

Durham E-Theses

Facing Gender: A Historiographical Analysis of Gender Construction in Iron Age Britain

MATIAS, JO ZALEA BURAC

How to cite:

MATIAS, JO ZALEA BURAC (2015) Facing Gender: A Historiographical Analysis of Gender Construction in Iron Age Britain, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/12110/

Use policy

 $The full-text\ may\ be\ used\ and/or\ reproduced,\ and\ given\ to\ third\ parties\ in\ any\ format\ or\ medium,\ without\ prior\ permission\ or\ charge,\ for\ personal\ research\ or\ study,\ educational,\ or\ not-for-profit\ purposes\ provided\ that:$

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, The Palatine Centre, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE e-mail: e-theses.admin@durham.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107 http://etheses.dur.ac.uk



Durham E-Theses

Facing Gender: A Historiographical Analysis of Gender Construction in Iron Age Britain

MATIAS, JO,ZALEA,BURAC

How to cite:

MATIAS, JO,ZALEA, BURAC (2015) Facing Gender: A Historiographical Analysis of Gender Construction in Iron Age Britain, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/12106/

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- $\bullet~$ a link is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, Durham University, University Office, Old Elvet, Durham DH1 3HP e-mail: e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107 http://etheses.dur.ac.uk

Facing Gender: A Historiographical Analysis of Gender Construction in Iron Age Britain

Jo Zalea Burac Matias

The aim of this thesis is to understand the ways that gender is continually constructed, perceived and presented in Iron Age Britain. A historiographic analysis uses both classical literature and Iron Age social models to provide the theoretical basis for understanding gender. The use of literature and mortuary data examines the current limits of gendered analysis for Iron Age Britain amd an examination of archaeological reconstructions discusses the actual presentation of gender for the period. Their purpose is to create a well-rounded view of *all* the influences that drive views of gender, one that is informed by the archaeological material, theory and classical literature, as well as other factors.

Though gender bias is present in discussions of gender for Iron Age Britain, gender as a topic is largely absent. Iron Age peoples are mostly discussed as monolithic entities – a group or culture rather than individuals. When gender does present itself, it manifests in male and female binaries, though not necessarily male warriors and female domestics. There is little discussion of gender as it relates to other aspects of identity, such as age and class, except in some recent studies. The male/female binary is largely static over time in British Iron Age literature, as is the presentation of society's identity, rather than people's identities. Iron Age Britain is faceless, populated by stock images rather than fully fleshed individuals. The analyses here demonstrate the need to keep examining gender and other identities so that Iron Age society is discussed on both a societal level and a personal level.

ii

Facing Gender: A Historiographical Analysis of Gender Construction in Iron Age Britain

Two Volumes

Volume I

Jo Zalea Burac Matias

Department of Archaeology

Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy Durham University 2015

Table of Contents

Volume I
Abstracti
Table of Contents iv
List of Tables viii
Table of Figuresix
Copyrightxiii
Acknowledgements xv
Chapter 1: Gender in Iron Age Britain 1
1.1. Approaching gender 1 1.2. Aims 2 1.3. Structure, objectives and methodology of the thesis 3 Chapter 2: An Engendered Archaeology 7
2.1. Introduction
archaeology 14 2.2.3.a. Sex and Gender 14 2.2.3.b. Performativity and the Archaeological Body 17 2.2.3.c. No more gender? 19
2.3. Gender in Iron Age Britain. 20 2.3.1. Iron Age Britain: men, women or genderless? 20 2.3.2. Material culture and embodied gender 25
 2.3.3. Burials and skeletal material
2.4.3. The sex and gender debate and future research trajectories
3.1. Introduction363.2. Searching for gender363.2.1. Hawkes and his critics on gender383.2.2. Structuring Society413.2.3. Post-Processual Social Models443.2.4. Examining the major publications463.2.5. Discussion48

3.3. "Celtic" and contemporary society and gender	49
3.3.1. Classical constructions of Iron Age people	50
3.3.1.a References to men, women and children in the classical sources	51
3.3.1.b Masculinity and the Celtic Warrior	53
3.3.1.c Feasting and gender	56
3.3.1.d Druids, religion and gender	58
3.3.1.e Gender relations	60
3.3.1.f Sexuality	62
3.3.1.g. Discussion	65
3.3.2. Irish medieval texts and gender	66
3.4. Adding gender to the British Iron Age	69
Chapter 4: Trajectories of engendered archaeology in the mortuary record of	Iron
Age Britain	72
4.1. Introduction	/2
4.1.1. Previous research on mortuary practices and beliefs in Iron Age Britain	/2
4.1.2. Constructing gender through the body and mortuary practice	80
4.2. Methodology for the case study comparison	81
4.2.1. Overview of Case Study Areas	82
4.2.1.a. Wessex	82
4.2.1.b. East Yorkshire	83
4.2.2. Terminology	83
4.2.3. Database construction	83
4.2.3.a. Data selection – the human remains	84
4.2.3.b Context Database	85
4.2.3.b Material culture	88
4.2.3.c Human osteology	88
4.2.4. Data summary	91
4.3. Quantitative analysis results	91
4.3.1. Wessex	91
4.3.1.a. Biological Sex	91
4.3.1.b. Osteological Age	93
4.3.1.c. Wessex results summary	95
4.3.2. East Yorkshire	95
4.3.2.a. Biological Sex.	95
4.3.2.b. Osteological Age	97
4.3.2.c. East Yorkshire results summary	97
4.4. The Language of Site Reports	98
4.5. Discussion	102
4.4.1. Age and Iron Age mortuary practices	102
4.4.2. The body and the limits of binary categories in mortuary analysis	105
4.4.3. Interpreting meaningful patterns in mortuary practices	111
4.6. Conclusion	113
Unapter 5: Images of Gender in Archaeological Reconstructions of Iron Age	
Britain	116
5.1. Introduction	116
5.2. Methodology: the theoretical basis, database construction and considerations	117

5.2.1. Image methodologies: differences and similarities in approach	117
5.2.2. Creating a dataset of images	121
5.2.3. Theoretical considerations and constructing a database	123
5.2.3.a. Image analysis: breaking down an image	124
5.2.3.b. Semiotics: the significance of signifiers and tropes in analysis and interpreta	ation
	124
5.2.3.c. Gesture politics and the social body	127
5.2.3.d. Quantifying emotion and perception?	129
5.2.3.e. Influence and impact	130
5.2.4. Categorising Individuals	131
5.3. Results	132
5.3.1. General age and sex distributions	132
5.3.2. Gender and activities	136
5.3.3. Gender, clothing and adornment	139
5.3.4. Gender and objects	142
5.3.5. Gesture	145
5.3.5.a. The passive stance	145
5.3.5.b. Occupational Gestures	147
5.3.5.c. Social gestures	149
5.3.5.d. Gender and the gesture	150
5.4. The practicalities of creating and presenting images	151
5.4.1. From the artists' perspective	151
5.4.1.a. Creating the image – logistics	151
5.4.1.b. Creating the image – personal and theoretical considerations	153
5.4.2. Commissioning an image	154
5.4.3. Museum displays and gender considerations	154
5.4.3.a. On ambiguity and overarching themes – David Clarke, National Museum of	f
Scotland	155
5.4.3.b. On the limitations of the material culture - Adam Gwilt, Cardiff National	
Museum	157
5.4.3.c. On presenting the Iron Age and keeping social themes – Jody Joy, The Briti	sh
Museum	158
5.4.4. Choice and the dynamics of power	159
5.5. Influencing the image	160
5.5.1. Archaeology	161
5.5.1.a. Antiquarians and archaeological theory	161
5.5.1.b. Archaeological sites and conventions of illustration	163
5.5.2.b.i Costumes of the Original Inhabitants of the British Islands	164
5.5.1.b.ii. Alan Sorrell and Scotland	166
5.5.1.b.iii. Historic England and its images	167
5.5.1.b.iv. Reconstructing graves and burials	169
5.5.1.c. Does theory influence image?	170
5.5.1.c.i. Activities	170
5.5.1.c.ii. Clothing and adornment	173
5.5.1.c.iii. Objects	174
5.5.2. Artistic, social and cultural movements	175
5.5.2.a. Archaeological images and fine arts	175
5.5.2.b. The Celtic Revival	179

5.5.2.c. Postmodernism and feminism	. 179
5.5.3. The classical sources	. 181
5.6. Discussion: Recurring Themes and Tropes	. 183
5.6.1. Masculinity and the Celtic Warrior	. 183
5.6.1.a. Boudicca: Subverting the Celtic Warrior?	. 185
5.6.2. The Druid	. 186
5.6.3. Femininity and Domesticity	. 187
5.7. Marking Gender in Images of the Iron Age	. 189
5.7.1. Are there masculine and feminine signifiers for the Iron Age?	. 189
5.7.2. The Smurfette Principle: adult males as default	. 190
5.7.3. Reimagining the past	. 192
Chapter 6: Perceptions of Gender in Iron Age Britain	194
6.1. Introduction	. 194
6.2. Results	. 195
6.2.1. Disengaging with gender	. 195
6.2.2. Male/female binaries and where they come from	. 197
6.3. A faceless Iron Age?	. 200
Bibliography	202

Volume II

Table of Contents	ii
Table of Figures	iii
Chapter 3: Gender and Social Models in Iron Age Britain	
Chapter 4: Trajectories of engendered archaeology in the mortuary record of Iron Age	Britain
Chapter 5: Images of Gender in Archaeological Reconstructions of Iron Age Britain	
Appendix A	290
Complete Site List and Number of Occurrences of Human Remains	
Wessex	
East Yorkshire	
Appendix B	295
List of Iron Age Reconstructions	295
-	

List of Tables

Table 3.1. Index of gendered terms used for textual analysis in Sections 3.2 and 3.3	7
Table 3.2. Index of studies analysed in Section 3.2	3
Table 3.3.1. Classical texts analysed for gendered terminology	2
Table 4.2.2. Terminology used in case study discussion	1
Table 4.2.3.b. Enclosed and unenclosed sites	5
Table 4.2.3.b.i. Site types	5
Table 4.2.3.b.ii. Burial Types	5
Table 4.2.3.b.iii. Burial context	5
Table 4.2.3.b.iv. Orientation, layout and side for human remains	7
Table 4.2.3.b.v. Iron Age Chronology	3
Table 4.2.3.c. Associated material culture 88	3
Table 4.2.3.d. Sex assessment of human remains 89)
Table 4.2.3.d.i. Age categories90)
Table 4.2.3.d.ii. Skeletal preservation 91	1
Table 4.4.1. Site reports used in word cloud analysis	3
Table 4.4.1. Associations of artefacts by material category with Wessex age groups105	5
Table 4.4.2. Associations of artefacts by material category with East Yorkshire age groups105	5
Table 5.2.1. Categorising individuals through physical characteristics	1
Table 5.3.1. Number of artistic reconstructions of Iron Age Britain published per decade from	
1800-2010 (as of 2014)	1

Table of Figures

FIGURE 3.1. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN HAWKES (1959)	236
FIGURE 3.2. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN HODSON (1964)	236
FIGURE 3.3. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN CLARK (1966)	237
FIGURE 3.4. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN CLARKE (1972)	237
FIGURE 3.5. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN HASELGROVE (1982). 238
FIGURE 3.6. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN HINGLEY (1992)	238
FIGURE 3.7. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN MOORE (2011).	239
FIGURE 3.8. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN HILL (2011).	239
FIGURE 3.9. NUMBER OF TIMES MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN A RE DISCUSSED IN "	THE GALLIC
WARS."	240
FIGURE 3.10. NUMBER OF TIMES MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN ARE DISCUSSED IN	"Germany
AND AGRICOLA."	240
FIGURE 3.11. NUMBER OF TIMES MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN A RE DISCUSSED IN	"HISTORIES,
Vol. I-II."	241
FIGURE 3.12 NUMBER OF TIMES MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN A RE DISCUSSED IN "	HISTORIES,
Vol. I-III."	241
FIGURE 3.13. NUMBER OF TIMES MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN A RE DISCUSSED IN	"GEOGRAPHY,
Vol. I-III."	242
FIGURE 4.1. MAP OF SITES IN WESSEX CASE STUDY ARE A.	243
FIGURE 4.2. MAP OF SITES IN EAST YORKSHIRE CASE STUDY AREA	244
FIGURE 4.3. DIAGRAM OF PRESERVATION OF SKELETAL ELEMENTS (AFTER MAYS	1998:2).
```	244 ´
FIGURE 4.4. OSTEOLOGICAL SEXING OF WESSEX BURIALS.	245
FIGURE 4.5. COMPARISON OF BURIAL CONTEXTS BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX	245
FIGURE 4.6. COMPARISON OF INDETERMINATE ADULT AND NON ADULTS BY BURIAN	L CON TEXT.
	246
FIGURE 4.7. COMPARISON OF BODY POSITIONING IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL SE	X.246
FIGURE 4.8. COMPARISON OF BODY LAYOUT IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX	247
FIGURE 4.9. COMPARISON OF BODY ORIENTATION IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL S	EX.247
FIGURE 4.10. COMPARISON OF INHUMATIONS AND DISARTICULATED REMAINS BY	
OSTEOLOGICAL SEX.	248
FIGURE 4.11. COMPARISON OF MULTIPLE AND SINGLE BURIALS BY OSTEOLOGICA	l sex. 248
FIGURE 4.12. OSTEOLOGICAL AGING OF WESSEX BURIALS.	249
FIGURE 4.13. COMPARISON OF BURIAL CONTEXTS BY AGE CATEGORY	249
FIGURE 4.14. COMPARISON OF BODY POSITIONING IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL A	GE.250
FIGURE 4.15. COMPARISON OF BODY POSITIONING IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL A	GE.250
FIGURE 4.16. COMPARISON OF BODY ORIENTATION IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL	AGE.251
FIGURE 4.17. COMPARISON OF INHUMATIONS AND DISARTICULATED REMAINS BY	
OSTEOLOGICAL AGE.	251
FIGURE 4.18. COMPARISON OF MULTIPLE AND SINGLE BURIALS BY OSTEOLOGICAL	LAGE. 252
FIGURE 4.19. OSTEOLOGICAL SEXING OF EAST YORKSHIRE BURIALS.	252
FIGURE 4.20. COMPARISON OF BODY POSITIONING IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL S	SEX.253
FIGURE 4.21. COMPARISON OF BODY LA YOUT IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX.	253
FIGURE 4.22. COMPARISON OF BODY ORIENTATION IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL	SEX.254
FIGURE 4.23. COMPARISON OF MULTIPLE BURIALS BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX	254
FIGURE 4.24. OSTEOLOGICAL AGING OF EAST YORKSHIRE BURIALS.	255
FIGURE 4.25. COMPARISON OF BODY POSITIONING IN GRAVES BY OSTEOLOGICAL	AGE.255

FIGURE 4.26. COMPARISON OF BODY LA YOUT IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL AGE	256 15.256
FIGURE 4.27. COMPARISON OF BUDY ORIENTATION IN GRAVE BY USTEOLOGICAL AG	257
FIGURE 4.20. WORD CLOUD CENEDATED FOR THE CLACTONDURY LAKE VILLAGE F	257 VGA VA TION
FIGURE 4.29. WORD CLOUD GENERATED FOR THE GLASTONBURY LAKE VILLAGE E REPORT.	257
FIGURE 4.30. WORD CLOUD GENERATED FOR THE SALMONSBURY CAMP EXCAVATION	N REPORT.
	258
FIGURE 4.31. WORD CLOUD GENERATED FOR THE GUSSAGE ALL SAINTS EXCAVATION	ON REPORT.
	258
FIGURE 4.32. WORD CLOUD GENERATED FOR THE DANEBURY EXCAVATION REPORT	.259
FIGURE 4.33. WORD CLOUD GENERATED FOR THE RUDSTON, BURTON FLEMING AND	GARTON-
ON-WOLDS EXCAVATION REPORT.	259
FIGURE 4.34. WORD CLOUD GENERATED FOR THE BATTLESBURY ROAD EXCAVATION	N REPORT.
FIGURE 4.35 PERCENTACE OF ARTEFACT MATERIALS ASSOCIATED WITH WESSEX A	CE CROUPS
FIGURE 4.55, I ERCENTAGE OF ARTEFACT MATERIALS ASSOCIATED WITH WESSER A	260
FIGURE 4.36 PERCENTACE OF ARTEFACT MATERIALS ASSOCIATED WITH EAST VOR	KSHIRF AGE
CROUPS	261
FIGURE 5.1 EXAMPLE OF RECONSTRUCTION WITH UNIDENTIFIABLE FIGURES (KONS	TAM STAM
2006:18).	262
FIGURE 5.2. EXAMPLE OF IMAGES WHERE INDIVIDUALS ARE MARKERS OF SCALE	
(ROMANKIEWICZ 2011:180).	262
FIGURE 5.3. A "DEPOPULATED" RECONSTRUCTION (CURRENT ARCHAEOLOGY 2009)	:15). 263
FIGURE 5.4. PROPORTION OF PEOPLED AND NON-PEOPLED ARTISTIC RECONSTRUCTI	IONS OF
IRON AGE BRITAIN.	263
FIGURE 5.5. TOTAL IDENTIFIED INDIVIDUALS IN 323 ARTISTIC RECONSTRUCTIONS O	F IRON AGE
BRITAIN	264
FIGURE 5.6. PERCENTAGE OF SEXED INDIVIDUALS PER DECADE OF PUBLICATION (18	600-1890).
	264
FIGURE 5.7. PERCENTAGE OF SEXED INDIVIDUALS PER DECADE OF PUBLICATION (19	00-2010).
	265
FIGURE 5.8. DRAWING OUTLINING AUTHOR'S VIEW OF LOCATION WITHIN IMAGES (A	AUTHOR'S
OWN)	265
FIGURE 5.9. LOCATION OF INDIVIDUALS WITHIN AN IMAGE.	266
FIGURE 5.10. LOCATION OF ADULT MALES IN IMAGES PER DEC ADE	266
FIGURE 5.11. LOCATION OF ADULT FEM ALES IN IMAGES PER DECADE.	267
FIGURE 5.12. LOCATION OF ELDERLY INDIVIDUALS IN IMAGES PER DECADE	267
FIGURE 5.13. LOCATION OF COMBINED INFANTS AND CHILDREN IN IMAGES PER DEC.	ADE. 268
FIGURE 5.14. PASSIVE VERSUS NON-PASSIVE ACTIVITIES IN IMAGES.	268
FIGURE 5.15. ACTIVITIES IN IMAGES (PART 1)	269
FIGURE 5.16. ACTIVITIES IN IMAGES (PART 2)	269
FIGURE 5.17. 1815 ILLUSTRATION DEPICTING AUTHOR'S DEFINITION OF A LOINCLOT	гн (Smiles
1994:20)	270
FIGURE 5.18. ITEMS OF DRESS IN IMAGES.	270
FIGURE 5.19. ITEMS OF ADORNMENT IN IMAGES.	271
FIGURE 5.20. TYPES OF ASSOCIATED OBJECTS IN IMAGES (PART 1).	271
FIGURE 5.21. TYPES OF ASSOCIATED OBJECTS IN IMAGES (PART 2).	272

FIGURES 5.22. (L)-5.23. (R). ILLUSTRATIONS THAT DISPLAY BODILY ADORNMENT: 2001	
ILLUSTRATION OF THE WINCHESTER HOARD AND 2009 ILLUSTRATION OF BODILY	
ADORNMENT (BRITISH MUSEUM 2001, LAMBRICK 2009:176)	
FIGURES 5.24. (L)-5.25. (R). FIGURES DEMONSTRATING THE "HEROIC" POSE IN THE 1921	
EDITION OF THE ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS AND THE CIRCA 1990S DISPLAY IN MUSEUN	1
OF THE IRON AGE (FORESTIER 1921:521, AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH)	
FIGURE 5.26. 1997 ILLUSTRATION OF IRON AGE CULTIVATION (ARMIT 1997:COLOUR PLATE).	
FIGURE 5.27. CIRCA 1990s ILLUSTRATION OF IRON AGE FARMING AT THE MUSEUM OF THE	
IRON AGE (AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH)	
FIGURE 5.28. 1991 ILLUSTRATION OF WETWANG WARRIOR BURIAL AT THE HULL AND EAST	
RIDING MUSEUM (AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH)	
FIGURE 5.29. 2004 ILLUSTRATION OF THE FOLLY LANE BURIAL (ST. ALBANS' MUSEUM). 275	
FIGURE 5.30. 2005 ILLUSTRATION OF ST. ALBANS CREMATION BURIAL (ST. ALBANS' MUSEUM	).
FIGURE 5.31. 2012 ILLUSTRATION OF THE CHARIOT BURIAL AT WETWANG SLACK (GILES	
2012;212)	пт
1997:60)	
FIGURE 5.33. 1899 ILLUSTRATION OF THE WILD BOAR HUNT AT THE CRANNOG (RCAHMS).	
FIGURE 5.34. 1999 ILLUSTRATION OF PICTS HUNTING (REYNOLDS 2002:34-35) 277	
FIGURES 5.35. (L)-5.36. (R). EXAMPLES OF MALE GESTURE IN THE HULL AND EAST RIDING	
MUSEUM AND A 2001 BOOK ON CELTIC WARRIORS (AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH, ALLEN AND REYNOLDS 2001:PLATE D)	J
FIGURES 5.37. (L)-5.38. (R). EXAMPLES OF FEMALE GESTURE IN THE 1921 ILLUSTRATED	
London News and 2008-2009 Quantock Hills website (Forestier 1921:510,	
QUANTOCK HILLS AONB EDUCATION)	
FIGURE 5.39. CIRCA 1990S ILLUSTRATION OF IRON AGE WARRIORS (HISTORIC ENGLAND).	
FICURE 5.40. 1993 ILLUSTRATION OF JRON ACE WOMEN WITH CHILDREN DURING A CEREMONY	v
(HISTODIC ENCLAND) 270	1
(IIISTORIC ENGLAND),	
TIGURES 3.41. (L)-3.42. (R). EXAMILES OF MAIS AND SITE I LANS (LAMBRICK 2007.107, 1111- DIVEDS 1887 DI ATE 1) 220	
FIGURE 5 43 (I) 5 44 (D) EVANDLES OF INFOCDADILICS IN SITE DEDODTS AND SCALE MODEL	r e
T THE MUSEUM OF THE IDON ACE (I AMBRICK 2009-216 AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOCRAPH)	19
280	
FIGURES 5.45. (L)-5.46. (R). 1998 PAOLOZZI FIGURES AT THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF	
SCOTLAND (AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH)	
FIGURES 5.47. (L), 5.48. (M), 5.49. (R). DIFFERENT GESTURES FROM THE 1998 PAOLOZZI	
FIGURES (AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH)	
FIGURES 5.50. (L)-5.51. (R). LONE PAOLOZZI FIGURE AND POSSIBLE FEMALE FIGURE AT THE	
NATIONAL MUSEUM OF SCOTLAND (AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH)	
FIGURE 5.52. ALAN SORRELL'S USE OF CHIAROSCURO IN A 1957 ILLUSTRATION OF CLICKHIMI	IN
BROCH IN THE ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (HAMILTON 1957:812-813)	
FIGURE 5.53. ALAN SORRELL'S USE OF CHIAROSCURO IN A 1981 ILLUSTRATION OF STAPLE HOWE (SORRELL 1981:36)	
FIGURE 5.54. A 1981 ILLUSTRATION OF A DRUID AT THE HEATHROW SETTLEMENT (SORRELL	
<b>1981:37</b> )	

FIGURES 5.55. (L)-5.56. (R). CIRCA 1990S ILLUSTRATIONS OF DANEBURY RAMPARTS AND
MAIDEN CASTLE ROUNDHOUSES IN A QUARRY DITCH (HISTORIC ENGLAND) 283
FIGURES 5.57. (L)-5.58. (R). 2009 ILLUSTRATIONS OF IRON AGE AGRICULTURE (HISTORIC
ENGLAND)
FIGURE 5.59. 1993 ILLUSTRATION OF COLCHESTER BURIAL (CURRENT ARCHAEOLOGY
<b>1993:497).</b>
FIGURE 5.60. 2006 ILLUSTRATION CARSINGTON INFANT BURIALS (AMBRUS AND ASTON
<b>2006:29).</b>
FIGURE 5.61. WOMEN'S DRESS IN THE 1921 ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (FORESTIER
<b>1921:510</b> )
FIGURE 5.62. SCATHA'S WAR SCHOOL IN A 2002 BOOK ABOUT THE PICTS (REYNOLDS 2002:
PLATE B)
FIGURES 5.63. (L)-5.64. (R). JOHN WHITE'S PICTS, ILLUSTRATED IN THE 1580S (HULTON
<b>1984:91,93).</b>
FIGURES 5.65. (L)-5.66. (R). GÉRARD'S LE COURAGE GAULOIS (1830) COMPARED TO THE 1ST
2ND CENTURY AD STATUE GAULOIS BLESSE (AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH) 287
FIGURE 5.67. EDWARD HORNEL'S 1890 PAINTING THE DRUIDS: BRINGING IN THE MISTLETOE
(GLASGOW MUSEUMS)
FIGURE 5.68. 1859 ILLUSTRATION OF CALGACUS (TAYLOR 1859: FRONTISPIECE) 288
FIGURES 5.69. (L)-5.70. (R). CIRCA 1990S ILLUSTRATIONS OF AN IRON AGE CHARIOTEER AND
ANOTHER IRON AGE CHARIOTEER IN THE MUSEUM OF THE IRON AGE (HISTORIC
ENGLAND, AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH)
FIGURES 5.71. (L)-5.72. (R). THOMAS MILTON'S 1810 ENGRAVING THE MASSACRE OF THE
DRUIDS AND AYLETT SAMMES 1676 ILLUSTRATION OF A WICKER MAN (SMILES 1994:111,
SAMMES 1676)
FIGURE 5.73. 1996 ILLUSTRATION OF CELTIC NOBLES (BRITISH MUSEUM)

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without the author's prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

The research for this thesis would not have been possible without funding assistance from the Prehistoric Society, the Rosemary Cramp fund, the Birley fund and the Ustinov Travel Award.

I would like to thank Joëlle Cunac from Bibracte, Katy Coate from Quantock Hills AONB Service, Virginia Smithson and Francesca Hillier from the British Museum, Lydia Fisher at RCAHMS, Fraser Hunter at the National Museum of Scotland, and a number of Historic Environment Record and Historic England staff for their help with data collection.

Research on Iron Age reconstructions would not have been possible without insight from Ian Armit, James Bruhn, Mel Giles and Richard Hingley. A number of individuals were extremely generous in their patience and assistance: Jody Joy and Adam Gwilt for explaining the inherent challenges of creating museum exhibits, Peter Halkon, for always answering my questions about East Yorkshire and guiding me around the Hull and East Riding Museum and David Clarke for taking me around the National Museum of Scotland and explaining the "Early People" exhibit in precise detail. Finally, I would also like to thank Christina Unwin and Alan Braby for explaining the process behind creating artistic reconstructions.

To my supervisors Tom Moore and Becky Gowland: thank you so much for your understanding and your support.

I wouldn't have made it through this process without the postgraduate community at Durham, especially my wonderful officemates in 329 and 330. Special thanks go to my Iron Age comrades: Elizabeth Foulds, Jennifer Peacock, Sam Wilford, Côme Ponroy and Tom Crowther. I know all the gender-related ranting and raving got old.

Last, but certainly not least, a big thank you goes out to my family and friends. You were there every step of the way and for that I am forever grateful.

For Andrea Cortez and Jose Matias, Jr.

### **Chapter 1**

### **Gender in Iron Age Britain**

[This study] should make it clear how archaeology has substantiated a set of culture-specific beliefs about the meaning of masculine and feminine, about the capabilities of men and women, about their power relations, and about their appropriate roles in society. Conkey and Spector 1984:1

### **1.1. Approaching gender**

Gender in Iron Age Britain (800 BC to AD 43) has, in the past, been examined through binary structures, but the recent works by Pope and Ralston (2011) and Giles (2012) marks the first efforts to examine gender by drawing on recent feminist theory. However, their focus on gender through the mortuary record and material culture creates a methodology that only works with specific archaeological material and therefore certain areas of Iron Age Britain. Whilst the archaeologies of Wessex and East Yorkshire are integral to understanding the Iron Age, models based on those areas cannot be used to understand Iron Age Britain as a whole. The combination of material culture and mortuary studies in Pope and Ralston (2011) and Giles (2012) does demonstrate the need to combine multiple methodologies in order to facilitate some understanding of the construction of gender within the period.

The analyses within this thesis are mainly historiographic in nature. Not only does this allow for a diachronic analysis of the application of gender in Iron Age archaeology, but it offers insight into how gender continues to be constructed within the lens of archaeology. It is important not only to know how archaeologists have conceived of gender for the Iron Age, but the underlying social, political, cultural and indeed, historic influences that affect the construction of gender. Chapters 3, 4 and 5 represent the different analyses and each demonstrates a means to understand the construction of gender in Iron Age Britain. The following sections will summarise the aims and objectives and the general structure of the thesis, as well as outlining the methodologies and expected outcomes of analysis.

### **1.2. Aims**

This thesis considers the present state of gender and feminist theory, the factors leading to trends in discussions of gender in social organisation within Iron Age Britain and the evidence used to discuss and perpetuate ideas of gender in the period. Therefore, the aims are:

- 1. To critically review the construction of gender in Iron Age Britain through literature and artistic reconstructions.
- 2. To examine British Iron Age mortuary practices as a method of constructing gender.

The first aim considers the development of gender and feminist theory and its main issues in order to ground the subsequent discussion of gender in British Iron Age archaeology. Some considerations include the continuing debate over the relationship between grave goods, the body and gender and the fluidity of gender identity beyond male and female. With these issues in mind, a historiographic reexamination of a selection of social models of Iron Age Britain will assess how gender is presented within them and how they affect methodological and theoretical approaches to gender. The background presented here is essential when considering the interpretations derived from the material culture. Modern day artistic reconstructions of Iron Age Britain are also included within this study due to the variety of influences behind their creation, not simply the artists' skill and creativity. It also examines how we (archaeologists and the public) theorise, discuss, and interpret gender identities in the past.

The second aim references the methodologies used in Hamlin (2007), Pope and Ralston (2011) and Giles (2012) to assess the continuing use of Iron Age mortuary practices as a means of constructing gender within the period. Burials from both the Wessex and East Yorkshire regions, in south-west and north-east Britain will be examined to determine if gender might be expressed in other aspects of the mortuary practices of the time. The main focus in the analysis is the body itself, rather than

any association with material culture, a method that has been particularly used in both Pope and Ralston (2011) and Giles' (2012) analyses. Therefore, categories of interest include burial context, body alignment, body positioning and others.

Though the analyses differ from Chapters 2 through 5, there are several expectations for the ways in which gender will present itself:

- 1. There will be extensive gender bias in most discussions of Iron Age gender where only males and females are the subjects.
- 2. For the British Iron Age, this gender bias will manifest in stereotypical depictions of male warriors and females within the domestic sphere.
- 3. Despite changing theoretical climates and despite the use of varying data, from models to human burials to iconography, such binaries will remain static.

### 1.3. Structure, objectives and methodology of the thesis

Acknowledging the way in which gender has been constructed means going back and seeing how it has been theorised and thus, constructed. Chapter 2 provides much of the literature review necessary for background information including brief overviews of the progression of gender and feminist theory, as well as its impact on archaeology. It also considers the specific treatment of gender within the literature on Iron Age Britain, much of it relegated to studies made within the past decade. There is also a review of approaches to gender within the field of bioarchaeology, which is necessary for many of the discussions and analyses contained within Chapter 4.

Chapter 3 examines the classical sources and the social models This analysis requires a re-evaluation of not only Iron Age social models and their various and sundry influences, but the classical sources, and the ways in which classical gender identities and sexualities informed the way gender and sexuality was viewed for contemporary Iron Age people. It begins with a historiographic analysis where the language of several social models is used to determine how gender is presented and why it is presented in that way. Some social models may be reliant on the classical sources for their interpretations, whilst others may use prevailing socio-cultural theories. An indexical search is also carried out for the journals Antiquity, Cambridge Archaeological Journal and Oxford Journal of Archaeology to track trends in articles relating to gender in Iron Age Britain. This search is also carried out with the first and sixth editions of Barry Cunliffe's Iron Age Communities in Britain in order to see how his approach to gender might have changed. The intent here is to create a diachronic analysis of how gender has been framed over time and what that means for future studies.

Chapter 3 also examines the ways gender is approached in the classical Greek and Roman sources and to a lesser extent, the Irish medieval sources, many of which have underpinned assumptions in later British Iron Age social models. It examines the underlying social, political and cultural factors that influence the way gender has been portrayed for non-Greek and Roman people in Europe. In the British Iron Age, classical Greek and Roman documents have been integral to understanding the lives of people living outside those societies. The expectation here is that classical observations of Iron Age societies reflect classical views of gender rather than those pertaining to the peoples observed.

Chapter 4 presents a concise investigation of the burial record in Iron Age Britain, by using a more contextual analysis of the graves. This study is part historiography and part data collection. A word cloud analysis is performed on several excavation reports used in the data collection in order to see if discussions of gender and society are present. It makes an attempt at intersectionality, breaking down the categories of sex and gender and performativity. Methodologically, these questions can only be satisfied through the analysis of a variety of archaeological material – e.g. settlement patterns, burial analyses (including osteological, isotopic and DNA tests) and artefact analyses. Unfortunately, that is beyond the scope of this thesis. The concise analysis of the burial record might be able to achieve this goal on a smaller scale. The analysis also determines the extent to which the current published data can be interpreted through the framework of current gender theory in order to present new insights into gender identity within the period.

With reference to Hamlin (2007), Giles (2012) and Pope and Ralston (2011), Chapter 4 re-examines Iron Age burials from the Wessex and East Yorkshire regions for any correlations within the mortuary practices that may indicate gender identity. With both regions exhibiting distinct mortuary practices (even within Wessex itself), any possible expressions of gender in death may present in different ways: through material culture, body alignment, burial context or other criteria. This, of course, operates on the assumption that gender might have been represented in Iron Age mortuary practices at all. Some practices may be restricted to sites or even time periods, but a great deal of variety is expected.

Chapter 5 analyses nineteenth and twentieth century images of Iron Age people in order to see how the past is presented and if theoretical shifts have changed the ways they are portrayed, especially in regards to gender. It pinpoints the visual language of the Iron Age and considers its importance in influencing the way archaeologists and the public perceive the past. How well are such concepts expressed through archaeological reconstructions and museum displays? Do they maintain their own influences? What aspects of gender do they portray? This analysis is essential because it details the ways in which archaeological knowledge is constructed for academic and public consumption. Images, amongst other details, contain some of the ultimate constructions of gender and thus must be interrogated for the messages they contain and how they were obtained. From there, it is possible to consider how future (re)constructions of gender and other social identities can be made and presented in order to reflect not just past possibilities, but future trajectories. Chapter 5 explores these issues.

Though images, as an artistic medium, have as many influences as social models, their main influences may come from the classical sources and the archaeological material. This will produce images that show gender in a stereotypical male-female binary and "traditional" male and female roles. Though the data in this set is pictoral in nature, the diachronic analysis of the images is also historiographic. Any differing trends in the portrayal of individuals and their gender roles can possibly be attributed to changing social and political factors.

Chapter 6 will discuss the outcomes to the hypotheses in Section 1.2. by summarising the major trends demonstrated within Chapters 3, 4 and 5. Chapter 6 will also discuss the implications of those findings as well as their place in gender and identity studies in Iron Age Britain and beyond.

Two appendices provide additional material in Volume II. Appendix A contains the complete list of sites and number of burials used for mortuary analysis in Chapter 4. Appendix B contains the complete list of images and image information (including date of publication, artist and source if provided) for the image analysis in Chapter 5. Volume II also contains the figures and illustrations referenced in Volume I.

The approaches in this thesis were selected in order to understand the ways that gender is continually constructed, perceived and presented in Iron Age Britain. Chapter 3's historiographic analysis uses both classical literature and Iron Age social models to provide the theoretical basis for understanding gender. Chapter 4's use of literature and mortuary data examines the current limits of gendered analysis for Iron Age Britain. Finally, Chapter 5's examination of archaeological reconstructions discusses the actual presentation of gender for the period. Together, their purpose is to create a well-rounded view of all the influences that drive views of gender, one that is informed by the archaeological material, theory and classical literature, as well as other factors. Gender is multiply constituted and the combination of these analyses show that the discussion on gender is only beginning.

### **Chapter 2**

### **An Engendered Archaeology**

### 2.1. Introduction

This chapter provides the theoretical and contextual basis for the analyses in Chapters 3, 4 and 5. Iron Age Britain presents several challenges in studying gender. Some areas of the country benefit from having a distinct mortuary practice, such as East Yorkshire, where the rich mortuary traditions have benefitted studies like Pope and Ralston (2011) and Giles (2012). Other areas might have excellent evidence for material culture, such as the hoards of torcs and other adornment in Norfolk, or the pits in Wessex. Therefore, analyses using skeletal material or material culture only work within areas that fit those criteria. Archaeologists wishing to answer the same questions about gender and social structure for the Iron Age in Cumbria or Northumberland, for example, would have to rely on more limited material culture, settlement evidence and other methodologies.

Iron Age Britain therefore presents itself with several limitations. The first is that some methods and materials work for certain areas and not others. The second is that some answers simply might not be accessible due to the material and methods available. The chances of determining whether or not societies in Iron Age Britain had non-binary gender systems are nearly impossible due to the lack of textual sources produced by the people themselves. Sexuality (after Voss 2007) is similar to gender in that it is a wholly social and cultural construct, but it might not be tied to biological sex and therefore would be difficult to determine from skeletal remains. The constraints mentioned here demonstrate that questions about gender in the period might only be answered up to a certain point. Without diversified evidence, some things must remain as conjecture rather than fact.

Section 2.2 will briefly summarize major trends in approaches to gender in archaeology and emphasises the particular aspects and methodologies that serve this thesis. Section 2.3 develops current approaches and the constraints in studying gender in Iron Age Britain in greater detail. Section 2.4 deals more specifically with how gender has been approached within the field of bioarchaeology, outlining recent

studies that have contributed to the study of gender in Iron Age Britain.

### **2.2. Gender: Theoretical Underpinnings**

This section will briefly outline the use of gender theory in the social sciences, trends of gender theory within archaeology and other related fields, as well as highlighting the issues in applying gender theory within archaeological practice. The aim is to emphasise the tenets of gender theory that serve as the theoretical and methodological basis for this thesis – namely, third-wave feminist theory, deconstruction and the rejection of male-female binaries. It also offers examples of the ways in which gender and feminist theory have been applied in various archaeological contexts across space and time, providing a basis of comparison for the treatment of gender in Iron Age Britain.

#### 2.2.1. Gender studies in and beyond the social sciences

Gender theory has its spiritual roots in the 1960s and the fight for the political, social, economic, and sexual equality of women (Meskell 1999:54). This "first wave" of feminism focused on modern women and their power, only drawing on women of the past to highlight their oppression. In the "second wave" of feminist thought, theorists rejected the androcentric assumptions of past studies, where men were assumed to hold all of the power. Previous androcentric studies excluded women from narratives both past and present, whether deliberately or unintentionally (Conkey and Spector 1981:5-14). Therefore, measures were taken to include women in academic studies within the social sciences, especially history (Meade and Wiesner-Hanks 2008), anthropology (Ortner and Whitehead 1981, Reiter 1975, Rosaldo and Lamphere 1974) and sociology (Ardener 1975). The second wave emphasized the need to broaden perspectives of the past by including those whose stories had been lost. Though it focused mainly on women, second-wave feminism brought to light the importance of rounded narratives of the past (Sørensen 2000:32).

Third-wave feminist thought rejected male-female dichotomies, stating that gynocentric views of the past were as narrow as their androcentric counterparts (Knapp 1998:368). Not only do dichotomies split concepts into either/or categories, they also imply the presence of a norm and an other: "masculine/feminine, rational/irrational, active/passive and so on" (Threadgold and Cranny-Francis

1990:1). In this framework, all dichotomies would be dissolved and all gender identities, including female (or rather, feminine) ones, would be seen as "multiply constituted" (Meskell 1999:55) or along a spectrum (Knapp 1998:367). Theorists (Butler 1990, 1993; Moore 1994; Nordbladh and Yates 1990) supported the deconstruction of male and female and thus, sex and gender. The sex/gender divide and deconstruction will be discussed in more detail in Section 2.2.3.a and Section 2.4 in regards to bioarchaeology. Other important areas of study within third-wave feminist theory are sexuality and the application of queer theory (Ortner and Whitehead 1981, Voss 2007), intersectionality of identity (McCall 2005), non-white/Western feminism and the relationship between race and gender (Gilman 1985, Hooks 1992, Hooks 2000), disability (Hillyer 1993, Gerschick 2000) post-colonial studies that highlight further intersections of power, race and gender (Dehejia 1997) and performativity (Butler 1990).

#### 2.2.2. Gender theory in archaeology

Conkey and Spector's 1984 paper, "Archaeology and the study of gender," is regarded as the landmark paper for gender and archaeology because it was the first paper to systematically detail the lack of study within archaeology as well as highlight the importance of studying gender. However, gender studies remained on the fringes of archaeological theory until the 1990s with the publication of multiple edited volumes concerning gender (e.g. Arnold and Wicker 2001, Claassen and Joyce 1997, Gero and Conkey 1991, Gilchrist 1999, Hays-Gilpin and Whitley 1998, Walde and Willows 1991). Many of these volumes contained papers that criticized androcentric views of the past that marginalized women, and theorised the application of gender theory to the archaeological past. These studies brought issues of women's visibility and power to the forefront, acknowledging their roles as agents of change and active actors within the past (e.g. Claassen and Joyce 1997, Walde and Willows 1991). Whilst many of these studies have been essential in their approach to material culture (Brumfiel 1991, Gero 1991b, Meskell 1999), their main focus remains on finding and explaining women's roles and contributions in the past.

This is not a critique of archaeological studies that utilise a second-wave feminist approach. However, gender itself is more than a singular experience (Gilchrist 1999,

Meskell 2007). Whilst "finding women" is one-dimensional on its own, it has prompted research into other overlooked narratives within the archaeological record, such as children, the elderly, slaves, the disabled and others (e.g. Joyce 2007, Joyce 2008, Moore and Scott 1997, Scott 1997, Sofaer Derevenski 2000). And in "finding women," archaeologists have also tried to find men. Masculinity is often neglected due to its association with androcentrism, though androcentric studies are equally guilty about neglecting men and masculinity. Masculinists argue that androcentric studies have presented men as "gender-neutral and thus as universal" (Knapp 1998:365). Whilst androcentric accounts of men might not be necessarily genderneutral, they have often depicted men in a singular fashion. In one study, men in prehistoric Denmark were given archetypal roles such as hunter and warrior, whilst assuming static positions through time and space (Skøgstrand 2010:65). By highlighting this imbalance, it has paved the way for other studies on masculinity, including the performance of masculinity and its intersection with cultural heritage (Engström 2012) and the "life style" of a warrior, lived through dress and material culture, in life and death (Treherne 1995:127).

Whilst "masculine" and "feminine" spectrums are welcome additions to gender studies, further complexity is possible (Joyce 2004). Genders may have existed outside these categories. Other genders, such as the Native American "two-spirit", may have been present within societies, though it is difficult to prove their existence within the archaeological record (Hollimon 1997:186-188). Such individuals performed specialized tasks, providing them with a status and identity that was neither male nor female (Hollimon 1997:176-177). However, third-wave critiques have argued against usage of terms such as "third gender" because they automatically assume and privilege a male/female binary within past societies (Arnold 1996:156). It may be more appropriate to discuss gender as a spectrum rather than distinct binary categories unless the evidence demonstrates otherwise.

Gender and feminist theory has been applied to archaeology in a number of ways since the early 1990s, especially through the publication of numerous edited volumes which focus on small case studies across space and time (Arnold and Wicker 2001, Bolger 2013, Claassen and Joyce 1997, Díaz-Andreu and Montón-Subías, Gero and Conkey 1991, Montón-Subías and Sánchez-Romero 2008, Nelson

2008, Rautman 1999, Walde and Willows 1991). It would be exhausting to cover all the ways in which gender and feminist theory have successfully been integrated within archaeological method, theory and interpretation. Instead, this section will explore the ways in which gender and feminist theory is specifically relevant to the material in this thesis: the relationship between the body, burial goods and mortuary practice and the manifestation of gender in archaeological representations. These studies provide the context for gender studies in Iron Age archaeology in Britain, demonstrating what has been done, what could have been done better and what needs to be done in the future in order to further gender studies not only in British Iron Age archaeology, but beyond.

The problematic assignment of gender to human remains via the grave good associations has been criticised by gender and feminist theorists within archaeology and has even been acknowledged as a result of personal bias on the part of the archaeologist (Taylor 1997:68). Whilst it is important to consider material culture in contexts outside of human burial, archaeologists often look to human remains and material culture to assess relationships between biological sex and culturally constructed gender identity (but see Section 2.2.3.a for problems in sex/gender dynamics). Gender archaeologists have worked to develop interpretations that look beyond typical binary associations such as weapons=male and jewellery=female. In doing so, it is also important to remember that a simple flip of the equation often serves to continually assert masculinity as primary and femininity as secondary (Harrington 2007:336). DNA analysis might alleviate some of these problems in the future, but is not a cure-all. Archaeologists must be aware of the incorrect sexing in bone reports and be prepared to acknowledge the possible interpretative problems that will arise from connecting those skeletal remains with grave goods and trying to determine gender (Effros 2000:637).

Meskell (1999:161-162) showed that more female burials were found in the Eastern Necropolis than the Western Necropolis of Deir-al-Medina in Egypt (1543-1077 BC), which had higher incidences of grave goods and male burials. Based on this information, it would be easy to assume females were of lower status than males. However, burial placement in Deir-al-Medina was based on affluence, followed by biological sex and age (Meskell 1999:174). It was therefore the material wealth of

an individual, rather than their gender, that resulted in their burial in certain parts of the necropolis. Crass (2000, 2001) showed that pre-Christian (pre-1800s) Inuit gender identity in Alaska, Greenland and Canada was fluid and could not be reliably interpreted from grave goods without ethnographic context. Other works have also demonstrated how complex the relationship is between gender, the body and grave goods, from Anglo-Saxon (AD 500-700) England (Stoodley 2000), Natufian to Middle Bronze Age (12,500-3,500 BC) Jordan (Peterson 2000), Bronze Age Thailand (Bacus 2007) and Iron Age (800 BC – AD 43) Wessex and East Yorkshire in England (Pope and Ralston 2011, Giles 2012). These studies are important examples of how much evidence is required in the framework for interpretations of gender in mortuary contexts, as well as in the interpretations themselves. These studies looked beyond dichotomous structures and are rooted in feminist frameworks that emphasise complexity and difference in the social construction of gender identity.

Equally important in interpreting the intersections between the body, material culture and gender identity are archaeological representations of the human body. Representations of the body in iconography have an added element of gesture that might otherwise be missing in a mortuary context and may provide insight into living bodies and their embodied identities (Rautman and Talalay 2000:5-6). Depending on the context, representations can also add dimensions of interpretation to non-living bodies or indeed, interactions between identities in life and death and how they manifest in the archaeological record (Meskell 2000:18). Here, it is important to conceive of how gender identity is not just constructed *on* the body, but *by* the body itself (Sofaer 2006b:156-157). For more on the importance of the archaeological body and how it relates to this thesis, see Section 2.2.3.b.

Studies of early prehistoric (23,000-9,000 BC) Venus figures in Europe and Asia constitute a great deal of the debate regarding gender identity and archaeological representations. Feminist critiques of previous androcentric studies accuse past interpretations of perpetuating modern gender stereotypes by equating the figurines to fertility figures and reducing women's roles to mothers (Rice 1981, Nelson 1993). Rice and Nelson take a more traditional feminist approach in their critique by highlighting the variability of women's roles beyond the mother. Ultimately, problems in sampling and research strategies make it difficult to use the figurines to

uncover information about women's roles and feminine gender identity for the period (Beck 2000:214). However, in other parts of the world and different time periods, various studies have shown how gender is displayed or performed through gesture in figurines or other depictions (Armit and Grant 2008, Hays-Gilpin 2000, Hollimon 1997). The variability between gendered interpretations shows the amount of difference that can be drawn from the archaeological record.

Though gender fluidity is central to this thesis, it is also important to acknowledge instances where gender can be strictly defined in dichotomies of masculine and feminine. In studies of representation, Lee (2000) examined the iconography of Minoan (1700-1450 BC) dress, concluding that attention to secondary sexual characteristics firmly divided depictions into male/female roles – though Hitchcock (2000), also looking at Minoans, argues for instances of ambiguity. Schaffer et al.'s (2000) analysis of Mimbres pottery in the American Southwest (AD 1000-1150) to demonstrate the strict divisions in gendered activities in Puebloan society. Binary interpretations can exist, though as with all archaeological evidence it is important to ensure such conclusions are fully informed by the temporal, social and cultural contexts, rather than simply *assuming* any interpretation would fall into such categories. In these cases, it is possible to acknowledge male/female interpretations from the evidence provided, especially if it is taken alongside corroborating evidence such as that from the mortuary record.

The key issue here is demonstrating the ways in which gender can be constructed and negotiated through the archaeological material, encompassing more than just the material culture or the body, but settlement and the wider landscape as well (Arnold 2001:223). Robb (1997:46) considers various forms of art, burials, skeletal evidence and literary sources when considering archaeological sources in prehistoric (6000-800 BC) Italy. Gender might not be visible within certain archaeological datasets, therefore it is also important to consider that there are instances where gender may not be a significant cultural variable (Rautman and Talalay 2000:10). There may be societies that did not consider gender as a socially significant aspect of identity. However, gender could be considered significant but only within a specific context, which means key aspects to its interpretation might be missing from certain datasets. For example, the construction of gender in life might differ greatly from the construction of gender in death and the grave goods and other details of the burial may reflect that. A lack of perceived gendered material does not mean gender identity did not exist or was not important. Another issue is that studies such as Meskell's (1999) are ideal in terms of archaeological analysis. They are able to integrate skeletal evidence, material culture and contemporary textual sources. This is not possible everywhere and other studies have to be aware of limitations in both material and thus, interpretation.

Though many of the case studies mentioned above have been useful in terms of emphasising difference in gender (Joyce 2006:43), they are still largely gynocentric. It is no longer enough to find women – androcentric critiques have already shown that marginalized groups such as women were present and were active agents, as well as many of the other individuals who have been invisible up to this point, such as children, the elderly, etc. What is clear here is that many archaeological studies are still firmly entrenched within second-wave theory and method and that theory itself is far outstripping the pace of archaeology. Section 2.2.3 discusses the more problematic aspects of third-wave feminist theory and its application to archaeological studies. Whilst gendered archaeology has made great strides, there are still avenues that have yet to be explored.

# **2.2.3.** Major themes and issues in the application of third-wave feminist theory to archaeology

Some aspects of gender theory render it difficult to apply to practical archaeology. The continuation of third-wave feminist thought has debated the definitions of sex and gender, embraced gender as a performance and even thrown out gender as an analytical category (Moore 2006:23-24). Within the current theoretical environment, gender has been deconstructed to an extent that makes it difficult to reconstruct from the archaeological record. Section 2.2.3.a will discuss sex and gender, Section 2.2.3.b will cover performativity and Section 2.2.3.c will address the deconstruction of gender.

### 2.2.3.a. Sex and Gender

The fundamental basis of any gender study first requires a firm definition of sex and gender. For many years, such terms were interchangeable. However according to the definitions in Hays-Gilpin and Whitley, there is a clear difference:

Gender: the cultural values inscribed on sex

Sex: categories based on observable biological characteristics of females, males and intersexed individuals. Sex categorization is usually based on the appearance of external genitals, but modern medicine takes into account internal organs, chromosomes, and hormonal differences (Hays-Gilpin and Whitley 1999:xv)

By these definitions, gender is culturally defined and sex is biologically defined. This put sex and gender into a series of strict structuralist dichotomies: science and culture, biology and behaviour, etc. Ironically, these are the types of dual oppositions that have been rejected within feminist and gender theory. The reality is that the nature and relationship between gender and sex is far from oppositional (Nelson 1997:15).

Even with the definitions stated above, terms such as sex and gender can be ambiguous in nature. Sørensen (2000:45) states that whilst biological sex can be informed by DNA, chromosomes, and external genitalia, there is much variation within the latter two, calling into question their viability as a method of determining a biological basis for sex. Modern experiences and prejudices might affect the categorization and perception of the physical manifestations of biological sex (Sørensen 2000:46). The biological sex and cultural gender model is only one possibility in a number of gender structures, yet few studies move beyond it. Theorists have also posited that biological sex is structurally constructed as gender. Biologically, polar oppositions of "male" and "female" neglect many overlapping qualities and the spectrum between them (Nordbladh and Yates 1990:222). Again, this ties back into repetitions of imposed binary systems on non-binary categories. Laqueur's (1990) study of pre-Enlightenment one-sex models demonstrates not only the complexity, but also the constructed nature of biological sex.

Therefore, according to the third wave, biological sex must be reconsidered and seen as more than just biological inevitability. Instead, it is a social and cultural construct that is similar to its gender counterpart in informing identities (Sørensen 2000:52). However, sex could be considered an experience that is mediated through the body, making it more of a material construct than gender, which is usually thought to be more of a state of being. Current debates theorise whether or not sex itself is wholly biologically or socially constructed (Bolger 2013:6). For some, gender is a series of structural codes based on sex (e.g. Maurer 1991), which ascribes to the total separation of sex and gender. Others say that sex is fluid and mediated through society via actions and practices (Sørensen 2000:54), which attempts to put gender and sex on an equal footing by claiming that both are socially and culturally constructed. Sex is not strictly biological in this case, but as culturally informed and fluid as gender.

Third-wave feminist theory also contains influences from postmodern deconstructionism, where there is no longer any distinction between sex and gender. Much of this has been influenced by the work of Judith Butler (1990, 1993), but has been seen earlier (see Ortner and Whitehead 1981, Rosaldo and Lamphere 1974). This school of thought states that individuals experience both biological sex and (1996:3) gender simultaneously. Meskell critiques Butler and other deconstructionists for failing to integrate the two categories. When sex is considered fixed, gender becomes the sole focus of study. There is a danger in making fixed biological sex a basis for social constructions (Laqueur 1990:29) because it is easy to return to the notion that one sex is weaker or lesser than the other due to biological difference. Furthermore, by eliminating any distinction between sex and gender, studies are reduced to one category of analysis. This in turn reduces the ability to analyse the complex relationship and negotiation between the two categories.

Due to these difficulties, there are few archaeological studies that approach this problem – perhaps with the exception of bioarchaeology, with its emphasis on the study of human remains. Even now, many discuss the problem and give definitions of the two before addressing one or the other (e.g. Bolger 2013, but see Davidson 2013, Hays-Gilpin 1999, Hollimon 1999 for studies that look at both). Despite current deconstructions of the two terms, there is still a relationship between sex and gender that needs to be discussed within archaeology. An engendered archaeology must take into account both sex and gender, rather than focusing on one or the other.

This divide shows how the relationship between gender and sex continues to be problematic within the realm of gender theory. One topic might be prioritised over the other much in the way that male/female and other related dichotomies have
permeated earlier studies. Whilst an amalgamation of biological sex and cultural gender is oftentimes theorised and applied within more modern contexts thanks to written and ethnographic sources, archaeologically it is necessary to separate and define the two categories, especially when archaeologists use human remains. Sørensen (2000:56) explains, "We may develop a conceptual framework that enables a constructive social analysis of difference(s), rather than denying or diluting its/their presence and relevance." The best way forward is to make it clear that the two concepts are equal and interconnected and are useful in discerning gender identities in the past.

# 2.2.3.b. Performativity and the Archaeological Body

The performativity of third-wave feminist theory is arguably one of the most applicable ideas to archaeological methodology. With performativity, gender is a performance that is acted out through daily life, experienced and lived through practices and objects that are gendered (Butler 1993). Performativity, embodiment and anthropologically based studies of the body are applicable to archaeology because archaeological studies have long been concerned not only with human remains, but the objects and landscapes associated with them (Tilley 1994, Yates 1993). How does body-centred research in archaeology approach the human body itself, i.e. human remains? Section 2.4 addresses the specifics of bioarchaeological techniques and gender, but here it is important to see body-centred research on gender within a mortuary context.

An overview of studies of the body would be incomplete without considering the work of Foucault. Much of Foucault's (1978) earlier work considering the body and power has been criticised due to his conceptualisation of a body that is completely at the mercy of an overarching social framework defined by power (McNay 1992:59,61). In other words, under this idea the individual has no agency and no room with which to construct his/her own identity. In this case, it is better to conceive of a system where the individual/body and the overall system interact to create social relations and identity (Giddens 1979:70). This relationship between the body and social systems was eventually accepted by Foucault (1988:11), allowing for a more flexible interpretation of the place of the individual and the body in creating its own identity and having its own agency. This is relevant to gender in

that gender structures are not wholly imposed on the individual from the outside, but are also constructed from within.

Borić and Robb (2008) identify five major influences on theoretical examinations of the body: the work of Bourdieu, ethnographic and anthropological studies, embodiment and concepts of physically unstable bodies. Each contains their own base ideas and methods, and arguably all of them serve as a foundation for studying the manifestation and play of identities through and with the body – including gender. For example, Bourdieu's work and ideas of agency have shown that ontologies between modern, theorised Western bodies might be very different from non-Western or past bodies (Borić and Robb 2008:3). In other words, archaeological case studies of the past can draw on modern theory, but theories of the ways in which the body was conceptualized and used have to be constructed within frameworks specific to time and place. They also emphasize the acts of individual agents within existing hierarchical power structures – acts that are normally ignored within archaeological narratives (Joyce 2006:54).

Archaeologically, performativity and embodiment have been used to inform gendered acts of the body through a few isolated case studies (Alberti 2001, Danielsson 2002, Joyce 1996, Meskell 1999). Each of these studies have seized upon different aspects of Butler and other theories of embodiment to interpret archaeological evidence, interpreting the relationship between gender and the body. Alberti (2001:194) determined that gendered signifiers on figurines created material definitions of gender rather than reproducing a gender norm whilst Danielsson (2002:182) argued that masked Scandinavian figurines pointed two bodies beyond the two-sex model. Studies like these have shown that archaeological images of the body as well as ancient iconography have much to say about the gendered bodies of people in the past and that there is more than a universal, masculine body or indeed, a two-sex binary.

Further studies, such as Rautman (1999) and Rebay-Salisbury et al. (2010) continue along the lines of body research. Ideas of fragmentation and body parts (after Chapman and Gaydarska 2006) are particularly relevant to the disarticulated human remains of the British Iron Age because of their potential symbolism and their ability to be interpreted as more than just objects of disassembly and loss (Rebay-Salisbury et al. 2010:2). Fragmentation theory can be used to develop and expand upon Cunliffe's (1992) interpretation of fragmented human remains as offerings and Hill's (1995) interpretations of disarticulated remains as ritual, structured depositions. Ideas of multiply constituted fractal bodies (Fowler 2008:49) have the potential to not only give many histories and meanings to whole bodies, but parts of bodies as well. Performativity, embodiment and fragmentation lend more possibilities to the interpretation of disarticulated human remains beyond functions as ritual offerings or deposits because they visualize the body parts as imbued with other roles (see Section 4 for detailed interpretations of disarticulated remains).

Body theory can also be applied to archaeology through representations. The number of studies done on representations of the body through Palaeolithic figurines, classical Greek and Roman statuary and imagery, and other statuary and imagery throughout the world are too numerous to mention here, but until recently there have been very few that approached the archaeological material and incorporated body theory as well as gender (for exceptions, see Joyce 2008, Marshall 2013, Rautman 1999). Body theory and performativity can also be interpreted through the archaeological record and in a gendered fashion through analyses of material culture by seeing how objects and dress might have enhanced or changed gendered identities rather than being explicitly gendered themselves (e.g. Ehrenberg 1989, Marcus 1993, Sørensen 1991, Sørensen 2000).

Performativity emphasizes that gender is not confined to any particular object, act or even person. In this thesis, it means that the body creates gender within specific contexts, through specific acts, and through specific objects that are always changing and dictated by a variety of social, cultural, geographic and temporal factors. So long as the body is not uncritically and automatically associated with women (see Meskell 1996 for critique) or the "ungendered, inherently masculine, universal body" (Joyce 2006:46) and the body itself is not the only focus of attention, performativity and other studies of the body are a valuable means of interrogating gendered identities within archaeological contexts.

2.2.3.c. No more gender?

An engendered archaeology aims to discern the different roles an individual could create and sustain throughout their lifetime, and the various ways gender may have been constructed within past societies. The question then becomes: how were these identities negotiated within the larger sociocultural framework of the society? What activities and material goods were used to strengthen these identities? How did gendered peoples utilize space and thus, was space gendered? The interaction of gender roles, attitudes towards gender, and the relationships between genders could all inform how past peoples negotiated their social lives. Cucchiari (1981:31) argues that institutions such as marriage and kinship structures were created by and therefore dependent on gender systems. Therefore, gender is an essential component of social life and no narrative is complete without it.

### 2.3. Gender in Iron Age Britain

Because the specific material in this thesis – the social models, the burial evidence and the reconstruction images – are taken from Iron Age Britain, it is important to situate them within the context of gender studies within the period. Like other eras of prehistory, Iron Age Europe has tended to be populated by 19th and 20th century stereotypes (Chapman 1992:5), including their gender roles (see Arnold 1996). Gender itself has rarely been a specific focus in social discussions within archaeology for this time period. It has been treated as an afterthought or an assumption rather than a major social and cultural category. This section summarizes approaches to gender within Iron Age Britain in order to contextualize where this thesis fits within the current climate and determine what work remains for this particular field in comparison to gender work done in other time periods and places.

### 2.3.1. Iron Age Britain: men, women or genderless?

Archaeological work done on the British Iron Age has often portrayed gender within the standard male/female divide with a primary emphasis on men as the lead, active figures – a "naturalized" division of the sexes (Edwards and Pope 2013:458). One of these divisions includes the warrior/husband and his wife: "The finest pieces are luxuries reflecting the taste of the warriors who enjoyed personal magnificence and the trapping out of their wives and horses" (Hawkes 1945:32). In this statement, the warriors are unequivocally male and their wives only exist to be adorned in the same manner as their horses, even if the material culture does not appear to be specifically gendered. Such attitudes may not be surprising for texts from earlier dates; however further examination will show how often the warrior/husband and wife relationship continues to persist. Discussions of social relations and identities for the period usually remain within that dichotomy or are genderless (for more discussions on a genderless Iron Age in regards to social models, see Chapter 3).

The Celtic Warrior is one example of how uncritical usage of gender identities perpetuates certain topics within Iron Age archaeology in Britain. Recently, the image of the warrior has been juxtaposed against the domestic image of weaving women in a study of the gendering of Iron Age museum displays (Ballard 2007). From the observations of classical sources and the interpretation of Iron Age martial artefacts, sites and human osteology, one could assume the Iron Age population was filled with warriors – mainly men – who did not hesitate to kill and were constantly pillaging other settlements (Cunliffe 2005:533). Hillforts, which have long been the focus of research in Iron Age Britain, were seen as defensive settlements where a ruling elite controlled production and trade distribution but studies have shown that this was not necessarily the case (e.g. Armit 2007). Not all hillforts were built with defence in mind (Collis 1996), with some hillforts being built within sight of one another. Instead, some believe that the monumentality of hillforts was more of a statement of a competing group identity rather than any attempt to forge a military presence (e.g. Frodsham et al. 2007).

The question of high-status females in Iron Age Britain, and of female warriors, is one that has been largely absent until recently (Giles 2012, Pope and Ralston 2011). Arnold (1991) discussing the burial of the Princess of Vix in late Hallstatt France, argued that there was a seeming inability of Iron Age archaeologists to discuss female power without qualifying it through various other factors such as ritual – a topic that has been revisited a number of times since (Arnold 1999, Arnold 2012). Kristiansen (1998:273) describes the Vix burial as "a Greek trader's or nobleman's daughter, married to the local king to strengthen their political alliance," whilst Knüsel (2002:299) suggests, "through ritual power, [the Vix Princess] became preeminent." In Iron Age Britain, Boudica's power has been suggested to be symbolic (James 1993:67) and female power is often overlooked (Pope and Ralston 2011:376). The issue here is a prevalent one, where female authority must be framed in certain ways, such as through ritual or as a substitute for male authority, in order for it to be accepted. The implication is that female power, on its own, is without merit and can only be gained through extraordinary circumstances. This is in contrast to male burials, where the presence of "rich" material culture leads to fairly uncontested assumptions of male power and, in the case of Iron Age Europe, the presence of chiefs (see Frankenstein and Rowlands 1978).

When a female is granted high status by virtue of her nearest male relative, her power is granted via "Appendage Syndrome" (Fraser 1988:12,21). In this instance, the female's prestige and power is legitimised through a masculine source of power. In Iron Age Britain, this can happen because females can be treated as trade goods themselves (Cunliffe 2005:581). It is not unlike when de Beauvoir (1972:189) says, "Her body is not perceived as the radiation of a subjective personality, but as a thing sunk into its own immanence; it is not for such a body to have reference to the rest of the world." Boudicca is used as an example of appendage syndrome because she assumes her husband's power whilst also harkening to traditions of female power in Britain. However, there is little archaeological evidence to corroborate any of this in an Iron Age context and reliance often falls upon written sources (Arnold 1995b:161). In the late Hallstatt (750-450 BC) period in what is now present-day Germany, fluid gender roles might have existed in times of need and upheaval, with women stepping into traditionally male roles of high power and status, though this might have only occurred amongst those of high status already (Arnold 1995b:162). In this case, the presence of rich grave goods in female graves is not indicative of "honorary male" status, but high status instead.

Female power or even female representation is often challenged when women take on martial roles. This is particularly relevant to Iron Age Britain, where Boudicca's role as leader of a rebellion raises questions about her combat role and where analyses of Iron Age human remains have discussed the sex of combatants and the role of women in warfare (Redfern and Chamberlain 2011, Western and Hurst 2013). There have been a number of studies published regarding women warriors in the past (Doucette 2001, Koehler 1997, Linduff and Rubinson 1998, Prezzano 1997, Westra 1991). In these instances female presence within a martial sphere is possible – but most importantly, not their sole defining trait (e.g. Koehler 1997). It is one aspect of their identity, and defined by critical moments and events in their lives. Despite these possibilities, female identities in Iron Age Britain are rarely discussed outside specific, domestic roles – and even fewer acknowledge female power in a martial sense except as aberrations or as a temporary, symbolic or inherited role, such as in the case of Boudicca.

It is important not to equate martial objects in burials as warrior graves. Härke (1990:32-33), studying Anglo-Saxon graves from AD 500-700, demonstrated that there was no relationship between weapon interment and actual evidence of warfare. A person buried with weapons was not necessarily a warrior and could have identified in other ways in life. Similarly, Iron Age (300 BC) Iberians had a formal military but also a militia made up of farmers and artisans who fought when necessary (Sanz 2015:506). These studies show that it is possible for societies to have martial aspects – but their soldiers do not always have to identify themselves as such. Martial objects could have been symbolic of other things, such as status and kinship. In Iron Age Britain, the appearance of weapons has been used to support the idea of a warlike society that thrived on violence, but like Anglo-Saxon England and Iron Age Iberia, weapon burials might not be synonymous with a warrior society.

In Iron Age Britain, much of the surviving record has been inferred from ritual deposits of weapons as well as weapons retrieved from burial contexts. In some cases, such as that of the Kirkburn sword, the weapons have been carefully tended and deliberately deposited for burial (Giles 2008:64-65). This could mean that weapons were mostly symbolic in nature, though James (2007) would suggest otherwise. The burial evidence in Iron Age Britain does show evidence that would point to acts of warfare (Cunliffe 1984a, Dent 1984, Redfern and Chamberlain 2011, Stead 1991), though perhaps not to the extent implied within the classical sources. Disarticulated remains were previously thought of as the victims of violence, but reinterpretations of the evidence have concluded that the secondary deposition of fragmented remains was merely an aspect of burial practices (Hill 1995). Overall, the physical evidence of warfare is inconclusive but for a several sites and specific areas. This evidence alone is not enough to continue conceptualising a society comprised of male Celtic warriors.

Research in other societies that claim to be warrior based, such as Scott (2006) in medieval Ireland, have demonstrated little evidence of skeletal trauma that might suggest high levels of violence. The same might applies to areas of Iron Age Britain. A lack of skeletal trauma related to sustained violence would not necessarily indicate that Iron Age Britain lacked warriors of any sort, but that there is more complexity to the social, political and economic roles of its people beyond that of a warrior. Though the classical literature might have seen Iron Age society in that particular light, a role or identity like that could have been purely symbolic in times that were unmarked by conflict.

Iron Age society is most often portrayed in a manner where male power is the norm. As previously mentioned, Iron Age women are rarely granted elevated status without some type of qualifier. A re-analysis of the Vix Princess reaffirmed the skeleton's sex as biologically female and focused specifically on several skeletal deformities, including an asymmetrical cranium and hip dysplasia (Knüsel 2002:292). These characteristics, when taken alongside the richness of the burial, are taken to suggest the Vix Princess status is due in part to her physical differences. There is nothing inherently wrong with correlating the Vix Princess' appearance with her possible occupation as a ritualist, but suggesting she would not have obtained her status without them implies that women have to do something extraordinary in order to attain something that is often granted to male counterparts in the archaeological record. Similarly, the female chariot burial at Wetwang Slack in East Yorkshire, England (300-100 BC) might have had a facial tumour, echoed by the amount of red coral in her grave (Hill 2001:2-3). The question becomes how normative male power was in the late Hallstatt and whether or not the Vix Princess or the chariot burial from Wetwang Slack are truly so extraordinary exceptions to the rule (Arnold 2012:219).

Gender does often appear in Iron Age archaeology through discussions of material culture, labour and space. Clarke's (1972) reassessment of the material from Glastonbury Lake Village in Somerset, England (250-50 BC) divided the spaces and activities within the village based on artefacts. Hingley (1990:139-140) interpreted the Romano-British villa of North Warnborough as having designated spaces: male/female, public/private and centre/periphery (see also Parker-Pearson and

Richards 1994:52). The issue in these interpretations is the fixed nature of space. Sites and houses become defined by the artefacts and who used them, as well as the activities they performed. This is not to say that divisions do not exist and have no meaning in Iron Age Britain (see Giles 2007), but identities would have constantly been negotiated within those spaces through the various artefacts used and activities performed, making it difficult to equate space with gender. Whilst divisions in space were evident, they might not be strictly defined as public/private as well as directly attributed to singular groups of individuals.

Children and the elderly are also usually absent from broader discussions of Iron Age society (see Green 1995). Karl (2005) does discuss children, but relies on medieval Irish and Welsh literary sources to examine practices of apprenticeship and fosterage. Therefore, there is a degree of age bias in discussions of Iron Age society – not simply gender bias.

### 2.3.2. Material culture and embodied gender

Artefact studies provide a promising avenue of research in the advancement of gender theory within Iron Age archaeology. Material culture can no longer be considered a passive reflection of society, but an active object with its own biography that could be used to embrace or reject societal norms (Garrow et al. 2008, Gosden 2005, Gosden and Marshall 1999, Sørensen 2000, Tilley 1996). For the Iron Age, the insights gleaned from studies of material culture and "art" can be used in conjunction with other lines of evidence to recreate the structures and values of the past rather than associated with biological sex. When taken alongside the idea of performativity, artefacts become important areas where gender was negotiated and performed within Iron Age society.

Giles (2008) emphasizes the aesthetic nature of martial objects by saying that the look and feel of the objects is as performative as its usage. Choices made in the production and maintenance (or lack thereof) of an object gives it meaning. Those choices mark the embodiment of the user's self: "Traces of sweat, wear, embellishment and mending become marks of the human affiliations they have enabled, and mnemonics of the events in which they played a role" (Giles 2008:61). Other decorative features of martial objects, such as the bright, flashing polished surfaces of swords and use of red enamel, could have projected a message of aggression and caution, whilst the intricate scrollwork has been suggested to be protective in nature (Giles 2008:67-69). Discussions of colour attribute red to blood, a symbol of both life and death (and thus violence and warfare), whilst the blue of glass beads is attributed to elderly women as a symbol of their age and status (Giles 2008:72). Foulds (2014:393-394) discusses beads and adornment within the context of performing status and different regional identities.

Iron Age mirrors have been considered within the context of object biographies, especially within the context of dress, adornment and ritual (Giles and Joy 2007, Joy 2008, Joy 2009). Studies of the wear and use-life of mirrors suggests that they were not "owned" in the modern sense of possessing an object, but were used to "act out" particular roles or to enhance one's position or status (Joy 2009:551). Additionally, Giles (2008:70-72) states that the highly polished and reflective nature of mirrors could have been used to intimidate others because they were so rarely used. Mirrors cannot be considered solely female objects (e.g. Cunliffe 1975:294, Cunliffe 2005:557), just as it cannot be asserted that swords belonged to men. Simply, there is not enough evidence within the archaeological record to say that mirrors were an exclusively female item (Joy 2011:475). As with all artefacts, it is important that all associations be proved and that the objects are considered beyond what they might say about the sex of the person they were buried with.

### 2.3.3. Burials and skeletal material

Research interests in regards to Iron Age burials have mostly been relegated to the studies of the burial practices themselves. Much has been made of the invisibility of Iron Age burial practices (e.g. Carr and Knüsel 1997, Carr 2007), as well as the variety of burial practices that have been found for the time period (e.g. Cunliffe 1992, Hill 1995, Whimster 1981). Little has been done to consider how burial practices and the burials themselves can be used to discover how Iron Age groups would have mediated and perceived gendered identities at death, if at all. When it comes to the human remains, there is still a tendency to associate gender with grave goods. One notable example is Rudston 163, from the East Yorkshire site of Rudston (200 BC), which Sheelagh Stead sexed as possibly female, but was not deemed female according to the grave goods, which consisted of an iron sword and

an iron shield fitting (Stead 1991:205). This is consistent with earlier research done on human remains in Iron Age Britain, where human remains were either sexed according to the material culture (Joy 2011:294) or sexed using methods that are now out-dated and thus need to be reassessed.

In southwest Britain, mortuary practices are generally dominated by a cist burial tradition where the bodies are mostly unaccompanied by grave goods (Whimster 1982:72). The Bryher mirror burial on the Isles of Scilly is interesting because it contains both weapons and a mirror but was unable to be sexed (Johns 2002:27, Joy 2011:474-475), providing a possible exception to the usual interpretation of mirror burials as female. Otherwise, gendered discussions of the mortuary practices for Iron Age southwest Britain are absent (Ashbee 1979, Johns 2012, Quinnell 1986, Webster 2008). As with many of the other areas of Iron Age Britain, burials in this region have not been assessed since the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, leaving many possibilities for their reassessment and reinterpretation.

Burial traditions of central southern Britain exhibit a variety of burial traditions such as inhumations in various contexts and cremations (Whimster 1982). Discussions of social relations and identity remain relatively rare even in the case of burials accompanied by grave goods, such as at the sites of King Harry Lane (Stead and Rigby 1989) and Stanway (Crummy 2007). At King Harry Lane, the burials are considered in the context of their material remains and subsequent connections with the European continent (Stead and Rigby 1989:86), and calls several groupings of burials "Family Groups," though this is more related to the spatial location of the burials than any commentary on social organisation (Stead and Rigby 1989:83). Issues of social organisation and hierarchy are still debated within Iron Age Britain (Hill 2011).

Continuing discussions of martial objects in mortuary contexts have also considered their dynamics beyond them being purely symbolic of a warrior identity. Even though there is evidence that most martial objects (i.e. swords, shields, spears) might be considered indicators of masculine identity, there is enough ambiguity within the Iron Age record to suggest otherwise (Farley et al. 2014, Giles 2008, Pope and Ralston 2011, Stead 1991). A possible female cremation burial with a helmet, brooch and spike does not only imply the possibility of a female warrior, but an individual with power and authority, Iron Age representations often associate the head and related material with such qualities (Farley et al. 2014:386). In this interpretation, the power and authority associated with the helmets are not inherently gendered, but allocated to the particular individual seemingly regardless of their biological sex.

Recent bioarchaeological studies focusing on Iron Age Britain have found little difference between the pathological profiles of males and females. A re-examination of skeletal remains from Iron Age Dorset have shown that skeletal trauma was not restricted to biological males or adults (Redfern 2007, Redfern 2011, Redfern and Chamberlain 2011), but that violence permeated all ages and all sexes of populations within that region. This is important for re-evaluating the ways in which archaeologists conceive of the nature of violence within the period. Isotopic analysis shows there was no differentiation between the diets of those of different status or sex in Iron Age East Yorkshire (Jay and Richards 2006). Osteological analyses showed that there might have been some social differentiation in activities within Iron Age East Yorkshire populations, but males and females were largely similar in their pathologies (Peck 2013). These studies show that from an osteological viewpoint, there was little differentiation between Iron Age individuals, regardless of age, class or gender.

Giles (2012) integrates the osteological material with an object biography as well as wider landscape in her study of identities in Iron Age East Yorkshire. The multilayered approach to examining the burials allows for more flexibility in the interpretations, allowing for conclusions beyond general discussions of the material that are prevalent for that region of Iron Age Britain (Dent 1982, Dent 2010, Stead 1991). There is flexibility within the indicators of status and gender, with various combinations showing that there were multiple feminine identities as well as masculine ones played out through the depositions associated with the body (Giles 2012:170-171, Pope and Ralston 2011:396-397). Ultimately, studies of burials demonstrate little evidence for gender within Iron Age mortuary practices (Pope and Ralston 2011:401) and there is evidence for multiple high-status feminine and masculine identities. For a more in-depth discussion of the effectiveness of these case studies in promoting an engendered archaeology in Iron Age Britain, see Chapter 4.2.

The shift in approach to the interpretation of funerary remains and mortuary practices towards acknowledging gender is promising. However, there are still a number of issues that need to be addressed: lack of integration between studies relating to issues of sex, gender, health, status, class, age and others; the persistence of male/female binaries and fewer discussions of intersex or ambiguous burials; and a focus on materials from specific areas of the country. Social organisation is only generally a topic of conversation when grave goods are found with the human remains. The few discussion on gender in Iron Age Britain are extremely regional and whilst most is due to the archaeological record itself, it is important to develop more studies within seldom-studied areas in order to bring in new insights and interpretations for the time period.

### 2.4. Bioarchaeology and Gender

In the past thirty years, gender has emerged as an area of study within bioarchaeology (Geller 2005, Geller 2008, Hollimon 2011, Sofaer 2012, Stone and Walrath 2006). Recent studies have shown that the skeleton has much to offer in terms of gender identity (Sofaer 2013:227). This section discusses current research trends in gender bioarchaeology, paying special attention to case studies and the methods that allow for the embodiment of gender in the human skeleton and a move away from simplistic sex and gender binaries in regards to the human body (see Section 2.2.3.a for more on the differentiation between sex and gender). The studies below demonstrate how much information can be derived from the body in mortuary contexts in order to study gender beyond associating biological sex with material culture.

### 2.4.1. Gendered activities and the skeleton

One of the main issues in gender archaeology concerns the gendered division of labour. Several papers have critiqued previous studies for assuming simplistic labour divisions, i.e. hunting men and gathering women (e.g. Gero 1991a, Hendon 1997, Owen 2005, Willoughby 1991). However, it is important to move beyond such simplistic assumptions. Not every society would have split activities solely because of gender differences. Osteological studies of the body and performativity suggest

that effects of continued activities could leave distinct morphologies on human bone (Sofaer 2006:105). Some of those activity markers include evidence towards "degenerative joint disease, tooth wear, biomechanical studies of robusticity and flexion, relationships between inferred workload and increased mortality, musculoskeletal stress markers, and trauma" (Hollimon 2011:153). Simply put, an individual's movements affect many parts of the skeleton and any morphological change can be affected by a variety of factors.

There has been considerable critique towards the use of degenerative joint disease and musculoskeletal stress markers as an indicator of activity patterns. Osteoarthritis has been used to determine past activity, but several studies have cautioned against it (Jurmain 1999, Jurmain and Kilgore 1995, Weiss and Jurmain 2007). Other studies have also looked at the problems with using musculoskeletal stress markers (Cardoso and Henderson 2013, Jurmain et al. 2012) and cross-sectional bone geometry (Capasso et al. 1999). Amongst these studies, the most common critiques in the study of past activity using the human skeleton include bad definitions of "activity," whether it is continuous or caused by one-time events, and if the relationship between cause/activity and effect/bone changes is truly so simple (Jurmain et al. 2012:532). In order to be effective, studies of past activity have to be cognizant of their definitions as well as the number of factors that affect born morphology. In this, it is not so difficult to see the similarities in interpreting past activity and other factors relating to studying gender in archaeological contexts.

Several studies have shown how bone morphology can be used to infer activities and division of labour whilst possibly inferring a few things about gender in the process. Dental wear and tooth loss can indicate the lack or presence of differential activities, if individuals consumed different food (Hollimon 2000) or even how tooth loss gendered meanings, such as the removal and replacement of teeth with gold dental appliances in upper-class Etruscan women (Becker 2000). Other studies have used musculoskeletal markers to investigate the possible relationships between gender and past activity. One such study found evidence of entheseal change – that is, changes in bone robusticity and morphology at the muscle insertion sites – in males of different occupations (Milella et al. 2015:22, but also see Peterson 2000, Rodrigues 2005). Here it is clear that while there is still work to be done in regards

to ideas of activity and human remains, there are plenty of possibilities that can take interpretations beyond male/female binaries of labour.

### 2.4.2. Health, disease and isotopic analysis

Diet, health, and disease could have impacted individuals with different gender roles in different manners (Hollimon 2011:157). Food might have been consumed in a different manner not just between people of different social classes, but people of different genders. In osteological analyses, dietary patterns can be detected from examinations of the teeth, skeletal growth and development, and isotopic analysis (Hollimon 2011:157). Health may have also been differential amongst those of different genders due to separation in activities and diet. The activities that could have indicated labour practices would have had an impact on health as well. People performing different activities may have been exposed to different diseases, and different activities may have led to different degenerative diseases. Finally, isotopic analysis is useful in determining diet and migratory patterns that may have been impacted by social events (Agarwal and Glencross 2011, Katzenberg 2012, Montgomery 2010). For ways isotopes and health have been studied in Iron Age Britain, see Section 2.3.3.

The general literature on health, disease and isotopes is vast, but there are a number of studies that focus specifically on the role gender might play. Lukacs (2008) studied dental caries, concluding that the rise of agriculture prompted different eating habits for women. These eating habits may have been prompted by increased reproductive demand due to a more sedentary lifestyle and agricultural activities (Lukacs 2008). Redfern and DeWitte (2010) compared the health of a Late British Iron Age population in Dorset to a Roman population in Dorset and found that the Late Iron Age diet was equal between the sexes, whereas male health declined in the Roman period. Other studies around the world have used stable isotopes (Ambrose et al. 2003, Bentley et al. 2007, Hastorf 1991) to consider possible gendered differences in the past. Section 2.3.3 demonstrated some of those studies for Iron Age Britain, though these studies show there are other populations that would benefit from such techniques.

### 2.4.3. Trauma, violence and warfare

Androcentric models of the past have also provided differing explanations for skeletal trauma between genders. In men, trauma was always ascribed to warfare, whilst in females it was applied to domestic violence and other activities; though newer approaches to biological archaeology and violent behaviour look into the nature of the trauma and how it might relate to violence (Glencross 2011, Hollimon 2011, Judd and Redfern 2012, Novak 2006). Recently, approaches to the subject have looked at the specific links between identity, age and agency throughout the life course through aspects of injury (Agarwal and Glencross 2012:7), showcasing the ways in which violence can be used to determine more than the presence of male or female warriors in the past. Indeed, manifestations of trauma on the skeleton have the potential to inform archaeologists about attitudes towards injury and interpersonal violence in the past.

As with all of these studies, the relationship between gender and trauma must be considered within the context of time and space. Several studies have shown that warfare related trauma was meted out to everyone, regardless of age or gender, or even social class (e.g. Hollimon 2001, Walker 2001, see Section 2.3.3 for Iron Age examples). Violence has even been shown to be highly dependent on context within sexes (Martin et al. 2010). Ultimately, several case studies on bioarchaeology and violence have shown that warfare was indeed divided amongst gender lines, with males doing the fighting and the killing (e.g. Robb 1997). Skeletal analysis of trauma must account for differing beliefs between societies concerning what was appropriate in terms of violence and warfare in order to infer what the attitudes towards violence might have been for different genders.

### 2.4.4. The sex and gender debate and future research trajectories

The preceding sections have shown many of the ways in which gendered inferences can be derived from the skeletal evidence. Despite the progress made in many areas of the social sciences in terms of gender, specific subfields within anthropology and archaeology have struggled in reconciling theory with practice. In particular, Geller (2008:16) has pointed to biological anthropology and bioarchaeology as distinctly lacking in progression involving gender theory. Within the past twenty years, there has been a call to pull bioarcheologists away from lines of thinking that assume gender correlates directly to sex, focusing on one or the other and perpetuating the idea of naturalized sex differences (Geller 2008:118, Geller 2009:66, Sofaer 2013:229). They point out the influence of 17th century thought and onwards, thought that firmly separated sex into distinctly male and female binaries (Laqueur 1990:149). These prevailing attitudes have strengthened over the years, informing the ways in which researchers, particularly those who dealt with skeletal remains, approached and interpreted their data. This assumes that sex is the most important analytical category (Sofaer 2013:229). In other words, osteological analyses cannot just assume that patterns will always emerge when biological sex is introduced as a category of analysis.

Several problems present themselves when using the human skeleton for analysis when sex and gender are considered distinct. Sex is the known quantity residing within the body, whilst gender is constructed outside the body. The human body does not add an element of inference whereas material culture in the form of grave goods often *does*, which leads to gender being constructed only through objects with the help of the body only through its determination of biological sex (Sofaer 2006:156). On the other hand, the categorisation of biological sex a construction eliminates the usefulness of osteological method in creating categories of analysis that can evaluated in terms of sex and gender (Sofaer 2006:158). This highlights the tension that often occurs in the intersection of method and theory between archaeology, osteology and feminism. Various categorisations and constructions within one field are fundamentally at odds with their counterparts elsewhere.

Technological advances have pinpointed potential avenues of study for bioarchaeology and continuing gender studies: DNA and bone measuring and imaging techniques (Sofaer 2013:237). Theoretical applications such as the "*anthropologie de terrain*," (Duday 2006) are equally important to develop because of their potential contribution to providing information of past burial practices: taphonomic factors are considered to recreate the specific burial contexts of an individual (e.g. body positioning, specific placement of grave goods) in order to study the mortuary rite to its fullest extent. Other theoretical methods include using the body as a place of lived gender experience (Knudson and Stojanowski 2008) and embodied gender (as seen in Section 2.2.3.b.), which have the potential to broaden the field of gender archaeology when used in tandem with bioarchaeological

### techniques.

It is important to note that many of the techniques mentioned here relate mostly to gender in mortuary contexts or within the greater confines of the gendered body, whether or not it is the "physical" body in death or the "represented" body in various forms of iconography. Studies using the body have generally yielded a larger body of results. Whilst there is still work to be done within these fields, gender archaeology and indeed, archaeology as a whole would benefit from studying gender through the lens of the body and alongside other archaeological material.

### 2.5. Conclusion

Sections 2.2 and 2.4 have tracked the development of gender studies and highlighted its possibilities and future trajectories. Intersectionality demonstrates the importance of all narratives, not just adult men and women. Bioarchaeology explores all the ways the human body, from bones to DNA and isotopes, relate issues such as health with aspects of identity like gender. Though the human body provides a great deal of information about gender, the examples in the preceding sections have shown that gender is something that can be determined from a variety of archaeological material and is indeed as varied and complex as theory suggests. Studies such as Meskell (1999) demonstrate a great deal of potential in the ways that gender, class and the life course are fully intertwined, skeletal evidence and material culture together with contemporary literary sources.

Studies like Meskell's (1999) also demonstrate the limitations in the application of gender archaeology. As stated in Section 2.2.2, Meskell's study is ideal in the amount of data she was able to draw upon in order to make conclusions about Deir Al-Medina. In that case, it was possible to apply theoretical concepts such as the life course and body theory to the evidence. It is not always possible to apply the theory to the archaeological or literary evidence available. Certainly the analytic limitations in Iron Age Britain are its lack of written sources as well as a paucity of archaeological evidence – especially skeletal remains – in certain regions. For Iron Age Britain, it simply is not possible to come to the same conclusions because of the lack of contemporary written sources. It would be difficult to determine if gender systems were non-binary without such evidence. Areas of Iron Age Britain would

not be able to make the same conclusions about class and gender as Pope and Ralston (2011) and Giles (2012) have because of a lack of skeletal material and even material culture compared to Wessex and East Yorkshire.

However, these limitations allow for a degree of creativity, as seen in Chapter 1. Analyses of social models and artistic reconstructions might not provide insight into gender during the period, but are valuable for evaluating constructions of gender that are modern and historic, as well as academic and public. Though the writing is not contemporary, nor is it from the perspective of British Iron Age peoples, they can be used to discuss some aspects of gender within that society. Suggestions of nonbinary gender roles and aspects of sexuality (after Voss 2007) might be found within the classical sources. Alongside analyses of clothing, adornment and material culture with skeletal remains, there is a possibility of determining facets of gender identity. The classical literature analysis in Chapter 3 and the evaluation of mortuary practices in Chapter 4 might be able to provide insight into the construction of gender for the period in a way that has not been considered before.

Sections 2.2 and 2.3 have demonstrated the importance of context when discussing gender. There is no denying the importance of social models in understanding the past, but their underlying sources are rarely contextualised. There are historical, social, cultural and political underpinnings to them, influences that must be understood because they also form the basis of any social understandings that are built into the model. For example, Meskell (1997) cites the first, second and thirdwave feminist movements from the 1960s and onwards as the basis of gender studies in academia. Those movements have had a distinct influence on the development of her archaeological analysis of Deir al-Medina, and thus should be acknowledged. Chapter 3's analysis of British Iron Age social models must also interrogate the various influences in order to demonstrate how gender has been (or has not been) addressed within the model. Such underpinnings also related to the artistic reconstructions analysed in Chapter 5, providing the context for these popular visual references of the period.

# **Chapter 3**

# Gender and Social Models in Iron Age Britain

The limited information we have on the lives of Celtic women shows that it was above all a man's world.

### Freeman 2002:53

## **3.1. Introduction**

The following historiographic analysis examines the literature that has made the most impact on the study of gender in Iron Age Britain. Section 3.2 analyses key models from Hawkes (1964) to Haselgrove (1987) to Hill (2011) and analyses their text for gender approaches through their use of specific key terms (such as male/female) and how they are explained within the text. Section 3.2 also contextualises these social models in their historical, social, cultural and political contexts, taking into consideration the various influences that determine how gender is approached through them, if at all. Finally, Section 3.3 takes key texts from the classical Greek and Roman literary sources on the Celts and contextualises those stories within the framework of the time to determine how useful they are as potential ethnographic sources as well as also analysing the gender-specific language used in the translations.

There are several expected outcomes for this chapter:

- 1. Models based on diffusion, evolution and systems models will discuss gender in terms of male/female binaries.
- 2. Some social models may not consider gender at all.
- 3. The classical sources and their information might have shaped gendered discussions of the British Iron Age.

# **3.2. Searching for gender**

This section looks at the core social models that influenced discussions of Iron Age society, especially during the cultural-historical and early functional-processual periods. It briefly outlines how they have discussed gender, both theoretically and through a

text-based analysis of the number of times key words are used throughout the models. Though the words used for this analysis will change from article to article, the most common words searched will be:

Search terms:
Male/man
Female/woman
Child/children
Elderly/old
Warrior
Chief

Table 3.1. Index of gendered terms used for textual analysis in Sections 3.2 and 3.3.

Words that would denote gender outside of male/female and other similar terms might be associated with profession or identity. For example, words like "warrior" or "chief" will most often be associated with male individuals when the words are used within the text. Other occupational terms that might be gendered will be counted on a case by case basis for the texts analysed in the following sections.

The studies analysed in the following sections (Table 3.2.) were selected by going through edited volumes whose focus was on Iron Age Britain that studied social aspects of the period, such as Collis (1996), Moore and Haselgrove (2007) and Pope and Haselgrove (2007). The works were chosen because of the frequency with which they were cited within the volumes, demonstrating their relevance and popularity. The two most recent articles (Hill 2011, Moore 2011) were chosen because they offer more recent, post-processual views of Iron Age society in Britain, not because of how often they were cited. The analysis is arranged chronologically to record possible temporal and therefore theoretical shifts in the language and focus of social models for Iron Age Britain. Some key texts were omitted due to length (e.g. Cunliffe 2005, Hill 1995, Sharples 2010), but would be useful in further studies of gendered language in social models.

Author	Year	Work	
Hawkes	1959	The ABC of the British Iron Age.	
Hodson	1964	Cultural grouping within the British pre-Roman Iron Age.	
Clark, G.	1966	The Invasion Hypothesis in British Archaeology.	
Clarke, D.	1972	A provisional model of Iron Age society and its settlement system.	
Haselgrove	1982	Wealth, prestige and power: the dynamics of late Iron Age centralization in south eastern England.	
Hingley	1992	Society in Scotland from 700 BC to AD 200, Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland	
Moore	2011	Detribalizing the later prehistoric past: concepts of tribes in Iron Age and Roman Studies.	
Hill	2011	How Did British Middle and Late Pre-Roman Iron Age Societies Work (if they did)?	

Table 3.2. Index of studies analysed in Section 3.2.

Finally, the analysis will do a brief diachronic terminology search of several key academic journals (*Antiquity. Oxford Journal of Archaeology, Cambridge Archaeological Journal*) as well as the indexes of the first and fourth editions of Barry Cunliffe's *Iron Age Communities in Britain* to see if there are any temporal changes in approaches to gender within Iron Age Britain.

## 3.2.1. Hawkes and his critics on gender

Hawkes' (1959) discussion of chronology and cultural diffusion is an example of a social model that prioritises the sites and the material culture rather than the people. Hawkes used stylistic changes within material culture, burials, and monumental architecture to account for various cultural "invasions" from the continent (specifically Spain and northern Gaul) into later prehistoric Britain (Childe 1940, Hawkes 1931:88). In all of these cases, technologically superior and aesthetically pleasing material culture replaced the cruder "native" items. This focus on the people as a whole manifests in broad, sweeping terms when discussing Iron Age people. Figure 3.1. shows that "culture" is the most popular term, occurring forty times within the text. The next few terms also refer to the people in broad terms: "people" (though the first three instances refer to Iron Age researchers, not people), "colonists," "invaders" and "immigrants."

The words "fathers" (Hawkes 1959:179) and "older folk" (Hawkes 1959:177) are used, but only in terms for ancestors.

Hodson (1964:109) grouped the Iron Age material into four cultural groups rather than Hawkes' three. However, this still linked culture with artefacts with little discussion of social dynamics beyond the assumed structures detailed within the written sources. The language within the critique is as broad as Hawkes', with none of the variation. Figure 3.2. shows that Hodson also made copious use of the word "culture/cultures" to signify Iron Age peoples as a whole. The word "people" is only used twice and no other words are used to describe society or people in Iron Age Britain. The focus is on specific cultural groups and their associated material culture, such as the chariot burials in East Yorkshire.

Clark (1966) critiqued Hawkes' ABC system and attributed most of the culture changes to "indigenous evolution" (Clarke 1966:188) rather than outside invasions. The analysis still focuses more on British Iron Age cultures or people as a whole, and the language used reflects that. As with Hawkes and Hodson, there are no specific mentions of individuals or their sex and gender. The terms used refer to large groups of individuals: "culture," "invaders," "people," "leaders" and "citizens" (Figure 3.3.). The term "leaders" is of interest because it does insinuate that there is some sort of social structure within these monolithic peoples being described, but the word itself is not gendered. When discussing Iron Age society on this level, it does not appear necessary to gender its people. Of course, this could be because of the broad overview presented within these models – gender simply does not seem to be a necessary social or cultural aspect to discuss.

Discussions of social structures within these types of broad social models rarely stray beyond a nebulous social hierarchy ruled over by chiefs and a warrior aristocracy. The presence of elites is often inferred from a small number of rich material culture, especially in the form of metalwork hoards (Childe 1940, Megaw and Megaw 1989). If there were indeed chiefs and social hierarchy, there was no attention paid to how they developed and maintained their power within their communities as well as their influence (if any) outside of them (Hill 2011:242). Interactions were inferred by changes in items such as pottery and metalwork, which were attributed to the influence of a different ethnic group. This explains the many cultural incursions that are apparent in the ABC system: subsequent shifts in the material culture were triggered by the invasion or migration of another cultural group (Moore and Armada 2011:28). Superior ethnic groups and thus, their cultures, would have had long histories in certain places and would have certainly influenced "lesser" culture groups, which is what Hawkes' envisioned for the British Iron Age (Hawkes and Hawkes 1948:101).

Within such models, it is easy to see where gendered assumptions fall: "In this northeastern region (East Yorkshire), more than any other, society fell into a highly aristocratic pattern...in that world it seems that women could occupy a high and honourable place" (Hawkes and Hawkes 1948:109). The perception is that women were not among the chiefs and warrior aristocracy, even if there is no definitive archaeological evidence to support this. Even with the inclusion of more archaeological evidence, there were few inquiries into the complexity of social life with men and women falling into the same unquestioned roles (Edwards and Pope 2013:458). Proponents of evolutionary or diffusionist models might not have been concerned with those social questions or felt that they could not be interpreted from the available material. Either way, the study of Iron Age people themselves fell to the wayside in lieu of other avenues of enquiry.

Diffusionist theories like those espoused by Childe functioned on the assumption that cultures chose traits that were "functionally advantageous or stylistically more attractive" (Trigger 2006:246) from one another. To that end, it makes sense to focus more on aesthetic changes in artefacts and tracking them through trade, exchange or migration. If gender was a consideration, most assumptions were aligned with the artefacts themselves, rather than considering the roles of the artefacts in maintaining and creating identities (see Section 2.3.2.).

### **3.2.2. Structuring Society**

The vocabulary describing society increases exponentially with Clarke's (1972) model of Iron Age society based on the excavations of the Glastonbury Lake Village. Clarke uses a variety of words because the social model he proposes outlines society at the site from a household level to the wider community level. The language is gendered from the outset, giving spaces both "male" and "female" identities (Clarke 1972:816). Variants of this gendered binary in Clarke's language are his use of "son," "brother," and "father" for males and "wife" and "handmaiden" to females. Women as wives are traded in marriage alliances in the same way as artefacts (Clarke 1972:838). It is significant that most of the ways that women are mentioned in the text is in relation to men. Men were mentioned with more variety, especially in terms of leadership in the use of the words "headman" and "chief." Other terms for occupations are fairly gender neutral, from builders to fishermen and trappers, but given Clarke's assignation male-centric focus, most of those occupations would have been fulfilled by men.

Clarke does use several words to indicate age, including "children," "juveniles," "adults," and "seniors" (Figure 3.4.). However, children are not mentioned often and are usually relegated to the same space on the site and the same conversations as women (Clarke 1972:817), though women are mentioned more frequently. "Seniors" are also mentioned infrequently, only two times, thus centring the discussion to adults. Though the use of age-related terms is limited, this analysis shows that Clarke has considered society of the site on an individual level. Combined with the words used most frequently to describe society, refer to the people as a whole: "tribes," "inhabitants," "population," "community," "family," "household," and others, demonstrates a breadth of discussion that has not been previously seen. The problem of gender within Clarke's model mainly resides in the equation of gender with artefacts and thus, space. There is no reason to assume that the artefacts at Glastonbury Lake were inherently gendered, and that their deposition also equates gender with that space. Without corresponding written records and stronger archaeological evidence, the same things cannot be applied to Iron Age Glastonbury Lake Village as a whole, let alone the rest of Iron Age Britain. So whilst Clarke's model is an incredibly well thought out model, there are still inherent biases in regards to gender that must be addressed.

Structural-Marxist theories of British Iron Age society used literary sources, archaeological material and ideas of cores and peripheries to imagine a prestige good economy in southern England – especially southeast England (Haselgrove 1982). The social terms used within Haselgrove's paper are expected, with words like "society" and "groups" (Figure 3.5.). However, the prestige good model also supposes a hierarchical society and that too is reflected in the language used, with words like "chief," "paramount," "head" and "authority." Such terms are strongly gendered, as evidenced by the author's use of "his" (Haselgrove 1982:83) to describe the chief. Other male gendered terms are "brother" and "son," used to refer to the king Cunobelin's relatives (Haselgrove 1982:85). The only mention of women is when they are included with slaves within the export/import model, as commodities to be traded (Haselgrove 1982:81) and, as with Clarke (1972), only defined by their relationship to men.

The prestige model described within does account for some mention of age: "seniors," "juniors" and "elders," though this is not surprising given the hierarchical nature of the model described. The issue here is the same as with Clarke's model based on Glastonbury Lake Village – assumptions are made about the fundamental nature of some of the social interactions discussed, without supporting evidence. Literary evidence is taken from Strabo (Haselgrove 1982:82), which accounts for the use of slaves within the import/export model, but it is not proven through the archaeological record – nor is the migration of women for marriage purposes. Archaeologically, there is evidence of male leaders through the Late Iron Age coinage and the appearance of named individuals like Cunobelin (Haselgrove 1982:83), but it cannot be assumed for all Iron Age leaders. Haselgrove (1982:85) does admit: "our knowledge of the potential variants of [the system's] underlying structure is relatively poorly developed theoretically and empirically," but this does not excuse the sheer number of social assumptions that are built within the model without sufficient supporting evidence.

The structural-Marxist models of the 1980s through the early 1990s do look at society at multiple levels, which does allow for more variety in social discussions as well as the terminology used. Hingley (1992) looks at society in Iron Age Scotland (700 BC-AD 200) at a household level, which is reflected in the number of times the word "household" is used, followed by "group" and "society" (Figure 3.6.). This does keep the majority of the social discussion fairly gender neutral, though sons and daughters are discussed once (Hingley 1992:11). The actual makeup of the Iron Age Scottish household is not broken down beyond those components to see whether the archaeological evidence would support a more modern idea of a nuclear family for a household or something else.

Hingley's description of society is not strongly gendered: women are only mentioned in reference to the Ballachulish figure (Hingley 1992:23) and the idea of fertility goddesses being embedded within a Scottish ideology of agriculture, fertility and cycles of life and death. The rest of the work is devoted to how the households and communities might have maintained status within a structured system that may or may not have been hierarchical. The maintenance of relationships and status is discussed through the frame of religion and labour and the exchange of items (Hingley 1992:24) without theorising the interactions on a more individual level as was done in Clarke (1972) and to some extent in Haselgrove (1982). The households themselves would have been a good way to describe gender performance in some form or another, with the way various members interact within the household.

All three articles discussed within this section provided a structural view of how Iron Age society could be conceived. They are similar in the breadth of their discussion of Iron Age society in Britain and Scotland, from a smaller individual or household level up to the community level. This is in contrast to the works in Section 3.2.1., where Iron Age society was examined on a much larger level due to the mode of study through societal change, whether it was externally or internally driven. Here, the models looked more at how communities interacted with one another as well as, to some extent, within itself. However, gender within Iron Age society is often assumed within these models –

driven by male dominance and female passivity. In Clarke's (1972) and Haselgrove's (1982) models, women are brides that are exchanged between communities. Furthermore, Clarke's (1972) model supposed male/female artefacts and space with no supporting evidence beyond assigning objects male and female identities. Though there is some evidence to argue for male leaders through coinage, there is not enough to support those conclusions.

These models are excellent in their detail describing new aspects of Iron Age society, but there are still gendered assumptions inherent in some of the concepts of how these societies would have worked. This is evident through the language used and the way some societies in Iron Age Britain are discussed.

#### **3.2.3.** Post-Processual Social Models

The two articles discussed here were chosen because they exemplify the way postprocessual archaeology in Britain has both reconsidered past treatises on social constructions of the period and attempted to move forward in how society is discussed. The first is Moore (2011), which deconstructs the idea of "tribes" for Iron Age Britain. As befitting the title of the article, most of the language does consider Iron Age society in Britain in terms of large groups: "tribes," "groups" and "people" (Figure 3.7.). Unlike earlier articles that have done the same, like Hawkes (1959) and Hodson (1964), Moore (2011) does not focus on how change has affected these groups, but attempted to explain how ideas of tribes, especially those written about in the classical sources, cannot quite be used to explain how groups of people would have organised and identified themselves in Britain during that time.

There could be more consideration in Moore (2011) about how the Iron Age groups would have organised themselves in terms of class, gender, age and other aspects of identity. The article does mentions chiefs and, quoting Caesar, Mandubracius the "young man," (Moore 2011:5), but this is uses a classical source as a reference. Authors like Caesar, upon meeting Iron Age peoples in Gaul and Britain, immediately ascribed to them (see Section 3.3.1.). Whether or not those perceptions are truly indicative of how society worked is uncertain. The message inscribed there is to use such sources

with caution and to remember the context in which they were written. So whilst Moore's (2011) paper takes perceptions of Iron Age tribes and uncovers the influences behind the ways in which they have been discussed, there is little speculation on how such groups would have worked.

This leads the analysis to Hill (2011) and his question of how Iron Age society in Britain worked. Though Hill's 1995 work is more widely cited amongst publications on Iron Age Britain, this more recent work is more explicit in how it theorises the structure and makeup of society at that time, whereas the former was more focused on ideology and depositional practices. As with other Iron Age archaeologists (Clarke 1972, Hingley 1992), Hill takes a more kin and family-oriented structure for his discussion, and that is reflected in the language within the text. "Households" are followed closely by "groups" and "society" (Figure 3.8.). In a departure from earlier works, the society mentioned within the paper is not hierarchical, but follows a model closer to Crumley (1974, 1995) and a heterarchical model. This has the distinction of not always positioning chiefs (usually male chiefs) at the top of society, though chiefs are mentioned ten times.

The model addresses gender, acknowledging it as a factor within society (Hill 2011:249) as well as how little attention has been paid to gender and age relations within households (Hill 2011:250). Hill (2011) does use language that differentiates age, such as "juniors," "seniors," "children" and "adults". Men are differentiated as younger men, adult men and senior men. Women are only mentioned twice, by distinguishing the differences between members of a particular society rather than lumping them together (Hill 2011:255) and that even within a heterarchal society, there is still some level of social importance and that women might not have benefitted from that (Hill 2011:255). Therefore, groups are the main focus within the article, functioning as the primary social unit, and contain many different individuals within. It is a small distinction, but it does separate Hill's paper from the ones in earlier sections that only acknowledged the groups (e.g. Hawkes 1959, Hingley 1992), or stereotyped the different people within (e.g. Clarke 1972, Haselgrove 1982).

The defining features of post-processual models within Iron Age Britain focus largely on redefining and restructuring the types of models that have come before. They may follow the same lines – discussing tribes or households, but they attempt to frame them in new ways, adding elements that enhance the complexity inherent within those interactions and individuals rather than glossing over or stereotyping the people or identities within. What remains from here is to elaborate on these underlying structures and to theorise the ways in which gender and age, as well as other structuring principles, would have shaped these different groups.

### **3.2.4. Examining the major publications**

The journals chosen for analysis in this section are *Antiquity*, the *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, and the *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*. All were chosen due to the high quality of scholarship as well as a long history of scholarship: *Antiquity* has been in press since 1927, the *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* since 1982 and the *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* since 1991. These will be examined for articles relating to gender in Iron Age Britain in order to track any trends in the subject's publication. Additionally, the first (Cunliffe 1975) and fourth (Cunliffe 2005) editions of Barry Cunliffe's *Iron Age Communities in Britain* will also feature in this analysis due to its continuing importance as a general resource on the Iron Age in Britain.

With the *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, the search terms "gender iron age Britain" yielded 145 results. However, a look through those results showed there were only three articles that were relevant for the search terms as well as the time period and location: Parker Pearson's (1999) "Food, Sex and Death: Cosmologies in the British Iron Age with Particular Reference to East Yorkshire," Parker Pearson's (2008) "The Powerful Dead: Archaeological Relationships between the Living and the Dead," and Giles' (2015) "Performing Pain, Performing Beauty: Dealing With Difficult Death in the Iron Age." Using "gender" as the only search term reduces the results to 24 and only brings up the Park Pearson 2008 article. Given the journal's start in 1991, it is not too surprising to find so few articles on gender overall and so few on Britain, though this can stand to be changed in the future.

A search in the *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* only yields 31 results – however, more of these articles are actually relevant to both gender as well as Iron Age Britain. This both speaks to the search engine for Wiley Online Library as opposed to the Cambridge Core, as well as the fact that Barry Cunliffe and Chris Gosden serve as editors. It stands to reason that the *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* would have a higher number of publications relating to Iron Age Britain. These articles include Giles (2007a), Redfern (2008, 2009), Chadwick (2012) and Chittock (2014). Gender is considered in a variety of ways through these articles, from the skeletal material (Redfern 2008, 2009), skills and artefacts (Giles 2007a), depositional practices (Chadwick 2012) and artefacts (Chittock 2014). Though all of these articles were written within the last decade, it does show progression in the publication of articles relating to gender in Iron Age Britain. Their publication also shows the different approaches taken in gender research for the period, indicating the potential for future studies.

For *Antiquity*, the usual search terms yielded 1,507 results, which meant the search terms had to be amended. When "gender" was used as the only search term, 30 results came up but none of them were relevant to Iron Age Britain. When "Iron Age Britain" was used as the search term, there were 1,484 results. Using "gender" as a keyword search within those finds yielded zero results. Finally, "Iron Age" was used as a search, with 1,134 results and zero finds when "gender" was used again within the keyword search. Whilst there are articles on gender published within *Antiquity*, it is very small considering its many decades of publication history. There is much room for improvement and hopefully there will be more articles published that not only have gender as the subject, but also focus on Iron Age Britain. It must be noted that the wide variety of search results is likely due to the Cambridge Host server, as was the case with the *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*.

In the first edition of *Iron Age Communities in Britain*, there is no overt mention of gender. Warrior graves are considered exclusively male, whilst female graves are defined by the presence of mirrors and "other trinkets appropriate to female attire"

(Cunliffe 1975:293). When discussing the structure of Iron Age society, especially southeast Britain, parallels are made with the Gaul – specifically, the highly patriarchal society described by Caesar (Cunliffe 1975:307) and further described in Section 3.3. He does acknowledge the possibility of other social structures outside this area, again citing the classical sources and the presence of Boudica and Cartimandua to provide evidence of possible matrilineal societies in Iron Age Britain (Cunliffe 1975:307). However, all of these conclusions are drawn from the classical sources, using little evidence to discuss possible gender roles in society beyond what is drawn from associating objects with burials.

Unlike the straightforward comparisons in the first edition of *Iron Age Communities in Britain*, in the later edition Cunliffe is more conscious of directly equating artefacts with sex and thus, gender: "At Bryher, Isles of Scilly, a burial provided with a mirror and a sword was found, implying that the burial tradition may have been more complex than the gender-related items may at first have suggested" (Cunliffe 2005:206). Though the "chariot burials" of East Yorkshire did contain some differentiation in grave goods, "This might suggest that the vehicle rite was associated with status rather than gender" (Cunliffe 2005:549), though he admits to wanting to contrast the "warrior" equipment with female equipment (Cunliffe 2005:549). This corresponds with other burials that he says display both gender and status (Cunliffe 2005:588). However, this does display a willingness to look at relationships between gender, burials and artefacts in different ways rather than direct association.

### **3.2.5. Discussion**

Sections 3.2.1 through 3.2.4 have shown that social models of the British Iron Age have followed distinct patterns in regards to their descriptions of society. Earlier models like Hawkes (1959), with their focus on external change, viewed Iron Age society on a wider level and the language within reflected that. Therefore, gender is not something that was mentioned in a way that could be quantified – that is, through mentions of men and women as well as anything associated with them. This became easier to track within the more processual models like Clarke (1972) and Haselgrove (1982). Those models contained language that was focused on male/female binaries, where women

were only framed in their relationshop to men. In Haselgrove's (1982), part of it was due to a reliance on classical sources to expand upon how Iron Age society would have worked on smaller levels and gender could be addressed. Clarke (1972) also relied upon classical sources, though most conclusions were drawn by associated objects with male/females and designating the space around them as male/female as well. Otherwise, language remained fairly consistent in referencing larger groups rather than the individual people (Hingley 1992). Larger group terminology was utilised far more often, which was not expected at the outset of this analysis.

Post-processual Iron Age models, even those specifically addressing how society worked in Iron Age Britain deconstructed the ways in which previous models framed it. Moore (2011) reconsidered how "tribes" worked in Iron Age Britain and whether or not larger social structures could actually perform that way. Hill (2011) put forward the idea that society was a heterarchy rather than a hierarchy, as seen previously (e.g. Haselgrove 1982, Cunliffe 2005). Rather than dismissing the models that came before, they considered how certain concepts within those models might not fit how society would have worked for that period. However, these newer ideas still do not venture to discuss how gender and age would have affected how society worked on those more individual levels. Still, it is possible to add gender to this discussion, paving the way for further research.

Finally, the journal article search, as well as the index search of Cunliffe's (1975, 2005) *Iron Age Communities in Britain* have demonstrated that the process of studying gender in Iron Age Britain is still ongoing. Published scholarship has really only occurred within the last twenty years, but the discussion is there, as seen in the differences to how gender is mentioned within Cunliffe's book. With this basis in mind, the analysis can move on to the literature that has affected much of the way gender has been framed for Iron Age Britain: the Greek and Roman classical sources.

### 3.3. "Celtic" and contemporary society and gender

Discussions of approaches to gender in archaeology illustrates that certain stereotypes have been persistent within discussion. It is worth considering where such ideas derive.

Here, particular passages reveal how classical authors viewed gender and how their own constructions and perceptions coloured them. These particular passages might have been used in Iron Age social models as a basis for ideas about gender relations and gendered identities. Can the portrayals of Celtic peoples within the classical sources be considered factual representations that can be applied further back within the period? In other words, were the classical writers making observations that reflected their society more than Iron Age societies, and what does that mean for subsequent social models or interpretations that use the classical sources as their base? It is also worth considering how contemporary ideas of gender existed alongside the inferences made from the written sources and how archaeologists reproduced these ideas within their works, which ultimately could lead to the perpetuation of male/female binaries and ideas of male power within Iron Age societies.

For ease of reference, all Iron Age peoples in the following section will be referred to as "Celtic." The term "Celt" is used widely and largely indiscriminately throughout the classical sources (Chapman 1992, Collis 2003) as well as many subsequent academic studies on the subject of Iron Age people, their culture and society in Europe. In this section it will simply be used a reference term in regards to those peoples outside the classical world that may correspond to the groups of people living in Britain and France in the later prehistoric period.

### **3.3.1.** Classical constructions of Iron Age people

Hill (2011:243) suggests that "Celticism" is one reason why Iron Age archaeologists rarely discussed social organization in detail until the 1970s. Ideas of social organization were drawn from the classical sources as well as Irish medieval sources (Leerssen 1996:1-2, Thurston 2009:347-348), as well as constructions of gender (Foxhall 2013:1). Archaeological works that drew on written sources might have viewed them as ethnographic parallels or historical fact, and classical sources could have informed the archaeology rather than the other way around. Contemporary Iron Age archaeologists have been more cautious about using written sources to make analogies about Iron Age societies (Hill 2011:246), but the examples below could

demonstrate how often the classical sources serve as a source of information. Table 3.3.1. references the specific classical texts used within this section.

### 3.3.1.a References to men, women and children in the classical sources

Discussions of Iron Age society have already been critiqued as being "all male and childless" (Collis 2011:223). The first item of interest is whether or not the classical sources already maintained a quantitative bias within their texts. In other words, do they talk about men more than they talk about women? This would provide the baseline for the discussion within the rest of this section. It is worth mentioning that gender and feminist studies have yielded a number of studies on marginalised people in the classical period such as women (Cameron and Kuhrt 2013, Dixon 2001, Foxhall 2013, Pomeroy 1995, Skinner 1987), children (French 1991, Wiedemann 2014) and slaves (Bradley 1984, Finley 2014). Foxhall (2013:9-10) has noted the relative paucity of articles within the classics focusing on women and gender, as well as the dominance of ideologies based on masculinity (Foxhall 1998:3). This provokes the question of whether or not the privileging of masculinity can be derived directly from the classical sources.

To investigate this, text documents of several key texts (Table 3.3.1.) were downloaded from the Project Gutenberg website. Their texts were analysed in order to see how many times men, women and children were mentioned. Total counts for 'men' included terminology such as man (when it referred specifically to biological males, not humanity has a whole) and husband. "Women" also included synonyms such as woman and wife. "Children" included synonyms such as baby and infant.

Five texts were compared: *De Bello Gallico and other commentaries of Gaius Julius Caesar* (Caesar and Quincey, n.d.), *The Germany and the Agricola of Tacitus* (Tacitus and Brooks 1897), *Tacitus, the histories* (Tacitus and Fyfe 1912), *The Histories of Polybius, Vol. 1-2.* (Polybius and Shuckburgh 1889) and *The geography of Strabo, Vol. 1-3* (Strabo et al. 1854). Figures 3.9. through 3.13. demonstrate how many times each word (or variant thereof) was mentioned within the text. The figures (see Volume II)

Classical Text	Author
Ethics	Aristotle
Politics	Aristotle
The Deipnosophists (multiple translations)	Athenaeus
De Bello Gallico and other commentaries of Gaius Julius	Julius Caesar
Caesar (multiple translations)	
The Historical Library of Diodorus the Sicilian (multiple	Diodorus
translations)	
Juvenal and Persius	Juvenal
The History of Rome	Livy
Laws	Plato
The Histories of Polybius	Polybius
Pomponius Mela's description of the world	Pomponius Mela
The Geography of Strabo	Strabo
A Dialogue Concerning Oratory, Or the Causes of Corrupt	Tacitus
Eloquence	
The Annals and History of Tacitus ( <i>multiple translations</i> )	Tacitus
The Germany and Agricola of Tacitus	Tacitus

 Table 3.3.1. Classical texts analysed for gendered terminology.

show that the majority of people mentioned within the classical sources are men. This is a pattern across all five works, but for some, such as *De Bello Gallico* (Figure 3.9.) or *The Histories of Polybius* (Figure 3.12.), the gaps between men and women are extremely marked, with women only constituting a fraction of the entire narrative. The only work showing a number close to parity is Strabo's *Geography* (Figure 3.13.) but even there, males account for 67% of mentions within the text. It is clear from the outset there is already a clear bias in the subject matter, meaning that gender imbalances are going to be implicit from the outset.

For some of the texts, the reason behind the imbalance is clear. In *De Bello Gallico*, for instance, Julius Caesar was travelling with armies, fighting wars and interacting mostly
with other soldiers. Within the context of war, it makes more sense that on a day-to-day basis, he saw more men than he saw women or children. However, the more historical volumes such as those by Polybius and Tacitus – whilst they do chronicle events of war, are not limited to those events. Polybius might have faced the ethnographic impasse of being male and having only male informants in his travels and this may have happened with other authors. Ultimately, the views of these male authors permeated their commentary on Celtic societies, which, as the following sections will demonstrate, was more often a commentary on their own societies rather than the Celts themselves.

#### 3.3.1.b Masculinity and the Celtic Warrior

Of all the dominant masculine ideologies that are present in the classical sources, the most relevant within the context of Iron Age Britain is the Celtic Warrior. Narratives of soldiers and warriors can be found in many of the classical sources, particularly Caesar's *The Gallic Wars*. The key issue here is that Caesar writes within the context of battle and naturally mentions the individuals present – which, in the case of The Gallic Wars, were soldiers. This does not necessarily mean that soldiers had to be male, but it is the inherent assumption: "Violence has been seen as a particularly male attribute and the usually legitimated violence offered by the soldier often meant that soldiers have been represented as ideals of manhood" (Alston 1998:205). Indeed, many of the situations described by the classical authors are within the context of conflict or battle, and Celtic warriors are chief amongst them. This could account for the persistence of the Celtic Warrior within discussions of the Iron Age – there are few personas as well described or theorised. The prominence and idealisation of the male warrior allows it to maintain its popularity within the public and academic mind.

The Celtic Warrior is the most common and privileged symbol of Iron Age gendered identities perpetuated by the classical sources. Caesar (n.d.:133) presents "knights" as the highest in Gallic society next to Druids. Sources describe their prowess in battle, from their bravery (Aristotle n.d.:51) to their training regimes, which apparently started at a young age (Aristotle 1912:141). Even when their campaigns were not entirely successful, Iron Age peoples outside of the classical world were known for their

military might (Rankin 1987:54). Polybius' account of Celtic defeat contains some of the most iconic descriptions of those who were considered part of the warrior class:

The Insubres and Boii were clothed in their breeches and light cloaks; but the Gaesatae from vanity and bravado threw these garments away, and fell in front of the army naked, with nothing but their arms; believing that, as the ground was in parts encumbered with brambles, which might possibly catch in their clothes and impede the use of their weapons, they would be more effective in this state (Polybius 1889a:144).

Not less terrifying was the appearance and rapid movement of the naked warriors in the van, which indicated men in the prime of their strength and beauty: while all the warriors in the front ranks were richly adorned with gold necklaces and bracelets (Polybius 1889a:145).

Strabo (1854a:226) and Diodorus Siculus (1814:313) also mention the bright clothing choices and selection of ornamental gold jewellery (mostly in the form of torcs) of the Celts. Further discussions of how all of these descriptions are used in the archaeological reconstructions can be found in Section 5.5.3 and 5.6.1, as well as more in-depth discussions of those characteristics as signifiers of a particular masculine identity.

But how exactly is male power and masculinity idealised within the scope of the Celtic Warrior within the classical sources? The issue here is if the Iron Age perception of the warrior carried the same ideals of masculinity that the classical authors carried for their own soldiers. Is the construction of the Celtic Warrior more in keeping with classical (that is, Greek and Roman) masculinity, or is it possibly indicative of some other identity? Does the presence of a female warrior such as Boudicca imply that Iron Age societies might have conceived of their warriors in different ways – that is, were warriors ascribed with an identity beyond simply masculine, as Foxhall (1998:4) ascribes to more elite males? In order to understand classical masculinity, it is important to understand its link with power.

Readings of *potestas* (power) and *vir* (idealized masculinity) within the Roman period demonstrate that the Roman soldier "did not conform to the ideals of manhood" (Alston 1998:211). The structure of Roman society revolved around potestas, and the ultimate

ideal was that of the (male) individual who was beholden to no one. Soldiers, as employees of the state, were certainly subject to another's power and therefore did not fulfil the terms of *vir* (Alston 1998:210-211). Additionally, Augustan-era regulations that did not allow soldiers to marry further exacerbated the lack of a soldier's ability to attain vir, as the formation of a separate household with a man at the head (*pater potestas*) was the pinnacle of male autonomy and thus, power (Alston 1998:212). For many Roman authors, a soldier and a warrior were not idealized men at all.

Tacitus and Pliny the Younger perceived potestas as something that was delicately negotiated in imperial Rome, particularly *within* the context of tyrannical rule (Alston 1998:215). Liberty could be attained, but at great cost – which may explain Tacitus' tone of admiration for the British warriors that rebelled against Rome – namely Boudicca and Caratacus. Tacitus emphasizes Boudicca's need to restore "liberty extinguished" (Tacitus 1839:322) and Caratacus' refusal to accept "interminable bondage" (Tacitus 1839:250). Contrast this with Cartimandua, whose unfailing servitude towards Emperor Claudius might have caused her "demoralization" (Tacitus 1912:158). Even though figures like Boudicca and Caratacus were clearly rebels and against Rome, their pursuit of freedom, power and ultimately, *vir* through warfare was seen as noble because they could do what most aristocratic Roman males could not do, except with much silence, delicacy and subterfuge (Tacitus n.d.:59). *Vir* was not something easily attainable at that time by anyone except rebellious soldiers or individuals.

The same case can be made for Caesar, who views the Gauls within a militarized setting. He might have respected their abilities, but ultimately they were either allies or rebels who needed to be subjugated. His own *vir* was at stake and he had to prove himself to the audience back in Rome that he was worthy of the ultimate *potestas*. Therefore, the image presented of the Celtic Warrior comes from the classical viewpoint: of soldiers striving to achieve *vir* but largely failing because of their eventual defeat by Rome. Their attempts are admirable, but ultimately in vain. In the texts, the Celtic Warrior is portrayed as an imperfect specimen of masculinity – when viewed

through the eyes of classical antiquity. Through the classical sources alone there is no way of knowing exactly what constituted a warrior identity and whether or not it was considered masculine. And yet, archaeological reconstructions continue to depict it as a paragon of more modern ideals of masculinity, when it was conceived and constructed differently in the past (Connell 2005:68-70).

The Romans viewed the Celtic Warrior as a failed example of *vir* – not only were they soldiers, but they were unable to achieve their goal of rebelling against the encroaching empire to retain their autonomy. Roman views of masculinity were intrinsically linked to power, but it is difficult to conclude from the classical sources alone whether or not power played the same importance within *Iron Age* constructions and perceptions of masculinity. Power could have been considered differently, especially in relation to military prowess.

Interpretations of masculinity and the Celtic Warrior are almost certainly different within an archaeological context, where "warrior societies" and a "warrior elite" (Collis 2011:223, Cunliffe 1997:91, Cunliffe 2005:449, Sharples 2010:113) have often been used to describe aspects of Iron Age social organisation. Several studies refer back to the classical sources to corroborate the image of a violent Iron Age society (Cunliffe 2005:533) – and this does not even include the persona of the Celtic Warrior within a modern popular media context (see Chapter 5.6.1). Therefore, it is even more interesting to contrast how the Celtic Warrior might have been viewed within a classical context. Social models that refer back to the classical sources in order to support the idea of elite warrior societies in Iron Age Europe might be viewing the masculine warrior through a more contemporary perspective, not necessarily the classical or even the Iron Age one.

#### 3.3.1.c Feasting and gender

Classical accounts of Iron Age eating and drinking habits have been used to corroborate long-held beliefs about exchange, material culture and acculturation in parts of Iron Age Europe (e.g. Arnold 1999, Bintliff 1984, Cunliffe 1997, Dietler 2010, Gosden 1985, Frankenstein and Rowlands 1978). The classical sources do little to discuss the

expression of gender roles and feasting, though a few assumptions can be inferred. During the Roman period, feasting was seen as a specifically high-class male activity (Dunbabin 2003:11). Most feasting references do centre on men rather than women, emphasizing the male role (Athenaeus 1854:267) and the tie between feasts, men and situations of interpersonal violence (Diodorus 1814:314). In the Greek feasting tradition, "proper" women were usually excluded from feasts, whilst in the Roman period there is varied evidence regarding the attendance of women at feasts (Dunbabin 2003:22-23). Authors of the classical sources had varying attitudes towards the presence of women at feasts and therefore, their status in being able to attend.

There are only two references to Celts, women and feasting within the classical sources: Camma, who poisons her husband's drink in revenge (Koch and Carey 2003:41-42), and a story of the foundation of Massalia, where the bride chooses her husband at a wedding feast (Athenaeus 2010: 333-335). The context of the wedding feast is interesting: Athenaeus is quoting Aristotle in regards to the foundation myth, so the viewpoints are tied into high-status Greek and Roman life. And whilst it may seem like the girl had the power in choosing her husband, the choice was still approved by her father and her husband changed her name (Athenaeus 2010: 333-335). This reflects not only the classical idea of the power of the father over the daughter in regards to matters of marriage (Saller 1994:205), but the fact that a woman exchanged her father's *potestas* for her husband's after marriage (Saller 1994:207). Even if the story is a myth, it is possible to see the cultural ideals that are embedded within it.

Though the examples of gender and feasting are limited, it is still fairly obvious that much of the stories are constructed through the lens of the classical Greek and Roman world, despite the location and the ethnicity of the characters. It is difficult to ascertain what aspects of the stories are directly applicable to Iron Age people. This is an area where archaeological material would be helpful, but most interpretations of the Iron Age archaeological record have only acknowledged female status from the presence of feasting detritus from the burial record (Arnold 1996, Giles 2012, Pope and Ralston 2011) or in the case of the Etruscans, through iconography (Pallottino 1975). Even

though the archaeological, historical and iconographic evidence is limited, there is still a suggestion that female power did manifest within the context of feasting. However, the few archaeological reconstructions of Iron Age Britain that depict feasting do not reflect this (see Chapter 5.6.3.a.).

Archaeologically, the context of feminine power and feasting is something that should be considered further in Iron Age studies, especially considering the material coming out of Iron Age southeast England with its potential ties to the classical world (Crummy 2007, Fitzpatrick 1991, Hill 1997, Hill 2002). Narratives of social organisation can use it to broaden discussions of the dynamics of power amongst upper levels of society within Iron Age Britain as seen in Arnold (1996) for late Hallstatt France.

#### 3.3.1.d Druids, religion and gender

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Druids became one of the most popular figures of later prehistory to emerge from the classical texts (Cunliffe 1997:11). Descriptions of Druids are generally gender-neutral (Aldhouse-Green 2010, Cunliffe 2005:571-574, Sharples 2010:154), though archaeological reconstructions have a tendency to portray them as male (Chapter 5.6.2.). Caesar's accounts of the Druids are particularly male-centric and his descriptions of their organisation have blatant parallels to Roman political and religious organisations (Hutton 2009:5). The Druids (and the Gauls) were seen as a lesser reflection of Roman society – enough alike that they would have made worthy additions to the empire, but still in need of Roman leadership. Therefore, Caesar's accounts of Druidic religious practices and most importantly, their gender biases, reflect Roman practices and gender ideologies. Another item to consider when discussing the classical world and Druidic practices is the general distaste towards practices such as human sacrifice (Hutton 2009:4-5), so any discussions were pejorative in tone and less than objective.

There are a number of references to female Druids within the classical sources, which corresponds to the Roman world, where women had active religious lives and did, in some cases, lead state cults (Pomeroy 1995:214). Strabo describes a cult of women in Gaul who worship Dionysius, the Greek god of wine (Strabo 1854a:226-227).

Druidesses in Gaul used their divination powers for the Roman emperors Alexander Severus, Diocletian, and Aurelian (Freeman 2002:43-44). Druids and Druidesses are mentioned in the attack on Anglesey in AD 60:

Around their ranks were women dressed like the Furies, running around with wild hair waving sticks. Everywhere the Druids were raising prayers to the sky and calling down curses, the sight of which terrified our men, who had ever seen such a thing before. They stood there exposed to the enemy's weapons as if their legs and arms were paralyzed. But thanks to mutual encouragement and to the urging of their commander not to be scared of a bunch of crazy women, they soon pressed forward, crushing and burning all resistance (Freeman 2002:66).

Freeman's translation is interesting because it calls Druidesses "crazy women." Other translations of the text called them "womanly and fanatical" (Tacitus 2004:289) or "an army of women and fanatics" (Koch and Carey 2003:34). This highlights the importance of interrogating the translations themselves, because the word "fanatical" implies extreme devotion to a cause, whereas "crazy" dismisses the women much in the way the female experience is often trivialised (Kitzinger and Wilkinson 1997:566, Wekker 2004:487). Thus, their roles and importance are overlooked and their contributions to the event at hand are deemed unimportant.

Freeman's use of a more pejorative term for religious women is surprising, since there is evidence that classical authors prized religious devotion amongst women (Aldhouse-Green 2010:212, Pomeroy 1995:212). The passage as a whole is a commentary on the barbarism of the Britons rather than a statement on Tacitus' feelings regarding women in religious contexts. Indeed, women were far from absent in religious life even outside the classical world: Strabo (1854a:333-334) describes the presence of older female religious practitioners amongst the Cimbri of present-day Denmark and Germany, whilst Pomponius Mela (1998:115) describes a group of priestesses similar to the Vestal Virgins living on what is possibly the Isles of Scilly, off the coast of Cornwall. And whilst neither of these examples, nor Tacitus' calls these priestesses Druidesses (Aldhouse-Green 2010:214-215, see also Aldhouse-Green 1995), they are significant religious figures in their own right regardless of their titles.

Within the polytheistic religious environment of the classical world, religion was one place where women could not only choose their place, but also depending on the place, achieve high status (Pomeroy 1995:213). This means that classical writers were not surprised to see foreign women in religious contexts and were not surprised if they were particularly devoted to religion, as the passage in Annals implies. The appearance of Gallic and British Druidesses in the classical sources might argue for their presence within Iron Age societies, and any exclusion might not be due to classical gender ideologies, but instead related to religious context (Pomeroy 2005:206). Therefore, women's contributions to the religions of the time (Druidism or not) should be acknowledged more often within discussions of Druids and within archaeological reconstructions of ritual, many of which exclude women altogether or situate them in the background (see Chapter 5.6.2).

#### **3.3.1.e Gender relations**

The previous discussions have already highlighted a few cases in which classical accounts do not always validate gendered interpretations of the archaeological material for Iron Age Britain. Indeed, the historical context of the classical world is very important within those comparisons. The introductory quote to this chapter (Freeman 2002:53) does not take into account the fact that classical writers came from societies with very strict gender roles and that those fundamental viewpoints coloured the way in which they viewed interactions between men and women (see Holmes 2012, Rabinowitz and Richlin 1993). According to various sources, including Caesar, Gallic families employed the practice of *paterfamilias* as the Romans did – that is, that men were the head of the family and "had the power of life and death over their wives and children" (Caesar n.d.:136). Tacitus critiqued the excesses of contemporary Roman society by contrasting it with Germanic tribes in Germania (Mattingly 1948:14, Rankin 1987:49), likening them to the Rome of the past. It served as a connection between perceptions of an idealized family power structure.

Patria potestas, or the absolute power of a father over his family, provides an enduring image of social and familial relations in ancient Rome (Saller 1994:102). The perceived

weakness of women – and thus, wives and daughters – meant that under the law, they were the responsibility of their male relatives (Dixon 1992:3, Hallett 1984:62-63, Pomeroy 1995:150). Males were also subject to *pietas*, but could attain their own independence once they were of an age or if their father died (Pomeroy 1995:150). Numerous examples of *patria potestas* can be found in the classical sources, especially in regards to the power of a father over his daughter and the husband over his wife (Dixon 1992, Hallett 1984, Pomeroy 1995, Saller 1994). This view permeated most authors' minds as they described family life outside of the classical world, and thus reflects on statements like Freeman's. There are so few examples relating to Celtic families within the text that classical authors could not conceive of other family dynamics or power structures and seized upon the examples familiar to them.

Even within the confines of *patria potestas* there is evidence for degrees of fluidity and power amongst females within these households. Hallett (1984:4-5) suggests that high-status Roman women were involved in a number of situations, acting as representatives of their family and deciding on their children's education and marriage prospects. Even though the Roman father was the head of the family, female power within domestic contexts was clearly possible, and even glorified – especially when a Roman mother educated her sons in a way that turned them into leaders (Tacitus 1811:22). This can only be applied to high-status families, as there is little written evidence on whether or not similar dynamics took place in lower class or slave families. Still, this also argues quite strongly for the existence of fluidity in the roles within Iron Age families.

In regards to gender roles, Strabo says, "Concerning men and women, the tasks which each sex performs is the opposite of that found in our society, but this is common among barbarian people" (Strabo 1854a:225). It is unfortunate that Strabo is not clearer on the types of tasks men and women perform, nor the contexts in which they take place. His statement makes it clear that, in his mind at least, the Gauls do things completely differently from the Romans. It is equally unfortunate that studies of women in the classical world conclude that writers focused on what made women "good" or "bad," always highlighting the fact that women were ultimately inferior to men (Foxhall 1998:4-5, Pomeroy 1995:228-240). The behaviour and role of women in those works was either idealized or exaggerated to extremes, effectively constructing the women of the time. In other words, classical sources did not write about real women.

Within that context, the views of classical authors towards Iron Age women make sense. Tacitus quotes, "'It is not unusual for Britons to follow a woman as leader into battle" (Annals, 14.35). Like some portrayals of classical women, Tacitus idealises Boudicca because he was critical of Roman society, yet her high status as a woman and her position as a rebel made her equally susceptible to critique for behaviour unbecoming for a woman, as seen by Cassius Dio. Similarly, Cartimandua is shamed for her sexual liberty because women in the classical world were supposed to be virtuous (Dixon 2001:33, Pomeroy 1995:159). Both Camma and Chiomara committed murder and were praised for it (Freeman 2002:55), but only because they were defending their virtue or avenging a husband. Iron Age women, then, were judged by Roman standards and it is difficult to remark on their character and identities because their narratives are so heavily influenced by the ideals of the classical world.

#### 3.3.1.f Sexuality

Feminist theory has a particularly strong place in discussing intersections of gender roles, relations and sexuality. Studies in archaeology (Voss 2007) as well as classics (Halperin 1990, Richlin 1993, Skinner 2005, Verstraete and Provencal 2005) have used feminist tenets to re-evaluate sexuality in the past – especially how sexuality in the form of heterosexual and homosexual binaries as understood now might not have existed. This section examines several passages from the classical sources within the context of classical reception studies and feminist theory to evaluate what gender roles or sexualities have been attributed to the Iron Age. From there, we can consider how reflective they are of Iron Age society or the classical societies that wrote of them.

It is widely accepted (Halperin 1990, Richlin 1993, Holmes 2008) that classical Roman sexuality was structured against binaries of power and powerlessness, activity and passivity, and perhaps to some extent, male and female. Foucault's (1978a:127) work on sexuality and its construction by society is often used as the basis of studies on

sexuality in antiquity (Halperin 1990, Winkler 1990). Halperin (1990:32) expands on this for Athenian society, where sexuality was not a matter of object fixation, i.e. same sex versus different sex, but was formed through the interactions of power, class and activity. In other words, sexuality in Athens revolved around those who penetrated (high-class Athenian males) and those who were penetrated (women, slaves, children – especially boys). The act of penetrating signified, above all things, power, and thus could not exist between two men of equal standing, only between men of high standing and someone of low standing, regardless of their biological sex (Halperin 1990:33).

This view of classical sexuality is important because it situates gender roles and interactions of that nature firmly within the context of the period. However, the assertion that modern ideas of homosexuality did not exist in antiquity is simplistic because it does not take into account the possibility of desire and love within men of a certain status and indeed, the issue is completely side-stepped. It is implied that the structure precluded most manifestations of passion and desire between individuals of equal status (Halperin 1990:32). While this might be true for Athenian Greece, there is evidence that in classical Rome, homosexual desire did exist and homosexual acts were performed (Richlin 1993:530). The existence of these acts does not mean that they were accepted during that period and there is an absolute distinction between "appropriate penetration," (a male penetrating anyone of the correct status or class) and the passive penetration of an adult male (Richlin 1993:568). Passive homosexuality in classical Rome is described in an extremely pejorative sense because it dissolves the power, status and reputation of the idealised Roman male. This framework of sexuality is also situated firmly around narratives of elite men, so sexuality might have functioned differently outside of this context.

What does this mean for the few mentions of Celtic sexuality in the classical sources? Diodorus Siculus, on the Gauls:

Although their wives are very comely, they have very little to do with them, but rage with lust, in outlandish fashion, for the embrace of males...And the most astonishing thing of all is that they feel no concern for their proper dignity, but

prostitute to others without qualm the flower of their bodies: nor do they consider this a disgraceful thing to do, but rather when anyone of them is thus approached and refuses the favour offered him, this they consider an act of dishonour (Diodorus 1939:183-185).

It is important to be careful with the translation, but there are a few terms within the translation that demonstrate ideals from antiquity – "disgraceful" and "prostitute to others without qualm." The 19th century translation uses similarly pejorative language: "the filthy act of sodomy" (Diodorus 1814:317) and "abominable" (Diodorus 1814:318). One term that is often used within Roman texts to deride passive homosexuality is *impudicitia* – literally "unchastity," but is often used to describe those who are penetrated in a dishonourable manner (Richlin 1993:531). The word choice within this translation implies that Gallic men might have expressed reciprocal homosexuality – that is, being either dominant or passive.

The translation might also imply something similar to modern bisexuality, where an individual may be attracted to both sexes, or even modern pansexuality, a sexual orientation which encompasses all gender identities (Bisexual.org, 2014). This is suggested by the line "...but rather are highly offended when anyone refuses them." Diodorus Siculus is referring to young males in this section, which neglects men of other age groups and women altogether, but it does suggest that sexual orientation could have been fluid for the Gauls and other contemporary groups. But because the Gauls are viewed through a classical framework, the observation is coloured by what is familiar, and that is the notion of *impudicitia* and passive homosexuality. Interestingly, Dio Chrysostom suggests that the overabundance of female partners causes men to seek other men, especially children, as sexual partners (Halperin 1990:34), though this is more of a commentary on the loose morals of women (and thus a rejection of their usual gender roles) than a parallel commentary on sexual orientation and object choice.

In addition, several lines from Juvenal's second satire lament that the Roman predilection for passive homosexuality has spread to its neighbours: "But things which are now done in the city of the conquering people/Those whom we have conquered do

not: and yet one/Armenian, Zelates, more soft than all our striplings, is said/To have yielded himself to a burning tribune (Juvenal 1789:79). Keeping in mind that the source material is Juvenal, a satirical writer, it does provide an interesting perspective on Romans and others, possibly the Celts. The Romans might have idealized other societies, where they perceived masculinity to be fully realized. What is clear here is that from Juvenal to Diodorus Siculus, the way in which other peoples' sexual orientations are framed is through the lens of Roman society. What few hints we do have suggest that groups like the Gauls might have structured their sexualities and thus, their gender roles differently. Of course, the majority of romantic relationships referred to between Celtic peoples are between males and females (e.g. Boudicca and Prasutagus. Cartimandua and Vellocatus), but again, that only suggests a binary norm and might not have been a reflection of all relationships and sexual orientations.

#### 3.3.1.g. Discussion

The popularity and impact of classical studies on aspects of later prehistory and the construction of a "Celtic" past gained momentum in major historical works from the 19th century and even into the 21st century (Leerssen 1996:4-5, Piggott 1989:6, Smiles 1994:8), though this is dependent on academic traditions and theoretical viewpoints. What is important here is how social observations from the classical sources have been reinterpreted within historical and archaeological texts and framed within contemporary societal norms in order to create an uncritical picture of a "Celtic" past that is moulded to fit specific historical, nationalistic and political agendas (Leerssen 1996:3, Piggott 1989:7). Within this construction, gender is rarely a question but more like natural state. Here, it is important to note that prehistory was viewed as a relatively short period, marked by little change in its people or culture (Champion 1996:66). It is not difficult to see how this might have perpetuated ideas of social continuity from the Iron Age to the time when they come into contact with the classical world. Even into the 20th century, issues of continuity might have been justified through ideas of similarity and analogy (see Chapter 3.3 and 3.4).

The uncritical use classical sources to support evidence of gender relations and gender identity in Iron Age Europe could be problematic simply because subtle gender differences might have gone unnoticed by the classical writers. It is possible that they would have had no frame of reference for recognising and discussing different gender structures. However, the previous sections demonstrated flexibility even with the seemingly rigid confines of social organisation in the classical world. This allows for the possibility of even more gender difference within both contemporary and past societies – this includes Iron Age people in Britain. Therefore, classical sources, as with all written sources, *can* be used as a point of comparison so long as one keeps in mind their social, cultural and political context.

#### **3.3.2.** Irish medieval texts and gender

Classical sources are not the only written sources that have influenced interpretations of Iron Age societies. Irish medieval laws, epic literature and myths have their own significance in regard to later prehistoric Britain and even contain similar themes that have been used to add credit to specific ideas about social and cultural life. Britain's history before the Roman conquest was seen as unsophisticated and barbarous when compared to the Anglo-Saxons (Smiles 1994:127). The Celtic Revival changed some of these attitudes in regards to historical perceptions of prehistory, influenced by the French romantic nationalism in Thierry's historical writing (Waddell 2005:126) and ideas of strong Celtic traditions surviving various invasions and periods of oppression (Champion 1996:67). From this perspective, it is understandable how parallels could be drawn from prehistory to the medieval period to modern times in order to perpetuate ideas of continuity, connection and national identity.

As with the classical sources, there is considerable debate about the suitability of Irish medieval literature as source material (Collis 2011, Mac Cana 1997, Waddell 2014). For Karl (2008:70), some aspects of medieval society in the British Isles are not only analogous, but also homologous. This reiterates the idea that Irish medieval literature, being relatively untouched by Roman influence, has roots reaching back to the Early Iron Age (Cunliffe 1997:25, Jackson 1964:5). The Irish sources are placed on equal

(Harding 2004:294) if not greater standing than ethnographic models when applied to the British Iron Age due to their geographic and chronological proximity to the period. However, as with any analogous text, ethnographic or otherwise, it is important to be aware of the specific social, cultural and temporal context of the written source, as proven with the classical literature in the previous section. For the Irish texts, this means being aware that the medieval scribes might have also drawn on classical Greek and Roman literature as well as Christian literature, not just Celtic oral tradition (Cunliffe 1997:26). This "source material" therefore contains a number of different themes from a variety of traditions.

The classic Iron Age warrior society has strong parallels with the society described within the Irish literature: "The principle of it is a primitive aristocracy, a warrior aristocracy in the sense that it is organised for the warfare which is its business" (Jackson 1964:8). The cattle raid which serves as the subject of the *Táin* is suggested as a commonplace event within a warrior aristocracy (Cunliffe 1997:26). However, texts like the *Táin* and others from the arguably mythologically based cycles of Irish epic literature (Mac Cana 1997:783) should be viewed carefully because of their genre as they are on par with mythology. The Irish texts have been criticised for their emphasis on the warrior leader as the focus of social interactions without acknowledging other kinds of power dynamics and relationships within society (Cunliffe 1997:27), but it is difficult to discern what aspects of the law are historically derived as opposed to contemporary to the medieval period, as well as whether or not the laws were real or idealised (Davies 1983:147).

One way Irish law has been used to mirror Iron Age society is through hierarchy and ranking. Irish medieval literature describes an aristocracy with a chief at the head, chief and inferior nobles, and freemen and craftspeople (Jackson 1964:9). This type of structure is often repeated when discussing Iron Age society in Britain (see Section 3.3.2), especially when discussing a chiefdom-like society (e.g. Dodgshon 1995, Haselgrove 1981). This idea is oftentimes supported by Caesar's descriptions of

hierarchical societies in Gaul, for example his use of the word "king" (e.g. Caesar n.d.:124). However, Caesar's terminology is described in Roman terms and might not reflect the actual social and political configurations of Gallic society (Champion 1997b:86, Dunham 1995:112). The same might have happened during transcription of Irish mythology during the medieval period – the terms might not have the same meaning due to the passage of time.

As with the classical sources, Irish medieval law appeared to be very strict in regard to the role of women in society. The Roman concept of *patria potestas*, or the man as the head of the family, does appear to have a direct parallel within the literature, but there are examples of women holding property, purchase it and even give property away (Davies 1983:151). Therefore, as with the Roman laws, there is evidence for flexibility within a seemingly rigid social structure. It is also important to remember how laws may vary from region to region: Davies (1983:162) observed that medieval Breton women had more property rights than their Irish counterparts, but Irish women were more likely to be important religious figures, which also granted them a degree of freedom and power in society. Still, it is difficult to discern where these rules and exceptions might originate, and especially if they come from an earlier Iron Age source from Britain.

Together, the classical sources and tales such as the Ulster cycle situate the Iron Age people amongst a landscape of myth and assumption (Piggott 1965:140). Some of these assumptions apply to gender relations in society as well: Jackson's (1964:8) interpretation of the literature assumes the same idea of heroic, male-centred warrior societies as the classical sources and others do the same (Dodgshon 1995, Smyth 1984), though alternate examples of social organisation have been suggested for "Celtic" societies. For example, the Venerable Bede described the Picts as matrilineal (Harding 2004:297) due to an origin myth and the assertion that the succession of several Pictish kings did not follow a patriarchal model (Smyth 1984:59). However, Smyth (1984:72-73) ultimately rejects assertions of a matriarchal society for the Picts, he argues that there is the fluidity of kingship and kingship structures (Smyth 1984:68-69). Such

fluidity in organisation can also be applied to how society was organised in Iron Age Britain.

As with the classical sources, medieval texts also contained evidence that must be contextualised when it is used as an ethnographic source. Otherwise, they are equally as problematic to transfer back onto the Iron Age as any of those from contemporary society or classical Greek and Roman society.

#### 3.4. Adding gender to the British Iron Age

This chapter has shown that despite the development of various archaeological theories and the application of various models derived from anthropology and beyond, ideas of social relations and social identities in Iron Age Britain have remained fixed, with few exceptions. Section 3.2. showed that gender is rarely a topic at all within social models and that gender, alongside age and status, are neglected in favour of examining Iron Age society on a larger scale – that is, in groups. This is reflected in the language used, where Iron Age people are often referred to on a group level, rather than individually. When they are, the descriptions are often stereotyped in a binary fashion, with male chiefs and warriors and female wives. Even some post-processual social models shy away from addressing gender. This could stem from a reluctance to enable further stereotyping, but this too is damaging because gender is still invisible within works that should be including it (e.g. Hill 2011).

Section 3.2.2. demonstrated that many of the binary stereotypes found in social models are rooted in the classical Greek and Roman views of Iron Age Europe, which are then transferred to Britain. This is an important distinction, because writing such as Caesar's on Iron Age Gaul have been used to perpetuate ideas of patriarchal societies where wives are traded like commodities, as in Clarke (1972:838) and Haselgrove (1982:81). Even classical concepts that elevate masculinity over femininity appear in the language of these social models, because men and male roles appear more than women and female roles, except in cases where the model is flipped (Cunliffe 1975:307). However, exchanging a patriarchy for a matriarchy does not solve the gender problem and could exacerbate stereotypes and simplify identities, switching chiefs and kings for queens

and flipping male warriors for female warriors. The breakdown of classical sources in Section 3.3.1. revealed that the observations are ethnographic in nature and framed by the classical view of society. Iron Age society in Europe, and therefore Britain, would have been viewed differently from within. The Irish medieval sources, when used, also represent a viewpoint that is largely removed from the British Iron Age, making it difficult to use as a parallel.

Works like Cunliffe (2005) and Haselgrove (1984) use models like Frankenstein and Rowlands (1978) as a basis for how society might have worked in Iron Age Britain, despite that model using ethnographies that are widely removed in space and time for the Iron Age and using them to look at Iron Age Central Germany. Though Iron Age Britain and Germany share temporal and possible cultural links, their societies could have worked differently. The broader systems-based approach espoused by Frankenstein and Rowlands (1978) also makes it easier for Iron Age society to be described on a larger group level. Though methodologically different from works like Hawkes (1959) who used material culture to describe society, the analysis in Section 3.2.2. displayed the same effectively neutral terminology. This inadvertently presents an Iron Age Britain that is populated by groups or tribes and does not say anything about the individuals who form the basis for society. Social models that leave out discussions of gender, age, status and other aspects of identity are effectively erasing people from the picture.

What does this mean for the social models of Iron Age Britain and beyond? Is there a way to reconcile the issues that have been presented here? The first step is to develop the methodologies to simply include gender in the discussion, from an individual level and up to a broader settlement and community scale. Chapter 4 will show that excavation reports do contain the evidence necessary to discuss gender, whilst the social models in Section 3.2. should have the ability to interpret the data to its fullest extent. It is important to do more than simply acknowledge it as an analytical category: it must be used within methodological frameworks. The difficulty in its application might result in

ambiguities in analysis and subsequent discussion, but the end result is more material to discuss and re-analyse for future interpretations of gender.

## **Chapter 4**

# Trajectories of engendered archaeology in the mortuary record of Iron Age Britain

## **4.1. Introduction**

This chapter builds upon the theoretical approaches discussed in the previous two chapters and examines the possible ways in which multiple, intersecting attitudes towards gender may manifest within the mortuary practices of Iron Age Britain. It contains a brief overview of previous studies of burial practices in Iron Age Britain, the methodology employed for data collection and an analysis of selected published Iron Age burials within the case study areas of Wessex and East Yorkshire (800 BC to AD 100), with reference to Hamlin (2007). The case study presented here assesses how useful it is to utilise the current burial record and basic quantitative analysis in pushing forward an engendered archaeology. Several key site reports were also used to create word clouds in a separate analysis section, demonstrating temporal trends in a historiographic discussion of excavated sites in Iron Age Britain.

### 4.1.1. Previous research on mortuary practices and beliefs in Iron Age Britain

Before analysing the evidence from the case studies, it is worth exploring how gender has been examined through mortuary remains in British Iron Age studies. The mortuary record of Iron Age Britain contains a number of different traditions, from complete and partial inhumations, the deposition of disarticulated or partially articulated skeletal elements and cremation (Cunliffe 2005:552). The small sample size of human remains in the Iron Age record raises the question of where bodies were deposited (e.g. bodies of water, off-site – see Cunliffe 2005, Wait 1985) or if practices such as excarnation (Carr and Knüsel 1997) were more widespread. In some regions of Iron Age Britain inhumation trends developed, such as the square barrow cemeteries of East Yorkshire (Dent 1985, Stead 1991) and the pit inhumations of Wessex (Cunliffe 1984, Hill 1995).

These human remains and their associated grave goods have formed much of the basis of recent gender studies in Iron Age British archaeology.

Methods of disposal are crucial in our understanding of social organisation, and, subsequently, our interpretations of gender. The treatment of the body can impart valuable information regarding what societies deemed important and how they conceived of themselves and the world around them (Parker Pearson 2009:45). Chapter 2.2.2.b emphasised the role that the body plays in constructing gender identity, and it would be admittedly more difficult to widen understandings of how different types of social identities are expressed without using the body as a basis for analysis (Arnold and Wicker 2001:ix). The question here is to what extent can bodies in combination with other aspects of mortuary practice (e.g. body positioning in the grave, orientation, etc.) and material culture can add nuance to existing interpretations of gender. And if so, what needs to be done in order to continue moving forward towards an engendered archaeology of human remains?

Previous approaches to the examination of mortuary practices such as Whimster (1981) and Wilson (1981) have presented broad overviews of patterns in Iron Age Britain. Whimster's (1981) study was derived from archaeological records published up to 1976 and described distinct regional burial practices, such as the square barrow inhumation cemeteries of East Yorkshire. Similarly, Wilson's (1981) study of Iron Age burials from 53 settlement sites in southern Britain identified burial trends such as crouched inhumation burials (Wilson 1981:162) and proposed several interpretations for them. Discussions of gender are limited: Wilson (1981:145) stated that sex was not a factor in mortuary practices, whilst Whimster (1981) did not make any overt claims about gendered mortuary practices beyond devoting a section to chiefly male warrior burials. Whilst both studies are useful for their extensive synthesis and their comprehensive focus on detailing regional burial traditions, they are lacking in explanations of the socio-cultural context of the burial practices themselves.

Wait (1985) attempted to situate Iron Age burial practices in the Wessex region of Britain within more of a sociocultural framework by addressing treatments of the dead and their chronological changes, processing of the dead on or off-site and the identities of the deceased. Aspects of Wait's work can be seen as the basis for later treatises on burials in Iron Age Britain, especially excarnation (exposure of the body and reburial of skeletal elements) as treatment of the dead (Carr 2007, Carr and Knüsel 1997). Wait briefly discussed age and sex patterns in burials, noting that adult burials are more common in the Early Iron Age and become less common through time and especially on settlement sites, while the number of infant burials grows through time on settlement sites (Wait 1985:90). In regards to distributions of sexed individuals, complete or mostly complete female skeletons were often found on settlements and hillforts in the Late Iron Age than male skeletons, whilst fragmented male skeletons or male skulls were found on hillforts in general throughout the Iron Age.

One of Wait's more interesting interpretations of the skeletal material refers to the identities of the deceased. Wait rejected the idea that the existing material represented Iron Age elites, although this is because he assumed elite burials were rich in material culture and located in special places already (Wait 1985:118). He speculated that Iron Age human remains were derived from those, "whose lifestyle and death was in some manner abnormal," (Wait 1985:119) such as criminals or witches. The latter suppositions are extremely speculative, but the line of enquiry itself is promising because the invisibility of most Iron Age human remains could imply that the surviving remains were chosen for curation for very specific reasons. Those reasons may be influenced by differing traits such as disabilities, which has been suggested in the case of the Vix Princess (Knüsel 2002:294). Other sociocultural factors such as kinship and status might also play a role in how individuals are chosen and grouped, as has been suggested by Stead and Rigby (1989:80) in the "family groups" and their wealthy grave goods at King Harry Lane (but see Fitzpatrick 1991 for criticism of that interpretation of the cemetery). In this case study, the aim is to determine whether or not gender or age might be a factor in selection.

More recent approaches to the study of mortuary practices are significant because of their emphasis on the symbolic nature of ritual deposits (Hill 1995:79) and distinctions between parts of a site, especially its boundaries, entrances and thresholds (Hill 1995:109). Whilst no specific attention has been paid to any gender or age influence in the symbolic deposition of human remains, neither age nor gender are not overlooked in favour of the interpretation of the animal remains and the material culture. In regards to full and partial burials, disarticulated human remains are sometimes seen as accidentally rather than deliberately curated (Wilson 1981:127). In fact, the deliberate curation of skeletal elements such as skulls and long bones (Brück 1995:247, Parker Pearson 1996:123) demonstrates how the treatment of disarticulated remains constitutes a specific set of beliefs in regards to treatment of the dead. It is by no means a casual process and carries its own significance, though no gendered patterns have emerged from their analysis (Wilson 1981:145).

Equally important to the analysis of mortuary practices and their constructed ideals is the spatial placement of the burials. The organisation of burial grounds can provide information about social identities, including gender (Parker Pearson 2009:12). The placement of human remains in boundaries and other liminal places was suggested to not only mark special, liminal places, but also special, liminal, defining moments in the life of a feature or site (Armit and Ginn 2007:125), whilst boundaries themselves have been acknowledged "construct social spaces and articulate relationships" (Haselgrove and Moore 2007:6). Giles (2012:123) also commented on death being a liminal stage, so correlations between burials in liminal spaces and the experience of death are a possibility. Iron Age burials have been placed in locations on-site that can be considered boundaries, e.g. ramparts and ditches (Whimster 1981), though there has been little attention paid to the social patterning behind this particular choice. Oftentimes, human remains in boundary contexts are seen as burials of convenience, especially in the case of warfare or interpersonal violence (see Wheeler 1943). However, interpersonal violence cannot explain all instances of deposition in boundary contexts. Other studies have shown that when human remains are deliberately curated, there are specific

patterns in their depositional contexts, their manner of disposal and their spatial location in or around sites (Roth 2011).

Issues of violence, warfare and human remains have remained topics of debate within the period (Armit 2007, Craig et al. 2005, James 2007) and continue to be relevant within the context of an engendered archaeology because of how often violence is universally applied to males (Redfern 2011:114). However, recent work on the skeletal material from Iron Age Dorset (Redfern 2007, Redfern and Chamberlain 2011) indicate that individuals of all ages and sex may be victims of interpersonal violence. A similar examination of the human remains at Kemerton Camp in Worcestershire also showed evidence of trauma regardless of the victim's age or sex (Western and Hurst 2013:170). However, in the interpretation of the Kemerton Camp's dead there appears a reluctance to acknowledge the possibility of female combatants except in "extreme" circumstances (Western and Hurst 2013:175). The actual distribution of skeletal trauma between biological sex is unclear due to disarticulation (Western and Hurst 2013:170) and the difficulty in ascertaining "combatant" Western and Hurst 2013:174) is acknowledged. In some areas of Iron Age Britain, it is clear that interpersonal violence can extend beyond a masculine arena.

Hamlin (2007) used published site reports for Dorset to examine the question of changes in gendered mortuary practices from the Late Iron Age and into the Romano-British period. Her results found both sex and age-related differences in mortuary practices, some of which did in fact change with Roman colonisation. In the Late Iron Age, there were no differences between the materials of grave goods buried with subadults compared with adults, but during the Romano-British period ceramics were most often buried with subadults and metals with adults (Hamlin 2007:299). The types of artefacts were also age-specific during the Romano-British period, whilst no such correlations appeared in the Late Iron Age (Hamlin 2007:303). Finally, body positioning, body side and grave good position did have age indicators in the more rural sample for the period (Hamlin 2007:314). For Dorset, there appeared to be no age-

specific mortuary practices in the Late Iron Age, but this did change into the Romano-British period.

Analyses of sexed individuals within the Dorset sample yielded gender-neutral results in regards to artefact deposition. There were no significant associations to be found with artefact materials and sex for both the Late Iron Age and Roman periods (Hamlin 2007:286). The same was true for the types of artefacts (Hamlin 2007:288). The rural component of the analysis showed that multiple burials shifted from being largely male to largely female from the Late Iron Age and into the Romano-British period (Hamlin 2007:311-312). Though multiple burials was not the most common form of burial for either period, it did appear to have gendered components that did change over time. Decapitation burials in the Romano-British period also appeared to be a female rite (Hamlin 2007:313). This re-examination of the burial evidence for Dorset showed some changes in mortuary practices over time that were associated with not only gender, but age. Though subtle, the patterns were present, highlighting the importance of adding these types of analyses not only to new evidence, but old evidence where they might have been previously overlooked.

Redfern (2011:133) highlighted the need to reassess the existing Iron Age record of human remains in order to develop a more fully realised narrative of how interpersonal violence is expressed for the period. Instances of interpersonal violence could not only be region specific, but site specific and the mortuary record needs to be investigated as such. There has been little significant evidence for large-scale interpersonal violence at Iron Age cemeteries (Anderson 1997, King 2009, Stead 1991), especially when the levels of interpersonal violence are compared with the number of martial objects that were found (Giles 2012:107). However, there is more evidence of catastrophic cases of violence in hillfort contexts (Barrett et al. 2000, Craig et al. 2005, Western and Hurst 2013, Wheeler 1943). The need for the contextualisation of interpersonal violence within the mortuary record of Iron Age Britain demonstrates how other aspects of social interaction need to be considered as well, with gender being chief among them.

Currently, there are two main studies (Giles 2012, Pope and Ralston 2011) that use a gendered method and theory to approach the mortuary record of Iron Age Britain. The first begins by stating that it addresses "the woman question" (Pope and Ralston 2011:375) for western Iron Age Europe, thus situating it within second-wave feminist narratives that focused on finding women (Nelson 1997:15). There is no doubt as to the importance of discussing ways in which women have been absent from narratives of the past, and Pope and Ralston (2011:376-379) do so, but gender archaeology is not just an archaeology of women: it considers as many narratives as possible In the arguably androcentric arena of later British prehistory, this does include males as well as children, the elderly, the disabled, etc. In the context of more current feminist theory, the study could be more inclusive of its subjects. However, the re-examination of Iron Age burials does well in demonstrating not only female status, but mortuary practices that appear to be structured around age rather than gender in Britain (Pope and Ralston 2011:401-402). Even if the study aimed to address the major problem of women in the Iron Age, it also uncovered promising avenues regarding an emphasis on age and neutrality to gender in mortuary contexts.

The rest of the study discussed gender identity solely through the lens of social status, focusing on the association of human remains with animal remains and material culture as a means of interpreting identity (Pope and Ralston 2011:403-404). This means that few interpretations could be offered for human remains that were unaccompanied by material culture. Therefore, only intersections between gender and status could be considered (Pope and Ralston 2011:407), when gender would be expressed in other dimensions such as age. When the overall burial tradition for Iron Age Britain contains consistent, ungendered patterns (Whimster 1981), one has to consider how useful the grave goods are in contributing to the discussion on their own. This does not take away from the study's push forward into reassessing material that has largely remained unquestioned, but it shows the extent of the work that is yet to be done, especially in discussing all narratives, not just those of higher-status females in Iron Age Britain.

Giles (2012) takes a life-course approach to the Iron Age burials of East Yorkshire, attempting to discern how life was lived and experienced through its various stages. Because of this, the study takes more time to examine aspects such as age. There were clear differences in the type of burial: infants were rarely buried on their own (Giles 2012:95) and there were more grave goods interred with older, adult individuals (Giles 2012:132). This suggests that in Iron Age East Yorkshire, age constitutes part of one's identity. Power and authority are shown through the number of grave goods an individual might have earned throughout life or even demonstrate the complex nature of relationships within a community. The interpretation demonstrates how social identities might not directly correspond to what is found in the burial record (Giles 2012:125). This leaves more room for interpreting how identities were constructed and expressed through burial practices in Iron Age East Yorkshire.

The intersection of age and gender identity is discussed through the deposition of beads and bracelets with elderly females (Giles 2012:150). However, the interpretation does not simply associate these objects with elderly females, but discusses how the colour and intricacy of them could evoke memories or experiences specifically associated with the individuals (Giles 2012:152-153). All of the grave goods are discussed meaningfully and beyond just their form and function, which was often the case in Pope and Ralston (2011), where the type of grave good solidified the status of the individual with whom it was buried. Here, the grave goods are not just passive reflections of identity, but aid in its construction through their use and symbolism (Giles 2012:170). It exemplifies how material culture can be used in conjunction with burials to discuss intersecting aspects of identity such as age, status and gender.

Both Pope and Ralston (2011) and Giles (2012) are reliant upon the use of material culture for the bulk of the interpretation. Earlier, it was made clear that many Iron Age burials are unaccompanied and that there are even entire regions where this is the norm, such as in southwest Britain with its cist burials (Whimster 1981). Even relatively artefact-rich areas such as East Yorkshire contain unaccompanied burials and it would be misleading to conclude that their identities simply did not exist. This demonstrates a

need to encourage the use of methodologies that are not as reliant upon the presence of material culture. Some avenues of exploration include the bioarchaeological approaches mentioned in Chapter 2.4 as well as deeper considerations of the spatial locations of burials both on-site and within the broader landscape.

This overview demonstrates that whilst Iron Age studies of human remains have changed rapidly within the past thirty or so years and covered a wide variety of topics and issues, gendered approaches in Iron Age Britain still rely heavily on artefact analysis and allow insight to a small section of society. Though measures have been taken to add nuance to gendered interpretations by including age and status, a large portion of the population is still unaccounted for.

#### 4.1.2. Constructing gender through the body and mortuary practice

One possible solution to theorising gender beyond status and material culture is through the body. Sections 2.2.3.b and 2.4 have briefly outlined the ways in which issues of performativity, the body and bioarchaeology have been used to further gender analyses in archaeology, but it is prudent to revisit some of these points to provide context for the following data analysis. First of all, whilst bodies can be the primary point of construction for identity (Sofaer 2006a), there cannot always be a direct correlation between the body and an individual's identity or personhood (Butler 1990, De Beauvoir 1972). Therefore, the following analysis has to be careful in not equating the treatment of the body in mortuary contexts as a direct reflection of Iron Age attitudes towards gender or any other identity should any patterns emerge. And whilst Marshall (2013:206) stresses the importance of objects and materials in creating personhood, the body can still provide the means to understand the performance of gender in death by examining how it is treated within mortuary practice.

In bioarchaeology, investigations of gender have often included the analysis of patterns in grave goods, body positioning and orientation in regards to biological sex (Sofaer 2013:232). The following analysis will use the patterning of body positioning as well as orientation in regards to both biological sex and osteological age to determine differences that might not be affected by status and grave goods, which is oftentimes the case in mortuary analysis (see Section 4.1.1). A related application of such techniques is "anthropologie de terrain," which reconstructs mortuary acts through an analysis of the depositional treatment of the body (Duday 2006). Similarly, Section 4.3 examines not only the treatment of the body but its spatial positioning on the site, that is, the location of the body on-site in regards to designated burial grounds, pits and most importantly, boundaries. Given the emphasis on borders and boundaries in British Iron Age studies (e.g. Bevan 1997, Giles 2006), it is possible that the placement of a body on-site might be reflective of some aspect of social or individual identity.

The above categories of analysis are significant not only because they constitute an arguably established mode of expressing identity for the British Iron Age (in the case of boundaries and settlement sites), but also demonstrate how the body can be the stage through which individual and community identity can be expressed (Meskell 2000:21). This interpretation is possible because whilst the dead do not bury themselves (Parker Pearson 1999:3), the burial itself contains aspects of social identity created by the community and expressed through the individual. So whilst body positioning and orientation might be dictated by social conventions of the time, and would have been particular to that specific group, they might still reflect how the individual might have conceived their own identity and personhood within that larger framework. In this way, the narrative of the body moves away from a more Foucaldian interpretation of control and power (Foucault 1978) and looks at it through a phenomenological sense, where it fulfils its own roles within a larger social entity (Merleau-Ponty 1980). Here, the body is not simply an object subject to outward forces, but is capable of agency within a specific social and cultural framework.

#### 4.2. Methodology for the case study comparison

In order to re-examine how we might see gender in mortuary rites independent of the material culture-heavy methodologies of Pope and Ralston (2011) and Giles (2012), this case study examines the same case study regions of Wessex and East Yorkshire with emphasis on the spatial location of the burial as well as the burial context. In doing so, it aims to discover how much information can be extrapolated from the current published archaeological record in order to expand our knowledge of gender or if it needs to be

reassessed (as called for in Redfern 2011). The following section explains how the case study was created and analysed, expanding upon the work done in Iron Age Dorset by Hamlin (2007).

#### 4.2.1. Overview of Case Study Areas

The following sections justify the choice of areas for this case study – not simply because they are also the main regions discussed in Pope and Ralston (2011) and Giles (2012), but because of the amount of published data available for re-analysis within these areas for the Iron Age.

#### 4.2.1.a. Wessex

The area of Wessex, roughly situated in the southwest-central part of England, was chosen as a study area because it is characterized by a variety of site types and burial practices during the Iron Age. The counties within the Wessex region (Somerset, Dorset, Hampshire, Wiltshire, Gloucestershire, and Oxfordshire) were chosen due to their relatively high incidence of human depositions from the time period and the impact studies focused on this region have had for interpretations of Early and Middle Iron Age societies in Britain (e.g. Cunliffe 1992, Hill 1995). The treatment of human remains in the Wessex region also encompasses many of the characteristic burial practices of the Iron Age, namely excarnation, which is defined as "leaving the body somewhere while the flesh decays" (Carr and Knüsel 1997:167) with a secondary burial. Sharples (2010:271-272) dismisses excarnation as a possible treatment due to the lack of weathering and animal gnawing on human bone. The wide range of treatment of the dead in such a large area could also be useful in pinpointing how specific regional burial traditions may reflect differing ideologies in regards to the treatment of gendered remains in death. Additionally, the dataset contains a range of Iron Age site types, from hillforts to enclosed settlements, with the human remains ranging from a variety of burial and deposition contexts within each site. In this way, a relatively complete picture of Iron Age burial practices can be generated in order to gain insight into the treatment of age in the later prehistoric past.

As stated in the aims of this thesis in Chapter 1.3., this case study utilises data recorded from the published archaeological literature. The range of information available in the

published material was deemed suitable for this analysis, though the inclusion of grey literature for future analyses provides further insight. The sites used for the case study were added from published site reports, reports in county journals (Somerset Archaeology and Natural History, Proceedings of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society, Wiltshire Archaeology and Natural History Magazine, Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society, Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society and Oxoniensia) and online Historic Environment Records (HERs) and the Archaeological Data Service (ADS) as necessary. For Wessex, 160 sites (Figure 4.1.) were recorded and 1,367 occurrences of human burials were recorded. For the full list of sites see Appendix B.

#### 4.2.1.b. East Yorkshire

East Yorkshire was chosen as a secondary case study area because of its distinctive burial tradition and mortuary practices, consisting of crouched or contracted inhumations in square barrow cemeteries (Dent 2010). The number of burials and the rich material culture make it an ideal contrast with the Wessex dataset. The dataset from East Riding consists of 32 sites (Figure 4.2.) and a total of 1,134 occurrences of human burials. The full list of site names can be found in Appendix A.

As with Wessex, the dataset for the East Yorkshire case study was obtained mainly through published site reports (e.g. Stead 1991), local archaeological journals like East Riding Archaeologist and the Yorkshire Archaeological Journal and the Archaeological Data Service (ADS) as necessary.

#### 4.2.2. Terminology

This section provides definitions for the specific terminology (Table 4.2.2.) used within this analysis (after Cunliffe 2005 and Parker Pearson 2009).

#### 4.2.3. Database construction

The data from each case study area was put into three databases (Context, Material Culture, Human Osteology) designed within Microsoft Excel. The material was analysed on a regional level, though some sites have been analysed on an individual basis for case study purposes.

Term	Definition
Burial	The act of disposing of the corpse
Inhumation	The burial of a whole or partial skeleton
Disarticulated remains	The burial of isolated human bones
Mortuary practices	Various acts of burial that are imbued with meaning
Pit	Burial feature dug for a previous purpose, usually storage
Grave	Burial feature dug specifically for mortuary purposes
Boundary	Burial feature consisting of a ditch or rampart, usually
	located on the periphery of a site
Posthole	Burial feature consisting of a hole dug for a post structure

Table 4.2.2. Terminology used in case study discussion.

#### 4.2.3.a. Data selection – the human remains

The dataset presented here contains information on inhumations, as well as disarticulated remains recorded from published site reports from the Wessex and East Yorkshire study areas. The invisibility of Iron Age human remains due to the practice of excarnation has been noted (Carr and Knüsel 1997). Though disarticulated, these remains may constitute a different burial ideology than inhumations: it is possible that patterns between specific categories of remains argue for specific ideologies in death. Beliefs inform how the dead are treated, and those beliefs may be tied into ideologies associated with gender, age, status, class, or a combination of those factors and many others. Cremations were not included in this dataset because they may constitute a set of beliefs that are very different from those of excarnation and inhumation (Cunliffe 2005:543). The gendered analysis of Iron Age cremated remains is put forth as a possibility for future avenues of research.

Ideally, a full analysis of age and sex would be fully carried out by a trained osteologist and there have been calls to reassess the current Iron Age osteological material (Redfern 2011). This type of analysis would include reassessments of biological sex and age in accordance with modern anthropological techniques whilst paying special attention to paleopathology. However, the aim of this case study is to assess the current published material from a gendered perspective as it is, without reference to the material culture (as in Giles 2012, Pope and Haselgrove 2011). The case study focuses more on the relationships between the burials and their specific placement on or around the sites and whether or not there is a gendered element to their spatial context. Therefore, specific osteological information beyond age and biological sex is not necessary for this case study, and the author fully acknowledges the biases that might have been present when the osteological material was originally assessed for those traits.

#### 4.2.3.b Context Database

Sites were labelled as enclosed (surrounded by a ditch and/or rampart) and unenclosed (without ditches or ramparts) for the spatial analysis.

Site Boundedness	
Enclosed	
Unenclosed	

Table 4.2.3.b. Enclosed and unenclosed sites

Sites were also divided into several categories: hillforts, non-hillforts, barrows, caves, and isolated burials. The distinction between hillfort and non-hillfort sites is not meant to allude to any core-periphery model (after Haselgrove 1982), especially when the relationship between hillforts and other Iron Age sites is debated (Collis 1996:91). It distinguishes between the oftentimes prominent and enclosed hillfort sites and other enclosed/unenclosed sites, both of which have shown evidence for habitation. It is true such terminology limits the interpretations available in regards to Iron Age landscapes (Haselgrove and Moore 2007:2-3), but they allow this discussion to focus on possible differences in how gender identity can change due to the specific nature of the site. For example, are there differences in how masculine identity is expressed on a hillfort site compared to a non-hillfort site? Due to the emphasis on published reports, the results will inevitably skew in favour of hillfort-style sites in Wessex and cemetery-sites in East Yorkshire, but such details are necessary for preliminary context recording and analysis.

Site Type	
Hillfort	
Non hillfort	
Cave	
Barrow	
Isolated burial	

 Table 4.2.3.b.i. Site types

Burial Type	
Inhumation	
Disarticulated	
Unknown	

Table 4.2.3.b.ii. Burial Types

The specific details of a burial were recorded in the following categories: **Orientation**, **Layout** and **Side**. In regards to orientation, many site reports were not clear as to what portion of the skull was used to interpret directionality (i.e. the face or the anterior portion of the cranium) and in the interest of simplicity, the site reports' given orientations were recorded as is. Though some site reports clearly defined their terms for **Layout** (e.g. Stead 1991), others have not and thus all interpretations within this category are subject to the idiosyncrasies of how they were recorded in the original report. They have been recorded in the database as written within the original site report.

<b>Burial Context</b>	
Pit	
Boundary	
Grave	
Posthole	

 Table 4.2.3.b.iii. Burial context

Orientation	Layout	Side
North	Crouched	Upright
Northeast	Flexed	Left
East	Extended	Right
Southeast		
South	Contracted	Supine
Southwest		
West	Sitting/standing	Prone
Northwest		

Table 4.2.3.b.iv. Orientation, layout and side for human remains

There is a certain danger in classifying categories within burial contexts separately as "grave" and "pit," especially when inhumations and depositions of disarticulated remains in the Wessex region have been distributed amongst them (Cunliffe 2005:552). It is possible that there is no distinct ideological difference in how these different contexts were perceived. However, the possibility that abandoned underground storage pits were significant due to associations with fertility (Cunliffe 1992:81) may suggest a difference when compared to burial contexts which were created specifically for mortuary purposes, such as scoops dug into ramparts. Therefore different burial contexts may add layers of meaning in regards to who was chosen to be buried within those specific features.

This study recognizes how previous Iron Age chronologies might have been overly complex and dependent on out-dated theories of invasion (Clark 1966). Previous divisions such as Early, Middle and Late Iron Age may not be relevant for some regions of Iron Age Britain, especially when they are dependent on ceramic typologies that ignore group agency (Moore 2007:48). Therefore, the time period for the burials included in this study is from 800 BC to 100 AD, with 800 to 400 BC for the Earlier Iron Age and 400 BC to AD 43 for the Later Iron Age (after Haselgrove and Moore 2007, Haselgrove and Pope 2007). This chronological division is not as restrained as

earlier ceramic typologies and therefore more appropriate to Iron Age Britain as a whole rather than specific areas.

Chronology		
Early Iron Age	800 – 400 BC	
Later Iron Age	400 BC – AD 43	

Table 4.2.3.b.v. Iron Age Chronology

## 4.2.3.b Material culture

This study will not address associations between human remains and material culture to discuss gender and age, focusing on determining gender through the body itself. Such analyses are important and have yielded interesting results (see Bonnabel et al. (2009), Evans 2004, Giles 2012, Hamlin 2007, Pope and Ralston 2011). However, the presence of associated material culture has been recorded in the event that it should add to the interpretations of the case study. The material culture was recorded in both general (see Table 4.2.3.c.) and more specific terms by listing the objects.

Associated Material Culture		
Human remains		
Faunal remains		
Ceramic objects		
Metal objects		
Stone objects		
Organic objects		
Burned objects		

Table 4.2.3.c. Associated material culture

## 4.2.3.c Human osteology

As noted earlier, very few Iron Age burials have been reassessed in recent years (for exceptions, see Redfern 2009), perhaps because of the scarcity of Iron Age collections and the fact that much Iron Age skeletal remains excavated in the antiquarian period have since been lost. The information provided by the site records and the human bone
reports was recorded as written. This could be problematic for some of the earlier sources used because some do not mention whether sex assessment was carried out through osteological means or through association with grave goods

Sexing	
Male	Male
Male?	
Indeterminate	Indeterminate
Female	Female
Female?	

Table 4.2.3.d. Sex assessment of human remains

Most non-adult remains were not assessed for sex in the original site reports because their sexual characteristics are not fully developed in regards to bone morphology (Mays 1998:38). In specific analyses regarding gendered treatment of the body, probable male and female remains were added to the estimated males and females in the sample in order to increase the sample size. Indeterminate individuals were marked as such for two reasons: either the site reports recorded the individuals as having indeterminate sex (that is, neither strongly masculine or feminine). Indeterminate individuals also consisted of those who were labelled as non-adults and thus were unable to be assessed for sex accordingly. This differentiates the indeterminate category from the unknown category. Individuals were recorded as having an unknown sex due to uncertainty in analysis (due to taphonomic degradation or disarticulation) or recording, or the information was altogether absent from the site reports. For this reason, those burials marked as unknown were excluded from the following quantitative analysis.

Age was entered as the numerical age range (i.e. 30-40 years) or the categorical age (i.e. "Adult) given in the human bone report or the site report in general. The age categories were divided into non-adults and adults. Non-adults are defined as the age group below 18 years of age. The age of 18 was chosen as end of the non-adults category because on

average, it marks the end of several major osteological changes: all permanent teeth will have erupted and the epiphyses of most long bones will have begun to fuse together (Anderson et al. 1976, Buikstra and Ubelaker 1994, Gustafson and Koch 1974, Scheuer and Black 2000). It is not meant to denote any social distinction. The non-adults category was further divided into three subcategories. Non-adults 1 referred to those whose age ranges most often fell from 0 to 3 years in age, based on the eruption of deciduous dentition (Gustafson and Koch 1974). Non-adults 2 referred to those from 4 to 11 years of age based on the formation and eruption of permanent teeth as well as the beginning of the epiphyseal fusion of the long bones (Buikstra and Ubelaker 1994).

Age Categories			
0-3 years	Non-adult 1		
4-11 years	Non-adult 2		
12-18 years			
19-29 years	Adult 1		
30-49 years			
50+ years	Adult 2		

Table 4.2.3.d.i. Age categories

Dividing the adult category into subcategories proved more difficult than it had for the non-adults samples. Age-related wear and degenerative changes observed in bone are more challenging to assess than the growth and development of bone (Lucy 2005:48). A combination of observations from pubic symphyseal wear (Brooks and Suchey 1990), tooth-wear patterns (Lovejoy 1985), and the wear of the ilium's auricular surface (Lovejoy et al. 1985) provided three general subcategories for adults: Adult 1, 19 to 29 years of age; Adult 2, 30 to 49 years of age, and Adult 3, 50 years of age or older, though due to the degeneration of joints in the body it is difficult to assess age at that point. Again, these subcategories are not precise, but serve to provide a general sense of age divisions for analysis.

Preservation of the remains was also recorded. It was ideal if the reports named which bones were present, though percentages of "completeness" of skeletons were considered acceptable as well.

Skeletal Preservation			
90 - 100%	Complete		
50-89%	Partially complete		
0-49%	Incomplete		

Table 4.2.3.d.ii. Skeletal preservation

Presence of body elements was recorded as (Figure 4.3.): the skull (cranium and mandible), the axial skeleton (vertebrae, ribs, scapulae, clavicles, sternum), the pelvis, and the limb bones, both upper (humerii, radii, ulnae, carpals, metacarpals, and phalanges) and lower (femora, tibiae, fibulae, tarsals, metatarsals, and phalanges).

#### 4.2.4. Data summary

The design of this methodology provides the basis for a wide-scale analysis of gender and other identities through Iron Age mortuary practices. This section illustrates the variety of data (and thus, variables) necessary to complete the quantitative analysis and the case study of the spatial analysis. The following sections will interpret the results and present the final discussion.

#### 4.3. Quantitative analysis results

The following sections discuss the results of the quantitative analysis. They are divided by case study area: Wessex and East Yorkshire, and the results are further sub-divided in accordance to biological sex and osteological age.

#### 4.3.1. Wessex

#### 4.3.1.a. Biological Sex

To reiterate, 160 sites were examined and 1,367 occurrences of human remains were recorded for Wessex. Out of 1,376 recorded human remains, 171 (12%) individuals were sexed as female and 245 (18%) as male, remembering for the purposes of this study probable females were grouped with females. The males were grouped the same

way: 418 (31%) were marked as indeterminate (Figure 4.4.). Five hundred and thirty-three (39%) individuals from the Wessex sample were described as unknown.

In the analysis of burial contexts – that is, boundaries, pits and graves – differing patterns between biologically sexed individuals and indeterminate or non-adult individuals is due to differences in deposition regarding articulated and disarticulated remains. The number of biological adult males and females were evenly distributed across the three categories despite the disparity in sample size (Figure 4.5.). Indeterminate adults and non-adults displayed similar patterns of deposition and were more commonly found in pit contexts regardless of their age (Figures 4.6.). Indeterminate individuals were more present in pit contexts than graves, whilst biologically sexed individuals were more likely to be buried in graves. This is due to a higher prevalence of disarticulated remains within pit contexts. Disarticulated remains, depending on the skeletal elements present, might be more difficult to sex. Therefore, it would appear there is no apparent inclination to deposit human remains within particular burial contexts based on biological sex.

When body positioning, body layout and body orientation were compared against biological sex, the comparisons between biological males and females remained consistently similar. This is especially true for body positioning (Figure 4.7.). For body layout, adult males did display a higher tendency to be laid on their backs, whilst adult females displayed a tendency to be placed on their right side (Figure 4.8.). However, these differences were not substantial enough to make a claim for gendered body positioning. Orientation was more difficult to determine due to the variety of directions, but the overall proportions of male and female orientations remained fairly consistent as well (Figure 4.9.). Whilst there were a few differences between biological males and females in terms of the ways in which their bodies were deposited, none appeared significant enough to infer preferential gendered positioning within burial contexts.

Inhumations were compared against disarticulated remains to determine whether or not adult biological males were more or less likely to be interred "whole," than adult biological females. The rates of inhumations versus disarticulated burials between adult males and females were similar with a high number of them occurring as inhumations (Figure 4.10.). This is due to preservation bias – inhumation burials are more likely to contain the skeletal elements that make methods of determining biological sex possible. Therefore, results within this category of analysis skew towards inhumations as a whole.

When human remains are deposited together within the same context, they are sometimes assumed to have some type of relation, whether it is through circumstance, kinship or another type of collective identity. The assumption of kinship and family ties is especially prevalent when biologically sexed adult females and non-adults are buried together. Associations between multiple and singular burials and biological sex were thus compared in order to determine whether or not this type of deposition was gendered in Iron Age Wessex. However, following the same general trend as the other categories in regards to biological sex, the proportion of multiple and single burials amongst adult biological males and adult biological females were nearly the same (Figure 4.11.). Despite the general diversity between types of bodily treatment, those who were sexed as male or female displayed the same trends.

#### 4.3.1.b. Osteological Age

For osteological age, 244 (18%) individuals were placed in the 0-3 year age range, 77 (6%) in the 4-11 year age range and 81 (12%) in the 12-18 year age range for non-adults. Numbers for the adult range were higher, with 482 (35%) of individuals in the 19-29 year age range, 116 (8%) in the 30-49 year age range and 16 (1%) were in the 50 years or older age range (Figure 4.12.). 351 (26%) individuals were of unknown age.

The quantitative analysis of burial contexts by age showed adults in the 19-29 year range were found in all four contexts, making up a large sample within each category. In the Boundaries context, the 0-3 non-adult year range contained a slightly larger sample than the 19-29 year range (Figure 4.13.). The 0-3 non-adult year range dominates the Posthole category, but this number is not likely to be significant due to the actual sample size for the category (thirteen total). Sample numbers for the other age

ranges were comparatively low across each burial context, which might attribute some importance to the deposition of human remains that fall into the 0-3 year range and the 19-29 year range, respectively. This, combined with the previous analyses, suggest there is some correlation between age groups and deposition, but not biological sex.

This pattern is repeated when age ranges are compared against body positioning, body siding and orientation (Figures 4.14., 4.15., 4.16.). The relationship between body positioning and age range does suggest a slight preference between the 0-3 year-old non-adults and a crouched body position, but the proportions are very similar for every category except the 12-18 year-old non-adults. The discrepancy in numbers for the 12-18 year non-adult category is due to the low sample size – a larger number of samples might demonstrate a similar trend with the other age groups. Body positioning, body siding and body orientation are site-specific and were probably selected with other criteria in mind beyond age and sex.

When inhumations and disarticulated remains were compared for the age ranges, there was a sizeable difference between the percentage of inhumations and disarticulated remains within the 0-3 year non-adult range (Inhumations = 23%, 159 occurrences; Disarticulated remains = 6%, 24 occurrences) and the 19-29 year adult range (Inhumations = 38%, 255 occurrences; Disarticulated remains = 21%, 81 occurrences). Even with the difference in sample size between age ranges, the difference is noteworthy (Figure 4.17.). The high proportion of disarticulated remains in the unknown age category is due to the inability to estimate age from individual elements of the body, with exception of parts of the pelvis and skull. Individuals within the 0-3 year non-adult age range and the 19-29 year adult age range appear to be deposited complete or close to complete than those in other age ranges, whilst biological sex again does not appear to be a factor in this type of mortuary treatment.

The same lack of patterning in multiple human burials was true across age categories (Figure 4.18.). Therefore, the presence of multiple human burials within a single burial

context is a decision that is not informed by biological sex or age range and other motivations must be considered, such as factors of kinship or community.

#### 4.3.1.c. Wessex results summary

In sum, the quantitative analysis of data from Wessex demonstrates that biological sex was not a factor in the selection of burial contexts, body positioning, body siding, body orientation, mortuary treatment or association between human remains. This would suggest that within these particular categories, the biological sex of the individuals involved was not a determining factor in how their bodies were interred and positioned. However, these observations are taken from sites all over Wessex and spanning the entire Iron Age. It is possible that individual sites or regions might display their own unique patterns over time. But in terms of overall patterns for Iron Age Wessex, there is no concrete evidence to suggest that biological sex was a consideration in these aspects of mortuary practice.

Age ranges, however, might have played a role in the selection of individuals within the 0-3 year non-adult range within Boundary contexts and inhumations, as well as the selection of 19-29 year adults for inhumations. Other categories showed no clear preferences in regards to age. Therefore, Wessex shows some patterning in mortuary practices when considering age.

#### 4.3.2. East Yorkshire

#### 4.3.2.a. Biological Sex

32 sites were examined and 1,134 occurrences of human burials were recorded for East Yorkshire for analysis. From the 1,134 occurrences, 351 individuals were biologically sexed as female and 277 as male, keeping in mind for the purposes of this study, the category of probable males and females was grouped with males and females respectively. 125 individuals were indeterminate and 381 individuals were of unknown biological sex (Figure 4.19.). The number of indeterminate individuals is lower for East Yorkshire than it is for Wessex. Part of this might be due to a strong tradition of associated biological sex with the material culture in the graves, as seen in Stead (1991). As other, more extensive studies (e.g. Dent 1982, Stead 1991) have shown, East Yorkshire Iron Age burials display very definite patterns in the way individuals are treated after death. This type of patterning is quite rare in the rest of Iron Age Britain and stands in contrast to the variety shown in the Wessex sample. Inhumation was the mortuary treatment of choice. Variation in burial contexts was negligible according to biological age. There were only two boundary contexts and one pit context recorded for unknown biological sex. The decisions in the depositions of East Yorkshire individuals in regards to mortuary treatment and burial context does not appear to be affected by biological sex. It was also easier to sex these individuals as the bodies were buried intact and therefore contained the skeletal elements (e.g. pelvis and skull) necessary for determining biological sex.

Body positioning did not seem to be affected by biological sex, with both sexes placed in a crouched position (Figure 4.20.). Despite the different sample sizes, proportions between biological males and females remained comparable. Body siding in burial yielded similar results across biological sex, with most individuals being deposited on their left side (Figure 4.21.). As with body positioning, the distribution of individuals across the different categories remained the same despite biological sex. There was no distinction between biological sexes as most of the burials largely favoured a northward orientation (Figures 4.22.). Overall, there was fewer variation in body orientation for the East Yorkshire samples than the Wessex samples.

Whilst East Yorkshire does not have the same degree of mixed depositions of human remains in pits and boundaries as Wessex, it was still important to determine whether or not human associations with burials showed any patterning. This is especially true in the case of intrusive burials in square barrows, either within the primary mound or the ditch. Though sample sizes were very small, biologically sexed females were associated with other human remains than males (Figure 4.23.). However, the indeterminate and unknown categories contained more. This is due to taphonomic processes in the case of younger non-adults in the 0-3 age range, whose bones are less likely to be preserved as older individuals' (Bello 2006:5). Additionally, ploughing

might have disturbed shallower intrusive burials, thus making it difficult to determine their biological age.

#### 4.3.2.b. Osteological Age

Age ranges showed 93 individuals in the 0-3 year non-adult range, 24 in the 4-11 year non-adult range and 38 in the 12-18 year non-adult ranges for East Yorkshire. Totals for adults were higher, with 422 in the 19-29 year range, 190 in the 30-49 year range and 3 in the 50 or more year range (Figure 4.24.). Three hundred and sixty-four individuals were of an unknown age.

Burial contexts heavily favoured grave and inhumation contexts. As with biological sex, osteological age did not appear to be a factor in the burial context or the way the body was treated. The only variance was that one adult in the 19-29 year range was found in a pit context and two unknown individuals were found in a boundary context. There is similar consistency amongst body positioning, body layout and body orientation in osteological age (Figures 4.25.-4.27.). The 4-11 year age group appeared to show some variation in different categories, such as a southward body orientation and body layout to the right, but this is due to the low sample size within the group.

In the human association analysis, adults appeared to be associated with other human remains than non-adults (Figure 4.28.). However, this group is very much in the minority compared to the greater East Yorkshire sample, so it difficult to say whether these patterns might coincide with any ideological mortuary display.

#### 4.3.2.c. East Yorkshire results summary

In sum, the quantitative analysis for East Yorkshire showed distinct mortuary practices, but they were mortuary practices that were not selected with biological sex or osteological age in mind. Any examples of possible gender and age identity were not displayed through the treatment or deposition of the body itself, but through the presence of particular types of material culture (Giles 2012). The reasoning behind the selection of most manners of deposition and body positioning in East Yorkshire are not readily apparent and may have more to do with other aspects of identity or group and kinship relations.

Author	Year	Report	Site
Bulleid and	1917	The Glastonbury Lake Village: A Full	Glastonbury Lake
Gray		Description of the Excavations and	Village
		the Relics Discovered 1892-1907	
Dunning	1931	Salmonsbury Camp, Gloucestershire	Salmonsbury
Wainright	1979	Gussage All Saints: An Iron Age	Gussage All Saints
_		Settlement in	
Cunliffe	1984	Danebury: an Iron Age hillfort in	Danebury
		Hampshire. Volume 1 The	
		excavations, 1969-1978: the finds	
Stead	1991	Iron Age cemeteries in East	Burton Fleming,
		Yorkshire: excavations at Burton	Rudston, Garton-on-
		Fleming, Rudston, Garton-on-Wolds	Wolds
Ellis and	2008	An Iron Age Settlement outside	Battlesbury Road
Powell		Battlesbury Hillfort, Warminster, and	
		Sites along the Southern Range Road	

Table 4.4.1. Site reports used in word cloud analysis.

#### 4.4. The Language of Site Reports

Continuing the historiographic analysis, the following section will take several key site reports used for the mortuary analysis in Section 4.4. and perform a word cloud analysis to see what terms dominate the reports. In order to facilitate a diachronic analysis that tracks changes over time, the site reports span several decades like the social models studied in Chapter 3. Each site was taken from a different county within the case study area. The site reports are listed in Table 4.4.1. To create the word clouds, site reports were converted from PDF to Plain Text format. The table of contents, appendices and bibliographies were removed and the files were uploaded to <u>www.tagcrowd.com</u> to generate the word cloud images.

The earliest site report used is Bulleid and Gray's (1917) excavation report of Glastonbury Lake Village in Somerset. Figure 4.29. shows that the most-used words are those associated with describing artefacts – words like "ornamented," "diam" for diameter and "mm" for measurements of those objects. Each chapter is devoted to categories of artefacts: for example, all iron objects and all bone objects (Bulleid and Gray 1917:xxxv). This is not entirely surprising as the artefacts were the focus of the excavation, given the period when the site report was written. The bone report focuses more on associating the skeletal remains with a massacre (Bulleid and Gray 1917:676)

and how the cranial measurements place the inhabitants of Glastonbury Lake Village in an ethnic sense (Bulleid and Gray 681-682). The cranial measurements are the only basis of a discussion of Iron Age society, by relating the inhabitants to ones at other sites. It was more important to discern the race, such as it was, of the people living there rather than how their society worked and how gender might have fit into it. Gender, as a word, does not appear in the site report at all.

The second report is Dunning's (1931) report of Salmonsbury Camp, a hillfort in Gloucestershire. Though this is only the pre-excavation report, this summary gives a good overview over the items that were most important to the excavation. The features and their measurements are the most common words found (Figure 4.30.), like "ditch," "pits" and "rampart." Shallow graves were found on the site, that of a male and a female (Dunning 1931:491) but are not theorised on. Again, this is likely because it was a pre-excavation report. Still, like Bulleid and Gray's report at Glastonbury Lake Village, the focus is more on the features and the artefacts, with no speculation about Iron Age society at the hillfort. Gender is also not mentioned here beyond the sexing of the two skeletons.

Gussage All Saints in Dorset (Wainright 1979) is the first of the more modern site reports, which is somewhat reflected in the word cloud. Emphasis on chronology of the site is evident with words like "phase" (Figure 4.31.), and those words seem to be evenly distributed with words describing artefacts and features on the site. The osteological report was extensive and looked at trauma to the bones as well as pathology, but did not shed light on the structure of society at Gussage All Saints, though it is suggested that the high number of skeletal abnormalities was due to inbreeding (Wainright 1979:171). Gender as a topic does not appear within the site report, and the discussion focuses more on situating the site within the broader Iron Age landscape of Dorset. In terms of society, the site is paralleled to a Celtic "*ilys*" or home to someone of high social standing (Wainright 1979:182). Beyond the description of skeletal remains in the osteological report, there is nothing indicating that gender is something to be considered.

Like Gussage All Saints, Danebury hillfort in Hampshire (Cunliffe 1984b) contains language that is focused more on the characteristics of the finds. There are no words within the analysis that indicate anything about society at the site (Figure 4.32.), despite the large number of human remains that were recovered, though both "bones" and "burials" are present. Due to the presence of both the human and animal bone reports, the discussion is expected to be focused more on society rather than the actual site building processes, as is the case with the first volume of the Danebury report (Cunliffe 1984a). Gender is used as a term within the site report, but it is conflated with sex (e.g. Cunliffe 1984b:452). The final discussion positions Danebury as a place with "a king and his followers" (Cunliffe 1984b:562), though there are other suggestions of the hillfort as a central residence for a collection of kin groups (Cunliffe 1984b:561). Still, it leaves the impression that hillforts remain a symbol of male power and that females, though obviously present thanks to the skeletal remains, have no place within that narrative.

The excavations at Rudston, Burton Fleming and Garton-on-Wolds in East Yorkshire (Stead 1991) yielded a word cloud that was very different from the previous reports, likely due to the fact that these sites were indeed cemeteries and not settlement sites. "Burials" and "grave" were amongst the most common words used (Figure 4.33.) and for the first time words like "male" and "female" appeared within the word cloud. Gender is only mentioned once, regarding pottery deposition in graves (Stead 1991:108). Sex is equated with gender here: R163 is sexed as a possible female, "but not according to the grave-goods" (Stead 1991:205). Specific artefacts, such as swords, are associated with warriors, which within this report are unequivocally male (Stead 1991:33). Jewellery is specific to females (Stead 1991:127), though there are burials with jewellery that might not be female. In terms of society, specific groupings of burials and certain skeletal traits have led to the existence of "family groups" (Stead 1991:131,134). Society in Iron Age East Yorkshire contains these family groups and is populated by male warriors and women who wear jewellery. Whilst this is more of a discussion of society, it is still constrained by male/female binaries.

The final site report is from the Battlesbury Hillfort environs in Wiltshire (Ellis and Powell 2008). The word cloud is a mix of terms, though the most common ones describe the site's features (Figure 4.34.). There is nothing that specifically indicates gender or even society at the site around the hillfort, though "burial" and "remains" can be found within the word cloud. Gender is still not a term used within the site report itself. As with the other sites with complete bone reports, the osteology and pathology gives a general overview of the health of those whose remains have been recovered. The individuals here did not appear to have physically taxing jobs, but were generally healthy across both sexes (Ellis and Powell 2008:81), though there might have been slight variations in diet between males and females (Ellis and Powell 2008:78). Like other discussions in the previous site reports, the report concerns itself with the patterns of activity that made up the site, and not necessarily considering the social impetus that would have led to the processes of site formation.

The trend in this analysis is an overall focus on features, artefacts and site formation processes. This is not out of the ordinary for a site report, but it does highlight the very specific focus within these works and a need to expand the discussions. Temporal trends involved a shift away from simply describing the artefacts and the major features. The more recent site reports also had more detailed osteological reports, following the trend of straying away from measurements and what that meant about race in favour of using the pathology to determine patterns of health and perhaps difference on these sites. For the most part, Iron Age society is largely absent within these works, aside from analyses of the people who were buried there. Much of the focus is on how the site was built over time, rather than the people that built it. Sites are often considered within the wider landscape context, but the detailed relationships between sites, as well as the relationships and identities of the residents, are not there. Gender was absent from all but one of the reports, and even then was framed in male/female binaries. The danger here is in forgetting about the people and leaving an impression of an uninhabited site.

It can be argued that an excavation report serves only one purpose: to present the hard data that comes out of excavation. More theoretical discussions regarding society and identity are probably meant for other mediums, such as journal articles. However, it is important not to divorce the artefacts and the site itself from the people who created it. Indeed, all of the raw evidence useful in discerning how Iron Age society worked is apparent within those pages. Archaeologists would be cautioned not to speculate on how life was on those sites whilst presenting the data.

#### 4.5. Discussion

The results in Section 4.3 emphasised several points. The first simply reiterates previous research: that biological sex is not a determining factor in how bodies were treated in the mortuary practices of Iron Age Wessex and East Yorkshire. The second is that in some cases, age *might* have been a consideration in regards to how some individuals were treated in burial. The third is the difficulty in applying body theory to certain data sets, and how easy it is to fall into binary and categorical pitfalls despite attempts to avoid them. In this analysis, the indeterminate category was a means to avoid simply using male and female categories when considering biological sex. Finally, it is important to consider the question of patterns and how meaningful they are in the interpretation of the archaeological record. The following sections will discuss each point in detail, highlighting the continuing problem of reconciling second and third wave feminist theory with certain datasets and even types of analysis in order to draw meaningful conclusions.

#### 4.4.1. Age and Iron Age mortuary practices

The results in Section 4.3.1.a demonstrated that gendered patterning is not obvious in Iron Age British mortuary practices without factoring in material culture. This is especially true in Romano-British Dorset (Hamlin 2007:305) and Iron Age East Yorkshire (Giles 2012:132,150). However, there were a few indications that age might have been a consideration within certain funerary rites. Interpreting these patterns might reveal some insight into how age was deemed significant in Iron Age Wessex and East Yorkshire. Hamlin (2007:313) found more evidence for age-related mortuary practice during the Romano-British period in Dorset, rather than the Late Iron Age. Figure 4.6. showed that individuals within the 0-3 age year range appeared in boundary contexts

than pit or grave contexts in Iron Age Wessex. The difference between this analysis and Hamlin's is that this is the pattern for Wessex as a whole, spanning the entire Iron Age. More work is needed to see whether or not this trend is actually localised to certain sites or even areas of Wessex and whether or not they are temporally constrained.

The placement of neonates and infants in Iron Age boundary contexts within the same region has been noted elsewhere (Matias 2011), though this differs on a site-by-site basis. The 0-3 year age group also appeared in posthole contexts, but the overall sample size for posthole contexts was so small, with less than 20 instances in Wessex and none in East Yorkshire, that it is difficult to determine whether or not the proportions were significant when compared with other burial contexts for Wessex. This could be paralleled with the general exclusion of the subadult Romano-British population in Dorset from coffined burial rites (Hamlin 2007:313-314). The posthole burials found on sites in Hampshire, Oxfordshire and Wiltshire spanned the length of the Iron Age and were not site-specific. Posthole burials were found on hillforts such as Danebury in Hampshire and settlement sites like Wyndyke Furlong in Oxfordshire. Posthole burials could have been a phenomenon restricted to eastern Wessex, but its span over hundreds of years with so few incidences makes it difficult to call a concrete trend.

Another age-related pattern concerned body positioning. The evidence in Figure 4.12. indicated that as an individual aged, they were oftentimes buried in a flexed position. However, there were no similar trends for any other position. The slight dip in crouched positions for the 12-18 year age group might be attributed to the smaller sample size for the group. No clear pattern emerged in body layout except for the high proportion of adults in the 19-29 year range who were buried on their right side. Again, as with body positioning there is no reverse trend with the other categories of body layout. The same is true for body orientation, which was also highly variable with no clear patterns. In comparison, Romano-British non-Poundbury (rural) burials showed that subadults were less likely to be buried in an extended, supine position than adults (Hamlin 2007:314). As with burial context, the flexed position trend spans all of Iron Age Wessex, indicating a more widespread and earlier overall trend.

Though this analysis did not focus on associating material culture with either age or sex, the data was obtained. Given that Hamlin (2007) found some associations with age groups and artefact materials, a quick analysis was made to see if there were any overall patterns associated between age and artefact types throughout Iron Age Wessex and East Yorkshire. Unknown burials were excluded from the analysis, and osteological ages were divided into neonates, nonadults and adults. Table 4.4.1. and Figure 4.35. show that neonates were less likely to be buried with objects made of ceramics, metal, bone and glass, but more likely with stone objects. By totals alone it appeared that adults were most often buried with ceramic and metal material, but the percentages show that adults were buried with metal objects more often. The biggest trends were the stone objects with neonates and possible metal objects with adults. Interestingly, the association of adults with metal objects parallels what Hamlin (2007:299) found in Dorset. This presents a promising case for further study in order to see what objects might have been specifically buried with these age groups.

Neonates were left out of the East Yorkshire analysis because there were only two samples and they were not found with any artefacts. Table 4.4.2. would make it seem that adults in East Yorkshire were buried with artefacts of all types over the nonadults, but Figure 4.36. describes a more complex story. Ceramics were equally likely to be buried with nonadults and adults, but metal was found more often with adults. Bone objects were found with nonadults more, but not to a significant degree. Stone objects, on the other hand, were more often deposited with adults and no glass objects were buried with nonadults. This correlates with Giles (2012:132) because adults were buried with objects more often than nonadults and certain material types of artefacts were also more prevalent in adult graves. This is also specific to the glass objects, which most often took the form of beads and were found with elderly females (Giles 2012:150).

Age has shown itself to be a factor in how burials in Iron Age Wessex and East Yorkshire were arranged. The placement of the majority of the 0-3 year age group in boundary contexts is interesting because it situates those individuals within a spatial

	Ceramics	Metal	Bone	Stone	Glass
Neonates					
(n=64)	5	1	0	18	0
Nonadults					
(n=413)	91	63	15	71	4
Adults					
(n=539)	134	113	17	93	1

 Table 4.4.1. Associations of artefacts by material category with Wessex age groups.

	Ceramics	Metal	Bone	Stone	Glass
Nonadults					
(n=248)	31	46	4	13	1
Adults (n=501)	62	118	6	16	17

Table 4.4.2. Associations of artefacts by material category with East Yorkshire age groups.

context that is imbued with meaning in regards to membership and association. Boundaries in Iron Age Britain make very clear statements about territory and kinship and symbolism (Collis 1996, Bevan 1997, Giles 2006), and placing certain individuals within those contexts creates ties between those people and those meanings. For example, placing an individual at the edge of a settlement site could suggest they were not considered a member of the group living within that place. Arnold (2001:214) has suggested that "non-persons" such as neonates were given different treatment in death in West Hallstatt. Individuals within the 0-3 age group might have been perceived as different members of society, which was marked by their deposition in a place that was different from all others as well as visually indicating their status as someone outside the group. And whilst it is important not to directly correlate the burial traditions of Wessex and East Yorkshire, Giles (2012:132) suggestion that younger non-adults carried very different social identities than adults makes a compelling case for some type of expression of age identity in Iron Age mortuary practices.

#### 4.4.2. The body and the limits of binary categories in mortuary analysis

Unlike Hamlin (2007), this study showed no mortuary trend outside of associated material culture in regards to gender. These results suggest that gender and age were not factors in the way bodies were arranged and placed within their specific burial contexts. In Iron Age East Yorkshire there was a high degree of standardisation in burial contexts and the placement of bodies within them. The change in gendered burial practices in

Dorset, however, changed from the Late Iron Age into the Romano-British period: multiple burials changed from largely male to largely female (Hamlin 2007:311) and decapitation rites appeared to be used with females (Hamlin 2007:312). Though these types of mortuary practices were not the norm, Hamlin's analysis paired with the findings here suggest that mortuary practices (without the consideration of associated artefacts) could have shifted to become more gendered in the Romano-British period and onwards. Therefore, without some evidence from material culture, there was little to distinguish gender from burials in Iron Age Wessex or East Yorkshire.

Section 4.1.2 outlined a method that attempted to determine gender identity through mortuary analysis without relying on correlating grave goods and the body. One inadvertent outcome was the compatibility, or lack thereof, between this particular dataset and body theory. Categories such as body positioning and body siding were meant to address the materiality of identity within the body, but the results in Section 4.3 did not provide any insight in that regard. Section 4.3 demonstrated an analysis that was not particularly nuanced in how it compared biological sex to the various body treatment categories and burial contexts, despite adding in categories such as "Indeterminate." In hindsight, the mode of data entry might have been to blame because there was not enough flexibility to draw out variations in the results and subsequent interpretation. By using categories such as male, female and indeterminate, the initial framework for analysis is already rigidly defined. With such restrictions at the start, it is easy to see how this analysis, as well as others, remain either inconclusive on the subject of gender, or retain the same male/female or masculine/feminine paradigm.

Flexibility in categorisation for data entry and analysis is not a clear-cut solution for this problem. Whilst it is important to recognise that the categories we as archaeologists create are constructions in and of themselves, it is impossible to do away with them completely. Section 2.5 demonstrated the problems with the deconstructive nature of third-wave feminism and how there is a need to qualify aspects of identity without falling back on stereotypes or essentialising particular qualities. This is one of the difficulties in reconciling some of the theories that formed the basis of this analysis,

particularly body theory. Foucault's theory of the body has been criticised for creating dichotomies of power and powerlessness and society versus the individual (Meskell 2000:16). Butler (1991) fully deconstructs the idea of the body alongside sex and gender, and yet discussions of the body often circle back to structuralist oppositions (Meskell 2000:21). If the theory itself cannot extricate itself from falling into oppositions or strict categories, how can we expect the data to do the same?

This type of struggle, or "binary bind" (Jordan et al. 2014) is a clear demonstration of how gender theory has been unable to make truly great strides within archaeology, barring a few notable exceptions. Flexibility in theory, methodology and final interpretation is difficult to come by, especially when it comes to mortuary practice. Though there have been exceptions to this rule for Iron Age Britain (Giles 2012, Pope and Ralston 2011) and even Iron Age central Europe (Arnold 2001), Section 4.1.1 showed that this is largely due to the analysis of oftentimes elite grave goods and therefore restricted to a certain group within Iron Age society. An attempt was made here to try and circumvent this limitation, but faced limitations of its own due to the nature of the recorded material and the way the analysis was structured. At the same time, it is difficult to determine how successful the results of Section 4.3 would have been with greater flexibility within categories such as biological sex.

In order to move forward, it is important to continually interrogate the types of categories we use to organise and analyse data. The categories themselves must be meaningful and tie into the theory rather than contradicting it – which was arguably the case within this chapter. It was not enough to simply refine some of the categories from the published burial data and expect the results to conform to the less rigidly defined concepts from body theory. The overall analysis would have benefitted from additional information on osteology, in order to add nuance to discussions of the body itself, as well as greater contextual information from the sites themselves. The omissions of such information are due to the nature of some of the published sources as well as the manner in which the data was recorded. In the future, greater care must be taken in considering the nature of the data before applying interpretation.

The lack of strong conclusions regarding gendered practices does not mean that Iron Age mortuary practices cannot be used to study gender identity. It means that other techniques and categories of analysis are necessary for further research. Previous studies (Giles 2012, Pope and Ralston 2011) have shown more correlations between age, gender and status through analyses of associated material culture for East Yorkshire, and other osteological (Peck 2014) and isotopic analyses (Jay 2008, Jay and Richards 2006, Jay et al. 2008) have demonstrated plenty of avenues of research with the potential for furthering identity studies from the human remains of Iron Age Britain. Most importantly, there is a great need to reassess the remaining Iron Age osteological collections with modern sexing techniques, allowing new interpretation to be made on skeletal material that might have been sexed using out-dated techniques or solely through the association of material culture.

Reassessing the skeletal evidence and performing isotopic studies have already added information to the results offered here. Jay and Richards (2006), Jay and Richards (2007) and Jay et al. (2008) have looked at Wetwang Slack and Garton Slack in East Yorkshire, determining how diet might have differentiated the people buried at those sites. At Wetwang Slack, results showed that the diet was rich in terrestrial animal protein and was the same amongst individuals regardless of sex, age or status (Jay and Richards 2006:?). The breastfeeding evidence showed that infants might have been weaned early and subsequently introduced to other foods (Jay et al. 2008:336). A separate osteological re-examination of the Rudston and Burton Fleming cemeteries in East Yorkshire corroborated the evidence of high and low status individuals having the same diet (Peck 2013:91). However, examples of degenerative joint disease and labour-induced trauma to the skeleton suggest that lower-status individuals might have lived more labour-intensive lifestyles than those of a higher status (Peck 2013:92).

In Wessex, Jay and Richards (2007) also looked at the sites of Winnall Down and Micheldever Wood in Hampshire, where the isotopic evidence did not give any information relating to age, sex or status: the individuals from those sites were highly mobile individuals (Jay and Richards 2007:183). At Danebury hillfort, also in Hampshire, the isotopic report also focuses more on what was consumed rather than who consumed it. The conclusions from the study state that the residents consumed a variety of food items, but the diet was relatively high in terrestrial animal proteins, which was consistent with other isotopic studies for nearby Iron Age sites (Stevens et al. 2010:425). Suddern Farm, also in Hampshire and close to Danebury, presented an interesting point of comparison with the hillfort. Both sites exhibited different mortuary practices, with inhumations at Suddern Farm and pit burials at Danebury. Suddern Farm could also be considered "rural" in comparison with Danebury. However, the isotopic signatures between the two sites were fairly homogenous, indicating that their diets were similar (Stevens et al. 2013:268-269).

The analysis of the diet of individuals at Glastonbury Lake Village showed that most individuals at the site did not consume as much animal protein as other nearby Iron Age sites, such as those in Hamphire (Jay 2008:213). There was little to indicate how diet might have been related to social standing at the site. At Yarnton in Oxfordshire, there were also indications of low animal protein consumption for the Iron Age population (Lightfoot et al. 2009:315). Further analysis of the Iron Age population showed little difference between the diets of sexed males and females (Lightfoot et al. 2009:316). Differences were also found between three different age groups: infants, children and juveniles, and adults. Infants were different due to the consumption of breast milk, whilst the differences between adults and the other non-adults was likely attributed to different rates of consumption of animal protein (Lightfoot et al. 2009:317). This shows that age does play some factor in differentiating individuals, whilst sex does not.

Low variation in diet was also found in Iron Age Poundbury in Dorset, though the Romano-British period showed evidence of differences with those buried in mausoleums, who had a more marine-rich diet (Richards et al. 1998:1249-1250). Those individuals could have been of a higher status, eating more seafood than terrestrial animals. Isotopic analysis was undertaken for several other sites in Iron Age and Romano-British Dorset, including Alingston Avenue, Flagstones, Gussage all Saints

and others. Alington Avenue had a more diversified diet compared to other Iron Age sites, with a diet that might have included seafood alongside terrestrial animals (Redfern et al. 2010:1158). The rest of the Iron Age sites reflected the trends seen previously, though this changed on a site-to-site basis into the Romano-British period, demonstrating the complexity of how Iron Age and Roman foodways might have interacted during the period (Redfern et al. 2010:1156). Sex did not appear to be a factor in diet in the Late Iron Age, though this did change between males and females in the Romano-British period (Redfern et al. 2010:1153).

The expression of different identities in mortuary practices was clear in the other results of the quantitative analysis, where age appeared to be a factor in some mortuary practices. Age has been an increasingly popular field of study in bioarchaeology, especially studies of childhood and within the context of the life course (e.g. Gowland 2006, Perry 2005, Sofaer 2006). This has yet to be done in Iron Age Britain (except Giles 2008, Giles 2013), not just through mortuary practices and age identity in death, but through other aspects of the archaeological record. The deposition of younger nonadults – those in the 0-3 year range specified in this analysis, for example – is one that could stand further attention in Iron Age archaeology. It is also important to keep in mind the mortuary data used in this study (especially in the case of Wessex) does represent a minority rite and the patterns that have emerged represent an even smaller sample of those that have been selected for deposition. This emphasises the need to integrate more evidence beyond the burial record, as well as the way we structure our data sets and analyse them. Finally, an osteological and isotopic analysis of nonadults in the Dorset region showed increasingly poor dental health as well as metabolic disease amongst nonadults into the Romano-British period (Redfern et al. 2012:1254). Isotopic evidence also showed differences in weaning diets from the Late Iron Age into the Romano British period (Redfern et al. 2012:1256). There did not appear to be any differences between nonadult age groups in terms of diet beyond the transition from breastfeeding to solid foods.

These examples have shown how much improvements in technology are helping the way archaeologists use the body to uncover information about the past. Further osteological and isotopic analyses have shown how differences in health and diet can provide insight into different groups of people. So far, there has been little variation in diet between the sexes, but age has once again shown itself to be a factor in how Iron Age people might have differentiated themselves amongst one another.

#### 4.4.3. Interpreting meaningful patterns in mortuary practices

Section 4.3 attempted to discern the visibility of difference within the collective patterning of mortuary practice in Iron Age Wessex and East Yorkshire. According to Bourdieu (1977:169) patterns expressed within the archaeological record could be the result of repetitive behaviour of individuals acting within an established orthodoxy. The patterns of gender identity in Pope and Ralston (2011) and Giles (2012) might be examples of Iron Age communities choosing to express particular ideas of gender, age and status for certain individuals. They are the manifestations of distinct gendered ideals and any departure from *those* patterns could represent another form of gendered expression. However, it is important to consider how meaningful these results are and whether or not they are arbitrary and naturalised (Bourdieu 1977:164). That is to say, the trend exists but how significant is it to our understanding of the importance (or lack thereof) in Iron Age Britain?

For example, comparisons between the burials of the moderately wealthy and paramount elite in the Hallstatt burials of Germany revealed distinct burial traditions of the very elite as well as evidence of individual preference in burials such as Hochdorf (Arnold 2001:219-220). Are the examples of agency and individuality significant *because* they are different from the pattern of other elite Hallstatt graves, and were these differences marked by late Hallstatt society at all? They are of course marked by the type of grave goods and burial site but are they a concrete idea of how status was viewed at the time? If we are "legitimising our own perceptions of past social systems in the course of interpreting archaeological patterns," (Arnold 2001:221) – in this case, strict ideas of how social hierarchies were constructed and displayed in death, then there

is also a very real possibility that we are doing the same thing in interpreting gendered patterns in burials.

From a third-wave feminist perspective, this could manifest in the complete deconstruction of gendered identities in Iron Age Britain. A straightforward interpretation suggests that gender identities are either unknown or unimportant for the time period. This is even with trying to locate gender through the body (after Sofaer 2006:156) as well as the material culture. And yet, Pope and Ralston (2011) and Giles (2012) have found evidence claiming the opposite. Gender might have been marked to some degree in life, but the manner of which was not deemed expressly necessary to display in mortuary practices. It is only for some elite and older individuals in that this was deemed necessary, which itself says much about how gender might have been perceived for the period.

In the case of East Yorkshire, Giles (2012) emphasised how an individual's age might have determined a degree of personhood. This has also been proven true in other time periods and areas (Arnold 2001, Gowland 2006). In Iron Age East Yorkshire, it is possible that a certain age was necessary in order to achieve a distinct gendered identity. If a youth died at a certain age, the gendered distinction would not have been necessary within the mortuary practices resulting in the circumstances of their burial. However, if a type of gendered identity had been achieved in life, it might have been important and significant enough to make it clearly marked within their burial. Of course, this explanation is only relevant to Iron Age East Yorkshire and does not explain the other non-gendered patterning, especially in Wessex. But continuing along this line of thought, communities in Iron Age Wessex might not have considered gendered distinctions in life to be significant enough to communicate in death.

This does not mean to take away any type of individual identity expression, but emphasises the difficulty of finding evidence of such within the archaeological record. Iron Age Wessex, with its high degree of variation in mortuary practices across space and time, displayed a certain amount of standardisation within its burial patterns when biological sex was concerned (a separate issue which will be discussed in Section 4.4.2). According to Arnold (2001:215), evidence of agency or individuality might manifest in departures from such rigidly standardised patterns, such as in the elite burials of the late Hallstatt period in west-central Europe. Given the amount of "standardisation" in areas of Iron Age Britain (especially East Yorkshire), any difference in the expression of gender might be cause to re-evaluate the general interpretations of binary gender identity. More often than not, this has been discussed in response to graves with weapons (Giles 2008, Giles 2012) or mirrors (Joy 2011) by rethinking how traditionally "masculine" and "feminine" such items actually are. In a similar vein, the material of the Vix burial has been reinterpreted (Arnold 1991, Arnold 2012) in order to see how it contributes to the debate of elite gender identity in Iron Age Europe.

#### 4.6. Conclusion

The data analysed here demonstrated that there were very few patterns that provided further insight into gendered identities for the period. For this reason it is difficult to come to a concrete conclusion about the communal expression of gender identity through Iron Age mortuary practices. Indeed, it appears for most mortuary practices in Iron Age Britain, gender identity in death was not a primary criterion for the manner of disposal (Edwards and Pope 2013:473). There might have been a number of ways in which identity was expressed in life, even in regards to gender, but it does not mean all of them carried over into beliefs and ideologies associated with death and burial. Gender was expressed in some ways through death and burial in Iron Age Britain (see Section 4.1.1), most notably in the association of animal remains and material culture with higher-status females (Pope and Ralston 2011:403-404). Giles (2012:150) also discussed the intersection of gender and age identities in East Yorkshire through the colour and use of material culture.

It is significant that the few gendered interpretations of the Iron Age burial record required the analysis of material culture. Section 4.3 attempted to discern gender from the burial record without the material culture in order to apply intersectional ideas of identity and to avoid privileging the burials with grave goods. The stories of higherstatus females in Wessex and East Yorkshire, or of elderly females in East Yorkshire are important, but they are not the full story of females or feminine individuals in Iron Age Britain, nor are they the story of other types of gendered identities. Nuanced narratives of masculine or other genders are still unaccounted for within discussions of the burial record. The same is true for the results in Section 4.3, which further demonstrated the lack of distinct gender signifiers amongst Iron Age burials (Whimster 1981). Traditional quantitative analysis of burial records favour interpretations based on distinct patterns in burial practices or burials with material culture, which highlights the importance of developing new ways to look at the burial data in order to draw out information that might otherwise go unseen.

Section 4.2. demonstrated the lack of consideration of gender within some of the site reports used within the analysis, and it would be fair to assume that this trend is followed within most other site reports as well. This could very well be a function of the report itself, as an excavation report is meant to report the facts. Discussions of the data at the end of the report is often thin, which might be due to a reluctance to fully explore the myriad interpretations afforded by the data. It might also be a reluctance to engage with the more theoretical concepts that are required in expanding on the social interactions that make up the very being of the site. However, it is not difficult to add such interpretations – the analyses shown by Hamlin (2007) and within this chapter show that it does not require too much additional analysis in order to uncover some of the ways aspects of identity might manifest on the site. Age was indeed a factor in Iron Age mortuary practices. Integrating this data with further osteological and isotopic analyses, and even more settlement data, can only expand on what has been found here.

It is important that those producing the excavation reports be aware of how the data can be used in order to discover how Iron Age society would have worked on these sites. There is no harm in exploring all the ways the data can be interpreted, as opposed to simply presenting the data as it is. The word cloud analysis showed what those types of site reports are, at their very root: descriptions of artefacts and features. In doing so, archaeologists are in danger of presenting these sites without the very people who created them, lived in them and died in them.

### **Chapter 5**

### Images of Gender in Archaeological Reconstructions of Iron Age Britain

#### **5.1. Introduction**

Images of the past encapsulated in paintings, statues, or artists' reconstructions are one of many ways to convey ideas about how people lived in the past. There have been numerous studies that demonstrate the extent to which such visual media influences and reinforces perceptions of the past (Berman 1999, Ducros and Ducros 2000, Gero and Root 1990, MacDougall 1997, Merriman 1998, Molyneaux 1997, Moser 1992; 1998a, Moser 1998b, Moser 2001, Moser 2003, Perry 2009, Perry and Johnson 2014, Perry and Marion 2010, Sheriff 2006, Smiles and Moser 2005, Van Dyke 2006, Westin 2014, Witmore 2006), focusing on specific subsets of images throughout space and time. Others have looked specifically at how such visual media portrays gender within illustrations of prehistory (Gifford-Gonzalez 1993, Moser 1993, Solometo and Moss 2013) to gender within museum displays (Butler 1996, Grab 1991, Jones 1991, Sørensen1998). Similar studies have also looked at the relationship between visual media, archaeology and representations of the past in later prehistoric Britain and France (Aldhouse-Green 2004, Champion 1997a, Guerrier 1982, Hingley 2001, Hingley and Unwin 2005, King 2001, Phillips 2005, Piggott 1978; 1989, Rieckhoff 2006, Smiles 1994; 2000). However, these studies have been specifically focused on the relationship between illustrations and archaeology or gender or later prehistoric Britain and France with reference to various social and cultural movements. This chapter analyses archaeological illustrations of Iron Age Britain and considers issues of gender, the social, political and cultural influences of images, and how these images affect academic and public perceptions of the later prehistoric past.

This chapter examines nineteenth, twentieth and twenty-first century images of Iron Age Britain in order to discuss the relationship between visual media, archaeology and gender. The focus is on archaeology and more "professional" illustrations, so the images discussed within are drawn from academic books and journals as well as museum displays, rather than more popular media such as children's or comic books, which contain their own particular set of agendas and meanings. This chapter seeks to better understand how gender is manifested within visual representations. To that extent, this chapter (1) asks if images show definitive gender biases (such as gender binaries in clothing and activities) and how they manifest, (2) considers for the influences behind such images, from archaeology, classical sources, contemporary fine art movements, contemporary culture and society, etc. through a variety of case studies, (3) discusses the impact of the influences on the images, as well as the influence of the images themselves, and finally (4) asks how images and other representations can be modified in order to present Iron Age gender in a manner that invites contemplation and discussion without being static and stereotypical.

# **5.2.** Methodology: the theoretical basis, database construction and considerations

#### 5.2.1. Image methodologies: differences and similarities in approach

Before commencing this study, it is worth exploring how other studies have addressed the issues in how images of the past are interrogated. While there are many studies that have offered case studies on images of Iron Age Britain and France (e.g. Champion 1997a, Guerrier 1982, Hingley and Unwin 2005, King 2001, Phillips 2005, Piggott 1989, Rieckhoff 2006), few have created detailed methodologies for analytical purposes. Analyses that work for one particular set of images, such as Forestier's Glastonbury Lake illustrations (King 2001) may prove useful for similar sets of images, such as the Historic England Iron Age Illustrations collection, but not others. Previous studies have also focused on very specific issues pertaining to the images studied, such as the impact of French nationalistic agendas on the creation of historical images (Champion 1997a). The goal is to examine which methodologies and studies have been particularly successful in order to create a methodology that can not only be used for a wide variety of images, but is flexible in how it addresses the various motivations behind their creation and use.

The theoretical and practical approaches to a representational analysis follow some of the same series of conventions proposed by Moser's (2001) comprehensive study of depictions of early prehistoric people. It represents a fundamental contribution to developing a methodology for this study as it represents one of the first detailed methods for analysing a large body of archaeological representations in the form of images. The methodology considers a range of specific categories that specifically address how important an image is in conveying particular ideas. These categories are: iconography, autonomy, longevity, authenticity, singularity, dramatism and persuasiveness (Moser 2001:269-280). Each category examines how particular elements of an image contribute to its impact, rather than simply discussing each image on a case-by-case basis.

Iconography is the notion that a single item can become symbolic of an idea or meaning. Moser (2001:269-270) uses fire as an example because it is often used to convey the idea of civilisation. Fire is an icon used repeatedly in images of the past, especially those concerning early humans. It is simultaneously technology, a tool and a weapon, but those who possess it have something more than those who do not. Iconography refers back to semiotics and Charles Peirce's taxonomy of signs, especially the icon (Danesi 2002:40, Eco 1976:166). Icons and iconography as a category bridge the gap between the study of signs (semiotics) and the communicative element of images, because it emphasises that initial ideas embedded within the creation of an image can grow to have a life and influence of their own (Moser 2001:271).

Moser's idea of autonomy applies to the thematic influence of an icon, whereas longevity simply refers to how long such influence endures. A theme can be autonomous but not have any longevity. To demonstrate the intertwined nature of these two criteria, Moser (2001:273) discusses uses the theme of nakedness, arguing that it implies barbarity and a lack of civilisation that can be seen in illustrations within the present day. This leads directly to singularity, which refers to choice and reproduction of a select image to use over and over again (Moser 2001:276). The singularity of an image is the culmination of its autonomy and longevity and in many ways the image becomes an icon itself. The problem with singularity is that it is a single image – it is not possible that one image can be representative of a people or subject or time period.

In other image studies, discussions of image autonomy, longevity and singularity are usually discussed in general terms regarding images as a whole (e.g. Molyneaux 1997, Piggott 1965, Piggott 1978), rather than specifically occurring elements within the images themselves, such as activities, clothing or gesture.

The last categories to consider are dramatism and persuasiveness, both of which are related to authenticity (or how accurate an image is). The heightened emotion of a scene can leave a lasting impression on the viewer (Moser 2001:277-279). A dramatized image can persuade a viewer of its power and truth, allowing it to have autonomy and longevity – but is it representative of real life? There is some correlation between the two, but does an increase in drama and emotion within an image heighten its persuasiveness as well? Within academia this may not be the case, because of the stigma of using stylised "fluffy" images. One can argue that drama and persuasiveness are very much an issue in populist images – the more sensational the better – but it is important not to be drawn into such dichotomies.

One of the fundamental problems with Moser's methodology is that it is composed of many broadly related categories and sometimes-overlapping categories that are largely descriptive in nature. Some aspects are valuable for this study, such as the iconicity of an image – its ability to stand on its own and for its components to develop meaning and value outside of the image as a whole. It is also important this study takes into account the emotional impact and the popularity of an image. However, Moser's categories provide a *theoretical* basis from which to structure an analysis. The categories do not say what elements should be recorded from the image or how they can be compared against others and there is no structure or clear approach to follow. Therefore, while the methodology is useful as a basis for comparison or theoretical foundation, it cannot be used easily in a quantitative application.

By comparison Solometo and Moss' (2013) analysis of gendered images within the illustrations of *National Geographic* contains a clear methodology and research aims (Solometo and Moss 2013:124). Their analysis shows significant trends in the

frequencies of gender and age categories and their activities. For example, men were more likely to hunt, perform rituals and build whilst women processed foot, cooked and weaved cloth (Solometo and Moss 2013:131). These trends emphasise the importance of male work and activities. Unlike Moser's methodology, which focuses more on the theoretical basis and neglects to state the actual sampling and study, Solometo and Moss (2013) display more rigorous sampling by using all images of prehistoric peoples published within *National Geographic*. The analysis was also more detailed in its use of graphs and charts, rather than just describing images. Solometo and Moss (2013) also interviewed the creative directors and illustrators of *National Geographic*, allowing them to gain more insight into the practicalities of creating an informational illustration of the past.

The analysis falls short in its discussion by addressing the types of influences regarding autonomy and longevity in Moser's (2011) study, and in providing suggestions for amending the situation. For example, they suggest "the reconstructions appear to be significantly influenced by biases present in the disciple of archaeology, and share with archaeology a general disinclination to challenge traditional interpretations of gender in the past" (Solometo and Moss 2013:141). Whilst it is a valid observation, Solometo and Moss do not explore how archaeology as a whole has avoided new and different presentations of gender. They also do not speculate on why current archaeological thought does not appear to affect the images, only referencing a reluctance to encourage debate, or worse, a lack of knowledge of current debate (Solometo and Moss 2013:141).

Similarly, the suggestions for improvement can be general aside from the obvious: making females principle actors, showing males doing "females' work" (Solometo and Moss 2013:142). Other suggestions require more detail and consideration: "gender relations themselves may be framed as a major goal of archaeological inquiry, and space allotted in reconstructions to the results of research aimed explicitly at teasing out the intersections, overlaps and divisions in the gender relations in specific social contexts in the past" (Solometo and Moss 2013:142). Intersectionality between gender and other identities has long been a tenet of feminist thought (see Butler 1990, Hooks

1992); though the statement does not go on to say how such intersectionality can be featured within future illustrations.

Ultimately, both studies are lacking in their methodology, analysis, dataset or some combination of all three. Some of the case studies were frequently anecdotal and drawn from a wide but unspecified dataset (Moser 2011), or relegated to a very specific dataset (Solometo and Moss 2013). In order to address some of the problems in previous approaches, this thesis aims to examine a far broader range of representations relating to Iron Age Britain. Therefore, the analysis includes a broad range of media: museum displays, artistic illustrations from academic books, magazines and elsewhere. This includes images created between 1800 and 2014 in order to analyse the broader trends of gender portrayals during this period. By conducting such a thorough assessment of visual representations, it aims to explore how images may be challenged in order to reflect on-going research within gender archaeology. In this way, traditional views of gender roles, both present and past, can be challenged and amended.

#### 5.2.2. Creating a dataset of images

This chapter analyses nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first century depictions of Iron Age people in Britain. These three centuries were selected for several reasons. The nineteenth century represents the tail end of a period marked by the "marked increase in the production of visual artefacts as a form of polite edification and entertainment" (Smiles 2000:3). Images created in this period and thereafter also benefitted from the increase in archaeological knowledge and shifts in scientific thought in general (Smiles 1993:12, Smiles 2000:2, see Section 5.5). The nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first centuries also saw the rise of artistic, political and social movements which would also leave their mark on the creation of images, namely the Italian Renaissance, Romanticism, the Celtic Revival, and postmodernism (see Section 5.5). The theoretical and social impact of these movements will be the focus of analyses here, rather than artistic style, because the analysis is interested in their effect on the portrayal of gender in images. Historical styles and their techniques (e.g. naturalism, Pre-Raphaelite, postmodernism) will only be discussed if they are directly influential to the analysis of an image, such as the application of *chiaroscuro* to Alan Sorrell's illustrations or

classical statue styles and Italian Renaissance themes on early nineteenth century gestures and poses.

There is a vast quantity of image data available for the period, but for the present purposes, the images analysed were restricted to print media from books. These include a range of different types of book publications from archaeological site reports to more populist books on archaeology, as well as archaeologically oriented magazines such as *The Illustrated London News*, *Current Archaeology* and *British Archaeology*. These types of media were selected because they contain information derived from archaeological material and would have displayed collaboration between artists/illustrators and archaeologists. In this way it would be possible to obtain an idea of how current archaeological method and theory affected the way in which people were portrayed within the image, with respect to social theories and especially gender.

Works of fine art such as paintings and statuary were not included because the dissemination of information behind such media is different from print media. This is not to say that paintings and statuary did not benefit from archaeological discourse or that they had no impact on archaeological thought (both academic and popular). However, in terms of aesthetics and overall aims of the work, it was felt that they did not fit the types of questions that this thesis is concerned with. This was the case for other forms of media, such as children's books, educational texts and comic books. The amount of data contained within these works was beyond the scope of this discussion, especially in terms of the political and educational factors involved in their production.

Images of Bronze Age or Roman period Britain were not compared to Iron Age images. It is beyond the purpose of this thesis to compare and contrast multi-period-specific themes, as well as multi-period theoretical awareness, but some examples from both periods are considered alongside Iron Age images in Sections 5.5 and 5.6 within relevant case studies. Images relating to Roman Britain were carefully considered, especially in light of more current archaeological thought that encourages the view of a continuous Iron Age into the Roman period, as well as a hybridised Iron Age/Roman

Britain (see Carr 2006, Haselgrove et al. 2001, Webster 2001), but images of a more "Romanised" Britain were excluded from analysis because they were illustrating a Roman, rather than Iron Age, style and content. However, images of clashes between Romans and Iron Age people were included, allowing a comparison of the way that Iron Age individuals were portrayed in opposition to the Romans within a single depiction.

Issues of Roman influence and a longer Iron Age were also considered in regards to images outside of southeast Britain. A longer Iron Age is widely acknowledged by period specialists, especially in Scotland (Harding 2004, Haselgrove and Moore 2007), therefore images from later time periods beyond the "usual" Iron Age periodization (800 BC to AD 43) were also included, even into the Pictish period in Scotland. Artistic reconstructions of Picts were often difficult to reconcile and for this study were narrowed down to images that showed distinct juxtapositions between Picts and "others" (namely Romans).

The other body of material considered here was artistic reconstructions from museums – again, because they fit the remit of being derived and sometimes even composed of archaeological material and demonstrate collaboration between archaeologists and curators. This sampling is by no means a complete or exhaustive one, but focuses on a selection of national museums (the British Museum, the National Museum of Scotland and the National Museum of Cardiff) as well as regional museums (the Museum of London, the Norwich Castle Museum, the Museum of the Iron Age, the Hull and East Riding Museum, and the Museum of York) in order to consider a broad range of approaches and attitudes towards presenting the Iron Age and its people to a wide audience.

#### 5.2.3. Theoretical considerations and constructing a database

Aspects of representation analysis were drawn from several disciplines to chart important themes and motifs. Most importantly, a variety of modes of interpretation were necessary to analyse all aspects of the images to their fullest extent (i.e. not just themes and motifs but context, influences, and impact). Broader interpretations were inspired by principles of the aesthetic experience in art history, with more specific aspects addressed by ideas derived from media semiotics, the body and society, and gesture politics. Despite the broad range of theoretical underpinnings used in the image analysis, this study is mindful of the feminist and structuralist theories discussed in Chapters 1 and 2. The following sections will explain the theoretical issues in greater detail and the way in which they informed the construction of the image database, the selection of elements chosen for analysis, and the interpretation of those elements.

#### 5.2.3.a. Image analysis: breaking down an image

The image database was created to gather quantitative data from the images, which will permit the question of gender bias within representations of the Iron Age to be analysed on more than just a superficial level.

Images can be divided into quantifiable categories that permit analysis. Principles of semiotics related to signs, icons, codes, and myths provided the basic underlying structure for breaking down images into elements (see Section 5.2.2.b), supported by aspects derived from gesture politics and studies of the body and society (see Section 5.2.2.c). In order to understand potential gender biases within the images, it was necessary to consider a number of quantifiable questions: who is in the images? How many of them are there? What are they doing? Where are they in terms of actual location and their placement within the image itself? What objects are they associated with? What clothing are they wearing? Within the database, each image was quantified into categories that correspond with the questions: activities, number of people in the image (divided into adult males, adult females, elderly males, elderly females, children and infants), perspective (where were the individuals within the space of the image), dress (detailing what depicted individuals were wearing), objects (associated artefacts) and gesture. Additional information about each image was recorded, including: the year of publication, the author, the illustrator, the type of media as well as the degree of how popular or academic a source might be.

# 5.2.3.b. Semiotics: the significance of signifiers and tropes in analysis and interpretation

The breakdown of images described in Section 5.2.2.a is best explained through semiotics. Semiotics can also explain how those parts are combined to create the
recurring themes that this chapter attempts to analyse. There are many definitions of what semiotics is. For example, Preucel (2006:3) defines semiotics as "the multidisciplinary field devoted to how human produce, communicate, and codify meaning." Eco (1976:12) defines the field as, "studying everything which can be used in order to tell a lie, because if something cannot be used to tell a lie, conversely it cannot be used to tell the truth; it cannot, in fact, be used to tell at all." Though the tone between the two definitions is at odds, their underlying meaning is the same: semiotics disseminates the ways that human beings represent the world through signs. The research questions presented in Section 5.2.2.a permit the images to be analysed for recognisable signs.

Analysis of linguistic signs (or indeed any sign) can be divided into synchronic or diachronic analyses (Berger 2012:20-21, Danesi 2002:30, Saussure 1960:99-100). A synchronic analysis examines a localised subset of data, such as the analysis of Historic England's illustrations of Iron Age Britain (see Section 5.5.1.b.iii). For small case studies such as this, relationships and meanings are studied for close comparison. Diachronic analysis, on the other hand, takes the long-term approach by studying signs generated over a period of time: in this case, it is the examination of all the images for broad temporal themes and patterns. A methodology combining the two is ideal, because the long-term analysis provides context whilst the localised analysis provides a strong dataset for specific comparison. In this study, the data is drawn from images produced from the nineteenth through the twenty-first century in order to track broader trends in gendered portrayals of Iron Age individuals, with specific case studies to identify more localised trends, which feed into question 3 (searching for the influences behind such images, from archaeology, classical sources, contemporary fine art movements, contemporary culture and society, etc.) and are explained in more detail in Section 5.5.

This section is more concerned with answering question 1 (if images show definitive gender biases and how they manifest). Semiotics provides the means by which components of images were analysed, as well as the basis for examining gender within the images: the signifier and the signified. The concept is derived from the linguistic

combination of concept and sound image (Saussure 1960:66-67). The relationship between signifier and signified is not accidental, but laden with meaning (Berger 2012:9). Repetitions of signifiers attached to a specific signified (e.g. swords signifying masculinity) amongst multiple images may highlight significant issues or concepts. In the case of signifier and signified, the relationship between the medium and the artist is extremely important. For example, in comic books and paintings, the illustrators or painters may be very much aware of the significance of the various signifiers within the image and may even include them deliberately. The unconscious repetition of signifiers may be just as important, if not more so, than their deliberate reproduction. Unconscious repetition can demonstrate just how embedded certain ideals can be within the time period, or within the mind of the illustrator.

Connotation and denotation expand on the idea of the signifier and the signified. Denotation refers to a set of characteristics pertaining to a concept, whether it is a person, television show, or historical period (Danesi 2002:36). Denotative features are general and may shift depending on specific interpretations of the concept. For example, a knight's denotative features might be his armour, his horse and his coat of arms. Connotation, on the other hand, refers to the historically and culturally rooted explanatory variables that make a group of denotative figures distinct (Berger 2012:18-19, Danesi 2002:36). The connotative interpretation of a knight is his vow to uphold the notions of honour and chivalry. In this study, the denotative features and their connotative interpretation, like the signifier and the signified, assign meaning to a particular element of an image. An analysis of the denotative and connotative factors can provide a measure of understanding regarding what characteristics or concepts are important and why.

Codes made of signifiers are the culturally specific "organizational systems or grids' for recurring elements that go into the constitution of anything that humans make, including signs, rituals, spectacles, behaviours, and representations of all kinds" (Danesi 2002:42). Archaeological semiotics can claim that codes are also present within the artefacts, sites, and landscapes that make up an archaeological record (Preucel 2006).

The analysis of repetitive codes within representations of Iron Age people can lead to an understanding of the types of behaviours and characteristics we expect to see from the people of the period. We can also see how audiences engage with codes and whether or not they retain their impact over time. Here, codes are equated with tropes and stereotypes. The repetition of codes/tropes/stereotypes in relation to gender is extremely important to this study, because they may reflect subconscious views of gender that may not related to archaeological knowledge or any theoretical, social or intellectual movements of the time.

A semiotic analysis allows a unique perspective on the past: namely, how the relatively informed (e.g. academic archaeologists) and the uninformed (e.g. the general public) continue to conceive and construct the past through the selection and repetition of signs and codes, as well as the dissemination of particular myths. However, these mechanisms are still quite simple: they are never indicative of the entire truth, especially when they pertain to portrayals of actual human beings. Signs and their related components can only mediate the truth (Danesi 2002:17) because they draw on a limited amount of information. In the case of contemporary images, interpretations are skewed towards what a modern audience (academic or not) expects to see when confronted with images of Iron Age people, whether they are archaeologically derived or accurate. Therefore, a semiotic analysis of Iron Age imagery cannot exist in isolation, but must be used alongside other theoretical components.

# 5.2.3.c. Gesture politics and the social body

In the absence of textual cues, the analysis of interaction between individuals within an image is largely constrained to gesture. Gesture is defined as a "complex structured system of bodily actions that are socially acquired and laden with cultural significance" (Farnell 1996:283). A wide variety of information about identities, power dynamics and relationships are displayed through gesture once it is viewed within highly specific cultural and spatio-temporal contexts (Braddick 2009:18). Sociocultural norms can manifest within a gesture and thus can be accepted or rejected by its use or disuse. Gender is something that can manifest within gesture and is allowed or denied through it. This begs the question: if a females or a man is performing a gesture that is not

considered to be particularly feminine or masculine, what overall meaning does that give to the image and what does it mean in terms of perpetuating certain ideas about gender?

Some examples of gesture and gender from the classical world involve manner of dress in Homeric myth (van Wees 2005) and the power dynamics of sitting versus standing in Greek and Roman art (Davies 2005). Such examples of gesture are deeply rooted in the strict gender divisions and hierarchies of the period, where gender binaries of man/woman might not have existed in the manner that it does today, but females were still seen as lesser than males (Holmes 2012:52). This is a useful context for framing the way that classical Greek and Roman societies viewed the "other" (in this case, Iron Age societies in Gaul and Britannia), especially in terms of their gender ideologies. The ways in which Iron Age societies were viewed manifests not only within the written texts, but also the classical statuary as well, which may have influenced the more contemporary images of the Iron Age analysed here.

These issues of gender and gesture reflect some of the underlying feminist theory in regards to study of the body as a whole, "that differences between males and females are historical, cultural and contingent rather than fixed by nature and divine will" (Turner 1996:5, see also Butler 1993, Synnott 1993). For the purposes of this analysis, the body is flexible rather than static and is constructed not only biologically, but also socially, culturally and situated within specific contexts (Hancock et al. 2000). Some of the biological and cultural factors relating to the construction of the body were discussed in Chapters 2 and 4, but this section focuses more on the sociocultural ideals espoused by gesture. However, the two are not separate and must always be considered together in order to gain a broad perspective on how the body and gender are related in later prehistory. Gesture is a descriptive category as an open text box within the database, which allows for freeform description of the various performative gestures found within the images.

# 5.2.3.d. Quantifying emotion and perception?

The "aesthetic experience" (Csikszentmihalyi and Robinson 1990) conceptualises the experience of viewing an image as a whole through the opinions of art critics and museum curators. This study is relevant because it demonstrates the idea that the interaction between viewer and viewed is not always as simple as absorbing the object (in this case, the image) at hand. Csikszentmihalyi and Robinson (1990) divided the aesthetic experience into emotional, perceptual, intellectual, communicative, and historically oriented dimensions. This section focuses on emotion, perception and communication, which are the most subjective and least (if at all) quantifiable dimensions and how they are addressed in this analysis.

The perceptual element consists of the viewer's interaction with the piece of art in question (Csikszentmihalyi and Robinson 1990:29). It is how a viewer sees the piece the first time and reacts to its presence and is tied into a physical awareness of the art in relation to the viewer: "But more often, the museum professionals referred to the physicality of the work in statements concerning the impact upon them of the size or scale of the object or its undeniable reality" (Csikszentmihalyi and Robinson 1990:30). Perception, then, relies more on a more tactile experience even if the viewer is not touching the art. It is a visceral reaction that can be applied to images because the viewer has a tendency to react to an image, whether the reaction is positive, negative or neutral.

The emotional dimension of viewing art is the most self-explanatory. For the experts surveyed, "an appreciable level of emotional involvement was reported [and] was, moreover, the primary response for nearly a quarter of them" (Csikszentmihalyi and Robinson 1990:14). The ability of a piece of art to evoke some type of emotion is seen as a necessary component of the aesthetic experience. The stronger a viewer's emotion were, whether positive or negative, was also shown to enhance this, though the study's participants had highly variable opinions on the subject (Csikszentmihalyi and Robinson 1990:14-15). Whilst emotion itself is difficult to measure and it is almost certain that everyone will have a different emotional experience upon viewing an

image, it is still an important element to consider even if it could not be quantified within the image database. When emotion is associated with an image, a connection is made and the image itself becomes more memorable and acquires meaning.

The communicative dimension implies that there is an on-going dialogue between the viewer and the object long after the initial viewing (Csikszentmihalyi and Robinson 1990:62). A continual feedback loop exists between the object and the viewer, suggesting that the effect does not travel in one direction. Just as the viewer is affected by and interprets the object, so too does the object absorb meaning and significance from the viewer. The time-depth aspect of the viewing experience must also be considered. The viewer may leave and continue to think of the object (perhaps due to the signifiers and codes depicted), linking back to the emotional dimension and the creation of a connection between the two. The stronger the communicative dimension is, the stronger the other dimensions are as well in fostering a relationship between viewer and art.

Perception and emotion are related in that they refer to the initial impression of the viewing and the emotions evoked during the act. They contribute to an image's impact (the communicative dimension) and should at least be considered within the context of popularised images and their continuing influence on individuals and archaeology as a discipline. Though such categories cannot be quantified within a database, it is at least possible to document the number of times an image has been reproduced outside of the initial publication.

#### 5.2.3.e. Influence and impact

The historically oriented dimension of the aesthetic experience relates to an understanding of the art based on previous knowledge. This is the historical context of the art in question. Again, the importance of this category varied between subjects within the study: "whereas some considered the historical context an essential part of their experience, others mentioned the object's historical context as an obstacle" (Csikszentmihalyi and Robinson 1990:50). However, it would be difficult to assign any meaning to an image without the knowledge of what it is derived from as well as the

time and place from which it came. In this case, the historical context adds dimension to the viewing and subsequent analysis of an image rather than taking away from it.

If a picture is indeed worth a thousand words, it is because of the stylistic, historical, emotional and other factors that go into its making. This study focuses on archaeological representation; as such, any influence derived from archaeology (contemporary excavations, dialogue with archaeologists, etc.) is the most important aspect. Archaeological input may not assure any degree of accuracy to the work, but in terms of influence it is important to document reciprocal relationships between imagery and archaeological interpretation. Historical, social and artistic movements may dictate style (i.e. gesture) and how individuals are portrayed, highlighting certain ideals of the period. These are considered in further detail in Section 5.5.

# 5.2.4. Categorising Individuals

Taking into account the theoretical concepts in Section 5.2.3., Table 5.2.1. describes how individuals within the images were sorted and categorised within dataset. This specifically refers to the categories of adult males, adult females, elderly males, elderly females, children and infants. The characteristics used to denote the various categories were defined by the author and are therefore subjective. However, it must also be said that these subjectivities were also based on the conventions used within the images used. The categories were defined using physical characteristics rather than on clothing and adornment.

	Physical Characteristics		
Adult Males	Facial hair, hair cut above the shoulders		
Adult Females	Hair below the shoulders, hairstyles (buns,		
	braids)		
Elderly Males	White/grey hair, facial hair		
Elderly Females	White/grey hair		
Children	Hair, bigger stature than infants		
Infants	Generally hairless, small in stature		

Table 5.2.1. Categorising individuals through physical characteristics.

## 5.3. Results

This section addresses the first question of the chapter: do images show definitive gender biases and how they do they manifest? Do they create what Moser (1992:831-832) and Smiles (2000:15) call a "visual language" that pertains to Iron Age Britain? To answer this question, entries within the images database took into account general numbers of males, females, elderly individuals, children and infants, their locations within the images, the activities they were portrayed, the clothing they wore and the objects they used. All of these activities were input into an Excel spreadsheet and coded for analysis. Any patterns that emerged were then considered as general biases in relation to gender in later prehistoric Britain.

It is important to acknowledge that any form of image analysis is highly subjective. Categories that seem relatively straightforward (e.g. identifying the sex and age of various individuals, identifying the placement of individuals, etc.) can be interpreted differently depending on who is viewing the image. Therefore, any and all image interpretations are the author's own.

## 5.3.1. General age and sex distributions

Basic analysis of the images included counting how many adult males, adult females, elderly individuals, children and infants were present within the image. In some cases these totals were difficult to estimate due to image perspectives and population – meaning that some images simply contained too many people to properly count, especially if they were in the background in large numbers. This also meant that some image perspectives, such as bird's eye-views made it difficult to see, let alone categorize, how many individuals of each type were present. In many cases, background individuals were too far away and general to determine any type of general characteristics relating to age or sex. Because of this, some counts were estimated to the nearest number of identifiable individuals.

It is also for this reason that a few images were eliminated from analysis. These images contained figures that were not immediately identifiable. This not only includes images where the people were too ambiguous or far away to identify (Figure 5.1.), but they

used entirely abstract portrayals of individuals that were meant to demonstrate the scale of the site in question (Figure 5.2.). Included in this count of images were artistic reconstructions that were eliminated because they could have included people but did not. These were called "depopulated images" and were very specific – they were not site plans or sections, but artistic illustrations that attempted to reconstruct the building or site as it was in the Iron Age. They demonstrate the environment of the site, but without the people that constructed or lived in it (Figure 5.3.). Figure 5.4. shows the total number of images gathered for this study and the number used based on these criteria.

Out of 325 images, there were 2006 separate individuals portrayed. 1278 were definitively adult males, 428 definitively adult females, 105 definitively elderly males, 22 definitively elderly females, 26 definitively infants and 160 definitively children (Figure 5.5.). The criteria for such "definitive" characteristics will be discussed later on. From these numbers adult males accounted for the majority of all depictions within the images. Even though demographics are difficult to obtain for Iron Age Britain, the actual demographics still would not match with the population proportions seen here. There is a preference for the adult male within these illustrations, which becomes even clearer when the tallies of elderly males and females are added to their younger adult counterparts. Then the percentage swells to nearly 70% for all adult males. These numbers alone demonstrate that there is a bias towards illustrating adult males above all other individuals.

The breakdown becomes more interesting when these categories are divided by decade of publication. Some of the images from online databases contained different copyright dates than their actual publication dates, with the copyright date corresponding to the year they were uploaded to the online database (e.g. Historic England and Historic Scotland). Table 5.3.1. displays the distribution of archaeological images per decade from 1800 to 2010. This has been corrected for some, but not all of the figures. For this comparison, it was easier to combine elderly and adult male counts as well as elderly and adult female counts for easier analysis. In the decades from the 1900s to the 2010s,

Number of	Year	Number of	Year
reconstructions		reconstructions	
1	1800	10	1910
12	1810	10	1920
0	1820	2	1930
1	1830	3	1940
1	1840	2	1950
2	1850	11	1960
1	1860	13	1970
2	1870	26	1980
1	1880	107	1990
1	1890	84	2000
0	1900	22	2010

 Table 5.3.1. Number of artistic reconstructions of Iron Age Britain published per decade from 1800-2010 (as of 2014).

adult males are almost always (except for the 1820s) the default portrayal (Figures 5.6.-5.7.). Combining the elderly males and females with their adult counterparts only widens the gap, emphasizing the ubiquity of the portrayal of males over all other sexes throughout the time scale of this study. Adult females, even when combined with elderly females, are usually portrayed alongside males but in smaller numbers. Interestingly enough, elderly individuals, despite having a few appearances within earlier years, are only consistently portrayed within images from the 1960s onwards.

The location of an individual within an image was also a consideration. Each image recorded where its people were placed, whether it was the foreground, midground or background of the image. This was done to determine whether or not certain categories of individuals were emphasised over others in terms of their placement. In other words, are adult males considered more important than adult females if they kept appearing in the foreground and adult females in the background? This was one aspect of the analysis where the interpretation was extremely subjective. For a study like this, it

would be ideal to show the images to a random sample of individuals who would then write down their interpretations on the locations of the people depicted. From there, the error can be calculated and the statistics evaluated accordingly in regards to how location is regarded. However, this was not possible within the scope of this study therefore all interpretations here are solely my own. Figure 5.8. demonstrates how most images were partitioned, though again this was subject to the perspective depicted within each piece of work. In works where a single individual was portrayed in a portrait style, their special designation was usually depicted as foreground, even if the shot was full-body or tighter on the face. This is because usually that individual was the singular focus (hence portrait style).

Because adult males as a whole have an advantage over all others in terms of sheer representation, the assumption was that they would be found in the foreground than anyone else. When compared side-by-side (Figure 5.9.), representation amongst adult males, adult females and elderly individuals (elderly males and elderly females combined) were fairly similar. Adult males were not in the foreground as much as hypothesised. The elderly appeared more in the midground, as did the general category of children (which combined the categories of children and infants). Children were also found in the midground - one out of two times. No one group of people was overwhelmingly represented in the background, though this may be because of the uncertainty in properly identifying individuals when they are far away.

Though there was no overall trend for a person's location within an illustration, the introduction of other factors, such as year of publication might have affected where a person appeared. For example, were adult males more likely to be portrayed in the foreground prior to the appearance of feminist theory in archaeology (e.g. the 1980s and onwards)? Were females more likely to move into the foreground after major social shifts, such as after World War II? Would children and the elderly become more prominent from the 1990s and onwards with the advent of post-processual archaeology? This was a line of questioning worth pursuing, even if possible trends could not be solely attributed to awareness of social, theoretical and cultural movements.

Interestingly, there was a dip in the location of adult males in the immediate decades following World War II, (Figure 5.10.). During this period the adult females also slip in position from the 1940s to the 1950s before disappearing from the foreground altogether in the 1960s. In the 1960s they appear again in the foreground before gradually rising in the current decade (Figure 5.11.). Adult males in the foreground continue to rise before peaking in the 1990s before declining. Again, this could be attributed to awareness of critical and archaeological knowledge of possible gender roles in the period, but with such a small sample it is difficult to tell. The only time females have the distinct advantage over males in the foreground is a few isolated images from the mid-1800s when Boudicca is the sole person portrayed in the foreground. Therefore, adult males still seemed to an advantage as the default portrayal and taking slight precedent in the foreground of images.

The elderly were most often in the foreground in the 1960s and can be found in the foreground quite often thereafter, dipping in the 1970s and growing incrementally ever since (Figure 5.12.). However, this applies much more to elderly males than elderly females, because elderly males are most often portrayed as Druids and chiefs and therefore granted prestige of position. Despite the climb in most recent decades, the elderly are still not portrayed in the foreground, but the midground. Children too seemed to stay in the midground for the most part, with their portrayals slipping sharply in the 1970s before steadily climbing back in the current decade (Figure 5.13.).

Locational biases are still tricky because of issues of perception, but overall it appears that theory may have some impact on the visibility of females, the elderly, and children in recent years, though it is clear through numbers and percentages that adult males are still the majority.

## 5.3.2. Gender and activities

In the images database, the types of activities portrayed and which individuals were depicted performing them were recorded. Many specific activities were collated into a single category for easy coding, such as tool production/maintenance for activities such as flint-knapping. This includes ritualistic activities, which could contain anything from celebrating funeral rites to sacrificing animals. It was important to consider how passive individuals were within an image, and if certain categories of people were portrayed as active at extent of another group's passiveness. In this way, it was possible to see whether or not certain categories of people were considered as more or less active on top of being relegated to specific activities. For example, Solometo and Moss (2013:136-137) found that females were portrayed more passively than males within an image, which is a distinction that creates a very specific message on what people think males and females did in the past.

If an individual was passive, he or she was sitting or standing still with no discernible movement or depiction of a task assigned to them. However, according to Figure 5.14., the percentages of activity versus non-activity were almost evenly split between all categories. In other words, adult males were just as likely to be portrayed as passive compared to everyone else. It should be noted that the children category combines children and infants, which skews the numbers into a more even split, as infants tend to be completely passive – they are oftentimes swaddled and held (mostly by adult females). Children were portrayed passively more than any other category.

Once the activities were split between adult males, adult females, the elderly and children, the initial assumption was that certain groups would exclusively dominate certain categories. Based on other studies (e.g. Solometo and Moss 2013:131-132), one would expect adult males to be the exclusive hunters, females would be the only ones cooking, etc. Results show that there is more diversity within categories of activities than previously expected, especially between adult males and adult females (Figures 5.15.-5.16.). The only activities exclusively given to adult females were weaving and personal grooming. Adult females were only excluded from adult male activities such as sport, eating and drinking, and sailing. The only activity where children dominated was playing whilst the elderly did not dominate any category. Every other activity was seen as within the providence of a variety of individuals, though the frequency between the activities varied greatly according to activity itself.

The initial expectation was that adult males would dominate in the categories of combat and tool production or maintenance than any other category, whilst adult females would dominate in carrying and cooking (see Solometo and Moss 2013:131-132). While these predictions were true and specific categories did dominate, there is evidence of diversity and many people were shown sharing in these activities (Solometo and Moss 2013:133). Adult males did indeed dominate representation within the combat category. The numbers become more interesting when Boudicca was removed from the count of females portrayed in combat situations. In doing so, the numbers shift towards something one would expect to see, which means combat is still seen as a male activity within depictions of individuals in Iron Age Britain.

Still, activities such as tool production and maintenance, carrying and food processing showed a relatively balanced distribution between adult males and adult females than previously predicted. This is a promising development, one that can be seen within illustrations made within the last twenty or thirty years, though it is not entirely clear if it is in accordance with theoretical developments within Iron Age archaeology in Britain. These results, as with all of the others, will be discussed in more detail in Section 5.5. There was less androcentric bias in the distribution of activities than initially anticipated. Even though the numbers support adult male dominance in the majority of the activities portrayed, there is still a degree of representation in activities between the two, resulting in less disparity between gender roles and gender representation.

This spread only applies to adult males and females. The degree of representation decreases drastically when it is applied to elderly individuals and children. Compared to the 24 discrete categories of activities documented within the images analysed, elderly individuals only present in 10 and children in 15, compared to 22 for adult males and 20 for adult females. Much of this can be attributed to fewer depictions of elderly individuals and children performing activities. Children were portrayed carrying items, assisting in agricultural activities helping with tool maintenance/production, but were

most often seen playing. The elderly were even more constricted and were most often seen in a less active or materially productive activity (such as tool production or maintenance) or in a ritual context. The variety in children's activities is encouraging, but the number of activities allocated for the elderly is less so. Overall, it would be better to see as much variety in their activities as it is for the adult males and females.

As with location a breakdown of activities portrayed by decade tracked potential trends in relation to social and theoretical movements. The variety of activities portrayed increased drastically for all categories from the 1970s onwards, especially for adult females and children. Adult females were excluded from more activities than adult males, though not by a wide margin. Interestingly enough, passive portrayals are also the default for all categories during this era as well. From this analysis, it is possible to conclude that activities were rarely split by gender – rather, there seems to be more of a bias towards age and the activities portrayed than anything else. Again, this could be attributed to overall representation, or it could also be a question of age and ability in regards to the necessary fitness or capability needed to perform a certain activity.

## 5.3.3. Gender, clothing and adornment

One prominent area significant gendered signifiers were expected was through clothing. Much of this is because of strong modern traditions of gendered signifiers through clothing, which theoretically will present more strongly within the images because of the poor preservation of textiles in prehistory as opposed to material objects and some structures (James 1997:35). Clothing and adornment (relating to jewellery and other items worn with or on clothing and directly on the body) were recorded within the main database and then coded, as with the other categorical data, in order to track specific trends between categories. As with some of the other criteria, elderly males and females were combined to create a bigger sample size, as were children and infants.

Clothing categories were based on the author's own observations and conclusions, and thus are subject to further interpretation. "Trews" were any trouser-like garment that covers both legs and could be either baggy or skin-tight, like modern leggings. Longsleeve tunics and short-sleeve tunics refer to a garment worn over the torso, whose length could range anywhere from the waist to mid-thigh. Long-sleeved tunics have sleeves that are between elbow and wrist length, whilst short-sleeved tunics are between shoulder and elbow length. A dress was any single garment reaching from the neck to the knee or ankle, and did not separately enclose both legs. A cloak was an outer garment, also usually in one piece, which fastened around the neck or shoulder (typically with a brooch) and reached from the head to either mid-thigh or ankle, and usually contained a type of hood that could cover the head.

A loincloth was something that was particularly "stereotypically" prehistoric costume. It usually consists of a single cloth that covers the torso and the genital area, perhaps only covering one shoulder, if it covered the torso at all (Figure 5.17.). A skirt refers to an item that hit anywhere from waist to mid-thigh through to the ankle, consisted of a single piece, and did not enclose both legs. Shorts were similar to skirts except they enclosed both legs and usually went from waist to knee. Swaddling cloths refer to a single piece of fabric wrapped all around an individual from head to toe, usually an infant. Aprons were also a single piece of fabric that covered the torso and the legs, but were open in the back. Tartans or kilts refer to the modern clothing worn in Scotland. A belt was some type of rope, metal, or fabric tie that could cinch a dress or tunic. A jacket was worn over the torso and open in the front, with a length varying from neck to waist or mid-calf. The difference between a jacket and a cloak was that the jacket usually did not contain a hood and was worn open rather than clasped with a brooch.

As predicted, there was a strong correlation between culturally-defined gender and clothing. Adult females were overwhelmingly portrayed in dresses whilst adult males were found in trousers paired with short or long-sleeved tunics (Figure 5.18). As with the activities there was a much smaller (but present) distribution of both adult males and females who were portrayed in clothing that was specifically relegated to their sex – there were males wearing dresses and skirts as well as females wearing tunics and trousers, though females wore tunics with skirts. Adult males and females were also seen wearing cloaks in roughly equal proportions. Despite the spread, there is a marked relationship between biological sex and clothing. Dresses can be seen as a gendered

signifier for females and femininity whilst tunics and trousers are gendered signifiers for males and masculinity.

In regards to nudity, the exposure of skin appears to be more of a masculinising gendered signifier. This is in opposition to the *National Geographic* illustrations where "non-Western, primitive, or ancient females" were more likely to be nude in a sexualised manner (Solometo and Moss 2013:137-139). Whilst adult males show more skin (males are the only ones, besides children, who are portrayed as naked or topless) and wear loincloths, their figures are not sexualized. Their close nudity is instead more closely related to their strength and prowess as a warrior, also echoing observations of partial or complete male nudity in *National Geographic* (Solometo and Moss 2013:139). The nudity of adult males may also mark their degree of civilisation in opposition to the Romans, as most nudity takes place in the context of combat. Women, on the other hand, are never depicted in the nude and Iron Age people are usually more clothed than other individuals in prehistory – which again might be emphasizing the extent of their "civilization" (Smiles 1994, 2000; Stout 2008).

There does not appear to any age signifier in regards to clothing for the elderly, except in regards to tartans (plaid or patterned fabric arranged in a kilt with a draped portion over the torso). Otherwise, clothing seen on the elderly ranges in fairly even patterns across tunics, trousers, dresses and other items. Children, on the other hand, exhibit stronger age signifiers in clothing. Shorts and swaddling cloths are exclusively attributed to children, with a smaller, yet mostly even spread amongst the other clothing categories. Clothing appears to display a strong degree of gendered and age signifiers. Strong differences can be found between adult males and females, and children and adults.

Adornment also displayed strong gendered signifiers (Figure 5.19.). Each type of adornment can be seen on adult woman and is displayed to different degrees on other categories of people depending on the specific type of adornment. Adult males are seen with more torcs than adult females, who otherwise dominate representations in the

adornment categories (except for the sole instance of a waist chain). Adult males are never seen wearing earrings or pins, and only occasionally wear bracelets and necklaces that are not torcs. This is in contrast to the elderly (both males and females), who can be seen wearing earrings, bracelets and necklaces in larger numbers. There is a strong age signifier in adornment in that children are not seen with any adornment except for one instance of a head ornament. Adornment also appears to have some degree of class signifiers attached to it, as only small numbers of individuals are portrayed with them if one compares overall counts of adornment to the total number of people.

Tattoos have also been included in the clothing and adornment category. Tattoos are strongly gendered and can be seen on most adult males when tattoos are shown within illustrations. There is some degree of age bias because adult and elderly males and females are depicted with tattoos, though some children are shown with tattoos as well. Tattoos are most often seen in combat situations and are also perhaps strongly indicative of class – in this case, a high-status warrior class due to their rarity and context.

Therefore, clothing and adornment display some of the strongest signs of gender bias amongst the image dataset. Dresses and adornment are the providence of adult females whilst trousers and tunics and tattoos remain mostly within the realm of adult males. Age bias does also appear to some degree in regards to clothing, with swaddling cloths and shorts signifying youth. Class signifiers appear as well in regards to adornment and, to some extent, tattoos.

### 5.3.4. Gender and objects

Objects are interesting to consider because of their iconicity – some modern media studies have shown that if objects are repeated often enough within arbitrary contexts they gain some gendered meaning, such as hair bows and females (Sarkeesian 2012). Therefore, as with clothing and activities, objects were also recorded and coded within the database in order to track frequencies in their associations with certain gender or age categories. A preliminary hypothesis assumed that combative objects such as weapons would appear more frequently with adult males, in accordance with other prehistoric

tropes and associations (see Moser 1998a, Solometo and Moss 2013). Also following that assumption is that more domestic items, particularly those associated with cooking and food preparation, such as pots, will appear more with females to signify a feminine, and more domestic, trope (see Moser 1998a, Solometo and Moss 2013).

For the most part, the above assumptions proved accurate. Combative objects such as swords, spears, shields and helmets were seen with adult males, though they did occur with much lesser frequencies in other categories (Figures 5.20.-5.21.). Chariots were often portrayed with adult females, though as with the frequencies of adult females in combative activities, almost all of these associations can be attributed to portrayals of Boudicca. The Iron Age queen oftentimes proves to be the exception, not the rule in terms of female portrayal in combative situations. Because of the number of portrayals of Boudicca with spears, there seemed to be more of a balance in representation, even if spears were more likely to be seen with adult females if they were with Boudicca. In the case of combative objects, especially shields and swords, there is a clear gender bias towards males.

Food and cooking items also displayed gender bias towards adult females (Figure 5.20.). Adult females were only sometimes depicted with eating or cooking tools (usually pots) and very infrequently with food items unless it was in the context of preparing or cooking. In terms of cooking or eating items, adult males were portrayed with baskets, though it is not clear in most cases if the baskets correlated with cooking or food processing – baskets and adult males seemed to appear more in construction contexts, which was the same with adult females. Conversely, adult and elderly males were seen exclusively with wine and drinking implements. Therefore, even within food and drinking there is a strong gender bias within the types of objects. The act of eating and drinking is largely the providence of males (especially drinking), whilst the act of preparing the food is within the realm of females. Children were also seen helping with food preparation rather than eating it, as opposed to elderly males, who were also eating or drinking rather than preparing the food. Therefore, food preparation is skewed

towards the young and female, whilst food and drink consumption is skewed towards the male and aged.

Animals, though not necessarily objects, also displayed strong gender bias, with adult males being seen more often with animals (Figure 5.20.). This is in correlation to the frequency of males and agricultural activities, as adult males were portrayed performing agricultural activities that dealt with handling livestock (cattle, sheep and pigs). Adult males were often seen with horses in a combative context and game in a hunting context. However, when this is broken down by percentages, the distribution becomes more common between all groups. Dogs appeared with children at a greater frequency than with any other category, mostly in the context of playing. Animals therefore appear in a situational, activity-based context, but still appeared with males because of the activities they shared.

Many of the rest of the objects are distributed between the categories with differing frequencies, but without strong correlations (Figure 5.21,). The only time when objects are depicted exclusively with particular categories of people correlate to the specific activities that are associated with objects – for example, adult females are exclusively associated with looms and textiles because all weaving activities only portray adult females performing such tasks. This also applies to adult and elderly males with ships because only they are seen performing maritime activities. These examples occur at such low frequencies that they do not display the same amount of iconicity that is apparent in combative objects and other objects associated with cooking and eating.

There were no strong gender or even age biases with ritual items. Many illustrations portraying rituals or indeed, people associated with ritual activity (Druids) were adult or elderly males. The assumption was ritual items – which could be anything from animal skulls to musical instruments (which were not inherently ritual objects, but could often be found illustrated within a ritual context) – were also masculinising gendered signifiers. The assumption turned out to be false, with ritual objects displaying more of an even spread between sex and age categories than other items (Figure 5.20.). Like

many other objects, those related to ritual do not display gender or age bias within this dataset. Musical instruments were very strongly biased in terms of gender, and were only played or held by adult and elderly males (Figure 5.20.).

There are a few items that display strong gender bias within Iron Age images. Weapons are strongly associated with adult males whilst food and cooking objects (not food items) are most associated with females. Animals too display strong gender bias in their portrayals, as they are most often depicted with males within agricultural or hunting contexts. There are no objects that display age bias, except in the case of assorted wooden objects with children (that may be toys) and ritual items or musical instruments with elderly individuals. In the case of ritual items and musical instruments, they are still more likely to be in the possession of adult males or females than elderly individuals – so while they display age bias, they are not strongly correlated with the elderly.

# **5.3.5. Gesture**

Gesture is a difficult and subjective category. Though each of the previous categories presented their own challenges in data input and analysis, they were still relatively easy to categorize and compare. Gesture does not lend itself so easily to categorization. However, interpretations of gesture can be even more subjective in terms of interpretation than all other categories related (Gwilt, pers. comm., James 1997:38, James 1998:122). It is also possible that the author's own interpretations of gesture changed throughout data collection and analysis as a variety of images were observed, many of which appeared to be variations on similar themes. Therefore, this section will consider a few case studies and the "general" gestures of males and females in images of the Iron Age before discussing how all the results combine within the discussion.

# 5.3.5.a. The passive stance

As mentioned in Section 5.3.2, a person's passiveness was considered as much of an activity as anything. A passive individual within an image was not obviously performing a specific task. They were seemingly immobile and stiff whether sitting or standing, with arms and hands mostly motionless. Whilst this may seem unimportant, the very inactivity of an individual is highly significant. In terms of execution and style,

it could simply be an artistic choice, the decision of an artist to exude as little effort as possible in depicting an individual. However, an individual's degree of passiveness could also be a choice on the part of the illustrator in terms of expectation. A person could be doing nothing because they are expected to do nothing.

This concept is applicable the so-called, "portrait" style images mentioned alongside passiveness in Section 5.3.2. When a person's sole purpose is to display the objects or clothing, it is unnecessary for them to be in action. Like modern jewellery advertisements, body and limb positioning may be important because of what is being displayed, but the body itself is not actively engaged in any sort of activity. One image that is emblematic of this is the Winchester Hoard (Figure 5.22.). The male and female are sitting or standing and perhaps conversing, but their forward facing positions show off the elaborate brooches and torcs, whilst the woman's raised wrist displays the bracelets. It is the hoard and not the people that take centre stage there. Figure 5.23. is also meant to show off the material culture, complete with close-up shots of the jewellery surrounding the female figure, which is merely there to display where and how they might have been worn on the body.

This type of mannequin-like display is not limited to females. Men are subject to this as well, most often in regards to weapons. Passive males are most often depicted standing with their left hand either resting on or holding a shield and holding a spear in the right hand (Figures 5.24.-5.25.). Though passive, this pose can be attributed to a "heroic pose" where the hero stands tall with weapons in hand, gazing off into the distance (Phillips 2005:80). The stance is still passive, but there is a sense of purpose to it, the implication of imminent action tied in with leadership and combat. Even if a person is not doing anything but adopting this pose, there is still a sense of agency to it, more so than other poses denoting non-activity such as the portrait pose. It seems that even with the passive pose, there was still a sense of activity in it– and that pose was attributed to males more often than not. For females, only Boudica adopts the heroic pose.

# 5.3.5.b. Occupational Gestures

Gestures related to work activities (called occupational gestures from here on) were the most common gestures found in the illustrations. Occupational gestures did vary between the different categories of adults, elderly and children, but that was especially expected in activities that were very specific to a category. For example, gestures related to weaving and spinning, such as standing at a loom or using spindle whorls to make thread were specifically female if only because females are the only ones depicted doing it. This applied to categories such as sport and drinking for adult and elderly males. Again, this was to be expected but as mentioned in Section 5.3.2, there were fewer activity categories that were so exclusive to a specific subset of people.

Solometo and Moss (2013:131) commented on the division of activities between males and females in regards to specific tasks such as agriculture. This divide can be seen in the Iron Age images as well (as discussed in Section 5.3.2), but the division is more interesting in regards to gestures within a specific activity and how they might be partitioned. Typical occupational gestures for agricultural activities range from leading oxen, pushing a plough, bending or kneeling in a field to either sow seeds or thresh grain, walking and herding various types of livestock with a stick, and so on. It was often the males leading oxen in ploughing or pushing the plough as well as herding (Figure 5.26.). Adult females, on the other hand, were often the ones sowing seeds or gathering (Figure 5.27.). This is significant, because the difference in gesture (or rather, posture) is that adult males were posed upright and adult females were posed bent over. One position appeared more confident and primary, the other more flaccid and secondary. It created a divide between individuals who are otherwise performing tasks that are equal in terms of importance.

This divide within activities can be seen elsewhere. Scenes involving ritual, especially in regards to funerary practices and grieving were particularly divisive. Most of the time it was the adult or elderly males who was presiding over the burial itself or lowering the items into the ground (Figures 5.28.-5.29.). In the same images, the adult or elderly females were in the background expressing their grief or contributing to the burial in

some other manner. There are some exceptions to this rule (Figures 5.30.-5.31.), especially in the case of the Wetwang reconstruction, where two females can be seen preparing the grave and its goods. Still, in regards to burials females are not only in the background and passive in terms of their participation, males were fully present and acting out the rituals – and in the foreground, as opposed to the background.

Another activity displaying this divide is construction. Men were the most likely to be up on ladders fixing the roof, or cutting the timbers that structure the house as a whole. In constructing ramparts, they were often digging. Women, on the other hand, were often the ones carrying the construction material (or construction waste) in baskets or in their arms (Figure 5.32.). Carrying items was not an exclusively female activity or gesture, but in the context of construction if something was being carried, it was usually being carried by a woman. This may be a statement about ability, but both males and females are physically capable of carrying out these activities. One last example is hunting – males were usually active, carrying weapons or even throwing them and carrying the game (Figure 5.33.). The sole instance of females participating in hunting showed one readying her horse whilst the other one examined a hunting bird (Figure 5.34.). There was no evidence of hunting equipment on their bodies or on their horses. Of course, the overall difference in occupational gestures is related to differences in activity, but the selection of individuals to perform a certain task is telling.

Children also displayed different occupational gestures. In construction, they were seen carrying items like adult females, but they were also found assisting an adult in a wide variety of activities. They were usually passive and non-participatory in depictions of ritual. The elderly also had a tendency to be strongly divided from everyone else – for example, in ritual activities they were often leading the ritual itself because most religious leaders are depicted as older than the general population. This could be in reference to their status and wisdom. Therefore, occupational gestures can also be divided along lines of age, despite the separation of activities that are also segregated people according to age.

The distribution of activities may seem egalitarian amongst adult males, adult females, the elderly, and children, but the breakdown of actual occupational gestures proves this wrong. It is not surprising to see that there are a variety of occupational gestures within a category: after all, a category such as "construction" is quite wide. What is surprising is the fact that for the most part, the same occupational gestures were given to a specific group of people almost by default. In the case of construction, adult males are depicted performing the more labour-intensive gestures, perhaps because in the present day, adult males are far more likely to be hard construction labourers. This is in accordance with the *National Geographic* illustrations of prehistory, where females were automatically relegated to specific activities due to their biological sex and thus, physical capabilities (Solometo and Moss 2013:131). Still, there may be a very real application of modern expectations to the distribution of past activities.

## 5.3.5.c. Social gestures

For the purposes of this section, social gestures are used to describe the gestures made during interpersonal interaction. Interpersonal in this case means small groups of no more than two to four people. The reason why this section focuses more in interpersonal than group interactions is because within this dataset, large group interactions tend to fall under the auspices of ritual and combat, which have already been discussed. For most illustrations, the majority of the interactions (and thus, context for gestures) are interpersonal. This was a particularly difficult set of gestures to interpret, so it must be said that these interpretations (as with all others) are strictly the author's own, though informed by observations from Boegehold 1999, Braddick et al. 2009 and others.

As with most of the other images, male interpersonal gestures appeared more active than female interpersonal gestures. For example, when males appear to be talking to one another, they were made gestures that extended their arms out from their bodies and into the air (Figures 5.35.-5.36.). Women, on the other hand, appeared to converse with their arms much more tightly bound to the body (Figures 5.37.-5.38.). When interacting with other people, males also touched other people, such as with an arm around a friend or a possible spouse (Figure 5.39.) than females, unless a woman was holding or

interacting with a child. In those cases, the woman was either holding the child or taking them by the hand (Figure 5.40.).

For the most part, social gestures in images of Iron Age Britain are very subtle. They may be as simple as two adults standing side by side with their heads turned towards one another. Most of the broad gestures mentioned above are few and far between. Still, it was interesting to note that even within these seemingly small gestures, adult males had a greater tendency to make the more active gestures than the females, or the gestures that appeared bigger. There was also the divide in regards to touching, perhaps illustrating taboos in regards to touch. This does not mean that adult males were never seen touching children, it is just that they touched other adults rather than children, and adult females touched children more often than other adults. This presents another interesting dimension to gendered gestures.

# 5.3.5.d. Gender and the gesture

From these brief case studies, it appears that there were some important distinctions not only between the gestures that males and females made, but that adults and children made within images of Iron Age Britain. The general trend is that males were portrayed using more active gestures and the females more passive gestures. In terms of age, children were more passive than adults. Therefore, there was a strong pattern in terms of age and gendered signifiers in regards to gesture and that certain categories were marked by the types of movements they make. These gestures are difficult to trace in regards to archaeological material, because there are few depictions of people that are not stylised within Iron Age artefacts. Whether or not these gestures are drawn with intent will be discussed in more detail in Section 5.4.1.b.

Even when a gesture was obviously passive, the arrangement of a person's limbs still denoted some type of intent. There was a difference between a person standing still to display their clothing and adornment and a person standing still with their weapons. More often than not, it was the man standing and displaying the weapons and the woman standing and displaying the clothing and adornment. Activities displayed a divide in terms of degrees of activity and passiveness. Men's posture was upright and they performed the main body of work, whilst females were often bent over in terms of posture and assisted in the work. Children too assisted rather than doing the main body of work. In ritual situations, males were more often front and centre and participating in the ritual alongside the elderly, whilst females and children observed from the background. Finally, in terms of social gestures, males and elderly individuals were more active and touched other individuals, whilst females' gestures were more contained and they were only portrayed touching other people if they are children.

# 5.4. The practicalities of creating and presenting images

This section attempts to answer questions 2 (what are the influences behind images?) and 3 (what is the impact of the influences on the images as well as the influence of the images themselves?) from the perspective of those who make and present the images. Its primary focus is on how contemporary illustrators work with archaeologists to create the reconstructions seen across various forms of media, but focusing on academic and semi-academic publications such as books. It also examines how museum curators attempt to use images in their displays to present concepts of gender in Iron Age Britain, or if it is possible to use images at all.

#### 5.4.1. From the artists' perspective

For this section of the analysis, the author interviewed two illustrators who have many years of experience in creating artistic reconstructions of the past, but Iron Age Britain and Scotland in particular (Christina Unwin and Alan Braby), while also bringing in perspectives from other illustrators (Adkins and Adkins 1989, James 1997, Lloyd 1976, Sorrell 1973, Sorrell 1981). The artistic process is unique to each illustrator, so this only presents a broad overview of how illustrators attempt to recreate the past. Still, it provides valuable insight into the logistics of modern historical illustration, from inception to finished product.

### 5.4.1.a. Creating the image – logistics

The first thing to note is that there are different types of images within the corpus of archaeological illustrations. First are maps and site plans (Figures 5.41.-5.42.), second are infographics or descriptive charts and lastly are reconstruction drawings (Figure 5.43.). Scale models and mannequins (Figure 5.44.) are 3-dimensional rather than 2-dimensional, but reconstructions nonetheless, and it is the reconstruction drawings,

scale models and mannequins that constitute the body of images within this study because of their attempts to fully realize the look of the past. This is in opposition to maps and plans, which focus more on the landscape and the site itself rather than the people, and infographics, which attempt to detail theories and concepts. Simon James (1997:39) breaks down the illustration further into computer graphics, colour drawings and line drawings. Most of the more modern images in this dataset are reconstruction drawings done in colour and line.

Once an image has been commissioned, a rough sketch is drawn out (James 1997:39). This part of the process is entirely dependent on the complexity of the commissioned piece: "It would really depend on the brief, how much info the client had supplied with it, photos, plans, sketches, etc. and whether I was familiar with the site, type of structure etc., however much background info was supplied" (Alan Braby, pers. comm.). In terms of applying archaeological knowledge, the artists commented that the majority of the specific detail is often supplied by the commissioner in terms of plans, sketches, photos, comparisons to other sites and other relevant information (Alan Braby, pers. comm.). However, they also do research themselves and often amass a great deal of information on their own (Christina Unwin, pers. comm.). This allows them to have a wide body of information that they can draw upon. Alan Sorrell (1981:24) often visited archaeological sites in order to experience how it is situated in the landscape and cited it as one of the most important things he could do when starting an illustration.

The rough sketch is then sent back with comments from the commissioner, and that is where the collaborative process truly begins: suggestions and tweaks are made and the reconstruction is adjusted accordingly (Alan Braby, Christina Unwin, pers. comm.). Depending on the publisher and the process, the degree of communication varies from very collaborative to very little exchange of feedback (James 1997:39). From there, finer details are added to the reconstructions and the artists make their own stylistic choices, whether it is finishing with pens (Christina Unwin, pers. comm.), leaving the image in black and white (Alan Braby, pers. comm.) or using "limited colour" (Sorrell 1981:25). The illustration is sent back for final approval, and then it is finished.

# 5.4.1.b. Creating the image – personal and theoretical considerations

According to Christina Unwin (pers. comm.), there exists a "politics of illustration" where every detail is considered, from the overall narrative of the reconstruction to the way that clothing is worn. Other examples include the gaze of the viewer, the posture of the illustrated people and how weapons are worn and how one bears them – especially swords, and especially outside of combat (Christina Unwin, pers. comm.). Simon James (1997:40-44) corroborates this through his account of illustrating the Palaeolithic site of Boxgrove. He says, "We had to decide numerous points, such as how many figures should be depicted, and what they should be doing" (James 1997:41). No illustration appears without thought or consideration: every detail is carefully planned out in advance and drawn accordingly.

In regards to theoretical considerations, especially when it comes to gender, the illustrators interviewed admitted to being aware – but also being constrained by the commissioner (Alan Braby, pers. comm.). On gender, he said:

"I will always attempt to mix up figurative scenes with males and females doing every sort of task, and try and make them interchangeable, females doing butchering of animals, males stirring the cooking cauldron and so on, you can get away with reversing and or questioning the stereotypes more with prehistoric or early historic period reconstructions, it makes the image more fun and informative and also give the viewer food for thought." (Alan Braby, pers. comm.)

One way of getting around this is by deliberately using ambiguity and for making figures vague, with their backs turned (Alan Braby, pers. comm.). Christina Unwin (pers. comm.) said that she enjoys challenging preconceptions and tries to be as intellectually rigorous as possible – or allowed. Regarding the Boxgrove illustrations and gender, "We attempted to make a point about possible gender roles and about cultural transmission" (James 1997:42). Therefore, theory and social roles are very much a part of the consideration behind some modern illustrations, but the question is whether or not that fully comes across in the completed image.

# 5.4.2. Commissioning an image

James (1997) also provides the point of view of a commissioner in regards to creating images. Within commercial publishing, "Quality control is largely out of the hands of the author. It is often a painful lesson when the idealistic first-time author discovers that publishing is driven by commercial, not academic, considerations" (James 1997:39). Therefore, when Braby and Unwin spoke of collaboration, this communication might take place with the publisher rather than the archaeologist, thus possibly limiting the amount of archaeological information that is passed on to the illustration. James (1997:40) admits to failures occurring on both sides for a variety of reasons: the author is not able to catch the mistakes and the illustrator may ignore or forget suggestions. Melanie Giles (pers. comm.) noted that with her own publication, she had quite a few discussions with the illustrator, but that the final product was very much a product of his own design. Ian Armit (pers. comm.) has said the same thing in regards to illustrations that he has commissioned.

Therefore, the process of producing an image does not create an uninterrupted feedback loop between the commissioner and the artist. Artistic license does factor into the process, affecting the final product. A commissioner could have a great deal of input or no input at all, and sometimes it is up to the illustrator to make the decisions – and for the publishing house or the commissioner to accept or reject the final image. Outside issues such as time constraints can hinder the production of the perfect image, so a process that seems relatively straightforward becomes less so, especially in regards to the commercial concerns of a publishing house that could be looking for a conventional or sensational image, not necessarily an archaeologically informed one. Even at this stage, an image is subject to questions of logistics, politics and interpretations. It is not difficult to see why their subsequent dissemination, consumption, appropriation and interpretations are equally as complicated.

## 5.4.3. Museum displays and gender considerations

In this section, the author interviewed several museum curators in order to understand how they approached the issue of presenting social structures of the past, especially gender, within the images of their displays. It is not meant to show how Iron Age gender is presented in all museums in Britain, but it examines some of the specific challenges these curators have encountered and how they negotiate them in order to present a more complete picture of the past. It also examines how well they are able to present certain topics and if they choose to present them at all.

# 5.4.3.a. On ambiguity and overarching themes – David Clarke, National Museum of Scotland

The National Museum of Scotland has a dedicated exhibit for later prehistory and into the Roman and Viking periods, called "Early People." The most prominent features of the "Early People" exhibit confront museum-goers before they fully enter – large metallic humanoid statues created by the artist Sir Eduardo Paolozzi. The Paolozzi figures are deliberately ambiguous and contain no obvious gendered signifiers (Figures 5.45-5.46), though many choose to read them as masculine (David Clarke, pers. comm.). Various pieces of adornment are placed on the figures in a rough approximation of where they might have been worn on the body, which accounts for their larger scale – the boxes containing the artefacts are larger, so the figures had to be adjusted accordingly (David Clarke, pers. comm.). According to David Clarke (pers. comm.), the larger scale of the figures also serves to disprove the idea people in the past were short and primitive.

The Paolozzi figures are arranged at the entrance to the exhibit in four major sections, with each scene surrounding the movement of a ball that symbolises "research, knowledge and the human aspect" (David Clarke, pers. comm.). Each scene also falls into the four major themes of the "Early People" exhibit – A Generous Land, Wider Horizons, Them and Us, and In Touch With Their Gods (National Museum of Scotland). The first theme – A Generous Land – shows the transformation of a box to a ball to symbolise the transformation of resources (e.g. stone working or construction). This theme is echoed throughout the rest of the exhibit through past peoples' use of resources to create various objects (David Clarke, pers. comm.). The second theme, Wider Horizons, shows one Paolozzi figure handing the ball to another figure, referring to contact and ties with other people (National Museum of Scotland). This is also echoed in the rest of the exhibit, displaying items that were made outside of Scotland.

An interesting note on one of the Paolozzi figures in this scene (Figure 5.47) is in regards to gesture: one has its hand up in a way that could mean "hello" or "stop" (David Clarke, pers. comm.).

The third theme (Them and Us) focuses more specifically on dual themes of social stratification and encounters with the Roman and Viking worlds (National Museum of Scotland). The Paolozzi statues in this scene feature a seated figure with one hand on the ball, signalling control over the resources, whilst two figures stand behind it showing their deference to the seated figure (Figure 5.48., David Clarke, pers. comm.). The rest of the theme in the exhibit shows Roman and Viking artefacts. The last theme, In Touch With Their Gods, shows the ball is no longer in the people's control, demonstrating the fuzzy nature of interpreting ritual and belief (Figure 5.49., David Clarke, pers. comm.). A lone figure (Figure 5.50.) also symbolises the difficulty in locating "the individual" in the past, and is juxtaposed against the type of evidence that could possibly show us those individuals – a stone slab with a female rider (Figure 5.51., David Clarke, pers. comm.). Most of the fourth theme is also arranged outside of the main space given for the "Early People" exhibit, implying ritual may have been something separate and distinct from other aspects of life, or also demonstrating its ambiguity.

When asked about the selection of the Paolozzi figures over other types of museum reconstructions (be it small-scale model reconstructions or illustrated tableaus), the response was that graphics can age quite rapidly within a few years, when permanent exhibits can span more than twenty (David Clarke, pers. comm.). On one hand, they were an aesthetic choice because they would age well alongside the exhibit as a whole. On the other hand, they also avoided using biased imagery whilst keeping the human element present within the exhibit without actually using illustrations or reconstructions of past people (David Clarke, pers. comm.). The way that the Paolozzi figures reflect the themes of "Early People" as a whole also demonstrate, on an abstract level, the relationship between past people, their objects and their society. The Paolozzi figures are also a good example of the interaction between artists and curators, which parallels

that of commissioners and illustrators in the previous section (Pearce 1998:24). It demonstrates how malleable interpretations can be, as well as the intersection between abstract, artistic thought and archaeological fact.

# 5.4.3.b. On the limitations of the material culture - Adam Gwilt, Cardiff National Museum

At the Cardiff National Museum, the "Origins Gallery" (closed as of early 2014) presented a different type of challenge than the one at the National Museum of Scotland. The exhibition was limited by the relatively temporary nature of the exhibit (five to seven years), the shape of the museum space and the nature of Cardiff's archaeological collections (Adam Gwilt, pers. comm.). The combination of these factors had a definite effect on the way the exhibit was presented, especially with the move of the content of the Origins Gallery to St. Fagan's, which will be discussed in more detail later. The structural constraints of the gallery meant that there was no hard transition between time periods, especially for the Bronze and Iron Age (Adam Gwilt, pers. comm.). Due to the nature of the archaeological connections, there was a divide in how those periods of time were presented.

The archaeological material for Iron Age Wales is largely concentrated on deposited material culture, as well as material found on hillforts (Adam Gwilt, pers. comm.). Therefore, the exhibit showed strong themes regarding hillforts and ritual deposition within the Iron Age section of the Origins Gallery. The votive offerings were key, focusing on the workmanship of the artefacts rather than the artisans themselves. Specific aspects of social identity (especially gender) were not considered due to the lack of burial evidence for the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age in Wales (Adam Gwilt, pers. comm.). The emphasis was on specific identities, rather than specific people: warriors because of the area's strong ties with Rome, priests because of the Druids and offerings, smiths for the metalwork and so on. The only tangible persona mentioned is Caratacus, the Iron Age rebel. There are no images of Caratacus or any of these other identities within the Iron Age portion of the Origins Gallery – except for a short film.

In an effort to humanise the gallery and its contents, artists, makers and composers were commissioned for their work, giving a contemporary feel to the artefacts, displaying its relevance and influence on the present (Adam Gwilt, pers. comm., Pearce 1998:23-24). In the Iron Age section, there was a film centred on abstract stories of the Iron Age artefacts displayed there. The people depicted within this film were abstract with very few gendered signifiers beyond weapons for males and adornment for females. The use of those gendered signifiers is a choice made by the artist rather than the curators, further emphasizing the absence of any overt statement in regards to identity in Iron Age Wales, especially gender.

At St. Fagan's, themes of daily life are more prevalent as the focus is on merging archaeology and history (Adam Gwilt, pers. comm.). There, re-enactors are more likely to make a statement about how life might have been in the Iron Age for its males, females and children. The new St. Fagan's (which is supplemented by the material from the Origins Gallery as well as other Welsh collections) will include many interactive exhibits, where it may be possible to explore some social themes in the past in more detail (Adam Gwilt, pers. comm.). The overriding message is the museum is restrained by its collections. If it is believed that the collections themselves cannot offer any insight into social structures and identities, it is difficult to present those ideas within the actual display as well.

# 5.4.3.c. On presenting the Iron Age and keeping social themes – Jody Joy, The British Museum

In 2015, the British Museum will open a new exhibit focus on the Celts. Former Iron Age curator Jody Joy spoke about the themes of the exhibit as well as the challenges of presenting social aspects of the past (especially gender) in these types of exhibits. The exhibition deals with perceived notions of what it means to be Celtic and seeks to change how people view the "Celtic" past (Jody Joy, pers. comm.). It aims to do this through the presentation of Celtic art and artefacts, showing where they come from, the types of motifs used and most importantly, what the objects are doing (e.g. how a shield ends up in the water in a votive deposit). This incorporates contemporary research into the life of an artefact, from inception to use to final deposition.

The exhibition itself will not contain many of the usual archaeological reconstructions – the only reconstruction will be a life-size model of the chariot from Wetwang/Newbridge. Because there will be a wide variety of objects going on display, from metalwork to paintings, the curators did not wish to clutter the exhibit with too much media (Jody Joy, pers. comm.). Some identified challenges in presenting this material are that viewers and researchers know or are at least aware of the end result (e.g. where the artefacts end up and what it is to be Celtic). The exhibition plans on moving the story of the Celtic World forward without thinking of that end result, focusing more on the story of how the period really was and for visitors to be immersed within that world (Jody Joy, pers. comm.). That way, it aims to change their perception of who the Celts were and what they did.

The exhibition is more modern in style, meaning that there is perhaps no overt theme or section of the exhibit that relates specifically to gender. Rather, gender is an underlying theme that runs throughout the entire exhibition, challenging visitors to look at and interpret the artefacts without the filters of modern society (Jody Joy, pers. comm.). Women, for example, are presented as more active through the artefacts they used, and warfare is considered without misrepresenting the evidence – oftentimes by saying it was only the males that participated. Through this type of presentation, ideas of gender are still present through the exhibition, though not in an overtly visual manner through the use of a dedicated section or through reconstructions and illustrations. Instead, it demonstrates ideas of gender in how the objects were used to define and express those identities.

### 5.4.4. Choice and the dynamics of power

The previous two sections have demonstrated the power that the illustrator, the commissioner and the curator have over the production and dissemination of an image. It has shown how their choices not only affect what goes into an image (beyond theory, expectation and other influences) but the initial context in which it is presented and indeed, whether or not the image is presented at all. This is especially true in the case of curators in museums, where they have the difficult task of deciding what material is

appropriate, how it will be created, how it will be displayed, and how to "negotiate a nexus between cultural production and consumption" (Macdonald 1996:4). The role of choice is an interesting one because of the relative stigmas associated with reconstructions in museum displays, namely lack of intellectual rigor, associations with children or even reluctance to encourage interpretation (James 1998:126). That type of aversion did not appear to manifest here, where reconstructions did not seem to fit the exhibit's theme (Gwilt, pers. comm., Joy, pers. comm.) or did not fit the museums aesthetics (Clarke, pers. comm.).

Curatorial choice in the case of presenting images is of particular interest. If a reconstructed image, diorama or tableau is excluded, it could imply that a level of interpretation and uncertainty is unacceptable (James 1998:128). However, it is the job of museums to mediate that information (Macdonald 1996:3-4), which is inherently subject to interpretation, always uncertain and never a true representation of the past (James 1998:130, Sørensen 1998:137). These displays (artefacts, text and reconstructions alike) are burdened with the expectation of truth, especially the images. Therefore, the challenge is balancing that expectation of truth with the reality of debate and multiple interpretations. Even outside of a museum context, the use or disuse of an image begs the question: are we, as archaeologists and the arguable source of information, stimulating debate by not including a (theoretically) one-dimensional image of the past, or encouraging it? The answer is not so simple, but it does raise that continual issue in what archaeologists choose to disseminate (to peers and to the public), and the manner in which they choose to do so.

## 5.5. Influencing the image

According to Sørensen (1998:136), archaeological exhibits obtain meaning through archaeological interpretations of the objects, the significance a museum places on an object as it is put into the exhibit and the input given by the viewer. In many ways, this echoes the same themes put forward by Moser (2001) and Csikszentmihalyi and Robinson (1990). However, each of those steps is embedded with its own set of influences, whether cultural, artistic, social, etc. This section attempts to unpick the various influences behind the various gender and age signifiers that appeared in Section
5.3, answering questions 2 (what are the influences behind images?) and 3 (what is the impact of the influences on the images as well as the influence of the images themselves?). Because there are so many movements, events and general factors that have the potential to inspire an image, only a few major themes will be covered through the use of case studies.

# 5.5.1. Archaeology

# 5.5.1.a. Antiquarians and archaeological theory

Antiquarian theory at the beginning of the nineteenth century drew on a variety of sources for insight and inspiration: "archaeology, etymology, folklore, anthropology, ethnology, heroic literature, comparative religion, etc." (Smiles 1994:12). The images produced during this period had the potential to draw, both stylistically and theoretically, on any number of influences. The most important of these comes from the rediscovery of antiquity and the re-emergence of Classical styles during the Renaissance, as well as a burgeoning scientific tradition of creating accurate drawings for classification and scientific purposes (Adkins and Adkins 1989:2-3, Piggott 1978:13). These two movements would form the basis for many of the images produced in the subsequent centuries, though there were many popular viewpoints that also influenced images of the early nineteenth century. For example, the belief in Biblical chronology and the compression of human prehistory (Moser 1998:39, Moser and Gamble 1997:191, Smiles 1994:3-4) engendered the notion that prehistory was short and riddled with uncertainty whilst its people were savage and entirely different from the Romans. Many of the early nineteenth century images in this dataset echo that "civilised-Roman versus savage-Briton" mentality, a dichotomy which has been noted by many (Chapman 1992, Collis 2003, Webster 2001) and paralleled by other depictions of the collision of the classical world with its "other" neighbours (Sparkes 1997).

The stigma of the savage, as well as its unsympathetic portrayals, was supplanted in the early to mid-nineteenth century with the advent of Romanticism (see Section 5.5.2). However, this is also a time when major excavations were being run in a more methodological manner and the nature of the archaeological material, interpretations

and the very reputation of archaeologists began to change, divorcing itself from antiquarianism (Adkins and Adkins 1989:3-4, Smiles 1994:8, Stout 2008:18). The changing ideas espoused by this shift could have accounted for the emergence of different portrayals of people in later prehistoric Britain. The expectation was for the illustrations of the early twentieth century to go through the same type of transition and embody more of the scientific theory and rationale behind the situations depicted.

General Pitt-Rivers and Mortimer Wheeler are credited with pioneering the current illustrative style of archaeological reconstructions (Adkins and Adkins 1989:5, Piggott 1978:53-55). The work of those two effectively moved illustrative styles and the theoretical rationale behind them into a style rooted in science and knowledge, away from what Piggott (1978:55) called "elegance" and what could be the influence of fine art movements. These illustrations, which include site plans and diagrams, are typical of that transitional period when antiquarianism turned to archaeology (specifically, cultural-historical archaeology). The typical images of the cultural-historical period are best typified by Amédée Forestier in the *Illustrated London News*, building on burgeoning collaborations between archaeologists and artists (Moser and Gamble 1997:202-203). Forestier's style was archaeologically informed, though his style appeared to blend fine art sensibilities and scientific accuracy.

In the 1960s, Stuart Piggott considered the growth of archaeological illustration as well as the drawbacks and benefits of using them in academic contexts. On the veracity of draughtsmanship in particular, he said, "The point at issue…is whether the record of an excavation…can be regarded as an objective statement…as the record is largely made in the form of drawings" (Piggott 1965:166). The concern is the balance of objectivity and subjectivity that is necessary to conduct fieldwork, and how much of that balance can be expressed in the plans produced onsite. The relationship between judgment, understanding and interpretation (Piggott 1965:166) is something that may be a processual concern in the production of artistic reconstructions. Processual archaeology's emphasis on scientific rationale and objectivity seems at odds with a medium that has the potential to constitute and embody scientific thought (Moser

1998:16). Therefore, the processual expectation of images is that they are accurate in their source material and execution. However, accuracy in scientific illustrations is reliant on a number of factors and may not be so straightforward (see Adkins and Adkins 1989, James 1997, Moser 1998).

Finally, a post-processual image rooted in feminist critique should look beyond simply adding missing individuals or switching the gender roles (Gifford-Gonzalez 1993:38, Sørensen1998:141). If a woman, child, or elderly individual is added to an image without conscious thought or situating them within their proper historical context, they are still in danger of becoming generalised. When a woman is made a warrior, the woman is still framed by a masculine worldview (Sørensen1998:141). If the focus is on a singular woman, a singular child, or a singular elderly individual, it is easy to forget about their fluidity present within all of them, either as an individual or a group. This can also happen to men (see Arnold 2005, Knapp 1998, Meskell 1999, Skøgstrand 2010), because additions or variations on the theme of man assume that males are still the dominant group and stereotyping them at the same time. The question then becomes: what should a post-processual, feminist image contain?

The answer lies within diversity: "I am advocating that a truly diverse range of possibilities be offered to viewers, with the scope that we as scientists and artists can image may have existed, where social arrangements differ from any known today" (Gifford-Gonzalez 1993:38). In other words, a post-processual, feminist image takes what archaeologists know about the past (namely, that its people had fluid and everchanging identities) and show them in all their complexity. It is a challenging concept, but not impossible. Unfortunately, even with changes in theoretical and artistic styles, most archaeological reconstructions have a tendency to follow the same visual language and use the same types of scenes and signifiers (Moser and Gamble 1997:190).

# 5.5.1.b. Archaeological sites and conventions of illustration

In keeping with the theme of archaeological theory, the case studies selected for this section attempt to follow the same trajectory by analysing case study groups in relation to periods associated with archaeological theory. Samuel Rush Meyrick and Charles

Hamilton Smith's book and illustrations roughly correspond to the early nineteenth century and build on Renaissance traditions and the progression of scientific illustration. Alan Sorrell's work, while straddling the transition from culture history into processual theory, will be looked at through the lens of culture history. Processual theory will be paired with various Historic England images, and finally a variety of illustrations depicting burials will be considered through a post-processual lens. None of these case studies are going to be entirely emblematic of the theory they are contemporaneous with, and may indeed draw on other theories and influences.

#### 5.5.2.b.i Costumes of the Original Inhabitants of the British Islands

Samuel Rush Meyrick and Charles Hamilton Smith's publication is one of many produced within the late eighteenth century and into the nineteenth century regarding historical costume and dress in Britain. It is, however, the only one within the parameters of this study that considers pre-Roman dress. There are seven colour plates that depict prehistoric individuals, though one or two of them may be attributed to a later date. All of the images contain individuals using items that are of archaeological provenance, though not perhaps specific to the Iron Age. For example, the first plate, "A Briton of the Interior" (see Figure 5.19.) features a circular shield, spear and axe. Both the shield and axe are noted, within the text, to be of Irish origin, and not during the later prehistoric period (Meyrick and Smith 1815:12). The same thing occurs within many of the other images, which display items of also attributed to the Roman period, as well as the Bronze Age. Some artefacts of Iron Age origin include the waist chain in Plate 3, "A Maæatæ and a Caledonian."

As mentioned earlier by Smiles (1994:12), antiquarians of this period were influenced by a variety of sources. There is a great deal of exposition in the text of the book explicating the individuals, the items they are using and the clothes that they are wearing. Meyrick and Smith's volume is no different; relying heavily on the classical sources including Pliny, Tacitus, Caesar and others (Meyrick and Smith 1815:16). The use of classical sources almost certainly informs some of the more barbaric looking images such as Plates 1 and 3. Plate 3 ("A Maæatæ and a Caledonian") in particular shows off the nakedness of two males – their tattoos are prominently displayed, as is their musculature, with their limbs are impressively twisted to show off their physique and their weapons. Similarly, the Briton in Plate 1 wears the type of clothing that would not be out of place in a Flintstones cartoon. Tonally, Plates 1 and 3 are very similar to the works of John Speed (1611) in his *History of Great Britaine* and Aylett Sammes' *Britannia antiqua illustrata* (1676), both of which are directly influenced by John White and Jacques Le Moyne de Morgues' ethnographically-inspired illustrations of Picts (Moser 1998:71-72, also see Section 5.5.2.a). In these illustrations, at least, artistic styles and ideas dating back to the Renaissance are firmly in place.

Meyrick and Smith's volume also make heavy use of Irish mythology and literature: Taliesin and Owen are referred to quite often in regards to "Celtic" behaviour and social structure (Meyrick and Smith 1815:16). The use of Irish texts and the plates they influence almost contradict Plates 1 and 3, with Plates 4, 6, 7 and 8 illustrating Druids and bards and a mounted warrior. The mounted warrior in Plate 4 is the most interesting because it depicts a man astride a rampant horse, but none of the items or clothing seem particular to later prehistory. In fact, the tone is almost modern because of his clothing: trews and some type of open jacket. If it were not for the fact that the plate is situated with the other prehistoric plates and the text describes client kingship and hostages (Meyrick and Smith 1815:20), one would assume that this plate belongs to a later part of the book. The rest of the people illustrated in Plates 6 through 8 are dressed in a Grecian manner, with dresses and cloaks wrapped toga-style. This manner of dress may also relate to Renaissance influences (see Section 5.5.2.a.) and the revival of Classical styles.

The emphasis on Irish literature within the body of Meyrick and Smith's work can be traced to the emerging Celtic Revival, which was marked by a growing appreciation for all things related to Celtic culture, history, etc., but especially the rediscovery of Irish literature and mythology (Smiles 1994:47-48, also see Section 5.5.2.b). Aspects of life from Irish literature are immediately apparent in Plate 7 ("A Bard and an Ovate") and Plate 8 ("Bardic Scholars"), as the relationship and lives of bards are heavily borrowed from Taliesin (Meyrick and Smith 1815:25). By associating the Britons with Celts and

granting them distinct culture and dignity, they become something more than an ambiguous end of prehistory as well as the ultimate point before Roman civilisation. So whilst some of the images might hearken back to this idea of a savage prehistory, Meyrick and Smith's images show the transition (mentioned in Section 5.5.1.a.) to a mass-produced, reliable image (Moser and Smiles 2005:4); albeit on borrowed and anachronistic information.

#### 5.5.1.b.ii. Alan Sorrell and Scotland

Alan Sorrell is largely known for the work he has produced on Roman and medieval Britain. He has produced a few illustrations relating to the Iron Age, most notably work on J.R.C. Hamilton's excavations at Clickhimin broch in Scotland. He has also illustrated the sites of Jarlshof, Staple Howe, Heathrow and Maiden Castle. Much of Sorrell's work was excluded from the main dataset because the wide, birds-eye perspective made it difficult to identify and analyse the people depicted within it. However, Sorrell's work is noteworthy because it was the most artistic, as he attended an art school and studied in Rome for two years (Sorrell 1981:9).

Sorrell's early work is firmly situated within the height of culture history, yet most of his work does not seem to reflect trends in archaeological theory. This is not to be confused with archaeological information, as Sorrell exchanged detailed correspondence with archaeologists while he worked on commissions (Perry and Johnson 2014:329, 340). Sorrell's attention to archaeological detail was clear: most perspectives looked out and over a site, detailing more of the site's layout and its location in the landscape. His technique is influenced by the Renaissance technique of *chiaroscuro*, with strong contrasts of light and dark and an emphasis on shadow (Figures 5.52.-5.53.). Though *chiaroscuro* itself is much older, Sorrell's particular artistic style has been defined as neo-Romantic, unique in its expression of nature but through realistic and archaeologically inspired techniques (Perry and Johnson 2014:344,346).

Sorrell's style complements contemporary archaeological thought, with his attention to the details of site structure and artefacts. Culture history focused more on cataloguing the differences between different artefact and settlement types, and individuals were mainly discussed in terms of migration, invasion and perhaps broader social categories such as chiefs (at least, this was the case in Iron Age archaeology in Britain at the time). Indeed, some of the only clear individuals within Sorrell's work look like chiefs or Druids (Figure 5.54.). The use of *chiaroscuro* adds dimension to the images, but serves to highlight the architecture within the image. Unlike the illustrations of Wheeler and Pitt-Rivers (see Section 5.5.1.a.), Sorrell's style is strongly artistic in a manner that differs even from the early twentieth century illustrations. It is a unique blend of fine art technique and attention to archaeological detail, which suits the blend of traditions occurring at that time (Moser and Smiles 2005:3, Perry and Johnson 2014:344), even if illustrative styles would soon exhibit less of the stylistic traditions and techniques of fine art.

#### 5.5.1.b.iii. Historic England and its images

Historic England maintains a large online image database where they keep copies of illustrations that have been specifically commissioned for their wide variety of sites. It is difficult to ascertain the exact provenance of some of the illustrations (the website's year affects the website's copyright, not the copyright for the images). Many important site publications were drafted in the 1980s and 1990s, meaning that they may have been commissioned earlier. It is also important to consider how a corporate entity like Historic England would control how their images are commissioned and produced. Another consideration is how they wish to portray the past – after all, their goal is to attract visitors to their sites. Therefore, it could be a case of what Simon James (1997:39-40) notes about neither artist nor author having control in the world of commercial publishing.

Because Historic England is site based and many of its images were commissioned just at the rise of post-processual archaeology, one would expect that most of their works would also follow processualism, balancing subjectivity with objectivity (see Section 5.5.1.a.). Because the images are for Historic England, the expectation is to also enhance the importance of the sites, especially their scale and significance in order to attract visitors. This hypothesis, then, is not so far removed from the actual reality of the Historic England illustrations. For example, the commissioned images for the Historic England Book of Maiden Castle (Sharples 1991) and Danebury (Cunliffe 1993), like Sorrell's images in the previous section, are mostly drawn from a wide-angled bird's-eye perspective, highlighting the site more than the individuals (Figures 5.55.). Additionally, the images focus on information taken directly from the excavations, showing inhabitants digging ramparts, various portions of the site such as roundhouses in old quarry pits (Figure 5.56.) and others.

Agriculture is also a popular theme amongst Historic England images (Figures 5.57.-5.58.), though it may not be a processual consideration but a practical one: sites are set in the landscape and most of the areas within that landscape were farmed and are marked by those historical works even to the present day. Agriculture, too, may simply be one of those stylistic choices that appears often as a theme simply because it is familiar and a seemingly inoffensive tableau to portray (Moser and Smiles 2005:6). Domesticity and work within the roundhouse also appears in Historic England images, again as a link between past and present, though more of the emphasis is placed on the site and the artefacts rather than the people. It is interesting in a way because it creates a faceless past, one populated by passive individuals. The fact also remains that these individuals are not doing anything terribly different, but reflect modern day mores except within a different context.

Despite the few images that may be reflective of current archaeological thought, the main aim of Historic England is its business and its sites are essentially museums. As such, "they inevitably raise questions about knowledge and power, about identity and difference, and about permanence and transience" (Macdonald 1996:2). Historic England's images are based on notions of permanence and continuity. By portraying people in many of the same situations that one could find people acting out today, Historic England is creating a connection between past and present by familiarising an oftentimes unfamiliar past. Visitors are bombarded with information about how people in the past lived and how they were not so different, cooking and cleaning and tending. It leaves out the very real debate about identities and the division of activities – debates

that should be present in museum displays (Porter 1996:114-116, Sørensen1998:148, Whitcomb 2003:2-4). What do we have to gain by portraying a past that is perhaps different, or pushes our expectations? Would viewers reject it? Or accept it?

#### 5.5.1.b.iv. Reconstructing graves and burials

Burial reconstructions provide an interesting subset of data within the images. They are taken directly from the archaeological evidence and provide insight into current archaeological thought regarding rituals surrounding death and burial. These images might benefit the most from post-processual theory, with its focus on individuals, personhood and cosmology (see Carr and Knüsel 1997, Hill 1995, Parker Pearson 1999). For this study and the set of images pertaining to ritual, the images relating to death and burial contain the most diversity in terms of the people portrayed and the activities they are performing, but are they are a direct result of post-processual influence?

One of the earlier reconstructions, and perhaps one of the most famous, is Peter Connelly's reconstruction of the burial of a male noble at Wetwang Slack in East Yorkshire (Figure 5.28.), on display at the Hull and East Riding Museum. The detail of the image is relatively faithful to the excavation report in regards to the grave goods and the positioning of the body. However, the image falls short in terms of portrayed diversity – there is only one female in the midground whilst the rest are in the background. The woman is relatively passive compared to the other males in the image. Though she is positioned close to the open grave, her action is emotional, holding her right hand up to her face and expressing grief. The expression of grief in images of burial rituals is interesting, especially in other illustrations of burials, such as at St. Albans and Colchester (see Figure 5.30., Figure 5.59.). Whilst most of the individuals are participating in a ritual in the St. Albans image, none of the males appear to be grieving. In Colchester, the only mourning figure is a woman – the rest of the males are standing still. There is still a clear division in ritual participation and, as it seems, emotional expression.

Burial reconstructions sometimes show greater demographic diversity, with examples from Carsington and Sigwells Trench. The Carsington illustration (Figure 5.60.) is one of the most diverse because it shows not only a young female burying her child with other infants, but it also seems to show an elderly woman in the background. The Sigwells Trench illustration shows a child participating in the burial of an infant by laying down grave goods. This is a change from other burial reconstructions from Wetwang Slack, St. Albans and Colchester, where there are either no children or the children are passive in the ritual as well. All of the images mentioned are accurate in their renderings of the burials, whilst interpretations of the rituals themselves and the roles of the people performing them display some knowledge of current theoretical perspectives.

An example of this is the reconstruction of burial WS453 at Wetwang Slack (Figure 5.31.). The tableau of the burial is presented from two different perspectives on the same scene – the burial of an elite, elderly female. The illustration is demographically diverse, containing infants, children, adult males, females (including a pregnant woman), and elderly males and females. Both males and females are assisting in placing the grave goods, whilst the rest of the onlookers (male and female alike) display various shades of grief. One man is even shown holding a crying child – it is very rare to see males holding children within illustrations. This is an image that is critically aware of the types of people that were present in society and pushes the boundaries of images forward through its portrayals and its basis in current theory: "It is inevitably an image of our own time with an aesthetic inspired by graphic novel art but informed by the evidence and ideas represented in this book" (Giles 2012:212). It is an image that acknowledges its biases and its basis in post-processual and feminist theory (see Section 5.5.1.a), and in doing so, documents all types of people and their identities, both masculine and feminine, young and old, elite and non-elite.

# 5.5.1.c. Does theory influence image?

## 5.5.1.c.i. Activities

Section 5.3.2 displayed a general trend where there was an increase in the diversity of activities portrayed from the 1940s onwards. This could be reflective of the shift from

antiquarianism and the development of archaeological method and theory (as discussed in Section 5.5.1.a.). New interpretations of the excavated material and indeed, more excavations in general may have contributed to depictions of a varied range of activities. Before the 1940s, people were portrayed in a limited variety of activities that were largely passive in nature, if not passive in and of themselves (see Section 5.3.2.). This occurs for females, the elderly and children rather than males, even though male activities outside of combat were not very active in this period. The lack of variety in activity pre-1940 cannot be fully explained by antiquarian method and theory versus archaeological method and theory.

Lingering sentiments of the period being savage and barbarous may contribute to the small number of activities that were shown in the pre-1940s images. That is, however, a very simplistic point of view considering the scholarly work that was being produced before the 1940s as well as the large body of earlier prehistoric illustrations that did contain active figures (see Berman 1999, Gifford-Gonzalez 1993, Moser 1998). One possible explanation is the ambiguity of later prehistory: the Iron Age was defined by many names and chronologies and was not rigorously defined, as it were, until the late nineteenth century (Collis 2003:71-80), even though it continues to be defined and divided (see Haselgrove and Pope 2007, Haselgrove and Moore 2007). A combination of these factors might have led to a sharper definition of the period and thus, its sites and its material culture, which allowed them to be studied as more of a cohesive whole. It was only then that more information from the period could reflect within the illustrations.

Returning to activities, there does appear to be some correlation between the rigorous methods adopted in the mid-twentieth century and onwards, the information produced and subsequently how they are portrayed within illustrations. Section 5.3.2. showed that there is a larger general trend of more diversity. For example, from 1800 to 1940, adult males are portrayed in an average of 1.167 activities, whereas post-1940 the average jumps to 3.58 activities. Much of this could be attributed to sampling, as the number of images jumps drastically from the 1960s onwards, but it is a trend worth considering.

Most notably, the types of activities males are portrayed doing jumps as well, from mostly combat to everything from smithing to fishing to agriculture.

Adult males are not portrayed in food processing activities until the 1980s, where three instances are recorded. The number jumps to eight in the 1990s, then four in the 2000s, before shrinking back to three for the 2010s. Therefore, there is a spike and then a downturn, one that is similarly noted in Solometo and Moss (2013:133) regarding females' portrayals. The way that it is explained for the *National Geographic* images is that the artists were aware of post-processual theory and utilised it, before subsequently abandoning it to avoid sparking debate (Solometo and Moss 2013:139-142). It is possible that the same thing is occurring in the alternative portrayals within Iron Age illustrations: artists and illustrators are aware of current debate and information, but due to pressures from publishers or elsewhere, do not include it. This reluctance does appear elsewhere: adult males were only portrayed cooking once, in the 1990s, gathering twice, in the 2000s and 2010s and are never seen in activities such as spinning or weaving. Openly grieving in ritual is another one that only shows up sporadically, once in the 2000s and twice in the 2010s.

The same trend occurs with adult females. Whilst the number of activities they are presented doing jumps after the 1940s (average 1.36 to average 2.98), there is still a spike in the 1990s that declines afterwards, again speaking of awareness of theory but lack of action in execution. Even in activities such as combat, it is still largely Boudicca who is actually participating in combat, rather than other females. Women are again excluded, or are portrayed more passively, in activities that are largely male dominated. For example, females are not portrayed sailing or participating in sport, and when they are portrayed smithing or hunting, they are pumping the bellows or sitting on horses rather than actively participating. Similar patterns in activities can be seen for the elderly and children. While knowledge has expanded and more activities can be seen, the actual diversity within activities is still much the same – though, as mentioned previously, putting females, children and the elderly in the place of males is a simplistic solution (Gifford-Gonzalez 1993:38, Sørensen1998:141). Illustrations of activities of

children and the elderly have also suffered from lack of theoretical application, despite a growing number of work stemming from the 1980s onwards on archaeologies centred on these groups (e.g. Lillehammer 1989, Moore and Scott 1997, Sofaer 2006) and on the life course approach (Gilchrist 2004, 2012).

#### 5.5.1.c.ii. Clothing and adornment

Clothing and adornment follow the same trends as activities. More information from archaeological excavations has led to largely accurate portrayals of dress and adornment, especially in the lack of loincloth portrayals going into the latter half of the twentieth century. Still, clothing is still an issue because of preservation, so it can be argued that there is more room for interpretation in regards to clothing and other, more fleeting, evidence (Adkins and Adkins 1989:132, James 1997:35-38). Well into the twentieth and twenty-first century, clothing styles have remained very much the same: males are still relegated to trews and tunics, whilst females are relegated to dresses. The most diverse (and perhaps controversial) depictions of clothing choices can be found in the reconstruction of the Wetwang burial WS453, where both males and females can be seen sporting a variety of clothing styles within a single image. The only other image with as much clothing diversity was drawn by Forestier in *The London Illustrated News* (Figure 5.61.), which showed females, not males, in a variety of different dress forms.

It is interesting to note that males were seen in dresses or skirts in earlier illustrations rather than later ones, perhaps owing to more of an ode to classical clothing styles and clothing of the nineteenth century. Though the archaeological evidence is not conclusive for Iron Age Britain (James 1997:35), modern audiences may not be as accepting of a man in a dress, expecting to see males in tunic and trews. And whilst a modern sensibility may make it acceptable for females to wear the same thing as adult males, a lingering sense of being "old-fashioned" or even adherence to modern expectations of gender binaries, may put them into the default category of wearing a dress. Children's clothing is more ambiguous, perhaps owing to children's gender neutrality in the archaeological record. The elderly tend to follow clothing trends by gender, though elderly males (especially if they are Druids) were often found in dresses.

Adornment also follows this pattern. Women are more portrayed wearing all types of jewellery, whereas males wear torcs and bracelets. There is no dramatic shift, as is the case with tattoos. Though more females are depicted with them in the late twentieth century, the trend does not hold very well and tattoos remain largely the providence of combative males. This is despite the amount of archaeological material that argues for people of all ages and sexes wearing all types of adornment, though Giles (2012:132) showed possible age bias in artefact deposition in death in Iron Age East Yorkshire. It is not as easy to make this claim for tattoos, but some archaeological evidence (see Pankova 2013) does show that females were tattooed as well, so there could be some precedence for it in the Iron Age.

Therefore, while there is plenty of room for interpretation and portrayal of clothing and adornment for Iron Age people, the depictions within illustrations, even into the twentyfirst century, do not reflect that, especially in the case of females, children and the elderly.

#### 5.5.1.c.iii. Objects

Objects are also subject to the same trends as activities, clothing and adornment. This is not surprising because objects have a tendency to be associated with specific activities, and activities in illustrations are indeed subject to a degree of gender bias, despite the somewhat promising evidence of diversity towards the end of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first. For example, males are seen with different animals, especially livestock and game, because they are often portrayed in agricultural and hunting contexts than any other group (also see Solometo and Moss 2013:131). It is also unsurprising considering the degree to which objects continue to be classified as "male" and "female" for the British Iron Age. Items like adornment but also loom weights and combs continue to be associated with females, whilst martial objects continue to be associated with males.

Even when objects cross the common boundaries, they are few and far between. Again, in the case of martial objects, females are only really seen holding them if they are Boudicca, or perhaps mentioned within other literary sources, such as Scatha and the Picts (Figure 5.62.). Such portrayals still frame females within a wholly male society (Sørensen1998:141) and do not offer the different levels of interpretation that are concurrent with modern archaeological thought. The elderly and children also suffered from a lack of portrayals with objects, mostly due to their depicted passivity in activities, some of which is not reflected in the archaeological evidence, especially for the elderly (Giles 2012:132).

# 5.5.2. Artistic, social and cultural movements

## 5.5.2.a. Archaeological images and fine arts

It is impossible to discuss archaeological illustrations (or rather, scientific images) without referencing naturalism and realism. Firstly, it is important to distinguish the two: "Naturalism is an adherence to the appearance of things, a replication of external features...a realistic representation is not only or necessarily naturalistic" (Shanks 1997:78). In other words, naturalism tries to be as close to reality as possible whilst realism may only obtain certain aspects of reality. Realism as a movement is seen as objective, yet is oftentimes used to illustrate "the novel or un-natural" (Gifford-Gonzalez 1993:28). Naturalism as a style is the obvious choice as a basis not only for scientific illustration, but also for other media and propaganda (Molyneaux 1997:2). What these two provide are the semblance of reality and the promise of objectivity. This plays into the influence of an image and its appearance of truth: "the fictions of the representations are made compellingly factual by their style" (Gifford-Gonzalez 1993:29). Even with the knowledge that an image is speculative and theoretical, its realistic or naturalistic style makes it seem more credible.

The emphasis on natural and accurate illustrations has been briefly discussed in Section 5.5.1.a. These images, as stated earlier, demonstrate the transition in style from fine art to the illustrative reconstructions that exemplify most of this study's dataset. Aspects of the techniques and styles of the Renaissance can be seen in the nineteenth and early twentieth-century images (Adkins and Adkins 1989:1-3, Moser 1998:52, also see Section 5.5.1.a and Section 5.5.1.b.ii). Poses of Boudicca that resemble classical statuary and Alan Sorrell's use of *chiaroscuro* are direct examples of the influence of Renaissance art. Moser (1998:9) also credits Renaissance traditions of linear

perspective, depth and the meeting of art and science with the rise of the scientific illustration. Renaissance concerns of accuracy and style can be seen in the sixteenth century works of Jacques Le Moyne de Morgues and John White, both of whom created images of later prehistoric people in Britain, namely the Picts. The "accuracy" of their images is derived from their travels and interactions with Native Americans (Moser 1998:71-72). The postures of these images can be paralleled to contemporary art styles whilst maintaining their aura of reality thanks to their attention to anatomy as well as ethnographic and classical (i.e. derived from classical sources) data.

Side-by-side comparisons of White's work with subsequent depictions (Figures 5.63.-5.64.) demonstrate how little this artistic style changed over the next two hundred years. Indeed, the posturing and details on the figures in the nineteenth century can be closely paralleled to Renaissance techniques exhibited by White's work in particular (Moser 1998:74-75). Many of the depictions originating in the sixteenth century continue into the nineteenth century, emphasising signifiers such as nudity. Implications of nudity in portrayals of prehistory have been considered by Gifford-Gonzalez (1993) and Solometo and Moss (2013), as well as briefly in Section 5.3.3, but it is necessarily to revisit it here. The reoccurrence of nakedness and its parallel with Native Americans and other indigenous groups of the time is that "this naked ancestor becomes established as the generic representation of the race" (Moser 1998:82). This plays into ideas of savagery and the uncertainty associated with the period, as referenced in Section 5.5.1.a.

Renaissance ideals of using factual sources can be paralleled in some of the artwork produced in from the  $18^{th}$  through early  $20^{th}$  centuries depicting prehistoric life. French artist François Gérard's *Le Courage gaulois* (1830) bears a remarkable resemblance to the  $1^{st}-2^{nd}$  century classical statue *Gaulois blessé (*Figures 5.65.-5.66.). Other French artists of the same period were similarly influenced, especially Fernand Cormon, who took a great deal of inspiration from Charles Darwin (Musée du Petit Palais). Paintings such as *Gaulois à cheval* (1897) and *La chasse* (1897) are notable for their precise technique as well as attention to historical detail through the use of artefacts. This style

is arguably reproduced in Forestier's contemporary illustrations of life in Iron Age Britain in the *Illustrated London News* and later, the works of Alan Sorrell.

The continued use of Renaissance style is clear in the context of the Romantic movement in the nineteenth century, which, amongst other things, glorified nature and simpler aspects of human life – including the simpler aspects of human nature (Moser and Gamble 1997:191-192, Smiles 1994:22). Romantic works emphasised the idea of the "Noble Savage," and a society that was wholly opposite to our own (see Kuper 1988). There is a dichotomy in the way that people in Iron Age Britain are portrayed in the nineteenth century. Their lack of civilisation is at times admired and lauded, or, thanks to increasing evidence from archaeological research and scientific enquiry, is questioned (Moser 1998:82-84, Smiles 1994:20-21). This is obvious in the 1911 London Illustrated News, where Forestier's reconstructions of Glastonbury Lake Village are accompanied by headlines that proclaim "Not the Woad-Daubed Savage" (Bulleid 1911:928). Romantic styles also emphasised the importance of situating the subject in a landscape – the more picturesque, the better (Piggott 1978:48), which leads into aspects of pre-Raphaelite art and its influence on archaeological illustration (Piggott 1978:55). Like archaeological illustration, which focuses on themes of the past, Pre-Raphaelite art often drew on subjects from literature or poetry (Prettejohn 2000:135), as opposed to the landscapes of Impressionism or the broader consciousness of abstract art.

The pre-Raphaelite movement in Britain not only grew alongside archaeological illustration, but popular imagery as well: the movement is contemporary with publications such as *The Illustrated London News* and *Punch* (Prettejohn 2000:92). Therefore, it is unsurprising that illustrators such as Forestier might have borrowed similar visual motifs and symbols from artists at the time. For example, Burne-Jones' *Going to Battle* (1858) and Siddall's *Lady Affixing a Pennant to a Knight's Spear* (1856) take medieval separations of knights and ladies that are strongly reminiscent of the strong gender divides in Victorian society (Prettejohn 2000:103). These images also juxtapose long, flowing feminine dress against the strong, sharp angles of medieval

armour. The use of distinct visual motifs to signify masculinity and femininity continues into contemporary archaeological reconstructions. The symbolism of dress, objects and gender is paralleled not only in Forestier's illustrations of Iron Age Glastonbury Lake Village, where female domesticity and male military prowess are highlighted, but is generally continued into later Iron Age illustrations (as seen in Section 5.3.).

Some aspects of Pre-Raphaelite style include productions of idealised and timeless landscapes that are nonetheless "true to life" (Hermann 2000:340). Examples of these would include Benjamin Leader's *February, Fill Dyke* (1881) and George Vicat Cole's *Harvest Time* (1860). This style of Pre-Raphaelite landscapes is exemplified by richly detailed and coloured paintings that are intensely atmospheric, but still naturalistic in nature. The naturalism in Pre-Raphaelite paintings was dependent on the artists' observations and their ability to create truth" (Prettejohn 2000:112). Archaeological reconstruction also attempts to produce a truthful perspective on the past, especially when it is derived from archaeological material. But illustration and art are subjective and as a medium, require degrees of interpretation despite having a factual basis.

In regards to gender, the art of the Pre-Raphaelites has been criticised for being misogynistic in its portrayal of female figures (Cherry and Pollock 1984). This is not a surprising critique for an art style contemporary with the Victorian era, which has long been seen as a major factor in creating ideas of male-female binaries (Laqueur 1991). For example, Edward Burne-Jones' *Clara von Bork* (1860) and *Sidonia von Bork* (1860) have often been interpreted as creating dichotomies of feminine perception within the male gaze: that is, the female as the virgin or the whore (Prettejohn 2000:208), but other interpretations can portray the two women as distinct characters in their own right (Prettejohn 2000:211). At the same time, interpretations of the medieval knight and maiden could err towards the women imbuing the men with power before they depart for their quests. Therefore, it is premature to blame Pre-Raphaelite art for perpetuating particular visual signifiers in regards to gender, when the truth is that the production of gendered ideals is complicated and subject to a variety of factors.

# 5.5.2.b. The Celtic Revival

Whilst the fine arts segment of the Celtic Revival did produce many paintings, the subjects were limited to figures from later Irish myths or more contemporary Druids, such as *The Druids: Bringing in the Mistletoe* by Edward Hornel (Figure 5.67.). These types of paintings are interesting in what they say about contemporary notions of Celtic society, but because they do not depict people from Iron Age Britain, they were left out of this study. Indeed, the Celtic Revival's focus on mythological figures may account for the lack of images of Iron Age people in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Instead, the Celtic Revival is considered here because it raised awareness of Celtic culture and history (Smiles 1994:17-18, Waddell 2005). An interest in literature and art sparked more interest in later prehistory, which may have had some effect on shifts in perceptions of the period, moving it away from nebulous notions and into something more definitive (see Section 5.5.1.a and Section 5.5.1.c.i).

The Celtic Revival built on the earlier movements, taking the elevation of the savage of Romanticism and further civilising it by making it more legitimate and relevant to contemporary society., paired with increasing information from the scientific world (specifically, alterations in chronologies that allowed for an older earth and a move away from restrictive Biblical chronologies) and the development of archaeological method and theory, moved the images away from the tradition of posed, engraved, stylized figures into images that highlighted the people, their objects and their sites antiquarianism (Adkins and Adkins 1989:3-4, Smiles 1994:8, Stout 2008:18). It is a catalyst more than anything else, for the movement may not have affected the aesthetics or social depictions within later images, but instead made it possible for such images to be created in the first place.

## 5.5.2.c. Postmodernism and feminism

Postmodernism as a movement is considered an influence on archaeological illustration in many ways, especially its general revulsion towards fixed ideas of societal norms, mores and the notion of originary. Privateer (2005:23) defines originary as "the first and oldest source of the privileging of certain knowledge and power." The Postmodernism that is discussed as an influence here does not have to do with architecture or art, but social movements and ideas, focusing on influences from Derrida (1997), and Baudrillard (1998) in particular. Postmodernist ideas of deconstruction, and particularly Derrida's dismissal of binaries are the root of post-processual and feminist theories that are thought to have some impact on the types of images produced of Iron Age Britain in the late twentieth century. Postmodernism and feminism are inextricably linked in that they involve some type of dissolution or turn from a previous status quo.

Ultimately, the rejection of established ideals and openness to new, more fluid interpretations is what marks the application of postmodernism and feminism to illustrations. Baudrillard's work mentions simulacra, "insisting that in a world over-saturated with images we no longer have the ability to tell representation and reality apart" (Jobling 2011:177). This ties in with modern expectations being projected onto the past and questions whether or not the representations that are created for the Iron Age truly reflect the Iron Age, or our own perceptions of how the past should have been. The images created may not be real at all, even if they are based on archaeological material and archaeologically informed theories. Therefore, a postmodern image challenges the typical image and presents something that would be considered controversial (Privateer 2005:24). An example of this is Melanie Giles' image of the Wetwang burial with its unconventional clothing and hairstyles – and most of all, the variety of people and roles portrayed.

Postmodernist fracturing and deconstruction also influence feminist theory. Feminism is, at its root, the social, political and economic equality of the sexes (Adichie 2013). Feminism embraces a multiplicity of identities; rejecting strict gender binaries in favour of fluidity (see Section 2.2.). For images, this would mean displaying a variety of identities with intersections of class, status, gender, ethnicity, sexuality and more. And whilst it would be a challenge to depict a third gender, it is a step in the right direction to portray individuals outside of what is expected. It could even be the absence of clearly defined gendered signifiers – an image full of androgynous figures where it is difficult to say exactly who is doing what. These are the types of influences that one

would expect from theoretically informed images of the twenty-first century, but so far, there are very few images that follow this credo.

#### 5.5.3. The classical sources

For some of the images mentioned within this analysis, the obvious source of inspiration was the classical sources – such as with Meyrick and Smith (Section 5.5.2.b.i). Other early images, such as the frontispiece of Calgacus for Taylor's *Pictorial History of Scotland*, only cite the classical sources within the body of the text in regards to later prehistory. Sources outside of the time period set by this data, such as *Britannia Antiqua Illustrata* and Speed's *The History of Great Britaine* openly cite the classical sources when discussing life in later prehistoric Britain. And whilst volumes such as Taylor's also feature sketches of Iron Age artefacts, it is clear that the observations of these Greek and Roman writers form the basis of construction for many of the images produced within those volumes.

It is sufficient to say that any image depicting Boudicca or Calgacus is going to be heavily influenced by the classical sources – indeed, without the classical sources we would not know that these figures existed at all. All images of Boudicca feature her speaking to her people and imploring them to fight, as mentioned in Tacitus and Diodorus Siculus. Otherwise, she is leading her people into battle or her people are attacking Roman cities, as they were mentioned within the Greek and Roman texts. The happens to Calgacus as well: the illustration on the frontispiece of Taylor's *Pictorial History of Scotland* illustrates a scene where he, like Boudicca, is encouraging the people to revolt (Figure 5.68.). There are no images that imagine these figures outside the context of struggle with the Romans. Perhaps this is because it is difficult to find them archaeologically (Hingley and Unwin 2005), therefore the only context in which we know them is within the context of war. However, like other unnamed figures in the past (as well as present), these people were more than rebel leaders.

Other images taken from Roman sources also happen within the context of war. Representations of individuals on chariots link back to Caesar and his description of warriors running along the chariot's neck and screaming (Figures 5.69.-5.70.). These types of images only display Iron Age people within a certain context and only give the males a very specific identity, one that may or may not have defined them in life or even death. Though it is common within Iron Age archaeology to interpret burials with martial objects (especially swords) as warrior burials, there are alternative explanations such as displaying ties within a certain kinship group. That type of portrayal may be difficult to depict within an illustration, but it has potential as an alternative portrayal, rather than the usual man with a sword as the warrior. Though there are adult females or indeterminate burials with swords (see Chapter 4 on burials, gender and grave goods) few of these individuals are illustrated as well.

Ritual and Druidism are also major themes that occur within the classical texts as well as illustrations. Some of the early nineteenth century images do refer to specific events, such as the slaughter on Mona, in modern day Anglesey (Figure 5.71.). There is a longer tradition of this within the earlier medieval or Renaissance illustrations such as the Wicker Man (Figures 5.72.). These types of images again create a very specific view of Iron Age Britain, one that is quite savage and deserving of its bloody end. Sam Smiles (1994:79) traces the evolution of contemporary attitudes towards Druidism in reference to rituals performed at the Neolithic sites of Stonehenge and Avebury, connecting them to themes mentioned earlier in regards to the degree of civilization to the past. He also links in the prevailing attitudes with differing theological movements of the time, in particular Deism against traditional views of Christianity versus paganism (Smiles 1994:96, Piggott 1968:101). These views of ritual and Druidism are particularly polarising, though in more contemporary images much of the "bloodier" aspects have been removed (see Figure 5.40.). These too can trace their roots within the classical and indeed the Irish mythology (e.g. use of mistletoe).

Some themes presented by the classical sources include the depiction of tattoos. This part of the discussion links in with some of the earlier ones on clothes and adornment. Woad and blue dye are mentioned by Caesar and Pliny the Elder, with the two authors lingering on the significance of the colours used such as yellow, but especially blue (see Speed 1614:181). Of course, in many of these depictions the tattoos are visible on bare

skin, linking tattoos with nakedness, which is also a theme in the classical texts (Speed 1614:181). This all refers to the idea of nakedness and savagery, and most of these are then supplemented by the fact that it is all usually framed within the context of war. The image of a naked, blue-tattooed Celt is not only popular within academic media, but popular media as well, from TV shows such as *Deadliest Warrior* to films such as *King Arthur* and *Centurion*. These portrayals effectively negate alternative ideas of tattoos representing something other than a warrior and savagery, And though there are a few portrayals of people with tattoos that do not occur in battle (Figure 5.73.), these are not the images that endure.

These few case studies represent the power of the classical texts in creating certain views of the Iron Age past, despite any theoretical, social, and cultural influences. These works are the root of all images, despite the application of archaeological method, information and theory.

# 5.6. Discussion: Recurring Themes and Tropes

The aim of this chapter was to discover whether or not gendered signifiers (or indeed, other types of identity signifiers) were present in the dataset of nineteenth and twentieth century images of Iron Age people. Section 5.3 revealed the various signifiers, Section 5.4 examined how they were created and presented, and Section 5.5 identified some of the significant social, cultural and theoretical movements that might have resulted in the appearance of those specific signifiers. This section answers research question 4 and considers the impact of the influences on the images, as well as the influence of the images themselves. It also looks at groups of signifiers, delving into what Gifford-Gonzalez (1994:34) calls schemata, Moser (2001:276) calls iconicity and here are called tropes. Tropes are important to consider because they represent broadly occurring trends that might appear unconsciously within images, perpetuating ideals that may not be true for the past – or even the present.

## 5.6.1. Masculinity and the Celtic Warrior

The Celtic Warrior has already been mentioned several times within this analysis, but it remains important because the Celtic Warrior is iconic of Iron Age Britain. Based on the results from Section 5.3, elements of the Celtic Warrior include tattoos, nakedness, a

torc, an array of martial objects but mostly a spear and shield, a chariot and a horse. The gestural aspect of the Celtic Warrior is significant as well – the warrior is usually standing with a spear in the right hand and a shield in the left while looking off into the distance (Phillips 2005:80), or running into battle brandishing both spear and shield. Depictions of the Celtic Warrior can include any number and combination of these signifiers, and many images contain all of them.

From Section 5.3, it is clear all of the signifiers mentioned above are mostly attributed to adult males. Therefore, those items are masculine signifiers. Section 5.3 also showed that there were a variety of items that could be masculine signifiers, especially in regards to items associated with aspects of agriculture and construction. This could argue for the presence of alternative ideals of masculine identity in the Iron Age, but the focus is on that distinct set of signifiers and the overall trope of the Celtic Warrior. The association of masculinity to this signifier is not inherently detrimental. It is when these items are used uncritically and over and over again when it begins to become problematic (Piggott 1978:7, Smiles and Moser 2005:6). It capitalises on the notion that, to be a man in Iron Age Britain, one wore only certain items and did certain things.

But what if ideals of masculinity were not so clearly defined? There have been numerous debates regarding the nature of violence and warfare within Iron Age society (e.g. Armit 2007, Frodsham et al. 2007). Even if society in Iron Age Britain was as warlike and violent as some have claimed, it is not possible to be a warrior at all times. The repetition of images of a Celtic Warrior is damaging because it puts forward the assumption that all adult males were warriors, all the time. It is also damaging because it presupposes a society that is steeped in and perhaps glorifies violence when that might not be the case. It further eliminates the possibility that there were other ways to be masculine within Iron Age society, and that someone other than a biological male could assume such a masculine identity. Section 2.5 even suggested that classical discussions of the Celtic Warrior were not aligned with Roman views of masculinity The problem with presenting a single image and only allowing it to be appropriated by certain individuals is that it creates a singular notion. It does not allow for any fluidity in identity despite context, age and other social and cultural factors. For the Iron Age, if the Celtic Warrior trope is expected to be the norm, then they are supposed to be strong males with good leadership skills, prowess in battle, with a great deal of focus and rage. It is limiting and it is almost certain that males in Iron Age Britain possessed many other qualities beyond those and expressed identities beyond the Celtic Warrior.

#### 5.6.1.a. Boudicca: Subverting the Celtic Warrior?

What happens when the masculine signifiers relating to the Celtic Warrior appear on a woman? Does it subvert the trope? Within this dataset, images of Boudicca usually contained: tattoos, a torc, a spear, a shield, sometimes a sword, a chariot and horses. The case becomes stronger when gesture is added: the Iron Age queen is usually standing still in the stereotypical "hero pose" with her gaze facing out into the distance with a spear in one hand and a shield in the other. Sometimes she is also riding a chariot into battle, brandishing both spear and shield in a threatening, combative manner. Boudicca is certainly a Celtic Warrior, but is that enough? Is a masculine trope, defined by masculine signifiers, subverted when a single individual outside of the norm is depicted in that manner? According to Gifford-Gonzalez (1993:38) and Sørensen (1998:141), the answer is no.

In some ways, Boudicca could subvert the Celtic Warrior trope because, unlike the scenarios mentioned in Section 5.6.1.a, Boudicca is allowed other identities beyond the Celtic Warrior. She almost always depicted with her daughters, who are usually crouched on the chariot behind her. Unlike the hypothetical males mentioned previously, Boudicca is allowed more flexibility in her identity. She can be a Celtic Warrior and she can also be a mother through the appearance of her daughters, oftentimes within the same image. The fact that Boudicca is allowed both a masculine and a feminine trope could well be a sign of subversion because she is crossing boundaries, challenging assumptions and maybe even assuming an identity beyond strict gender binaries: she can be both masculine and feminine.

Boudicca is an exceptional figure in history. It does not matter if she was real or not: her story and her legacy are legendary. It would almost be expected that such an extraordinary person would defy notions, whether historical or modern, of what it means to be masculine or feminine. Does the fact that she embodies only two identities count against her? Boudicca is always portrayed as a Celtic Warrior and a mother (and perhaps, to a lesser but still implied degree, a queen) and other aspects of her identity are never explored. Boudicca ultimately does not subvert the trope because Section 5.3 showed that she was the sole exception to many masculine signifiers and one example is not capable of subverting a trope. For the Celtic Warrior trope to be subverted, adult males should be depicted in other ways, or perhaps in warlike scenarios without those tropes. It means that other individuals beyond adult males should be illustrated with those items whilst also emphasising other aspects of their identities, in accordance with Gifford-Gonzalez (1993:38) and Sørensen (1998:141).

#### 5.6.2. The Druid

The signifiers applied to the Druid are not as specific as the ones that make up the Celtic Warrior. A Druid is most often portrayed in a dress and a robe, perhaps a necklace or bracelet, ritual items and musical instruments. Whilst most of them are quite general in their associations within images, the dress is the most strongly gendered signifier – a feminine signifier. Necklaces are usually feminine signifiers as well, cloaks and bracelets tend to be even in their distribution and both ritual items and musical instruments displayed a strong age bias as signifiers. White as a colour also usually denotes a Druid as well. This is especially interesting as most of the figures that are pointed out as Druids within the images are either elderly males or adult females, suggesting a changing view of gender over an individual's life course if they took on this particular role.

The multiplicity of the signifiers could indicate the "other" nature of a Druid. Their signifiers are mixed and are not strongly masculine or feminine, but are more indicative of age. The Druid is the only trope that was uniformly applied to the elderly individuals depicted within this study. The combination of mostly feminine dress, mixed adornment and objects that signify the elderly, suggest that the identity given to a Druid, whether

elderly male or female or even adult male, is something wholly different from the usual gender binaries that appear not just through other tropes, but amongst the general population of people within images of the Iron Age. The spiritual nature of their profession could render a Druid into some other type of gender – or they could even be gender neutral.

This is an exciting possibility in regards to creating different images of the past. Mixing signifiers – masculine, feminine, elderly and so forth, might have the effect of depicting an individual that is unexpected for the modern viewer, but might not have been so remarkable in the past. It is a controversial suggestion, one that would be based purely on speculation and perhaps a few scattered burial case studies but is something to consider. The difficulty of presenting other categories beyond a male-female binary has been discussed before and the way that Druids are depicted may offer a solution. This type of depiction could raise debate from its ambiguity alone. New information in regards to archaeological methods and theory raise many questions, and the images showing that should do the same.

# 5.6.3. Femininity and Domesticity

The Mother has not been explicitly discussed as a possible trope for females in the Iron Age, though her signifiers were mentioned in Section 5.3. The Mother is simply characterised by her proximity to children, if children can be considered an object or signifier (Gifford-Gonzalez1994:34). While the tropes associated with adult males place them outside the roundhouse and in an open-air situation, feminine tropes relegate them in and around the roundhouse, centring on the ideal of domesticity (Solometo and Moss 2013131-132).

Section 5.3 demonstrated that cooking and serving were a primarily female activity, though children participate as well. There were only a few instances of adult males cooking, such as showing a man stirring a pot. The only other individual seen in the act of serving was an elderly man. There have only been two instances showing individuals in the act of serving, so there is no actual pattern. Even if more recent images show males participating in aspects of food processing, such as preparing fish or game, they

are very rarely shown cooking the food items. This may be a reflection of the creation of strict gender roles in the 1950s following the flexibility of the war years (Solometo and Moss 2013:139, also Meyers 1999). In any case, the act of cooking is a signifier for femininity simply because of the lack of adult males performing the activity.

Serving, as stated before, is another difficult pattern to consider because there are so few examples to analyse. Still, the pattern that emerges from this analysis is that females are portrayed in activities relating to the processing, cooking and serving of food rather than the act of eating it. It does not afford them the status that eating and drinking do, despite archaeological evidence to the contrary (Giles 2012, Pope and Ralston 2011). According to Hill (2002), eating habits changed in some parts of southeast Britain towards the Late Iron Age. The diversity of artefacts, especially in regards to ceramics related to eating and drinking, pointed towards the importance of a status-based ritual such as feasting. The individuals associated with these burials were male, which may account for the limited evidence for depictions of females in regards to the act of feasting, and eating and drinking in general. Other archaeological evidence includes isotopic analysis from Inca sites that suggested that males drank more of the fermented corn-based drink called chicha than females (Hastorf 1991). Ethnographic evidence suggested that females brewed the beverage whilst the males drank it, creating clear gender distinctions not only through activities, but also through the consumption of food items.

There does not appear to be as much of a difference in the consumption of food items for the Iron Age, simply because there have been very few isotopic analyses carried out for burials from Iron Age Britain (but see Jay and Richards 2006, Jay et al. 2008). However, the Inca example provides an intriguing theory, at least in regards to the types of portrayals that come with the activities of cooking, serving, eating and drinking. Women are never depicted with wine or its accoutrements, such as amphorae or drinking vessels unless it is in the context of serving the wine. This does not necessarily create a trope of the Eater or Feaster for the males, simply because there are not enough images to corroborate this.

# 5.7. Marking Gender in Images of the Iron Age

## 5.7.1. Are there masculine and feminine signifiers for the Iron Age?

The analysis proves that there are certain objects and activities that denote masculine and feminine signifiers for the Iron Age. In terms of clothing, tunics and trews signified the man whilst dresses signified the woman. Tattoos signify males, though most adornment could signify both males and females. Swords, spears, shields, and most animals signify males, whilst loom weights, spindles and even children signify females. Activities that signified masculinity were combat, agriculture and construction, whilst spinning, weaving and cooking signified femininity. These are general themes with some degree of freedom between them, but as seen in Section 5.3 and 5.6, these clothes, objects and activities are iconic of masculinity and femininity within images of Iron Age Britain. The presence of masculine and feminine signifiers within these images is not inherently damaging to perceptions of the past – it does, however, have a considerable effect on the viewer and subsequent images that are produced.

Repetitious portrayals can increase the impact an image and the ideas it contains within the viewer. If that type of image is repeated often enough, one might even consider it to be an accurate representation (Molyneaux 1997:1-5, Moser 19992:831, Piggott 1965:165-166, Smiles and Moser 2005:6), especially if it is one of the informative image types that constitute the bulk of this study. The assumption is that because the work is derived from archaeological data, the ideas that it represents must be accurate. However, we have seen earlier that images may be rooted within archaeological knowledge, but not necessarily archaeological theory. Illustrators may be cognisant of social debates within the field, but due to a variety of factors, may not include them within an illustration (Solometo and Moss 2013:139-140).

By displaying the same masculine and feminine signifiers over and over again, they can be accepted as the norm. Men always wore tunics and trews and females always wore dresses. Men were always the warriors and the farmers and females were always the cooks and weavers. It turns people of the past into caricatures, especially those people who have been named within the classical sources, people such as Boudicca, Cartimandua, Calgacus and Caratacus, forever seen as rebellious or traitorous leaders. It denies them of their agency and limits them to a single identity when they would have embodied many, perhaps even simultaneously (Gifford-Gonzalez 1993:38, Sørensen1998:141). In some ways, the use of masculine and feminine signifiers makes it so that an individual's sole defining characteristic is that they are a man, woman or child. The presence of specific signifiers is not problematic: the unconscious use and reproduction of them is. The fact that there are not as many signifiers for the elderly and for children is also a consideration: their relative lack of signifiers grants them more room for flexibility when they are actually portrayed, but there is also the consequence that they are not marked. This is in contrast to what was found in Chapter 4, where age and not gender were marked in Iron Age mortuary practices. The use of signifiers is something that should be carefully considered when applied to people in the past.

## 5.7.2. The Smurfette Principle: adult males as default

In 1991, a *New York Times* article discussed the problems of male and female representation in popular media and concluded, "The message is clear. Boys are the norm, girls the variation; boys are central, girls peripheral; boys are individuals, girls types. Boys define the group, its story and its code of values. Girls exist only in relation to boys" (Pollitt 1991). This is not an isolated observation: "The history of males has been presented as the history of us...since their story and the general story are interwoven...due to their granted central roles in society" (Sørensen 1998:138-139). In other words, males are history. Adult males populate images of the Iron Age, often outnumbering all other individuals two to one. Males are given the bulk of activities and objects and agency in regards to gesture. Males have more flexibility to be something else, even if their default is usually that of the Celtic Warrior. Images of males in the Iron Age are so ubiquitous that even the most famous Iron Age personage so far, Boudicca, is portrayed as a variant of their most popular trope.

There is some degree of freedom within the activities given for adult females, for the elderly and for children. Additionally, no single group was given precedence in regards to location within an image, which differs from the findings in Solometo and Moss' study. However, there was not enough diversity within the images for these to be

significant. Demographic proportions within images skew heavily towards the males, which many not reflect the burial record (or the demographic record) for Iron Age Britain. Depictions of other individuals can be seen to almost be in opposition to the default portrayal. Even if activities and objects were similar between adult males and females, the female portrayal is almost always defined in the way that it opposes the male portrayal. This could be seen in the binary opposition of inside versus outside, domestic versus non-domestic, etc. Even when activities are shared, as seen in Section 5.3, the types of activities differed because of perceptions of ability.

Men as the default portrayal can be seen in depictions outside of Iron Age archaeology. Solometo and Moss (2013) observed an even higher degree of bias towards male portrayals in illustrations created for *National Geographic*. In their study, males were not just the default portrayal, dominating scenes in terms of location and sheer activity (as opposed to passiveness), but that depictions of females were sometimes sexualised (Solometo and Moss 2013:137-139). The perception of female objectification, even in "informational" images is not new: Moser (2001) acknowledges it in portrayals of earlier prehistory (many dating from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries), Gifford-Gonzalez (1994:36) in her analysis of the hands and knees position of the "Drudge on a hide" schemata and even James (1997:45) commented that someone referred to one of the females he illustrated as a "sex kitten." Illustrated prehistory has a tendency not only to default to the male, but also sometimes portray its females in ways that are harmful. Fortunately, this is not the case for the Iron Age, but there are still issues with portrayals of all individuals in Iron Age images.

Pollitt's article is titled "The Smurfette Principle" because it refers to the token female within a cast of default males. When a group of people become token, their importance diminishes because they are always framed by their relationship with the default rather than having narratives and fully realised identities of their own. In this case, it is difficult to say what is more harmful: the lack of portrayal or the continual portrayal with limited development. It implies that they do not contribute in any meaningful way except in the case of females, to feed the primary workers. This is an extreme

interpretation and does not mean to imply that the opposite represents a truthful version of the past. Instead, it follows the idea that "the reliance upon there being one engendered understanding of the past...will limit, and possibly be contradictory to, the project of engendering the presentation of archaeology" (Sørensen 1998:137). Default portrayals are harmful, but so too is the unconscious swapping of androcentrism for gynocentrism, or even just "adding females."

The point here is not to vilify the default portrayal of adult males within illustrations of Iron Age Britain, but to discover the bias and discuss how it may affect interpretations of social relations and attitudes towards gender. As androcentric viewpoints damage interpretations of masculine identity, so too do default portrayals of males. As discussed in section 5.6.1, being in the majority does not make one immune to stereotyping and generalisation. A default depiction paired with rampant stereotyping is inherently limiting. The males become the focus of unrealistic expectations. This type of problem does not disappear simply by adding females – instead, that compounds the problem by forcing another set of expectations on the females. Adding females (or indeed, adding elderly individuals and children) without making them active and without connecting them to the overall narrative of society creates a flat view of past society and culture.

### 5.7.3. Reimagining the past

As archaeologists, it is our job to analyse the evidence and use it to mediate the truth – however, there is no absolute truth. We are limited by our biases, our worldview and the context of our respective societies. It may seem premature to place all of this on the shoulders of images. But images are part of the learning experience and carry their own weight and responsibility. When important details are omitted, such as attention to feminist theory, the work and ultimately the viewers suffer for it. They assume that the image is accurate, fully accepting the representations within. This is not to say that academic images are unequivocally accepted, but there is very little debate, academic or otherwise, about it. It is only recently that ideas of representations in media of all sorts, but especially popular media, has been questioned. And Pollitt's article, now twenty years old, still remains relevant. Images as a whole are not diverse enough, or truly

reflective of current society – therefore how can we be sure that they reflect the past as well?

How can we create diverse images? Is it enough to simply include what's been identified as "missing?" Is it possible to create images of the past without compromising complexity? How do we give them nuance make them discursive without resorting to stereotypes and symbols? Is it even possible? Some of these have been considered before, such as with trope subversion and with the inclusion of missing elements (e.g. Melanie Giles' Wetwang burial reconstruction). Perhaps a divisive, controversial image is necessary in order to move the range of depictions forward. We do not know for certain what kind of roles people fulfilled within the Iron Age past, so why limit the people within illustrations? It is important for archaeologists to take reconstructions seriously and be aware of the types of messages they are sending. We must also become more comfortable with presenting scenes of the past that may be considered controversial. Academic archaeology moves forward through active debate and discussion and our images should do the same.

# **Chapter 6**

# **Perceptions of Gender in Iron Age Britain**

# **6.1. Introduction**

The aims of this thesis were 1) to critically review the construction of gender in Iron Age Britain through literature and artistic reconstructions and 2) to examine British Iron Age mortuary practices as a means of constructing gender. The first aim required historiographic analyses, which included a review of relevant gender theory as well as investigations of how social models, classical Greek and Roman texts, Irish medieval texts, British site reports and artistic reconstructions of Iron Age Britain presented gender. The presence and even the absence of gender within these sources is critical for understanding how society has been constructed for the period, both theoretically and methodologically. It is also crucial for understanding how to approach gender in future studies and how archaeologists as a whole continue to present Iron Age people in Britain.

The second aim required an analysis that reassessed burial data from Iron Age East Yorkshire and Wessex, with reference to Hamlin (2007), Giles (2012) and Pope and Ralston (2011). The analysis examined possible correlations between burial context, from burial location to body placement, and osteological sex. The analysis did not associate material culture with osteological sex in an attempt to shed light on possibilities that might have been previously overlooked, especially when gender is often determined through the association of artefacts with skeletal material in Iron Age Britain. The following sections present the outcomes of these studies and what it means for continuing studies of gender in Iron Age Britain, but first the expected hypotheses from Chapter 1 must be reiterated:

- 1. There will be extensive gender bias in most discussions of Iron Age gender where only males and females are the subjects.
- 2. For the British Iron Age, this gender bias will manifest in stereotypical depictions of male warriors and females within the domestic sphere.

3. Despite changing theoretical climates and despite the use of varying data, from models to human burials to iconography, such binaries will remain static.

# 6.2. Results

#### 6.2.1. Disengaging with gender

There were distinct patterns in the terminology analysis of Iron Age social models in Chapter 3. Models like Hawke (1959), Hodson (1964) and Clark (1966) viewed Iron Age society through cultural changes. The language reflected this, using words like "invaders" and others that regarded the people as a whole. Words that could be used to assess gender, like male and female, were not present. Hingley (1992) also used language that referred to Iron Age people in groups, leaving gender out of the picture. Processual models like Clarke (1972) and Haselgrove (1982), however, did use genderspecific language that structured it in male/female binaries. Both articles relied upon classical sources and medieval literature to reach these conclusions, though some were drawn by associating objects with male/females and designating the space around them as male/female as well.

Moore (2011) reconsidered how "tribes" worked in Iron Age Britain and whether or not larger social structures could actually perform that way. The focus on tribes meant that the terminology within the article echoed the previous models that did not consider more individualised aspects of identity and gender was not discussed. Hill (2011) framed Iron Age society as a heterarchy rather than a hierarchy and was the only model to mention gender. These two articles deconstructed previous concepts used to describe Iron Age society and how some of those concepts might no longer fit. Though Hill (2011) mentioned gender, he did not expand on how gender could have been constructed within the heterarchichal system described within the article.

There has been an overall lack of attention paid to concepts like gender in social models of Iron Age Britain. It is possible that the earlier models like Hawke's (1959) with their focus on artefacts and change, simply did not conceive of gender as a relevant topic. That explanation is not tenable with models such as that of Hingley (1992) and Moore (2011) because even when society is discussed in terms of households, groups or even tribes, there are still people who make up those classes, people whose identities can dictate the way those groups are structured and the way they interact with one another. It is not certain whether gender was left out deliberately or unconsciously, but its absence is noted, especially in works like Hill (2011). As previously stated in Section 3.4. a lack of gendered discussion in more recent work could be construed as reluctance to present the material and concepts in a way that would perpetuate false stereotypes, whether of male warriors and female wives or something else.

The same could be true of some of the more recent site reports that were analysed using word clouds in Chapter 4. The reports dated from the 1970s onwards all contained discussion sections at the end, but only Cunliffe (1984b) discussed gender in any form. Again, this could be a function of the reports themselves, where they are expected to only provide the excavation data as is, with as little interpretation as possible in order to allow others to create their own interpretations. But this could also be a sign of reluctance to engage with the material and speculate about how society worked in Iron Age Britain. The data analysis in Chapter 4, as well as what was seen in Hamlin's (2007) work show that it does not require too much effort to generate the types of results that provide insight into gender and age. Gender as a subject seems almost anathema in its omission from the social models as well as the excavation reports.

The persistent omission of gender in works specifically dealing with society in Iron Age Britain is a self-perpetuating cycle that has continued throughout decades of scholarship. First it was not a consideration. In other studies, it was not considered relevant even when it probably was, such as in discussions of households and tribes or publications focused solely on the data, like excavation reports. Second, fear of mischaracterising it keeps some from attempting to discern how it was constructed and performed within the broader context of Iron Age society. Unfortunately, omission and avoidance do not help with furthering gender studies. One way to do so is to talk about it. Iron Age archaeologists have to be willing to discuss gender in order to keep pushing forward, rather than dismissing it as too difficult, too theoretical or not relevant.
This section shows that hypotheses #1, #2 and #3 were confirmed – if gender was discussed, it was most often in male or female terms and most often in the form of male warriors as well as male chiefs and kings. Women were only discussed as domestics, or rather, wives. When males and females were mentioned within both the social models and the excavation reports, it was within these same contexts. For the most part, gender appears to have been an either/or: it was either omitted or discussed in terms of gender binaries. It is fortunate that the indexical searches of *Antiquity*, the *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* and the *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*, as well as Cunliffe's (1975, 2005) *Iron Age Communities in Britain* showed that gender scholarship for Iron Age Britain is actually growing. Articles about gender have only been published within the last twenty years, a trend that seems to follow gender scholarship in archaeology as a whole.

## 6.2.2. Male/female binaries and where they come from

The social models analysis also revealed several models that relied on either the Greek and Roman texts or the Irish medieval literature to support various claims about Iron Age society in Britain. The prestige system depends on the flow of imports and exports out of south-east Britain, items that are described by Strabo (Haselgrove 1982:80). Suetonius' work is also used to describe kingship in Iron Age Britain (Haselgrove 1982:83), but Strabo's work has nothing that explicitly described women as exchange goods within the prestige system. This is the only time that women are mentioned within the article (Haselgrove 1982:83). There is a similar occurrence in the analysis of Glastonbury Lake Village, where Caesar was used to posit the idea that marital partnerships were patrilocal and polygynous (Clarke 1972:847), based upon the already problematic association of objects and space with gender.

It should be noted that Clarke (1972:845) did assign a number of professions to the residents of Glastonbury Lake Village, from farmers to druids. The gender of these workers is not specified, but considering male-centric focus of the model, it is not likely that the roles were considered equally divided. In the excavation reports, Stead (1991:33) emphatically assigns warrior status to males who are buried with martial objects and thus given some identity. Women were only considered in relation to the

objects they were buried with, without the benefit of an identity of their own (Stead 1991:108). At Danebury, when rank comes into question it is framed in terms of kings and is also paralleled to the Irish medieval literature (Cunliffe 1984b:560). When rank is concerned, it is usually androcentric in nature, which is especially evident when words like "king" and "chief" are used, despite evidence (Pope and Ralston 2011) that Iron Age women in Britain did hold high status. Yet words to describe high-status women have not appeared in any of the works analysed within this thesis.

The artistic reconstructions examined in Chapter 5 were also expected to show a certain degree of binaries in terms of the ways men and women were portrayed. Section 5.3.2. showed that there was more variation in male and female activities within the images, with very few activities portrayed that were exclusive to either sex. Clothing was shown to have a binary split, with males wearing tunics and trews and females wearing dresses. Objects were also gendered, oftentimes displaying males with martial objects and females with eating or cooking tools. This echoed the male/warrior and female/domestic split seen in the social models. Section 5.3.5. investigated gesture and found that males used gestures that appeared to be more active, giving them more agency than females. This too was seen to some extent in the historiographic analyses of social models and excavation sites, where males were mentioned more often than females and given more active roles or identities, such as warriors or kings.

Influences from the classical sources on the artistic reconstructions were expected, and discussed in Section 5.5.3. Many "historical" Iron Age personas from Britain have been depicted within the illustrations, like Calgacus and especially Boudicca. All depictions of Boudicca were taken directly from the texts of Tacitus and Diodorus Siculus, showing her in battle or inspiring her people to revolt. Illustrations of Boudicca are one of the few times when Iron Age women are shown performing typically "male" activities, but flipping a stereotype is not an effective way to expand understanding of the gender roles that were in play in Iron Age Britain. When artistic reconstructions draw from the classical sources, they are faithful to the words of the Greek and Roman authors.

When discussions of Iron Age society are paired with sections from the classical or medieval literature, the literature provides an ethnographic parallel to support the claim. It is true that the classical and the medieval sources do provide the closest ethnographic parallel for the British Iron Age, explaining their popularity. However, Section 3.3. deconstructed the classical and medieval literature and showed that all were written within very specific contexts that might not reflect how society and people were in Iron Age Britain. As expected, works that drew from the classical sources depicted people in binaries, when they were depicted at all, and most often in a stereotypical fashion. Warriors were not as ubiquitous in the social models or the excavation reports, but kings and chiefs were. This is likely a function of the works themselves, where artefacts and settlements make it easier to discuss concepts like status rather than warfare. As with hypothesis #3, all of these trends were fairly consistent regardless of theoretical or temporal influence.

The artistic reconstructions displayed more variation but still had a tendency to present males and females in stereotypical ways, from their activities to their clothing and down to their gestures. The reasoning behind these portrayals is complex and cannot simply be attributed to personal bias on the part of the artist or commissioner, or even the classical sources, when applicable. One way the artistic reconstructions differed from the social models and site reports was in how specific trends waxed and waned. The 1980s and 1990s benefitted from more sophisticated excavation techniques and became more accurate in terms of how objects looked within the illustrations. Theoretical changes were less obvious, though there was more variation in portrayed activities within the artistic reconstructions from the 1980s onward compared with earlier works. The most notable "theoretically-forward" illustration is of burial WS453 at Wetwang Slack (Figure 5.31.), which contained a variety of hairstyles and clothing choices, as well as showing females performing rituals and men holding children.

The most significant deviation in expectations to come out of this thesis was not in terms of gender, but age. In Chapter 4, the reassessment of skeletal remains from Iron

Age Wessex showed several trends in mortuary practices that separated nonadults from adults. Nonadults in the 0-3 year old range were more often found in boundary contexts rather than pit or grave contexts, whilst a small percentage of neonates were found in posthole contexts. Nonadults were also less likely to be placed in a flexed burial position. The analysis did not find any sex-related differences in mortuary practices. Age was a category that was considered even less than gender within the historiographic analyses and even the images analysis, and yet it proved to be the only one of some significance within the mortuary analysis. This shows the importance of adding age to the discussion, alongside gender, in regards to how Iron Age society in Britain worked.

The results of this section make it seem that there were marked differences between males and females in Iron Age Britain. However, the isotopic analyses in Section 4.4.2. would show that in terms of diet, there were very few differences between males and females across Iron Age Britain. If gender was marked in some way during the period, it was not in a way that is archaeologically visible. Aspects of age identity, however, *are* visible, presenting an exciting aspect of study that has yet to be fully explored for Iron Age Britain. Gender too requires further study, leading it away from the consistent binary, stereotypical trends shown here.

## 6.3. A faceless Iron Age?

Whilst researching and analysing the images in Chapter 5, there were two things that stood out: one was the number of individuals within the images that had to be left out because their figures were too far away or not detailed enough to gain any information for analysis. The second was Alan Braby's comment about deliberately drawing figures with their backs to the audience in order to facilitate ambiguity and perhaps, interpretation. There is a great deal of ambiguity when it comes to Iron Age people in Britain. Of course there were binaries and stereotypes within the social models and the site reports, and the artistic reconstructions contained plenty of people. But more often than not, Iron Age peoples were indeed faceless, briefly considered but more often ignored in favour of the artefacts they made, the sites they built and ironically enough the society they created. Even social models did not do enough to consider how individuals and their identities shaped society as a whole.

The analyses here, alongside several others, have taken the steps to turn around those faceless images. By demonstrating the lack of gender and the stereotypical ways it has been portrayed in British Iron Age studies, there is an understanding of where gender studies have yet to go. Age has shown itself as a possible, significant way in which nonadults and adults differentiated themselves. The isotopic studies mentioned in Chapter 4 have already changed some views on how society worked, painting a picture of a more egalitarian Iron Age than previously assumed – at least in terms of diet. Further osteological, isotopic and DNA analyses can only expand our understanding of Iron Age society in Britain.

It is not enough to acknowledge the existence and importance of gender and age. British Iron Age archaeologists have to be ready to engage in the conversation and bring it into the social models and into discussions. Images and museum displays could be more interpretative and even creative in their depictions of life in Iron Age Britain, presenting possibilities and challenging established perspectives. Only then is it possible to truly put a face on gender and other Iron Age identities.

- Abramson, P., Boylson, A., Dore, J., Haughton, C., Huntley, J.P., Makey, P., and Stallibrass, S. (1996) Excavations along the Caythorpe gas pipeline, North Humberside, *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 68, pp. 1-88.
- Adichie, C. (2013) We should all be feminists, TEDxEuston. [Accessed 12 March 2014]. Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hg3umXU_qWc.
- Adkins, L. and Adkins, R. (1989) Archaeological Illustration. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Adlam, A.T. and Stevens, E.T. (1934) The Iron Age Settlement at Highfield, *The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 46, pp. 579-624.
- Agarwal, S.C. and Glencross, B.A. (2011) Building a Social Bioarchaeology. In Agarwal, S.C. and Adkins, B.A. (eds): *Social Bioarchaeology*. Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 1-12.
- Alberti, B. (2001) Faience goddesses and ivory bull-leapers: the aesthetics of sexual difference at Late Bronze Age Knossos, *World archaeology*, *33*:2, pp. 189-205.
- Aldhouse-Green, M. (1995) Celtic goddesses: warriors, virgins and mothers. London, British Museum Press.
- Aldhouse-Green, M. (2004) An archaeology of images: iconography and cosmology from Iron Age and Roman Europe. London, Routledge.
- Aldhouse-Green, M. (2010) Caesar's Druids: Story of an Ancient Priesthood. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Allen, S. and Reynolds, W. (2001) Celtic Warrior: 300 BC-AD100. Oxford, Osprey Publishing.
- Allen, T.G. (1990) An Iron Age and Romano-British enclosed settlement at Watkins Farm Northmoor Oxon. Oxford, Oxbow.
- Allen, T.G. and Robinson, M.A. (1993) *The prehistoric landscape and Iron Age* enclosed settlement at Mingies Ditch, Hardwick-with-Yelford, Oxon. Oxford, Oxbow
- Alston, R. (1998) "Arms and the man: Soldiers, masculinity and power in Republican and Imperial Rome." In Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J. (eds): When Men Were Men: Masculinity, power and identity in classical antiquity. London, Routledge, pp. 205-223.
- Ambrose, S.H., Buikstra, J., and Krueger, H.W. (2003) Status and gender differences in diet at Mound 72, Cahokia, revealed by isotopic analysis of bone, *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology*, 22:3, pp. 217-226.
- Ambrus, S. and Aston, M. (2006) *Drawing on Archaeology: Bringing History to Life.* London, Tempus.
- Anderson, T. (1997) The human skeletons. In Parfitt, K. (ed.): *Iron Age Burials from Mill Hill, Deal.* London, British Museum Press, pp. 114-144.
- Anderson, D.L., Thompson, G.W., and Popovich, F. (1976) Age of attainment of mineralization stages of permanent dentition, *Journal of Forensic Sciences* 21, pp. 191-200.
- Anon. (1907) St. Margaret's Mead, *The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 35, p. 391.

- Anon. (1917) Liddington Castle, *The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 39, p. 501-502.
- Anon. (1937) Archaeological Notes, Oxoniensia 2, p. 201.
- Anon. (1957) Boreham Down, *The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 56, p. 120.
- Anon. (1960) Notes on Excavations, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 27, pp. 344-351.
- Anon. (1971) East Boreham, *The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 66, p. 190-191.
- Anon. (1973) Excavation and Fieldwork in Wiltshire 1971, *The Wiltshire* Archaeological and Natural History Magazine 68, p. 129.
- Anon. (1975) Excavation and Fieldwork in Wiltshire 1973, *The Wiltshire archaeological magazine* 70, p. 134.
- Anon. (1992) Excavation and Fieldwork in Wiltshire 1990, *The Wiltshire archaeological magazine* 85, p. 160.
- Anon. (1995) Excavation and Fieldwork in Wiltshire 1993, *The Wiltshire archaeological magazine* 88, pp. 153-154.
- Anon. (2004) Land at Downton Road, Salisbury, Wiltshire. Salisbury, Wessex Archaeology, Unit Report number: 57810.01.
- Ardener, S. (1975) Perceiving women. New York, John Wiley and Sons.
- Aristotle (n.d.) Ethics. Project Gutenberg.
- Aristotle (1912) Politics, trans. W.Ellis. London, J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd.
- Armit, I. (1997) Celtic Scotland. London, BT Batsford Limited.
- Armit, I. (2003) Towers of the North: Brochs of Scotland. Stroud, Tempus.
- Armit, I. (2007) Hillforts at War: From Maiden Castle to Taniwaha Pâ, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 73, pp. 25-38.
- Armit, I. and Ginn, V. (2007) Beyond the GraveL human remains from domestic contexts in Iron Age Atlantic Scotland, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 73, pp. 113-134.
- Armit, I., and Grant, P. (2008) Gesture politics and the art of ambiguity: the Iron Age statue from Hirschlanden, *Antiquity* 82:**316**, pp. 409–442
- Arnold, B. (1991) The deposed princess of Vix: the need for an engendered European prehistory. In Walde, D., and Willows, N.D. (eds): *The archaeology of gender: Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Conference of the Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary*. Calgary, University of Calgary Archaeological Association, pp. 366-374.
- Arnold, B. (1995a) The material culture of social structure: rank and status in early Iron Age Europe. In Arnold, B., and Gibson, D.B. (ads): *Celtic Chiefdom, Celtic State*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Arnold, B. (1995b). "Honorary males" or women of substance? Gender, status, and power in Iron Age Europe, *Journal of European Archaeology* 3:2, pp. 153-168.
- Arnold, B. (1999) 'Drinking the feast': Alcohol and the legitimation of power in Celtic Europe, *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 9:1, pp. 71-93.
- Arnold, B. (2001) The limits of agency in the analysis of elite Iron Age Celtic burials, Journal of Social Archaeology 1:2, pp. 210-224.

- Arnold, B. (2012) The Vix Princess Redux: a retrospective on European Iron Age gender and mortuary studies. In Torreira, L.P. (ed.) La Arqueología funeraria desde una perspectiva de género. Madrid, Publicaciones de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, pp. 215-232.
- Arnold, B. and Wicker, N.L (2001) Introduction. In Arnold, B. and Wicker, N.L. (eds) Gender and the Archaeology of Death. Walnut Creek, AltaMira Press, pp. viixxi.
- Arnold, B. and Wicker, N.L. (2001) *Gender and the Archaeology of Death.* Walnut Creek, AltaMira Press.
- Arnold, D. (2005) Unlearning the Images of Archaeology. In Smiles, S. and Moser, S. (eds): *Envisioning the Past: Archaeology and the Image*. Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 92-114.
- Ashbee, P. (1979) The Porth Cressa cist-graves, St. Mary's, Isles of Scilly: a postscript, *Cornish Archaeology 18*, pp. 61-80.
- Athenaeus (1854) *The Deipnosophists or Banquet of the learned of Athenaeus*, trans. C. Yonge. London.
- Athenaeus (2010) *Athenaeus: The Learned Banqueters. Books 12-13.584b*, trans. S.D. Olson. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Avery, M. (1993) Hillfort defences of southern Britain. Oxford, BAR 231.
- Bacus, E.A. (2007) Expressing Gender in Bronze Age North East Thailand: The Case of Non Nok Tha. In Hamilton, S., Whitehouse, R.D., and Wright, K.I. (eds): Archaeology and Women: Ancient and Modern Issues. Walnut Creek, Left Coast Press, pp. 312-334.
- Ballard, S. (2007) Warriors and Weavers: Constructing British Iron Age Identities in Museums. In Hamilton, S., Whitehouse, R.D., and Wright, K.I. (eds): *Archaeology and Women: Ancient and Modern Issues*. Walnut Creek, Left Coast Press, pp. 167-182.
- Barrett, J. (1987) The Glastonbury Lake Village: Models and Source Criticism, *Archaeological Journal* 144, pp. 409-423.
- Barrett, J., Freeman, P.W.M., and Woodward, A. (2000) *Cadbury Castle, Somerset. The Later Prehistoric and Early Historic Archaeology.* London, English Heritage.
- Baudrillard, J. (1998) The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures. London, Sage.
- Beck, M. (2000) Female Figurines in the European Upper Paleolithic: Politics and Bias in Archaeological Interpretation. In Rautman, A. (ed.): *Reading the Body: Representations and Remains in the Archaeological Record*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 202-214.
- Becker, M.J. (2000) Reconstructing the Lives of South Etruscan Women. In Rautman,A. (ed.): *Reading the Body: Representations and Remains in the Archaeological Record.* Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 55-67.
- Bentley, R.A., Buckley, H.R., Spriggs, M., Beford, S., Ottley, C.J., Nowell, G.M., Macpherson, C.G., and Pearson, D.G. (2007) Lapita migrants in the Pacific's oldest cemetery: isotopic analysis at Teouma, Vanuatu, *American Antiquity* 72:4, pp. 645-656.
- Berger, A.A. (2012) Media Analysis Techniques. London, Sage.
- Berger, J. (1972) Ways of Seeing. London, BBC and Penguin Books.

- Berman, J. (1999) Bad Hair Days in the Paleolithic: Modern (Re)constructions of the Cave Man, *American Anthropologist* 101:2, pp. 288-304.
- Bertelsen, R., Lillehammer, A., and Næss, J.R. (1987) *Were They All Men? An Examination of Sex Roles in Prehistoric Society*. Stavanger, Arkeologisk museum I Stavanger.
- Bevan, B. (1997) Bounding the landscape: place and identity during the Yorkshire Wolds Iron Age. In Gwilt, A., and Haselgrove, C. (eds): *Reconstructing Iron Age Societies*. Oxford, Oxbow monograph, pp. 181-191.
- Bintliff, J. (1984) Iron Age Europe in the Context of social evolution form the Bronze Age through to Historic times. In Bintliff, J. (ed.): *European Social Evolution: Anthropological Perspectives*. Bradford, University of Bradford Press, pp. 157-226.
- Bisexual.org, (2014). What is the difference between bisexual, pansexual, polysexual, omnisexual, ambisexual, and fluid? | Bisexual.org. [online] Available at: http://bisexual.org/qna/what-is-the-difference-between-bisexual-and-terms-like-pansexual-polysexual-omnisexual-ambisexual-and-fluid/ [Accessed 13 Oct. 2014].
- Boegehold, A.L. (1999) When a Gesture Was Expected: A Selection of Examples from Archaic and Classical Greek Literature. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Bolger, D. (2013) A companion to Gender Prehistory. Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bonnabel, L., Moreau, C., Saurel, M., Richard, I., Auxiette, G., and Vauquelin, E. (2009) Pratiques funéraires entre le Hallstatt final et La Tène moyenne en Champagne-Ardenne: un genre de point de vue, le point de vue du genre. In Barral, P., Dedet, B., Delrieu, F., Giraud, P., Le Goff, I., Marion, S., and Villard-Le Tiec, A. (eds): Gestes funéraires en Gaule au Second Âge du fer. Actes du XXXIIIème colloque international de l'AFEAF, Caen, 20-24 mai 2009. Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté, pp. 129-153.
- Borić, D. and Robb, J. (2008) *Past bodies: body-centered research in archaeology*. Oxford, Oxbow Books.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Bowden, M. (2000) Past, Newsletter of the Prehistoric Society: Lieutenant-General A.H.L.F. Pitt Rivers, *The Prehistoric Society* 34.
- Braddick, M. (2009) Introduction: The Politics of Gesture. In Braddick, M. (ed.): The politics of gesture: historical perspectives. Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp.
- Bradley, K.R. (1984) *Slaves and masters in the Roman Empire: a study in social control.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Brooks, S., and Suchey, J.M. (1990) Skeletal age determination based on the os pubis: A comparison of the Acsádi-Nemeskéri and Suchey-Brooks methods, *Human Evolution* 5, pp. 227-238.
- Brück, J. (1995) A place for the dead: the role of human remains in Late Bronze Age Britain, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 61, pp. 245-277.
- Brun, P. (1995) From chiefdom to state organization in Celtic Europe. In Arnold, B., and Gibson, D.B. (eds): *Celtic Chiefdom, Celtic State*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 13-25.

- Brun, P. (2006) L'origine des Celtes: Communautés linguistiques et réseaux sociaux. In Vitali, D. (ed.): Celtes et Gaulois, l'Archéologie face à l'Histoire, 2: la Préhistoire des Celtes. Glux-en-Glenne, Bibracte, Centre archéologique européen, pp. 29-44.
- Brumfiel, E.M. (1991) Weaving and Cooking: Women's Production in Aztec Mexico. In Gero, J.M. and Conkey, M.W. (eds): *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*. Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 224-251.
- Buchsenschutz, O. (1996) Dis-Moi où tu habites... In Plouin, S., and Jud, P. (eds):
  Habitats, Mobiliers et Groupes Régionaux à lÂge du Fer, Actes du XXe
  colloque de l'A.F.E.A.F., Colmar-Mittelwihr, 16-19 mai 1996, pp. 201-205.
- Buchsenschutz, O. (2000) Les oppida celtiques, un phénomène original d'urbanisation.
  In Guichard, V., Sievers, S., and Urban, O.H. (eds): Les processus d'urbanisation à l'âge du Fer. Eisenzeitliche Urbanisationsprozesse, Actes du colloque des 8-11 juin 1998. Glux-en-Glenne, Bibracte, Centre archéologique européen, pp. 61-64.
- Buikstra, J.E., and Ubelaker, D.H. (1994) *Standards for Data Collection from Human Skeletal Remains*. Fayetteville, Arkansas Archaeological Survey Report Number 22.
- Bulleid, A. (1911) Not the Woad-Daubed Savage of the Old History Books, *Illustrated London News 3789A*, pp. 928-933.
- Bulleid, A. and Gray, H. (1917a) The Glastonbury Lake Village: A Full Description of the Excavations and the Relics Discovered 1892-1907. Glastonbury, Glastonbury Antiquarian Society.
- Bulleid, A. and Gray, H. (1917b) The Glastonbury Lake Village: A Full Description of the Excavations and the Relics Discovered 1892-1907. Glastonbury, Glastonbury Antiquarian Society.

Bulleid, A. and Gray, H. (1948a) The Meare Lake Village, Volume 1. Taunton, Taunton Castle.

Bulleid, A. and Gray, H. (1948b) The Meare Lake Village, Volume 2. Taunton, Taunton Castle.

Bulleid, A. and Gray, H. (1966) The Meare Lake Village, Volume 3. Taunton, Taunton Castle.

- Butler, B. (1996) Virginia Woolf, Madonna and me: searching for role-models and women's presence in museums and heritage. In Devonshire, A. and Wood, B. (eds): *Women in Industry and Technology: Current Research and the Museum Experience*. London, Museum of London/WHAM, pp. 19-27.
- Butler, J. (1990) Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity. London, Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1993) Bodies that Matter: on the Discursive Limits of Sex. London, Routledge.
- Butler, J. (2004) Undoing gender. London, Routledge.
- Caesar, J. (1998) Seven commentaries on the Gallic War. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Caesar, J. (n.d.) *De Bello Gallico and other commentaries of Gaius Julius Caesar*, trans. T.D. Quincey. London, J.M. Dent and Sons.
- Cameron, A. and Kuhrt, A. (2013) Images of women in antiquity. London, Routledge.

- Capasso, L., Kennedy, K.A.R., and Wilczack, C.A. (1999) Atlas of Occupation Markers on Human Remains. Terama, Edigrafital S.p.A.
- Cardoso, F.A. and Henderson, C. (2013) The Categorisation of Occupation in Identified Skeletal Collections: A Source of Bias? *International Journal of Osteoarchaeology*, 32:2, pp. 186-196.
- Carr, G. (2006) Creolised bodies and hybrid identities: examining the early Roman period in Essex and Hertfordshire. Oxford, BAR.
- Carr, G. (2007) Excarnation to cremation: continuity or change? In Haselgrove, C., and Moore, T. (eds): *The Later Iron Age in Britain and Beyond*. Oxford, Oxbow, pp. 444-453.
- Carr, G. and Knüsel, C. (1997) The ritual framework of excarnation by exposure as the mortuary practice of the early and middle Iron Ages of central southern Britain. In Gwilt, A. and Haselgrove, C. (eds): *Reconstructing Iron Age Societies*. Oxford, Oxbow 71, pp. 167-173.
- Chadwick, A.M. (2012) Routine Magic, Mundane Ritual: Towards a Unified Notion of Depositional Practice, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 31:3, pp. 283-315.
- Chambers, R.A. (1977) A Crouched Pit Burial at Cassington Mill, Oxon., *Oxoniensia* 42, pp. 256.
- Champion, T. (1985) Written sources and the study of the European Iron Age. In Champion, T., and Megaw, J. (eds): Settlement and Society: aspects of West European prehistory in the first millennium B.C. Leicester, Leicester University Press, pp. 9-22.
- Champion, T. (1997a) The power of the picture: the image of the ancient Gaul. In Molyneaux, B. (ed.): *The cultural life of images: visual representations in archaeology*. London, Routledge, pp. 213-229.
- Champion, T. (1997b) Power, Politics, and Status. In Green, M. (ed.): *The Celtic World*. London, Routledge, pp. 85-94.
- Chapman, A. (2006) An Iron Age Enclosure at Site A, Kennel Farm, Basingstroke, Hampshire, *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society* 61, pp.16-62.
- Chapman, J.C. and Gaydarska, B.I. (2006) *Parts and wholes: fragmentation in prehistoric context*. Oxford, Oxbow.
- Chapman, M. (1992) The Celts: Construction of a Myth. London, St. Martin Press.
- Cherry, D., and Pollock, G. (1984) Patriarchal Power and the Pre-Raphaelites, *Art History* 7:4, pp. 480-495.
- Childe, V.G. (1940) Prehistoric communities of the British Isles. London, W. & R. Chambers.
- Chittock, H. (2014). Arts and Crafts in Iron Age Britain: Reconsidering the Aesthetic Effects of Weaving Combs, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 33:3, pp. 313-326.
- Claassen, C., and Joyce, R.A. (1997) *Women in Prehistory: North America and Mesoamerica*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Clark, G. (1966) The Invasion Hypothesis in British Archaeology, *Antiquity* 40:159, pp. 172-89.
- Clarke, D.L. (1972) A provisional model of Iron Age society and its settlement system. In Clarke, D.L. (ed.): *Models in Archaeology*. London, Methuen and Co, pp. 801-869.

- Clay, R.C.C. (1924) An Early Iron Age Site on Fyfield Bavant Down, *The Wiltshire* Archaeological and Natural History Magazine 42:140: pp.457-496.
- Clay, R. C. C. (1927) Supplementary Report on the Early Iron Age Village on Swallowcliffe Down, *The Wiltshire Archaeology and Natural History Society* 43, pp. 540-47.
- Clifford, E. (1930) A prehistoric and Roman site at Barnwood, near Gloucester, *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* 52, pp. 201-254.
- Coles, J., & Minnitt, S. (1995) "Industrious and Fairly Civilized": The Glastonbury Lake Village. Somerset, Somerset Levels Project and Somerset County Council Museums Service.
- Collier, J. and Rosaldo, M.Z. (1981) Politics and gender in simple societies. In Ortner, S. and Whitehead, H. (eds): *Sexual meanings: the cultural construction of gender and sexuality*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 275-329.
- Collis, J. (1996) Hillforts, enclosures, and boundaries. In Collis, J., and Champion, T. (eds): *The Iron Age in Britain and Ireland: Recent Trends. Sheffield, Sheffield University Press*, pp. 87-94.
- Collis, J. (2003) The Celts. Origins, myths, and reinventions. London, Tempus.
- Collis, J. (2011) "Reconstructing Iron Age Society" Revisited. In Moore, T., and Armada, X. (eds): *Atlantic Europe in the First Millenium BC: Crossing the Divide*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 223-241.
- Conkey, M.W., and Spector, J. (1984) Archaeology and the study of gender, *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* 7, pp. 1-38.
- Connell, R. (1995) Masculinities. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Craig, R., Knüsel, C., and Carr, G. (2005) Fragmentation, mutilation and dismemberment: an interpretation of human remains on Iron Age sites. In Parker Pearson, M. and Thorpe, I. (eds): *Warfare, Violence and Slavery in Prehistory*. Oxford, BAR, pp. 165-170.
- Crass, B.A. (2000) Gender in Inuit Burial Practices. In Rautman, A. (ed.): *Reading the Body: Representations and Remains in the Archaeological Record*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 68-76.
- Crass, B.A. (2001) Gender and Mortuary Analysis: What Can Grave Goods Really Tell Us? In Arnold, B., and Wicker, N.L. (eds): *Gender and the archaeology of death*. Oxford, AltaMira Press, pp. 105-119.
- Cromarty, A.M., Foreman, S. and Murray, P. (1999) The Excavation of a Late Iron Age Enclosed Settlement at Bicester Fields Farm, Bicester, Oxon., Oxoniensia 64, pp. 153-233
- Crumley, C. (1974) Celtic Social Structure: The Generation of Archaeologically Testable Hypotheses from Literary Evidence. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Museum of Anthropology, Anthropological Papers, no. 54.
- Crumley, C.L., 1995. Heterarchy and the analysis of complex societies *Archeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association*, 6:1, pp.1-5.
- Crummy, P. (2007) *Stanway: an elite burial site at Camulodunum.* London, Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. and Robinson, R.E. (1990) *The Art of Seeing: An Interpretation of the Aesthetic Encounter*. Los Angeles, Getty Publications.

- Cucchiari, S. (1981) The gender revolution and the transition from bisexual horde to patrilocal band: the origins of gender hierarchy. In Ortner, S. and Whitehead, H. (eds): Sexual meanings: the cultural construction of gender and sexuality. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 31-79.
- Cunliffe, B. (1975) Iron Age communities in Britain : an account of England, Scotland and Wales from the seventh century BC until the Roman conquest. 1st Edition. London, Book Club Associates.
- Cunliffe, B. (1984a) *Danebury: an Iron Age hillfort in Hampshire. Volume 1 The excavations, 1969-1978: the finds.* London, Council for British Archaeology Research Report 52.
- Cunliffe, B. (1984b) Iron Age Wessex: Continuity and Change. In Cunliffe, B. and Miles, D. (eds): *Aspects of the Iron Age in Central Southern Britain*. Oxford, Oxford Committee for Archaeology, pp. 12-45.
- Cunliffe, B. (1988) *Greeks, Romans and Barbarians: spheres of interaction.* London, Batsford.
- Cunliffe, B. (1992) Pits, preconceptions and propitiation, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* **11**, pp.69-83.
- Cunliffe, B. (1993) English Heritage book of Danebury. London, English Heritage.
- Cunllffe, B. (1995) *Danebury: an Iron Age Hillfort in Hampshire. Vol. 6: A hillfort community in perspective.* London, Council for British Archaeology Research Report 102.
- Cunliffe, B. (1997) The Ancient Celts. Oxford, Oxford University Press. Cunliffe, B. (2005) Iron Age Communities in Britain: An account of England, Scotland and Wales from the Seventh Century BC until the Roman Conquest. 4th Edition. London, Routledge.
- Cunliffe, B., and Poole, C. (2000a) *The Danebury environs programme: the prehistory* of a Wessex landscape. Volume 2, part 2. Bury Hill, Upper Clatford, Hants, 1990. Oxford, Institute for Archaeology.
- Cunliffe, B. (2005) Iron Age communities in Britain : an account of England, Scotland and Wales from the seventh century BC until the Roman conquest. 4^{th t} Edition. London, Book Club Associates.
- Cunliffe, B., and Poole, C. (2000b) *The Danebury environs programme: the prehistory* of a Wessex landscape. Volume 2, part 3. Suddern Farm, Middle Wallop, Hants, 1991 and 1996. Oxford, Institute for Archaeology.
- Cunliffe, B., and Poole, C. (2000c) *The Danebury environs programme: the prehistory* of a Wessex landscape. Volume 2, part 4. New Buildings, Longstock, Hants, 1992 and Fiveways, Longstock, Hants 1996. Oxford, Institute for Archaeology.
- Cunliffe, B., and Poole, C. (2000d) The Danebury environs programme: the prehistory of a Wessex landscape. Volume 2, part 6. Houghton Down, Stockbridge, Hants, 1994. Oxford, Institute for Archaeology.
- Cunliffe, B., and Poole, C. (2000e) *The Danebury environs programme: the prehistory* of a Wessex landscape. Volume 2, part 7. Windy Dido, Cholderton, Hants, 1995. Oxford, Institute for Archaeology.
- Cunnington, W. (1922) Battlesbury Camp, *The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 42, pp. 368-373.

- Cunnington, B.H., and Cunnington, M.E. (1913) Casterly Camp: Being an account of Excavations carried out by Mr. and Mrs. B.H. Cunnington, *The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 38, pp. 53-105.
- Cunnington, M. E. (1911) Knap Hill Camp, *The Wiltshire Archaeology and Natural History Society* 37, pp. 42-65.
- Cunnington, M.E. (1925) Figsbury Rings, an Account of Excavations in 1924. The Wiltshire Archaeology and Natural History Society 43, pp. 48-58.
- Cunnington, M.E. (1933) Excavations in Yarnbury Castle Camp, 1932, *The Wiltshire* Archaeological and Natural History Magazine 46, pp. 198-213.
- Danielsson, I.B. (2002) (Un)masking Gender gold foil (dis)embodiments in late Iron Age Scandinavia. In Hamilakis, Y., Pluciennik, M., and Tarlow, S. (eds): Thinking through the Body: Archaeologies of Corporeality. London, Kluwer Academic, pp. 179-200.
- Danesi, M. (2002) Understanding Media Semiotics. London, Arnold.
- Davidson, J. (2013) Bodymaps: Sexing Space and Zoning Gender in Ancient Athens. In Foxhall, L. and Neher, G. (eds): *Gender and the City before Modernity*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Davies, G. (2005) On being seated: gender and body language in Hellenistic and Roman Art. In Cairns, D. (ed.): *Body Language in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. Swansea, Classical Press of Wales. pp. 215-238
- Davies, J. (2005) *The land of Boudica: prehistoric and Roman Norfolk*. Oxford, Oxbow.
- Davies, S.M. (1981) Excavations at Old Down Farm, Andover Part II: Prehistoric and Roman, Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society 37, pp. 81-163.
- Davies, W. (1983) Celtic Women in the Early Middle Ages. In Cameron, A. and Kuhrt, A. (eds): *Images of Women in Antiquity*. London, Croom Helm, pp. 145-166.
- Davis, O. (2013) Re-interpreting the Danebury Assemblage: Houses, Households, and Community, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 70, pp. 353-375.
- Davies, S.M. and Grieve, D. (1986) The Poundbury Pipe-line: Archaeological Observations and Excavations, *Proceedings of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society* 108, pp. 81-88.
- Davis, O., Sharples, N., and Waddington, K. (2008) Changing perspectives on the first millennium BC: Proceedings of the Iron Age Research Student Seminar 2008. Oxford, Oxbow.
- Dawson, G.J. (1961) Excavations at Purwell Farm, Cassington, Oxoniensia 26/27, pp. 1-6.
- De Beauvoir, S. (1972) The Second Sex. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Dehejia, V. (1997) Representing the Body: Gender Issues in Indian Art. New Delhi, Kali for Women.
- Dent, J. (1984) Wetwang Slack: an Iron Age cemetery on the Yorkshire Wolds. Unpublished MPhil thesis, University of Sheffield.
- Dent, J. (2010) The Iron Age in East Yorkshire. Oxford, British Archaeological Reports.
- Derrida, J. (1997) *Of Grammatology*, trans. G. Spivak. London, The Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Díaz-Andreu, M. (2005) Gender identity. In Díaz-Andreu, M., Lucy, S., Babic, S., and Edwards, D.N. (eds): *The Archaeology of Identity: Approaches to Gender, Age, Status, Ethnicity, and Religion*. London, Routledge, pp. 13-42.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. & Montón-Subías, S. (2013) Feminist and Gender Studies in Southwestern Europe: Spanish, Portuguese and French Prehistoric Archaeologies. In: D. Bolger (ed.) A Companion to Gender Prehistory. Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell, pp.
- Dietler, M. (2010) Archaeologies of colonialism: Consumption, entanglement, and violence in ancient Mediterranean France. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Diodorus (1814) *The Historical Library of Diodorus the Sicilian, in Fifteen Books,* trans. G. Booth. London, W. McDowall.
- Diodorus (1938) *Diodorus of Sicily, Volume III,* trans. C.H. Oldfather. London, William Heinemann Ltd.
- Dixon, S. (1992) The Roman Family. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dixon, S. (2001) *Reading Roman Women: Sources, Genres and Real Life*. London, Duckworth.
- Dodgshon, R.A. (1995) Modelling chiefdoms in the Scottish Highlands and Islands prior to the '45. In Arnold, B. and Gibson, D.B. (eds): Celtic chiefdom, Celtic state: The evolution of complex social systems in prehistoric Europe. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 99-109.
- Dommasnes, L.H. and Montón-Subías, S. (2012) European Gender Archaeologies in Historical Perspective, *European Journal of Archaeology* 15(3), pp. 367-391.
- Doucette, D.L. (2001) Decoding the Gender Bias: Inferences of Atlatls in Female Mortuary Contexts. In Arnold, B., and Wicker, N.L. (eds): *Gender and the archaeology of death*. Oxford, AltaMira Press, pp. 159-178.
- Ducros, A. and Ducros, J. (2000) *L'homme préhistorique: Images et imaginaire*. Paris, L'Harmattan.
- Duday, H. (2006) Archaeothanatology or the Archaeology of Death, trans. C. Knüsel. In Gowland, R. and Knüsel, C. (eds): Social Archaeology of Human Remains. Oxford, Oxbow, pp. 30-56.
- Dunbabin, K. (2003) *The Roman banquet: images of conviviality*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dunham, S.B. (1995) Caesar's perception of Gallic social structures. In Arnold, B. and Gibson, D.B. (eds): Celtic chiefdom, Celtic state: The evolution of complex social systems in prehistoric Europe. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 110-115.
- Dunning, G.C. (1931) Salmonsbury Camp, Gloucestershire, Antiquity 5, pp.489-91.
- Dunning, G. C. (1976) Salmonsbury, Bourton on the Water. In Harding, D. W. (ed.) *Hillforts. Later prehistoric earthworks in Britain and Ireland*. London, Academic Press, pp. 76-118.
- Eco, U. (1976) A theory of semiotics. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.
- Edwards, B. and Pope, R. (2013) Gender in British Prehistory. In Bolger, D. (ed.): *A* companion to Gender Prehistory. Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 458-479.
- Effros, B. (2000) Skeletal sex and gender in Merovingian mortuary archeology, *Antiquity* 74:285, pp. 632-639.

Ehrenberg, M. (1989) Women in prehistory. London: British Museum Publications.

- Ellis, C., and Powell, A.B. (2008) An Iron Age Settlement outside Battlesbury Hillfort, Warminster, and Sites along the Southern Range Road. Salisbury, Wessex Archaeology Report 22.
- Englestad, E. (1991) Feminist Theory and Post-Processual Archaeology. In Walde, D., and Willows, N.D. (eds): *The archaeology of gender: Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Conference of the Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary*. Calgary, University of Calgary Archaeological Association, pp. 116-121.
- Engström, E. (2012) Gender in the Marking of Masculinities in Practice at a Cultural Heritage Site, *Stockholm Studies in Archaeology* 58, pp. 83.
- Evans, D., Holbrook, N. and McSloy, E. R. (2006) A later Iron Age cemetery and Roman settlement at Henbury School, Bristol: excavations in 2004. In Watts, M. (ed.) *Two Cemeteries from Bristol's Northern Suburbs*. Cirencester, Cotswold Archaeology, pp. 1-50.
- Evans, T. (2004) Quantitative Identities: A Statistical Summary and Analysis of Iron Age Cemeteries in North-Eastern France 600 - 130 BC, BAR International Series S1226. Oxford, Archaeopress.
- Farley, J., Parfitt, K., Richardson, A., Antoine, D., Pope, R., and Sparey-Green, C. (2014) A Late Iron Age Helmet Burial from Bridge, near Canterbury, Kent, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 80, pp. 379-388.
- Farnell, B. (1996) Gesture and Movement. In Barnard, A. and Spencer, J. (eds): *Encyclopedia of cultural anthropology*. London, Routledge, pp. 536.
- Fasham, P.J. (1987) *A Banjo Enclosure in Micheldever Wood, Hampshire.* Southampton, Hampton Field Club.
- Fenton-Thomas, C. (2011) Where Sky and Yorkshire and Water Meet: The Story of the Melton Landscape from Prehistory to the Present: Archaeological Excavations on the A63 Grade Separated Junction at Melton, East Yorkshire. York, On-Site Archaeology.
- Fenton-Thomas, C. and Bayliss, A. (2009) *A Place by the Sea: Excavations at Sewerby Cottage Farm, Bridlington* (No. 1). Oxford, Oxbow Books Limited.
- Fichtl, S. (2006) L'émergence des civitates en Gaule et dans le monde celtique. In Haselgrove, C. (ed.) *Celtes et Gaulois, l'Archéologie face à l'Histoire, 4: les mutations de la fin de l'âge du Fer*. Glux-en-Glenne, Bibracte, Centre archéologique européen, pp. 41-54.
- Finley, M.I. (2014) Classical slavery. London, Routledge.
- Fischer, F. (1995) The early Celts of west central Europe: the semantics of social structure. In Arnold, B., and Gibson, D.B. (ads): *Celtic Chiefdom, Celtic State*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 34-40.
- Fitzpatrick, A.P. (1991) Death in a material world: the Late Iron Age and Romano-British cemetery at King Harry Lane, St. Albans, Hertfordshire, *Britannia* 22, pp. 233-244.
- Fitzpatrick, A.P. (1997) Archaeological excavation on the route of the A27 Westhampnett bypass, West Sussex, 1992. Vol. 2., The late Iron Age, Romano-British, and Anglo-Saxon cemeteries. Salisbury, Trust for Wessex Archaeology.

- Foucault, M. (1978) *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1988) Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-1984. London, Routledge.
- Foulds, E.M. (2014) *Glass Beads in Iron Age Britain: A Social Approach*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Durham University.
- Fowler, C. (2008) Fractal bodies in the past and present. In Borić, D. and Robb, J. (eds): Past bodies: body-centered research in archaeology. Oxford, Oxbow Books, pp. 47-58.
- Foxhall, L. (1998) Introduction. In Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J. (eds): When Men Were Men: Masculinity, power and identity in classical antiquity. London, Routledge, pp. 1-9.
- Foxhall, L. (2013) *Studying Gender in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Frankenstein, S., and Rowlands, M.J. (1978) The internal structure and regional context of early Iron Age society in south-western Germany, *Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology* 15, pp. 73-110.
- Fraser, A. (1988) *The Warrior Queens: the legends ad the lives of the women who have led their nations in war.* New York, Anchor Books.
- Freeman, P. (2002) War, women, and Druids. Austin, University of Texas Press.
- French, V. (1991) Children in antiquity. In Hawes, J.M. and Hiner, N.R. (eds): Children in Historical and Comparative Perspectives: An International Handbook and Research Guide. Greenwood, New York, pp. 13-29.
- Frodsham, P., Hedley, I., and Young, R. (2007) Putting the neighbours in their place? Displays of position and possession in northern Cheviot "hillfort" design. In Haselgrove, C., and Moore, T. (eds): *The Later Iron Age in Britain and Beyond*. Oxford, Oxbow, pp. 250-265.
- Garrow, D., Gosden, C., and Hill, J.D. (eds) *Rethinking Celtic Art*. Oxford, Oxbow Books.
- Geller, P. (2005) Skeletal analysis and theoretical complications, *World Archaeology* 37:4, pp. 597-609.
- Geller, P. (2008) Conceiving Sex: Fomenting a Feminist Bioarchaeology, *Journal of Social Archaeology* 8, pp. 113-138.
- Geller, P. (2009) Identity and Difference: Complicating Gender in Archaeology, *Annual Review of Archaeology* 38, pp. 65-81.
- Gerschick, T. (2000) Toward a Theory of Disability and Gender, *Signs* 25:4, pp. 1263-1268.
- Gero, J.M. (1991a) Gendered Divisions of Labor in the Construction of Archaeological Knowledge. In Walde, D., and Willows, N.D. (eds): *The archaeology of gender: Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Conference of the Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary*. Calgary, University of Calgary Archaeological Association, pp. 96-102.
- Gero, J.M. (1991b) Genderlithics: Women's Roles in Stone Tool Production. In Gero, J.M. and Conkey, M.W. (eds): *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*. Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 163-193.

- Gero, J.M. and Conkey, M.W. (1991). *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Gero, J.M. and Root, D. (1990) Public Presentation and Private Concerns: Archaeology in the Pages of National Geographic. In Gathercole, P. and Lowenthal, D. (eds): *The Politics of the Past*. New York, Routledge, pp. 19-37.
- Gibson, C. (2004) The Iron Age and Roman Site of Viables Two (Jay's Close), Basingstroke, *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological* Society 59, pp.1-30.
- Gibson, C., and Knight, S. (2007) A Middle Iron Age Settlement at Weston Down Cottages, Weston Colley, near Winchester, Hampshire, *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society* 62, pp.1-34.
- Giddens, A. (1979) Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis. London, Macmillan.
- Gifford-Gonzalez, D. (1993) You Can Hide, But You Can't Run: Representations of Women's Work in Illustrations of Paleolithic Life, *Visual Anthropology Review* 9:1, pp.21-41.
- Gilchrist, R. (1999) Gender and archaeology. London, Routledge.
- Gilchrist, R. (2004). Archaeology and the Life Course: A Time and Age for Gender. In Meskell, L., and Preucel, R.W. (eds): A Companion to Social Archaeology. Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 142-160.
- Giles, M. (2007a) Making Metal and Forging Relations: Ironworking in the British Iron Age, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 26:4, pp. 395-413.
- Giles, M. (2007b) Good Fences Make Good Neighbours? Exploring the Ladder Enclosures of Late Iron Age East Yorkshire. In Haselgrove, C. and Moore, T. (eds): *The Later Iron Age in Britain and Beyond. Oxford*, Oxbow, pp. 235-49.
- Giles, M. (2008) Seeing red: the aesthetics of martial objects in the British and Irish Iron Age. In Garrow, D., Gosden, C., and Hill, J.D. (eds) *Rethinking Celtic Art*. Oxford, Oxbow Books, pp. 59-77.
- Giles, M. (2012) A Forged Glamour: Landscape, Identity and Material Culture in the Iron Age. Oxford, Windgather Press.
- Giles, M. (2015) Performing Pain, Performing Beauty: Dealing With Difficult Death in the Iron Age, *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 25:3, pp. 539-550.
- Giles, M., and Joy, J. (2007) Mirrors in the British Iron Age. In Anderson, M. (ed.): *The* book of the mirror: an interdisciplinary collection exploring the cultural story of the mirror. Newcastle, Cambridge Scholars Press, pp. 16-31.
- Gilman, S. (1985) *Difference and Pathology: Stereotypes of Sexuality, race, and Madness.* Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Glencross, B. (2011) Skeletal Injury Across the Life Course: Towards Understanding Social Agency. In Argwal, S.C., and Glencross, B.A. (eds): Social Bioarchaeology. Oxford, Wiley Blackwell, pp. 390-409.
- Gosden, C. (1985) Gifts and kin in early Iron Age Europe, Man 20:3, pp. 475-493.
- Gosden, C. (2005) What Do Objects Want? Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory, 12:3, pp. 93-211.
- Gosden, C. and Marshall (1999) The Cultural Biography of Objects, *World Archaeology* 31:2, pp. 169-78.

- Gowland, R. (2007) Age, ageism and osteological bias: the evidence from late Roman Britain, *Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series* 65: pp. 153-169
- Grab, T. (1991) Women's concerns are men's concerns: gender roles in German museums, *Museum International* 171:3, pp. 136-139.
- Gray, H. (1952) Meare Lake Excavations, Somerset Archaeology and Natural History Society Proceedings 97, pp. 187-188.
- Green, J.D.M. (2007) Anklets and the Social Construction of Gender and Age in the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age Southern Levant. In Hamilton, S., Whitehouse, R.D., and Wright, K.I. (eds): *Archaeology and Women: Ancient and Modern Issues*. Walnut Creek, Left Coast Press, pp. 283-311.
- Green, M. (1995) The Celtic World. London, Routledge.
- Guerrier, J. (1982) L'imagerie des Gaulois à Sens. In Viallaneix, P. and J. Ehrard (eds) : Nos ancêtres les Gaulois. Clermont-Ferrand, Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de l'Université de Clermont-Ferrand II, pp. 283-294.
- Guido, M. (1978) An Iron Age Burial from Battlesbury. *Wiltshire Archaeology* and Natural History Journal 72/73, pp. 177-78.
- Gustafson, G., and Koch, G. (1974) Age estimation up to 16 years of age based on dental development, *Odontologisk Revy* 25, pp. 297-306.
- Hallett, J. (1984) Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society: Women and the Elite Family. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Halperin, D. (1990) One Hundred Years of Sexuality and Other Essays on Greek Love. London, Routledge.
- Hamlin, C. (2007) The Material Expression of Social Change: The Mortuary Correlates of Gender and Age in Late Pre-Roman Iron Age and Roman Dorset. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.
- Hancock, P., Hughes, B., Jagger, E., Patterson, K., Russell, R., and Tulle-Winton, E. (2000) *The body, culture and society: An Introduction*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Harding, D.W. (2004) *The Iron Age in Northern Britain: Celts and Romans, Natives and Invaders.* London, Routledge.
- Harding, D.W., Blake, I.M., and Reynolds, P.J. (1993) *An Iron Age Settlement in Dorset: Excavation and Reconstruction*. Edinburgh, University of Edinburgh Department of Archaeology.
- Harding, P. (2010) An Iron Age Farmstead at Somborne Park Farm, Little Somborne, Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society 65, pp.7-22.
- Härke, H. (1990) "Warrior Graves"? The Background of the Anglo-Saxon Weapon Burial Rite, *Past & Present* 126, pp. 22-43.
- Harrington, S. (2007) Stirring Women, Weapons, and Weaving: Aspects of Gender Identity and Symbols of power in Early Anglo-Saxon England. In Hamilton, S., Whitehouse, R.D., and Wright, K.I. (eds): Archaeology and Women: Ancient and Modern Issues. Walnut Creek, Left Coast Press, pp. 335-352.
- Haselgrove, C. (1982) Wealth, prestige and power: the dynamics of late Iron Age centralization in south eastern England. In Renfrew, C., and Shennan, S. (eds): *Ranking, Resource and Exchange*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 79-88.

- Haselgrove, C. (1995) Late Iron Age society in Britain and north-east Europe. In Arnold, B., and Gibson, D.B. (ads): *Celtic Chiefdom, Celtic State*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 81-87.
- Haselgrove, C. and Moore, T. (2007) New narratives of the Later Iron Age. In Haselgrove, C. and Moore, T. (eds): *The Later Iron Age in Britain and Beyond*. *Oxford*, Oxbow, pp. 1-15.
- Haselgrove, C. and Moore, T. (2007) *The Later Iron Age in Britain and Beyond*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Haselgrove, C. and Pope, R. (2007) Characterising the Earlier Iron Age. In Haselgrove, C. and Pope, R. (eds): *The Earlier Iron Age in Britain and the Near Continent*. Oxford, Oxbow, pp. 1-23.
- Haselgrove, C. and Pope, R. (2007) *The Earlier Iron Age in Britain and the Near Continent*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Haselgrove, C., Armit, I., Champion, C., Gwilt, A., Hill, J.D., Hunter, F., and Woodward, A. (2001) Understanding the British Iron Age: An Agenda for Action. Salisbury, Trust for Wessex Archaeology.
- Hastorf, C. A. (1991) Gender, space, and food in prehistory. In Gero, J. and Conkey, M. (eds): *Engendering archaeology: women and prehistory*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, pp. 132-159.
- Hawkes, C.F.C. (1930) The earliest Iron Age culture of Britain. In Hawkes, C.F.C., Myresm J.N.L., and Stevens, C.G. (eds): St. Catherine's Hill, Winchester, Proc. Hants Field Club 11, pp. 1-286.
- Hawkes, C.F.C. (1931) Hill forts, Antiquity 5, pp. 60-111.
- Hawkes, C.F.C. (1959) The ABC of the British Iron Age, Antiquity 33, pp. 170-182.
- Hawkes, C.F.C., and Dunning, G.C. (1931) The Belgae of Gaul and Britain, *Archaeology Journal* 81, pp. 150-335.
- Hawkes, C.F.C., and Hawkes, J. (1948) *Prehistoric Britain*. London, Chatto and Windus.
- Hawkes, J.H. (1945). Early Britain. Glasgow, W. Collins.
- Hawkes, S.C. (1958) The Early Iron Age enclosures on Longbridge Deverill Cow Down, Wiltshire. In Frere, S.S. (ed.): *Problems of the Iron Age in Southern Britain*. London, University of London Institute for Archaeology, pp. 18-20.
- Hays-Gilpin, K. and Whitley, D. (1998) Reader in gender archaeology. London, Routledge.
- Heaton, M. and Harding, P. (1995) Excavation and Fieldwork in Wiltshire 1993, *The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 88, pp. 153-154.
- Hendon, J.A. (1997) Women's Work, Women's Space, and Women's Status Among the Classic-Period Maya Elite of the Copan Valley, Honduras. In Claassen, C., and Joyce, R.A. (eds): *Women in Prehistory: North America and Mesoamerica*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 33-46.
- Hermann, L. (2000) Nineteenth Century British Painting. London, DLM.
- Hewer, T.F. (1926) Guy's Rift, Slaughterford, Wilts: An Early Iron Age Habitation, *The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 43:145: pp. 483-489.
- Hill, J.D. (1989) Rethinking the Iron Age, Scottish Archaeological Review 6, pp. 12-24.
- Hill, J.D. (1995) *Ritual and rubbish in the Iron Age of Wessex: a study on the formation of a specific archaeological record.* Oxford, BAR 242.

- Hill, J.D. (1997) The end of one kind of body and the beginning of another kind of body? Toilet instruments and Romanization. In Gwilt, A., and Haselgrove, C. (eds): *Reconstructing Iron Age Societies*. Oxford, Oxbow Monograph 71, pp. 96-107.
- Hill, J.D. (2001) A New Cart/Chariot Burial from Wetwang, East Yorkshire, *PAST* 38, pp.2-3.
- Hill, J.D. (2002) Not just about the potter's wheel. Making, using and depositing Middle and Late Iron Age pottery in south-east England. In Woodward, A. and Hill, J.d. (eds): *Prehistoric Britain, the Ceramic Basis*. Oxford, Oxbow, pp. 143-160;
- Hill, J.D. (2011) How Did British Middle and Late Pre-Roman Iron Age Societies Work (if they did)? In Moore, T., and Armada, X. (ads): *Atlantic Europe in the First Millennium BC: Crossing the Divide*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 242-263.
- Hillyer, B. (1993) Feminism and disability. Normal, University of Oklahoma Press.
- Hingley, R. (1984) Towards a social analysis in archaeology: Celtic society in the Iron Age of the upper Thames valley. In Cunliffe, B., and Miles, D. (eds): Aspects of the Iron Age in Central Southern Britain. Oxford, OUCA Monograph 2, pp. 72-88.
- Hingley, R. (1990) Domestic Organisation and Gender Relations in Iron Age and Romano-British Households. In Samson, R. (ed.) *The Social Archaeology of Houses*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, pp. 125-148.
- Hingley, R. (1992) Society in Scotland from 700 BC to AD 200, Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland 122, pp. 7-53.
- Hingley, R. ed. (2001) Images of Rome: Perceptions of Ancient Rome in Europe and the United States in the modern age. Portsmouth, Journal of Roman Archaeology.
- Hingley, R., and Unwin, C. (2005) *Boudica: Iron Age Warrior Queen*. London, Hambledon and London.
- Hitchcock, L.A. (2000) Engendering ambiguity in Minoan Crete: it's a drag to be a king. In Donald, M. and Hurcombe, L. (eds): *Representations of Gender from Prehistory to the Present*. London, Macmillan, pp. 69-86
- Hodson, F.R. (1964) Cultural grouping within the British pre-Roman Iron Age, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society 30*, pp. 99-110.
- Hollimon, S.E. (1997) The Third Gender in Native California: Two-Spirit Undetakers Among the Chumash and their Neighbors. In Claassen, C., and Joyce, R.A. (eds): *Women in Prehistory: North America and Mesoamerica*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 173-188.
- Hollimon, S.E. (2000) Sex, Health, and Gender Roles Among the Arikara of the Northern Plains. In Rautman, A. (ed.): *Reading the Body: Representations and Remains in the Archaeological Record*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 25-37.
- Hollimon, S.E. (2001) Warfare and Gender in the Northern Plains: Osteological Evidence of Trauma Reconsidered. In Arnold, B., and Wicker, N.L. (eds): *Gender and the archaeology of death*. Oxford, AltaMira Press, pp. 179-193.

- Hollimon, S.E. (2011) Sex and Gender in Bioarchaeological Research. In Argwal, S.C., and Glencross, B.A. (eds): *Social Bioarchaeology*. Oxford, Wiley Blackwell, pp. 149-182.
- Holmes, B. (2009) Gender: Antiquity and Its Legacy. London, I.B. Tauris.
- Hooks, B. (1992) Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics. London, Routledge.
- Hooks, B. (2000) Feminist theory: From margin to center. London, Routledge.
- Hooley, R.W. (1929) Excavation of an Early Iron Age Village on Worthy Down, Winchester, *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological* Society 10, pp.178-195.
- Hulton, P. (1984) *America 1585: The Complete Drawings of John White*. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press.
- Humphrey, J. (2003) *Re-searching the Iron Age: Selected papers from the proceedings* of the Iron Age Research Student Seminars, 1999 and 2000. Leicester, Leicester Archaeology Monograph 11.
- Hutcheson, N. (2007) An archaeological investigation of later Iron Age Norfolk: analysing hoarding patterns across the landscape. In Haselgrove, C., and Moore, T. (eds): *The Later Iron Age in Britain and Beyond*. Oxford, Oxbow, pp. 358-370.
- Hutton, R. (2009) *Blood and Mistletoe: The History of the Druids in Britain*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Jackson, K.H. (1964) *The Oldest Irish Tradition: A Window on the Iron Age.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- James, S. (1993) Exploring the world of the Celts. London, Thames and Hudson.
- James, S. (1997) Drawing inferences: visual reconstructions in theory and practice. In Molyneaux, B. (ed.): *The cultural life of images: visual representations in archaeology*. London, Routledge, pp. 22-47.
- James, S. (1998) Reconstructions in the Museum Gallery. In Merriman, N. (ed.): *Making Early History in Museums*. London, Cassell, pp. 117-135.
- James, S. (2007). A bloodless past: the pacification of Early Iron Age Britain. In Haselgrove, C. and Pope, R. (eds): *The Earlier Iron Age in Britain and the Near Continent*. Oxford, Oxbow, pp. 160-73.
- Jay, M. (2008) Iron Age diet at Glastonbury Lake Village: the isotopic evidence for negligible aquatic resource consumption, Oxford Journal of Archaeology 27:2, pp. 201-216.
- Jay, M., Fuller, B. T., Richards, M. P., Knüsel, C. J., and King, S. S. (2008) Iron age breastfeeding practices in Britain: isotopic evidence from Wetwang Slack, East Yorkshire, *American journal of physical anthropology 136*:3, pp. 327-337.
- Jay, M. and Richards, M.P. (2006) Diet in the Iron Age cemetery population at Wetwang Slack, East Yorkshire, UK: carbon and nitrogen stable isotope evidence, *Journal of Archaeological Science* 33:5, pp. 653-662.
- Jay, M. and Richards, M.P. (2007) British Iron Age diet: stable isotopes and other evidence, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 73, pp. 169-190.
- Jobling, P. (2011) Between words and images: simulation, deconstruction and postmodern photography. In Adamson, G. and Pavitt, J. (eds): *Postmodernism: style and subversion*. London, V&A Publishing, pp. 176-181.

- Johns, C. (2002) An Iron Age sword and mirror cist burial from Bryher, Isles of Scilly, *Cornish Archaeology* 41-42, pp. 1-79.
- Johns, C. (2012) Isles of Scilly Historic Environment Research Framework: Resource Assessment and Research Agenda. London, English Heritage.
- Jones, S. (1991) Presenting the past: towards a feminist critique of museum practice, *Field Archaeologist 14*, pp. 247-249.
- Jordan, A., Ghisleni, L., and Fioccoprile, E. (2014) Binary Bind: Deconstructing Sex and Gender Dichotomies in Archaeological Practice. In: Binary Bind: Deconstructing Sex and Gender Dichotomies in Archaeological Practice, 20th Annual Meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists. Istanbul, Turkey, 10-14 September 2014.
- Joy, J. (2008) Reflections on Celtic Art: a re-examination of mirror decoration. In Garrow, D., Gosden, C., and Hill, J.D. (eds) *Rethinking Celtic Art*. Oxford, Oxbow Books, pp. 78-99.
- Joy, J. (2009) Reinvigorating object biography: reproducing the drama of object lives *World Archaeology*, 41:4, pp. 540-556.
- Joy, J. (2011) Exploring Status and Identity in Later Iron Age Britain: Reinterpreting Mirror Burials. In Moore, T., and Armada, X. (ads): Atlantic Europe in the First Millennium BC: Crossing the Divide. Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 468-487.
- Joyce, R.A. (2004) Embodied Subjectivity: Gender, Femininity, Masculinity, Sexuality. In Meskell, L., and Preucel, R.W. (eds): *A Companion to Social Archaeology*. Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 82-95.
- Joyce, R.A. (2006) Feminist Theories of Embodiment and Anthropological Imagination: Making Bodies Matter. In Geller, P. and Stocking, M. (eds): *Feminist Anthropology: Past, Present and Future*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 43-54.
- Joyce, R.A. (2007) Girling the girl and boying the boy: the production of adulthood in ancient Mesoamerica. In Insoll, T. (ed.): *The Archaeology of Identities: A Reader*. London, Routledge, pp. 77-86).
- Joyce, R.A. (2008) *Ancient Bodies, Ancient Lives: Sex, Gender, and Archaeology*. London, Thames and Hudson.
- Judd, M.A. and Redfern, R. (2012) Trauma. In Grauer, A.L. (ed.) *A Companion to Paleopathology*, Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 359-379.
- Jurmain, R. 1999. Stories from the Skeleton. Behavioral Reconstruction in Human Osteology. Canada: Gordon and Breach Publishers.
- Jurmain, R., Cardoso, F.A., Henderson, C., and Villotte, S. (2012) Bioarchaeology's Holy Grail: The Reconstruction of Activity. In Grauer, A.L. (ed.) A Companion to Paleopathology, Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 531-552.
- Jurmain, R.D., and Kilgore, L.(1995) "Skeletal Evidence of Osteoarthritis: A Palaeopathological Perspective," *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 54: 443-450.
- Juvenal (1789) *A new and literal translation of Juvenal and Persius, vol. 1.* London, printed for the editor, at Mr. Lewis's.
- Karl, R. (2005) Master and apprentice, knight and squire: education in the "Celtic" Iron Age, Oxford Journal of Archaeology 24:3, pp. 255-271.

- Karl, R. (2008) Random Coincidences Or: the return of the *Celtic* to Iron Age Britain, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 74, pp. 69-78.
- Katzenberg, M.A. (2012) The Ecological Approach: Understanding Past Diet and the Relationship Between Diet and Disease. In Grauer, A.L. (ed.) *A Companion to Paleopathology*, Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 97-113.
- Kimmig, W. (1969) Zum Problem späthallstättischer Adelssitze. In Otto, K.H., and Herrmann, J. (des): Siedlung, Burg und Stadt: Studien zu ihren Anfängen. Berlin, Akademie Verlag, pp. 95-113.
- King, A. (2001) Vercingetorix, Asterix and the Gauls: Gallic symbols in French politics and culture. In Hingley, R. (ed.): *Images of Rome: Perceptions of ancient Rome in Europe and the United States in the modern age*. Portsmouth, Journal of Roman Archaeology, pp. 113-125.
- King, R., Barber, A. and Timby, J. (1996.) Excavations at West Lane, Kemble: an Iron-Age, Roman and Saxon burial site and a medieval building, *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* 114, pp. 15-24.
- King, S. (2009) Warfare and violence in the Iron Age of east Yorkshire, *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* S48, pp.165.
- Kitzinger, C. and Wilkinson, S. (1997) Validating women's experience? Dilemmas in feminist research, *Feminism & Psychology* 7:4, pp. 566-574.
- Knapp, A. (1998) Boys will be Boys: Masculinist Approaches to a Gendered Archaeology. In Hays-Gilpin, K. and Whitley, D. (eds): *Reader in Gender Archaeology*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Knudson, K.J., and Stojanowski, C.M. (2008) New Directions in Bioarchaeology: Recent Contributions to the Study of Human Social Identities, *Journal of Archaeological Research* 16, pp. 397-432.
- Knüsel, C. (2002) More Circe than Cassandra: The Princess of Vix in Ritualized Social Context, *European Journal of Archaeology* 5:**3**, pp/ 275-308.
- Koch, J.K. (2013) Gendered Contacts between Early Iron Age Landscapes in Central Europe: The Case of the Magdalenenberg, at the Edge of the Black Forest, Germany. In: Engendering Landscapes and Landscaping Gender, *Sixth IEMA Visiting Scholars Conference*. Buffalo, New York, 13-14 April 2013.
- Koch, J.T. and Carey, J. (2003) *The Celtic Heroic Age: Literary Sources for Ancient Celtic Europe and Early Ireland and Wales*. Aberystwyth, Celtic Studies Publications.
- Koehler, L. (1997) Earth Mothers, Warriors, Horticulturists, Artists, and Chiefs:
  Women Among the Mississippian and Mississippian-Oneota Peoples, Ad 1211
  to 1750. In Claassen, C., and Joyce, R.A. (eds): *Women in Prehistory: North America and Mesoamerica*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 211-226.
- Konstam, A. (2006) The Forts of Celtic Britain. Oxford, Osprey Publishing
- Kristiansen, K. (1998) Europe Before History. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Kuper, A. (1988) *The invention of primitive society: transformations of an illusion*. London, Routledge.
- Lambrick, G. H. and Robinson, MA (2008) The Thames Through Time The First Foundations of Modern Society in the Thames Valley 1500BC-AD50. Oxford, Oxford Archaeology.

- Laqueur, T. (1990) *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. London, Harvard University Press.
- Lee, M.M. (2000) Deciphering gender in Minoan dress. In Rautman, A. (ed.): *Reading the Body: Representations and Remains in the Archaeological Record*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 111-123.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1963) Structural Anthropology. Middlesex, Penguin Books.
- Lightfoot, E., O'Connell, T.C., Stevens, R.E., Hamilton, J., Hey, G., and Hedges, R.E.M. (2009) An Investigation Into Diet at the Site of Yarnton, Oxfordshire, Using Stable Carbon and Nitrogen Isotopes, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 28:3, pp. 301-322.
- Linduff, K.M. and Rubinson, K.S. (2008) Are All Warriors Male? Gender Roles on the Ancient Eurasian Steppe. New York, AltaMira Press.
- Livy (1853) The History of Rome. London, H.G. Bohn.
- Llewlyn-Davies, M. (1981) Women, warriors, and patriarchs. In Ortner, S. and Whitehead, H. (eds): *Sexual meanings: the cultural construction of gender and sexuality*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 330-358.
- Lloyd, S. (1976) Illustrating Monuments: Drawn Reconstructions of Architecture. In Megaw, J.V.S. (ed.): *To illustrate the monuments: Essays on archaeology presented to Stuart Piggott*. London, Thames and Hudson.
- Lovejoy, C.O. (1985) Dental wear in the Libben population: Its functional pattern and role in the determination of adult skeletal age at death, *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 68, pp. 47-56.
- Lovejoy, C.O., Meindl, R.S., Pryzbeck, T.R., and Mensforth, R.P. (1985) Chronological metamorphosis of the auricular surface of the ilium: A new method for the determination of adult skeletal age at death, *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 68, pp. 15-28.
- Lovell, J. (1999) Further Investigations of an Iron Age and Romano-British Farmstead on Cockey Down, near Salisbury, *The Wiltshire Archaeology and Natural History Society* 92, pp. 33-38.
- Lucy, S. (2005) The archaeology of age. In Díaz-Andreu, M., Lucy, S., Babic, S., and Edwards, D.N. (eds): *The Archaeology of Identity: Approaches to Gender, Age, Status, Ethnicity, and Religion*. London, Routledge, pp. 13-42.
- Lukacs, J.R. (1996) Sex Differences in Dental Caries Rates with the Origin of Agriculture in South Asia, *Current Anthropology* 37, pp. 147-153.
- Mac Cana, P. (1997) Mythology and the Oral Tradition: Ireland. In Green, M. (ed.): *The Celtic World*. London, Routledge, pp. 779-784.
- Macdonald, S. (1996) Introduction. In Macdonald, S. and Fyfe, G. (eds): *Theorizing Museums: Representing identity and diversity in a changing world*. Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 1-18.
- MacDougall, D. (1997) The Visual in Anthropology. In Banks, M. and Morphy, H. (eds): *Rethinking Visual Anthropology*. New Haven, Yale University Press, pp. 276-293.
- Marcucci, A., and C.J. Kerns. (2011) A Preliminary Report on the 2010 Excavations at Read's Cavern, *Proceedings of the University of Bristol Speleological Society* 25:2, pp. 165–186.

- Marcus, M.I. (1993) Incorporating the body: Adornment, gender, and social identity in ancient Iran, *Cambridge archaeological journal* 3:2, pp. 157-178.
- Marshall, Y. (2013) Personhood in Prehistory: A Feminist Archaeology in Ten Persons. In Bolger, D. (ed.): *A companion to Gender Prehistory*. Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 204-225.
- Martin, D.L., Harrod, R.P. and Fields, M. (2010) Beaten down and worked to the bome: Boarchaeological investigations of women and violence in the ancient Southwest, *Landscapes of Violence* 1:1, pp. 1-19.
- Matias, J. (2011) Interpreting Age Identity from Burial Contexts in Early to Middle Iron Age Central Southern Britain. Unpublished MA thesis. Durham University.
- Mattingly, H. (1948) *Tacitus on Britain and Germany*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, Penguin.
- Maurer, B. (1991) Feminist Challenges to Archaeology: Avoiding an Epistemology of the "Other." In Walde, D., and Willows, N.D. (eds): *The archaeology of gender: Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Conference of the Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary*. Calgary, University of Calgary Archaeological Association, pp. 414-419.
- Mays, S. (1998) The archaeology of human bones. London, Routledge.
- Megaw, R. and Megaw, J.V.S. (1989) *Celtic art: from its beginnings to the Book of Kells*. London, Thames and Hudson.
- McCall, L. (2005) The complexity of intersectionality, *Signs: Journal of women in culture and society* 30:3, pp. 1771-1800.
- McNay, L. (1992) Foucault and Feminism: Power, Gender and the Self. Boston, Northeastern University Press.
- McOmish, D., Field, D., and Brown, G. (2010) The Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age Midden Site at East Chisenbury, Wiltshire. *The Wiltshire Archaeology and Natural History Society* 103, pp. 35-101.
- Meade, T.A., and Wiesner-Hanks, M.E. (2008) *A companion to gender history*. New York, John Wiley and Sons.
- Mela, P. (1998) *Pomponius Mela's description of the world*, trans. F.E. Romer, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1980) The Phenomenology of Perception. London, Routledge.
- Merriman, N. (1998) Introduction. In Merriman, N. (ed.): *Making Early History in Museums*. London, Cassell, pp. 1-11.
- Meskell, L. (1996) The somatization of archeology: institutions, discourses, corporeality, *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 29:1, pp. 1-16.
- Meskell, L. (1999) Archaeologies of Social Life: Age, Sex, Class et cetera in Ancient Egypt. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Meskell, L. (2000) Writing the Body in Archaeology. In Rautman, A. (ed.): *Reading the Body: Representations and Remains in the Archaeological Record*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 13-21.
- Meskell, L. (2007) Archaeologies of identity. In Insoll, T. (ed.): *The Archaeology of Identities: A Reader*. London, Routledge, pp. 23-43.
- Meyers, M. (1999) *Mediated Women: Representations in Popular Culture*. Cresskill, Hampton Press.

- Milella, M. Cardoso, F.A., Assis, S., Lopreno, G.P., and Speith, N. (2015) Exploring the relationship between entheseal changes and physical activity: A multivariate study, *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 156:2, pp. 215-223.
- Miller, D. and Tilley, C. (1984) Ideology, Power and Prehistory: An Introduction. In Miller, D. and Tilley, C. (eds): *Ideology, Power and Prehistory*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-16.
- Millett, M., and Russell, E. (1982) An Iron Age burial from Viables Farm, Basingstroke, *The Archaeological Journal* 139, pp. 69-90.
- Molyneaux, B. (1997) Introduction: the cultural life of images. In Molyneaux, B. (ed.): *The cultural life of images: visual representations in archaeology. London, Routledge, pp. 1-8.*
- Montgomery, J. (2010) Passports from the past: Investigating human dispersals using strontium isotope analysis of tooth enamel, *Annals of Human Biology* 37:3, pp. 325-346.
- Montón-Subías, S., and Meyer, W. (2014) Engendered Archaeologies. In Smith, C. (ed.): *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*. New York, Springer.
- Montón-Subías, S. and Sánchez-Romero, M. (2008) *Engendering Social Dynamics: The Archaeology of Maintenance Activities*. Oxford, BAR International Series 1862.
- Moore, H.L. (1994) A Passion for Difference. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Moore, H.L. (2006) The Future of Gender or the End of a Brilliant Career? In Geller, P. and Stocking, M. (eds): *Feminist Anthropology: Past, Present and Future*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 23-42.
- Moore, J., and Scott, E. (1997) *Invisible People and Processes: Writing Gender and Childhood into European Archaeology*. London, Leicester University Press.
- Moore, T. (2011) Detribulizing the later prehistoric past: concepts of tribes in Iron Age and Roman Studies, *Journal of Social Archaeology* 11:3, pp.334-360.
- Moore, T., and Armada, X. (2011) Crossing the Divide: Opening a Dialogue on Approaches to Western European First Millennium BC Studies. In Moore, T., and Armada, X. (ads): Atlantic Europe in the First Millennium BC: Crossing the Divide. Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 3-79.
- Morris, E.L. (1988) Iron age occupation at Dibble's farm, *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History Society Proceedings* 132, pp. 83-88.
- Moser, S. (1992) The Visual Language of Archaeology: A Case Study of Neanderthals, *Antiquity* 66, pp. 831-844.
- Moser, S. (1993) Gender Stereotyping in Pictorial Reconstructions of Human Origins.
   In du Cros, H. and Smith, L. (eds): Women in Archaeology: A Feminist Critique.
   Canberra, Department of Prehistory, Research School of Pacific Studies, pp. 75-92.
- Moser, S. (1998a) *Ancestral images: the Iconography of Human Origins*. Stroud, Sutton Publishing.
- Moser, S. (1998b) The Dilemma of Didactic Displays: Habitat Dioramas, Life-Groups and Reconstructions of the Past. In Merriman, N. (ed.): *Making Early History in Museums*. London, Cassell, pp. 65-116.
- Moser, S. (2001) Archaeological Representation: The Visual Conventions for Constructing Knowledge about the Past. In Hodder, I. (ed.): *Archaeological Theory Today*. Cambridge, Polity, pp. 262-283.

- Moser, S. (2003) Representing Human Origins: Constructing Knowledge in Museums and Dismantling the Display Canon, *Public Archaeology* 3, pp. 1-17.
- Moser, S., and Gamble, C. (1997) Revolutionary images: the iconic vocabulary for representing human antiquity. In Molyneaux, B. (ed.): *The cultural life of images: visual representations in archaeology*. London, Routledge, pp. 184-211.
- Moser, S., and Smiles, S. (2005) Introduction: the Image in Question. In Smiles, S., and Moser, S. (eds): *Envisioning the Past: Archaeology and Image*. Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 1-12.
- Muir, J., and Roberts, M. R. (1999) *Excavations at Wyndyke Furlong, Abingdon,* Oxfordshire, 1994. Eynsham, Thames Valley Landscapes Monograph No. 12. Oxford, Oxford Archaeological Unit.
- Musty, J.W.H. (1965) Rescue and Research Work in the Salisbury Area, *The Wiltshire* Archaeological and Natural History Magazine 58, pp. 35.
- Nan Kivell, R. (1925) Excavations on the Romano-British Site at Cold Kitchen Hill, Brixton Deverill, *The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 27, pp. 279.
- Nash, D. (1978) Territory and state formation in central Gaul. In Green, D., Haselgrove, C., and Spriggs, M. (eds): Social Organisation and Settlement: Contributions from Anthropology, Archaeology and Geography, Part ii. BAR International Series 47:ii, pp. 455-476.
- Nash, D.(1984) The basis of contact between Britain and Gaul in the late pre-Roman Iron Age. In Macready, S., and Thompson, F. (eds): Cross-Channel Trade between Gaul and Britain in the pre-Roman Iron Age. London, Thames and Hudson, pp. 92-107.
- Neal, D.S. (1980) Bronze Age, Iron Age, and Roman Settlement Sites at Little Somborne and Ashley, Hampshire, *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society* 36, pp.91-143.
- Nelson, S.M. (1990) Diversity of the Upper Paleolithic "Venus" Figurines and Archaeological Reality. In Nelson, S.M. and Kehoe, A.B. (eds): *Powers of Observation: Alternative Views in Archaeology*. Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association 2, pp. 11-22.
- Nelson, S.M. (1993) Diversity of the Upper Paleolithic "Venus" Figurines and Archaeological Mythology. In Brettell, C.B. and Sargent, C.F. (eds): *Gender in Cross-Cultural Persepctive*. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, pp. 51-58.
- Nelson, S.M. (1997) *Gender in Archaeology: Analyzing Power and Prestige*. London, AltaMira Press.
- Nelson, S.M. (2008) Handbook of gender in archaeology. Lanham, AltaMira Press.
- Newall, R.S. (1926) Pits at Winterbourne Stoke, *The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 43, pp. 344-345.
- Newall, R.S. (1961) Pits at Winterbourne Stoke, *The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 58, pp. 35.
- Nordbladh, J., and Yates, T. (1990). This perfect body, this virgin text: between sex and gender I archaeology. In Bapty, I., and Yates, T. (eds): *Archaeology after Structuralism*, pp. 222-237.

- Novak, S.A. (2006) Beneath the Façade: A Skeletal Model of Domestic Violence. In Gowland, R. and Knüsel, C. (eds): *Social Archaeology of Human Remains*. Oxford, Oxbow, pp. 238-252.
- Olivier, L. (1996) "Peuples," "Cultures," et Manifestations Archéologiques de l'Âge du Fer. Gustav Kossinna, Gordon Childe et Nous. In Plouin, S., and Jud, P. (eds): Habitats, Mobiliers et Groupes Régionaux à lÂge du Fer, Actes du XXe colloque de l'A.F.E.A.F., Colmar-Mittelwihr, 16-19 mai 1996, pp. 231-239.
- Ortner, S. (1981) Gender and sexuality in hierarchical societies: the case of Polynesia and some comparative implications. In Ortner, S. and Whitehead, H. (eds): *Sexual meanings: the cultural construction of gender and sexuality*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 359-409.
- Ortner, S. and Whitehead, H. (1981) Introduction: Accounting for sexual meanings. In Ortner, S. and Whitehead, H. (eds): *Sexual meanings: the cultural construction of gender and sexuality*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-28.
- Oswald, A., (1997) A Doorway on the Past: Practical and Mystic Concerns in the Orientation of Roundhouse Doorways. In Gwilt, A. and Haselgrove, C. (eds)L Reconstructing Iron Age Societies: New Approaches to the British Iron Age. Oxford: Oxbow Monograph 71, pp. 87-95.
- Owen, L.R. (2005) *Distorting the Past: Gender and the Division of Labor in the European Upper Paleolithic.* Tübingen, Tübingen Publications in Prehistory.
- Pallottino, M. (1975) The Etruscans. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.
- Pankova, S. (2013) Tattoos from mummies of the Pazyryk culture. In Della Casa, P. and Witt, C. (eds): Tattoos and body modifications in antiquity – proceedings of the sessions at the EAA annual meetings in The Hague and Oslo, 2010/11. Zurich, Chronos, pp. 82-93.
- Pare, C. (1991) Furstensitze, Celts and the Mediterranean World: Developments in the West Hallstatt Culture in the 6th and 5th Centuries BC, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 57:2, pp. 183-202.
- Parker Pearson, M. (1996) Food, fertility and front doors in the first millennium BS. In Champion, T. and Collis, J. (eds): *The Iron Age in Britain and Ireland: recent trends.* Sheffield, J.R. Collis Publications, pp. 117-132.
- Parker Pearson, M. (1999) Food, sex and death, *Cambridge Archaeology Journal* 9, pp. 43-69.
- Parker Pearson, M. (2008) The Powerful Dead: Archaeological Relationships between the Living and the Dead, *Cambridge Archaeology Journal* 3:2, pp. 203-229.
- Parker Pearson, M. (2009) *The Archaeology of Death and Burial*. Stroud, The History Press.
- Parker Pearson, M., and Richards, C. (1994) *Architecture and Order: Approaches to Social Space*. London, Routledge.
- Parker Pearson, M., and Richards, C. (1994) Architecture and Order: Spatial Representations and Archaeology. In Parker Pearson, M., and Richards, C. (eds): Architecture and Order: Approaches to Social Space. London, Routledge, pp. 38-72.
- Parrington, M. (1978) The excavation of an Iron Age settlement, Bronze Age ringditches and Roman features at Ashville Trading Estate, Abingdon (Oxfordshire) 1974-76. London, The Council for British Archaeology.

- Pearce, S. (1998) Presenting Archaeology. In Merriman, N. (ed.): *Making Early History in Museums*. London, Cassell, pp. 12-27.
- Peck, J.J. (2013) Status, health, and lifestyle in Middle Iron Age Britain: A bioarcheological study of elites and non-elites from East Yorkshire, Northern England, *International Journal of Paleopathology* 3:2, pp. 83-94.
- Perry, M.A. (2005) Redefining childhood through bioarchaeology: Toward an archaeological and biological understanding of children in antiquity, *Archeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association* 15:1, p. 89-111.
- Perry, S. (2009) Fractured Media: Challenging the Dimensions of Archaeology's Typical Visual Modes of Engagement, *Archaeologies* 5:3, pp. 389-415.
- Perry, S. and Johnson, M. (2014) Reconstruction Art and Disciplinary Practice: Alan Sorrell and the Negotiation of the Archaeological Record, *The Antiquaries Journal* 94, pp. 323-352.
- Perry, S. and Marion, J. (2010) State of the Ethics in Visual Anthropology, *Visual Anthropology Review* 26:2, pp. 96-104.
- Peterson, J.D. (2000) Labor Patterns in the Southern Levant in the Early Bronze Age. In Rautman, A. (ed.): *Reading the Body: Representations and Remains in the Archaeological Record*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 38-54.
- Phillips, J. (2005) "To Make the Dry Bones Live": Amédée Forestier's Glastonbury Lake Village. In Smiles, S., and Moser, S. (eds): *Envisioning the Past: Archaeology and Image*. Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 72-91.
- Piggott, S. (1965) Archaeological Draughtsmanship: Principles and Practice Part 1: Principles and Retrospect, *Antiquity* 39(3), pp. 165-176.
- Piggott, S. (1968) The Druids. London, Thames and Hudson.
- Piggott, S. (1978) *Antiquity depicted: aspects of archaeological illustration*. London, Thames and Hudson.
- Piggott, S. (1989) Ancient Britons and the antiquarian imagination: ideas from the Renaissance to the Regency. London, Thames and Hudson.
- Pitt-Rivers, A. (1887) *Excavations in Cranborne Chase, Near Rushmore, on the Borders of Dorset and Wilts.* Privately published.
- Plato and Jowett, B. (n.d.) Laws. Champaign, Project Gutenberg.

Pollitt, K. (1991) Hers: The Smurfette Principle. *The New York Times* [online]. 7 April. Available at < <u>http://www.nytimes.com/1991/04/07/magazine/hers-the-</u> <u>smurfette-principle.html</u>> [Accessed 11 March 2014].

- Polybius (1889a) *The Histories of Polybius, Vol. 1*, trans. E.S. Shuckburgh. London, Macmillan & Co.
- Polybius (1889b) *The Histories of Polybius, Vol. 2*, trans. E.S. Shuckburgh. London, Macmillan & Co.

Pomeroy, S. (1995) Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity. New York, Schocken Books.

Pope, R. (2007) Ritual and the roundhouse: a critique of recent ideas on the use of domestic space in later British prehistory. In Haselgrove, C. and Pope, R. (eds): *The Earlier Iron Age in Britain and the Near Continent*. Oxford, Oxbow, pp. 204-228.

- Pope, R., and Ralston, I. (2011) Approaching Sex and Status in Iron Age Britain with Reference to the Nearer Continent. In Moore, T., and Armada, X. (eds): *Atlantic Europe in the First Millenium BC: Crossing the Divide*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 375-415.
- Porter, G. (1996) Seeing through solidity: a feminist perspective on museums. In Macdonald, S. and Fyfe, G. (eds): *Theorizing Museums: Representing identity and diversity in a changing world*. Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 105-126.
- Powell, K., Laws, G. and Brown, L. (2008) A Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age Enclosue and Iron Age and Romano-British Settlement at Latton Lands, Wiltshire. Salisbury, Publication Report for Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine.
- Prettejohn, E. (2000) The Art of the Pre-Raphaelites.
- Preucel, R. (2006) Archaeological Semiotics. London, Blackwell.
- Prezzano, S.C. (1997) Warfare, Women, and Households: The Development of Iroquois Culture. In Claassen, C., and Joyce, R.A. (eds): *Women in Prehistory: North America and Mesoamerica*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 88-99.
- Privateer, P. (2005) Romancing the Human: The Ideology of Envisioned Human Origins. In Smiles, S. and Moser, S. (eds) *Envisioning the Past: Archaeology and Image*. Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 11-28.
- Quinnell, H. (1986) Cornwall during the Iron Age and the Roman Period, *Cornish Archaeology* 25, pp. 111-134.
- Rabinowitz, N.S. and Richlin, A.E. (1993) Feminist Theory and the Classics. London, Routledge.
- Rankin, D. (1987) Celts and the Classical World. London, Routledge.
- Rautman, A. and Talalay, L.E. (2000) Introduction: Diverse Approaches to the Study of Gender in Archaeology. In Rautman, A. (ed.): *Reading the Body: Representations and Remains in the Archaeological Record*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 1-12.
- Rebay-Salisbury, K., Sørensen, M. L. S., and Hughes, J. (2010) *Body parts and bodies whole*. Oxford, Oxbow.
- Redfern, R. (2007) A bioarchaeological analysis of violence in Iron Age females: a perspective from Dorset England (mid to late seventh century BC to the first century AD). In Davis, O.P., Sharples, N.M. and Waddington, K.E. (eds): *Changing Perspectives on the First millennium B.C.* Oxford, Oxbow, pp. 139-160.
- Redfern, R. (2008) New Evidence for Iron Age Secondary Burial Practice and Bone modification from Gussage All Saints and Maiden Castle, Oxford journal of archaeology 27:3, pp. 281-301.
- Redfern, R. (2009) Does Cranial Trauma Provide Evidence for Projectile Weaponry in Late Iron Age Dorset? *Oxford journal of archaeology* 28:4, pp. 399-424.
- Redfern, R. (2011) A Re-appraisal of the Evidence for Violence in the Late Iron Age Human Remains from Maiden Castle Hillfort, Dorset, England, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 77, pp. 111-138.

- Redfern, R., and Chamberlain, A. (2011) A demographic analysis of Maiden Castle hillfort: Evidence for conflict in the late Iron Age and early Roman period, *International Journal of Paleopathology* 1, pp. 68-73.
- Redfern, R. and DeWitte, S, (2011) A new approach to the study of Romanization in Britain: A regional perspective of cultural change in late Iron Age and Roman Dorset using the Siler and Gompertz–Makeham models of mortality, *American journal of physical anthropology 144*:2, pp. 269-285.
- Redfern, R., Hamlin, C., and Athfield, N.B. (2010) Temporal changes in diet: a stable isotope analysis of late Iron Age and Roman Dorset, Britain, *Journal of Archaeological Science* 37, pp. 1149-1160.
- Redfern, R., Millard, A.R., and Hamlin, C. (2012) A regional investigation of subadult dietary patterns and health in late Iron Age and Roman Dorset, England, *Journal of Archaeological Science* 39, pp. 1249-1259.
- Reiter, R. (1975) *Toward an anthropology of women.* New York, Monthly Review Press.
- Renfrew, C. (1973) Wessex as a social question, Antiquity 47, pp. 221-225.
- Reynolds, W. (2002) Pictish Warrior AD 297-81. Oxford, Osprey Publishing.
- Rice, P.A. (1981) Prehistoric Venuses: Symbols of Motherhood or Womanhood? Journal of Anthropological Research 7:4, pp. 402-416.
- Richards, M.P., Hedges, R.E.M., Molleson, T.I., and Vogel, J.C. (1998) Stable Isotope Analysis Reveals Variations in Human Diet at the Poundbury Camp Cemetery Site, *Journal of Archaeological Science* 25:12, pp. 1247-1252.
- Richardson, K.M. (1952) Excavation of Iron Age villages on Boscombe Down West, *The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 54, pp. 123-168.
- Richlin, A.E. (1993) 'Not before Homosexuality: The Materiality of the Cinaedus and the Roman Law against Love between Men,' *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 3:4, pp. 523-573.
- Richmond, I. (1968) *Hod Hill Volume Two: Excavations carried out between 1951 and 1958 for the Trustees of the British Museum.* London, Trustees of the British Museum.
- Rieckhoff, S. (2006) Celtes et Gaulois dans l'Histoire, l'Historiographie et l'Ideologie Moderne. Actes de la Table Ronde. Glux-en-Glenne, Bibracte.
- Riley, D. (1988) 'Am I That Name?' Feminism and the Category of 'Women' in History. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Robb, J. (1997a) Female Beauty and Male Violence in Early Italian Society. In Koloski-Ostrow, A.O., and Lyons, C.L. (eds): *Naked Truths: Women, sexuality, and gender in classical art and archaeology*. London, Routledge, pp. 43-65.
- Robb, J. (1997b) Violence and Gender in Early Italy. In Martin, D.L., and Frayer, D.W. (eds): *Troubled Times: Violence and Warfare in the Past*. Amsterdam, Gordon and Breach, pp. 111-144.
- Rodrigues, T. (2005) Gender and social differentiation within the Turner population, Ohio, as evidenced by activity-induced musculoskeletal stress markers. In Carr, C. and Case, D.T. (eds): *Gathering Hopewell: Society, Ritual, and Ritual Interaction.* New York, Springer, pp. 405-427.
- Romankiewicz, T. (2011) The Complex Roundhouses of the Scottish Iron Age: An Architectural Analysis of Complex Atlantic Roundhouses (brochs and Galleried

*Duns), with Reference to Wheelhouses and Timber Roundhouses.* Oxford, Archaeopress.

- Rosaldo, M.Z. (1974) Woman, culture, and society: A theoretical overview. Rosaldo, M.Z., and Lamphere, L. (eds): *Woman, Culture, and Society*. Stanford, Stanford University Press, pp. 17-42.
- Rosaldo, M. Z. (1980) The use and abuse of anthropology: reflections on feminism and cross-cultural understanding, *Signs*, pp. 389-417.
- Rosaldo, M.Z., and Lamphere, L. (1974) *Woman, Culture, and Society*. Stanford, Stanford University Press.
- Roth, N. (2011) *Regional Patterns and the Cultural Implication of Late Bronze Age and Iron Age Burial Practices in Britain.* Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Sheffield.
- Sahlins, M. (1963) Poor man, rich man, big man, chief; political types in Melanesia and Polynesia, *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 5, pp. 285-303.
- Saller, R. (1994) *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Sammes, A. (1676) Britannia Antiqua Illustrata: or, the antiquities of Ancient Britain...with a chronological history of this kingdom, etc. London.
- Sanz, F.Q. (2015) Iberians as Enemies. In Le Bohec, Y., and Brizzi, G. (eds): The Encyclopedia of the Roman Army, Vol. 1. Chichester, Wiley Blackwell, pp. 505-508.
- Sarkeesian, A. (2012) Tropes vs. Women in Video Games. [Accessed 26 January 2014] Available from:

https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLn4ob_5_ttEaA_vc8F3fjzE62esf9yP61

- Saussure, F. (1960) Course in General Linguistics. London, Peter Owen.
- Schaffer, B.S., Gardner, K.M., and Powell, J.F. (2000) Prehistoric and Ethnographic Pueblo Gender Roles: Continuity of Lifeways from the Eleventh to the Early Twentieth Century. In Rautman, A. (ed.): *Reading the Body: Representations* and Remains in the Archaeological Record. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 139-149.
- Scheuer, L. and Black, S. (2000) Development and Ageing of the Juvenile Skeleton. In Cox, M. and Mays, S. (eds): Human Osteology in Archaeology and Forensic Science. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 9-22.
- Scott, E. (1997) Introduction: On the incompleteness of archaeological narratives. In Moore, J., and Scott, E. (eds): *Invisible People and Processes: Writing Gender* and Childhood into European Archaeology. London, Leicester University Press, pp. 1-14.
- Scott, R.E. (2006) Social Identity in Early Medieval Ireland: a Bioarchaeology of the Early Christian Cemetery at Omey Island, Co. Galway. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.
- Shanks, M. (1997) Photography and Archaeology. In Molyneaux, B. (ed.): *The cultural life of images: visual representations in archaeology*. London, Routledge, pp. 73-107.
- Sharples, N. (1991) English Heritage book of Maiden Castle. London, Batsford.
- Sharples, N. (2010) Social Relations in Later Prehistory: Wessex in the First Millenium BC. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

- Shennan, S.J. (1987) Trends in the Study of Later European Prehistory, *Annual Review* of *Anthropology* 16, pp. 365-382.
- Sheriff, M. (2006) How Images Got Their Gender: Masculinity and Femininity in the Visual Arts. In Meade, T.A. and Weisner-Hanks, M.E. (eds): *A Companion to Gender History*. Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 146-169.
- Skinner, M. (1987) Rescuing Creusa. New Methodological Approaches to Women in Antiquity. Lubbock, Texas Tech University Press.
- Skinner, M. (2005) *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Culture*. Oxford, Blackwell Publishing.
- Skøgstrand, L. (2010) Is Androcentric Archaeology Really About Men? Archaeologies, Journal of the World Archaeological Congress 7(1), pp. 56-74
- Smiles, S. (1994) *The Image of Antiquity: Ancient Britain and the Romantic Imagination*. London, Yale University Press.
- Smiles, S. (2000) *Eye Witness: Artists and Visual Documentation in Britain 1770-1830.* Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Smiles, S. and Moser, S. (2005) *Envisioning the Past: Archaeology and Image*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Smith, R.J.C., Healy, F., Allen, M.J., Morris, E.L., and Woodward, P.J. (1997) Excavations Along the Route of the Dorchester Bypass, Dorset, 1986-8, Salisbury, Wessex Archaeology, Wessex Archaeology Report No. 11. Salisbury, Wessex Archaeology.
- Smyth, A.P. (1984) *Warlords and Holy Men: Scotland AD 80-1000*. London, Edward Arnold.
- Sofaer Derevenski, J.R. (2000) Children and Material Culture. London, Routledge.
- Sofaer, J.R. (2006a) *The Body as Material Culture: A Theoretical Osteology*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Sofaer, J.R. (2006b) Gender, Bioarchaeology and Human Ontogeny. In Gowland, R. and Knüsel, C. (eds): Social Archaeology of Human Remains. Oxford, Oxbow, pp. 155-167.
- Sofaer, J.R. (2013) Bioarchaeological approaches to the gendered body. In Bolger, D. (ed.): A companion to Gender Prehistory. Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 226-243.
- Solometo, J. and Moss, J. (2013). Picturing the past: gender in National Geographic reconstructions of prehistoric life, *American Antiquity* 78(1), pp. 123-146.
- Sørensen, M.L.S. (1991) The Construction of Gender Through Appearance. In Walde, D., and Willows, N.D. (eds): *The archaeology of gender: Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Conference of the Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary*. Calgary, University of Calgary Archaeological Association, pp. 121-129.
- Sørenson, M. (1998) Archaeology, Gender and the Museum. In Merriman, N. (ed.): *Making Early History in Museums*. London, Cassell, pp. 136-150.
- Sørensen, M.L.S. (2000) Gender Archaeology. Cambridge, Blackwell.
- Sorrell, A. (1973) The artist and reconstruction, Current Archaeology 41, pp, 177-181.
- Sorrell, M. (1981) Reconstructing the Past. London, Book Club Associates.
- Sparey-Green, C. (1987) Excavations at Poundbury. Volume 1: The Settlements, Dorchester, Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society Monograph

Series 27. Dorchester, Dorset County Museum.

- Sparkes, B. (1997) Some Greek images of others. In Molyneaux, B. (ed.): *The cultural life of images: visual representations in archaeology*. London, Routledge, pp. 130-158.
- Speed, J. (1614) The History of Great Britaine, etc. London, J. Sudbury and G. Humble.
- Standing, K. and Smith, J. (1986) New Archaeological Sites in Eastern Dorset, Proceedings of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society 108, p. 171.
- Stead, I.M. (1986) A Group of Iron Age Barrows at Cowlam, North Humberside, *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 58, pp. 5-15.
- Stead, I.M. (1991) Iron Age cemeteries in East Yorkshire: excavations at Burton Fleming, Rudston, Garton-on-Wolds. London, English Heritage.
- Stead, I.M. and Rigby, V. (1989) Verulamium: the King Harry Lane site. Swindon, English Heritage.
- Sterry, M., Tullett, A., and Ray, N. (2010) In search of the Iron Age: Proceedings of the Iron Age Research Student Seminar 2008, University of Leicester. Leicester, Leicester Archaeology Monograph 18.
- Stevens, R.E., Lightfoot, E., Hamilton, J., Cunliffe, B., and Hedges, R.E.M. (2010) Stable Isotope Investigations of the Danebury Hillfort Pit Burials, Oxford Journal of Archaeology 29:4, pp. 407-428.
- Stevens, R.E., Lightfoot, E., Hamilton, J., Cunliffe, B., and Hedges, R.E.M. (2013) Investigating Dietary Variation with Burial Ritual in Iron Age Hampshire: An Isotopic Comparison of Suddern Farm Cemetery and Danebury Hillfort Pit Burials, Oxford Journal of Archaeology 32:3, pp. 257-273.
- Stoodley, N. (2000) From the Cradle to the Grave: Age Organization and the Early Anglo-Saxon Burial Rite, *World Archaeology* 31:3, pp. 456-472.
- Stout, A. (2008) Creating Prehistory: Druids, Ley Hunters and Archaeologists in Prewar Britain. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Strabo (1854a) *The geography of Strabo, Vol. 1*, trans. H. Hamilton and W. Falconer, London, H.G. Bohn.
- Strabo (1854b) *The geography of Strabo, Vol. 2*, trans. H. Hamilton and W. Falconer, London, H.G. Bohn.
- Strabo (1854c) *The geography of Strabo, Vol. 3*, trans. H. Hamilton and W. Falconer, London, H.G. Bohn.
- Stone, P.K. and Walrath, D. (2006) The Gendered Skeleton: Anthropological Interpretations of the Bony Pelvis. In Gowland, R. and Knüsel, C. (eds): Social Archaeology of Human Remains. Oxford, Oxbow, pp. 168-178.
- Synnott, A. (1993) The Body Social: Symbolism, Self and Society. London, Routledge.
- Tabor, R. (2008) *Cadbury Castle: the hillfort and landscapes*. Stroud, The History Press.
- Tacitus, C. (n.d.) The Germany and the Agricola of Tacitus. Project Gutenberg.
- Tacitus, C. (1811) *A Dialogue Concerning Oratory, Or The Causes of Corrupt Eloquence,* trans. A. Murphy, London, John Stockdale.
- Tacitus, C. (1839) *The Annals and History of Tacitus: A New and Literal English Version*. Oxford, D.A. Talboys.

- Tacitus, C. (1897) *The Germany and the Agricola of Tacitus*, trans. E. Brooks, Philadelphia, David McKay.
- Tacitus, C. (1912) Tacitus, the histories, trans. W. Fyfe, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Tacitus, C. (2004) *Tacitus: The Annals*, trans. A.J. Woodman, Cambridge, Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.
- Taylor, J. (1859) The Pictorial History of Scotland: From the Roman invasion to the close of the Jacobite Rebellion. AD 79-1746. J.S. Virtue.
- Taylor, T. (1997) The Prehistory of Sex. London, Fourth Estate.
- Threadgold, T. and Cranny-Francis, A. (1990) *Feminine, masculine and representation*. Sydney, Allen & Unwin.
- Tilley, C. Y. (1994) *A phenomenology of landscape: places, paths, and monuments.* Oxford, Berg.
- Treherne, P. (1995) The warrior's beauty: the masculine body and self-identity in Bronze-Age Europe, *Journal of European Archaeology* 3:1, pp. 105-144.
- Trigger, B.G. (1996) A History of Archaeological Thought. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Tringham, R.E. (1991) Households with Faces: The Challenge of Gender in Prehistoric Architectural Remains. In Gero, J.M. and Conkey, M.W. (eds): *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*. Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 93-131.
- Turner, B. S. (1996) The Body and society: Explorations in social theory. London, London and Thousand Oaks.
- Van Dyke, R. (2006) Seeing the Past: Visual Media in Archaeology, *American Anthropologist* 108:2, pp. 370-384.
- van Wees, H. (2005) Clothes, class and gender in Homer. In Cairns, D. (ed.): *Body Language in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. Swansea, Classical Press of Wales, pp.1-36.
- Verstraete, B. and Provencal, V. eds. (2005) Same-Sex Desire and Love in Greco-Roman Antiquity and in the Classical Tradition of the West. London, Harrington Park Press.
- Victoria County History, Wiltshire (1957) West Overton, Boreham Down. I:I, pp.120.
- Voss, B. (2007) Feminisms, queer theories, and the archaeological study of past sexualities. In Insoll, T. (ed.): *The Archaeology of Identities: A Reader*. London, Routledge, pp. 124-136.
- Waddell, J. (2005) Foundation myths: the beginnings of Irish archaeology. Bray, Wordwell.
- Waddell, J. (2014) Archaeology and Celtic Myth: An Exploration. Dublin, Four Courts Press.
- Wait, G.A. (1985) Ritual and religion in Iron Age Britain. Oxford, BAR 149.
- Wainright, G.J. (1979) Gussage All Saints: An Iron Age Settlement in Dorset. London, Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
- Wainwright, G. J., Harrison, R. J., Evans, A. M., Bowman, A., and Bird, P. F. (1969) The Excavation of a Durotrigian Farmstead near Tollard Royal in Cranbourne Chase, Southern England *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 34, pp. 102-147.
- Walde, D., and Willows, N.D. (1991) The archaeology of gender: Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Conference of the Archaeological Association of the
*University of Calgary*. Calgary, University of Calgary Archaeological Association.

- Walker, P.L. (2001) A Bioarchaeological Perspective on the History of Violence, Annual Review of Archaeology 30, pp. 573-596.
- Walters, B. (1979) M4 Report. The Wiltshire archaeological magazine 74/75, p. 125.
- Webster, C.J. (2008) South West Archaeological Research Framework: Resource Assessment and Research Agenda. Taunton, Somerset County Council.
- Webster, J. (2001) Creolizing the Roman Provinces, *American Journal of Archaeology* 105:2, pp. 209-225.
- Weed, E. and Schor, N. (1997). *Feminism meets queer theory*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.
- Weiss, E., and Jurmain, R. 2007. "Osteoarthritis Revisited: A Contemporary review of Aetiology," *International Journal of Osteoarchaeology* 17: 437-450.
- Wekker, G. (2004) Still Crazy after All Those Years...Feminism for the New Millenium, *European Journal of Women's Studies* 11:4, pp. 487-500.
- West, L.F. (1917) Skeleton Found on Liddington Hill, *The Wiltshire Archaeological* and Natural History Magazine 39, pp. 501-502.
- Western, A.G. and Hurst, J.D. (2013) "Soft Heads': evidence for sexualized warfare during the Later Iron Age from Kemerton Camp, Bredon Hill. In Knüsel, C. and Smith, M.J. (eds): *The Routledge Handbook of the Bioarchaeology of Human Conflict.* Abingdon, Routledge, pp. 161-184.
- Westin, J. (2014) Inking a Past; Visualization as a Shedding of Uncertainty, *Visual Anthropology Review* 30:2, pp. 139-150.
- Westra, H. (1991) The Myth of the Amazons. In Walde, D., and Willows, N.D. (eds): The archaeology of gender: Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Conference of the Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary. Calgary, University of Calgary Archaeological Association, pp. 343-346.
- Wheeler, R.E.M. (1943) *Maiden Castle, Dorset.* London, Society of Antiquaries of London.
- Whimster, R. (1981) Burial Practices in Iron Age Britain. Oxford, BAR 90.
- Whitcomb, A. (2003) *Re-Imagining the Museum: Beyond the Mausoleum*. London, Routledge.
- Wiedemann, T. (2014) Adults and Children in the Roman Empire (Routledge Revivals). London, Routledge.
- Williams, A. (1950) Excavations at Allard's Quarry, Marnhull, *Proceedings of the* Dorset Archaeological and Natural History Society 72, pp.20-75.
- Willoughby, P. R. (1991).Human origins and the sexual division of labour: An archaeological perspective. In Walde, D., and Willows, N.D. (eds): The archaeology of gender: Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Conference of the Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary. Calgary, University of Calgary Archaeological Association, pp. 284-294.
- Wilson, C.E. (1981) Burials within settlements in southern Britain during the Pre-Roman Iron Age, *University of London Institute of Archaeology Bulletin*, 18, pp. 127-169.
- Winkler, J. (1990) The Constraints of Desire. London, Routledge.

- Witmore, C.L. (2006) Vision, Media, Noise and the Percolation of Time: Symmetrical Approaches to the Mediation of the Material World, *Journal of Material Culture* 11, pp. 267-292.
- Wylie, A. (1991) Feminist Critiques and Archaeological Challenges. In Walde, D., and Willows, N.D. (eds): The archaeology of gender: Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Conference of the Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary. Calgary, University of Calgary Archaeological Association, pp. 17-23.
- Wylie, A. (1992a) The Interplay of Evidential Constraints and Political Interests: Recent Archaeological Research on Gender, *American Antiquity* 57:1, pp. 15-35.
- Wylie, A. (1992b) Feminist Theories of Social Power: Some Implications for a Processual Archaeology, *Norwegian Archaeological Revue* 25:1, pp. 51-68.
- Wylie, A. (2007) The constitution of archaeological evidence: gender politics and science. In Insoll, T. (ed.): *The Archaeology of Identities: A Reader*. London, Routledge, pp. 97-118.
- Yates, T. (1993) Frameworks for an archaeology of the body. In Tilley, C. (ed.): *Interpretative Archaeology*. Providence, Berg, pp. 31-72.
- Young, D. (2007) Iron Age, medieval and recent activity at Whitegate Farm, Bleadon, North Somerset, *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History Society Proceedings* 151, pp. 31-81.

# Facing Gender: A Historiographical Analysis of Gender Construction in Iron Age Britain

Two Volumes

Volume II

Jo Zalea Burac Matias

Department of Archaeology

Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy Durham University

2015

#### **Table of Contents**

#### Volume II

Table of Contents	ii
Table of Figures	iii
Chapter 3: Gender and Social Models in Iron Age Britain	236
Chapter 4: Trajectories of engendered archaeology in the mortuary record of Iron Age I	3ritain
	243
Chapter 5: Images of Gender in Archaeological Reconstructions of Iron Age Britain	
Appendix A	
Complete Site List and Number of Occurrences of Human Remains	
Wessex	
East Yorkshire	
Appendix B	
List of Iron Age Reconstructions	
•	

### **Table of Figures**

FIGURE 3.1. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN HAWKES (1959) 23	6
FIGURE 3.2. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN HODSON (1964)	6
FIGURE 3.3. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN CLARK (1966)	7
FIGURE 3.4. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN CLARKE (1972)	7
FIGURE 3.5. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN HASELGROVE (1982). 23	8
FIGURE 3.6. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN HINGLEY (1992)	8
FIGURE 3.7. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN MOORE (2011).	9
FIGURE 3.8. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN HILL (2011)	9
FIGURE 3.9. NUMBER OF TIMES MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN ARE DISCUSSED IN "THE	
GALLIC WARS."	0
FIGURE 3.10. NUMBER OF TIMES MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN ARE DISCUSSED IN	
"GERMANY AND AGRICOLA."	0
FIGURE 3.11. NUMBER OF TIMES MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN ARE DISCUSSED IN	
"Histories, Vol. I-II."	1
FIGURE 3.12 NUMBER OF TIMES MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN ARE DISCUSSED IN	
"HISTORIES, VOL. I-III."	1
FIGURE 3.13. NUMBER OF TIMES MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN ARE DISCUSSED IN	
"GEOGRAPHY, VOL. I-III."	2
FIGURE 4.1. MAP OF SITES IN WESSEX CASE STUDY AREA	.3
FIGURE 4.2. MAP OF SITES IN EAST YORKSHIRE CASE STUDY AREA	.4
FIGURE 4.3. DIAGRAM OF PRESERVATION OF SKELETAL ELEMENTS (AFTER MAYS	
1998:2)	4
FIGURE 4.4. OSTEOLOGICAL SEXING OF WESSEX BURIALS.	.5
FIGURE 4.5. COMPARISON OF BURIAL CONTEXTS BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX	.5
FIGURE 4.6. COMPARISON OF INDETERMINATE ADULT AND NONADULTS BY BURIAL	
CONTEXT	6
FIGURE 4.7. COMPARISON OF BODY POSITIONING IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX.24	6
FIGURE 4.8. COMPARISON OF BODY LAYOUT IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX 24	.7
FIGURE 4.9. COMPARISON OF BODY ORIENTATION IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX.	
	.7
FIGURE 4.10. COMPARISON OF INHUMATIONS AND DISARTICULATED REMAINS BY	
OSTEOLOGICAL SEX	8
FIGURE 4.11. COMPARISON OF MULTIPLE AND SINGLE BURIALS BY OSTEOLOGICAL	
SEX	8
FIGURE 4.12. OSTEOLOGICAL AGING OF WESSEX BURIALS.	.9
FIGURE 4.13. COMPARISON OF BURIAL CONTEXTS BY AGE CATEGORY	.9
FIGURE 4.14. COMPARISON OF BODY POSITIONING IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL AGE.	
	0
FIGURE 4.15. COMPARISON OF BODY POSITIONING IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL AGE.	
	0
FIGURE 4.16. COMPARISON OF BODY ORIENTATION IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL AGE.	
	1
FIGURE 4.17. COMPARISON OF INHUMATIONS AND DISARTICULATED REMAINS BY	
OSTEOLOGICAL AGE	1

FIGURE 4.18. COMPARISON OF MULTIPLE AND SINGLE BURIALS BY OSTEOLOGICA	<b>AL</b>
AGE	252
FIGURE 4.19. OSTEOLOGICAL SEXING OF EAST YORKSHIRE BURIALS	252
FIGURE 4.20. COMPARISON OF BODY POSITIONING IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL	SEX.
	253
FIGURE 4.21. COMPARISON OF BODY LAYOUT IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX.	253
FIGURE 4.22. COMPARISON OF BODY ORIENTATION IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL	SEX.
	254
FIGURE 4.23. COMPARISON OF MULTIPLE BURIALS BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX.	254
FIGURE 4.24. OSTEOLOGICAL AGING OF EAST YORKSHIRE BURIALS.	255
FIGURE 4.25. COMPARISON OF BODY POSITIONING IN GRAVES BY OSTEOLOGICAL	AGE.
	255
FIGURE 4.26. COMPARISON OF BODY LAYOUT IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL AGE.	256
FIGURE 4.27. COMPARISON OF BODY ORIENTATION IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL	AGE.
	256
FIGURE 4.28. COMPARISON OF MULTIPLE BURIALS BY OSTEOLOGICAL AGE.	257
FIGURE 4.29. WORD CLOUD GENERATED FOR THE GLASTONBURY LAKE VILLAG	E
EXCAVATION REPORT	257
FIGURE 4.30. WORD CLOUD GENERATED FOR THE SALMONSBURY CAMP EXCAVA	TION
REPORT.	258
FIGURE 4.31. WORD CLOUD GENERATED FOR THE GUSSAGE ALL SAINTS EXCAVA	TION
REPORT.	258
FIGURE 4.32. WORD CLOUD GENERATED FOR THE DANEBURY EXCAVATION REPO	DRT.
	259
FIGURE 4.33. WORD CLOUD GENERATED FOR THE RUDSTON, BURTON FLEMING	AND
GARTON-ON-WOLDS EXCAVATION REPORT.	259
FIGURE 4.34. WORD CLOUD GENERATED FOR THE BATTLESBURY ROAD EXCAVAT	TION
REPORT.	260
FIGURE 4.35. PERCENTAGE OF ARTEFACT MATERIALS ASSOCIATED WITH WESSE	X AGE
GROUPS.	260
FIGURE 4.36. PERCENTAGE OF ARTEFACT MATERIALS ASSOCIATED WITH EAST	
YORKSHIRE AGE GROUPS.	261
FIGURE 5.1. EXAMPLE OF RECONSTRUCTION WITH UNIDENTIFIABLE FIGURES	
(KONSTAM 2006:18).	262
FIGURE 5.2. EXAMPLE OF IMAGES WHERE INDIVIDUALS ARE MARKERS OF SCALE	
(ROMANKIEWICZ 2011:180).	262
FIGURE 5.5. A "DEPOPULATED" RECONSTRUCTION (CURRENT ARCHAEOLOGY	262
2009:15).	263
FIGURE 5.4. PROPORTION OF PEOPLED AND NON-PEOPLED ARTISTIC	262
RECONSTRUCTIONS OF IRON AGE BRITAIN.	263
FIGURE 5.5. I OTAL IDENTIFIED INDIVIDUALS IN 323 ARTISTIC RECONSTRUCTION	SOF
IRON AGE BRITAIN.	264
r iguke 5.0. percentage of sexed individuals per decade of publication 1900)	(1800-
	264
r iguke 5./. PERCENTAGE OF SEXED INDIVIDUALS PER DECADE OF PUBLICATION 2010)	(1900-
$\mathbf{E}_{1} = 5 \cdot 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 = 0 + 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0$	265
FIGURE 5.8. DRAWING OUTLINING AUTHOR'S VIEW OF LOCATION WITHIN IMAGE	.S Эсг
(AUTHOR'S UWN).	205
FIGURE 3.7. LUCATION OF INDIVIDUALS WITHIN AN IMAGE.	∠bb

FIGURE 5.10. LOCATION OF ADULT MALES IN IMAGES PER DECADE	266
FIGURE 5.11. LOCATION OF ADULT FEMALES IN IMAGES PER DECADE.	267
FIGURE 5.12. LOCATION OF ELDERLY INDIVIDUALS IN IMAGES PER DECADE	267
FIGURE 5.13. LOCATION OF COMBINED INFANTS AND CHILDREN IN IMAGES PER	
DECADE.	268
FIGURE 5.14. PASSIVE VERSUS NON-PASSIVE ACTIVITIES IN IMAGES.	268
FIGURE 5.15. ACTIVITIES IN IMAGES (PART 1).	269
FIGURE 5.16. ACTIVITIES IN IMAGES (PART 2).	269
FIGURE 5.17. 1815 ILLUSTRATION DEPICTING AUTHOR'S DEFINITION OF A LOINCLO	ОТН
(SMILES 1994:20)	270
FIGURE 5.18. ITEMS OF DRESS IN IMAGES.	270
FIGURE 5.19. ITEMS OF ADORNMENT IN IMAGES.	271
FIGURE 5.20. TYPES OF ASSOCIATED OBJECTS IN IMAGES(PART 1).	271
FIGURE 5.21. TYPES OF ASSOCIATED OBJECTS IN IMAGES (PART 2).	272
FIGURES 5.22. (L)-5.23. (R). ILLUSTRATIONS THAT DISPLAY BODILY ADORNMENT:	2001
ILLUSTRATION OF THE WINCHESTER HOARD AND 2009 ILLUSTRATION OF BOD	ILY
ADORNMENT (BRITISH MUSEUM 2001, LAMBRICK 2009:176)	272
FIGURES 5.24. (L)-5.25. (R). FIGURES DEMONSTRATING THE "HEROIC" POSE IN THI	E
1921 EDITION OF THE ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS AND THE CIRCA 1990S	
DISPLAY IN MUSEUM OF THE IRON AGE (FORESTIER 1921:521, AUTHOR'S OWN	N
PHOTOGRAPH).	273
FIGURE 5.26. 1997 ILLUSTRATION OF IRON AGE CULTIVATION (ARMIT 1997:COLOU	UR
PLATE)	273
FIGURE 5.27. CIRCA 1990S ILLUSTRATION OF IRON AGE FARMING AT THE MUSEUM	1 OF
THE IRON AGE (AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH).	274
FIGURE 5.28. 1991 ILLUSTRATION OF WETWANG WARRIOR BURIAL AT THE HULL A	ND
EAST RIDING MUSEUM (AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH).	274
FIGURE 5.29. 2004 ILLUSTRATION OF THE FOLLY LANE BURIAL (ST. ALBANS'	
MUSEUM).	275
FIGURE 5.30. 2005 ILLUSTRATION OF ST. ALBANS CREMATION BURIAL (ST. ALBANS	s'
MUSEUM).	275
FIGURE 5.31. 2012 ILLUSTRATION OF THE CHARIOT BURIAL AT WETWANG SLACK	
(GILES 2012:212).	276
FIGURE 5.32. 1997 ILLUSTRATION OF RAMPART CONSTRUCTION AT BROWN	
CATERTHUN (ARMIT 1997:60)	276
FIGURE 5.33. 1899 ILLUSTRATION OF THE WILD BOAR HUNT AT THE CRANNOG	
(RCAHMS)	277
FIGURE 5.34. 1999 ILLUSTRATION OF PICTS HUNTING (REYNOLDS 2002:34-35)	277
FIGURES 5.35. (L)-5.36. (R). EXAMPLES OF MALE GESTURE IN THE HULL AND EAST	
RIDING MUSEUM AND A 2001 BOOK ON CELTIC WARRIORS (AUTHOR'S OWN	
PHOTOGRAPH, ALLEN AND REYNOLDS 2001:PLATE D)	278
FIGURES 5.37. (L)-5.38. (R). EXAMPLES OF FEMALE GESTURE IN THE 1921	
ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS AND 2008-2009 QUANTOCK HILLS WEBSITE	
(FORESTIER 1921:510, QUANTOCK HILLS AONB EDUCATION).	278
FIGURE 5.39. CIRCA 1990S ILLUSTRATION OF IRON AGE WARRIORS (HISTORIC	
ENGLAND)	279
FIGURE 5.40. 1993 ILLUSTRATION OF IRON AGE WOMEN WITH CHILDREN DURING A	4
CEREMONY (HISTORIC ENGLAND).	279

FIGURES 5.41. (L)-5.42. (R). EXAMPLES OF MAPS AND SITE PLANS (LAMBRICK
2009:107, PITT-RIVERS 1882, PLATE 1) 280
FIGURES 5.43. (L)-5.44. (R). EXAMPLES OF INFOGRAPHICS IN SITE REPORTS AND SCALE
MODELS AT THE MUSEUM OF THE IRON AGE (LAMBRICK 2009:216, AUTHOR'S
OWN PHOTOGRAPH)
FIGURES 5.45. (L)-5.46. (R). 1998 PAOLOZZI FIGURES AT THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF
SCOTLAND (AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH)
FIGURES 5.47. (L), 5.48. (M), 5.49. (R). DIFFERENT GESTURES FROM THE 1998
PAOLOZZI FIGURES (AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH)
FIGURES 5.50. (L)-5.51. (R). LONE PAOLOZZI FIGURE AND POSSIBLE FEMALE FIGURE
AT THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF SCOTLAND (AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH) 281
FIGURE 5.52. ALAN SORRELL'S USE OF CHIAROSCURO IN A 1957 ILLUSTRATION OF
CLICKHIMIN BROCH IN THE ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (HAMILTON 1957:812-
813)
FIGURE 5.53. ALAN SORRELL'S USE OF CHIAROSCURO IN A 1981 ILLUSTRATION OF
STAPLE HOWE (SORRELL 1981:36)
FIGURE 5.54. A 1981 ILLUSTRATION OF A DRUID AT THE HEATHROW SETTLEMENT
(SORRELL 1981:37)
FIGURES 5.55. (L)-5.56. (R). CIRCA 1990S ILLUSTRATIONS OF DANEBURY RAMPARTS
AND MAIDEN CASTLE ROUNDHOUSES IN A QUARRY DITCH (HISTORIC ENGLAND).
FIGURES 5.57. (L)-5.58. (R). 2009 ILLUSTRATIONS OF IRON AGE AGRICULTURE
(HISTORIC ENGLAND)
FIGURE 5.59. 1993 ILLUSTRATION OF COLCHESTER BURIAL (CURRENT ARCHAEOLOGY
1993:497)
FIGURE 5.60. 2006 ILLUSTRATION CARSINGTON INFANT BURIALS (AMBRUS AND ASTON
2006:29)
FIGURE 5.61. WOMEN'S DRESS IN THE 1921 ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (FORESTIER
1921:510)
FIGURE 5.62. SCATHA'S WAR SCHOOL IN A 2002 BOOK ABOUT THE PICTS (REYNOLDS
2002: PLATE B)
FIGURES 5.63, (L)-5.64, (R), JOHN WHITE'S PICTS, ILLUSTRATED IN THE 1580S
(HULTON 1984:91.93)
FIGURES 5.65. (L)-5.66. (R). GÉRARD'S LE COURAGE GAULOIS (1830) COMPARED TO
THE 1ST-2ND CENTURY AD STATUE GAULOIS BLESSE (AUTHOR'S OWN
PHOTOGRAPH). 287
FIGURE 5.67. EDWARD HORNEL'S 1890 PAINTING THE DRUIDS: BRINGING IN THE
MISTLETOE (GLASGOW MUSEUMS)
FIGURE 5 68 1859 ILLUSTRATION OF CALGACUS (TAVLOR 1859: FRONTISPIECE) 288
FIGURES 5.69 (L)-5.70 (R) CIRCA 1990S ILLUSTRATIONS OF AN IRON AGE
CHARIOTEER AND ANOTHER IRON AGE CHARIOTEER IN THE MUSEILM OF THE IRON
AGE (HISTORIC ENGLAND, AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH) 288
FIGURES 5 71 (L)-5 72 (R) THOMAS MILTON'S 1810 ENCLAVING THE MASSACOF OF
THE DRUDS AND AVLETT SAMMES 1676 ILLUSTRATION OF A WICKEP MAN
(SMILES 1994-111, SAMMES 1676) 220
FICHER 5 73 1006 II I HETDATION OF CELTIC NODI DE (RDITIEU MHEDIM) 200
TIGURE 3.73, 1770 ILLUSTRATION OF CELTIC NODLES (DRITISH MUSEUM),



**Chapter 3: Gender and Social Models in Iron Age Britain** 

FIGURE 3.1. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN HAWKES (1959).



FIGURE 3.2. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN HODSON (1964).



FIGURE 3.3. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN CLARK (1966).



FIGURE 3.4. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN CLARKE (1972).



FIGURE 3.6. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN HINGLEY (1992).





FIGURE 3.8. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE IRON AGE SOCIETY IN HILL (2011).



FIGURE 3.9. NUMBER OF TIMES MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN ARE DISCUSSED IN "THE GALLIC WARS."



FIGURE 3.10. NUMBER OF TIMES MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN ARE DISCUSSED IN "GERMANY AND AGRICOLA."







FIGURE 3.12 NUMBER OF TIMES MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN ARE DISCUSSED IN "HISTORIES, VOL. I-III."



FIGURE 3.13. NUMBER OF TIMES MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN ARE DISCUSSED IN "GEOGRAPHY, VOL. I-III."

## Chapter 4: Trajectories of engendered archaeology in the mortuary record of Iron Age Britain



FIGURE 4.1. MAP OF SITES IN WESSEX CASE STUDY AREA.



FIGURE 4.2. MAP OF SITES IN EAST YORKSHIRE CASE STUDY AREA.

# FIGURE 4.3. DIAGRAM OF PRESERVATION OF SKELETAL ELEMENTS (AFTER MAYS 1998:2).



FIGURE 4.4. OSTEOLOGICAL SEXING OF WESSEX BURIALS.



FIGURE 4.5. COMPARISON OF BURIAL CONTEXTS BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX.



FIGURE 4.6. COMPARISON OF INDETERMINATE ADULT AND NONADULTS BY BURIAL CONTEXT.



FIGURE 4.7. COMPARISON OF BODY POSITIONING IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX.



FIGURE 4.8. COMPARISON OF BODY LAYOUT IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX.



FIGURE 4.9. COMPARISON OF BODY ORIENTATION IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX.



FIGURE 4.10. COMPARISON OF INHUMATIONS AND DISARTICULATED REMAINS BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX.



FIGURE 4.11. COMPARISON OF MULTIPLE AND SINGLE BURIALS BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX.



FIGURE 4.12. OSTEOLOGICAL AGING OF WESSEX BURIALS.



FIGURE 4.13. COMPARISON OF BURIAL CONTEXTS BY AGE CATEGORY.



FIGURE 4.14. COMPARISON OF BODY POSITIONING IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL AGE.



FIGURE 4.15. COMPARISON OF BODY POSITIONING IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL AGE.



FIGURE 4.16. COMPARISON OF BODY ORIENTATION IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL AGE.



FIGURE 4.17. COMPARISON OF INHUMATIONS AND DISARTICULATED REMAINS BY OSTEOLOGICAL AGE.



FIGURE 4.18. COMPARISON OF MULTIPLE AND SINGLE BURIALS BY OSTEOLOGICAL AGE.



FIGURE 4.19. OSTEOLOGICAL SEXING OF EAST YORKSHIRE BURIALS.



FIGURE 4.20. COMPARISON OF BODY POSITIONING IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX.



FIGURE 4.21. COMPARISON OF BODY LAYOUT IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX.



FIGURE 4.22. COMPARISON OF BODY ORIENTATION IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX.



FIGURE 4.23. COMPARISON OF MULTIPLE BURIALS BY OSTEOLOGICAL SEX.



FIGURE 4.24. OSTEOLOGICAL AGING OF EAST YORKSHIRE BURIALS.



FIGURE 4.25. COMPARISON OF BODY POSITIONING IN GRAVES BY OSTEOLOGICAL AGE.



FIGURE 4.26. COMPARISON OF BODY LAYOUT IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL AGE.



FIGURE 4.27. COMPARISON OF BODY ORIENTATION IN GRAVE BY OSTEOLOGICAL AGE.



FIGURE 4.28. COMPARISON OF MULTIPLE BURIALS BY OSTEOLOGICAL AGE.



FIGURE 4.29. WORD CLOUD GENERATED FOR THE GLASTONBURY LAKE VILLAGE EXCAVATION REPORT.



FIGURE 4.30. WORD CLOUD GENERATED FOR THE SALMONSBURY CAMP EXCAVATION REPORT.

age area base bone bronze clay Cm complete cut date deep diameter ditch drawn enclosure end entrance evidence excavation fabric features figure form fragment grains greensand group gussage in arge lower mm mumber objects phase pit possible recorded represented saints section Settlement sherds site small stone suggested surface type vessels

FIGURE 4.31. WORD CLOUD GENERATED FOR THE GUSSAGE ALL SAINTS EXCAVATION REPORT.

age although animals area bones burials cattle ceramic complete contexts cp danebury decoration deposition different distribution early evidence examples excavation fabric fig form found fragments general group horse including iron material mm number objects period phase pits possible remains represented sheep site skull small suggest table tools type used weights

FIGURE 4.32. WORD CLOUD GENERATED FOR THE DANEBURY EXCAVATION REPORT.

age area barrows bf blade bones brooch burials burton cemeteries copper-alloy different ditch east end erratic examples excavated fabric female fig fleming found garton grave group gs iron kirkburn length male possible pots probably remains rudston sites size socket station suggests surface table temper type vessels wetwang wood yorkshire

FIGURE 4.33. WORD CLOUD GENERATED FOR THE RUDSTON, BURTON FLEMING AND GARTON-ON-WOLDS EXCAVATION REPORT.



FIGURE 4.34. WORD CLOUD GENERATED FOR THE BATTLESBURY ROAD EXCAVATION REPORT.



FIGURE 4.35. PERCENTAGE OF ARTEFACT MATERIALS ASSOCIATED WITH WESSEX AGE GROUPS.



FIGURE 4.36. PERCENTAGE OF ARTEFACT MATERIALS ASSOCIATED WITH EAST YORKSHIRE AGE GROUPS.

## Chapter 5: Images of Gender in Archaeological Reconstructions of Iron Age Britain

FIGURE 5.1. EXAMPLE OF RECONSTRUCTION WITH UNIDENTIFIABLE FIGURES (KONSTAM 2006:18).

FIGURE 5.2. EXAMPLE OF IMAGES WHERE INDIVIDUALS ARE MARKERS OF SCALE (ROMANKIEWICZ 2011:180).



FIGURE 5.3. A "DEPOPULATED" RECONSTRUCTION (CURRENT ARCHAEOLOGY 2009:15).

FIGURE 5.4. PROPORTION OF PEOPLED AND NON-PEOPLED ARTISTIC RECONSTRUCTIONS OF IRON AGE BRITAIN.


FIGURE 5.5. TOTAL IDENTIFIED INDIVIDUALS IN 323 ARTISTIC RECONSTRUCTIONS OF IRON AGE BRITAIN.



FIGURE 5.6. PERCENTAGE OF SEXED INDIVIDUALS PER DECADE OF PUBLICATION (1800-1890).



FIGURE 5.7. PERCENTAGE OF SEXED INDIVIDUALS PER DECADE OF PUBLICATION (1900-2010).



FIGURE 5.8. DRAWING OUTLINING AUTHOR'S VIEW OF LOCATION WITHIN IMAGES (AUTHOR'S OWN).



FIGURE 5.9. LOCATION OF INDIVIDUALS WITHIN AN IMAGE.



FIGURE 5.10. LOCATION OF ADULT MALES IN IMAGES PER DECADE.



FIGURE 5.11. LOCATION OF ADULT FEMALES IN IMAGES PER DECADE.



FIGURE 5.12. LOCATION OF ELDERLY INDIVIDUALS IN IMAGES PER DECADE.



FIGURE 5.13. LOCATION OF COMBINED INFANTS AND CHILDREN IN IMAGES PER DECADE.



FIGURE 5.14. PASSIVE VERSUS NON-PASSIVE ACTIVITIES IN IMAGES.



FIGURE 5.15. ACTIVITIES IN IMAGES (PART 1).



FIGURE 5.16. ACTIVITIES IN IMAGES (PART 2).



#### FIGURE 5.17. 1815 ILLUSTRATION DEPICTING AUTHOR'S DEFINITION OF A LOINCLOTH (SMILES 1994:20).

FIGURE 5.18. ITEMS OF DRESS IN IMAGES.



FIGURE 5.19. ITEMS OF ADORNMENT IN IMAGES.



FIGURE 5.20. TYPES OF ASSOCIATED OBJECTS IN IMAGES(PART 1).



FIGURE 5.21. TYPES OF ASSOCIATED OBJECTS IN IMAGES (PART 2).

FIGURES 5.22. (L)-5.23. (R). ILLUSTRATIONS THAT DISPLAY BODILY ADORNMENT: 2001 ILLUSTRATION OF THE WINCHESTER HOARD AND 2009 ILLUSTRATION OF BODILY ADORNMENT (BRITISH MUSEUM 2001, LAMBRICK 2009:176). FIGURES 5.24. (L)-5.25. (R). FIGURES DEMONSTRATING THE "HEROIC" POSE IN THE 1921 EDITION OF THE ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS AND THE CIRCA 1990S DISPLAY IN MUSEUM OF THE IRON AGE (FORESTIER 1921:521, AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH).

FIGURE 5.26. 1997 ILLUSTRATION OF IRON AGE CULTIVATION (ARMIT 1997:COLOUR PLATE).

FIGURE 5.27. CIRCA 1990s ILLUSTRATION OF IRON AGE FARMING AT THE MUSEUM OF THE IRON AGE (AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH).

FIGURE 5.28. 1991 ILLUSTRATION OF WETWANG WARRIOR BURIAL AT THE HULL AND EAST RIDING MUSEUM (AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH).

FIGURE 5.29. 2004 ILLUSTRATION OF THE FOLLY LANE BURIAL (ST. ALBANS' MUSEUM).

FIGURE 5.30. 2005 ILLUSTRATION OF ST. ALBANS CREMATION BURIAL (ST. ALBANS' MUSEUM).

FIGURE 5.31. 2012 ILLUSTRATION OF THE CHARIOT BURIAL AT WETWANG SLACK (GILES 2012:212).

FIGURE 5.32. 1997 ILLUSTRATION OF RAMPART CONSTRUCTION AT BROWN CATERTHUN (ARMIT 1997:60).

FIGURE 5.33. 1899 ILLUSTRATION OF THE WILD BOAR HUNT AT THE CRANNOG (RCAHMS).

FIGURE 5.34. 1999 ILLUSTRATION OF PICTS HUNTING (REYNOLDS 2002:34-35).

FIGURES 5.35. (L)-5.36. (R). EXAMPLES OF MALE GESTURE IN THE HULL AND EAST RIDING MUSEUM AND A 2001 BOOK ON CELTIC WARRIORS (AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH, ALLEN AND REYNOLDS 2001:PLATE D).

FIGURES 5.37. (L)-5.38. (R). EXAMPLES OF FEMALE GESTURE IN THE 1921 ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS AND 2008-2009 QUANTOCK HILLS WEBSITE (FORESTIER 1921:510, QUANTOCK HILLS AONB EDUCATION). FIGURE 5.39. CIRCA 1990s ILLUSTRATION OF IRON AGE WARRIORS (HISTORIC ENGLAND).

FIGURE 5.40. 1993 ILLUSTRATION OF IRON AGE WOMEN WITH CHILDREN DURING A CEREMONY (HISTORIC ENGLAND).

FIGURES 5.41. (L)-5.42. (R). EXAMPLES OF MAPS AND SITE PLANS (LAMBRICK 2009:107, PITT-RIVERS 1882, PLATE 1).

FIGURES 5.43. (L)-5.44. (R). EXAMPLES OF INFOGRAPHICS IN SITE REPORTS AND SCALE MODELS AT THE MUSEUM OF THE IRON AGE (LAMBRICK 2009:216, AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH).

FIGURES 5.45. (L)-5.46. (R). 1998 PAOLOZZI FIGURES AT THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF SCOTLAND (AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH).

FIGURES 5.47. (L), 5.48. (M), 5.49. (R). DIFFERENT GESTURES FROM THE 1998 PAOLOZZI FIGURES (AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH).

FIGURES 5.50. (L)-5.51. (R). LONE PAOLOZZI FIGURE AND POSSIBLE FEMALE FIGURE AT THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF SCOTLAND (AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH).

FIGURE 5.52. ALAN SORRELL'S USE OF CHIAROSCURO IN A 1957 ILLUSTRATION OF CLICKHIMIN BROCH IN THE ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (HAMILTON 1957:812-813).

FIGURE 5.53. ALAN SORRELL'S USE OF CHIAROSCURO IN A 1981 ILLUSTRATION OF STAPLE HOWE (SORRELL 1981:36).

FIGURE 5.54. A 1981 ILLUSTRATION OF A DRUID AT THE HEATHROW SETTLEMENT (SORRELL 1981:37).

FIGURES 5.55. (L)-5.56. (R). CIRCA 1990S ILLUSTRATIONS OF DANEBURY RAMPARTS AND MAIDEN CASTLE ROUNDHOUSES IN A QUARRY DITCH (HISTORIC ENGLAND).

FIGURES 5.57. (L)-5.58. (R). 2009 ILLUSTRATIONS OF IRON AGE AGRICULTURE (HISTORIC ENGLAND).

FIGURE 5.59. 1993 ILLUSTRATION OF COLCHESTER BURIAL (CURRENT ARCHAEOLOGY 1993:497).

FIGURE 5.60. 2006 ILLUSTRATION CARSINGTON INFANT BURIALS (AMBRUS AND ASTON 2006:29).

FIGURE 5.61. WOMEN'S DRESS IN THE 1921 ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (FORESTIER 1921:510).

FIGURE 5.62. SCATHA'S WAR SCHOOL IN A 2002 BOOK ABOUT THE PICTS (REYNOLDS 2002: PLATE B).

FIGURES 5.63. (L)-5.64. (R). JOHN WHITE'S PICTS, ILLUSTRATED IN THE 1580S (HULTON 1984:91,93).

FIGURES 5.65. (L)-5.66. (R). GÉRARD'S LE COURAGE GAULOIS (1830) COMPARED TO THE 1ST-2ND CENTURY AD STATUE GAULOIS BLESSE (AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH).

FIGURE 5.67. EDWARD HORNEL'S 1890 PAINTING THE DRUIDS: BRINGING IN THE MISTLETOE (GLASGOW MUSEUMS).

FIGURE 5.68. 1859 ILLUSTRATION OF CALGACUS (TAYLOR 1859: FRONTISPIECE).

FIGURES 5.69. (L)-5.70. (R). CIRCA 1990S ILLUSTRATIONS OF AN IRON AGE CHARIOTEER AND ANOTHER IRON AGE CHARIOTEER IN THE MUSEUM OF THE IRON AGE (HISTORIC ENGLAND, AUTHOR'S OWN PHOTOGRAPH). FIGURES 5.71. (L)-5.72. (R). THOMAS MILTON'S 1810 ENGRAVING THE MASSACRE OF THE DRUIDS AND AYLETT SAMMES 1676 ILLUSTRATION OF A WICKER MAN (SMILES 1994:111, SAMMES 1676).

FIGURE 5.73. 1996 ILLUSTRATION OF CELTIC NOBLES (BRITISH MUSEUM).

### Appendix A

## Complete Site List and Number of Occurrences of Human Remains

Wessex				
Site Name	County	Easting	Northing	Occurrences of Human Remains
Alington Avenue	Dorset	370200	89900	19
Flagstones	Dorset	370400	89900	8
Flower's Barrow	Dorset	386400	80500	1
Gussage All Saints	Dorset	399800	110100	64
Maiden Castle	Dorset	366900	88500	79
Marnhull, Allard's Pit	Dorset	379500	119800	1
Owlsebury	Dorset	452500	124600	1
Pimperne Down	Dorset	389100	109700	4
Poundbury	Dorset	368500	91100	59
Poundbury Pipeline	Dorset	368300	90600	1
Quatre Bras	Dorset	364200	93400	1
Scotland Farm	Dorset	406200	140800	1
Stourpaine, Hod Hill	Dorset	385700	110700	8
Trumpet Major	Dorset	370200	90100	3
Western Link Road	Dorset	366700	90700	24
Whitcombe	Dorset	371100	88100	12
Woodcutts	Dorset	396300	118100	6
Woodyates	Dorset	402788	119447	1
Badgeworth	Gloucestershire	392600	216200	1
Bagendon	Gloucestershire	401800	206200	1
Barnwood	Gloucestershire	386500	217900	2
Birdlip	Gloucestershire	393100	215300	2
Blaise Castle	Gloucestershire (Bristol)	355800	178400	2
Bourton-on-the-water	Gloucestershire	416700	221000	8
Brockworth	Gloucestershire	390200	216000	1
Crickley Hill	Gloucestershire	392500	216100	1
Ditches	Gloucestershire	399500	209500	4
Frocester	Gloucestershire	378600	202700	6
Guiting Power	Gloucestershire	408300	225800	1
Henbury School	Gloucestershire	356200	179100	24
High Nach Caleford	(Bristol)	25(700	210100	1
Hign Nash, Coleford	Gloucestershire	356/00	210100	1
Irelely Farm	Gloucestershire	403/00	230500	2

Kemble	Gloucestershire	398700	197100	3
Kingscote	Gloucestershire	382000	196900	1
Lynches Trackway	Gloucestershire	402100	205100	1
Norbury	Gloucestershire	412600	215600	2
Roughground Farm	Gloucestershire	420900	100500	2
Salmonbury Camp	Gloucestershire	417300	220300	8
Shipton Oliffe	Gloucestershire	403800	218600	1
St Georges Church, Kings	Gloucestershire	381800	204000	1
Stanley				
The Park	Gloucestershire	408250	225850	1
Tinkley Lane	Gloucestershire	381000	200000	1
Uley Bury	Gloucestershire	378300	198900	1
West Lane	Gloucestershire	389700	197200	3
Bury Hill	Hampshire	434562	143537	3
Danebury	Hampshire	432451	137591	182
Houghton Down	Hampshire	434100	136100	7
Little Somborne	Hampshire	438900	132800	5
Micheldever Wood	Hampshire	452700	137000	17
Nettlebank Copse	Hampshire	434100	139300	2
New Buildings	Hampshire	434400	137400	14
Old Down Farm	Hampshire	435600	146500	14
Site A, Kennel Farm	Hampshire	459870	148530	2
Somborne Park Farm	Hampshire	437940	133055	1
Sparsholt	Hampshire	441500	130100	1
Suddern Farm	Hampshire	427600	137600	122
Viables Two, Jay's Close	Hampshire	463200	150050	3
Weston Down Cottages,	Hampshire	449750	141130	2
Weston Colley				
Windy Dido	Hampshire	424900	142620	<u> </u>
Abingdon Pipeline	Oxfordshire	452600	200250	<u> </u>
Allen's Pit	Oxfordshire	45/500	196200	1
Angelinos to Ardley	Oxfordshire	451950	224570	1
Ashville	Oufordahira	448200	107200	7
Asilvine Barton Court Farm	Oxfordshire	448300	197300	/
Board Mill	Oxfordshire	430930	205700	
Bernwood First School	Oxfordshire	440200	203700	1
Bicester Fields Farm	Oxfordshire	459200	222200	<del>1</del> 1
Cassington	Oxfordshire	444500	211900	3
Cassington Mill	Oxfordshire	444810	210010	3
City Farm	Oxfordshire	443000	211100	1
Frilford	Oxfordshire	443900	196200	2
Gravelly Guy	Oxfordshire	440290	205340	14
Joint Service Command and	Oxfordshire	424920	190660	3
Staff College	-	_		-
Mingies Ditch	Oxfordshire	439100	205900	3
Sinodun Hill Camp/Castle	Oxfordshire	456900	192500	1
Hill				
Station Inn	Oxfordshire	449810	197260	2

Sutton Courteney	Oxfordshire	450000	194000	1
Thrupp Farm	Oxfordshire	452500	197200	1
Vicarage Field/Beard Mill	Oxfordshire	440000	205000	1
Gravel pits				
Watkins Farm	Oxfordshire	442600	203500	5
Wyndyke Furlong	Oxfordshire	448250	197720	3
Backwell	Somerset	349240	168010	18
Browne's Hole	Somerset	366930	147570	1
Cadbury Castle	Somerset	362837	125110	91
Charlcombe	Somerset (Bath)	372800	169300	1
Charterhouse Warren Farm	Somerset	349360	154570	29
Swallet				
Clevedon	Somerset	340000	172000	1
Cook's Hill Wood Cave	Somerset	352160	148440	1
Cooper's Hole	Somerset	346820	154020	1
Coronation Road, Worle	Somerset	335120	162670	3
Dibble Farm	Somerset	338400	157500	21
Field Farm	Somerset	362500	142500	1
Glastonbury Lake Village	Somerset	342900	141100	38
Gough's New Cave	Somerset	346700	153910	5
Great Oone's Hole	Somerset	346800	153920	1
Henstridge	Somerset	372000	120000	3
Herriots Bridge	Somerset	357100	158100	5
Keltic/Reads Cavern	Somerset	346820	158440	4
Little Solsbury	Somerset (Bath)	376700	168000	1
Meare East Lake Village	Somerset	344680	142118	1
Meare West Lake Village	Somerset	344426	142207	11
Middle Chinnock	Somerset	347230	113220	2
Peasdown	Somerset	370470	156910	1
Pig's Hole/Sow's Hole	Somerset	347700	154550	1
Saye's Hole	Somerset	346630	153890	<u>l</u>
Small Down Camp	Somerset	366000	140000	<u> </u>
Soldier's Hole	Somerset	346870	154000	<u> </u>
South Cadbury	Somerset	362800	125200	<u> </u>
Sun Hole Cave	Somerset	346900	154000	4
Lickenham Rock Shelter	Somerset	344410	1/21/0	2
Walton Down	Somerset	343150	1/3940	<u> </u>
Whitegate Farm	Somerset	333990	156920	2
Wookey Hole	Somerset	353200	148000	3
worlebury	Somerset	331400	162500	/1
Allotments	Willshire Willshire	393900	153800	1
Battlesbury Camp	Wiltshire	389/80	145430	/
Battlesbury Road	Wiltshire	390000	140070	33
Berwick Down Biddestene, Slenghtenford	Wiltshire	404390	140270	1
Diduestone, Staughterford	Wiltshire	384300	1/3/00	/1
Dishopstrow Form	Wiltshire	41443U 200100	132380	l
Dishupstruw Farm Boseembe Down West	Wiltshire	410120	143970	l
Boscombo Down West	Wiltshire	419120	139230	<u>l</u> 1
Duscumpe Down west	w mishine	419040	139140	1

Chisenbury TrendleWiltshire4151901538701Cockey Down enclosure, Petersfinger Main PipelineWiltshire4170001314001Cold Kitchen HillWiltshire3833501387802Downton RoadWiltshire4149001282001East BoscombeWiltshire4206401388201Ebbesbourne Wakes, FifieldWiltshire3995001250001Bavant41880013380010Gore LaneWiltshire4151001892001Groundwell WestWiltshire4151001358005HighfieldWiltshire41330013080013Knap HillWiltshire41330013080011Latton LandsWiltshire4085001961003Liddington, LiddingtonWiltshire3887001405002DownWiltshire3986501327701Manor FarmWiltshire3986501327701Manor FarmWiltshire4009701328801Lane39957001187003Jown3985701405002Down3986501327701Manor FarmWiltshire4187011Manor FarmWiltshire4089701328801Lamb399570189003LidenhallWiltshire4019701328801 <th>Budbury Hill</th> <th>Wiltshire</th> <th>382130</th> <th>161130</th> <th>2</th>	Budbury Hill	Wiltshire	382130	161130	2
Cockey Down enclosure, Petersfinger Main PipelineWiltshire4170001314001Cold Kitchen HillWiltshire3833501387802Downton RoadWiltshire4149001282001East BoscombeWiltshire4206401382801Ebbesbourne Wakes, Fifield BavantWiltshire41880013380010Gore LaneWiltshire4181001382001Groundwell WestWiltshire4151001892001Groveley CastleWiltshire4121001637001Latton LandsWiltshire4121001637001Latton LandsWiltshire3988701394001Liddington, LiddingtonWiltshire3988701405002DownWiltshire3988701405002DownWiltshire3986501327701LandsWiltshire3986501327701Manor FarmWiltshire3967801254303MildenhallWiltshire4417101722901Manor FarmWiltshire4417101722901MiddenhallWiltshire4403001448502New SarumWiltshire4403001180001MiddenhallWiltshire4403001180001Manor FarmWiltshire3949001105002DownWiltshire4417101320502MiddenhallWiltshire44147101	Chisenbury Trendle	Wiltshire	415190	153870	1
Petersfinger Main Pipeline	Cockey Down enclosure,	Wiltshire	417000	131400	1
Cold Kitchen HillWiltshire3833501387802Downton RoadWiltshire4149001282001East BoscombeWiltshire4206401382801Ebbesbourne Wakes, FifieldWiltshire4180013380010Gore LaneWiltshire4180013880010Gore LaneWiltshire4151001892001Groundwell WestWiltshire416001358005HighfieldWiltshire4121001637001Lamb DownWiltshire4121001637001Latton LandsWiltshire4209001797001CastleWiltshire4209001797001CastleWiltshire3988701405002DownWiltshire3986501327701Manor FarmWiltshire39067801254303MiddenAalWiltshire4089401488502NownWiltshire4011701322801LaneWiltshire4012011328001Romor Farmhouse, SandhillsWiltshire4118701722901MiddenhallWiltshire4118701722901Net Down Barrow GroupWiltshire3940001182002New SarumWiltshire4033001961801RotherleyWiltshire4033001961801ShorncoteWiltshire4033001961801ShorncoteWiltsh	Petersfinger Main Pipeline				
Downton RoadWiltshire4149001282001East BoscombeWiltshire4206401382801Ebbesbourne Wakes, Fifield BavantWiltshire3995001250001Figsbury RingWiltshire41880013380010Gore LaneWiltshire44276401788101Groundwell WestWiltshire44048001388005HighfieldWiltshire41130013080013Knap HillWiltshire4121001637001Latton LandsWiltshire4085001961003Liddington, LiddingtonWiltshire4085001961003Longbridge Deverill, Cow DownWiltshire3988701327701Manor FarmWiltshire3986501327701Manor FarmWiltshire3967801254303Middle/Swallowcliffe DownWiltshire4212201693208Monkton Down ReservoirWiltshire4118701722901Net Down Barrow GroupWiltshire40590011950036Rushmore ParkWiltshire403001961801Shorncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire41940016890012Shorncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire41940016890012Compered Markin Kitshire419400168900121Shorncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire41940016890012Compered Miltshire419400166800 <td< th=""><th>Cold Kitchen Hill</th><th>Wiltshire</th><th>383350</th><th>138780</th><th>2</th></td<>	Cold Kitchen Hill	Wiltshire	383350	138780	2
East BoscombeWiltshire4206401382801Ebbesbourne Wakes, Fifield BavantWiltshire3995001250001Figsbury RingWiltshire41880013380010Gore LaneWiltshire4176401788101Groundwell WestWiltshire4111001892001Groundwell WestWiltshire410001358005HighfieldWiltshire41330013080013Knap HillWiltshire413001394001Lamb DownWiltshire4085001961003Liddington, LiddingtonWiltshire3986701394001Caste	Downton Road	Wiltshire	414900	128200	1
Ebbesbourne Wakes, Fifield BavantWiltshire3995001250001Bavant41880013380010Groundwell WestWiltshire4180001388001Groundwell WestWiltshire4151001892001Groveley CastleWiltshire4130013080013Knap HillWiltshire4130013080013Latton LandsWiltshire4121001637001Latton LandsWiltshire40850019961003Liddington, LiddingtonWiltshire3887001405002Longbridge Deverill, Cow DownWiltshire3986501327701Manor FarmWiltshire3986501327701Manor FarmWiltshire3967801254303Middle/Swallowcliffe DownWiltshire4118701722901Manor Farm KeservoirWiltshire4118701722901MiddnehallWiltshire413000130002New SarumWiltshire4130001693202New SarumWiltshire4130001189001ShorncoteWiltshire3957001189001Shorncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire4133001300012Castle	East Boscombe	Wiltshire	420640	138280	1
BavantImage: Constant of the system of the syst	Ebbesbourne Wakes, Fifield	Wiltshire	399500	125000	1
Figsbury RingWiltshire41880013380010Gore LaneWiltshire4276401788101Groundwell WestWiltshire4151001892001Groveley CastleWiltshire41030013580013Knap HillWiltshire4121001637001Lamb DownWiltshire3988701994001Latton LandsWiltshire4085001961003Liddington, LiddingtonWiltshire3887001405002Castle3887001405002DownWiltshire3986501327701Manor FarmWiltshire3986501327701Manor Farmhouse, SandhillsWiltshire3967801254303Mildel/Swallowcliffe DownWiltshire4118701722901Net Down Barrow GroupWiltshire4118701722901Net SorumWiltshire4009701407802Parsonage DownWiltshire4009701189001ShorncoteWiltshire4009701189001ShorncoteWiltshire4009701189001Shorncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire4033001961801Shorncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire4033001961801Shorncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire4194001668001Upavon, Casterley CampWiltshire39420011040012Castle <th>Bavant</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	Bavant				
Gore LaneWiltshire4276401788101Groundwell WestWiltshire4151001892001Groveley CastleWiltshire4133001338005HighfieldWiltshire4130013080013Knap HillWiltshire4121001637001Lamb DownWiltshire4085001961003Liddington, LiddingtonWiltshire408500197001Castle1405002Manor FarmWiltshire3986501327701Manor FarmWiltshire3966501327701Manor Farmhouse, SandhillsWiltshire3967801254303MildehAllWiltshire4009701328801Lane113205028Monkton Down ReservoirWiltshire4118701722901Net Down Barrow GroupWiltshire4118701320502Parsonage DownWiltshire4116001140002Shorncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire4116001140002Shorncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire4103001961801St. Margaret's MeadWiltshire4103001961801Steeple Langford, Yarnbury CastleWiltshire41030014030012Camp39420011960011Under Rampart, Battlesbury Wiltshire410300140300121Castle <th>Figsbury Ring</th> <th>Wiltshire</th> <th>418800</th> <th>133800</th> <th>10</th>	Figsbury Ring	Wiltshire	418800	133800	10
Groundwell WestWiltshire4151001892001Groveley CastleWiltshire4048001358005HighfieldWiltshire4130013080013Knap HillWiltshire4121001637001Lamb DownWiltshire3988701394001Latton LandsWiltshire4209001797001CastleViltshire3887001405002DownWiltshire3986501327701Manor FarmWiltshire3986501327701Manor FarmWiltshire3967801254303Milde/Swallowcliffe DownWiltshire4212201693208Monkton Down ReservoirWiltshire4118701722901Net Down Barrow GroupWiltshire4005901407802New SarumWiltshire40059011950036Rushmore ParkWiltshire40059011950036Rushmore ParkWiltshire4033001961801ShorncoteWiltshire4033001961801Shorncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire4033001961801Steaple Langford, YarnburyWiltshire4194001688001Steaple Langford, YarnburyWiltshire4194001688001Steaple Langford, YarnburyWiltshire4194001668001Under Rampart, BattlesburyWiltshire4194001668001Under Rampart, Batt	Gore Lane	Wiltshire	427640	178810	1
Groveley CastleWiltshire4048001358005HighfieldWiltshire41210016370013Knap HillWiltshire4121001637001Lamb DownWiltshire4085001961003Liddington, LiddingtonWiltshire4209001797001CastleCastle200001257001Longbridge Deverill, CowWiltshire3986501327701DownWiltshire3986501327701Manor FarmWiltshire3966501327701Manor Farmhouse, SandhillsWiltshire4009701328801LaneViltshire4118701722901Middle/Swallowcliffe DownWiltshire4418701722901MiddlenhallWiltshire4418701320502Net Down Barrow GroupWiltshire40059901407801Rushmore ParkWiltshire39957001189003SourhmillWiltshire4033001961801SourhmillWiltshire4116001314002Nerger's MeadWiltshire4033001961801Southmill HillWiltshire4194001689001Southmill HillWiltshire4194001689001LaneViltshire4194001689001LaneViltshire4147101320502New SarumWiltshire4147101320502 <th< th=""><th>Groundwell West</th><th>Wiltshire</th><th>415100</th><th>189200</th><th>1</th></th<>	Groundwell West	Wiltshire	415100	189200	1
HighfieldWiltshire41330013080013Knap HillWiltshire41210016370011Lamb DownWiltshire39887013940011Latton LandsWiltshire40850019610033Liddington, LiddingtonWiltshire42090017970011Castle	Groveley Castle	Wiltshire	404800	135800	5
Knap HillWiltshire4121001637001Lamb DownWiltshire398701394001Latton LandsWiltshire4085001961003Liddington, LiddingtonWiltshire4209001797001CastleZastle20001405002DownWiltshire3887001405002DownWiltshire3986501327701Manor FarmWiltshire4009701328801LaneWiltshire3967801254303Milde/Swallowcliffe DownWiltshire4212201693208Middle/Swallowcliffe DownWiltshire4418701722901Net Down Barrow GroupWiltshire4118701722001Net Down Barrow GroupWiltshire39490011950036RotherleyWiltshire3957001189001Salisbury, Tinker PitWiltshire4033001961801Shorncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire4033001961801Southmill HillWiltshire4033001445402CampWiltshire4115001314002CampWiltshire4157501405502Storncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire4194001689001Subshire4033001961801Subshire40350014030012CampWiltshire4194001689001Subshire4035001	Highfield	Wiltshire	413300	130800	13
Lamb DownWiltshire3988701394001Latton LandsWiltshire4085001961003Liddington, LiddingtonWiltshire4209001797001Castle	Knap Hill	Wiltshire	412100	163700	1
Latton LandsWiltshire4085001961003Liddington, LiddingtonWiltshire4209001797001Castle	Lamb Down	Wiltshire	398870	139400	1
Liddington, Liddington CastleWiltshire420900 420900179700 1797001Longbridge Deverill, Cow DownWiltshire3887001405002Manor Farm Manor Farmhouse, Sandhills LaneWiltshire3986501327701Minder Samdbills LaneWiltshire3967801254303Milde/Swallowcliffe Down Wiltshire3967801254303Mildenhall WiltshireWiltshire4212201693208Monkton Down Reservoir WiltshireWiltshire4118701722901Net Down Barrow Group WiltshireWiltshire4147101320502Parsonage Down Rushmore Park ShorncoteWiltshire39490011950036Rushmore Park Shorncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire4033001961801Shorncote/Ashton Keynes St. Margaret's Mead CastleWiltshire39420011960011Suthmill Hill WeitshireWiltshire410300122St. Margaret's Mead WiltshireWiltshire41940016890011Upavon, Casterley Camp WiltshireWiltshire3947001113502Camp West Overton, Boreham DownWiltshire4115001535004Wiltshire41150015350044Wiltshire411400016680011DownWiltshire41140001668001	Latton Lands	Wiltshire	408500	196100	3
CastleImage: constraint of the system of the sy	Liddington, Liddington	Wiltshire	420900	179700	1
Longbridge Deverill, Cow DownWiltshire3887001405002Manor Farm Manor Farmhouse, Sandhills LaneWiltshire3986501327701Minor Farmhouse, Sandhills LaneWiltshire4009701328801Middle/Swallowcliffe Down MiltenhallWiltshire3967801254303Middenhall Net Down Barrow GroupWiltshire4118701722901Net Down Barrow Group Parsonage DownWiltshire4147101320502Parsonage Down SthireWiltshire4147101320502New Sarum Parson age DownWiltshire39490011950036Rushmore Park ShorncoteWiltshire4116001314002Shorncote CastleWiltshire4033001961801Southmill Hill Under Rangaret's Mead CastleWiltshire4194001689001Upavon, Casterley Camp CampWiltshire41950113502West Overton, Boreham DownWiltshire4115001535004West Overton, Boreham DownWiltshire4127001541101	Castle				
DownWiltshire398650132770Manor FarmWiltshire3986501327701Manor Farmhouse, Sandhills LaneWiltshire4009701328801Middle/Swallowcliffe DownWiltshire3967801254303MiddenhallWiltshire4212201693208Monkton Down ReservoirWiltshire4118701722901Net Down Barrow GroupWiltshire4147101320502Parsonage DownWiltshire4059901407801RotherleyWiltshire39490011950036Rushmore ParkWiltshire4116001314002ShorncoteWiltshire4033001961801Southmill HillWiltshire4033001961801Southmill HillWiltshire4194001689001Suteple Langford, Yarnbury CastleWiltshire3942001196001Under Rampart, Battlesbury CampWiltshire4115001535004West Dean, Royal Navy Armaments DepotWiltshire4127001541101Wiltshire41400016680011DownWiltshire4140001668001	Longbridge Deverill, Cow	Wiltshire	388700	140500	2
Manor FarmWiltshire3986501327701Manor Farmhouse, SandhillsWiltshire4009701328801Lane3967801254303Middle/Swallowcliffe DownWiltshire4212201693208MiddenhallWiltshire4118701722901Net Down Barrow GroupWiltshire4118701722901Net Down Barrow GroupWiltshire4109401448502New SarumWiltshire4059901407801RotherleyWiltshire39490011950036Rushmore ParkWiltshire4033001961801Salisbury, Tinker PitWiltshire4033001961801ShorncoteWiltshire4137501405502St. Margaret's MeadWiltshire3942001196001Under Rampart, BattlesburyWiltshire3942001136001Upavon, Casterley CampWiltshire4115001535004West Overton, BorehamWiltshire41140001668001Wiltshire411400016680011OwnWiltshire41140001668001Wiltshire4140001668001Middinton FarmWiltshire4140001668001Upavon, Casterley CampWiltshire4140001668001West Overton, BorehamWiltshire4140001668001Wiltshire4140001668001	Down				
Manor Farmhouse, SandhillsWiltshire4009701328801Lane	Manor Farm	Wiltshire	398650	132770	1
LaneImage: Constraint of the systemMiddle/Swallowcliffe DownWiltshire3967801254303MildenhallWiltshire4212201693208Monkton Down ReservoirWiltshire4118701722901Net Down Barrow GroupWiltshire4089401448502New SarumWiltshire4147101320502Parsonage DownWiltshire4059901407801RotherleyWiltshire39490011950036Rushmore ParkWiltshire3957001189001Salisbury, Tinker PitWiltshire4033001961801ShorncoteWiltshire4033001961801Southmill HillWiltshire4157501405502St. Margaret's MeadWiltshire40350014030012CastleImage: Castle St. Margaret's MeadWiltshire3942001196001Under Rampart, Battlesbury CastleWiltshire4194001535004West Dean, Royal Navy Armaments DepotWiltshire4191501113502West Overton, Boreham DownWiltshire4127001541101	Manor Farmhouse, Sandhills	Wiltshire	400970	132880	1
Middle/Swallowcliffe DownWiltshire396/801254303MildenhallWiltshire4212201693208Monkton Down ReservoirWiltshire4118701722901Net Down Barrow GroupWiltshire4089401448502New SarumWiltshire4147101320502Parsonage DownWiltshire4059901407801RotherleyWiltshire39490011950036Rushmore ParkWiltshire3957001189001Salisbury, Tinker PitWiltshire4033001961801ShorncoteWiltshire4033001961801Shorncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire4103001405502St. Margaret's MeadWiltshire43942001196001Under Rampart, Battlesbury CampWiltshire3942001196001Upavon, Casterley Camp WiltshireWiltshire4391501113502Wiltshire4191001535004West Dean, Royal Navy Armaments DepotWiltshire4127001541101	Lane	****1. 1 *		105100	
MildenhallWiltshire4212201693208Monkton Down ReservoirWiltshire4118701722901Net Down Barrow GroupWiltshire4089401448502New SarumWiltshire4147101320502Parsonage DownWiltshire4059901407801RotherleyWiltshire39490011950036Rushmore ParkWiltshire3957001189001Salisbury, Tinker PitWiltshire4033001961801ShorncoteWiltshire4033001961801Shorncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire4137501405502St. Margaret's MeadWiltshire4137001430012CastleUiltshire3942001196001Under Rampart, BattlesburyWiltshire3942001196001Upavon, Casterley CampWiltshire4115001535004West Dean, Royal NavyWiltshire41140001668001Widtshire41400016680011West Overton, BorehamWiltshire4127001541101	Middle/Swallowcliffe Down	Wiltshire	396780	125430	3
Monkton Down Reservoir     Wiltshire     411870     172290     1       Net Down Barrow Group     Wiltshire     408940     144850     2       New Sarum     Wiltshire     414710     132050     2       Parsonage Down     Wiltshire     405990     140780     1       Rotherley     Wiltshire     394900     119500     36       Rushmore Park     Wiltshire     395700     118900     1       Salisbury, Tinker Pit     Wiltshire     403300     196180     1       Shorncote     Wiltshire     403300     196180     1       Shorncote/Ashton Keynes     Wiltshire     415750     140550     2       St. Margaret's Mead     Wiltshire     419400     168900     1       Steeple Langford, Yarnbury     Wiltshire     394200     119600     1       Under Rampart, Battlesbury     Wiltshire     389780     145430     2       Castle	Mildenhall	Wiltshire	421220	169320	8
Net Down Barrow GroupWiltshire4089401448502New SarumWiltshire4147101320502Parsonage DownWiltshire4059901407801RotherleyWiltshire39490011950036Rushmore ParkWiltshire3957001189001Salisbury, Tinker PitWiltshire4033001961801ShorncoteWiltshire4033001961801Southmill HillWiltshire4157501405502St. Margaret's MeadWiltshire40350014030012Castle	Monkton Down Reservoir	Wiltshire	4118/0	172290	<u>l</u>
New SarumWiltshire414/101320502Parsonage DownWiltshire4059901407801RotherleyWiltshire39490011950036Rushmore ParkWiltshire3957001189001Salisbury, Tinker PitWiltshire4116001314002ShorncoteWiltshire4033001961801Southmill HillWiltshire4033001961801Southmill HillWiltshire4137501405502St. Margaret's MeadWiltshire40350014030012CastleUltshire3942001196001Upavon, Casterley CampWiltshire4115001535004West Dean, Royal NavyWiltshire4140001668001West Overton, BorehamWiltshire4140001668001DownWiltshire4140001541101	Net Down Barrow Group	Wiltshire	408940	144850	2
Parsonage DownWiltshire4059901407801RotherleyWiltshire39490011950036Rushmore ParkWiltshire3957001189001Salisbury, Tinker PitWiltshire4116001314002ShorncoteWiltshire4033001961801Shorncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire4033001961801Southmill HillWiltshire4157501405502St. Margaret's MeadWiltshire4194001689001Steeple Langford, Yarnbury CastleWiltshire3942001196001Under Rampart, Battlesbury CampWiltshire4115001535004West Overton, Boreham DownWiltshire4140001668001Wiltshire41400016680011Wiltshire4140001668001	New Sarum	Wiltshire	414710	132050	2
RotherleyWiltshire39490011950036Rushmore ParkWiltshire3957001189001Salisbury, Tinker PitWiltshire4116001314002ShorncoteWiltshire4033001961801Shorncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire4033001961801Southmill HillWiltshire4157501405502St. Margaret's MeadWiltshire4194001689001Steeple Langford, Yarnbury CastleWiltshire3942001196001Under Rampart, Battlesbury CampWiltshire3897801454302Upavon, Casterley CampWiltshire4195001113502West Overton, Boreham DownWiltshire4127001541101	Parsonage Down	Wiltshire	405990	140780	1
Rushmore ParkWiltshire3957001189001Salisbury, Tinker PitWiltshire4116001314002ShorncoteWiltshire4033001961801Shorncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire4033001961801Southmill HillWiltshire4157501405502St. Margaret's MeadWiltshire4194001689001Steeple Langford, Yarnbury CastleWiltshire40350014030012Tollard RoyalWiltshire3942001196001Upavon, Casterley Camp WiltshireWiltshire4115001535004West Dean, Royal Navy Armaments DepotWiltshire4140001668001WiltshireWiltshire4140001668001WiltshireWiltshire4140001668001	Rotherley	Wiltshire	394900	119500	36
Salisbury, Tinker PitWiltshire4116001314002ShorncoteWiltshire4033001961801Shorncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire4033001961801Southmill HillWiltshire4157501405502St. Margaret's MeadWiltshire4194001689001Steeple Langford, Yarnbury CastleWiltshire40350014030012Tollard RoyalWiltshire3942001196001Under Rampart, Battlesbury CampWiltshire4115001535004West Dean, Royal Navy Armaments DepotWiltshire419001668001Wiltshire41400016680011Wiltshire4140001668001	Rushmore Park	Wiltshire	395700	118900	<u> </u>
ShorncoteWiltshire4033001961801Shorncote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire4033001961801Southmill HillWiltshire4157501405502St. Margaret's MeadWiltshire4194001689001Steeple Langford, Yarnbury CastleWiltshire40350014030012Tollard RoyalWiltshire3942001196001Under Rampart, Battlesbury CampWiltshire3897801454302Upavon, Casterley Camp West Dean, Royal Navy Armaments DepotWiltshire4115001535004West Overton, Boreham DownWiltshire4140001668001Wiltshire4140001668001	Sansbury, Tinker Pit	Wiltshire	411600	131400	2
Shorhcote/Ashton KeynesWiltshire4033001961801Southmill HillWiltshire4157501405502St. Margaret's MeadWiltshire4194001689001Steeple Langford, Yarnbury CastleWiltshire40350014030012Tollard RoyalWiltshire3942001196001Under Rampart, Battlesbury CampWiltshire3897801454302Upavon, Casterley CampWiltshire4115001535004West Dean, Royal Navy Armaments DepotWiltshire4191501113502Wiltshire4140001668001DownWiltshire4127001541101	Shorncote Shorncote/Ashton Vormas	Wiltshire	403300	196180	<u> </u>
Southmin HinWiltshire4137301403302St. Margaret's MeadWiltshire4194001689001Steeple Langford, Yarnbury CastleWiltshire40350014030012Tollard RoyalWiltshire3942001196001Under Rampart, Battlesbury CampWiltshire38978014543022Upavon, Casterley CampWiltshire4115001535004West Dean, Royal Navy Armaments DepotWiltshire41915011135022Wiltshire4140001668001Wiltshire4127001541101	Shorncote/Ashton Keynes	Wiltshire	403300	140550	1
St. Margaret s MeadWitshire4194001089001Steeple Langford, Yarnbury CastleWiltshire40350014030012Tollard RoyalWiltshire3942001196001Under Rampart, Battlesbury CampWiltshire3897801454302Upavon, Casterley CampWiltshire4115001535004West Dean, Royal Navy Armaments DepotWiltshire4391501113502West Overton, Boreham DownWiltshire4127001541101	Southmill Hill St. Mangapatis Mood	Wiltshire	415/50	140550	<u> </u>
Steeple Langlord, Yarnbury CastleWitshire40330014030012Tollard RoyalWiltshire3942001196001Under Rampart, Battlesbury CampWiltshire3897801454302Upavon, Casterley CampWiltshire4115001535004West Dean, Royal Navy Armaments DepotWiltshire4391501113502West Overton, Boreham 	St. Margaret's Meau	Wiltshire	419400	108900	12
CastleWiltshire3942001196001Under Rampart, Battlesbury CampWiltshire3897801454302Upavon, Casterley CampWiltshire4115001535004West Dean, Royal Navy Armaments DepotWiltshire4391501113502West Overton, Boreham DownWiltshire4140001668001Wiltshire4127001541101	Castle	wittshife	405500	140300	12
Tonard RoyalWitshire3942001190001Under Rampart, Battlesbury CampWiltshire3897801454302Upavon, Casterley CampWiltshire4115001535004West Dean, Royal Navy Armaments DepotWiltshire4391501113502West Overton, Boreham DownWiltshire4140001668001Wiltshire4127001541101	Tollard Doval	Wiltshire	204200	110600	1
Camp3397801434302Upavon, Casterley CampWiltshire4115001535004West Dean, Royal NavyWiltshire4391501113502Armaments DepotWiltshire4140001668001West Overton, BorehamWiltshire4127001541101	Under Remnert Bettleshury	Wiltshire	394200	145430	1
Upavon, Casterley CampWiltshire4115001535004West Dean, Royal Navy Armaments DepotWiltshire4391501113502West Overton, Boreham DownWiltshire4140001668001Wiltshire4127001541101	Camp	w mishine	389780	145450	2
West Dean, Royal Navy Armaments DepotWiltshire4391501113502West Overton, Boreham DownWiltshire4140001668001Wiltshire4127001541101	Unavon Casterley Camp	Wiltshire	411500	153500	4
Armaments DepotWiltshire100001110002West Overton, Boreham DownWiltshire4140001668001Wildington Farm WiltshireWiltshire4127001541101	West Dean Royal Navy	Wiltshire	439150	111350	2
West Overton, Boreham DownWiltshire4140001668001Wildington Farm WiltshireWiltshire4127001541101	Armaments Denot	,, institut	157150	111550	2
Down Wiltshire 412700 154110 1	West Overton, Boreham	Wiltshire	414000	166800	1
Wildington Farm Wiltshire A12700 154110 1	Down			100000	1
$v_1u_1u_2v_1 r_1u_1 = v_1u_1u_1u_2 = v_1u_1u_2 = v_1u_2 = v_1$	Widdington Farm	Wiltshire	412790	154110	1

### East Yorkshire

Site Name	County	Easting	Northing	Occurrences of
	ŀ	0	0	Human Remains
Arras	East Riding	493000	441300	16
Beverley	East Riding	502000	439100	3
Bugthorpe	East Riding	477300	458000	1
Burstwick	East Riding	524400	427600	1
Burton Fleming	East Riding	509400	470300	22
<b>Burton Fleming:</b>	East Riding	510600	471500	43
Bell Slack	_			
Calais Wold	East Riding	483000	456000	1
Cawthorne	East Riding	478400	489900	1
Caythorpe Gas	East Riding	510600	468500	5
Pipeline				
Cowlam	East Riding	498350	466700	13
Danes Graves	East Riding	501700	463200	116
Eastburn	East Riding	500700	456400	76
Garton Slack	East Riding	495900	459500	85
Garton Station	East Riding	498200	457800	10
Grimthorpe	East Riding	481600	453500	5
Hayton	East Riding	481800	447200	2
Hornsea	East Riding	521000	448000	1
Huggate	East Riding	488000	455000	1
Hunmanby	East Riding	510100	476700	1
Huntow	East Riding	515500	470500	1
Kirkburn	East Riding	498400	457400	13
Melton	East Riding	497740	426360	20
Middleton-on-	East Riding	493140	430800	1
the-Wolds				
North Grimston	East Riding	483400	466800	1
Pexton Moor	East Riding	484800	485300	1
Rudston	East Riding	509600	469200	195
<b>Rudston:</b> Argam	East Riding	509600	470200	19
Lane				
Scorborough	East Riding	501700	445300	7
Park				
Seamer	East Riding	503300	483900	1
Sewerby Cottage	East Riding	518139	468217	2
Farm,				
Bridlington				
Skipwith	East Riding	464500	437700	22
Wetwang Slack	East Riding	494500	460000	446
Wharram	East Riding	485700	464600	1
Wykeham	East Riding	495000	488000	1

# Appendix B

# List of Iron Age Reconstructions

Image Title	Year	Artist	Image Source
Trading at Hengistbury Head,			
Dorset	2013	Chris Evans	Historic England Photo Library
Din Lligwy	2012		Current Archaeology 273
Ty Mawr	2012		Current Archaeology 273
Inside an Iron Age House	2012	Paul Birkbeck	Historic England Photo Library
Wetwang 1	2012	Aaron Watson	Melanie Giles. A forged glamour.
Wetwang 2	2012	Aaron Watson	Melanie Giles. A forged glamour.
U			Sonia Livestockes, Christopher
			Livestockes. Longbridge Deverill
Reconstruction drawing of			Cow Down: An Early Iron Age
House 3	2012	Edward Impey	Settlement in West Wiltshire.
Digging defence ditches	2011	Miranda Schofield	Historic England Photo Library
Roman soldiers in battle with			
Celtic tribes	2011	Paul Birkbeck	Historic England Photo Library
			Nic Fields. Boudicca's Rebellion AD
Boudicca speaks to her people	2011	Peter Dennis	60-61.
			Nic Fields. Boudicca's Rebellion AD
Destruction of the temple	2011	Peter Dennis	60-61.
			Nic Fields. Boudicca's Rebellion AD
Ambushing of the detachment	2011	Peter Dennis	60-61.
			Nic Fields. Boudicca's Rebellion AD
Final reckoning	2011	Peter Dennis	60-61.
Boudica	2010		Current Archaeology 247
Iron Age Warriors	2010	Judith Dobie	Historic England Photo Library
Nornour in 500 BC, Isles of			
Scilly	2010	Peter Dunn	Historic England Photo Library
			Miles Russel, Stuart Laycock.
Traditional view of "the			UnRoman Britain: Exposing the
Briton," here an Iceni warrior	2010	Sue White	Great Myth of Britannia.
The unenclosed roundhouse			Miles Russel, Stuart Laycock.
"Roman"-period settlement			UnRoman Britain: Exposing the
Cefn Cwmwd	2010	John Hodgson	Great Myth of Britannia.
Clay-walled "Roman"-period			Miles Russel, Stuart Laycock.
roundhouse at Melyn y Plas,			UnRoman Britain: Exposing the
Anglesey	2010	John Hodgson	Great Myth of Britannia.
			Framework Archaeology. Landscape
Artist's reconstruction of HE1			Evolution in the Middle Thames
enclosure and waterhole		Karen Nichols, Tim	Valley: Heathrow Terminal 5
148303 in the Middle Iron Age	2010	Goskar	Excavations Volume 2.
Artist's reconstruction showing			Framework Archaeology. Landscape
the HE1 enclosure used as an			Evolution in the Middle Thames
animal pen in the Middle Iron		Karen Nichols, Tim	Valley: Heathrow Terminal 5
Age	2010	Goskar	Excavations Volume 2.
			Framework Archaeology. Landscape
Artist's reconstruction of			Evolution in the Middle Thames
possible superstructure of		Karen Nichols, Tim	Valley: Heathrow Terminal 5
Four-post structure 9	2010	Goskar	Excavations Volume 2.

UnRoman roundhouse, Cen			
Du, Anglesey	2009	John Hodgson	Current Archaeology 249
UnRoman settlement	2009	John Hodgson	Current Archaeology 249
Iron Age Silchester	2009	Peter Urmston	Historic England Photo Library
Iron Age farming I	2009	Ivan Lapper	Historic England Photo Library
Iron Age farming II	2009	Ivan Lapper	Historic England Photo Library
		**	George Lambrick, Mark Robinson.
			The Thames through Time: The
			Archaeology of the Gravel Terraces
Middle Iron Age open		Magdalena	of the Upper and Middle Thames.
settlement at Perry Oaks/T5		Wachnik, Peter	The Thames Valley in Late
Heathrow	2009	Lorimer	Prehistory: 1500 BC-AD 50.
			George Lambrick, Mark Robinson.
			The Thames through Time: The
			Archaeology of the Gravel Terraces
		Magdalena	of the Upper and Middle Thames.
		Wachnik, Peter	The Thames Valley in Late
Enclosed or unenclosed?	2009	Lorimer	Prehistory: 1500 BC-AD 50.
			George Lambrick, Mark Robinson.
			The Thames through Time: The
			Archaeology of the Gravel Terraces
		Magdalena	of the Upper and Middle Thames.
Large roundhouses with		Wachnik, Peter	The Thames Valley in Late
porches reconstruction	2009	Lorimer	Prehistory: 1500 BC-AD 50.
			George Lambrick, Mark Robinson.
			The Thames through Time: The
			Archaeology of the Gravel Terraces
		Magdalena	of the Upper and Middle Thames.
Semi-circular structure at		Wachnik, Peter	The Thames Valley in Late
Farmoor	2009	Lorimer	Prehistory: 1500 BC-AD 50.
			George Lambrick, Mark Robinson.
			The Thames through Time: The
			Archaeology of the Gravel Terraces
Later prehistoric and early		Magdalena	of the Upper and Middle Thames.
Roman personal jewellery and		Wachnik, Peter	The Thames Valley in Late
fastenings	2009	Lorimer	Prehistory: 1500 BC-AD 50.
			George Lambrick, Mark Robinson.
			The Thames through Time: The
			Archaeology of the Gravel Terraces
		Magdalena	of the Upper and Middle Thames.
Reconstruction of tablet		Wachnik, Peter	The Thames Valley in Late
weaving	2009	Lorimer	Prehistory: 1500 BC-AD 50.
			George Lambrick, Mark Robinson.
			The Thames through Time: The
			Archaeology of the Gravel Terraces
		Magdalena	of the Upper and Middle Thames.
Prehistoric land cultivation in	2000	Wachnik, Peter	The Thames Valley in Late
the Middle Thames Valley	2009	Lorimer	Prenistory: 1500 BC-AD 50.
			George Lambrick, Mark Robinson.
			The Thames through Time: The
		Marchelen	Archaeology of the Gravel Terraces
Destauding to the tot		Magdalena	of the Upper and Middle Thames.
Pastoral land use in the later	2000	wachnik, Peter	Ine Inames Valley in Late
Iron Age	2009	Lorimer	Prenistory: 1500 BC-AD 50.
waste disposal and recycling at	2009	Magdalena	George Lambrick, Mark Robinson.

Runnymede		Wachnik, Peter	The Thames through Time: The
		Lorimer	Archaeology of the Gravel Terraces
			of the Upper and Middle Thames.
			The Thames Valley in Late
			Prehistory: 1500 BC-AD 50.
			George Lambrick, Mark Robinson.
			The Thames through Time: The
			Archaeology of the Gravel Terraces
		Magdalena	of the Upper and Middle Thames.
Timber post alignments at		Wachnik, Peter	The Thames Valley in Late
Hartshill Copse	2009	Lorimer	Prehistory: 1500 BC-AD 50.
			George Lambrick, Mark Robinson.
			The Thames through Time: The
			Archaeology of the Gravel Terraces
Artist's impression of the		Magdalena	of the Upper and Middle Thames.
Grims Ditch at Aldermarston,		Wachnik, Peter	The Thames Valley in Late
Berks.	2009	Lorimer	Prehistory: 1500 BC-AD 50.
Suggested reconstruction of the			Chris Fenton-Thomas. A Place By
funerary ritual associated with			the Sea: Excavations at Sewerby
the mortuary enclosure	2009	Rebecca Causer	Cottage Farm, Bridlington.
			John Davies. The Land of Boudica:
Portrait of Boudica	2009	Ivan Lapper	Prehistoric and Roman Norfolk.
	2008-		
Boudica	2009	Ellie McQueen	Current Archaeology 217
	2008-		Quantock Hills AONB Education,
Quantock Hills trader	2009	Jane Brayne	Hazel Riley
	2008-		Quantock Hills AONB Education,
Quantock Hills women	2009	Jane Brayne	Hazel Riley
Quantock Hills, daily life at an	2008-		Quantock Hills AONB Education,
Iron Age farmstead	2009	Jane Brayne	Hazel Riley
			David Allen. Iron Age Celts in
Tribe battles against tribe	2008	Mike Codd	Wessex.
			David Allen. Iron Age Celts in
Iron Age farming life	2008	Mike Codd	Wessex.
Rich female burial found at			David Allen. Iron Age Celts in
Viables Farm, Basingstoke	2008	Mike Codd	Wessex.
Sigwells Trench 12: Burying			Richard Tabor. Cadbury Castle: The
an infant	2008	Amanda Tabor	Hillfort and Landscapes.
Maiden Castle	2007	Paul Birkbeck	Historic England Photo Library
Iron Age roundhouse	2007	Judith Dobie	Historic England Photo Library
Iron Age Man and Woman	2007	Peter Dunn	Historic England Photo Library
Chysauster Ancient Village I	2007	Judith Dobie	Historic England Photo Library
Brean Down	2007	Peter Dunn	Historic England Photo Library
Celtic Chariot	2007	Chris Evans	Historic England Photo Library
A Celtic Feast	2007	Chris Evans	Historic England Photo Library
Iron Age tribesmen	2007	Paul Birkbeck	Historic England Photo Library
Ploughing	2007	Judith Dobie	Historic England Photo Library
Shrine at Nornour, Isles of		-	
Scilly	2007	Peter Dunn	Historic England Photo Library
Chysauster Ancient Village II	2007	Judith Dobie	Historic England Photo Library
Rural landscape	2007	Judith Dobie	Historic England Photo Library
	1007		Who were the Celts? National
Illustration of warriors fighting	2007	Tony Dalv	Museum of Wales
The horse feast at the		- ,,	Victor Ambrus. Drawing on
roundhouse at Standish	2006	Victor Ambrus	Archaeology: Bringing History to

Gloucestershire			Life.
			Victor Ambrus. Drawing on
The Iron Age fort at Gear			Archaeology: Bringing History to
Farm, Helford, Cornwall	2006	Victor Ambrus	Life.
			Victor Ambrus. Drawing on
The Carsington Child Burials,			Archaeology: Bringing History to
Derbyshire	2006	Victor Ambrus	Life.
			Victor Ambrus. Drawing on
Wittenham Clumps, Little			Archaeology: Bringing History to
Wittenham, Oxfordshire	2006	Victor Ambrus	Life.
The Iron Age jetty at Green			Victor Ambrus. Drawing on
Island, Poole Harbour,			Archaeology: Bringing History to
Hampshire	2006	Victor Ambrus	Life.
			Victor Ambrus. Drawing on
The Salt Pan, Skipsea,			Archaeology: Bringing History to
Yorkshire	2006	Victor Ambrus	Life.
			Victor Ambrus. Drawing on
The broch at Applecross,			Archaeology: Bringing History to
Wester Ross	2006	Victor Ambrus	Life.
			Victor Ambrus. Drawing on
			Archaeology: Bringing History to
The broch in war and peace 1	2006	Victor Ambrus	Life.
			Victor Ambrus. Drawing on
			Archaeology: Bringing History to
The broch in war and peace 2	2006	Victor Ambrus	Life.
			Victor Ambrus. Drawing on
			Archaeology: Bringing History to
Syndale Park, Kent	2006	Victor Ambrus	Life.
			Victor Ambrus. Drawing on
The Iceni uprising, Colchester,			Archaeology: Bringing History to
Kent	2006	Victor Ambrus	Life.
			Victor Ambrus. Drawing on
			Archaeology: Bringing History to
Pictish warrior and lady	2006	Victor Ambrus	Life.
			Victor Ambrus. Drawing on
Executed man, Brading Haven,			Archaeology: Bringing History to
Isle of Wight 1	2006	Victor Ambrus	Life.
			Victor Ambrus. Drawing on
Executed man, Brading Haven,			Archaeology: Bringing History to
Isle of Wight 2	2006	Victor Ambrus	Life.
Reconstruction of a broch, AD			Angus Konstam. The Forts of Celtic
100	2006	Peter Bull	Britain.
	_		Angus Konstam. The Forts of Celtic
Reconstruction of a hut interior	2006	Peter Bull	Britain.
Boudica's chariot	2005	Christina Unwin	British Museum
St. Albans reconstruction	2005	John Pearman	St. Albans Museum
Midhowe Broch	2005		Historic Scotland
			KE Qualmann, H Rees, G Scobie, R
			Whinney. Oram's Arbour: The Iron
Iron Age buildings at Staple			Age enclosure at Winchester Volume
Gardens	2004?	Mark Barden	
Two-storeyed roundhouse at		<b>D</b> . <b>D</b> .	Francis Pryor. Britain BC: Life in
Fison Way, Thetford (AD 40-	<b>-</b>	Piers Millington-	Britain and Ireland before the
80)	2004	Wallace	Romans
Old Scatness reconstruction	2002	Victor Ambrus	Current Archaeology 177

			Paul Wagner Pictish Warrior AD
Caledonian tribesman AD 200	2002	Wayne Reynolds	297-841
	2002	wayne recynolas	Paul Wagner Pictish Warrior 4D
Scatha's school of war	2002	Wayne Reynolds	207 8/1
Seatila's senioor or war	2002	wayne regnords	237-041. Daul Wagner Pictish Warrier AD
Pictish boats	2002	Wayne Reynolds	207 8/1
Pietish raid on Hadrian's Wall	2002	wayne regnords	237-041. Daul Wagner Pictish Warrier AD
AD 260	2002	Wayna Daynalda	207 941
AD 300	2002	wayne Keynolus	297-041. Devil Weaper Distish Wannier 4D
Drochs	2002	Wayna Daynalda	207 941
Winchester invellery	2002	Varan Hughas	297-041. Dritich Museum
Winchester Jewenery	2001	Kaleli Hugiles	Billisii Museulli
Kemerton, worcestersnife -			Vistor Amhrus Mish Aston
houses and analoging fores	2001	Victor Amhruna	Victor Amorus, Mick Aston.
nouses and enclosing lence	2001	victor Amorus	Viston Ambrus Mish Astan
	2001	Vistor Ambres	Victor Ambrus, Mick Aston.
Iron Age people	2001	victor Ambrus	Recreating the Past.
A reconstruction of a "banjo	2001	X7. / A 1	Victor Ambrus, Mick Aston.
enclosure" in Iron Age wessex	2001	Victor Ambrus	Recreating the Past.
	• • • • •		Boudica and the Romans. Norwich
Entering the Land of the Iceni	2001		Castle Museum and Art Gallery
			Boudica and the Romans. Norwich
Gods and Holy Places	2001		Castle Museum and Art Gallery
			Boudica and the Romans. Norwich
Life on the Land	2001		Castle Museum and Art Gallery
			Boudica and the Romans. Norwich
Iron Age village	2001		Castle Museum and Art Gallery
			Boudica and the Romans. Norwich
Disarming the Iceni	2001		Castle Museum and Art Gallery
			Boudica and the Romans. Norwich
Defeat	2001		Castle Museum and Art Gallery
Great Roundhouse, Butser			British Museum. Stephen Allen,
Ancient Farm	2001		Celtic Warrior: 300 BC-AD 100.
Fostering and Clientage,			
Southern Britain Early 1st			British Museum. Stephen Allen,
century AD	2001	Wayne Reynolds	Celtic Warrior: 300 BC-AD 100.
British Chariot Warrior, Early			British Museum. Stephen Allen,
1st century AD	2001	Wayne Reynolds	Celtic Warrior: 300 BC-AD 100.
Ambush and Skirmish,			
Southern Britain mid 1st			British Museum. Stephen Allen,
century BC	2001	Wayne Reynolds	Celtic Warrior: 300 BC-AD 100.
			Boudica and the Romans. Norwich
Boudica's rebellion	2000s?		Castle Museum and Art Gallery
Butser Ancient farm			
reconstruction	2000	Peter Reynolds	Current Archaeology 171
			Anne Crone. The history of a
			Scottish lowland crannog:
			excavations at Buiston, Ayrshire
Reconstruction of the crannog	2000	Alan Braby	1989-90.
		Amanda Balfour,	
		Steve Crummy,	
Schematic interpretation of		Karen Nichols,	Andrew Lawson. Potterne 1982-5:
stages in the development of		Elizabeth Robinson,	Animal Husbandry in Later
the site 900 BC	2000	John Vallender	Prehistoric Wiltshire.
Schematic interpretation of		Amanda Balfour,	Andrew Lawson. Potterne 1982-5:
stages in the development of	2000	Steve Crummy,	Animal Husbandry in Later
the site 800 BC		Karen Nichols,	Prehistoric Wiltshire.
--------------------------------	--------------	---------------------	--------------------------------------
		Elizabeth Robinson,	
		John Vallender	
			Rachel Butter. Kilmartin: Scotland's
		David Lyons, Harry	richest pre-historic landscape: an
Torran hoard	1999	Morrison	introduction and guide.
			Rachel Butter. Kilmartin: Scotland's
		David Lyons, Harry	richest pre-historic landscape: an
Depositing the Shuna swords	1999	Morrison	introduction and guide.
			Mike Parker Pearson, Niall Sharples,
			Jacqui Mulville, Helen Smith.
			Between Land and Sea: Excavations
Dun Vulan	1999	Bill Neill	at Dun Vulan, South Uist.
			Martin Carver. Surviving in Symbols:
Carving a Symbol Stone	1999	Mike Moore	A Visit to the Pictish Nation.
			Martin Carver. Surviving in Symbols:
Roundhouses and Souterrains	1999	Historic Scotland	A Visit to the Pictish Nation.
			Martin Carver. Surviving in Symbols:
Winter Burial at Garbeg	1999	Mike Moore	A Visit to the Pictish Nation.
			Martin Carver. Surviving in Symbols:
Inside the Fort at Gurghead	1999	Mike Moore	A Visit to the Pictish Nation.
			Martin Carver. Surviving in Symbols:
Hunting: the Noblest Sport	1999	Mike Moore	A Visit to the Pictish Nation.
			Martin Carver. Surviving in Symbols:
An Early Pictish Woman	1999	Mike Moore	A Visit to the Pictish Nation.
¥			Martin Carver. Surviving in Symbols:
A Later Pictish Man	1999	Mike Moore	A Visit to the Pictish Nation.
			Martin Carver. Surviving in Symbols:
On the Beach	1999	Mike Moore	A Visit to the Pictish Nation.
			R.P.J. McCullagh and R. Tipping.
			The Lairg project: the evolution of
			an archaeological landscape in
House 6	1998	Christina Unwin	Northern Scotland.
			R.P.J. McCullagh and R. Tipping.
			The Lairg project: the evolution of
			an archaeological landscape in
Reconstruction of House 3	1998	Christina Unwin	Northern Scotland.
Inside a souterrain	1998	Joanna Richards	Val Turner. Ancient Shetland
Ness of Burgi blockhouse fort			
as it may have looked 2000			
years ago	1998	Joanna Richards	Val Turner. Ancient Shetland.
Inside a wheelhouse	1998	Joanna Richards	Val Turner. Ancient Shetland.
Building a Pictish smithy	1998	Joanna Richards	Val Turner. Ancient Shetland.
Cremation at Folly Lane, St.			
Albans	1998	Peter Froste	St. Albans Museum
Dun Carloway	1997	Alan Braby	Ian Armit. Celtic Scotland.
Liddle, Orkney, cellular house	1997	Alan Braby	Ian Armit. Celtic Scotland.
Four stages of constructing a			
wheelhouse	1997	Alan Braby	Ian Armit. Celtic Scotland.
Artist's impression of rampart			
construction at Brown			
Caterthun	<u>19</u> 97	Alan Braby	Ian Armit. Celtic Scotland.
Rotary quern in use	1997	Alan Braby	Ian Armit. Celtic Scotland.
Ballachulish figure, artist's			
reconstruction	1997	Alan Braby	Ian Armit. Celtic Scotland.

Artist's impression of daily life			
in a ring-ditch house, 500 BC.	1997	Alan Braby	Ian Armit. Celtic Scotland.
Reconstruction of a hut circle			
settlement in Holyrood Park,			
Edinburgh	1997	Alan Braby	Ian Armit. Celtic Scotland.
Iron Age cultivation of freely			
draining slopes in Holyrood			
Park	1997	Alan Braby	Ian Armit. Celtic Scotland.
Hut circle I, Kilphedir	1997	Alan Braby	Ian Armit. Celtic Scotland.
Artist's impression of an Iron			
Age crannog	1997	Alan Braby	Ian Armit. Celtic Scotland.
Construction of the souterrain			
complex at Pitcur in Perthshire	1997	Alan Braby	Ian Armit. Celtic Scotland.
			Brian Davison. <i>Picturing the Past:</i>
Grinding corn for flour on a	1005	1 11 5 1	Through the Eyes of Reconstruction
saddle-shaped stone quern	1997	Judith Dobie	Artists.
			Brian Davison. <i>Picturing the Past:</i>
Grinding corn with a two-part			Through the Eyes of Reconstruction
rotary quern	1997	Judith Dobie	Artists.
Spinning woollen thread with			Brian Davison. <i>Picturing the Past:</i>
spindle weighted with a			Through the Eyes of Reconstruction
perforated stone	1997	Judith Dobie	Artists.
			Brian Davison. <i>Picturing the Past:</i>
			Through the Eyes of Reconstruction
Celtic warrior	1997	Geraint Derbyshire	Artists.
Celtic aristocrats	1996	Peter Connelly	British Museum
Loch na Berie, pre-Norse			Ian Armit. The Archaeology of Skye
settlement, artist's impression	1996	Alan Braby	and the Western Isles.
Reconstruction of a ring-ditch			J. Kendrick. Excavation of a
house at Douglasmuir	1995	J. Kendrick	Neolithic enclosure
			Sally Grant. Boudicca: Queen of the
Boudicca's chariot	1995	David Yaxley	Iceni.
Artist's reconstruction of the			
broch, forework and later			
buildings phases of Midhowe,			
Rousay	1995	Alan Braby	Anna Ritchie. Prehistoric Orkney.
Reconstruction of roundhouse			
and elevations of Rennibister			
earth-house	1995	Alan Braby	Anna Ritchie. Prehistoric Orkney.
			John Coles and Stephen Minnitt.
The site from the NE, Late	1005	I D	Industrious and Fairly Civilized:
Phase	1995	Jane Brayne	Glastonbuy Lake Village.
A reconstruction of a			
wheelhouse interior by Alan	100.00		Niall Sharples. A late iron age
Braby	1994?	Alan Braby	farmstead in the outer Hebrides.
The main east gate of			
Danebury in its final state,			
about 100BC, at the moment of	1000	T C	Barry Cunlitte. <i>Historic England</i>
attack	1993	Karen Guttogg	Book of Danebury.
The houses in the quarry			
hollow behind the rampart in	1000	W G M	Barry Cunliffe. <i>Historic England</i>
the second century BC	1993	Karen Guffogg	Book of Danebury.
The sanctuaries in the centre of	1005		Barry Cunliffe. <i>Historic England</i>
Danebury during a ceremony	1993	Karen Guffogg	Book of Danebury.
One of the streets in the	1993	Karen Guffogg	Barry Cunliffe. Historic England

southern part of the hillfort			Book of Danebury.
showing rows of storage			5 5
buildings, probably for grain			
Colchester burial	1993	Peter Froste	Current Archaeology 132
St Albans burial	1993	Alexandra Thorne	St Albans Museum
	1775	Thomanana Thomas	Michael Avery Hillfort defenses of
Dinorben reconstruction	1993	Michael Avery	southern Britain
	1775	Whender Arvery	Simon James Exploring the World
Celtic Community structure	1003	Simon James	of the Celts
	1775	Simon Junes	Boy Burrell Oxford First Ancient
Lake Villages	1001	Peter Connelly	History
The burning of the temple of	1771	Teter Connerry	
Claudius at Colchester	1001	Patar Frosta	The Castle Museum, Colchester
Danabury in the Iron Age	1000c		Museum of the Iron Age
Iron A co Worrier	19905		Museum of the Iron Age
Iron Age warnor	1990s		Museum of the fron Age
Grain storage	1990s		Museum of the Iron Age
Woman weaving at upright	1000		
loom	1990s		Museum of the Iron Age
Wheelhouse at Station 3 at	10000		
Jarlshof	1990?		Historic Scotland
Jarlshof Prehistoric and Norse			
Settlement	1990?		Historic Scotland
An artist's impression of life			
around AD 100 in the			
prehistoric hillfort, Edinburgh	1990?		Historic Scotland
			Ian Armit. Beyond the brochs:
			changing perspectives on the later
Loch na Berie reconstruction	1990	Alan Braby	Iron Age in Atlantic Scotland.
			Ian Armit. Beyond the brochs:
			changing perspectives on the later
Cnip 2	1990	Alan Braby	Iron Age in Atlantic Scotland.
			Ian Armit. Beyond the brochs:
			changing perspectives on the later
Cnip wheelhouse	1990	Alan Braby	Iron Age in Atlantic Scotland.
Garton Station warrior	1990	Tracey Croft	James Dyer. Ancient Britain.
		Tracey Croft. J.	
Hillfort	1990	Dver	James Dyer. Ancient Britain.
Little Woodbury	1990	Tracey Croft	James Dyer. Ancient Britain.
Iron Age settlement, c. 400-150		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
BC	1990	Derek Lucas	Nick Merriman. Prehistoric London.
Battle across the Thames	1990	Derek Lucas	Nick Merriman Prehistoric London
	1770	D then Dura	Anna Ritchie Picts An introduction
			to the life of the Picts and the carved
Reconstruction drawing of the			stones in the care of the secretary of
Pictish house at Gurness	1989	David Pollack	state for Scotland
Tietisii nouse at Guiness	1707	David I Ollack	Anna Ditchia Dists An introduction
			to the life of the Diete and the earned
			stones in the care of the secretary of
Inside the house of Gurness	1020	David Dollaak	stones in the cure of the secretary of
inside the nouse at Gumess	1989	Caralina Querra LD	siaie for scottana.
		Caroline Overy, J.D.	
Inco A co coord	1000	Hill, Simon Mays,	J.D. Hill, Simon Mays, Caroline
Iron Age crops	1989	Cathy Barrow	Overy. <i>The Iron Age</i> .
		Caroline Overy, J.D.	
Danebury as the home of a	1005	Hill, Simon Mays,	J.D. Hill, Simon Mays, Caroline
chief	1989	Cathy Barrow	Overy. The Iron Age.

		Caroline Overy, J.D.	
Danebury as a centre for the		Hill, Simon Mays,	J.D. Hill, Simon Mays, Caroline
whole community	1989	Cathy Barrow	Overy. The Iron Age.
			J.M. Coles and B.J. Coles.
Glastonbury Lake Village	1989	Jane Bravne	Prehistory of the Somerset Levels
		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	I.M. Coles and B.I. Coles
Meare Lake Village	1989	Iane Bravne	Prehistory of the Somerset Levels
	1707	Julie Druylle	Anna Ritchie Scotland BC: an
			introduction to the prehistoric
			houses tombs caramonial
			monuments and fortifications in the
			care of the Secretary of State for
Castlelaw Midlothian	1088	David Pollack	Scotland
	1900	David I Ollack	Anna Ditabia Soctland PC: an
			introduction to the prehistorie
			houses tombs commonial
			nouses, iomos, ceremoniai
			monuments and jorifications in the
Davidhavaa	1000	Name on Marriet	care of the secretary of state for
Roundhouse	1988	Norman Mowai	Scottana.
Koman "conquest"	1988	L Pd D L	Historic England Photo Library
wine for sale	1988	Judith Doble	Historic England Photo Library
Less Assa Comments	1007		Bruce Robinson and Tony Gregory.
Iron Age turnace	1987	Sue white	Cettic Fire and Roman Rule.
An Iron Age warrior and his	1007		Bruce Robinson and Tony Gregory.
charioteer	1987	Sue White	Celtic Fire and Roman Rule.
An Icenian warrior reading for	1005	a wate	Bruce Robinson and Tony Gregory.
battle	1987	Sue White	Celtic Fire and Roman Rule.
	1007	a with	Bruce Robinson and Tony Gregory.
The battle taxi	1987	Sue White	Celtic Fire and Roman Rule.
Quarry site roundhouses at	1000	<b>T 1 T T</b>	Barry Cunliffe. Danebury: Anatomy
Danebury	1986	John Hodgson	of an Iron Age Hillfort.
The roundhouse constructed at	1000		
Butser Ancient Farm	1986		Longworth and Cherry?
A crannog	1985		Christina Fredengren. Crannogs.
Different crannog	1005		
representations	1985		Christina Fredengren. Crannogs.
Cat's Water site, Fengate	1984?		
Reconstruction of a round			
house showing the inner circle			
of posts	1984	P.H. Hill	P.H. Hill. A sense of proportion.
			Francis Pryor. Excavation at Fengate
Cat's Water Middle Iron Age	10	Erick Ricketts,	Peterborough, England: The Fourth
settlement	1984	David Rayner	Report.
Cat's Water iron age			
settlement, about 200 BC	1982	Sara Lunt	Francis Pryor. Fengate
			Michael G. Jarrett and Stuart
			Wrathmell. Whitton: An Iron Age
	1001	TT 13-	and Roman Farmstead in South
Whitton Iron Age farmstead	1981	Howard Mason	Glamorgan.
Iron Age settlement at Staple			
Howe, viewed from the south-	1001		Mark Sorrell. Alan Sorrel:
east	1981	Alan Sorrell	Reconstructing the past.
Iron Age tarmer	1980s?	Dianne Sutherland	SCRAN
Celtic Settlement, c500 BC	1980s?	Dianne Sutherland	SCRAN
Pictish warrior	1980s?	Dianne Sutherland	SCRAN

The burial of an Iron Age noble			
with his chariot and other grave			
goods at Wetwang Slack,	1980s-		
North Humberside	1990s?	Peter Connelly	Hull and East Riding Museum
Bards entertained the nobles	1980s-		
with songs and poetry	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
Nobles gave protection to their			
dependents in return for their	1980s-		
loyalty, goods and services	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
Druids were guardians of the	1980s-		
traditional wisdom of the tribe	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
Fine textiles and ordinary cloth			
were made by the weavers.			
wheelwrights provided wheels	1000-		
for the hobies' charlots and the	19808-		Hall and East Diding Massaure
Discharge the made successing for	19908?		Hull and East Kloing Museum
the pebles as well as tools for	10200		
the common people	19808- 1000s2		Hull and East Piding Museum
A grigultural labourers	19905!		
produced the food that kent the	1080c		
whole of society alive	1980s- 1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
	1980s-		
Celtic society	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
	1980s-		Than and Bast Hang Massain
A Celtic World 1	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
	1980s-		
A Celtic World 2	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
	1980s-		
A Celtic World 3	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
	1980s-		
A Celtic World 4	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
	1980s-		
Settlement	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
	1980s-		
Building a roundhouse	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
Consider 1	1980s-		H H and Fast Diding M and m
Spring I	19905?		Hull and East Kloing Museum
Spring 2	1980s- 1000c2		Hull and East Riding Museum
Spring 2	19908		Thun and East Riding Museum
Spring 3	1980s- 1990s?		Hull and Fast Riding Museum
Spring 5	1980s-		Than and East Rhang Wuseum
Summer 1	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
	1980s-		
Summer 2	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
	1980s-		
Summer 3	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
	1980s-		
Summer 4	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
	1980s-		
Autumn	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
	1980s-		
Winter 1	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
Winter 2	1980s-		Hull and East Riding Museum

	1000s?		
	10800		
Winter 2	19005-		Hull and East Diding Museum
whiter 5	19908?		
XX7 (1 1	1980s-		
Wetlands	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
_ ·	1980s-		
Farming	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
	1980s-		
Woodland	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
Digging up clay to make	1980s-		
pottery	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
Placing farves around the			
clamp to maintain a high, even	1980s-		
temperature	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
	1980s-		
Smithing	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
Druid in a coracle throwing the			
Sutten scabbard plate into the	1980s-		
River Trent	1990s?		Hull and East Riding Museum
	1980s-		
Iron Age farmer	1000s-	Peter Connelly	Hull and East Riding Museum
	10905	Teter Connerry	
Iron A go formors	19808-	Potor Connolly	Hull and East Diding Museum
Iton Age farmers	19908?	Peter Connerry	Hull and East Riding Museum
	1980s-	IV I D III	
Hasholme Boat	1990s?	Kate Dennett	Hull and East Riding Museum
	1980s-		
Boat sinking	1990s?	Kate Dennett	Hull and East Riding Museum
	1980s-		
Hasholme Boat	1990s?	Peter Connelly	Hull and East Riding Museum
Reconstruction of the Iron Age			
warrior from St. Peter Port	1978?		Guernsey Museums and Galleries
			Barry Cunliffe. Danebury: the story
Danebury	1976	David Salariya	of an Iron Age hillfort.
Section through the main			Barry Cunliffe. Danebury: the story
defences	1976	David Salariya	of an Iron Age hillfort.
			Barry Cunliffe. Danebury: the story
The East Gate	1976	David Salariva	of an Iron Age hillfort.
			Barry Cunliffe Danebury: the story
The settlement 1	1976	David Salariya	of an Iron Age hillfort
	1970	Duviu Suluriyu	Barry Cunliffe Danebury: the story
The settlement 2	1976	David Salariya	of an Iron Age hillfort
The settlement 2	1770	David Salariya	Borry Cupliffe Danabury: the story
Dita	1076	David Salariya	of an Iron Age hillfort
Fits	1970	David Salariya	Of an Iron Age milijori.
	1070	D 101	Barry Cuniffe. Danebury: the story
Daily bread	1976	David Salariya	of an Iron Age hillfort.
	10-		Barry Cunliffe. Danebury: the story
The farming system	1976	David Salariya	of an Iron Age hillfort.
			Barry Cunliffe. <i>Danebury: the story</i>
Chariot fighting	1976	David Salariya	of an Iron Age hillfort.
			Barry Cunliffe. Danebury: the story
Iron Age society	1976	David Salariya	of an Iron Age hillfort.
			Barry Cunliffe. Danebury: the story
Thanking the gods	1976	David Salariya	of an Iron Age hillfort.
			John Hamilton. The Brochs of Mousa
Wheelhouse inside broch tower	1970	Alan Sorrell	and Clickhimin.

	1968-		
Riding Wood	1969	William Bulmer	Museum of Antiquities at Newcastle
	1968-		
Huckhoe reconstruction	1969	William Bulmer	Museum of Antiquities at Newcastle
	1707	William Builler	IR C Hamilton Excavations at
Clickhimin block/gatebouse	1068	Alan Sorrell	Clickhimin Shotland
Earta/abariata asomnarad ta	1900	Alan Sonten	LP C. Hamilton Engugations at
Forts/charlots compared to	10/0		J.K.C. Hammon. Excavations at
Interature	1908		Ulcknimin, Shellana.
	10/0		J.R.C. Hamilton. Excavations at
	1968		Clicknimin, Shetlana.
West Harling Iron Age	10.00		J.R.C. Hamilton. Excavations at
Farmstead	1968		Clickhimin, Shetland.
Iron Age farmstead at Little			
Woodbury, Wiltshire	1968	Alan Sorrell	Barbara Green. Prehistoric Britain.
Building an Iron Age Stone			
fort in Scotland	1968	Alan Sorrell	Barbara Green. Prehistoric Britain.
An Iron Age warrior chieftain	1968	Alan Sorrell	Barbara Green. Prehistoric Britain.
British war chariots	1968	Alan Sorrell	Barbara Green. Prehistoric Britain.
An artist's impression of the			
pottery working site at Les			
Huguettes, Alderney	1966	Peter Arnold	Alderney Museum
Reconstruction of Llanmelin			
hillfort, Monmouth	1965	Alan Sorrell	Stanley Thomas. Pre-Roman Britain.
Reconstruction of the			
Heathrow settlement and			
temple	1965	Alan Sorrell	Stanley Thomas. Pre-Roman Britain.
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			The Great Shetland Broch Tower in
			Clickhimin Loch, as It Was in the
Clickhimin Broch from the			First Century A.D. Illustrated
south-west	1957	Alan Sorrell	London News Issue 6154
	1907		IRC Hamilton When the Romans
The broch tower and Pictish			ruled England and the Picts
Village of Jarlshof on the neck			Shetland: the houses of the Iron Age
of Sumburgh Head			in Illtima Thule - Iarlshof
reconstructed from recent			excavations London Illustrated
excavation	1952	Alan Sorrell	News Issue 5909
The neck-irons from L lyn	1752		Cyril Fox A Find of the Early Iron
Cerrig Bach as they were			Age from Llyn Cerrig Back
probably used	1046	C Fox?	Age from Ligh Cerrig Duck,
probably used	1940	C. FOX!	Anglesey. Stuart Biggott A Note on the
			Palative Chronology of the English
			Long Porrows Drogoodings of the
Iron A go nit dwalling	1025	Stuart Diggat	Duchistorie Societ:
Iron Age pit dwelling	1935	Stuart Piggot	Prenistoric Society.
Hollingbury - section of			
rampart giving a provisional			
reconstruction of the original			
timberwork in contrast to its	1021		
present profile	1931		Antiquaries Journal XI.
Druids contront the Romans			
led by Suetonius Paulinus on		I.D.	Dudley Wright. Druidism: The
Anglesey	1924	J. Burrow	Ancient Faith of Britain.
			Belgic Fashions in Ancient Britain:
			Women in Roman Times. <i>Illustrated</i>
The Laena (tunic) fastened	1921	Alain Forestier	London News.
Laena worn over Chemise	1921	Alain Forestier	Belgic Fashions in Ancient Britain:

			Women in Roman Times. Illustrated
			London News.
			Belgic Fashions in Ancient Britain:
Kirtle (or kilt) with bodice,			Women in Roman Times. Illustrated
cloak worn as Irish shawl	1921	Alain Forestier	London News.
			Belgic Fashions in Ancient Britain:
			Women in Roman Times. Illustrated
Mar (jacket) over kirtle	1921	Alain Forestier	London News.
			Belgic Fashions in Ancient Britain:
			Women in Roman Times. Illustrated
Mar bound by girdle	1921	Alain Forestier	London News.
			Belgic Fashions in Ancient Britain:
			Women in Roman Times. Illustrated
A woman at her toilet	1921	Alain Forestier	London News.
			Belgic Fashions in Ancient Britain:
			Women in Roman Times. Illustrated
Cloak worn as Scottish plaid	1921	Alain Forestier	London News.
			Belgic Fashions in Ancient Britain:
			Women in Roman Times. <i>Illustrated</i>
Ceremonial dress	1921	Alaın Forestier	London News.
			Belgic Fashions in Ancient Britain:
Window should	1021		Women in Roman Times. <i>Illustrated</i>
winter cloak	1921	Alain Forestier	London News.
			Belgic Fashions in Ancient Britain:
Head accoring (bright barghist)	1021	Alain Equation	Women in Roman Times. <i>Illustratea</i>
Head covering (bright kerchier)	1921	Alam Forestier	London News.
			Kinsmen of the Belgae Illustrated
Warriors at a feast	1921	Alain Forestier	London News
warnors at a reast	1721	7 Hulli 1 Ofestici	Warriors Caesar fought in Britain:
Chequered trews woolen tunic			Kinsmen of the Belgae <i>Illustrated</i>
kilt	1921	Alain Forestier	London News
	1721		Warriors Caesar fought in Britain
Warriors in their "war-paint"			Kinsmen of the Belgae. <i>Illustrated</i>
awaiting the enemy's approach	1921	Alain Forestier	London News.
From the Column of Antoninus			
in the Louvre: the Head of a			Our Belgic Ancestors. Illustrated
Gaulish Warrior	1921	Alain Forestier	London News.
A Primitive Gaul's Head: a			
type of "Tall, Blonde Warriors			Our Belgic Ancestors. Illustrated
who Scoured Europe"	1921	Alain Forestier	London News.
Women of Belgic type in			
Roman Britain engaged in			Our Belgic Ancestors. Illustrated
spinning	1921	Alain Forestier	London News.
A British chief of Roman			
times, in chequered trews, with			
bronze weapons and helmet;			Our Belgic Ancestors. Illustrated
and his wife	1921	Alaın Forestier	London News.
Celtic warriors going into	1020.0		
battle	1920s?	D. Ostan W. 1 '	Hull and East Kiding Museum
Hadrian's Wall	1911	K. Caton Woodville	London News 1911
Civilized Ancient Briton	1911	Alain Forestier	Illustratea Lonaon News
Nata Waad Davhad Street	1911	Alain Forestier	IIIUSITAIea Lonaon News
The Angient Driter 1	1011	Alain Forestier	Illustrated London Naus
The Ancient Briton I	1911	Alain Forestier	Illustratea Lonaon News

The Ancient Briton 2   1911   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     Not a Woad-Daubed Savage:   1   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     Not a Woad-Daubed Savage:   1   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     Not a Woad-Daubed Savage:   1   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     Not a Woad-Daubed Savage:   1   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     A Civilised Man: the Ancient   1   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     Briton on His Crannog   1911   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     and Defended; a Home of Arts   1911   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     and Crafts   1911   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     The wild boar hun at the   1   HE: Marshall. Our Island Story.     The wild boar hun at the   1   Scottish National Portrait Gallery     Calgacus   1889   William Donnelly   Scottish National Portrait Gallery     Gaut to the new Caesar,   Charles Taylor,   British Museum   Galt to the new Caesar,     Definace, emport, Nuli I   1870   John Tenniel   Punch, London Charivari. <td< th=""><th>Not a Woad-Daubed Savage:</th><th></th><th></th><th></th></td<>	Not a Woad-Daubed Savage:			
Nota Woad-Daubed Savage:     Instruction 3     1911     Alain Forestier     Illustrated London News       Not a Woad-Daubed Savage:     Instruct Instruct A     1911     Alain Forestier     Illustrated London News       Not a Woad-Daubed Savage:     Instruct Instruct A     Instruct Instruct A     Instruct Instruct A       A Civilised Mar: the Ancient     Instruct Instruct A     Instruct Instruct A     Instruct Instruct A       A Civilised Mar: the Ancient     Instruct Instruct A     Instruct Instruct A     Instruct Instruct A       A Civilised Mar: the Ancient     Instruct Instruct A     Instruct Instruct A     Instruct Instruct A       A Civilise Mark Mark Ancient     Instruct Instruct A     Instruct Instruct A     Instruct Instruct A       A Civilise Mark Mark Ancient     Instruct Instruct A     Instruct Instruct A     Instruct Instruct A       A Civilise Mark Mark Ancient     Instruct Instruct A     Instruct Instruct A     Instruct Instruct A       A Civilise Mark Mark Ancient     Instruct Instruct A     Instruct Instruct A     Instruct Instruct Instruct Instruct Instruct Instruct I       Will you Iollow me, men?"     1905     A.S. Frost     I Harrison Maxwell. Dumbuck Instruct Instruct Instruct Instruct Instruct Instruct Instruct Instruct Instru	The Ancient Briton 2	1911	Alain Forestier	Illustrated London News
The Ancient Briton 3   1911   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     Not a Woad-Daubed Savage:   1   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     Not a Woad-Daubed Savage:   1   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     Not a Woad-Daubed Savage:   1   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     A Civilised Man: the Ancient   1911   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     In England 2000 Years Ago: A   1   Prehistoric Village Organised   1     and Defended; a Home of Ars   1911   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     "Will you follow me, men?"   1905   A.S. Frost   H.E. Marshall.Our Island Story.     The wild boar hum at the   1   Soctish National Portrait Gallery     Galgous   1889   William Hole   Frieze     Submission of the Britons to   1   British Museum   Gall to the new Caesar,     Defrance, emperor, while 1   1   Soctish National Portrait Gallery     Invalue Strength to huri it!   1870   John Tenniel   Punch, London Charivari.     Kinahan's reconstruction with   British   G.H. Kinahan. Notes on a Crannoge   Soctland, from the Roman Invasion <t< td=""><td>Not a Woad-Daubed Savage:</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Not a Woad-Daubed Savage:			
Not a Woad-Daubed Savage:     1911     Alain Forestier     Illustrated London News       Not a Woad-Daubed Savage:     1911     Alain Forestier     Illustrated London News       A Civilised Man: the Ancient     1911     Alain Forestier     Illustrated London News       A Civilised Man: the Ancient     1911     Alain Forestier     Illustrated London News       Prehistori Vilage Organised and Defended; a Home of Arts and Crafts     1911     Alain Forestier     Illustrated London News       "Will you follow me, men?"     1905     A.S. Frost     H.E. Marshall. Our Island Story.       The wild boar hunt at the crannog     1899     William Donnelly     Scottish National Portrait Gallery frieze       Calgacus     1889     William Hole     Frieze     Gall to the new Caesar, Defance, emperor, while I       have strength to hurl it!     1870     John Tenniel     Punch, London Charivari.       Kinaban's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island     E.H. Corbould and E.H. Corbould and I. from the Roman Invasion free Markar, Island Prize Cartons.     Edward Armitage, British Museum       Calgacus Addressing His Army     1854     William Linnell     Cartons.       Caesar's first invasion of E.H. Corbould and I. Story Singleton, AD 79-1746	The Ancient Briton 3	1911	Alain Forestier	Illustrated London News
The Ancient Briton 4     1911     Alain Forestier     Illustrated London News       Not a Woad-Daubed Savage:     1     Alain Forestier     Illustrated London News       A Civilised Man: the Ancient     1     Alain Forestier     Illustrated London News       A Civilised Man: the Ancient     1     Alain Forestier     Illustrated London News       In England 2000 Years Ago: A Prehistoric Village Organised     1     Alain Forestier     Illustrated London News       and Defended; a Home of Arts and Crafts     1911     Alain Forestier     Illustrated London News       "Will you follow me, men?"     1905     A.S. Frost     H.E. Marshall. Our Island Story.       The wild boar hunt at the crannog     1899     William Donnelly     crannog.       Submission of the Britons     1     Charles Taylor, the Roman Emperor Claudius     1872     Samuel Wale     British Museum       Gaul to the new Cassar, Defiance, emperor, while I have strength to huri it!     1870     John Tenniel     Punch, London Charivari.       Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island     1866     Kinahan     8.       Calgacus Addressing His Army 2016     1854     William Linnell     1901 Taylor.	Not a Woad-Daubed Savage:			
Not a Woad-Daubed Savage: 1911 Alain Forestier Illustrated London News   A Civilsed Man: the Ancient 1911 Alain Forestier Illustrated London News   A Civilsed Man: the Ancient 1911 Alain Forestier Illustrated London News   In England 2000 Years Ago: A Prehistoric Village Organised 1911 Alain Forestier Illustrated London News   and Crafts 1911 Alain Forestier Illustrated London News   The wild boar hunt at the 1910 A.S. Frost H.E. Marshall. Our Island Story.   The wild boar hunt at the 1999 William Donnelly Scottish National Portrait Gallery frizze   Calgacus 1889 William Hole Frizze   Submission of the Britons to Charles Taylor, British Museum   Gaul to the new Caesar, Definec, emperor, while I Punch, London Charivari.   Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island 1866 Kinahan   Caesar's first invasion of Edward Armitage, British Museum. The Pricorial History of Scotland, from the Roman Invasion to the Close of the Jacobite Rebellion. AD 79-1746   Caesar's first invasion of Edward Armitage, British Museum.   British Museum 1820 Stewart   Julius Caesar engaged with the British Stees. Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles. <td>The Ancient Briton 4</td> <td>1911</td> <td>Alain Forestier</td> <td>Illustrated London News</td>	The Ancient Briton 4	1911	Alain Forestier	Illustrated London News
The Ancient Briton 5     1911     Alain Forestier     Illustrated London News       A Civilised Man. the Ancient     5     6     6       Briton on His Crannog     1911     Alain Forestier     Illustrated London News       In England 2000 Years Ago: A Prehistoric Vilage Organised and Defended, a Home of Arts and Crafts     1911     Alain Forestier     Illustrated London News       "Will you follow me, men?"     1905     A.S. Frost     H.E. Marshall. Our Island Story.       The wild boar hunt at the crannog     1889     William Donnelly     crannog.       Calgacus     1889     William Donnelly     crannog.       Submission of the Britons to the Roman Emperor Claudius     1872     Samuel Wale     British Museum       Gaul to the new Caesar, Defiance, emperor, while I have strength to hurl it!     1870     John Tenniel     Punch, London Charivari.       Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of elii the stand     1866     Kinahan     8.       Calgacus Addressing His Army     1859     William Linnell     Cartoons.       The free northern Britons     Edward Armitage, British     British Museum     1901       Stewart     1830s     Stewart<	Not a Woad-Daubed Savage:			
A Civilised Man: the Ancient Briton on His Cranog   1911   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     In England 2000 Years Ago: A Prehistoric Village Organised and Crafts   1911   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     "Will you follow me, men?"   1905   A.S. Frost   H.E. Marshall. Our Island Story.     The wild boar hunt at the crannog   1899   William Donnelly   Scottish National Portrait Gallery frieze     Calgacus   1889   William Hole   Frieze     Submission of the Britons to the Roman Emperor Claudius   1872   Samuel Wale   British Museum     Gaul to the new Caesar, Defiance, emperor, while 1 have strength to hurl if   1870   John Tenniel   Punch, London Charivari.     Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island   1866   Kinahan   8.     Calgacus Addressing His Army   1859   W. Greatbach   British Museum. The Prize Cartoons.     The free northern Britons surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the Solway   British Museum   British Museum     British Museum   1843   William Bond   British Museum     Britons   1843   William Bond   British Museum     Marine Arow Soluto   1843   Securat   Britis	The Ancient Briton 5	1911	Alain Forestier	Illustrated London News
Briton on His Cranog     1911     Alain Forestier     Illustrated London News       In England 2000 Years Ago: A Prehistoric Village Organised and Defended; a Home of Arts     1     Illustrated London News       "Will you follow me, men?"     1905     A.S. Frost     H.E. Marshall. Our Island Story.       The wild boar hunt at the crannog     1899     William Donnelly     crannog.       Calgacus     1889     William Hole     Frieze       Submission of the Britons to the Roman Emperor Claudius     1872     Samuel Wale     British Museum       Gaul to the new Casar, Defiance, emperor, while I have strength to hurl it!     1870     John Tenniel     Punch, London Charivari.       Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island     1866     Kinahan     8.       Calgacus Addressing His Army     1859     We Greatbach     British Museum. The Prize Caroons.       Calgacus Addressing His Army     1854     William Linnell     Caroons.       The free northern Britons surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the Stowar     British Museum     The Prize       Julius Casar engaged with the Britos     1823     Stewart     British Museum       British Iuseum     1815	A Civilised Man: the Ancient			
In England 2000 Years Ago: A Prehistoric Village Organised and Defended; a Home of Arts and Crafts   1911   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     "Will you follow me, men?"   1905   A.S. Frost   H.E. Marshall. Our Island Story.     The wild boar hunt at the crannog   1899   William Donnelly   J Harrison Maxwell. Dumbuck crannog.     Calgacus   1889   William Donnelly   Scottish National Portrait Gallery frieze     Submission of the Britons to the Roman Emperor Claudius   1872   Samuel Wale   British Museum     Gaul to the new Caesar, Defiance, emperor, while 1 have strength to hurl it!   1870   John Tenniel   Punch, London Charivari.     Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island   1866   Kinahan   8.     Calgacus Addressing His Army   1859   W.Greatbach   British Museum. The Prictorial History of Scottand, from the Roman Invasion to the Close of the Jacobite to the Close of the Jacobite to the Close of the Jacobite to the Close of the Jacobite     Calgacus Addressing His Army   1854   William Linnell   Cartons.     The free northern Britons surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the Solway   Daniel Lizars, John   British Museum     Britos   1828   William Bond   British Museum     Boadicea <td< td=""><td>Briton on His Crannog</td><td>1911</td><td>Alain Forestier</td><td>Illustrated London News</td></td<>	Briton on His Crannog	1911	Alain Forestier	Illustrated London News
Prehistoric Village Organised and Defended; a Home of Arts and Crafts   1911   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     "Will you follow me, men?"   1905   A.S. Frost   H.E. Marshall. Our Island Story.     The wild boar hunt at the crannog   I   J Harrison Maxwell. Dumbuck   crannog.     Calgacus   1889   William Donnelly William Hole   J Grantos.     Submission of the Britons to the Roman Emperor Claudius   Charles Taylor,   Scottish National Portrait Gallery frieze     Gault to the new Casar, Defiance, emperor, while I have strength to hurl it!   1870   John Tenniel   Punch, London Charivari.     Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island   1866   Kinahan   8.     Calgacus Addressing His Army   1859   W. Greatbach   British Museum. The Pictorial History of Scotland, from the Roman Invasion to the Close of the Jacobite Rebellion. AD 79-1746     Casar's first invasion of British   1854   William Linnell   Charles Taylon, British Museum. The Prize     The free northern Britons suprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the Slotway   1824   William Bond   British Museum     Boadicea   1820   Stewart   British Museum     Boadicea   1820   Stewart   Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume	In England 2000 Years Ago: A			
and Crafts   1911   Alain Forestier   Illustrated London News     "Will you follow me, men?"   1905   A.S. Frost   H.E. Marshall. Our Island Story.     The wild boar hunt at the crannog   1899   William Donnelly   crannog.     Calgacus   1899   William Donnelly   Scottish National Portrait Gallery     Gaulto the new Caesar, Define on the new Caesar, Define on the new Caesar, Define on the margin of the Island   Charles Taylor, the Xinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island   Gaulto the new Caesar, Define on the margin of the strange on the margin of the island   Gaulto the margin of the Store on the County of Cavan, Proc. R.I.A.     Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island   1866   Kinahan   Scottish Museum     Calgacus Addressing His Army   1859   Careata's first invasion of the Dritorial History of Scotland, from the Roman Invasion to the Close of the Jacobite Roman Invasion   Scotland, from the Roman Invasion     The free northern Britons surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the Stewart   British Museum   Heary Singleton, Hear	Prehistoric Village Organised			
and Crafts1911Alain ForestierIllustrated London News"Will you follow me, men?"1905A.S. FrostH.E. Marshall. Our Island Story.The wild boar hunt at the crannog1899William DonnellyJ Harrison Maxwell. Dumbuck crannog.Calgacus1889William HoleScottish National Portrait Gallery friezeSubmission of the Britons to the Roman Emperor Claudius1872Samuel WaleGaul to the new Caesar, Defiance, emperor, while 1 have strength to hurl it!1870John TennielNanharis reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island1866Kinahan's reconstruction Vift buildings around the margin of the islandJohn TennielCalgacus Addressing His Army1859W. Greatbach Rebelution. AD 79-1746Scotland, from the Roman Invasion to the Close of the Jacobite Rebelution. AD 79-1746Caesar's first invasion of Britain1854William LinnellCartoons.The free northern Britons surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the Stolway1843W.B. ScottIllustrated London News, 12 August StewartJulius Caesar engaged with the Britos1820sStewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1820sStewartBritish MuseumAn Arch Druid in His Judicial HabitCharles HamiltonBritish Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial HabitCharles HamiltonBritish Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the Charles HamiltonCharles HamiltonSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles. <td>and Defended; a Home of Arts</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	and Defended; a Home of Arts			
"Will you follow me, men?" 1905 A.S. Frost H.E. Marshall. Our Island Story.   The wild boar hunt at the crannog 1899 William Donnelly J Harrison Maxwell. Dumbuck crannog.   Calgacus 1899 William Donnelly Scottish National Portrait Gallery   Calgacus 1889 William Hole Frieze   Submission of the Britons to the Roman Emperor Claudius Charles Taylor, British Museum   Gaul to the new Caesar, Define, while 1 Samuel Wale British Museum   Maxe strength to hurl it! 1870 John Tenniel Punch, London Charivari.   Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the siland 1866 Kinahan 8.   Calgacus Addressing His Army 1859 W. Greatbach Rebellion. AD 79-1746   Caesar's first invasion of British Edward Armitage, British Museum. The Prize Cartoons. Cartoons.   The free northern Britons surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the Solway 1843 W.B. Scott 1843.   Julius Caesar engaged with the British Sitewart British Museum Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.   An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit 1815 Smith Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.   A Briton of the Interior 1815 Smith Samuel Rush Me	and Crafts	1911	Alain Forestier	Illustrated London News
The wild boar hunt at the crannog   1899   William Donnelly   J Harrison Maxwell. Dumbuck crannog.     Calgacus   1899   William Donnelly   Scottish National Portrait Gallery frieze     Submission of the Britons to the Roman Emperor Claudius   1872   Samuel Wale   British Museum     Gaul to the new Caesar, Defiance, emperor, while 1 have strength to hurl it!   1870   John Tenniel   Punch, London Charivari.     Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island   1866   Kinahan   G.H. Kinahan. Notes on a Crannoge in the County of Cavan, Proc. R.I.A.     Galgacus Addressing His Army   1856   Kinahan   John Taylor. The Pictorial History of Scotland, from the Roman Invasion to the Close of the Jacobite     Calgacus Addressing His Army   1854   W. Greatbach   Rebellion. AD 79-1746     Caesar's first invasion of surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the Stoway   1843   William Linnell   Illustrated London News, 12 August Stoway     Solway   1820   William Bond   British Museum     Briton   18208   William Bond   British Museum     Marcea   1828   William Bond   British Museum     Macea   1828   William Bond   British Museum     Marcea	"Will you follow me, men?"	1905	A.S. Frost	H.E. Marshall. Our Island Story.
crannog1899William Donnellycrannog.Calgacus1889William HoleScottish National Portrait Gallery friezeSubmission of the Britons to the Roman Emperor Claudius1872Samuel WaleBritish MuseumGaul to the new Caesar, Defiance, emperor, while I have strength to hurl it!1870John TennielPunch, London Charivari.Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island1866Kinahan8.Calgacus Addressing His Army1866Kinahan8.Caesar's first invasion of Burtish in the Roman Mall between the Tyne and the SolwayEdward Armitage, William LinnellBritish Museum. The Prize Social and, from the Roman Invasion to the Close of the Jacobite Rebellion. AD 79-1746British Britosn1854William LinnellCartoons.Julius Caesar's first invasion of surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the BritosnBritish MuseumBritish MuseumBritos18308StewartBritish MuseumBritos18308StewartBritish MuseumBritos18308StewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1815SmithBritish MuseumA Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the CassiteridesCharles HamiltonSamuel Rush Meyrick. C	The wild boar hunt at the			J Harrison Maxwell. Dumbuck
Calgacus   1889   William Hole   Scottish National Portrait Gallery     Submission of the Britons to the Roman Emperor Claudius   1872   Samuel Wale   British Museum     Gaul to the new Caesar, Defiance, emperor, while I have strength to huri it!   1870   John Tenniel   Punch, London Charivari.     Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island   1870   John Tenniel   Punch, London Charivari.     Galgacus Addressing His Army   1886   Kinahan   8.     Calgacus Addressing His Army   1859   W. Greatbach   British Museum. The Pictorial History of Scotland, from the Roman Invasion to the Close of the Jacobite     Ratian   1854   W. Greatbach   British Museum. The Prize     Britain   1854   W.B.Scott   Illustrated London News, 12 August     Julius Caesar engaged with the Britons   Daniel Lizars, John   British Museum     Boadicea   1828   William Bond   Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.     An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit   1815   Smith   Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.     A Belgic Briton of the Interior   1815   Smith   Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles	crannog	1899	William Donnelly	crannog.
Calgacus1889William HolefriezeSubmission of the Britons to the Roman Emperor ClaudiusCharles Taylor, Samuel WaleBritish MuseumGaul to the new Caesar, Defiance, emperor, while I have strength to hurl it!1870John TennielPunch, London Charivari.Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island1866Kinahan8.Calgacus Addressing His Army1866Kinahan8.Calgacus Addressing His Army1859W. Greatbach Rebellion. AD 79-1746Rebellion. AD 79-1746Caesar's first invasion of Britain1854William LinnellCartoons.The free northern Britons surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the Britos1830sStewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1884W.B.Scott1843.Julustrated London News, 12 AugustBoadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea Queen of the Iceni1815StewartBritish MuseumBoadicea Queen of the Iceni1815SmithBritish Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the Cassiterides1815SamithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Magata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Cos				Scottish National Portrait Gallery
Submission of the Britons to the Roman Emperor ClaudiusCharles Taylor, Samuel WaleBritish MuseumGaul to the new Caesar, Defiance, emperor, while I have strength to hurl it!1870John TennielPunch, London Charivari.Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island1866KinahanG.H. Kinahan. Notes on a Crannoge in the County of Cavan, Proc. R.I.A.Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island1866KinahanJohn Taylor. The Pictorial History of Scotland, from the Roman Invasion to the Close of the Jacobite Rebellion. AD 79-1746Calgacus Addressing His Army Britain1854Edward Armitage, W. GreatbachBritish Museum. The Prize Cartoons.Britain The free northern Britons surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the Solway1843W.B.ScottIllustrated London News, 12 August StewartJulius Caesar engaged with the Britons1828Daniel Lizars, John StewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea1815SmithBritish MuseumAn Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Berlion of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Berlio of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Berlio of the Interior1815SmithSamuel R	Calgacus	1889	William Hole	frieze
the Roman Emperor Claudius   1872   Samuel Wale   British Museum     Gaul to the new Caesar, Defiance, emperor, while I have strength to hurl it!   1870   John Tenniel   Punch, London Charivari.     Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island   1866   Kinahan   G.H. Kinahan. Notes on a Crannoge in the County of Cavan, Proc. R.I.A.     Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island   1866   Kinahan   8.     Calgacus Addressing His Army   1859   W. Greatbach   British Museum. The Prize of the Jacobite Rebellion. AD 79-1746     Caesar's first invasion of Britiain   1854   William Linnell   British Museum. The Prize Cartoons.     The free northern Britons surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the Solway   1843   W.B. Scott   1843.     Julius Caesar engaged with the Britons   1830s   Stewart   British Museum     Boadicea   1828   William Bond   Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.     An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit   1815   Smith   Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.     A Belgic Briton and one of the Charles Hamilton   Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.   Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the	Submission of the Britons to		Charles Taylor.	
Gaul to the new Caesar, Defiance, emperor, while I have strength to hurl it!   1870   John Tenniel   Punch, London Charivari.     Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island   1866   Kinahan   G.H. Kinahan. Notes on a Crannoge in the County of Cavan, Proc. R.I.A.     Calgacus Addressing His Army   1866   Kinahan   8.     Calgacus Addressing His Army   1859   W. Greatbach   Rebellion. AD 79-1746     Caesar's first invasion of Britain   1854   William Linnell   British Museum. The Prize     The free northern Britons suprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the Solway   1843   W.B.Scott   1843.     Julius Caesar engaged with the Britons   18208   Stewart   British Museum     Henry Singleton, Boadicea   1815   Smith   British Museum     Mathematical Archiver of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.   Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.     An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit   1815   Smith   Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.     A Briton of the Interior   1815   Smith   Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.     A Belgic Briton and one of the Casstreides   1815   Samuel Rus	the Roman Emperor Claudius	1872	Samuel Wale	British Museum
DefinitionJohn TennielPunch, London Charivari.Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the island1860KinahanG.H. Kinahan. Notes on a Crannoge in the County of Cavan, Proc. R.I.A. 8.Calgacus Addressing His Army1866Kinahan8.Calgacus Addressing His Army1859W. GreatbachScotland, from the Roman Invasion to the Close of the Jacobite Rebellion. AD 79-1746Caesar's first invasion of Britain1854William LinnellBritish Museum. The Prize Cartoons.The free northern Britons surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the Solway1843W.B.ScottIllustrated London News, 12 August 1843.Julius Caesar engaged with the Britons1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the LassieridesCharles Hamilton SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the CassiteridesCharles HamiltonSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maærat and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maærat and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the Bri	Gaul to the new Caesar.			
have strength to hurl it!1870John TennielPunch, London Charivari.Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the islandG.H. Kinahan. Notes on a Crannoge in the County of Cavan, Proc. R.I.A. 8.the island1866KinahanS.Calgacus Addressing His Army1859W. GreatbachScotland, from the Roman Invasion to the Uses of the Jacobite Rebellion. AD 79-1746Caesar's first invasion of BritainE.H. Corbould and E.H. Corbould and W. GreatbachBritish Museum. The Prize Cartoons.The free northern Britons surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the Solway1843W.B.ScottBritish MuseumJulius Caesar engaged with the Britons1830sStewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial HabitCharles HamiltonSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the Cassiterides1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maærat and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maærat and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.	Defiance, emperor, while I			
Kinahan's reconstruction with buildings around the margin of the islandG.H. Kinahan. Notes on a Crannoge in the County of Cavan, Proc. R.I.A. 8.Calgacus Addressing His Army1866KinahanJohn Taylor. The Pictorial History of Scotland, from the Roman Invasion to the Close of the Jacobite Rebellion. AD 79-1746Calgacus Addressing His Army1859W. GreatbachBritish Museum. The Prize Cartoons.Caesar's first invasion of BritainEdward Armitage, Edward Armitage, Ullus Caesar engaged with the BritonsBritish Museum. The Prize Cartoons.Julius Caesar engaged with the BritonsDaniel Lizars, John StewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBoadicea1815SmithAn Arch Druid in His Judicial HabitCharles Hamilton SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the CassiteridesCharles Hamilton SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Magata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Magata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Magata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.	have strength to hurl it!	1870	John Tenniel	Punch. London Charivari.
buildings around the margin of the islandin the County of Cavan, Proc. R.I.A. 8.Image: Strain of Calgacus Addressing His Army1866KinahanS.Calgacus Addressing His Army1859W. GreatbachJohn Taylor. The Pictorial History of Scotland, from the Roman Invasion to the Close of the Jacobite Rebellion. AD 79-1746Caesar's first invasion of BritainEdward Armitage, 1854British Museum. The Prize Cartoons.The free northern Britons surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the SolwayImage: Scott 1843.Julius Caesar engaged with the BritonsDaniel Lizars, John StewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBoadicea1828William BondBoadicea Queen of the Iceni1815SmithAn Arch Druid in His Judicial HabitSmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the CaasiteridesCharles Hamilton SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Magata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Magata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Magata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.	Kinahan's reconstruction with			G.H. Kinahan. Notes on a Crannoge
the island1866Kinahan8.Ite island1866Kinahan8.Ite island1866Kinahan8.Ite islandIte islandJohn Taylor. The Pictorial History of Scotland, from the Roman Invasion to the Close of the Jacobite Rebellion. AD 79-1746Cagacus Addressing His Army1859W. GreatbachBritish Museum. The Prize Cartoons.Caesar's first invasion of surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the SolwayEdward Armitage, Henry Singleton, Henry Singleton,British Museum. The Prize Cartoons.Julius Caesar engaged with the BoadiceaDaniel Lizars, John StewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the CassiteridesCharles Hamilton SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Magrata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Magrata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.	buildings around the margin of			in the County of Cavan, Proc. R.I.A.
Calgacus Addressing His Army1859John Taylor. The Pictorial History of Scotland, from the Roman Invasion to the Close of the Jacobite Rebelion. AD 79-1746Caesar's first invasion of Britain1854W. GreatbachBritish Museum. The Prize Cartoons.The free northern Britons surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the Solway1843W.B.ScottBritish Museum. The Prize Cartoons.Julius Caesar engaged with the Britons1843W.B.Scott1843.Julius Caesar engaged with the BritonsDaniel Lizars, John StewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBoadicea1815SmithBoadicea Queen of the Iceni1815SmithAn Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithA Briton of the Interior1815SmithA Belgic Briton and one of the CassiteridesCharles Hamilton SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Marzata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Marzata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.	the island	1866	Kinahan	8.
Calgacus Addressing His ArmyI859Scotland, from the Roman Invasion to the Close of the Jacobite Rebellion. AD 79-1746Caesar's first invasion of BritainEdward Armitage, William LinnellBritish Museum. The Prize Cartoons.The free northern Britons surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the SolwayI843William LinnellJulius Caesar engaged with the BritonsDaniel Lizars, JohnBritish MuseumBritons1830sStewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea18215SmithBritish Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the CassiteridesCharles Hamilton SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Magrata and Caledonian1815SmithBritish Isles.A Magrata and CaledonianCharles Hamilton SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Magrata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.				John Taylor. The Pictorial History of
Calgacus Addressing His ArmyE.H. Corbould and W. Greatbachto the Close of the Jacobite Rebellion. AD 79-1746Caesar's first invasion of BritainEdward Armitage, William LinnellBritish Museum. The Prize Cartoons.The free northern Britons surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the SolwayIts54William LinnellJulius Caesar engaged with the BritonsDaniel Lizars, John StewartBritish MuseumJulius Caesar engaged with the BoadiceaDaniel Lizars, John Henry Singleton, William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea Queen of the Iceni1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the Cassiterides1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Magata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Magata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Magata and Caledonian1815SmithBritish Isles.				Scotland, from the Roman Invasion
Calgacus Addressing His Army1859W. GreatbachRebellion. AD 79-1746Caesar's first invasion of BritainEdward Armitage, William LinnellBritish Museum. The Prize Cartoons.The free northern Britons surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and theIllustrated London News, 12 AugustIbetween the Tyne and the Solway1843W.B.ScottJulius Caesar engaged with the BritonsDaniel Lizars, JohnBritons1830sStewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea Queen of the Iceni1815An Arch Druid in His Judicial HabitCharles Hamilton SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the CassiteridesCharles Hamilton SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Magata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Magata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.			E.H. Corbould and	to the Close of the Jacobite
Caesar's first invasion of BritainEdward Armitage, William LinnellBritish Museum. The Prize Cartoons.The free northern Britons surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the Solway1854William LinnellBritish Museum. The Prize Cartoons.Julius Caesar engaged with the Britons1843W.B.Scott1843.Julius Caesar engaged with the BritonsDaniel Lizars, John StewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea Queen of the Iceni1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815Charles Hamilton SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the Cassiterides1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Mageata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.	Calgacus Addressing His Army	1859	W. Greatbach	Rebellion. AD 79-1746
Britain1854William LinnellCartoons.The free northern Britons surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the Solway1843W.B.ScottIllustrated London News, 12 August 1843.Julius Caesar engaged with the Britons1843W.B.Scott1843.Julius Caesar engaged with the Britons1830sStewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea Queen of the Iceni1815SmithBritish Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the Cassiterides1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maærata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maærata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.	Caesar's first invasion of		Edward Armitage,	British Museum. The Prize
The free northern Britons surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the Solway1843W.B.ScottIllustrated London News, 12 August 1843.Julius Caesar engaged with the Britons1843W.B.Scott1843.Julius Caesar engaged with the Britons1830sStewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea Queen of the Iceni1815SmithBritish Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815Charles Hamilton SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the Cassiterides1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Magrata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Magrata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.	Britain	1854	William Linnell	Cartoons.
surprising the Roman Wall between the Tyne and the Solway1843W.B.ScottIllustrated London News, 12 August 1843.Julius Caesar engaged with the BritonsDaniel Lizars, John StewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1830sStewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea Queen of the Iceni1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the Cassiterides1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Mazeta and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Mazeta and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.	The free northern Britons			
between the Tyne and the Solway1843W.B.ScottIllustrated London News, 12 August 1843.Julius Caesar engaged with the BritonsDaniel Lizars, John 1830sBritish MuseumJulius Caesar engaged with the BritonsDaniel Lizars, John 1830sBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea Queen of the Iceni1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the Cassiterides1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maæata and Caledonian1815SmithBritish Isles.A Maæata and Caledonian1815SmithBritish Isles.	surprising the Roman Wall			
Solway1843W.B.Scott1843.Julius Caesar engaged with the BritonsDaniel Lizars, John StewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1830sStewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea Queen of the Iceni1815SmithBritish Isles.Boadicea Queen of the Iceni1815SmithBritish Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithBritish Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the Cassiterides1815SmithBritish Isles.A Mazata and Caledonian1815SmithBritish Isles.A Mazata and Caledonian1815SmithBritish Isles.	between the Type and the			Illustrated London News, 12 August
Julius Caesar engaged with the BritonsDaniel Lizars, John StewartBritish MuseumBritons1830sStewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea Queen of the Iceni1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815Charles Hamilton SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815Charles Hamilton SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the Cassiterides1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maæata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.	Solway	1843	W.B.Scott	1843.
Britons1830sStewartBritish MuseumBoadicea1828Henry Singleton, William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea Queen of the Iceni1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815Charles Hamilton SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the Cassiterides1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maæata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.	Julius Caesar engaged with the		Daniel Lizars, John	
Boadicea1828Henry Singleton, William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea Queen of the Iceni1815Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.Boadicea Queen of the Iceni1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815Charles Hamilton SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the Cassiterides1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Magrata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.	Britons	1830s	Stewart	British Museum
Boadicea1828William BondBritish MuseumBoadicea Queen of the Iceni1815Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.Boadicea Queen of the Iceni1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the Cassiterides1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maxata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.			Henry Singleton,	
Boadicea Queen of the Iceni1815Charles HamiltonSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815Charles HamiltonSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815Charles HamiltonSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the Cassiterides1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maxata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.	Boadicea	1828	William Bond	British Museum
Boadicea Queen of the IceniCharles Hamiltonthe Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial HabitCharles HamiltonSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the CassiteridesCharles Hamilton 1815Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maxata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.				Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of
Boadicea Queen of the Iceni1815SmithBritish Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial HabitCharles Hamilton 1815Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the CassiteridesCharles Hamilton 1815Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maxata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.			Charles Hamilton	the Original Inhabitants of the
An Arch Druid in His Judicial HabitCharles Hamilton 1815Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.An Arch Druid in His Judicial Habit1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the Cassiterides1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maxata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.	Boadicea Queen of the Iceni	1815	Smith	British Isles.
An Arch Druid in His Judicial HabitCharles Hamilton 1815the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.Habit1815SmithBritish Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the CassiteridesCharles Hamilton 1815Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maxata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.				Samuel Rush Mevrick. Costume of
Habit1815SmithBritish Isles.A Briton of the Interior1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the CassiteridesCharles HamiltonSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the CassiteridesCharles Hamilton 1815Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maxata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.	An Arch Druid in His Judicial		Charles Hamilton	the Original Inhabitants of the
A Briton of the Interior1815Charles HamiltonSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the CassiteridesCharles HamiltonSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maxata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.	Habit	1815	Smith	British Isles.
A Briton of the InteriorCharles Hamiltonthe Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the CassiteridesCharles HamiltonSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maxata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.				Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of
A Briton of the Interior1815SmithBritish Isles.A Belgic Briton and one of the CassiteridesCharles HamiltonSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maxata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the the Original Inhabitants of the			Charles Hamilton	the Original Inhabitants of the
A Belgic Briton and one of the CassiteridesCharles HamiltonSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maxata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the the Original Inhabitants of the	A Briton of the Interior	1815	Smith	British Isles.
A Belgic Briton and one of the CassiteridesCharles Hamiltonthe Original Inhabitants of the British Isles.A Maæata and Caledonian1815SmithSamuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the				Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of
Cassiterides 1815 Smith British Isles.   A Maæata and Caledonian 1815 Smith Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of the Original Inhabitants of the Originat Inhabitants	A Belgic Briton and one of the		Charles Hamilton	the Original Inhabitants of the
A Maæata and Caledonian 1815 Smith the Original Inhabitants of the	Cassiterides	1815	Smith	British Isles.
A Maxata and Caledonian 1815 Smith the Original Inhabitants of the			Charles Hamilton	Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of
in Original Innabiants of the	A Maæata and Caledonian	1815	Smith	the Original Inhabitants of the

			British Isles.
			Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of
		Charles Hamilton	the Original Inhabitants of the
A Mounted British Warrior	1815	Smith	British Isles.
			Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of
		Charles Hamilton	the Original Inhabitants of the
British fishing and husbandry	1815	Smith	British Isles.
			Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of
		Charles Hamilton	the Original Inhabitants of the
Costume of the Druidical Order	1815	Smith	British Isles.
			Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of
		Charles Hamilton	the Original Inhabitants of the
A British Bard and an Ovate	1815	Smith	British Isles.
			Samuel Rush Meyrick. Costume of
		Charles Hamilton	the Original Inhabitants of the
Bardic Scholars	1815	Smith	British Isles.
Boadicea the British Queen		William Sharp,	
Animating the Britons	1812	Thomas Stothard	British Museum
Boadicea haranguing her		Thomas Milton,	
troops	1810	Robert Smirke	British Museum
The Massacre of the Druids		Thomas Milton,	
	1810	Robert Smirke	David Hume. History of England.
The City of London burnt by			
the Troops of Boadicea, Queen		John Tomlinson,	
of the Iceni	1803	Thomas Slothard	British Museum
Boadicea Haranguing the		William Sharp, John	
Britons	1800	Opie	British Museum