbolically-based orientation of site entrances are based on unclear evidence. Hamilton and Manley for example state that:

"a unifying characteristic of the hillforts of south-east England is western and eastern orientations of their entrances....this suggests adherence to over-arching 'macro' cosmologies concurrent with period specific traditions of hillfort placement."

(Hamilton, Manley 2001,11)

This claim is supported with the evidence, shown on Illus. 117. However, dominance of E and W orientations is not visible from it.
It is interesting that entrances, either to roundhouses or enclosed sites, are only discussed if they show signs of 'symbolic orientation'. Other orientations are ignored and no one ever questions why those anomalies occurred if sun and mysticism formed such a big part of the building of an enclosed settlement.

Putting the enclosed sites used in Hamilton and Manley's study back into their surrounding landscape, they clearly show that most of the entrances were located either on flat ground or N or S facing hill slopes (for a quick evaluation of this see Hamilton, Manley 2001, Figs. 3, 4 and 7). Results from this analysis prove that the entrances were located on the points of easiest access to the enclosed sites.

Another study which pays no attention to local topography is based on evidence from Wessex (Hill 1995). Here, small enclosed settlements were observed and a claim that cosmologically inspired entrance orientations show that "it was 'proper' to enter such settlements from the East/South-East" (Hill 1995, 51). There are 70 entrances (50.4%) that do point towards E-SE, but why do 49.6% of the entrances (69 entrances) point in other directions (see Illus. 118)? Moreover, observing the topography around the enclosed sites
which were analysed in Hill’s article shows a similar story to the SE England example. Most of the entrance orientations can be explained by easiest access/pointing down the hill.

![Diagram: The Orientation of 139 Non-Hillfort Enclosures in Wessex](image)

Illus. 118: Wessex, entrance orientations of enclosed sites (From: Hill 1995, Fig. 7)

One more example of discussion of symbolism without looking at the landscape locations of the enclosed sites is a study of Severn-Cotswolds, completed by T. Moore (Moore 2006). He concludes that entrance orientations are somewhat different from the ones in Wessex and Southern Britain in general and assigns this to different cultural preference (Moore 2006, 59). However, very good maps included in Moore’s paper show that most of the entrances of enclosed sites follow the line of the easiest approach/closest water resource (compare for example Moore 2006, Fig. 4.2, 4.3, 4.5. with Figs. 4.16. and 4.23).

Illus. 120 shows the entrance locations of enclosed sites in Peeblesshire, Berwickshire and E Dumfriesshire where the immediate terrain is flat with easy access to the nearest water resource and therefore the entrances could be positioned anywhere. Observing entrance locations of enclosed sites located on almost flat terrain, there are four favourite locations, E, W, NE and SW. There are two possible explanations for that, one being the mystical approach, favoured by archaeologists mentioned above. According to this approach, entrances could point towards sunrise and sunset.
The other explanation could be a simpler, functional one. For example, the land in Berwickshire falls from NW towards SE. Even on nearly flat terrains, it is possible to observe the surrounding landscape, which falls slightly in this direction and therefore the easiest way to build a level entrance would be either on NE or SW. This can be seen on a smaller scale in structure entrances of unenclosed settlements, where entrances are mostly located in a way to make the entrance level with the least possible effort (see for example reconstruction in: Feachem 1963, Ill. 26).

Illus. 119: Severn-Cotswolds, later prehistoric enclosed site entrance orientations in two areas (From: Moore 2006, Figs. 4.16. and 4.23)

Illus. 120: Enclosed site entrance orientations, evidence of sites located on flat ground in Peeblesshire, Berwickshire and E Dumfriesshire
ROUNDHOUSE ENTRANCES

It is possible to discuss the symbolic roles of the entrance orientations when only roundhouse entrances are observed and other nearby structures and terrain are ignored (see section 3.5.). But by observing the whole of enclosed settlement, other explanations are possible. It can be suggested that roundhouses on levelled grounds did have their entrances orientated so that they could use the sunlight as much as possible. But undulating landscapes show a different picture. Entrances here follow the landscape, access routes, yards, settlement entrances and other features within enclosed settlements. Enclosed settlements/roundhouses within more hilly landscapes were adapted to their surroundings and made as much as they could from their nearby terrain/other structures in the vicinity. To confirm that something is related to symbolism, a good dataset based on a variety of different landscapes is required. This has not been done yet, but the evidence collated has suggested that symbolism did not play a major role.

I will discuss entrance orientations of the enclosed sites and roundhouses together with their landscape locations in Chapter 6, where further questioning of the cosmological model will occur again (see also section 2.5.).
The analysis of entrance orientations in this chapter has shown that similar trends in enclosed site entrance orientation over wider areas of Britain exist. These directions have previously been explained as symbolic (e.g. Hill 1995). However, observing entrances within their nearby landscape demonstrated that most of the entrances are orientated down the slope where the easiest access to the enclosed site is or towards the closest water resources.

Moreover, roundhouse entrance orientations were also examined. These were similar to those of enclosed sites, and also seen as being symbolic (e.g. Oswald 1997). Comparing roundhouse entrances together with entrances through the ramparts surrounding them and their nearby landscape with studies made in other parts of Britain, two possibilities occur. It can be seen that in flatter areas, such as Berwickshire and S England the entrances could be orientated to get the most of the sun warmth/light. More undulating terrains however, show that the entrances were pointing to achieve the most out of the immediate landscape. Roundhouse entrances are here turned down the hill (perhaps also for better drainage in Scottish weather), towards the entrances through the ramparts enclosing the roundhouses or towards the paths within the sites.

To summarise, there are similarities in the enclosed site/roundhouse entrance orientation, which can be noted on wide areas. Observing these within their nearby landscape shows, that they were positioned in a way to get the most of their immediate terrain. There is a possibility of a symbolic meaning of some orientations, but this cannot yet be confirmed. To validate this hypothesis I would expect percentage of sites/roundhouses to have their entrances oriented towards what seem ‘symbolic orientations’ regardless of their nearby landscape. However, these ‘symbolic orientations’ are not clear anymore as it can be seen from Illustrations that the entrances point in many different directions. It is the authors that choose to discuss only some of these orientations and label them symbolic. I would, therefore, at this point suggest that more analyses on this topic on undulating terrains throughout Britain are made in order to create clearer patterns concerning entrance orientations.
5.1. Introduction

"Its principal defining feature is that its scale and elaboration exceed the requirements for any practical functions that a building is intended to perform."

(Trigger 1995, 119)

What is necessary to make an entrance is a gap in the stretch of rampart and perhaps an additional feature to hold the door. Anything more than a gap and a door is put there for reasons beyond a simple entrance. The entrance is the most vulnerable part of the enclosed site and needs to have additional protection, if defence is an important factor, while building it. Defence cannot be ruled out from the interpretations of entrances with additional stretches of ramparts or other similar features (e.g. Harehope, Peebleshire, in: Feachem 1960). The fact is that many enclosed site entrances all over Europe look impressive and their massiveness indicates that they could be defensive (for some examples see below). However, some of them appear to be massive structures but could, in fact, never actually have to be used as defensive. At Bindon Hill, Dorset, for example, the excavations did not find any sign of a gate at the 13.5 m wide entrance (Ralston 2006, 84; Wheeler 1953, 6-7, Plate 4). Mont Beuvray, Burgundy, France, had an entrance 19 m wide and the reconstructions of gates, made on the basis of excavation, show that defence was probably not the first concern (Ralston 2006, 83-84).

In this chapter, I will observe additional features set at the entrances to enclosed sites. Some of these sites differ from others in more than just an entrance (e.g. size, altitude, line of approach; see Chapters 2 and 4). Some of these sites perhaps had different roles from many of the other, more simply built sites. Are the sites with impressive entrances a sign of communal or private use?  

---

8 Linear earthworks, which may form part of impressive entrances, will be discussed in Chapter 8.

9 Private: used by a small number of people (e.g. family) for everyday survival purpose (e.g. sleeping, food preparation, keeping the animals); communal: used by a large number of people for a purpose that is not crucial for survival, e.g. meetings, fairs.
While observing the impressive entrances, I will also consider if it is possible to detect different roles for these entrances, such as impressive (e.g. Collis 1984; Ralston 2006, 82-84; Sharples 1991), defensive (e.g. Avery 1993; Cunliffe 1971; 2000; Wheeler 1943) or the need to drive the cattle/sheep through safely and easily (Ralston 2006, 66, 68; Wheeler 1953, 7) (see also sections 10.2. and 10.4.).

5.2. Impressive entrances

Enclosed sites with possible impressive entrances (20 sites):

- Peeblesshire: Cademuir 2b; Cademuir 2c; Hamildean Hill; Milkieston Rings 1; Milkieston Rings 2; Upper Kidston 1 (?); White Hill 3; Whiteside Rig 1
- Berwickshire: Cockburn Law 1; Kirktonhill; Pilmuir; Warlawbank
- E Dumfriesshire: Range Castle; Woody Castle

Impressive entrances show additional features, which may not have any other role than to impress. More than one entrance formed only by a gap between the outside and the inside can be seen, for example, at Brendan Hill, Gloucestershire, where trophies of human skulls were maybe displayed at the entrance (Ralston 2006, 120). Other display factors could be perhaps additional structural features of the entrances, which are discussed here.

Impressive entrances emphasize the transition of outer to inner space and may indicate the importance of the inner space and the activities that are practised inside. The transition between the outside and the inside is accentuated much more at sites with impressive entrances than at sites with simple entrances. Monumentalism is seen already in the gateways of Middle Bronze Age settlements, at Boscombe Down East, Wessex (Stone 1936) and Itford Hill, Sussex (Burston, Holleyman 1957), for example. Impressive entrances are present in oppida of continental Europe (e.g. Steinburg bei Römhild, Thuringia (Collis 1984, 69, Fig. 6-3) and Dünsberg bei Giessen, Germany (Collis 1984, 208, Fig. A 12)). Another good example, as noted, is Mont Beuvray, Burgundy, France (Ralston 2006, 82-84), where the entrance was 19m wide; with this width it is unlikely that defence was one of the most important considerations while building it. Entrance locations usually followed the line of the easiest access (e.g. Hrazany, Bohemia (Collis 1984, 126, Fig. 8-16), Titelberg, Luxemburg (Collis 1984, 173, Fig. 10-7)).
Impressive entrances can be seen at enclosed sites all over Britain (e.g. Danebury (Cunliffe 2000 and references), Gussage All Saints (Wainwright 1979), Port Seton (McCullagh, Haselgrove 2000), Maiden Castle (Sharples 1991; Wheeler 1943), Traprain Law (Curle 1914)). Excavations rarely show evidence for attacks on enclosed sites (except Maiden Castle, Dorset, in: Wheeler 1943; see also burning of the gates at Danebury and Broxmouth, in Chapter 10). Therefore, the explanation for the monumentality of some of the enclosed sites should be sought elsewhere. Haselgrove (2001, 55) questions whether British impressive entrances were of a military nature or whether they were built to amaze. J. Collis has suggested the impressive entrances at Gussage All Saints, Maiden Castle, Hambledon Hill and others possibly displayed wealth, power or community identity (Collis 1981, 75; 1996, 90, 110).

Interestingly, nineteenth century analysis of later prehistoric enclosed sites by J. Veitch discusses the massive built rampart and entrances where the approach would be the easiest, and “of course the whole circle would be palisaded” (Veitch 1893, 28). This idea of a monumental entrance, which would be visible by approaching the site and lighter rampart enclosing the rest of it was not discussed in later publications. Consequently, the idea was soon forgotten and RCAHMS Inventories refer to these sites as “unfinished hill-forts” (RCAHMS 1967, vol.1, 28; Feachem 1971; section 8.2.)

A good example here is Hamildean Hill, Peebleshire (Illus. 121, 122). A palisade enclosed the whole circuit of the site, with additional stretches of earth and stone ramparts at the side of the entrance and the side most visible while approaching the enclosed site from the valley below. The massive entrance with a very insignificant palisaded rampart around it would not hold a hostile attack for long. Even if we accept the RCAHMS explanation (RCAHMS 1967, vol.1, 118) that this enclosure was unfinished, a purely defensive purpose for the monumental entrance is still unlikely.

Other issues arise over the defensibility of multiple ramparts. A palisade and an additional stretch of earth and stone rampart at the entrance enclosed Hamildean Hill. It is possible to notice a similar phenomena with additional features on the side of the entrances at Cockburn Law 1, Milkieston Rings, Range Castle, Warlawbank, White Hill, Whiteside Rig and possibly Upper Kidston.
Illus. 121: Peeblesshire, landscape location of enclosed site with possible impressive entrance at Hamlidean Hill (From: PASTMAP)

Illus. 122: Peeblesshire, Hamildean Hill (from RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, Fig. 100). The whole circuit of the site is enclosed by a palisade, with additional stretches of earth and stone ramparts on the E and N side.
All of the sites mentioned, except Cademuir 2, have entrances located on the side of the easiest approach to the enclosed site (Group 2, see section 4.3.). They were all located high above most of the other later prehistoric sites with altitudes ranging from 260 m OD to 405 m OD (average 345 m OD; see Appendices 1-3 for exact altitudes for each site). This is also above the average of the sites forming Group 2. Moreover, apart from Range Castle (0.18 ha) and Milkieston Rings (0.16 ha), these sites are some of the biggest sites in the studies areas. Their ramparts enclose areas from 0.63 ha to 2.61 ha (see Appendices 1-3 for exact measurements of each site). They sometimes show signs of internal timber-built roundhouses.

These features are widespread. They could even be compared to the Acropolis in Athens, Greece. The most important place of the Athenians had spectacular features while approaching it. Getting to the Acropolis itself was an impressive experience, full of additional features that did not have any other function than to amaze the person approaching it. Even today, it is still possible to feel you are approaching a special place. Most of the sites with impressive entrances are very big, and they may represent communal, instead of private places (section 5.1.).
5.2.1. Chevaux de frise

Enclosed sites with chevaux de frise are rare:

- Peeblesshire: Cademuir 2b; Dreva

The chevaux de frise is formed by pointing stones being positioned upright in front of the ramparts of enclosed sites. Pointed pieces of wood instead of stone are sometimes used (e.g. South Barrule, Isle of Man, In: Harbison 1971) but these are rare, perhaps due to preservation. All of the British and Irish enclosed sites with stone chevaux de frise had stone built ramparts, built with dry-stone construction. What is interesting is that none of the enclosed sites with chevaux de frise in Britain show visible internal settlement evidence in the phase when the chevaux de frise was in use (but see section 1.12.2.). They sometimes form rows, but usually seem as they were placed in the ground with no particular order (e.g. Ralston 2006, 85; RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, 27; Simpson 1969, 15). This would confuse the attackers, as they could not move easily through the chevaux de frise (Harbison 1971, 195).

As indicated here, the chevaux de frise is traditionally seen as a form of defence (ibid.) and it is only recently that this role has been questioned based on the chevaux de frise of temperate Continental Europe (e.g. Ralston 2006, 88).

Close examination of some of the British chevaux de frise indicates a great possibility that the stones were positioned in an orderly fashion (see below and Illus. 124, 126, 131), which could be another clue of an additional feature to the impressive approach towards the enclosed sites.
Illus. 124: Wales, Castell Henllys, rows of the chevaux de frise (From: http://www.archaeology.co.uk/ca/timeline/prehistory/castellhenllys/castelh.htm)

It has been said that the stones forming the western chevaux de frise at Kaimes Hill, Midlothian, were placed in the ground randomly (Simpson 1969, 15). Reconsidering the evidence show rows of stones, with a pattern. Rows of stones are placed diagonally if the whole chevaux de frise is observed while approaching the entrance; it gives an impressive approach with the entrance being a focal point (Illus. 125; 126).
Illus. 125: Midlothian, Kaimes Hill, *chevaux de frise* (From: Simpson et al. 2004, Illus. 16)

Horizontal, vertical, diagonal or circular rows of stones can all be seen in *chevaux de frise* in Britain and Ireland. Lines of stones usually follow the shapes of the ramparts. This gives another clue that the *chevaux de frise* was built as an additional impressive feature. Upright stones, together with a paved path running towards the entrance (Carn Alw for example, see Mytum, Webster 1989, 264; Illus. 127) provided a good visual effect with the entrance being the central point.

Illus. 127: Wales, Carn Alw and position of the *chevaux de frise* with the path running through it (From: Mytum, Webster 1989, Fig. 1)

Despite excavations at some of the enclosed sites with *chevaux de frise* in Britain and Ireland, their dating is still questionable. But there is a known relative chronology, which shows that all of the excavated sites with *chevaux de frise* are multi-period and sometimes very short lived. Radiocarbon dates from Castell Henllys in Wales, for example, showed that the multi-period site was built and abandoned in 150 years (I. Ralston, *pers. comm.*). The *chevaux de frise* were built and almost entirely demolished as a later rampart was built on top, and this all happened in a very short period of time. The same can be seen at Pen-Y-Gaer, Wales (Ralston 2006, 86).

At Cademuir 2b, the *chevaux de frise* is visible on the E side of the enclosed site, in the gully close to the rampart (Illus. 130). Approach to the enclosed site from this side is almost flat.
However, this is the side opposite to the entrance, with a massive stone rampart enclosing the site (see Illus. 128). Yet, there is no evidence that the *chevaux de frise* and the rampart would be in contemporary use.
Illus. 128: Peeblesshire, Cademuir 2b: a- remains of a massive rampart close to the *chevaux de frise*; b- *chevaux de frise* E of the enclosure; c- possible remains of *chevaux de frise* W of enclosure
It could be argued that *chevaux de frise* were not necessary at the entrance of Cademuir 2b, due to its very strong natural defence. However, careful examination of the site itself and comparison with other sites make it clear that some of the stones in the ground remarkably resemble stones forming the *chevaux de frise* on the other side of site (Illus. 128). None of the other known examples of *chevaux de frise* were placed only at the back of the enclosed site, leaving the side of the entrance without it, despite the steep terrain. Moreover, if we accept the idea of monumentality being one of the main reasons for *chevaux de frise* in Britain and Ireland, than the ‘annexe’ (Cademuir 2c in Appendices), built on top of the *chevaux de frise* at the entrance of Cademuir 2b looks a lot like the monumental entrances of Crickley Hill in Gloucestershire (Dixon 1994). Maybe we can expect a similar shape of entrance at Cademuir 2b.

Illus. 129 shows the comparison of the two entrances. Apart from being very similar in shape, both are set on flat ground just outside the enclosed sites. In both cases, the immediate landscape is steep and it is not easy to get to the entrance. Without excavation nothing more than speculations can be made for the entrances and the *chevaux de frise* at Cademuir 2b. But even with these speculations it is not easy to suggest that there is a missing constructional phase at this multi-period site. Excavations would be necessary.

However, the *chevaux de frise* at Cademuir 2b is set on the area of the easiest access to the enclosed side, even if there is no entrance there. An almost 10 m wide gap with only one fallen stone visible is set right in the middle of the *chevaux de frise* (Illus. 130). But the multi-period ramparts do not show signs of an entrance on this side in any phase. Perhaps it was part of the enclosed site represented by rampart D today, which is overlaid and destroyed by later phases. The stretch that is still visible on the N side does show a curve, which, if the whole circuit were still be visible today, would enclose an area just in front of the *chevaux de frise* (see Illus. 130). Enclosed site entrances set on the line of easiest access were seen before (section 5.3.). Yet, this possible entrance is not visible and the gap in the *chevaux de frise* could instead indicate destruction in later periods, even if this seems unlikely, while the stones are set so densely to the left and right of it (Illus.130). This is another unfortunate issue, which cannot be answered without excavation.
Illus. 129: Comparison of entrance at Crickley Hill, Gloucestershire (upper; From: Dixon 1994, III.185a) with the entrance of Cademuir Hill 2c (lower; From: RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, Fig. 81)
Path through the *chevaux de frise* has been seen at Carn Alw (Illus. 127). However, the best example here is the one at Burgi Geos, Yell in Shetland. There, a path follows a narrow neck of the promontory, with a row of stones being placed in an even line on one side and lines of *chevaux de frise* on the other. A path between these two artificial features is clearly visible (Illus. 131, 132) and it seems likely that these features were placed there to make access to the enclosed site safer as much as making it look more impressive.
Illus. 131: Shetland, Burgi Geos, Yell, (From: Harbison 1971, Fig. 5)

Illus. 132: Shetland, Burgi Geos, Yell, approaching the enclosed site, row of stones seen on the right and the *chevaux de frise* on the left (From: RCAHMS archive no. SC 596839)
Similarly to Cademuir, the SW *chevaux de frise* at Dreva is located on the side opposite to the entrance of the enclosed site. Unfortunately only a few stones are still in their original position, and any possible order in the stone locations cannot be definitely be determined. The other stretch of the *chevaux de frise* was located on the site of the entrance and demolished by later settlement built over it (x on Illus.133). This is, therefore, another *chevaux de frise*, which was demolished while later structures were built over it on the side of the entrance. The same can be seen at Castell Henllys and possibly at Cademuir (Illus. 130).

![Image](Illus. 133: Peeblesshire, Dreva 1, 2, x with the *chevaux de frise* (From: RCAHMS 1967, vol.1, Fig. 91))

5.3. Multiple entrances

Entrances are the most vulnerable parts of enclosed sites. This is an especially important issue when the ramparts were built to defend the interior. When, however, an easier/ or more impressive approach to the interior is more, or at least as important as a purely defensive role, more than one entrance makes the journey to the interior more straightforward.
There are 365 sites which are in good enough condition to observe their entrance numbers and orientations (sections 4.2.1., 4.2.2. and 4.2.3.). Of them, 66 have two or more entrances, which represents less than one fifth (18.9%) of the whole assemblage.

Enclosed sites with two entrances (59 sites):

- Peeblesshire: Black Meldon 1; Cademuir Hill 1; Camp Law Plantation 2; Cardrona; Dreva 1; Easter Dawyck 1; Gallowberry Wood; Green Hill; Hallmanor 1; Harehope Rings; Helm End 1; Helm End 2; Meldon Burn 4; Middle Hope Rig 2; Milkieston Rings 1; Orchard Rig 1; Parkgatestone Hill; Pirn Wood 1; Pirn Wood 2; Stanhope 3; Syke Hill; The Whaum 2; Tor Hill, Torbank; Waddenshope; White Hill 2; White Hill 3; Whiteside Hill 2; Whiteside Hill 3; Worm Hill; Wormiston Rings
- Berwickshire: Big Chesters, Bowshiel 2; Blackchester 1; Borthwick Quarry; Brotherstone; Ewieside Hill 2; Fernyecastle; Greenwood; Grizzlefield, East Rings; Habchester; Longcroft 1; Prestoncleuch; Swallowdean; Tollis Hill 1; Warlawbank; West Addiston
- E Dumfriesshire: Bank Head Hill; Bessie’s Hill 1; Bessie’s Hill 2; Blacklaw Burn; Castle O’Er 1; Castle O’Er 2; Dinwoodies Green 2; Little Hill; Loch Hill; Mosspeebie; Newland Hill 1; Shaw Hill, Calkin; Stidriggs 1; Stidriggs 2

Enclosed sites with three entrances (five sites):

- Peeblesshire: Blyth Hill; Northshield Rings 1; Northshield Rings 2; Woodhouse Hill
- Berwickshire: Hareheugh Craigs
- E Dumfriesshire: /

Enclosed sites with four entrances (one site):

- Peeblesshire: /
- Berwickshire: Cockburn Law 1
- E Dumfriesshire: /

Most of the enclosed sites (59 sites) have two entrances, five sites have three entrances and one enclosed site has four entrances. In Berwickshire and E Dumfriesshire multiple entrances are present only at sites bigger than 0.4 ha. In addition, Berwickshire’s sites with two or more entrances occur at sites with two or more ramparts. Moreover, the data show a
slight difference in the average altitude of sites with different number of entrances (see Illus. 92, 94 and 96).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Size of enclosed site (ha)</th>
<th>Two or more ramparts</th>
<th>Altitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peeblesshire</td>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwickshire</td>
<td>&gt; 0.4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Dumfriesshire</td>
<td>&gt; 0.4</td>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illus. 134: Important factors in building of the enclosed sites with more than one entrance

In addition, more than half of the sites with multiple entrances show signs of internal roundhouses, at least 37 sites are multi-period, 14 have linear earthworks close by, and one has *chevaux de frise* visible at the entrance.

The number of entrances and their orientation has been an important part of studies of enclosed sites in S Britain, where J.D. Hill (1995) shows that double entrances were placed on the E and W side of enclosed sites. The evidence from the studied areas does not confirm this (e.g. Bessie’s Hill I has entrances pointing towards NE and WNW; Harehope Rings has entrances turned towards E and S). Orientation of the entrances was primarily connected to practical reasons (sections 4.3. and 4.5.). When enclosed sites with more than one entrance are located on undulating terrain, at least one of the entrances points towards the route of easiest access. One of the entrances usually points towards the closest water resource.

Berwickshire is the only county which shows a connection between multiple ramparts and multiple entrances. It is possible to suggest that these ramparts may try to represent what the terrain in less flat areas is representing to people approaching the enclosed site. Building multiple ramparts together with multiple entrances does not make much sense from a view of defensiveness (section 5.4.). As discussed in the section on impressive entrances, multiple lines of ramparts could suggest monumentality and a special experience in approaching these sites. Therefore, enclosure of a whole site with multiple ramparts and constructing more entrances means that the enclosed site was approached from more directions and looked equally impressive from every direction of approach.
5.4. Discussion

Some of the entrances show more than just a gap and an additional feature to hold the doorway. On the basis of this it is possible to assume that there were more roles for the entrances than just being simple gaps for a transition between the outside and the inside. The most common of these additional features are:

a) width of the entrance. In many cases the width of the entrance is not certain anymore due to the preservation of the sites. However, excavated examples from Britain and all over Europe (e.g. Ralston 2006, 82-84) give information on some very wide entrances, which can exceed 19 m (e.g. Mont Beuvray, France). These entrances were too wide to have been used only for driving the cattle through them (i.e. the number of cattle used for every day agriculture), for pedestrians or chariots for example. Some of them had a complex system to allow many people coming and leaving through them. Reconstruction of the excavated gate at Mont Beuvray shows an example, where paths for two way traffic and pedestrians were made (Illus. 135). This site had to be a communal site (section 5.1.) where many people were entering and leaving, as it just does not make any sense if it was being used as a private, restricted site. Similar sites can perhaps be seen in the area studied. The similarity they show is an impressive approach and entrance, the sheer internal area and the fact that they have their entrance orientated towards the path of the easiest access to them (for examples see section 5.2.).
Illus. 135: Burgundy, entrance at Mont Beuvray, a- plan of the gateway, b- possible reconstruction (From: Ralston 2006, Illus. 43, 44)

b) additional stretches of ramparts at the entrance, while the circuit of the site is only slightly enclosed. It could be argued here that the additional protection of the most vulnerable part of the enclosed site, *i.e.* the entrance, was necessary. This does not make sense in some of the sites. Some of the sites were overlooked from higher ground (e.g. West Hill, Northumberland, In: Frodsham et al. 2007, 252, 261), or had considerably slighter ramparts encircling them (e.g. Hamildealan Hill). This would be crucial in times of attack as the invader could easily see which part of the ramparts is the weakest. Even if the site is not overlooked or shows additional ‘strong’ defence at the line of easiest approach (e.g. Hamildealan Hill), just a short walk around the ramparts would be enough to find a weak spot.
c) number of entrances. Even if ramparts are multiple and massive, the defensiveness of the site would be jeopardised by multiple entrances. The most impressive example here is Brown Caterthun, Angus with nine entrances. In addition, this site shows more similarities with sites that were, perhaps, used as communal areas (Group 2, section 4.3.; also with impressive entrances, discussed in this chapter): it enclosed more than 2 ha, and its ramparts were set away from the peak of the hill, but deliberately on a slope, so that it was possible to see the interior from the distance (Illus. 136). The nine entrances do not show signs of gates (Ralston 2006, 174), which would, apart from the sheer number of openings in the ramparts, make the site non-defensible. The fact that Brown Caterthun is enclosed by multiple ramparts, makes a question of ramparts being connected to defence rather than visible prestige, less plausible.

Illus. 136: Angus, Brown Caterthun (seen in the background, White Caterthun in the foreground); notice the setting of the ramparts down the slope, which deliberately shows the interior (From: Ralston 2006, 174, Illus. 179)
d) chevaux de frise. The chevaux de frise were explained as a defensive feature at Cademuir 2b and Dreva 1, both Peeblesshire. At Cademuir the chevaux de frise are hidden in the gully and this would present a surprise defence, which would not be visible until the attacker was upon them (RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, 111). Moreover, at both sites the chevaux de frise were positioned at the side of an easy access, which represents a weak point if the defence is necessary. The question that arises here is why would the invader charge towards the massive stone rampart on the side opposite to the entrance? It is true that this side is much flatter than the side where the entrance is, but there is not much land to progress on towards the entrance, even if you do get to the ramparts, which are still so massive today (Illus. 128, 130), that it is hard to imagine attacking from the side where the chevaux de frise is. Moreover, Ralston’s suggestion (pers. comm.) that the chevaux de frise may be used to prevent invaders placing ladders against ramparts does not work here as the chevaux de frise are not placed directly beside the ramparts in most British examples.

Moreover, if we accept the fact that defence was the main purpose of chevaux de frise, who or what would they protect? Even the excavated sites with the chevaux de frise around/in front of them do not show any visible internal settlement evidence. In addition, some show paths going through them and stones which have been organised in an orderly fashion. This proves that the stones were not just put in the ground but some thought has been put into their locations. Stones of the chevaux de frise were therefore not only offering possible protection to the sites but also had a visually notable role while approaching the entrance to the sites.

Studies of other areas indicate similar patterns of impressiveness to those discussed in this chapter. West Hill in Northumberland, for example, has the most visually impressive stretch of rampart constructed at the entrance to the enclosed site, which is not connected with defence (Frodsham et al. 2007, 252, 261). The site can also be overlooked from higher ground (ibid.). Moreover, Gregory Hill, only a short walk away from West Hill, has its entrance orientated towards the easiest access to the enclosed site, while the stretch of ramparts does not follow naturally the most ‘defensive’ contours. Instead it follows the path of easy access. Also, it is at the entrance where ramparts are the slightest, while the most impressive and massive stretch of rampart is positioned on the side facing West Hill. This side is the steepest one to get to the enclosed site, but it also forms part of an impressive approach to it. It has therefore been suggested that the ramparts at Gregory Hill have been
built more for show than for defence (ibid., 254, 261). Moreover, the site was built so that it could be overlooked from higher ground some 80 m to the S.

These are not the only examples where defensiveness of the site was perhaps not the most important issue while building the sites. More similar sites can be seen in the Cheviots; Mid Hill (Frodsham et al. 2007, 254, 261) is overlooked by higher ground a few metres from it, and a similar position is seen at Staw Hill (ibid., 255), while one can see the interior of Yeavering Bell as one approaches (Frodsham, O’Brien 2005).
SUMMARY

The visually impressive approaches to some of the enclosed sites were probably not built only, or primarily, for defence. These sites show additional similarities in approaches to them, such as intervisibility and the sizes of their internal areas. With the data presented in this chapter, it is assumed that a great majority of sites discussed were probably communal structures where people met and not private structures built for individuals or smaller power-groups (section 5.1.). The defensive role of multiple ramparts was questioned, as well as multiple entrances.

Moreover, re-examining the chevaux de frise gives hints of use both as a possible defence but also as visually impressive features, connected to an impressive approach to the sites and perhaps connected with the prestige of the site itself. They would therefore form part of sites and their role in the community instead of being aimed solely towards the protection of the site.

Based on the study made on the impressive entrances and additional features close to them, a slight distinction between defensive and impressive roles can be seen. Multiple entrances, visually ordered rows of stones forming the chevaux de frise and massive ramparts at the entrances with weaker ones on the sides, where approach would also be possible, do not help much to defend the site. Moreover, multiple entrances breaching multiple ramparts endanger sites, as entrances are the most vulnerable features of enclosed sites. In addition, if sites are intervisible, it is easier to make a plan of attack as the most important and the weakest points within enclosed sites are visible.

Every structural feature present at the enclosed sites can be associated with many different usages, the two most often quoted being defence and prestige. A clearer indication of usage of later prehistoric sites could perhaps be distinguished with the examination of the artefacts found in the interiors. This is not aim of this thesis, but quick observation of published excavations show that there is a lot more evidence for prestigious life in the later prehistory than for warfare. The two are not mutually exclusive, but the analysis presented above tips the balance more to a desire to create an impression.
PART TWO:

PLANNING DOMESTIC SPACE AND TAMING THE WILD

"...defences were from the first built by knowledgeable and rational individuals with intelligent purposes."

(Avery 1993, 3)

The main questions in observing the enclosed sites within the landscape are:

- Were the enclosed settlement interiors patterned?
- Are there any indications, which would show enclosed site patterns within the landscape? If yes, can we distinguish different groups, which perceived the landscape around them differently and therefore see variable enclosed site patterns?
- Do boundaries between the enclosed sites/different groups exist? In what form?
- What was the role of linear earthworks in later prehistory?
- What are the anomalies within later prehistoric enclosed site evidence and how can we explain them?
CHAPTER 6: ENCLOSED SITE PATTERNS IN THE LANDSCAPE

6.1. Introduction

From the presentation of the data and detailed analyses shown in previous chapters, I will now turn to more general discussions on the enclosed site patterns. Here I will follow the ideas presented in studies made by Fletcher (1978) and Hillier et. al. (1978). They have noted that societies organise themselves and space around them according to clear and defined codes and rules. As a result, patterns should be visible in all of the landscapes, which societies settle. Therefore, I will observe possible patterns within (6.2.) and between the settlements (6.3.) in this chapter. Patterns that occur could represent signs of different groups settling different areas and organising their space differently. Moreover, organisation of the landscape on a wider scale meant that distinct groups did not feel the need to represent themselves with different styles of building. Patterns could also form several chronologically distinct types. However, it is also possible that no patterns can be detected, especially at small sites (homesteads etc.) and that the interiors and surroundings were organised on a site-to-site level.

Enclosed site ramparts and entrances usually attract discussions in later prehistoric settlement archaeology and are the main target of excavations, while interiors are overlooked (e.g. Avery 1993). The lack of excavations of interiors of enclosed sites could be justified with the vast amount of work necessary for this. These usually mean big projects, long-term excavations and the problems that come with them. Less than 1% of the later prehistoric enclosed sites presented in this thesis were excavated. Therefore, we need to search for different ways of studying the interiors of enclosed sites.

As shown in previous chapters, some of the interiors of the enclosed sites were visible from a distance, from higher or lower grounds. Some ramparts were apparently built only to separate the inside from the outside, perhaps as a sign of the social status of the inhabitants (Harding 2004, 62) or the people, who used that particular site. Entrances, especially monumental entrances, formed an important mental role in the transition between the outside and the inside (McOmish 1999, 118; Chapter 5). In most of the enclosed sites, ramparts were
perhaps only built “to enclose activities” (Collis 1996, 87; Hingley 1990, 96; for different views see Avery 1993; Lock et al. 2003, 123-125; Sharples 1991, 260; also Chapter 9).

Regardless of the reasons for the construction of ramparts, they were built to separate two locations within the landscape. It is therefore necessary to observe the surroundings together with the enclosed sites. No enclosed sites exist alone, separated from everything else in the nearby landscape. One could not exist without the other. This sort of observation is very rarely done in present studies. Moreover, the study suggests that some of the earlier sites were still visible while building later archaeological features. The idea that people perceived the surrounding landscape together with the archaeological features that already existed within the landscape could form a study on its own (e.g. Bradley 2002). It would also require observation and understanding of many different types of sites from different periods. As this is not possible to accomplish due to the time restrictions I have for this thesis, the relationship between the earlier and later monuments is noted but not discussed in-depth. Consequently, several signs of patterned landscape and boundaries within enclosed site patterns will be discussed.

Part Two of this thesis generally observes the interaction between human, enclosed site and landscape. It shows the importance of observing enclosed site evidence in the context of its surrounding landscape. This kind of analysis demonstrates that people in prehistory were a great deal more aware of their surrounding landscape than researches typically show. Basic study of the landscape surrounding the archaeological sites is important and it should form a part of every examination of enclosed site patterns.

6.2. Patterned enclosed settlement interiors (semi-micro level)

In previous chapters I observed enclosed sites and roundhouses within them as separate features. This enabled me to compare particular features within a wide area and to make comparisons of both forms of enclosed sites, enclosures and settlements. Here, I will observe enclosed settlements and look at the plans that ramparts, entrances and roundhouses within form. This will enable the discussion of possible patterned interiors and whether interiors were patterned differently from site to site or if any wider patterns occur.

At the beginning of this section it has to be clear what patterned enclosed settlement actually
means. G.C. Guilbert described it as an enclosed site with the interior that would have been planned and then laid out as a whole (Guilbert 1975, 203). This means that planning would be a single event. Furthermore, he claimed that single events of constructing planned interiors are recognisable in archaeological research (ibid.).

R. Bradley on the other hand, emphasizes the idea of a moving roundhouse (Bradley 2002, 58). This would possibly happen when one of the occupants died (ibid.; Brück 2007, 29). The other occupants would then abandon that roundhouse and build another one close to it. Furthermore, S. Halliday suggested that the building of a new roundhouse could happen with a shift of a family unit. For example, grandparents would build the first roundhouse, the one next to it by their offspring and so on (S. Halliday, pers. comm.). Movement of roundhouses around the settlement has also been suggested by C. Gingell (1981) and T. Allen and M. Robinson (1993). T. Moore (2006, 105) has suggested the reason for this could be the utilisation of new/fresh ground space due to building requirements or possible cosmological references.

The process of movement of a roundhouse could create a picture of patterned interior in the layout, especially when people respected the position of earlier structures (see sections 6.3.3. and 6.4.). Aerial photos and plans are the only records existing for the majority of enclosed settlements within the study area of this thesis, and even the excavated sites mostly do not give enough data to provide relative chronologies on sites. The suggested long-term view (see paragraph above and Allen, Robinson 1993; Gingell 1981; Moore 2006) is the one, which seems the most appropriate.

The focus of this section is the position of roundhouses within enclosed settlements. This helps to determine different types of planning of the interior. This analysis brings most fascinating results. That is, most of the enclosed settlement interiors show signs of planning, which is characterized in several different ways (some explanation has already been given in the chapter on entrance locations of the roundhouses; Chapter 4). No two enclosed settlements are patterned on exactly the same uniform model, but settlement organisation is seen from the majority of settlements and the organisation of settlements is so similar that it is possible to distinguish different types of planning.

There are 104 enclosed sites with clearly visible internal settlement evidence and a further 206 sites with less clear internal settlement evidence. 85 settlements are in good enough
condition to be able to determine the type of internal planning. Other settlements are either not preserved well enough to be able to determine internal planning, or they have roundhouses built over one another and sometimes even over the ramparts.

Planning of the enclosed settlements:
a) Central roundhouse

- Peeblesshire: Caerlee 3; Harehope 1; Harehope 2; Langhaugh 2 (?); Meldon Burn 1; South Hill Head 3; Stanhope dun; Tor Hill, Kailzie; White Knowe
- Berwickshire: Edin’s Hall 2
- E Dumfriesshire: Stockbridge Hill

b) Central roundhouse with roundhouses surrounding it

- Peeblesshire: Easter Dwyck 2; Goseland Hill; Harehope Rings (?); Lady Blair Plantation; Hartree Hill (?); Orchard Rig 2
- Berwickshire: /
- E Dumfriesshire: Boyken Burn; Carthur Hill; Cornal Burn

c) Roundhouses set circularly, no central house (possibly not visible)

- Peeblesshire: Castle Hill 2; Green Hill (?); Hammer Knowe 2 (?)
- Berwickshire: /
- E Dumfriesshire: /
d) Two roundhouses (usually no space for central roundhouse or other roundhouses, arranged in a circle (type c))

- Peeblesshire: Glenachan Rig; Hearthstane 1; Hillside Knowe 2 (?)
- Berwickshire: /
- E Dumfriesshire: Barrack Hill; Beattock Hill 2; Broomhillbank Hill

e) Roundhouses on one or both sides of access route

- Peeblesshire: Black Meldon 1; Cardon (?); Charge Law Plantation 2 (?); Chester Rig, Cardon 2; Glenrath 1; Helm End 2 (?); Hopeterrick Burn; Nether Dod (?); Rachan Hill (?); Torbank Hill (?); Toryknees (?); Vane Law; Ven Law 3 (?); Woodhouse Hill; Worm Hill 1
- Berwickshire: Duns Law 3
- E Dumfriesshire: /

f) Roundhouses set in a row opposite to the entrance (sunken yard in front of them usually visible)

- Peeblesshire: Black Meldon 2; Black Meldon 3; Cademuir 5; Canada Hill; Clashpock Rig; Clover Hill; Easter Dawyck 3; Flemington Burn; Glenveg; Great Hill; Hallmanor 2 (?); Hearthstane 1; Kidston Mill; Middle Hope Rig 1; Mossfennan 1; Old Caberston 1; Old Caberston 2; Stanhope Cottage 2; The Bank B; The Bank C; The Bank D; Wood Hill 2; Wood Hill 3; Woolshears Hill
- Berwickshire: Mire Loch 3 (?); Mire Loch 4
- E Dumfriesshire: Beattock Hill 2; Boonies; Calvertsholm; Chapel; Dinwoodie Mains; Mote Knowe; Shiel Burn (?); Staneshiel Rig

g) Pattern not distinguishable/ roundhouses over earlier roundhouses/ over ramparts/ settlement so big that the interior appears haphazard but without loss of space

- Peeblesshire: Dreva 2; Drum Maw; Drumelzier Ford; Henry’s Brae; Orchard Rig 1; Pirn Wood 1; Pirn Wood 2; Purvis Hill 3; White Meldon
- Berwickshire: Coldingham Loch 1, 2; Staneshiel Hill 1
- E Dumfriesshire: Castle O’Er 1; Castle O’Er 2; Clerk Hill 2; Gibb’s Hill; Little Hill; Loch Hill; Mosspeeble; Potholm Hill; Tanlawhill

h) Roundhouses positioned around yards

- Peeblesshire: Hog’s Knowe
- Berwickshire: /
- E Dumfriesshire: /

i) Roundhouses set within yards, determined by partition walls

- Peeblesshire: Glenrath Hope; Meldon Burn 2
- Berwickshire: Duns Law 2; Edin’s Hall 3
- E Dumfriesshire: /

Observing settlements in other parts of Britain, it is possible to see these types of planning over wider areas. At multi-period sites it is sometimes noticeable that the plan of the enclosed settlement stayed the same (e.g. West Brandon, Co. Durham, in: Jobey 1962 and Harehope, Peeblesshire, in: Feachem 1960, where later roundhouses were positioned directly on top of earlier ones). This shows that there was some importance in the interior pattern. At some enclosed settlements, it is possible to notice overlapping plans of roundhouses (e.g. Gibb’s Hill, E Dumfriesshire). Planning of the interior is not easy to determine there.
Illus. 137: Peeblesshire, Harehope, a- later roundhouses built directly on top of the earlier ones (From: Feachem 1960, Fig. 5), b- roundhouse sequence (From: Feachem 1960, Fig. 6)
Illus. 138: E Dumfriesshire, Gibb’s Hill, a conglomerate of roundhouses from more than one phase (From: RCAHMS 1997, Fig. 116). Possible planning of the settlement interior is not easy to detect here.

Illus. 139: Map showing different types of planning of the settlement interiors (only settlements where planning was possible to determine are shown)
Illus. 139 shows the distribution of different types of settlement interior plans: all the types are widespread and do not form clusters in the landscape. Group e is more widespread on the areas with steeper slopes. Most sites within this type are so-called Scooped settlements, which are scooped into the slopes to create a flat area for the interior. This is a style of building, which occurs on the undulating terrain. It is clear that internal plans do not reflect community or regional differences. Instead, different approaches to planning of the interior could reflect the different needs of the inhabitants, or different chronological phases. A patterned interior informs how people moved about within the individual settlement and how the activities of one roundhouse were separated from the activities of another. It would be interesting to observe the excavated interiors of different types and the distribution of artefacts/pits/hearths etc. within. This is, however, beyond the aims of this thesis.

From this point on, all types of planning of interior a-f will be referred as ‘typical later prehistoric enclosed settlements’. These types of planning are not dependent on the style of construction of roundhouses within; they occur within settlements with ring-groove, ring-ditch, timber-built and stone-walled roundhouses and are present in most of the enclosed settlements within the research area. Moreover, these settlements were usually built on a multi-period location.

On the other hand, planning the roundhouses around yards (type h) and construction of light partition walls between groups of roundhouses (type i) only occur at enclosed settlements with stone-walled roundhouses. Roundhouses within these two types of planning are much smaller than those of the other types. These settlements usually occur in new locations.

6.2.1. The question of ‘Votadinian’ settlements and an attempt of an explanation

The enclosed settlements with stone-walled roundhouses were named ‘Votadinian’ by P. Hill (1982a). They are present roughly in the area which most interpretations of Ptolemy’s map of North Britain accept as being settled by the tribe of the Votadini, and the name is derived from this (section 1.5.).

Stone-walled roundhouses however, are found over a greater area than that traditionally assigned to the Votadini. The term ‘Votadinian’ implies that these settlements were first
developed in the *Votadinian* area and later expanded, either due to the movement of ideas or people throughout the landscape of SE Scotland and NE England (similar was suggested for lowland brochs in: Macinnes 1984a, 239-240). We are yet to find evidence for this, however. Observing the *Votadinian* ‘territory’, it is obvious that, for example, there are very few such settlements visible in Berwickshire, which formed the heart of the *Votadinian* territory according to most studies (on discussion of tribes in SE Scotland see section 1.5.). Moreover, most of the best-preserved *'Votadinian'* settlements in the researched areas are in Peeblesshire, an area usually not assigned to the Votadini.

Ilus. 140: Distribution of enclosed settlements containing stone-walled roundhouses
There is a possibility that Illus. 140 only shows areas where preservation of settlements with stone-walled roundhouses is best. Preservation is of a major importance when observing site patterns over wide areas, as some areas appear blank only due to later activities, which demolished older sites. It is not possible to know the whole extend of later prehistoric enclosed settlements, but the general areas of bigger clusters are probably still visible.

Interesting results occur when the locations of settlements with stone-walled roundhouses is projected on a proposed reconstruction of political geography of SE Scotland, made by I.M. Smith (1990; see Illus. 141, 142 and also section 1.5. on critique of his study).

Illus. 141: Proposed reconstruction of political geography of S Scotland at approximately 120 AD (after Smith 1990, Fig. 8.3.) and locations of settlements with stone-walled roundhouses
Stone-walled roundhouses appear in N England and SE Scotland in the last centuries BC (Hill 1982a, Figure 7; Hill 1982b). The lack of excavation and dating of enclosed settlements in the studied areas does not allow the making of a precise chronological sequence in the development of the enclosed settlements. But this does not have to be a barrier in interpretation. There are enough data available to suggest some broad sequences (Chapter 3) and hypotheses in the development of enclosed settlements.
Scholars have supported the role of local tradition in the development of first stone-walled roundhouses (e.g. Macinnes 1982b, 33). Macinnes’ theory can further be supported with observation of the evidence from Peeblesshire and excavated examples from Northumberland (e.g. Jobey 1959). In fact, it is perhaps possible to follow the development of enclosed settlements with stone-walled roundhouses. Early stone-walled roundhouses appear in multi-period sites. These settlements do not differ from those enclosed settlements with timber-built \(^{10}\) roundhouses (type a – f). Stone-walled roundhouses are on average as big as the timber-built ones and the interiors of enclosed settlements are patterned in the same way regardless of the material of which roundhouses were built (e.g. Charge Law Plantation; Chester Hill, Hundlehope; Chester Rig, Cardon; Hallmanor; Helm End, all in Peeblesshire; Blackchester, Berwickshire).

In some locations it is possible to follow the further development of settlements with stone-walled roundhouses. Type i could develop from a desire for more privacy within bigger enclosed settlements. The transition between typical later prehistoric patterned interior of enclosed settlements and settlements of type h can be seen at sites such as Hog’s Knowe. There stone-walled roundhouses were enclosed by a rampart, typical for later prehistoric enclosed sites. The interior however, was organised differently as the evidence from the earlier settlements shows. Stone-walled roundhouses were only half of the size or even less in comparison to the roundhouses, which appear in the typical later prehistoric settlements. Moreover, some of them were set in clusters around small yards.

One more step can be seen in the development of small, enclosed units with the small stone-walled roundhouses within. At this stage, also the style of building the ramparts differs from the typical later prehistoric enclosed settlements. Instead of isolation from others with roundhouses set around yards (and entrances to the roundhouses pointing towards yards), construction of partition walls between groups of roundhouses presents a further step towards the separation from the other roundhouses. This type of enclosed settlement (type i) was always constructed on new locations and never positioned on multi-period locations.

\(^{10}\) All types of timber-built roundhouses (see section 1.14.).
The above paragraphs show that it is perhaps possible to follow the transition from the typical later prehistoric enclosed settlement towards the type with slight partition walls. This is a strong indication of a locally-developing tradition (Macinnes 1982b, 33).

At type i partition walls physically separate 2-3 roundhouses (perhaps one immediate family) from the rest of the group living in the same settlement. Change towards the isolation of smaller groups within one settlement perhaps happened due to changes in the view on personal belongings and identity and the demand for more privacy within one settlement. The cause for the changes in the settlement evidence could be environmental changes and intensification of a sense for personal possessions. Evidence from Central England shows rapid cooling in the time of the Roman Iron Age (Taylor 1975, 12, Figs. 4 and 5). The climate change was also recorded in S Scotland; environmental analysis from Talla Moss, Peeblesshire (NT 152 03) revealed a change in climate and a start of a particularly wet era dated to c. 1930 BP (Chambers et al. 1997, 391-399). That would mean that the higher areas were not suitable for agriculture anymore. People needed to adapt to new environmental conditions. The changing climate meant a smaller surplus, which could feed smaller units of people. This could mean that the idea of sharing goods with others within one settlement shifted. Consequently the demand for more privacy and sense of personal belongings became more significant than before.

Another issue that needs to be addressed at this stage is why this change happened in some areas but not others. The internal arrangements of enclosed settlements are signs of interaction within settlements. In some areas this interaction changed, and the urge for isolation resulted in settlements with partition walls. Some of the enclosed settlements with
stone-walled roundhouses form clusters in the landscape (Illus. 140). This could be a sign of groups that shared knowledge of construction of a stone-walled roundhouse, and in this way differed from others. Moreover, the visible clusters form a mixture of types of enclosed settlements with stone-walled roundhouses. Enclosed settlements with stone-walled roundhouses that do not form clusters, are all typical later prehistoric enclosed settlements (types a – f). They are generally regarded as pre-Roman later prehistoric (Armit, Ralston 2003, 179)

7.3. Organisation of the landscape (macro level)

The two main questions posed when considering the organisation of the landscape are:

- Is it possible to detect any clusters of enclosed sites and consequently any settlement systems within the landscape?

- Is it possible to detect any boundaries between enclosed sites and possibly between different clusters in the landscape?

The most obvious clusters that were detected within the landscape are presented here with two case studies. These have been chosen because of the very good preservation of the sites. This makes it possible to show different examples of possible settlement patterns. The first case study is Meldon Burn valley in Peeblesshire, where a mixture of different enclosed sites is present. The second case study is the area at Orchard Rig, Peeblesshire, where a cluster of very similar enclosed settlements is visible. These areas were chosen to show how settlement patterns could be detected and observed within the landscape. Enclosed sites within one cluster/case study were almost certainly not contemporary but settlement patterns are detectable. This means that patterns in the landscape cannot be looked at as a single event. Instead, they probably developed through centuries (see sections 6.3.3. and 6.4.).
6.3.1. Meldon Burn valley, Peeblesshire

Meldon Burn valley has a very high quality preserved archaeological landscape, which is why it makes a good candidate for a case study. There was almost no building or ploughing in the valley over the centuries. Most of the valley was, and still is, only used for grazing.

Meldon Burn valley is located 4 km W of Peebles. The valley runs N-S and is approximately 3.5 km long. The N end is enclosed by hills up to 427m high, but an access further N towards the Eddleston Water (and further on towards Edinburgh) is possible. Going down the valley, towards the S, the E side remains high, while the W side widens out onto less steep ground at Lyne Townhead. The Meldon Burn is a stream created by the confluence of three smaller streams at the very N end of the valley. It runs along the valley floor, flowing into the Lyne Water at the S end of the valley. The Lyne Water flows into the River Tweed just 1km to the E. Entering the Meldon Burn valley from the S, traces of four Roman camps and forts are visible. For a distance of 600 m, it is also possible to follow a Neolithic pit alignment/enclosure at Meldon Bridge, between Lyne and Meldon Burn, where possible Neolithic structures and cremations were discovered (Speak, Burgess 1999). Just over the Lyne Water, there is a field called Sheriff Muir, which was used for training in the
First World War and before that as a ground for the Tweedale Militia (ibid., 8). At least one of the battles was fought there. Speak and Burgess presume this could be the site of a so-called 'loca', a tribal meeting place of the Selgovae, mentioned in the Ravenna Cosmography (ibid.). A Roman road runs less than 500m E of the valley, parallel to it. Another Roman road follows today's main road from Peebles to Glasgow, which runs perpendicular to the Meldon Burn valley (Speak, Burgess 1999).

Meldon Burn valley, with its rising slopes on either side of the stream, is an area of great archaeological potential. With several settlements, enclosures and cultivation terraces on its slopes, overlooked by the high hill of White Meldon on one side and Black Meldon on the other, both have enclosed settlements on the top, making this valley a very good case study. Here, it is possible to observe enclosed site patterns on a small scale, within an area of well-defined natural boundaries. It is areas like this where we might expect signs of a patterned landscape by a particular group. The aim of this particular case study is to observe whether it is possible to detect a valley-based settlement system.

Illus. 145: Peeblesshire, Meldon Burn valley with White Meldon and its enclosed settlement on top visible in the background

LATER PREHISTORIC SETTLEMENT EVIDENCE FROM MELDON BURN VALLEY

Meldon Burn valley produces a variety of different sites. There are at least four sets of
unenclosed settlements in the N part of the valley, three enclosed settlements located on prominent positions (at least one of them multi-period), two multi-period enclosures, two sites enclosed with timber palisades, a multi-period enclosed settlement with timber-built roundhouses, an enclosed settlement with timber-built roundhouses, and an enclosed settlement with stone-walled roundhouses. There is also evidence of cultivation terraces in the valley. Only one settlement has been subject to excavation (Feachem 1961; Jobey 1980), but as this was an unenclosed settlement, it will not be discussed in detail here.

On top of the White Meldon (427 m OD), the second biggest enclosed settlement of Peeblesshire is located (White Meldon 4). It consists of several different phases, which show the importance of the location through time. The biggest phase enclosed more than 2.5 ha; 29 ring-groove houses are still visible within, but there is enough space for many more. All traces of possible earlier settlement evidence have disappeared and only hints of enclosure walls and ramparts from the earlier phases exist. Without excavations, it is impossible to discuss the previous phases of the site in detail, and therefore this study concentrates only on the last phase, with the acknowledgment of earlier phases.

The settlement was probably enclosed by a single wall in its last phase. The position of the entrance is not clear, but there are some indications that it might exist on the NE side, which is also the closest way to the spring of one of the streams which form Meldon Burn. This side is also the line of easiest approach to the settlement. The interior rises up to 17 m above the line of the rampart, which suggests that it was possible to get a slight glimpse into the activities within the settlement while approaching it and from the valley below (Illus. 145). Looking from within the settlement, wide views of the Meldon Burn valley with its surrounding hills and beyond can be observed. Within the settlement, some of the ring-groove roundhouses show slight signs of a patterned interior as they seem to be positioned on both sides of a path which probably runs S-N.

On the E flanks of White Meldon, there is a multi-period site of Upper Kidston. It does not seem to be connected directly to the Meldon Burn valley but because of its entrance located towards the Meldon Burn valley, this site will be discussed as a part of the valley.

On the NW side of the valley rises Black Meldon (407 m OD). The settlement on top of it (Black Meldon 1) is enclosed by a rampart with an additional rampart on its N, S and W sides. The entrance to the enclosure is located on the SSW side, which gives wide views of the Lyne valley. The entrance is located on the side of closest approach to the spring of a
small burn that flows into the Meldon Burn. Inside, there are traces of at least seven ring-groove roundhouses, which are aligned on each side of the path running through the middle of the enclosure (roughly NNE-SSW). Roundhouse entrances, where traceable, are located on the broad S side of the roundhouses. It appears that they were positioned so that it was easy to get to the roundhouses from the path, but still offered privacy since it was not possible to see directly through the entrance from the path.

On the NW slopes of White Meldon, and on the other side of the burn, on the slopes of Green Knowe, there are signs of 34 unenclosed hut platforms, forming four clusters. One of the roundhouses was excavated in 1961 (Feachem 1961b; RCAHMS 1967, vol.1, 71-72) and other excavation took place in 1977-78 (Jobey 1981).

Close to these, on the W slopes of White Meldon, two enclosures, built one on top of another (Meldon Burn 3, Meldon Burn 4), are located.

Further down the valley, on the W side, near the foot of Black Meldon, there is a very badly preserved multi-period enclosed settlement (Black Meldon 2, Black Meldon 3). The early phase was enclosed by a rampart with the entrance on the E, towards the Meldon Burn. Three roundhouse platforms are still visible in the interior. The later phase of the settlement is represented by a single rampart with the entrance on the E side and three roundhouse platforms inside.

On the other bank of the Meldon Burn and a little higher up the slope, there are traces of an enclosed settlement with stone-walled roundhouses (Meldon Burn 2) with the entrance on the SW side.

On the SE slopes of South Hill Head, a small, palisaded settlement (South Hill Head 3) with one roundhouse in the interior is located. The entrance is on SSW side. The roundhouse inside was of ring-ditch type.

Another palisaded settlement exists in the valley, on the S flank of South Hill Head (Meldon Burn 1). A single ring-ditch roundhouse is visible in the interior. The entrance is located on the E side. This enclosed settlement is facing away from the valley and does not seem to be closely connected with it. It would be possible to assume that its land perhaps extended on the slopes of the small valley to the E of it. The enclosed settlement could be used for animal
farming, and therefore its location on the edge of the valley, used for agriculture, seems reasonable.

Further along the valley, on the slopes of South Hill Head, there are two enclosures, located on top of one another (South Hill Head 1, South Hill Head 2). The earlier enclosure had an entrance on the E side. The smaller, and probably later enclosure, lies inside the bigger one. It had an entrance on the W side.

Illus. 146: Peeblesshire, Meldon Burn valley, positions of later prehistoric enclosed sites and their entrance orientations

INTERPRETATION OF SETTLEMENT PATTERN FROM MELDON BURN VALLEY

The archaeological landscape in the valley suggests that it has been controlled by a group of people settling it. This can be claimed on the basis of several factors.
Firstly, all the prehistoric settlements in the valley (and the multi-period enclosed settlement of Upper Kidston) are located in equal distances of 0.5 km (as the crow flies) from one another. This is a sign of enclosed site pattern in the landscape. This is an interesting pattern, as sites observed cannot be tied into any tight chronological phases and is impossible to tell which sites were contemporary. Nevertheless, with such an evenly patterned landscape, it can be argued that the knowledge of enclosed site locations existed and the memory probably survived over the centuries. It would appear that it was not possible to build a new site on any location. Instead, the whole archaeological landscape pattern in the valley appears to be considered while finding the location for construction of a new site.

Secondly, this case study presents more data on enclosed site entrance orientations, which were discussed in more detail in Chapter 5. Based on White Meldon 4, the second biggest enclosed settlement in Peeblesshire, it is again possible to argue against the proposition that enclosure entrances were positioned towards the important hillfort (for more evidence on this see section 4.3.). Not one of the enclosure entrances faces towards White Meldon. In this case, it would be possible to argue that not even one of the sites was contemporary with the site at White Meldon. However, while observing other enclosed sites in the area and their entrance locations it can be said with no doubt that the hypothesis of the entrance orientation towards the most important enclosed site in the area is incorrect.

Instead, entrances point towards the easiest access to the site, towards the closest water resources or even springs and, if possible, away from one another (Illus. 146).

Illus. 147: Peeblesshire, possible cluster of enclosed sites in Meldon Burn valley (shown in blue circle)
The above study showed that the enclosed sites of the Meldon Burn valley form a cluster within the landscape. This can be particularly well seen from Illus. 147 where we can notice the lack of enclosed site evidence immediately around the Meldon Burn valley. This cluster could be questioned if we would observe the sites only within the limits of the RCAHMS categories (RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1). To be precise, the Meldon Burn valley cluster consists of two multi-period enclosures, three hillforts (two of them with several phases), two palisaded settlements, two settlements with timber-built roundhouses, one scooped homestead and one settlement with stone-walled roundhouses according to the RCAHMS categories. The main problem here would be the presence of three hillforts (Black Meldon 1, Upper Kidston 1, White Meldon) in such a small area (c. 6 km²), two of which are multi-period. Three hillforts set so close to one another would probably not be contemporary according to the hierarchy that was noticed in the study of Castle O’Er, E Dumfriesshire, and its surrounding enclosed sites (RCAHMS 1997, 82). But all the enclosed sites except White Meldon, enclose an area of 0.31 ha or less. With c. 0.5 ha being an important size boundary (section 3.6.; Illus. 75), the RCAHMS’ suggestion of hierarchy of hillforts is not valid here. If hierarchy can indeed be seen in the area boundaries, the three hillforts could be contemporary. Moreover, the ramparts, overall plan and entrance locations of Black Meldon 1 and Upper Kidston 1 do not differ much from the ones of other enclosed sites in the valley. The only noticeable difference is that Black Meldon 1 is positioned on top of a hill in contrary to other sites, with the exception of White Meldon.

6.3.2. Orchard Rig, Peeblesshire

Orchard Rig is located c. 1.5 km W of Traquair. In an area of just 1 x 2 km there are traces of six enclosed sites, at least one of them multi-period. Most of Orchard Rig has been under cultivation for centuries and this has damaged some of the sites (RCAHMS 1967, vol.1, 95), but enough is still visible to be able to observe enclosed sites in more detail. Extensive cultivation is also an indication of a soil suitable for agriculture and this is the reason for such a rich area of later prehistoric settlement remains.

The area, where a possible cluster of later prehistoric enclosed sites is detectable occupies one spur, which is bounded by streams on three sides and ground, higher than 450 m OD on one side. The spur falls from NW towards SE and it is approximately 2 km long. The area within these boundaries is rich with cord rig and cultivation remains.
LATER PREHISTORIC SETTLEMENT EVIDENCE FROM ORCHARD RIG

The enclosed site pattern on Orchard Rig is not as varied as is the one in the Meldon Burn valley. None of the sites have been excavated.

There are traces of an unenclosed settlement in the middle of a spur. Enclosed sites are set a small distance away from it. The highest enclosed settlement on the spur is Orchard Rig 1. It is enclosed by two ramparts and two ditches, with entrances pointing towards SE and WSW. There are traces of 17 timber-built roundhouses within, probably forming several phases of construction. The interior falls approximately 10 m in the W- E direction, which means it was possible to see the interior while approaching it.

The settlement positioned in the middle of the spur was enclosed by a single palisade and contained two rung-ditch roundhouses (Orchard Rig 5). It may be multi-period.

Approximately 200 m to the ESE of Orchard Rig 5, there are traces of a single rampart enclosure with the entrance pointing towards the N (Orchard Rig 7).

Orchard Rig 4a and 4b are set on a multi-period location on the S side of a spur, roughly in the middle of it. A single palisade has enclosed them both and they both include traces of ring-ditch roundhouses.

Less than 100 m to the NE of Orchard Rig 4a and 4b there is another settlement, enclosed with a single palisade (Orchard Rig 6). It contains traces of four ring-ditch roundhouses and it was badly damaged with later cord rig cultivation.

Orchard Rig 2 was the furthest S of all the enclosed sites mentioned. It was enclosed by two ramparts and external ditch, with the entrance pointing towards W. There are traces of nine timber-built roundhouses visible within the settlement.

Located on the far E side of the cluster was a settlement with two ramparts and a medial ditch, with a possible entrance on the ENE side (Orchard Rig 3). Traces of at least one roundhouse are still visible in the interior.
INTERPRETATION OF SETTLEMENT PATTERN FROM ORCHARD RIG

The area of a spur at Orchard Rig forms a possible cluster of later prehistoric enclosed sites in the landscape. Entrances are visible at four enclosed sites (see above). They are all located towards water resources, away from other settlements and towards different streams (Illus. 148). There are no visible boundaries between most of the enclosed sites and some of the sites are set quite close together. However, the entrance positions that were set away from other settlements probably show that the landscape was organised and sites had some 'private' space outside the entrances even without detectable boundaries. Comparable evidence of domestic activities outside enclosed settlement boundaries exists in the Upper Thames Valley (Lambrick 1983).

But what makes this area even more worthy of highlighting is that settlements enclosed by two ramparts, show incredible similarities (Illus. 149). The most unique detail of these settlements is that they all show a large gap (up to 20 m) between the inner and the outer rampart. This is an element not usually seen in other sites in the whole area of this research.
Illus. 149: Peeblesshire, similarity of the shape of the enclosed settlements at Orchard Rig

Other sites which are comparable to one another exist, but they are not set so close together in the landscape (Henderland Hill 2, Langhaugh 1, Nether Stewarton, Worm Hill 1 and Worm Hill 3 (see Fig. 150); Glenveg, Manor Sware, Morning Hill and Rough Side; also Great Hill, Easter Dawyck 3 and Whiteside Hill 1 for example).
Illus. 150: Peebleshire, similarity of later prehistoric enclosed settlements at Henderland Hill 2, Langhaugh 1, Nether Stewarton, Worm Hill 1 and Worm Hill 3 (drawn based on RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, Figs. 56, 75, 104, 148 and 160)

This similarity of settlements at Orchard Rig could indicate a group which shifted location of the enclosed settlement during a period of time, or, if settlements were contemporary, a bigger group with one style of building. Other enclosed sites at Orchard Rig are set very close to one another, and all of them were set within an area of defined natural boundaries,
showing this in fact could be a cluster of enclosed sites within the landscape.

Observing the area around Orchard Rig (Illus. 152), there is an unfinished or palisaded enclosure at Young Bush, which is located just over the stream on the E side of the cluster. Only traces of one possible rampart are visible and it does not have any detail visible to be able to compare it with the enclosed sites of the Orchard Rig cluster. Close to it, there are traces of unenclosed settlement.

On the spur just N of Orchard Rig, are the remains of a 0.32 ha enclosure with multiple ramparts (Grieston Hill). 750 m to the E, on another spur there are remains of Chester Rig, Traquair, a 0.45 ha enclosure with two ramparts. The latter one falls into the category of big enclosed sites (section 3.6.). These two enclosures have probably been built with a different purpose to the ones on the spur at Orchard Rig, but at least one of them could be part of the same cluster. To be precise, the two ramparts at Chester Rig, Traquair are set up to 20m apart (Illus. 151) which represents a similar style of building as is present at Orchard Rig (Illus. 150).

![Illus. 151: Peeblesshire, Chester Rig, Traquair (From: RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, Fig. 87)](image_url)

Apart from the three sites mentioned, there are no later prehistoric remains visible in the vicinity of Orchard Rig. The nearest enclosed sites are more than 2 km away from the cluster.
Illus. 152: Peeblesshire, possible cluster of enclosed sites at Orchard Rig (shown with blue circle)

6.3.3. Comparison with other case studies

The focus here has been the two clearest clusters of enclosed sites in the study area; others can also be identified, for example in the areas around Coldingham Loch and, Marygoldhill Plantation (both in Berwickshire). The two case studies presented show a variety of features which can be compared to other case studies.

Studies in Hertfordshire have shown Iron Age settlement clusters (or settlement complexes as they named them), similar to the one in the Meldon Burn valley (Bryant, Niblett 2001). There, clusters are visible within or close to major river valleys. Similar clusters have been noticed elsewhere in Britain, especially in parts of S England (Hill 1999, 193). T. Moore also sees clusters in the Avon valley (Moore 2006, 135).

Observing areas closer to the Meldon Burn valley, I.M. Smith's work on the Manor Valley,
Peeblesshire showed similar patterns. He assumed that a territorial framework existed over the whole of the valley. Sites were located at equal distances from one another with boundaries separating them. These boundaries were situated as close to the middle of the distance between the sites as possible, represented by the closest natural feature that was appropriate to serve as a boundary, such as mainstream or ridge (Smith 1990, 370-373). However, he observed this neat settlement pattern as a sign of a size of population at one time. This could be doubtful because there is no chronology known for the sites whatsoever. Instead, I suggest the idea of memory and a phenomenon I decided to call living ancestor ¹¹ (after Living house: signifying continuity by D.W. Bailey 1990; see also section 5.4.).

RCAHMS’ study of the lowland Solway Plain, Eastern Dumfriesshire (RCAHMS 1997, 51-57) is relevant here. This area is highly cultivated today, and very few of later prehistoric enclosed sites can still be seen in the area (see RCAHMS 1997, Fig. 47) but some conclusions could be made. RCAHMS discus two different types of possible later prehistoric enclosed sites, oval and ones with clearly defined corners. These rectilinear sites are considered as part of the later prehistoric settlement pattern here, but will be discussed as a possible a-typical shape in more detail later on (section 8.5.). RCAHMS (1997, 57) suggest that the oval sites belong to a broadly contemporary organisation of the landscape. However, it is never clarified in the text what the term ‘broadly contemporary’ stands for. Consequently, my opinion here remains unchanged; settlement patterns were probably formed over many generations with respect towards older structures, which were, in the majority, tied into the patterns in the landscape.

Another case study made by the Royal Commission was in the area of Upper Annandale, Eastern Dumfriesshire (RCAHMS 1997, 57-74). There is some cultivation of the low-lying

¹¹ Living ancestor: while observing enclosed site patterns as they appear in the landscape, one can notice that a lot of earlier monuments were incorporated in the later site patterns. The patterns of remains in the landscape therefore appear ‘neat’ although they were not contemporary built or actively used. This idea of memory in prehistoric societies is an interesting topic and could form a comprehensive study on its own (e.g. Bradley 2002). Although fascinating, this topic is not the main focus of this thesis. However, it was a reoccurring factor in a number of the analyses and merits some observations and a short focused discussion on the living ancestor and evidence for it that was detected (section 10.3.). This can hopefully serve as an introduction for any more thorough study in the future.
land present today, but most of the area is used for pasture if at all. Therefore the archaeological potential of this case study is large, and there are many visible later prehistoric enclosed sites in the area (ibid., 57, Fig. 53). Observing these sites in their landscape, some general patterns can be noticed; enclosed sites are located at some distance from one another (200 – 500 m apart (as the crow flies), with only a few exceptions where the distance is bigger); settlements are situated close to water resources or other natural boundaries; and they do not usually use the same water resource. Some rectilinear sites are present in Upper Annandale and are here seen as part of later prehistoric settlement pattern. However, their shape will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 8 (see above and section 8.5.)

The third case study made by the Royal Commission, was located in the area of Upper Eskdale, Eastern Dumfriesshire (RCAHMS 1997, 75-93). The study area covers valleys of the White and Black Esk and it is mostly under aforestation now. It was chosen for a case study due to the presence of several attractive enclosed sites and their surrounding structures, such as Castle O'Er (ibid., 75). The linear earthworks around Castle O’Er will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 7. As in Upper Annandale, the general settlement pattern is represented by enclosed sites, which are positioned close to water resources or other natural boundaries. In the valley of White Esk, a pattern of one settlement per spur protruding into the valley can be seen (ibid. 78). Sites are generally 200 - 500 m (as the crow flies) apart but many of them are set up to 1 km away from each other. This greater distance can be especially well observed in the Black Esk valley (ibid., Fig. 70).

6.4. Discussion

PATTERNED SETTLEMENT INTERIORS

Observation of the patterned interiors of enclosed settlement did not produce the expected results. It was thought that most of the sites do not show any internal planning; the ones that would show patterned interiors would be easy to determine and, when put on the map, there would be areas which show patterned interiors and areas without. This would help to determine the locations of different groups within the landscape, which practised different types of planning of their settlements. However, this soon proved to be too optimistic.
Instead, a result that is even more exciting appeared. A lot of enclosed settlements demonstrate some signs of planning. Where planning was not visible, it was usually because of poor preservation or, at some multi-period sites, where particular phases were not possible to distinguish. This result somehow seems almost too neat to be real and therefore requires study of wider areas. Some comparison with other parts of Britain has been made (p. 200) and similar results in patterned settlement interior occurred. This perhaps underlines the fact that more studies of Britain as a whole need to be undertaken rather than only researches into individual areas.

The majority of settlement evidence within enclosed sites shows signs of planning, which is probably not all the product of a single event. Instead, positions of new roundhouses within enclosed settlement often respect the positions of earlier ones. Also, many roundhouses within settlements were repeatedly built on the same spot (e.g. Harehope, see Illus. 137; also: Harding 2001, 357).

These results are dissimilar to Guilbert’s conclusions on planned hillfort interiors (Guilbert 1975). His article is often wrongly cited in publications on the patterned interiors of enclosed sites of later prehistory (e.g. Cunliffe, Rowley 1976, 140). Guilbert himself claims throughout the article that he is dealing with planned settlements. Yet observing his conclusions and the plans he produced, it is clear; he was not discussing the settlement data. The only structures which show signs of patterning are four poster structures, which are too small to represent living space for people. On the other hand, roundhouses within Moel Y Gaer do not show signs of patterning of the interior (see Guilbert 1975, 205 and Fig. 1).

Moreover, planned interiors, as suggested by Guilbert (1975, 203) can, most probably, not be expected within later prehistoric enclosed settlements. Roundhouses neatly set in lines producing rectangular patterning of the interior are not present in the enclosed settlements analysed in this thesis. It is clear that the ‘later prehistoric mind’ was producing round structures. Enclosed sites in great majority do not have any corners, and roundhouses within are as round as possible. It is impossible to expect rectangular patterning, as round patterning seems much more appropriate while observing the settlement data.
PATTERNS IN THE LANDSCAPE AND COMPARISON WITH OTHER CASE STUDIES

The case studies presented in this chapter, and comparison with other case studies interestingly show clear patterns within the landscape. Each case study represents a different type of planning within the landscape, but they all show the idea of living ancestor (i.e. respect towards the older structures within the landscape; see sections 6.3.3. and 9.3.) on a semi-micro and also on a macro level.

It is possible to conclude that as much as respect towards the older roundhouses was practised (see section 6.2.) the same was true for the older settlements, which were built into the new settlement patterns. This is especially well seen in Meldon Burn valley, where a long time span of planning of settlement pattern can be observed. Moreover, it seems that parts of the landscape, which seem to be important during the existence of older settlements (in particular water resources, which usually also signified boundaries), were kept respected while constructing new sites (sections 6.3.1. and 6.3.2.).

Some scholars have suggested that this phenomenon of patterning is a result of infilling desirable spots in the landscape. The patterns would therefore be a consequence of a natural way to fill the space, i.e. new enclosed sites would be set as far as possible from already existing sites to avoid intruding their space (Hodder 1975). This makes much sense when the sites are contemporary. There is, however, no evidence of this in the Meldon Burn valley. On the contrary, excavation of some of the sites in the Meldon Burn valley show a long-term use of this valley (see section 6.3.1).

The same thing can be noticed at Orchard Rig. The difference here is, that sites are set much closer to one another (sometimes just 100 m) and three of the settlements look almost identical to one another. Here, I suggested a term 'wandering settlement', which means that one settlement was moving around the landscape in a short time span (section 3.6.). It could even be possible that the settlements are contemporary, built in the same style, which would distinguish this group from the others in the area. A big enclosure on the edge of this cluster, built on another spur, with an additional boundary of a stream dividing the settlement cluster and big enclosure, shows a similar style of building.

At the Orchard Rig cluster entrances to the enclosed sites are, if possible turned away from other enclosed sites in the vicinity (section 6.3.2.; Illus. 148). Similar entrance locations can
be seen in other areas (see Chapter 4).

All of the case studies show that, if possible, each of the enclosed settlements was using a different water resource. There are various possible interpretations:

- The water resource belonged to the settlement and they treated it as such and not as a possession of a group occupying the area.

J. Brück emphasizes that in many societies there was a symbolic relationship between a particular settlement and a kin group that inhabited it (Brück 1999, 153). Symbolism of a living house (Bailey 1990; section 4.4.) is also very significant, meaning that when house was abandoned, its position remained respected and in most cases new roundhouses were not built over the older ones. Some cases show that this kind of symbolism was applicable to the whole settlement. Once people live in a certain place for a certain amount of time they start to perceive the landscape around them as a space where human activities and events take place (Tilley 1994, 9-10). When the settlement was abandoned people respected its position and possibly its water resource. If the people moved they found another water resource for the new settlement. In this case settlements could or could not be contemporary. The symbolism of ‘living settlement’ and ‘humanized space’ (Tilley 1994, 10) is very important in later prehistory, forming neat settlement patterns in some areas.

- The water resource was seen as the property of a settlement (family?) in a group and could be seen as a boundary between the space used by different settlements.

In this case settlements at Orchard Rig could be contemporary. This example is possible to follow in different parts of Britain. A study of hillforts in Sussex (Cunliffe 2005), for example, shows where hillforts from the 1st century BC were equally distributed each between two rivers which served as boundaries. Another good example of streams/rivers being seen as boundaries are White Hill in Roxburghshire and the linear earthworks around Castle O’Er in Eastern Dumfriesshire. The linear earthworks were built from one stream to another and were clearly seen as boundaries. Linear earthworks will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 7.

- People picked a place to build a settlement near the closest water resource and the settlement patterns which can be observed today, are only a coincidence.
This could be the case if patterns only occurred in small areas. However, as mentioned above (section 6.3.3.) it is possible to follow later prehistoric settlement patterns on wide areas over Britain. At this point it has to be emphasized again, that we are observing later prehistoric settlement patterns without any detailed chronology available. This makes neat patterns in the landscape even more fascinating and it shows that the organisation of the sites within the landscape was not accidental or insignificant.

Another possible cluster of sites within the landscape was presented previously (section 2.6.). Multivallate enclosed sites occupy a small area in central Peeblesshire. This is very similar to the settlement pattern at Orchard Rig, where similar enclosed sites were possibly ‘wandering’ around the small area (section 2.6.).

Study of the organisation of enclosed settlement interiors and settlement patterns does not show any clear hierarchy within the settlements or in the landscape. This has also been noticed in NE England (Ferrell 1995, 136) and the Severn-Cotswolds (Moore 2006, 105). RCAHMS, however, sees a developed hierarchical system in the White Esk valley, E Dumfriesshire, with a pattern of one central enclosed site (Castle O’Er) and a series of smaller sites. These were, perhaps, lower on a hierarchical scale around it (RCAHMS 1997, 83). However, without any chronology available, I cannot make these presumptions for the areas analysed. This thesis is based on the longer time scale of later prehistory because of a question of chronology. With almost no exceptions, enclosed sites of the study areas are not dated. This means that patterns of enclosed sites in the landscape that we see today were produced over many centuries. This also means that looking for patterns and the organisation of landscape within one period of time is a task impossible to complete as the sites could be contemporary or as much as 500 years or more apart.

All this makes the results of case studies even more attractive. Namely, the enclosed site patterns appear very neat in some areas. This means that earlier sites were incorporated in the enclosed site patterns of later phases. The memory of previous actions in the landscape was incorporated in the new organisation of the landscape (i.e. living ancestor).

The case studies presented in this chapter show different possible ways of detecting settlement patterns. Different areas show different sites and different settlement patterns. In some areas, similar sites are present (e.g. Orchard Rig, multivallate enclosed sites in central Peeblesshire). Other areas, on the other hand, show a cluster of different sites, with different
character and probably different roles within the society (e.g. Meldon Burn valley). Despite these differences, the settlement patterns are generally the same, showing respect towards other sites nearby, their boundaries and water resources.
SUMMARY

Study of settlement interiors show that a great majority exhibit signs of planning. More than one style of typical later prehistoric planning exists. Some of the interiors of enclosed settlements of late phases show different style of planning.

Two case studies observed possible clusters of enclosed site evidence within the landscape. They both show similar results despite the cluster seen in Meldon Burn valley being a result of a long time span and Orchard Rig probably being created in a shorter time. Both clusters have clear natural boundaries surrounding them and no other enclosed sites can be seen in the vicinity of these clusters.

People respected earlier archaeological features in the landscape. Although not contemporary and maybe not having the same function, new sites were not built ignoring previous land organisation. Settlement patterns in the landscape were built over the centuries, yet they still show a neat pattern, which can be observed today.

Clusters of enclosed sites sometimes show that a particular group had a particular style of building, perhaps due to different needs or to separate themselves from the other groups living in the area. Within the cluster, there can be at least one enclosure constructed with different role of usage in mind and set on the outskirts of a cluster.
CHAPTER 7: LATER PREHISTORIC LINEAR EARTHWORKS, POSSIBLY CONNECTED TO ENCLOSED SITES

7.1. Introduction

Linear earthworks are usually represented by a continuous ditch and a bank, which was constructed from material removed from the ditch; or as a pit alignment. Most of the pit alignments are of a Neolithic date, but not all; some of them are accepted as being later prehistoric (Barber 1985; Halliday 1982; Ralston 1996; Rylatt, Bevan 2007; Wilson 1978). Earlier examples show only signs of a line of pits (Meldon Bridge, Peeblesshire for example, see Burgess 1976; Speak, Burgess 1999). Later prehistoric pit alignments usually form a line created as a series of pits, which look almost like an interrupted ditch (e.g. Gallaberry Hill, E Dumfriesshire, in: RCAHMS 1997, 98). Sometimes they have a bank on one side only (e.g. Lamberton Moor, Berwickshire; see Halliday 1982, 78; RCAHMS 1980, 38, nos. 314). Some recent excavations have shown that these could in fact be ploughed-out remains of linear earthworks (Barber 1999, 65) and do not represent a different style of construction. Furthermore, T. Moore suggested that linear earthworks and pit alignments had the same role but were built differently according to location and usage of the land (seasonal grazing vs. all year round usage) (Moore 2006, 137; also Hingley 1984b; Rylatt, Bevan 2007, 226).

Linear earthworks sometimes form almost straight lines through the landscape, or are set to enclose parts of it. Series of linear earthworks can form partly enclosed divisions in the landscape (e.g. Big Chesters, Bowshiel, Berwickshire; Woden Law, Roxburghshire; see Halliday 1982, 78, Fig. 5; 2002). Because of the nature of the linear earthworks (and later prehistoric pit alignments), they are usually seen as boundaries in the widest sense of the word. They have been interpreted as being enclosures for cattle (Halliday 1982, 80; 2002, 98; Mercer 1995), as forming parts of territorial boundaries (Wheeler 1931), as representing the remains of farm boundaries (Halliday 1982, 75, 78-80), division between pastures and field systems (Collis 1996, 88 with bibliography) or as having a defensive role (Barber 1999, 118; Pitt-Rivers 1881; Spratt 1989). I.M. Smith saw linear earthworks as a sign of a trend towards the definition of boundaries due to the development of centralised authorities (Smith 1990, 48).
In this chapter, I will study linear earthworks, which are set close to later prehistoric enclosed sites and could possibly be related to them. The importance of incorporating earlier monuments in the later settlement patterns within the landscape has been noted before (i.e. living ancestor, Chapters 6-9). Based on the detection of this phenomenon, I will look at three possibilities. Firstly, linear earthworks which probably represent local boundaries between two archaeological features within the landscape are observed (Chapter 7.2.1.). I will look at linear earthworks that could be contemporary to the enclosed sites nearby and those, which could be built to protect earlier sites within later settlement pattern. Secondly, linear earthworks that could have formed part of an impressive approach to enclosed sites will be examined (7.2.2.) and thirdly, I will look at the linear earthworks which predate enclosed sites nearby (7.2.3.).

Regardless of the purpose of linear earthworks, they did play an important social and symbolic role in the landscape and formed parts of that organised landscape. The main reason for creating this chapter is to try to find out if there are any possible differences between linear earthworks, which were used for different purposes apart.

7.2. Linear earthworks and enclosed sites

It has generally been accepted that not all linear earthworks were built for the same purpose (e.g. Barber 1999). Nevertheless, they did provide some sort of visible structures within the landscape and were therefore part of the perception of the surroundings of groups settling the landscape.

J. Barber published an extensive study of linear earthworks of S Scotland (Barber 1999). He categorized them into three main groups; political/administrative land divisions, economic land divisions and miscellaneous, which included defensive outworks (ibid., 69-70). Here, a possibility of another category of linear earthworks will be anticipated: some of them are located near enclosed sites and could form parts of them. Barber included only a short study of this potential category in his paper (ibid., 117-128). Moreover, he did not discuss or list most of the linear earthworks from Peeblesshire (ibid., 154).

No firm dating is available for most linear earthworks in Britain and a very broad chronology exists for the enclosed sites of the study area (meaning that they are loosely dated to the
period of later prehistory, see Chapter 3). Despite the absence of adequate dating, the relationship between the two features within the archaeological landscape seems worth discussing, especially as the respect towards the older structures in the landscape can be seen in several studies (Chapters 6-9). Linear earthworks formed parts of the landscape and were therefore part of the community settling it. Through the act of their construction and maintenance of them, they perhaps encompassed physical, as well as symbolic roles through more than one generation.

In this section I will observe linear earthworks which are possibly not connected to the animal husbandry or had another role than just possible farming land boundaries. Observation of the linear earthworks and the later prehistoric enclosed sites nearby creates several questions:

- If both features were contemporary, what were the possible roles of the linear earthworks?
- If the linear earthworks were built later than the enclosed sites nearby, were the enclosed sites the reason for their construction?
- If the linear earthworks pre-date the enclosed sites nearby, why were the enclosed sites built so close to them? Were the linear earthworks still in use at the time and after the enclosed sites were built next to them?
- What do the linear earthworks separate?
- Were the linear earthworks private or communal structures?
- Observing the linear earthworks, what was the inside and what was the outside?

I discuss 16 enclosed sites in the study area with records of the linear earthworks nearby. The linear earthworks are located immediately outside the enclosed site and up to 150 m away from the ramparts (Warlawbank, Berwickshire, see RCAHMS 1980a, 39, no. 324).

Asking the question of what was the outside and what was the inside in the observation of linear earthworks in the landscape, ramparts of the enclosed sites can be helpful. At the great majority of sites, the rampart was on the inside and the ditch was on the outside. Therefore, linear earthworks will be interpreted this way. At the end of the chapter I will discuss if this view was the right one to choose, if linear earthworks were built according to different criteria or if it is not possible to tell which side was the internal and which internal.
Three main types of linear earthworks in close proximity of enclosed sites can be recognised. These are linear earthworks that possibly served as boundaries between two features in archaeological landscape, linear earthworks which could be connected to the experience of approaching the enclosed site and formed a part of the monumental entrances of enclosed sites, and those, which pre-date enclosed sites nearby. Sometimes linear earthworks could belong to either of the first two types, but are listed in the text according to which type seems more plausible with a question mark written next to them. Moreover, linear earthworks probably did not have one single function, but served several (see section 7.1.). I will here represent some of them, which are possible, but usually not mentioned in other studies.

7.2.1. TYPE 1: Linear earthworks as local boundaries between two archaeological features within the landscape

Sites forming this category:

- Peeblesshire: Harehope Rings; Langlaw Hill; Worm Hill
- Berwickshire: /
- E Dumfriesshire: Castle O’Er (option 1); Potholm Hill

Linear earthworks that possibly form local boundaries can be observed as two categories as they could be contemporary with the nearby sites or they can pre-/post-date them.

LINEAR EARTHWORKS WHICH WERE PROBABLY CONTEMPORARY TO THE ENCLOSED SITES NEARBY

The main characteristics of this type are three:

1) Linear earthworks are located where there are no clear natural boundaries nearby. Therefore, the linear earthworks can be built on any side of the enclosed site.
2) Ditches of linear earthworks were located on the side furthest away from the enclosed site, with a bank on the side closer to it.
3) Enclosed sites with linear earthworks of this type usually show settlement evidence within in Peeblesshire and E Dumfriesshire, but not in Berwickshire (for information on individual sites see Appendices).
Linear earthworks which probably formed boundaries between different features in archaeological landscape are especially well seen in Berwickshire (see below) and parts of Eastern Dumfriesshire (RCAHMS 1997, Fig. 41), in locations where natural boundaries were not clear due to flat terrain or a lack of natural features forming boundaries. Some signs of linear earthworks exist in vibrant landscapes; there was probably little need for them there as natural boundaries were well established (Halliday 2002, 92). On flat terrains however, long stretches of linear earthworks are still visible (e.g. Herriot’s Dyke, Berwickshire, in: RCAHMS 1915, 95-96, no. 172; Craw 1928, 361-364; Graham 1962). Linear earthworks of this type were perhaps contemporary to at least one of the enclosed sites nearby (for a contrary view see Halliday 2002, 92).

EXAMPLE: Harehope Rings, Peeblesshire

The linear earthwork at Harehope Rings is located at the back of the enclosed settlement and not on the side with entrances (Illus. 153). Two streams (Millhope Burn and Lyne Burn) probably form part of the settlement boundaries (for this topic see sections 6.3.2. and 6.4.) and the linear earthwork maybe represents a third boundary, as there is no visible natural boundary on this side.
LINEAR EARTHWORKS POSSIBLY BUILT TO PROTECT EARLIER SITES WITHIN LATER ARCHAEOLOGICAL LANDSCAPE

EXAMPLE: Castle O’Er, E Dumfriesshire, option 1

The linear earthworks close to Castle O’Er were used at least some time when enclosed settlement was in use. Other linear earthworks in the valley were built over a longer time span (Halliday 2002, 98). Some dates from the ‘annexe’ (C on Illus. 154) exist. These are cal AD 75-428 and cal 55 BC-AD 134 (Halliday 2002, 98). The pollen evidence shows that at the time when linear earthwork C was in use, the land around it was firmly pastoral and linear earthworks around Castle O’Er have therefore been explained as cattle-handling arrangements (ibid.).
Observing linear earthworks close to Castle O’Er show some indication that they could possibly form part of a monumental entrance and an approaching experience (section 8.2.2.). These linear earthworks formed a sort of annexe on the E side of the enclosed settlement. There are however, many more stretches of linear earthworks, which can be followed for over 3 km over the White Esk Valley (Illus. 163). The system of linear earthworks around the enclosed site was first mapped in 1896 (Halliday 2002, 98). The whole system covers around 100 ha (ibid.). The focus of this study is to analyse linear earthworks closest to the enclosed site and the wider system of linear earthworks will briefly be discussed later on (7.3.).

Illus. 154 shows Castle O’Er with the nearby stretches of linear earthworks. Illus. 155 is a stylised model showing locations of ramparts and ditches at the site. From it, it is possible to notice that the ditches of linear earthworks were positioned on the side closest to the enclosed settlement. This means that a person approaching the enclosed site would go through a series of similar gaps in linear earthworks and the ramparts of the enclosed settlement, always seeing banks first. This also tells that the linear earthworks were probably not built for defence, as ditches on the side closest to the enclosed site would make it hard to defend the site. Instead, nearby linear earthworks could be seen as part of an approaching experience and part of a monumental entrance to the enclosed settlement (section 7.2.2.). This could happen if linear earthworks were contemporary to the enclosed settlement, but also if the linear earthworks were built when the settlement was already in use or even abandoned. Something similar has been recently detected at Ferrybridge Henge in Yorkshire (see below and Roberts 2005).
Illus. 154: E Dumfriesshire, Castle O’Er and linear earthworks close by (From: RCAHMS 1997, Fig. 73)
Illus. 155: E Dumfriesshire, Castle O’Er, stylised model showing locations of ramparts and ditches at the site
Long distance linear boundaries appeared in the Late Bronze Age. Some of them used earlier monuments and springs as points of alignment (Bevan 1997, 183). But it was not until recently that the published excavations in Yorkshire revealed another view on linear earthworks, which are positioned close to other archaeological features in the landscape (Roberts 2005). Excavations of Ferrybridge Henge and its surroundings discovered a boundary, which separated archaeological features of a long period of time. A gully and a later pit alignment (Iron Age/ Roman Iron Age in date) were built to separate the Late Neolithic/ Early Bronze Age henge from the Iron Age/ Roman Iron Age settlement (Roberts, Richardson 2005, 207-209), while the henge ditch was still being cleaned in the Iron Age/ Roman Iron Age (Gaunts, Chase, Bateman 2005, 236). This is a significant discovery, which serves as further evidence of the respect towards the earlier archaeological features in the landscape (similar has been noted in Chapters 7 and 9). A similar phenomenon has been noticed close to the henge at the island of Maxey, but the connection between the hedge, linear boundaries and the settlement has not been made (see Taylor 1997). Perhaps we can see a boundary between everyday life and symbolic/ afterlife also at Langlaw Hill, Peebleshire (RCAHMS 1967, vol.1, 128-130, no. 300), where a linear earthwork forms a boundary between the enclosed site on one site and several barrows on the other. Moreover, D. Miles et al. have suggested that regular cleaning of linear ditches could have marked a linkage to the ancestors who created them (Miles et al. 2003, 256).
Illus. 156: Yorkshire, Ferrybridge, prehistoric remains (From: Roberts 2005, Fig. 10.)
This evidence suggests that we could perhaps interpret some of the linear earthworks located nearby enclosed sites with caution. Castle O’Er is one of best examples here. It was noted above that the linear earthworks almost enclose the enclosed settlement, and that their ditches are positioned on the side closest to the settlement. Comparing these observations with the data gained from the Ferrybridge excavation, it would perhaps not be wrong to assume that the linear earthworks at Castle O’Er could have been built to exclude or protect the site from later activities. Observation of linear earthworks constructed within the broad area around Castle O’Er (Illus. 163), indeed shows that they were built in an orderly way around the enclosed site. They seem to form a system of large enclosures (RCAHMS 1997, 78), with streams forming parts of the boundaries between these enclosed spaces. Parts of linear earthworks were built over a longer period of time (e.g. earthwork D cuts through the earthwork C on Illus. 154). R. Mercer (in prep.) tells us that the ramparts of Castle O’Er remained in use during the first centuries of 1st millennia AD (see also RCAHMS 1997, 21, 79; Halliday 2002, 98) and are later than some of the phases of enclosed settlement, although they show that enclosed settlement was still being used at the time when nearby linear earthworks were built (Halliday 2002, 100).

7.2.2. TYPE 2: Linear earthworks as parts of impressive approach and monumental entrances to the sites

Sites forming this category:

- Peeblesshire: Blyth Hill; Edston (?); Helm End 1; Langlaw Hill; Milkieston Rings; Whiteside Hill
- Berwickshire: Warlawbank
- E Dumfriesshire: Castle O’Er (option 2)

The main characteristics of this type are:

1) Linear earthworks are located on the side of the entrance to the enclosed site
2) Enclosed sites with this type of linear earthworks nearby are either bigger than 0.4 ha they have multiple ramparts or both
3) Enclosed sites nearby are multi-period (except Warlawbank, where it is not possible to distinguish more than one phase)
4) Ditches of the linear earthworks can be on either side of their banks.
5) Linear earthworks have a gap/possible entrance towards the enclosed sites, which is not necessarily completely aligned with the site entrance.

EXAMPLE: *Milkieston Rings, Peebleshire*

Barber's study proposed several different types of usage of linear earthworks. The linear earthworks of Milkieston Rings were categorised as defensive outworks (Barber 1999, 118), yet Barber emphasized the entrances of the linear earthworks being 6.4 m and 12 m wide.

![Image of Milkieston Rings and linear earthworks](From: RCAHMS 1967, vol.1, Fig. 119)

Barber's categorisation however, is hard to accept. Firstly, the inner (X) and the outer two (Y, Z) earthworks are morphologically different (Illus. 157). They all consist of a rampart
and a ditch, which is the most common form of linear earthwork in S Scotland (Barber 1999, 136). However, X has a ditch on the side further away from the enclosed site and Y and Z have ditches on the side closer to the settlement (Illus. 156). It has therefore been suggested that X is contemporary to the settlement, but the date and purpose of Y and Z are uncertain (RCAHMS 1967, vol.1, 133). But the site is a multi-period one and it is not known to which phases, if any, the linear earthworks could be contemporary.

There is a possibility that all the three linear earthworks are connected to the multi-period site as “sheer bloody common sense” (words of G. Jobey, cited in Bennet 1983, 205) does not allow us to think differently as these linear earthworks were set so close to the site and were set on the side of the easiest approach to the enclosed site (Illus. 157).

Parallels to linear earthworks Y and Z in connection to one of the phases of Milkieston Rings can be found at Sutton Common at S Yorkshire (Illus. 158). There, two nearby enclosures were connected with a causeway and it was suggested that one enclosure was simply an annexe to the other one rather than forming a separate enclosure (Parker Pearson, Sydes 1997, 255). Enclosure A probably formed part of an entrance to enclosure B (ibid.). As Illus. 157 shows, enclosure B had its ramparts constructed in such a way that their ditches would face the person coming towards the enclosure A. This means that approaching the site and going through the rampart entrances would be continuous, facing ditches first at all three entrances and facing banks at all the gaps on the way out. Also, ditches are all located down the hill so the draining value on such a marshy terrain as Sutton Common cannot be ignored.

It is not hard to imagine that linear earthworks Y and Z at Milkieston Rings would have had a similar role. As the ditches are on the side facing the enclosed settlement and the gaps through them are so wide, the defensive value of these linear earthworks is questionable. However, such impressive linear earthworks could represent part of an impressive approaching experience and part of a monumental entrance to the settlement site (this has been discussed before, Chapter 5).
At this stage, I would question the phases of the site of Milkieston Rings, as recognised by the RCAHMS (1967, vol. 1, 131-133) for current information also see CANMORE. Enclosed sites with monumental entrances show a certain type of ramparts (i.e. they are only located on the site of the entrance (which is always located on the side of the easiest approach to the enclosed site) and possibly on the side which can be easily approachable and clearly seen while coming towards the entrance of the site (see Chapter 6), which is yet to be recognised in the clutter of ramparts belonging to different phases at Milkieston Rings (Illus. 157). Yet a monumental approach to this enclosed site and its entrance would explain the unusual settlement ramparts of later stages. Linear earthwork X and the two pairs of ramparts on the NNE side of the settlement site, close the monumental approach of the earlier phase and the entrances, are now opened towards the closest water resources. It is probably at this phase that enclosure is replaced by settlement as it was shown before that settlements often have their entrances located towards the nearby water source and enclosures do not (see section 4.3.). Milkieston Rings is the only multi-period settlement where a major change of usage of location is recognisable (section 3.3.).
Similar organisation can be seen at Castle O’Er (option 2). There, the person approaching the site, would see banks first, and while leaving the site ditches first (section 7.2.1., see also Illus. 155). This could be important information for detecting the outside and the inside of the linear earthworks/outworks. At Sutton Common, both enclosures were contemporary (Parker Pearson, Sydes 1997) and the ramparts were always set on the side closest to the interior of enclosure A (Illus. 158). Based on the observations made earlier in the text this means that the interior of the enclosure A was on the inside of the complex and enclosure B could be a forecourt.

8.2.3. Linear earthworks that predate the enclosed sites nearby

Sites forming this category:

- Peebleshire: /
- Berwickshire: Pit alignment: earlier than enclosure at Marygoldhill Plantation 3; Bluehouse and Warlawbank
- E Dumfriesshire: Hayknowes Farm (NY 1724 6555; site not included in other analyses in this thesis, for details see Gregory 1996; Gregory 2001; RCAHMS 1997, 49, 50, 134, 299, no. 622)

The main characteristics of this type are:

1) The linear earthwork was most probably abandoned in the time of the construction of the enclosed site.
2) One of the sides of the enclosed site is aligned and set directly on top of the linear earthwork.

EXAMPLE: Marygoldhill Plantation 3, Berwickshire

The rectilinear enclosure is set on top of the linear earthwork, with the SE side following the linear earthwork, the external rampart being aligned with the linear earthwork bank and the medial ditch being aligned with the linear earthwork ditch (Illus. 159). There has been no evidence found that the bank of the earthworks would be incorporated into the enclosure
rampart (Strong 1988, 123). However, the ditch of the linear earthworks has been filled with large stones to make a foundation for a later rampart (ibid.). The excavation of the ditch showed that the ditch was still clearly visible at the time when the rectilinear enclosure was constructed, although it was half filled with deposition layers (Strong 1988, 116-123). This means that it was probably abandoned by the time that the construction of the enclosed site started.

Illus. 159: Berwickshire, Marygoldhill Plantation, rectilinear enclosure and two linear earthworks (From: Strong 1988, Illus. 3)
EXAMPLE: *Hayknowes Farm, E Dumfriesshire*

This site was not included in the selection of later prehistoric enclosed sites from E Dumfriesshire. However, it is one of the few excavated sites in the county and the relationship to the linear earthwork was established by excavation (Gregory 2001).

Hayknowes Farm is located on flat ground. Several sites are set in close vicinity to each other (Illus. 160). A double-ditched enclosure (c. 0.7 ha) with later settlement (Enclosure 1, Illus. 160), a circular enclosure just E of it and a rectilinear enclosure (c. 0.2 ha) (Enclosure 2, Illus. 160) have a series of linear earthworks close by. There is also a Roman temporary camp nearby (Gregory 1996).

Excavation revealed that the rectilinear enclosure at Hayknowes Farm was partly constructed on top of the earlier linear boundary (Gregory 2001, 40-41). The excavated part of the intersection revealed two phases of later features overlying the linear earthwork. The first phase is represented by a gully of unknown purpose and the second one is the enclosure (ibid., Illus. 161).

!Illus. 160: E Dumfriesshire, archaeological remains at Hayknowes Farm (From: Gregory 2001, Figure 2)
Further characteristics, which can be assigned to this type are:

1) At the time of construction of the rectilinear enclosure, the linear earthwork was no longer in use. This can be seen in the natural backfill of the linear ditch at both examples.

2) At the time of construction of the rectilinear enclosure, the linear earthwork was visible in the landscape. This can be seen in the intentional removal of all traces of the linear ditch, and perhaps also in the alignment of the enclosed site rampart.

3) Both sites set on top of linear earthworks are rectilinear and relative chronology is clear. Furthermore, Hayknowes Farm site also provided a radiocarbon date of the rectilinear enclosure, which is 50 cal BC – 140 cal AD (Gregory 2001, 42, Table 1). This tells us that the linear earthwork was abandoned by the first century AD.

7.3. Discussion

In this chapter, I studied some of the linear earthworks as possible extensions of the ramparts of nearby enclosed sites. I also discussed linear earthworks, which were perhaps built to protect earlier sites from later activities nearby, or to emphasize the approach towards them. The sites, built on top of linear earthworks, kept their alignment in the alignment of their
ramparts. Most of these views have not been discussed in detail before. However, they do represent other interpretative possibilities for linear earthworks near the enclosed sites. They are no less plausible than any possible defensive role of linear earthworks, farm boundaries, enclosures for cattle, or signs of the development of centralised authorities (section 7.1.). Their role has to be discussed on the level of a particular site and its surroundings. The role of linear earthworks was probably different from site to site, and the linear earthworks probably did not have only one role (see Castle O’Er, E Dumfriesshire, for example, where linear earthworks were built over a longer period of time, perhaps with different functions, sections 7.2.1. and 7.2.2.; also Halliday 2002).

The excavated evidence and dating of the enclosed sites and linear earthworks close by is sparse in S Scotland. Even with the dates that are available (see Halliday 2002, 94), it is not possible to relate the construction of the linear earthworks and enclosed sites to any particular time. S. Halliday claims there is no firm ground or data to base our researches on the linear earthworks and contemporary enclosed sites nearby (Halliday 2002, 92).

But what all the linear earthworks have in common is that they try to enclose something and they, in the great majority, use natural landscape features and streams to help them. Most of the times, it is not possible to establish the relative chronology of the linear earthworks and the enclosed sites located nearby. However, it is possible to see that usually one was not built without considering the other. The features of the approaching experience have been discussed already (section 7.2.1.). The approach or departure to/ away from the site was set in such a way that one would always face ramparts or ditches first. One example from S Scotland goes even further with this detail (see below).

White Hill, Roxburgh, is a site enclosed by two ramparts and a ditch (Illus. 162). What is interesting is that while approaching the S and SW sides of the enclosed site, one faces the rampart side of the enclosed site and adjacent earthwork, while approaching it from the N or E the ditch is seen first. The linear earthworks (possible field boundary, see Halliday 1985, 80) can be seen SE, E and NE of the site. They were built in the same manner as the ramparts and the ditch of the enclosed site. Observing the landscape however, one can claim that the ramparts were always built on the side sloping down the hill, with the ditches behind them. This is an easy but unusual method of building ramparts (c.f. Castle O’Er, E Dumfriesshire and Milkieston Rings, Peebleshire). The appearance of the linear earthworks was not dependent only on the landscape they were built in.
Although observation of linear earthworks and nearby enclosed sites produced some new data on the possible connection of the two, linear earthworks should be looked at within a longer period. The same is true for the study of settlement patterns. Linear earthworks could pre-/post-date the enclosed sites nearby or were contemporary to them. This is hard to tell even with the data gained from excavation (see for example Miles et al. 2003, 130-131).
Relations between linear earthworks and enclosed sites nearby, as well as possible dating of the two, need to be observed on a site-to-site level. Nevertheless, these must not stop us from studying occurrences mentioned. There are numbers of possibilities for studying the relationship between linear earthworks and other archaeological features near by, as outlined above.

Moreover, observing linear earthworks/ linear ditches and pit alignments in Berwickshire reveals, that most of the linear features are set close to enclosed sites with multiple ramparts (e.g. Aytonlaw, Fosterland Burn, Springhill, Warlawbank). Warlawbank has been previously discussed as a possible part of a monumental approach to the site (section 7.2.2.). However, it seems that this phenomenon is more widespread, as linear earthworks are more common close to more complex sites in the whole area of research (e.g. Milkieston Rings in Peeblesshire, Castle O’Er, in E Dumfriesshire). This is perhaps connected to the trends of explaining linear features as parts of animal husbandry (section 8.1.); it especially well fits into the Bowden and McOmish’s theory on monumentality of ramparts showing status of the ‘owners’ (Bowden, McOmish 1987) given the supposition that the amount of livestock was the sign of wealth in later prehistory (e.g Cunliffe 1997, 73).

Observing all the enclosed sites with adjacent linear earthworks as studied above, several similarities occur (for details of each site see Appendices). Of the 13 sites, at least 10 were multi-period, 11 were enclosed with more than one rampart and at least eight had more than one entrance. Seven sites show signs of internal roundhouses, which were of a ring-groove, ring-ditch or timber construction with no particular type assigned. Sites were not set on low-levelled ground; their altitude rises from 62 m OD to 401 m OD with the average being 284 m OD.

The system of linear earthworks around Castle O’Er was in previous studies discussed as being for substantial ‘cattle- ranching’ (section 7.2.1.; see also Halliday 2002: RCAHMS 1997, 21, 79). Similar systems can also be seen at White Hill, Roxburghshire (Halliday 1982). Farming on a large scale cannot be dismissed with the results from the analysis made in this chapter. There is a possibility, however, that the earlier sites were protected from later activities (e.g. extensive farming) with linear earthworks set close to them (section 7.2.1.) especially with the data from Castle O’Er, which shows that the linear earthwork C was built slightly over the rampart of the early phase of the enclosed site (Castle O’Er 1; see Illus. 154).
Linear earthworks that post-date other archaeological sites nearby include earlier monuments in planning the outline for the linear earthworks (section 7.2.1.). Similar, but on a much smaller scale, can perhaps be seen at the broch of Edin's Hall, Berwickshire, where dry-stone wall, abutting the broch wall, was built to prevent direct line of approach to the entrance passage of the broch (Dunwell 1999, 317, see Illus. 164). Could this be built to show that the broch was no longer in use and to make a boundary between the old and the new? Or perhaps to make a boundary between the ancestors and later activities at the same site, to pay respect to the construction of the ancestors and make sure it would not be destroyed by later activities?
Illus. 164: Berwickshire, Edin’s Hall (From: Dunwell 1999, Illus 8), later wall, which abuts the broch is shown in red

Some of the linear earthworks can be seen as communal constructions within the landscape. There is evidence of segmented ditches in the Cotswolds and upper Thames valley, which implies that different teams of people built different parts of one linear earthwork and contributed to one boundary within the landscape (Moore 2006, 129). This can be said for longer linear earthworks, like Deil’s Jingle in E Dumfriesshire or Heriot’s Dike in Berwickshire. However, the linear earthworks which were examined in this chapter form mostly short stretches within the landscape and could be built by people ‘owning’ the enclosed site nearby. Even then it is not possible to assign the linear earthworks as private constructions, as most of the enclosed sites with linear earthworks close by are not the ‘typical’ later prehistoric sites. As noted before, most of these sites show at least one atypical feature which differs from most of the enclosed site evidence, and could therefore be seen as possibly being communal enclosed sites (see also Moore 2006, 137).

12 i.e. smaller than 0.5 ha, enclosed with one rampart, with one entrance
Analysis of linear earthworks makes it clear that the land was divided according to different purposes, either as living space vs. farming (possibly seen at Castle O’Er), as the every day landscape vs. monumental approach to a somewhat different enclosed site (possibly seen at Milkieston Rings), division between the old and the new (Ferrybridge) or a division between the dead and the living (Ferrybridge). Division between lands which would be used for different purposes is visible at other sites across Britain. For example, J. Rylatt and B. Bevan (2007, 226) noticed a division of land at the later prehistoric pit alignment at Kilvington, Devon. There the pit alignment divides the flood plain from the land suitable for agriculture (ibid.). Several more examples of division of different topographical zones were detected (Rylatt, Bevan 2007, 230-231).

Moreover, linear earthworks from the Yorkshire Wolds show occasional alignment on earlier barrows nearby (Dent 1982, 450). A feature similar to linear earthworks but much earlier are reaves, which were studied by A. Fleming in the area of S Dartmoor (Fleming 1978). Reaves are stone walls, which are usually long-distance boundaries, dated to the second half of second millennia BC. Fleming’s study shows that reaves are usually laid out deliberately to run beside stone circles and rows, which date to the first half of the second millennia BC. This means that stone circles/rows are on the outside, excluded and bounded from the later activities (Fleming 1978, 109). At Dartmoor, J. Collis sees land divisions between the areas of lowland pastures and field systems and the communal high ground summer pastures (Collis 1996, 88). Moreover, study of Welsh Marches shows that extra care was taken to respect ring ditches close to where pit alignment was built (Wigley 2007, 129). Other examples of respect towards the earlier monuments in the landscape are plentiful (e.g. Barker et al. 1991, Bradley et al. 1994, 194; Giles 2007b; Humn 2000). This provides a firm argument for the studies of smaller areas with observation of the whole range of the archaeological features identified there.

The analysis of linear earthworks and their connection to the enclosed sites nearby allow us to observe the archaeological landscape on levels of wide time-scales. It also shows that each archaeological feature put in the landscape depended on features that already existed there. The same conclusion was reached from the case studies of settlement patterns made in this chapter (see also Chapters 6, 8 and 9).

This is the point where we could start to question landscape archaeology studies which focus on particular types of sites or particular moments in time. We must be aware that these
studies (which include this thesis) do not show a whole picture of the archaeological landscape as we focus only on a narrow time scale or particular types of sites. The evidence of respecting positions of earlier structures within landscapes emerged so many times during the course of this thesis that it made me question the approach I chose for the analysis. Consequently, all the information that is coming to the surface makes one aware that the only way to get to know an area in archaeology is to observe all the archaeological features from that area, regardless of their chronology.

Whatever the roles of linear earthworks were, we can argue the following. Linear earthworks and enclosed sites nearby were not built in isolation from one another. Instead, the visual effect and ‘neatness’ of the archaeological features in the surrounding area was important. Many of them were not built or even used contemporarily (e.g. Halliday 1985, 75, 80). Yet, they respected the earlier features while building close by in the later phases, regardless of the reason for construction.

Where linear earthworks were earlier than the enclosed sites nearby, they were undoubtedly still distinct features in the landscape. Most of the linear earthworks stayed unaffected when later archaeological features were built close to them. The same is true for the opposite; linear earthworks were not usually built over earlier sites. However, there is an indication of a change at some stage in later prehistory. Some rectilinear enclosed sites were built over earlier linear earthworks (e.g. Marygoldhill Plantation 3 and Hayknowes Farm, see 7.2.3.). These were already abandoned at the time of construction of the enclosed sites. However, the rectilinear enclosed sites did not demolish the line of the linear earthworks. Instead, one of the lines of newly built ramparts followed the line of the linear earthwork and was built on exactly the same line as the earlier earthwork and the line of the linear earthwork was kept respected. Is it possible that the rectilinear shape was chosen on purpose, to keep one of the ramparts aligned with the earlier archaeological feature within the landscape?
Chapter 7 presents a study of linear earthworks which were set close to the later prehistoric enclosed sites. Linear earthworks most probably had more than one role and the roles, which are rarely discussed in other studies, were presented here. The importance of the respect towards the earlier structures in the landscapes, indicated in previous chapters, was confirmed throughout this chapter. Some of the linear earthworks may have formed boundaries between the old and the new in the landscape. This can be further established with the study from Ferrybridge Henge in Yorkshire. The division was perhaps created as a sign of respect towards the older features and to protect these features from the new usage of the nearby landscape. It could also form part of a symbolic transition between the new and the old, while approaching the older features, which is especially well seen at Ferrybridge. The chronological sequence of the archaeological remains at Castle O’Er, E Dumfriesshire is not clear, but similar separation between the old and the new could be observed if the linear earthworks are later than the enclosed site itself.

Moreover, some of the linear earthworks could form parts of a monumental entrance and approaching experience towards the site with the monumental entrance. This phenomenon is usually present if linear earthworks are built contemporarily or if the sites are in contemporary use. This can be seen at Sutton Common, Yorkshire, at Milkieston Rings, Peeblesshire and perhaps at Castle O’Er, E Dumfriesshire. If linear earthworks were earlier than the enclosed sites built next to them, their alignment is usually incorporated in the enclosed site layout.

Linear earthworks were never built in isolation from the rest of the constructions in the vicinity. They are generally built into the existing settlement patterns and later structures almost without exception respect their positions within the landscapes.
CHAPTER 8: ANOMALIES IN THE ENCLOSED SITE EVIDENCE

8.1. Introduction

This chapter will observe four oddities that appear in the later prehistoric enclosed site record. These are the re-examinations of the ‘unfinished’ enclosed sites (8.2.); the dun at Stanhope and Edin’s Hall broch (8.3.); the question of the so-called minor oppida (8.4.) and rectilinear sites (8.5.). I will observe each of these anomalies separately, tie them into the later prehistoric settlement record and question their place in the native later prehistoric enclosed site patterns.

The first group of sites examined has been categorized as ‘unfinished’ by the RCAHMS (e.g. RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, 28; 1997, 140-141). The re-examination of these sites, presented in the section 8.2., will observe a possibility that the stretches of ramparts visible today were perhaps deliberately built so that they did not encircle the whole of the site. Some examples of this are known. At the dun of Stanhope, for example, the rampart was built only on the broad S side, where access is easiest and where the entrance is located; the rampart makes access to the site more impressive (MacLaren 1960; RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, 157-158).

Secondly, I will observe the dun at Stanhope and Edin’s Hall broch within their settings in later prehistoric enclosed site patterns (8.3.). The main issue of this study is to see how these enclosed sites with massively built stone structures are incorporated into the native settlement pattern. Later on, the question of big sites, so-called minor oppida in SE Scotland and NE England is considered (section 8.4.). These sites will be contrasted based on their settings in the enclosed site patterns, as well as compared with each other.

The last oddity discussed will be the question of the rectilinear enclosed sites (8.5.). Different types of these sites will be observed and the comparison with the other later prehistoric settlement record will be made. There were a lot more rectilinear sites discovered than studied in this thesis. However, their dating is obscure (sections 3.2. and 8.5.) and only those sites that were labelled as later prehistoric in earlier studies (e.g. RCAHMS 1997) will be discussed.
8.2. 'Unfinished' enclosed sites

The 16 sites studied in this section are considered 'unfinished' in the RCAHMS Inventories (RCAHMS 1915; 1920; 1967; 1980a; 1980b; 1997); sites in E Dumfriesshire that are used only for this part of the thesis have their map locations and bibliography quoted next to them:

- Peebleshire: Cademuir Hill 1; Charge Law Plantation 1; Gallowberry Wood; Hamildean Hill; Hammer Knowe 1; Langlaw Hill 1; Rough Side; Tor Hill, Torbank; White Hill 3; White Meldon 4; Woodhouse Hill; Young Bush Wood
- Berwickshire: / (none of the sites has been labelled 'unfinished', probably due to poor preservation)
- E Dumfriesshire: Castle Hill (NY 1860 9255; RCAHMS 1920, 108, no. 289; 1997, 141, 299, no. 656; Jobey 1971, 88); Craig Hill 1; Newland Hill 1; Slippery Knowe (NY 2483 9312; RCAHMS 1920, 79, no. 201; 1980b, 26, no. 151; 1997, 78, 141, 299, no. 658)

It was believed for a long time that ramparts that did not seem to enclose the whole of the circuit of the enclosed sites, were 'unfinished'. This could be seen at either primary sets of ramparts (e.g. Young Bush Wood; Illus. 165, a) or at additional stretches of ramparts to primary works (e.g. Hamildean Hill; Illus. 165, b). Sometimes the arrival of the Romans was quoted as a reason for abandonment (e.g. Feachem 1966, 70; 1971, 34; RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, 118) as well as unstable environmental/ economic/ political conditions (Feachem 1971, 38). A lack of material/ builders for construction of ramparts (ibid., 20, 38) could also prevent the completion of ramparts.
Several enclosed sites in the area analysed show signs of a rampart partly enclosing an area, with no visible rampart enclosing the other side. Sometimes merely a sign of a shallow trench is visible on that side (e.g. Gallowberry Wood). This shallow trench has previously been explained as a ‘marker trench’, marking the line of the future rampart (RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, 28; Feachem 1971, 21, 23) and the sites containing it have been labelled ‘unfinished’ (ibid.). Later observations of the sites made it clear that palisades can be detected today as slight trenches in the landscape, which are almost identical to the ‘marker trenches’ (RCAHMS 1997, 140). Moreover, these could remain undetectable for most of the year and without frequent visits and aerial photos of these sites taken in different weather conditions, parts of ramparts cannot be seen and the sites can therefore be labelled ‘unfinished’.
Recent researches also made it clear that the ramparts of one site can be built with a combination of more than one building material (e.g. Gibb’s Hill (ibid. 122-125), Edin’s Hall 1, Berwickshire (Dunwell 1999, 346), which means that ‘marker trenches’ could at some sites represent remains of palisades used in combination with ramparts built of other materials. Combination of materials could be the case at some of the sites such as Charge Law Plantation 1, which only shows a short stretch of earth and stone rampart with no ramparts enclosing the whole of the circuit of the enclosed site (Illus. 166). It is possible that a palisade trench is not yet detected (see above), or that the majority of it was ruined in building the next phase of the site.

Illus. 166: Peeblesshire, Charge Law Plantation and its unfinished phase 1 (From: RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, Fig. 85)

While some enclosed sites may in fact be unfinished (in those cases a question mark is put next to them when discussed in text), a lot of them can now be reinterpreted with the ‘marker trenches’ reclassified as palisades. Re-examination of these sites made it possible to establish three different groups:

- Enhanced rampart features possibly forming part of a monumental entrance as parts of the experience of approaching the site
This group includes sites that have circuit of ramparts built of one material, with extra stretches of ramparts at the entrance or on the side of easiest approach:

Gallowberry Wood; Hamildean Hill; Tor Hill, Torbank (?); White Hill; White Meldon (?)

Lines of ‘marker trenches’ and ramparts built of other materials have been set on each side of the entrance or on sides where the easiest access to the enclosed site exist, possibly forming another feature in the impact of approaching the site and monumental entrance. Monumental entrances and the experience of approaching the site have been discussed before (Chapter 5).

‘Marker trenches’ which could form part of a monumental entrance and the experience of approaching the site can also be seen in examples from other parts of Britain, such as Caster Cliff, Lanarkshire (Feachem 1971, 33), Cnoc an Duin, Ross and Cromarty (ibid., 149; 1971, 28), Durn Hill, Aberdeenshire (Feachem 1963, 110-111; 1971, 28), Winkelbury, Wiltshire (Feachem 1971, 32) and others. In addition, C. Haselgrove noticed that at some of the British enclosed sites, ramparts were massively built only on sides where it would be possible to see them while approaching the enclosed site (Haselgrove 2001, 55). This can be seen at big enclosed sites such as Maiden Castle, Dorset and also at small ones, such as Port Seton, East Lothian (ibid.). All these examples can further validate the idea of the monumental entrances and the impact of approaching the site (Chapter 5).

- Stretches of ramparts built of different material, parts of ramparts not seen anymore

Sites, forming this category:

Charge Law Plantation 1; Hammer Knowe 1, Woodhouse Hill

‘Unfinished’ ramparts have been recognised at sites showing ‘gang work’, where builders were divided in several groups, each starting work at different points around the perimeter of the rampart. Therefore, it is possible to follow stretches of earth and stone ramparts with stretches where other materials were perhaps used for enclosing the area. As mentioned before, there is more than one example where the circuit of the rampart was
built from more than one material (e.g. Edin’s Hall 1; Gibb’s Hill) and perhaps only remains of one material are still visible today.

Moreover, it has been suggested that ‘marker trenches’ and ‘marker banks’ were incorporated into the full-scale ramparts (Feachem 1971, 22-23). Excavation at Ladle Hill, Hampshire showed that the ‘marker trench’ and bank represented the inner lip of the ditch (Feachem 1971, 24; Piggott 1931), which was still visible and not completely dug away while constructing the ramparts and ditches. This could show that the ‘marker trench’ perhaps had a role bigger than simply being quarried away while digging a ditch. Excavated examples from Northern Britain do not show any signs of this kind of ‘marker trenches’ and banks and therefore suggest that maybe we should look for a different way of marking the circuit of the enclosed site (RCAHMS 1997, 140).

- ‘Unfinished’ ramparts and ambiguous sites

Castle Hill shows signs of a rampart and a ditch on one side of the enclosed site, while the other side does not show any signs of either ramparts or a ‘marker trench’ (Illus.167, a). At least two timber-built roundhouses are visible in the interior (B and C on Illus. 167, a), with many more scoops of possible roundhouses, which could represent more that one phase of building. The ramparts of this enclosed settlement do indeed look unfinished. However, RCAHMS’ comment on the positions of the roundhouses, which are set in a shelter “from the full force of the westerly winds” raises a question as to whether the rampart was built for this purpose and was not needed on the other side (RCAHMS 1997, 141). Perhaps some were not intended to be ramparts that enclosed sites, but earthworks which provided shelter. This cannot yet be confirmed. Nevertheless, it has to be noted that all the other three ‘unfinished’ enclosed sites in E Dumfriesshire, which are located in the area of 15 x 7 km, have their ‘ramparts’ built on the W side, while the E side is ‘unfinished’ (see Illus. 167). Similar structures, but on a smaller scale, have been mentioned as possible windbreaks (e.g. Alexander, Watkins 1998, 246).
The latest examination of Young Bush Wood, Peeblesshire shows that its ‘marker trench’ is unconvincing and that this site is a questionable one (RCAHMS 1997, 140). At Cademuir 1 and Rough Side traces of gang work can be seen as short stretches of ditches and ramparts (Illus. 168). These sites do not show any signs of ‘marker trenches’ or similar between these
stretches and it is unlikely that the currently ‘empty’ stretches would have been built with a different material, e.g. palisades. The outer stretches of ramparts at these two sites were probably unfinished.

Illus. 168: Peeblesshire, Rough Side (From: RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, Fig. 130)

Langlaw Hill shows signs of a ‘marker trench’ on the E side of the enclosed site (Y on Illus.169). This could be a stretch of a palisade. Moreover, one side of the rampart and a ditch at 1b (Illus. 169) seems unfinished. There is also another stretch of a rampart and a ditch (X on the Illus. 169), which appears to be unfinished. The site that we see today was undoubtedly formed by multiple phases and the explanation is obscure.

Some of the sites may genuinely be unfinished. However, the study presented showed other possible explanations for many of these sites.
8.3. Brochs/ duns and their surroundings

"Their green sites, still undefaced by the plough, rise conspicuously from cultivated fields."
(Christison 1895, 172)

Lowland brochs and duns are types of structures usually connected to the Atlantic region of Scotland, but sometimes also discussed as possibly being a result of local tradition (Macinnes 1984a; for opposite see for example Harding 2001, 370). Their time span is not
long; most of the excavated examples have been dated to the first and second centuries AD (e.g. Curle 1892; Dunwell 1999; Macinnes 1984a; Main 1998; Piggott 1951), though the evidence is not without its problems.

There are two massively-built stone-walled structures in the area researched in this thesis. I will only briefly describe Edin’s Hall broch and the dun at Stanhope as constructions as this has been done before (e.g. Dunwell 1999; MacLaren 1960; Martlew 1982). What is more important at this stage is their position in the landscape and in later prehistoric settlement patterns. Such a study was proposed by L. Macinnes in 1984 (Macinnes 1984a, 240) but has not yet been done.

8.3.1. Stanhope dun, Peeblesshire

THE SITE

Stanhope dun is situated on high ground above the river Tweed, less than 5 km N of Tweedsmuir, at a height of 341m OD (Illus. 171). The site is visible from the entire central Tweed valley. The interior of this enclosed site can also be seen from higher ground on its E and SE side.

The dun was briefly mentioned by J.A. Smith in 1876, where he was describing a hoard of bronze objects, found near a site of “an old fort” (Smith 1881, 317). RCAHMS partly excavated the structure in the course of preparation for the Inventory of Peeblesshire (MacLaren 1960; RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, 157-158). These are the only publications that exist on this site.

A rampart and an external ditch with an entrance on the SW partly enclose the dun on the S side, which is the side of the easiest access. The dun itself (Illus. 170) was built with a massive dry-stone wall, which was 3.7-4.6m thick. The entrance passage, which was paved (MacLaren 1960, 195), was on the SW side. Excavation did not find any sign of a door but MacLaren suggested that an arrangement of stones forming a revetment wall on the inner side of the entrance passage could be a sign that the door was positioned there (MacLaren 1960, 195). The interior of the dun was irregularly shaped and the floor was not levelled. Part of it was cut into bare rock and a revetment wall was built to prevent the scarp from
slipping down (*ibid.*). There is no proof that the interior would have been paved. Eight post-holes, roughly following the shape of the dun and its entrance, were found in the interior. These were interpreted as post-holes for a circular building, with the entrance orientated the same way as the entrance to the dun (*ibid.*, 196). The interior of a dun was badly damaged by a pit, perhaps dug by a treasure hunter (*ibid.*, 197). There was no formal hearth discovered inside. The dun’s entrance and the entrance through the rampart were connected by a paved passage and steps (MacLaren 1960, 198).

Illus. 170: Peeblesshire, Stanhope dun (From: RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, Fig. 151)

THE SURROUNDINGS

The site itself is located in the central Tweed valley, on the NW face of the Laigh Hill above the floodplain (Illus. 171). The steepness of the hill resulted in the site being partly terraced into the slope (see Illus. 170) and that is probably the reason why the rampart was built only on the S side, which is the side of the easiest access (for more on this see Chapter 5). A
similar situation can be seen for example at the broch at Scalloway, Shetland, where ramparts were built only on the side of easiest access despite a possible access from the other side (Sharples, Parker Pearson 1996, 257).

Illus. 171: Peebleshire, Stanhope dun and its surroundings

Illus. 171 shows enclosed site evidence around the Stanhope dun. The sitting and spacing of the dun indicate that it was incorporated into the later prehistoric settlement pattern and not
excluded from it. There are 26 later prehistoric enclosed sites in the area of c. 5 x 7 km (Illus. 171) and more than 100 other sites, such as unenclosed ring-ditch roundhouses (NT 115 292), hoards (Smith 1881), etc. Direct evidence on which enclosed sites could be cotemporary to the dun is not available and therefore we cannot discuss whether the isolation of massive stone-walled structures were isolated from the rest of the contemporary settlement evidence (e.g. Sharples, Parker Pearson 1996, 263). However, observing from a wide time-scale view, the dun does not represent any special position within the later prehistoric landscape and it obeys the ‘rules’ of later prehistoric building (e.g. height above the sea level is within a normal range, the location within the landscape and the nearby settlement pattern is fairly typical; see sections 3.3., 3.4., Chapters 6 and 9). The dun was highly visible from the central Tweed valley and from higher ground. This makes it similar to some of the large sites and those with impressive entrances discussed before (see section 2.6. and Chapter 5).

8.3.2. Edin’s Hall, Berwickshire

"... it seems pertinent to ask what exactly is the problem of the brochs?"

(Swanson 1984, 19)

THE SITE

The broch at Edin’s Hall lies approximately 2 km SE of Abbey St Bathans, on NE slope of Cockburn Law, above the steep slopes of the Whiteadder Water (Illus. 174).

The broch has been a target of research and excavation (often not professional, e.g. Turnbull G. 1857, 9 mentioned treasure hunters) for many decades (Lefroy 1870; Michie 1869; Turnbull J. 1881; Dunwell 1999). Descriptions and detailed site plans have been made from the 18th century onwards (Christison 1895; HBNC 1923, 270; 1863; 168-169, 246; 1872, 48, 110; 1910, 27; OSA 1791; Stuart 1871, Turnbull 1857; Turnbull 1881; and there cited older surveys). The earliest published notes on the site are the most valuable ones, as the broch was in a much better condition than it is now. The broch has been used as a quarry for the construction of field boundaries nearby (Turnbull 1857, 9; Dunwell 1999, 306), which resulted in great destruction of the site itself. The walls of the broch were partly reconstructed at some point between 1887 and 1906 (Dunwell 1999, 306).
The site itself is multi-period (Illus. 172). The earliest phase is represented by the remains of an enclosed site with two ramparts and one or two ditches (Edin's Hall 1). Several platforms, which could represent the residue of roundhouses, are visible within the enclosed site. However, more convincing evidence of possible settlement evidence could be destroyed by later phases of the site. The second phase of this location is represented by a broch and its enclosure (Edin's Hall 2), which lie within the earlier enclosure, occupying most of the W part of it and using its N ramparts as a part of its ramparts. One rampart with an external ditch visible on the SW side enclosed the broch itself. The rampart was constructed with a mixture of different materials (part stone, part earthen rampart) and has been discussed before (section 8.2.).

The broch (Illus. 173) itself was a dry-stone structure with a 4.8 - 6 m thick wall. Internally it measures 17.2-18-3 m, with at least partly paved floor. There are no signs of hearths within the broch (Dunwell 1999, 315-316). The broch had its entrance on the ESE side, which was 1.3-1.6m wide with signs of a door in the middle of the passage (ibid., 116). The passage
was paved (Turnbull 1881, 89). Two chambers extend S and N of the entrance passage, of which at least the N one shows signs of paving. Three additional intramural chambers exist inside the broch’s wall, one of them with evidence of stairs allowing access to the higher level (Dunwell 1999).

The last phase of the site is a settlement with stone-walled roundhouses and associated yards and enclosures (Edin’s Hall 3). The settlement occupies the E part of the earlier enclosed site (Edin’s Hall 1) and partly lies on its ramparts. However, the locations of the broch and its enclosure were kept respected and not built over. There are 12 or 13 stone-walled roundhouses visible.

Some authors have argued that the settlement is at least partly contemporary with the broch and therefore not built one over the other (Macinnes 1984a, 236; Hingley 1992, 28-29). L. Maciness has suggested a contemporary usage of them based on the entrance alignments of
the broch and the settlement (Macinness 1984a, 236). Based on the study of entrance orientations and the reasons for them made in Chapter 4, this can now be dismissed, as the entrances are pointing down the hill and towards the entrances to the yards, or the paths. Moreover, as shown in the earlier chapters, locations of older structures were often respected (e.g. section 6.3). A later built wall, which does not allow straight access to the broch itself, could form part of this respect towards the structure. The potential relationship between the broch and the settlement with stone-walled roundhouses needs more examination but on the basis of the two arguments above we cannot tell if they were contemporary or not.

Roundhouse 1 (Illus. 172) however, is abutted by the broch rampart (Dunwell 1999, 349). This roundhouse also differs from the others in its size and internal paving (ibid.). It was suggested that this roundhouse perhaps formed a focal role within the settlement (Edin’s Hall 3) (ibid.). It is, however, possible that this roundhouse represents a separate period. Stone-walled roundhouses, positioned in the centre of older enclosed sites were recognised elsewhere (Chapter 6). Although none of these roundhouses is as large as roundhouse 1 at Edin’s Hall, they are all considerably larger than the roundhouses surrounding them (e.g. Easter Dawyck 2). When the central roundhouse is the only visible roundhouse in the interior, as at Caerlee 3 for example, the roundhouse also belongs to the group of big roundhouses (i.e. typical later prehistoric settlement, see Chapter 6).

THE SURROUNDINGS

There has been some discussion on the locations of brochs. Many of them emphasize the isolation of brochs from other settlement remains. This forms part of the debate on S Scottish brochs and duns (Dunwell 1999, 351) as well as for the brochs of Atlantic Scotland (Sharples, Parker Pearson 1997, 263). However, deliberate isolation does not seem plausible while observing Edin’s Hall broch within its archaeological landscape (for contrary see Dunwell 1999, 351). The same can be seen from observation of the surroundings of Stanhope dun (section 8.3.1., Illus. 171).

Illus. 174 presents a map showing all later prehistoric enclosed sites discussed in this thesis which are located near Edin’s Hall broch. The location of the broch does not seem to be an isolated position away from these enclosed sites. On the contrary, it is set on a location where most of the enclosed sites in the area were built. The settings of the broch and its
enclosure were observed before and they make it clear that this enclosed site used the same 'rules' for building as did the other later prehistoric sites (see sections 3.3., 3.4., Chapters 6 and 9).

If we only look at the remains in the area close to the broch, there are several later prehistoric enclosed sites visible (Illus. 174) and over a 100 other recorded traces of human presence in the prehistory. For example, flint scrapers were found at Cockburn (data taken from CANMORE), possible prehistoric long cists were discovered at Cockburn (Falconer 1932; RCAHMS 1980a, 19, no. 126), a Neolithic stone axe and Middle Bronze Age flanged axe
were found at Windshiel (Coles 1966, 134), an Early Historic silver chain was found at Hoardweel (Dunglas, Smith 1881), and several hut circles can be seen in around the Cockburn Law (e.g. RCAHMS 1915, 68, no. 121; RCAHMS 1980, 66, no. 586). This was a busy landscape, which was frequently used in later prehistory.

8.4. Hirsel Law and comparison with other big sites and *minor oppida*

Hirsel Law is a low isolated hill of 94 m OD situated 1.5 km NW of Coldstream, Berwickshire. It provides a dominant view in all directions and is the highest hill in c. 10 km radius around it. Access to it is easy from all directions, with the land falling most steeply towards the S. Since this enclosure was discovered by aerial survey in 1977, little attention has been paid to it. One geophysical survey was done on this location and the results were published in 1985 (Aspinall 1985). Since then, there have been no further attempts to explore this site.

The enclosure was discovered when RCAHMS was surveying parts of Berwickshire. They took three aerial photos of the site, all of them showing cropmarks with ditches and a possible bank surrounding the summit of the hill. Further marks can be seen to the S where it
looks like smaller enclosures are cutting the ditches of the big enclosure (Illus. 176). The enclosure measures 4.1 ha, which makes it the biggest enclosure in the study area. Nothing of this enclosure is visible on the ground.

Geophysical survey was carried out in 1982-1984 by A. Aspinall from Bradford University; the survey concentrated on the enclosure ramparts (Aspinall 1985). As this site is an igneous plug, the geology of it was difficult for the geophysics and interpretation of the results was not easy (ibid.). The results show the presence of a ditch with an inner bank (Aspinall 1985, 58, 62; Illus. 176) with a possible palisade (R. Cramp in: www.brad.ac.uk/arcsci/conferences/aspinall). There is a possible entrance on the SE side (Aspinall 1985, 64; Illus. 176). No internal structures are visible from the aerial photos (R. Cramp suggests differently, see ibid.) but there are some cropmarks showing a potential second ditch.

RCAHMS (CANMORE web site) suggests this site could represent the remains of a *minor oppidum*. This statement was made purely on the size of the enclosure (for more on the term *minor oppidum* see section 1.12.2.).
It has been suggested that big enclosed sites were located away from existing social groups and acted as meeting places for those groups (Moore 2006, 149). It has been proposed that large enclosed sites could be built by new groups, which settled areas away from existing groups (Haselgrove 1976; Hill 1995; 2007, 23; Moore 2007b, 55). These enclosed sites were possibly deliberately placed in spaces, which were not densely settled and did not have strongly set boundaries and ownership, set in a neutral space.

Apart from size and the location of the enclosure, there are no other similarities between other big enclosed sites and Hirsel Law. The position of its rampart shows that it was possible to see inside the enclosure from a distance. All of the information available for Hirsel Law makes it a good candidate for a Group 2 site (section 4.3.), the group to which most of the biggest sites from the studied area were categorised.

The problem with the term *minor oppidum* was discussed before (section 2.2.). However, the term was kept in this thesis for convenience reasons (*ibid.*). The main characteristics of these big sites are presented in the Illus. 177.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>no. of entrances</th>
<th>Roundhouse evidence</th>
<th>Multi-period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arthur's Seat, Midlothian</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnswark, E Dumfriesshire</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>timber, r-g</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eildon Hill North, Roxburghshire</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>timber</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirsel Law, Berwickshire</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howman Law, Roxburghshire</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2 (possibly 3)</td>
<td>timber, r-g</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaimes Hill, Midlothian</td>
<td>3.4 (?)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>timber, stone</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Berwick Law, E Lothian</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>platforms</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubers Law, Roxburghshire</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury Craigs, Midlothian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dunion, Roxburghshire</td>
<td>5.3, possibly up to 6.5</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>r-g</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traprain Law, E Lothian</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>t (?)</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Meldon, Peeblesshire</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>r-g (?)</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteside Rig, Peeblesshire</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1, possibly 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeavering Bell, Northumberland</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>platform, r-g, stone</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illus. 177: *Minor oppida* in SE Scotland and NE England
Illus. 178: Map of minor oppida in Scotland and N England (area studied encircled red; Hirsel Law marked with blue dot); 6 – 10 acres = 2.4 – 4 ha; 10 – 20 acres = 4 – 8 ha; 20 – 30 acres = 8 – 12 ha (From: Feachem 1966, Fig. 13)

All of the big enclosed sites show some similar features in the way that they are set in the landscape. For example, all of them are set on prominent hills, regardless of their height. Hirsel Law lies only at 94 m OD, but the hill is prominent and rises above the nearby landscape. Most of these hills stand alone in the landscape; if not, they are set on the
outermost hill, where is possible to see the enclosed site while approaching it from lower grounds (Yeavering Bell for example). Moreover, most of the interiors of these sites are visible from a distance while approaching them. This means that the activities inside these enclosed sites were visible from the outside. The ramparts roughly follow the contours in the landscape and are probably more lines, which divide the inside from the outside than defensive constructions. Some of the walls are very slight and set on an awkward position which was not the best one for the purpose of defence (Owen 1992, 65, 68; Rideout et al. 1992, 141).

Moreover, the Dunion is not set on top of the hill, but on a spur, which has a linear earthwork built on the side of easiest access (see ibid., Figure 3.1). The ramparts, as at other sites, used local topography to best effect but they were not built well and were very slight (ibid., 116). This seems to be due to the local stone used, which was not of a good enough quality for dry-stone walling (ibid.). Moreover, there is no evidence for very substantial ramparts at either Eildon Hill North (Owen et al. 1992, 64, 68, 139) or White Meldon (F. Hunter pers. comm.).

Some of the minor oppida developed from earlier, much smaller enclosed sites (e.g. Eildon Hill North, The Dunion, Humbledon Hill) (Rideout et al. 1992, 139), and some of them show evidence of smaller enclosures within, which date to later phases (Hownam Law, Yeavering Bell). Traprain Law possibly expanded over time and later became smaller again (ibid., 141). The datable material available for these sites shows that many had a significant Late Bronze Age phase (Jobey 1976; Owen 1992, 66). This phenomenon can be traced over many other parts of Britain and Ireland (for examples and more detailed bibliography see Owen 1992, 66).

Despite claims that minor oppida of S Scotland do not form a coherent group if we observe the construction of them (Rideout et al. 1992, 141), one detail can be noticed. All of them, except one, were enclosed with stone ramparts with possible timber preceding (e.g. Burnswark, in: Jobey 1978a). At the Dunion (and possibly Eildon Hill North) it is even possible to notice that the ramparts were built very poorly because the local stone was not suitable for dry-stone construction (Rideout 1992, 116). However, Hirsel Law was enclosed by an earth and stone rampart and an external ditch (Aspinall 1985).
There does seem to be one key difference between the minor oppida of SE Scotland, NE England and Hirsel Law. All the other sites show signs of long-term usage and several phases of occupation. It is possible that we are missing a great amount of data from Hirsel Law, as this was never studied properly. But this is, however, unlikely. The geophysical survey and the aerial photographs would show at least some hint of long-term usage. Is it possible that we are dealing with an ‘ unsuccessful’ big enclosed site, which was abandoned soon after completion?

8.5. Rectilinear sites

- Peeblesshire: /  
- Berwickshire: Mire Loch 3; Mire Loch 4; Neuk; Oatlee Hill; Whitecross  
- E Dumfriesshire: Bar Hill; Gibb’s Hill 2; Hangingshaw; Lochwood Plantation; Peat Hill 3; Stockbridge Hill

As the great majority (c. 99%) of later prehistoric enclosed sites in the researched area are oval/round it would not be mistaken to include rectilinear sites on the list of anomalies within the later prehistoric settlement record. Early interpretations did not see them as a native later prehistoric form. Rectilinear sites have been interpreted as a sign of Romanisation, which was showing in the rectilinear shape as well as in the Roman finds discovered in the excavated settlements (e.g. Jobey 1960, 24-26; 1964, 41; 1972, 73, 75). Nevertheless, from early on, speculation on possible pre-Roman origin occurs (e.g. Jobey 1960, 22). More datable material has since come out of excavated sites and rectilinear sites are now accepted as having their ongoing in the first millennium BC; they appear from the 4th century BC on (Moore 2006, 24-26, 52; Oswald 1974), or even earlier according to some authors (Wilson 1983, 40).

Rectilinear sites have been discovered mainly by aerial photography (e.g. RCAHMS 1997, 55). G. Jobey was the first who described them in detail based on the evidence from Northumberland (e.g. Jobey 1960). Ramparts of these sites are of a near-rectangular, sometimes trapezoidal shape with well defined, usually round corners and an entrance in the middle of one side. Sometimes they have another entrance opposite the first one (e.g. Bellingham: Jobey 1960, fig. 1.48). At some of the sites only signs of an enclosing ditch can be seen today, the ramparts perhaps disappearing due to later disturbances (e.g. Bar Hill,
Neuk, Whitecross) Where ramparts next to the ditches are still visible, they can be of any construction: earth (e.g. Stockbridge Hill), earth/stone (e.g. Oatlee Hill), stone (e.g.) or palisades (e.g. Nunraw Barns, E Lothian, in: Hale et al. 2001, 69). Sometimes they were enclosed by more than one ditch (e.g. Lochwood Plantation) or only a stone (e.g. Mire Loch 3; Mire Loch 4; Peat Hill 3) or timber rampart (e.g. Gibb’s Hill II). They can contain up to four timber-built or stone-walled roundhouses.

Roundhouses within rectilinear sites were positioned in several different ways:

a) at the back of the interior with a ‘yard’ left at the front, if the settlement has one entrance (class A: Jobey 1960, 32-33; Illus. 179, a);

b) set in the middle of the enclosed settlement, especially when the settlement has two entrances (class B: Jobey 1960, 32 –33; Illus. 179, b);

c) rectilinear settlements sometimes contained only one roundhouse, which was set in the middle (class C: Jobey 1960, 33; see Illus. 179, c);

d) Only a few rectilinear settlements with double/multiple ramparts/ditches exist (class D: Jobey 1960, 33; Jobey 1965, 45-47; see Illus 179, d).

Illus. 179: Forms of rectilinear settlements
Some of the sites do not show signs of settlement evidence within and their dating is even more obscure (e.g. Bar Hill). These sites could be dated to any period between later prehistory and the recent past.

The rectilinear settlements are generally located in easily accessible areas of up to 150 m OD, with only a few exceptions set up to 230 m OD (e.g. Cornal Burn). They generally enclose an area smaller than 0.4 ha (see Appendices 1.1, 2.1 and 3.1), with hardly any examples measuring up to 0.5 ha. These bigger examples, such as East Bearford in E Lothian, only show signs of ditches, with possible evidence of internal bank (Hale et al. 2001, 69), which would make the interior of the settlement smaller (section 1.12.1.).

An area smaller than 0.4 ha falls into a size category together with a great majority of the other later prehistoric enclosed sites (section 3.6).

The best known of all rectilinear sites is probably West Brandon, Co. Durham (Jobey 1962). The site is of type c, with one central roundhouse. The most interesting discovery at this site was its multi-period nature. One set of ramparts form a rectilinear shape and was built of a double palisade. Outside them is a ditch and a bank which form another phase. The ditch is internal, which is rare in settlements. Moreover, the interior of the settlement also shows that the settlement is multi-period. The central roundhouse has been rebuilt on the same spot at least once (ibid., 12-119). Just outside the palisades and cut by the settlement ditch, another roundhouse was discovered (ibid., 23-25).

Multi-period locations can also be seen at other sites, such as Manside, Northumberland, Eskdalemuir, Hangingshaw, Birrens Hill and possibly Lochwood Plantation, all in E Dumfriesshire. The dating of West Brandon, Co. Durham is unfortunately unknown. G. Jobey (1962, 29) compared it to sites dated to fourth and third century BC and D. Harding dated it to the second century BC or earlier (Harding 2004, 41).

More than 140 rectilinear settlements were discovered in S-central Northumberland, in the areas of North Tynedale, Redesdale and the upper Wansbeck (Hogg 1950; Jobey 1960; 1963; 1977; 1978; 1981) while some of the rectilinear sites occur in the Cheviots, Doddington and Fowberry Moors, all in Northumberland (Jobey 1960, 19). It is possible to notice that they form clusters throughout the county, but this can in some cases be due to topographical reasons, such as moors and peat deposits (Jobey 1960, 20). Rectilinear
settlements are also present in East Lothian, where they form a cluster around Traprain Law (Macinnes 1982b, 70; 1984a, 183-185). They also occur in Fife, where they do not form clusters (Macinnes 1982b, 70;)

There are more than 40 rectilinear sites known in E Dumfriesshire (RCAHMS 1997, 149). However, only very loose dating is known and many of the sites could be medieval rather than later prehistoric (ibid; section 3.2.). No rectilinear sites are present in Peeblesshire, perhaps as a result of its topography (see below and Wilson 1983, 40).

Illus. 180: Distribution of rectilinear enclosed sites in SE Scotland and NE England. Data for A- Northumberland from: Jobey 1960, Fig. 9; 1963. B- E Lothian from: Macinnes 1984b, Fig. 9.4.; C – Traprain Law Environs from: Hale et al. 2001; 2003
Rectilinear sites are widespread. For example, T. Moore’s research shows just how many angular sites there are in the Severn-Cotswolds (2006, 45-52). As at Traprain Law and in Northumberland, they usually form clusters (ibid., 46). Moore suggests that these sites could be contemporary or that they were built and rebuilt in close proximity many times (ibid.).

Observation of the rectilinear sites with their surrounding landscape shows the following:

a) At least some of the rectilinear sites form a typical part of later prehistoric settlement patterns (RCAHMS 1997, 167). They were set in the landscape with similar spatial requirements to the other enclosed sites;

b) The only requirement that differs from others is a fairly flat position usually up to 150 m OD;

c) Moreover, rectilinear sites are usually not set apart from the other later prehistoric settlement evidence, but form part of it (see RCAHMS 1997, Fig. 47, 53 and 70). They were, as with most other later prehistoric enclosed sites, sometimes set within boundaries of two streams and were located at some distance from the other sites (for more on streams seen as boundaries and planning of the landscape see section 6.3.).

8.6. Discussion

Brochs, rectilinear and ‘unfinished’ enclosed sites have traditionally been observed as part of discussions of the Roman presence in S Scotland (e.g. Feachem 1971; Jobey 1960; 1964; 1972; RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, 118). However, new information from these sites confirmed that we can now observe their construction as part of native settlement patterns (sections 8.2., 8.3., 8.4.). In contrast D.W. Harding still discusses lowland brochs and duns in his chapter on Romanisation (Harding 2004, 187-188).

‘UNFINISHED’ ENCLOSED SITES

A group of enclosed sites has been categorized as ‘unfinished’ by the RCAHMS (RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, 28; RCAHMS 1997, 140-141) However, re-examination of these sites tells us
that most of them can now be put into different categories, stretches of ‘unfinished’ ramparts are perhaps not unfinished and we can expect that the stretches of ramparts at some sites did not encircle the whole site. It has been suggested before that ‘marker trenches’ could represent remains of palisades, which completed the rampart circuit (RCAHMS 1997, 140). From this, I propose two different types of usage of ‘marker trenches’, some of them being used as parts of monumentalism of the sites and others as parts of ramparts themselves. Both types can be seen in wider parts of Britain.

Some of the ‘marker trenches’ represented additional lines of ramparts at the entrances and at parts of the enclosed site circuit seen while approaching the site. This means that some of the sites had very slight ramparts elsewhere, or ramparts were perhaps not even necessary. The idea of monumental entrance has been discussed before (Chapter 5). Many of the ‘unfinished’ enclosed sites studied in this chapter do not differ from the majority of other sites observed in this thesis. For example, Whiteside Rig, Peeblesshire, had never been considered as ‘unfinished’ by the RCAHMS database (RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, 153-154) despite having an extra stretch of stone rampart visible only at the entrance. The word ‘unfinished’ was mostly used at sites, which display palisades. Perhaps we should start perceiving wooden palisades as features equally important to the stone/earth and stone ramparts; hopefully this thesis is a step closer to understanding that different kinds of materials fit into the same landscape patterns. A wooden structure does not necessarily mean that these sites date early in later prehistory nor does it mean a temporary/short-lived character (Chapter 3).

Moreover, the rampart at the dun at Stanhope was never labelled ‘unfinished’, despite the excavation, which showed that it never completely encircled the site. This can be another indication of the role of some of the ramparts, which were not unfinished, but simply built where needed the most, perhaps to protect from high winds (section 8.2.) or to make approach seem more impressive, for protection or other reasons (Chapter 5).

The second usage of ‘marker trenches’ was simply as a rampart or part of it. This can well be seen at Rough Castle, Peeblesshire where stretches of ‘marker trenches’ followed by stretches of earth and stone banks and ditches enclose the site. Different types and materials used for the building of enclosed sites were noted before, at Gibb’s Hill, E Dumfriesshire (Harding 2004, 55) or at Edin’s Hall, Berwickshire for example (Dunwell 1999, 346).
A combination of the two groups mentioned also occurs. A good example of this is Castle Knowe, Midlothian, where stretches of earth and stone bank and ditch can be seen at the entrance (for importance of the entrance see Chapter 6, and above) and at the NE side of the enclosed site, where the ground in front was almost flat and therefore represented the point of easiest access to the site. The rest of the circuit of the enclosed site is visible as a ‘marker trench’/palisade, which follows the line of the bank. At Castle Knowe we can therefore follow the combination of monumental entrance and the experience of approaching the site (Chapters 4 and 5).

Sometimes the ramparts are too insignificant to put them into the category of ‘defences’; these were previously thought to be unfinished. This was first seen at the excavation of Bindon Hill, Dorset (Wheeler 1953; Feachem 1971, 22). There are no such examples in the areas studied in this thesis. However, slight ramparts can be seen at some of the sites and this phenomenon often produces discussions on the possible roles of ramparts, *i.e.* especially symbolic ones (*e.g.* section 8.4., Chapter 9).

None of the Berwickshire enclosed sites was labelled ‘unfinished’, but this may be due to poor preservation, especially from long-term ploughing. It is therefore not known in most cases if parts of the sites are not visible anymore due to this obliteration or because they were unfinished. A good example here is Mensie Potts, where only a small stretch of a ditch is visible. Another example is Milne Graden 1, where half of the enclosed site was probably destroyed by a landslide. There are many more enclosed sites like these two in Berwickshire.

**BROCHS/ DUNS AND THEIR SURROUNDINGS**

The broch and dun in the study area seem good examples of emphasizing oddities in the later prehistoric settlement patterns. They were built to differ from all the other structures nearby, they were abandoned in a short period of time (Macinnes 1984 with bibliography) and a similar form was never built again. But this thesis suggested at a number of points that variability, fluidity and openness to new ideas are reoccurring features of the area’s settlement history. Taking into consideration: that the *chevaux de frise* and a lot of the ramparts/entrances were used only for a short period of time (Chapters 5 and 9); that roundhouses probably lasted only for a few decades (sections 2.6. and 6.2.); the respect towards the locations of earlier structures in the landscapes (Chapters 6-9) and the new,
probably short-lived enclosed sites were built instead of re-using the older ones for a long period of time; then the Lowland brochs and duns do not seem such an anomaly anymore. They were built, used for a generation or two, and then abandoned. Similar phenomenon can be seen in the whole of the later prehistoric settlement evidence.

Moreover, both of the structures are positioned on locations, which would allow them to be seen from lower and from higher grounds, similar to other sites in the area analysed, and a sign of a non-defensive role. The entrance of the broch enclosure pointed towards the easiest access to the enclosed site and towards Whiteadder Water. Based on the discussions in previous chapters (especially Chapter 2), it would not be wrong to suggest possible connections to the river transport.

Apart from observations mentioned above, Edin’s Hall broch and Stanhope dun produce more data that allow them to fit into the native later prehistoric settlement evidence:

- The rampart at Stanhope did not probably encircle the whole area around the dun, but was positioned only where it could be seen best while approaching the enclosure. This can be seen as part of monumental entrance (Chapter 5);

- the way the broch and dun were set within their enclosures could be paralleled to settlements with a central roundhouse (section 6.2.);

- broch and dun were located in areas where other stone-walled roundhouses occur and are not present in areas with a lack or near lack of stone-walled roundhouses;

- excavation of the dun showed that the structure did not have doors on the inside of the massive wall and there are no signs of doors on the outside wall (MacLaren 1960, 195). The passage through the enclosure to the circular structure inside was cobbled. The entrance to the circular structure inside is aligned with the entrance to the enclosure. Entrances are 0.93 and 1.24m wide respectively and therefore not suitable for agricultural use. It may be suggested that the Stanhope dun was perhaps used only periodically, its massiveness suggests a prestige value rather than defence. It was maybe used by the group of people living near by for special purposes, as a place where everyday activities did not happen often. It could have been built for similar purposes to big enclosed sites and sites with impressive entrances (e.g. section 7.2.2., Chapter 5) but under different
circumstances. The broch and dun could not be built for the usage of a big group of people at the same time due to their size. However, their positions in the landscape and structural details of the sites do suggest that they were constructed with the arrival of people who were not living at the location in mind. These people needed to be amazed by the sites upon their arrival and several constructional details allowed this to happen (see also Chapters 2, 5 and 7).

HIRSEL LAW, BERWICKSHIRE AND MINOR OPPIDA

There is not much known about the enclosed site at Hirsel Law and therefore not many conclusions can be made. The location of the site and its rampart position are identical to the locations of other sites of similar size (i.e. minor oppida). However, the material used for the construction of the ramparts (earth as opposed to stone) is different to other minor oppida. This is unlikely to be due to lack of suitable material, as some other sites show poor structure and very slight ramparts because of the unsuitable stone for construction. Despite this, stone was still used. Moreover, Hirsel Law does not show multiple phases in its construction or an impressive entrance, which are present at other minor oppida.

Due to our very poor knowledge of the site, not much can be said about it. We can only speculate on its position within the group of big enclosed sites, and suggest it was a failed centre. However, this is one of the sites, which should be observed with more interest and should see more on-site work.

RECTILINEAR SITES

Aerial photographs show that the evidence of rectilinear sites is not as sparse as previously thought (RCAHMS 1997, 149). There are more than 200 of them known in Northumberland and S Scotland alone (Illus. 180). Radiocarbon dating of these has shown that no chronological distinction can be made between the rectilinear and curvilinear enclosed sites (section 3.2.).

The reasons for the absence of rectilinear sites in some areas (such as Peeblessshire for example) are twofold. The first one is local topography. These sites demand fairly flat ground, which is not widespread in Peeblessshire. The second reason for the absence of
rectilinear sites in some areas is unfortunately still lack of research. A good example here can be the study of E Dumfriesshire, where more than 40 new rectilinear sites were discovered by aerial photography (RCAHMS 1997).

Some of the rectilinear enclosed sites are multi-period. However, despite showing several phases of palisaded and stone built ramparts and rebuilding of the interior they were not altered much over time. This can be especially well seen in North Tyne valley, Northumberland, where a site could be settled from second century BC to second century AD and the size and internal arrangement were kept for the whole period (Wilson 1983, 38).

Rectilinear sites sometimes form clusters within the landscape and obey the ‘rules’ of organisation of later prehistoric landscape (section 8.5., Chapter 9). They therefore seem to form parts of later prehistoric settlement patterns. Where clusters of rectilinear sites are visible, it is possible that they are ‘wandering sites’ (section 2.6.), or were connected to a group, which separated themselves from others and showed their individuality on the basis of the form of their settlements. A similar phenomenon can perhaps be seen in sites with multiple ramparts (section 2.6.) and groups of sites, which are almost identical to each other (e.g. section 6.3.3.).
SUMMARY

The purpose of this chapter was to discuss anomalies in the later prehistoric native settlement evidence. The study of ‘unfinished’ enclosed sites, the broch and dun, the big enclosed site at Hirsel Law and rectilinear sites showed that they all fit into the later prehistoric organisation of the landscape and the label of ‘anomaly’ can be dismissed.
Illus. 181: Roxburghshire, Eildon Hills and the surrounding landscape, river Tweed in the foreground (minor oppidum Eildon Hill North occupies the hill on the left). Note how prominent these hills are in the landscape. (From: RCAHMS archive, DP 019860)

Illus. 182: E Lothian, Traprain Law and the surrounding landscape. Look how prominent this hill is in the landscape (From: RCAHMS archive, SC 817864)
Illus. 183: Northumberland, Yeavering Bell and its surrounding landscape (From: Frodsham, O’Brien 2005, Photo 1)

Illus. 184: Midlothian, Arthur’s Seat and its surrounding landscape (From: RCAHMS archive no. SC408215)
"The task of the archaeologists is not to attempt to understand how Iron Age people thought, as this is impossible, but to look at the long term trends in the way in which people shaped the landscape and the sites within it and the logics which underlay these long lasting patterns of action. It is necessary to try to distinguish patterns of action which were long repeated, as these were presumably most important and distinguish these from ephemeral or short term acts, whilst acknowledging the limitation that not all past actions will leave equal traces in the archaeological record."

(Barclay et al. 2003, 248)
CHAPTER 9: CONCLUSIONS

"You cannot live in that land without asking or looking at or noticing a boulder or rock. And there's always a story."
(Silko 1981, 69)

9.1. Introduction

Later prehistoric settlement evidence of SE Scotland (especially Berwickshire and Peeblesshire) has, until now, been dismissed as a poor focus of study (Haselgrove et al. 2001, 25, Table 3). There are large numbers of enclosed sites present in these areas (see Appendices) and aerial photography uncovers more with every flight (e.g. RCAHMS 1980a). Desktop studies of the vast amount of data can be gathered from the aerial photos, plans of sites and site visits, give good results and show that areas which appear blank on the maps of archaeological research have no real reason to stay blank.

This study of later prehistoric enclosures emphasizes that some distance needs to be taken from the RCAHMS’ categories. I am aware that these categories are well embedded in archaeological thought, but analysis made in this thesis shows that there is a great potential for new insights as long as we start questioning previous ‘neat’ categorisations and observe the sites as one single group. The aim of this thesis was to examine later prehistoric settlement patterns from a general point of view, ignoring earlier set categorisations and hypotheses. Making this fresh start, where all the sites became unmarked again, gave me a chance to illustrate some new questions and to consider some new possibilities within southern Scottish settlement archaeology.

To achieve this, I firstly made a list of sites, collected illustrations or photos of all the sites studied and added maps of the landscapes nearby the sites. All sites were then studied with the same parameters such as internal area, their rampart structure, possible internal roundhouses, and height. This resulted in four appendices, which are attached in Volume 2 of this thesis.

With all the data gathered, I then studied particular features of all sites. Areas of sites, their rampart construction and any internal roundhouses were observed first, with the results
presented in Chapter 3. As an outcome of my study, possible size boundaries were shown (Illus. 75, sections 2.6. and 9.2.). These boundaries have not been detected in previous studies. Moreover, the role of cosmology in the roundhouse entrance orientations, which is widely accepted amongst scholars, was questioned (section 2.5.).

The appearance of the sites (e.g. number of ramparts, rampart construction) was presented in Chapter 2 and this formed a good basis for discussion of possible chronologies and their problems. This was done based on excavated examples from the areas studied and beyond (Chapter 3).

These early chapters considered the sites in isolation, without consideration of settings of their settings within their nearby landscapes; I studied this in later chapters (Chapters 4 – 8). Observation of local topography resulted in detection of several distinct groups of sites according to their orientations towards easy access to these sites and their closest water resources. This was shown in Chapter 4. In this chapter cosmological causes for the orientations of entrances of enclosed sites and internal roundhouses were further questioned and dismissed. Consequently, earlier studies of entrance orientations due to cosmological reasons were critiqued (section 4.5.).

Entrances were a further focus of study in Chapter 5, where I presented impressive entrances, and impressive approaches to the sites containing them. These sites were successfully linked to the size boundaries discovered earlier (Chapter 2) and different groups of sites according to their topographical position and orientation of entrances (section 4.3.).

In the next chapter I tried to establish possible patterns within settlements (section 6.2.) and within landscapes (section 6.3.). Several different possible patternings were detected and the possibility of deliberate or unintentional patterning was discussed (section 6.4.). Possible patterning was discussed in Chapter 8 as well. There, I observed linear earthworks, set close to the later prehistoric enclosed sites, and discussed several aspects, which had seen little or no previous work.

Sites, which previous studies labelled as ‘anomalies’ in the enclosed site evidence, were discussed in Chapter 8. Several explanations were offered in discussion of ‘unfinished’ and rectilinear sites (sections 8.2. and 8.5.), while examples of a broch and dun were considered as parts of local settlement patterns (section 8.3.) and the minor oppidum at Hirsel Law,
Berwickshire was compared with other S Scottish and NE English large sites. Its status in the category of *minor oppida* was questioned and does not seem appropriate (sections 8.4. and 8.6.). However, the site, although remarkable, has never been studied properly and further discussions are not possible at this stage.

With this thesis, I tried to show that it is necessary to consider the range of evidence holistically, studying ramparts, entrances, possible internal roundhouse evidence, nearby landscapes and nearby archaeological features to build the picture. A step towards this was recently taken in N England (Frodsham et al. 2004), but most Scottish studies do not look beyond the enclosure ramparts (*e.g.* Dunwell 1999). Moreover, a critique on observing only parts of sites has to be emphasized. Ramparts and features within them were constructed as one site and it is crucial to observe them this way. If roundhouses, ramparts and entrances are taken out of their context then an accurate picture of settlement patterns is lost. In addition, placement of later prehistoric sites was dependent on surrounding landscapes and nearby economic resources (*e.g.* Chapter 4). Therefore, it is crucial to observe them within the landscape in order to understand their setting and avoid too much speculation.

Above I briefly presented the main conclusions of this thesis. They will now be incorporated in discussions of broader issues.

### 9.2. Two different forms of sites

"Crucially there can be no single correct interpretation of the meaning and function of hillforts or enclosures. Rather they should perhaps be seen as elements of a vocabulary that could be used to express a variety of ideological statements... we can be fairly sure that hillforts... meant many different things to many different people. At some times and in some places, they may have been symbols of community, while elsewhere they may have signified the power of individual leader or dominant lineages. Some may have been for simple, pragmatic military defence."

(Armit 1999, 73, 74)

Not every enclosed site was studied separately. Instead, a series of parameters, such as size, landscape location and entrances were analysed at all sites. One of the results deriving from the analysis of later prehistoric sites is a clear area boundary of c. 0.5 ha. This was noticeable in all three areas (Illus. 29, 46, 47, 59, 61, 75). A second possible area boundary has been
seen at 0.2 ha and another probable at 0.7 ha. At this point, the evidence for the 0.2 ha boundary is too slight to be discussed as a certain one. Due to the small number of sites bigger than 0.7 ha, with their span from 0.8 ha – 4.1 ha this boundary needs more research in order to be proven or dismissed.

Sites smaller than c. 0.5 ha are usually enclosed with one rampart (and associated ditch) and show signs of settlement evidence, with roundhouses of all types (section 1.14.). They are sometimes visibly multi-period, but not often; their entrances are simple gaps through the ramparts. Many of the sites in this category are smaller than 0.2 ha (section 2.6.; Illus. 27, 44, 56 and 75).

In contrast, sites bigger than c. 0.5 ha show some similarities over the whole study area (section 2.6.). Where the internal settlement evidence is still detectable, they show internal ring-groove roundhouses or signs of timber-built roundhouses with no clearer distinction. No ring-ditch roundhouses were detected. Only sites bigger than 0.5 ha either have impressive entrances, multiple ramparts or can be looked into from the distance, higher or lower grounds. Sometimes they contain a combination of these features.

Impressive entrances can be seen at several sites. These all fall into the group of big sites, and belong to Group 2 according to positions of their entrances. This group has entrances located on the side of easiest access to the enclosed site (section 4.3.). All the details suggest that these sites were intended for a lot of people to come to them as easily as possible, with some form of monumental approach. This kind of access is not seen at smaller sites (i.e. sites with area < 0.5 ha). Moreover, many of these big sites are located in such a way that their interior can be seen either from distance or from higher ground. Apart from the controlled access towards and through the entrance, some of the ramparts of these sites were not massively built (e.g. section 8.4.2).

These big sites are usually multi-period. Hints on the usage of some can be seen in other, older structures found within. The excavated site at Kaimes Hill, Midlothian, for example, revealed standing stones and cup-and-ring marks, which are, together with some other finds, explained as evidence of a symbolism and ritual (Simpson et al. 2004, 110). Moreover, the site was enclosed by multiple ramparts, which formed an impressive entrance (ibid., 111) and had chevaux de frise (for more on chevaux de frise see section 5.2.1.).
Furthermore, the excavated evidence more often than not shows that ramparts of these big sites were not used for a long period of time. The rampart at Albie Hill in E Dumfriesshire for example enclosed c. 0.6 ha. The enclosed site had two entrances, one of which was wider than necessary for simple usage of one-way traffic (3 m and 8.5 m, in: Strachan 1999, 9). Excavation revealed a number of different periods, from early prehistory to the Roman Iron Age, and a possible symbolic offering of a sickle in a pit in the interior of the enclosure (Strachan 1999, 13). Moreover, the enclosure ditch was infilled rapidly, which suggests either severe weather conditions or deliberate action (ibid., 9). Additionally, the ditch does not show multiple cuttings or cleaning of it. It is possible that the ditch was dug in the late stages of usage of the site. The location itself was perhaps unenclosed for a long time, and we could perhaps expect the same at some other enclosed sites, which show signs of usage over long periods. The location was an important one over more than a millennium and it is only at one point in the past when people felt the need to enclose the place and consequently isolate it from its surroundings.

Uppercleuch, also in E Dumfriesshire, shows a similar pattern (Terry 1993). The rampart enclosed an area of c. 0.47 ha. The ditch does not show any signs of cleaning or recutting (ibid., 58). Post-holes and pits discovered at the site do not always respect the position of the ditch. Here, the entrance was again 8.5 m wide, with no surviving evidence of a gate (ibid., 58). Another example is Hayknowes Farm, E Dumfriesshire where the ditches of the enclosed site were backfilled rapidly (Gregory 2001, 43). The site revealed dates of 415 – 45 cal BC and 165 cal BC- 120 cal AD (Gregory 2001, 34, 42, Table 1). Similar short-term usage of one of the impressive structures at these sites can be seen from the excavations at Castel Henllys, Wales, where the multi-period site was built and abandoned in 150 years (I. Ralston, pers. comm.). The chevaux de frise were built and almost entirely demolished as a later rampart was built on top, and this all happened in a very short period of time. More evidence of short-term usage occurs at other excavations. At Danebury, Hampshire for example, different periods between new/ additional construction at either ramparts or entrances lasted only c. 50 years (Cunliffe 1995, 15- 18).

Observation of the sizes of enclosed settlements with signs of internal settlement evidence compared to those without is not very rewarding. It is not possible to tell, based on the sizes of enclosed sites, which sites that seem ‘empty’ today, may have had roundhouses within in the past (section 4.5.; also Gregory 2001; Harding 2004, 294). However, enclosed sites
bigger than 0.5 ha contain only ring-groove roundhouses within or include traces of timber-built houses; they lack ring-ditch or stone-walled roundhouses.

Several studies, which question the role of different types of roundhouses exist and have been discussed before (sections 1.14, 2.6. and 4.3.). Some of them suggest possible longer-term use of ring-ditch roundhouses, where the ring-ditch would be created possibly by cattle or as storage space (ibid.). This suggests all-year-round long-term use of ring-ditch roundhouses. In contrary, ring-groove roundhouses were perhaps used on a more temporary basis and could be used short-term (ibid.; also Pope 2003). It was shown in this thesis that different types of roundhouses were perhaps used in the two different forms of sites detected. Ring-groove roundhouses often occur in large sites with impressive entrances, which are located towards the easiest access to them, and in sites, where the orientation of the entrance does not seem important (Illus. 99 and sections 2.6. and 4.3.). Moreover, ring-ditch roundhouses are often present in smaller sites and possibly show two different types, which were perhaps used in a different way (section 2.6.). This forms another clue in the question of whether different types of roundhouses show different chronological sequences or merely different styles of construction and purpose (for more on this see section 2.6.; also Macinnes 1982a).

There seems no doubt about the differences between enclosed sites, which are smaller or larger than c. 0.5 ha. Based on these differences, we can now come to some discussion of possible roles of these two forms. Some scholars suggested hierarchy (e.g. RCAHMS 1997, 82) as the reason for differences in the construction and landscape positions of sites. Big sites have a longer length of ramparts, which means a lot of work for many people while building them. For example, the ramparts at Maiden Castle, Dorset were almost continuously built over 300 years, which perhaps meant annual assemblies of people working on them (Sharples 1991, 260). These ramparts were perhaps never finished, but were possibly also never meant to be finished, as the act of people coming together and the build itself was more important than actually finishing the ramparts (or, at least what we see as finished today). This could also be seen as keeping many people busy to prevent any kind of unwanted acts from these people, perhaps in months when they would not have much else to do. This, of course, could only be assigned to hierarchical societies, but certain evidence for this is still to be found in later prehistoric Britain. There were some suggestions that big sites would serve as meeting places for greater numbers of people (e.g. Haselgrove 2007, 416; Hill 1996, 10; Ralston 2005, 174) and perhaps groups of people would meet to build a site
together for communal activities (Brück 2007, 28). These actions do not need hierarchical society (for more on hierarchy see section 9.7).

The differences between the two groups of sites are such that it can be suggested they were used for different purposes. Two main differences were shown. It was suggested that most of the smaller sites were probably domestic structures. The bigger sites had roles different from day-to-day living. They were most probably used by a lot of people for reasons we cannot identify for certain anymore. It has been discussed several times before that no site had a single function and that people always exploit a number of different activities at sites (Barrett 1989, 1). Regardless of the precise roles of these big sites, it can be said that they were built to be seen and to have an impact on people approaching them.

9.3. Living ancestor

While observing enclosed site patterns as they appear in the landscape, it became clear that a lot of earlier monuments were incorporated in the later site patterns. This idea of memory in prehistoric societies is an interesting topic and could form a comprehensive study on its own (e.g. Bradley 2002). Although fascinating, it was not the main focus of this thesis. However, it was a recurring factor in a number of the analyses and merits some observations and a short focused discussion on the living ancestor and evidence for it that was detected. This can hopefully serve as an introduction for any more thorough study in the future.

Important ancestral links can be seen at some of the sites, which had earlier monuments on display within the later structures. A roundhouse at Hayknowes Farm, E Dumfriesshire, for example, had a cup-and-ring mark incorporated into the later structure (Gregory 2001, 43). A similar feature was discovered at Kaimes Hill, Midlothian, where cup-and-ring marked stones were incorporated into later ramparts and standing stones were incorporated in part of the interior of the enclosed site (Simpson et al. 2004, 87-90, 111). Numerous sites also have earlier cairns incorporated into later interiors (e.g. Kaimes Hill, Traprain Law, both in E Lothian; White Meldon, Peeblessire). These sites, which show a very long time-scale, fall mostly into the category of large sites (bigger than 0.5 ha; see section 9.2.).

Moreover, it was shown on several occasions that a respect towards older archaeological features in the landscape existed, and these were often built within or as parts of the new
settlement patterns (Chapters 6 and 7). In addition, locations of roundhouses within settlements often show signs of patterning. It is unlikely that all roundhouses within one settlement were always contemporary, yet they often show respect towards the location of one another (section 6.2.

C. Haselgrove emphasized that ramparts are more than just boundaries between the inside and the outside, but have a symbolic significance that is inherited through generations (Haselgrove 1984). Sites that are continuously occupied, are so because of intentional acts and the knowledge of earlier activities on the sites (ibid.). R. Hingley, however, disregards this hypothesis and argues that there was a desire to physically obscure earlier settlement boundaries (Hingley 1990, 99). He formed his argument around the fact that some of the abandoned sites show signs of feasts in the later stages, remains of which can be particularly well seen in the ditches of enclosed sites. Ramparts and ditches, when still in use, formed a boundary between the groups living outside them and people using the interior of the enclosed site. Later activities such as feasting on the site, according to Hingley, could be a sign of local groups obtaining the space of the enclosed site and making it part of their community (ibid., 100). However, feasting, symbolic depositions and other similar activities on abandoned sites could represent part of a respect towards and connection with the ancestors. This would also mean that some of the old, abandoned sites, which were incorporated into the settlement patterns, were still in use from time to time and therefore formed an important part of the groups living in the vicinity (e.g. Miles 2003).

Some of the locations of older sites have been used again, with newly built structures on the same location. These are multi-period sites. Some of them show that parts of older structures were demolished in order to build new settlements (i.e. Muirburn, Peeblesshire). This would be convenient as the old and abandoned sites were a good source of material for the construction of new sites. However, this does not happen often, and it is possible to see that the newly built structures normally respected the positions of the older ones. This is one of the problems in defining a multi-period site as one with multiple ramparts, as it is hard to tell without excavation whether they were contemporary (section 2.6.). It also makes it hard to distinguish the number of contemporary roundhouses within one settlement, as the later ones respect the position of the earlier ones (section 6.2.). Respect towards older structures (i.e. living ancestor) can therefore be observed on two levels: within the landscape and within sites themselves.
Settlement evidence within the areas researched is very rich. I.M. Smith explained the construction of new sites as a sign of growing population, which resulted in a densely settled landscape (Smith 1990, 46). However, the analysis of settlement evidence made in previous chapters suggested that some of the enclosed settlements perhaps lived for a very short time but they were still built into the settlement patterns (section 6.3). Observation of patterns within the landscape sometimes shows a very neat picture (ibid.), but this does not necessarily mean that all the sites were used at one time (e.g. Giles 2007a, 107). Instead of thinking that the landscape was densely settled, people chose different locations for new sites as they had enough land to build new enclosed sites, respecting the landscape patterns created by the ancestors who had lived in the same area. Neat settlement patterns are therefore not a good factor to discuss population size.

The importance of earlier monuments within the landscape is widely accepted amongst scholars (e.g. Bradley 1993; 2002; Cripps 2007, 145; Gosden, Lock 1998; 2007; Hingley 1999; Wigley 2007, 129). One of the theories for this was offered by R. Bradley (2002, 8). People did not have written resources and the only possibility of maintaining a close link between their own histories and past events would be through old architecture (ibid.). Where the link to living ancestor was not respected and new structures were built on top of earlier ones, it could be for two reasons. Firstly, the link and memory of a particular site was lost, either through time or through the level of importance (i.e. perhaps a group of people forgotten or unknown to the people settling the landscape later constructed the site). Secondly, the same people that built one site then constructed another one over it (this could perhaps be seen in construction and repair of roundhouses).

At the start of my study, I was aware of big restrictions in the dating of the sites and thought that this thesis might suffer from that. Nevertheless, the analysis done showed that most of the sites were long-lived, either as sites that were reused again and again or as sites that lived on in the memory of people. Later prehistoric archaeological remains therefore need to be looked at as a single unit and should not be restricted to studies of certain periods.
Ever since the description of the people of Britain in Tacitus' *Agricola* it has been presumed that they were war-like barbarians. However, this cannot give an accurate picture. Even if these literary sources tell a real story, they are describing the time when the Romans came to Britain. Therefore, they cannot be projected on the big enclosures, which were built much earlier and mostly abandoned by the time of the Roman presence in N Britain (section 3.2.; also *e.g.* Burgess 1984, 162). Some of the big enclosed sites could of course act as defence in times of war, but would at the same time bring groups of people closer with the act of building (see also section 9.2.). With this in mind, gatherings for the purpose of building would not necessarily require a strong hierarchical figure within society. It would be enough for a tradition of coming to these areas to construct ramparts to last from year to year (*ibid.*). This statement could be backed up with the study made by K. Marx, which presents a model for 'communal' sites (*cf.* Ferrell 1997, 236). According to Marx, individuals do not own land. Instead, groups hold the land as their possession. Therefore, all the work done is based...
on a division of labour amongst the groups and the results are a product of groups, which are working for their own community (ibid.).

Times of construction of big enclosed sites (hillforts) are sometimes explained as times of conflict and war between different groups settling the landscape (e.g. Avery 1993). However, the explanation mentioned in the paragraph above can provide a basis for explaining the building of numerous enclosed sites differently. We could perceive the times of their construction as peaceful. Groups of people had time to get together in months when they were not busy on their fields for example, and construct the ramparts as a communal act. Many of these sites were built on locations awkward for permanent habitation, but perhaps in places where they were not taking up much land useful for agriculture. On the contrary, unstable times (e.g. conflicts, unstable weather conditions) would mean that construction was put on a halt.

The question of a war-like society, as seen from the enclosure evidence, can be backed up with finds from the enclosed sites. It is worth turning first to some of the classic Wessex hillforts. For example, pebbles which are interpreted as ‘sling stones’ were found behind the rampart at Danebury’s early phase and at the main entrance in the late phase (c. 100 – 10 BC) (Cunliffe 1995, 94, 100, 262). At Crickley Hill, Gloucestershire, similar smooth small pebbles were found deposited in a pit (Dixon 1994, 105) and the same was found at Maiden Castle (Wheeler 1943, 48- 51). At the eastern entrance of this site, 22 600 pebbles were discovered in a pit, and more smaller pits with round pebbles were found on other positions within the settlement (Avery 1993, 7; Sharples 1991, 244). These were interpreted as defensive weapons (Avery 1993, 7).

This ‘war-like’ evidence could be interpreted in other ways. Cunliffe (1995, 97) accepts the hypothesis that the fire at Danebury could be a symbolic fire at the stage when the meaning of the enclosure changed at the end of 1st century BC (Cunliffe 1995, 97). Crickley Hill could be interpreted similarly. Moreover, pebbles could also be deliberately deposited at ramparts and the main entrance of Danebury and Maiden Castle. These pebbles, as slingshots, symbolised protection and good things (e.g. hurting an enemy, killing animals for food) for the people that used them. There is no reason to think that this experience would be seen only in the act when they would shoot the sling stones. The pebbles themselves probably had an important symbolic role. Therefore, deposited in pits within enclosures,
close to the ramparts of enclosures and at the entrances, together with symbolic fires, they could play a very powerful role.

Turning back to Scottish enclosed sites, no such sling stones have been found and there is no other indication of warfare within them (e.g. Armit, Ralston 2003, 182). Moreover, the great majority of British enclosed sites do not show signs of attacks. Is this because they were built and used during peaceful times? If we observe the wider context, analyses of hoard finds found within enclosures on the Continent show interesting results. Most of the hoards contain agricultural tools and there is a general lack of weaponry (I. Ralston, pers. comm., see also papers published in Bataille, Guillaumet 2006).

The construction of big enclosed sites in peaceful times and the possible abandonment of their building in times of distress could represent a study in itself. Observation of later prehistory from this point of view would indeed give some interesting new perspectives on the way we interpret the past. For example, could short periods of abandonment of Eildon Hill, Selkirkshire and Traprain Law, E Lothian represent times of distress and periods of building massive ramparts in the landscape peaceful times? Avery notes a period in the later second century BC when some hillforts were newly built or refortified (Avery 1993, 159). He explains this as a widespread war scare and later mentions the appearance of new Celtic art styles which appeared on swords and scabbards (ibid.). This could as well represent peaceful times, when some people could be active in building and others could develop new styles of decoration or changing times, when more visible symbols became necessary.

Some indication of possible building and constant usage of big sites in peaceful times has been shown above. However, this cannot be answered with one short study. The issue discussed requires several studies, where climatic changes and changes in types of artefacts need to be studied in conjunction with different types of sites. However, it serves to illustrate some of the interpretative issues around our views of these sites.

9.5. Lowland brochs/ duns

We can now turn to the Lowland brochs and duns. It was shown before (sections 8.3. and 8.6.) that these structures and their accompanying ramparts, although they appear very differently in their structural form, follow the same ‘rules of building’ as big enclosed sites.
(compare Chapters 4, 5 with section 8.3.). They are set in locations where they can be seen from a distance and higher ground, and their entrances (through the enclosure and the entrance to broch/ dune) are located on the line of easiest approach. The appearance of the broch and dun themselves was an impressive one and presumably amazed people approaching them (ibid.). The dun at Stanhope, Peebleshire had an additionally emphasized impressive approach with a paved pathway through the enclosure entrance to the entrance of the dun (MacLaren 1960, 195; RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, 157).

Moreover, the data from excavation suggest that they have all been built and abandoned in a very short period of time (section 8.6.; but see Dunwell 1999, 352). A lot of discussion held the presence/ absence of the Romans responsible for this. This does not need to be the case, however. A short time span of particular periods of sites has been noted before (section 9.2.). Time spans of different sites vary, but particular periods typically show short-term usage, which corresponds to the period often assigned to the Lowland brochs and dunes (e.g. Dunwell 1999, 347-348; MacInnes 1984b, 236-238; MacLaren 1960, 200, 201; RCAHMS 1967, vol. 1, 158).

Based on several similarities of brochs and dunes with the big enclosed sites, one can assume that they were intended to be used for similar purposes. Their appearance and scale is different, and they are apparently chronologically later than the big sites, but the ideas behind the construction itself are similar.

9.6. Can any major settlement pattern groups be detected in Southern Scotland?

Despite a lot of similarities in the settlement patterns of the areas analysed, some differences are also detectable, and they show two major settlement pattern groups in Southern Scotland (Illus. 186 and 187). These groups are not dependent on differences in landscape.

The first group combines the whole wider area of the river Tweed. This area shows the same tradition, with only smaller regional differences. Detailed analysis of Selkirkshire and Roxburghshire was not made in this thesis but results of other studies (e.g. RCAHMS 1956; 1957) show that these two counties share many similarities to Peebleshire and Berwickshire.
E Dumfriesshire differs from this group. There are almost no stone-walled roundhouses present there, very few sites with multiple ramparts and more rectilinear sites than in the other two counties. Another difference which was noticed earlier in the study (section 4.4.) is that there are less enclosed sites with visible multiple phases in the rampart sequence, but more sites which show multiple phases in the roundhouse sequence (e.g. Boonies, Burnswark, Gibb’s Hill). Moreover, there are a higher number of roundhouses visible within sites in E Dumfriesshire than in Peeblesshire and Berwickshire. This could be partly due to preservation of the sites, but the difference is immense and preservation cannot be the only reason for the number of visible roundhouses. Due to lack of excavation, we can only assume that there were either fewer roundhouses built within enclosed sites in Peeblesshire and Berwickshire, or that the style of building roundhouses in these two areas did not leave any visible remains. Some roundhouses could be built without post-holes (Harding 2001, 294) and if they were in use for short periods of time before they were abandoned (Bradley 2002, 67; Gerritsen 1999; Halliday 1999, 60; Reynolds 1995, see also section 6.2.), there is not much chance in discovering them without detailed excavation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peeblesshire</th>
<th>Berwickshire</th>
<th>E Dumfriesshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple ramparts</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectilinear enclosed sites</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone built roundhouses</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broch/ Dun</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear earthworks</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symbols: ● yes o sparse evidence x no

Illus 186: Similarities and differences in the enclosed site record of the areas studied
This possible boundary between two settlement pattern groups (Illus. 186 and 187) can now be compared with several of the proposed area boundaries, which were presented earlier in the thesis (section 1.5.). The outcome of combining several analyses done in this thesis does not support Smith’s proposed boundaries (Smith 1990; see Illus. 9, 10), neither does it sustain Feachem’s proposition (Feachem 1963; see Illus. 7). However, there is a similarity between Ptolemy’s map of Scotland (Illus. 6) and the map that Mann and Breeze produced with the interpretation of Ptolemy’s Geography (Illus. 8); though the possible boundary between two areas (between the Selgovae and the Votadini on Mann and Breeze’s map, see Illus. 8) is set too far N (compare area boundary on Illus. 8 with Illus. 187). The reason for this discrepancy is probably the result of modern county divisions. Modern county divisions were for many years a base for setting boundaries between possible different archaeological traditions (e.g. RCAHMS Inventories). Mann and Breeze’s proposition on boundaries between the areas is clearly a result of this (Mann, Breeze 1987). Moreover, S. Piggott’s division of Scotland on four provinces; Atlantic, Solway-Clyde, Tyne-Forth and North Eastern, defined in 1966 (but first presented in the RCAHMS Inventory in 1956) as an extension of C. Hawkes’ model for England and Wales, is, again, clearly set on modern
county boundaries (Piggott 1966; Illus. 188). Piggott’s division, although criticized for its simplicity and unconvincing archaeological units many times (e.g. Harding 1982, 1-2; Hill 1982a, 21), still forms the structure of research in many publications (e.g. Harding 2004; Macinnes 1984b; Megaw, Simpson 1979). B. Cunliffe attached principal distributions of some regionally- distinctive settlement types (Illus. 188). However, it is again clear that the boundary between his types follows the modern county division between Peeblesshire and Dumfriesshire.

I have been conscious of the risk of plotting modern county divisions on ancient data since the start of this thesis (see Chapter 1). This awareness paid off, with the results shown on Illus. 186 and 187. Modern county divisions did not exist in later prehistory and we must not be trapped within them while studying the distant past.

Illus. 188. Dotted lines- division of Scotland on four provinces (A: Atlantic, NE: North-East, SC: Solway Clyde, TF: Tyne- Forth) developed by S. Piggott (1966). Emphasized lines- the principal distributions of regionally- distinctive settlement types, developed by B. Cunliffe (1983). (From: Edwards, Ralston 2003, Figure 10.1.)
9.7. Can hierarchy be seen from the settlement record?

"Evidence suggests little centralisation of power or social unity at regional level, beyond what would have been implicit in kinship ties."

(Harding 2004, 294)

Some settlement patterns are visible over a wide study area. Two different types of planning of enclosed site positions were shown in case studies (Chapter 6). Moreover, some similarities in the layout of enclosed sites were noticed (section 6.3.2.). Similarities in the layout of enclosed sites set close to one another produces two possible explanations. The area could be settled by a particular group that showed their difference from others in the specific way of building enclosed sites. Moreover, it is possible that the same group moved from one enclosed site to the other and built it according to the same plan (i.e. ‘wandering settlement’, see section 3.6.; also Gerritsen 1999; Hill 1999).

Arguments for a hierarchical society in later prehistoric S Scotland are not supported by the results of this thesis. The settlement evidence does not show, for example, bigger roundhouses within settlements that could be interpreted as chieftain’s dwellings. Some sites are big and elaborate, but they fail to provide any other evidence of hierarchy. There is much more evidence for non-hierarchical societies than for hierarchical ones when observing settlement evidence. G. Ferrell’s study of later prehistoric settlements in NE England speaks against the centralisation of authority (Ferrell 1997, 233). The same can be seen in the Iron Age of the Netherlands (ibid.). Further S however, in Area 4 of her study (NE Durham) she noticed that sizes of sites vary more than in other areas and that the spacing between the sites is more regular. She sees these as a possible indication of hierarchy (ibid.; Ferrell 1999, 134). However, regular spacing and variations on sizes of settlements have been seen and studied in this thesis as a possible sign of non-hierarchical social units (sections 6.3. and 6.4.). Case studies of Meldon Burn valley and the area of Orchard Rig, both in Peebleshire, have shown possible small-scale social units, which were detected in the construction of the sites as well as in the patterned location of these units within a particular unit and in the wider landscape (ibid.). Studies of small areas where one possible group could be living create a very similar sequence of sites over time. The lack of chronological sequences, which we could follow over wider areas, was mentioned before (Chapters 1 and 3). However, these similarities over smaller areas show a possibility of social units, which perhaps need to be chronologically and socially observed on a small scale (Ralston, Ashmore 2007, 230).
I. Smith has suggested that linear earthworks can be seen as boundaries deriving from the development of centralised authorities (Smith 1990, 48). S.R. Bryant and R. Niblett (1997, 278) give more possible evidence on the hierarchical status of sites based on linear dykes. Although S English linear dykes differ from the S Scottish linear earthworks in their massiveness and length, it is worth considering them as an analogy. It was noted before (section 7.3.) that linear earthworks are often set close to complex sites in Berwickshire, perhaps due to the need for impressiveness of the nearby landscape, which would be possible to create in undulating terrain and was there created with the linear earthworks. In this study however, a different argument for the role of linear earthworks has been established (Chapter 4), which is not connected to the hierarchical society but the importance of some sites in the memory of people. In some areas, enclosed sites and other archaeological features in the landscape were integrated with the system of linear earthworks, each feature respecting the position of the others. Several roles of linear earthworks were detected (Chapter 7), with the main one being separation between two parts of the landscape. This was used in a different way, for separating the activities on one side of the linear earthwork from the activities on the other side. Linear earthworks in connection to enclosed sites nearby suggest that these sites perhaps had a special role, one that respects constructions made by the ancestors and protects their work from later activities nearby (section 9.3.). In other instances, linear earthworks accentuated roles of the enclosed site nearby as different from the one of the ‘everyday’ site (ibid.).

This short discussion on hierarchy can be best concluded with the words of C. Haselgrove, who suggested that:

"Social power in late Iron Age societies was essentially personal, and settlements derived their status from the people with whom they were identified, rather than the other way round."

(Haselgrove 2000, 107)
9.8. Future work

"We need to start writing interesting stories!"
(N. Sharples at the FMSG Seminar 6.6.2006)

There are several objectives that need to be dealt with and studied further.

The first, and most obvious from this thesis, is the question of two different types of enclosed sites (section 9.2.). This would need to be tested on wider areas, starting with the areas close to the counties studied. The use of GIS would be appropriate to further test observations made in this thesis.

Furthermore, multivallate sites still hold a lot of questions. These were previously interpreted as a need for more defence (e.g. Avery 1993) as indicators of chronology (Piggott 1948) and as signs of status of such sites (Bowden, McOmish 1987; Hill 1995). Some of these interpretations have been questioned before (section 2.6.; also e.g. Harding 2004, 93). Moreover, results of this thesis do not fit into any of these three categories. Some of the sites which appear to be multivallate today are perhaps the result of more than one phase of the site (see Broxmouth, E Lothian, pre- and post- excavation for example: Hill 1982b). These sites have perhaps not been multivallate in any of the phases (section 3.6.). However, some similarity between them exists. In the studied area they appear in clusters in areas, which show a bigger density of enclosed sites. In contrast, multivallate sites are absent from areas with a small density of other enclosed sites (Illus. 24 and 76). Some possible explanations on this have been given in one of the previous chapters (section 2.6.) but more study on the topic of multivallate sites is needed, as well as more excavations of these sites in order to establish possible chronologies.

More work needs to be done on the roundhouses. As shown in this thesis, different types of roundhouses are present in two different forms of sites (e.g. Chapter 2 and section 9.2.). This could be just a coincidence and it would need to be tested on more sites and wider areas. The question of great importance for the further development of later prehistoric archaeology is whether different constructions of roundhouses were used for different purposes.
The very attractive topic of the living ancestor and question of how people of the past perceived the earlier monuments in the landscape was barely touched in this thesis (Chapters 6, 7 and section 9.3.). There is, however, a lot of evidence on the relationship between archaeological features of different eras. This would need to be studied locally, on smaller areas, and discussed in more detail. Smaller areas should be looked at from a wider time span, and should include archaeological evidence of different periods and different types of sites. The later prehistoric landscape was not a blank canvas. Instead the sites set in it and settlement patterns, which were formed, included earlier remains.

Moreover, the occurrence of a possible boundary between two areas with slightly different settlement structure (section 9.6.) should be tested using artefacts and other archaeological remains. If the boundary could be confirmed, this would open new possibilities for several studies, such as when this boundary first developed or if any other boundaries elsewhere in Scotland could be detected by the same kind of analyses.

These are just the main suggestions for future work. They could (with great hope) generate more interest in S Scottish settlement archaeology amongst the younger generation of archaeologists and consequently continue the work started by D. Christison, C.M. and S. Piggott, R. Feachem and D.W. Harding. The S Scottish enclosed site record is rich and therefore offers a great potential for further research.

9.9. Final words

I chose to ignore neat categories in which the enclosed sites were put almost a century ago. With this, many new observations became apparent which need to be looked at over wider areas in order to embed them in later prehistoric settlement archaeology.

In the course of this thesis, I presented one possible view on the later prehistory in S Scotland. Later history is not easy to explain, and there will always be more ways of explanation. During the analysis of later prehistoric enclosed site evidence, the list of questions became longer and longer. I am aware of the imperfections in this work, but I am also aware of the potential for short studies, which I present in this thesis. Some of them are somewhat radical and come from a completely different point of view from previous work. However, they all stimulate discussion on more than one level and point out the potential of
blank areas within later prehistoric research, as well as showing that we need to question established typologies of sites. These short studies also force the reader to start observing from a different perspective and give a broad enough base to come out with fresh ideas and new questions which are necessary in the future development of settlement archaeology.

"What if?"

What if there were no chiefdoms in the Iron Age?
What if defences surrounding hillforts were not defensive?
What if the common assumption of a generalised 'Celtic' form of Iron Age social organisation or religion is a myth? What if hillforts and oppida can not be understood within the framework of Central Place Theory?
What if the very archaeological record we excavate is not a straightforward reflection of the past?
What if the European Iron Age was fundamentally different from what we have always assumed?
What if... ?"

(Hill 1995, 45)
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