From the *Transactions* of the
Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society

Gloucestershire and the Iron Age of Southern Britain

by B. W. Cunliffe
1984, Vol. 102, 5-15

© The Society and the Author(s)

Trans Bristol Gloucestershire Archaeol Soc 102 (1984) 5–15

Gloucestershire and the Iron Age of Southern Britain

By BARRY CUNLIFFE

Presidential Address delivered at the Council House, Bristol, 24 March 1984

For the last fifty years or so the Iron Age of Gloucestershire has received much attention, both from excavators and field-workers, providing a considerable body of evidence from which to work. But much of what has been published is essentially site-oriented and this creates difficulties when attempting to view the situation in Gloucestershire against the broader canvas of British development. This is not to say that there have been no works of synthesis. The magisterial survey, presented in Elsie Clifford's report on her excavation at Bagendon published in 1961, was a brilliant attempt, by Derek Allen, Molly Cotton, and Christopher Hawkes, to draw together the threads of the story into a single comprehensive narrative; but that was more than twenty years ago and the discipline of archaeology has moved fast during the last two decades. The present moment, when archaeologists everywhere in Britain are sitting back and taking stock, is an appropriate time for us to attempt a broad view of our theme, to focus on what we know (or can reasonably deduce) and to turn our minds to thoughts of designing new research strategies to lead us into the next century.

An essay of this kind is not the place to discuss the material evidence in great detail or to provide lists or extensive bibliographies. This has now been done in an important review of the evidence, recently published by Alan Saville (1984), which forms the essential starting point for any consideration of the Gloucestershire Iron Age. Here we are concerned more with general themes and the broader context within which the local evidence must be seen to fit.

The archaeology of Gloucestershire has tended, in the past, to be overshadowed by discoveries in Wessex and the Upper Thames Valley, to such an extent that the implicit view has arisen that the region is essentially peripheral to the main developments of the chalklands and river valleys lying to the east and south-east. Old theories, now long discredited, of Iberian invaders into the lands flanking the Severn, gave Gloucestershire, albeit briefly, a false place in the 'history' of pre-Roman Britain. More recently the county has been seen as sitting, rather uncomfortably, on the interface between several regional developments, having no distinctive character of its own.

The question of territorial divides within the region is one to which we shall return below but what of the broader picture? Perhaps the best way to begin to consider the problem is in terms of a simple threefold division of southern Britain (Cunliffe 1984a). Briefly stated, we can define a *western zone*, comprising Devon, Cornwall, and western Wales, in which settlement is in the form of strongly defended homesteads, known variously as rounds and raths, together with small multivallate hillside and cliff-end fortifications, densely scattered in the landscape. An *eastern zone*, centring around the rivers flowing into the North Sea, has a very different settlement structure. Fortification is noticeably absent throughout much of the period and settlements tend to be quite large, in some instances approximating more to the village. Between these two regions is a zone we shall call *central southern Britain*, extending from the south coast, including Sussex, through Gloucestershire and the Welsh Borderland, to North Wales. This is a region dominated by strongly defended hillforts each sited in a distinct territory, within which lie a number of large

farming settlements of single family or extended family size. While it is possible to see a number of regional differences within the central southern zone, the overall similarity in settlement form and economy, in contrast to the western and eastern zones, serves to give it a degree of cohesion. Insofar as we can tell from the available evidence, there is a broad and impressive similarity of development over this whole region throughout much of the Iron Age.

Gloucestershire sits firmly within the central southern zone, but at the point where the eastern and western zones most closely approach each other and where the Severn neatly divides it into two parts. Thus while the development of Gloucestershire may be seen as typical of that of the centre south, its interest is greatly enhanced by its central, rather than peripheral, geographical position.

Crucial to any consideration of the period is the problem of chronology. Here we have to rely on a chronological scheme developed for Wessex, where the ceramic sequence is better understood and a sufficient number of radiocarbon dates is available to enable an, admittedly imperfect, calibration to be attempted (Cunliffe 1984b). Briefly summarized it is possible to divide the Iron Age into five broad periods which we can call *Earliest*, *Early*, *Middle*, *Late*, and *Latest*. The *Earliest* period spans the transition from bronze to iron technologies and may be dated roughly from *c.* 800 BC to 550 BC. The *Early* period appears to be one of rapid socio-economic change lasting from *c.* 550–400 BC, when the long *Middle* period begins with its stable and well-ordered economic regime but stressful social system. The *Late* period begins about 100 BC with the re-establishment of close trading links with the Continent. The *Latest* period, beginning about AD 10, marks the last significant phase of economic and political reorientation, inspired by Roman trading relations with eastern Britain, before the actual invasion of AD 43 makes Britain part of the Roman Empire. Baldly stated like this it all sounds straightforward and clear-cut. It most certainly is not. The scheme is crude, ill-focused, and generated for an area outside Gloucestershire but it is the best at present available, and so long as we use it with circumspection, it helps to order an otherwise bewildering mass of detail into a cohesive structure of phased development.

In Wessex, the Earliest period is characterized by a highly developed pottery tradition, known after the type site of All Cannings Cross. Strictly there are two components, 'fine wares' made in a variety of forms but with high technical skill and involving a rich repertoire of decorative geometric motifs, and a 'coarse ware' component of simpler forms, usually jars, with little more than finger-tip decoration. Until recently this group of material, probably spanning two centuries from the eighth to sixth centuries, could not be broken down into sub-phases, but the current excavation of a most important site at Potterne, Wilts. will soon allow a much greater precision to be adopted.

In Gloucestershire there are a number of pottery assemblages likely to be of this date but the fine-ware component is virtually absent. A few decorated sherds from Sandy Lane (Charlton Kings), Leckhampton Hill, and Crickley Hill are all that our region can boast. This by no means implies 'backwardness' but simply that the two areas had diverging ceramic traditions and pottery was not extensively exchanged between them. This may suggest a cultural divide but need imply little more.

The most dramatic structures to be erected during the Earliest period were the very large hilltop enclosures (too insubstantial in their defences to be regarded as hillforts). A number have now been examined in Wessex (e.g. Harting Beacon, West Sussex; Winklebury I, Hants.; Balksbury I, Hants.), sufficient to suggest that the principal characteristics include: simple defences usually with some kind of vertical-walled rampart; a massive area enclosed; internal buildings sparsely scattered but including small four-post structures usually considered to be granaries or fodder-ricks; and very little occupation debris. How to interpret these sites is still a

problem but they involve a considerable amount of communal effort in their construction. One possibility is that they may be stock enclosures, belonging to the larger community, for penning the flocks and herds at certain times during the farming year, possibly during the winter. This is little more than a guess but the general lack of occupation debris implies that they were not inhabited by large communities for long periods.

Sites of this kind extend into Gloucestershire. One has recently been examined at Norbury Camp, Northleach (Saville 1983). The camp on Bathampton Down, Avon would seem to be another, while Nottingham Hill, Gotherington conforms to the general characteristics of the type.

But these hilltop enclosures, whatever their function, were not the only defended sites of the Earliest period. The excavation of the strongly-fortified promontory fort of Budbury just over the border in Wiltshire has produced a mass of contemporary occupation material including highly-decorated pottery of All Cannings Cross type. In Gloucestershire, Crickley Hill with its substantial stone-built and timber-laced rampart (Crickley period 2) must belong to this period, for it has produced three radio-carbon dates suggestive of construction in the eighth century BC (Dixon 1972; 1976). Philip Dixon's large-scale excavation here is of outstanding importance for the evidence it is providing of the Earliest and Early phases of the Iron Age in Gloucestershire. Inside the gate of the period 2 fort he has discovered a number of four-post buildings together with several long rectangular structures which are either houses (as the excavator prefers to see them) or rows of four-, five-, and six-post 'granaries', some of them in fenced enclosures. At any event the massiveness of the Crickley 2 defences and the density of buildings within, combined with the comparatively small area enclosed, serves to distinguish Crickley from the broadly contemporary hilltop enclosures, suggesting that the fort was occupied by a community of some status. Thus we can begin to see a pattern emerge with a few very strongly-defended forts like Crickley and Budbury possibly representing the residences of the elite, while the larger hilltop enclosures may have been pastoral structures serving larger communities. That the period was one of some stress is shown by the destruction of Crickley 2 by fire and its partial rebuilding in period 3a.

It was during the Early period in Wessex that hillforts seem suddenly to have proliferated. This may well have been the case in Gloucestershire but the evidence is rather less clearly defined. At Crickley however, in period 3b, there is dramatic evidence for the massive rebuilding of the defences with complex outworks to protect the entrance. A single radiocarbon assessment suggests the construction date may have been in the sixth or fifth century BC. Excavations within the fort showed that the layout of the settlement had changed, the exclusively rectangular structures giving way to a new layout dominated by a very large roundhouse sited just inside the gate. The nearby hillfort of Leckhampton, defended by a timber-laced rampart with stone fronting-wall, is thought to have been built at about the same time; it too could boast an entrance of monumental proportion.

Of the other Gloucestershire forts there is little to be said. Shenberrow seems to belong to the Early period, based on assessment of the pottery, while Bury Hill, Avon has structural similarities to the Early group of forts, but excavation at both was limited and was conducted many years ago. Also just outside the county, Little Solisbury near Bath, Chastleton and Lyneham in Oxfordshire, and the outer fortifications at Bredon, Hereford and Worcester can all, with some confidence, be assigned to the Early period.

Standing back from the great mass of available evidence, of admittedly very varying quality, it is a fair generalization that the Early period (*c.* 550–400) in central southern Britain saw the building of strongly-defended hillforts on a quite unprecedented scale. Indeed it is quite possible that, with the exception of the Early hilltop enclosures and a few other sites, the great majority of

our hillforts may have originated in this period in what can only have been a time of increasing social stress. The burning and abandonment of Crickley 3b and Leckhampton offer vivid evidence of this.

What caused the wave of forts to be built, and where within the region the process began, we can only guess. Population increase and the desire of the elite to control land and resources are two possible causative factors; so too are the stresses consequent upon the social and economic readjustment caused by a change from a bronze-using economy to one in which iron prevailed. Bronze was a rare commodity requiring a complex network of exchange mechanisms for its distribution; iron was far more widely spread in the landscape and readily available, given the technical skill for its extraction. The change-over from one to the other cannot have failed to have had a dislocating effect on traditional socio-economic systems and it may be this that we see reflected in the spate of hillfort building in the Early period.

The precarious history of these Early hillforts, the nature of the settlement within them, and their functions in their regional contexts are all matters well beyond the scope of the present evidence, but we must not forget that the forts are only one element in the settlement complex. The presence of non-hillfort settlements, presumably farmsteads, is well attested by chance finds of pottery from various sites in the county, but of the contexts of these finds we are entirely ignorant. It may be that these settlements were similar to large enclosed farmsteads found in Wessex at, for example, Old Down Farm, Hants., Little Woodbury, Wilts., and Gussage All Saints, Dorset, but we have no means of telling and short of an extensive programme of excavation, the Early Iron Age farmsteads of Gloucestershire must remain completely unknown.

If we are correct in seeing the Early hillforts of central southern Britain as the physical manifestation of a comparatively brief period of social readjustment in the sixth and fifth centuries BC, it seems that the new socio-economic system had reached a level of stability by about 400 BC or soon after for it was by, or about, this time that many of the forts were abandoned, some having been destroyed. Those remaining in use were invariably redefended with refurbished ramparts, or new lines of defence, constructed on the glacis principle, that is with no vertical wall but instead a continuous slope from ditch bottom to rampart crest. The Wessex sites provide ample evidence for this sequence and moreover show that each of these 'developed hillforts' usually dominated a distinct territory, often defined by natural boundaries such as deep river valleys. In other words it seems as though, in each region, one fort emerged to a position of dominance while the others were abandoned (Cunliffe 1984b).

Three forts of this kind have been excavated on a comparatively large scale in southern Britain: Maiden Castle, Dorset; South Cadbury, Somerset; and Danebury, Hants. All show evidence of intensive occupation involving the digging of hundreds of storage pits, the building of granaries, and the constant reconstruction of quite densely-spaced houses usually occupying protected positions behind the ramparts. The sheer quantity of occupation debris alone is sufficient to imply an intensity of activity quite unlike that in the earlier forts. Another characteristic of the developed hillforts of Wessex is the effort expended on the defensive circuits. The ramparts were frequently repaired, the ditches were kept clear of silt, leading to the creation of substantial banks of spoil along the outer ditch lip, the entrances were elaborated, often with complex outworks, while, in some cases, additional lines of defence were added giving rise to multivallate forts of which Maiden Castle is a prime example.

It has been necessary to outline the Wessex developments in this detail simply because good evidence from Gloucestershire is lacking. On the borders of the county, however, at Bury Wood in Wiltshire, Bredon Hill (the inner fortifications) and Midsummer Hill, Hereford and Worcester, excavations have shown typical developed hillforts to exist. It is reasonable, therefore, to expect some of the Gloucestershire forts to conform to the same type, but in the

absence of adequate excavation we have little more than topographical considerations to guide us. Uley Bury, though unusually large, may be a 'developed' hillfort; at any event it has yielded a small collection of pottery of the correct date. Lydney Park is a more typical example and it too has produced pottery of the Middle Iron Age, though the excavation of the Iron Age levels was very limited. The sadly mutilated fort of Kimsbury, on Painswick Beacon, with its multivallate defences and inturned entrance, is one of the best examples which the county can boast, while Sodbury (Avon), with two widespaced lines of defence, suggests multi-phase occupation of which the inner circuit conforms, in profile, to defences typical of the Middle Iron Age. The date of the others must remain uncertain, though some at least may eventually prove to be of this Middle period. In advance of a programme of excavation there is, unfortunately, very little more that can be said of the Middle Iron Age forts of Gloucestershire except by analogy with the far better-known forts of Wessex and the Welsh borderland.

Our knowledge of Middle Iron Age, non-hillfort, settlements is a little better, almost entirely as the result of three recent excavations. In the Upper Thames Valley, at Claydon Pike near Lechlade, a large-scale programme of rescue work in advance of gravel extraction has exposed an undefended settlement of considerable extent occupying gravel 'islands' divided from each other by marshy areas. The settlement comprises a number of occupation units typically consisting of shallow-ditched enclosures surrounding circular timber houses. A not dissimilar arrangement was found just beyond the northern limits of the county, on the Severn gravels at Beckford in the shadow of Bredon Hill. Here, circular houses with paved yards and numerous storage pits set in ditched enclosures show all the traces of intensive and long-term occupation. The third site, Guiting Power, in the Cotswolds, though examined on a far more limited scale, hints that upland farmsteads with storage pits, like those of Wessex, are to be expected on the limestone hills possibly in the same density (every kilometre or so) as is found on the chalklands of the south. If those Cotswold farms prove to be similar to the Wessex sites, that is of family or extended family size, then the contrast with the much larger 'villages' of the gravels will need to be explained in terms of differing socio-economic systems (Hingley 1984). The problem is one of some considerable interest but we will require far more evidence before it can be pursued.

So far we have considered the broad similarities of settlement and settlement hierarchy which exist within the central southern zone. It is only during the Middle Iron Age, when pottery becomes comparatively common throughout the area, that regional differences can begin to be defined. A percentage of the pottery in use at this time was decorated in a variety of motifs created by the linear tooling, or the impressing, of leather-hard fabrics before firing. The different styles of tooling are geographically restricted in a manner suggestive of regional preferences. The analysis of pottery fabrics has added a further dimension (Peacock 1968; Morris 1981). Most dramatic is the demonstration that much of the decorated pottery used in northern Gloucestershire and in Hereford and Worcester was made from clays tempered with rock particles obtainable from the vicinity of the Malverns. The distribution of this Malvernian pottery, with its characteristic array of decorative motifs, may well represent a distinct territory possibly representing an ethnic unity – in other words an area within which the various communities were bound together by systems of exchange and by patterns of social interdependence. Interesting confirmation for this view is provided by the distribution of the coarse ceramic containers (briquetage) in which the salt, extracted from the Droitwich springs, was transported. The pattern corresponds closely to that of the Malvernian pottery (Morris 1981).

Another distinctive type of Middle Iron Age decorated pottery to impinge upon our region was the so-called 'Glastonbury' ware made from clays obtained in the Mendip region (Peacock 1969). The distribution concentrates south of the Somerset Avon but spreads to a few sites on the north bank of the river. The known distribution of Malvernian ware in northern Gloucestershire and

Mendip Glastonbury ware in northern Somerset leaves a considerable gap in southern Gloucestershire and along the north shore of the Severn estuary. The gap is partly caused by the comparative lack of archaeological activity in the area but even so it may represent a third 'territory' distinct from the north and the south. What little pottery exists is predominantly of local clays and exhibits a somewhat different range of decorative motifs to those of neighbouring regions. This is especially true of the coastal region on the north shore of the Severn where the pottery from Lydney and Llanmelin and several other neighbouring sites shares many motifs in common. However, in the absence of clearer evidence from this middle area, it is perhaps simplest to suggest a twofold territorial division with, say, the Gloucestershire Frome-Upper Thames axis serving as the (very) approximate boundary. We will return to this question of boundaries again later.

The Roman annexation of southern Gaul in the years around 123 BC introduced a totally new economic factor into the affairs of the southern British tribes. Entrepreneurs moving into the new province of Transalpina were anxious to exploit native resources, especially the manpower (in the form of slaves) and raw materials, available in the barbarian regions to the north and west. The quest for those materials reinvigorated ancient trade routes, introducing a new commodity – Italian wine – into the courts of the barbarian elites. The effects of this new pattern of exchange were considerable, for not only did they create a sudden demand for commodities which had not previously been regarded as exportable, like slaves and possibly the hides and hunting dogs mentioned by Strabo, but they introduced wine, and all the equipment – cups, strainers, and jugs – needed in the wine-drinking ceremony, as items of prestige and display avidly sought by those aspiring to positions of power. In short, the proximity of the Roman consumer market created a totally new set of stresses in the social and economic systems of the barbarian fringes (Cunliffe 1984c).

The effects of the Roman presence in southern Gaul were directly felt on the shores of southern Britain some time about 100 BC when Armorican middlemen brought cargoes of Italian wine, in distinctive wine amphorae, to the harbours of Hengistbury and Poole. It was on sites like Hengistbury Head that British products, derived largely from the south-west, were exchanged for Mediterranean luxury goods (Cunliffe 1982). Thus began a process which was to increase in intensity over the next one hundred and forty years, culminating in the Roman invasion of AD 43. Throughout this time the axis of cross-Channel contact changed, swinging gradually further east until, following the consolidation of the Rhine frontier, the principal route from the Mediterranean focused on the Rhone-Rhine axis, eventually impinging on the shores of Essex. It was here and in the hinterland of eastern Britain that, in the three or four decades before the invasion, the luxury imports were concentrated, finding their way into the graves of the elite. At first these events were remote from Gloucestershire but towards the end of the first century BC the effects of the great socio-economic upheaval in the south-east were beginning to make themselves felt in our area. Throughout much of Wessex there is evidence that the developed hillforts of the Middle Iron Age were being abandoned sometime about 100 BC. The same may be true of Gloucestershire but in the total absence of evidence it is impossible to say, and indeed there is no need to suppose that the forts of the Cotswolds and beyond succumbed at once to the factors affecting Wessex – there may well have been a time-lag.

One site, Salmonsbury, is of crucial significance to this question. Although it has enjoyed extensive excavation the results have not been published in a way which facilitates reinterpretation. Salmonsbury is a lowland fortification in the upper reaches of the valley of the River Windrush (a tributary of the Thames), at the point where the river begins to cut into the higher slopes of the Cotswolds. It is sited so as to dominate one of the principal routes between east and west and herein must lie its significance. The excavation shows that the fortifications probably

date to the time when elaborately-decorated pottery of Middle Iron Age style was in use, but the occupation spans the period when a quite different style of wheel-turned pottery of the Late and Latest Iron Age became prevalent. The problems are: what does this mean in terms of socio-political change and when should the change in ceramic style be dated?

To take the second part of the question first. In Wessex and the south-east there is a range of evidence to suggest that wheel-turned pottery, and the considerable change of style which the new technology involved, was introduced in the period *c.* 100–50 BC, the earliest recognizable influence being found on the south coast, in the Hengistbury region, some time about 100 BC. In those areas like Gloucestershire, away from the south and east coasts, the change between Middle and Late styles of pottery may have followed some decades later and, indeed, it is a possibility that Middle Iron Age styles of decorated pottery continued in vogue until the end of the first century BC or even into the early years of the first century AD. A thorough restudy of the Salmonsbury pottery, together with further sample excavation, would enable the chronology of these technological changes to be refined significantly.

The socio-political implications of the changes in settlement location and form, recognizable over much of south-eastern Britain in the first century BC, cannot be discussed in any detail here. Suffice it to say that the increased intensity of trade with the Roman world, through the ports of eastern England, led to a reordering of the networks of trade and exchange. Hillforts became largely redundant and new settlements, which we may group under the general-purpose term 'oppida', came into existence. The oppida, like Salmonsbury, were usually sited at route nodes where they could command the passage of goods and control trade. It seems quite probable that the dyke systems of Bagendon represent the defences and land divisions of just such a complex, beginning (on present evidence) some time just before the invasion of AD 43. Within the considerable area defined we might expect there to have been a number of occupation foci specializing in the various functions in which a complex urban site of this kind would have been involved. Only further field-work and excavation on a large scale will tell.

Another site in need of reconsideration is the complex of earthworks on Minchinhampton Common, which is usually claimed to be of Late Iron Age date. If so it may represent another 'oppidum', this time controlling the Upper Thames-Frome route, but again, evidence is far too slight to allow more than a passing mention of this interesting possibility.

The three potential oppida mentioned above all occupy the northern territory which we have defined on the basis of the distribution of Middle Iron Age pottery. No comparable site is known in the southern zone but we should not forget the attraction which the sacred spring at Bath, presided over by the goddess Sulis, would have had in focusing attention and perhaps settlement in the area of Bath, which is also on one of the major routes through the Cotswolds. Further south at Camerton, where a Roman settlement was later to develop, finds of pre-Roman metalwork and coins hint at another location of considerable potential interest but much more work is needed here if there is to be any progress in understanding the complex.

Finally we must consider the implication of Late Iron Age coinage in our region. Briefly stated, there developed, in south-eastern Britain, two separate coin-issuing zones: a *core zone* in the extreme south east and a *peripheral zone* around it (Cunliffe 1981). The core zone was represented by the coinage of rulers of the major dynasties of the Trinovantes, Catuvellauni, and Atrebates, while the peripheral zone, stretching from Lincolnshire to the Dorset coast, was divided into four tribal coinages belonging to the Coritani, Iceni, Dobunni, and Durotriges. Gloucestershire lay within the territory of the Dobunni which stretched from the Welsh borders to the Upper Thames Valley and from Hereford and Worcester to the Somerset Levels.

Current work (Sellwood 1984) is beginning to show us something of the fascination of the Dobunnic coin series, and much more that is new will emerge as the study proceeds, but here

there is time to mention only one point. The coinage appears to reflect, in the distribution of several of its issues, the divide between north and south we have already noticed in the earlier pottery. The conclusion would seem to be that the two distinct territories, representing separate but related ethnic groups, had already crystallized out by perhaps as early as the fifth century BC; a southern territory stretching from the Somerset Levels to the vicinity of the Gloucestershire Frome, and a northern territory from the Frome northwards into Hereford and Worcester. By the beginning of the first century AD these two peoples were sufficiently close to share a broadly similar coinage and may well, at certain stages of their later history, have begun to come together under a single authority, perhaps regarding themselves as members of a larger entity called the Dobunni. Nevertheless, the old divide remained, reminding us that the larger tribal groupings, known to us from the Late Iron Age coin series and the classical authors, were composed of a number of *pagi* of very ancient origin.

This brief survey of the evidence does little more than highlight a few of the themes and problems which are of current interest to the author. It has, I hope, emphasized some of the strengths and weaknesses of the data with which we are forced to work. Useful collections of artefacts, like pottery and coins, still have considerable potential and can be made to yield a great deal of information, and intensive field surveys can enhance our understanding of the density and location of settlement, but without programmes of large-scale excavation, like those of Crickley, Beckford, and Claydon Pike, there can be little significant advance. Our understanding of chronology is still far too hazy, our knowledge of settlement form and society is almost negligible, and we have nowhere begun to assess the economic base of the society we are studying. The last forty years have seen some significant advances in Iron Age studies in Gloucestershire. What is needed now is a long-term research design which will take us over the threshold to a new level of understanding and awareness.

APPENDIX

Principal references to sites mentioned in the text.

Avon	
Bathampton Down	Wainwright 1967
Bury Hill	Davies & Phillips 1929
Little Solisbury	Dowden 1957, 1962; Falconer & Adams 1935
Sodbury	RCHM 1976, 103–4
Dorset	
Chalbury	Whitley 1943
Gussage All Saints	Wainwright 1979
Hengistbury Head	Cunliffe 1978
Maiden Castle	Wheeler 1943
Gloucestershire	
Bagendon	Clifford 1961; RCHM 1976, 6–9
Crickley Hill	Dixon 1969–73, 1972, 1973, 1976
Claydon Pike	Miles & Palmer 1982, 1983a, 1983b
Guiting Power	Saville 1979
Kimsbury	RCHM 1976, 91–3
Leckhampton Hill	Burrow, Paine, Knowles & Gray 1925; Champion 1971, 1976
Lydney Park	Wheeler & Wheeler 1932
Minchinhampton	Clifford 1937; RCHM 1976, 81–4
Norbury, Northleach	Saville 1983

Nottingham Hill	Hall & Gingell 1974
Salmonsbury	Dunning 1931, 1976; O'Neil 1977
Sandy Lane, Charlton Kings	Purnell & Webb 1950
Shenberrow	Fell 1961
Uley Bury	Saville & Ellison 1983
Gwent	
Llanmelin	Nash Williams 1933
Hampshire	
Balksbury	Wainwright 1970a
Danebury	Cunliffe 1984d
Old Down Farm	Davies 1981
Winklebury	Robertson-Mackay 1977; Smith 1977
Hereford and Worcester	
Beckford	Britnell 1974; Oswald 1970–2
Bredon	Hencken 1938
Midsummer Hill	Stanford 1981
Oxfordshire	
Chastleton	Leeds 1931
Lyneham	Bayne 1957
Somerset	
South Cadbury	Alcock 1972, 1980
West Sussex	
Harting Beacon	Bedwin 1978, 1979
Wiltshire	
All Cannings Cross	Cunnington 1923
Budbury	Wainwright 1970b
Bury Wood Camp	King 1961, 1962, 1967
Little Woodbury	Bersu 1940; Brailsford 1948, 1949

Bibliography

Alcock, L. 1972. *By South Cadbury is that Camelot*. London.

Alcock, L. 1980. The Cadbury Castle sequence in the first millennium BC. *Bull Board Celtic Stud* 28, 656–718.

Bayne, N. 1957. Excavations at Lyneham Camp, Lyneham, Oxon. *Oxoniensia* 22, 1–10.

Bedwin, O. 1978. Excavations inside Harting Beacon Hill-fort, 1976. *Sussex Archaeol Collect* 116, 225–40.

Bedwin, O. 1979. Excavations at Harting Beacon, West Sussex: second season. *Sussex Archaeol Collect* 117, 21–36.

Bersu, G. 1940. Excavations at Little Woodbury, part I. *Proc Prehist Soc* 6, 30–111.

Brailsford, J.W. 1948. Excavations at Little Woodbury, part II. *Proc Prehist Soc* 14, 1–23.

Brailsford, J.W. 1949. Excavations at Little Woodbury, parts IV and V. *Proc Prehist Soc* 15, 156–68.

Britnell, W. 1974. Beckford. *Current Archaeol* 45, 293–7.

Burrow, E.J., Paine, A.E.W., Knowles, W.H. and Gray, J.W. 1925. Excavations on Leckhampton Hill, Cheltenham, during the summer of 1925. *Trans BGAS* 47, 81–112.

Champion, S.T. 1971. Excavations on Leckhampton Hill, 1969–70. Interim Report. *Trans BGAS* 90, 5–21.

Champion, S.T. 1976. Leckhampton Hill, Gloucestershire, 1925 and 1970. In D.W. Harding (ed.), *Hillforts: later prehistoric earthworks in Britain and Ireland*, 177–90. London.

Clifford, E.M. 1937. The earthworks at Rodborough, Amberley, and Minchinhampton, Gloucestershire. *Trans BGAS* 59, 287–307.

Clifford, E.M. 1961. *Bagendon: a Belgic oppidum, excavations 1954–1956.* Cambridge.

Cunliffe, B.W. 1978. *Hengistbury Head.* London.

Cunliffe, B.W. 1981. Money and Society in pre-Roman Britain. In B.W. Cunliffe (ed.), *Coinage and Society in Britain and Gaul*, 29–39. London (= CBA Res Rep 38).

Cunliffe, B.W. 1982. Britain, the Veneti and beyond. *Oxford J Archaeol* 1(1), 39–68.

Cunliffe, B.W. 1984a. Settlement, hierarchy and social change in southern Britain in the Iron Age. *Analecta Praehistorica Leidensia* 15, 161–87.

Cunliffe B.W. 1984b. Iron Age Wessex: Continuity and Change. In B.W. Cunliffe and D. Miles (eds.), *Aspects of the Iron Age in Central Southern Britain*, 12–45. Oxford.

Cunliffe, B.W. 1984c. Relations between Britain and Gaul in the first century BC and early first century AD. In S. Macready and F.H. Thompson (eds.), *Cross-Channel Trade between Gaul and Britain in the pre-Roman Iron Age*, 3–23. London (= Soc Antiq London Occasional Paper 4).

Cunliffe, B.W. 1984d. *Danebury: an Iron Age hillfort in Hampshire. Vols 1 and 2, The excavations 1969–1978.* London (= CBA Res Rep 52).

Cunnington, M.E. 1923. *The Early Iron Age inhabited site at All Cannings Cross.* Devizes.

Davies, S.M. 1981. Excavations at Old Down Farm, Andover, Part II: Prehistoric and Roman. *Proc Hampshire Fld Club Archaeol Soc* 37, 81–163.

Davies, J.A. and Phillips, C.W. 1929. The Percy Sladen Memorial Fund excavation at Bury Hill Camp, Winterbourne Down, Gloucestershire, 1926. *Proc Univ Bristol Spelaeol Soc* 3, 8–24.

Dixon, P.W. 1969–1973. *Crickley Hill: interim reports 1–5.* Cheltenham (Duplicated reports).

Dixon, P.W. 1972. Crickley Hill 1969–71. *Antiquity* 46, 49–52.

Dixon, P.W. 1973. Longhouse and roundhouse at Crickley Hill. *Antiquity* 47, 56–9.

Dixon, P.W. 1976. Crickley Hill 1969–72. In D.W. Harding (ed.), *Hillforts: later prehistoric earthworks in Britain and Ireland*, 161–75, 424–9, 507–8. London.

Dowden, W.A. 1957. Little Solisbury Hill Camp. *Proc Univ Bristol Spelaeol Soc* 8, 18–29.

Dowden, W.A. 1962. Little Solisbury Hill Camp. *Proc Univ Bristol Spelaeol Soc* 9, 177–82.

Dunning, G.C. 1931. Salmonsbury Camp, Gloucestershire. *Antiquity* 5, 489–92.

Dunning, G.C. 1976. Salmonsbury, Bourton-on-the-Water, Gloucestershire. In D.W. Harding (ed.), *Hillforts: later prehistoric earthworks in Britain and Ireland*, 75–118, 373–401, 488–94. London.

Falconer, J.P.E. and Adams, S.B. 1935. Recent finds at Solisbury Hill Camp, near Bath. *Proc Univ Bristol Spelaeol Soc* 4, 133–222.

Fell, C.I. 1961. Shenberrow Hill Camp, Stanton, Gloucestershire. *Trans BGAS* 80, 16–41.

Hall, M. and Gingell, C. 1974. Nottingham Hill, Gloucestershire, 1972. *Antiquity* 48, 306–9.

Hencken, T.C. 1938. The excavation of the Iron Age camp on Bredon Hill, Gloucestershire, 1935–1937. *Archaeol J* 95, 1–111.

Hingley, R. 1984. Towards Social Analysis in Archaeology: Celtic Society in the Iron Age of the Upper Thames Valley. In B.W. Cunliffe and D. Miles (eds.), *Aspects of the Iron Age in Central Southern Britain*, 72–88. Oxford.

King, D.G. 1961. Bury Wood Camp. Report on excavations, 1959. *Wiltshire Archaeol Natur Hist Mag* 58, 40–7.

King, D.G. 1962. Bury Wood Camp. Report on excavations, 1960. *Wiltshire Archaeol Natur Hist Mag* 58, 185–208.

King, D.G. 1967. Bury Wood Camp. *Wiltshire Archaeol Natur Hist Mag* 62, 1–15.

Leeds, E.T. 1931. Chastleton Camp, Oxfordshire, a hillfort of the Early Iron Age. *Antiq J* 11, 382–98.

Miles, D. and Palmer, S. n.d. (but 1982). *Figures in a landscape: archaeological investigations at Claydon Pike, Fairford/Lechlade, Gloucestershire: interim report 1979–81.* Oxford (= Oxford Archaeological Unit Interim Report).

Miles, D. and Palmer, S. 1983a. Claydon Pike. *Current Archaeol* 86, 88–92.

Miles, D. and Palmer, S. 1983b. Claydon Pike, Fairford/Lechlade, Gloucestershire. *Proc Prehist Soc* 49, 385–8.

Morris, E.L. 1981. Ceramic exchange in western Britain: a preliminary view. In H. Howard and E.L.

Morris (eds.), *Production and Distribution: a ceramic viewpoint*, 67–81. Oxford (= BAR Int Ser 120).

Nash-Williams, V.E. 1933. An Early Iron Age hill fort at Llanmelin, near Caerwent, Monmouthshire. *Archaeol Cambrensis* 88, 217–315.

O'Neil, H.E. 1977. Salmonsbury, Bourton-on-the-Water: some aspects of archaeology in Bourton Vale. *Trans BGAS* 95, 11–23.

Oswald, A. 1970–72. Excavations at Beckford. *Trans Worcestershire Archaeol Soc* 3, 7–54.

Peacock, D.P.S. 1968. A petrological study of certain Iron Age pottery from western England. *Proc Prehist Soc* 34, 414–27.

Peacock, D.P.S. 1969. A contribution to the study of Glastonbury ware from south-western Britain. *Antiq J* 49, 41–61.

Purnell, F. and Webb, E.W. 1950. An Iron Age A site near Cheltenham. *Trans BGAS* 69, 197–9.

RCHM. 1976. *Ancient and Historical Monuments in the County of Gloucester. Vol. 1: Iron Age and Romano-British Monuments in the Gloucestershire Cotswolds.* London (Royal Commission on Historical Monuments, England).

Robertson-Mackay, R. 1977. Defences of the Iron Age hillfort at Winklebury, Basingstoke, Hampshire. *Proc Prehist Soc* 43, 131–54.

Saville, A. 1979. *Excavations at Guiting Power iron age site, Gloucestershire, 1974.* Bristol (= CRAAGS Occasional Papers No. 7).

Saville, A. 1983. Excavations at Norbury Camp, Gloucestershire, 1977. In A. Saville, *Uley Bury and Norbury hillforts: rescue excavations at two Gloucestershire Iron Age sites*, 26–45. Bristol (= WAT Excavation Monograph No. 5).

Saville, A. 1984. The Iron Age in Gloucestershire: a review of the evidence. In A. Saville (ed.), *Archaeology in Gloucestershire*, 140–178. Cheltenham.

Saville, A. and Ellison, A. 1983. Excavations at Uley Bury hillfort, Gloucestershire, 1976. In A. Saville, *Uley Bury and Norbury hillforts: rescue excavations at two Gloucestershire Iron Age sites*, 1–24. Bristol (= WAT Excavation Monograph No. 5).

Sellwood, L. 1984. Tribal boundaries viewed from the perspective of numismatic evidence. In B.W. Cunliffe and D. Miles (eds.), *Aspects of the Iron Age in Central Southern Britain*, 191–204. Oxford.

Smith, K. 1977. The excavation of Winklebury camp, Basingstoke, Hampshire. *Proc Prehist Soc* 43, 31–130.

Stanford, S.C. 1981. *Midsummer Hill, an Iron Age hillfort on the Malverns.* Hereford.

Wainwright, G.J. 1967. The excavation of an Iron Age hillfort on Bathampton Down, Somerset. *Trans BGAS* 86, 42–59.

Wainwright, G.J. 1970a. The excavations of Balksbury Camp, Andover, Hants. *Proc Hampshire Fld Club Archaeol Soc* 26, 21–55.

Wainwright, G.J. 1970b. An Iron Age promontory fort at Budbury, Bradford-on-Avon, Wiltshire. *Wiltshire Archaeol Natur Hist Mag* 65, 108–66.

Wainwright, G.J. 1979. *Gussage All Saints: an Iron Age settlement in Dorset.* London (= Dept of Environment Archaeol Rep 10).

Wheeler, R.E.M. 1943. *Maiden Castle, Dorset.* Oxford (= Soc Antiq London Res Rep 12).

Wheeler, R.E.M. and T.V. 1932. *Report on the excavation of the prehistoric, Roman, and post-Roman site in Lydney Park, Gloucestershire.* London (= Soc Antiq London Res Report 9).

Whitley, M. 1943. Excavations at Chalbury Camp, Dorset, 1939. *Antiq J* 23, 98–121.