

---

# **NORTH PENNINES ARCHAEOLOGY LTD**

---

**Project Report No. CP 460/I/08**

**PHASE I  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
EVALUATION OF THE  
DRUIDICAL JUDGEMENT SEAT,  
BRACKENBER MOOR,  
APPLEBY-IN-WESTMORLAND,  
CUMBRIA**

**NGR: NY 658 334**



**FOR  
APPLEBY ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP**

Martin Railton, BA Hons MA AIFA  
North Pennines Archaeology Ltd  
Nenthead Mines Heritage Centre,  
Nenthead,  
Alston  
CUMBRIA  
CA9 3PD  
Tel: (01434) 382045  
Fax: (01434) 382294  
Email: [m.railton@nparchaeology.co.uk](mailto:m.railton@nparchaeology.co.uk)

September 2008



---

# CONTENTS

---

	<i>Page</i>
1 INTRODUCTION AND LOCATION.....	1
2 HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND.....	2
3 PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORK .....	3
4 AIMS AND METHODOLOGY .....	4
4.1 Project Aims and Objectives.....	4
4.2 Trial Trench Evaluation .....	5
4.3 Health and Safety .....	6
4.4 Publication .....	6
4.5 Archive.....	6
5 PHASE I EVALUATION RESULTS.....	7
5.1 Introduction .....	7
5.2 Trench 2 .....	8
5.3 Trench 3 .....	10
5.4 Trench 4 .....	11
5.5 Discussion .....	13
6 THE FINDS .....	15
6.1 Introduction .....	15
6.2 Pottery .....	16
6.3 Flint .....	18
6.4 Other Finds.....	24
7 ENVIRONMENTAL SAMPLES .....	25
7.1 Introduction .....	25
7.2 Results.....	25
7.3 Discussion and interpretation.....	27
8 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	29
8.1 Conclusions.....	29
8.2 Recommendations.....	30
8.3 Project Design .....	31
9 BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	32
APPENDIX I: CONTEXTS .....	34
APPENDIX II: ILLUSTRATIONS .....	35
APPENDIX III: UPDATED PROJECT DESIGN.....	36

---

# CONTENTS

---

## LIST OF PLATES

Plate 1: Aerial view of the Druidical Judgement Seat earthwork.....	Page 4
Plate 2: View of the excavated section across the earthwork enclosure banks and ditch in in the northern end of Trench 2 .....	Page 7
Plate 3: Northern leg of Trench 2, showing the inner bank (305) and capping stones (306), with the ditch [302] beyond .....	Page 7
Plate 4: Section through the inner bank (305) showing capping stones (306) .....	Page 9
Plate 5: East-west leg of Trench 2, showing dispersed stones (307) in the centre of the trench .....	Page 9
Plate 6: Excavated stone-lined pit (204) in Trench 3.....	Page 10
Plate 7: Section through stone-lined pit (204) in Trench 3.....	Page 11
Plate 8: Remains of the earthwork enclosure inner bank (105) in Trench 4.....	Page 12

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Location map .....	Appendix II
Figure 2: Trench location plan.....	Appendix II
Figure 3: Plan and section of archaeological deposits in Trench 2.....	Appendix II
Figure 4: Plan and section of archaeological deposits in Trench 3.....	Appendix II
Figure 5: Plan of archaeological deposits in Trench 4 following topsoil removal ....	Appendix II
Figure 6: Plan and sections of excavated archaeological deposits in Trench 4 .....	Appendix II

---

## SUMMARY

---

In July 2008 North Pennines Archaeology Ltd. were invited by Appleby Archaeology Group to supervise an archaeological evaluation on land at Brackenber Moor, Appleby-in-Westmorland, Cumbria, as part of a community archaeology project. The fieldwork was undertaken jointly by North Pennines Archaeology Ltd. (NPA), members of the group, and the public, under the supervision of NPA staff. The project was funded by a grant from The Cumberland and Westmorland Archaeological and Antiquarian Society (CWAAS), and was timed to coincide with National Archaeology Week, which is organised by the Council for British Archaeology (CBA).

Brackenber Moor has been occupied since at least the Bronze Age, and a number of burial monuments survive from this period, including a number of possible Bronze Age burial cairns. A number of possible prehistoric settlement sites exist in the area, which could potentially date to the Iron Age or Romano-British periods. The Druidical Judgement Seat, on the southwest side of the moor, is a D-shaped enclosure, comprising an outer bank and inner ditch, with a single entrance on the northwest side. Similar sites in Cumbria are usually interpreted as Iron Age or Romano-British farmsteads. However, no archaeological features are visible within the enclosure, and no archaeological evidence has been available with which to date the site.

This report presents the results of the first phase (Phase I) of an archaeological evaluation, which comprised the excavation of a series of trial trenches, targeting The Druidical Judgement Seat, a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The complete project will also include landscape survey, to set the results of the trial trench evaluation in context, including geophysical survey and metric survey at other possible archaeological sites on Brackenber Moor (Railton 2008). By necessity the project was divided into two phases, due to uncertainties regarding the group's funding bid. However, having since been successful in their bid, it is fully expected that Phase II of the evaluation will be completed in 2009.

It was evident from the Phase I trial trench evaluation that the earthwork enclosure originally comprised an inner bank and outer ditch occupying a natural headland, with an outer bank on the northwest side to further isolate the headland from the ridge of land to the west. The banks were constructed with material excavated from the enclosure ditch, and the inner bank at least was originally reinforced with cobbles from a nearby stream. These may have also served to support a palisade or fence, evidence for which consists of a single posthole in one of the trenches. The banks appear to have been truncated by later ploughing, which has undoubtedly also disturbed features within the enclosure. No suitable deposits were recovered with which to date the enclosure ditch and banks during the Phase I evaluation, and dating the earthwork remains a priority for Phase II.

An assemblage of flint tools and flakes were recovered, which are typologically dated to the late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age. All of the flint finds were residual, and are likely relate to earlier activity at the site, possibly associated with the nearby Bronze Age burial monuments. The only internal feature revealed by the evaluation comprised a possible stone-lined pit. Interpretation of this feature was difficult given the small size of the trench. An Early Bronze Age button/thumb nail scraper, a blade and a flint flake were recovered from its fill, although these finds are also considered to be residual.

A single irregularly-shaped body sherd of hand-made pottery was recovered from a layer of ploughsoil, to the west of the stone-lined pit. The dating of the pottery was problematic due to the lack of comparable assemblages, the general scarcity of pottery from later prehistoric sites in Cumbria, and the absence of a chronological framework for handmade fabrics of this type.

---

## SUMMARY

---

Consultation with a number of pottery specialists indicated that the pottery could date from anywhere between the late Bronze Age and early post-Roman period, although a mid-Iron Age date is not unlikely. The pottery was recovered from a possible plough soil, so cannot be associated with clearly stratified deposits. However, it is considered that the potsherd is likely to relate to the occupation of the enclosure, and remains the only evidence for possible Iron Age occupation of the site recovered to date.

From the three trenches excavated, a total of 5 soil samples were collected for the retrieval of plant macrofossil assemblages, as well as other artefacts and ecofacts. Features sampled included the fills of the enclosure ditch, a pit deposit, and a posthole fill. However, the site provided poor conditions for the preservation of plant remains. All the samples contained small amounts of charred remains, but the majority of the remains were thought to have been introduced through modern landscape management practices, and probably do not relate to the archaeological contexts.

It is believed that The Druidical Judgement Seat was subject to ploughing during the Napoleonic period, when large parts of Brackenber Moor were planted with arable crops. This activity is believed to be responsible for the paucity of archaeological features within the enclosure. Following this episode, the earthwork was apparently abandoned, and the characteristic earth hummocks which cover the site were formed by frost action on the former plough soil. The excavation has also revealed evidence for a charred layer of heather, which had previously colonised the site, and was evidently subject to management through burning. It is believed that this layer could be the source of some of the charred material recovered from the soil samples.

This first phase of the archaeological evaluation has gone some way towards fulfilling the project objectives, including establishing the nature, extent and state of preservation of archaeological features associated with The Druidical Judgement Seat. The artefacts recovered so far indicate activity at the site during Early Bronze Age, and tentative evidence for occupation of the enclosure during the Iron Age or Romano-British periods. Having secured the required funding, it is expected that Phase II of the evaluation will be completed by Appleby Archaeology Group in 2009, and subsequently a final report on the project will be submitted to English Heritage and The Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society. It is hoped that the Phase II evaluation will provide further evidence regarding the nature of early activity at the site, and provide much-needed dating evidence for the enclosure. To this end, some minor alterations to the original project design are proposed. A revised project design is included in Appendix III.

The pottery, although not closely datable, has added to the small number of known examples of handmade pottery from later prehistoric sites in Cumbria. The recovery of material suitable for C14 dating from secure contexts remains a priority for the project. In particular, the recovery of pottery associated with material suitable for C14 dating, or with artefacts with established chronological correlates would be an ideal outcome of future work at the site.

It is recommended that the flint tools from both phases of the evaluation be compared with other assemblages from Cumbria, and the final results of the project be published in the Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society.

---

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

North Pennines Archaeology would like to thank Appleby Archaeology Group for commissioning the project and Appleby Golf Club for granting permission for the fieldwork. Thanks are also due to Mark Brennand, Senior Historic Environment Officer, Jo Mackintosh, Historic Environment Record Officer at Cumbria County Council, and Andrew Davidson of English Heritage for their advice and support during the project. Thanks also to Margaret and Tom Brass at Espland Farm for their help during the fieldwork. North Pennines Archaeology would also like to extend their thanks to Carol Allen, Christopher Cumberpatch, and Blaise Vyner for their expertise in the field of prehistoric pottery. The project was kindly funded by grants from Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society and the Cumbria County Council Neighbourhood Forum.

The fieldwork was conducted by Margaret Albon, Christine Britton, Jennifer Callis, Marjorie Campion, Stanley Darke, Heather Edwards, Jo Emsley, Pete Emsley, David Greenwood, Tony Greenwood, Carol Mitchell, Maureen Moore, Jenny McWilliam, Peter McWilliam, Phyllis Rouston, Richard Stevens, T Turner, Ian Walker, Ann Wardle, and Derrick Watson, under the direction of Martin Railton, with the assistance of Angus Clarke, Kevin Mounsey and Patricia Shaw of North Pennines Archaeology. The flint was assessed by David Jackson, and the environmental samples were assessed by Patricia Shaw, North Pennines Archaeology Environmental Supervisor. The pottery was assessed by Christopher Cumberpatch and Blaise Vyner. This report was prepared and illustrated by Martin Railton, Project Manager, North Pennines Archaeology.

## **1 INTRODUCTION AND LOCATION**

- 1.1 In July 2008 North Pennines Archaeology Ltd. were invited by Appleby Archaeology Group to supervise an archaeological evaluation on land at Brackenber Moor, Appleby-in-Westmorland, Cumbria, as part of a community archaeology project. The fieldwork was undertaken jointly by North Pennines Archaeology Ltd. (NPA), members of the group, and the public, under the supervision of NPA staff. The project was funded by a grant from The Cumberland and Westmorland Archaeological and Antiquarian Society (CWAAS), and was timed to coincide with National Archaeology Week, which is organised by the Council for British Archaeology (CBA).
- 1.2 This report presents the results of the first phase (Phase I) of the archaeological evaluation, which comprised the excavation of a series of trial trenches, targeting a possible prehistoric earthwork known as The Druidical Judgement Seat, a Scheduled Ancient Monument (County Monument 427). The complete project will also include landscape survey, to set the results of the trial trench evaluation in context, including geophysical survey and metric survey at other possible archaeological sites on Brackenber Moor (Railton 2008). By necessity the project was divided into two phases, due to uncertainties regarding the group's funding bid. However, having since been successful in their bid, it is fully expected that Phase II of the evaluation will be completed in 2009.
- 1.3 Brackenber Moor is situated *c.*3km to the east of Appleby-in-Westmorland, between the settlements of Hilton and Coupland Beck. It comprises 11ha of unenclosed moorland, bounded by the Hilton Beck to the north, enclosed fields to the east and west, and the A66 road to the south (Figure 1). Brackenber Moor is an open common, with a number of local farmers exercising grazing rights. Parts of the moor are used as a golf course, and are managed by Appleby Golf Club.
- 1.4 The Druidical Judgement Seat, occupies a natural headland, with steep banks on the north, east and south sides. It is centred on Ordnance Survey grid reference NY 719 189. This earthwork is the site of a possible prehistoric or Romano-British settlement, about which nothing was known. The Phase I evaluation comprised the excavation of three trenches targeting the earthwork boundary banks and ditch, and part of the earthwork interior (Figure 2).
- 1.5 The solid geology of the area comprises New Red Sandstone, overlain by glacial deposits of boulder clay. George Gill, on the south side of Brackenber Moor is a Site of Special scientific Interest (SSSI), and is well known because of the a series of rocky crags, exhibiting rock formations which were laid down in the Permian Period. A number of wind-blown caves are also known in George Gill. The topography of the area is of undulating character with elevations ranging between *c.*150m and *c.*230m OD. A prominent hill, known as Ketland occupies the southeast corner of Brackenber Moor, with a peak of 192m OD. Flodders Tarn is situated toward the centre of the moor. A minor tributary circumvents the headland from the north, and flows towards Coupland Beck, where it joins Hilton Beck.

## 2 HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

- 2.1 There are 20 known archaeological sites in the immediate vicinity of Brackenber Moor. This information is recorded in the Cumbria County Historic Environment Record (HER).
- 2.2 Brackenber Moor has been occupied since at least the Bronze Age, and a number of burial monuments survive from this period, including a number of possible Bronze Age burial cairns. Three of these are Scheduled Ancient Monuments (HER 1820-1823), but have been disturbed both in antiquity, and in more recent times by illicit metal detecting. Another burial cairn is located to the west of the club house, near Hilton Beck (HER 15896). A number of possible prehistoric settlement sites exist in the area, which could potentially date to the Iron Age or Romano-British periods. The Druidical Judgement Seat, on the southwest side of the moor, is a D-shaped enclosure, comprising an outer bank and inner ditch, with a single entrance on the northwest side (HER 1817). Similar sites in Cumbria are usually interpreted as Iron Age or Romano-British farmsteads. However, no archaeological features were visible within the enclosure, and no archaeological evidence was available with which to date the site.
- 2.3 The present route of the A66 to the east of Coupland Beck, is known to follow the course of the High Street Roman Road (HER 1890). The site of a camp is illustrated on the 1<sup>st</sup> edition Ordnance Survey map of 1861, immediately to the east of Coupland Beck (HER 1815). However, no visible evidence for this survives. The same map illustrates a ‘Roman Fortress’ to the northwest of Coupland Beck, on the north side of the road to Appleby (HER 1816). This has been interpreted as the site of a possible Roman signal station, which survives as a circular earthwork in the corner of the field. An earthwork enclosure on the east side of Brackenber Moor has also been interpreted as the site of a possible Roman signal station (HER 3473). A third possible site is recorded in the Cumbria County Historic Environment Record, situated to the southeast of the Appleby Golf Club clubhouse (HER 1819), however no evidence for this is visible on the ground.
- 2.4 No medieval features are known on Brackenber Moor, but a number of post-medieval agricultural features have been identified on the 1<sup>st</sup> Edition Ordnance Survey map of 1861. Some of these survive as earthworks including possible stack stands (HER 3088), sand pits (HER 15875), gravel pits (HER 15876), quarries (HER 18574 & HER 25689), and a lime kiln (HER15877).
- 2.5 The majority of Brackenber Moor has survived as unenclosed agricultural land into the modern period. The golf course was founded in 1902, and the greens, bunkers and fairways of the present golf course occupy a large part of Brackenber Moor, between Coupland Beck and Brackenber. The Appleby Golf Club now manages the moor, and holds the title of ‘Lord of the Manor’.
- 2.6 A military rifle range is believed to have been located immediately to the west of the Druidical Judgement Seat, on the lower slopes of the Ketland near George Gill in the 1880’s (*pers comm.* Bill Flentje). During the Second World War, parts of Brackenber Moor were used as a temporary army training camp. The concrete foundations of buildings from this period can still be seen near Flodders Tarn, to the northeast of the Appleby Gold Club clubhouse.

### **3 PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORK**

- 3.1 In July 2007, North Pennines Archaeology Ltd., with the help of Appleby Archaeology Group, undertook geophysical surveys of land at Brackenber Moor. This was supported by a grant from Charles Haywood Foundation, which provided the opportunity for members of the group to learn geophysical survey techniques, with the support of North Pennines Archaeology staff.
- 3.2 The geophysical survey area comprised c.0.5ha of land and was located in the southeast corner of Brackenber Moor, close to Espland Farm and was undertaken to target The Druidical Judgement Seat earthwork. Both earth resistance and geomagnetic survey were undertaken (Railton 2007). The work was conducted in accordance an English Heritage Licence (Ref. AA/011404/5), as the site is a Scheduled Ancient Monument, protected by law.
- 3.3 A number of features were detected which could be associated with the former use of the earthwork by the Appleby Golf Club, as indicated on a modern air photograph of the site. These include possible land drains or gullies, and sub-surface deposits, as well as two visible spoil heaps. A modern service pipe was also detected to the north of the enclosure.
- 3.4 The earth resistance survey proved to be the most effective technique for detecting archaeological features at the site, although the presence of earth hummocks over the interior of the earthwork may have masked insubstantial archaeological features. No definite archaeological features were revealed within the interior of the earthwork. Both geophysical survey techniques detected the earth-filled enclosure ditch, and parts of the earthwork banks. In addition, the earth resistance survey detected deposits within the ditch terminals, which suggests that the entrance has been widened at some time.
- 3.5 Given the results of the geophysical survey, further evaluation work was recommended, in order to test the results of the geophysical surveys, and to determine the presence/absence, nature and extent of any archaeological features within the enclosure. It was believed that this could provide valuable information regarding the nature and past use of the site, and provide much needed dating evidence for the earthwork enclosure. In addition it was believed that this could provide a valuable study in terms of assessing the impact of earth hummocks on subsurface archaeological deposits, and the possible masking effect caused by the hummocks to geophysical survey techniques.
- 3.6 In addition to the geophysical survey, members of Appleby Archaeology Group identified a number of previously unrecorded earthworks on Brackenber Moor, comprising an earthwork enclosure on the Ketland, and a series of banks and ditches of unknown date. It is possible that these features are associated with a former field system of prehistoric, Romano-British or medieval date. A number of post-medieval agricultural features were also investigated, including areas of former ridge and furrow cultivation, and possible stack stands.

## 4 AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

### 4.1 Project Aims and Objectives

- 4.1.1 This project forms part of a wider landscape study by members of Appleby Archaeology Group with the aim of developing an understanding of the history and development of Brackenber Moor from prehistoric times to the present day. The project also aims to provide opportunities for community involvement in archaeological research, including training in archaeological techniques and hands-on experience of archaeological work carried out to professional standards. Brackenber Moor has been selected by the group as an area of high archaeological potential, containing archaeological features from several periods, which has seen limited modern disturbance or agricultural improvement, providing an ideal focus for the group's research.
- 4.1.2 One of the primary objectives of the archaeological evaluation was to establish the date and function of the earthwork known as The Druidical Judgement Seat, which was believed to potentially date to the Iron Age or Romano-British Periods (Plate 1). A recent English Heritage document has highlighted the need for further research into this period, and described Cumbria as a 'black hole' in terms of Iron Age archaeology, as it is a region which lacks even a basic Iron Age chronology (*Understanding the British Iron Age: An agenda for action*, Haselgrove 2001, 25). The North West Regional Research Agenda has identified the Eden Valley as an area of high potential in terms of prehistoric rural settlement (Brennand 2007, 41), although this is a subject that is poorly understood at present. The proposed evaluation at Brackenber Moor therefore had the potential to make a contribution to the understanding of Iron Age and Romano-British rural settlement in Cumbria, and meet research objectives as outlined in both regional and national research agendas.



**Plate 1:** Aerial view of the Druidical Judgement Seat earthwork, looking southeast  
(Photograph courtesy of Simon Ledingham, [www.visitcumbria.com](http://www.visitcumbria.com))

## **4.2 Trial Trench Evaluation**

- 4.2.1 North Pennines Archaeology Ltd. produced a project design for the archaeological evaluation (Railton 2008), which was approved by English Heritage prior to the commencement of the fieldwork. A licence for the evaluation was granted by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), as the Druidical Judgement Seat is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM), protected by law. All work was conducted according to the recommendations of the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA 1994).
- 4.2.2 The completed field evaluation as originally designed will involved the excavation of four evaluation trenches (Trenches 1-4), undertaken in order to determine the form, function, date and state of preservation of features associated with the Druidical Judgement Seat (Railton 2008).
- 4.2.3 The Phase I field evaluation comprised the excavation of Trench 2, Trench 3, and Trench 4. However, the excavation of Trench 2 was halted at a depth of 1.6m, which was believed to be the maximum safe depth, given the unstable nature of the subsoil, and permitted width of the trench. Therefore, the full depth of archaeological deposits in this trench was not reached, and it is proposed that this be resolved in the second phase of the evaluation (Phase II).
- 4.2.4 In summary, the main objectives of the field evaluation are:
- to establish the nature, extent and state of preservation of archaeological features associated with The Druidical Judgement Seat;
  - to establish the character of those features in terms of cuts, structures, soil matrices and interfaces.
  - to recover artefactual material, especially that useful for dating purposes;
  - to recover palaeoenvironmental material where it survives in order to understand site and landscape formation processes;
  - to recover samples suitable for radiocarbon dating if these are present;
  - to assess the impact of earth hummocks (caused by frost action) on archaeological deposits at the site.
- 4.2.5 Turf and topsoil were excavated by hand under close archaeological supervision, to either the top of archaeological deposits, or the natural substrate, whichever was observed first. Trenches were subsequently cleaned and all features investigated and recorded according to the North Pennines Archaeology Ltd. standard procedure as set out in the Excavation manual (Giecco 2003).
- 4.2.6 All excavated spoil was sieved on site in order to maximise finds recovery. Finds were returned to the North Pennines Archaeology Ltd. offices at Nenthead for processing. Consultation with appropriate specialists was then undertaken where required.
- 4.2.7 Environmental samples taken during the work were processed under the direction of Patricia Shaw, BSc Hons, North Pennines Archaeology Environmental Supervisor, who also undertook the environmental assessment.

- 4.2.8 The fieldwork programme was followed by an assessment of the data, the process being adopted as set out in the *Management of Archaeological Projects* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, 1991). An updated project design for the Phase II evaluation is included in Appendix III.

### **4.3 Health and Safety**

- 4.3.1 Full consideration was given to health and safety issues during all fieldwork. North Pennines Archaeology Ltd Health and Safety Statement conform to the provisions of the Standing Conference of Archaeological Unit Managers (SCAUM) Health and Safety Manual.
- 4.3.2 A full risk assessment was undertaken to assess all real and potential hazards prior to the commencement of fieldwork. Participants on the project were given a health and safety induction prior to fieldwork commencing.
- 4.3.3 North Pennines Archaeology staff were covered by North Pennines Heritage Trust insurance. Appleby Archaeology Group and invited members of the public were covered by the public liability insurance provided by The Council for British Archaeology for the duration of the fieldwork.

### **4.4 Publication**

- 4.4.1 It is proposed that the findings of the completed evaluation will be published in the *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Archaeological and Antiquarian Society*.
- 4.4.2 One copy of this report will be deposited with the Cumbria County Council Historic Environment Record, where viewing will be available on request.
- 4.4.3 The project is also be registered with the **Online AccesS** to the **Index** of archaeological InvestigationS (**OASIS**), where a digital copy of the report is available.

### **4.5 Archive**

- 4.5.1 All finds belong to the landowner, but initially have been transferred to the North Pennines Archaeology Ltd's premises at Nenthead. Agreement will be sought for the final deposition of finds with a local specialist museum.
- 4.5.2 During and after the excavation, all recovered artefacts were stored in the appropriate conditions to ensure minimal deterioration and loss of information (this included controlled storage, correct packaging, regular monitoring of conditions, and immediate selection for conversation of vulnerable materials). All work was carried out in compliance with IFA Guidelines for Finds Work and those set by UKIC.
- 4.5.3 Ultimately it is recommended that the curation of both finds and the site archive should be vested in Penrith Museum.

## **5 PHASE I EVALUATION RESULTS**

### **5.1 Introduction**

- 5.1.1 The completed field evaluation, as outlined in the project design (Railton 2008), will comprise the excavation of four evaluation trenches at The Druidical Judgement Seat earthwork. One 5m-long and 4m-wide trench (Trench 1) will be excavated over the eastern earthwork ditch terminal and entrance. The previous geophysical survey suggested that the entrance has been widened at this point, potentially sealing earlier archaeological deposits in this area. The excavation of this trench was beyond the scope of the Phase I evaluation.
- 5.1.2 The Phase I evaluation was undertaken between the 12<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> July 2008, to coincide with National Archaeology Week. Three evaluation trenches were excavated in total (Figure 2). A 1m-wide L-shaped trench measuring 15m long north-south and 8m long east-west (Trench 2) was excavated on the north side of the enclosure to investigate a section of the outer bank and ditch, and the most notable internal feature detected on the earth resistance survey of the site. Trench 3 measured 1m by 5m and was excavated to sample the interior of the enclosure and target a possible internal feature detected by the previous geophysical survey. Trench 4 measured 1m by 10m and was excavated across the eastern inner bank including part of the earthwork interior.
- 5.1.3 All excavated deposits were sieved for finds on site, and the topsoil and turf were scanned with a metal detector. At the completion of the Phase I evaluation, all trenches were backfilled with the excavated material, and the turf re-laid by hand.



**Plate 2:** View of the excavated section across the earthwork enclosure banks and ditch in the northern end of Trench 2



**Plate 3:** Northern leg of Trench 2, showing the inner bank (305) and capping stones (306), with the ditch [302] beyond

## **5.2 Trench 2**

- 5.2.1 Following the removal of turf and topsoil by hand, Trench 2 was cleaned to reveal the remains of the banks and ditch of the earthwork enclosure (Figure 3). The ditch was subsequently half-sectioned, the maximum excavated depth of this trench being 1.6m in the centre of the ditch (Plate 2). This was considered the maximum safe depth for the excavation, given the friable nature of the subsoil, and the width of the trench.
- 5.2.2 The natural fine orange sand (311) was encountered at a depth of 0.5m below ground level (bgl) in Trench 2, above which was a 0.3m-deep layer of fine orange-brown sand containing occasional rounded stones (309). This was cut by the ditch [302] of the earthwork enclosure, which was revealed in the central section of Trench 2.
- 5.2.3 The enclosure ditch [302] measured 3.7m wide at the top, with concave sides, and an excavated depth of 1.1m. The excavated section of the enclosure ditch was filled by a 0.6m-depth of red-brown silty sand (308) containing occasional small rounded pebbles. A sample was taken from this deposit for environmental assessment (Section 7, Sample 4).
- 5.2.4 Above this was a darker 0.06m-deep layer of grey-brown silty sand (310), which may be interpreted as a layer of natural silting. Above this was a 0.4m-deep layer of red-brown silty-sand (303), which contained occasional small pebbles and some larger pieces of sandstone. A number of burnt cobbles, measuring *c.*0.1m in diameter, were recovered from this layer, which appeared to be a deliberate deposit. These were interpreted as possible ‘pot-boilers’, which may have been used for heating water. This deposit was also sampled for environmental assessment (Section 7, Sample 3).
- 5.2.5 At the northern end of Trench 2 was a 3.3m-wide, 0.2m-deep deposit of grey-brown silty sand (304), containing frequent inclusions of gravel and occasional rounded cobbles, which formed the outer bank of the earthwork enclosure. A similar 4.5m-wide, 0.2m-deep deposit grey-brown silty sand (305) was revealed to the south of the ditch, forming the inner bank of the earthwork. A number of larger rounded cobbles (306), measuring between 0.2m and 0.3m in diameter, were set in the top of this bank (Plate 3). These were probably brought from the nearby stream to reinforce the top of the bank, the banks themselves having been constructed from material excavated from the ditch (Plate 4).
- 5.2.6 Above the upper ditch fill (303) between the inner and outer banks, (304) and (305), was a 0.3m-deep layer of sandy subsoil (301), interpreted as a possible plough soil. The same sandy subsoil filled the southern east-west leg of Trench 2, from which two flint tools were recovered (Section 6, Find No 2 and Find No 5), and two pieces of unworked flint.
- 5.2.7 Within this subsoil at the southern leg of the trench was a random spread of rounded cobbles and some larger stones (307), aligned approximately northwest to southeast, measuring between 0.15m and 0.4m in diameter (Plate 5). These appeared to have been dislodged by later ploughing, and may originally have formed part of the inner bank, although this was uncertain. These stones corresponded to the location of a geophysical anomaly, detected in the previous earth resistance survey of the site. No other archaeological features were revealed in the southern part of Trench 2.

- 5.2.7 Above these features was a thin 0.06m-deep layer of topsoil and turf, from which a flint blade (Section 6, Find No 6) and some smaller fragments of flint were recovered. Two fragments of modern metal and a round metal object were also recovered from the turf during the metal detector survey (Section 6, Find No 3).



**Plate 4:** Section through the inner bank (305) showing capping stones (306) (looking southwest)



**Plate 5:** East-west leg of Trench 2, showing dispersed stones (307) in the centre of the trench (looking northeast)

### **5.3 Trench 3**

- 5.3.1 The natural fine orange sand (206) was encountered at a depth of 0.5m below ground level (bgl) in Trench 3, which was the maximum excavated depth of this trench. Above the natural sand was a 0.35m-deep layer of orange-brown sandy subsoil containing occasional frequent rounded stones and occasional cobbles (201), interpreted as a possible former plough soil.
- 5.3.2 Above the natural sand, at the northeast end of Trench 3, was a deposit of rounded stones (204) measuring 0.4m wide, and 1.76m across northwest to southeast, which appeared to line a shallow pit (Figure 4, Plate 6). The centre of this feature was filled by a 0.7m-wide, 0.3m-deep deposit of grey-brown silty sand (202), which contained occasional small stones and fragments of charcoal (Plate 7). A flint scraper, blade and flint flake were recovered from this deposit (Section 6, Find No 4, Find No 7 and Find No 8), which was also sampled for environmental assessment (Section 7, Sample 5). Immediately to the east of this feature was a 0.25m-deep deposit of orange-brown silty sand (203), which extended beyond the limits of the trench.



**Plate 6:** Excavated stone-lined pit (204) in Trench 3 (looking west)

- 5.3.3 The features in the northeast end of Trench 3, were indicative of prehistoric occupation, which was supported by the number of finds recovered. However, interpretation of the stone-lined pit was difficult, given the small size of the trench.
- 5.3.4 Above these features was the orange-brown sandy subsoil (201), from which two broken flint blades and some fragments of flint were recovered. A single sherd of prehistoric pottery (Section 6, Find No 1) was also recovered from the west side of

the stone-lined pit. Above this soil was a 0.03m-deep layer of grey-black ash and silty sand (205), interpreted as a burning episode, probably associated with heather management. Above this was a 0.05m-deep layer of turf and topsoil (100), from which four flint flakes were recovered.



**Plate 7:** Section through stone-lined pit (204) in Trench 3 (looking north)

## **5.4 Trench 4**

- 5.4.1 Following the removal of turf and topsoil in Trench 4, the remains of the inner bank (101) of the earthwork enclosure was revealed at the northeast end of the trench (Figure 5). Following the excavation of archaeological features, a slot was excavated at the southwest end of the trench in order to determine the nature of the natural subsoil (Figure 6).
- 5.4.2 The natural glacial gravel (104) was identified at the southwest end of Trench 4, at a depth of 0.6m bgl. Above which was a 0.3m-deep layer of natural fine orange sand (103).
- 5.4.3 At the northeast end of Trench 4 the inner core of the earthwork enclosure bank was identified (Figure 6). This comprised a 1.15m-wide, 0.18m-deep deposit of orange-brown silty sand (105) containing frequent sub-rounded cobbles up to 0.15m in diameter, and occasional larger stones (Plate 8). Immediately to the east of this material was a 0.6m-wide deposit of compacted light brown silty sand (106), which continued beyond the limits of the trench. Cutting this deposit in the northwest trench section was a 0.3m-wide, 0.15m-deep posthole [107], with straight sides and a flat base. This was filled with dark brown-black silty sand (108), which contained a number of sub-rounded stones, interpreted as packing stones. The bank (105) and posthole fill (108) were sampled (Section 7, Sample 1 and Sample 2).
- 5.4.4 Above these deposits was a 3.2m-wide, 0.2m-deep deposit of orange-brown silty sand (101). This material appeared to be the dispersed remains of the truncated inner bank, and was believed to be the result of ploughing. Above this material, filling the southwest end of Trench 4 was a 0.25m-deep layer of yellow-brown sandy subsoil

(102), interpreted as a former plough soil. A number of cobbles and larger rounded stones were revealed in the top of this subsoil, which may have been the ploughed-out remains of the enclosure bank or other structure (Figure 5). A single flint flake was also recovered from this layer.

5.4.6 Cutting the subsoil (102) in the northwest and southeast trench sections were two postholes. The northern posthole [112] was 0.3m wide at the top and 0.3m-deep, with concave sides and a rounded base. This was filled with brown silty sand (113), which contained a number of sub-sounded packing stones. A slot was excavated to determine the full extent of this posthole, which is recorded in the northwest trench section (Figure 6). The second, southern posthole [109] was similar in form, and was 0.35m wide and 0.32m deep, filled with similar brown silty sand (110) containing a number of sub-rounded packing stones. These postholes were stratigraphically later than the earthwork bank, and may be associated with a relatively recent fence or other structure.

5.4.7 Immediately above the postholes was a 0.02m-deep layer of grey-black ash and silty sand (111), interpreted as a burning episode similar to that identified in Trench 3. Above this was a 0.05m-deep layer of turf and topsoil (100), from which a single flint flake was recovered.



**Plate 8:** Remains of the earthwork enclosure inner bank (105) in Trench 4 (looking northeast)

## **5.5 Discussion**

- 5.5.1 The Phase I evaluation has identified the remains of the inner bank of the Druidical Judgement Seat earthwork, and revealed the presence of an outer bank on the northwest side of the enclosure. Both had evidently been truncated by later activity, and would originally have been substantially higher. The banks were constructed with material excavated from the enclosure ditch, and the inner bank at least was originally reinforced with cobbles from the nearby stream. These may have also served to support a palisade or fence, evidence for which consists of a single posthole in Trench 4. Although the bottom of the enclosure ditch was not reached during Phase I (due to time constraints and the unstable nature of the subsoil), in Trench 2 the ditch had concave sides, being 3.7m wide at the top, an excavated depth of 1.1m. The ditch appeared to contain two distinct fills, between which was evidence for a possible natural silting episode. It is hoped that the full profile of this ditch will be revealed in the Phase II evaluation.
- 5.5.2 The poor condition of the enclosure banks, and general paucity of features within the areas investigated, supported the interpretation that the site had been subjected to ploughing in the relatively recent past. It is worth noting that a similar paucity of internal features was revealed within an enclosure site at Crosshill Farm (NY 502 333), the nearest comparable excavated site. Nevertheless the remains of a number of timber structures were revealed by the excavation. Given that only a small percentage of the present site has been excavated, it is uncertain whether other archaeological deposits survive elsewhere within the enclosure.
- 5.5.3 The only discrete archaeological feature identified within the enclosure during the evaluation was a possible stone-lined pit in Trench 3. Interpretation of the function of this was difficult, given the small size of the trench, and further investigation in this area is recommended. A similar stone-lined pit was identified at Crosshill Farm, in association with a 12m-diameter round house of possible Iron Age or Romano-British date. However, the function of the feature at Crosshill Farm was not known (Higham and Jones, 1983, 50). The recovery of a number of flint tools from the fill of the present pit, including an Early Bronze Age button/thumbnail scraper (Find No 4), suggests that that this feature may be associated with an early phase of Bronze Age activity on the headland, which is demonstrated by a number of nearby burial monuments. However this date is tentative as the finds are believed to be residual.
- 5.5.4 Although no dating evidence for the earthwork has been recovered during the Phase I evaluation, the enclosure is morphologically very similar to the sub-rectangular enclosures which are the type-site of the middle and later pre-Roman Iron Age in northeast Yorkshire, and southeast Durham (Blaise Vyner *pers. com.*). Similar enclosures are also found in the Pennines, for example at East Mellwaters, Bowes (Vyner 2001).
- 5.5.5 In Cumbria there are a large number of comparable sites comprising single banked or ditched enclosures, which exhibit wide morphological variation, including circular, curvilinear, rectilinear and square forms. These native settlement forms may have extended from the Bronze Age to the end of the Roman period and may also have continued into the post-Roman period. Some of these sites have been dated to the Romano-British period on the basis of pottery evidence, whilst Iron Age sites have

largely gone unrecognised, due to the apparent absence of Iron Age material culture and a lack of alternative dating evidence. It is not satisfactory to date the Druidical Judgement Seat enclosure on morphological grounds alone, especially since the earthwork is to a large part defined by the shape of the natural headland. Typological dating, on the basis of comparisons with other areas, is also unsatisfactory. The recovery of dating evidence for the earthwork enclosure therefore remains a priority for the Phase II evaluation.

## 6 THE FINDS

### 6.1 Introduction

- 6.1.1 All excavated soils and deposits were sieved for finds on site. In addition, the excavated topsoil and turf were scanned with a metal detector. All of the finds recovered during the Phase I evaluation were labelled on site, and returned to the North Pennines Archaeology Ltd. offices at Nenthead for assessment.
- 6.1.2 Bulk finds were labelled by context. In addition a number of artefacts were recovered during the excavation, which were believed to be *in situ*, and these were given individual small find numbers (Find Nos 1-8). These are summarised below in Table 1 and Table 2.
- 6.1.3 During and after the excavation, all recovered artefacts were stored in the appropriate conditions to ensure minimal deterioration and loss of information (this included controlled storage, correct packaging, regular monitoring of conditions, and immediate selection for conservation of vulnerable materials). The finds were subsequently sent to the appropriate specialists for assessment.

Find No	Trench No	Context	Description	General Period
1	3	201	Pottery sherd	Prehistoric/RB
2	2	301	Flint scraper	Prehistoric
3	2	100	Iron object	Modern
4	3	202	Flint scraper	Prehistoric
5	2	301	Flint blade	Prehistoric
6	2	U/S	Flint blade	Prehistoric
7	3	202	Flint blade	Prehistoric
8	3	202	Flint blade	Prehistoric

**Table 1:** Small finds recovered during the Phase I evaluation

Context	Trench No	Material	Number	Weight (g)	General Period
100	2	Flint	3	3.0	Prehistoric
100	3	Flint	5	2.0	Prehistoric
201	3	Flint	3	3.0	Prehistoric
102	4	Flint	1	1.0	Prehistoric
201	3	CBM	1	1.0	Unknown

**Table 2:** Bulk finds from the Phase I evaluation

## 6.2 Pottery

*By Christopher Cumberpatch*

- 6.2.1 A single sherd of pottery (Find No 1) was recovered during the Phase I evaluation of the Druidical Judgement Seat. This was retrieved from Trench 3, from a possible ploughsoil layer (201), close to the location of a stone-lined pit. The sherd was initially examined by Dr. C. Allen who suggested that it was of later rather than earlier prehistoric date, after which it was passed to the author for assessment.
- 6.2.2 **Description:** the pottery is an irregularly shaped body sherd weighing 18 grams. The colour varies from a dark brown to a lighter orange-brown across the surface, and there are traces of a black, probably burnt, deposit internally. The sherd is undecorated and the thickness varies from approximately 5.7 mm to approximately 7.7 mm.
- 6.2.3 The irregular thickness of the sherd, and the absence of characteristic throwing marks, suggest that the vessel was hand-made without the aid of a wheel or even a turntable, and the surface shows no sign of burnishing or any other technique of decoration or modification. The hyphenated colours indicate the variation in colour expected from poorly controlled firing conditions (Blaise Vyner *pers. com.*)
- 6.2.4 The fabric of the sherd contains abundant fine temper which gives it a surface texture similar to fine sandpaper. Given the rarity of prehistoric pottery from the area, the normal method of breaking off a corner of the sherd to examine the fabric in cross-section was deemed to be unwise, and the following description is based on the surface of the pottery and the worn broken edges. This is not standard practice but was adopted due to the particular circumstances of the case.
- 6.2.5 Under the microscope the temper consists of a number of distinct types of grit. Quartz appears to be the commonest and it is the fine, sub-angular grains of this mineral which give the sherd its characteristic surface texture. The quartz grains are generally less than 1 mm in size (measurements refer to the longest axis visible) with a small number approaching 1.5 mm, and the majority are around 0.5 mm. Larger inclusions are also present and these are of a non-crystalline nature and can be easily scratched with a stainless steel scalpel blade. They are suggested to be fragments of grog (fired clay or potsherds crushed, ground and added to the clay body before forming and finishing). Also present, although in small quantities, were soft white non-crystalline inclusions of an unknown type. It is highly probable that other rock and mineral grains are also present, but the identification of these would require the use of a destructive analytical technique such as petrography. At the present stage this is not recommended although were a larger assemblage of pottery to be recovered from the site, or from another site in the area, it would be highly advantageous to develop a programme of analysis using such techniques with a view to characterising the local pottery and locating possible source areas for the clay (as, for example, was possible at Mellor near Stockport, Ixer 2005).
- 6.2.6 **Dating:** the sherd has no distinctive typological features. The fabric, while it has its own particular characteristics, these are not so distinctive that they can be used to ascribe a date to the sherd. Nor is the practice of making pots without the aid of a

throwing wheel chronologically diagnostic; hand-made pottery is certainly common in the later prehistoric period, but in northern England the ‘native tradition’ continues throughout the Roman period. It is also characteristic of the post-Roman period, and in parts of England continues as late as the 14<sup>th</sup> century although medieval hand-made wares are extremely distinctive and are unlikely to be confused with any pre-Conquest, Pre-Roman or Roman period native tradition wares. While a post-1066 date is extremely unlikely for this sherd, this still leaves a long period within which the sherd can be dated on technological grounds.

- 6.2.7 **Dating:** *By Blaise Vyner:* The manufacturing style suggests a pre-Roman Iron Age or Romano-British date, although a late Bronze Age or early post-Roman date is also a possibility. That would provide a broad continuum extending from around 800 BC to 800 AD, although the balance of probability would place it in the period 400 BC to 100 AD on the basis that in northern England the vessel wall thickness and fabric is more consistent with a mid-Iron Age rather than earlier horizon, while after the end of the first century AD some accompanying element of Roman pottery might be expected.
- 6.2.9 **Discussion:** quartz tempered, sandy textured pottery is one of the fabric groups which is characteristic of the later prehistoric period in northern England, and forms part of Rigby’s Erratic Tempered ware (ETW) group (Rigby 2004, 25). Similar fabrics also appear in alternative classificatory schemes, notably that used by Didsbury, where it forms part of the H2 group (see Cumberpatch 2006 for a discussion of this scheme). Work to date has tended to focus on areas with larger quantities of later prehistoric pottery, notably East and northeast Yorkshire, while areas to the west appear to have continued to produce only small assemblages or isolated sherds. Even with the increase in the intensity of work under the PPG 16 regime, and with the aid of Lottery funding for amateur and voluntary groups, the quantities of later prehistoric pottery remain small (although they are increasing), suggesting that much of central northern and north-west England remained to some degree aceramic, or at least characterised by a very low level of pottery use in the later prehistoric period (Bevan 1999, Nevell and Redhead 2005).
- 6.2.10 Discussions of later prehistoric pottery in northern England inevitably focus on eastern Yorkshire, but even here where pottery is relatively abundant, attempts to construct chrono-typological schemes have proved to be difficult in the absence of the kinds of stylistic and technological variables that are essential for such frameworks. The situation in Cumbria and neighbouring areas, where pottery is much scarcer, is far more difficult to understand. The results of the excavation are of considerable interest in that they show that sites of later prehistoric date do produce pottery, but they tend to confirm that the quantities are small. Further work on this site or similar sites is essential if we are to move beyond the current situation. The recovery of pottery associated with material suitable for C14 dating, or with artefacts with established chronological correlates would be an ideal outcome of future work but until this happens, individual sherds such as this one will continue to ‘float’ in a chronological wasteland.

## 6.3 Flint

By David Jackson

- 6.3.1 **Introduction:** The lithic assemblage recovered during the Phase I evaluation comprised a total of seventeen separate pieces, from six separate contexts, including a single piece from an unstratified context. Of the sixteen pieces recovered from stratified deposits, only three can be regarded as coming from a relatively undisturbed contexts; the fill (202) of a possible stone-lined pit, with the remainder being recovered either from topsoil (100), or deposits (102), (201) or (301) which have all been interpreted as a possible former ploughsoils. The details of the lithic analysis are summarised in Table 3 and Table 4 below (note: all measurements for the analysis were taken at the maximum point in relation to the axis of percussion unless otherwise stated).
- 6.3.2 **Results:** Of the seventeen pieces within the assemblage, twelve can be categorised as *debitage*, with the remaining five pieces being categorised as tools, all displaying signs of modification to some degree. For the purposes of the text, it is unnecessary to describe any individual piece of *debitage* in any detail as this has been provided in Table 4, other than to mention that one of the possible tools recovered (Find No 8) was reinterpreted as an unmodified flake during the analysis. Any significant attributes which the *debitage* has contributed to the assemblage as a whole is discussed below.
- 6.3.3 Although the details of the modified pieces have been provided in Table 3 below, it is deemed appropriate to discuss them separately here as diagnostic pieces (e.g. tools and other modified flakes) generally provide the best opportunity for acquiring critical information about an individual assemblage; this is especially true within small assemblages. Unfortunately, the results of the tool/modified flake analysis were largely equivocal. Of the five pieces analysed, only three can be interpreted with any certainty as being modified; the other two pieces being a possible intended blade or broken blade with no visible sign of retouch (Find No 5), and an irregular flake with possible evidence of use-wear damage (Find No 6).
- 6.3.4 One of the examples with definite retouch, Find No 7 could not be placed within in any particular category of tool type, as both the proximal end and left lateral margin were missing, probably as a result of post-depositional trampling. This is unfortunate as Find No 7 was one of only three pieces from a relatively secure context; the fill (202) of a pit. However, it is interesting that this particular example displayed extremely fine retouch along the distal margin which could only be seen clearly under a microscope at x40 magnification. Whatever this tool was intended for, it certainly indicates a relatively high degree of skill in the technique of pressure-flaking.
- 6.3.5 The other two retouched pieces (Find No 2 and Find No 4) can be classified as scrapers. Find No 2 can be further sub-categorised as an end-scraper as it displays direct abrupt/semi-abrupt retouch along the entire distal end. This tool has been produced on a small, thick, hard-hammer flake and was probably utilized because it retains a large dorsal scar and thick butt making it very comfortable to hold. The utilization of such a small flake may also be a response to the general lack of suitable raw material in the area (see below). Unfortunately, this piece has been produced on

an irregular flake of un-standardised form, making it difficult to assign the tool to any specific period. Furthermore, this piece was retrieved from a relatively disturbed deposit, interpreted as ploughsoil (301). However, given the flakes general attributes and the wider context in which it was retrieved, Find No 2 can loosely be placed somewhere within the Neolithic/Bronze Age period.

6.3.6 The second scraper identified (Find No 4) can be sub-categorised as a button or thumbnail scraper based on its small size (c. 22mm in diameter) and its overall shape. The example is sub-oval in plan, triangular in cross-section and is thicker at the distal end giving a rough plano-convex appearance in profile. Approximately 7 dorsal scars are also present. These type of scrapers generally exhibit retouch around all or most of the edge (Butler 2005, 168), but this particular piece only exhibits a small 3.83mm section of direct semi-abrupt retouch along the right lateral margin and further sporadic retouch at the proximal end. However, based on its general shape and size, Find No 4 is unlikely to represent anything other than a button/thumb nail scraper; the general lack of secondary working possibly being unfinished or unnecessary. Find No 4 provides the best dating evidence within the entire assemblage as this type of scraper is typical of the Early Bronze Age (*ibid*, 168). Furthermore, Find No 4 was one of only three pieces retrieved from a relatively secure context; deposit (202) which has been interpreted as the fill of a possible stone-lined pit (204), providing a likely date for this feature.

6.3.7 **Discussion:** although the lithic assemblage retrieved during the Phase I evaluation is relatively small, several inferences can be made from the analysis. Firstly it is apparent that three knapping techniques were employed; these include the hard hammer, soft hammer and pressure-flaking techniques. The most common occurrence appears to be the soft hammer technique, although this is not surprising as the assemblage displays a general lack of cortex retention suggesting that most of these pieces are tertiary flakes, being removed towards the end of the core-reduction sequence, when a more delicate soft hammer of bone or antler billet would have been used. A greater number of dorsal scars would add support to this interpretation, as one would expect cores to be more intensively worked towards the end of the reduction sequence. However, whilst it may be argued that the examples display a relatively low frequency of dorsal scars, this is likely to be a result of small flakes and flake fragments constituting a small assemblage in which the true frequency of dorsal scars has been lost. Furthermore, it is likely that there was every reason to work cores to exhaustion in an area with such limited raw material sources (see below). It may also be significant that no primary flakes or few secondary flakes are present within the assemblage, possibly suggesting that the initial stages of core reduction was carried out elsewhere. However, this is an especially tentative suggestion for an assemblage which has largely come from probable disturbed contexts.

6.3.8 As previously mentioned, raw material sources within the vicinity of Brackenber Moor are scarce; the only known sources of workable stone in the area being small pockets of local cherts, with unpredictable amounts of Irish beach flint on the West Cumbrian coast and other workable rock within the Cumbrian area, including volcanic tufts in the Central Lake District (Cherry & Cherry 1987 & 2002). Flint from each of these sources is poor quality in comparison to fresh flint outcrops. However, the majority of flakes from the assemblage (some 76.4%) appear to be from a fresh flint source, with a small amount of chert and possible beach flint making up the

remainder. Although the distinction between fresh flint and derived (beach pebble) flint is difficult to determine accurately without the presence of surface cortex, lithic assemblages produced from derived flint generally retains a greater percentage of this cortex, which is virtually absent from the Brackenber assemblage. Although the exact provenance of the flint is not known, the closest identified source of fresh flint is located on the east coast of Yorkshire. This is a reasonable assumption as the East Yorkshire sources are largely made up of pale grey/white and brown flints (Cherry & Cherry 2002, 69), similar to that seen within the analysed assemblage. Furthermore, this appears consistent with the findings of P. J. and J. Cherry (1987 & 2002) in which lithic assemblages from Neolithic and Bronze Age sites within the uplands of Cumbria are largely dominated by fresh flint, probably brought into the area via trading routes with East Yorkshire.

- 6.3.9 It is also notable that the assemblage displayed a high incidence of knapping breaks; a massive 47% of flakes either terminated in a step or hinge fracture, or they retained a dorsal scar which attests to one. These types of fractures generally occur because of poor quality raw material, or as a result of inadequate knapping ability. However, it has already been noted that most of the raw material used was probably of a good quality flint from a fresh source. This strongly suggests that much of the material from Brackenber was produced as a result of insufficient hammer blows and inaccurate flaking angles by an individual or individuals who did not fully understand the mechanics involved in lithic production. However, the intricate button/thumbnail scraper (Find No 4) and the fine retouch observed on Find No 7 would suggest that a higher degree of knapping skill was also attainable.
- 6.3.10 By far the most critical piece within the assemblage in terms of dating evidence is the button/thumbnail scraper (Find No 4). Although concerns over the general lack of retouch have already been noted, it is unlikely that this tool is anything other than a thumbnail scraper. More importantly, this individual find provides a relatively secure Early Bronze Age date for the fill (202) of the possible stone-lined pit, and by association, an EBA date for Find No 7 and Find No 8. This is interesting as the two pieces of the assemblage which display the greatest degree of knapping skill (Find No 4 and Find No 7) are two of only three pieces which are securely associated. Still, this does not rule out the possibility that more or even all of the assemblage is related to a single event or a single time period. However, as the large majority of the flakes were recovered from disturbed contexts, and in the absence of more diagnostic elements, it would be inappropriate to assume that this entire assemblage is related in any way other than to suggest that people were present at Brackenber Moor and producing stone tools.
- 6.3.11 **Conclusion:** the analysis of the lithic material recovered during the Phase I evaluation has provided information about several different facets of this small assemblage. This evidence includes details about the knapping techniques, and mistakes of the individual(s) who produced the assemblage, and details regarding raw material procurement which is consistent with the findings from extensive research conducted within the area (Cherry & Cherry 1987 & 2002). More importantly, the analysis has suggested a probable date for one of the secure deposits located during the evaluation. This probable Early Bronze Age date is not surprising given the extensive habitation which seems to have occurred during this period of prehistory. However, there are inherent difficulties in attempting to firmly interpret such a small

lithic assemblage, especially when most of the assemblage has come from disturbed contexts and may not be related. It is possible that many of the results presented above would either be emphasised or contradicted if a much larger assemblage was available for analysis. This is something that may be resolved when the Phase II evaluation is undertaken at the site. Based on the results obtained here, there is certainly potential for the retrieval of a much larger data-set with the possibility of learning much more about the people who produced these assemblages.

**Table 3:** Details of reworked lithic material

Context	Trench	Small Find	Classification	Brief Description	Dimensions/Weight
U/S	2	6	Tool?	Tertiary flake of mottled grey/tan flint with white inclusions and black streak. Marginal butt with diffuse bulb. Hinge fracture termination. 2 dorsal scars. Possible evidence of attempted retouch along left lateral margin. However, very sporadic and insignificant. May be post-depositional damage or use-wear damage.	Length - 20.57mm Width - 13.05mm Thickness - 2.19mm Weight - 0.001kg
(202)	3	4	Tool (Thumbnail scraper)	Tertiary flake of tan flint with white inclusions. Marginal butt with diffuse bulb of percussion. c.7 dorsal scars. Sub-oval in plan, plano-convex profile, triangular in cross-section. Surprising lack of retouch. Small section of direct semi-abrupt uni-facial retouch along 3.83mm of right lateral margin with some sporadic retouch at proximal end. Possible unfinished piece.	Length - 24.02mm Width - 22.91mm Thickness:- 3.41mm (proximal end) 8.05mm (Distal end) Weight - 0.004kg
(202)	3	7	Tool Fragment?	Secondary? flake of mottled grey flint with creamy white inclusions. Small area of remnant cortex. Right distal portion only; proximal and left lateral cleanly broken off. 2 dorsal scars. Very discreet area of direct abrupt uni-facial retouch along distal margin (10.07mm), almost invisible to the naked eye. Further possible sporadic retouch along right lateral margin. May be natural damage. However, distal retouch appears far too regular. May be fragment of larger tool.	Length - 22.66mm Width - 24.2mm Thickness - 3.05mm Weight - 0.002kg

Context	Trench	Small Find	Classification	Brief Description	Dimensions/Weight
(301)	2	2	Tool (End Scraper)	Secondary? flake of mottled grey flint with occasional white inclusions. Plain butt with prominent bulb of percussion. Deep scar on dorsal surface (ideal recess for thumb). Direct abrupt uni-facial retouch across entire distal margin (29.5mm, becoming more semi-abrupt towards right lateral. Irregular shape and diminutive size suggests the utilisation of a fortuitous flake.	Length - 16.52mm Width - 29.53mm Thickness - 4.97mm Weight - 0.003kg
(301)	2	5	Tool? (Intended Blade?)	Mottled green/brown flake of possible beach flint. May be remnant cortex along entire left lateral. Distal portion only. Hinge fracture termination. 2 dorsal scars including one negative step fracture. Arris runs parallel with the axis of percussion giving triangular cross-section. Long lenticular profile. No evidence of retouch. Possibly part of blade or intended blade.	Length - 30.86mm Width - 14.51mm Thickness - 4.92mm Weight - 0.002kg

**Table 4:** Details of lithic *debitage*

Context	Trench	Small Find	Classification	Brief Description	Dimensions/Weight
(100)	2	N/A	Chip	Chip of dark blue chert with slight creamy white mottling.	Length - 9.72mm Width - 8.51mm Thickness - 3.32mm Weight - N/A
(100)	2	N/A	Fragment	Elongated fragment of brown/grey chert with 20% cortical remnant. Possibly naturally fractured.	Length - 21.79mm Width - 9.54mm Thickness - 7.16mm Weight - 0.002kg
(100)	2	N/A	Flake	Dark green/black chert-like material. Diffuse bulb, marginal butt, slight lip and curving profile. 4 dorsal scars, including negative scar of step fracture.	Length - 22.93mm Width - 10.45mm Thickness - 4.63mm Weight - 0.001kg

<b>Context</b>	<b>Trench</b>	<b>Small Find</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>Brief Description</b>	<b>Dimensions/Weight</b>
(100)	3	N/A	Fragment	Distal end fragment of tertiary flake. Mottled blue/grey flint. 1 dorsal scar. Prominent hinge termination. Broken at left lateral margin after production. Prominent ripple marks.	Length - 11.08mm Width - 12.67mm Thickness - 2.94mm Weight - 0.001kg
(100)	3	N/A	Flake	Tertiary flake of grey flint. 3 dorsal scars. Possible step fracture termination. Broken at right lateral.	Length - 15.09mm Width - 10.33mm Thickness - 1.6mm Weight - N/A
(100)	3	N/A	Flake	Tertiary flake of mottled grey flint with white inclusions. Marginal butt with diffuse bulb of percussion. Deep dorsal scar.	Length - 10.59mm Width - 13.14mm Thickness - 2.41mm Weight - N/A
(100)	3	N/A	Flake	Mottled grey flint flake with white inclusions. 2 dorsal scars.	Length - 10.42mm Width - 10.31mm Thickness - 1.45mm Weight - N/A
(100)	3	N/A	Chip	Small chip of translucent flint.	Length - 7.68mm Width - 7.07mm Thickness - 1.32mm Weight - N/A
(102)	4	N/A	Flake	Tertiary flake of grey/white flint with. Marginal butt with diffuse bulb of percussion. Hinge fracture termination.	Length - 9.17mm Width - 12.55mm Thickness - 2.19mm Weight - N/A
(201)	3	N/A	Flake	Tertiary flake of grey/brown flint with occasional creamy white inclusions. Marginal butt with diffuse bulb of percussion. 2 dorsal scars.	Length - 20.1mm Width - 17.81mm Thickness - 3.41mm Weight - 0.002kg
(201)	3	N/A	Fragment	Tertiary flake fragment of mottled grey flint with slight patina. Siret portion only. 3 dorsal scars including step fracture scar. Some post-depositional damage to lateral margin.	Length - 19.4mm Width - 11.17mm Thickness - 4.13mm Weight - 0.001kg
(202)	3	8	Fragment	Dark brown flint with occasional creamy white inclusions. Mesial portion only; proximal, distal and most of right lateral missing. 3 dorsal scars including negative hinge termination.	Length - 24.31mm Width - 15.42mm Thickness - 4.08mm Weight - 0.001kg

## **6.4 Other Finds**

*By Martin Railton*

- 6.4.1 ***Metal objects***: a number of iron (fe) objects were recovered from the topsoil (**100**) and turf during the Phase I evaluation using a metal detector. All of the objects were modern, including a number of tractor parts, and were discarded.
- 6.4.2 One of the objects was believed to be of some antiquity when discovered (Find No 3). However, upon inspection this was identified as a corroded light fitting from a tractor, and was also discarded.
- 6.4.3 ***Ceramic building material (CBM)***: a single worn fragment of ceramic building material was recovered from a layer of plough soil (**201**) in Trench 3. This comprised an undiagnostic orange-brown gritty material with some small quartz inclusions. No further information could be obtained from this material.

## **7 ENVIRONMENTAL SAMPLES**

*By Patricia Shaw*

### **7.1 Introduction**

7.1.1 This work resulted from the Phase I evaluation of the enclosure site, known as the Druidical Judgement Seat, on Brackenber Moor near Appleby-in Westmorland, Cumbria. The excavation revealed the presence of surviving archaeological features and deposits at the site. From the three trenches excavated, a total of 5 samples were removed (Samples 1-5), details of which appear in Table 5 below. The samples were taken for the retrieval of plant macrofossil assemblages, as well as other artefacts and ecofacts. Features sampled included the fills of the enclosure ditch, deposits, and a posthole fill.

7.1.2 The methodology employed required that the whole-earth samples be broken down and split into their various different components. The samples were manually floated and sieved through a ‘Siraf’ style flotation tank. (See Table 5 below for context and sample information). The residue was retained, described and scanned using a magnet for ferrous fragments. The flot was dried slowly and scanned at x40 magnification for charred and uncharred botanical remains. Identification of these was undertaken by comparison with modern reference material held in the Environmental Laboratory at North Pennines Archaeology. Plant taxonomic nomenclature follows Stace (1997).

7.1.3 The retent, like the residue from wet sieving, will contain any larger items of bone, heavy (eg waterlogged) ecofacts or artefacts, and the heavy portion of the matrix, usually as stones and gravel. The flot or floating fraction will generally contain organic material such as plant matter, fine bones, cloth, leather and insect remains. A rapid scan at this stage was done to allow further recommendations to be made as to the potential for further study by entomologists or palaeobotanists, with a view to retrieving vital economic information from the samples.

7.1.4 Favourable preservation conditions can lead to the retrieval of organic remains that may produce a valuable suite of information, in respect of the depositional environment of the material, thus enabling assessment of anthropogenic activity, seasonality and climate, and elements of the economy associated with the features from which the samples are removed.

7.1.5 Sample numbers appear in brackets thus < >, whilst context numbers appear in brackets thus ( ) for all analysis and discussion below.

### **7.2 Results**

7.2.1 The samples produced flots larger than 100ml in each case, apart from Sample <4> (308), which only produced 30ml in total. The plant remains that were recovered from the samples were very low in concentration, but were generally in a good state of preservation. All the samples contained some plant macrofossils or charcoal, and they are discussed below in relation to the trench from which they came.

**Table 5:** Details of environmental analysis of the Phase I evaluation (DJS-A)

Sample	1	2	3	4	5
Context	105	108	303	308	202
<i>Volume processed (litres)</i>	20	10	40	20	20
<i>Volume of retent(ml)</i>	1300	1000	5000	4000	3000
<i>Volume of flot (ml)</i>	600	300	1000	30	250
<i>Samples suitable for radiocarbon dating</i>	√	√	√	√	√
<b><u>Residue contents (relative abundance)</u></b>					
Bone/teeth, burnt bone	-	-	-	-	-
Burnt clay	-	-	-	-	-
Charcoal	-	-	-	-	-
Flint/chert	-	-	-	-	-
Pottery	-	-	-	-	-
Quartz	1	1	1	1	1
Stones/gravel	3	3	3	3	3
<b><u>Flot matrix (relative abundance)</u></b>					
Bark fragments	-	-	-	1	1
Bone/teeth, burnt bone	-	-	-	-	-
Cereal/grass stalks - modern	1	1	1	1	1
Charcoal	1	1	1	1	1
Charred heather	-	-	-	1	-
Grass seeds, modern	-	1	1	1	-
Modern roots	3	3	3	3	3
Moss fragments	-	1	-	-	1
Woody plant parts	-	-	-	-	1
<b><u>Charred plant remains (total counts)</u></b>					
(c) Cerealia types	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Other plant remains (relative abundance)</u></b>					
(x) <i>Chenopodium</i> sp (Goosefoot)	-	-	1	-	1
(x) Poaceae (Grasses) modern intruders	-	-	1	-	1
(x) <i>Polygonum</i> sp.	-	-	-	-	1
(x) <i>Potentilla</i>	-	-	-	-	1
(x) <i>Ranunculus</i> sp.	-	-	-	-	1
(x) <i>Vicia</i> sp.	-	-	-	-	1

Key: (c = cereal types, x = wide niche)

Relative abundance is based on a scale from 1 (lowest) to 3 (highest), where - means not present

- 7.2.2 **Trench 2, Sample <3> (303) and Sample <4> (308):** both samples were recovered from Trench 2, and were fills of the enclosure ditch. Sample <3> was the uppermost fill, while Sample <4> came from the deepest stratigraphic level encountered during this phase of the evaluation.
- 7.2.3 **Sample <3> (303):** the upper fill of the enclosure ditch was moderate dark brown-red silty sand with occasional inclusions of large sandstone peices, and infrequent small stones. The volume of the flot was large, but it was mainly made up of modern root

fragments. This was to be expected as the deposit was close to the surface, and the roots would have come from the turf overlying the soil above. Bark fragments were also present, with grass stalks and a few seeds of grasses. These were identified as modern intruders as they showed no signs of mineralisation. There was also a seed of fat-hen, a weed of damp nitrogen rich soils, but again this was of modern origin. A small amount of charcoal was also recovered from the sample. The retent produced only stones and gravel, and a few fragments of quartz.

- 7.2.4 **Sample <4> (308):** this was a lower fill of the enclosure ditch, and consisted of moderate red-brown silty sand with inclusions of small rounded pebbles. The volume of the retent was quite large, and it was mainly stones and gravel, with occasional inclusions of quartz material. The flot matrix was very small at a volume of 30mls. The flot contained small amounts of both charred heather and charcoal. The only seeds that were present were modern, and included grass and a small amount of modern cereal stalks and bark.
- 7.2.5 **Trench 3, Sample <5> (202):** the only sample recovered from Trench 3 was Sample <5> (202). This medium compacted grey-brown silty sand had inclusions of small stones. Context (202) was recovered from a possible shallow pit, lined with stones. The matrix was darker than that outside the feature, due to water retention. It also had inclusions of small stones and charcoal fragments. A flint scraper, flint blade and flint flake were recovered from this deposit (see Section 6.3).
- 7.2.6 The retent consisted of mainly stones and gravel, with some quartz fragments. The flot matrix was again mainly modern roots, with other inclusions of moss and bark fragments, small amounts of charcoal with modern intrusions of cereal/grass stalks. Several seeds were recovered from this flot from *Potentilla*, *Ranunculus*, *Polygonum*, *Vicia* and grass species. The only charred seed was that of *Vicia* species. A fragment of charcoal measuring 20x20mm was also recovered from this sample.
- 7.2.7 **Trench 4, Sample <1> (105):** Sample <1> comprised a deposit of orange-brown silty sand (105), containing frequent sub-rounded cobbles and occasional larger stones. It was interpreted as the core of the inner bank surrounding the perimeter of the site. The retent yielded mainly stones and gravel, with a small amount of quartz pieces. The flot matrix consisted of mainly modern roots. Other modern intruders occurred as cereal/grass stalks. A small amount of charcoal was recovered, but no seeds were present in this flot.
- 7.2.8 **Trench 4, Sample <2> (108):** this sample was the fill of a post hole [107], which was identified in the northwest trench section. The fill comprised dark brown-black silty sand (108), which contained a number of sub-rounded stones, interpreted as packing stones. The matrix of the retent was mainly stones and gravel with some quartz fragments.
- 7.2.9 The flot consisted of mainly modern root material. Other modern intruders were seen as cereal/grass stalks with modern grass seed. A small amount of charcoal was also recovered from the flot.

### 7.3 Discussion and interpretation

- 7.3.1 All the samples produced similar retents of mainly stones and/or gravel with small amounts of quartz present as pebbles and small fragments. The main constituents of the flots were also similar, in that the plant remains were mainly modern intruders. Overall the plant remains that were recovered from the samples were very low in concentration.
- 7.3.2 No seeds were recovered from Sample <1>. The uncharred seeds in Samples <2>, <3>, <4> and <5> seemed to be modern intruders from various species including *Chenopodium*, *Ranunculus*, *Vicia*, *Polygonum*, *Potentilla* and Poaceae species. Charcoal occurred in all of the flots.
- 7.3.3 From Sample <3> (**303**) a number of burnt cobbles measuring c.0.1m in diameter, were recovered. These were interpreted as possible ‘pot-boilers’, which may have been used for heating water. There are no indicators from the flot or retent to further interpret the presence of the burnt cobbles.
- 7.3.4 The lower fill of the enclosure ditch, 2 Sample <4> (**308**), produced only 30mls of flot in total. This reflects the fact that the sample matrix came from a lower stratigraphic context, and so contained much less modern root material. There were still modern intruders present, which are believed to have been introduced to the matrix as contamination whilst sampling, or from wind-blown activity.
- 7.3.5 The fill of the possible pit in Trench 2, Sample <5> (**202**), produced a fragment of charcoal measuring 2x2cm in. The size of the fragment would make it suitable for radiocarbon dating. However, this should be used with caution as the age of the wood from which it initially came could vary by as much as 500 years. This would only give a broad indication as to the period to which the feature dated.
- 7.3.6 Small amounts of charcoal were present in most of the samples. A very thin layer of burnt material occurred directly beneath the turf across the site, which was made up of fragments of burnt heather. This probably originated from the burning of the moorland to improve the habitat, either for improving grazing or for breeding of bird species for shooting as this practice is also thought to promote the growth of upland plant species. It is believed that this layer could be the source of some of the burnt material recovered from the flots.
- 7.3.7 The aerobic, well-drained nature of the upper matrices forming the majority of the samples allowed for the penetration of modern roots, but provided poor conditions for the preservation of plant remains. All the samples contained small amounts of charred remains, however the majority of the remains were thought to have been introduced through modern landscape management and probably do not relate to the archaeological contexts.

## **8 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **8.1 Conclusions**

- 8.1.1 The Phase I trial trench evaluation of The Druidical Judgement Seat has examined the remains of the earthwork enclosure banks and ditch, and investigated two possible geophysical anomalies identified within the enclosure on a previous earth resistance survey. It is evident from the Phase I trial trench evaluation that the earthwork enclosure originally comprised an inner bank and outer ditch occupying a natural headland, with an outer bank on the northwest side to further isolate the headland from the ridge of land to the west. The banks were constructed with material excavated from the enclosure ditch, and the inner bank at least was originally reinforced with cobbles from the nearby stream. These may have also served to support a palisade or fence, evidence for which consists of a single posthole in Trench 4. The banks appear to have been truncated by later ploughing, which has undoubtedly also disturbed features within the enclosure. The previous geophysical surveys also suggested that the preservation of features within the enclosure was relatively poor, and this has been supported by the limited evidence from Trench 2 and Trench 4. The most notable feature detected during the earth resistance survey corresponded to the location of a random spread of stone in Trench 2, which was believed to be disturbed material from the bank. No suitable deposits were recovered with which to date the enclosure ditch and banks. However, the enclosure is morphologically similar to sites northeast Yorkshire, the Tees Valley and southeast Durham, typically dated to the middle and later pre-Roman Iron Age. Dating the earthwork remains a priority for the Phase II evaluation.
- 8.1.2 The majority of the finds from the Phase I evaluation were recovered from Trench 3, including the only pottery from the site. An assemblage of flint tools and flakes were recovered, which are typologically dated to the late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age. All of the flint finds were residual and are likely relate to earlier activity at the site, possibly associated with the nearby Bronze Age burial monuments. The only internal feature revealed at the site comprised a stone-lined pit in Trench 3. Interpretation of this feature was difficult given the small size of the trench. An Early Bronze Age button/thumbnailed scraper a blade and a flint flake were recovered from its fill, although these finds are also considered to be residual.
- 8.1.3 The dating of the pottery from the evaluation is problematic due to the lack of comparable assemblages, the general scarcity of pottery from later prehistoric sites in Cumbria, and the absence of a chronological framework for handmade fabrics of this type. Consultation with a number of pottery specialists has indicated that the pottery could date from anywhere between the late Bronze Age and early post-Roman period, although date a mid-Iron Age date is not unlikely. The pottery was recovered from a possible plough soil, so cannot be associated with clearly stratified deposits. However, it is considered that the potsherd is likely to relate to the occupation of the enclosure, and remains the only evidence for possible Iron Age occupation of the site recovered to date.

- 8.1.4 The site provided poor conditions for the preservation of plant remains. All the samples contained small amounts of charred remains. However, the majority of the remains were thought to have been introduced through modern landscape management and probably do not relate to the archaeological contexts.
- 8.1.5 The evaluation has provided an opportunity to investigate the impact of earth hummocks (caused by frost action) on archaeological deposits at the site. It is believed that The Druidical Judgement Seat was subject to ploughing during the Napoleonic period, when large parts of Brackenber Moor were planted with arable crops. This activity is believed to be responsible for the paucity of archaeological features within the enclosure. Following this episode, the earthwork was apparently abandoned, and the characteristic earth hummocks which cover the site were formed from the former plough soil. The excavation has also revealed evidence that heather, which would have colonised the area, and was subject to management through burning.

## **8.2 Recommendations**

- 8.2.1 This report presents the results of the first phase (Phase I) of the archaeological evaluation, the results of which have gone some way towards fulfilling the project objectives, including establishing the nature, extent and state of preservation of archaeological features associated with The Druidical Judgement Seat. The artefacts recovered so far indicate activity at the site during Early Bronze Age, and tentative evidence for occupation of the enclosure during the Iron Age or Romano-British periods. Having secured the required funding, it is expected that Phase II of the evaluation will be completed by Appleby Archaeology Group in 2009, and subsequently a final report on the project will be submitted to English Heritage and The Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society.
- 8.2.2 It is hoped that the Phase II evaluation will provide further evidence regarding the nature of early activity at the site, and provide much-needed dating evidence for the enclosure. To this end, some minor alterations to the original project design are proposed and outline in Section 8.3.
- 8.2.3 The pottery, although not closely datable, has added to the small number of known examples of handmade pottery from later prehistoric sites in Cumbria. The recovery of material suitable for C14 dating from secure contexts remains a priority for the project. In particular, the recovery of pottery associated with material suitable for C14 dating, or with artefacts with established chronological correlates would be an ideal outcome of future work at the site.
- 8.2.4 It is recommended that the flint tools from both phases of the evaluation be compared with other assemblages from Cumbria, and the results of the project be published in the Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society.
- 8.2.5 No further work is recommended on the Phase I environmental samples, due to the low numbers of plant remains. However, it is recommended further samples be taken from the bottom of the enclosure ditch, and any other secure deposits encountered during the Phase II evaluation, in order to maximise the recovery of charcoal or charred plant material suitable for C14 dating.

### **8.3 Project Design**

- 8.3.1 The Phase I evaluation saw the excavation of three out of the four trenches originally planned for the site in the project design (Railton 2008). The excavation of the section through enclosure ditch in Trench 2 was not completed during the Phase I evaluation, due to the friable nature of the subsoil, the narrow-width of the trench, and unexpected depth of the feature. It is recommended that the fourth trench, located at the enclosure entrance (Trench 1) is excavated in the Phase II evaluation as originally planned, but with the provision of an additional area on the east side to allow the trench to be stepped down to reach the bottom of the enclosure ditch in this area, which was not possible during the Phase I evaluation.
- 8.3.2 In addition it is recommended that Trench 3 is extended, to investigate the remains of the stone-lined pit, and other possible early features. This area produced a higher proportion of finds than the other two excavated trenches, and has the potential to provide further information on activity within the earthwork enclosure. To this end an updated project design is included in Appendix III.
- 8.3.3 The Druidical Judgment Seat is a Scheduled Ancient Monument, protected by law. Although Scheduled Monument Consent was given for the project in 2008, this permission lapsed before the Phase II evaluation could be completed. The revised project design will need to be approved by English Heritage, and further Scheduled Monument Consent will need to be gained in order to complete the Phase II evaluation in 2009.

## 9 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bevan, B, 1999 *Northern Exposure: interpretative devolution and the Iron Ages of Britain*, Leicester Archaeology Monographs 4
- Brennand, M, 2007, *Research and Archaeology in North West England: An archaeological research framework for North West England: Volume 2*, Archaeology CBA North West 9
- Butler, C, 2005, *Prehistoric Flintwork*. Tempus, Stroud
- Cherry, J and Cherry, P J, 1987, *Prehistoric Habitation Sites on the Limestone Uplands of Eastern Cumbria: A Survey of the Area Between Shap and Kirkby Stephen*. Trans Cumberland Westmorland Antiq Archaeolog Soc, Research Series Vol. II
- Cherry, P J and Cherry, J, 2002, Coastline and Upland in Cumbrian Prehistory – A Retrospective. *Trans Cumberland Westmorland Antiq Archaeolog Soc*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Series. Vol. III
- Cumberpatch, C G, 2006 *Hand-made pottery of later prehistoric and Roman date from excavations on the A165 Reighton by-pass, North Yorkshire*, unpublished archive report for Archaeological Services WYAS
- Giecco, F O, 2003, *North Pennines Archaeology Excavation Manual*, unpublished, North Pennines Heritage Trust.
- English Heritage, 1991, *Management of Archaeological Projects (MAP2)*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., London, English Heritage
- Haselgrove, C, 2001, *Understanding the British Iron Age: An agenda for action*, English Heritage
- Higham, N J and Jones, J D B, 1983 The excavation of two Romano\_british farm sites in North Cumbria, *Britannia XIV*, 45-72
- Institute of Field Archaeologists, 1994 *Standards and Guidance for the Archaeological Field Evaluations*, IFA, Birmingham
- Ixer, R, 2005 Petrographic analysis of the vessel from OVM01 Trench 15, Context 021, In C.G. Cumberpatch, A. Walster, R. Ixer and E. Morris Mellor: A review of the later prehistoric ceramics, In M. Nevell and N. Redhead *Mellor: Living on the Edge*, Manchester Archaeological Monographs 1
- Nevell, M and Redhead, N, 2005 *Mellor: Living on the Edge*, Manchester Archaeological Monographs 1
- Railton, M, 2007 *Geophysical surveys of the Druidical Judgement Seat, Brackenber Moor, Appleby-in-Westmorland, Cumbria*, unpublished report CP392/07, North Pennines Archaeology
- Railton, M, 2008 *Project Design for an archaeological evaluation of the Druidical Judgement Seat, Brackenber Moor, Appleby-in-Westmorland, Cumbria*, unpublished project design CP640/08, North Pennines Archaeology

Rigby, V, 2004 *Pots in Pits: The British Museum Yorkshire Settlements Project 1988 – 92, West Riding Archaeologist 11*

Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England, 1999, *Recording Archaeological Field Monuments: A descriptive specification*, RCHME Swindon

Stace, C, 1997 *New Flora of the British Isles*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Cambridge CUP

Vyner, B E 2001 *Stainmore: The Archaeology of a North Pennine Pass*, Tees Archaeology Monograph I

## APPENDIX I: CONTEXTS

Context	Description	Above	Below	Cuts	Cut by	Filled by	Fill of
100	Turf & topsoil		N/A				
<b>Trench 4:</b>							
101	Eroded bank material	108	102				
102	Sandy subsoil	101	111		109, 112		
103	Natural orange sand	104	102		109, 112		
104	Natural sandy gravel	N/A	103				
105	Core material of bank	103	101				
106	Deposit on east side of bank	103	101		107		
107	Cut of post hole	106	108	106		108	
108	Fill of post hole 107	107	101				107
109	Cut of post hole in s section	102	110			110	
110	Fill of posthole 109	109	111				109
111	Burnt layer	102	100				
112	Cut of posthole in n section	102	113			113	
113	Fill of posthole 112	112	111				112
<b>Trench 3:</b>							
201	Sandy subsoil	202	205				
202	Sandy silt deposit	203	201				204
203	Sandy silt deposit	206	202				
204	Stone deposit/feature	206	202				
205	Burnt layer	201	100				
206	Natural orange sand	N/A	203				
<b>Trench 2:</b>							
301	Sandy subsoil	303	100				
302	Cut of ditch	309	308	309		303,308, 310	
303	Upper fill of ditch 302	310	301				302
304	Outer bank material	309	100				
305	Inner bank material	309	306				
306	Stone layer	305	100				
307	Stone deposit	301	100				
308	Lower fill of ditch 302	302	310				302
309	Sandy subsoil	311	304, 305				
310	Middle fill of ditch 302	308	303				302
311	Natural sand						

## **APPENDIX II: ILLUSTRATIONS**

## **APPENDIX III: UPDATED PROJECT DESIGN**