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Proceedings
EDITORIAL

It is with great sadness that we record the death, on 1st August 2002, of Mr W F Cormack M.B.E. F.S.A. Scot., who was business editor for thirty five volumes of these Transactions. An obituary to Mr Cormack is included in this volume.

Contributions are invited on the Natural History, Geology, Antiquities and Archaeology including Industrial Archaeology, of South-West Scotland or the Solway Basin, and preference is always given to original work on local subjects. Intending contributors should, in the first instance, apply to the Editors for 'Instructions to Contributors', giving the nature and approximate size of their paper. Each contributor has seen a proof of his or her paper and neither the Editors nor the Society hold themselves responsible for the accuracy of scientific, historical or personal information in it. A copy of the current Rules, dated 13th October 1995, appeared in volume 69.

The Hon. Secretary, Mr R. McEwen, 5 Arthur's Place, Lockerbie DG11 2EB, deals with all matters other than membership which are dealt with by the Hon. Membership Secretary, Mrs M. Rochester, Acorn Bank, 6 Bracken Wood, Gatehouse of Fleet, Castle Douglas DG7 2FA, Tel. 01557-814966.

Exchanges should be sent to the Hon. Assistant Librarian, Mr J. Williams, St Albans, 43 New Abbey Road, Dumfries DG2 7LZ. Exchange volumes are deposited in the Library of Dumfries Museum at which location they may be freely consulted by members. However, as public opening hours may vary, it is recommended that prior contact be made with Museum staff (phone 01387 253374) before visiting.

Enquiries regarding back numbers of Transactions - see rear cover - should be made to the Hon. Librarian, Mr R. Coleman, 4 Lover's Walk, Dumfries DG1 1LP. As many of the back numbers are out of stock, members can greatly assist the finances of the Society by arranging for any volumes which are not required, whether of their own or those of deceased members, to be handed in. It follows that volumes marked as out of print may nevertheless be available from time to time.

All payments, other than subscriptions, should be made to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr L Murray, 24 Corberry Park, Dumfries DG2 7NG. Payment of subscriptions should be made to Mrs M Rochester (see above), on behalf of the Hon. Treasurer. The latter will be pleased to arrange for subscriptions and/donations to be treated as Gift Aid under the Finance Acts, which can materially increase the income of the Society without, generally, any additional cost to the member. Important Inheritance Tax and Capital Gains Tax concessions are also conferred on individuals by these Acts, in as much as bequests, or transfers of shares or cash to the Society by way of Gift Aid are exempt from these taxes.

Limited grants may be available for excavations or other research. Applications should be made prior to 28th February in each year to the Hon. Secretary. Researchers are also reminded of the Mouswald Trust founded by our late President Dr R.C. Reid, which provides grants for work on certain periods. Enquiries and applications for grants to that Trust should be made to Primrose and Gordon, Solicitors, 92 Irish Street, Dumfries DG1 2PF.

The Council is indebted to the following bodies for substantial grants towards publication costs viz Historic Scotland for Mr Tools' paper on Promontory Forts and Mr Henderson et al's Crannog Survey; the Mouswald Trust for Mr Wilson's paper on Roman and Native; the Savings Banks Museum and the Crichton University of Southern Scotland Action Group for Dr Booth's paper on the Curries and Duncans; and private donations for the paper on Variations in Pink-footed Geese.

The Society has received a bequest from Mr Cormack’s estate and Council has decided to use this bequest to create a Cormack Lecture which will be delivered in his memory on an annual basis.

The illustration on the front cover is of the Wamphray cross-slab from the article The Early Church in Dumfriesshire by W.G. Collingwood, in volume XII, Series III (1926) of these Transactions. It is discussed afresh by Prof. Richard Bailey in Whithorn Lecture No. 4 (1996).
MEASUREMENTS OF GEESE BY R A H COOMBES: 
relationships between mass and body size of pink-footed and greylag goose 
by Hugh Boyd1 and John Young2

Linear measurements and masses of over 700 geese, most shot around the Solway Firth in 1938 – 1960, provide scarce information on total length and wing span and identify some differences in mass and in linear measurements from those reported elsewhere. The samples of Greylag Anser anser (262) and Pink-footed A. brachyrhynchos (227) geese show different relationships between mass and total length and wing length. Associations between mass and size of Pink-footed Geese were strongest for adult females and weak for adult males and first-winter females. The Greylag Geese showed no significant associations between the mass of adult males and females and their total or wing lengths, though there were significant correlations with adult culmen lengths and with all three linear measures of juveniles of both sexes. At the same body size, the mean mass of first-winter male Pink-footed Geese, although 15% less than that of adult males in autumn, had become equal by February.

Introduction
Robert Coombes (1902 – 1988) was a keen wildfowler, an excellent ornithologist and a skilled taxidermist. His great interest in geese caused him to prepare an unusually large collection of specimens, now housed in the Zoological Museum of the University of Manchester. Though Coombes did not publish much on geese under his own name (Coombes and Boase 1933, Coombes 1947, 1951, 1957), his knowledge was drawn on extensively by the Wildfowl Inquiry Sub-Committee of the British Section of the International Committee for Bird Preservation, the editors of The Handbook of British Birds (Witherby et al. 1939) and by D. A. Bannerman (Bannerman and Lodge 1957). Having been shown his collection in 1967, we believe that it may be useful to draw attention to some of the wealth of material it contains. Most of the geese were taken between 1938 and 1960, chiefly in Dumfries and Galloway and elsewhere around the Solway Firth.

Coombes collected and measured over 700 geese (Table 1). He measured the birds on the day they were shot, and skinned out immediately afterwards those he wished to keep. He weighed most of the geese and made up to eleven linear measurements on some of them. As all the measurements are his, they should be more consistent than those assembled from varied sources, or those made on live geese caught for ringing, which have provided most recent morphometric data, summarized in Cramp et al. (1977) and updated for the Pink-footed Goose Anser brachyrhynchos by Fox et al. (1997). We have not found descriptions of Coombes’s measuring techniques. He seems likely to have followed the procedures described by Witherby et al. (loc.cit.), though they do not describe how to measure total length or wing span, for which he perhaps used the methods described in Baldwin, Oberholser and Worley (1931), the standard work on measuring birds at that time.

1 Hugh Boyd, 1032 Pinewood Crescent, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K2B 5Y5.
2 John Young, 11 Ash Grove, Heathhall, Dumfries DG1 3TG.
Coombes recorded total length, wing length and wing span to $\frac{1}{16}$ in., converted here to cm. In his later years, some of those measurements were recorded in mm., which he had always used for bill measurements, including height and width as well as exposed culmen. The weight (mass) of geese was recorded in Imperial measure, to $\frac{1}{4}$ oz., converted here to kg, to the nearest 10 g. We make extensive use of four linear measurements: total length, wing span and lengths of wing and culmen. Measurements of wing span were made on only 90 birds, while total length was measured on 142. Neither is often reported, nor can they be obtained from live geese, yet both are useful as indicators of whole body size. All measurements were entered on a standard form, which included where the goose was shot (county or country) and when (month and year, but not the day). He sometimes added notes on the appearance or internal condition of a bird, which we have not transcribed. We have compared Coombes’s measurements with published summaries relating to the same stocks of geese and do not usually cite them when they are in close agreement with those already published.

The second part of this report explores the relationships between the mass of individuals and their total length and wing length, used as indicators of body size, of Pink-footed and Greylag geese, the species providing the most measurements.

### Results

#### Sex- and age-ratios

Coombes shot more males than females (Table 1). The sex-ratios in the juvenile samples vary from 85 males to 100 females in the Bean Goose to 162 : 100 in Greylag Geese, though the differences from the pooled mean of 116 : 100 are not statistically significant. In the (larger) adult samples, with a pooled mean of 135 : 100, the range is even wider, from 84 : 100 for Bean Geese to 215 : 100 for White-fronted Geese, and these differences are significant (chi-square 9.94, 3 df, $p < 0.02$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Total (N)</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>Juvenile</th>
<th>Incomplete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bean <em>Anser fabalis</em></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink-footed <em>A. brachyrhynchus</em></td>
<td>227</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-fronted <em>A. albirostris albirostris</em></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser White-fronted <em>A. erythropus</em></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greylag <em>A. anser</em></td>
<td>262</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnacle <em>Branta leucopsis</em></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent <em>B. bernicla</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-breasted <em>B. ruficollis</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes birds identified by age but not sex, or sex but not age; very few were assigned neither age nor sex.

Table 1: Numbers of Geese in the Coombes collection
The combined age-ratio of 217 juveniles to 398 adults (35% juveniles), is rather higher than would usually be obtained from field observations, consistent with other evidence that young geese are easier to shoot than older ones (e.g. Boyd 1953, Elder 1955, Matthews & Campbell 1969, Owen 1980). This suggests that Coombes was not being highly selective when collecting. It is puzzling that half the sample of 74 Barnacle Geese lacked complete information on the age and sex of the birds shot; they are not especially hard to classify.

The age-ratio in Coombes’s collection of Pink-footed Geese (44.5% juveniles) was much higher than the 18.7% among 75 taken by John Berry in Fife in 1929 – 1948 (Boyd and Berry 1996). There was an extraordinary scarcity of first-winter males (3/75) in the Fife sample. The adult sex-ratios also differed greatly: Solway 222 males per 100 females, Fife 79: 100.

The age-ratio in Coombes’s collection of Greylag Geese was lower (37.3% juveniles) than the 46.6% among 667 geese shot in eastern Scotland in 1966 – 1969 (Matthews and Campbell 1969). The sex-ratios also differed: adults, 104 males: 100 females on the Solway, 129: 100 in eastern Scotland; first winter, 162: 100 on the Solway, 110: 100 in the east.

**Total length (Table 2) and wing span (Table 3)**

Alpheraky (1905) provided measurements of total length of most species and of wing span (‘expanse’ or ‘spread’) of several. He gave only ranges, or upper limits, without separating different breeding stocks or age- and sex-classes, and with no indication of sample sizes. Greenewalt (1962) cited wing spans for several species, [taken from Magnan (1922), which we have not seen], again without sample details.

Owen (1980) noted that adult males tend to be larger than females and juveniles about 5% smaller than adults of the same sex. Though Owen did not report measurements of total length or wing span, his summary seems to hold for them too, with males about 4% longer than females in their first winter and 5% when full grown.

For all the age- and sex- classes among Coombes’s collection of grey geese, the ratio of mean wing span to mean total length is about 2.07; for Barnacle Geese 2.14. Despite the awkwardness of making these large measurements, the coefficients of variation of both total length and wing span are well within the range of values (4 – 10) usually encountered in anatomical measurements of vertebrates (Simpson and Roe 1939), suggesting that Coombes succeeded in standardizing his techniques of measuring wing span and total length, though some of the small samples probably underestimate the variability likely to occur within entire populations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>First-winter</th>
<th>A-Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pink-footed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White-fronted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>albibrons Greece/Netherlands</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flavirostris Scotland</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lesser White-fronted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greylag</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solway</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barnacle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solway</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Mean total lengths (cm) of geese in the Coombes collection:
N = number of specimens, s.d. = standard deviation, A-range = ranges given by Alpheraky(1905).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>First-winter</th>
<th>A-G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galloway female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>162.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>167.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>151.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>158.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pink-footed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>151.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>155.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White-fronted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>albibrons</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>140.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>150.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flavirostris</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>142.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>150.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greylag</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>154.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>163.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>163.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barnacle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solway</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>134.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>140.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Mean wing spans (cm) of geese in the Coombes collection:
N = sample size, s.d. = standard deviation. A-G = measurements given by Alpheraky(1905) or Greenewalt(1962).
Other linear measurements

Bean Goose *Anser fabalis*

Coombes was a forceful advocate of the view that two races of Bean Geese winter in western Europe: ‘forest’ *A. f. fabalis* and ‘tundra’ *A. f. rossicus*. He collected 42 in Holland, where both forms occur, and assigned almost all of them to *rossicus*, while classing all his Scottish-taken specimens as *fabalis* (Coombes 1947, 1951, Bannerman and Lodge 1957). The measurements of the Bean Geese he collected in the Netherlands, Belgium and northwest Germany are consistent with those given for *rossicus* in Cramp *et al.* (1977).

Table 4 summarizes the measurements of adult Bean Geese taken in Galloway by Coombes in 1939 – 1950, when several hundred wintered there, and compares them with the measurements of *fabalis* given in Cramp *et al.* (*loc.cit.*). Though the samples are small, adults of both sexes taken in Galloway appeared to have significantly shorter and deeper bills than those taken elsewhere in north-west Europe. Their tarsus measurements were also longer. The lengths of their wings did not differ significantly from those published for other samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wing chord</th>
<th>Culmen</th>
<th>Depth of lower mandible</th>
<th>Tarsus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galloway</td>
<td>9 455 13.2</td>
<td>7 57.6 3.3</td>
<td>9 8.5 0.5</td>
<td>9 79.7 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Europe</td>
<td>73 460 13.7</td>
<td>75 60.0 2.7</td>
<td>6 6.2 0.6</td>
<td>11 76.7 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galloway</td>
<td>5 476 16.7</td>
<td>5 58.3 5.5</td>
<td>5 9.4 0.5</td>
<td>5 85.6 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Europe</td>
<td>87 481 5.5</td>
<td>93 63.6 3.0</td>
<td>13 6.4 0.6</td>
<td>21 76.7 3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Linear measurements (mm) of adult Bean Geese shot in Galloway compared with those of *Anser fabalis* wintering in northwest Europe (from Cramp *et al.* 1977). N = sample size, s.d. = standard deviation.

In comparing specimens of Bean Geese and Pink-footed Geese “Pay no attention whatever to the colour of the bill. It will only confuse and mislead” Coombes wrote in Bannerman and Lodge (1957), while dissenting from Berry’s (1939) belief that the form *segetum* used to occur in Fife. The colours of soft parts of museum specimens of geese often differ greatly from those recorded immediately after death. Yet, while that dismissive comment may apply to the study of museum skins, bill colours and markings, and leg colours, can be useful to observers of live geese.
Pink-footed Goose *Anser brachyrhynchus*

The large numbers of Pink-footed Geese shot on the Solway Firth by Coombes from 1933 to 1946 differed very little in size from those measured by Berry in Fife between 1928 and 1948, or from those caught and ringed in Lancashire in 1987 – 1995 (Fox et al. 1997). These linear measurements are of greatest value when studying seasonal variations in mass (Table 5 and see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bean <em>fabalis</em></td>
<td>Galloway</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Coombes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Roselaar in Cramp et al., 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>rossicus</em></td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Coombes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Roselaar in Cramp et al., 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink-footed</td>
<td>Solway, 1933-46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Coombes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fife, 1928-48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Combes &amp; Berry, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Britain, Oct/Feb 1987-95</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>Fox et al 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greylag</td>
<td>Solway</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Coombes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Galloway</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Coombes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Scotland 1953-68</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>Elder 1955, Matthews &amp; Campbell, 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Coombes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Mean masses of adult grey geese weighed by Coombes, converted here to kg, to nearest 10 g, with comparisons from published sources. N = sample size, s.d. = standard deviation.

White-fronted Goose *Anser a. albifrons* and *A.a. flavirostris*

The samples are small and none of the measurements differ importantly from those reported elsewhere.

Greylag Goose *Anser anser*

Coombes collected Greylag Geese in several parts of Britain and in The Netherlands, though he made unusually few measurements on many of them. His samples from Galloway (Table 6), in conjunction with those made by J. Young and H. Boyd (unpublished report to Wildfowl Trust, 1966) on adults moulting there and with others shot in
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autumn in eastern Scotland (Matthews and Campbell 1969), suggest that the indigenous
goose in Galloway tended to have longer bills and shorter wings than winter immigrants
from Iceland.

Widespread introductions of Greylag Geese have been made in Britain since Coombes
was active (Mitchell and Fox, 1999) so that it is no longer practicable to look for differ-
ences in size between residents and winter immigrants. It might be possible to determine
from historical museum material whether the residents in the Hebrides and in northern
Scotland were also larger than migrants from Iceland, as a few specimens suggest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Region/period</th>
<th>First-winter females</th>
<th>First-winter males</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>s.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bean</td>
<td>Galloway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossicus</td>
<td>Solway 1933-46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink-footed</td>
<td>Britain 1953-59</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Britain 1987-94</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greylag</td>
<td>Solway 1933-48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Scotland 1953</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Scotland 1966-9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Mean masses (kg) of juvenile (first winter) geese weighed by Coombes,
compared with published records for samples from the same stocks.

Barnacle Goose *Branta leucopsis*

Coombes’s measurements of Solway-wintering Barnacle Geese did not differ from those
in the much larger samples caught there for ringing in later years (Owen 1980).

Weights of geese during the shooting season

Coombes weighed most of the geese he shot (Tables 5,6), though many of the records are
of limited use because either the sex or the age was not recorded. (There were most omissions
in the early 1930s, when he was most active.) The majority of the records refer to
October- November and January-February, so do not provide a complete picture of changes through the winter.

Table 5 records the mean masses of adult geese weighed in southern Scotland and in
The Netherlands. The samples of White-fronted and Barnacle geese were too small to be useful.
That *fabalis* Bean Geese in Galloway weighed more than *rossicus* in The Netherlands is consistent with their larger body size (Tables 2, 3 and 5).

Adult Pink-footed Geese taken around the Solway Firth between 1933 and 1946 had mean masses much the same as those shot in Fife between 1928 and 1948 (Boyd & Berry 1996). In both samples, adult females were rather heavier than those taken in rocket-nets in several British regions in 1953–1959, others shot in east Scotland in 1967 and 1968, or those caught with cannon-nets in Lancashire in 1987–1984 (Fox *et al.* 1997), though the masses of adult males and juveniles of both sexes showed no long-term differences.

Matthews and Campbell (1969) examined large samples of Greylag Geese taken in eastern Scotland and concluded that the indigenous Galloway birds were slightly larger and heavier than winter immigrants from Iceland. Coombes’s Solway samples weighed much the same as those later caught or shot in east Scotland. The mean masses of adults of both sexes caught while moulting in Galloway (Young and Boyd, unpub.) were higher than those of geese wintering in the same area, suggesting that the indigenous birds, mixed with immigrants from Iceland in winter, probably weigh substantially more throughout the year. The Greylag Geese taken by Coombes in The Netherlands were heavier than those in Britain, although not differing clearly in body size.

The few Barnacle Geese weighed by Coombes that were fully classified by age and sex had mean masses greater than those of the corresponding classes in recent samples from the Solway Firth in both October and January (Owen 1980), though his samples were too small for those differences to be statistically significant.

**Weights of geese in their first autumn and winter**

Table 6 summarizes the masses of the young geese in the collection. It has long been known (Schiøler 1926, Elder 1955) that geese in their first winter are much lighter than adults, especially soon after completing their first southward migration. The mean mass of young males was about 11% greater than that of young females in autumn and 14% greater in January and February. Over the entire winter, juvenile females and males were both about 10% lighter than adults, while the mean masses of juvenile males were close to those of adult females (range 94% - 114%).

**Mass and body size**

**Pink-footed Geese**

Beer and Boyd (1962), who weighed large samples of Pink-footed Geese caught in rocket-nets in October and November between 1953 and 1959, but were able to measure few wing lengths of few, found that the masses of adults and juveniles of both sexes were highly and positively correlated with wing length. Though Coombes’ samples were smaller, they can be used to explore the relationships between mass and total length (Table 7) and wing length (Table 8). For adult females, the correlation coefficients of mass and total and wing lengths were very high, but decreased through the winter. Those of adult males
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were lower and also decreased from November to February, as did the coefficients of the small juvenile samples.

When adjusted to a common total length, the mean mass of first-winter males, though about 15% less than that of adult males in autumn, had increased to the same level by February.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Adult females</th>
<th>Adult males</th>
<th>Juvenile females</th>
<th>Juvenile males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  r  p</td>
<td>N  r  p</td>
<td>N  r  p</td>
<td>N  r  p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solway</td>
<td>50  0.876 &lt;0.001</td>
<td>87  0.328 &lt;0.01</td>
<td>41  0.204 NS</td>
<td>34  0.793 &lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>23  0.623 &lt;0.01</td>
<td>19  0.608 &lt;0.01</td>
<td>11  0.808 &lt;0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>14  0.880 &lt;0.001</td>
<td>21  0.318 NS</td>
<td>11  0.606 &lt;0.05</td>
<td>10  0.871 &lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>11  0.743 &lt;0.01</td>
<td>21  0.680 &lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.</td>
<td>15  0.632 &lt;0.01</td>
<td>29  0.392 &lt;0.05</td>
<td>13  -0.117 NS</td>
<td>12  0.683 &lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb.</td>
<td>10  0.394 NS</td>
<td>16  -0.238 NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Correlation of mass with total length of:
(a) Pink-footed Geese shot on the Solway Firth by Coombes, 1928-1960; and by Berry in Fife, 1929-1958 (from Boyd and Berry 1996); and (b) correlations in different months. N = sample size, no entry where < 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Adult females</th>
<th>Adult males</th>
<th>Juvenile females</th>
<th>Juvenile males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  r  p</td>
<td>N  r  p</td>
<td>N  r  p</td>
<td>N  r  p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solway</td>
<td>48  0.750 &lt;0.001</td>
<td>87  0.271 &lt;0.02</td>
<td>42  0.221 NS</td>
<td>34  0.626 &lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>28  0.677 &lt;0.001</td>
<td>17  0.085 NS</td>
<td>10  0.576 &lt;0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>12  0.818 &lt;0.001</td>
<td>21  0.458 &lt;0.05</td>
<td>11  0.359 NS</td>
<td>10  0.679 &lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>11  0.844 &lt;0.001</td>
<td>21  0.556 &lt;0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.</td>
<td>15  0.718 &lt;0.01</td>
<td>29  0.101 NS</td>
<td>14  0.049 NS</td>
<td>12  0.541 &lt;0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb.</td>
<td>10  0.613 &lt;0.05</td>
<td>16  -0.042 NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Correlation of mass with wing length of Pink-footed Geese:
(a) shot by Coombes on the Solway Firth, 1928-1960 and by Berry in Fife, 1928-1958 (from Boyd and Berry 1996); and (b) in different months. N = sample size, no entry where < 10.
Greylag Geese

In contrast to the Pink-footed Geese, the masses of adult Greylag Geese were not clearly correlated with total or wing length, though positively associated with culmen length, while the masses of juveniles were correlated with all three linear measurements (Table 9). Most of the Greylag samples were taken in late autumn, so that within-season comparisons cannot be made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>linear measurement</th>
<th>Adult females</th>
<th>Adult males</th>
<th>Juvenile females</th>
<th>Juvenile males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  r</td>
<td>N  r</td>
<td>N  r</td>
<td>N  r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total length</td>
<td>43 -0.155</td>
<td>47 -0.101</td>
<td>22 0.422*</td>
<td>35 0.512*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wing length</td>
<td>43 0.115</td>
<td>47 0.229</td>
<td>22 0.664**</td>
<td>36 0.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culmen</td>
<td>42 0.309*</td>
<td>47 0.384**</td>
<td>35 0.605**</td>
<td>35 0.464**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Correlation of mass with linear measurement of Greylag Geese collected by Coombes between 1934 and 1979, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, no entry where p >0.1.

Discussion

As measuring total length and wing span is impracticable on museum skins and live geese, making those measurements very soon after collecting the geese was clearly useful. These lengths are relatively large, and perhaps less affected by different techniques of measurement than wing chord (how much flattening?), tarsus (what fixed points should be used?) and culmen (does the end of feathering correspond to the change from skull to bill?). Dzubin & Cooch (1992) describe how total length should be measured, but make no reference to wing span, for which Baldwin, Oberholser and Worley (1931) seem to offer the only detailed published description. Perhaps some field biologists can be persuaded to measure wing spans during bag checks, because the relationship between wing span and total length must be of interest in connection with the aerodynamics of flight, as well as in the contexts explored here.

Coombes collected nearly all his geese when the numbers wintering in Britain were far smaller than they have been in the last 40 years. When geese were scarce, and shooting pressure in Britain was much higher than in recent years (though it has increased in Iceland), the individual geese seem to have been at least as large as they are at present. Yet modern farming provides them with more, and better quality, food in winter, thanks to grass varieties that resume growth much earlier and have higher growth rates and greater yields than the ‘unimproved’ grazing that was general in the 1930s, when British agriculture was in a depressed state. This seeming contradiction is consistent with evidence from North America (Cooch et al 1991, Sedinger and Flint 1991) and Sweden (Larsson and Forslund 1991) that competition on brood-rearing areas is of greatest importance in determining adult body size, and hence winter mass too.
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The collections at Stranraer Museum include a flint artefact (Fig.1) from the shore at Wig Sands, south-east of the village of Kirkcolm, Wigtownshire. Wigs Sands is an area of flat sand and cobbles forming the beach of The Wig bay on the west side of Loch Ryan, some five miles (7.5 km) north of Stranraer. The artefact was found in 1992 by Mrs Anne Brownlee, while searching for shells on the beach with her daughters. It was lying exposed on the surface of the beach at about the high-water mark (approximate find-spot = NX 038679). Mrs Brownlee reported her find to Stranraer Museum, where it was accessioned and registered as WIWMS 1993.3.

The Wig Sands artefact is a bifacial core-tool, flaked with a hard hammer across both faces from both edges. Finer trimming (mostly on the face on the right in Figure 1) has straightened the edges, creating a near symmetrical planform except at the base. The notch visible on one edge reflects a natural hollow present in the original cobble or nodule from which the tool was made. The artefact is complete and in a reasonably good state of preservation, apart from some slight modern damage at the tip and the lower part of one edge. In cross-section it is mainly quadrangular, becoming more triangular or plano-convex towards the base. There is a distinct tip and butt to the implement, in the sense that the uppermost end (as illustrated) is thinner and more pointed, whereas the lower end is
thicker and semi-blunted. The dimensions are: length 137mm; maximum breadth 44mm; maximum thickness 26mm; and the weight is 166 grams.

The overall condition of the implement is slightly ‘rolled’, more so on one face (on the right in Figure 1) than the other, as a result of exposure to water action of some kind. The superficial colouration is mainly a creamy light grey, with some ochreous yellow areas on both faces. These colours represent a discolouration of the surface from weathering and staining over time, since it can be seen where the interior is exposed by edge damage that the original colour was a darker medium grey. The appearance and internal colour of the flint are very similar to the Antrim flint of the east coast of Northern Ireland, where flint is a persistent element of the Ulster White Limestone Formation.

This context is the most likely ultimate source of the raw material for the Wig Sands core-tool, though it did not necessarily derive directly from Northern Ireland itself. Deposition of appropriate Upper Cretaceous sediments occurred over a broad area encompassing what is now north-east Ireland, south-west Scotland and the North Channel. Other than in north-east Ireland, these deposits subsequently were largely removed by erosional processes. Thus flint-bearing Cretaceous deposits on the seabed between Ireland and Scotland have proved very elusive (Fyfe et al. 1993; Jackson et al. 1995). Nevertheless, much of the flint component of these eroded deposits will have survived and undergone complex redeposition and redistribution since the Cretaceous era, particularly as a result of Pleistocene glaciation (Dawson & Dawson 2000). Cobbles of grey flint are, for example, reported from Dounan Bay, only some five miles (7.5 km) west of Kirkcolm on the opposite side of the Rhins (John Pickin pers. comm.).

It is difficult to categorize the Wig Sands core-tool in terms of a specific implement type. Although there is some damage at the tip, this terminal would never have been a cutting edge in the normal sense of the blade end of an axehead. The most appropriate designation for the artefact in its present form might be ‘pick-like’, but it lacks the robust, more sharply pointed, terminal of a true pick. There is no positive indication as to whether the implement has actually been used. Thus it could alternatively be unfinished, and a transverse flake removal from one side of the tip may have been intended in order to create a *tranchet*-blow ‘axehead’, or there may have been an intention to make the tip more pointed and more definitely pick-like.

---

1 The late Bill Cormack read the initial draft of this paper and kindly offered the following very pertinent observations on flint occurrence from his own fieldwork experience in Galloway. I am delighted to be able to include Bill’s comments here as an appropriate coda to this part of my article. ‘I was mystified how flint appeared in the Rhins and yet nowhere else along the Galloway coast either in the beaches or on ploughed fields (pace numerous authors who shall not be named), yet flint-using Mesolithic sites abound. However, as one moves east in Galloway the flint-work and debitage on the sites becomes less and other material – chert and quartz – increases. An explanation appeared in Sissons (1967: 79 & fig. 33) and seems to be confirmed in our *Transactions* by Kerr (1982).

The clue lies in the fact that in the Rhins there are “early” drumlins carrying material from north to south and “later” drumlins carrying material from north-east to south-west. Both of these learned authors point out that the earlier differ in contents from the later in that they alone carry shelly fragments, presumably from the bottom of the Firth of Clyde, but what they omit to say is they also have much raw flint. Thus at Terally there is a spot on the shore, where presumably the sea has been eroding a north-south drumlin, where one could fill a sack with workable flint nodules in a few minutes. Longshore drift has spread them widely along the shore. Then inland, cultivation and erosion has exposed on the tops and flanks of such drumlins when ploughed many nodules mixed with Mesolithic and later working debitage. A very good example occurs near Portankil just north of Mull Farm near the end of the peninsula.

Now I have never seen, among this Rhins flint, a nodule larger than a cricket ball. This, though negative evidence, supports the view that the Wig Sands find is a human import.’
There are no precise parallels, so far as the writer is aware, for this implement anywhere in Scotland, where flint axeheads in general are relatively rare, and picks or other core-tools of this type extremely rare. In fact the only comparable examples of flint core-tools from Scotland both have somewhat unsatisfactory contexts.

A core-tool found on Fair Isle (Cumming 1946; Lacaille 1954: 274; Saville 1994 & 2000) is the most distinctively Mesolithic of the Scottish core-tools in terms of its typology, even though it lacks an obvious working end. However, it remains entirely enigmatic given the absence of other indicators of early prehistoric activity and appropriate raw material in that location, and the present writer remains unconvinced that this is a genuinely indigenous Mesolithic item.

More significant is the large flint core-tool from Morton, Fife (Coles 1971: 314; Saville 1994). This was a surface find which may or may not relate to the well-known Mesolithic occupation site investigated by excavation at Morton Farm (Coles 1971). The circumstances of discovery are unfortunately sketchy (Anon 1968: 201). This find, which is in the National Museums of Scotland collection (registration no. X.ABB 3), has not previously been published in detail so illustration and description here are appropriate (Figure 2).
The Morton core-tool is of medium to light grey flint which is not discoloured. The dorsal surface has a large patch of thin, waterworn and chatter-marked cortex, suggesting a beach origin for the original cobble from which it was made. The ventral surface has a large area of cream-coloured, matt, coarser-grained inclusion. As with the Wig Sands core-tool there is careful bilateral, bifacial flaking, which has produced an elegant biconvex planform. The cross-section varies from quadrangular to sub-lenticular. There is no ‘rolling’ and the tool is in reasonably fresh condition, though it does have some smoothing of the arrises on the edges and at some places at the tip. The dimensions are: length 182 mm; maximum breadth 60 mm; maximum thickness 34 mm; and the weight is 319 grams.

The thin, pointed tip of the Morton core-tool is not at all robust, making the precise functionality of the tool problematic. Coles (1971: 314) describes this implement as an ‘axe’, but it has a pointed tip rather than a cutting edge. In colour, condition and type of cortex the flint of which this tool is made is similar to that of many of the distinctively Mesolithic artefacts from the excavations at Morton. There can be no guarantee the Morton core-tool itself is Mesolithic, though this would seem the most probable date for it.

In addition, and in this case from the south-west of Scotland, there is the bifacially worked surface find fragment from Stairhaven, on Luce Bay, which has been interpreted as possibly one end of a flint ‘axe or adze’ (Coles 1963: 86 & fig.3: 11). If so, this piece would presumably be the butt end of a core-tool, but there is little else which can be said about quite what type of implement this fragment may represent.

This survey of the limited comparanda from Scotland raises two related questions. Firstly what are the ages and origins of the Wig Sands and Morton implements, and secondly why are there so few flint core-tools from Scotland?

There must of course remain some uncertainty as to whether the Wig Sands implement is a genuine Scottish find. Since it has no proper context, its actual origin will remain a matter of subjective judgement. The writer is inclined to accept the findspot at face value and to assume that the core-tool found its way to the surface of the beach by natural processes, after being lost or otherwise disposed of somewhere in the vicinity in prehistory. Was it made in Scotland, however, or is it an import? As stated above, it is made on flint which appears very similar to that of Antrim, but it is just possible that a sufficiently large nodule of Antrim flint could have been found as an erratic on the Wigtownshire coast.

---

2 In the 1960s the flint of the Morton core-tool was sampled for trace elements. The conclusion was reached that the raw material was ‘... more likely to be derived from flint deposits under the North Sea through erosion or glacial action’ than imported from England (Coles 1971: 314-317). The sample point on the core-tool is shown by the filled oval on the upper left side of the left hand (dorsal view) illustration in Figure 2.
Apart from the Morton implement, the best and certainly the most local parallels for the Wig Sands core-tool are to be found in Northern Ireland among the group of artefacts known in the older literature as the ‘Larne type of axe or celt’ (Knowles 1893: 140-142). One of the closest analogues is the example originally published by Burchell (1931: fig.42), and described as ‘slightly rolled and exhibits a creamy-white porcellanous patination, flecked with patches of ferruginous staining’ (Figure 3). This was found in the gravels of the ‘25 foot’ raised beach, Larne (the same implement is illustrated in Movius 1942, fig.32, no.3 and Movius 1953, fig.14, no.134). Similar implements were figured previously by Knowles (1893: 143; 1914: 110) and by Coffey and Praeger (1904: figs.8 & 10), mostly from the Larne/Island Magee coast. Other examples of this kind of implement were described by Knowles from the River Bann (1912: plates 15-16), of which one from the Bann at Coleraine or Mount Sandel (plate 15:77; Ulster Museum A14614) is perhaps the most similar. A further example comes from higher up the Bann at Portglenone (Ulster Museum A14653).

There has been considerable debate over the typology of these Irish finds, echoing the problems of categorizing the Wig Sands implement. Coffey and Praeger (1904: 187) regarded ‘Larne celts’ as roughouts, intended either as *tranchet*-blow axeheads or adzes, or to be partly polished at one end to become chisels or narrow axeheads. Knowles on the other hand, without being entirely specific, seems to have preferred to describe them as picks (1893: 141; 1914: 109), a term he used more categorically with reference to some of the finds from the River Bann (1912: 201).

This terminological debate was reviewed, rather inconsequentially, by Movius (1953: 63-68). He was, however, labouring under the misapprehension that the associated tool-kit included the so-called ‘Larne pick’ (Movius 1953: 61-63), which he had identified as the type implement of the later Larnian phase of the Irish Mesolithic (Movius 1942: 166). This bogus implement confused many prehistorians interested in the Irish Mesolithic and possible Scottish connections (e.g. Lacaille 1954), and rather compromised the correct use of the term ‘pick’ for any other implement, until the final acceptance that the ‘Larne pick’ was not an implement at all but simply a type of plunging core-rejuvenation flake (Woodman 1978: 100).

For the time being it is perhaps wise to restrict use of the term ‘pick’ to those implements which truly have robust pointed terminals, to use ‘*tranchet*-blow axehead’ or ‘adze’ only when there is unequivocal evidence for the appropriate transverse termination, and to refer to implements such as those from Wig Sands and Morton, and their closest Irish parallels simply as non-specific ‘core-tools’. 
Regrettably few of the ‘Larne celt’ core-tools have been found in firmly dated archaeological contexts, but they are accepted as relating essentially to the Mesolithic period in Ireland, and apparently more so to the later Mesolithic than the earlier (Woodman 1978), though they do form an important element in both (Woodman 1985). Some confusion between Mesolithic core-tools and those of the Neolithic period, especially axehead roughouts, is probably inevitable (Woodman 1992: 94), but the majority of the former have particular traits, such as a quadrangular section, which allow reasonable confidence over their attribution. On this basis both the Wig Sands and Morton implements can be regarded as most likely of Mesolithic age.

Those implements discussed here form a part of the wider family of Mesolithic core-tools found throughout north and north-west Europe where there is suitable raw material (Clark 1936: 102). In England these are best known in the form of *tranchet*-blow axeheads and so-called ‘Thames picks’ (Field 1989), which are both recognized features of the Mesolithic tool-kit (Wymer 1977: xiii), even if it is the *tranchet*-blow resharpening flakes which are much more often found in association with Mesolithic assemblages than the core-tools themselves.

The fact that the Wig Sands implement thus far has hardly any parallels in Scotland, that it was found on Loch Ryan (a natural harbour for cross-channel transit), that it appears to be of Antrim flint, and that its closest parallels lie with the Mesolithic core-tools of north-east Ireland, all raise the distinct possibility that this is an Irish import. If so, it would be the exception to prove the rule, since there are virtually no other indications of any kind of contact across the Irish Sea between Ireland and Scotland in the Mesolithic period (see Saville 2003).

The later Mesolithic in Ireland is characterized by the presence of butt-trimmed flakes, uniplane cores, stone axeheads, and flint axeheads/picks and other core-tools, and by the absence of microliths (Woodman & Andersen 1990). This is not the case in Scotland where, despite many earlier references in the literature to the ‘Larnian culture’ of south-west Scotland (e.g. Lacaille 1954: 138-160), Mesolithic industries are essentially different. Coles (1963) established this fact and further work on the Mesolithic of south-west Scotland has served to reinforce the separateness of the industrial traditions either side of the North Channel in the later Mesolithic (Mithen 2000; Saville 2003). So if there had been regular contact across the Irish Sea in the Mesolithic period, this is not reflected in the material culture.³

If the Wig Sands implement is an import of an exceptionally unusual kind, the further question arises as to why are there so few core-tools of Mesolithic character from Scotland, with the Morton example being possibly the only indigenous example? In one sense the answer is simple. Raw materials were generally not transported over large distances in Mesolithic Britain and therefore, in the absence of sufficiently large pieces of local flint (or other similarly flakeable raw materials) for manufacturing core-tools, they had to be done without. If so, what about the task(s) they would perform?

³ By contrast, the Isle of Man in the Mesolithic period shares aspects of its material culture quite specifically with that of Ireland, and both flint core-tools and edge-ground stone axeheads are present (McCartan 1994 & pers. comm).
The function of Mesolithic core-tools, including axeheads, is somewhat problematic, especially in Britain, where the organic materials on which they are likely to have been used are rarely preserved in archaeological contexts. An exception is the early Mesolithic site of Star Carr, North Yorkshire (Clark 1954), where preserved felled and worked timbers demonstrated the use of heavy tools. These tools probably included *tranchet*-blow axeheads, even though the use-wear analysis of axehead-resharpening flakes from Star Carr gave little support for this (Dumont 1988: 116). On the other hand, wear-analysis of early Mesolithic core-tools at Mount Sandel, Northern Ireland, suggested wood-working as their main function (Dumont 1988: 155-172).

There is, however, accumulating evidence for the use of heavy tools of red-deer antler being used as axeheads or adze-blades for chopping and shaping timber (*pace* Smith 1989). This has been shown to be feasible by experiments in Denmark using replica Mesolithic antler axeheads (Jensen 1991 & 1996). It also seems to be the conclusion from the numerous antler axeheads with heavy edge damage from the Late Mesolithic sites at Hardinxveld in The Netherlands (Louwe Kooijmans 2001), where no large tools of flint or stone which could have been used for wood-working were present.

Mesolithic antler axeheads will obviously only survive in the archaeological record given favourable soil conditions for preservation. In most parts of Scotland, where soil conditions are generally acidic, finds of such objects are unlikely. When they do survive it is in association with shell-midden deposits, which have an alkaline micro-environment, and in peat deposits where anaerobic conditions prevail. Examples of the former case are the so-called antler-beam mattocks from the Oronsay and Risga shell-middens (Clark 1956; Mellars 1987: 123), and of the latter the mattock from Meiklewood, Stirlingshire (Clark 1956). The fact that relatively few of these substantial tools occur at the shell-midden sites, despite the good conditions for survival, relates to another factor which weighs against their preservation. This is that once these implements become damaged in normal use, they tend to be cannibalised for the manufacture of smaller tools, such as awls and bevel-ended pieces (Mellars 1987: 120-125).

Red deer were abundant in Scotland during the Mesolithic period (Kitchener 1998). It is probably a reasonable assumption that large antler tools, such as the antler-beam mattocks, were a common part of the Mesolithic tool-kit throughout the country, but that they are under-represented archaeologically because of the constraints on their survival. This situation would bring Scotland into line with the other parts of Europe where red deer were plentiful in the Mesolithic period and their antlers were a highly prized and extensively exploited resource (Clark 1936).

Can it be assumed that heavy antler implements are the woodworking tools which might explain the absence in Mesolithic Scotland of flint core-tools? In parts of Denmark, where both antler and flint were readily available, both raw materials were used during the Mesolithic for manufacturing heavy tools which could be used for woodworking (e.g. at Ringkloster, Jutland: Andersen 1974). Perhaps it was the case that specific tools in different raw materials were preferred for different tasks. Where the luxury of having both antler and flint did not exist, however, as in the flint-free Rhine/Meuse delta, antler sufficed and it seems probable the same was true in Scotland.
It might be objected that Mesolithic stone axeheads and other stone ground-edge tools create a difficulty with this scenario. It is not entirely clear what purpose stone axeheads served in Mesolithic contexts, but for the sake of argument here it will be assumed they were also woodworking tools. Since stone axeheads were a normal part of the later Mesolithic tool-kit in the north of Ireland (Woodman 1978: 108-114), why are they absent in Scotland despite the abundance of suitable lithic resources throughout the country? The only possible candidate for a Mesolithic example from Scotland is the edge-ground pebble axehead from Cambwell, Peebleshire (Saville 1994), which was identified as possibly Mesolithic on purely intrinsic typological grounds, since it has no archaeological context.

There is no easy answer to this absence in Scotland, but it could relate to the fact that red deer were apparently absent from Ireland in the early Holocene (Stuart & Wijngaarden-Bakker 1985; Woodman 2000; Woodman et al. 1997). In the absence of red-deer antler as a resource in Ireland, other local solutions had to be found in the form of stone tools, whereas in Scotland the abundance of red deer may have obviated the need to find alternatives in flint and stone. Only when rare serendipitous discoveries of large flint beach cobbles occurred, as appears the case with the Morton implement, could a core-tool be manufactured. Otherwise, red-deer antler appears to have been the staple commodity for the production of woodworking tools in Scotland during the Mesolithic period.
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MONUMENTS AND LANDSCAPE
Encounters at Cairnholy
By Vicki Cummings
School of History and Archaeology, Cardiff University

Introduction

Set against the broader background of the Neolithic in south-west Scotland, this paper will consider the two well-known Neolithic monuments of Cairnholy I and II in Dumfries and Galloway, with a particular focus on the types of experiences that these monuments may have created in the Neolithic. The emphasis will be on the architecture of these sites and their broader setting within the landscape. It will be suggested that the use and experience of these sites changed over time and that the two sites may have been used in rather different, but complementary ways.

The Neolithic of Dumfries and Galloway: background

The Neolithic in south-west Scotland is represented by a series of flint scatters and axe finds as well as a diverse range of monument forms. No settlements are known in Dumfries and Galloway, although several locales may represent ‘domestic’ activity. Luce Sands on the south-western coast of Galloway has produced one of the densest concentrations of lithics and pottery in the region. The erosion of sand dunes has revealed considerable quantities of both early and late Neolithic pottery, as well as leaf-shaped arrowheads, axes, flint knives and large quantities of worked flint (Cowie 1996; McInnes 1964). Unfortunately, no faunal remains have been recovered due to the acidic conditions and quick erosion rates of exposed material. A dense concentration of Neolithic flint scatters has also been found around Stranraer and this area may also have seen considerable activity (information from Chris Boardman and Eland Stewart). Recent excavations at Fox Plantation also revealed possible Neolithic domestic activity, as well as ritual activity (MacGregor 1999).

Many axes have been found in Dumfries and Galloway, although no axe source or production site is located in the region. The majority of axes have been found as stray finds, although some have come from archaeological contexts such as some of those around Luce Sands; a fragment of an axe was also found at Cairnholy I. Most axes in the area seem to originate in Cumbria, although a few come from Ireland as well as one from Pembrokeshire (Ritchie and Scott 1988). A number of jadeite axes have also been found in the region, two from Luce Sands (McInnes 1964, 59). The axes appear to have been primarily imported as rough-outs and there are several concentrations of debitage which may represent areas where the rough-outs were shaped (Williams 1970). This is supported by the presence of polishing stones, one from Cairnholy, and another at Stoneykirk near Luce Sands (Taylor 1996, 232). Combined with the density of axe fragments at Luce Sands, this may have been an area where stones axes were imported and worked (Williams 1970, 112). It is also of interest that a concentration of Bronze Age axe-hammers has been found
in the area, and there are suggestions that Group XXVII implements may originate in Galloway (Fenton 1988, 103).

Excavations in Dumfries and Galloway over the last ten years have revealed what seems to be a quite widespread phenomenon in this area; the digging of pits which are not associated with structural remains (i.e. the pits never held posts). At Carzield near Dumfries, an early Neolithic pit was discovered, containing pottery, fragments of a polished stone axe, flint flakes, bladelets of Arran pitchstone, charred grains and burnt hazelnut shells (Maynard 1993, 25). Two radiocarbon dates were obtained with ranges of 3960-3660 and 4000-3500 BC (Beta 68480 and 68481). Two more early Neolithic pits were found near Castle Douglas. At Greenlaw a pit contained fire-cracked stone and charcoal and produced a radiocarbon date of around 3500 BC (Beta 68472). Blairhall Burn pit four kilometres away from Greenlaw contained fragments of a polished stone axe (Maynard 1993, 27). A series of both early and late Neolithic pits were found further west in the Fox Plantation excavations. The early Neolithic pit, dated to 3540-3350 BC (AA 28061), contained pottery, flint and carbonised hazelnut shells (MacGregor 1999). The late Neolithic pit contained a polished stone axe, a fragment of a polished stone implement, a flint knife, lithics, pottery, charcoal and fragments of human and animal bone (MacGregor 1999).

Pits have also been found in association with monuments. A large pit was found near the entrance of Bargrennan which contained burnt soil, cremated bones and a flint fabricator (Piggott and Powell 1949, 152). More recent work by Julian Thomas has revealed a whole series of pits associated with monumental structures near Dumfries. At Pict’s Knowe henge, a pit contained fragments of seven carinated vessels, flints and a flake of a polished stone axe. Several pits were found at Holywood North, one containing charcoal, a carinated bowl, a burnt nutshell and a piece of burnt bone (Thomas 1998). A second pit
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contained deliberately broken stone and charcoal which had been deposited in separate, discrete episodes (Thomas 1998). Finally, Thomas’ most recent work at Dunragit near Stranraer has revealed a palisade enclosure, also associated with pits (Thomas 1999). It seems clear, then, that the digging of pits and the deposition of material culture were an important part of Neolithic ritual activity in this region.

South-west Scotland (in this article incorporating Dumfries and Galloway and southern Ayrshire) has a total of 29 Neolithic chambered cairns and long cairns. This may be considered quite a low density of monuments for such a sizeable area, especially compared to areas such as Arran or Orkney. However, there is a clear concentration of tombs in the south-west of Galloway, with much of the rest of the county being devoid of monuments (Figure 1). There are other megalithic monuments in the area, including eight definite stone circles (Barnatt 1989; Burl 1995) as well as several ‘four posters’. Furthermore, there are five cursus monuments all clustered around Dumfries and most recently, a series of palisaded enclosures have been found at Dunragit near Stranraer (Thomas 1999). There are also a series of standing stones across the county which may be the remains of stone circles (Barnatt 1989). Many of these monuments in south-west Scotland have been excavated. Nine chambered tombs and long cairns have been excavated, although the Water of Deugh and Drannandow produced no finds (Curle 1930; Edwards 1922). Furthermore, six other monuments have been excavated within the last ten years by Julian Thomas, including a henge, a stone circle, three cursus monuments and a palisade enclosure.

The chambered cairns of south-west Scotland have been classified into three different types of monument. The Bargrennan group is found exclusively in south-west Scotland (see Cummings 2001; 2002a; Henshall 1972; Murray 1992) and these monuments consist of a chamber or chambers with narrow passages set within a round cairn. These monuments are currently undated although Murray (1992) suggests a mid to late Neolithic date. There has been only one recent excavation, that of the White Cairn at Bargrennan, but the chamber had been robbed out (Piggott and Powell 1949, 148). Fragments of cremated bone and pottery were found scattered on the paving in the passage and a burnt pit was found at the entrance which contained charcoal, cremated bone and a flint tool (Piggott and Powell 1949, 150). It is hoped that ongoing excavations at Cairnderry may resolve the date of these sites (Cummings and Fowler 2002).

There are also a number of long cairns in south-west Scotland. Two of these, Lochhill and Slewcairn, have been excavated. At Lochhill a timber structure was revealed under the stone-built cairn and chamber. A three-post timber structure with a burnt oak plank floor produced cremated human bone (Masters 1973, 97). This wooden structure had a shallow concave façade made of 16 posts, probably with four orthostats forming a porch (Masters 1981, 167). Slewcairn produced a largely similar structure. A three-post mortuary structure, this time without a timber façade, produced cremated bone. Both sites produced quantities of pottery and a radiocarbon date of 3950-3800 BC (I 6409) from a plank at Lochhill places these monuments right at the beginning of the Neolithic. At present it remains unknown whether all the long cairns in the area contain wooden mortuary structures.
Finally, the two Cairnholy monuments are part of the broader ‘Clyde’ group of monuments which are found throughout western Scotland (Henshall 1972; Scott 1969). These monuments were key in discussions on monumentality in the 1940s and 1950s and elsewhere I have discussed the history of the classification of these sites (Cummings 2002a). Henshall’s (1972) inventory of Clyde sites was key for documenting and discussing these sites in their local context, but since then there has been a fall-off in interest as the focus has shifted to the monuments of Orkney and Wessex. Little has been written about the Clyde monuments of south-west Scotland in recent years, with a few notable and important exceptions (Gregory 2000; Murray 1991; 1994).

There are seven (definite and possible) Clyde monuments in south-west Scotland (Cairnholy I and II, Mid Gleniron I and II, High Gillespie, Boreland and Newton). Clyde monuments consist of a simple chamber with no passage, frequently with an impressive megalithic façade, set within a long cairn. These monuments seem to be early Neolithic in date but continue to be used into the late Neolithic and early Bronze Age. The pottery from Cairnholy I and Mid Gleniron is all early Neolithic in date, probably early fourth millennium BC. The pottery found in the blocking of Cairnholy I suggests that this site was closed in the late Neolithic, although we know that the site was still in use in the Bronze Age as the rear chamber contained Bronze Age pottery and a slab with a cup and ring motif (Piggott and Powell 1949). A similar chronology can be suggested at the two Mid Gleniron sites.

Clyde monuments also seem to be multi-phase constructions. Excavations at Mid Gleniron I and II also revealed a clear sequence of events (Corcoran 1969). The chamber at Mid Gleniron I began as a single chamber surrounded by a small round cairn. Next, a second chamber was constructed in front of the first, also set within its own round cairn. Thirdly, the façade and lateral chamber were added, and all the chambers were enclosed within a long cairn. Finally, the forecourt was blocked, although activity continued into the Bronze Age (Corcoran 1969). A similar sequence occurred at Mid Gleniron II and will be suggested for Cairnholy I (see below).

**Cairnholy I and II**

Both monuments have a simple box-like rear chamber with an outer chamber or ‘porch’ (Figure 2). Both sites have two large and impressive
portal stones and Cairnholy I also has an orthostatic façade. This creates a forecourt area in front of the monument. Both sites are set within long cairns.

Excavations

Cairnholy I and II were excavated in 1949 by Piggott and Powell. At Cairnholy I the two chambers, the forecourt and small areas of the cairn were excavated. The rear chamber had been severely robbed out and only a few scraps of cremated bone were recovered. However, in the corner of the chamber, a few sherds of Bronze Age pottery were found, along with a small slab with a cup-and-ring mark engraved on it (Piggott and Powell 1949, 118; Morris 1979, 74). The front chamber had originally been roughly paved and was filled with earth and stones, which produced a few scraps of cremated bone. Towards the dividing slab Peterborough Ware and Beaker fragments, cremated bone and a flint knife were found. Under the slab which divided the chamber area into two, early Neolithic pottery was found as well as a chert leaf-shaped arrowhead. Finally, behind the portal blocking more pottery as well as Arran pitchstone and a fragment of a polished jadeite axe were located (Piggott and Powell 1949, 117).

The forecourt area proved to be equally informative. The old ground surface had evidence of a series of small fires, one of which had been carefully covered with clean earth so that it was indistinguishable from the rest of the forecourt. Underneath this clean earth was a flake of Arran pitchstone and pottery. A socket for a stone was also found in the forecourt, which may once have held a standing stone. Before the forecourt was blocked, a mass of seashells, pottery, a flake of Arran pitchstone and a jet bead were deposited. The space between the portals was carefully blocked with a closing stone. Within the mass of the blocking two stone disks, a flint point and sherds of pottery were found. The cairn itself had clearly been revetted and lumps of white quartz had been scattered along the old ground surface (Piggott and Powell 1949, 110).

Cairnholy II did not produce as many finds as Cairnholy I. The rear chamber had been completely robbed out, and the front chamber had also been badly disturbed although a leaf-shaped arrowhead, a flint knife and pottery were found (Piggott and Powell 1949, 127). This chamber also contained a hearth and Beaker. In contrast to Cairnholy I, there was no evidence of any activity in the forecourt. However, the entrance through the portals and the forecourt had been blocked (Piggott and Powell 1949, 125). It could be suggested, then, from the remains recovered that both monuments were used for the deposition of both human remains and material culture, a pattern found at monuments throughout the British Isles.

Structure and sequence

It seems likely that both Cairnholy I and II were multi-phase constructions, comparable to Mid Gleniron. Scott (1969) suggested that Cairnholy I began as a simple chamber (the rear chamber being the earliest). Secondly, a pair of portal stones were added, which were then converted into a porch or antechamber (Scott 1969, 194). The concave façade and
trapezoidal cairn were added at a later date and ultimately the forecourt was blocked and the entrance to the chambers sealed. Scott (1992) even suggests that the rear chamber may first have stood in wood (what he described as a ‘proto-megalith’). A similar sequence could also be suggested for Cairnholy II. This is supported by evidence from elsewhere along the Irish Sea where small simple monuments were being converted into much larger sites with a forecourt area (for example at Trefignath (Smith and Lynch 1987) and Dyffryn Arudwy (Powell 1973) in north Wales).

**Landscape setting**

Over the past decade there has been increasing interest in the role of the landscape in people’s lives (e.g. Bender 1993; Bergh 1995; Hirsch and O’Hanlon 1995; Tilley 1994). It is now widely accepted that the landscape would not have been a neutral backdrop to activity but an active part of the experience of particular places. In relation to the landscape settings of the monuments of Dumfries and Galloway, Henshall noted that Clyde monuments are usually near the coast, positioned above the valley floor on the sides of hills (Henshall 1972, 24). Murray (1994) considered the landscape settings of the Clyde monuments in her doctoral thesis, and she noted that Clyde monuments are all situated on slopes, ridges or terraces. 26% of views from the sites are restricted, 49% are intermediate and 26% are distant. The author conducted a more thorough analysis of the landscape settings of the monuments of south-west Scotland, which are presented in full elsewhere (Cummings 2001; 2002a). In general, however, Clyde monuments seem to be located in low-lying positions close to the coast. They are not located in relation to rivers, although they may have been positioned above settlements in the valley or low-lying areas. All monuments have a restricted view in one direction and a wide and expansive view for at least half of the vista. In addition, a number of sites seem to be located to have views of the sea or the Isle of Man.

Both Cairnholy I and II fit into this general pattern of the setting of Clyde monuments. Located on the southern slopes of Cairnholy Hill, the sites are positioned between two

![Figure 3. Schematic diagrams of the landscape settings of Cairnholy I (left) and II (right).](image-url)
streams. The cairns are set on a natural hillock and rich agricultural land surrounds the sites on all sides. There are also a number of rocky bluffs on the surrounding hillside and Cairnholy II is set upon one of these, only 150m to the north of Cairnholy I. The view from the two sites is essentially the same, with minor differences (Figure 3). The view is restricted from the north round to the NNE by the hill on which the cairns stand, although Cairnholy II can just be seen, skylined on the horizon, from Cairnholy I. To the NNE, the dominating presence of Cairnharrow becomes visible, followed by Barholm Hill. This trails off towards the sea and a small hillock is visible just as the sea becomes visible. The sea is visible from the SSE round to the SSW, and the Isle of Man can clearly be seen on clear days to the south. The peninsula with the Mull of Galloway at its tip can be seen stretching round to the west, although the view of the sea disappears before then. The view from the west to the north is then filled with Cairnholy Hill, which is a relatively restricted view.

Elsewhere I have discussed the broader significance of these particular views. The general settings of Cairnholy I and II are very similar to other monuments found all along the Irish Sea coasts, from sites in south-west Wales to monuments in Ireland (Cooney 2000; Cummings 2001). The similarity in landscape setting between these sites may therefore be part of an expression of a shared identity across this area, a crucial component of building monuments from stone. I have suggested that the view of the Isle of Man may have been important as it also connected these monuments to other places in the Irish Sea zone (Cummings 2002a; forthcoming). A view of a distant place may have made people feel part of a broader Neolithic community in this part of the world. In a similar way, a view of the sea may also have been about making references to other parts of Britain. We know that Neolithic people were crossing the Irish Sea on a regular basis, as axes from Britain have been found in Ireland and Irish axes and flint found in Britain (Gregory 2000; Saville 1994, 63; 1999; Sheridan et al. 1992). Knowledge about the Neolithic ‘package’ may also have originally arrived by sea. A view of the sea, then, may have referred to distant places, or even to origins of the Neolithic. References to distant places was also made through the deposition of Arran pitchstone and the fragment of a jadeite axe at Cairnholy I.

It seems likely that the outcrops on which these monuments sit were already imbued with significance before the Neolithic. The coasts of Dumfries and Galloway were utilised throughout the Mesolithic (Cormack 1970; Cormack and Coles 1968) and distinctive landscape features such as mountains and outcrops may well have been important landmarks, tied to local mythology and cosmology (Cummings 2000; 2003). By building monuments on these places people may have been referencing places in the landscape that were already important. Cairnholy I and II, then, seem to have been placed in the landscape in relation to a series of important landscape features. We will return to the importance of the landscape in relation to the architecture shortly.

Architectural choreography

The setting of these monuments seems to have been carefully chosen in order to refer to specific locales in the landscape. In a similar way, the stones used to construct the monuments also seem to have been carefully chosen. It has been noted that the stones used to
construct many Neolithic monuments have distinctive textures (Cummings 2002b). At Cairnholy II distinctive visual textures are incorporated into the chamber, so that the northern side of the chamber is rough, while the southern side is smooth. This relationship is reversed in the portal stones, where the northern one is smooth and the southern slab rough. There are no clear textural differences in the chamber at Cairnholy I, although the façade at this site is made up of different textured stones. This is particularly evident with the two portal stones, where the right portal is covered with distinctive striations. There are other, much less obvious textures in the façade which may have been much more visible in low light levels, or by firelight. For example, the first stone to the left on approach is much smoother than that to its right.

All the Clyde monuments in south-west Scotland incorporate an array of different shaped stones but it is the most pronounced in the façade at Cairnholy I, where a combination of triangular and rectangular slabs were used. The most distinctive aspect of the use of shape in the façade at Cairnholy I is that the shapes of the stones are carefully contrived to reflect one another; on each side of the two portal slabs, the stones are triangular, rectangular, rectangular creating transitory or repeating symmetry (Figure 4). A further opposition is created as one side of the façade is straight while the other is concave. In a similar way, the two portal stones are quite opposed. The stone to the left is rectangular in shape with vertical lines running down its surface. In contrast, the portal stone to the right is triangular in shape and has angled hollows across it.

![Schematic diagram of the façade at Cairnholy I.](image)

The site of Cairnholy II does not have an orthostatic façade, but uses two different shaped stones to create the portal. The left portal is triangular in shape and is considerably smaller than the stone to the right which is also rectangular (Figure 5). This is reminiscent of the early Neolithic sites elsewhere, where entrance or portal slabs are often opposing shapes (Cummings 2001). However, there is the possibility that the left portal stone has been snapped off, and the two portal stones were originally of a similar height (Niall Sharples pers comm.).
The façade at Cairnholy I, then, seems to deliberately use different textured and shaped stones to create oppositions between the two sides of the forecourt. This is further enhanced by the actual shape of the façade itself. This division between the two sides of the façade is also expressed in the landscape settings of the site. Standing in the façade at Cairnholy I looking into the monument, the view to the left looks out over a wide and expansive view, looking down towards the sea, peninsulas and the Isle of Man. In contrast, the view to the right is restricted, looking up the hill towards Cairnholy II. The long axis of the monument is aligned precisely on the division between open and more restricted views. This division of the monument and landscape also works at Cairnholy II where the use of texture combines with landscape setting to create distinctions between the two sides of the monument. Elsewhere it has been suggested that the ‘sidedness’ of monumental architecture and setting may have been representative of broader divisions within society, perhaps connected to differences between the living and dead (Cummings et al. 2002).

So far, we have only considered the architecture and landscape setting from the forecourt area of the monument. This is likely to have been a place where people gathered to conduct rituals or rites of passage connected with the burial of the dead, and the views of the monument and landscape would have been available to all those who participated in activities there. However, the façade and chambers at both Cairnholy I and II create certain effects for people engaging with and entering these monuments. Standing in the façade at Cairnholy I looking directly at the entrance to the chamber, the view to the left is towards the Isle of Man, while the view to the right is inland and upland, looking up at a closed view and Cairnholy II. However, the left side of the façade is concave which as you get closer to the portals effectively blocks the view of the Isle of Man. This is even more pronounced as one enters the portal. To enter the chamber at Cairnholy I one must turn sideways; it is too narrow to enter straight on. As such, if one turns to the side looking downhill, the façade completely blocks out the view in that direction. This would per-
haps not be surprising, but for the fact that the other side of the façade is straight, permitting views up to Cairnholy II and beyond, even as one enters the chamber. This means that people entering the monument through the portal stones were able to look up to another Neolithic monument, but not look out over the Isle of Man and the sea.

The experience of entering the outer chamber through the portal stones would have been a very different experience to gaining entry to the rear chamber. Essentially a sealed box, it seems likely that entry to the rear chamber would have been gained by taking off the capstone. This contrasts to the experience of actually entering the monument through the portal as many people would have had to participate in the removal of the capstone whereas only one person could actually enter the outer chamber through the portal stones. This suggests that gaining access to the rear chamber may have been a communal event involving a number of people, while entry to the outer chamber was a solitary encounter. The significance of this is discussed below.

Cairnholy II seems to have generated rather different encounters than Cairnholy I. This site has no large orthostatic façade and the site is positioned on the outcrop on which it sits in such a way that it would be very difficult for many people to stand at the entrance to the monument. The ground drops away just beyond the portal stones so that there is no forecourt area as at Cairnholy I. This monument, then, may not have been for large gatherings of people. People gathering here would not have been able to stand close to the monument, and in many places, even see it.

The issue of phasing

So far, only the monuments in their final form have been considered. However, as we have seen, it seems likely that both monuments were multi-phase constructions. Both monuments probably began life as a simple box-like chamber with the second chamber or porch and the façade later additions. This has a number of implications. Firstly, it has already been suggested that in order to access the rear box-chamber a number of people would have been involved in order to remove the capstone. The nature of the chamber also means that a small number of people could gather round and see into the chamber. At a later stage a large and impressive façade was added to Cairnholy I creating a forecourt area. This would enable the congregation of much larger groups of people. However, access into the monument itself had become more restricted as only one person would be able to enter through the portal and into the outer chamber. It seems likely at this stage the rear chamber was inaccessible, covered over with cairn material.

This suggests a changing role for Cairnholy I: a monument designed for larger groups of people to gather but with increasingly limited access to the chamber and deposits. In contrast, Cairnholy II never seems to have been enlarged in order to accommodate the gathering of large groups of people. No façade was added and no extensive forecourt area created. Could this suggest that only a small number of people ever participated in events or rituals held at this site? The elaboration and addition of the façade at Cairnholy I is consistent with the enlargement of monuments elsewhere in Britain, with a seemingly increased desire to create locales for the congregation of larger groups of people. This culminated in the later Neolithic with the construction of stone circles and henges.
There is also the issue on contemporaneity. Were Cairnholy I and II in use at the same time or were they used for different rituals or ceremonies, or perhaps at different times? The poor preservation of deposited material culture makes this question hard to answer. What is clear, however, is that the two monuments seem to be carefully positioned in order to have views of one another. Cairnholy II is visible on the skyline when standing in the façade at Cairnholy I. Had Cairnholy II been positioned only a few metres north then it would no longer have been visible from Cairnholy I. Had it been positioned only a few metres to the south it would not have been skylined. This suggests that the intervisibility of the two sites was of key importance to the builders. This could also suggest that the two monuments were used at the same time, where participants could see activities at the other site.

The final use concerning the phasing of the sites relates to the changing views of the landscape. As we have already seen, the façade at Cairnholy I is concave on one side (Figure 6) which I have suggested was deliberate in order to block views of the sea and the Isle of Man. This seems to suggest that people positioned the first-phase monument in order to have distant views, which may have referred to the origins of the Neolithic and monumentality. However, by the time the façade was added they no longer wanted these distant landscape features to be visible. Could it be that people were trying to play down the importance of links with the wider world? This is consistent with the increasing insularity of communities as the Neolithic progressed.

Figure 6. Cairnholy I looking in towards the façade.
Conclusion

In this paper I have suggested that both landscape and architecture were important components of the experience of Cairnholy I and II. In combination, landscape and architecture created a range of different experiences for participants as well as referring to other parts of the local and wider world. It also seems that Cairnholy I and II may have been used in rather different ways. Cairnholy I seems to have been designed for the congregation of numbers of people, while Cairnholy II may only have been used by smaller groups of people. There would have been differences in the experience of each monument at different points in the construction sequence. Therefore, each monument creates a unique range of encounters but which are part of a shared range ideas and experiences found at monuments throughout Neolithic Britain. Finally, it is worth noting that these sites seemed to have had enduring significance to people in the area. At some point in the use of these monuments, the gap between the portal stones was sealed and the forecourt areas were blocked. This may have been designed as the end of the monuments’ life and is consistent with the sealing of chambered monuments throughout Britain in the later Neolithic. However, Cairnholy I was reused in the Bronze Age, evidenced by the deposition of pottery and rock art in the rear chamber and the engraving of a cup and ring on the capstone. This suggests that Cairnholy continued to be a significant location in the late Neolithic and early Bronze Age world, a place where people continued to come together and encounter these remarkable sites.

Acknowledgments

Many thanks to the School of History and Archaeology for funding my doctoral research from which this paper is derived and particular thanks to my supervisors Alasdair Whittle and Niall Sharples. Eland Stuart and Chris Boardman kindly provided unpublished information on the Neolithic lithic scatters in Dumfries and Galloway, while Gavin MacGregor sent information on the GUARD Fox Plantation excavations.

References


Curle, A. 1930. Examination of a chambered cairn by the Water of Deugh, Stewartry of Kirkcudbright. *PSAS* 64, 272-5.


A SURVEY OF THE PROMONTORY FORTS OF THE NORTH SOLWAY COAST
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Abstract
This paper presents the results of a survey of promontory forts on the Solway Coast of Dumfries and Galloway. This work was carried out by the author primarily to determine the extent and nature of erosion affecting these sites. The surveying programme also attempted to determine morphological and topographical traits that might clarify aspects of the nature of occupation of the Galloway promontory forts. Sixteen sites were surveyed between 1996 and 1997. A further survey took place in 1999 and 2000 as part of the pilot ‘Shorewatch’ Scheme. The resulting site plans provide a baseline of data from which future assessments may measure the condition of these sites and develop appropriate research and conservation priorities.

Introduction
A programme of site surveys of sixteen promontory forts was instigated by the author in 1996 following the Coastal Assessment Survey of the North Solway Coast commissioned by Historic Scotland and carried out by the Centre for Field Archaeology in 1996 (Cressey & Toolis 1997). The selection of promontory forts as a subject for survey followed the identification of this class of site in the Coastal Assessment as a distinct site pattern within the general corpus of archaeological sites on the North Solway Coast (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 474-476). While the monuments of the post-medieval and modern periods on the Solway Coast are almost exclusively of an industrial, maritime or military nature, the coastal monuments of the Iron Age and early medieval period, represented largely by promontory forts, are places of settlement located generally on the seaward limits of high ground. Promontory forts appear then to offer a marked contrast with the settlement record of the medieval period onwards, during which this geographical setting seems to have been much less favoured. The threat of localised coastal erosion at many of these sites, together with the impact of agriculture, development and tourism, led to the recommendation within the Coastal Assessment for a further programme of surveying and monitoring (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 476).

Following this initial assessment and its recommendation, the author prepared a surveying and monitoring programme. The same sample area of the Dumfries and Galloway coastline was chosen for further detailed site surveys. Of the 49 promontory forts on the coastline of Dumfries and Galloway, 25 are located on the North Solway Coast, defined here as the coastline between the Mull of Galloway and the River Sark (Figure 1). From this number, 16 were selected for site surveys, the rest being deemed either inaccessible due largely to excessive vegetation, unnecessary due to previous investigation or in the case of Port O’Warren (NMRS: NX85SE 2) no longer possible due to previous development.
Figure 1: Distribution Map of Promontory Forts on the Galloway Coast showing sites selected for survey on the North Solway Coast.
The author carried out the programme of site surveys between October 1996 and August 1997. Further repeat surveys of one of the sites was carried out by the author in December 1999 and February 2000 as part of the pilot Shorewatch Scheme, administered by the Council for Scottish Archaeology and funded by Historic Scotland. The preparation of this paper was partially funded by Historic Scotland.

**Background**

Promontory forts can be classified as sites of varying size, on the tip of a hill, spur or cliff, with a barrier of varying construction and dimensions across the line of easiest approach, while the other sides of the site rely on the natural steepness of the slope or cliff (Bray & Trump 1982, 200).

The distribution of coastal promontory forts in the British Isles is restricted to geographical clusters, predominantly on the western and northern seaboards (Lamb 1980, 5). Within Scotland, promontory forts can be found on the coastlines of Berwickshire, Angus, Moray, Caithness, Orkney, Shetland, the Western Isles and Galloway. On the western seaboard south of Galloway, promontory forts are distributed along the coastlines of the Isle of Man, Pembrokeshire, Cornwall and Brittany and along the west coast of Ireland. Some have insisted that their restricted distribution suggests that promontory forts represent a tradition in themselves and are not just a local brand of hillfort on a coastal site (Lamb 1980, 6) but the distribution pattern may simply represent the distribution of suitably incised coastlines within which promontories are formed (Cunliffe 1991, 340-1). Promontory forts, it should be added, are not exclusively found on coastal sites either as inland promontory forts are found throughout Scotland, Wales, Ireland and England (Proudfoot 1980, 112; Taylor 1982, 215; Rideout 1996, 199; Perry 2000, 27; Arnold & Davies 2000, 74 & 159; Raftery 1994, 45-46; Cunliffe 1991, 340). Dumfries and Galloway is no exception with examples such as Carminnows fort (NMRS No. NX69SW 8) and Drumnoral fort (NMRS No. NX43NE 1). The distribution of promontory forts within the British Isles, as a group, probably represents no more than the use of suitable, easily defined sites within the landscape, similarly distinctive in topographical setting as hillforts and crannogs, but not necessarily a cultural indicator.

The first survey of promontory forts on the North Solway Coast was carried out in 1890, as part of a general survey of later prehistoric and medieval field monuments in the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright (Coles 1891; Coles 1892; Coles 1893). The first measured plans of a selected number of promontory forts on the Stewartry coast were produced by Coles in this survey and have enabled a tentative comparison of coastal erosion to be made with the present survey site plans. The Royal Commission on Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS) carried out a marginal land survey of a wide variety of archaeological sites and monuments in the 1950’s (RCAHMS 1955; Feachem 1956), which produced further site plans, again enabling a measured comparison to be made of coastal erosion at a selected number of promontory forts.

Excavations of promontory forts on the North Solway Coast have been limited to three, rather unrepresentative, sites. The first site, McCulloch’s Castle, does not occupy a promontory but lies at the edge of a straight coastal cliff. This semi-circular ditched enclo-
sure, excavated between 1962 and 1963 (Scott-Elliot 1964, 118) nonetheless occupies a comparable location and therefore warrants attention. The excavations revealed a secondary stone wall crowning the earth rampart that defined the site and a possible gateway between the cliff edge and the western terminus of the rampart ((Scott-Elliot, 1964, 121). The interior of the site was heavily disturbed by an early 20th century ornamental garden at the site (Scott-Elliot 1964, 119). Therefore, while a large number of post-holes were revealed, no structures could be identified within the interior of the fort (Scott-Elliot 1964, 123). The only demonstrably original feature within the interior of the site was a hearth, from which a sherd of mid 2nd Century AD Samian Ware was recovered (Scott-Elliot 1964, 123).

Cruggleton Castle, a seat of the early Lords of Galloway, was excavated between 1978 and 1981 in response to coastal erosion (Ewart 1985, 6). The earliest occupation of the site was represented by the partial remains of a roundhouse, with a probable diameter of c. 8 m, from which a radiocarbon date of AD 50 ± 70 was recovered (Ewart 1985, 12-14). The next phase of occupation was represented by a timber hall, dated to the mid-8th century AD (Ewart 1985, 18), subsequently altered and extended during the 12th century while the site was transformed into a motte (Ewart 1985, 18-22). A stone castle with a curtain wall was developed and altered from the late 13th century until the mid-17th century when the site was finally abandoned (Ewart 1985, 12). In addition to the radiocarbon date from the roundhouse, a bronze bow brooch of the mid-1st to mid-2nd century AD (Caldwell 1985, 64), albeit from a disturbed context, provided further evidence of Iron Age occupation and led the excavator to interpret the origins of Cruggleton Castle as a promontory fort (Ewart 1985, 14), although one must assume that the subsequent occupation of the site had removed the original defining ramparts.

More recently an exploratory excavation was carried out at the Mull of Galloway to investigate the two linear earthworks that cross the headland either side of the narrow isthmus between East and West Tarbet bays (Strachan 2000). This investigation revealed a set of closely spaced multivallate linear inner earthwork ramparts and a mixed stone and earth dump linear outer rampart (Strachan 2000, 3-4). Unfortunately no dating evidence was recovered and while comparisons have been drawn between the morphology of the closely spaced multivallate ramparts at the Mull of Galloway and Iron Age promontory forts in Ireland such as Knockdhu and Lurigethan (Strachan 2000, 30-31), it is difficult to make comparisons, in terms of scale and morphology, with other promontory forts on the Galloway Coast. The location of a cairn near the tip of the Mull and the recording of numerous early prehistoric artefacts, including a Neolithic polished stone axe (NMRS No. NX13SW 25), a black flint spearhead (NMRS No. NX13SW 34) and a green chert arrowhead (NMRS No. NX13SW 36) in close proximity to the earthworks, along with flint scatters detected within the area enclosed by the earthworks (Pickin pers comm.) indicate that occupation of the Mull of Galloway originates much earlier than the Iron Age.

Previous excavations of promontory forts elsewhere in the British Isles have yielded a more extensive array of information. Burghead on the Moray coast stands out within Scotland as a large, strongly fortified, high status site with ready and immediate access to the sea and occupied from the 3rd century AD until the 9th century AD (Small 1969, 67;
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Edwards & Ralston 1980, 207; Alcock 1988, 26; Ralston & Armit 1997, 225; Foster 1998, 11). A smaller, though strongly fortified, site on the Moray coast, with ready access to the sea is Green Castle, Portknockie, where excavations revealed a 6 m wide timber laced rampart, which provided dates indicating occupation of the site during the 7th and 8th centuries AD (Ralston 1980, 32). The excavation of Cullykhan provided evidence of an elaborate defence and entrance passage, leading into an industrial area of iron and bronze working, later overlaid by a timber-laced rampart (Ralston 1980, 37). Less elaborate, stone faced ramparts of rubble and earth were exposed at Broch of Burland and Ness of Burgi, Shetland, which yielded a tentative Iron Age date, (Carter et al. 1995, 466 & 446), while simple earth and rubble banks were revealed by excavations at Scatness (Carter et al. 1995, 435). The excavation of Fort Vowlan on the Isle of Man provided evidence of a series of small rectilinear buildings, probably occupied during the late first millennium AD (Bersu 1949, 62-75). Excavations at Coygan Camp in Carmarthenshire, Wales provided evidence of episodic occupation from the Mesolithic period until the middle of the first millennium AD (Wainwright, 1967, xii; Arnold & Davies, 2000, 74). Dunbeg promontory fort in Co. Kerry, Ireland provided radiocarbon dates from the early first millennium BC to the late 10th or early 11th centuries AD (Barry 1981, 324) as has Cnoc a Chaisteal in Easter Ross (Rideout 1987, 63) while Drumanagh yielded a Roman potsherd of the first century AD (Raftery 1994, 48).

Evidence of multiperiod occupation of varying ‘status’ within coastal promontories defined by a range of different forms of barriers, from at least the 1st millennium BC onwards, if not earlier (Wainwright 1967, 16; Sharpe 1992, 66-68), is therefore not exceptional. Parallels can be drawn, for instance, between Cruggleton Castle and Castle Park, Dunbar, where evidence gathered from excavations have revealed an original Iron Age site being re-occupied later in the first half of the first millennium AD (Perry 2000, 21-29) and reoccupied again as a royal Anglian site (Perry 2000, 319) and later in the medieval period. Hence the multi-period occupation at Cruggleton Castle, with its origins in the late Iron Age and subsequent re-occupation from the 8th century AD onwards is by no means exceptional though nonetheless a locally significant aspect of an historically attested high status site.

However, while the evidence accumulated from McCulloch’s Castle, Cruggleton Castle and the Mull of Galloway corresponds broadly with the chronology of occupations established at other sites within the British Isles, not one of the Galloway sites has provided substantial evidence for the nature of the original construction, occupation and function of promontory forts within a local context. Furthermore, of the three excavated sites, only McCulloch’s Castle offers easy comparison, in terms of site morphology, with other promontory forts on the Galloway Coast.

Objectives
In an effort to establish more information on the morphology and condition of the Galloway Coast promontory forts as a group, the objectives of the survey comprised:
(i) creating an accurate measured plan of each selected site and reviewing morphological and topographical traits
(ii) measuring the extent of areas within each site affected by erosion
(iii) determining the cause of erosion of each site
(iv) presenting this information as a baseline of data from which future assessments may measure the condition of each selected site and appropriate management strategies be implemented
(v) developing further research and conservation priorities on the basis of the results of the survey.

**Survey Method**

The site surveys were carried out using EDM surveying equipment. Survey works established temporary stations both within and outwith each site. All data were recorded and plotted manually on graph paper at a scale of 1:200 or 1:400. The resulting plans, together with earlier, comparative plans, were then scanned, reduced to identical scale and prepared for publication using Adobe Illustrator. It should be noted that while the earliest site plans, produced by Coles (1892 & 1893) offer to some extent comparison with the latest site plans, Coles did not claim absolute accuracy for his plans (1891, 354), only for his measurements. The measurements within his site plans have therefore been adhered to rather than simply the plan. It has been assumed, however, that the plans produced by RCAHMS during the 1950s are sufficiently accurate to be taken at face value.

**Results**

The results of the programme of survey are detailed below and comprise a description of each site, its topographical location, its condition, extent of erosion and plan. Intervisibility between sites was also noted, although as only one team carried out the work, the observations made are only tentative. The results are arranged in order from west to east.

**Garliachen, Laigh Sinniness (NX 2157 5219)**

Garliachen, Laigh Sinniness is a multivallate fort comprising an outer earth and stone rampart (1) and an inner drystone rampart (2), both utilising to a great extent natural outcrops of rock, which enclose a promontory roughly 450 m² in size, bounded on the east, south and west by cliffs (Figure 2). The inner drystone rampart has been reduced to ground level and survives only as a ‘stony foundation’. Corresponding gaps, around 2 m wide, between rocky outcrops within each rampart line, close to the western side of the site, appear to define the original entranceway. No trace of an outer ditch recorded in 1911 (RCAHMS 1912, 112), nor traces of internal structures, are evident.

The site lies on a shallow till cover over precipitous greywacke cliffs (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 70) at a height of approximately 20 m above sea level. The land to the north is improved land with a gentle slope down to the site from a distance of about 400 m. Garliachen promontory fort overlooks a small shingle bay on the eastern side. There is a limited view of the coastline north and south of the site, but like all the promontory forts on the west coast of the Machars, the east coast of the Rhins of Galloway is clearly visible from Garliachen.
No current coastal erosion was evident and since no previous measured plan has been made of the site, it is not possible to measure any potential encroachment of the cliff edge into the site. The inner rampart has obviously been robbed of its stones, at some point in the past before a modern record was made. A gap in the north-eastern side of the outer rampart was recorded in 1911 as being modern erosion caused by farm access to the sea (RCAHMS 1912, 112). The continuing action of cattle scraping against the exposed scarp has exacerbated the erosion of the outer rampart at this point. Excessive vegetation over the outer rampart must imply a potentially significant impact from root action.

**Barsalloch Point (NX 3474 4121)**

Barsalloch Point Fort is a multivallate cliff fort, defined by two semicircular earthen ramparts and a medial ditch, enclosing an area of roughly 950 m² (Figure 3). No traces of internal structures are evident. An entrance on the north-eastern side of the site, recorded in 1911, is also not evident (RCAHMS 1912, 78).

The fort occupies an area adjoining a coastal slope composed of marine sands and gravels (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 102) at Barsalloch Point. The site lies roughly 30 m above sea level and overlooks Monreith Bay to the south-east. The immediate hinterland of the site is improved, level farmland. There is a limited view of the coastline to the north and south.
The adjacent field boundary encroaches into the north-eastern part of the ramparts, which has resulted in that part being reduced. Cultivation within the interior and the ditch was recorded in 1955 (RCAHMS 1955), which may account for the lack of any surface features within the interior. An entrance widened by ploughing was also recorded in 1955 (RCAHMS 1955) but no trace of this was evident during this survey. The similar morphology of the site to McCulloch’s Castle might suggest that the original entrance lay close to the cliff edge but an insufficient gap exists between either rampart terminus and the slope edge. However, as comparison with the plan made by RCAHMS in 1955 indicates, there is no evidence for recent erosion of the cliff edge that may explain the absence of an entrance. Erosion of the site is apparent in the form of rabbit burrows and scarps caused by sheep or cattle, which affect large elements of the ramparts. Furthermore, much of the ramparts, particularly on the northern and north-eastern sides, are heavily overgrown with gorse vegetation, with root activity almost certainly reducing sub-surface archaeological remains. Although this monument is in the care of Historic Scotland and efforts have been made to improve the management of the site since this survey was made, Barsalloch Point Fort appears to have suffered significant damage in the recent past from the impact of animals, agriculture and vegetation.

**Back Bay (NX 3696 3932)**

Back Bay is a univallate promontory fort, comprising a curvilinear rock-cut ditch and rampart topped by the foundations and lower courses of a drystone wall, approximately 2.8 m thick, enclosing a promontory roughly 1,300 m² in size (Figure 4). An earth causeway across the ditch, near the north-eastern edge of the promontory neck leads into the site through a clearly defined entrance, 1.5 m wide, in the stone rampart. A number of rectilinear features are evident within the interior, imme-
Immediately behind the entrance into the site and although slight, have been interpreted together with the additional stone bank above the earth rampart as evidence for secondary medieval occupation (RCAHMS 1955).

The fort occupies a seaward sloping promontory of clay rich glacial drift deposits overlying greywacke sandstone bedrock cliffs that contain sea caves (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 110 & 463). The site overlooks Back Bay to the north-west. There is a limited view of the coastline to the south. The hinterland of the site comprises rough grazing land that slopes steeply down to the promontory, which lies at 30 m above sea level.

Localised coastal erosion at both western and eastern sides of the promontory neck is evident at Back Bay, where the clay rich earthwork underlying the stone rampart is exposed to constant weathering by the elements. However, comparison of the latest measured site survey with the previous measured plan (RCAHMS 1955) reveals that the most significant coastal erosion comprises the encroachment of slope failure of the glacial drift deposits overlying the southern cliff edge, where the tip of the promontory has evidently been lost since 1955. Animal impact at the site, including cattle and sheep tracks and rabbit burrowing is also contributing piecemeal erosion of the defining features of the fort, particularly of the eastern area of the ditch and the northern face of the central rampart area.
Carghidown (NX 4356 3507)

Carghidown is a univallate enclosure, defined by a linear earthen rampart, enclosing a small square promontory approximately 400 m² in size (Figure 5). The rampart rises to a significantly higher level above the interior ground level in comparison to the exterior ground level. A gap of 2.8 m between the rampart terminus and the cliff edge at the south-east corner of the site appears to form the original entrance into the site. Two circular depressions, one 10 m and the other 8.2 m in diameter are evident within the interior of the site, the larger one being immediately behind the rampart. A small open area lies between the two circular features, the north-eastern entrance and the south-eastern cliff edge.

The site lies at approximately 30 m above sea level on a promontory of till overlying a precipitous, fractured greywacke cliff containing sea caves (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 118). There are no bays nearby nor is any alternative access to the sea apparent. The hinterland comprises very steeply seaward-sloping rough grazing ground, which overlooks the site. Castle Feather is possibly visible along the coastline to the south.

Localised coastal erosion of both the north-western and south-eastern sides of the promontory neck is evident at Carghidown, where the soft till is being gradually removed from the cliff edge by slope failure and constant weathering by the elements. As no previous plans had been made of this site before the present survey, the long-term rate of erosion cannot yet be measured, although as the site was noted in 1795 as occupying half an acre, or 4,050 m², (Davidson 1795, 287) it would appear to have been severely reduced. Since the entrance gap to the site was measured as 8.5 m wide in 1973 (NMRS No. NX43NW 8) and is now only 2.8 m wide, considerable coastal erosion has taken
place. This is further demonstrated by the reduction of the 28.5 m (NE-SW) x 24 m (NW-SE) internal area of the site measured in 1973 (NMRS No. NX43NW 8) compared to the measurement of 20 m (NE-SW) x 20 m (NW-SE) taken in 1996. Return visits to the site in 1999 and 2000, as part of the Shorewatch Scheme, revealed that between 0.02 m and 0.27 m of coastal erosion had occurred at the south-eastern cliff edge of the site within two months (Toolis 2001, Appendix 5). The return visits also allowed the rate of erosion to be measured from the 1996 plan. This revealed that erosion of till at the south-eastern cliff edge had encroached up to 1.20 m into the site since 1996. Animal impact is also evident at Carghidown, with burrowing at the north-western rampart terminus and a small scarp close to the eastern rampart terminus eroding the fabric of the earthwork.

**Castle Feather (NX 4482 3423)**

Castle Feather is a multivallate promontory fort, comprising five linear earthen ramparts and ditches on the north side of a central entrance causeway and three on the south side, defining a promon-
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tory approximately 1,400 m² in size (Figure 6). A stone wall 2 m wide and up to 3.7 m high has been constructed on the inner side of the innermost ditch, behind which are rectilinear stone walls defining what has been interpreted as a towerhouse and ancillary buildings, representing a secondary medieval occupation of an originally Iron Age site (RCAHMS 1912, 174). The entrance comprises a central mutilated causeway 2 m wide as it enters the interior of the site. A quarry pit is located close to the seaward head of the promontory.

The fort defines a promontory of till, 30 m above sea level, overlying a precipitous, fractured greywacke cliff containing sea caves and overlooking rock platforms (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 126). There are no bays nearby nor is any alternative access to the sea apparent. The hinterland comprises gently seaward-sloping ground, currently occupied by a caravan site. The Burrow Head promontory forts are clearly visible a short distance along the coastline to the east while Carghidown is possibly visible along the coastline to the north-west. The Isle of Man is visible on the horizon to the south.

Localised coastal erosion of the site is evident; particularly at the northern side of the neck of the promontory where slope failure above the cliff edge has encroached into the internal site features since the site was previously surveyed in 1953 (RCAHMS 1955). Localised erosion of the cliff edge along this part of the coast is evident from the numerous rock falls apparent at the base of the cliffs (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 128). Slight human impact, in the form of an informal pathway, is evident near the north-eastern periphery of the site.

**Burrow Head I (NX 4553 3415)**

Burrow Head I, the westernmost of a pair of adjacent sites at Burrow Head, is a multivallate promontory fort, consisting of three curvilinear ramparts and ditches across the promontory neck (1-3, Figure 7) dissected by a causeway from the north-east leading into the site. No features are evident within the 660 m² area of the interior.

The fort defines a promontory of till overlying a precipitous, fractured cliff containing sea caves and overlooking rock platforms (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 126). There are no bays nearby nor is any alternative access to the sea apparent from the promontory, which lies at 30 m above the sea. The immediate hinterland comprises gently seaward-sloping rough grazing ground.

Coastal erosion of Burrow Head I has not evidently made an impact, since 1955 (RCAHMS 1955) and 1912 (RCAHMS 1912, 175) when the site was previously surveyed. However, the earthworks have been severely affected by cattle erosion, an informal coastal path and partial removal of the outer rampart, recorded in 1973 (NMRS No. NX43SE 1). Due to the modern informal path, the earthworks of this site are difficult to distinguish, at the adjoining point, from the earthworks of Burrow Head II to the east. However, it appears from the 1955 plan that the ditch of Burrow Head II cut the outer rampart on the eastern flank of Burrow Head I. Due to the impact of human pedestrian traffic and farming, this is now no longer apparent.

**Burrow Head II (NX 4559 3412)**

Burrow Head II is a univallate fort, adjoining Burrow Head I on its eastern side, and consisting of a single linear earth rampart (1) and a wide curvilinear ditch, defining a small promontory 351 m² in size (Figure 7). A gap of 5 m between the eastern ditch terminus and the cliff edge appears to form an entranceway into the site. A small linear rise (2) is the only surface feature evident within the interior of the site.
Figure 7: Burrow Head I & II.
Like the adjacent fort, Burrow Head II defines a promontory of till, 30 m above sea level, overlying a precipitous, fractured greywacke cliff containing sea caves and overlooking rock platforms (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 126). Likewise, there are no bays nearby nor is any alternative access to the sea apparent. The hinterland comprises gently seaward sloping rough grazing ground.

Coastal erosion of the site is not evident since 1955 (RCAHMS 1955). However, like its neighbour, agriculture and an informal coastal path have impacted upon the earthworks here. As discussed above, the coastal path currently obscures the adjoining point of the two forts.

**Isle Head (NX 4803 3605)**

Isle Head is a multivallate promontory fort, comprising three curvilinear ramparts (2-4) and one linear rampart (1), defining the landward side of a level summit 12,800 m² in area (Figure 8). The total interior area defined by the multivallate defences is approximately 28,800 m² in size. The outermost rampart (1) comprises a slight linear earthwork bank. Two medial curvilinear ramparts are separated by a ditch, within which lies a considerable amount of stone rubble, leading to the suggestion that the inner (3) of these two ramparts was originally stone faced (RCAHMS 1912, 177). The innermost rampart line (4) follows the scarp and natural rock outcrops of the interior summit. A quantity of stone rubble lying at the bottom of this scarp suggests that it too was originally stone faced (RCAHMS 1912, 177). A gap of 10 m narrowing down to 2 m between the western terminus of the ramparts and the coastal edge appears to form the original entrance. It is not clear if a gap through the western part of the ramparts, now defined by one of the modern pathways into the site, may also represent an entranceway. Both circular and rectilinear features are evident within the interior summit of the fort, as previously observed (Thomas 1961b, 79), as is a modern tower used for maritime navigation that occupies the highest point of the headland. Another linear bank, linking the central two inlets of the Isle, is located at a short distance outwith the outermost rampart but does not appear to be part of the site defences. Rig and furrow survive in the area between this earthwork and the outer rampart.

The fort occupies the raised summit of the low headland of the Isle of Whithorn, at a height of around 10 m above sea level. The Isle of Whithorn is situated at the confluence of two geological faults and comprises till overlying greywacke rock (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 133). The coastline around the Isle is composed of greywacke rock platforms that are incised into numerous gullies and ledges (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 134). The Isle protects a small sandy bay immediately to the north, between it and the mainland. The mainly pastoral hinterland of the coast slopes gently seaward towards the Isle. There is a limited view of the coastline either north-east or west. The Isle of Man is clearly visible on the horizon to the south.

As no previous measured survey plans have been made of this site, it is not possible to measure slope failure within any area of this site. However, while coastal erosion is not currently evident at the site, the ramparts have been affected in places by human action. Three informal visitor paths cut through each of the ramparts at separate points and lead to the modern tower, from which they meander across the site. Another visitor path follows the original entrance into the site along the western coastal edge of the site. The worst impact of this erosion occurs where the paths cut through the ramparts, scarps and entrance point of the site, while within the interior of the site, with the exception of the area around the modern tower the paths make only a light impact on the ground surface.
Figure 8: Isle Head
Stein Head (NX 4853 3718)

Stein Head is a multivallate promontory fort, comprising three curvilinear earth and stone ramparts (1-3) and one outer ditch (Figure 9). The earthworks define an internal area of approximately 950 m². A gap of around 2 m, close to the northern side of the site, leads into the interior of the fort, where plough rigs are evident. No other features are apparent within the interior of the site.

Stein Head occupies a promontory, approximately 20 m above sea level, comprising till overlying greywacke rock with an exposed and incised cliff edge indented by precipitous gullies (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 134). There are no bays offering access to the sea apparent on the immediate coastline. The nearby hinterland comprises moderately steep, seaward sloping pasture. Cairn Head promontory fort is visible along the coastline to the north but there is a limited aspect of the coastline to the south. Like all the promontory forts of the east coast of the Machars, a clear aspect of the Kirkcudbrightshire coast east of Wigtown Bay and Fleet Bay is apparent from Stein Head.

![Figure 9: Stein Head.](image)

As has been previously recognised (RCAHMS 1955) slope failure has reduced a considerable part of this site on its north-east edge but, as comparison with the 1955 plan indicates, appears to have made no more inroads into the site. Coastal erosion of the southern cliff edge, however, continues to threaten further encroachment (Figure 9). Cultivation has also made an impact at the site, removing much of the medial rampart and the central part of the ditch (RCAHMS 1955). A stone structure within the interior was recorded in 1911 (RCAHMS 1912, 177) but no trace was found in 1955 (RCAHMS 1955), due evidently to the modern cultivation features within the interior. Animal impact, in the form of exposed scarps and tracks across the ramparts, is also evident at Stein Head.
Old Fort, Dinnans (NX 4786 4026)

The Old Fort, Dinnans is a multivallate promontory fort, comprising two massive curvilinear earth ramparts (1-2) and ditches defining an internal area of approximately 1000 m² (Figure 10). An originally central causeway, 5.5 m wide, may represent the original entrance but this is obscured by its modern use for farm access. The causeway leads into the interior of the fort, which is dissected by a modern field wall and contains a WWII coastal watchtower. No other features are apparent within the interior of the site.

Old Fort, Dinnans occupies a promontory, 20 m above sea level, comprising till overlying greywacke rock with an irregular incised high cliff edge (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 142). There are no bays immediately adjacent to the site nor is any alternative access to the sea apparent. The immediate hinterland comprises gently seaward-sloping pasture ground. Cruggleton Castle is clearly visible on the coastline to the north of the site while Cairn Head promontory fort is visible to the south.

Coastal erosion has reduced a considerable part of this site, as previously noted (RCAHMS 1955) and evidently continues to encroach further into the fort as the disparity between the 1955 coastline and the 1996 coastline demonstrates (Figure 10). Two cattle feed cages located within the interior, immediately behind the inner rampart, have brought about severe deterioration of the site.

Figure 10: Old Fort, Dinnans.
by cattle, with deep and widespread erosion of much of the fabric of the ramparts and interior. Three possible timber house platforms identified in 1973 (NMRS No. NX44SE 3) and no longer apparent appear to have been obliterated by the impact of this erosion. The preservation of archaeological remains within the remaining interior of the site may have also been further compromised by the construction of the WWII coastal watchtower.

**Dinnans (NX 4792 4057)**

Dinnans is a univallate promontory fort, comprising one massive curvilinear earth rampart and the trace of an outer ditch defining an internal area of approximately 2,600 m² (Figure 11). A gap 4.4 m wide, between the southern terminus of the rampart and ditch and the cliff edge, appears to form the original entrance into the interior of the fort although another gap at the north end of the rampart has been previously identified as an entrance (RCAHMS 1912, 176). A modern field wall and foundations line the coastal edge of the interior. No other features are apparent within the interior of the site.

Figure 11: Dinnans.
Dinnans occupies a low promontory terrace, no more than 10 m above sea level, comprising till overlying greywacke rock with an irregular incised cliff edge (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 142). A small landing place, White Port, lies immediately south of the site. The immediate hinterland of pasture ground drops sharply down to Dinnans with the result that the adjacent ground overlooks the site. Cruggleton Castle is clearly visible on the coastline to the north of the site.

Coastal erosion is not evident at this site, nor is indicated by comparison with the plan made in 1955. However, animal impact, in the form of cattle scarps, is resulting in the erosion of the rampart. Cultivation within the interior of the site, recorded in 1955 (RCAHMS 1955), appears to have removed any possible trace of internal features from the ground surface of Dinnans. The outer ditch was also apparently much more evident on the ground in 1955 than it is now.

Muncraig Heugh (NX 6028 4615)

Muncraig Heugh formerly called Doo Cave Fort, is a small univallate cliff fort, defined by a semi-circular earth and stone rampart and an inner ditch, enclosing an area of roughly 300 m² (Figure 12). A central causeway entrance, around 2 m wide, provides access into the site. No traces of internal structures are apparent.

Muncraig Heugh is located 30 m above sea level on a precipitous incised cliff edge, comprising till overlying exposed greywacke platforms (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 238). There are no bays immediately adjacent to the site nor is any alternative access to the sea apparent. The immediate hinterland comprises gently seaward-sloping pasture ground providing a limited aspect inland. The Isle of Man and the eastern Machars coastline are however clearly visible.

Figure 12: Muncraig Heugh.
Coastal erosion is not evident at Muncraig Heugh from a comparison between the 1890 plan and the 1996 plan, despite the recognition of slow coastal erosion of the surrounding coastline, attributed to the susceptibility of bedding planes within the greywacke cliffs to wave action and basal scouring (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 240). Cultivation, however, appears to have had an impact since the 1890 survey as the northern part of the rampart, inland of the modern fence line, has since been reduced.

**Borness Batteries (NX 6198 4466)**

Borness Batteries is a relatively large multivallate promontory fort, defined by three curvilinear earth and stone ramparts (1-3) and two medial ditches, enclosing an area of roughly 1,000 m² (Figure 13). Several upright stones are apparent on the medial rampart (2) although their function is not known. A roughly central causeway entrance, 3.2 m wide, provides access into the site. No traces of internal structures are apparent.

The fort is located 30 m above sea level on a precipitous promontory, comprising till overlying exposed greywacke platforms with a fractured and incised cliff edge (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 238). There are no bays apparent immediately adjacent to the site, but the location of Bone Cave (NMRS No. NX64SW 1) very close to the east of the site, may suggest a small landing bay. Borness Batteries also lies close to the western headland of Brighouse Bay. The immediate hinterland comprises a golf course, formerly pasture. The aspect of the site comprises a clear view south to the Isle of Man and south-west to the Machars coastline between Eggerness Point and Stein Head Point but a limited aspect either east or west along the North Solway coastline.

![Figure 13: Borness Batteries.](image-url)
Coastal erosion is evidently making an impact at Borness Batteries as the exposed western cliff edge and comparison between the coastlines surveyed in 1890 and 1996 demonstrate (Figure 13). Coastal erosion is recognised as occurring at a slow rate along this part of the coastline (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 240) but has nevertheless made a significant impact at Borness Batteries. While no internal features are apparent, a possible hut circle near the point of the cliff, noted in 1911 (RCAHMS 1914, 45), may have been lost to coastal erosion. Slight traces of rectangular structures were seen in 1951 (RCAHMS 1955) but these are no longer apparent either. Cultivation appears to have also had an impact, before the first detailed record was made of this site (Coles 1893, 130), as illustrated by the reduction of the northern part of the outer rampart and the outermost ditch, east of the modern field boundary (Figure 13). A beaten pathway has also made an impact on the fabric of the two outermost ramparts, as it cuts through the site.

**Castleyards (NX 7548 4552)**

Castleyards is a univallate promontory fort, comprising one curvilinear earth rampart defining an internal area of approximately 1000 m² (Figure 14). Gaps between the eastern and western terminus of the rampart and the corresponding cliff edges may form the original entrances to the site, but the central gap is probably due to modern erosion. A modern field wall lines the cliff edge of the interior. No features are apparent within the interior of the site, other than a modern pit containing dead stock, located immediately inside the rampart at its eastern edge.

Castleyards occupies a promontory terrace on a raised beach, approximately 20 m above sea level, comprising glacial sands and gravels (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 278). The site overlooks Port Mary Bay and the small landing place of White Port, both immediately south of the site. The imme-

![Figure 14: Castleyards.](image-url)
diate hinterland composed of improved farmland slopes gently seaward down to Castleyards. There is a limited aspect both west and east along the coastline.

Coastal erosion is not evident at this site as it lies within the inland edge of a raised beach. As no previous plan has been made of this site, it is not possible to measure any potential degree of slope failure. However, farming activity, in the form of a pit for the disposal of dead stock, has evidently made some impact within a potentially significant part of the site. Root activity as a result of excessive vegetation over the ramparts may also be eroding the fabric of the rampart.

**Airds (NX 8190 4834)**

Airds is a small multivallate promontory fort, composed of two curvilinear earth ramparts and a medial ditch, defining an area approximately 440 m², dissected by the corner of a modern dry-stone field boundary (Figure 15). The outer rampart is more substantial than the slight, inner rampart. A gap of 2.5m, between the north-eastern terminus of the outer rampart and the cliff edge may represent the original entrance to the site. There are no features evident within the interior.

![Figure 15: Airds.](image)

The site occupies a small cliff-bound headland near Airds Point, composed of drift boulder clay overlying precipitous, deeply incised limestone cliffs 30 m above sea level (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 294). The immediate hinterland of improved farmland slopes down in a seaward direction. The site has a clear view of the Solway Coast west, as far as the promontory fort of Castle Muir but little view east. Both Cumbria and the Isle of Man are visible to the south. There are no bays immediately adjacent to Airds but Rascarrel Bay and Balcary Bay are situated a short distance to the west and north respectively.
No current coastal erosion was evident and as no previous plans have been made of Airds, it is not possible to measure any potential encroachment of the coastal cliff edge. However, it should perhaps be borne in mind for future assessments that the general coastline around Airds Point is susceptible to localised coastal erosion (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 296). Human impact, on the other hand, is clearly evident at the site where a beaten pathway cuts through the south-eastern part of the ramparts, the interior and the western terminus of the ramparts (Figure 15). An erosion scarp caused by cattle or sheep is also evident within the inner face of the outer rampart.

**Castlehill Point (NX 8541 5242)**

Castlehill Point is a large multivallate promontory fort, comprising a curvilinear outer earth rampart (1), a medial rock-cut ditch (2) and a thick inner dry-stone rampart (3), defining a raised level summit area of 1100 m² (Figure 16). A broken rubble-strewn slope rises from the ditch to the inner stone rampart, which is composed of large, unmortared, squared blocks laid in courses. A central causeway 2.8 m wide leads through the outer rampart and ditch, and up through a defined 2 m wide entrance in the inner stone rampart, into the interior of the site. Although slight internal features have been recorded in the past (NMRS No: NX85SE 1), no internal features could be discerned during this survey. It is possible nevertheless that the large amount of rubble lying within the inner rampart may mask internal features. A modern field fence and a derelict field wall dissect the edge of the site.

Figure 16: Castlehill Point.
Castlehill Point occupies the prominent eastern headland of Rough Firth, the mouth of the river Urr. The headland is composed of till and fluvio-glacial drift overlying precipitous greywacke cliffs, 20 m above sea level. The immediate hinterland of level, improved farmland rises steeply at a short distance from the site, to the summit of Barcloy Hill to the north-east. Castlehill Point, however, has a clear view of the land around Rough Firth to the north and west to the headland of Auchencairn Bay. Cumbria is also clearly visible across the Solway Firth to the south. There is a limited view east along the coastline. Castlehill Point overlooks a small bay immediately to the north-east of the site while further access to the sea is possible from Port Donnel to the north.

Comparison with the only previous plan made of Castlehill Point, that of 1890 (Coles 1893, 93) appears to indicate slope failure and coastal erosion of some parts of the cliff edge at Castlehill Point (Figure 16). Furthermore, considerable erosion of the ramparts close to their western and eastern extremities is apparent due to the impact of an informal coastal visitor path that cuts through the site. A limited area of erosion, where the ground surface has been broken, is also evident around a viewing cairn within the interior of the site. Extensive bracken covers much of the ditch and slope of the site, with resultant root activity impacting on the sub-surface archaeological remains.

Discussion

One of the primary purposes of the surveying programme was to create an accurate measured plan of each site. The site plans presented above clearly demonstrate a considerable variety of features evident within the promontory forts of the North Solway Coast, which are summarised in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Multi/ Univallate ramparts</th>
<th>Curvi/ Linear ramparts</th>
<th>Earth/ Stone ramparts</th>
<th>Internal Features evident</th>
<th>Size Group (1/2/3)</th>
<th>Inter-visible</th>
<th>Access-to the Sea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garliachen</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>St</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barsalloch</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Bay</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carghidown</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Feather</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrow Head I</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrow Head II</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle Head</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stein Head</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Fort Dinnans</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinnans</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muncraig Heugh</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borness Batteries</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>St?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castleyards</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airds</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlehill Point</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Site characteristics of promontory forts selected for survey
Defensive attributes

The promontory forts included in the survey comprise six univallate and ten multivallate sites. The majority of both the univallate and multivallate sites have curvilinear barriers, as opposed to linear barriers. Within the group of curvilinear forts, sites such as Barsalloch Point, Muncraig Heugh and perhaps originally Old Fort Dinnans share an obvious morphology with McCulloch’s Castle (Scott-Elliot 1964) in having semi-circular boundaries that enclose an area adjoining a straight cliff edge. However, aside from the extra resources required to construct a semi-circular boundary, there appears nothing significantly different in the use of a cliff edge from that of a promontory. There is also nothing very obvious, from either the surface remains or the excavation results from McCulloch’s Castle, that indicates anything to distinguish these sites from inland, enclosed settlements, which are usually enclosed by curvilinear barriers. It may be also worth noting that ramparts were only apparent across the landward margins of the sites. At no sites were there signs of enclosure, other than modern field banks, on the seaward margins, perhaps a surprising aspect of what are often very exposed coastal sites but noted elsewhere (Ralston 1995, 73).

Most of the barriers defining the Solway Coast promontory forts, whether curvilinear or linear, are constructed of earth. There is nothing to indicate in these sites any other form of construction other than simple dump ramparts as revealed as the original form at McCulloch’s Castle (Scott-Elliot 1964, 121). The presence of stone faced ramparts at a minority of sites may therefore perhaps represent an indicator of status, especially given the apparent absence of stone as a building material from later prehistoric settlements in Galloway (Cowley 2000, 173) save for a limited selection of settlements, forts and ‘exotic’ structures such as brochs and duns. The distribution of stone walled promontory forts largely adheres to the general distribution pattern of stone walled settlements within Galloway, with concentrations in central Galloway and the west coast of the Machars (Cowley 2000, 172). While the stone walled settlements have been tentatively interpreted by some as a cultural indicator, perhaps of a tribal settlement pattern (Cowley 2000, 172), it should be stressed that there exists great variety amongst stone walled settlements within the region in general and even amongst the promontory forts of the Solway Coast. Of the stone ramparts recorded amongst these sites, some, such as Back Bay, McCulloch’s Castle and Castle Feather, appear to be successive to earthwork ramparts and may perhaps represent medieval occupation. On the other hand, while a castle apparently once stood on Castlehill Point (Pont 1654; Harper 1876, 194) the stone-faced rampart surviving at this site does not appear secondary to the earthworks, the medieval castle presumably occupying the central area of the site. The stone-faced ramparts at Isle Head too do not appear to be secondary to the earthworks. The stone ramparts evident at these two sites appear rather more similar to the stone-faced ramparts revealed at Trusty’s Hill and Mote of Mark (Thomas 1961a, 69; Laing 1973, 37-38), although given the absence of vitrified stone from either of these promontory forts, or any other on the Solway Coast, only excavation might establish this.

A closer observation of the ‘defensive’ nature of the Solway coast promontory forts shows that while the promontory forts at Castlehill Point, Castle Feather and Eggerness Castle (NMRS No: NX44NE 5), for instance, were suitably defensive locations for sub-
sequent medieval castles, as has been demonstrated at other promontory sites such as Cruggleton (Ewart 1985, 55) and Castle Park, Dunbar (Perry 2000, 322), many others, such as Carghidown, Airds and Dinnans, patently do not occupy defensive locations. Other medieval coastal sites with no evidence for earlier occupation, such as Kirkclauagh motte and bailey and Raeberry Castle indicate that defensive locations on the North Solway Coast were not limited to the sites of earlier promontory forts. Given that the hinterland often slopes down to the majority of the promontory sites, if not actually overlooking them, a trait not exclusive to Galloway promontory forts (Bersu 1949, 75; Ralston 1986, 101), it is difficult to recognise a universal defensive quality to these sites. This is not something new to be observed of promontory forts (Lamb 1980, 68-69; Hingley 1992, 19) nor of many later prehistoric sites where the enclosures formed by ramparts often do not form rational defences (Rideout et al. 1992, 141; Ralston 1995, 59) but appear rather to offer an outward impression of strength without being strictly defensible (Bowden & McOmish 1987, 77). Such an explanation may be proposed perhaps for Castle Feather and Old Fort Dinnans, for example, where the multiple lines of defence stand at more or less the same level. Only at Isle Head, Castlehill Point and Borness Batteries do the ramparts protect or form a raised area that may have offered an advantage in defending the site (Plate 1). It is worth reiterating here the survival of potentially complex stone-faced ramparts at the first two of these sites, indicative of considerable investment in making truly strong defences at what may be pre-eminent settlements.

Plate 1: Castlehill Point.
In contrast Carghidown stands out in particular as a distinctly disadvantageous site for defensive purposes since it is quite starkly overlooked by the immediate hinterland (Plate 2). It might seem more plausible that the diminutive defining rampart at Carghidown was designed to keep people or stock in rather than out of the site. The same observation can be made of another small site, Airds, where the outer rampart is distinctly higher than the slight inner bank. The larger fort of Dinnans, on the other hand, while being defined by a massive earth rampart, nonetheless occupies a vulnerable position overlooked by its immediate hinterland. The same stark indefensible siting can be observed of the Galloway broch sites of Stairhaven, Doon Castle and Crammag Head. It should be noted that these broch sites share a remarkably similar morphology to promontory forts, being located on coastal promontory sites defined by outworks, one of several aspects of similarity between promontory forts and brochs noted elsewhere in Scotland (Lamb 1980, 6; Armit 1997, 59).

While some of the forts may be interpreted as offering merely an impression of defence, very few of the selected promontory forts sites occupy truly defensive locations. The function of the ‘defences’ of many of the sites may have simply adhered to domestic needs, such as the separation of domestic livestock from living areas for instance (Cunliffe 1991, 494), or perhaps the definition of ‘religious sites’, as has been suggested for many similarly exposed promontory forts elsewhere in Atlantic Europe (Cunliffe 2001, 346; Cunliffe 2002, 89). Alternatively the ramparts may have simply been symbolic of the status of the inhabitants as postulated for other sites in Dumfries and Galloway (Banks 2000,
Certainly the surviving remains and topographical location of the majority of sites indicate a largely non-military purpose for many of the promontory forts on the North Solway Coast, an observation that has been made of similar sites across Western Europe (Ralston 1995, 61). Despite the use of terms such as ‘forts’ one cannot assume a defensive strategy to the purpose or siting of the majority of promontory forts on the North Solway Coast.

**Occupation**

The nature of the occupation of the Galloway promontory forts, however, is difficult to define from surface remains, as internal structures are rarely apparent within the selected sites and where they are apparent are more often found within stone walled sites and indicative perhaps of secondary occupation. While the absence of surface indications within the majority of the surveyed sites does not preclude the sub-surface survival of timber ring-groove round house remains, as recorded at Cruggleton (Ewart 1985, 12) and other sites in Dumfries and Galloway such as Rispain Camp, Carronbridge, Woodend and Hayknowes (Haggarty & Haggarty 1983; Johnston 1994; Banks 2000; Gregory 2001), it may suggest perhaps that promontory forts were not occupied in the same intensive way as other later prehistoric settlements, such as Gibb’s Hill (RCAHMS 1997, 122) and Boonies (Jobey 1975, 138). However, as will be discussed below, modern cultivation has distorted the record at many of the Galloway sites. The survival of visible interior features within Back Bay, Carghidown and Isle Head, possibly pertaining to the original occupation in the case of at least the latter two sites, is therefore all the more remarkable. The two circular features facing an open ‘courtyard’ at Carghidown draws parallels with Boonies in East Dumfriesshire, where the internal layout was divided between a living area of successive roundhouses and an open yard (Jobey 1975, 138). The internal features apparent at Isle Head are concentrated in the central raised area of the site, which could mean theoretically that the remaining lower areas of the site were left available for stock but the substantial disparity in size between Isle Head and Carghidown inhibits the drawing of parallels between the two sites. The terraced form of Isle Head conforms rather to the typical layout of a nuclear fort (Driscoll & Yeoman 1997, 228). However, that the internal features at Back Bay also congregate within a specific limited area, leaving the remaining interior ground available for stock, does suggest the possibility of a common internal layout pattern amongst the Galloway promontory forts.

The size of the internal areas within the promontory forts, available for occupation, varies from the exceptional large site of Isle Head (12,800 m²) to the very small one at Muncraig Heugh (320 m²). While it has been demonstrated and will be discussed below that at some of the promontory forts coastal erosion has clearly reduced the internal area of the site, as a general rule the promontory forts of the North Solway Coast appear to fall into three groups according to size;

1. an extremely limited number of large sites over 2,000 m² in internal area
2. the most numerous group of sites between 800 m² and 1500 m² in internal area and
3. a smaller group of sites between 320 m² and 500 m² in internal area
However, no correlation can be drawn between the size of sites and any obvious characteristic in their morphology, such as rampart attributes, topographical locations or internal features. While Group (3) may fit into the RCAHMS ‘homestead’ category of site, the not insubstantial defences apparent at Garliachen and Burrow Head I are difficult to accept as indicative simply of a ‘homestead’, whatever that may mean. Of the two largest sites, Isle Head and Dinnans, there is great disparity evident in terms of rampart morphology and topographic attributes. Having stated this, the range of internal areas apparent throughout the three groups highlighted above accords with the pattern evident across the latter prehistoric settlement record of Galloway where the vast majority of sites fall within 0.7 ha. Only a small minority of Galloway sites enclose distinctly larger areas and these sites generally exhibit more complex defences and predominantly occupy higher altitude locations. However, while the promontory forts of the Solway Coast generally follow this pattern, the reduction of many of the sites by coastal erosion rather inhibits classification of the promontory forts into groups simply according to size.

**Inter-visibility attributes**

Inter-visibility between different promontory forts and other potentially contemporary inland sites was also observed. While the results would appear to indicate that inter-visibility, being a common attribute to promontory forts on the Solway Coast, might be a significant attribute, very few sites were inter-visible with those along the same coastline. For it should be noted that all those selected sites on the west and east coastlines of the Machars peninsula are inter-visible with sites, whether selected or not, on the east coast of the Rhins and western part of the Kirkcudbrightshire coast respectively. Given the distance involved, this apparent inter-visibility may be no more than an accident of geography. Certainly, given the haphazard occurrence of inter-visibility between the sites along the same coastline and the lack of an inland aspect from all but two sites, Castlehill Point and Airds, as well as the lack of evidence for contemporary occupation at a sufficient number of these sites, inter-visibility should not, at least yet, be accepted as a significant attribute of the promontory forts on the Solway Coast.

**Maritime access**

Perhaps surprisingly, given their proximity to the sea, only half of the surveyed sites are adjacent to bays or obvious landing places, where access to the sea is available. This apparent disinterest in maritime activity is in contrast to what has been noted at many promontory forts in other regions of Scotland, such as Moray for instance, leading to the observation by some (Ralston 2002) that the Galloway promontory forts ‘have their backs to the sea’. It should, however, be countered that a similar lack of maritime access has been observed of promontory forts elsewhere in Scotland, Wales, Ireland and the Isle of Man (Lamb 1980, 69; Hogg 1972, 16; O’Kelly 1953, 35; Barry 1981, 323; Bersu 1949, 79). Within the selected group of Galloway sites, the only correlations that can be drawn between site characteristics such as size or morphology and access to the sea are that access to the sea is much less common amongst group (3) outlined above, comprising the smallest sites, than it is amongst the other two groups of larger sites. Furthermore at none of the sites with linear defences was access to the sea apparently a favoured attribute.
However, while promontory forts in Galloway cannot be collectively associated with maritime activity, it may be possible to identify likely maritime activity associated with particular individual sites. Observations have previously been made regarding the possible association of the Isle of Whithorn with the long distance trade of the 5th to 7th centuries AD evident at Whithorn (Alcock & Alcock 1990, 119; Hill 1997, 5-6; Thomas 1997, 98). The presence of a large, well-defended promontory fort at Isle Head, guarding the small bay at the Isle of Whithorn (Plate 3), the traditional port of Whithorn, could be interpreted as a secular counterpart to the ecclesiastical high status settlement at Whithorn itself. Furthermore, the promontory fort of Castlehill Point, with comparable defensive and maritime attributes to Isle Head, lies in close proximity to the Mote of Mark, another node along with Whithorn in the long distance trade network of the mid 1st millennium AD. This trade network, of course, connected many such sites, such as Dunadd, Dinas Powys, Dumbarton and Tintagel, with Continental Europe and the Mediterranean (Laing 1973, 38; Laing 1975, 98; Fulford 1989, 4; Alcock & Alcock 1990, 113-119; Thomas 1993, 93; Campbell 1996, 87).

![Plate 3: Isle Head, marked by the white tower on the headland.](image)

Given the lack of any stratified dating evidence from Isle Head and Castlehill Point (Radford 1957, 169; Truckell 1967, 172), one can only speculate on the potential or not of contemporary connections between these two promontory forts and Whithorn and Mote of Mark, two of the richest site artefactual assemblages from the post-Roman trade network of the western British seaboard (Alcock & Alcock 1990, 126; Campbell 1996, 87). While neither of the promontory forts can be dated, it should be borne in mind that the occupation, or re-occupation of originally Iron Age coastal promontories, during the early
historic period appears to be a common pattern (Edwards & Ralston 1980, 208; Ralston 1980, 33, 37 & 39) within a greater settlement shift to coastal locations between the 1st century BC and the 6th or 7th centuries AD (Alcock & Alcock 1990, 120). Furthermore, within models where imports were first obtained at ‘primary’ sites and then subsequently distributed to ‘secondary’ sites during the 5th, 6th and 7th centuries AD, Whithorn is suggested as a ‘secondary’ recipient site of wine and oil while the Mote of Mark is suggested as a primary site, though perhaps largely of an industrial nature (Snyder 1998, 244). It is feasible using these models that the Isle of Whithorn and Castlehill Point fulfilled the role of primary sites too, being perhaps settlements of local secular power from where imports were obtained and distributed during the Early Historic period.

It is not just during the Early Historic period, however, that potential associations between promontory forts and maritime activity have been postulated (Armit 1997, 59). The presence of Roman pottery at McCulloch’s Castle (Scott-Elliot 1964, 123) and a 1st century AD denarius of Vespasian at Borness Batteries (Wilson 2001, 113), for instance, are not perhaps especially significant, aside from indicating likely dates for occupation of these sites. However, the distribution of Roman finds, particularly from native contexts, adheres to a predominantly coastal, clustered dispersal pattern in Galloway (Robertson 1970, 203-211; Wilson 2001, Fig. 7). One of the clusters of Roman finds from native contexts is found west of Kirkcudbright Bay (Wilson 2001, Fig. 7) concentrated around Borness Cave (Clarke 1876; Clarke 1878), close to the foot of Borness Batteries promontory fort. Having yielded a stray 1st century Roman coin (Wilson 2001, 113), it is not inconceivable that Borness Batteries was occupied at the same time as Borness Cave. Brighouse Bay, again within this cluster of Roman finds, yielded a counterfeit coin mould of the 3rd century AD during a watching brief in 1992/93 (Maynard 1994, 20; Boon 1994, 21). The assumption that the counterfeit coin mould can only be understood in terms of Britain south of the Solway, not the North Solway Coast (Boon 1994, 21), not only ignores the local native context for Roman finds but also the evidence from sites elsewhere in the British Isles, such as the promontory fort of Coygan Camp in Carmarthenshire, which provided a native context for counterfeit coin production during the 3rd century AD (Wainwright 1967, 60). Given this potential parallel and the cluster of Roman finds on this part of the Kirkcudbrightshire coast, it is quite feasible that the counterfeit activity at Brighouse Bay could have been instigated by native communities keen to acquire Roman goods from the south, as others have tentatively suggested (Holmes & Hunter 2001, 173-4).

While the cluster of Roman finds from Luce Bay (Breeze & Ritchie 1980, 84; Saville & Shiels 1998, 130; Saville & Shiels 1999, 116; Saville & Shiels 2000, 129; Wilson 2001, 112 & 116-118) does not appear associated with any known native site, the correlation between the concentration of clusters of Roman finds from native contexts, around Rough Firth and the southern Machars (Hunter, 1994, 55; Wilson 2001, Fig. 7), with the locations of large, well defended promontory forts, such as Castlehill Point and Isle Head, should not be ignored when examining trade and exchange patterns throughout the first millennium AD. The evidence from Dumfries and Galloway for the adoption of ideas from outside the region during the Iron Age, in the form of ‘exotic’ structures such as brochs and
square barrows (Cowley 2000, 174; Cowley 1996, 112; Halliday 2002, 104) and a range of high status artefacts (MacGregor 1976, 8; Warner 1983, 166; Mackie 1995, 660; Hunter 1997, 121; Harding 2002, 204), indicates that native communities participated in extensive networks of communication and exchange on their own terms and independent of the Romans. The economic basis of this exchange was probably the agricultural wealth of local communities as suggested by recent excavations of later prehistoric settlements in south-west Scotland (Haggarty & Haggarty 1983, 43; Johnston 1994, 281; Banks 2000, 271; Gregory 2001, 44). Given the limited impact of the brief Roman presence in Scotland (Hanson 1997, 216; Ralston & Armit 1997, 218), it is not unreasonable to postulate that trade and exchange continued unabated through and beyond the first half of the first millennium AD, without requiring the effect of ‘Romanization’. Since the presence of native ‘ports’ is evident elsewhere in the British Isles (Cunliffe 1978; Raftery 1994, 208; Raftery 1995, 651; Cunliffe 2002, 78-79) it is conceivable that some of the promontory forts on the North Solway Coast may preserve the stratified contexts for local participation in these networks of communication and exchange.

Figure 17: Sites referred to in text.
Settlement patterns

While the promontory forts of Galloway’s coastline have been noted in the past as a peculiar regional settlement form (Feachem 1966, 76), it is difficult to accept, given the results of the survey, that they represent anything more than a reflection of the topography of the region. The site plans produced in this survey demonstrate considerable variety in interior size, scale and morphology of defining boundaries and topographical attributes. Since a similar trait of diversity is apparent amongst the general distribution of later prehistoric enclosed and fortified settlement forms in Galloway (Cowley 2000, 173) and that where internal settlements layouts are visible on the ground, the internal organisation of features adheres to patterns identified within inland settlements, promontory forts do not appear to represent a distinct, homogenous settlement form within the regional settlement pattern at all. Observations of the morphological traits of the promontory forts of the Rhins of Galloway in RCAHMS surveys (1985, 14-19) and by the author would concur with this sense of diversity. While easy to group together in terms of topography, ‘promontory forts’ covers a variety of dissimilar sites, much in the same way that ‘hillforts’ hides a disparate assemblage of sites.

If the promontory forts of the Galloway coast are simply manifestations of inland settlement forms distributed across the region, it should be possible to recognise the same types of enclosed and fortified settlements amongst the promontory forts. As has been noted above, the concentration of stone walled promontory forts on the west coast of the Machars and the central Galloway coastline adheres to corresponding inland concentrations of stone walled settlements within Galloway (Cowley 2000, 172). Furthermore, Isle Head and Castlehill Point, which stand out amongst the Galloway promontory forts in exhibiting evidence of complex defences at places of strength with ready access to the sea, may belong to a class of pre-eminent site, evident in the region, exemplified by Mote of Mark, Castle O’er, Tynron Doon and Trusty’s Hill. Excavations attribute these latter sites to the early and middle centuries of the 1st millennium AD (Longley 1982, 132-134; Cowley 2000, 173; Williams 1971, 110; Thomas 1961, 67-69). While not necessarily synchronous, these sites perhaps together with the nucleated ‘courtyard forts’ (Truckell 1963, 94-5; Feachem 1966, 76; Laing 1977, 36), may represent roughly the same high echelon of status within the later prehistoric/early historic settlement pattern in Dumfries and Galloway. Other prominent settlement forms on the Galloway coastline, specifically the brochs at Stairhaven, Crammag Head and Ardwell Point occupy identical topographical sites to many of the more diminutive promontory forts. Perhaps the more prominent dry-stone structures within the interior of these enclosed sites have obscured the similarities the sites as a whole share with other enclosed settlements.

However, while other settlement forms, such as rectilinear enclosed settlements (Haggarty & Haggarty 1983, 43; Johnston 1994, 284-5) and crannogs (Barber & Crone 1993, 531; Hunter 1994, 65) appear to occupy distinct though perhaps less prominent positions within the settlement hierarchy of the 1st millennium AD, little has been established for the majority of enclosed settlements within Galloway (Cowley 2000, 172), whether on the coast or inland. Even with the distinct concentration of promontory forts, crannogs and brochs, together with the perceived dominance of small, circular enclosed
sites (Truckell 1984, 200), that distinguishes the later prehistoric settlement pattern of Galloway from the lands east of the Nith and particularly south-east Scotland (Banks 2000, 273-278), there is a dearth of evidence (Armit & Ralston 1997, 187-88), particularly from stratified contexts, to prove any kind of underlying cultural identity. As others have recognised (Oram 2000, 242; Banks 2002) much more work is required before a meaningful settlement pattern can emerge. It will be only through carefully selected excavations, carried out in conjunction with the study of the local context that the nature of occupations and perhaps more importantly the relationships between contemporary sites within the same region might be better understood, as has been achieved elsewhere, as for example, at Buiston in Ayrshire (Crone 2000, 159).

**Condition of sites**

In addition to creating an accurate measured plan of each site, the survey also measured the extent of erosion at each site and determined the cause of the erosion in each case. This was carried out in order to appraise the condition of the selected sites, a necessary prerequisite if detailed investigation, based on the relative values and costs of such work (Ashmore 1994, 39), is to be planned in the future. The results of the survey demonstrate that all of the selected sites are currently affected, to a greater or lesser extent, by erosion of some form. The types of erosion apparent include coastal erosion and slope failure, animal impact, agricultural impacts, root activity and footpath erosion.

Comparison between previous site plans and the site plans produced in this most recent survey demonstrates that coastal erosion is evident at seven of the twenty-five sites on the North Solway Coast. That coastal erosion is evident at a number of sites should come as no surprise, given that one would expect the same process that formed ‘defensible’ promontories to continue eroding the margins of these same promontories through wave attack and slope failure (Gilbertson et al. 1996, 105). Localised and fairly limited coastal erosion of the cliff edges at Back Bay, Carghidown, Castle Feather, Stein Head and Old Fort Dinnans is apparent. More significant coastal erosion, however, has apparently made inroads into the cliff edges of Castlehill Point and Borness Batteries, as demonstrated by comparison with survey plans of the sites made in 1890, although caution should be applied as to the accuracy of the older plans. Comparable massive coastal erosion of Stein Head and Old Fort Dinnans has also clearly taken place at some point in the past, but not since 1955 when the first measured plans of these sites were made.

Slope failure is also apparent at Back Bay, Carghidown and Castle Feather where the overlying till is being eroded at a faster rate than the underlying geology. This is an important aspect of the coastal erosion of these promontory forts, for while the underlying geology may be more impervious to weathering and wave attack, it is within the overlying and more vulnerable till that the archaeological remains survive. It is apparent at sites such as Carghidown that relatively insignificant erosion of the underlying cliff has resulted in slope failure, which has led to the ground surface being broken and the underlying till being exposed to weathering (Plate 4). The repeat inspections of Carghidown demonstrate that this is a constant and steady process. The significant slope failure evident at Back
Bay, Carghidown and Castle Feather is thus probably of more immediate threat than the periodic erosion of the underlying geology at these and the other sites. The slope failure apparent at these three sites is of particular consequence as it is the rare preservation of internal features within them that is under threat.

The surveying programme has also illustrated that the impact of burrowing animals, probably rabbits, is eroding areas within three of the selected promontory forts. Burrowing is evident at Barsalloch Point, Back Bay and Carghidown, although following guidelines set out for recording infestations (Dunwell & Trout 1999, 13), at none of these sites was there intense activity evident. There was no sign of the animals responsible for damage and many of the holes may be empty. There were less than ten holes at each site and these occurred very close together affecting less than 25% of the earthworks at any one site. Nevertheless burrowing, in affecting the defining earthworks, may have made a significant impact on the archaeological remains at each site. The occurrence of burrowing at these three sites may be attributable to the relatively marginal status of these sites within the modern landscape.

At ten of the selected promontory forts, the surveying programme recorded scarps caused by breakage of the ground surface and the continued wearing of the exposed soil by stock, particularly cattle. This type of erosion is evident at Garliachen, Barsalloch Point, Back Bay, Carghidown, Burrow Head I and II, Stein Head, Dinnans and Airds to a greater or lesser degree. However, it is at Old Fort, Dinnans where the most extensive
damage from the impact of cattle is apparent. At Old Fort Dinnans, as at all these sites, it is the earthworks, which are most susceptible to erosion from stock grazing. The ground surface of a large part of the earthworks at Old Fort Dinnans has been broken and is resulting in the gradual compression of the ramparts. The substantial erosion apparent at Old Fort Dinnans is due to the congregation of stock at two cattle feed cages occupying the area immediately behind the internal rampart (Plate 5), with subsequent repercussions for the preservation of the underlying archaeology. The detrimental impact on the survival of archaeology at Old Fort Dinnans is further demonstrable by the absence of internal features noted in previous inspections (NMRS No. NX44SE 3).

Other agricultural activities either have in the past or are currently making an adverse impact at seven of the selected sites. McKerlie noted the damage by ploughing to many of the promontory forts around the southern tip of the Machars (1906, 418) and inspections by the Royal Commission for Ancient and Historical Monuments (RCAHMS 1955) noted cultivation within the interiors of Barsaloch Point, Stein Head and Dinnans, though now longer practised. Partial removal of ramparts, predominantly as a result of ploughing, has taken place at Barsaloch Point, Stein Head, Muncraig Heugh and Borness Batteries in former times but more recently a substantial part of the outer ramparts of Burrow Head I has been removed (NMRS No. NX43SE 1). The excavation of an animal disposal pit at Castleyards also belongs to more recent times.
Erosion of the sub-surface archaeological remains from root activity, as a result of excessive vegetation, appears to be present at four of the selected sites, to a greater or lesser degree. While bracken obscures much of the ditch at Castlehill Point, gorse obscures a large part of the earthworks at Garliachen, Barsalloch and Castleyards. It should also be noted that at five of the promontory forts not selected for survey, excessive vegetation, in the form of gorse or trees, deemed them inaccessible. The presence of unmanaged, excessive vegetation is largely the result of the marginal status of these sites within the modern landscape.

The impact of human pedestrian traffic is evident at seven of the selected promontory forts. At most of the sites this amounts to little more than the breaking of the ground surface by informal beaten paths and the subsequent compression of limited areas within the sites. However, at Isle Head and Castlehill Point (Plate 6) the number of people following informal beaten paths has caused significant damage to archaeological remains within specific areas of each site. The detrimental impact of visitors at these two latter sites is due to their inclusion within popular recreational coastal paths, where the management of visitors around the sites has not been considered.

The survey plans (Figures 2-16) produced in this programme of work provide a baseline of data from which future assessments may measure the condition of each selected site and aid the implementation of appropriate management plans. A long term monitor-
ing programme, possibly incorporated into the national Shorewatch scheme, is clearly required to address coastal erosion (Gilmour 2001, 3). This could also augment the present system of inspection and liaison with landowners by Historic Scotland. Given the Scheduled Ancient Monument status of the majority of the selected sites, their current land management clearly merits review and modification, under the guidance of Historic Scotland (Barclay 1994; Macinnes & Ader 1995). Furthermore, liaison between national and local bodies and interested groups must develop if an effective, coordinated strategy is to be implemented that will enhance the general protection and management of the promontory forts of the North Solway Coast. While attempts have been made by the author, for instance, to minimise the impact of pedestrian traffic at Borness Batteries, a more comprehensive strategy for the coast is required.

Conclusion
The survey has illustrated the considerable variation amongst the promontory forts of the Solway Coast of Dumfries and Galloway. There are evidently complex sequences of construction and re-occupation at a number of sites and there remains the potential survival of significant evidence from some sites for cross-cultural contacts over a long period. However, the chronological range for the initial construction, occupation and abandonment of promontory forts on the North Solway Coast has yet to be established. The form and profile of the boundaries of an adequate sample of sites have not yet been determined, nor have the nature and status of the occupation and reoccupation of these sites been resolved. Evidence for the nature of the occupation of promontory forts must be collected if the relationship of these sites to their contemporary landscape, land-use and the greater settlement pattern is to be clarified. More evidence must also be gathered if a better understanding is to be attained of how the promontory forts of the North Solway Coast fit into patterns of maritime activity, such as local and long-distance trade; a research theme of more than local significance (Barclay 1997, 32).

If we are to enhance our understanding of the Galloway promontory forts further research and conservation priorities must be developed (Haselgrove et al 2001, 28), especially where voluntary public participation is hoped to play a role (Cressey & Toolis 1997, 478-9; Gilmour 2001, 3). The survival of these archaeological remains is threatened by a variety of factors. Coastal erosion, agricultural practices, animal burrowing and pedestrian traffic are currently and steadily reducing the archaeological remains of a significant number of promontory forts on the North Solway Coast. These threats, due inherently to the coastal location of these sites, must be addressed if these archaeological remains and the potentially significant evidence they hold are to be conserved for the future.
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A CONDITION SURVEY OF SELECTED CRANNOGS IN SOUTH-WEST SCOTLAND

by Henderson, J.C., Crone B. A. and Cavers, M.G.¹

Introduction

The first phase of the South-West Scotland Crannog Survey, the primary fieldwork for which was carried out in 1989, examined the assumption that submerged crannogs in the south-west were relatively stable while their counterparts on drained land were rapidly decaying. The work, presented in two publications – Barber & Crone (1993) and Crone (1993) – confirmed the latter assumption but, perhaps more significantly, challenged the former. While clear indications of the accelerated organic decay of sites on drained land were obtained, it was also suggested that submerged sites were suffering from the infestation of underwater plant and animal life due to high levels of biological activity present in certain lochs (Barber & Crone 1993, 528). The results of the 1989 survey demonstrated that crannogs in south-west Scotland, both on dry land and underwater, are undergoing organic decay on a scale that is significantly diminishing their potential archaeological value. However, it was not possible to fully establish the condition of the surviving crannogs by superficial examination alone and no attempt was made to assess their stability.

The aim of the second phase, which began in 2002, is to establish an effective system of monitoring the rate of organic decay on crannog sites in different environments (submerged and on land) in an effort to provide accurate data on the sustainability of the crannog resource throughout south-west Scotland. It is hoped that this monitoring will identify the mechanisms and causes of organic decay in the area. Using the information gathered in Phase 2, steps can then be taken to preserve the resource through the establishment of appropriate management strategies.

Background

Catchments

22 sites were selected for field visits in 2002 to assess their suitability as monitoring sites. The sites chosen form a representative sample of the range of site conditions and environments encountered in south-west Scotland.

The organic remains present on crannog sites can only be preserved in situ by the preservation of the environments in which they lie. Unlike dryland sites, deposits of great archaeological value on sites in wetlands can be destroyed by activities which can take place at some distance from the sites themselves. Drainage, acidification, eutrophication and pollution of water bodies and river systems can all impact on the sedimentary matrix
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within which crannogs survive (whether on wetlands or fully submerged in lochs). Even in anoxic environments, chemical processes, invisible at the ground surface or on upper levels, can lead to a slow degradation of the organic component of crannog sites. As a result, the definition of hydrological catchments at the outset is crucial to the future development of monitoring work in south-west Scotland.

Eleven hydrological catchments can be identified in the south west, each defined by major river systems (Figure 1). An awareness of these catchments and the selection of a range of sites within them, allows the study of lochs and their environs as part of a fully functioning hydrological system. This type of morphometric unit is commonly used in geography, geomorphology and general earth sciences and provides clearly defined and unambiguous units of study (Chorley 1969, 37). The establishment of monitoring programmes within distinct catchments is important in terms of establishing future projects and the integration of existing work by other interested groups (such as SEPA).

Based on the main concentrations of sites in the south-west, two main study areas have been selected. The twenty two sites have been selected from these two study areas, each one composed of three hydrological catchments: 11 sites from Study Area A (composed of the Nith, Urr and New Abbey catchments); and 11 sites from Study Area B (composed of the Bladnoch, Luce and Piltanton catchments).

Figure 1 Hydrological catchment and location of crannog sites selected for assessment visits.
Methodology

All fieldwork was carried out during July 2002. Assessment of the loch environs was carried out by Anne Crone, together with Alex Hale, Jon Henderson and John Barber. This consisted of a brief walkover survey to record the environs of the loch and establish the ease of access to the loch and crannog.

The condition survey of the submerged crannogs was carried out by Jon Henderson and Graeme Cavers. The underwater work consisted of a visual inspection of the crannogs by snorkelling or, more usually, diving around the sites. Timbers and organic deposits, once located, were examined for biological infestation. If necessary, samples of algae, molluscs and aquatic plants were taken for identification. Timbers were sampled from sites which previously lacked absolute dating evidence. Water samples were also taken from each loch visited. Rough sketch maps were made showing the location of any significant features on the submerged crannogs (see Figures 2-8). All sites were also recorded using underwater digital photography.

Field Assessment and Evaluation of Selected Crannogs

Black Loch of Sanquhar (Nith catchment – see Figure 1)

Previous work

The existence of a crannog in the Black Loch was reported when the loch was drained in 1863. The crannog (NS 7970 1068) was described as a wooden platform, some 15 m W-W by 12 m, held together by mortised beams and piles (TDGHNHAS 1865). Two logboats have also been discovered in the loch (NMR record).

Underwater observation

This is a shallow marshy loch located in the middle of a sedge and sphagnum bog. Access was very difficult, as the ground becomes very wet and boggy about 100 m from the loch. Water depth was 0.5 m to the top of very deep silt deposits – no firm bottom could be felt under these silt deposits. Water visibility was nil because of levels of sediment suspended in the water. The crannog survives as a peat island, 15 m x 12 m, some 0.5 m above the water level. The island itself is featureless apart from evidence of an artificial inlet on its north side. It seems likely that this inlet was formed by small excavations in the 19th century to facilitate the recording of the section referred to above. Some stones are visible around the rim of the island. Underwater the mound slopes gently down to 0.5 m and is covered with thick silt. Presumably the thick deposits of silt are providing protection for the core of the crannog. Search underwater revealed firmly embedded horizontal timbers in only two places some 4-5 m from the north-eastern edge of the mound. A group of three in situ oak piles were also located some 1.5 m off the eastern edge of the mound, one of which was sampled for C-14 dating. These piles may form part of the causeway referred to in earlier reports but no further piles could be located to confirm this interpretation.
Recommended action

This is not a suitable candidate for monitoring. There are no obvious threats to this site as the moorland around the loch is used only for rough pasture. Due to problems of access and visibility archaeological work underwater is not feasible. Access is only possible using waders or a drysuit.

**Barean Loch (Urr catchment –see Figure 1)**

*Previous work*

A crannog (NX 8615 5555), consisting of a circle of oak piles enclosing a wooden floor, was found in Barean Loch in 1865 during drainage work. Two Roman bronze cooking pots dating to the 1st or 2nd century AD were also recovered from the site at this time. The site was dived during the 1989 survey and two piles were sampled for C-14 dating (GU-2642 2140 ± 60 bp; GU-2641 1280 ± 50 bp).

Figure 2 Barean Loch.
Underwater observation

The crannog survives as a tree-covered island, *circa* 6 m in diameter, located in the south-western corner of the loch. Visibility in the loch was 1.5-2 m but the loch bed is covered in soft silt which if disturbed can quickly reduce visibility to nil.

Underwater observation revealed that the island visible above the water level sits on the centre of a much larger mound underwater (Figure 2). This larger mound is roughly circular and is approximately 32 m in diameter. From the island the mound shelves down to *circa* 3 to 5 m depth on all sides but is covered in soft silts which presumably obscure the true base of the crannog mound. The top of the mound appears more stony (average size of stones *circa* 0.3 – 0.5 m) creating a flat top or level area on the mound. Some 8-10 oak piles are located on the north and north-western sides of the mound sitting in amongst dense growths of water lilies. The piles survive from *circa* 0.3 – 0.8 m in height and have diameters of 0.15 to 0.2 m. Timbers can be felt in all places under the silt surrounding the mound and the whole mound moves as if it is a framework of timbers. Several large horizontal timbers were seen running down the mound in a radial arrangement. Timbers are also present at the sides of the mound, but all are obscured by a thin covering of silt. A loose flat horizontal timber *circa* 0.75 m long was raised from the base of the mound on the south side. It is oak and appears to have the remains of an eroded mortice hole on it (Figure 3).

A large horizontal timber is eroding from the south side of the tree-covered island. This section of the mound is eroded and is possibly the ‘vandalism’ noted by Dixon during the 1989 survey (Barber & Crone 1993). The erosion could be the result of activities by fisherman creating a boat noost.

Recommended action

There is no obvious threat to the crannog. The covering of silt provides protection to the core of the mound. Oak timbers survive to heights of 0.80 m without signs of degradation and there was little faunal or floral infestation encountered. No evidence of erosion was encountered other than a section on the southern edge of the tree-covered island. The farm is managed under the ESA scheme and so the land is not fertilised, although the Forestry Commission conifer plantations on the north, south and east shores may have had some impact on the acidification of the loch. Monitoring is not recommended.
Milton Loch 1 (Urr catchment –see Figure 1)

Visibility in the loch was very poor at 0.5-1 m but this is because the algal bloom had just developed in loch. This level of biological activity may be related to run-off from the fields immediately adjacent to the loch where cattle are pastured.

Previous work

A crannog (NX 8388 7188) was revealed in 1953 at the north-western end of Milton Loch, when the loch level was lowered, and was subsequently excavated by Piggott (1955). Structural evidence was recovered in the form of extensive timber framing supporting a single house with a central hearth, a causeway and a possible dock. Finds dating to the 1st and 2nd century AD were obtained alongside two pre-Roman radiocarbon dates (K-1394 2350 ± 100 bp; K-2027 2440 ± 100 bp). The site was dived during the 1989 survey and one pile was sampled for C-14 dating (GU-2648 2080 ± 50 bp).

Underwater observation

The site survives as a tree-covered island measuring 14 m east-west by 16 m. Timbers can be located in the water in all directions from the island. Extensive biological activity in the form of boring organisms, algae and aquatic plants can be seen on the surfaces of all exposed timbers. Around 20 oak piles were seen on the northern and western margins of the site, all of which display evidence of biological degradation. In addition some 40 loose horizontal timbers were found in the water and had presumably eroded off the crannog. All of these timbers were soft and in a poor state of preservation.

Recommended action

Although the site was excavated, only the surface features were recorded and no investigation of the underwater features was done. It is recommended that the exposed timbers be fully surveyed, given that they are under attack. Monitoring is recommended because of what appears to be the active degradation of the site. Access is relatively easy, the crannog sits in 0.5 m of water and can be waded out to from shore, although reeds surround it.

Milton Loch 2 (Urr catchment –see Figure 1)

Previous work

A crannog (NX 8428 7120) was revealed near the south-eastern end of the loch in 1953, when the level of the loch was lowered. The site was dived during the 1989 survey and one pile was sampled for C-14 dating (GU-2647 2060 ± 50 bp).
**Underwater observation**

The crannog appears as a tree-covered island sitting in just 0.5 m of water about 20 m from the south-eastern shoreline. The site is choked by reeds on the eastern (landward) side. The island measures just 8 m in diameter but the site can be felt to be much larger (visibility is virtually nil in the shallow, silty loch). Stones and horizontal timbers can felt under the silt in an oval around the island some 20 m in diameter. All the horizontal timbers observed were subject to the same biological attack noted at Milton Loch 1 with boring worms in abundance. Only one vertical oak pile was observed. The plethora of piles observed in 1973 (NMR record) were certainly not visible during this visit. It is possible that they have eroded away or, more likely, that they lie sealed under the extensive silt layer on the site. The site sits next to the Milton Burn outlet of the loch which may explain why it has been so heavily silted up.

**Recommended action**

Without a boat access is only possible with waders through dense tree-cover along the south-eastern side of loch. However, the level of biological activity noted makes it a viable candidate for monitoring.

**Milton Loch 3 (Urr catchment –see Figure 1)**

**Previous work**

This site was discovered during the 1989 survey (NX 8394 7149). At that time, two piles were sampled for C-14 dating (GU-2645 1470 ± 50 bp; GU-2646 1460 ± 70 bp).

**Underwater observation**

The site sits on a natural outcrop of bedrock on the end of a promontory running from the western side of the loch (NX 8428 7120). It appears above the water as a tree-covered island _circa_ 20 m in diameter. The island shelves away underwater to depths of between 2 and 3 m, ending up with a final diameter of _circa_ 30 m for the mound as a whole. The occurrence of boulders, piles and transverse timbers underwater indicate that the mound is mainly of artificial construction. However, in places boulders sit on natural outcropping bedrock suggesting the artificial mound is an enhancement of a natural feature. Piles were noted on the north-western margins of the site, several of which retained their bark, while several horizontal oak timbers were visible projecting from various parts of the mound. The site is choked with aquatic plants and all the exposed wood was being actively eroded by worms and infested with algae.
Recommended action

As with Milton Loch 2 this is a possible candidate for monitoring because of the evidence for biological activity.

**Milton Loch 4 (Urr catchment –see Figure 1)**

**Previous work**

Dixon noted a possible fourth crannog (NX 8381 7152) during the 1989 survey some 75 m to the west of Milton Loch 3.

**Underwater observation**

The site appears as a tree-covered island located on the same bedrock outcrop as Milton Loch 3. The island is composed of outcropping bedrock and appears to be entirely natural in origin. However, it does have a small length of drystone walling (*circa* 2 m long and 0.8 m high) surviving some four courses high on its southern side. A hearth of unknown antiquity (though recently used) is indicated on the island by two long flat stones. Other than this the island is featureless. It is not considered to be a crannog site, and is not considered further.

**Recommended action**

None.

**Loch Urr (Urr catchment –see Figure 1)**

**Previous work**

The remains of a drystone castle on Rough Island were reported in 1787. Several dug-out canoes were reportedly found near the north-west outlet of the loch in the early 20th century.

**Underwater observation**

Rough Island (NX 7625 8449) is a roughly boat-shaped island, measuring 53 m by 25 m, which is encircled by the tumbled remains of a drystone wall surviving up to 1 m high in places and varying in width from 1.5 to 2.8 m (Figure 4). Around 20 m to the east is a second featureless island measuring *circa* 18 m across. Both islands appear to be artificial and constructed from boulders averaging *circa* 0.4 to 0.5 m in diameter although large boulders up to 1 m across appear to make up part of the structure as well. Underwater observation revealed that both of the islands seen above water are part of the same stone
boulder structure. The site is connected to the shore by a submerged stone causeway, some 6 – 8 m wide, on its south-eastern side. No mortar or worked stone was found underwater which supports an Early Historic date or earlier for the wall on the island.

No organic deposits or timbers were located anywhere on the site. However, the remains of a logboat was found lying at a depth of 2.7 m where the stone mound met the loch bed on the south-western edge of the site. The logboat fragment is made of oak and is 1.6 m long and 0.7 m wide with a draft of keel estimated to be circa 0.45 m. The hull is 100-150 mm thick and appears to be lying on one side. There is a clear groove tooled down the middle of the hull and a small circular hole had been cut near the lip of what was taken to be the prow. It is possible that this fragment is the remains of a large trough rather than a logboat, although the curved profile of the object is more suggestive of the latter.

**Recommended action**

This site is not a candidate for monitoring due to the absence of timbers and organics on the site. The moorland around the loch is used for sheep pasture and there are no obvious
threats to the site. However, it is recommended that the logboat is recorded in more detail and sampled for C-14 dating.

**Lochrutton Loch (Urr catchment – see Figure 1)**

*Previous work*

The upper levels of the site were excavated in 1901 and 1902 and were found to consist of a circular mound of earth resting on a foundation of logs. All finds were of medieval type. The site was dived during the 1989 survey and two piles were sampled for C-14 dating, the results confirming the medieval dating of the site (GU-2639 820 ± 50 bp; GU-2640 830 ± 50 bp).

*Underwater observation*

The site sits in the middle of Lochrutton Loch and consists of a tree-covered island some 24 m in diameter (NX 8983 7299). Underwater the island expands to a mound some 40 m in diameter at a depth of 3 m. The mound consists of small boulders (0.3 – 0.4 m across on average), horizontal timbers (visible under stones on sides of the site in various places) and vertical piles. The latter are found mainly in concentrations around the site margins where the mound meets silt bed but some were also detected within the mound itself. Several of the structural oak piles were over 0.4 m in diameter. Alder piles were also recognised but there were no indication of other species present. Timbers were especially abundant on the southern and eastern sides of the mound. Here a mortised timber was seen with three holes cut along one edge with fragmentary remains of the cross-piece in one of the holes. Along the eastern side of the site where the mound meets the loch bed, two parallel oak timbers, *circa* 2.5 m long and 0.3 m wide, were seen which appeared to have been hollowed on the insides. A hole *circa* 30 mm wide had been bored through the narrower end of one of the timbers. These timbers may represent the remains of wooden troughs.

The crannog is relatively well-protected by deep deposits of silt. Where timbers are exposed algae is growing on them but there is no evidence of major organic degradation. Although visibility in the loch was around 0.5 to 0.7 m this was due to silt in suspension rather than biological activity or water quality. Freshwater oysters were found living all over the site suggesting good water quality in the loch. This is despite rumours from local people of slurry emptied into some of burns draining into the loch.

An island 110 m to the west of the crannog and marked on the 1:10,000 map as Dutton’s Cairn was inspected. It was found to entirely natural (a combination of boulders and gravel) and seems to be most likely of glacial origin.

*Recommended action*

Monitoring is not recommended. Organic deposits on the crannog appear to be well protected.
Loch Arthur *(New Abbey catchment –see Figure 1)*

**Previous work**

The crannog (NX 9028 6898) was first noted in 1874 when the level of Loch Arthur was exceptionally low. Small exploratory excavations carried out in 1966-7 revealed possible medieval structures (Williams 1971). The site was dived during the 1989 survey and two piles were sampled for C-14 dating, the results indicating Iron Age activity (GU-2643 2260 ± 50 bp; GU-2644 2240 ± 60 bp). A fragment of a dug-out canoe reported during the 1996-7 work could not be re-located in August 1992 during diving by Niall Gregory.
Underwater observations

Diving revealed that the majority of this site lies underwater and is much larger than the tree-covered island (on which mature oak and beech trees are growing) visible from the shore.

The island lies off-centre over a much larger mound, which is entirely underwater (Figure 5). These two structures are distinguished by their composition, the upper mound, i.e. the island, being built primarily of large boulders and soil, the lower mound of timber, organic deposits and stones. The lower mound extends to the east of the tree-covered island further out into the loch and is at least 25 m in diameter. It’s upper surface lies only 0.3 m below the water level.

Both horizontal and vertical timbers are visible throughout the lower mound. Horizontals appear to be arranged radially from the centre of the site. Around the western base of the mound circa 30 piles were noted, eroded flat to the loch bed (circa 0.13 - 0.2 m diameter). Rich organic deposits, consisting of bracken, twigs, comminuted plant matter, etc were exposed over the upper surface of the lower mound.

Most of the exposed timbers are covered in vegetation which appears to be accelerating their erosion. The condition of the timbers varies from freshly exposed timber bearing no vegetal growth, timbers covered in vegetation, to timber in advanced stages of decay.

Recommended action

Visibility in Loch Arthur was up to 3 m, the best encountered during the survey. Water quality is good, the land around the crannog being managed organically by the Camphill Community. Despite these conditions, organic deposits and timbers on the site are actively being exposed and plant growth and other factors appears to be causing the degradation of exposed timbers. Also erosion, possibly caused by wave fetch is exposing a section on the south-eastern margin of the site where horizontal logs are visible.

The site should be fully surveyed to better reveal the relationship between what appears to be an earlier, Iron Age, crannog and the upper, possibly medieval crannog. A digital terrain model of the site may provide information on how much of the site has already been eroded. The exposed section should be recorded and placed within the context of a more detailed survey of the site.

There appears to be active decay on the lower mound, possibly because its upper deposits lie in very shallow water, in the photosynthesising zone. Wave action may be uncovering deposits on which vegetation can then develop, causing the break-up of the timbers. Monitoring is therefore recommended. It is feasible in terms of both access to the crannog and water visibility.
Barhapple Loch (Bladnoch catchment – see Figure 1)

Previous work

The crannog (NX 2595 5915) was recognised in 1878 when Barhapple Loch was drained, and was then excavated in 1880 and 1884. The site consisted of a row of oak piles enclosing an area, circa 50 m by 40 m, within which were ‘mainly .. piles and platforms of wood with rough stones at one point’. The crannog was reportedly connected to the northern and eastern shores by gangways on piles. The few finds recovered included a cannel coal ring, two broken shale rings, a spoon-like wooden implement, hammer and grinding stones, and fragments of a canoe and paddle.

Underwater observations

The loch is situated in an area of rough pasture. No natural streams feed into the loch but ditches cut from surrounding higher land on all sides drain into it. The loch is very shallow, rarely more than circa 0.8 m, and the loch bed is covered by a layer of silt at least 1 m deep, through which the loch bed itself could not be detected.

There were no surface indications as to the location of the crannog. A circular area of dense reeds proved to be nothing more than that. The crannog lies some 20 m south of the dense reeds. Due to poor visibility it was impossible to discern the full extent or the structure of the crannog. There appears to be no clear mound, the site manifesting itself as an area which was more firm and compact than the surrounding soft loch silts, with piles, horizontals and a few stones scattered across that area. The loch bed around the site was very soft with silts up to 1.5 m deep suggesting that the site has silted up so much that the mound is disguised. Over 40 piles were located, the majority of which were oak. Non-oak piles were also identified and the horizontal timbers scattered amongst the piles also appeared to be non-oak. In many places horizontal timbers were observed with vertical piles at either end. Many of the timbers were in a poor state of preservation, with a spongy consistency. Much of the site lies only 0.5 m deep meaning that small changes in loch level could have drastic effects on the surviving timbers. It was noted that timbers in areas which were very shallow (0.3 m deep and less) were choked with aquatic plants and algae presumably because they are well within the light zone for photosynthesis to occur. Significantly, sapwood was present on a number of timbers projecting above the level of the silt. Sapwood, the outer growth rings on oak, is very susceptible to decay and biological attack and its presence indicates that this exposure was relatively recent.

Only a few oak piles were located which could be said to belong to the postulated wooden causeway, mentioned by Munro, running to the east side of the shore. It is likely that much of the causeway is now under the soft silt of the loch. Two oak piles were sampled for C-14 dating.
**Recommended action**

The main threats to the site appear to be the combined effects of the fluctuating water table and the shallowness of the water. Access to the site itself is only possible by boat. The loch bed is too silty for waders. However, loch levels could be monitored as the loch can be easily accessed on its eastern side. A survey of the timbers present in the loch is recommended as a preliminary to monitoring the ongoing erosion of the sapwood on the exposed timbers.

**Dernaglar Loch (Bladnoch catchment – see Figure 1)**

**Previous work**

The existence of an artificial island (NX 2640 5810) and a dug-out canoe were reported around 1855 by Munro. Significantly, Munro states that the island was not sufficiently exposed to admit investigation which implies he did not actually see the site himself. The site has never been seen since this report despite being visited by the Ordnance Survey in 1976 when the loch had been partially drained.

**Underwater observations**

A snorkel search around the loch failed to produce any evidence of a crannog. If it does exist it is under silt. The silt is deep throughout, except on the east side which is dominated by outcropping bedrock and boulders. It seems unlikely that there was ever a crannog in this loch.

**Recommended action**

None.

**White Loch of Ravenstone (Bladnoch catchment – see Figure 1)**

**Previous work**

The island (NX 4017 4404) was excavated in 1884, revealing a timber substructure below the stone buildings visible on the surface. These buildings were re-surveyed in early 2002 (Lowe & Dalland 2002) prior to a programme of tree-felling on the island.

**Recent observations**

At the time of the visit, vegetation around loch was impenetrable. Dense alder carr lines the northern shore of the loch while the south, west and east shores are lined with a dense, scrub woodland of willow, oak and some pine, which was very wet and boggy underfoot.
and virtually impassable. The loch was fringed with a deep halo of phragmites reeds. Consequently, the crannog could not be located on the day of the survey.

**Recommended action**

The difficulties of access experienced suggest that this could not be a prime candidate for a monitoring exercise.

**White Loch of Myrton (Bladnoch catchment – see Figure 1)**

*Previous work*

The existence of a crannog (NX 3585 4328) towards the south end of the White Loch of Myrton was noted by Munro (1895). Munro reports that the island was surrounded by piles, and constructed of layers of furze, faggots, brushwood and fern.

*Underwater observations*

The island itself was tree-covered and was not explored. Visibility in the water was nil and so all observations are based on feel. Underwater, the crannog consisted of a stone-covered mound surrounded by thick reeds on the southern and western sides.

On the northern and eastern side of the island was a dense concentration of small vertical piles, over 100 of which were located (Figure 7). Two piles featuring clear tool facets were sampled and identified as ash (Figure 6). The piles varied greatly in diameter from 0.1 m to 0.4 m and appeared to be regularly spaced about 1 m apart. Most of the tops of the piles lay flush with the loch bed, occasionally sitting proud by about 0.2 m. The two sampled piles measure only 0.46 and 0.50 m respectively in height, suggesting that the better part of their height has already decayed away. Bivalve tracks around the top of these piles suggest that freshwater molluscs are the cause of their destruction. The piles appear to have been inserted into the loch bed in a halo around the stone mound. No piles were found within the stone mound itself.
Recommended action

Monitoring is not recommended. The organic component of the crannog has already eroded away to the level of the loch bed and/or the crannog mound where it appears to be well protected.

Whitefield Loch (Bladnoch catchment – see Figure 1)

Previous work

A crannog, known as Dorman’s Island, was noted in the south-eastern corner of Whitefield Loch in 1873.

Underwater observations

Dorman’s Island lies off the southern shore of the loch (NX 2375 5502). It is a tree-covered island about 50 m in diameter. The crannog is a clearly defined mound of stones with sides shelving to 2.5 m underwater (Figure 8). The existence of a causeway, 1.5 m wide, to the south shore was confirmed and consists of medium-sized boulders.

A ring of stones *circa* 8-10 m in extent encircles the island, a feature frequently found on Highland crannogs. Both vertical and horizontal timbers were visible among the stones. Oak piles were also visible in the surrounding silts, projecting up to 1 m above the
silt levels. Timbers were particularly exposed on the north-west side of the island, possibly because of wave action in this area.

Eroding sections were located at three points on the north-west side of the boulder mound. The stratigraphy exposed in these sections consisted of a layer of stones over inorganic silt and grit which in turn lay over rich organic deposits consisting of structural timbers, plant matter, dung, twigs, woodchips, charcoal, hazelnut shells, etc. In at least one section vertical piles could be seen driven through horizontal members. The north-west side was the most exposed part of the site and the impact of wave fetch was particularly severe on this side when the wind was in a north-westerly direction. Erosion on this side could ultimately undermine the large trees growing on the island, causing more damage to the archaeology.
There is extensive biological activity on the site. *In situ* timbers are heavily infested by freshwater mollusca and other biota; the tops of the two sampled non-oak piles had been eaten away by mollusca.

**Recommended action**

Monitoring at this site is strongly recommended because of the evidence for active biological degradation and recent erosion. The exposed sections on the north-west side of the crannog should be fully recorded and sampled, and a strategy should be developed to prevent further erosion on this side.

---

**Barlockhart Loch** *(Luce catchment – see Figure 1)*

**Previous work**

The crannog is located on the western edge of Barlockhart Loch (NX 2047 5631), in land which is now drained. It was examined by Wilson in the late 19th century who reported two circular foundations of stone and a stone causeway, and found two querns and two spindlewhorls. The site was located again during the 1989 survey and coring recorded wood, burnt bone, charcoal and plant matter below the surface.

**Recent observations**

The area where the crannog is supposedly located, on the western side of the loch, is overgrown with willow carr, sedge and tall grasses. A circular area 10 m in diameter was only just distinguishable from the surrounding land by a slight rise in ground level and a modest change in vegetation cover with grasses more predominant than sedges. If this is indeed the location of the crannog then it lies some 10 - 15 m east of the break in slope which defines the old shoreline and is some 25 – 30 m west of the modern shoreline.

**Recommended action**

The main threat to the site appears to be a seasonally fluctuating water table, drainage into the loch coming off the steeply sloping pastureland around the loch. As one of the few ‘drained’ crannogs which retains organic deposits (see Barber & Crone 1993, 527) it is a worthwhile candidate for monitoring. The site is easily accessible. However the location and full extent of the site would have to be confirmed by coring before monitoring is implemented.
Cults Loch 1 (*Piltanton catchment – see Figure 1*)

*Previous work*

A crannog (NX 1206 6047) formed of stones was recorded in 1872. Staff on the Stair Estates, who own the land, remember that, about 40 years ago, they were able to walk out to the crannog after the loch was temporarily drained. The crannog is a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

*Underwater observations*

The position of the crannog is indicated by a small reedy peat bank, measuring 7.5m north-south by 5.1 m, which lies over the crannog proper. The crannog itself is a large, submerged silty mound, measuring 19.5 m north-south by 17 m, sitting about 2.6 m above the loch bed (Figure 9).

![Figure 9 Cults Loch.](image-url)
Despite conditions of zero visibility, caused by sediment suspension in the water, abundant evidence of structural timbers could be felt occurring under a 1 - 2m layer of silt covering the whole site. Most timbers are horizontal, some lying at angles of *circa* 45°, but are very secure and part of the matrix of the mound. These timbers appear to be a mixture of oak and alder. One burnt timber was noted. The upper part of the mound consists of stones, grit and silt. Two vertical piles were noted off the north-western margins of the mound. One oak and one alder timber featuring a mortise hole were sampled for C-14 dating.

**Recommended action**

There is no evidence of organic decay or erosion, the site is well protected by a thick covering of silt. The main threat to the site is the current drainage of the loch by the landowner. Between two visits to the site, the loch level had dropped by at least 0.3 m. We recommend that the loch level is monitored by the local monument warden.

**Cults Loch 2 (Piltonanton catchment – see Figure 1)**

Wilson had also found beams and stakes along the shore of the loch and in looking for these features this possible site was found during the 1989 survey (NX 1190 6062). It was described as a low, grassy mound lying in the marshy ground on the north-western corner of the loch. Coring at the time indicated that it was probably a natural feature and it could not be located during the 2002 survey.

**Cults Loch 3 (Piltonanton catchment – see Figure 1)**

Cults Loch 3 is located on a small promontory projecting into the northern shore of the loch (NX 1203 6058). Wilson had observed beams and stakes along the shore of the loch and Murray had seen timbers around the promontory. Coring in 1989 produced charcoal. The promontory is flat and featureless, and despite the lowered water levels (see above) no timbers were observed.

**Recommended action**

The area should be monitored by the local Monument Warden.
Black Loch, Castle Kennedy; Heron Isle (Piltanton catchment – see Figure 1)

Previous work

The existence of a crannog was reported after the excavation of an earth and stone mound, circa 20 m in diameter, in the middle of Heron Isle about 1870-1. Objects recovered include a glass bangle of the 1st or 2nd century AD, part of the rim of a cast bronze vessel, a bone comb of the early 3rd century AD, and two 17th century coins.

Underwater observations

The ‘crannog’ reported by Munro now lies high and dry on the middle of Heron Isle (NX 1139 6118), a large island covered in trees (sycamore, holly, and varied woodland). The earth and stone mound (circa 20 m diameter) interpreted as a crannog has been hollowed out, by excavation and appears now as five mounds of roughly circular shape sitting around a hollowed out centre (Figure 10).

Figure 10 Heron Isle, Black Loch, Castle Kennedy.

The island that this mound sits on is some 45 m by 30 m and roughly oval. It is comprised of boulders, circa 0.3 - 0.4 m diameter, and may therefore be of man-made origin. The margin of the boulders is 10 m out from the island and disappears into silt at 3-4 m depth. Timbers are present amongst the boulders in the margins but there are no clear structural timbers; no verticals were seen and the horizontals encountered were loose suggesting they may simply be collapse from the woodland on the island.

It remains to be proven if the feature excavated in 1871 can be confidently classed as a crannog as it is unclear whether it was ever surrounded by water. The larger island on
which the excavated mound sits does seem to be at least partly artificial in origin and can therefore be considered a crannog. The fact that the material recovered from the excavated mound dated to the 1st – 2nd centuries AD and later may suggest that the larger unexcavated island dates to the prehistoric period.

Two further islands in Black Loch were examined and although both were found to have been artificially enhanced it was thought that was related to an extensive landscaping programme carried out by Lord Stair in the 19th century in an effort to create areas for fishing.

Recommended action
No organics were encountered and there are no visible threats. This is not a suitable candidate for monitoring.

Archaeological Observations
During the course of the assessment project a number of interesting observations were made regarding the nature of the crannog sites found in the study areas, which have a bearing on the archaeological interpretation of the site type more generally. At this point, before any systematic survey and recording has been fully initiated in the area, little more than preliminary suggestions can be made. However, it may be noted that the sites examined were seen to display features that would complicate and blur previously held perceptions of the typical crannog site type in this south-western region.

Munro (1882) was the first to introduce a basic grouping system of crannog ‘types’ based on his investigative excavations carried out on drained sites in the nineteenth century. He established the category of the ‘packwerk’ crannog, constituting an artificially created islet, typically composed of peat and brushwood deposits, that provided the basis for a timber superstructure and suggested that it was this form which characterised the South-West of Scotland. This variant has traditionally been held in contrast to the stone and boulder mound types more typically encountered in Highland regions north of the Forth-Clyde isthmus since this time (Morrison 1985). However, it was noted during the course of the current project that many of the sites examined comprised a substantial stone element, such that they would be difficult to separate on constructional grounds from the highland boulder sites. Furthermore, it was observed that on several sites (namely those where eroding sections were encountered - Loch Arthur, Whitefield Loch) deposits very similar in nature to those encountered in the course of underwater excavation of the highland site at Oakbank, Loch Tay, were to be seen (Dixon 1981, 19). These included woodchips and hazelnut shells within matrices of comminuted plant and wooden material. It seems clear that the lack of basic underwater survey in the south-west of the country has masked important characteristics of crannog sites that may only be observed below the water level.
Little can be taken from these initial observations beyond an indication that the previously held type boundaries may be far less distinct than has been recognised. It is clear, however, that further research involving proper recording of submerged deposits is required. Since they bear so directly on issues of taphonomy and dating, such studies will be necessary before the chronology of multi-phase sites such as Loch Arthur, where clear horizons of occupation in the prehistoric and medieval periods are evident, may be correctly established.

**Future work**

The survey has identified crannogs in 6 lochs as candidates for a future monitoring programme: Milton Loch, Loch Arthur, Whitefield Loch, Barhapple Loch, Cults Loch and Barlockhart.

The reasons for their selection is varied. In the case of the crannogs in Milton Loch extensive biological activity appears to be actively degrading the exposed timbers. The loch is a designated SSSI which means that certain activities around the loch are prohibited. It is not clear what is causing enhanced biological activity in this loch. It is recommended that one of these crannogs be selected for monitoring.

Biological degradation is also a cause for concern in both Whitefield Loch and in Loch Arthur. In the latter this may be occurring because water quality is good and light is able to penetrate deeper into the loch, enabling photosynthetic activity. The top of the lower mound lies only *circa* 0.30 m below the surface of the water and organic deposits are clearly visible. It is not clear why these organic deposits are being actively exposed, although wave action may be responsible. Wave action certainly appears to be responsible for localised erosion on Dorman’s Island, in Whitefield Loch.

Although much of the crannog in Barhapple Loch appears to be protected by deep silts, freshly exposed sapwood around the base of erosion cones on the oak piles indicates that the silts are being actively disturbed. It is thought that this may be caused by the shallowness of the water, allowing wave action to disturb the silts. Water levels should be monitored, as well as the erosion cones to see if they increase.

Loch levels in Barlockhart and Cults Loch should also be monitored, together with the condition of the surviving organics. The location and full extent of the crannog at Barlockhart should be established through coring, which will also provide a record of the nature of the surviving deposits. There is particular cause for concern at Cults Loch as the landowner is actively draining the loch. The loch was apparently drained 40 years ago which raises doubts over the condition of the organic deposits. Certainly, the oak timbers sampled were very eroded. In any case, loch levels and the effects of changes on the organics present at both sites should be monitored.

Work is now focusing on developing a monitoring system suitable for use on submerged structures and monitoring programmes which will record external variables such as loch levels, local weather conditions and water chemistry (Henderson & Crone 2002b). The nature and scope of the monitoring programme has not yet been determined but the 6 selected lochs will now form the focus for future fundraising efforts and the development of community-based projects. The monitoring programme will necessarily be a long-term venture and, in order to ensure its success it will be essential to involve the local community in its development and implementation.
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ROMAN AND NATIVE IN DUMFRIESSHIRE
by Allan Wilson
44 Princes Drive, Harrow HA1 1XH

Summary

Dumfriesshire in the Roman Iron Age was possibly the least decentralised area of south-west Scotland with much of its territory probably occupied by north-western Brigantes embracing septs such as the Anavionenses of Annandale. Few Roman finds and none of outstanding quality on native sites imply at least indifference and at most hostility to Rome. Rome probably first conquered Dumfriesshire in 72-73 AD when Cerialis subdued the northern Brigantian rebel Venutius and his allies. During the reign of Trajan, Anavionenses may have been conscripted into the Roman army serving possibly in Germany. Early in the 2nd century AD Dumfriesshire lay outside a new Tyne-Solway frontier subsequently delineated by Hadrian’s Wall. The particular strengthening of the western defences of the Wall anticipated a northern threat from Dumfriesshire and beyond. The intense early Antonine Roman military grip of Dumfriesshire following reincorporation into the Empire, and the probable destruction of Birrens by Anavionenses, indicate significant unrest in the area.

Following Roman withdrawal, native squatters occupied at least two Dumfriesshire Roman sites and may have been involved in Roman arrangements for frontier security, though 3rd/4th century AD Roman material has so far been found on only two native sites of uncertain date. There are no Latin inscribed stones indicating links with Romano-British Christianity though there may have been early British churches at Eccles and Ecclefechan and early Christian cemeteries at Burnswark and Trohoughton. The use of Roman masonry in early church building at Hoddom appears purely functional though Roman deposits in early levels at Brydekirk and Hoddom may commemorate Romano-British Christian origins. There is little evidence in Dumfriesshire, however, of affinity for Roman civilisation itself.

Introduction

Divergent perspectives on Romanisation have stimulated greater awareness of the diversity of Roman and Iron Age culture and terms such as ‘Roman’, ‘Celt’ and even ‘Briton’, no longer convey instantly recognisable homogeneous cultural stereotypes (Wilson 2001, 73-74). The new culture emerging from Romano-Native contact showed elements of continuity and discontinuity and cannot be adequately defined in terms exclusively Roman or native (Woolf 1997). There is need to reassess how we identify groups and individuals in the Iron Age and how Romano-Native contact changed Roman and native perceptions of themselves and each other (Hill 2001).

Romanisation was a two-way process of exchange initiated by Rome through patronage and rewards for services rendered. On conquest Rome replaced undesirable native rulers with their own appointees. All approved native leaders would have used Roman patronage to advance personal wealth and status. It should be remembered,
however, that Rome’s formal dealings were with the chosen elite not the population at large though conscription and taxation probably affected all. The Roman Empire was a meeting place generating new ideas affecting culture and technology which in turn contributed to political, social and economic change within native society. Although the Roman occupation of southern Scotland in Flavian and Antonine periods was thorough, the area was never fully Romanised. It was effectively a *Limesvorland*, a frontier area under Roman military surveillance, where the civilisation of Rome was the military culture of the army (James 2001).

Archaeological material and palynological research are essential aids in assessing the relationship between Roman and native but the material requires cautious handling. Finds are often unstratified whether unearthed by excavation, field walking or metal detection. A Roman find on a native site does not in itself imply either Roman sympathy or antipathy. The processes by which Roman material reached native sites were complex. Some finds may have been direct gifts or booty or goods exchanged with other communities, but other finds may have reached native sites by more indirect processes of trade and supply through middle men, *conductores, negotiatores* and *publicani* (Whittaker 1989, 69-74). Trade cycles and fluctuations in the production of Roman goods such as pottery (Going 1992), affected availability and can distort the archaeological record on certain sites at particular times.

Dating native sites by Roman finds may obscure pre-Roman and post-Roman occupation and Roman finds may not even be as precise a means of dating within the Roman period as sometimes thought. Roman material whether coins, pottery, glass or metalwork could have a long life, eg Republican *denarii* of Mark Antony persisted in circulation up to the reign of Probus, 276-82 AD (Robertson 1974B, 19) and some material was recycled for further use (Wilson 1996, 1; Hunter 2001A, 301). Late 1st century AD Roman material could therefore survive into the 2nd century AD and beyond and some Roman material survived into Early Historic and Medieval times. Roman deposits on later Christian sites at Brydekirk (ND 3/1) and Hoddom (ND 7/3 & 4) may commemorate Romano-British Christian origins but reliquary theories do not adequately account for all survivals (Wilson 1996,1). The term ‘residual’ is preferable to ‘reliquary’ (Hunter 2001A, 292). There is a long history of finds looted from Roman sites for antiquarian or utilitarian purposes. Stones looted from Birrens were preserved in stately homes such as Burnfoot House (HD 3) or Hoddom Castle (HD 9), or used for building and repairing local dykes, roads, walls, etc (HD 9 & ID 25).

Research on archaeological material depends on accuracy in describing and attributing finds and recording the circumstances of discovery. There may not be detailed records and finds may no longer be available for examination. Thousands of recorded finds from excavation, field walking and metal detection on Roman sites in Dumfriesshire, await
analysis and publication. Significant recent discoveries are referred to in the Inventory where relevant. The term Romano-Native embraces material common to Roman and native sites and traditionally recognised categories are respected. Tabular presentation is avoided which may obscure or ignore uncertainties of discovery or attribution. Sites are arranged alphabetically dependent on location and numbered within the body of the text according to the Inventory. Illustrated finds are asterisked.

THE ROMAN IRON AGE IN DUMFRIESSHIRE

Political Geography and Social Structure

Dumfriesshire lay within the Solway-Clyde province of the Scottish Iron Age sharing with Cumbria the common culture of the Solway Plain (Piggott 1966, 4-5, fig 1, regions 37 & 30 respectively). It is not clear from the contemporary Roman geographer Ptolemy how far north the territory of the Brigantes extended owing to inexactitude in mapping but, as most commentators have observed, it probably extended into Dumfriesshire (Birley 2001, 17 with select bibliography). Brigantian settlement archaeology north and south of the Solway had much in common (Higham and Jones 1975, 27-34; Jones and Walker 1983; RCAHMS 1997, 171). Differences may be detected, however, west and north-west of Dumfriesshire in Galloway and Strathclyde where there were Roman Iron Age brochs and crannogs so far undetected in Dumfriesshire and where the population appears decentralised (Wilson 1997 & 2001). Larger sites at Burnswark (ND 4), Castle O’er (ND 6) and Tynron Doon (RCAHMS 1920, 207-8, no 609; Williams 1971) suggest stronger hierarchical groupings in Dumfriesshire though the last site awaits detailed excavation.

Inscribed and sculptured stones from Birrens provide clear hints of Brigantian identity. Brigantia is portrayed as Minerva on a 2nd century AD relief (RD 2/1) and there may be two further representations of the goddess (RD 2/2-3). There is at least one horned head relief (ID 7/1) representing a European cult particularly widespread in northern Brigantia at Alnwick, Benwell, Carvoran, Chesters, Corbridge, Lanchester and Netherby (Ross 1960, 16-18, 1961 and 1967, 81-83 & 127-67). The worship of Maponus is implied on a dedication by Cistumucus from locus Maponi (RD 2/4), a place-name inferred from the Ravenna Cosmography (Richmond and Crawford 1949, 15, 19 & 39), probably Lochmaben (Radford 1954; Rivet and Smith 1979, 395-96), though the name survives also in the Clochmabenstane at Gretna (Crone 1983). Dumfriesshire thus probably hosted a central place for Maponus whose worship was widespread in Brigantia at Ribchester, Corbridge, Brampton and Vindolanda (Birley 1954; RIB 583, 1120-22 & 2063; Britannia 2, 1971, 291, no 12). The Romans identified local gods with their own, the interpretatio Romana, eg Brigantia with Minerva and Victory and Maponus with Apollo.

---

2 David Breeze informs me that Historic Scotland is planning to publish detailed excavation reports on several Roman forts in southern Scotland where final publication has been delayed.

3 In northern England Brigantia was also associated with Victory (RIB 627 & 628; Joliffe 1941, 40).
The *Brigantes* of Dumfriesshire were bounded in the north-west and west by the pro-Roman *Damonii* and *Novantae* (regions 35 and 36) and in the north and east by the *Selgovae* generally regarded as anti-Roman (region 34). Tacitus implies the *Brigantes* were the largest tribe in Britain (*Agricola* 17.1) with territory probably extending from the Peak District into southern Scotland (Clarke 1939, 81-82; Hartley and Fitts 1988, 4-6). Septs included the *Anavionenses* of Annandale with their probable centre at Burnswark (Rivet and Smith 1979, 249-50; Rivet 1982; Birley 2001) and further south the *Carvetii* (Rivet and Smith 1979, 301-2) whom it is claimed also extended into Dumfriesshire (Hartley and Fitts 1988, 3). Venutius, the divorced consort of queen Cartimandua, led a powerful anti-Roman faction in Brigantia in the mid first century AD supported by allies probably from north-west England and southern Scotland.4

In addition to the larger sites mentioned above, other sizable hillforts in Dumfriesshire such as Dinwoodie Hill in Annandale and Bailiehill in Eskdale (RCAHMS 1997, nos 639 & 651), may have been of lesser rank within the native hierarchy though scale is not necessarily commensurate with status. The majority of Iron Age settlement sites were enclosed or unenclosed, curvilinear, palisaded, rectilinear or scooped and most are unexcavated (Jobey 1971; Truckell 1984; RCAHMS 1997, 118-67; Gregory 2001B, 36-38, figs 3.1 & 3.2). Some excavated sites lack precise dating owing to limitations in radiocarbon 14 dating and the absence of chronologically sensitive material.

Fieldwork and excavation have added significantly to our knowledge of major Roman Iron Age sites in Dumfriesshire. Burnswark hillfort (ND 4) was occupied at this time with slighted defences (Jobey 1978) but the western sector may have been enclosed by a contemporary perimeter (RCAHMS 1997, 130). Castle O’er (ND 6) was occupied in the early centuries AD, the centre of a system of linear earthworks (RCAHMS 1997, 78-82 and 280) possibly formalised under Roman surveillance. To the south, a similar undated system of earthworks accompanied the settlement on Craighousesteads Hill (NY 2375 8519; RCAHMS 1997, 47-50, figs 43-44, no 674).

There are numerous rectilinear settlements in Dumfriesshire (RCAHMS 1997, 149-51). Excavated sites include Albie Hill (ND 1; Strachan 1999), Blackettlees (Truckell 1958), Craigmuiue (Clarke 1952), Carronbridge (ND 5) and Hayknowes (Gregory 2001A). The first and last sites are probably Iron Age/Roman Iron Age. The next two are undated. Enclosure A at Carronbridge had three Iron Age periods but Roman Iron Age occupation only in period III, phases 1b-c & 2, when round houses of ring-groove construction were built (Johnston 1994, 279-83). A similar rectilinear structure was occupied at this time at Rispain in Galloway (Wilson 2001, 105, W7) and there were also rectilinear Romano-British sites in Cumbria, (Higham and Jones 1983, 97; Bewley 1994, 24-51) and Northumbria (Jobey 1960, 1973 & 1977). The proximity of some rectilinear enclosures to Roman sites prompted the suggestion that ‘given the ephemeral nature of Roman occupation,’ Roman sites may have been deliberately located near concentrations of native settlement (Johnston 1994, 284). Roman occupation in Flavian and Antonine

---

4 On the politics of Brigantia at this time see Turnbull and Fitts 1988.
periods, however, was not ephemeral and the sites at Butterhole Brae, NX 9364 8447, Lag’s Tomb, NX 9276 8324, West Gallaberry, NX 9627 8272, and Whitespots, NX 9027 8871, are undated. Roman military influence has also been suggested in the design of rectilinear settlements but their life span was long, Iron Age to the Middle Ages, and many factors may have influenced their evolution.

The majority of settlements in Dumfriesshire are curvilinear. A distinctive type is the scooped settlement, formerly described as ‘birrens’, with a wall enclosing a sunken floor (RCAHMS 1997, 144-49). Excavated Roman Iron Age scooped settlements include Boonies (ND 2) and Uppercleugh (ND 13). Boonies is partially scooped with its enclosure bank erected probably in the first century AD (Jobey 1975) though the original settlement may be earlier (RCAHMS 1997, 160). Roman Iron Age occupation commenced with one house followed by others in seven structural phases. Uppercleugh had an internal bank and entrance leading to a cobbled yard with a single ring-grooved house of diameter 7.5 m (Terry 1993). An oval enclosure excavated at Woodend Farm, Johnstonebridge, was built in the Late Pre-Roman Iron Age with occupation continuing in the Roman Iron Age. It consisted of two banks and internal enclosures with round houses and livestock pens (Banks 2002).

The postulated religious centre of Maponus at Lochmaben awaits archaeological confirmation but excavation at Over Rig (ND 10) suggests a Roman Iron Age ceremonial centre may have been located in Upper Eskdale. The site formed a natural amphitheatre containing round houses which showed no evidence of domestic habitation but could possibly have accommodated priests and their religious accoutrements. The hoards at Bailie Knowe (HD 1), Lochar Moss (HD 10), Middlebie Moss (HD 12) and probably Burnswark Moss (ID 8) are probably votive deposits. Simpler deposits on native sites probably include the sickle blade from a pit at Albie Hill (ND 1/1; Strachan 1999, 13) and the trumpet brooch from the penannular ditch at Carronbridge (ND 5/1; Johnston 1994, 250; Hunter 2001A, 301).

There is no single morphological model for the evolution of Iron Age settlement in Dumfriesshire. There may have been some form of political and social hierarchy with larger sites at Burnswark, Castle O’er and possibly Tynron Doon mediating their authority through lesser hillforts to smaller settlements. Rome would have dealt directly with native leaders and on withdrawal continued to monitor their activities. Following Roman withdrawal, native huts were erected within the Roman fortlet at Burnswark (RCAHMS 1997, 181-2, fig 194 A, B & C) and on a final intervallum road in the Roman fort at Broomholm (JRS 52, 1962, 164). Those at Broomholm indicate occupation in the late 2nd or early 3rd century AD. Perhaps these native squatters were employed by Rome in arrangements for frontier security.

5 On such deposits see Hunter 1997A. On the ritual symbolism of metalworking see Hingley 1997.
6 The ring-groove of building 1 in Enclosure A at Carronbridge produced a radiocarbon 14 date of 140-415 AD but no finds were discovered of immediate post-Roman date (Johnstone 1994, 276-80). Other native enclosures on Roman sites at Dalswinton (Truckell 1984, 201, no 9), Milton (RCAHMS 1997, 175, no 718) and Wardlaw (Truckell 1984, 202, no 24; Maxwell and Wilson 1987, 24) are undated.
**Land Usage and The Iron Age Economy**

The essential Iron Age economy was farming but the Dumfriesshire archaeological database is limited (RCAHMS 1997). Pollen evidence stresses the emphasis on pastoral farming. The relative proportions of cattle, sheep/goat and pig in the Early Iron Age in Dumfriesshire are unknown as is any change during the Roman Iron Age. Recent research indicates the average species proportions in northern England and southern Scotland varied at this time, cattle and sheep constituting c 20%-70% and pig 0-20% but no particular regional trends in animal husbandry were detected (Hambleton 1999, 47). The presence of Roman troops would have had some impact on pastoral farming. Remains of small ox, sheep/goat, pig, pony and deer are recorded from Birrens (Robertson 1975A, 107-8).

The front yard at Boonies was interpreted as a stock yard (Jobey 1975, 138) and a livestock pen at Woodend Farm was associated with structure 13 in block 5 where butchering implements were found (Banks 2002, 237-38 and 258). Linear earthworks at Castle O’er in Upper Eskdale were probably part of a common pastoral regime, a cattle ranch partly divided into a series of enclosed parks at the beginning of the first millennium AD (RCAHMS 1997, 79). This type of regional landscape management, possibly inherited from pre-Roman times, may not have been unique in southern Scotland and may have survived in later systems (Halliday 2002). Such a development in the Roman Iron Age would have been formalised under Roman surveillance and perhaps even initiative. The earthworks and droveway at Craighousesteads Hill south of Castle O’er are undated but could be contemporary though some other linear earthworks are much later (RCAHMS 1997, 47-49). A possible droveway and series of ditches dividing land into irregular enclosures at Hayknowes may be Early Iron Age but the eastern linear boundary postdates the Roman camp ditch (Gregory 2001A, 44, fig 2) indicating its evolution following Roman penetration in the area.

The farming economy of the Iron Age was mixed and agriculture is evidenced by cord rig cultivation. There have been detailed landscape studies of the Solway Plain around Kirkpatrick Fleming, the valley of the Kinnel Water in Upper Annandale, and Upper Eskdale (RCAHMS 1997, 51-93). The primary woodland cover of much of southern Scotland was oak, elm and hazel with subsidiary birch. There was significant woodland clearance in the Early Iron Age c 500 BC and a marked increase in the Late Pre-Roman and Roman Iron Age. Pollen evidence associates this clearance with more intensive farming though some clearance in the Roman Iron Age may reflect Roman military activity (Tipping 1994 and 1995). No woodland regeneration occurs until c 300 AD at Burnfoothill Moss and c 550 AD at Over Rig and Walton Moss though the reasons for this are unknown (RCAHMS 1997, 22).

An Iron Age ard beam was recovered from Whitereed Moss near Lochmaben (DM 1949.51; *Tools and Tillage* II.1, 1972, 64, fig 1; RCAHMS 1997, no 1091 and refs) but the wooden ‘shoulder yoke’ from the Lochar may be neither agricultural nor ancient (UD 6/4). The record of crops from native sites in Dumfriesshire is limited, emmer and spelt wheat at Uppercleuch (Terry 1993, 59), emmer, spelt and club wheat at Carronbridge though mainly from the Roman temporary camp (Johnston 1994, 270), charred grains
mainly of barley at Milton (HM F 1948.275) and emmer, spelt and club wheat and barley, some hulled, at Birrens (DM 1934.77 & 1967.546; Robertson 1975A, 264-65). The bread club wheat may have been a Roman import as at Fox Plantation I and Rispaín in Galloway (Wilson 2001, 80). The Roman army probably supplemented local grain supplies with imports.

Querns imply on-site processing. Fragments of imported Andernach or Niedermendig lava querns were found at Roman Birrens (NMS FP 64, 66 & 67; Anderson 1896, 196; Robertson 1975A, 103), Carzield (DM 1959.100.6 & 12) and Milton (HM F 1946.236 and 1961.29). Fragments of other querns at Birrens may have been manufactured locally (Robertson 1975A, 103). Native querns were found on Iron Age sites. Boonies produced five fragments including three upper beehive (Jobey 1975, 133-34, fig 7), Burnswark hillfort part of a saddle quern, an upper beehive and fragments of an upper and lower rotary quern (Jobey 1978, 94-95, nos 2-44, fig 16/2 & 3), Over Rig part of a rotary quern (RCAHMS 1997, 84) and Woodend Farm remains of a trough quern, two beehives and a quern identified as late Romano-British (Banks 2002, 257-58, ill 14). At least one bun shaped quern was found at the undated site on Camp Hill, Trohoughton (MacKie 1971, 71).

The Iron Age economy was augmented by crafts. Native pottery was found on Iron Age sites at Albie Hill (Strachan 1999, 12-13), Boonies (Jobey, 1975, 135) and Burnswark hillfort (Jobey 1978, 82-83, fig 12/1-5) and Roman Barburgh Mill (RD 1/1) and Birrens (RD 2/7). It is unknown whether glass was manufactured on Iron Age sites. Annular glass beads, Guido 1978, 62-62 & 128-33, group 5A, have been found so far only on native sites, Burnswark hillfort (ND 4/22), Carronbridge Enclosure A (ND 5/4), Castle O’er (ND 6/2) and Mosspeebie (ND 9/1) though some beads may be Roman. A minute yellow disc bead, Guido 1978, 73-76, group 8, from Burnswark South Camp (RD4/3) is native. Globular native glass beads, Guido 1978, type 7(i) and (viii), were found at Birrens (RD 2/20a-b) and Carronbridge Enclosure A (ND 5/5). A fused bead from Burnswark hillfort (ND 4/23) might indicate on-site glass working. Native craftsmen were probably involved in producing Romano-Native glass bangles and beads listed below under Roman and Romano-Native material.

The skill of the Iron Age craftsmen in working copper alloy is exhibited not only in Galloway (Wilson 2001, 81) but also in the Dumfriesshire hoards mentioned above. These hoards are North British in origin. The detection of external influence, eg HD 12/2d, does not imply the presence of immigrant craftsmen in Dumfriesshire (Macgregor 1976, 180) as the owners of such hoards may have amassed them from different markets. The Lochm Moss torc (HD 10/1) exhibits advanced skill in design and technology. The use of zinc suggests Roman influence. Much Iron Age copper alloy metalwork is harness equipment. A one-link bit and at least two derivative three-link bits were found in

7 Cf annular beads of this type from Buiston and Castlehill in Strathclyde (Wilson 1997, 15, MO 6, A/BUI 3 & 4 & MO 20, A/CAS 7); for European distribution maps of Roman annular glass beads with single scrabble/wave see Swift 2000, figs 135 & 136.
8 Cf disc beads of this type from Aitnock, Castlehill and Lochspouts in Strathclyde (Wilson 1997, MO 5, 20 & 40).
10 On British Iron Age harness equipment see Macgregor 1976, 23-51.
Middlebie Moss (HD 12/1a-c) and at least one three-link bit in Burnswark Moss (ID 8/1). A bridle cheek piece with Iron Age muzzle motif was found at Birrens (RD 2/8), quatrefoil and double boss and petal harness mounts at Burnswark hillfort (ND 4/12a-b) and elongated and petal/cruciform strap junctions in Middlebie Moss (HD 12/2a-e). Terrets include a knobbed example at Burnswark hillfort (ND 4/11a), several with grooves at Middlebie Moss (HD 12/3f-k), decorated platform varieties at Birrens (RD 2/18a-c) and Middlebie Moss (HD 12/3e), an undecorated platform example at Birrens (RD 2/18d), three with grooved collars and one with a vertical collar but no grooves at Middlebie Moss (HD 12/3a-c & d) and a possible incipient Donside terret at Broomholm (RD 3/1). Different types of terret may reflect differing tribal preferences (Allason-Jones 1989, 14).

The cauldron from Whitehills (ID 38/1) is a native Battersea type. Natives were probably involved in producing a range of Romano-Native products such as brooches, buckles, button-and-loop fasteners and studs listed below under Roman and Romano-Native material.

Warfare is represented by Brigantian crown sword-hilt guards, Piggott 1950, type IVB at Birrens (RD 2/17), Milton (RD 8/1) and Middlebie Moss (HD 12/4) and possibly type IVA from Dalswinton (RD 6/1). The iron sword blade from Burnswark hillfort could be Roman or native (ND 4/13) but the spearhead does not appear to have been found in the hillfort (Anderson 1899, 249, fig 8). The ‘La Tène III’ sword from the Lochar, however, is probably more recent (UD 6/3). Much ironwork from Dumfriesshire sites is too corroded and fragmentary to permit precise identification.

There is very little evidence for industrial production on native sites in Dumfriesshire. Slag has been found at Albie Hill (Strachan 1999, 12) and Over Rig (Mercer forthcoming) but large fires at Carronbridge Enclosure A were associated with domestic cooking (Johnston 1994, 283). There is little evidence for on-site industrial production at Burnswark hillfort although much of the interior still awaits excavation and a lead ingot discovered there could have been used in metalworking (ND 4/18).

The essential Roman Iron Age economy was farming and Roman occupation must have had some impact on pastoral farming. The demand of the Roman army for cattle products was considerable, milk, beef and hides. Leather was a prime Roman requirement for clothing and tents. The organisation of the landscape at Castle O’er into a large cattle ranch was probably formalised to intensify local stock production and during the Roman Iron Age would have occurred under Roman surveillance if not initiative. There was presumably also some Roman impact on native agriculture but how much surplus was available for Roman consumption is unknown and bread wheat may have been imported. Some kind of political hierarchy is envisaged in the Dumfriesshire Roman Iron Age and the numerous smaller farming settlements may have been integrated into regional structures controlled by larger sites. Rome would have preferred dealing with larger entrepreneurs who co-ordinated the activities of small scale producers. The Iron Age economy was augmented by crafts and although evidence for on-site craft production, glass manufacturing and metalworking, is limited, some native products are of distinctive quality.

11 For the Roman impact on settlement patterns and farming in the southern Solway Plain see Bewley 1994, 74-81.
Roman and Romano-Native material

Roman coins have been found on only two Dumfriesshire native sites, a little worn *denarius* of Domitian (ND 4/1) from Burnswark hillfort and a coin of Constantius II from the undated Thornhill homestead (ND 12/1). Samian ware has been found at Burnswark hillfort, 2nd century AD sherds of Drag 27 and probably Drag 18/31 (ND 4/2-4) and an undated sherd from medieval Brydekirk (ND 3/1). A sherd of Drag 37 from Crofthead (ID 14/1) probably originated from Milton Roman fort. Roman coarse ware was discovered on only two Iron Age sites, sherds of a small bowl and flagon at Boonies (ND 2/1-3) and sherds of bowls or jars, flagons and a mortarium at Burnswark hillfort (ND 4/5-8). A flagon sherd was also found at Crofthead (ID 14/2).

The only Roman iron finds from a native site were from Burnswark hillfort, including a Republican socketed *pilum* (ND 4/14) found on the slope outside the hillfort and nine trilobate tanged arrow-heads (ND 4/15). In addition to iron weapons and ballista balls (ND 4/25), at least one hundred and sixty five lead *glandes* (ND 4/16) were found inside and outside the hillfort, discharged during training exercises or actual warfare. Domestic items include a balanced Romano-British type sickle blade from Albie Hill (ND 1/1) and Great Chesterford cauldron chains from Bailie Knowe (HD 1/1).

A Roman bronze arm purse and disc brooch were discovered in early church foundations at Hoddom (ND 7/3-4). A range of Romano-Native copper alloy brooches, buckles, buttons and fasteners has been found on Roman and native sites. Bow brooches include Dolphin brooches from Birrens (RD 2/10a-b), headstud derivatives from Birrens (RD 2/11a-b), a Langton Down brooch from Milton (RD 8/2), Nauheim derivatives from an unknown location (ID 17/1a-b) and fragments from Birrens (RD 2/10c), Carzield (RD 5/1) and Milton (RD 8/3), all datable to the Roman Iron Age. Penannular brooches, Fowler 1960 type A3(i), of probable Roman Iron Age date, have been found at Roman Barburgh Mill (RD 1/2) and Birrens (RD 2/13) and native Boonies (ND 2/4). Circular disc brooches were found at Birrens (RD 2/14a), Durisdeer (RD 7/1) and Hoddom (ND 7/4), an oval disc brooch at Birrens (RD 2/14b) and a double disc brooch at Carzield (RD 5/2), all of which may be Roman. A knee brooch was found at Birrens (RD 2/12). Trumpet brooches were found at Birrens (RD 2/15a-b), Burnswark hillfort (ND 4/9) and Carronbridge Enclosure A (ND 5/1). A buckle found at Kirkton Glebe (ID24/1) may be from Carzield which yielded a dumb-bell button (RD 5/3). Button-and-loop fasteners, Wild 1970 class 3, have been found at Birrens (RD 2/16b-c), Milton (RD 8/4a-b), Burnswark hillfort (ND 4/10) and Middlebie Moss (HD 12/5a-c) which also produced a looped stud (HD 12/6).

Roman glass from Iron Age sites in Dumfriesshire includes an *intaglio* of Venus Victrix from Burnswark hillfort (ND 4/19). The annular beads mentioned above from Burnswark hillfort (ND 4/22), Carronbridge (ND 5/4) and Castle O’er (ND 6/2) may be Roman.

---

12 The Roman hoard from Burnswark (HD 4) was found in the Roman South Camp not the native hillfort as implied recently (Birley 2001, 18).
13 Burnswark hillfort was excluded from an earlier survey of Roman finds from non-Roman sites as it was considered undefended in the Roman period and the relationship between Roman and native ‘impact’ rather than ‘contact’ (Robertson 1970, 200). There was Roman Iron Age occupation, however, and a possible western defensive perimeter (RCAHMS 1997, 130).
14 On Iron Age and Romano-British brooches see Hattatt 1985 and on those occurring in Roman military contexts Allason-Jones 1989, 15 and Snape 1993.
Melon beads, not present in Britain before the Roman Iron Age, were found on Roman and native sites, being popular with Roman soldiers who wore them as amulets affording protection against the ‘evil eye’ (Allason-Jones 1991, 1; Puttock 2002, 95). The highest quality deep blue glass melon beads were found at Roman Broomholm (RD 3/3a-b), Dalswinton (RD 6/2) and Milton (RD 8/5b & e) and native Castle O’er (ND 6/1). Faience melon beads were found at Roman Barburgh Mill (RD 1/3), Birrens (RD 2/19a-e), Broomholm (RD 3/3c), Milton (RD 8/5a & c-d) and Raeburnfoot (RD 9/1) and native Burnswark hillfort (ND 4/21a-c), Carronbridge Enclosure A (ND 5/3) and Over Rig (ND 10/2).15 Counters were discovered, of deep blue glass at Milton (RD 8/6c), vitreous black paste at Birrens (RD 2/22a-b) and white paste at Birrens (RD 2/22c), Milton (RD 8/6a-b) and Burnswark hillfort (ND 4/24).16

Another distinctive product of the Roman Iron Age was the Romano-British glass bangle (Kilbride-Jones 1938; Stevenson 1957 and 1976; Price 1988 and Johns 1996, 121-23). Type 2 fragments were found at Broomholm (RD 3/2a-b), Burnswark South Camp (RD 4/1) and Uppercleuch (ND 13/1a-b). This type of bangle previously considered late (Kilbride-Jones 1938, 372-76), has also been found in Flavian or earlier contexts (Price 1988, 342-48).17 Type 3 fragments were found only on native sites, 3A at Boonies (ND 2/5), Burnswark hillfort (ND 4/20a-f), Carronbridge Enclosure A (ND 5/2) and Over Rig (ND 10/1a-b), 3B at Burnswark hillfort (ND 4/20g-h) and Over Rig (ND 10/1c-d) and 3D at Burnswark hillfort (ND 4/20i).18 Type 3 bangles cannot be more precisely dated than late 1st/2nd century AD (Price 1988, 349). An unknown type of bangle from Carzield is lost (RD 5/4). These bangles were probably made from recycled Roman glass with a marked distribution close to Roman forts suggesting that they were produced by, or in close association with, Roman military units (Price 1988, 354).

A range of Roman and Romano-Native finds has been outlined above. There are markedly fewer Roman finds from native sites in Dumfriesshire than in Strathclyde and Galloway (Wilson 1997 and 2001) and no prestigious Roman artefacts of quality save possibly the intaglio from Burnswark hillfort which could have been a Roman loss. Lack of evidence for the production of Romano-Native products on native sites may suggest their manufacture in civilian annexes at Roman forts such as at Brough and Stanwix in Cumbria (Macgregor 1976, 124). North British Romano-Native metalwork highlights the achievements of native craftsmen employing traditional skills to meet the demands of a new Roman market.

A significant number of Iron Age sites has now been excavated in Dumfriesshire and the lack of Roman material is notable. Indifference or hostility to Rome is indicated. The particular strengthening of the western defences of Hadrian’s Wall, the intense early

---


16 Cf counter from Buiston crannog in Strathclyde (Wilson 1997, 15, MO 6, A/BUI 7). On counters see Crummy 1983, 91-96. They were probably used as playing men on gaming boards found at Birrens (NMS FP 92; Robertson 1975A, 100, no 55, fig 26), Newstead (Curle 1911, 339, fig 50) and South Shields (Allason-Jones and Mikel 1984, 349, no 12/1).


18 Cf type 3A bangles from Gourlock Burn in Strathclyde (Wilson 1997, 15, MO 26-27, A/GOU 10) and Borness Cave, Dowalton Loch and Whithorn in Galloway (Wilson 2001, 83, K2/2b, W5/2a & W8/4b) and type 3B bangles from Borness Cave and Dowalton Loch II (Wilson 2001, 83, K2/2c & W5/2b).
Antonine Roman military occupation of Dumfriesshire and the likely destruction of Birrens c 154-155 AD probably by Anavionenses, indicate significant unrest in the area. Recent archaeological evidence, outlined below, substantiates classical references to warfare in Britain at this time. The north-western Brigantes of Dumfriesshire may have inherited a tradition of hostility to Rome from Venutius and his supporters in north-west England and southern Scotland where the place name Venutio may even enshrine his memory (Wilson 2001, 87).

THE CHRONOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

The Later First Century AD

In 69 AD Venutius removed Cartimandua as queen of the Brigantes with support from his allies and Rome revoked client-kingdom status (Tacitus, Histories 3, 45). Q Petillius Cerialis, governor of Roman Britain in 71 AD, pursued Venutius across the Stainmore Pass and built a fort at Carlisle dated by dendrochronology to 72/73 AD, a base for campaigning further north. The multiple gates and traverses in the original design of Burnswark South Camp are reminiscent of Rey Cross and may be Cerialian. The discovery at Burnswark of the only known Republican pilum in Britain (ND 4/14) adds weight to the suggestion of early Flavian penetration. Cerialis may have built other temporary camps in Dumfriesshire and possibly permanent forts at Broomholm in Eskdale, Bankfoot I, Dalswinton, in Nithsdale and possibly Milton in Annandale.¹⁹ The western entry route through Dumfriesshire was probably of considerable importance affording primary Roman access to Scotland before the construction of Dere Street north of Corbridge.

Successful campaigning in southern Scotland by Cerialis would explain the rapid advance of Gn Julius Agricola to the Tay in his third campaign in 79/80 AD. Agricola probably built the larger temporary camps with Stracathro gateways at Bankend, Beattock in Annandale, Bankfoot, Dalswinton, in Nithsdale (Wilson 1999, 30-31 & 34) and Castledykes in Clydesdale (Wilson 1996, 3), and probably one of the larger camps at Glenlochar in Galloway (Wilson 2001, 87). The semi-permanent camp at Wardlaw at the mouth of the Nith is probably Flavian. Temporary coastal camps at Annan and Ruthwell may be small Flavian beachheads but could be later. Agricola consolidated his advance with permanent forts at Broomholm in Eskdale, Milton and probably Birrens and Ladyward in Annandale, and Bankfoot II, Dalswinton, and Drumlanrig in Nithsdale (Wilson 1999, 21, 26-28, 30 & 34-35).²⁰

¹⁹ On Cerialis in north-west England and south-west Scotland see Wilson 2001, 87. Failure to recover the plan of the postulated Cerialian fort during excavations at Milton in 1950 (Clarke 1951, 205-7) and 1958 (unpublished) does not disprove its possible existence (Daniels 1989, 31).

²⁰ The capital of a large undated and unpublished Roman altar was discovered almost thirty years ago in Lower Eskdale near the assumed crossing of the Annandale road over the Esk at the Roost (Wilson 1999, 25) and structural remains nearby may indicate a Roman fort/port in the vicinity. Tony Wilmott informs me that a report on the altar is currently being prepared.
In addition to northern routes penetrating Annandale and Nithsdale, Cerialis may have built a cross route along Lower Eskdale, Ewesdale and Teviotdale to the Tweed.\footnote{Sheppard Frere has drawn my attention to the possibility that the old road from Langholm to Annan might mark a Roman road from Broomholm to Birrens crossing the Esk near the Irvine burn. The line is marked by a farm track to Dodden Beck, NY 366 811, and beyond by a stony mound in places six to seven metres broad. It is then marked by the modern road to Barnglieshead and the Woodsid burn, and Solwaybank to Wallacehall and in these stretches could follow a Roman line but not beyond. A track on the north side of the Forest might mark a crossing of the Kirtle at Springkell where a Roman coin was discovered three feet below the surface on the line of an old road (ID 33/2). The only possible trace beyond Springkell is the unclassified road running from the east gate at Birrens across the Middlebie burn and along the crest north of the Water of Mein. Cultivation may have destroyed further traces.} This link between south-west and south-east Scotland was probably necessary before construction of Dere Street north of Corbridge c 80 AD. There is a probable Roman watch tower along this route at Ewes Doors and temporary camps at Denholm and Cavers Mains, though these sites are undated (Wilson 1999, 37-40). A North Dumfriesshire Flavian cross route along Moffatdale and Ettrickdale may have linked Agricolan forts at Milton, Oakwood and Newstead and the probable Flavian fortlet at Barnhill at a crossing of the Evan Water, may have guarded a junction of roads along Moffatdale and Annandale (Wilson 1999, 46-51).

The conquest of south-west Scotland was completed by Agricola’s fifth campaign in 81/82 AD and a South Galloway Roman trunk road built from Dalswinton to an as yet undiscovered Flavian fort at Glenlochar, the fortlet at Gatehouse and as yet undiscovered forts near Newton Stewart and Stranraer (Wilson 1989, 8-12 and 2001, 87). The Flavian fortlet at Kirkland may lie on a Mid Galloway Roman trunk road running from the fort at Drumlanrig to the postulated fort near Newton Stewart, a route of much antiquity, the medieval royal pilgrimage road from Edinburgh to Whithorn (Wilson 1989, 12-13, 1996, 21 and 1999, 55).

Agricola completed the conquest of Scotland in 83/84 AD. Coins and pottery indicate Roman withdrawal from northern and central Scotland between 87 and 90 AD to a frontier in southern Scotland (Wilson 1997, 18-19) possibly established originally by Cerialis (Breeze 1996, 92). The reason for withdrawal may have been the transfer of Legio II Adiutrix and probably auxiliary units to Dacia and Moesia (Birley 1953, 21). New larger forts were built at Milton in Annandale and Bankhead I, Dalswinton, in Nithsdale. The Flavian I rampart at Broomholm in Eskdale was strengthened and occupation probably continued at Ladyward in Annandale. Trajan, however, abandoned Scotland completely c 105 AD. No Roman fort in Dumfriesshire shows incontrovertible evidence of enemy destruction at this time (Frere 1999, 109). The reason for abandonment was probably Trajan’s military requirements in Dacia. Dumfriesshire now lay outside a new Tyne-Solway frontier.\footnote{It is unlikely that the Tyne-Solway frontier was Domitianic rather than Trajanic and the Domitianic forts in southern Scotland merely outliers (Jones 1991, 105; Shotter 1996, 45). The Stanegate is generally regarded as a strategic road not a frontier in the Domitianic period. On the Stanegate as a Trajanic frontier see Hodgson 2000.}

The only Roman find of definite late 1st century AD date from a native site in Dumfriesshire is a little worn denarius of 87-89 AD from Burnswark hillfort (ND 4/1; see fn 12). Roman hoards were probably buried at this time at Broomholm (HD 2/1) and Wauchope Bridge (HD 13/1). The north-western Brigantes of Dumfriesshire may
originally have supported Venutius and lack of Roman material on native sites may imply not indifference but hostility to Rome. The analogy has been drawn between recalcitrant north Britons and Dacians portrayed on Trajan’s column (Clarke 1958, 38-39). Conscription into the Roman army may have occurred following the census of the \textit{Brittones Anavionenses} by T Haterius Nepos (Rivet 1982, 321-22) either by forceful draft or normal conscription (Breeze 1996, 107). The date of the census has been revised from c 112 to 102-104 AD following discovery of a letter from Nepos to Flavius Genialis, prefect at Vindolanda (Birley 2001, 15-16). \textit{Anavionenses} may therefore have been conscripted into the Roman army before Roman withdrawal from Scotland c 105 AD and it has been recently suggested that they may have seen active service at the Roman fort of Niederbieber in Germany (Birley 2001, 21).

The Second Century AD

Following Roman withdrawal, Dumfriesshire is likely to have been subject to continuing Roman patrol despite lying beyond the frontier. Archaeological evidence suggests there was warfare in Britain during Trajan’s reign. By 105 AD the Roman army in Britain was reinforced by \textit{cohors II Asturum} and a tombstone of their commander, C Julius Karus, records a military decoration probably won before 115 AD in Britain (Birley 1953, 22-24). The tombstone of Titus Annius at Vindolanda records his death from enemy action under Trajan (Birley 1998) and the most likely location, although not specifically mentioned (Breeze and Dobson 2000, 26), is north Britain. Some time after 103 AD but before 122 AD, \textit{cohors I Cugernorum}, stationed in Britain, was granted battle honours with the title \textit{Ulpia Traiana}. Classical writers record further warfare on Hadrian’s accession in 117 AD with Britons described as ‘out of control’ (\textit{SHA, Hadrian} 5, 2). Heavy Roman losses were compared with those of the Jewish revolt of 132-135 AD when a Roman legion was slaughtered (Cornelius Fronto, \textit{Letters}, 2, 22). Some legionary losses may be implied, perhaps of \textit{Legio IX Hispana} before its transfer to Nijmegen (Birley 1953, 20-30). A coin commemorating Roman success in Britain was issued in 119 AD (\textit{RIC} Hadrian 577a).

The construction of Hadrian’s Wall in 122 AD effectively separated northernmost 
\textit{Brigantes} from their southern compatriots making common cause against Rome more difficult.\textsuperscript{23} Several factors suggest a military threat to Rome came from south-west Scotland. A rare milliary cavalry unit was stationed at Stanwix, Carlisle, housing possibly the \textit{ala Petriana}, capable of penetrating deep into southern Scotland. Outpost forts to Hadrian’s Wall were built only in the west at Birrens, Netherby and Bewcastle and possibly Broomholm, protecting the Wall from hostile movement down Annandale, Eskdale and Liddesdale. There was an extension to the Wall down the Cumberland coast to prevent outflanking. There are no Hadrianic outposts in the east nor is there any extension of the Wall down the east coast. Coin issues from Alexandria suggest continuing warfare in northern Brigantia probably contributed to the decision c 124 AD to

\textsuperscript{23} On Hadrian’s Wall as a moral and legal as well as physical barrier, see Gillam 1958, 61-62.
build forts on the Wall itself (Bidwell 1999, 20). Further warfare may be indicated c 130 AD when Hadrian sent M Maenius Agrippa and T Pontius Sabina on an expeditio Britannica (Birley 1953, 28-29; Frere 2000).

Warfare is recorded in Britain on the accession of Antoninus Pius in 138 AD (Wilson 2001, 88). A thick layer of burning covered a wide area of the Hadrianic fort at Birrens though it is unclear whether this was due to Roman demolition or enemy action (Robertson 1975A, 280). Coins minted in 142-144 AD commemorate Roman victory in Britain (RIC Pius 743-45). Southern Scotland was reoccupied c 139 AD and the Antonine Wall built in 142 AD delineating a new frontier across the Forth-Clyde isthmus. It is unlikely the Antonine forward advance was simply a douceur to restless generals and more likely a response to a military threat. Northern access roads along Annandale, Clydesdale and Nithsdale were recommissioned. Early Antonine temporary camps in Dumfriesshire may have included Kirkpatrick Fleming, Torwood and Beattock in Annandale with permanent forts reoccupied at Birrens and Ladyward. In Nithsdale a new cavalry fort was built at Carzield replacing Dalswinton, and Drumlanrig was reoccupied (Wilson 1999, 29-35).

In addition to the northern routes through Annandale and Nithsdale, a new cross route was built linking south-west and south-east Scotland probably replacing the original Flavian link along Ewesdale and Teviotdale. The earlier route may not have been so vital following construction of Dere Street north of Corbridge and the new road indicates closer surveillance of a wider upland area of southern Scotland. It ran eastward from Ladyward along Dryfesdale to a new Roman fort at Raeburnfoot (RD 9) and thence eastward across Craik Moor to the Tweed (Wilson 1999, 41-46). The Roman road along lower Eskdale may have continued along upper Eskdale to the new Roman fort at Raeburnfoot (Wilson 1999, 22-24).

A tighter Roman grip on south-west Scotland in the early Antonine period is particularly indicated by intensive use of intermediate fortlets in Dumfriesshire and Upper Clydesdale with troops probably outstationed from neighbouring forts. These fortlets included Burnswark and Milton in Annandale, Redshaw Burn, Wandel and Lamington in Upper Clydesdale, Murder Loch on the road linking Annandale and Nithsdale, Lantonside, Barburgh Mill and Sanquhar in Nithsdale and Durisdeer on the Well Path (Maxwell 1989, 177-78, fig 9.5). This type of fortlet is reminiscent of milecastles on Hadrian’s Wall. This intense military concentration indicates considerable Roman apprehension of native unrest in an area of southern Scotland where there appears to have been a tradition of hostility to Rome (Hanson and Maxwell 1986, 63; Hanson 1987, 93).

The Antonine II occupation of Scotland is controversial. Early last century it was considered the Antonine Wall had three periods, 142-155, 158-180 and 184-185 AD (Macdonald 1934A, 478-82). The third period was subsequently dismissed (Steer 1964) and the second period redated 158-163 AD on the basis of pottery though a stratified coin of Lucilla from Old Kilpatrick is dated 164-169 AD (Wilson 1997, 21). A single period of Antonine occupation in Scotland with gradual rundown, has also been proposed (Hodgson 1995) but, while this may apply to the Antonine Wall, there appear to be two periods south of the Wall not least at Birrens (Frere 1999, xv-xvi).
The close of Antonine I in Dumfriesshire is dated by an unworn *dupondius* of 153/154 AD from the build of an Antonine II street south of building XIX at Birrens. Trouble at this time in Britain is confirmed by a coin-issue of 154/155 AD celebrating Roman victory (*RIC* Pius 930). The widespread random destruction at Birrens was interpreted as due to enemy action not deliberate demolition (Robertson 1975A, 283). There is at present no evidence of similar destruction elsewhere in Dumfriesshire thus suggesting local activity by *Anavionenses*. This could not have justified wider Roman withdrawal from southern Scotland but could have contributed to the decision to withdraw. Perhaps there was a brief siege at Burnswark at this time involving remodelled defences though this could have occurred later in the 2nd century AD (Maxwell 1998, 48-49; Wilson 1999, 27). Such remodelling postdated the assumed Antonine I fortlet. It may have included replacing original gateways with artillery placements on the north side of the South Camp, the ‘Three Brethren,’ and perhaps the clavicular type extension on the North Camp suggested as a gun pit with communication trench (Collingwood 1927, 52). A brief siege might have ended before completion of remodelling in the North Camp.

Evidence of Antonine II occupation in Dumfriesshire occurs only in Annandale at Milton and Birrens where a new stone fort was built by *cohors II Tungrorum* in 158 AD (*RIB* 2110). There is at present no evidence of permanent reoccupation in Nithsdale though brief reoccupation occurs further north in Clydesdale at Crawford, Castledykes and Bothwellhaugh and further west on the Dee at Glenlochar. It is unknown why the intense early Antonine military occupation in Dumfriesshire was relaxed. Perhaps the threat of native insurgence had been eliminated or the demand for Roman troops abroad was a higher priority, leaving insufficient troops to man all previously held posts. A combination of factors is possible. It is also possible that an original decision to withdraw by the governor Julius Verus was subsequently reversed by Rome (Breeze 1996, 95). Such a decision by a governor on a major issue without prior approval from Rome would be unusual but, if it did occur, withdrawal may have reached a stage permitting only limited reoccupation.

War threatened in Britain c 161 AD on the accession of Marcus Aurelius (*SHA Marcus*, 8, 7). A new governor, S Calpurnius Agricola, may have accelerated the process of withdrawal from Scotland c 162 AD leaving Birrens the only occupied fort in Dumfriesshire, probably an outpost to Hadrian’s Wall. Further trouble is recorded c 169 AD (*SHA Marcus* 22, 1). Birrens may have been abandoned c 180 AD. Coins minted in 184 AD record victory in Britain under the governor Ulpius Marcellus (*RIC* Commodus 451-2 and 459e). Unrest continued and, with Roman troops on the continent supporting the imperial candidature of Clodius Albinus, northern defences may have been left weakened and exposed prompting *Caledonii* and *Maeatae* to attack. There is little evidence of destruction on the Wall at this time though raiders may have circumnavigated the Wall by sailing down the coast.

---

24 On the possibility of a north-west Brigantian attack on the *Novantae*, see Wilson 2001, 89.
25 It has been suggested that the second period of occupation at Birrens should be dated c 180- c 192 not c 158- c 180 AD (Mann 1988) but this ignores the inscription dated 158 AD (*RIB* 2110).
Roman material from Iron Age sites in Dumfriesshire in the 2nd century AD is meagre. It consists of Samian sherds from Burnswark hillfort (ND 4/2-4) and coarse ware sherds from Boonies (ND 2/1-3) and Burnswark hillfort (ND 4/5-8). The latter site also produced a sword blade, arrow heads, lead slingshot and an intaglio (ND 4/13, 15, 16 & 19) though these cannot be precisely dated within the Roman period. Roman hoards were probably deposited around this time at Burnswark (HD 4), Closeburn (HD 6), Durisdeer (HD 7) and Friars Carse (HD 8). There are a number of 2nd century AD isolated Roman finds from Dumfriesshire (ID 1/1, 4, 9, 10/2 & 3, 12, 16/3 & 4, 18/2, 22 & 23).

A range of Romano-Native material detailed above from Roman and native sites, cannot be precisely dated within the Roman Iron Age. Glass/faience finds include type 3 bangles found only on native sites (ND 2/5, ND 4/20, ND 5/2, ND 10/1, ND 13/1), melon beads from Roman and native sites (RD 1/3, RD 2/19, RD 3/3, RD 6/2, RD 8/5, RD 9/1, ND 4/21, ND 5/3, ND 6/1 & ND 10/2), annular beads only from native sites (ND 4/22, ND 5/4 & ND 6/2) and globular beads (RD 2/20 & ND 5/5). Copper alloy finds include items of native harness equipment (RD 2/8 & 18, RD 3/1 & ND 4/11 & 12), native Brigantian crown sword-hilt guards from Roman sites (RD 2/17, RD 6/1 & RD 8/1) and items of dress including brooches and button-and-loop fasteners (RD 1/2, RD 2/10-16, RD 5/1-3, RD 7/1, RD 8/2-4, ND 2/4, ND 4/9-10, ND 5/1 & ND 7/4). Native pottery from Barburgh Mill (RD 1/1) and Birrens (RD 2/7) suggests some form of native presence on these Roman sites.

Analysis of this material indicates imbalance in the flow between Roman and native sites in Dumfriesshire as observed elsewhere in north Britain (Allason-Jones 1989, 18). Roman finds have been discovered on only two of nine established Roman Iron Age native sites but Romano-Native material was found on eight of nine excavated permanent Roman sites and seven of the nine Roman Iron Age sites. The higher incidence on native sites of Romano-Native goods at a time when Roman goods were more generally available, emphasises the greater demand for them and the native preference for goods which displayed their traditional skills in design and technology. The lack of Roman finds on Dumfriesshire native sites indicates continuing indifference or hostility to Rome.

Burnswark poses many unanswered questions. In addition to semi-permanent occupation in the South Camp there was permanent occupation in the Antonine I (?) fortlet (RCAHMS 1997, 181, fig 194). The location of the fortlet, however, so far from the Annandale road questions its role as a road post. It may have accommodated rotating centuries of troops from Birrens carrying out short term training exercises (Davies 1972) but its main role may have been to monitor the hillfort. Did oppressive taxation, excessive recruitment or some other reason inflame the Anavianenses to resist Rome and destroy Birrens c 154 AD? Perhaps the recruits trained at Burnswark were Brittonnes Anavianenses being prepared for service overseas, possibly in Germany. Such training does not, however, preclude use of the site for campaigning or even a brief siege in the second half of the 2nd century AD. A tense relationship between Roman and native in Dumfriesshire in the 2nd century AD is indicated which may have led to actual conflict.
The Third Century AD and Beyond

Following the defeat of Clodius Albinus in 197 AD there was need to restore the northern frontier and counter threats of *Caledonii* and *Maeatae*. The new governor, Virius Lupus, bought peace with the *Maeatae*, permitting unfettered restoration (Dio 75, 5, 4). The governor L. Alfenus Senecio rebuilt forts in the Pennines and restored Hadrian’s Wall from 205 to 207 AD. The emperor Septimius Severus arrived in person in 208 AD to lead campaigns against the northern Scottish tribes (Herodian 3, 14, 2-10). His main advance was along Dere Street though there may have been a subsidiary western route through Annandale and Upper Clydesdale. A large camp at Kirkpatrick Fleming might mark a line of march (Wilson 1999, 25-26). No permanent bases in Dumfriesshire would have been necessary. Severan occupation has been postulated at Birrens (Birley 1937, 321 and 326-28) but there is no structural evidence of permanent occupation after the 2nd century AD and the ‘late’ pottery has been reassessed by Colin Wallace and dated Antonine (NMS FP 220 & DM 1952.25.60; Wallace forthcoming; see fn 31 below).

Following the death of Severus in 211 AD, Caracalla made peace with northern tribes and withdrew from Scotland. New arrangements were probably made for frontier security using *exploratores*, scouts, based on forts at Netherby, (*Castra Exploratorum*), Bewcastle, Risingham and High Rochester.26 It has already been suggested that native huts at Broomholm and Burnswark Roman fortlet might have accommodated squatters possibly involved in Roman frontier surveillance. Official tribal meeting places may have been authorised at this time including *Locus Maponi*, probably Lochmaben, though Richmond’s tentative identification of *Minox* with the Mennock (Wilson 1997, 24) has been rejected (Rivet and Smith 1979, 418). The new frontier policy created stability in southern Scotland for most of the 3rd century AD possibly stimulating political centralisation and contributing to the eventual emergence of powerful regional kingdoms.

Castle O’er may have been occupied in the 3rd century AD but the only native site producing Roman material possibly of this date is Baille Knowe where 3rd/4th century AD cauldron chains were discovered (HD 1/1) though the site itself is undated. A coin of Severus Alexander (222-235 AD) was found in a hoard at Whita Hill deposited probably at this time if the *centionalis* of Constantius II was not original to the hoard (HD 13). At Birrens an unstratified *denarius* of Severus Alexander and *antonianus* of Victorinus minted 268-270 AD, do not establish permanent Roman reoccupation (Birley 1937, 340; Macdonald 1939, 241 & 272; Robertson 1964, 134). Two isolated Alexandrian coin finds of Claudius II (268-269/270 AD) from Dumfries (ID16/5) and Probus (276-282 AD) from Kirkpatrick Fleming (ID 31/1), may not be original losses. The absence of Roman material on native sites may indicate continuing apathy or hostility to Rome though, on Roman withdrawal from Dumfriesshire, the availability of Roman material would have been significantly reduced and the market for Romano-Native products probably declined significantly.

---

By the close of the 3rd century AD, Picts, emerging from a realignment of tribes north of the Forth, contributed to unrest on the northern frontier such that in 306 AD, Constantius Chlorus mounted a successful campaign against them (Wilson 1997, 25). There is no structural evidence from any site in Scotland for this campaign though earlier camps or perhaps forts such as Birrens might have been reused as overnight halts without leaving significant trace of occupation. The gold medallion of Constantius Chlorus from Birrens (Gordon 1726, 18; Macdonald 1918, 218-19) might originally have been lost on such an overnight stay but it had been converted into an amulet probably in post-Roman times. Neither the medallion nor the ae of Constantine I found in a rabbit scrape (Robertson 1963, 134) establishes permanent site reoccupation. The unique gold crossbow brooch of 303 AD found on the Roman road up Ericstane Brae (ID 19) was probably a personal gift from Diocletian to a senior official perhaps lost while travelling in Annandale or on campaign in 306 AD. The rudely marked inscription FORTV might commemorate bravery on campaign.

Frontier security was probably reorganised in the early 4th century AD when areani, area men, natives involved in Roman military intelligence, replaced exploratores. It is unknown whether Netherby had already been abandoned but Bewcastle, a centre for the worship of Cocidius as well as an outpost fort of Hadrian’s Wall, appears to have been occupied until the mid 4th century AD at least. There was continuing unrest c 343, 360 when loca were laid waste, 364 and 367 AD when the comes litoris Saxonic was killed and the Dux Britannorum surrounded. Valentinian I sent Theodosius to restore the province including Hadrian’s Wall. He disbanded the areani and probably finally abandoned any remaining outpost forts. After a brief respite, Picts and Scots continued to attack despite defeat by Magnus Maximus in 382 AD. Further wars were conducted against them in 397 AD and in the early 5th century AD. In addition to the 3rd/4th century AD cauldron chains from the probable native site at Bailie Knowe (HD 1/1), a coin of Constantius II was found at the undated Thornhill homestead (ND 12/1). Isolated 4th century AD Roman coins are found only in southern Dumfriesshire, aes of Constantine I from Carlesgill (ID 11), Maxentius from Dockenflat (ID 15), Constantius II from Springkell (ID 33/2) and Valentinian II from Kirkmahoe (ID 37/1).

There appears to have been a significant reorganisation on the northern frontier near the close of the 4th century AD when the areani were disbanded after being implicated in treachery (Ammianus Marcellinus 28, 3, 8). Theodosius may have created client kingdoms in southern Scotland among tribes friendly to Rome (Frere 1999, 346). The province of Roman Britain had been split in two in the early 3rd century AD and later into four provinces. A fifth province was now created, Valentia, possibly in north-west England with its capital at Carlisle (Wilson 2001, 91). A letter from Vindolanda confirms Carlisle as an important regional centre by the 2nd century AD (Bowman and Thomas 1994, 221-22, no 250) and it presumably became the centre of Roman regional administration in the north-west. Growing centralisation led eventually to the formation of the Early Historic kingdom of Rheged which probably included both Dumfries and Galloway (Wilson 2001, 92).

28 For a recent review of the emergence of Rheged see McCarthy 2002, 131-51.
A distinctive feature of the late Roman Empire was the emergence of Christianity as the official state religion after 313 AD. Tertullian writing earlier, c 210 AD, *(Adversus Judaeos 7, 4)* refers to the presence of Christianity in Britain in places inaccessible to Rome but archaeological evidence for this is lacking. There is, however, increasing archaeological evidence for the presence of late Romano-British Christianity in north-west England with Carlisle as the assumed diocesan headquarters (McCarthy 1999; Todd 1999). Evidence for Christianity at this time in Dumfriesshire is slight with no Latin inscribed stones as in Galloway. There may have been an early Christian cemetery in the Iron Age hillfort at Trohoughton where oriented burials gradually replaced haphazard graves but these are undated (Simpson and Scott-Elliot 1964, 132). It is possible the small undated enclosure within the Roman fortlet at Burnswark was an early Christian burial ground (RCAHMS 1997, 181-82, fig 194D).

Etymological evidence suggests the presence of early British churches in Dumfriesshire at Eccles near Penpont on a possible Mid Galloway Roman road and Ecclefechan on the Annandale Roman road (Wilson 1997, 28). The latter site is close to Hoddom where according to Jocelyn’s medieval Life of St Kentigern, the saint sojourned, organising the see and carrying out ordinations *(Vita, 32-33)* before his return to Glasgow where he died c 612 AD (MacQuarrie 1986). The reliability of such a late source may be questionable but recent excavations on the site of the Anglian monastery at Hoddom uncovered in area 8 beneath an early enclosure bank, a stone structure oriented east-west incorporating reused Roman masonry (ND 7). The orientation suggests an early church building and a carbonised oak plank, possibly part of a sill beam, gave a radiocarbon 14 date of 450 ± 50 AD, 525-625 cal AD (Lowe 1991, 19-23). Whether such a church would have been a survivor of Romano-British Christianity in Dumfriesshire is unknown though Roman material deposited in the lowest levels at Brydekirk (ND 3/1) and Hoddam (ND 7/3 & 4) could commemorate Romano-British Christian origins without implying affinity for Roman civilisation itself.

The earliest Christian sculpture in Dumfriesshire is Early Historic (RCAHMS 1997, 4 & 252-64). A British origin c 600-700 AD has been suggested for plain stone pecked crosses from Ruthwell (Radford 1951), Staplegorton (NY 3521 8791; Radford 1956) and Foregirth (NX 9532 8366; Truckell 1965), the latter two close to the suggested lines of Roman roads (Wilson 1999, 22 & 34). Such dating, however, is insecure as simplicity of design does not in itself constitute evidence for primary dating in the evolution of an art form and the timber prototype of the Staplegorton cross could even be medieval (RCAHMS 1997, 256). The Northumbrian monastery at Hoddom dates to the mid 8th century AD as may a cross fragment buried under the east drive of Hoddom Castle (Lowe 1991, 29, no 1353; see HD 9 below). The Ruthwell cross, like the Bewcastle cross, probably dates to c 731 AD (McLean 1992, 70). The Iron Age people of Dumfriesshire showed no particular affinity for Roman culture, preferring their own, and in post-Roman times there may have been little, if any, continuity with Roman Britain. In Roman times Brigantia was associated with Minerva and Victory but in post Roman Christianity she was associated with St Brigit. In Irish mythology Brigit was a Celtic fertility goddess associated with the purification festival of Imbolc and many elements of her cultus were absorbed into the later Christian cult of St Brigit which has also been compared with Roman cults of the Matres and the Vestal Virgins (Puttock 2000, 49-50).
Figure 2 Roman Dumfriesshire.
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INVENTORY

A Romano-Native and Native finds from Roman sites

RD1 Barburgh Mill Roman Fortlet NX 9021 8844 (Wilson 1999, 34, refs)

1 Native pottery: Nine jar sherds of fabric found on Romano-British sites in eastern Brigantia and Traprain Law (DM 1971.160 & 1974.113; Breeze 1974, 155, fig 6/6)

2 Penannular brooch: Copper alloy (DM 1971.160; Breeze 1974, 160, fig 8/37); Fowler 1960 type A3(i); see RD 2/13 & ND 2/4 below

3 Melon bead: Complete small irregularly shaped turquoise faience bead; (DM 1974.113; Breeze 1974, 159, fig 8/29); cf Newstead (Curle 1911, 336, fig 91/34) and 4th century AD Colchester (Crummy 1983, 30, fig 32/542)

RD 2 Birrens Roman Fort NY 2180 7513 (Wilson 1999, 26-27, refs) 30

Inscribed/Sculptured Stones Representing Native Deities or Victory

1* Statuette of Brigantia: Red sandstone; dedicated by Amandus; Brigantia armed with wings of Victory, holding Minerva's sword and shield with globe on her right representing the 'world-wide rule of the Brigantine region' (Toynbee 1962, 157, no 80, pl 77); possibly from annexe shrine west of fort; purchased by Sir John Clerk from Mrs Bell of Land and taken to Penicuik, 1731; transferred to Society of Antiquaries in Edinburgh, 1857 (NMS FV 5; Surtees Society Publication 80, 396-98; Pennant 1790, 3, 412; Macdonald 1896, 133-36, no 6, fig 11; RIB 2091 with addenda & corrigenda; CSIR 12, pl 4); Hadrianic/Antonine 31

2 Head possibly of Brigantia: Red sandstone; 1895 excavation (NMS FP 8; Robertson 1975A, 99, no 36); even if Minerva (CSIR 10, pl 4), the association with Brigantia is significant; late 1st/2nd century AD 32

3 Head possibly of Brigantia: Red sandstone; found probably c 1730, west annexe (NMS FV 8; CSIR 21, pl 7); late 1st/2nd century AD

Figure 3 Statuette of Brigantia (© The Trustees of the National Museum of Scotland).

30 S M Mason recently discovered around 8,000 finds while field walking in the west annexe (NY 217 752: DES 1987, 4; Bateson 1990, 166). D Johnston discovered further finds by metal detection including Roman coins from the west annexe (DM 1985.14.5 & 6), north of the annexe (DM 1984.27.52), north east of the fort (DM 1984.27.21 & 33-37) and its general environs (DM 1983.44.1, 1984.27.17-19, 54-59, 93-108 & 112). Coins from the 1960’s excavations have recently been acquired by DM (DM 1999.72.1-22; Robertson 1975A, 245-49).

31 A 3rd century AD date for occupation at Birrens was rejected long ago but recently resurrected on grounds of 'late' pottery, coins and the relief of Brigantia (Birley 2001, 18). There is no structural evidence for 3rd century AD occupation and surviving 'late' pottery has been reassessed by Colin Wallace as Antonine (NMS FP 220; Wallace forthcoming). I am grateful to him for identifying particularly the suggested Nene valley/Oxford ware sherd as from an Antonine Lower Rhineland cornice-rimmed beaker with roughcast decoration (DM 1952.25.60*: Robertson 1975A, 214). The presence of unstratified late coins on a number of Roman sites in Scotland (Robertson 1975B, 380-91; Bateson 1990, 167; Abdy 2002, 206) does not establish late permanent Roman occupation. The revised edition of RIB accepts that the relief of Brigantia cannot be dated 208 AD as its dedicator can no longer be identified with the 3rd century legionary Valerius Amandus (Miller 1937).

32 For an altar to Minerva from Birrens see HD 3/1 below.
Figure 4  Finds from Birrens.
4 **Dedication slab probably to Maponus:** Red sandstone; animal carving on slab may be a dog, the hunting companion of Apollo/Maponus; dedication by Cistumucus from *Locus Maponi*; 1967 excavation (HM unclassified; Robertson 1975A, 95-97, fig 25/3 & pl 10; *CSIR* 14, pl 5; Keppie 1984, 399); on Maponus see Radford 1954 & Ross 1967, 367-69; possibly Antonine

5 **Altar to Mars and Victory:** Red sandstone; dedication by *cohors II Tungrorum*; found c 1812, Birrens; deposited 1866, NMS (NMS FV 2, Kirkpatrick Sharpe Collection; Macdonald 1896, 155-57, no 18, fig 25; *RIB* 2100; *CSIR* 7, pl 3); Antonine II

6 (a)-(h) **Fragments of altars/slabs commemorating Victory:** 1895 excavation except for *CSIR* 26a (HD 9/8 below) seen 1760 in Hoddom Castle wall (NMS FP 6, 7, 12, 14, 16, 24 & 25; Pococke 1887, 33-34, fig 1; *RIB* 2111; *CSIR* 26 & 27, pls 9 & 10; Keppie 1984, 391-92 & 1994, 41-44; Hunter and Scott 2002, 81-85)

**Native pottery**

7 **Hand-made:** Indeterminate fragments (Robertson 1975A, 234)

**Copper Alloy Finds**

8 **Bridle cheek-piece:** 1936/37 excavations (DM 1952.25; Birley 1938, 337, fig 38/3; Robertson 1975A, 120, no 107, fig 39/7, Macgregor 1976, 38, no 42, map 4/1); cf cheek piece from Eckford (Piggott 1955, 20-21, fig 4/E1) and Celtic ‘muzzle’ motif on finds from Vindolanda and Aldborough (Macgregor 1976, nos 3 & 30) and Lochspouts (Wilson 1997, MO 40-41, A/LOS/7)

9 **Plaque:** Fragmentary; red enamel traces; relief of Hercules with Gorgon’s head; discovered by D Johnston (DM 1984.27.30); probably Roman

10 **Bow brooches:**

(a) & (b) Fragmentary plain dolphin brooches; discovered by D Johnston (DM 1984.27.16 & 75); cf Clifford 1961, 172, fig 31/2, Collingwood and Richmond 1969, 295, group H, fig 102/13, Crummy 1983, 12, type 94, fig 6, Hattatt 1985, 76, fig 31/359, Snape 1993, 13, group 2.2 and bow brooches from Cruggleton and Glenluce in Galloway (Wilson 2001, W 4/1 & W 25/8a-c, figs 1 & 6)

(c) Two fragments of small bow brooch; 1895 excavation (NMS FP 266; Anderson 1896, 194)

11 **Headstud brooches:**

(a) Fragmentary; found by D Johnston (DM 1984.27.85); I am grateful to Lindsay Allason-Jones for identifying it as part of a headstud derivative brooch; probably late 1st/2nd century AD

(b) Fragmentary; found by D Johnston (DM 1984.43); hinged pin, wings and base missing; possible early plain headstud variant; cf Collingwood and Richmond 1969, 296, type Q, fig 103/43 and Hattatt 1987, fig 41/941

12 **Knee brooch:** Tubular headed cylindrical springcase; 1960’s excavations (Lost; Robertson 1975A, 116, no 76, fig 36/8); Collingwood and Richmond 1969, 298, group V; cf Hadrian’s Wall (Hattatt 1985, 121, fig 51/476), Newstead (Curle 1911, 325, pl 87/31 & 32), South Shields (Allason-Jones and Miket 1984, 98, find 3.22) and Traprain Law (Burley 1958, 160, nos 40, 41 and 43-45)

33 For an altar to Mars or the Matres from Land farm on which Birrens is situated, see ID 25/1 below.
13 **Penannular brooch:** Knobbed terminal only; 1960’s excavations (Lost; Robertson 1975A, 116, no 77, fig 37/1); Fowler 1960 type A3(i); see RD 1/2 above

14 *Plate/Disc brooches:*

(a) Circular with raised centre and rear clasp; possible green enamel traces on outer border; found by D Johnston (DM 1985.14.3); Snape 1993, 25, group 10.12 without lugs; cf brooches from Traprain Law (Cree and Curle 1922, 232, fig 28/5-6)

(b) Oval with raised centre; blue enamel on outer oval; found by D Johnston (DM 1985.14.4); Snape 1993, 25, group 10.14; cf brooches from Borness (Wilson 2001, 94, K 2/4) and South Shields (Allason-Jones and Miket 1984, 115-16, find 3.136)

15 *Trumpet brooches:*

(a) Fragmentary small brooch; found by D Johnston (DM 1984.27.76); possible early type; possibly Collingwood and Richmond 1969, 297, group R(iii) without acanthus, fig 104/55 or group R(iv) with poorly executed acanthus; cf Castledykes (Robertson 1964, 159-60, pl 7/7), Dragonby (May 1996, 255, fig 11.10/109), Edinburgh Castle (Driscoll and Yeoman 1997, 136, ill 120/1, find SF 133), Luce Sands (Wilson 2001, 116, fig 6, W25/7b), South Shields (Allason-Jones and Miket 1984, 98, find 3.31) and Traprain Law (Burley 1958, 156, no 11)

(b) Brooch with head loop; found by D Johnston (DM 1985.38); variant of Collingwood and Richmond 1969, 297, group R(iv) and Snape 1993, 16, group 4.1; cf Newstead (Curle 1911, 322, pl 85/8)

The fragmentary base of another possible fibula was found by D Johnston (DM 1983.44.9)

16 **Button-and-loop fasteners:**

(a) Fragmentary fastener head or large pin; 1960’s excavations (Lost; Robertson 1975A, 110, no 26, fig 30/11)

(b)* Fragmentary petal-shaped fastener or stud; found by D Johnston (DM 1983.44.2); cf similar design on stud from York (Macgregor 1976, 136, fig 8/2)

(c)* Petal-shaped fastener; found by D Johnston (DM 1984.27.113); Wild 1970 class 3 with many parallels; cf class II fasteners from Traprain Law (Burley 1958, 178-79, nos 222-29)

17 **Crown sword-hilt guard:** Found by D Johnston (DM 1986.96); Brigantian guard (Piggott 1950, 17-21, no 149, type IVb); cf Castlehill in Strathclyde (Wilson 1997, MO 20, A/CAS/8, fig 3), Milton & Middlebie (RD 8/1 & HD 12/4 below)

18 **Terrets:**

(a)-(c) Decorated platform terrets; (c) fragmentary; 1936/37 excavations; (DM 1952.25; Birley 1938, 337, fig 38/1 & 2; Macgregor 1976, 45-46 & 67-68, nos 65 & 66, map 9/3); Leeds 1933, 125, type 5/6; cf Balmuildy, Fremington Hagg and Great Chesters or Benwell (Macgregor 1976, nos 64 & 69-70)

(d)* Fragmentary undecorated platform terret without collared grooves; found by D Johnston (DM 1983.44.3); Leeds 1933, 124, type 7; cf Middlebie (HD 12/4 below)

34 A fifth terret is Roman (NMS FP 249; Anderson 1896, 193, fig 43).
Glass/Faience Finds

19 Melon beads:
(a)* & (b) Two turquoise faience beads; 1895 excavation (NMS FP 253; Anderson 1896, 79, 188 & 192)
(c) & (d) Two turquoise faience beads; (d) fragmentary; 1960’s excavations (Lost; Robertson 1975A, 135, no 32, fig 47/7 & 8)
(e)* Large faience bead; 1960’s excavations (DM 1967.390; Robertson 1975A, 137, no 46, fig 47/9)

20 Globular beads:
(a) Large undecorated olive glass bead; 1895 excavation (NMS FP 254; Anderson 1896, 192; Robertson 1975A, 137 no 42, fig 48/4); Guido 1978, 69 & 166-67, group 7(i) Iron Age bead
(b) Black opaque bead; 1895 excavation (NMS FP 255; Anderson 1896, 192; Robertson 1975A, 137, no 43, fig 48/5); Guido 1978, 70-71 & 175, no 43, group 7 (viii) Iron Age bead

21 Blue glass beads: 1960’s excavations (Lost; Robertson 1975A, 135, no 30)

22 Counters:
(a) Black paste; 1895 excavation (NMS FP 256; Anderson 1896, 192; Robertson 1975A, 137 no 45, fig 47/3)
(b) Black paste; 1960’s excavations (Lost; Robertson 1975A, 135 no 20, fig 47/1)
(c) White paste; 1960’s excavations (Lost; Robertson 1975A, 135 no 31, fig 47/2)

RD 3 Broomholm Roman Fort NY 3781 8140 (Wilson 1999, 21, refs) 35

1 Terret: Iron coated with copper alloy (NM BHM 12+; DES 1956, 14); corrosion prevents precise identification; cf terret from Chesterholm exhibited in NM; possible early version of Donside type, Leeds 1933, 126, type 8; cf Ballistrade and Crichie (Macgregor 1976, 47-48, nos 111 & 116) and Parton and Wheatcroft in Galloway (Wilson 2001, 81)

Glass/Faience Finds

2 *Bangles:
(a) and (b) Two fragments; blue-green glass with three light yellow cords, outer two containing diagonal blue lines (NM BMM 8x); Kilbride-Jones 1938 type 2; Price 1988 type 2C; cf type 2 bangles from Hyndford and Black Loch crannogs, Borness cave, Theave Castle and Whithorn Priory (Wilson 1997, 15 & MO 53, L/HYN/27-30 and 2001, 83, W2/1, K2/2a, K12/1 & W8/4b) and Burnswark South Camp and Uppercleugh (RD 4/1 & ND 13/1 below)

3 Melon beads:
(a) Fragment, large dark blue glass (NM BHN 33/10)
(b)* Complete, dark blue glass (NM BMM 8+)
(c)* Turquoise faience bead (NM BHM A4)

35 Pre-Roman occupation on the site was indicated by post-holes, ditches and boulders possibly toppled from a native rampart into the earliest Roman ditch (JRS 55, 1965, 202); native huts erected across the final intervallum road were probably late 2nd/early 3rd century AD (JRS 52, 1962, 164). Lindsay Allason-Jones informs me that the finds from Broomholm will probably be transferred to a Dumfriesshire museum.
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RD 4  

Burnswark Roman South Camp  NY 188 785 (Wilson 1999, 27, refs) 36

Glass/Faience Finds

1  Bangle:  Small fragment; green glass; central blue and white cord with oval spots near edge; 1898 excavation (NMS GP 93; Anderson 1899, 231 & 247, fig 4); Kilbride-Jones 1938, type 2; Price 1988 type 2Ai; see RD 3/2 above

2  Melon bead:  Turquoise faience; probably South Camp; 1898 excavation (NMS GP 94 or 95; Anderson 1899, 247)

3  Minute annular beads:  Fragmentary; yellow; recent excavations (DM BW 65/290; Jobey 1978, 94, no 4); Guido 1978, 73-76, native group 8; see fn 8 above

RD 5  

Carzield Roman Fort  NX 968 818 (Birley and Richmond 1942; DES 1955, 11-12, 1966, 23, 1967, 21 & 1968, 14; Williams 1977)

Copper Alloy Finds

1  Bow brooch:  (Lost; DES 1967, 21); see RD 2/10 above

2  Double disc brooch:  Unusual type; blue and red enamel; found March 1965 with Roman artefacts in rubbish spread (NX 968 821; DM 1965.26.4; Henig 1969, 103-4, fig 2 with detailed description); cf equal-armed plate brooch from Kent (Hattatt 1989, 140-41, fig 66/1590). 37

Finds RD 5/1-2 presented through James Williams

3*  Dumb-bell button:  Found by D Johnston (DM 1983.45.2); common Romano-British type (Macgregor 1976, 134, fig 8/13-19); cf Newstead (Curle 1911, pl 82/6 & 8), Traprain Law (Burley 1958, 177, fig 3/208) and an isolated find from High Torrs (Wilson 2001, 116, fig 6/W23)

Glass Find

4  Glass bangle:  (Lost; DES 1955, 11-12)

RD 6  

Dalswinton Roman Fort, Bankhead  NX 9331 8485 (Richmond and St Joseph 1957; Birley 1988, 248-50; Wilson 1999, 34, refs) 38

1*  Sword-hilt guard:  Found by D Johnston (DM 1984.31.2); Roman or native; cf undersides of Piggott 1950 Group IVA guards from Newstead (Macgregor 1976, nos 153-4)

2  Melon bead:  Complete, deep blue glass (Lost; Riddell 1787, 293); See RD 1/3 above

36  An Antonine Samian sherd and Roman coarse ware sherds from the 1898 excavation (NMS GP 99A-D) are probably from the Roman fortlet in the South Camp (Jobey 1978, 83-84).

37  Other Roman finds from what is best described as a rubbish spread not individual pits, include Samian ware (Dr 33, 35 & 37), black burnished ware, an intaglio of Apollo (DM 1965.26.1; Henig 1969, 100-3 and 1974, ii, 11-12, no 27, type 2) and metalwork.  The metalwork includes a bronze enamelled seal box (DM 1966.170.5; Henig 1969, 108, fig 3), and a silver wheel clasp with beaded double border and inner cross and bar for attaching to pendant (DM 1965.26.3); cf gold wheel pendants from Backworth and silver bracelets from Snettisham (Johns 1996, 92-93, fig 5/5 & 6 & 1997, 42 & 113, no 318) and the silver wheel pendant from Newstead (Curle 1911, 333-34, pl 87/34).  Metal detection by D Johnston has discovered further Roman finds including a copper alloy phallic amulet (DM 1983.45.1) similar to one from Colchester (Crummy 1983, 139, fig 163/4257).

38  Metal detection by D Johnston has uncovered many Roman finds including two well worn denarii, one of which is Trajan (DM 1984.31.4 & 71.3), and finds of copper alloy including harness equipment (DM 1984.31.3 & 1985.17.2) and lead.
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RD 7 Durisdeer Roman Camps NX 891 032 (Wilson 1999, 51, refs)

*Copper alloy finds* (Discovered by J Lennon)

1 Disc brooch: Small circular brooch; corroded edges; found at NX 8910 0340 (DM 1994.23.1); see RD 2/14(a)

2* Stylized panther head: Found at NX 8935 0343 (DM 1994.23.3); small panther face; circular perforation runs vertically through mount with horizontal perforation for attachment; I am grateful to Lindsay Allason-Jones for identifying this as a possible furniture mount though its discovery close to a Roman road might suggest it came from a cart; I am grateful to Ralph Jackson for drawing my attention to a panther mount on the leg of a 3rd century AD folding tripod table from Cologne; this is similar to a 1st century AD folding tripod table from near Vesuvius, exhibited in the BM Greek and Roman Gallery, no 69, with a panther or leopard mount on each leg; another similar panther mount from a Roman fountain was exhibited recently in Padua Museum (Zampieri and Lavarone 2001, 225, fig 7)

A *denarius* of Antonine Pius dated 150-51 AD was discovered near the camps in 1992 (Wilson 1999, 51, fn 59)

RD 8 Milton Roman Fort NT 0924 0142 (Wilson 1999, 30, refs) 39

*Copper Alloy Finds*

1* Crown sword-hilt guard: * Found by D Johnston (DM 1984.29.6); probable Brigantian crown guard (Piggott 1950 type IVb); see RD 2/17 above

2* Langton Down brooch: Reeded bow carried over spring cover; found by D Johnston (DM 1991.22.2); Hawkes and Hull 1947, 317-19, type 12, pl 94/91; Collingwood and Richmond 1969, 292-93, group K

3 Bow brooch: Base only; found by R Fitzsimmons (DM 1982.1.2); see RD 2/10 above

4 Button-and-loop fasteners:

(a)* Petal-shaped with broken loop; found by R Fitzsimmons (DM 1982.53.2)

(b)* Petal-shaped complete fastener; purchased from widow of J Magee (HM F.1993.2)

Both Wild 1970 class 3; see RD 2/16(b) above

*Glass/Faience Finds*

5 Melon beads:

(a) Complete; medium sized; turquoise faience (Lost; Riddell 1787, 293)

Figure 5 Panther Head (James Williams, courtesy of Dumfries Museum).

39 Mr R Fitzsimmons discovered Roman copper alloy objects including a comparatively rare dolphin model at NT 0937 0134 (DM 1982.70.1; Green, Cowie and Lockwood 1985) and a cavalry mount (DM 1982.70.2) paralleled on many Roman sites, e.g. Newstead (Curle 1911, 300, pl 73/2-4). Metal detection by D Johnston uncovered many Roman finds in the fort environs, a significant number west of the fort where no Roman structures have yet been discovered. These include coins (DM 1983.43.8-9, 35, 38-39 & 48, 1984.29.8 & 1991.22.1; Bateson and Holmes 1997, 530), Samian and coarse ware sherds, iron finds including a distinctive bar with attachments (DM 1983.43.37) and lead finds including the base of a lamp (DM 1983.43.46) and at least twenty weights.
(b)* Incomplete; deep blue glass; 1948 excavation (HM F.1948.187)
(c)* Complete; turquoise faience; 1949 excavation (HM F.1949.58)
(d)* Complete; blue faience; 1961 excavation (HM F.1961.46; DES 1962, 27)
(e)* Complete; blue glass (DM 1962.72; Truckell 1964, 60)

6 Counters:
(a) White paste; 1948 excavation (HM F.1948.278)
(b) White paste with central perforation; 1961 excavation (HM F.1961.45)
See RD 2/22(c) above
(c) Dark blue glass; 1961 excavation (HM F.1961.44)

RD 9 Raeburnfoot Roman Fort NY 2510 9908 (Wilson 1999, 24, refs)
1 Melon bead: Fragmentary; 1959-60 excavations (DM 1963.10; Truckell 1964, 60; Robertson 1962, 47)

B ROMAN AND ROMANO-NATIVE FINDS FROM NATIVE SITES

ND 1 Albie Hill, Applegarthtown NY 1087 8424 (Strachan 1999)
1 Iron sickle blade: Balanced type found on Roman and native sites (present location unknown; Strachan 1999, 12-14, fig 4, with parallels)

ND 2 Boonies, Westerkirk NY 3049 9004 (Jobey 1975; RCAHMS 1997, 146-47, no 963, fig 148)
Roman Coarse Ware (Lost; Jobey 1975, 135)
1 Small bowl: Rim sherd; reddish-buff fabric; house II surface find; probably Flavian/Trajanic
2 Flagon: Base sherd; orange fabric; probably late 1st/early 2nd century AD
3 Wall sherd: Probably from above flagon; house II enclosure bank

Copper Alloy Find
4* Penannular fibula: Corroded (DM 1984.9.2; Jobey 1975, 137, fig 8/12); Fowler 1960 type A 3(i); see RD 1/2 above

Glass Finds
5* Bangle fragments: Opaque white glass; rounded triangular section; house 7 entrance, first road surface; also two splinters from posthole within house (DM 1984.9.1; Jobey 1975, 135 37, fig 8/11); Kilbride-Jones 1938 type 3A; cf ND 4/20a-f, ND 5/2 & ND 10/1a-b below

ND 3 Brydekirk Church, Annan NY 1853 7110 (Crowe 1984)
1 Samian ware sherd: Light orange fabric; from deepest levels of vallum at medieval church (DM 1986.77.5; DES 1983, 6; Crowe 1984, 38)

ND 4 Burnswark Native Hillfort NY 1843 7835 (Jobey 1978, RCAHMS 1997, 129-30, figs 125 & 192, no 627
1 Denarius of Domitian: Little wear; recent excavations, tail of rampart; minted 87-89 AD (Lost; Jobey 1978, 85; Robertson 1974A, 117 & 1983, 407); cf hoard of denarii from Burnswark South Camp (HD 4/1)
Figure 6  Finds from Burnswark hillfort.
Central Gaulish Roman Samian Ware (Recent excavations)

2 Sherd: Drag 27 dated c 100-130 AD; Area A (Lost; Jobey 1978, 84, no 1)

3 Sherd: Probably Drag 18/31; north rampart, cutting 12 (Lost; Jobey 1978, 84-85, no 6)

4 Fourteen small sherds: Different locations (DM BW 84-85; Jobey 1978, 84, nos 2-5)
   Probably all 2nd century AD

Roman Coarse Ware (Lost; recent excavations)

5 Flagons:
   (a) Grey fabric with pale surface; area A (Jobey 1978, 85, no 1, fig 12/9); cf Gillam 1970, 5, type 5, dated 110-150 AD though type normally in light self-coloured fabric
   (b) Rim and wall sherds; fine dark grey surface; paler core; area A (Jobey 1978, 85, no 2, fig 12/10)
   (c) Foot ring; hard grey fabric; area B (Jobey 1978, 85, no 7)
   (d) Small sherd, micaceous grey-white ware; area B house (Jobey 1978, 85, no 8)

6 Mortarium: Twelve sherds; pinkish-buff surface; pale grey core; area B (Jobey 1978, 85, no 6); cf Gillam 1970, 26, type 244, from Sulloniacae though usually in orange-buff fabric, 110-150 AD; see ID 32 below

7 Jar: Four sherds from same vessel; one, dark coarse grey fabric with darker surfaces and three, blue-grey core with thin yellow-buff surface; area A (Jobey 1978, 85, nos 4-5)

8 Small body-sherds: Two; dark grey coarse fabric with black surface; area A (Jobey 1978, 85, no 3)

Copper Alloy Finds

9 Trumpet brooch: Fragment; plain head with oval spring; 1898 excavation backfill (DM BW 252; Jobey 1978, 91, no 8); see RD 2/15 above

10* Button-and-loop fastener: Damaged; petal head with boss; area A occupation earth, recent excavations (DM BW; Jobey, 1978, 91, no 6, fig 14/5); Wild 1970, 138-40, class 3; see RD 2/16(b) & (c) above

11 Terrets: (Recent excavations)
   (a) Knobbed terret fragment; enamel missing; area A (DM BW 153; Jobey 1978, 91, no 1, fig 14/1); Leeds 1933, 125, type 5; see RD 2/18(a-c) above
   (b) Small fragment; redoubt (DM BW; Jobey 1978, 91, no 2, fig 14/2)
   (c) Small fragment; area A (DM BW; Jobey 1978, 91, no 3)

12 Harness mounts:
   (a) Quatrefoil mount; four petals with central boss; recent excavations, redoubt (DM BW 19; Jobey 1978, 91, no 4, fig 14/3); cf precise parallel from Traprain Law (Burley 1958, 191, no 317; Macgregor 1976, no 27)
   (b) Double boss and petal looped-stud; recent excavations, redoubt (DM BW 16; Jobey 1978, 91, no 5, fig 14/4); cf Colchester (Crummy 1983, 106, fig 109/2544), Middlebie Moss (HD 12/6 below) and Traprain Law (Burley 1958, 191-92, nos 323-6; Macgregor 1976, 134, fig 8/4)
(c) Damaged mount; 1898 excavation (NMS GP 89; Anderson 1899, 247)

Other copper alloy finds from 1898 excavation (Anderson 1899, 247) are unlocalised including the base of a Roman *patera* (NMS GP 88)

**Iron Finds**

13 **Sword blade:** Corroded; recent excavations, north rampart (DM BW; Jobey 1978, 86-87, fig 13); Roman or native

14* **Republican socketed pilum:** Found by Bill Cormack and Robert Little outside hillfort on slope above South camp (NMS FR 689; Cormack 1961, 190-91, pl 10); I am grateful to Peter Connolly for identifying this as Republican with no parallel in Britain; it is paralleled at Alésia in Gaul where Julius Caesar besieged Vercingetorix in 52 BC (Reddé and Schnurbein 2001, 228, pl 70/373-4)

15* **Arrow-heads:** Nine, trilobate and tanged; recent excavations (five DM BW 99, 115 & 666; Jobey 1978, 89-90, fig 13 and parallels); on arrow-heads see Davies 1977 and Bishop and Coulston 1993, 113, illus 74/8-9

Other unlocalised iron finds from the 1898 excavation (Anderson 1899, 249, figs 6-8) include two axe-heads (NMS GP 83-84), a spearhead (NMS GP 86), horseshoe (NMS GP 85) and fifty further fragments.

**Lead Finds**

16* **Sling-shot:** Currently one hundred and sixty five but others may be unrecorded or located in other museums; weights vary from 14g to 55g; acorn, elliptical, lemon, oval, round and squat profiles: DM 1957.32.2 & 32.3, 1960.27.2 [13], 1961.9, 1988.2 [4] & 42 [9] & 1989.48; NM 1983.27; NMS GP 79 [65] & 80 [65]; THM calmg 1960.70.1-4; 40 (Anderson 1899, 246, fig 3; Cormack 1959 and 1961; Truckell 1964, 61; Jobey 1978, 87-89, fig 13; Bishop and Coulston 1993, 113, fig 74/4-7); most discovered in hillfort, its gates or slopes below; possibly fired from a machine but could have been discharged by slingers

Mike Bishop informs me that all Roman troops were trained to use the sling; recent experiments at the besieged fortress of Velsen I demonstrated that lead shot could be fired accurately irrespective of form, the better formed shot taking up to thirty seven seconds to manufacture compared with seventeen seconds for unshaped shot (Bosman 1995)

17 **Weight or plumb bob:** 104.62g weight; 1898 excavation backfill (DM BW; Jobey 1978, 91, no 1, fig 14/6)

18 **Oval disc:** Possibly ingot; recent excavations, area B house (DM BW; Jobey 1978, 91, no 2)

There is also a lead scrap from Area A (Jobey 1978, 92, no 3)

**Glass/Faience**

19 **Intaglio of Venus Victrix:** Paste imitating nicolo; flat oval with bevelled edge; from finger ring bezel; found under stone outside redoubt, 1898 excavation (NMS GP 97; Anderson 1899, 242 & 247, fig 5); Henig 1969, 107-8 and 1974, ii, 42, no 283, type 7, and 98 with parallels from Caerleon and Inveresk

---

40 The quantity of lead glandes for each museum reference number is indicated in square brackets.

20 **Bangle fragments:**

(a)* & (b)* Two fragments; opaque white glass with green streaks; 1898 excavation (NMS GP 96; Anderson 1899, 231 & 247); Kilbride-Jones 1938 type 3A

(c)*-(f)* Similar bangle fragments; recent excavations, area A (DM BW 65/30, 74, 302 & 308; Jobey 1978, 93, nos 1-3, fig 15/1 & 2); on this type of bangle see ND 2/5 above

(g)*-(h) Two fragments; opaque yellow (NMS GP 96); 1898 excavation (Anderson 1899, 247); probably Kilbride-Jones 1938 type 3B; cf Over Rig (ND 10/1 below)

(i)* Fragment; opaque white with yellow inlay; 1898 excavation; (NMS GP 96); Kilbride-Jones 1938, 384, fig 7/7, type 3D

One of 1898 bangles found in circumvallation cutting 14 and two in hillfort (Anderson 1899, 235 & 242)

Another unlocalised glass fragment from 1898 excavation (NMS GP 96) is part of rim and wall of a clear glass vessel

21 **Melon beads:**

(a) Light blue faience; badly corroded; 1898 excavation, redoubt (NMS GP 94; Anderson 1899, 242)

(b) Turquoise faience, badly corroded and worn (NMS GP 95)

(c) Small; turquoise faience; badly corroded; recent excavations, redoubt entrance (DM BW 65/43; Jobey 1978, 94, no 2, fig 15/3)

For a melon bead from the South Camp see RD 4/2 above

22 **Annular bead:** Fragment; opaque light blue glass with white marvered trail; recent excavations, redoubt entrance (DM BW 65/25; Jobey 1978, 94, no 1, fig 15/4); Guido 1978, 62-63, group 5A; cf Roman bead from Colchester (Crummy 1983, 32, fig 33/546)

23 **Fused bead:** Fragment; opaque sky blue glass; recent excavations, area A (DM BW; Jobey 1978, 94, no 3, fig 15/5)

24 **Counter:** glazed white paste; convex, badly damaged; unlocalised; 1898 excavation; not previously recorded (NMS GP 96); see RD 2/22(c) above

Stone Finds

25 **Ballista balls:**

(a)-(b) Red sandstone; 1898 excavation (NMS GP but impossible to identify which; Anderson 1899, 245-46, fig 2)

(c) Red sandstone; roughly cut; recent excavations, west gate backfill (DM BW 65/266; Jobey 1978, 90, no 3)

(d) Red sandstone; found by Bill Cormack, 23rd February 1976, on north east side of site (DM 1976.22)

There are at least eleven more balls (NMS GP 58-68; DM BW 1965.83 & 230 & 1976.22) and nine more fragments (NMS GP 69) from South Camp save one from North camp; four different approximate weights, 1.1kg, 0.7kg, 340g & 170g, small compared with medium sized 3.27kg balls from Hatra (Baatz 1987, 7) and larger 50kg balls from 2nd century AD Halton Chesters and 3rd century AD Risingham and High Rochester (Jobey 1978, 90-91); they could not be
thrown far by hand and were therefore probably projected from *carroballistae* (Vegetius 2, 25 & 4, 22) located at Burnswark on artillery platforms, the ‘Three Brethren’ (Bishop and Coulston 1993, 114-15, illus 75/3) 42

Cf ballista balls from Milton (HM F.1947.47) and Glencairn (ND 11/1 below)

**ND 5  Carrownbridge Native Settlement** NX 869 977 (Wilson 1999, 35, refs)

*Copper Alloy Find*

1 **Trumpet brooch**: Enclosure A ditch (DM 1995.1.67; Johnston 1994, 266-67, illus 23 & MF 2C5-6 with detailed description); probably Flavian; see RD2/15 above

*Glass/Faience Finds*

2 **Bangle fragment**: Opaque white glass; triangular section; Enclosure A (DM 1995.1.62; Johnston 1994, 269, no 3, & 273, MF 2C10); Kilbride-Jones 1938 type 3A; see ND 2/5 above

3 **Melon bead**: Blue faience fragment; Enclosure A (DM 1995.1.40; Johnston 1994, 268, no 6, 273 & MF 2C10)

4 **Annular bead**: Green glass; topsoil near cuts 1 & 2 (DM 1995.1.16; Johnston 1994, 268, no 2 & MF 2C10 with parallel from Verulamium)

5 **Globular bead**: Brown weathered glass; temporary camp ditch (DM 1995.1.27; Johnston 1994, 268, no 5 & MF 2C10)

**ND 6  Castle O’er** NY 2419 9287 (RCAHMS 1997, 78-82, figs 72 & 73, no 650)

*Glass/Faience Find*

1 **Melon beads**:

(a)* Blue glass; found 1970; donated by Mr Anderson in 1980 (DM 1980.55)

(b) Blue glass; external diameter 20 mm; internal diameter 5 mm; depth (DM lost); measurements taken c 1960 when fragments of six more were examined recorded by RCAHMS as from Castle O’er; the six additional beads were from the Bell Collection, however, and could have come from Birrens, Dryburgh or Newstead

2 **Annular bead**: Translucent blue glass with irregular wave; (DM 1948.19); Guido 1978, 63, group 5A; see ND 4/22 above

*Stone Find*

3 **Globular bead**: Minute lithomarge bead (DM unumbered; Stevenson and Collins 1976, 56)

**ND 7  Hoddom Church** NY 1668 7268 (RCAHMS 1997, 247, fig 262, no 1744)

*Roman building stones*

1 Three/four courses of stones, some with diamond broaching, discovered during 1915 excavation; nave of early church; (RCHAMS 1997 no 1744); one stone inscribed *Legio VI Victrix* built into south east corner of nave (Lost; *RIB* 2113); it has been suggested the whole church was built of Birrens stone (Macdonald 1923, 72)

---

42 Smaller stone balls possibly thrown by hand, have been found on Roman sites such as Birdoswald. It is not always easy to determine which may be Roman though Mike Bishop informs me that Roman stones often have a slightly flat facet on one side. There is no record of smaller ceramic, clay or stone sling shot from Burnswark such as from Carlisle (Padley in Caruana forthcoming, G 36-38, M 3-11 & N 98-103) though these may have eluded the archaeological record.
2 Two discovered in recent excavations on Anglian monastery, one recording work by vexillations of *Legio VIII Augusta* and *Legio XXII Primigenia* (Lowe 1991, 21-23, figs 7-8; Keppie 1994, 44-49), the former recorded at Brougham (*RIB* 782) and Newcastle (*CIL* 7, 495) and the latter at Cliffe and Falkirk (*RIB* 1026 & 2216).

*Copper alloy finds*

3 **Roman arm-purse**: Corroded; originally five fragments, now two bowl fragments and two arms, one with provision for a hinge (BM 51.7-15.3; Birley 1963, no 5); see ID 1/2 below.

4 **Disc brooch**: Four equal convex sides with central peg and rear catch-plate (BM 51.7-15.4); see RD 2/14 above.

Finds 3 & 4 discovered in early chapel foundations, perhaps votive offering commemorating Romano-British Christian origins; finds purchased by BM from Kirkpatrick-Sharpe Collection at auction 1851.

ND 8 **Hoddomcross Church** NY 1783 7351 (RCAHMS 1997, 245, no 1750)

*Inscribed Stone*

1 **Altar to Jupiter**: Red sandstone; dedication by *cohors I Nervana Germanorum*; in Hoddom old church wall in 17th century and on church’s demolition 1817, built into new Hoddomcross church porch (DM unregistered; *RIB* 2097; Keppie 1984, 399); badly damaged during fire in April 1975 and removed in several pieces to DM early 1976; Antonine I 43.

ND 9 **Mosspeeble** NY 3848 9328

1 **Undecorated annular bead**: Translucent green glass; medium size; found with a whorl in a settlement containing round houses; site across Ewes opposite probable Roman road up Ewesdale (Wilson 1999, 37); donated by A H Borthwick 1869 (NMS FJ 39; RCAHMS 1997, 133, & 299, no 692, fig 127); Guido 1978, 65-66 & 142, group 6ii; Iron Age type.

ND 10 **Over Rig** NY 2455 9345 (RCAHMS 1997, 84-86, fig 76, no 1035; Mercer forthcoming); all finds from clay raft forming floor of natural amphitheatre; finds with excavator.

1 *Glass bangle fragments:

(a)-(b) Opaque white (OR 84/25 & 39); Kilbride-Jones 1938, type 3A; see ND 2/5 above

(c)-(d) Opaque yellow, (c) in many fragments (OR 84/36 & 43); Kilbride-Jones 1938, type 3B; see ND 4/20 (g)-(h) above.

2* **Melon bead**: Fragment; light blue faience (OR 84/19).

ND 11 **Shancastle Doon (?)**, Glencairn NX 815 908 (Ordnance Survey Name Book, 1858, 21, 144; Corrie 1910, 24; RCAHMS 1920, 88, no 240)

1 **Ballista ball**: Grey stone; (DM 1965.78); Grierson Museum Catalogue cites Glencairn as findspot (Black 1894, 74, no 40); reported discovery on slopes of Shancastle (Jobey 1978, 91) unconfirmed; there is no Roman site on the Doon (Corrie, 1910, 27) though an RCAHMS aerial photograph of 1996 suggests a possible Iron Age fort (AP 73/396/207); on ballista balls see ND 4/25 above.

---

43 For another altar to Jupiter from Birrens see ID 33/1 below.
ND 12 Thornhill Homestead NX 8767 9480 (Wilson 1999, 35)

1 Coin of Constantius II: Found by David McFadzean in rabbit scrape on south face of undated homestead not a Roman signal station as previously suggested (DM 1964.105, stolen; Robertson 1974A, 121)

ND 13 Uppercleugh, Lockerbie NY 1132 8714; Terry 1993)

1 Bangle fragments:

(a) Translucent pale blue glass; three blue twisted cords with white cable pattern; enclosure ditch ploughed infill (Find with Guard; Terry 1993, 61-62, fig 5.1); Kilbride-Jones 1938 type 2; Price 1988 type 2Aii; see RD 3/2 above

(b) Fragment of possible bangle similar to (a)

C ROMAN AND NATIVE IRON AGE COLLECTIONS/HOARDS

HD 1 Bailie Knowe NY 0154 70481

1 Cauldron chains: From at least two cauldrons found 1789 in square stone-lined pit within destroyed circular earthwork (Lost; Riddell 1787, 245-46; Francis Grose’s drawings in SAS MS 476, 10-16; RCHAMS 1920, 25, no 37; Close-Brooks 1986); Romano-British chains of Great Chesterford type (Manning 1983, 142-50, fig 8/3); cf similar collared junctions from Blackburn Mill and Carlingwark (Piggott 1955, 32 & 42-44, B 17 & C10) and 4th century AD cage hangers on chains from Great Chesterford, Silchester and Appleford; dated 3rd/4th century AD on basis of cage hangers

HD 2 Broomholm NY 37 81

1 Roman coin hoard: Six aurei (three Nero, two Vespasian, one Domitian) discovered 1782 (last with Lady Douglas of Douglas; Wilson 1999, 21, fn 11; Robertson 2000, 19, no 97)

HD 3 Burnfoot House NY 2516 7444

Inscribed/Sculptured Stones

1 Altar to Minerva: Dedication by cohors II Tungrorum; found 1810, Birrens west annexe; sundial at Burnfoot 1813 (DM 1950.53.1; Macdonald 1896, 124 & 152-55, no 16, figs 21-23; RIB 2104; CSIR 9, pl 4); Antonine II

2 Altar to Fortuna: Found 1886, Birrens west annexe; taken to Burnfoot 1895 (DM 1950.53.2; Macdonald 1896, 159-60, no 21, fig 28; RIB 2095)

3 Head of Goddess: Found 1886, Birrens west annexe; taken to Burnfoot presumably 1895 (DM 1950.53.3; CSIR 20, pl 7 but reddish not whitish-grey sandstone as recorded); ‘Dutch bonnet’ head-dress style found in Rhine homeland sculpture of Cohors II Tungrorum stationed at Birrens (Toynbee 1953); Antonine II

Stones presented to DM 1950 by Mrs Cavan-Irving of Burnfoot House (Truckell 1952, 139-40; Keppie 1994, 39); for other stones from Land farm, originally on the Burnfoot Estate, see ID 25

HD 4 Burnswark South Camp NY 188 785

1 Roman coin hoard: Four denarii (one Nero, one Vespasian, two Trajan) discovered South Camp c 1726; placed before Society of Antiquaries of London by Roger Gale 2 February 1727
(MS Minutes of the Society of Antiquaries of London 1, 1717-32, 183; Gordon 1726, 184; Macdonald 1918, 216-17; Robertson 2000, 23-24, no 125) 44

HD 5  Canonbie (?)

1 Roman flue tile fragments: Presented to DM 10 March, 1950 by Captain J G Milne Home with Bronze Age stone mould and axe (DM lost; TDGNHAS 3rd ser 28, 1949-50, 227; RSA 683); if local, possibly from Broomholm fort bathouse

HD 6  Closeburn c NX 89 92 (NMS FR 205; presented before 1892; probably from Menteath Collection at Closeburn Hall)

Roman glass 45

1* Phials: Fragments of three unguent bottles:

(a) Coated with silverish substance
(b) Bulbous base
(c) Plain base

On phials see Charlesworth 1959, 54, fig 10/2 & 3 & pl 5/2

2* Pillar-moulded bowl sherd: Part of rim, wall and handle (NMS FR 205) 46

HD 7  Durisdeer NS 9028 0487

1 Roman patera: Copper alloy; tinned internally (DM 1968.38; Curle 1932, 370, no 31); part of hoard of two goblets and two plates found in ditch by fortlet entrance during ploughing c 1850 (Black 1894, 80, no 16 & MS Catalogue no 1059; Truckell 1966, 67)

HD 8  Friars Carse, Ellisland NX 9189 8467

1 Two Roman trullae: (a) containing (b); found about one mile north of Friars Carse while building Turnpike road from Dumfries to Sanquhar in 1790 (Lost; Riddell 1787, 285-86 with drawings of both):

(a) Fragmentary but damaged by workmen
(b) Inscribed copper alloy trulleum; tinned internally (Riddell 1808, 105, pl 8; Black 1894, 80, no 66; RIB 2415.5); manufacturer, Campanian bronzesmith, L Ansius Epaphroditus; cf general outline, Eggers 1966, 109, types 140-44, stamp, Radnóti 1938, 19, taf 1/2, 39, taf 3/11 & pl 17/6-8, cord design bordering handle, Den Boesterd 1956, 7 pl 1/15a, and raised sharp grooves on the base, Den Boesterd 1956, 7, pl 13/17 & Radnóti 1938 taf 1/2, 3/13 & 4/18

HD 9  Hoddom Castle NY 1560 7297

Collection of Roman Inscribed/Sculptured Stones

1 Altar to Fortuna: Dedication by cohors I Nervana Germanorum; Kirkpatrick-Sharpe Collection (NMS FV 4; Macdonald 1896, 147-48, no 14, fig 19; RIB 2093; CSIR 3, pl 2); Antonine I

44 The amended discovery date c 1725 based on the minute referred to above, is incorrect (Robertson 1984, 417); the correct date is c 1726 as New Year’s Day in England was observed on 25th March until 1752 and by today’s calendar the minute would have been dated 2 February 1727; New Year’s Day in Scotland was changed to 1st January in 1599 (Cheney 1945).

45 Dominic Ingemark confirms that all these finds could have come from a local Roman military site.

46 This find was incorrectly recorded as the neck of Roman coarse ware flagon (Robertson 1970, 224).
2 Altar to Harimella: Dedication probably by cohors II Tungrorum to Rhineland goddess (DM 1951.31.1; Macdonald 1896, 141-42, no 10, fig 15; RIB 2096; CSIR 13, pl 5); Antonine II

3 Altar to Viradecthis: Dedication by Cohors II Tungrorum to Rhineland goddess (DM 1951.31.2; Macdonald 1896, 142-44, no 11, fig 16; RIB 2108; CSIR 16, pl 6); Antonine II

4 Sculptured Stone: Inscribed Legio XX Vict; (Lost; Macdonald 1896, 149; Robertson 1975A, 97, no 7; RIB 2114)

5 Tombstone of Afutianus Bassus: Centurion, cohors II Tungrorum (DM 1951.31.3; Macdonald 1896, 145-46, no 13, fig 18; RIB 2115); Antonine II

6 Pedestal of Statue of Fortuna: (Lost; Macdonald 1896, 144-45, no 12, fig 17; RIB 2094; CSIR 4, pl 2); Antonine II

7 Tombstone (?): Possibly from Birrens (Lost; Macdonald 1896, 139; CSIR 23, pl 8)

8 Commemorative slab of Victory: (NMS FV 21; Macdonald 1896, 121-23, fig 5; CSIR 26; RD 2/6(e) above)

1-7 seen at Hoddum 1772 (Pennant 1790, 3, 408-12) where, apart from 1, they remained until 1895; 1 was taken to Kirkpatrick-Sharpe’s house in Edinburgh c 1812 with altars then found at Birrens (Mars and Victory, Ricagambada and Frumentius; NMS FV 2, 1 & 3; RIB 2100, 2107 & 2109), then to University of Edinburgh 1851 and Society of Antiquaries Museum 1866; 2, 3 & 5 presented on permanent loan to DM 1951 by Captain Edward Brook of Kinmount House; 8 was first seen in castle fabric 1760 (Pococke 1887, 33-34); 6 and possibly other stones were first taken from Birrens to Knockhill summer house, then Hoddum 1935; moved to Castle cellar for safe-keeping 1939 but removed by Pioneer Corps in Second World War (RCAHMS 1997, no 1754); Walter Bell, a road roller driver, reported he buried Roman stones and Christian crosses in widening the north side of Hoddum Castle east drive, one hundred and fifty yards from the drawbridge (c NY 1565 7283; Maxwell-Irving 1987, 213, fn 1); on the Hoddum connection see Birley 1961 and Keppie 1994, 39-40)

HD 10  Lochar Moss

1 *Copper alloy torc: Upper part crescent-shaped and lower part beaded; found before 1846 dismembered inside HD 10/2 while cutting peat about two miles north of Comlongon Castle (NY 035 717; BM 53.11.5; Way 1852; Macgregor 1976, 97-99, no 204, map 15/9, pl IIIa); XRF analysis revealed a significant difference in the zinc content of the crescent compared with the beads; J D Hill confirms this was to distinguish the crescent from the beads; cf similar use of zinc in the Deskford carnyx (Hunter 2001B, 78-80); the broken back scroll design of the bar is paralleled on the Mortonhall scabbard (Macgregor 1976, no 150); cf beaded torcs from Carlisle, Embsay, Hyndford and Lamberton Moor (Macgregor 1976, nos 199-200 & 202-3)

Figure 7  Copper alloy torc
(© The Trustees of the British Museum).
2 Sheet bronze bowl: Everted rim, gently swelling shoulder and rounded base; found containing HD 8/1 (BM 53.11.5; Way 1852, 86; Macgregor 1976, 168, no 297)

Both in Kirkpatrick-Sharpe Collection auctioned 1851; torc reassembled at BM following purchase but some beads were missing

HD 11 Lochar Moss, The Syke, Torthorwald

1 Republican silver coin of Fufius Calenus: Worn; one of hoard of fifteen or sixteen silver coins found sixteen feet below surface in peat cutting (Lost; Jardine 1867, 18); issue of Q Fufius Calenus, 82 BC (Babelon 1886, 511) or 72 BC (Grueber 1910, 415, nos 3358-63) or 70 BC (Crawford 1974, 83) or 71-67 BC (Sydenham 1952, 131); Calenus served under Julius Caesar as consul in 47 and 44 BC

HD 12 Middlebie Moss

Bronze hoard of twenty eight objects found c 1737 in moss near ‘Roman camp’ (Minutes of the Society of Antiquaries of London III, 1738, 125-26 & folio of drawings, II, 6; Curle 1913, 100-1, pl 2); North British origin likely despite southern influence on HD 12/2d

1* Bridle bits:

(a) One-link bit (NMS FA 70; Ward-Perkins 1939, 185; Macgregor 1976, 31 & 54, no 11)

(b)-(c) Two derivative three-link bits, one lost (NMS FA 71; Ward-Perkins 1939, 183; Macgregor 1976, 25-28 & 53, nos 5 & 6, map 1/5); cf Newstead (Macgregor 1976, no 7)

(d)-(g) Circular rings with flattened sections (NMS FA 45-48; Macgregor 1976, 31 nos 12 & 13)
2* Strap junctions:
(a)-(c) Elongated (NMS FA 49-51; Macgregor 1976, 35-36 & 58, nos 33-35, map 3/5)
(d)-(e) Petal/cruciform with red enamel (NMS FA 55 & 56; Macgregor 1976, 33-35 & 58, nos 22 & 23, map 3/2); cf (d) with Saham Toney which prompted the suggestion that it is an import (Macgregor 1976, 34-35); cf (e) with Newstead (Curle 1911, 302, pl 75/3 and Traprain Law (Burley 1958, 191, no 318)

3* Terrets:
(a)-(c) Simple terrets with grooved collars; (c) fragmentary (NMS FA 60, 61, & 68; Macgregor 1976, 62, nos 55, 56 & 58, map 5/22); cf terrets from Dunure & Honley (Macgregor 1976, nos 51-52)
(d) Simple terret with vertical collar; no grooves (NMS FA 67; Macgregor 1976, no 57); cf terret from Torwoodlee (Macgregor 1976, no 60); see RD 2/18(d) above
(e) Platform terret with splayed collar; red enamelled decoration round blue central spot with red enamelled grooves (NMS FA 58; Macgregor 1976, 45 & 69, no 72, map 9/12); Leeds 1933 type 5; cf Chesters & Traprain Law (Macgregor 1976, nos 67 & 75-76; Burley 1958, 195, nos 352-53); see RD 2/18(a)-(c) above
(f)-(k) Knobbed terrets with grooved collars (NMS FA 59 & 62-66; Macgregor 1976, 46-47 & 69, nos 88-93, map 10/18); Leeds 1933 type 7; cf Muircleugh & Traprain Law (Macgregor 1976, nos 94-95, 103-4 & 106-8); see RD 2/18(d) above

4* Crown sword-hilt guard: (NMS FA 57; Curle 1913, 102-3, fig 9; Macgregor 1976, 91, no 149, map 13/11); Brigantian guard (Piggott 1950, 27, type IVb); see RD 2/17 & RD 8/1 above

5* Button-and-loop fasteners:
(a)-(c) Button and loop fasteners (NMS FA 52-54; Macgregor 1976, 131-33, fig 7/1-2); Wild 1970, 149, class 3; cf knurled protuberance on 5(a) with that on strap junction from Carlisle (Macgregor 1976, no 19); see RD 2/16(b) above

6* Looped stud: (NMS FA 69; Macgregor 1976, 134, fig 8/1); cf Burnswark Hill (ND 4/12(b) above), Newstead (Curle 1911, 302, pl 75/9) and Traprain Law (Burley 1958, 191, nos 320-2)

HD 13  **Wauchope Bridge** c NY 361 845

1  **Aureus of Otho**: Found possibly with two more aurei c 1782 (Last in possession of Baron Baillie Little of Langholm; OSA 13, 1794, 597; Macdonald 1918, 242)

HD 14  **Whita Hill, Langholm** NY 376 841

1  **Roman coin hoard**: Ten much worn, corroded coins found by quarryman; two sestertii of Hadrian, three sestertii possibly of Hadrian, worn as of Antoninus Pius, sestertius and as of Antoninus Pius, as of early 3rd century AD, possibly Severus Alexander, and centionalis of Constantius II; presented to DM December 1966 by A McCracken but found many years before (Lost; DES 1967, 20; Robertson 1974A, 129 and 1978, 209, no 29); last coin suggested as later find owing to unconfirmed report of separate late Roman coin from Langholm
D ISOLATED ROMAN AND IRON AGE FINDS

ID 1  Annan

1  *As/dupondius of Hadrian:* Well worn; found c 1920, Butts Street garden (NY 194 667; Macdonald 1924, 328)

2  Roman arm purse: Rigid type; flat handle; no lid; found 1940, town street; Carrick Collection (THM L 29.12; Birley 1963, 16-17, no 8, fig 4 with parallels); see ND 7/3 above

ID 2  Annandale

1  Trulleum handle: Dog’s head terminal; ‘Canterbury’ type (NMS FT 8; Curle 1932, 301-2 & 369-70, no 30, fig 13; Den Boesterd 1956, 28-29); cf handles from Canterbury, Santon Downham and Thornborough (Moore 1973, 155 & 159; Koster 1997, 78-79, no 104)

ID 3  Baitford, Penpont NX 8647 9536

1*  Melon bead: Turquoise faience (DM 1965.68; Riddell 1787, 20-21; Black 1894, 76, no 106; DES 1965, 18, Truckell 1966, 67)

ID 4  Barburgh Mill c NX 902 884

1  *As/dupondius of Marcus Aurelius/Lucius Verus:* heavily worn, corroded; found 1950 during haymaking by Mr Rennie of Station House on ‘Roman road’ opposite Barburgh Mill fortlet (DM 1951.42; Robertson 1963, 140; Wilson 1999, 34, fn 41)

ID 5  Berscar NX 897 893

1*  La Tène III brooch: Pin missing; found by D Johnston (DM 1990.49.1); Collingwood and Richmond 1969, 292, group F, fig 102/9; Hawkes and Hull 1947, 308-10, type 3, pl 90/20 & 21, dated 49-61 AD; found near line of probable Roman road up Nithsdale (Wilson 1997, 35, fn 42)

ID 6  Birkhill NY 9783 7644

1  Dobunnic gold stater of Bodvoc: Well worn; obverse with Bodvoc across whole field; reverse with disjointed three-tailed horse to right with two ring ornaments, crescent and three small pointed crosses; found 27 November 1861 in garden with imported, though presumably local, soil; subsequently made into brooch but probably not in antiquity (NMS H.C 18402 not FE 35 as previously recorded; Numismatic Chronicle new ser 2, 1862, 153-54, illus; Evans 1864, 135, illus; Hunter 1997B, 517); Bodvoc ruled the Dobunni or northern Dobunni, 30 to 40 AD, on the most recent dating (Creighton 2000, 32); on the origin and evolution of Dobunnic gold coins and a close parallel see Allen 1961, 76-83, pl 35/11

ID 7  Burnswark or Birrens

1  Horned head relief of Priapus: (NMS FV 19; Macdonald 1896, 149-52, no 15, fig 20; RIB 2106; CSIR 11, pl 4); found before 1810 in ‘camp near Burnswark’, possibly the fort at Birrens; an alternative dedication has been suggested to Celtic deity Eriapus (Ross, 1961, 80)

ID 8  Burnswark Moss

1  Cast bronze bridle bit: Derivative three-link bit found before 1785 in deep moss at ‘end of Birrenswark Hill’; donated by R Clapperton (NMS FA 29: Leeds 1933, 116; Macgregor 1976, 28-30 & 53, no 2, map 1/1, pl Vc); claimed as one of pair (Ward-Perkins 1939, 183) but second bit lost; microscopic examination revealed red and blue enamelling; cf bit from Rise (Macgregor 1976, no 10) and interlocked cells on a terret from Colchester (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 331, pl 99/5)
ID 9  Cairnpark  NX 865 988

1  *Ae of Antoninus Pius*: Found digging Second World War army hut foundations about one mile north of Carronbridge west of A 76; (Lost; Robertson 1963, 134)

ID 10  Canonbie

1  *Aureus of Nero*: Found in glebe east of church, NY 396 763, c 1840 (Lost; *NSA* 4, 490; Macdonald 1918, 241)

2  *Ae of Antoninus Pius*: Well worn; corroded; found by A Roe (DM 1997.16)

3  *Samian ware sherd*: Dr 18/31; good dull red glaze (NMS FR 254, Duns Collection); first half 2nd century AD

ID 11  Carlesgill, Westerkirk  NY 330 880

1  *Ae of Constantine I*: Hardly worn; possibly minted at Arles; found May 1960, foot of orchard-garden of Major and Mrs Parton (DM; Robertson, 1963, 140)

ID 12  Cleughbrae, Mouswald  NY 0655 7403

1  *Alexandrian coin of Antonine Pius*: Fairly well worn; found May 1960 by R C Reid in his garden (DM lost; Robertson, 1963, 140)

ID 13  Cove, Kirkpatrick Fleming  NY 266 704

1  *Roman gold handle*: Buffer terminals; obverse *HELENVS F*; reverse *III MB*; found before 1772 about eighteen inches under surface (Lost; Pococke 1773, 41, pl 3, fig 4; Camden 1806, 4, 63; *RIB* 2413.1)

ID 14  Crofthead  c NT 12 05

*Roman pottery*

1  *Base of Samian bowl, Dr 37*: Soft orange clay with dullish glaze (HM F 1969.10)

2*  *Neck of coarse ware flagon*: orange clay with cream slip (HM F 1969.12)

Both sherds donated by A and D Foote in Mann Collection

ID 15  Dockenflat, Waterbeck  NY 235 777

1  *Ae of Maxentius*: Mint condition; found c 1935 in repairing stone dyke near Birrens (Last with A Cunningham, Larchcroft, Ecclefechan; Birley 1938, 340; Macdonald 1939, 243)

ID 16  Dumfries

1  *Aureus of Augustus*: Found c 1793, Nith opposite town mills, c NX 9742 7543 (Lost; *OSA* 5, 1793, 142; Macdonald 1918, 242)

2  *As of Domitian*: Minted at Rome; found 1982, garden, 138 Annan Road, (DM 1982.54; Bateson and Holmes 1997, 532)

3  *Aureus of Trajan*: Very good condition; found 22 January 1836, moss near Dumfries (NMS C 14494; *Archaeologica Scotica* 5, 1890, Appendix, 35; Macdonald 1918, 242)

4  *Sestertius of Hadrian*: Found 1926, Nith; *RIC* Hadrian 785, minted 134-138 AD (Coin with finder?; information from Donal Bateson in advance of publication)

5  *Alexandrian coin of Claudius II*: Somewhat worn; R Brownlie reported its discovery in 19th century near Dumfries (Lost; Robertson 1963, 140)
Figure 9 Isolated finds and finds from hoards.
6* Roman pick-axe: Found 1866-1867, digging foundations for Greyfriars Church on/beside ‘Roman road’(?) through Dumfries (NX 9712 7630; DM 1936.64; Truckell 1964, 161; Manning 1976, 28, fig 6, type 2 dolabra); cf Corbridge (Allason-Jones and Bishop 1988, 53, fig 72), Lochlee crannog (Wilson 1997, 16, MO 33, A/LOL 29, fig 4; Milton (HM F 1949.50) and Newstead (Curle 1911, 278, pl 57/1)

ID 17 Dumfriesshire

1 Bow fibulae:

(a)-(b) Donated by J K Richardson (NMS FR 666-7; PSAS 92, 1958-59, 120); Nauheim derivatives (Snape 1993, 12, group 1.1); cf Bagendon (Clifford 1961, 169, type C, nos 11 & 12, fig 30/1-2) and Colchester dated 49-61 AD BC (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 312-13, type 7, pl 92/56-7); probably late 1st century AD

2 Oval Roman catacomb lamp: Stylized palm branches on shoulder and raised points either side of handle; 5th century AD; NMS FR 198; Bailey 1980, 392-93, type U; probable modern import (Eckhardt 2002, 220 & 401, fig 95/2229)

ID 18 Ecclefechan

1 Gold billon piece of Alexander the Great: found in local stream (Lost; NSA 4, 292 93)

2 Dupondius of Hadrian: ‘Fairly’ worn; minted 119-138 AD; reported June 1981 by C Stewart as found ‘near a Roman fort near Ecclefechan’, presumably Birrens (Robertson 1984, 407)

ID 19 Ericstone Brae, Moffat c NT 06 11

1* Roman gold openwork crossbow brooch: Inscribed IOVI AVG and VOT XX with FORTV rudely scratched on underside; found c 1787 cutting peat on Roman road (Los Angeles County Museum Inv No A.5141.50-826; Gentleman’s Magazine 57, 1787, 540; RIB 2421.42; Wilson 1999, 32, fn 33, refs; Swift 2000, 274, fig 91, type 2ii with pronounced cut at base of bow); only openwork gold crossbow brooch found in Roman Empire (Noll 1974, 227-30, A1, bild 6 & 7); celebrates twentieth anniversary on 20 November 303 AD of Diocletian’s accession, likely imperial gift to senior Roman officer; possibly lost while travelling in Annandale perhaps on Constantius I’s Pictish campaign in 306 AD; crude underside inscription suggests an award for bravery possibly on campaign

ID 20 Gilnockie(?)

1 Roman coins and inscribed stones: Reported from ‘vicinity’ of Gilnockie (OSA 14, 1795, 421-22) but ‘vicinity’ may cover most of Lower Eskdale and the Roman fort at Netherby in particular as the finds were last in the possession of James (Jockie) Graham of Netherby

ID 21 Glass Rig, Mitchellslacks NX 954 959

1 Roman melon bead: Blue faience (Lost; DES 1961, 30; Robertson 1970, 224)
ID 22  
**Gretna** c NY 32 67

1  **Denarius of Trajan:** Found in river Sark (With finder; Shotter 1990, 235; RCAHMS 1997, 311, no 1244)

ID 23  
**Irvine House** NY 3746 8066

1  **Denarius of Antoninus Pius:** Found 1924 in garden (Lost; Macdonald 1934B, 30)

ID 24  
**Kirkmahoe Glebe, Kirkton** NX 974 815 (Wilson 1999, 34, fn 38)

1*  **Small bronze buckle:** Clasp intact; found by D Johnston (DM 1990.57.1); probable Roman stray from Carzield; cf Newstead (Curle 1911, pl 88/14)

ID 25  
**Land Farm** NY 2148 7539 47

*Roman inscribed/sculptured stones*

1  **Altar to Mars or the Matres:** Upper portion only (Lost; Macdonald 1896, 155, no 17, fig 24; *RIB* 2101; *CSIR* 6, pl 2); found 1866, farm-house garden, but presumably removed c 1810 from Birrens by James Clow, proprietor of Land, or more likely his contractor, the Land tenant-farmer John Leach; Leach informed Alexander Nivison that he was appointed contractor to Clow c 1816 to build dykes on estate farms; he removed HD 3/1 in 1810 and HD 9/6 in 1813 among ‘hundreds of tons’ of stone from the site, particularly from the west annexe; Land became part of the Burnfoot Estate in 1837 (Macdonald 1896, 124); Antonine II?

2  **Five pine cone filials:** found 1864 at or near Birrens (Lost MS journal of Arthur Mitchell; *CSIR* 24); late 1st/2nd century AD

ID 26  
**Lochar Moss**

1  **Bronze cup with dancing bacchantes:** Found nine feet below surface (Lost; Way 1852, 84)

ID 27  
**Meadowpark, Kirkton** c NX 97 81

1  **Iron Age querns:** Found near Roman fort at Carzield but not located in DM:

(a)*  Upper beehive quern (DM.1979.275)

(b)  Upper flat quern (DM 1979.276)

ID 28  
**Middlebie Village** NY 214 761

1  **Roman stone:** Inscribed AXAN CONIS; seen before 1726 built into house at Middlebie (Lost; Gordon, 1726, 18; *RIB* 2116); presumabaly from Birrens

ID 29  
**Mouswald** NY 0655 7403 48

1  **Annular/globular bead:** Small; reddish yellow; donated 1889 by C Carruthers (NMS FJ 44; Guido 1978, 152, group 6iiib)

2  **Onyx intaglio of Mars Gravidus:** (Lost; *Arch J* 2, 1846, 395; Way 1852, 83); on intaglios of Mars Gravidus see Henig 1974, 16-17, nos 70-74

---

47  Birrens is situated on Land farm.

48  The polygonal bead from Mouswald (NMS FJ 45) is Saxon (Laing 1973, 45, no 2).
**ID 30  Nithsdale**

1 **Annular wave bead**: blue glass with marvered trails in white and cream; found in ‘Meikle Wood Moor’ (Lost; Riddell 1787, 241-3, no 4; Guido 1978, 77-79 class 9?); cf bead from Crossmichael Grave Mound (Wilson 2001, 98, K6/2)

**ID 31  Raeburnhead farm, Kirkpatrick Fleming NY 2878 7120**

1 **Alexandrian coin of Probus**: Minted Alexandria 279 AD; fairly well worn; brought 2 August 1955 by pupil to D Mitchell, then Headmaster of St Mungo’s School, Lockerbie (DM 1955.6; Robertson 1963, 140)

**ID 32  Shillahill Bridge NY 107 808**

1* **Mortarium sherd**: Rim and part of wall; buff-orange fabric; found in gravel bed on west bank north of bend in the Annan by Robert Little (DM 1962.108; DES 1962, 27); may have come from Roman fort at Ladyward; cf mortarium from Corbridge dated 130-160 AD (Gillam 1970, 27, type 249); see ND 4/6 above

**ID 33  Springkell NY c 25 75**

1 **Altar to Jupiter**: Found 1814 in ‘small vicinal camp’ on banks of Kirtle near Springkell, presumably Birrens (Lost; Macdonald 1896, 160, fn 1; RIB 2098; CSIR 5, pl 2); late 1st/2nd century AD 49

2 **Ae of Constantius II**: Fairly well worn; found c 1960 during drainage operations by Sir Neil Johnson-Ferguson three feet below surface on old road one mile north of Springkell House (DM 1961.5; Robertson 1963, 140); found close to postulated Roman road from Birrens to Broomholm (see fn 21 above)

**ID 34  Water of Mein**

*Roman pottery;* Found by A Gibbs; (DM 1965.34; unlocated in museum)

1 **Samian sherd**

2 **Sherd of amphora**

3 **Rim of coarse ware**

**ID 35  West Gallaberry NX 9636 8272**

1 **As of Vespasian**: Well worn; found 1980, Roman road near Roman camp (Lost; Robertson 1984, 407); 69-71 AD

**ID 36  Westhills NY 2722 6555**

1 **Roman altar**: Found eighty feet north of farm buildings (Lost; RCAHMS 1920, 93, no 266); O G S Crawford suggested it may have come from an as yet undiscovered Roman site in the vicinity 50

**ID 37  Whitehill Farm, Kirkmahoe NX 9813 8092**

1 **Small ae of Valentinian II**: Found c 1903 in mole hill (DM 1955.96; Macdonald 1934B, 31)

---

49 For another altar to Jupiter from Birrens see ND 8/1 above.

50 Such a site might have been *Maporiton* recorded in the Ravenna Cosmography, recently suggested as Maponus’ ford over the Solway near the Clochmabenstane (Birley 2001, 19).
ID 38  Whitehills Moss NY 086 828

1  Beaten bronze cauldron: Shallow globular cauldron found before 1889 in unknown circumstances (NMS DU 6; Macgregor 1976, 150-51 & 170-71, no 307, map 21/15); Battersea type; for parallels see Piggott 1955, 40-41 and Macgregor 1976, nos 301-6); X-ray analysis by David Dungworth revealed the composition as Cu 93.2%, Pb nd, Sn 5% & Zn 1.2%

E  FINDS OF UNCERTAIN OR INACCURATE ATTRIBUTION OR DATE

UD 1  Annandale

1  Two three-toed bronze feet: medieval not Roman; (Curle 1932, 369, no 30, fig 53; Robertson 1970, 222)

UD 2  Claygate c NY 396 791

1  Roman (?) pick-axe: Roman attribution unconfirmed (Lost; Wilson 1999, 21, fn 9)

UD 3  Dryfesdale

1  Roman (?) finds: No record in Ashmolean Museum where claimed to have been deposited (Wilson 1999, 43, fn 51); Roman attribution unconfirmed

UD 4  Dumfries

1  Hoard of silver coins: Found at Duke of Queensberry’s Monument, NX 98 76 (Lost; OSA 5, 1793, 142); hoard contained two medieval fibulae and was presumably medieval

2  Roman coins: Roman and Scottish coins found at different times digging foundations of houses in Dumfries (NSA 4, 1845, 12); Roman attribution unconfirmed

3  ‘Celtic’ head: In DM garden wall (DM 1955.75); found Rockallhead rockery, site of possible early chapel near Collin (NY 0542 7626; RCAHMS 1997, no 1726); deep-set bulging eyes, wedge-shaped nose and slightly drooping rectangular mouth reminiscent of Celtic sculpture, cf Janiform head from an established Celtic temple at Roquepertuse in France (Ross 1967, 95, fig 64) or the rather grotesque head of a Celtic god from the Roman fort at Netherby (Toynbee 1962, 146, no 42, pl 49); lack of established Celtic context, however, prevents confirmation as Celtic 51

Other carved heads from Dumfriesshire which have been claimed as Celtic lack established Iron Age contexts and some show few features distinctive of Celtic art. J D Hill confirms there is no evidence of any prehistoric carved stone head in mainland Britain; it is not until the Roman period that human representation becomes common

UD 5  Kirkland Motte NX 82 91

1  Roman (?) sandal: last with Robert Riddell (Lost; OSA 5, 1793, 142); unlikely to have been Roman if similar to UD 6/2 as claimed

51 A similar head on the whetstone from Collin (DM 1953.28) was tentatively identified as Maponus without supporting evidence (Dodds 1972, 36-37). It is possible this tentative identification arose from its similarity to Celtic heads from Corbridge. These heads were questionably identified with Maponus because three altars to Apollo/Maponus built into Hexham Abbey originally came from Corbridge where it was therefore assumed there was a shrine to Maponus (RIB 1120-2; Richmond 1943, 206-10 & figs 10-11 and 1956, 11-15). The whetstone has been identified as a ceremonial mace paralleled at Sutton Hoo and therefore dated Early Historic (Laing 1973, 46 & 51-52, no 5). For the Celtic head from Rose Hall, Trohoughton, see UD 10/2 below. On Celtic heads see Ross and Peachem 1984 and Billingsley 1998.
UD 6  
Lochar Moss

1  **Roman (?) modius of mixed metal:**  (Lost; OSA 1, 1791, 160); Roman attribution unconfirmed

2  **Roman (?) sandal:**  Found June 1709, eight feet below surface (Lost; Riddell 1787, 243-44, drawing); Roman origin unlikely

3  ‘Iron Age’ (?) sword:  found c1860, bed of Lochar; identified as La Tène III (DM 1935.38; Truckell 1964, 59); profile slightly reminiscent of Iron Age swords from Mildenhall (Piggott 1950, 7, fig 2/1), La Tène (De Navarro 1972, pt 2, 414, no 89), Tuchomsyl and Holubice (Pleiner 1993, pls 8, 10, 20 & 22) and brass-inlaid stamp on blade from La Tène (Vouga 1923, 38, fig 7j, pl 6, figs 1 & 2); Ian Stead, J D Hill and Fraser Hunter have expressed reservations which I support on Iron Age origin bearing in mind profile, width of tang and rectilinear style of brass-inlaid stamp; David Coldwell rejects Scottish medieval origin but Allan Carswell suggests possible remnant of broken or shortened 17th/18th century AD British/European blade or 19th century AD military musician’s/drummer’s sword though tang is wide even for these

4  Wooden shoulder Yoke:  found in bed of Lochar (DM unnumbered; Truckell 1964, 59); this object superficially resembles Iron Age horn yokes (Vouga 1923, 96-97, pl 35) and the more recent Shetland shorter yoke, the skammyok (Fenton 1965, 287, fig 9); it lacks, however, distinctive features of either, not least the essential thong holes for attaching ropes to the oxen; it is not dissimilar to Early Iron Age paddle spades (Lerche 1995, 198-99, fig 35) but the spade blades at each end are too large and the central section correspondingly too short; it is unlikely to be a farming implement

UD 7  
Lochmaben Castle Loch NY 08 81

1  **Roman (?) pilum:**  (Lost; NSA 4, 386); Roman attribution unconfirmed

UD 8  
Middlebie

1  **Roman patera:**  found seven feet underground with iron ploughshare, 355 mm long (Wilson 1999, 27, fn 26); Roman attribution unconfirmed

UD 9  
Priestside, Ruthwell NY 105 660

1  **Roman (?) anchor:**  Bow type; 840 mm long; corroded spike at right angles to blade; found at depth of six feet while draining coastal mudflats (DM 1936.86; Truckell 1964, 60); detailed examination impossible owing to location in museum; RSA 147 records Roman attribution by Richmond and Birley possibly because of similar anchor displayed on Roman altar found 1903, Newcastle upon Tyne Swing Bridge (RIB 1320); there are, however, notable differences; DM identified anchor as Roman following a letter from Martin Dean on 24 April 1991 comparing it with an anchor from Bulbury Camp in 1881 (Upham 1983, 9) but this is probably Iron Age not Roman (Cunliffe 1972, 300-2, no 14); there are similarities between the Priestside anchor and a Viking anchor from Ladby (Upham 1983, 10) and a medieval or later anchor from the Thames at Blackfriars (Marsden 1994, 160-62, fig 142)

Colin Martin informs me the anchor may have belonged to a modestly-sized open boat rather than sea-going ship and expressed reservations on Roman attribution; he suggested a more recent deposit bearing in mind the dynamic nature of the Solway sediments which could have buried it rapidly; the blades of the bow do not look Roman and I am grateful to Shaun Kingsley for reminding me that Roman blade points are rounded and not rectangular as UD 9; Roman origin therefore unlikely
Figure 11  Isolated finds.
Trooughton

1. **Roman (?) sandal**: last with Robert Riddell (Lost; *OSA* 5, 1793, 142); Roman attribution unconfirmed; is this UD 5/1 above?

2. **‘Celtic head’**: Discovered at Rose Hall, 1977 (NX 996 726; Dodds 1978); this head does display features of Celtic art but lacks an established Iron Age context
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Glentenmont, Rattra, Tarras, and Tinny Bank are all in Dumfries and Galloway, with Cumbric names that respectively seem to mean ‘fire-river mountain’, ‘great homestead’, ‘strong river’, and ‘hill of (a man called) Tanet’. They are thus evidence for the ancient Brittonic language of the region, suggest meanings for the names of Rattray and Carstairs elsewhere in Scotland, and help locate the southern limit of Rutherglen’s early legal privileges.

Glentenmont

Glentenmont Height (NY 2885), a 1351-foot hill ten miles east of Lockerbie, surveys Glentenmont Burn, a tributary of the Esk. Watson thought the name meant ‘fire-hill glen’, comparing the second element here with Welsh *tân* and Gaelic *teine* ‘fire’ and the last with Welsh *mynydd* ‘mountain’. He imagined the hill once had a beacon or warning fire on its summit.¹

Watson’s philology is sound. His interpretation is not. There seems no evidence to suggest the Height was used as a beacon, for which it is ill-suited, being inconveniently high, remote, and surrounded by other peaks (some higher than itself, so that any blaze would be seen only in a small region to the south).

A more plausible explanation relates the element ‘fire’ to the streams dropping 300 feet on the Height’s south face. These are swift, so that a Cumbric term corresponding to Welsh *tân* ‘fire’ would be apt here. Watson makes the point elsewhere. He related the river Teinntidh near Callander to Middle Irish *teintide* ‘fiery’ (he refers to its ‘rapid boiling course’), the Evelix near Dornoch to Gaelic *eibhleag* ‘ember’, and the Tennet of Glentennet (NO 4982) in the Grampians to Irish *teinidh* ‘fire’.² The stream at Aberlosk (NT 2603) in Eskdalemuir, eleven miles north of Glentenmont, is hence surely related to Welsh *llosg* ‘burning’; in Somerset, the Tone at Taunton seems to have a Celtic name meaning ‘fire’ river.³

This points to an explanation at Glentenmont. The hill would be called from the Cumbric equivalent of Welsh *tân* ‘fire’ and *mynydd* ‘mountain’, referring to the waters rushing down its south face. The valley below would be the glen of the ‘fire hill’. Later, when the meaning of *Glentenmont* was forgotten, the hill was called ‘Glentenmont Height’, even though -*mont* means ‘hill, height’.

¹ W J Watson, *The Celtic Place-names of Scotland*, Edinburgh (1926), 399
² Watson, 443, 475
So we should not think of beacons lit on the summit of the Height. It has a Cumbric name meaning ‘fire hill’ from the streams running down it, with Glentenmont Burn below being called the ‘fire’ river by the Britons of southern Scotland, just as they knew Aberlosk Burn a few miles north as the ‘burning’ river.4

Rattra

The farm of Rattra (NX 6049), five miles west of Kirkcudbright and a mile from Wigtown Bay, has grander namesakes. Watson compared it with Rattray (NO 1845) in Perth and Kinross, and Rattray (NK 0857) in Aberdeenshire. The first of these (with Blairgowrie) is a burgh, while the second was once a royal burgh in its own right. The southern Rattray occurs as Rotrefe in 1291, Retref in 1296, Rothtref in 1305, and Rotreffe in rolls of Robert I. The northern Rattray is Retref in early papal letters, Retref(fis) in rolls of Robert I, and Rethtre in rolls of David II. Watson thought the first element of Rattra and Rattray corresponded with Gaelic rath ‘rath, circular defensive earthwork’ or Welsh rhath ‘rath’, and the second with Welsh tref ‘farm, homestead’. He believed this interpretation was supported by archaeology, in the form of a moat near Rattra, the ancient fort supposedly preceding the (vanished) castle at Rattray in Blairgowrie, and the castle at Rattray in Buchan.5 Watson thus considered all three place-names meant ‘rath homestead, ring-fort settlement’.

Watson was surely right on the second element: tre(f) ‘settlement, homestead’ is common throughout the Brittonic world. But his reference to a rath is unconvincing. In Ireland there are thousands of these so-called ring-forts (though many were originally no more than cattle-enclosures or farmyards), the majority built apparently between the fifth century and the eleventh.6 Yet in eastern Scotland raths are uncommon, and rath infrequent in place-names (Rohallion in Perth and Kinross, Romanno in Borders, and Rathillet in Fife, respectively the raths of Caledonians, monks, and Ulstermen, are amongst the few examples).7 As for Watson’s Welsh rhath ‘earthwork, fort, mound’, this is also a rare form, probably a loan from Old Irish ráth, and occurring as a toponym in Pembrokeshire and at Roath or Y Rhath (now a Cardiff suburb) only.8 There is no reason to think it gained currency amongst other Britons, especially the Cumbrians of Galloway or Picts of Strathmore. Nor are the medieval defences at Rattra and the two Rattrays evidence for earlier raths, which are structurally very different, are usually sited on gently sloping ground (not on commanding positions), and normally guarded places of no political or military importance.9

4 After this was written, the editors of this journal asked the writer’s opinion on the name of Beltenmont, which does not appear on standard maps but is in the parish of Kirkpatrick Fleming (NY 2769). Early attestations include Beltenmont (Blaeu, 1654) and Beltenment (Hearth Tax returns, 1690s); the stress is on the second syllable, suggesting a Gaelic first element baile ‘homestead’. The toponym would thus be a Gaelic-Cumbric hybrid.
5 Watson, 364
7 Watson, 21, 153, 239; Alcock, 266
8 Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru, Caerdydd (1950-), 3039-40; Alcock, 268
9 Norman and St Joseph, 38; Alcock, 255-6
The first element of the Scottish forms points to another origin. It seems to correspond rather with Welsh *rhy* ‘too, excessively, greatly’, Old Breton *ro, re*, and Old Irish *ro, ru* ‘very, excessively’ (as in *ro-mag* ‘great field’). This figures in ancient place-names. A familiar one is *Regulbium* ‘great beak, great headland’, Reculver in Kent, the site of a Roman fort built on a conspicuous promontory (now hard to recognize, thanks to coastal erosion and land reclamation) opposite the Isle of Thanet. In Galloway itself was *Rerigonium* ‘most royal (place)’, a Roman fort or camp (perhaps under Stranraer) with a name surviving in the present Loch Ryan.10

These suggest a solution for Rattra and Rattray. An equivalent of Welsh *rhy* is apparently found in *Rotrefe, Rettref, Rotreff*, and *Retref* ‘Rattray’. No early form supplies the *a* expected from early Irish *ráth* ‘ring fort’. So it is reasonable to take Rattra and Rattray as meaning, not ‘rath homestead’, but ‘great homestead, prominent settlement’.

This has four implications. First, archaeologists need no longer seek raths at these places. Second, the names can be shown to be pure Brittonic: Cumbric in the case of Rattra, and Pictish for the Rattrays north of the Tay. (There is no reason to invoke Welsh *rhath* here, which is not well attested and seems in any case to be a loan from Irish.) Third, settlement at these places can be proved to be early. At Rattra it must predate the extinction of Cumbric in about 1100, and may be much older. At the northern and southern Rattray it would predate the disappearance of Pictish in the later ninth century (after Kenneth son of Alpin seized Pictland in 842). Fourth, it suggests all three places were (in varying degrees) of some importance. Although Rattra was probably just a larger farm than ordinary (and not the seat of a Galloway king), the two other sites had long-term advantages for settlement. The burgh of Blairgowrie and Rattray is a substantial town (a centre for raspberry farming) to this day, while in 1564 Rattray in Buchan was created a royal burgh by Mary Queen of Scots. If wind-blown sands had not choked its harbour in the eighteenth century, the northern Rattray might still be a town. So names meaning ‘great homestead’ imply the potential of these places was spotted long ago, when they were perhaps locations significant for lordship and power in Celtic Scotland.

The names of Rattra and Rattray do not, then, point to the existence of raths or ring forts. They suggest rather a meaning ‘great homestead’, with elements corresponding to Welsh *rhy* ‘too, excessively’ and *tref* ‘farm, settlement’, indicating they were centres of some importance in early Galloway and Pictland.

### Tarras

Tarras Water runs near the eastern edge of Dumfries and Galloway. It rises 1700 feet up (NY 4493) on Hartsgarth Fell (by the limit with Roxburghshire/Borders), flowing eight miles south-south-west to enter the Esk south of Langholm. By it are Tarras Lodge (NY 4087), facing Tarras Rig; the tributary Little Tarras Water; and Tarrasfoot (NY 3780), near Tarrasfoot Hill and the point where Tarras Water joins the Esk. These are all surely called after the Tarras, suggesting *Tarras* is a hydronym.

---

10 Watson, 34-5; A L F Rivet and Colin Smith, *The Place-Names of Roman Britain*, London (1979), 446-7
Watson related Tarras Water with Carstairs, a village (NS 9346) and (later) railway junction in South Lanarkshire. This is attested as Casteltarras in 1172, Castrotharis in about 1250, Castalstaris in 1540, and Carstaris in 1579. The first part is explained as Middle English castel ‘castle’, the second as ‘a personal name Tarra, of uncertain origin’. But it is unclear why ‘Tarra’ here is taken as a personal name. Watson did not regard it as such; it resembles nothing in Celtic nomenclature; it does not help as regards Tarras Water. So another approach is worth trying.

A Celtic form making sense in this context is obsolete Welsh traws ‘oppressive, strong’. In the Gododdin, a series of laments for North British heroes wiped out in an attack on Catterick about 600, the poet praises a warrior, ‘black slayer of a host of brigands’, a man whose ‘purpose was stubborn (traws)’. A twelfth-century gnomic poem declares ‘Better too strong (rydraws) than too wretched.’ The thirteenth-century Mabinogion tale of Rhonabwy’s Dream calls Arthur’s knight Elphin a cross-grained (traws) youth; but a religious poem of about 1380 declares more positively, ‘You are fair, O God, strong (traws) munificence.’ The Welsh Bible of 1588 renders ‘thou hast delivered me from the violent man’ of Psalm 18:48 as achubaist fi rhag y gwr traws, while the man ‘perverse in his ways’ of Proverbs 28:6 is traws et ffyrdd.

These senses ‘strong, stubborn, violent’, even ‘oppressive’, suit Tarras Water, a powerful river draining a large area of moorland. If a Cumbric equivalent of traws gave Tarras, the intrusive development of the first vowel may result from what linguists call epenthesis (heard in modern non-standard pronunciations of athletic as ‘atheletic’ or film as ‘fillum’). The shortening in the last syllable might then be due to reduction of an unstressed vowel. A sense ‘strong’ for Tarras Water has parallels elsewhere in Britain. The rivers Stour of lowland England are from a Germanic (not Celtic) form meaning ‘strong’; the Tern of east Shropshire is the ‘strong’ river (cf. Welsh tren ‘strong’); the Northumberland Kielder and rivers Calder of Cumbria, Lancashire, and much of Scotland from Caithness southwards were known for being ‘strong’ or ‘violent’ (cf. Welsh caled ‘hard’). So there are phonological and semantic reasons for thinking Tarras Water has a Cumbric name meaning ‘strong one, stubborn one’. It was a dangerous river, not to be deflected, and meddled with at one’s peril.

Does this help concerning Carstairs? Perhaps. We need not take its last element as a personal name, despite what reference books say. Tarras Water instead points to another hydronym. Mouse Water runs to the north of Carstairs, but its name (related to the mosses or bogs on its upper course?) does not seem Celtic. It may thus once have been a namesake of Tarras Water. Its nature below Carstairs Bridge would accord with this. The upper Mouse Water is sluggish and winding, but after Carstairs it drops 300 feet in under five

11 Watson, 386-7
12 Patrick Hanks and Flavia Hodges, A Dictionary of Surnames, Oxford (1988), 96
14 Blodeugerdd Barddas o Ganu Crefyddol Cynnar, ed Marged Haycock, s.l. (1994), 318
15 Williams, 296
16 K H Jackson, Language and History in Early Britain, Edinburgh (1953), 195, 221; A C Breeze, ‘The Fife Place-Name Kirkcaldy’, Scottish Language 16 (1997), 97-9; Coates and Breeze, 77, 268, 360, 363
miles, cutting an impressive gorge to the north of Lanark, before joining the Clyde above Stonebyres Falls. If Mouse Water were originally called Tarras ‘strong one’, this would well describe its lower course. If so, Carstairs would have been ‘castle of the Tarras’, the river above which it stood, just as Castlemilk near Lockerbie is ‘castle of the Milk’, the river Milk running below it.

There is reason to believe, then, that Tarras Water has a Cumbric name resembling Welsh *traws* ‘strong, stubborn’, and that this also explains the name of Carstairs near Glasgow as ‘Castle of the Tarras’, the old name of Mouse Water at the foot of Carstairs Hill.

Tinny Bank

Tinny Bank (NT 0213), near Beattock Summit, is a border hill. It stands 1370 feet high just north of the point where road and railway leave Dumfries and Galloway for South Lanarkshire. This hill is identified with a boundary mark in a charter (perhaps of 1180 x 1185) specifying privileges of the burgh of Rutherglen. The bounds of these ran from Nethan to Polmadie, from Garrion Burn to Kelvin, from Loudoun to ‘Prenteneth’, and from ‘Karnebuth’ to ‘Karun’.17 The Nethan enters the Clyde (NS 8247) north of Lesmahagow; Polmadie is in Rutherglen; Garrion Burn enters the Clyde (NS 7951) near Wishaw; the Kelvin does the same in Glasgow; Loudoun Hill (NS 6037) is by the East Ayrshire-South Lanarkshire border; ‘Karnebuth’ may be Cairn (NS 4951), by the limit of East Renfrew and East Ayrshire; ‘Karun’ may be Crawhin Hill (NS 2471), near Greenock. Clearly, Rutherglen privileges ran wide.

Barrow says *Prenteneth* is unidentified, but may have been Tinny Bank. As regards meaning, Watson takes the first element as equivalent to Welsh *pren* ‘tree’ and the second as Middle Irish *tened* ‘of fire’. This he relates to Irish *bile tened* ‘tree of fire’ (now Billywood, near Moynalty in north-west Meath). He quotes P. W. Joyce’s suggestion that Beltane or May Day fires were lit at this Irish tree, and thinks the same occurred at *Prenteneth*, so that it would be a good landmark for charter bounds.18

Watson was surely right in taking the first element here as Cumbric *pren* ‘tree’. But the second hardly refers to Beltane fires, as this was a Gaelic custom, not a British one.19 There seem two real possibilities. We might take *-teneth* as a river-name meaning ‘fiery one’, referring to a stream by Tinny Bank. Parallels here would be the Teintidh near Callander (from Irish *teintide* ‘fiery’) and Tennet of Glentennet (NO 4982) in the Grampians (cf. Irish *teinidh* ‘fire’).20 If so, we should have a (Gaelicized) Cumbric equivalent of Welsh *Tanad*, the river Tanat ‘fiery river, brilliant river’ flowing from Wales into Shropshire.

---

18 WJ Watson, 352, 399
19 Cf A C Breeze, *Irish Beltaine “May Day” and Beltanca*, a Cattle Rent in pre-Norman Lancashire’, *Éigse* 29 (1996), 59-63
20 Watson, 443
However, another explanation seems likelier. There was an Old Welsh personal name Tanet (also occurring in Old Cornish and Old Breton), attested in the twelfth-century Book of Llandaff (as the name of an eighth-century priest) and the life of St Cadog. The landmark in the Rutherglen charter may thus have been ‘Tanet’s tree’, while Tinny Bank above it would preserve Tanet’s name. It is true that Watson explained Barncluith (NS 7254) near Hamilton as ‘Clyde tree’, perhaps showing trees might be called after rivers. Yet this may not be the case at Tinny Bank. It is more probable that a tree and hill would alike be called after a local person than that both should be called after a stream.

So it seems reasonable to take Prenteneth as a Cumbric toponym (later semi-Gaelicized) meaning ‘Tanet’s tree’. The tree was presumably a conspicuous one, growing by the road close to the modern regional border. Tanet ‘fiery one’ would also have left his mark on Tinny Bank, rising above the spot. He may have lived at a house on the site of Nether Hawcleugh, the modern farm just below (on the 900-foot contour).

Whether he did or not, our analysis points to two historical conclusions, besides its philological ones. First, we need no longer think the Celts of Beattock Summit habitually lit fires under a tree to celebrate May Day. Second, Professor Duncan, discussing the important marketing monopoly and tolls set out in this Rutherglen charter, describes its boundaries as ‘apparently of the lower ward of Lanarkshire’. If Prenteneth is correctly located at the ancient limit by Tinny Bank, we can be sure that Rutherglen’s privileges stretched much wider, to the southern edge of Lanarkshire’s upper ward, where it meets Dumfries and Galloway.

**Correction**

There is an error concerning Monedamderg ‘hill of (the) red stag’ in the title and summary (not the text) of the previous paper in this series. The form ‘Monedamderg’ there is incorrect. The correct title is ‘Brittonic Place-Names from South-West Scotland, Part 3: Vindogara, Elvan Water, “Monedamderg”, Troquhain and Tarelgin.’

[In a letter of 7 December 2002, Professor G W S Barrow suggests Mone- here is monadh ‘heath’ rather than ‘hill’, which may well be right. The first e of Monedamderg counts against his alternative explanation from móin ‘bog, moss’, despite Mosshill and Mossend nearby.]

22 Watson, 352
23 A A M Duncan, *Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom*, Edinburgh (1975), 475
A good many years ago, the writer was in Edinburgh University Library when it was mentioned that a volume of Mouswald Kirk Session Minutes had recently been purchased by the Library: would he be interested in acquiring a microfilm of it? He said yes, in due course bought the microfilm and when Marion Stewart came to the Archive Room passed it on with other microfilms he had acquired, to her. In December 1998 he borrowed it back, with the microfilm reader he had also passed on to the Archive Centre, and transcribed and indexed it in the Spring of 1999. The material in it being good social history it was decided to publish extracts from it in these Transactions. Mr James Williams, co-editor, has as always been of the utmost help.

Nowhere do the Minutes name the Minister, but he was Alexander Makgown, born 1605, eldest son of William Macgown, merchant burgess of Dumfries, who figures prominently in the Burgh Court Book. Alexander graduated M.A. at St. Andrews in 1626 and became minister at Mouswald in 1637. Refusing to conform to Episcopacy, he was suspended by the Synod 28th April 1664 and confined to his parish. He relinquished the charge and died at Dumfries 7th June 1677. He married Elizabeth Ramsay, who died 24th July 1661, and had issue: Alexander, conjoined with his father in a sasine of land at Dumfries, 25th November 1644; James, graduated at St. Andrews 1656; Thomas; and a child baptized 3rd October 1652.

It was a troubled time: the Engagement, when an amateur Scottish army was hammered by Cromwell’s troops and the consequent invasion and defeat of Scotland by Cromwell, followed by English occupation. Grierson of Lagg, the local Laird, has to abase himself in church for his part in the Engagement, as have several of his family and servants: all of them figure in the Minutes from time to time. The Session and its Elders were powerful, but the Elders, taking their oaths with upraised arms, were themselves subject to severe scrutiny by their colleagues at the Inquisitions.

A few months after the volume ends King Charles returned and all was changed. The Covenant, from being paramount, became a crime and in the end ‘The Minister’ had to go. But there is the life of the parish: agriculture, drunkenness, piping at weddings, gathering hazel nuts on Sabbath in Autumn – those guilty knew the risk they were taking but nut-gathering, with famine often threatening, was an essential source of winter protein – one remembers the huge mass of hazel shells found during the excavations of Lochrutton Crannog.

1640


8th July, The quhilk day the minister and elders for the repressing of wickedness and furthering of discipline did statute and ordaine these actis as after followis.
Imprimis it is statute and ordainit be the minister and foirsaid elders that everie fornicator both man and also woomain for the first fault should stand (this word is unclear) thrie days in the pillar of repentance with sheits and to pay fourtie shilling of penaltie for the second six days with sheits and to pay four pundis and for the thrid fault to stand six dayes in saccloath and to pay tuentie marks.

Seconlie it is ordainit that everie adulterer sall stand tuelffe sondays in sackclothe the first and Last quhairof they stand at the kirk doore betuixt the ring of the first bell and the Last and also to pay tuentie pund of penaltie yit so that if the adulterer or adulteresse foirsaid hes not bein in tymes bygane of ane scandlous conversatione and give they shall give readie and reall obediance efter they are sentenced and shall shaw evident signes of trew humilatione then the offendaris foirsaid shall onlie pay tuentie marks of penaltie.

Thirdly it is ordanit that everie sclander shall pay threttie shillings for the first fault and to crave god and the partie sclandered mercie in the presence of the sessione, for the second fault to pay fourtie shillings and to stand on day in the pillar with sheits for the thrid to pay fourtie shillings and to stand thrie dayes in the piller with the sheits and for everie fault they crave both god and the partie offended mercie otherways to be put in the gorgettis.

4. Item it is statute that if any compleine of his neighbour for sclander and in the meine tyme cannot prove the same then the compleineris them seffis shall be punished it plena talwmw [A bungled attempt at legal Latin?] and vnderly the punishment that should be inflicted vpon the persone if that that foirsaid sclander had bein provin and trew: and that no compleiner shall be hard till first he shall Lay done tuentie four shilling wiche shall be given again give they prove their complent utherways the samyn to be foirfalted.

5. Item it is ordaned that none shall sell any aill vpon the Lords day aither within the house or without betuixt the ringing of the Last bell and the ending of the preiching vnder the pane of tuentie shilling toties quoties and that all extraordinar and scandolous drinking and gossoping vpon the Lords day at any tyme be forborne vnder the same penaltie and standing one day in the pillare with sheits as also that thair be no extreordinar or scandulous drinking vpon any other day and especiallie efter nyne or ten houris at night vnder the foirsaid penaltie to be vplifted both of the ostleris and drinkeris bot soollie on the sabbath day from the soune setting.

6. It is ordained that all cursers and sweirars shall pay tuelff penneis toties quoties.

7. It is ordained that everie fighter and bloodshedder shall stand in the pillar with sheitis one day and also to pay fourtie shilling and quhatever that with the civill magistrat imposth vpon them.

8. It is ordained that everie one absent for everie dayes absence from the kirk shall pay ane groat except they can shawe a resonable excuse and that none shall goe from thair awin hous to any other vpon the Lordis day vnder the paine foirsaid except they have some urgent necessitie and resonable excuse.

As also that everie on that profaneth the Lordis sabbath by working careing of Loadis going of vnecessare errandis grinding on quernis knocking of big bleiching of cloth drying of Lint bollis or woll pleying at nyne hollis pennie stane or any such Lyk idle pastymes druncknes and other gross faults shall pay fourtie shilling and stand in the pillar one day with sheitis.

9. Item it is ordained that these that are notoriouse flytteris with thair neighbouris shall stand in the gorgets with ane paper upon thair head.
10. Item it is ordained that if any be sentenced both to stand in the pillare and to pay ane penalitie for any fault that they shall not be resaved to the pillare before they pay thair penalitie at the sessione board.

11. It is ordaned that if any be sentenced for ane fault that the verie nixt day afterwardis they shall give obedience and for everie day thay delay the same they shall pay ane groat and be poynded for the same.

12. It is ordained that if any be sumoned to the sessione to be censured for any fault or that any be sumoned as ane witnes to prove ane fault and if they doe not answer at the summondis both the partie and witnesses not compearing shall pay ane groat for thair disobedience except that they can give ane resonable excuse for thair absence.

13. It is ordaned that when parteis are to be proclaimed to be married that before proclamatione they shall consigne tuo dolloris into the menisteris hand with tuo dolloris in case that they persewe not the mariage within tuo moneths after the first dayes proclamatione bot shall revolt and yit give offence to the congregatione then and in that case the shal be coverted to some pious vse for the kirk but if that they shall performe the marriage within the tym foresaid then the twa dolloris shall be delievered to the partieis againe conditionallie that thair be no fighting extraordinarie Drinking efter denner or idle pyping or premusueir dancing at thair mariage nor if it be provin shall be takin to the consideratone of the minister and elderis.

14. It is also ordaned that when any man hes ane chyld baptyzed he shall fynd cautione before the sacrament of baptizome shall be administrat that he shall pay all the expensss himself and that efter denner is done thair shall none of the gossope being in thair quartir met vnder the pain of twentie shilling and standing in the pillar one day in the pillar [sic]

It is also ordaned that WHATSOEVER PERSONES THAT CONSULTIS WITH FAMIOLARE SPIRITIS OR WITCHES SHALL PAY FIVE MARKS AND STAND THRIE DAYES IN SACKCLOTH FOR GIVEN SCANDALL TO THE CONGREGATIONE.

1649

July 8, The which day all exprise of discipline was suspended in respect of the ministers absence who at the command of the committee of the synod went that day to the kirk of Kirkpatrick to preache and to intimate the sentence of despositione against Mr Thomas Chalmers late minister thair.

August 5, Discipline suspended that day in respect of the ministers absence who was supplieing for that day the place of Mr Gavin Young who at that tyme was ane commissionar for the Generall Assemblie.

October 14, Elders desired to have ready the names of the poor of the parish by next Sunday that they might be carried to the Presbytery and afterwards provided for according to the ordinance of Parliament; and that the parish poor who were out of the parish should be called home by a public intimation from the pulpit and that the poor of other parishes should go to their own parishes for help there. Elders also desired to search for witches.

November 4, Thomas Bratton, trooper, accused of fornication with Margaret Greir in Woodside.

November 11, Bratton purges himself by his great oath and satisfies the session.
December 16, John Wright in Langdyke and Sara Carter his wife made their repentance for drinking on the Sabbath and were rebuked for conversing with Charles Carruthers an excommunicate person.

1650

January 13, Charles Carruthers being already excommunicate and so not capable of any further charge the people were admonished to refrain from bearing him as one alreadie for his scandals and contumacie delveryed into the hands of satan’.

January 20, John Rome referred by the Presbytery to Mouswald parish church for engaging in the late unlawful war against England: acknowledges his sin openly in a separate place in the body of the Kirk where he sat uncovered during the service: subscribes the act of Assembly bearing a confession of his guilt, and the act of the Synod of Dumfries of October 1649, & swears to observe & keep to his utmost the League & Covenant.

January 27, Jane Wright spouse of Edward Mundell in Woodside complains that Andrew Greir and Jane Greir his sister, suspecting that she had accused their mother of some points of witchcraft, not only used opprobrious words against her but had watched her with lanterns in the night so that she was forced to flee for her safety from her own house.

February 3, The Greirs called deny it but witnesses clearly prove it.

March 10, John Rae accused of filthy & scandalous drunkenness, especially that upon the marriage day of Andrew Brattane in Brackehirst he abused many people, his friends & others, fought with and struck those who were in his way ‘and of others he cutted their bonnets with his knyffe’.

March 24, The elders in the toun of Mouswald declared that there were some young boys who profained the Lords day after noon by playing at poundstone and nine holes & that sometimes ‘they resorted to houses in companies and spent in them much of the Lords day in idle exercises’ – George Wilkin, John Bell younger, John Carruthers in Hole younger, and Robert Edgar named & summoned.

March 31, William and Robert Greirs sons to Sir Robert Grierson of Lag and William Greir of Chappell servitor to Sir Robert, having applied to the presbyterie for their receiving the League & Covenant & Holy Communion and being commanded by the presbyterie before their admission first to sit in a separate part in the body of the kirk with their heads uncovered in time of divine service & afterward to make their confessione on their knees in being captains in the late unlawful engagements & to subscribe the act of the Assembly 1649 where is contained a confession of their guilt as also to promise to give satisfaction to the articles of the late Synod of Dumfries in October last and to subscribe the same and to observe all the particulars contained in the League & Covenant to their utmost power by their great oath and their hands lifted up to Heaven. All this being done they were received to the subscribing of the league & Covenant.

Intimation made of a fast to be observed on the next Lords day for such sins which were the grounds of former humiliations as also to crave a blessing to the late application made by the commissioners of State and Kirk to his Majesty.

April 28, Agnes Greir & Isobel Rome accused of fighting on the Lords day but it could not be proven.
May 5, John Rae again scandalously drunk in Ruthwell: Edward Ferguson also so drunk at the same time ‘so that he was not able to keip his cloaths from burning’.

John Irving son to Bessie Bennoch, Matthew Dickson son to Agnes Wright and Robert McGay accused of profanation of the Lords day by fishing while they were watching their cattle.

May 12, The above persons appeared and acknowledged their fishing in the burns on the Lords day [McGay shown as McCay] ‘but they being but young boyes It was thocht convenient they sould be dismissed for the first tyme with an sharpe rebuke which was presentlie given them before the sessione’.

May 19, Mr Gavin Young minister at Ruthwell confirms the drunkenness of John Rae and Edward Ferguson [he of the burning clothes] from his elders & others despite their denial.

May 26, Thanksgiving to be observed the next Lords day conform to the direction from the Commissioner of the Kirk ‘for the happie victorie in the north agains James Ghrame and the rest of his malignant complices’.

June 2, This day Sir John Greir being remitted by the commission of the Kirk to the presbytery of Lochmaben that by their order he should satisfy for his accession to the late unlawfull engagement and being commanded by the presbytery that before his admission to the covenant & communion he should sit in a separate part of the church before the pulpit bare headed during the time of the forenoon worship & afterwards on his knees confess his fault and subscribe the acknowledgement of the general assembly and the articles of the synod and afterwards to swear and subscribe the League & Covenant: he did all this & subscribed.

June 9 & 16, Holy Communion.

June 23, No discipline in respect of the ministers absence being commanded by the committee to go to Cummertrees to intimate the sentence of deposition against Andrew Rowat late minister there.

June 30, Fast intimated to be observed the next lords day for the sins of the land for preventing of danger to our Land from England and to seek a blessing to the next General Assembly.

July 28, Janet Ferguson in Woodside calls Thomas Mundell elder there ‘a nastie surfet traitor’.

James Dickson was exercising a charge laid upon him to nominate & put out soldiers against the English army of sectaries that has invaded our nation and nominated Agnes Walker spouse to James Reid’s servant – she slandered him and wounded him with a stone and imprecated our cause and covenant and prayed that the sectarian army might prevail against us – witnesses called.

Thomas and Richard Craik sons to William Craik in Bucklerhole profane the Lords day by casting peats belonging to James Roule in the peat pot.

John Alison & Helen Stermont delated by the minister for swearing whereof he was an earwitness.

This day likewise a twofold fast and humiliation was ordered to be observed by the authority of the General assembly for mercy against the sins of the land for the Lord’s assistance against the English army of sectaries ‘who hes alreadie invaded our land to subdue our natioine and to overturn our covenant etc.’ the first fast to be private in every family next Friday and after the family
humiliation finished at home to repair in the afternoon towards evening to the kirk so that a small closure might be made to that exercise by public prayers and preaching by the minister: the next humiliation to be public by the congregation the next Lords day.

August 4, Thomas & Richard Craiks appeared for peat cutting on the Sabbath: being young boys were sharply rebuked before the session and to confess their fault and ask God mercy for the same in the body of the kirk the next Lords day.

August 18, The Craik boys were called forth from their seats to the body of the kirk and were rebuked for their profanation of the Lords day and after their profession of repentance and sorrow for their fault they were received.

September 1, Janet & Jane Greir cannot go to the presbytery to be censured for their slander and contumacy and ask to be censured at home: but it not being in the Session’s power to meddle with that which was being tabled before the presbytery’s licence thereto they thought it convenient the minister should represent their case to the presbytery and obtain their licence to enjoin their censure at home.

September 1 & 8, A roll made up of the absents from church: taken round parish by kirk officer: they appear: most of their excuses are found reasonable: only John Rae in Robbiequhat & Matthew Irving in Langdyke are found to have detained some of their family needlessly at home – rebuked before the session and to be publicly rebuked before the congregation the next Lords day.

September 15, Agnes Walker – contumacie and disobedience superadded to her former fault – was commanded to be cited to the presbytery – appears this day ‘and acknowledging her former miscarriage to have proceeded of womanly passion’ – session ordain her one day to make her repentance & to pay 3/- sterling of penalty.

Andrew Greir’s case continued as he is in the army: the Minister reported that he had signified to his Captain that he might be permitted to make his repentance and the army might be purged of him and reported the Captain’s promise to remit him as desired.

September 29, Intimation made of a fast to be observed the next Lords day for the causes presented to us from the Commissioner of the General Assembly ‘that we might be more humbled before the Lord who had mightily manifested his displeasure against the nation in the Late defeat of our army by the english sectaries.

October 13, Many absent from church: roll delivered to clerk.

October 20, Absents dealt with: James Rae in Cleuchbrae had detained William Crorie, John Rae had detained one John Wright in Rockell two, James Rule one, Mungo [?] Robton one, Agnes Wright one, Thomas Smith one, John Cavart one, John Greir two – to be rebuked publiclie the next Lords day and to pay a groat for every person absent

November 3, William Irving in Panthet hill accused of fornication with Jonat Caruthers in Hole ‘the which scandalous fact at Least ane scandalous carriage was reported to have been seen by Jonat Service’.
1650

**November 10,** Irving appeared and accused of fornication with Janet Carruthers: denies the offence: offers to purge himself by his oath: ‘but in respect he was reported to have been found scandalously with hir in the nicht by Jonat Service the sesione thocht it not convenient to tak his oath till he should be confronted with the said Jonat Service’.

There was ane publick intimatioune made out of pulpit of ane charitable contributione to be gathered the next lords day for the relief of the prisoners in england whereof many are dead alreadie by hunger and cold and the rest in great danger of starving except they be relieved by our charitie as we were informed by letters directed from by the commissioun of the Kirk, all now exhorted to use their Conscience according to their means and power’.

**November 17,** [Five blank pages when: when the minutes take up again on October 19, 1650 we have a new session clerk with a different hand and spelling.]

1651

**October 19,** A large batch of absentees from church: most found reasonable: but John Wright hostler in Rockall, James Carlyle there, ?Tuatie Johnstone, Nanie Kirkmichell, George Irving in Woodside, Janet Neilson and James Reid have detained one or two of their family needlessly at home.

**November 2,** Robert Robson in Rockell complains that Helen Johnston spouse to John Robson there had called him a creeping thief.

[ ? ] **November 9,** Helen confesses. Ordered to crave God & the partie’s mercy.

1652

**28 January,** John Mundell miller in Torthorwald ‘being found carting Loadis in tyme of preiching on the Lords day was delated to the sessione and Robert McKynnell was ordanit to wrytte to Mr Humphrey [?]Hind to cause the said John come to our sessione and give satisfactione for his profaning the Lords day’.

**1st February,** Elspeth Richardson spouse to John Palmer in rockell and he for his interst complain that Janet Ferguson spouse to John Brainzer in Woodside has called her both whore and thief – party & witness called.

Gavin Henderson in Hetlandhill accused of fornication with Jane Lyndsay: this is the first appearance of Gavin, a merchant who trades in Ireland, a multiple fornicator who disobeys the session in every way, atones for his sins & immediately fornicates again with two women: so by July 1653 he has for some time been under process of excommunication.

Edward Millar accused of fornication with Jane Wright in Rockell.

Mr Humphrey minister at Torthorwald has been written to but has not replied – to be written to again about John Mundell, miller, carting in Mouswald on the Lords day.

Jonnat Murray accused of fornication with James Brattone, Jannat Wright with William Brattone, & Jane Wright with Matthew Dickson.
February 15, Janet Murray appears and being challenged of her alleged fornication with James Brattane within the Kingdom of Ireland denies it and clears herself by her oath.

March 7, Edward Millar clears himself of fornication with Janet Wright by his oath.

Janet Ferguson’s witnesses can prove nothing: she is assoilzied.

March 21, Mathew Dickson & William Brattone being returned from Carrick: Brattone purges himself by his great oath & satisfies the session: Dickson desires continuation till the next session.

George Tueidop in banks, John Palmer in Rockell & Robert Robson there elected & chosen ruling elders ‘in respect the reuling elderis in thair respective bounds were takin away by death’.

Gavin Henderson continuing in his disobedience both to the presbytery & sessione ordained to be summoned to the presbytery pro secundo.

‘Jane Lyndsay came into the sessione and in most humble maner desryit hir chyld begottin in fornicatione betuixt hir and Gaving Hendersone whon she affirmed by hir great oath to be hir chylds father and that she had no other father to hir chyld at all but the said Gaving, to be baptyzed Bot in respect of the said Gaving his disobedience wold not for the present bot continued the sacrament giving till he should speik his bretherne of the presbyterie the next presbyterie day’.

March 28, Matthew Dickson confesses fornication with Nanie Wright – to stand 3 days in the public place of repentance and to pay 40/-.

Agnes Wright to be summoned for her fornication with Matthew Dickson.

Gaving Henderson gatt the first public admonitione of excommunicatone for his disobedience both to the presbyterie and sessione and that according to the ordinance of the presbyterie’.

April 4, ‘Agnes wright being summoned called vpon compeared not in respect she was tyed in the bed of seiknes so she was continued till she should permit.

Thomas Nicollsone was delaittit guiltie of the transgressing of the discipline and order of the church of scotland conforme to the covenant and word of god and was ordanit to be summoned against the nixt day’.

April 11, ‘The boyes that brak the sabbath by thair idle pastymes’ rebuiked if they do it again to stand a day in the pillar and pay ‘such ane pecuniall penaltie as the sessione should enjoyne’.

‘Mathow dicksone being by the providence of almichtie god removed out of this mortall Lyffe to Lyffe eternall his repentance now for fornicatione being begun the day preceeiding was clossed this day’.

‘Gaving Hendersone being come into some piece of obedience his process was continued vpon conditione he should go to the presbyterie the next presbyterie day ensewing and give satisfactione to them for his disobedience and get from them his injunctiones for his sinne of vncleines and trelapsed fornicatione’.

April 25, Intimation made to the people ‘for observing of the sabat day afternoone after the worshipe be endit for thair catechiseing and examinatione’.
May 2, ‘Gaving Hendersone having Longtym continued disobedient having bein at the presbyterie ane day to his promise maid apryll the elevint day and their gatt his injunctione and was returned back to our sessione where the minister reported thair order that the said Gaving should stand tuell sabbath dayes in sacco and to pay ane hundreth marks of penaltie bot to be mitigatit be the minister according as he saw him humbled and penitent and saw some evident signes of humiliatione and repentance’.

1654

May 14, Johne wreight pyper gave satisfactione for his scandulous druckenenes and flyttig and removed the scandell by his repentance. All further exercissees of disciplein continued in respect ane troup of dragounes cam and qwaernt vpon the paroche tym of the worship.

September 17, Jannat Blaik being summoned for being with chyld and to declare who was the father of hir chyld called compeired and deponit that she was nother with chyld nor never had sinned with any man to gett ane chyld so the mater was continued till the Lord should show further Light and cleirnes in the said mater.

November 12, It was reportit to the sessione That Jannat Blaik that had bein formerlie before the sessione (bot was delayed till the Lord should send some greater Light in the mater) was delyverit of ane chyld for all hir denyell bot she was continued till she should recover hir health.

1655

April 29, Causs of ane fast intimat to be observed the first thursday of may and the sabbath Immediatlie following for the causs after mentionat viz
1. The grosse aithisme and Ignorance of god.
2. The many obstructiones in the way of the planting of the gospell.
3. The not proffetit vnder the gospell.
4. The formalitie of many professoris.
5. The increas of poperie heresie and vther errors.
6. The Breith of covenant by all rankis and the casting of it behind our backes wich would requyre the Lords people wold, make conscience of personall covenanting with him selffe whill the covenant cannot be publickli and solemnli renewed.
7. That the Lord wold find out ane way of making vp the breitches of this Land and vniting the hearts of his people in treuth and in himselfe.
8. That the Lord wold repair and preserve the government of his house wich in Justice he may dissolve for the slighting and corrupt managing of it.
9. The not proffetit vnder the Lords dispensatione of this Laitt tyme.
10. The greit Loosnes and profanitie especiallie by druckenenes and that in greit ones, the incre of the sine of filthines.
11. The greit murmuring of the people for cheapnes and vnder the rodis of god

Thursday the 3 of May, The quhilk day being ane day of fasting and humiliatiune intimatione was maid efter sermon to the people that excomunicat persones within the province of drumfreis whos names follows viz

In the presbyterie of drumfreis for poperie Dame Elizabeth Bremont countes of nithsdil with Elizabeth Maxwell Ladie Conhath Euphame Beattie servitrix to the Ladie maxwell William and Robert maxwells callit of Conhath.
Helen Maxwell Ladie mabie elder
Broon of ?Backlie and his wyffe
Jannat Maxwell callit of garrarie
Helen Broone sister to Carsluthe
Grissell Gordone servitrix to the Ladie mabie younger
Elizabeth Maxwell spous to Robert Rige
Androw Lyndsay of glenstocken
Marion Gray his spous
Cuthbert Broone brother to ?,artine
ffrancis Lyndsay brother to ?martines Lait father
Cathrene Broone spous to Johne McKurtney of culwen
Constance Broone spous to Edward morisone of Edinghame
Margrat Maxwell servitrix to the deceist Ladie herreis
James Jairdein in mylnetone and his sone Jone for murther and the said James for adulterie also
Martha weir spous to Johne Mcmichane and Johne McMichen his sone for murther
Johne and Robert Sturgeones sones to Torrorie for incest
Robert Clerk and Jannat Maxwell in Kilbeine for adulterie

In the presbyterie of penpont
Roger Greirsone for adulterie and marione mylne for witchcraft

In the presbyterie of Lochmaben
Charles Carrutheris and jane Irvine for adulterie
Walter Jonstone in [wyndome or wyneone] relapse in incest and cohabitatione
Jannat Ker for Incest

In the presbiterie of middelbie
James Maxwell of Springkell callit master of maxwell
James Irving of wysbie for incest
Connie Richardsone for adulterie
Helen armstrange for adultrie
John Bell in cleuchbray for incest

May 6, John Wilkin accused of abusing his father.

May 13, Boys accused of breaking Sabbath by fishing

May 27, Janet & Margaret Greir appeal against being put in the Gorgets – granted.

July 15. Blench Carlyle of Torthorwald parish complains that Mungo Brattane has called her a witch. Mungo says she has borne that report for a long time past

John Wright the piper always in trouble – first within the parish, then at Caerlaverock and finally being banned from playing within the bounds of Synod.

November 26, Minister in St Andrews visiting his son James.

December 23, Janet Greir’s process continued until the Laird of Lag should be present.
1656

January 22, The school to be removed out of the town of the Banks where it is now as it is not in a convenient place for the whole parish to betuixt the park yett and the maecarholme ford as that is the most convenient part of the parish and middle centre thereof.

February 5, John Denhame calls Andrew Crowdie ‘Bell Theif’.

March 23, Gilbert Grierson the Laird’s brother charged with showing violence to and struggling with Elspeth Heuchen (this drags on for months – he eventually unwillingly admits it).

March 30, John Denholm (busy on the Laird’s affairs is taking one of Lag’s children up to Edinburgh) accused of saying, in the Minister’s house in presence of the Elders, says that the Earl of Hartfell sat up all night drinking in Rockall Place ‘and went not to bed whill day’: also that some swore in the Minister’s presence and he did not rebuke them for it: that there was [?]seeing of women in the parish in the day time ‘and the minister did not rebuke that sin nather’: “That there was some in the paroch that fell in the fyre for druchennes and the minister took no notice of that sine nather” (there are several cases in the Minutes of drunks falling in the fire and burning their clothes and themselves).

Denholm is summoned to the Presbytery - he is eventually let off quite lightly as his charges are clearly true – but he is ordained ‘to becume ane humble man’.

April 6, Jane McMillan in Rockall complains that Elizabeth Ramsay said she had the glengore (syphilis) and had borne two bastard bairns in Ireland.

April 20, Janet Wright complains that Jane McKneillie called her a witch.

April 27, David Neilson and Francis Wright in Collin, sent by the session of Torthorwald for their carrying of loads out of Carlisle to the Place of Rockall on the Sabbath.

May 4, John Denholme’s case continued in respect he was employed by the Laird of Lag to go to Edinburgh with a carriage.

May 18, John Denholm employed by the Laird of Lag to take one of his children to Edinburgh.

June 1, Intimation made out of the pulpit concerning Mr George Blair’s sentence of excommunication warning the people to keep away from him.

June 8, George Graham’s case continued in respect all the rest of the servants were in the church and he onlie at home to keip the place’.

June 22, Many people absent from church because of the hay harvest.

October 12, John Brown in Collin and Isbell Avieson there charged with swearing in Mouswald parish.

Last day of November, No discipline this day in respect of the lateness of the night.
1657

February 5, Fast observed, but no other discipline because the Minister was sent for to his brother who was lying at the point of death.

February 8, Minister preaching in Kirkmichael at the direction of the presbytery.

February 15, John Ferguson and the Ivings – a good brawl – pulling hair and kerchiefs. William Irving felled John Bell with a handspade out of the mill.

April 26, Richard Irving complains that Janet Greir (never out of trouble) had said that her father was troubled with carrying his father to the gallows and called him a creeping thief.

June 14, John Dickson in Hole, John Goldie younger and George Tweidope in Banks summoned for their vain and worldly discourse in the churchyard between sermons.

July 12, Robert Edgar told Janet Underwood that there was a stolen cow hide found once in her father’s house.

July 26, No discipline – Minister in Edinburgh visiting his son Mr James – so James has graduated.

September 6, John Irving in Howthat and his family accused of gathering nuts on the Lord’s day.

September 27, Matthew Rae has come from another parish to confess his fornication with Nanie Smyth who is with child to him.

October 11, Robert Robson chosen ruling elder to go to the synodal assembly in Dumfries on 13th October ‘and thair to sitt and voyce in materis thair to be handled’.

November 22, John Irving back from South of England but off to Linlithgow on important business.

December 27, John Irving (Howthat) clears himself by his oath of the nut gathering ‘his delators not being cleir in thair delationes’.

1658

February 14, Janet Thomson confesses selling ale through the night ‘till Cockcrowing’.

March 12, Robert Rule to be summoned for scolding his mother.

April 18, Gilbert Grierson charged with being alone with Agnes Grierson behind closed doors in time of worship (this case drags on) – he denies fornication with her this time but admits it on another occasion (plus drinking, Sabbath breaking, etc.).

May 23, John Dickson delated guiltie of sabbath breaking by riddling of malt.

June 27, Public humiliation to be kept by command of the Synod – causes gross ignorance and profanity, etc.

July 2, Intimation made of a publick visitation of the Kirk of Mouswald to be held by the Presbytery of Lochmaben on 9th July being the Friday following July 11th.
Christopher Carruthers and Thomas Crorie delated for scandalous flyting at the hay working.

*August* 22, Richard Craik found to be laughing and sporting in time of divine worship – *August* 29 – to get a public rebuke in his seat.

*October* 16, Matthew Palmer is returned from his shearing in Lothian – delated to have left here on the Lord’s day.

*October* 23, Palmer purges himself by oath and says he started his journey to Lothian on Monday morning.

*November* 21, Euphan Johnston confesses she said Herbert Tueidope stol corn but made the excuse that she hard the same of mathow dikson who is knowne grosslie To be defective in his naturals’ – but she has to acknowledge her slander the next Lord’s day.

*December* 12, Bessie Bell with child – to come to the next Lord’s day and to say who the father is.

*December* 19, Bessie absolutely refuses to name the father and to appear before the presbyterie.

*December* 26, Roger Grierson ‘hearing ane report to goe through the countrie’ of his fornication with Nicolas Greir asks the Session to let him purge himself by his oath – they agree – swore ‘by the name of the great god’ – clears his and her names.

1659

*January* 9, Roger Grierson delated of fornication with Magdalen Scot – this case drags on for months but he eventually confesses – public report going through the country – some persons had found him in the very act – but as I say he eventually confesses (kicking and screaming all the way) – he had threatened to appeal to the Synod.

*January* 16, Bessie Bell confesses she was with child to Hew Maxwell.

*April* 10, Roger Grierson has confessed privately to the minister his fornication with Magdalen Scott and promised to pass from his appeal to the Synod and come in to the session and publiclie confess but wants 20 days ‘vpon sum considerable reasons which he imparted to the minister quhairvnto the sessione condescended’.

*April* 24, Celebration of the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper the two next Lord’s days following June 5, 1659.

Andrew Bratton out of the parish ‘being at sum faire’ – for several weeks.

*June* 12, ‘It being found that severall fornications were committed by young men inhabiting alone with young women not haveing other persones in the house: the sessione thocht fitt ordan that no such scandalouse vcohabitatioune should be permitted vnder the pain of church censures and that this order should be publiklie intimated out of the pulpit the next lords day’.

*July* 24, John Bratton in Rockell complains that Agnes Greir his sister-in-law has stolen 8/- sterling out of his pocket: this case drags on for weeks: she denies it: he agrees to her clearing herself by her oath, which she does, and he agrees to be punished for slandering her – but then changes his tune: when the volume ends on 20th November 1659 he is still holding out and the session has started excommunication proceedings against him.
August 14, August 28, etc., Jane Byers who for years has been a problem never attending church and leaving the parish when the pressure gets too much has returned: she is to make her repentance ‘in the publik place thrie dayes’.

Fast to be kept the next Thursday and Sunday.-

‘The causes of the fast:

Vnproficiencie vnder the gospell and rods of god.

Abounding of errors shifines heresies patronized by ane act of toleratione.

The defectione of many of the Land from the Jurisdictione and government of his Kirk quhairvnto they are solemmelie suorne.

The abounding of all profanitie drukennes suearing especiallie among the greater sort.

That the lord would be pleased to blesse the harvest and prevent deserved famine.

That the lord would raise vp religiouse & faithfull men to bear charge and rule over his people for the defence and propagatioune of the gospell and administratioune of justice and happilie settle the sad distemperis and confusiones of these naitiones.’

October 2, Another slander case – Herbert Mundell, ruling elder, accuses Thomas Smith of corn stealing – Mundell admits it – is suspended from his eldership but acknowledging his sin on 16 October his eldership is restored.

October 30, Andrew Bratton delated for drunkenness and swearing in the minister’s presence, as also for breaking an interdiction of the company of Janet Dickson by kissing and embracing her in the presence of several persons.

November 6, ‘Andrew Bratton being called compeired and being challenged of his drukennes swearing threatning to be about with these that rebuked him for his scandalouse cariage with Jonat dikson and breaking ane interdictioune in kissing and embraceing hir he denyed all tho the minister was ane witnes of his swearing drukennes and threatning these that rebuked him for his scandalouse kissing and embraceing Jonat dikson and the witnesses admitted by himself did suear they saw him [with] the foresaid woman’ – ordained to make his repentance – he refuses to obey ‘and adding threatning expressiounes to the minister and elderis he was cited apud acta to appear before the presbiterie’.

November 13, Bratton does not appear before the presbitrie – summoned to the presbitrie ‘the second tyme’.

November 20, John Bratton ‘proceeded agains with the first publik prayer’ (towards excommunication).
THE ROLE OF WIGTOWNSHIRE IN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY SMUGGLING

By Frances Wilkins

8 Mill Close, Blakedown, Kidderminster DY10 3NQ

According to the Board of Customs in Edinburgh, ‘very considerable’ quantities of contraband goods were landed in Wigtownshire during the eighteenth century. Only 1.3% of Scotland’s population lived here at the time so that the region could not provide customers for all the contraband that was apparently smuggled along its coasts. Wigtownshire was extremely important, however, as the first stage on the smuggling routes that supplied mainland Scotland and the Borders with a high proportion of their contraband brandy, rum, tea and tobacco.

At first Wigtownshire’s role in the smuggling trade was significant because of its close proximity to the Isle of Man. Goods imported into the Island could be transported there with comparative ease. After the loss of the Island’s warehouse status in 1765, these well-established networks were still used to disperse the contraband, now brought directly from Europe in large, heavily armed vessels.

Sources of information

This story is reconstructed from contemporary evidence in the Scottish customs records at the National Archives of Scotland in Edinburgh and at the Ayrshire Archives and in the eighteenth century customs ingates and outgates, court records, merchant letters and wills at the Manx National Heritage library in Douglas. Ballantrae is included in this survey, because it was one of the creeks belonging to the port of Stranraer (Table 3).

Evidence of Wigtownshire’s Role

The Board of Customs was made aware of the contraband being landed in Wigtownshire through letters from neighbouring regions, mainly in the form of complaints that greater attempts were not being made on the spot to prevent the problem.2

A high proportion of the goods landed in Wigtownshire during the middle years of the eighteenth century belonged to the Ayrshire smugglers. The collector at Ayr reported to the Board that in early April 1779 ‘large quantities of tea and spirits passed through this country from Ballantrae and Galloway’. The following year the same collector heard that two large smuggling cutters were expected on the coast of Galloway, ‘a considerable part

2 Information about the Wigtownshire area is found in the custom house letter-books for Ayr (CE76), Dumfries (CE51), Stranraer (CE77) and Wigtown (CE61). The main sources for this article are the Class 1 letters from the Collector & Comptroller to the Board of Customs in Edinburgh and the Class 2 Letters from the Board of Customs in Edinburgh to the Collector & Comptroller at the local port. The Ayr letter-books are currently held at the Ayrshire Archives Centre and the Dumfries, Stranraer and Wigtown letter-books at the National Archives of Scotland in Edinburgh. For further information about these records see Scottish Customs & Excise Records, with particular reference to Strathclyde (1992) and Family Histories in Scottish Customs Records (1993), which uses examples from Dumfries & Galloway. In the subsequent notes, only the letter-book reference number and the date have been quoted for letters to and from the local port and the Board.
of the cargoes of which, belonging to the smugglers at Troon, is to be conveyed through this country’.³

Of greater concern were complaints received by the Board from England. The supervisor of riding officers⁴ at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, had information that in December 1782 an armed lugger landed a large quantity of tea and other goods in Galloway while on 28 February 1783 an armed cutter with twenty-two guns landed at the same place 600 ankers of spirits and 300 boxes of teas.⁵ He believed that the contraband had been purchased overseas by the smugglers based at Langholm, who had ‘associated themselves with formidable bodies [of men] to carry and convey these goods through the country into Cumberland, Northumberland, Newcastle and Southern Counties with firearms, threatening the riding officers with murder whenever they meet them’.⁶

When challenged by the Board to account for his failure to seize these goods, the collector at Dumfries replied: ‘I have no doubt that these practices have been carried on to a considerable extent … the cargoes deposited in places of concealment, till they find suitable opportunities of removing them … The importations on the coast of Galloway, I mean such part thereof as goes towards Cumberland, is seldom carried by land, the smugglers having hiding places and associates in the Borders of England, to whom they send such goods up the Firth, in the night time, in boats of 15 or 20 tons, and the business is begun and ended without an officer knowing of the matter till it is entirely over … the great carriage … is by water, which is more safe and expeditious than by land. I understand, or at least I am informed, there is a company lately settled at Sarkfoot, near Gratney, to whom the care of such goods is sent from the coast of Galloway, and they transport them in their turn to the coast of Cumberland etc. But they have such hiding places underground that nothing short of a direct information can discover them’.⁷

Several Wigtownshire boats were seized along the eastern Solway shore with contraband goods on board:

1789: Mayflower of Wigtown, to the east of the Nith estuary, 30 miles from Dumfries;
1797: William & Ross of Port William, Morrison master, at Torduff Point and
1804: sloop Nancy of Stranraer, at the Hagg, seven miles from Dumfries.⁸

In 1780 John Scot from Galloway was one of several people who deforted Baldwin Martin, a tidesman at Annan⁹, and Robert Johnson, an excise officer stationed there, when

---

³ CE76 1/11 27 April 1779 & 6 January 1780.
⁴ A riding officer patrolled his area, usually covering 10 miles in each direction, on horseback.
⁵ The lugger had two or three masts, each with a four-sided lugsail. The cutter was a fore and aft rigged vessel with one mast, two or more headsails and a running bowsprit. See William Falconer *Universal Dictionary of the Marine* (London, 1780) and Admiral W H Smith *Sailor's Word Book A Dictionary of Nautical Terms* 1867 & London Conway Maritime Press 1996.
⁶ CE51 1/4 Collector at Dumfries to Mr Armstrong, Supervisor of riding officers at Newcastle, 23 March 1787. See also CE51 1/4 28 May 1786 – the collector suggests that the goods are carried across the Firth into England and CE51 1/4 2 August 1786 – the boats are described as 10 to 15 tons and the smuggling company at Sarkfoot is named as Mc Dowal & Co.
⁷ CE51 1/5 10 November & 30 December 1789, 15 February, 26 March & 2 April 1790; CE51 1/6 24 August 1797 and CE51 1/7 5 December 1804.
⁸ CE51 2/3 19 March 1783.
⁹ The tidesmen were employed to board every vessel arriving on the coast, on the tide.
they attempted to seize smuggled goods. Mr Short, a messenger at Dumfries, ‘who is looked upon as very active in that line of business’, went out twice with a party of volunteers to apprehend them. The smugglers, however, ‘having got a suspicion of what was going on ... had always people on the lookout to give the alarm and consequently could not be laid hold of. In this situation Mr Short, with our concurrence (the procurator fiscal having gone to some mineral wells in England for his health), was under the necessity of accepting terms proposed to him through their agent, which was upon the promise of not being apprehended to appear in Dumfries’. This was accepted. The trial was held at Dumfries before the High Court of Justiciary, when the jury acquitted the smugglers by a ‘plurality of votes’. Short’s charges were £47 16s 1d.10

The Role of the Isle of Man

During the first part of the eighteenth century, the Isle of Man played a major role in the smuggling trade on the Irish Sea coasts. The significance of its location in respect to Galloway can be seen in Figure 1. The Island did not belong to the crown but was held by the Lords of Man – until 1736 the Earls of Derby and subsequently the Dukes of Atholl. This independent status meant that the Lord could set his own duties on imported goods. As a result, it was advantageous for a merchant to import brandy, rum, tea or tobacco there

Figure 1 Location of the Isle of Man with respect to Galloway.

10 CE51 1/4 4 July, 21 July, 29 July, 31 July and 16 September 1780. CE51 2/3 6 June, 29 June, 7 August, 20 December 1780 and 8 January 1784.
rather than in Scotland or England, where the customs duties were considerably higher. At the same time, it was possible to import goods into the Island that were prohibited on the mainland, either because they were imported from a country currently at war with Britain or because they came under the remit of the East India Company, which held a monopoly on all goods from the East Indies, in particular teas. These contraband goods were warehoused on the Island and then run onto the coasts as and when needed and convenient, preferably during the dark of the moon and when there were no revenue cruisers active in the Channel. The customs officers on the Island were Manx appointees, although from the beginning of the century onwards there were two crown officers there, who could observe and attempt to forewarn their colleagues on the mainland of an intended smuggling run, but could do nothing else.11

Merchants supplying the contraband landed in Wigtownshire
There were several merchants based on the Isle of Man, mainly in Douglas and Peel, who supplied customers in Scotland directly or would act as agents for merchants based elsewhere.

George Moore was a Manx-born merchant living in Peel (Figure 2). He imported large cargoes of brandy, rum, wine, tea, tobacco and Barcelona handkerchiefs, which were warehoused at the port and repackaged by his Scottish cooper, Thomas Taylor, before they were taken to North Britain by small boats or wherries and sold to a network of customers stretching from Tarbert in the north to Stranraer in the south.

Moore visited Scotland for two months each summer in order to make personal contact with his customers and arrange the delivery of new orders. He used a string of agents to collect the money owed and, if necessary, to sue for any outstanding debts in the local courts. These agents included John Allan in Ballantrae and William Kerr in Stranraer.12
One of Moore’s Wigtownshire customers was William McNellie of Ballantrae, who had two brothers, Hugh and Thomas, both of whom were mariners. In July, October and December 1734 William McNellie received deliveries of brandy from Moore on a wherry, John McNish master. On 7 May 1735, he ordered more goods from Peel:

‘Receive from my brother, Hugh, eight pounds sterling in bank notes and send per him, or in the wherry, ten dozen of good claret and four casks of brandy, at the same price that my brother can buy it. Your answer to this demand will oblige me to pay your order, when called for. This is all from, Sir, your humble servant’.

As the orders were normally delivered in casks, McNellie sent Moore three bags to protect the wine. At this point his orders had totalled £33 13s 4d. Twenty pounds had been received by Moore, including the eight pounds from brother Hugh. On 8 March 1736, Thomas McNellie was on the Island and paid him a further two pounds. William McNellie refused to pay the outstanding balance of £11 13s 3d, because he claimed that customs officers had seized the goods. Moore would not accept this excuse – all his customers knew that once a wherry left the ‘headlands’ of the Island the goods were their responsibility. Several customers would take out insurance policies to this effect and were reimbursed, if it could be proved that the goods had been lost at sea, by one means or another. There was no insurance cover once the goods were on land, although Moore would allow an abatement of 5% on the value of any losses.\textsuperscript{13}

On 12 April 1743 Moore charged McNellie with debt in the Manx Chancery Court. As a result, six ankers and two half ankers of spirits ‘the effects of William McNellie’ on the Island, waiting for a wherry to transport them to Ballantrae, were arrested against the debt. Moore won his case and McNellie was instructed to pay £11 13s 3d plus 2s 4d, court costs. The spirits were sold for £5 8s 0d. This meant that £6 7s 7d was still due.\textsuperscript{14}

Moore wrote to McNellie in 1752, ‘I’ve been thus long waiting in hopes of your payment of this balance, which now I desire you will pay to John Allan in Ballantrae, and take his receipt for the same, or send me the value by the bearer, John Wilson, who will take care to deliver it me’. When no money was forthcoming, Moore commented to Allan, ‘I thought that McNellie’s circumstances were in a better condition. If you can fall on any method to secure the debt he owes me, I beg you will’.\textsuperscript{15} It is not known whether Moore ever received his payment.

In the meantime, his relationship with Allan was deteriorating. Moore wrote on 5 January 1758, ‘I have delivered to the bearer, Thomas McNellie, and the rest of your boatmen, four hogsheads of your claret, 27 tons of French brandy, 27 tons of rum and two

\textsuperscript{13} See CE60 I/1 7 November 1749 for details of an insurance policy dated Peeltown, 7 August 1749.
\textsuperscript{14} MNHL: 10071: Chancery File 1743 f25, 12 April 1743.
\textsuperscript{15} MNHL: 10071 Liber Canc 1740-1743 64. 12 April 1743 & Chancery File 1743 f25. 12 April 1743 & MS 501C (MIC68) 7 February 1752 and 12 March 1753.
bags containing six dozen claret. Your boatmen had no money to pay their credit and other
necessaries here, so I was forced to give them 20s’. Presumably, this was reimbursed. On
28 February Moore delivered to McNellie and another boatman, David Ferguson, goods
worth £72 19s 1d. Part of this shipment was seized and Moore allowed Allan the standard
abatement of 5%. He was unable to see his agent during the annual visit to Scotland and
wrote to him from the Island in August, ‘I had some hopes that, if I had seen you in
Ballantrae in my return from Glasgow, that you would have settled with and paid me’.

Despite this, Moore sent Allan more goods in 1759: 24 ten gallon casks and six five
gallon casks of brandy, six five gallon casks of rum and two bags of claret. He reassured
him, ‘the quality of the brandy I send you is very good, for it is Bordeaux and the best in
this town’. The price of the rum was high because it was ‘very scarce and must continue
scarce until the new rum arrives’. There were no Barcelona handkerchiefs in the Island so
that this part of Allan’s order could not be completed. A further sum of £51 8s 7d was
added to Allan’s debt but in an attempt to pacify him over having to pay 95% of the value
of the goods lost in 1758, Moore added 30 bottles of white claret in a bag. The boat
master’s name was Simon Crow and he charged Allan a freight of 2s 2d per cask. There
is no information about the payment of these debts.

Allan had offered Moore a joint venture in a further 20 casks of brandy and rum but the
Manx merchant declined. His comment, ‘as I do not deal in any such way, I hope you will
excuse my declining any such risk’, emphasises the role of a merchant based on the Island
– to supply the goods but never become involved in the actual smuggling onto the Scottish
coasts. As a result, many of the Manxmen could claim with some justification that they
were merchants involved in the legal trade of buying and selling. The men who ran the
goods on shore and those who received them in Scotland were the smugglers.

The Margaret of Wigtown
Moore owned his own fleet of vessels to transport goods to the Island but on any particular
day there would be boats belonging to Scotland, England, Wales, Ireland and European
ports at the Island. With either William Clark or Alexander Blain as her master, the
Margaret of Wigtown made frequent voyages to and from the Island in 1715 and 1716,
bringing brandy from France (Nantz) and both wine and brandy from Spain
(St Sebastian’s) and taking cargoes to Whitehaven and Dublin. These voyages are
summarised in Table 1.

In October 1715, John Murray of Douglas landed eight pipes, four hogsheads, two
quarter casks and 10 ankers containing brandy for James McGuffock of Wigtown. As the
pipes contained 115 gallons each, they would be too cumbersome for smuggling on to the

16 MNHL: MS 501C (MIC68) 5 January 1758 and 25 August 1758.
17 MNHL: MS 501C (MIC68) 26 March 1759.
18 MNHL: 10058 Customs Ingates & Outgates 1716 & 1717.
coast, where speed of dispersal was all-important. A Manx cooper would have used the 5,000 staves and 36 bundles of hoops also on board to make more 10-gallon casks for the brandy.

McGuffock may have been one of the owners of the Margaret. He was frequently in Ramsey and Blain met him there in January 1716, possibly to discuss his appointment as master of the vessel. McGuffock would have used a smaller boat or wherry to send the casks to Galloway. The involvement of Thomas Caine, a wherrymaster from Rush near Dublin and Thomas Bailie, a boat master from Galloway, in the Margaret’s cargo from Dublin in February 1716 suggests that they may have been in his employ.

Both John Bignall and James Dymond were Dublin merchants, who now lived on the Island, in Ramsey and Douglas respectively. When Bignall died in 1736, his Irish executors spent several years trying to collect all the debts owed by his customers in Galloway and round Kirkcudbright, for cargoes of brandy and tobacco.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Importer/exporter</th>
<th>From/to</th>
<th>Goods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 1715</td>
<td>John Murray for Mr McGuffock, John Fogue</td>
<td>From Nantz</td>
<td>brandy, staves, hoops &amp; paper, brandy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1715</td>
<td>John Bignall</td>
<td>To Whitehaven</td>
<td>Canary &amp; Vidonia wine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1715</td>
<td>John Bignall</td>
<td>From Whitehaven</td>
<td>tobacco, leather hides, a furnace and indigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philip Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td>tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1716</td>
<td>Philip Moore, James Dymond, and John Murray for Mr Gulbally</td>
<td>To Dublin</td>
<td>Florence and Canary wine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander Blain</td>
<td></td>
<td>leather hides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1716</td>
<td>Thomas Stevenson, Thomas Caine, Thomas Bailie, Neale Reynolds</td>
<td>From Dublin</td>
<td>assorted goods including hops, madder, currants, Spanish juice, pepper, beef, shot, gunpowder, lampblack, candles, white paper, leather hides, calf skins, handkerchiefs, heels, whalebone, pitch, soap, wool and tow cards, indico, and an old chest of drawers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1716</td>
<td>James Dymond</td>
<td>To St Sebastians</td>
<td>bees wax, tallow and butter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1716</td>
<td>James Dymond and John Calloale</td>
<td>From St Sebastians</td>
<td>wine and brandy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Voyages of the Margaret of Wigtown October 1715 to August 1716

Note: William Clark was master for the first two voyages and Alexander Blain for the subsequent ones.

19 MNHL: 10071 Petition File 1716 f57. 11 January 1716.
20 MNHL: papers with John Bignall’s will 1736.
Irish and Scottish merchants using the Isle of Man for cargoes smuggled into Wigtownshire

Dublin was a major port in the eighteenth century. Provisions, including butter and salted beef, were exported to Europe, America and the West Indies. The duties on imported goods were high, however, in parallel with England and Scotland. As a result, several of the Dublin merchants sent their valuable home-coming cargoes to the Isle of Man. This meant that the merchants either needed an Irish partner based on the Island or an agent, who would import the cargoes on their behalf. The Dublin merchant partnership of Jean Favre, George Almond and Joseph Gibson used Almond’s cousin by marriage, John Murray, as their agent on the Island.

In May and June 1707, Murray imported over 12 tons of brandy, 21 tons of red and white wine, 15 tons of Bay salt together with prunes, raisins, vinegar and barrel hoops for the partnership from on board the Mary of Glasgow, Peter Hughes master. In September part of this cargo was subsequently exported on board the Alice of Douglas, Thomas Vance master, and Favre on board as supercargo.21

The Alice appeared at Lough Ryan, where the collector and comptroller of Port Patrick, who were suspicious of her intentions, seized her temporarily. When it was proved that her rigging was in urgent need of repair, she was released. Instead of sailing as soon as the repairs were completed, however, the Alice remained in the Lough for several days. In the meantime, Favre went to Glasgow, to discuss the delivery of her cargo with his customers there, and Colonel Andrew Agnew of Lough Ryan purchased £15 worth of brandy.22

Because Vance knew the Wigtownshire coast well, Charles Dalrymple, a tobacco merchant in Glasgow and John Hunter of Shillah Hill, Northumberland subsequently employed him as master of their boat, that regularly landed goods near Whithorn. After he had undertaken several voyages for the partnership, Vance sued Dalrymple for his wages. The Dalrymple/Hunter partnership came to a somewhat abrupt end when Hunter and Robert Douglas, another of his erstwhile partners, both led troops of horse under the Earl of Derwentwater during the Jacobite rising of the ’15. Although they were captured at the battle of Preston, they managed to escape but disappeared from the smuggling scene. This caused problems for John Bignall and Jacob Turner, because Hunter had been in charge of the accounts for their joint partnership. The resultant problems occupied the Manx courts for several years.23

All the merchants described so far were involved with large cargoes of contraband. Several Wigtownshire merchants dealt in comparatively small amounts of goods. James Lafries was born at Edinburgh in December 1675. By the early eighteenth century he was established as a merchant in Wigtown, dealing with John Wattleworth junior, William

21 MNHL: 10058 Customs Ingates & Outgates 1707 & 1708.
23 See The Isle of Man & the Jacobite Network.
Kelley and Pat Clark, all living on the Isle of Man. When Clark was drowned, Lafries attempted to charge his widow with a supposed debt. His claim was rejected in the Manx court, 'it being too common a practice with Lafries to sue and molest several persons that he has had to deal with, after a just payment of what he could demand'. 24 Other merchants charged with small debts in the Manx courts included Simon Gilliam, James McKie and William McWhinney, all of Wigtown.

**The boats that transported the contraband to Wigtownshire**

A large number of small boats visited the Island on a regular basis during the first half of the eighteenth century. Although the goods imported there may have formed part of an essential coastal trade, in the majority of cases, they left with contraband goods on board. The Appendix lists the presence of Wigtownshire boats there. On 18 January 1711 William Johnson, as master of the *Hope* of Port William, paid 2s 10d duty on 17 barrels of white herrings landed at Douglas. On 20 January he cleared out ‘for Sligo’ with a very different cargo: three hogsheads claret, 822 gallons Spanish spirits (brandy) and 600 lbs. roll tobacco. There is no evidence of John Wilson’s incoming cargo but on the 26th September of the same year, he cleared from Peel with 5,179 lbs. of leaf, cut and prick tobacco and 30 gallons of Spanish spirits for ‘Londonderry’.

The destinations are in quotes because of a ruse used by the merchants on the Island. The collector at Dumfries described this in 1724. He was anxious: ‘to deprive these smugglers the protection they now enjoy in their trade by taking out sham cockets in the Isle of Man from one port to another coastways … if they be attacked at sea or upon the coasts here in small boats they will pretend they are forced from the Island by bad weather … and will never stand to make oath that they are actually bound for the place for which they have their cocket, though they be actually designed to land their goods in Britain if they can have any opportunity’. 25

Two separate documents exist for a voyage of the *Mary*, Ewan Christian master. Her Pass, signed by the Manx comptroller of customs on 12 August 1721, permits the *Mary*, her captain and crew to sail for North Britain ‘about their lawful occasions’ i.e. to deliver goods there. Her Cocket, dated Douglas 16 August 1721, states that the merchant, Robert Oates, has entered on board 12 ankers of brandy and seven trusses of tobacco – the *Mary’s* destination is listed as Peel. 26

This highlights one of the problems when trying to reconstruct the smuggling history between the Island and Scotland. The term ‘North Britain’ is used in the majority of cases instead of identifying the exact destination.

---

24 MNHL: 10071 Liber Canc 1707-1718 1715 f33. 20 April 1715.
25 CES5 1/2 25 November 1724.
26 MNHL: 10071 Petition File 1721 f15.
The Sarah of Clanyard
In June 1702 James Agnew, master of the Sarah of Clanyard, entered on board his vessel at Peel 10 gallons wine, ‘for use of some churches in Galloway, being part of a parcel landed at Peel out of the Love’s Increase of Chester last March, duty paid inwards’ and three tanned hides, six pieces of earthenware and 24 lbs. resin imported out of William of Gourock the previous May. This customs entry suggests a legal cargo.27

On the 9th of September the Sarah was in Douglas, when William Maxwell of Monreith entered on board her two hogsheads claret, part of parcel imported out of the Terestrone of Rode in January and 20 lbs. tobacco out of Rose of Douglas in March. This cargo together with one entered by Agnew at Peel in December: one hogshead claret, seven bottles containing nine gallons brandy and six score pounds tobacco suggest involvement in the smuggling trade.

All the tobacco from the British Plantations had to be transported in British vessels and landed at British ports, where it paid a high duty, before it could be exported to the large markets in Europe. Once it could be proved that the tobacco had been re-exported to France, Holland or Sweden then the duty was reimbursed, a system known as drawback. Some of the tobacco was sold on the European market but a large quantity of it was collected in smaller vessels and landed on the Isle of Man, ready to be smuggled back into Britain duty free.

Between 1704 and 1707 the Sarah collected several tobacco cargoes on the Island. These are listed in Table 2. As these pre-date the custom house letterbooks, there is no evidence about seizures of any of these cargoes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port &amp; Date</th>
<th>By whom entered and details of goods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peel, 13 January 1704</td>
<td>William Dumbill: 600 lbs. tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel, 29 February 1704</td>
<td>the master: 166 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>766 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel, 10 March 1705</td>
<td>the master: 336 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel, 22 May 1705</td>
<td>John McClery: 330 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel, 24 September 1705</td>
<td>John Murray &amp; Robert Moore: 1,120 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>1,786 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel, 22/26 February 1705</td>
<td>Edward Hopes, John Murray &amp; Robert Moore: 843 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel, 18 April 1706</td>
<td>Robert Moore: 336 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel, 8 June 1706</td>
<td>John Murray: 1,200 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel, 17 June 1706</td>
<td>John Murray &amp; Robert Moore: 1,320 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>3,699 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel, 5 April 1707</td>
<td>John McClery, for Stranraer: 224 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel, 15 April 1707</td>
<td>Philip Moore (George Moore’s father) for James Richmond for Stranraer: 336 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel, 13 May 1707</td>
<td>John McClery, for Bergen: 672 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel, 21 &amp; 26 June 1707</td>
<td>William Moore &amp; John Edgar, for Bergen: 1,344 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>2,576 lbs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The Sarah of Clanyard, James Agnew master: tobacco cargoes 1704-1707
Note: the quantities of tobacco have been converted into lbs. for easy comparison

27 MNHL: 10058 Customs Outgates 1704 – 1707.
The Manx wherries

The majority of cargoes were transported to Wigtownshire, not in local boats, but in Manx wherries. In May 1724 there were nine wherries at the Isle of Man, ‘ready laden with brandy and tobacco all bound for Galloway Firth’.28 The following December the collector at Wigtown received a letter from William Henderson, a king’s officer on the Isle of Man, with information about a wherry, belonging to ‘a parcel of Borderers’ and loaded with brandy, rum and other goods ‘ready to sail for this coast’. The letter was sent express to Dumfries, where the collector reported, ‘I shall do all that lies in my power to prevent the running of her goods or to seize them, when run. But though I get an information when they arrive yet before I can march a party to that country they will have the goods so disposed of through the country that it will be impossible for me to lay hands on them’.29

According to the collector at Dumfries in 1762, the Manx wherries were ‘all open, about five or six tons burthen and generally brings from the Isleman betwixt 40 or 50 small casks of spirits (brandy, rum and gin), containing about eight or nine gallons each, and six or eight lbs. weight tea, in leather bags, in each boat. They are rigged sometimes with two masts and two square sails and at other times only one mast and one sail and in calm weather they row with four oars, and carry eight men in each boat’.30

The wherrymen

There is evidence of Manx wherrymen being regularly in Wigtownshire. In 1757 Caesar Parr, co-owner of the *Sisters* wherry of Peel and her current master, ordered his crew to wait for him with the boat at John Main’s saltpans. Leaving Parr to collect debts from customers in Ayrshire they headed for Galloway. On their arrival there, they were warned by Main about a customs barge at Port Nessock ‘on the lookout’. The revenue man, John Wilson, tried to seize their small boat, which was ‘by force got off from him’. The *Sisters*, with three Manx passengers, who had been waiting for a ‘put’ to the Island, set sail without Parr. She was wrecked and two of the wherrymen were drowned, the other crew and the passengers returning to the shore with great difficulty.31 Main’s saltpans have not been identified.

If a wherry crew were caught at sea with goods on board then any ‘fit and stout’ members were pressed into the navy. William Lace and Patrick Cooile, two Manx wherrymen, were impressed in December 1756. Lace’s wife, Margaret, and William Cooile, Patrick’s father, went to Galloway in an attempt to ‘get them off’. They found the men in Stranraer gaol ‘until they could be put on board a king’s ship’ and that it was ‘impossible to get them discharged’. Margaret suffered greatly during the next few years, ‘in supporting herself and child’, because William was on board HMS *Enterprise*, stationed on the coast of Jamaica, and could send no money to her. When he died in 1761, she hoped for some relief because there was ‘a considerable sum’ of wages still due. It is not clear whether or not she ever received this money.32

28 CE51 1/2 18 May 1724.
29 CE51 1/2 1 December 1724.
30 CE51 1/3 8 February 1762.
31 MNHL: 10071 Petition File: 1758, 1759 and 1760. 1760. f1. See also 2,000 Manx Mariners (2000).
32 MNHL: papers with William Lace’s will 1761 & 2,000 Manx Mariners (2000).
Wigtownshire’s Role after 1765

After 1765 the situation changed completely, when the government purchased the fiscal rights of the Island from the Duke of Atholl for £70,000, in the vain belief that this would stop smuggling for all time. The smuggling trade provided too much profit for too many respectable merchants, however, and the equally respectable customers were unwilling to pay exorbitant prices for goods that they were now accustomed to receiving more cheaply on a regular basis.

There was no longer any facility for storing the contraband on the Isle of Man so that the cargoes came directly from Europe. Some of these cargoes came on ships returning to their homeports. In May 1766 the Minerva, Joseph Bryce master, ran goods in the Bay of Luce on her way home from Spain. She was seized when she arrived at Ayr.

On the afternoon of 11 March 1785, a 40 ton sloop belonging to Ayr arrived off Port William on her voyage home from Virginia. She discharged a large quantity of tobacco in hogsheads and small packages. Both the tidesmen in the neighbourhood had been ‘taken up by persons whom they do not know and confined until the smuggling was over and the tobacco all secured’ by the smugglers. This was done by cutting the hogsheads ‘asunder’ and making the tobacco up into packages ‘for putting two upon a horse. A vast number of carriers assembled, who had just returned from carrying goods of a former smuggle, who were again loaded towards Ayrshire, where we are told the principal owners live’.

When in June 1787 a brig, Archibald Crocket master, with wine and fruit on board from Bordeaux for Wigtown and Dumfries, was found hovering between St Bees Head and Abbeyburn two of the Prince Edward revenue cutter’s mariners were stationed on board to ensure that her cargo was delivered correctly.

In 1788 the collector at Dumfries described to the Board the system for smuggling goods that was now employed along the coasts between Irvine and the Water of Urr.

‘The vessels in which these importations are made are generally freighted at Ostend or Guernsey, and some small ones from Ireland and the Isle of Man. The usual freight paid on such cargoes is 20s per bale of tobacco, weighing about 120 lbs., and 10s per anker [cask containing 10 gallons] of spirits. The vessels now used in this business are in general less than they were a few years ago and 200 bales of tobacco and 400 ankers are thought a pretty large cargo and would load a vessel of 80 or 100 tons but more cargoes are of 100 to 150 bales and of 200 to 300 ankers than above 200 bales and 400 ankers.

---

33 CE76 1/13 16 March 1785.
34 CE76 1/5 14 June, 24 June, 14 October, 4 November 1766 and CE76 2/3 3 June 1766 & CE51 2/3 25 June 1787.
‘The quantities imported within the limits mentioned has some years amounted to 4,000 bales but on an average the quantity may safely be reckoned 3,000 per annum, for there has been some cargoes consisting mostly of tobacco. It is carried for sale overland to Edinburgh, Glasgow, Paisley, Ayr etc. and a good deal by water to Whitehaven and the Cumberland coast, from whence it is again carried further into the country, and a good deal that is also carried by water to Sarkfoot and that neighbourhood, from whence it is conveyed to Langholm and also towards Northumberland.

‘The number of sailors employed in the importing vessels are in proportion to the burthen, being from six to 18 or 20 and their wages is 12 shillings per week each, with two guineas each per safe trip, and put under no allowance as to meat or drink, having liberty to break open a cask or anker when another is done. As a pilot is always necessary on these occasions, his trouble is generally rewarded with the carriage of a certain quantity of goods freight free…

‘The insurance, when any is made on the adventures from Ostend, Guernsey etc., is about 2½%, being for the ordinary sea risk. But it is very seldom that any insurance is made. With regard to the time of performing one of these adventures, it can generally be done in six weeks and the vessels be ready to engage in a new one’.35

A further report from Dumfries in August 1791 described landings in Wigtownshire during the last two years. These included:

From Ostend:
*John & Jenny* cutter with tobacco and spirits worth £1,300.
A sloop, name unknown, with 350 or 400 packages of assorted cargo worth £1,200 to £1,300.

From Guernsey:
Sloop *John & Mary* with 350 packages of tobacco and spirits worth £1,200 to £1,300.
On another trip she was seized off Annan with 1,071 gallons brandy, 177 gallons rum, 549 gallons geneva, 8,837 lbs. tobacco and 679 lbs. tea all appraised at Kirkcudbright as worth £1,310 2s 9d.

A brig with 700 or 800 packages of tobacco, rum, brandy and geneva worth £1,900 to £2,000.

In other words, known cargoes of goods from Ostend and Guernsey had been worth over £7,000 or nearly half a million pounds in current terms.

---

35 CE51 1/4 January 1788.
The Dumfries collector continued, ‘besides the above we have no doubt that very considerable quantities of tobacco and spirits are carried up the Firth … from the different repositories and hiding places on the coast of Galloway, where the importations are made but it is impossible for us to ascertain either the extent or the value. The whole inhabitants of the country are friendly to the smugglers rather than to the revenue officers and when an importation takes place the cargo is hurried with as much dispatch as possible into different parts of the country and away towards the counties of Northumberland and Cumberland’.36

In February 1790, a smuggling cutter from Ostend was in the offing at Ballantrae. Tobacco and spirits were collected from her by the local fishermen John Coulter, Robert Allan and Hugh Galloway and received on shore by William Galloway, Hugh Thomson, John Cuming and William McKissock.37 Although their names were known, no witnesses could be found to support a prosecution.

**Wigtownshire vessels involved in smuggling**

Wigtownshire vessels were also involved in this trade. In April 1778 the *Neptune* brigantine, 50 tons, Robert Neil master, originally belonging to Stranraer but now the property of smugglers at Mull of Galloway, discharged her cargo at the Foot of Water of Fleet. She immediately sailed to the Mull, where Alexander Ramsay went on board. The collector at Ayr knew that he was going to Dunkirk to purchase another cargo of goods to be smuggled at the Mull, or once more at the Foot of Water of Fleet.38

In May 1788, a cutter built at Ramsey on the Isle of Man in 1779 and registered at Stranraer on 21 March 1787 to Hugh Crane and Daniel Wallace of Kirkmaiden but with no visible name ‘except wrote with chalk’, 15 tons burthen and with six or seven ‘stout sailors’ on board with the master was seized by Mr Hepburn, riding officer and Mr Twaddel, landwaiter, of Dumfries, the morning after she had run her cargo of goods. ‘When the crew saw the officers were serious in making the vessel a seizure, one of the hands observed that they had no great reason to complain for she had already done enough for her share, or words to that purpose. Indeed we are told that for a considerable time by past either this vessel or some such like has not been less than once a week at the same place, always with full cargoes’.39

Robert Agnew, master of the *Surry* of Port William, was known to be deeply involved in the smuggling trade. He would meet the *Neptune* of Carlisle, John Patton master, at sea regularly to take on board some of her tobacco, which had been cleared out from Liverpool or Port Glasgow for Ostend or Bergen. One example was quoted to the Board:

36 CE51 16 August 1791.
37 CE76 1/10 4 October & 31 October 1777 & CE77 2/1 25 February 1790.
38 CE76 1/10 April 1778.
39 CE51 1/4 28 May 1787.
Agnew would land the tobacco at Sarkfoot, where James Ritchie lived. He was the principal pilot for the Solway Firth, and part-owner of the *Surry*. According to Mr Nicol, commander of the barracks at Port William, in early 1794 Agnew was still at Sarkfoot. Nicol had seen a bag of flour Agnew had sent to his wife from there.

At the end of May, the *Surry* appeared in the Channel, ‘supposed to be going for Guernsey’. On the 14th June, Agnew arrived at Port William in a small boat from the Isle of Man, where he had left his vessel, after smuggling a cargo of spirits in the Solway. Ritchie was also back home in Sarkfoot. Nicol ‘conversed’ with Agnew, who admitted that he had received a letter, warning him to keep out of the way, because he was to be called as a witness against the *Neptune*. Agnew knew that the warrant would be sent to Dumfries, where there was a person on the outlook, who would inform him if there were any danger.40

### The landing places

There were favourite landing places in Wigtownshire. On the afternoon of the 10th and morning of the 14th July 1789 a smuggling lugger, Thomas Goulder master, smuggled tea, spirits and tobacco at Auchinmalg Bay. The Board was highly critical. ‘A proper watch should have been set so that a constant lookout might have been kept both night and day, Auchinmalg being the known seat of smuggling and where it was to be supposed she would return, as she did’. The collector at Stranraer was to explain, ‘whether it was owing to fatigue that both Mr Williamson and the tidesmen went to bed … For if one of them had continued on the lookout it might have answered the purpose of apprising you of the return of the smuggler, so as to have prevented the smuggling’.

Unfortunately, the collector’s reply has not survived.

One of the problems was the number of guns and crew on board the smuggling luggers – the local customs officers could not attempt to interfere with a large lugger with 18 guns and 60 men, which landed a cargo of brandy and geneva at the Bay of Luce in January 1801. All they could do with safety was to observe and report.

At five o’clock in the morning of 13 July 1802, there was a lugger off the Mull of Galloway and at seven o’clock she stood up bay for Drumore, with a small smack accompanying her. There was also a brig lying off and on between the Big Stair and the Mull, ‘which appears very suspicious’.

40 CE51 2/6 31 December 1793, 9 May 1794, 13 June 1794 & 18 June 1794.  
41 CE77 2/1 16 July 1789.  
42 CE77 2/3 25 January 1801.  
43 CE77 2/3 15 July 1802.
Warnings of intended smuggles

There were several warnings of potential landings. During 1776 a lugger, about 60 tons burthen, William Morrison master, sailed from Donaghadee in Ireland to Roscoff in France for a load of goods to be run at Ballantrae or Ladyburn. On 16 January 1778 a very large smuggling cutter was discovered between Port Patrick and Donaghadee, ‘waiting an opportunity to come on the west coast’. Finally in March 1785 the Thomas of Ringsend in Ireland, William Crestian master, a cutter of about 40 tons, with a remarkable hanging stern, had sailed to Roscoff for a cargo of brandy etc. to be landed at Ballantrae or ‘within side the Mull of Galloway’. Her supercargo, a man called Graham, had ‘a remarkable cut on his lip, or a hair lip, and has been wounded in the left hand’.44

The revenue officers

The revenue officers suffered from several problems: competition between customs and excise, and between them and the army and navy; corruption of officers; violence and obstreperousness from the local people and the simple logistics of too large an area to defend with too few men. There were successes. Smuggling vessels were seized and their crews impressed into the navy. Some of the prosecutions at Edinburgh were actually successful.

Table 3 lists the customs establishment in the Wigtownshire area. The main problem was that there were very few officers attached to each port so that only one tidesman was appointed to most of the creeks. Co-operation between officers within a Port, and between Ports, was essential. The customs officers’ pay was very low, however, and the only way to supplement it was through the share of seizure money. Therefore, in theory, the fewer people involved in any one seizure the better so that any information tended to be guarded by individuals rather than passed on to others. This resulted in fewer seizures than should have been possible – and to the somewhat justifiable complaints received by the Board of Customs.

In addition, the local hostility to the customs officers was deepseated. In 1727 James Lafries reported to the Board that Campbell, the customs officer based at Auchencairn, was frequently absent from his duty. In particular on 26 and 27 December Campbell was ‘feasting in the country’. When no corroborating proof could be found, the collector concluded that the information against Campbell ‘proceeded rather from ill-will in Mr. Lafries to him than any inclination to serve the revenue’. 45

44 CE76 1/9 23 January 1776; CE76 1/10 19 January 1778 & CE76 1/13 13 April 1785.
45 CE51 1/2 8 May 1727.
In 1767 Alexander Gordon, surveyor of customs, received information that a large cargo of wines, spirits and other goods had been landed on the Galloway coast but ‘where they were lodged was uncertain’. He went to Galloway with three other officers from Ayr and five soldiers. They ‘ranged the coast’ but only found 90 lbs. bohea tea and 106 silk handkerchiefs, within the district of Stranraer. They also succeeded in re-capturing John Lees, a well known smuggler, and ‘committed him prisoner’ to the military.

The customs officers were ‘very ill-used’ by the people and ‘noted smugglers’ at Ballantrae, who, ‘for fear of a search ... assembled and threw stones at them until they pelted the officers out town’. In the meantime:

‘A part of them, armed with broadswords and pistols, countenanced and headed by Andrew McQuaker, excise officer at Ballantrae, came amongst the soldiers and forcibly rescued Lees, whom they marched to Stranraer tollbooth with a view to the reward published in the newspapers for apprehending Lees. But who, we are well informed, has again made his escape from the prison, which may be justly imputed to the exciseman’s heading and unwarrantable procedure with such a rabble, in a matter he had no concern in. It rather looks as if he were too much in the interest or concerted with these smugglers under his survey, from whom we have been told it scarcely will appear that he ever made a seizure but in a compounding manner. For had he not carried off Lees to gratify such a banditti but offered his assistance to secure him here then Lees would not have escaped’.46

Table 3: The Wigtownshire Customs Establishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ports</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Creeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stranraer</td>
<td>Portpatrick</td>
<td>Ballantrae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bay of Cairn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loch Float</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drumore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glenluce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigtown</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Burn of Monreith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isle of Whithorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newton Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gatehouse of Fleet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Original Scottish Ports, Members and Creeks in 1707
Note: The original spelling has been used in this list

46 CE76 1/5 18 May 1767.
In September 1777 there was a considerable smuggle on Glen Luce shore. Three parties of officers set out to search for the goods, supported by a sergeant and eight dragoons brought from Ayr. William McCleish, surveyor at Stranraer, and Robert Williamson from Ayr travelled for four or five miles, ‘through wild moors’ until the country people told them that the carriers were ‘far out of their reach’. They examined the road ahead ‘by spy glass’ but could see nothing suspicious. The second party, John Mitchell, excise supervisor at Wigtown, Robert Cheshire, another riding officer from Ayr and John Sloan, excise officer at Newton Stewart, found nothing. The third party, consisting of James Scott, excise officer at Port Patrick, William Thompson, excise officer at Stranraer and another excise officer named Sloan, found two boxes and a bag of tea in house and barn belonging to James McMihan. They wanted the seizure to be stored in a public house at Glen Luce but the customs officers argued that it should be taken to Stranraer. They reckoned that there would have been more seizures if the excise officers had not misled them. The Board of Customs at Edinburgh concluded that there had been ‘an improper misunderstanding between the officers of customs and excise, for which perhaps both parties are blameable’.47

Whenever possible the customs would ask the military for assistance when they went out to search for goods. The following December Mr Reid, attached to the custom house at Ayr, received information about a large smuggle at the Mull of Galloway. He sent Peter McKnight with news of the information and promised to send some dragoons from Ayr to assist them. McKnight waited with the collector of Port Patrick and the collector and surveyor from Stranraer for one day for the soldiers but they were delayed, ‘having in their way fallen in with a smuggle and made a large seizure at Girvan’. The Wigtownshire party raised a sergeant, corporal and eight soldiers from Port Patrick and a lieutenant and seven mariners from HMS Arethura in Lough Ryan. They did not ‘dare venture’ to the Mull of Galloway, however, with ‘so few’ men.

In the meantime, Reid, armed with muskets, pistols and swords, raised 16 mariners from the Prince of Wales revenue cutter and two crew from the Cumbraes revenue wherry. He marched them over land and employed them as soldiers, ‘which sailors were day and night under arms and did duty all the time’. This group made two seizures of 66 boxes and 93 bags of tea, a bag of coffee, two bottles spirits, three boats and two guns. The Board agreed that the mariners should receive the same share of the seizure money as if they had been soldiers.48

In February 1788 the cutter Flora from Guernsey landed part of her cargo at Abbeyburn, where the Kirkcudbright officers seized 47 ankers. Two years later, it was reported that she had landed part of her cargo on the Wigtownshire coast. The Stranraer officers searched but found nothing. On 25 November 1790 they sent an express message to the Pilote and Royal George cutters and the Porcupine frigate, which were all in Loch

47 CE76 1/10 4 October & 31 October 1777 & 22 January, 3 February & March 1778.
48 CE76 1/10 26 March 1778.
Ryan. The *Flora* returned and landed the remainder of her cargo at Auchenmalg. She was not seized, however, because the ships were still in the mouth of Lough Ryan. 49

There were regular attacks on the custom houses by the smugglers, who frequently rescued any of their goods that had been seized. On the night of 24 July 1712 Robert Dunbar, a riding waiter at Wigtown and John Moore, a waiter at Dumfries, seized four casks containing 35 gallons of brandy. They carried these to the queen’s warehouse at Kirkcudbright, but as this had been ‘lately broke’, they were advised to take the seizure to Dumfries.50

In March 1724 James Douglas, tidesurveyor at Whithorn, seized 40 small casks of brandy and rum, 16 trusses leaf tobacco and four hogsheads wine on a ship that had sailed from Whitehaven with a cargo of deals and coals. He attempted to carry her to Whithorn but the wind was against them. Instead, he took her to Kirkcudbright, where he met Mr Hamilton, his collector. They decided to unload the goods and lodge them in the king’s warehouse.

An express arrived from Dumfries advising against this. The collector there had guessed correctly that the owners, who turned out to be Baillie David McClelland and Alexander Hesker, might live in Kirkcudbright. He advised the Whithorn officers to keep the goods on board the ship and anchor her in the river, ‘where they could not be attacked by a mob’, until the wind was fair for Wigtown, where there was a party of dragoons to protect goods, or for Dumfries, where there was a large warehouse. Before this letter arrived, however, the goods had been unloaded. On the Friday night a mob, consisting of several women and one man, ‘all servants and of little account’, arrived ‘beat and tied the officers on watch, broke open the warehouse and carried all the goods away’. Now the Dumfries collector advised them to unrig the ship, take off her rudder and destroy it and take out her masts or ‘cut them by the board’. Before this could be done, the ship was arrested in river by William Dunbar, a messenger, at the instance of ‘John McClelland, a carrier’, who was in fact the Baillie himself.51

There were regular problems with witnesses to smuglins. In 1765 the collector at Stranraer attempted a prosecution against Robert Whiteside and James Cochrane, who were known to be the owners of a boat and its large cargo of rum, which had been seized by his officers. He felt confident that the twelve witnesses named would prove conclusively that Charles Gordon, a merchant in Peel on the Isle of Man, had supplied the rum to the Loans smugglers. Alexander Gordon, the surveyor of customs at Ayr, was ordered to serve the witnesses with subpoenas. It was explained to the Board, however, that ‘as they are all concerned in the smuggling trade and frequently abroad on different parts of the coast or out at markets and fairs it is very uncertain to get them at home’. The trial, which should have been heard at Edinburgh on 9 December 1765, was postponed and eventually Whiteside and Cochrane were acquitted.52

49 CE51 1/4 19 February 1788 & CE77 2/1 29 November 1790.
50 CE51 1/1 13 August 1712.
51 CE51 1/2 6 & 22 April 1724.
52 CE76 1/4 Collector 14 November, 15 November, 26 November, 4 December 1765 and CE76 1/5 22 July 1766.
John Torris of Dunkirk claimed a cargo of spirits that had been seized after the Leveller of Rush had landed them on the Wigtownshire coast. The case should have been heard in Edinburgh on 25 November 1776 but was postponed. The Board instructed the collector at Ayr to stop the witnesses. These included Mathew Quirk, Barton and Crean, merchants at the Mull of Galloway and Peter Barklay, formerly a mariner on the Cumbraes revenue wherry but now living near Loch Ryan. As Barklay was already at Ayr, he was sent back to Wigtownshire with instructions to make ‘diligent enquiry for them both on the road and at the several public houses by the way’. Their travelling expenses to date would be paid at Stranraer custom house.

Alexander Agnew, master of George of Stranraer, was needed at the Exchequer Court in Edinburgh on 31 July 1771, to give evidence against John Kerr. In early July he cleared the George out from Ayr with tobacco for Norway. The vessel had not sailed but Agnew could not be found on board or ‘at other places in town’. He had gone to Robert Arthur at Irvine for his freight money for a parcel of deals from Bergen that had been discharged at Ayr. According to a letter to John McKie, merchant in Stranraer, dated 22 May, Arthur agreed to pay 22s per hundred for the deals. On 10 July 1771 he informed McKie that he had paid Agnew £25. The master then went overland to Stranraer to see his other owners and to meet vessel there. She sailed from Ayr on 15th July.

Conclusion
This brief review of Wigtownshire’s role in the eighteenth century smuggling trade has emphasised the need to look beyond the area when attempting to reconstruct its history. It has attempted to introduce the reader to the wealth of relevant material available on the Isle of Man.
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### Appendix: Wigtownshire Ports and their Boats 1701-1755

Based on information obtained from the Manx Ingates and Outgates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port &amp; Vessel</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Port &amp; Vessel</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ballantrae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Port Nessock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Finley, John</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Murdock, John</td>
<td>1743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Drennin, John</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>Suite, Pat</td>
<td>1721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortane</td>
<td>McKenzie, Murdock</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>McCollock, John</td>
<td>1710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Wilson, John</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Chambers, William</td>
<td>1701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Galley, John</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Agnew, John</td>
<td>1744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Abernethy, James</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Jennet</td>
<td>Davison, Alex</td>
<td>1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennett</td>
<td>McMurray, Thomas</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td>1712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Drinnen, John</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Port Patrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>McKneale, Gilbert</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Greere, Robert</td>
<td>1716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Wilson, James</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Lyon, Edward</td>
<td>1711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Wilson, James</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>McNish, John</td>
<td>1742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Boyd, Archibald</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>McKonnie, Patrick</td>
<td>1711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broughton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Kennedy, Anthony</td>
<td>1745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Blaine, Alex</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>Jennett</td>
<td>Cor ruthers, William</td>
<td>1711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clanyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>1701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>McCleary, John</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>McNaish, Thomas</td>
<td>1717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td></td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Weather, Patrick</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennett</td>
<td>Davison, Alex</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>Nathaniel</td>
<td>Withers, Nathaniel</td>
<td>1741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Agnew, James</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Three Brethren</td>
<td>Lenox, James</td>
<td>1709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Three Brothers</td>
<td>Lenox, James</td>
<td>1711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Agnew, John</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Three Brothers</td>
<td>Ratcliff, James</td>
<td>1712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galloway</td>
<td>Port William</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Johnson, William</td>
<td>1711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrough</td>
<td>Kennen, Hugh</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Steward, Ringin</td>
<td>1719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isles of Fleet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stranraer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donaghadee</td>
<td></td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Douglas, John</td>
<td>1716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isable</td>
<td>Hennin, John</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>Gourdon, John</td>
<td>1716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lough Ryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>McFerlin, John</td>
<td>1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>McCormick, Alex</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>Jennett</td>
<td>Finny, James</td>
<td>1715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>McKneal, Thomas</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Jennett</td>
<td>Mure, Robert</td>
<td>1716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>McKissag, Andrew</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Jennett</td>
<td>Jeffry, John</td>
<td>1716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennett</td>
<td>Jordan, Robert</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Fary, William</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Bell, David</td>
<td>1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Gawley, James</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td></td>
<td>1719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>McKissock, Andrew</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>Whithorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Wilson, James</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Sloane, William</td>
<td>1717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Mcyvorey, John</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>Molly</td>
<td>Broadfoot, James</td>
<td>1754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome Home</td>
<td>Carson, Charles</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>Brunton, David</td>
<td>1710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peggy</td>
<td>Rob, Alexander</td>
<td>1746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Clark, Pat</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Campbell, John</td>
<td>1719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull of Galloway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wigtown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennett</td>
<td></td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Ferguson, William</td>
<td>1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Fenwick, John</td>
<td>1720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

I Each vessel and master is only recorded once. For example, James Broadfoot was master of the Molly in 1754 and 1755.

II Not all the master’s names were recorded in the entries.

III The survey includes the Ingates and Outgates until 1743 and the Ingates only from 1744, when recording details of outgoing cargoes that had paid duty on importation was stopped. No summary books of the Ingates and Outgates have survived from 1755 to 1765.

55 MNHL: 10058 Customs Ingates & Outgates 1701-1755.
The awakening interest in the Kirkcudbright School

In recent years there has been growing interest in the many artists who have lived and worked in Galloway and particularly those, who based themselves in and around Kirkcudbright over the last 150 years. An exhibition, held in Kirkcudbright in the summer of 2000, entitled *The Homecoming*, which was accompanied by the publication of a book entitled *Kirkcudbright 100 years of an artists' colony* focused on the century from 1850 to 1950. This is the period, which spans the emergence of the Faed family from Gatehouse of Fleet and the death in 1949 of Jessie M King. In 1999 there was an exhibition in the Tolbooth in Kirkcudbright to mark the 50th anniversary of the death of Jessie M King and the Homecoming exhibition in Kirkcudbright was accompanied by exhibitions in Kirkcudbright and Gatehouse connected with the centenary of the death of Thomas Faed.

The year 2002 saw the centenary of the death of the artist John Faed the eldest of the six children of James Faed and Mary McGeoch, four of whom were to see their work exhibited in the Academies and one was to make a successful farming career in Australia. The Scottish National Portrait Gallery has three engravings by the youngest of the family, George, who showed great talent but died in 1852.

It is timely now to focus on the Faeds for they are intimately associated with the development of the Kirkcudbright area as an artist’s colony. Just as E A Hornel inspired those around him after his return to Kirkcudbright in 1885 and Jessie M King and her husband E A Taylor were the inspiration for a host of artists in the first part of the twentieth century so it was the Faeds, who as Patrick Bourne says in his introduction to *Kirkcudbright 100 years of an artists’ colony* were not just the precursors of the Kirkcudbright School but the model for the artists, who were to form the nucleus of painters, who first gave the area its reputation. As Bourne writes: ‘The catalyst, however, for the arrival of artists in the Stewartry, and the general acceptance of the fact that the life of a painter could be a respectable and potentially lucrative career, was the phenomenon of the Faed family of Barlae Mill Gatehouse.’

The work of the Faeds has been illustrated in the pioneering work of Mary McKerrow and there are now a number of monographs on individual artists associated with Kirkcudbright, notably E A Hornel and Jessie M King but there has been no detailed examination of the relation between the two. Following the centenary of the death of John Faed and, as the campaign to create a permanent home for the works of the Galloway artists gathers pace, it is appropriate to concentrate on this particular link.

2 Patrick Bourne ed. op.cit. p12.
The term Kirkcudbright School covers many artists over a period of some 100 years and includes locals and visitors as well as those who made their home in the area. This article will focus on the Faeds and the small group of artists who came from Galloway or lived for a long time in the area and who may be considered as the founding members of the Kirkcudbright School. They included the leader of the School, E A Hornel (1864-1933), W S MacGeorge (1861-1931) from Castle Douglas, William Mouncey (1852-1901), Thomas Blacklock (1863-1903), and F R Coles (1853-1927), also known for his pioneering archaeological work in Galloway. These men were part of a wider circle including Malcolm Harper, the Castle Douglas banker, painter and author, Thomas Fraser, the Dulbeattie publisher and John Faed’s friend from Gatehouse, George Sproat the renowned breeder of Galloway cattle and author of *Bonnie Gallowa* and other poems. Some, like MacGeorge and Blacklock, studied with Hornel in Edinburgh or Antwerp or, in the case of William Mouncey, were related to him by marriage. It is the aim of this article to show that the connections between John Faed and these men were numerous and, I believe, significant in their development as artists.

**Introducing John Faed**

John Faed was born at Barlay Mill, Gatehouse in August 1819. He showed an early aptitude for art and by the age of eleven had left school and had embarked on a career as a miniaturist. John was fortunate that at Roseville, the house of William Campbell in Anne Street, Gatehouse, he not only learned to paint miniatures on ivory but was able to develop other talents. For, as he recalled many years later, ‘besides the artistic improvement I derived from their pictures I was deriving mental qualities which were of value to me in the outer world I was soon to enter’.

About 1840 John went to Edinburgh to develop his career and began to leave behind ‘the weary miniatures’ turning to themes from Scottish history, the works of Shakespeare, Burns and Scott and painting many portraits.

John’s father died at Barlay Mill in 1842 and the rest of the family gradually moved up to Edinburgh. With John’s support his brother Thomas enrolled at the Trustees’ Academy and his brothers James and George embarked on careers as engravers.

In 1852, John’s brother George died, Tom moved to London and William emigrated to Victoria, Australia. Members of the McGeoch family had earlier left for Canada. The themes of emigration, partings and trysting recur in the Faeds’ work. In 1856 William Hornell left Kirkcudbright for Australia, settling at Bacchus Marsh, also in Victoria. There is no evidence of any links between the two families although, in the only surviving letter from William to his brother James, he does mention those he has met recently with local connections.
In the early sixties John also packed his bags for London, but it was always to Gatehouse that he turned for inspiration and for recuperation from London for, as he wrote to the art dealer Charles Hargitt, ‘I broke a blood vessel in my lungs 4 months ago, and was reduced to a state of weakness for many weeks…. but a month ago I went to Galloway and have just returned greatly better, stronger, and my back nearly well’ 8.

In 1867 John began to build a house, Ardmore in Gatehouse, spending half the year in London and half in Gatehouse before returning full time to Gatehouse in 1880, for as he said, ‘finding that the class of subjects I was then engaged with required country models, and Gatehouse could supply them of all ages, in perfection, I finally resolved to leave London, which I did in 1880.’ 9

The return to Gatehouse

As the 61-year-old John returned so the 16-year-old Edward Atkinson Hornel left for the art school in Edinburgh. We are fortunate that the voluminous collection of letters to EAHornel at the National Trust for Scotland’s Broughton House, Kirkcudbright tell us so much, not just about Hornel, but also about his family and many other correspondents including the Faeds.10

On the 9th September 1880, Hornel’s great uncle, Edward Atkinson, who had recently retired as general manager of the National Provincial Bank, wrote to him thanking him for some drawings which he had sent, ‘You show considerable ease and freedom in your drawings seeing you have not had any lessons’. He goes on to say, ‘An artist must be first class in order to command patronage - anything short of that standing is a poor way of making a living, and attended with privations.’ In the context of the present article the next passage is the most interesting. He writes, ‘The Faeds have done well, particularly Mr Thomas and he can get any price he likes for his pictures.’ Uncle Edward then describes a recent picture by Tom based on a shop in Gatehouse. He concludes, ‘Won’t write any more as we expect to be in Gatehouse in about 14 days or so’ and hopes that Edward will be able to go over to see him there.11

The Faeds, therefore, were shown to be living proof that Galloway boys could, with skill and perseverance, make a success as artists, still using Gatehouse as their subject matter, even if they had left the town to seek their fortune. It does not take much of a stretch of the imagination to picture Great Uncle Atkinson drawing young Edward’s attention to the Faeds’ origins in Gatehouse and showing him John’s new house on the cut (on the Castle Douglas road out of Gatehouse).

8 National Library of Scotland, John Faed to Charles Hargitt 18/7/1864.
9 Private collection, John Faed, Notes and Stories (MS).
Uncle Atkinson certainly did not leave the subject of the Faeds alone for, in February 1881, Hornel received a letter from his mother in which she tells him that ‘I had a letter last week from Uncle Edward he says you must try to put Tom Faed in the shade so that is something for you to try’. One imagines that Mrs Hornel would have written regularly to her son and wonders why this particular letter should have survived.

The Fine Art Association Exhibitions

In 1885, the 21-year-old Hornel returned from studies in Antwerp and, with his friends Mouncey, MacGeorge and others, set about creating a Kirkcudbrightshire Fine Art Association. Again the Faeds played an important part. John was persuaded to become the first President and his brothers James and Thomas fulfilled honorary roles. However, all three, as well as their sister Susan and the next generation of Faeds had their work hung at the Association’s exhibitions in Kirkcudbright, Castle Douglas, Dumfries and Dalbeattie over the next few years.

The first exhibition was held in Kirkcudbright in December 1886. It would have been interesting to know what the famous Glasgow Boys, James Guthrie and George Henry, who had the task of hanging the exhibition, thought of the Faeds’ work but, as they were staying in Kirkcudbright that autumn, there was no reason for letters to exist in the Hornel archive. However, in a letter to Hornel, F R Coles wrote: ‘I saw Faed yesterday and he means to send the Poet’s Dream - hooray!’

Correspondence regarding Susan Faed’s work is also illustrative. The Association had been set up for male artists and John wondered about showing Susan’s work. F R Coles suggested to Hornel that ‘she should become an Hon Member first; but perhaps some arrangement could be come to’. Thankfully the matter was resolved. However, it appeared that John had sent in two of Susan’s pictures from Ardmore and Susan also sent two from her home in London. John advised Hornel to choose the best two. In the event we find that all four of Susan’s pictures were hung.

Guthrie had good reason to support the Faeds, for it was John and another artist James Drummond who had persuaded Guthrie’s father to let his son become an artist. The press notices of Guthrie’s election as an associate of the RSA and his election to the Presidency referred specifically to the support he had received from the Faeds.

In its preview of the first exhibition The Kirkcudbrightshire Advertiser noted that ‘The exhibitors include such well-known artists as the Faed brothers, whose names are familiar all the world over’. In his opening remarks Malcolm Harper, deputising for the unwell John Faed, said ‘Mr Faed and his brothers had from the first taken a lively interest in the

12 Hornel Library, Mrs Hornel to her son E. A. Hornel 7/2/1881.
13 Hornel Library, F.R. Coles to E A Hornel, n.d.
15 See, for instance Dispatch 19/11/1888.
formation of their association, and had in the most generous manner forwarded some of
the rare works of their genius to the exhibition, which added so much to its attraction.16
In the report on the exhibition the paper noted that ‘Mr Faed RSA has five pictures on the
walls and these are certainly the feature of the exhibition.’17 Thus at the first exhibition and
in later exhibitions, where celebrated works such as Tom’s Last of the Clan were shown
it was the Faeds who would be the crowd pullers.

A comment made by the honourable Charles Hope, who opened the exhibition has as
much relevance today as it did then. The paper stated, ‘In a district so much identified
with art and artists it was rather surprising that such an association had not been
established long ago, and he trusted the time was not very far distant when there would
also be a permanent gallery for the reception of works of acknowledged excellence by
Galloway artists instituted among them’.18

Typically, the press were not so favourable towards some of the younger artists’ work
and some wanted to hit back. They turned to John for advice. MacGeorge wrote to
Hornel, ‘I had a letter from Faed last night in answer to mine in regard to the art critiques.
He says that the people who will believe such notices are not the people to whom you have
to appeal - he simply advises that no notice be taken publicly or otherwise of the criticism
as it would make the critics of so much more importance – he advises you and others to
go manfully to work and dispute the position which the critics place you in, and show that
you can and do intend to paint nature’.19 John’s endorsement here of the painting of nature
shows that he also appreciated what they were trying to achieve. Interestingly, John
Faed’s comments are very similar to those of George Henry who wrote, ‘My God, Sir, if
a man was to defend himself from all stupid things said about himself or his work, he
would produce nothing’.20 John lent Hornel’s A Cottage’s Garden, Kirkcudbright to the first
open exhibition of the Association, which was held in Castle Douglas in the summer of
1887. Many years later Hornel would lend John’s portrait of his mother to the annual
exhibition of the RSA. Mr Osborne, the Kirkcudbright cabinetmaker, had purchased the
picture on Hornel’s behalf at the Ardmore sale, following Susan’s death in 1909.21

Continuing contacts

From the mass of correspondence preserved at Broughton House we learn that the
contacts with John Faed continued. We note Harper proposing to go over to see him and
suggesting that Hornel join him. Interestingly, Harper told Hornel that John was thinking
of doing an illustration of Nicholson’s ‘Brownie’ for Harper’s Bards of Galloway. Did this
inspire Hornel to produce the strange picture, which Harper chose?22 George Sproat also
provided advice on dealing with the old man.

16 Kirkcudbrightshire Advertiser 17/12/1886.
17 ibid.
18 ibid.
19 Hornel Library, W.S MacGeorge to E A Hornel 11/2/1887.
20 Hornel Library, George Henry to E A Hornel nd.
22 See the illustration in Kirkcudbright op cit p 35.
In a series of letters in 1892 connected with elections to the RSA we see both Guthrie and Henry asking Hornel to press John to vote for certain candidates. ‘Please keep this strictly private except to Faed, who is a member, and on no account let it leak out to the press’, says Guthrie. In a note on the front page of another letter, in which he gives very detailed voting instructions, Guthrie, perhaps sensing that he has gone over the top, writes, ‘If you can get Faed to go for Burnet either instead of Honeyman or instead of Campbell do so but don’t risk shaking him up all over’. Henry writes, ‘Guthrie will have written to you about Faed I suppose’.

In December 1894 another of Hornel’s artist friends, Charles Mackie, wrote to him from Gatehouse, ‘I called on Old Faed this week. He was asking kindly after you. What a dear little body Mrs Faed is’. So we see the young artists continuing to pay their respects to John Faed.

Mackie wrote again to Hornel from his Edinburgh home on 28 December 1894 in a letter which sums up the influence of the Faeds. ‘I have seen no one since I came back to town. As far as art is concerned this is a city of the dead. You have much more art life down in your St Cuthbert’s than we have here. Even in Gatehouse I think there was a consciousness of being a force and having a raison d’être for being an artist that seems wanting here.’

The Faeds had helped to create that environment in which art would continue to flourish well into the twentieth century. Such indeed was this sense of the artistic presence that, when it was suggested that one of the mill dams at the head of the town be drained, this was refused because it had been immortalised in John’s View over Gatehouse.

Of course, in their painting the Kirkcudbright artists were much influenced by The Glasgow Boys, by what Hornel and MacGeorge had learnt on the continent and also from Hornel and Henry’s trip to Japan. We know, too, that the Glasgow Boys despised the sentimental and anecdotal genre painting of what Henry described to Hornel as the ‘Glue pat school’ and much of their innovative early work was a reaction to earlier styles, but this comment was directed particularly at the establishment painters in Glasgow. There is no doubting the respect, which the younger generation had for the Faeds.

While they had encouraged Guthrie to become an artist, supported the young Galloway artists in their endeavours to find a platform for their work in the area and stood by them against their critics, they were also able to give practical advice. For, as John Faed wrote to Hornel from Carrick cottage, where he would go for a summer break, ‘If any accident brought you near you must come and see this lovely shore. I look upon it as a reflection of any local artist than he is unacquainted with this bonny bit of Borgue shore.’

---

23 Hornel Library, James Guthrie to E A Hornel 16/3/1892.
24 ibid 24/3/1892.
25 ibid 17/3/1892.
26 Hornel Library, C H Mackie to E A Hornel December 1894.
27 ibid 28/12/1894.
28 Dumfries and Galloway Standard, 22/7/1893.
29 Hornel Library, John Faed to E A Hornel nd.
of course, to Carrick and Brighouse Bay that Hornel would come for much of his inspiration in the last 30 years of his life.

The Faeds led the way. They were proof to parents and others that it was possible for Galloway lads to make their way in the art world. They showed that the everyday life of Galloway was there to be interpreted on canvas. They allowed their names to be used as standard bearers for the encouragement of the arts in Galloway and, by sending some of their best work for exhibition in the area, attracted a wider audience for the young artists than they would have achieved on their own.
There have been Curries and Duncans in Dumfriesshire and Galloway for many generations. There were Curries in Kirkcudbright and Dumfries during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and by the end of the seventeenth century there had been a James Currie who served as Provost of Dumfries. Several became ministers of the Kirk, one serving as Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. Family tradition suggests that the Duncan family had a more shady lineage. During the dark periods of border warfare, the family of Charteris was highly regarded, a head of the family having held the office of Warden of the Western Marches. At some stage of these border conflicts, a member of the family found himself in trouble. He is said to have sought safety by removing himself to a distant place of refuge, in his case the Orkney Islands, where he changed his name to Duncan. The first member of his family to return to the mainland reputedly spent most of his life as a merchant in Aberdeen. The legend cannot now be confirmed but it is certain that two later Duncan descendants became successive ministers at the parish of Lochrutton, out on the Castle Douglas road. In the graveyard of their lonely Kirk upon a hill, their tombstones are preserved to this day.

The close links that developed between the Currie and Duncan families were originally nurtured by the friendship between James Currie, minister first at Kirkpatrick Fleming, where he was ordained in 1746, and the Rev George Duncan of Lochrutton. Currie had been given the Christian name of his father, minister of the nearby parish of Hoddom, who had died in 1726 when his son James was only ten years old. As a young minister, James

---

1 This paper is the text of a lecture given by Christopher C Booth to the Crichton University of Southern Scotland Action Group.
Currie attended Presbytery meetings in Dumfries, where he grew to appreciate the friendship and advice of an older man, the Rev George Duncan who was his senior by twenty-five years. In 1727, Duncan had married Ann Boyd, widow of Robert Boyd, a Writer to the Signet, or lawyer, in Dumfries. Ann already had a child, Jean, by her first marriage. She was to have five more children from her second marriage, all of whom were brought up alongside their stepsister. When in 1753 James Currie married Jean Boyd, that stepsister, he therefore established a close relationship that was to bring together subsequent generations of his own family and the Duncans. Until the sad death of George Duncan from drowning in the loch at Lochrutton in 1765, James Currie and he laboured together in the affairs of the Kirk, the Presbytery records of 1755, for example, showing their joint concern for a lady of bad character. George Duncan's son George, who married Ann MacMurdo, was to succeed him at Lochrutton. Ann came from a distinguished family. Her grandmother was a Charteris and her cousin a Chamberlain to the Duke of Queensberry.
It was at Kirkpatrick Fleming that James Currie’s son, heir and namesake was born in 1756 and there he spent his earliest years. As a young boy, he was held in great affection by his Duncan kinsfolk. In 1762, when James was only six, his father transferred to the parish of Middlebie, no great move since it was only a few miles from his previous home. His education began at Middlebie but in 1769 his father wished to spare him the agony of watching the death of his mother as she succumbed to consumption, an affliction that was to affect later generations of her family. The young James was sent to Dumfries where he attended the school. At nearby Lochrutton he could seek solace with the Duncans, soon to mourn the loss of their much loved stepsister.

Two years later, when James Currie was only fifteen, the question of his future had to be considered. James himself had been drawn to medicine. His cousin William, son of his father’s elder brother, had graduated MD in Glasgow in 1770 and his thesis *De phthisi pulmonale* (pulmonary phthisis or consumption) had not unnaturally engaged the young James Currie’s interest. Another cousin, also James Currie, had graduated MD in Glasgow the year before. He later emigrated to America where he became a respected physician in Richmond, Virginia. Sadly, however, James’ father could afford no more than a term in Glasgow, there being insufficient in the family coffers for a medical degree. Instead the Rev James Currie now took advantage of an opportunity to apprentice James to one of the great tobacco companies of Glasgow.

James Currie joined the firm of William Cunningham and Co, whose business was with Virginia, and he at once travelled to the James River, taking passage in the Company ship *Cochrane*. There he settled down to the ledger work of an apprentice, but he also learnt much of the way of life of a southern colony. In particular, he witnessed at first hand the plight of slaves on the plantations with which he had to conduct Cunningham and Co’s business. It was this experience, together with what he saw later in the West Indies, that left James Currie with convictions on the evils of slavery that he held throughout his life.

In 1773, however, he was faced with family problems. His father’s death at his home in Middlebie in that year meant that as the eldest and only son, although far away, he had to do what he could to provide for his sisters. With the help of his relations and the efforts of the Rev George Duncan, it was arranged that the Currie girls would come under the supervision of Ann Duncan, the minister’s wife at Lochrutton, where they were to be
brought up together with the Duncan boys. It was different to the forested glens around Middlebie but there, living in the Manse beneath the Kirk upon the hill, they could ramble on the furze-clad slopes around them.

James Currie’s continued employment in Virginia was not to be for long. In 1774, after the First Continental Congress held in Philadelphia had banned all trade with Britain, no ships were able to land their cargoes at the James River. One year later, the American War of Independence broke out and contact with the mother country was lost. James Currie spent some months with his cousin in Richmond, Virginia before finding a ship to the West Indies. From there he took passage home.

In the autumn of 1777, with the financial help of his relations, he was able to realise his ambition to study medicine. He went to Edinburgh, then the most favoured medical school in the country, where he stayed with Christian Duncan, sister of the Rev George Duncan, who gave him much support. For reasons of convenience, he did not graduate from Edinburgh but took his MD in Glasgow in 1780. He was at first undecided as to his future career. There was no obvious opening in his native Scotland and after an abortive attempt to obtain a position in Jamaica, he travelled to Chester to seek advice from his cousin, Dr William Currie, established there as a physician since 1770. It was a period during which physicians were increasingly required in the newly established hospitals in the provincial cities throughout the land. In Chester he also met the young Dr John Haygarth, who had become physician to the Infirmary in 1767 after studies in Edinburgh, and who was to become a firm friend. Dr William Currie was familiar with the medical fraternity in Liverpool and he took his 24-year old cousin to meet with Dr Mathew Dobson, who he knew was contemplating retirement. James also had conversations with Drs Brandreth, Bostock and Rutter, all Edinburgh graduates and physicians to the Liverpool Infirmary, who could advise him of the opportunities he might meet. Mathew Dobson, who was clearly impressed by the young physician, promised his whole-hearted support. There were therefore compelling reasons in favour of settling in Liverpool not least because of its relative proximity to his native Scotland. He was the first of the Curries and the Duncans to emigrate to the Mersey.

Liverpool had by now become the main port in England for the importation of American cotton, the trade reaching as much as five million pounds (in weight) by the 1770’s. At the same time, and not to James Currie’s liking, the traffic in slaves was one of the major activities of Liverpool merchants and shipmasters. Liverpool had close ties with the south-west of Scotland. Vessels sailed regularly to Dumfries and Kirkcudbright and three times a week a coach set out for Carlisle, where there were connections for Dumfries.

James Currie rapidly settled down to a successful career as a Liverpool physician. In his early years in practice, his income did not exceed £1000 a year but by the time that he retired more than twenty years later it has been estimated that he had been earning an annual income of as much as £2000 for some years, then an ample sufficiency. In 1783 he married Lucy Wallace, daughter of William Wallace, a successful Irish merchant in the city. Their first born son was to be christened William Wallace Currie after his grandfather.
He was first appointed physician to the Liverpool Dispensary, an institution whose staff, unlike those in the hospitals, undertook the hazardous task of visiting the poor in their own homes. This was an experience that left Currie with lasting impressions of the effect of poor housing and overcrowding on the public health. He was particularly concerned with narrow closes and cellar dwellings. In a public statement describing what he had encountered, he roundly condemned ‘the unhealthiness of the cellar dwellings and the pernicious practice of building the new labourers’ houses in small confined courts which have a communication with the street by a narrow aperture but no passage of air through them, and without drainage or cleansing, and greatly overcrowded......’ The variety of his work at the Dispensary was of great value to him as a future social reformer but he resigned when he was appointed Physician to the Liverpool Infirmary in 1786. By now he was established as the leading physician in his town.

During his time in Liverpool, it was customary for the physicians of Liverpool, Manchester and Chester to meet regularly in Warrington, where the Warrington Academy was a centre for dissent. In this way, Currie maintained particularly close contacts with the Warrington dissenters, Unitarians, Quakers and others, as well as with John Haygarth of Chester. Thomas Percival, physician to the Manchester Infirmary, also a Unitarian, was not only also a close friend but was also to be his patient. Haygarth, in his studies of the diseases and population of Chester, had drawn attention to the tribulations of the poor living, as in Liverpool, in conditions of great overcrowding and subject particularly to attacks of fever. Like Haygarth and Percival, Currie was deeply interested in the problems of infectious fevers. He was not the first to use cold douches to treat fever but in 1787 he claimed success in seven cases of ‘contagious fever’ probably typhus - all of whom recovered. Currie’s medical works were published in a series of Medical Reports, the first coming out in 1797, published by the London firm of Cadell and Davies.

Currie was influential in many of the advances in public health that occurred in Liverpool in his time. He was the leading figure behind the establishment of the Liverpool Lunatic Asylum. His friend John Haygarth of Chester had been the first to show the importance of isolation in the management and control of infectious fevers. Both Currie in Liverpool and Thomas Percival in Manchester followed his precepts by founding Houses of Recovery - in fact fever hospitals - for the isolation and care of the poor and destitute.

Currie was at the forefront of radical causes throughout his life in Liverpool. The Socinian controversy deeply concerned him as a member of his father’s kirk, for the Socinians were Unitarians who rejected the concept of the Trinity. His strongly dissenting views soon led him to the Unitarianism of the Socinians and he worshipped no longer at the Presbyterian Chapel in Kay Street but moved with the Rev John Yates to the Paradise Street Chapel. Unhesitatingly antislavery, he joined with William Roscoe, Liverpool MP and emancipist, and with Thomas Clarkson to feed important evidence in support of the antislavery cause in Parliament. William Wilberforce told Currie: ‘I set a high value on your suggestions’. In 1791, he was chosen by the Liverpool dissenters to prepare an address to the Unitarian Joseph Priestley following the Birmingham riots against those supposedly sympathetic to the French Revolution. Priestley lost his home and laboratory and soon afterwards emigrated to Pennsylvania. Two years later Currie caused a sensation
with a pamphlet published under the pseudonym ‘Jasper Wilson’, severely castigating the Pitt Government for its war policy and for its intolerance of dissenters. The work, printed in London, went to a remarkable 10,000 copies and seriously upset the government, which sought out the mysterious Jasper Wilson with vigour. The situation became so perilous that Currie had to make contingency plans to flee the country.

Throughout his life, Currie suffered from repeated attacks of pulmonary tuberculosis, the family affliction that had removed his mother. He retired from active practice in 1803, aware of his impending and premature demise. He spent his last days with his sister in Bath, visiting his old friend John Haygarth, now removed to Bath and living in some splendour in the Royal Crescent. Joining 15 others around Dr Haygarth’s fire he would sit and wonder at the lack of order and the wide range of talk. He died in August 1805; he was only two years older than the hero of Trafalgar.

Throughout his life in Liverpool, Currie maintained the closest contact with his friends and relations in Scotland. Any Scot visiting Liverpool would find himself dining with the Currie family. Others came for medical advice. In 1794 Currie attended Lord Daer, son of the Earl of Selkirk. The young man was consumptive and Currie recommended that his life might be prolonged if he travelled to a milder climate. Sadly, Daer died soon afterwards, unable to undertake the journey advised by his physician. Currie always had a desire to possess property in Scotland, perhaps to retire to after his labours in Liverpool were done. By the year 1792 his prosperity was such that he was able to purchase the properties of Stakeford and Dumcrieff, the first presumably because it was at Nithside which had been the birthplace of his mother, the second in Annandale where his father had been born. John Syme, Dumfries friend and fellow student in Edinburgh, became the factor for the absentee landlord.

In Scotland Currie is best remembered as the first biographer of Robert Burns. He first came across Robert Burns in 1786 when he was sent the Kilmarnock edition of Burns, poems by Dr John Moore, a Glaswegian who had settled in London. His son Graham was a young naval officer in Liverpool who was enjoying Currie’s hospitality. Currie was at once captivated by the author of ‘The twa dogs’ and the ‘Address to the De’il’. Burns was, he wrote to Graham Moore, an original poet with the admirable simplicity of true genius. He went on: ‘His thoughts are natural and flow easily: and by turns he is humorous, pathetic and sublime.’ The ‘Address to the mouse’, that ‘Wee sleekit, cow’rin’ tim’rous beastie...........’ had, he thought, all these characters of writing united. In his view ‘none but a ploughman could have written it.’ Currie never came to know Burns personally. When in Scotland on the affairs of Dumcrieff and Stakeford in 1792, he did take the opportunity of paying his respects to the poet in Dumfries, a meeting that served to impress him further of the force and versatility of his talents, but this was their only encounter. Burns’ health, however, was becoming increasingly precarious. By 1795, he felt that good health had flown him. In the summer of the next year he was ordered to the Brow Well but it was to no avail; he died on 21 July.

There were at once among Burns’ friends proposals to collect enough money to provide for his destitute wife and children. At the same time, it was proposed by his executors, who included John Syme, Currie’s factor, that a memoir of his life should be written, for
the same cause. After protracted discussions it was agreed that Currie should be approached to undertake this task. It was a mammoth endeavour. Currie had to deal with a great number of disorganised papers, as well as with missing letters such as those of the winsome Maria Riddell, one of Burns’ many flames, who had insisted on keeping her Burns letters to herself. Finally, in 1800, however, Cadell and Davies produced his prodigious four volumes: *The Works of Robert Burns: with an account of his Life and a Criticism of his Writings...* dedicated to Captain Graham Moore (as he had now become). Further editions were called for in each of the next three years and by 1820 the 8th edition had been published. There are among Burns scholars those who have criticised Currie’s work. He had, it was said, not known Burns nor had he understood the human frailties referred to in the obituary published in the *Edinburgh Evening Courant* for the 23 July. Yet it achieved its end. The first edition alone made £1400 for Burns’ widow.

Throughout his Liverpool career Currie, remembering the kindness and support which the Duncan family had given him in so many ways, sought to help his Duncan relations. The Rev George Duncan’s five sons had all been born at the Lochrutton Manse. There were four of them, however, who came to owe much to James Currie, distinguished Merseyside physician. The successful business careers in Liverpool of George, William and Robert were all launched with Currie’s help. Henry too was intended for a career in Liverpool but he was the only one of the brothers who instead returned to the land of his birth. He had no interest in mercenary concerns but became a Minister of the Church of Scotland who had an important influence not only on his Kirk but also on the affairs of his native land.

**GEORGE DUNCAN**  
1771-1831  
m.1795  
**CHRISTIAN CURRIE**  
Sister of Dr James Currie
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James  
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Ann Isabella  

**WILLIAM HENRY**  
1805-1863  
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Isabella  
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Henry Duncan, known as Harry in his early years, was first educated at the Dumfries Academy and at the age of fourteen he went to the University of St Andrews where he studied languages. In 1790, however, his father decided that he should accept the proposal of his kinsman Dr Currie that he should enter the office of Messrs Heywood, bankers in Liverpool. Currie’s patronage seemed likely to be of great help to the young man. He
reached his destination by sea, taking passage in one of those small vessels that plied between the Nith and the Mersey. Warmly welcomed by his brothers William and Robert already established in Liverpool, he was to stay in Dr Currie’s home for the next three years, attending daily to the business of his employers.

The extent to which the young Henry Duncan shared Currie’s dissenting views is uncertain but Currie may well have encouraged his uncompromising opposition to slavery. Since Dr Currie’s home was visited by friends of an intellectual and refined character, it was not long before Henry Duncan’s thoughts were to be directed to religion. The controversy over the Socinians or Unitarians had broken out with considerable violence. Henry, imbued by his father with the traditional teaching of the Scottish Kirk clearly did not share Currie’s Unitarian views, for he produced an anonymous tract in which he strongly supported the Trinitarian side of the argument. His anonymity, however, was blown when his father recognised his own ideas being expounded by the writer. At the same time, it became increasingly clear that Henry Duncan was not cut out for a commercial career. Dr Currie wrote to his father complaining that he was becoming careless in matters of business and that he lacked ambition. Henry himself also wrote to his father, explaining that he derived no pleasure from the life of a merchant, and that on the contrary his disposition ‘gives me no relish for more money than will support myself, or be useful to my friends’. He enclosed a sermon that he had composed. It must be stated that although he now felt himself drawn to a clerical life, there was at that time little spiritual in his conversion, Dr Currie and the Rev George Duncan reluctantly agreed to his decision, Currie writing: ‘he is indeed a fine young man, and I hope his time is not thrown away..... Harry’s manners appear to me to be extremely engaging’.

Henry Duncan went to Edinburgh University in November 1793. He was to study for five more years before he could become a Minister, both in Edinburgh and also in Glasgow where he was much influenced by the law lecturers of Professor Millar, one of the doyens of the Scottish Enlightenment. He was ordained by the Presbytery of Annan to the pastoral charge of Ruthwell on 19th September 1799. He was at once concerned with the distressing state of affairs within his parish. For several years the failure of harvests had resulted in a dramatic increase in the price of provisions and there was hardship in Ruthwell. He at once ordered, without considering the pecuniary hazard, a cargo of Indian corn from his brothers in Liverpool which he then retailed at minimal cost.

If he was drawn at this early period of his ministry to philanthropy, he had not as yet developed that spiritual nature which was later so much to guide him. He had, during the threat of a Napoleonic invasion in 1802, raised a company of volunteers with himself as their Lieutenant, a laudable patriotic gesture, but some thought it incompatible with his position as a minister. There were also murmurs that the young bachelor minister, not yet thirty, spent too much time in the Assembly Rooms in Dumfries.

It was in 1804 that his life began to change. Attending his Presbytery one day in Annan, he learnt that three Quakers, Deborah Darby, Rebecca Byrd and Solomon Chapman were to hold a meeting that evening He was much impressed by the pious sincerity of the speakers. He invited them to the Manse at Ruthwell on their way to Dumfries and they came and dined the following day. Both his parents were there from
Lochrutton, as well as his sister, Christian, who wrote a moving account of the occasion. Deborah Darby recorded in her diary for July 24th her meeting with the ‘kind clergyman’.

A member by marriage of the Quaker family of ironmasters who first smelted iron at Coalbrookdale, Deborah Darby was one of the most remarkable of the ministering Friends who travelled the country at that time. According to James Jenkins, a Quaker diarist, she had a sweet and harmonious voice. Her sentences were short, effective and very much to the point. Some years before it had been she who turned the young Elizabeth Fry to her admirable life of piety and service. Elizabeth Fry never forgot Deborah Darby’s forecast that she would be ‘a light to the blind, speech to the dumb and feet to the lame’.

Deborah Darby seems to have had a similar effect on Henry Duncan. After dinner, she addressed him in the most friendly and affecting way, saying ‘that she could not leave his hospitable roof without expressing the interest she felt in him, and the assurance that she entertained that he would be a blessing to those among whom he lived and whom he was engaged in teaching the glorious Gospel of Jesus Christ. She pointed out the responsibility of his situation and gave many sweet addresses and warnings.......’ After she had spoken Henry Duncan attempted to reply but was so overcome that he burst into tears. Deborah Darby then laid her large hat upon the table, as was her wont on such occasions, and the whole company fell to their knees.

Ever after Henry Duncan endeavoured, as he wrote, ‘to follow the example of the very respectable sect of Christians called Quakers, whose principles and conduct.... I think worthy of being adopted’. In many ways he came to share the Quaker concept of the inner light, the equivalent to him perhaps of the influence of the Holy Spirit. His sympathy with Quaker ideals, however, did not extend to sharing their testimony on pacifism.

A month later, as an expression of his spiritual development, he wrote out in a small note book the duties he owed to God, the duties he owed to his fellow creatures and the duties he owed to himself. He read these rules at least once a day until he had them by heart. His son George wrote later that although ‘the Spirit was already striving within him’, a seed had now been sown in the soil of his heart that was to produce abundant fruits. Some years afterwards, Henry Duncan’s sister Christian went to Coalbrookdale to visit Mrs Darby, who expressed her gratitude that God had guided her to Ruthwell and that she felt ‘satisfied that the good thus accomplished was a sufficient reward for her mission’.

If 1804 was to be an important year in Henry Duncan’s spiritual Odyssey, it was also a year in which the duty that he owed to himself was reflected in his marriage to Agnes Craig. Agnes was the daughter of his predecessor at Ruthwell and she therefore knew both the Manse and the parish intimately. She had entertained Robert Burns at the Manse in his last days when he was at the Brow Well. According to family tradition repeated by the Rev John Dinwiddie, a later Minister of the Parish of Ruthwell, the sun was shining on the poet’s face and she went to pull the blind down. Burns asked her not to shut out the sun, saying to her: ‘He hasna’ lang to shine for me’. Henry Duncan had also met Burns when he visited his father’s manse at Lochrutton, where he received much kindness and hospitality. On his first visit the Rev George Duncan had told his sons: ‘Look well at Mr Burns, for you’ll never again see such a genius’. By the time of their marriage Henry and his wife would no doubt have been sent a copy of Currie’s Memoir by the author.
The Manse at Ruthwell was greatly improved during Henry Duncan’s tenancy. It came to be known as an abode where there was always the kindest welcome to distinguished visitors such as Dr Thomas Chalmers, Sir David Brewster, Robert Owen (before his denial of religion) and Thomas Carlyle. There was an equal welcome to the most unfortunate and deprived of the parish. His garden was extensively developed during his time, with the help of James Veitch, his faithful gardener. The Glebe was also included in its master’s interest in improvement. For many years new methods of fertilising were tested there so that the Manse’s land, not much more than fifty acres, became the experimental farm for the district. Always interested in the welfare of the young, Henry Duncan set up a small school for his own children, for his nephews from Liverpool and for other selected youths. There, together with the tutor, he interested the young people, who all called him ‘Uncle Henry’, in scientific machines, in astronomy and in such matters as how bees go about producing honey, constructing a glass beehive for their amusement. He was devoted to his own children, two sons and a daughter, and although extraordinarily active throughout his days, he managed to maintain an affectionate correspondence with them. He was a man of sensitivity and unquestionably a romantic. How about these words to his daughter coming to the end of her schooling in Edinburgh: ‘Your present life’, he wrote, ‘may be compared to that of a caterpillar, which is destined to go down for a time to the grave, and then to burst its cerements, that it may assume a new form of being, and instead of grovelling in the dust, sip nectar from the opening breast of a tulip, and repose on the soft and perfumed leaves of the rose, and flutter through the balmy air on painted wings, and bask in the sunny meadow, inhaling sweets from every breath of summer’.

Henry Duncan’s career was devoted to his ministry in his small parish of Ruthwell but he had an influence that was to become increasingly national. He was imbued with a deep desire to influence the world by helping the poor and improving popular education so much an ambition of the thinkers of the Enlightenment. In 1809, with the financial help of his Liverpool brothers, and the support of his younger brother, Thomas Tudor Duncan who, although an MD of Edinburgh, chose to be a Minister in Dumfries, he founded the Dumfries and Galloway Courier that he went on to edit for the first seven years of its existence. Many of its early editorials were from his pen. In later years they were to found the Dumfries and Galloway Standard, still published today.

The next year, 1810, concerned with the poverty that he met with every day in his parish, he founded the Ruthwell Parish Savings Bank, the first set up on business principles. He was averse to the idea of the poor rate which he believed was both begrudging and degrading and argued that the best way of improving the lot of the disadvantaged was to encourage prudent forethought and economy among the people themselves. It was an immediate success. In the four following years the funds of the Ruthwell Bank rose successively to £151, £176, £241 and £922. The idea soon spread throughout Scotland. In England too, similar institutions were introduced. In Bath, in 1815, for example, Dr Currie’s old friend John Haygarth, now in old age - he was 75 - established the Bath Provident Institute for Savings. He paid tribute to Henry Duncan’s foundation of the Bank in Ruthwell but owing to the particular situation in England developed his scheme somewhat differently. Henry Duncan’s bank went on to become the
Another public venture in which Henry Duncan was closely involved for many years was the proposal to establish a University of Dumfries. The idea had first surfaced in 1814 when a suggestion was made by the authorities of the University of St Andrews that they should move to Dumfries. Nothing came of this, however, and it was not until 1823 that Henry Duncan and his Dumfries brother, Thomas Tudor Duncan, were able to put forward a better idea. In that year Dr James Crichton, who had made a fortune in the East, left much of his considerable wealth in trust for his wife. She was to support such charitable purposes as she might suggest to her trustees. To the Duncans, who knew Mrs Crichton well, it was a heaven sent opportunity to resurrect their proposal for a University, to be funded by the Crichton bequest. Mrs Crichton herself was favourably disposed to the idea but for many years, as a result of the efforts of James Crichton’s brother John to contest the settlement, the financial affairs of the trust could not be settled. There were political problems, too, the authorities being unlikely to approve a University for Dumfries while at the same time refusing degree status to Durham and the newly founded University of London. Men such as Dr Thomas Chalmers, strong supporter of popular education, could not be persuaded to accept the headship of the proposed institution and despite Henry Duncan’s friendship with the Chancellor, Lord Brougham, who had been his fellow student at Edinburgh, matters could not be resolved. The whole episode has been carefully disentangled from a mass of letters and other documents by Rene Anderson. Sadly, from the Duncan’s point of view, the money went to fund the famous Asylum for Pauper Lunatics, the Crichton Royal, which opened its doors in 1839. Today, however, in view of the establishment of higher education here, there must be celebrations in whatever Valhalla gives rest to the souls of the Duncan brothers.

In addition to the many causes to which Henry Duncan devoted his boundless energies, he also became a well-known antiquarian. The ancient Ruthwell Cross, which dated from Anglo-Saxon times and upon which there were old Runic inscriptions, had been cast down by order of the Covenanters, who at the Aberdeen Assembly of 1640, has passed an Act ‘Anent the demolishing of idolatrous monuments’. The local minister at Ruthwell, the Rev Gavin Young, seems to have tried to save the cross from its total destruction but by Henry Duncan’s time the cross itself was in pieces scattered around the churchyard. After many years of patient work and the assistance of a local stonemason, however, he was able to re-erect the Cross in the garden of the Manse, where it stood until its later removal to within the church itself. In 1832 he contributed a paper to the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland (of which he was a corresponding member), describing, with his own careful
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1 Members may be interested to note that the late Bill Cormack commented that 'Following Ruthwell, many Parish Savings Banks were formed but Duncan realised that Parliamentary guidelines were essential for their proper management in Scotland. It was only after a decade of lobbying in Parliament and pulling strings that he got passed the Act 59 George III, Cap. 62. This was nothing to do with the later Trustee Savings Bank Acts. I don’t know how many banks took advantage but when I came into business in the 1950s there were still four or five going under Henry Duncan’s Act, among them Airdrie, Dumfries, Annan and Lockerbie (one of which may have absorbed Ruthwell). They were under the general supervision of the Justices of the Peace. Having wider investment powers they paid a higher rate of interest than the Trustee Savings Banks who could only invest their funds in Government stocks. All have now closed as a result of post-war inflation that rendered hard-earned balances of two or three hundred pounds of little purchasing power. These “Henry Duncan” banks were, however, very proud of their long history and direct association with Henry [Duncan].’ (Eds)
drawings, the scenes and inscriptions upon the cross. The secretary, Donald Gregory, wrote to say: ‘Our meeting last night went off with great eclat, your paper being the principal part of the entertainment’.

Another contribution to the knowledge of the time was his discovery of indelible animal footprints in the red sandstone strata at Corncocklemuir quarry, Templand near Lochmaben. Examples may be seen in the Dumfries Museum. Henry Duncan concluded that these footprints had been made by four-footed creatures at a remote time that preceded the age of the dinosaurs. We may safely ignore the opinion of Adam Sedgwick, the anti-evolutionist Cambridge geologist and divine, and his friend Robert Murchison who paid little attention when they visited the site during their tour of Scotland. Professor William Buckland of Oxford, however, was greatly impressed by Henry Duncan’s observations and wrote to him: ‘I look upon your discovery as one of the most curious and most important that has ever been made in geology....... it is a discovery that will forever connect your name with the progress of this science’. There were others, Sir David Brewster and Dr Thomas Chalmers among them, who fully agreed with Professor Buckland. Subsequent analysis has amply confirmed their views.

Although Dr Duncan’s life as a minister had for so long been devoted to his Ruthwell flock, the last few years of his life were to be governed by the affairs of the Kirk throughout the land. His reputation had by now spread far beyond the confines of his small parish. Despite his many achievements he was a modest man and it was a great surprise when in 1823 he was awarded degree of Doctor of Divinity by his Alma Mater, the University of St Andrews. It was a greater honour when, in 1839, he was elected to the office of Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. It was a difficult time for the Church which was split between the so-called moderates and the Evangelicals. The major point at issue was the right of parishioners to select their own ministers, as against the desires of proprietors or the Crown, supported by the temporal courts. The Evangelicals passionately stood by the rights of parishioners which, on a motion of Dr Thomas Chalmers, were reaffirmed by the 1839 Assembly. Henry Duncan was generally admired for ‘the manly and impartial manner in which he presided over the business of that venerable court’. Matters, however, did not end there. The crisis between the two wings of the Church, effectively a battle between Church and State, grew until at the 1843 Assembly the Moderator, supported by one hundred and ninety two members, read his Protest against the intrusion of the civil power into what were properly the affairs of the Church. More than half of the Assembly members then processed, calmly and with great solemnity, into the street. In what became known as the Disruption, four hundred and seventy two ministers out of twelve hundred who constituted the clergy of the Church of Scotland renounced their livings, Dr Duncan, his two sons, his son-in-law and his stepson among them. Their Church was to be the Free Church of Scotland. It meant for Henry Duncan giving up, for a principle, much of what he held dear, his manse, the garden he had so lovingly created, his glebe, his school and of course his church where he could no longer preach to his beloved parishioners. In his seventieth year it was a courageous thing to do.

His last years were spent in trying to build a new church and school, outwith his own parish. It was an enormous task only made worthwhile by the multitudes who often assembled in their thousands in the open air to hear the message of the Free Church.
Henry Duncan sought funds from far and wide and he was able to make a start at Mount Kedar, where there is a plaque to his memory.

In early 1846, he went to Liverpool. His brother George had predeceased him and it was his nephews who took affectionate care of him accompanying him to the train to speed him on his way. Sadly it was the last time they saw him. Shortly afterwards, back in Ruthwell, preaching on the text ‘For behold the stone’ in the house of an Elder, he was felled by a fatal stroke.

Although they had lost their father, who had died at Lochrutton in 1807, the bond between Henry Duncan and his brothers in Liverpool remained strong throughout their lives. The Liverpool brothers frequently gave Henry financial support when he most needed it. They had helped him to build a cottage near the manse for his mother-in-law, Clarence Cottage in Clarencefield, in which he stayed for a short time after the Disruption. The cottage is still there. His nephews had also given him, to replace his phaeton, a gig small enough to attract no tax during the privations of his last years.

Henry’s Liverpool brothers all had successful careers in the world of commerce. Robert Duncan developed his own business in Seel Street. William became a partner of the eminent Quaker William Rathbone. He was undoubtedly the most flamboyant of the sons of the Lochrutton Manse. His nephew, George, elder son of the Rev Henry Duncan, remembered him as ‘a man of very amiable temper’. He recorded that ‘during part of his lifetime, he was very successful in mercantile speculation, when he showed a great love of display and was very profuse in his expenditure’. On one occasion ‘he brought his family, with carriages and servants in livery, to Dumfriesshire, where his equipage on the racecourse was of the showiest. George was particularly impressed with uncle William’s wife, ‘a splendid woman’, who was very beautiful. In later years reverses seem to have interfered with such follies, but George, a minister like his father, clearly felt some satisfaction in knowing that they both took pleasure in nobler gratifications before they met their maker.

George Duncan, the eldest of the Duncan brothers had a highly successful career as a merchant in Liverpool. He first settled in Dumfries. In 1795, there was an event that brought the Currie and the Duncan families closer than ever, for George Duncan married Christian Currie, sister of Dr James Currie, whom he would have known as a child when the Currie girls lived at the Lochrutton manse. The marriage was solemnised by his father, the Rev George Duncan, in Edinburgh and the first child was born at Lochrutton. In 1810, however, he decided to join his two brothers in Liverpool. By 1810, George Duncan was living in Seel Street near his brother Robert. He was well known as a roper, naval store dealer, and ship chandler in partnership with Robert McMurdo, almost certainly another cousin from Dumfries, who supervised the warehouses close to the waterfront and across the street from the tobacco warehouse and the King’s Dock.

George and his wife had three sons and four daughters. The third son, William Henry, was born in Seel Street in 1805. It was he who became the first Medical Officer of Health for the Borough of Liverpool, and in fact the first in the country. He is therefore regarded today as the founder of the medical speciality of Public Health. There is a plaque on the house where he was born.
Little is known of William Henry’s education except that he was one of Henry Duncan’s Liverpool nephews who spent at least some of his time at the schoolhouse in the Manse at Ruthwell. He went to Edinburgh and graduated MD in 1829, with a thesis entitled *De ventris in reliquum corpus potestate* (how the stomach affects the rest of the body). His early career seems to have been that of an increasingly successful practitioner. He had rooms in Rodney Street, the up and coming Harley Street of Liverpool, but at the same time he was, as his uncle James Currie had been, physician both to the South Dispensary and to the Infirmary. He gave lectures at the medical school on Medical Jurisprudence. Through his Dispensary work he was, like his uncle before him, appalled by the gross overcrowding and lack of sanitation which were the common lot of the labouring class.

In 1843, Duncan gave two lectures to the Liverpool Literary and Philosophical Society which were subsequently published as a pamphlet entitled *The Physical Causes of the High Rate of mortality in Liverpool*. He first ascribed the high mortality, especially from infectious disease, to the overcrowding throughout the poorer areas of the town. In words that closely resembled those used by James Currie, forty years before, he roundly condemned the construction of the narrow courts which were a feature of Liverpool life. Furthermore, as many as twenty percent of the working class were living in wretchedness in overcrowded cellars, usually with unpaved earthen floors. Cellars were often less than ten or twelve feet square and rarely as much as six feet in height. There was no window and no sanitation or water supply. He estimated that there were upwards of eight thousand inhabited cellars in Liverpool, their occupants from 33 to 40 thousand out of an estimated working population of one hundred and seventy five thousand. Ashpits and privies were rarely emptied. As to courts, he wrote, ‘I do not know of a single court which communicates with the street or sewer by a covered drain’. Sewers were in fact non-existent in working class areas of the Borough. He concluded by bewailing the fact that public health occupied a very subordinate position in Britain compared to other European countries such as France.

Reform, though, was the spirit of those years that followed the passage of the great Reform Bill of 1832. Education became a priority. Henry Brougham founded the *Society for the Propagation of Useful Knowledge*, a secular answer perhaps to the *Society for the Propagation of the Christian Gospel*. Throughout the land there was a desire, fostered by the influence of social reformers such as Jeremy Bentham, to improve the lot of the labouring classes. In 1842, stimulated by Edwin Chadwick who had been Bentham’s secretary, the Poor Law Commission presented to parliament its *Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population of Great Britain*. Liverpool was at the forefront of the movement for change. In 1846 the Town Council passed the Liverpool Sanitary Act which sought to control housing, the paving of the streets, the provision of sewers and the supervision and control of infectious disease. Overcrowded houses were also to be supervised. It was a pioneering Act which in addition called for the first time for the appointment of a Medical Officer of Health as well as for a Borough Engineer, and a supervisor of nuisances. The choice of the Medical Officer of Health was never in doubt. On the 1st January 1847, Dr W H Duncan was appointed the first Medical Officer in the country. At first, he was paid £300 per annum and reserved the right to private practice. It soon became apparent that there might be conflicts of interest between his private
patients and his proposals as Medical Officer of Health. Within a year the Council decided to make it a full-time post, at the princely salary of £750 a year. Duncan was an idealist and a dedicated man. He could, as his uncle did, have made so much more from private work. By now he had married Catherine MacAndrew, daughter of a fellow Liverpool Scot.

Dr Duncan had chosen a career which during his first years in his new post was testing in the extreme. The world pandemics of cholera hit Liverpool hard in 1849 and 1854, the Borough being particularly susceptible to the importation of disease by passengers on ships from far and wide. At the same time, refugees from the Irish potato famines of the 1840s surged into Liverpool, exacerbating an already desperate housing crisis. Duncan never once lost his nerve, patiently devoting himself to the duties of his office. He was very much helped by the Borough Engineer, James Newlands with whom he worked through the years in harmony and who rarely took action on matters such as the building of sewers without consulting his medical colleague.

At once there were improvements that stemmed immediately from the powers given by the passage of Liverpool’s Sanitary Act. Dr Duncan had estimated that by 1850 upwards of five thousand cellars had been cleared of their inhabitants and twenty thousand inmates displaced. The cellar population had formed twelve per cent of the working population of inner Liverpool in 1847; three years later it had fallen to two per cent. At the same time the housing regulations led to the imposition of restrictions on the size of courts. Paving was greatly extended. Narrow and unsavoury courts were increasingly taken down and later Duncan could boast that there was scarcely a court in the borough that did not have a covered drain.

As a result of Newlands’ sterling efforts the Borough’s sewage disposal was progressively improved. Between 1847 when the Sanitary Act came into operation and 1858, eighty miles of sewers were constructed together with sixty six miles of main drains, a total length of one hundred and forty six miles. The main outlet sewer, six miles long, and six feet high by four feet wide, was included in these works.

Proper ashpits and privies were made and bath and wash-houses erected by the Council. Slaughterhouses were regulated; noxious manufactures and stores, which were injurious to health, were dealt with. Knackers yards were placed under control and the nuisance from smoke much abated. Many of the improvements in sanitation depended to a large degree on a plentiful supply of clean water. This the Council achieved first by buying out the two private companies controlling the water supply and then developing the Rivington Scheme. In this way they were able to rely on a supply that was only one quarter from wells and which could provide the town with more than one hundred million gallons a day.

By the time of his Report of 1860, Dr Duncan could state that the death rate in Liverpool which had been 36 per thousand in the 1840s had now been as low as twenty five. It is salutary to remember that the average age at death - life expectancy - in the Parish of Liverpool, that is the Centre of the Borough, was only twenty years in 1840. Twenty years later it had risen to no more than twenty five. Even in 1944 it had only improved to 55 years, compared to the more than seventy years that individuals may expect today.
Dr Duncan’s reports and correspondence are models of clarity, written with all the old fashioned courtesy of a Victorian physician. Yet they are not devoid of humour. In one letter he describes how he has tried to get rid of the rats in his home by stopping up their holes and directing them towards his neighbour. Sadly, though, they soon showed signs of returning, their ‘pickets and advance guard’ having been discovered in the library. On another occasion, he was asked, in a circular from the Council, to list the members of staff of his department. His reply was as follows: The following list comprises the whole of the officer in my department paid by the Corporation: William Henry Duncan, M. D. Medical Officer of Health.

In 1862, perhaps worn out by his efforts on behalf of the citizens of Liverpool, Dr Duncan’s health sadly began to fail. He died on the 23rd May 1863, whilst visiting his wife’s Forsyth relations in distant Elgin. He was buried in the Forsyth family vault in the cathedral and there, on his tombstone, is an inscription to his memory.

Dr Duncan is still remembered affectionately in Liverpool. There is a Duncan building and a Duncan Society which deals with the public health. And opposite, his birthplace in Seel Street, there is a public house which for many years was the Dr Duncan pub. It now has an incomprehensible Irish name but inside the bar, high on the wall, are two painted inscriptions. The first relates to the decision of the Council of the Borough of Liverpool to appoint him to a full-time post in 1848: the second to his efforts to enforce the provisions of the ‘Sanatory Act’ in controlling the epidemic of cholera in 1849. It is to be hoped that the present Irish landlord will leave them there.

There is now, in downtown Liverpool, a new Dr Duncan public house. Outside, the public house sign is his portrait. Within, another portrait of Dr Duncan, surrounded by the bottles of a modern pharmacy, looks benevolently down upon those revellers who now enjoy the hygienic benefits that he and his colleagues first established so long ago. And those revellers may also buy a Dr Duncan T-shirt.

The individuals whose lives have been examined in this paper were all imbued with the Enlightenment ideal of human improvement. I tend to share the view of that historian of the Enlightenment, Roy Porter, who found such men’s minds congenial and who revered their pithy prose. He always felt more at home with them than with those aggrieved Puritans who enthral yet appal. For myself I can only express my boundless admiration for James Currie, Henry Duncan, his nephew and their families. They were kind and amiable men, their letters never revealing any sense of conflict with their colleagues or malice towards them. Their devotion was complete, their energy boundless. They died, as all men must wish to do, having earned the love and affection of their friends and families, and with the knowledge that they had left the world a better place than when they entered it.

The Society is indebted to the Savings Banks Museum and the Crichton University of Southern Scotland Action Group for generous grants towards the publication costs of this paper.
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NOTES ON COASTAL EROSION AND MID 19th CENTURY ANTIQUARIES
AT NEWBIE SHORE, ANNAN
by James Williams

During the course of the preparations for volumes 75 and 76 of these Transactions there existed a possibility that Dr Mike Cressey of the Centre for Field Archaeology, University of Edinburgh, might have been able to supply a potential article on his work on eroding shorelines, sea-level changes and the paleoenvironment at Newbie near Annan. In the event his presentations on these subjects elsewhere would have meant repeating existing publications and thereby precluded publication here. In the original work towards supporting Dr Cressey’s article, and being aware that this Society had, in the 1860s, made a number of excursions or field trips to the Newbie shoreline the printed proceedings, and the appropriate MS minute books, were searched and revealed a number of interesting accounts - as also two previously unpublished original pencil drawings by our first president Sir William Jardine. As it had originally been hoped to bring this supplementary information to members’ attention it has now been decided to publish it separately.

Figure 1. Foreshore at Newbie, Annan in September 1865

1 Dr Mike Cressey, Centre for Field archaeology, University of Edinburgh, Old High School, 12 Infirmary Street, Edinburgh EH1 1LT.
(1) Wetlands Archaeological Research Project (WARP) conference at Dublin in August 1998: Sea level changes and Paleoenvironment at Newbie Cottages, near Annan, Upper Solway Firth, South West Scotland.
(3) Scottish Natural Heritage monograph reporting on parts of the wider aspects of the SSSI site at Newbie.
The earliest records of the Society are contained in a MS volume of proceedings maintained by Sir William Jardine. The volume contains the proceedings for 1862-63 and the Presidential addresses by Sir William on 1st December 1863, 6th December 1864 and 8th December 1865 - in addition there are numerous tipped-in billets of meetings and correspondence. It contains the original drawing for the published cross-section of the Black Loch Sanquhar Crannog and in addition, as mentioned above, two original drawings of an excursion to the Newbie shore in September 1865.

1. 24.5 x 17.8 cms view of the foreshore at Newbie showing erosion of the shoreline with an artificial mound cut by the erosion. Three members of the Society are illustrated examining the mound – in the section can be seen the end of the kist exposed. The top left-hand corner shows one fully developed detailed sketch of the cist section and two trial pieces. See figure 1.

2. 17.75 x 14.2 cms pencil sketch on cartridge paper showing the trackway to the lee of the eroded mound – with three figures. The individual with the large-brimmed hat is probably Dr T B Grierson of Thornhill. See figure 2.

Figure 2. Newbie showing the trackway to the lee of the eroded mound.

2 The presentations list for the 1912-13 session includes, against the date of 25th October 1912, the following entry:- W.I.H.Maxwell, Esqr. of Munches – MS Transactions and Journal of Proceedings of the Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society, 1862-1865-6, in the holograph of Sir Wm. Jardine, with sketches, some of which are not included in the printed Transactions’ see Transactions, Series III, Vol 1, 1912-13, p.362. The volume consists of bound blue-glazed and lined paper, 10½ x 8 inches, with ¼-calf and red/blue sprinkle-marbled boards - the spine is wanting.
3 See Presidential Address for 8th December 1865, Transactions, Series I, Vol 3, page 5.
These illustrations of 1865 in fact relate to a second excursion to the same location - there had been an earlier ‘private’ excursion in July 1864 - a printed account of this is provided by Sir William’s Presidential Address of 6th December 1864.⁴

‘At different times excursions have been made by Members of the Society independently of the fixed monthly meetings and the information then acquired may very properly be incorporated among the work of the year.

It had been reported that some stone coffins had been discovered near Newby, in the vicinity of Annan, and on the 8th July a small party made arrangements to proceed thither and ascertain the truth of the report. On reaching Newby they ascertained that, although two stone coffins were to be seen, they had been known to the tenant, Mr Beatie, and others, for some years. One of the coffins was placed in a mound of drift, a short distance from the farm-house. A workman stated that it had been opened about ten years since by some idle persons, probably in expectation of finding concealed treasure, and the stone slab or covering had been replaced immediately afterwards, and had not been disturbed since. Upon again removing the covering, and digging amongst the mould and rubbish which had been thrown in, a number of fragments of an ancient urn were found, which, when pieced together, indicated plainly that it was rudely fashioned, as if by the hand, and was marked with the herring-bone pattern of ornamentation. Some small fragments of bone were also found. The coffin itself was formed of unhewn slabs of sandstone resting against each other, forming an irregularly shaped hole.⁵ The covering overlapped the cavity considerably, and with the slabs forming the sides was five inches in thickness. From the dimensions of this coffin, the body must have been placed in a sitting posture, for which there was sufficient depth. The long axis was placed nearly due east and west.

The site of the second coffin was about 200 hundred yards further along the coast. It had also been placed on a mound of drift, on which the sea had made considerable inroads, and some years since had exposed a coffin similar to the last, but longer, as if the body had been placed in a lying posture. All the slabs which formed this coffin, except the end one remain; but the cavity is now mostly filled with stones and débris.

The clearly artificial character of the superficial parts of the mound, to a depth of probably three or four feet, satisfied the party of the almost certain existence of other coffins, probably resembling those which had already been opened, and of their importance of further explorations⁶.

On 8th December 1865 Sir William again reports in his Presidential address.⁶

‘The last excursion of the summer was made upon the 7th of September to Newbie. The private excursion to the same place last year had given the hope that more stone kists would be discovered. Permission had been requested from Mr Mackenzie⁷ to make explorations on the banks of the burying places. This was at once granted, and Mr Beattie, the tenant of the land, not only gave every facility for the exploration as well as information but also permitted his men to assist in excavating and digging into the mounds supposed to contain the stone graves.

⁴ *Transactions*, Series I, Vol 2, 1866: The Presidential Address, 6th December, 1864, p12 et seq.
⁵ The MS volume includes a sketch plan of one of the cists - showing a trapezoidal shape with sides measuring 1f. 8in.; 2f. 10in.; 2f. 4in. and 2f. 8ins.
⁷ Although the published account in the *Transactions* records the excursion date as 7th September 1865 the original letter from E.MacKenzie to Sir William Jardine is dated the 8th September at Fawley Court [Marlow Road, Henley-on-Thames, Oxfordshire] and reads.-’

Dear Sir, your letter dated the 5th inst. is to hand this morning with regard to the researches you wish to make on my property near the farm house occupied by Mr Beattie, by this you have my sanction and I hope you may be repaid satisfactorily for all your pains and perseverance. And I am yours respectfully. E.MacKenzie’.
The party was unsuccessful in finding any new kists. A part of one now only exists and the history remains a little obscure. The mound in which the end of the remaining kist is seen faces the sea. The sea bank there was formerly higher and extended much further seaward, in fact the road now along the top of the bank once ran between the bank and the sea. The sea washed away both road, bank and part of the mound, and so exposed the kists in the latter. The account that we collected was that there were formerly three kists all placed in line with that now partly existing, the ends pointing to the sea. They all had bones in them when discovered, but they were mixed with sand and gravel, and as the workpeople expressed it when exposed “They went to meal.” The part of the kist at present standing has the sides formed of strong sandstone flags, six inches thick, placed on edge; the width inside is about two feet and the top is covered with a flag three feet broad; the depth from the cover to the lower edge of the side flags is little more than two feet. When this remaining kist was discovered there was upon the north side a small hole formed of four flags not more than a foot square and about eighteen inches deep. There was no cover upon the top and it was filled with small pieces of bone. Over these two there was a mound of loose stones as if an artificial cairn had been made over it all, and there is reason to believe that this was also carried over the other graves which have now disappeared.

Upon a mound nearer Newbie House the kist opened last year remained as left. It may be remembered that on removing the cover last year pottery with herring bone pattern was found here. The form of this kist when opened was irregular; it is placed east and west, the width at the east end being two feet four inches, and at the west only one foot two; but the flags – about four inches thick – appear to have been moved and the kist most probably was originally square. The depth was about one foot ten inches, and the whole was covered by an irregularly shaped flag. Though searched for no other graves were found upon this or the adjoining mounds.

After as far as possible satisfying themselves that nothing further would be found here, the party proceeded to the ridge at Annan Waterfoot on which the lighthouse is placed and where human bones were said to be found. Upon making a trial human bones could be found in quantity at very little depth below the surface. It had evidently been the site of a burying place, and as there appeared nothing of antiquarian research worthy of spending time here, those of the party who were independent of trains returned and examined the site and what yet remained of Newbie Castle, together with objects of a more recent kind, - the fine specimens of cattle, both Galloway and shorthorn, feeding and preparing to be tied up, for which Mr Beattie has long been so justly celebrated. Mr Beattie was also so kind as to induce the remaining members to partake of refreshments before they endeavoured to find the ancient forest on the shore of which the billet gave notice.

Changes are constantly going on upon a sea shore, and some 15 to 20 years ago I made a sketch of the shore nearly opposite where the kists were discovered. Beyond the coast mounds the fields had not been reclaimed or drained, and there was a moss covered with heather then existing. This moss ran under the shore mounds and upon it the trees had grown. At that time the roots stood higher above the surface than they do at present, and at low water could easily be seen at some distance above the surface. These sand hills and mounds extended at one time much further seaward, and as we have seen a gradual encroachment has been made. On examining the shore we found roots still

---

8 Members present were not listed in the printed account in the Transactions but the MS volume records Mr McDiamid [a founder member of Society]; Mr Gibson [a founder member]; Mr T Jackson [Writer, Nith Place, Dumfries. Elected 6 January 1863]; Dr Dickson [a founder member]; Dr Grierson Thornhill [a founder member]; Mr [J.J.] Coupland Dfs. [perfumer, Dumfries, elected 3rd May 1864]; Mr [T.] Corrie Pr.F. [Procurator Fiscal – a founder member] and Mr Paterson Vet.S. [Veterinary Surgeon, Dumfries, elected 3rd December 1863].

9 It has unfortunately not been possible to locate this illustration. The writer is indebted to Sir Alec Jardine, the present baronet, for making an unsuccessful search of family papers.
remaining at the edge of the shingle and seawards, and Mr Beattie is aware of their existence as far northwards as Newbie House. What we saw and uncovered were the roots of oak trees of considerable size.

Several good plants occur along the shore here, but the season was rather too far advanced for the botanist. The entomologists of the party were, however much gratified by seeing several specimens of *Colias edusa* flitting along the sea beach herbage upon both sides of Newbie House, but in Mr Lennon’s absence no one was provided with catching apparatus, and the colias proved more than a match for the hats and hankerchiefs of the most nimble members. This butterfly, very rare in Scotland, has been taken several times about the Carse at the mouth of the Nith upon the same line of coast, but has not previously been observed so far northward.

The stake nets frequently take specimens for which they are not properly set. Birds are occasionally drowned therein: diving after fish they get into the netted houses and cannot find their way out.

The tunny, *Thynnus vulgaris*, has been taken in them; and Mr Beattie has in his lobby the head of a swordfish, *Xiphias gladius*, which was entangled in 1852 or ’53 in the net opposite the house.

Respecting the archaeological finds from the Newbie cist sites it is apparent that Dr Grierson acquired a fragment of the food vessels described above - this, decorated with whipped cord impressions, transferred in the mid 1960s to Dumfries Museum. A further apparent fragment, “23 by 16 mm and 18mm thick, from a sand dune near the shore” at ‘Newby Hill’ is attributed to W F Cormack in J N Graham Ritchie’s ‘Beaker Pottery in South-West Scotland’. The neolithic at Newbie is represented in the Dumfries Museum collections by ‘a tanged scraper in grey chert or mudstone 26mm long found eroding from the cliff’ and presented in April 1974 by our late member Robert Little of East Hayrigg.

---

10 One of the Clouded yellows.
11 Mr William Lennon, Crichton Royal Institution, elected January 6th, 1863. One of the ‘Heads of Sections’ - appointed April 5th, 1864 for the zoology department. Lectured to the Society on various occasions on the rarer lepidoptera of the district.
12 ‘The Grierson Collection, Thornhill and its Dispersal’ by A E Truckell, *Transactions*, Series III, Vol 43, p.67. There is no reference to this item in Grierson’s MS catalogue but it is noted in the printed catalogue of G F Black’s redisplay of 1894.
13 W F Cormack has indicated, per. comm., that this entry may represent an additional item of beaker discovered by the late Robert Little of East Hayrigg.
The Galloway Pony or Nag

One of the many problems regarding writing about the Galloway Pony or Nag arises from the uncertainty of its origin. While some experts conclude that it is an indigenous breed others have speculated on alternative sources. Others favour the view that it was descended from horses left behind from the Roman occupation, and has given rise to the Fell pony of the Lake District on the English side of the Solway Firth, and the Galloway on the Scottish. Although Robert Beck, in his book *Scotland's Native Horse its history, breeding and survival*, quotes John Walker, writing in the 18th Century, as stating that according to tradition it was introduced from Spain by Fergus, Lord of Galloway in the 12th Century. Perhaps such matters are best left to the experts and we should content ourselves with the Oxford English Dictionary definition of the Galloway as ‘One of a small but strong breed of horses peculiar to Galloway; hence a small-sized horse especially for riding’.

In ‘Farming’ by John McFadzean in *Mochrum - A Parish History* (1994) the legend is repeated that Robert the Bruce was mounted on a Galloway at the Battle of Bannockburn when he defeated Sir Henry de Bohun and slew him. However, one of the problems of this account is that most representations of the battle show Bruce to have been heavily armoured and as such his mount is unlikely to have been a Galloway. Indeed Bishop Leslie in his *History of Scotland* (1578) makes this very point that ‘Galloway Horses are small and fast but not fit for carrying an armoured man’.

What is known without fear of contradiction is that the Galloway was highly regarded for its speed and endurance and retained this position up to the nineteenth century. In 1594 Shakespeare was to write in the second part of *King Henry the Fourth* ‘Know we not Galloway Nags’ which shows how far the fame of the Galloway had spread. While in 1713 an article in the *Guardian* stated that ‘If any member purchase a horse of his own riding above 14 hands and an half in height that horse shall be sold, a Scotch Galloway bought in its stead for him, and the surplus of the money shall treat the Club’.

The Galloway was also ideally suited for use by the Border Reivers as it was fast over short distances and was capable of sufficient endurance to outrun pursuing riders. According to legend during one of the raids a Scottish raider was killed and his horse was found wandering by an English farmer. As he found it eating the heather he gave it the name Lingcropper and used it as a stud animal with considerable success.

By the beginning of the nineteenth century the Galloway had fallen from favour and was losing position to larger draught animals which were more suitable for agricultural work. In 1801 the *Dumfries Weekly Journal* carried the following advertisement:

‘Dumfries Races by Galloway

In the month of September, or in the beginning of October next, as will be hereafter more particularly advertised a PLATE OF FIFTY POUNDS will be given by the Dumfries and Galloway Hunt, to be run over the Course of Tinwald Downs, by HORSES BRED IN SCOTLAND not exceeding 14 hands high, and carrying not less than 12 stone.- The object of the Hunt in giving this Plate, being to recover the breed of GALLOWAYS now almost lost, it is their contemplation annually to give a PLATE on similar terms at the Dumfries Races’.

However, whatever the good intentions of the Hunt the battle seems to have been lost, as evidenced by the Rev. Samuel Smith’s 1813 *Agricultural Survey of Galloway*: the Survey indicates the displacement of the Galloway by the Clydesdale and refers to by-gone years when ‘Ten, twelve or fourteen horses would not have been reckoned sufficient for the operations of husbandry which are now performed by two or three’.
In addition, an 1840 description contained in *The Clydesdale Horse* by Eric Blair paints a picture of further decline and degeneration of the breed from the high point of previous centuries - ‘As mostly of a dirty kind of brown, with little hair on the legs, carried on top of the ankles like a heather broom. They had thin heads, long backs, and slatey ribs, and were also bad feeders’. A contrast which is even more pronounced when compared with William Youatt’s description in 1866 - ‘A horse between 13 and 14 hands in height is called a Galloway from a beautiful breed of little horses once found in the south of Scotland. The pure Galloway was said to be nearly 14 hands high and sometimes more, of a bright bay, or brown, with black legs, small head and neck, and peculiarly deep and clean legs’.

Today the breed is extinct although, according to the Fell Pony Society, there is considerable Galloway blood incorporated in the Fell Pony. This is in part due to the inter-border trade between Scotland and England but is also due to the wagering which took place at trotting matches between the Scots with their Galloway’s and the English and their Fell Ponies, so the genetic pool is not completely lost.

Evidence also exists that there was a thriving market in Galloway’s which were shipped from Glencaple in south-west Scotland to America where they were used for racing. They were extremely fast over the first quarter mile and thus became known as the ‘quarter horse’.

The fact that the Galloway is now extinct is a matter for regret and it is unfortunate that it is lost to future generations. However, before World War I, Gatehouse had a Horse Breeding Society and its secretary D Y Veitch, Low Creoch, wrote to the *Galloway News* stating ‘The Gatehouse District Horse-Breeding Society still has charge for the revival of the Galloway pony …. the animal to be aimed at should be of the old Galloway type, that is, with good shoulders, a short back, heavy quarters, and short canon bones, but considerably larger than the old Galloway was, as we must try to breed what Sir Matthew Wallace termed a utility animal’. Unfortunately, I have been unable to determine whether any practical attempts were made to achieve this aim or whether the Galloway remains firmly lost in the past.


Now this is how a book with such a title should be written! The chapter heads tell us a good deal - The Landscape - Prehistoric beginnings - The Romans and the land of the Carvetii - *Lugavallium*, the *civitas* capital - Settlement in the hinterland - Roman society and the economy - The post-Roman period and the kingdom of Rheged - and a copious list of ‘Further reading’ in which our Society and the Museum get full credit: R.C.Reid, Eric Birley, Ian Richmond, Charles Thomas - and the late Daphne Brooke’s *Wild Men and Holy Places* - all figure in the list.

While a very full picture of the development of Carlisle itself during the Roman period is given the Solway and Dumfriesshire are also well covered. At the beginning of the preface the author * Price to members of the Society £14.99
quotes Sir Mortimer Wheeler - ‘Too often we dig up mere things, unrepentantly forgetful that our proper aim is to dig up people’ - and this indeed is what he tries to do throughout the book. He says ‘indeed the Solway Firth is one of the forgotten corners of Britain’ commenting that so much of our archaeology concentrates on the great centres of population. He goes on to cover our area from the end of the Ice Ages, covering the Mesolithic and onwards to the Iron Age, dealing with the progress from hunting-gathering to farming, the Neolithic and Bronze Age, traces of religion and the development of farming techniques. On the subject of ploughing one of the illustrations show the writer of this review bearing the Lochmaben Ard (plough) on his shoulder, and he mentions the ard-head found under Milton Crannog during Mrs Piggott’s excavation there. The many illustrations are very good, including the Balmacellian Mirror and copper mount, the Lochar Moss Torc and the Torrs horned chamfrein.

The author takes Carlisle, Cumberland and Dumfriesshire from 72 A.D. and Petilius Cerialis onwards in full detail up to the Roman departure traditionally in 410 A.D. - and then goes on to the post-Roman period - a period of much interest to many of us. He points out that the best archaeological clues to what happened in the Roman to post-Roman transition are found at the Hadrian’s Wall fort at Birdoswald and in the probable civital capital at Carlisle, both of which have been extensively investigated. At Carlisle evidence comes both from the fort and the town. Excavations in 2000 and 2001 in the central range of the fort, have provided clear evidence for the continued use after the end of the fourth century of the headquarters building as well as buildings adjacent to the south side of the via principalis. It is far from clear how long the substantially built principia continued in use but we know that St Cuthbert apparently saw a fountain in the seventh century (implying a continuing piped water supply) and William of Malmesbury, writing in the earliest years of the twelfth century, had seen a Roman vaulted building bearing an inscription to Mars or Victory. There are suggestions that timber buildings, perhaps incorporating Roman walls or foundations, were also in use at the same time.

The picture we have of the Roman fort in the fifth century is therefore one in which some substantial stone buildings not only survived, but probably continued to be inhabited in some form, while other buildings in the vicinity were to include timber elements, and two of the principal roads were maintained in use. He covers the Dark Ages evidence from Dumfriesshire and Whithorn - Hoddam, Ruthwell, Tynron Doon, possible occupation at Castle O’er, and studies the Rheged evidence in detail, concentrating on Urien and his family.

A reviewer should not normally interpose himself - but the references to so many of my friends and helpers, and to sites with which I had something to do - I found the Lochmaben ard propped dusty against the wall of the balcony of Kirkcudbright Museum, and was on Milton Crannog with Mrs Piggott when a workman reached down among the timbers and pulled out the beautiful, golden ard-head, the grain of the wood clear, only to darken as we watched and the air hit it - man, this was my life! He mentions Wardlaw and Caerlaverock: I worked there in 1948-51 and was digging at Carzield under the direction by post of Eric Birley by May 1948 - and I worked there for nearly 20 years - James Bowie, my Museum Committee vice-chairman had worked as an apprentice to James Barbour, his later partner, at Birrens in the 1890s. Ah yes, a very well written book and one we needed very much.

A.E.Truckell.
William Fleming Cormack (1920-2002) - An Appreciation

William Fleming Cormack (Bill) the second son of Mr & Mrs David Cormack was born at Royal Bank house in Lockerbie in 1920. He received his early education at Lockerbie, Moffat and Merchiston Castle School, Edinburgh. His university studies were interrupted when, in 1940, he enlisted in the Argyll & Sutherland Highlanders. Following a spell with the 15th Battalion in the Orkneys, he joined the 7th Battalion and was transferred to Egypt in 1942 as part of the 51st Highland Division of the Eighth Army and there took part in the Battle of Alamein in October of the same year. Taken prisoner at Gerbini in Sicily he was in several POW camps in Italy and then Germany, notably OFLAG VA at Weinsberg. Promoted Captain on his return to Britain, he was able to resume his law studies in 1946, graduated MA, LLB and obtained his WS qualification during 1949 - and later that same year joined his father in the family business ‘Cormack and Byers, WS’ in Lockerbie, where he worked until his retirement in 1981. He died on 1st August 2002.

For over 50 years Bill was associated with local and national archaeological and antiquarian societies. His association with this society commenced with his election in 1951 - following in the footsteps of his father David and grandfather John who had been elected, respectively, in February 1913 and June 1893. He was appointed a member of Council in 1961; a Vice-President for the period 1964-67; and in 1979 appointed, under Rule 10, a Fellow of the Society in recognition of his having ‘done outstanding scientific work’. In 1964 he was appointed Business Editor of the Transactions - and thus continued until the time of his death. Very early in his editorship, 1965, he was principally responsible for the introduction of the present green-covered crown quarto format of the volumes. Under his detailed and diligent editorship he produced some 35 annual volumes - and, additionally, the ‘Cruggleton Castle’ monograph and the ‘Index to the First and Second Series of the Transactions’. To this workload was added the editorial work associated with the work of the Ann Hill Committee - of which he was a founder member. As well as his meticulous editorial skills, he brought to the Ann Hill Committee an enormous wealth of advice and information. In particular he advised the engagement of Roger Mercer to take charge of the archaeological and buildings survey of Kirkpatrick Fleming, and this in turn gave access to the skills of a variety of experts in their respective fields. A particularly enjoyable aspect of many Ann Hill committee meetings was the period after the formal business when he would lead the conversation through a multitude of byways of archaeology, history and indeed many other subjects. All these various volumes of publication will stand for years to come as a fitting monument to his memory.

His own publications and scholarship were of the highest standard; he published widely on topics ranging from the Mesolithic to 19th century traditions. He was an excellent field-walker with a ‘nose’ for a significant find - no matter how unpromising the locality. These finds generally saw an early appearance in Discovery and Excavation in Scotland and the presentation of the artifacts to the appropriate local museum - his work as an excavator was also renowned. He had a particular interest in the Mesolithic and was involved in much of the early identification of coastal sites. He excavated, among others, the Mesolithic sites of Low Clone and Barsalloch; a Bronze Age cairn site in Luce Sands; prehistoric sites at Kirkburn, Beckton and Harthill, all near Lockerbie; Dinwoodieg, Annandale and a corn-drying kiln at Airylick, Port William. Rising to the challenge made by the late Raleigh Radford at the Society’s Centenary Meeting in 1962, over the location of early church sites, he turned his attention to local parish churches. There his local knowledge and research on landscape, artefacts and oral traditions lead to the discovery and subsequent excavation of the important early church site of Barhobble. The results of these excavations, carried out with the help of his wife and other dedicated members from 1984-94 were published in an exemplary fashion in the dedicated Volume 70 of the Transactions. Visitors to the excavations were always highly impressed with the immaculate presentation of the site and the information and welcome given to them.
He was also an active member of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, to which he was elected a fellow in 1961, serving as a council member from 1967-70 and vice president from 1970-73. Bill was on the Board of Trustees of the National Museum of Antiquities of Scotland from 1972 until the establishment of the National Museums of Scotland in 1985.

In 1995 he was awarded an MBE for services to archaeology in SW Scotland and in 1998 the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland presented their ‘Dorothy Marshall Medal’ for his outstanding service to archaeology for nearly half a century.

Besides archaeology, Bill had many wide-ranging interests. He is survived by his wife Sheila, two children, two grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

J Williams

Bibliography of W F Cormack

Transactions of this Society:

1966  ‘Northumbrian Coins from Luce Sands’. Transactions Vol 42 p. 149.
      ‘Barhobble, Mochrum Excavation of a Forgotten Church Site in Galloway’. Ibid, p 6-106.
1998 ‘Obituary - Professor Anne S Robertson’, ibid p. 122.
‘Review - Seven Centuries in the Royal Four Towns of Lochmaben by Anne Fairn’, Ibid, p. 325.
‘Obituary - Raleigh Radford’ (co-author), Ibid p. 239.
‘Drengs and Drings’ *Transactions* Vol 74 p. 61.
2001 ‘Review - Galloway, a Land Apart by Andrew McCulloch’, *Transactions* Vol 75, p. 188.

**Publications in Journals other than the *Transactions* and elsewhere**

*George Petrie (Orkney Antiquary)*, MS Notes (with Margt. Watters and Sheila Cormack), Copy with Orkney Archivist.
Obituary - Jack Gillespie Scott *Scottish Archaeological News*.

**Entries in Discovery and Excavation in Scotland not included above.**

1955 Pottery find at Crawthat Cottage, Middlebie Parish.
1962 Flint scraper found at Shuttlefield, Lockerbie.
1963 Mesolithic sites around Luce Bay
Bronze buckle find from Luce Sands, Old Luce Parish.
Flint slug knife from Kilfinnan, Old Luce Parish.
Flint knife from Redkirk Point, Gretna Parish.
1964 Mesolithic sites at Mull Glen and Drummore, Kirkmaiden Parish and Innerwell, Kirkinner Parish.
Bronze penannular brooch, 2 black farthings of James III from Luce Sands, Old Luce Parish.
Mesolithic site at Dalton Hook, Dryfesdale Parish.
1965  Mesolithic site reported at Gillespie, Old Luce Parish.
Mesolithic sites at Gillfoot, Maxwellfield and Tallowqhairn, Kirkbean Parish.
Petit-tranchet arrowhead found on Kirkburn, Dryfesdale Parish.
Sixpence of Elizabeth I reported found at Twiglees, Eskdalemuir Parish.
1966  Mesolithic site at Brocklerigg, St Mungo Parish.
1967  Bronze penannular brooch and Anglian coin from Luce Sands.
Roman coin reported found at Wigtown.
Romano-British glass bangle find at Kirkhill, St Abbs.
1968  Mesolithic site reported at Monreith, Glasserton Parish.
1969  Mesolithic site at Grennan, Stoneykirk Parish.
1973  Kerb grave at Valtos, Lewis.
Flints and pottery at Ard Nisabost, Borve and Hushinish, Harris.
Flint scraper found at Newbie, Annan Parish.
1976  Bronze pin, spindle whorl etc, Torrs Warren, Old Luce Parish.
1982  Mesolithic site, glass bangle frag. etc, at Portankill, Kirkmaiden Parish.
Whorl, shell midden and mesolithic site at Sheddock, Whithorn Parish.
1983  Inscribed stones in wall of 10 N. Bank Street, Wigtown.
Stone jetty in Auchenmalg Bay, Old Luce Parish.
Shell midden at Sheddock, Whithorn Parish, C-14 dated.
Causeway etc at Rough Loch, Mochrum Parish.
Pottery and flints at Cruggleton Castle, Sorbie Parish.
1984  Flint scraper find reported from Airylick, Mochrum Parish
Mesolithic site at Kilfillan, Sorbie Parish.
Scratch sun-dial at Kirkmadrine, Sorbie Parish.
1985  Flint scatter etc at Carlin Stone, Derrie, Mochrum Parish.
Mesolithic site at Bladnoch, Kirkinner Parish.
Mesolithic site at Portyerrock, Whithorn Parish.
1986  Flint knife from Falhaar, Whithorn Parish.
1988  Burnt mounds at Falhaar, Whithorn Parish and Eggerness, Sorbie Parish.
Compass-inscribed circles on wall of Kirkmadrine, Sorbie Parish.
1995  Polished stone axe find reported from Dixons, Tundergarth Parish.
1996  ?Chapel, occupation material, Cill Choinnich, Colonsay & Oronsay Parish.
Medieval pottery, Whitekirk Mains, Whitekirk & Tynemouth Parish.
Medieval pottery and glass fragment, Whitekirk Mains, Whitekirk & Tyningham Parish.
Proceedings 2001-2002

5th October 2001
Annual General Meeting
Speaker: Mr Patrick Crichton - ‘From Pax Romana to Pax Britannica: Policing the Frontier’ (Presidential Address)

19th October
Speaker: Innes Macleod - ‘Merthyr Tydfil, Whitechapel and the Dumfries and Galloway connection’

2nd November
Speaker: Mrs Jane Brann - ‘There’s Archaeology out there! The local authority archaeology service in Dumfries and Galloway’

16th November
Speaker: Mr Alan Saville - ‘First people: the Mesolithic Archaeology of Scotland’

7th December
Speaker: Mr Keith Kirk - ‘The Solway Coast’

18th January 2002
Speaker: Miss M Stewart - ‘From Cutlasses to Fingerprints: A Century of the Constabularies of Dumfries and Galloway, 1850-1950’

1st February
Speaker: Mr D Fairlamb - ‘Mersehead RSPB Reserve’

15th February
Speaker: Mr P Yeoman - ‘Footsore and Penitent: On Pilgrimage in Medieval Scotland’

1st March
Members’ Night
Speakers: Mr R McEwen - ‘Glimpses of Old Lockerbie’
Mrs J Brann - ‘Recent Developments in Regional Archaeology’
Dr C Brydon - ‘Jane Boyd’s Old Moffat’

15th March
Special General Meeting
Speaker: Mr N Anderson - ‘The Buchanites’

23rd March
Speaker: Mr S Faed - ‘The Faed Family of Artists’
This meeting was held in Kirkcudbright
Publications funded by the Ann Hill Research Bequest

The History and Archaeology of Kirkpatrick Fleming Parish

No.1 Ann Hill and her Family. A Memorial, by D. Adamson (1986)

No.2* Kirkpatrick Fleming Poorhouse, by D. Adamson (1986)

No.3* Kirkpatrick Fleming Miscellany
   Mossknow Game Register 1875
   Diary of J. Gordon Graham 1854
       edited by D. Adamson and I.S. MacDonald (1987)

No.4* Middlebie Presbytery Records, by D. Adamson (1988)

No.5* Kirkpatrick Fleming Miscellany
   How Sir Patrick Maxwell worsted the Devil
   Fergus Graham of Mossknow and the Murder at Kirkpatrick
       both by W.F. Cormack (1989)

No.6 Kirkpatrick Fleming, Dumfriesshire - An Anatomy of a Parish in
   South West Scotland, by Roger Mercer and others (1997) – Hardback, out of print;
   Reprint in laminated soft cover, 1997, £20 plus postage and packing (£3.40 U.K. only)


   Nos.1 to 5 and No.7 are crown quarto in size with a 2-colour titled card cover.
   Publications marked * are reprinted from the Transactions

The Records of Kirkpatrick Fleming Parish

No.1 Old Parish Registers of Kirkpatrick Fleming, 1748-1854, indexed and in 5 parts

No.2 Kirkpatrick Fleming Census 1851

No.3 Kirkpatrick Fleming Census 1861

No.4 Kirkpatrick Fleming Census 1871

No.5 Kirkpatrick Fleming Census 1841

No.6 Kirkpatrick Fleming Census 1881

No.7 Kirkpatrick Fleming Census 1891

No.8 Kirkpatrick Fleming Graveyard Inscriptions

The Record series is duplicated in A4 size with a titled card cover

Information on the availability and prices of Ann Hill Publications can be obtained from
Mr R. McEwen, 5 Arthur's Place, Lockerbie DG11 2EB
Publications of the Society


Prices: Single Volumes (to Members) - Current Vol. £6, previous Vols. £4. All plus post & packing.

Single Volumes (to non-Members) - £6 for one; £5 for 2nd; £4 for 3rd. All plus post & packing.

Runs of Volumes - on application to the Hon. Librarian.

A List of the Flowering Plants of Dumfriesshire and Kirkcudbrightshire, by James McAndrew, 1882.*

Birrens and its Antiquities, by Dr J.Macdonald and James Barbour, 1897.*

Communion Tokens, with a Catalogue of those of Dumfriesshire, by Rev. H.A.Whitelaw, 1911.*

History of Dumfries Post Office, by J.M.Corrie, 1912.*

History of the Society, by H.S.Gladstone, 1913.*

The Ruthwell Cross, by W.G.Collingwood, 1917.*


Notes on the Birds of Dumfriesshire, by H.S.Gladstone, 1923*.

A Bibliography of the Parish of Annan, by Frank Millar, F.S.A.Scot, 1925*.

Thomas Watling, Limner of Dumfries, by H.S.Gladstone, 1938*.

The Marine Fauna and Flora of the Solway Firth Area, by Dr E.J.Perkins, 1972, Corrigenda to same*.

Birrens (Blatobulgium), by Prof. A.S.Robertson, 1975*.


Index to Transactions, Series 1 and 2, £2.00 plus postage and packing.

Electronic Index to Series 1, 2 and 3 - development copies available on CD-ROM at £10.00 inc. p&p from Mr J.Williams.

* Indicates out of print, but see Editorial.

Reprints

The Early Crosses of Galloway by W.G.Collingwood from Vol. x (1922-3), 37pp text, 49 crosses illustrated and discussed, £1.00 plus post (UK) to Members.

Flowering Plants etc. of Kirkcudbrightshire by Olga Stewart, from vol. lxv (1990), 68pp. Price on application to Hon. Librarian.

Publications in print may be obtained from the Hon. Librarian, Mr R.Coleman, 4 Lovers Walk, Dumfries DG1 1LP

Kirkpatrick Fleming, Dumfriesshire - an Anatomy of a Parish in south-west Scotland, by Roger Mercer and others, Hardback*. Reprint in laminated soft cover, 1997. This publication was funded by the Ann Hill Research Fund - see inside back cover for details of price and availability.