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ABSTRACT

The Uphill Quarry is in the Carboniferous Limestone at the western end of the Mendip Hills (fig. 55). Since the early 19th century a number of caves and fissures were discovered and destroyed in the process of working the quarry, which is now derelict.

A full account of the discoveries at Uphill has never been published and many of the misconceptions which exist about the site are due to this fact. This paper brings together information from archaeological and other sources to describe the sequence of the discoveries.

The caves have been numbered serially in the order of their discovery in the hope that this will simplify reference to the site in the future. All the stone artifacts that can be traced are described and illustrated in many cases for the first time. They comprise Middle and Early Upper Palaeolithic implements. Other material from the sites is mentioned and, where known, its whereabouts.

DESCRIPTION OF THE CAVES

All the recorded dimensions of the caves have been converted into metric units. Their locations within the quarry are shown in fig. 56. There are 13 caves to be considered.

Uphill 1 (Fig. 57).

This was the first cave to be recorded at Uphill (Rutter 1829). It was discovered accidentally, when, in 1826 workmen were quarrying stone from the steep slope beneath the church at a height of about 9.0m above the base of the cliff.

The workmen cut into a small cave containing an ossiferous deposit. Some of the bones which were found were shown to the Rev. David Williams of Bleadon, who recognised them as belonging to 'animals of a country and climate differing from our own' (Rutter 1829).

Mr. Williams employed two of the men to dig out the cave and the remains of rhinoceros, hyaena, bear, ox, horse, hog, fox, polecat, water-rat, mouse and birds were found. Hyaena remains were "very abundant" and the bones of the larger mammals had been gnawed by hyaenas. Rutter (1829) shows this hyaena den as the wider part of an almost vertical fissure, but Day (1863) who visited the site shows it as a small cave with a vertical fissure descending from the rear portion of the cave floor. Day does not include a scale on his drawing but if
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his proportions are correct the approximate dimensions of Uphill 1 were, height at the cave mouth 1.5m and length of the cave 2.5m.

A peculiarity of this cave was that part of the floor was formed by blocks of limestone which were wedged into the mouth of the vertical fissure to form a suspended floor. It was Day (1863) who first remarked upon the possibility that if the floor had given way, the hyaena den fauna, which rested upon it, would have been found apparently stratified above recent deposits in the cave below, Uphill 2.

Uphill 1 was quarried away some time between 1863 (Parker 1866) and 1898 (Wilson and Reynolds 1901). The few remains in the British Museum (Nat. Hist.) are almost certainly from Uphill 1 since they were acquired by the Museum before the discovery of the second series of caves which contained Pleistocene remains i.e. Uphill 7 and 8.

The Rev. Williams presented bones from Uphill to the Geological Society but these have not been traced.

**Uphill 2. (Fig. 57).**

Although this cave has now been quarried away, it is probably the best known of the caves at Uphill and this is undoubtedly due to the illustrated account of the cave, by Rutter (1829), which has formed the basis of most later accounts.

Uphill 2 was discovered by Williams' workmen when they followed
the descending fissure from the floor of Uphill 1. This fissure opened into the roof of Uphill 2. The cave was 12m long, between 2.5m and 6.0m wide and the height varied from 2.5m to 3.0m. The long axis of the cave was approximately north-south and, at its southern end, had an entrance at the base of the cliff which was blocked by “a quantity of loose stones” (Rutter 1829). This entrance had become sealed in relatively recent times for in the ferruginous sand and mud which formed the floor of the cave were found “a Roman piece of pottery, and a coin of the Emperor Julian; deeper were found other bones of sheep, fox, cuttlefish and bird” (Rutter 1829). During the removal of the material blocking this lower entrance, a pot containing almost two hundred Roman coins was found (Jackson 1877). Rutter describes several other fissures which led off the main chamber of Uphill 2 but none of these contained deposits of archaeological interest.

In 1898 this cave was in use as a store for explosives having had doors fitted to it for the purpose (Wilson and Reynolds 1901). In 1936 a small part of the cave remained but quarrying was still taking place (Balch 1936).

Uphill 3. (Fig. 58).

This cave was discovered and explored by James Parker in 1863 and although he did not publish his findings the discovery was reported
briefly in the 'Geologist' by Charles Pooley, who had visited the cave (Pooley 1863).

The Parker Collection in the University Museum, Oxford, contains Parker's unpublished manuscript notes and plans which give information on the general layout of the quarry as it was in 1863. It has been possible therefore to include in fig. 56 the approximate line of the quarry face as it existed in 1863, also to indicate the positions of some of the caves, including Uphill 3, which have been destroyed by quarrying since that date.

The entrance to Uphill 3 was about 18m above the base of the cliff and opened towards the south. The Parker Document 1, shows that the cave was approximately 12m long, 2m wide and 2.5m high at the mouth.

Pooley's letter says of the deposit "besides the usual stalagmitic breccia, common to the caves of the Mendips, this is partially filled with an unctious loam, which is exceedingly rich in animal remains."

Although Parker does not mention the stalagmitic breccia, he does give a more detailed account of the rest of the deposit. The deposit was formed of earth and sand "mixed throughout with small bones of mice, frogs, etc." and Parker observed that the deposit was layered. In one layer "much redness was observable, in another a much blacker soil occurred from the great quantity of burnt wood etc. mixed with it".
Parker considered that this layering was due to the "natural arrangement of the substances by the action of water" and not indicative of "successive periods".

The combined list of fauna from Uphill 3 is drawn from three sources, Parker (1866 (P)), Pooley (1863 (Py.)), and Dawkins (1874 (D)).

Parker qualified some of his faunal identification as "possibly" and "as far as I know at this date". Dawkins’ list was almost certainly drawn up after his examination of the Parker material in Oxford, and Charles Pooley listed his own finds.

**FAUNAL LIST UPHILL 3.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homo</td>
<td>(P., Py., D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>(P., D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>(P., Py.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>(P., Py., D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild cat</td>
<td>(D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otter</td>
<td>(Py.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badger</td>
<td>(P., D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos</td>
<td>(P., D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>(P., Py., D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boar</td>
<td>(P., Py., D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>(P.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water rat</td>
<td>(D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frog</td>
<td>(P.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>(P.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parker discovered at least six human skulls and numerous other human bones which he thought represented at least seven individuals (Parker 1866 and Catalogue of Human Crania in the Zoological collections, University Museum, Oxford). Many of the human bones were discoloured and weathered and at least one of the skulls was ‘waternorn’ (Parker 1866).

Pooley also recovered human material from Uphill 3, “a thighbone, part of a frontal bone, and portions of an upper jaw with the teeth still in situ.” Man was also represented by one sherd of “rude unbaked pottery” and by charcoal (Pooley, 1863).

Some of the skulls have been described by Dawkins (1874) and further details are given by Buxton (1924).

In all probability the deposit in Uphill 3 was composed of disturbed Neolithic material. The faunal list is fairly typical of such deposits in Mendip caves and those in other parts of Britain, as is the presence of associated human skeletal material. The relatively large amounts of human material is reminiscent of the Neolithic deposits at Chelum’s Combe, Cheddar (Balch and Palmer 1926). An even closer comparison may be drawn with the ‘Sepulchral Cave’ at Perthi-Chwareu (Dawkins 1874), where the form and size of the cave, the deposit and the archaeological material are almost identical with those at Uphill 3.

Uphill 3 was still in existence in 1877 (Jackson, 1877) but had been destroyed by quarrying by 1900 (Wilson and Reynolds, 1901).
Uphill 4 and 5.

Little is known of these two caves except their location on the 1863 cliff line and that they were both examined by Parker, who marked them on his plan of the quarry as “Cave tried”.

Uphill 4 was about 9.0m above the base of the cliff and has a note by it on Parker’s plan — “Red breccia”.

Uphill 5 was about 4.5m above the base of the cliff.

Uphill 6.

This cave was discovered in 1881 (Knight, 1902) and was described as a “small cave high up the face of the quarry”. Knight was present at the finding “under the broken stalagmite floor [of] a human skull together with some pieces of charcoal”. The skull, said Knight, was that of an “old man, whose teeth, though undecayed, were much worn.” It is not known what became of this skull.

He wrote that this cave was “near the same spot” as the caves explored by Wilson, i.e. Uphill 7 and 8. The photograph of Wilson’s caves (plate 19) shows a cave which was labelled by Reynolds as “Old Cave with stalagmite floor.” This cave seems therefore to be Uphill 6, but since this cannot be proved absolutely, the site of Uphill 6 is marked with a ‘?” in fig. 56.

Uphill 7 and 8. (Plate 19).

These caves were discovered in 1898 and were examined by Edward Wilson on behalf of the Bristol Museum. Wilson died before the work was completed and from his notes S. H. Reynolds wrote a brief account of the excavation and also prepared a list of the fauna. (Wilson and Reynolds, 1901).

The caves explored by Wilson consisted of a small complex of caves and fissures “lying at three or four horizons” but Reynolds and Weare (1898) both describe two principal caves, an upper (Uphill 7) and a lower (Uphill 8). Reynolds gives a brief description of the two caves but his faunal list combines material from both caves.

By 1901 these caves had largely been destroyed (British Assoc. Report 1901).

Uphill 7.

Reynolds states that the deposit in this cave varied “much in thickness in short distances.” At one point the following section was noted:

4. Deep purplish red soft sandy marl containing blocks of limestone, 1.3m.
3. Greenish yellow soft sandy marl, 35cm.
2. Greenish drab argillaceous sandstone with sparry calcite seams, 1.7m.
1. Carboniferous Limestone floor.
In other places, however the top layer of red marl rested directly on the limestone "owing to the irregularity of the floor".

The greenish marl was "frequently brecciated and occasionally tufaceous". It was this bed which yielded the bulk of the faunal remains and the hyaena coprolites.

_Uphill 8._

Reynolds describes this cave as a "somewhat larger cavity at a lower level" than Uphill 7. It contained a mass of rubble or cave earth which in places was 2m-2.5m thick. This deposit contained bones and teeth which were generally in a more broken state than those in Uphill 7. It was in this cave earth that the flint implements were found "in the same rubble as that containing the hyaena and rhinoceros bones". Wilson however thought this rubble and its included material had possibly undergone some displacement since its deposition.

From the main chamber of Uphill 8, a fissure led off in a NE direction and opened into an "irregular cavernous hollow" and from this cavity arose several smaller fissures and a 'chimney'. The primary fissure contained the same rubble as the main chamber of Uphill 8. (The chimney is marked ‘C’ in plate 19).

_Fauna from Uphill 7 and 8._

There are faunal remains from Uphill 7 and 8 in the collections of The British Museum (Nat. Hist.), The Bristol City Museum and The Woodspring District Museum, Weston-super-Mare.

The faunal list is by Reynolds’s (Wilson and Reynolds 1901) with additional identifications by Sutcliffe (Pers comm.) and by Hinton ( teste Davies, 1926). (R. Reynolds, S. Sutcliffe).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Felis leo spelaea</em></td>
<td>Cave lion, (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Crocuta crocuta</em></td>
<td>Spotted hyaena, (R., S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vulpes vulpes</em></td>
<td>Fox, (R., S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Meles meles</em></td>
<td>Badger, (R.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ursus sp.</em></td>
<td>Bear, (R., S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mammuthus primigenius</em></td>
<td>Woolly mammoth, (R., S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Coelodonta antiquitatis</em></td>
<td>Woolly rhinoceros, (R., S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Equus sp.</em></td>
<td>Horse, (R., S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bison priscus</em> (R.)</td>
<td>Steppe wisent (Kurtén) ('bovid 'S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cervus (?elaphus)</em></td>
<td>Deer (? red), (R.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rangifer tarandus</em></td>
<td>Reindeer, (S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? <em>Megaloceros giganteus</em></td>
<td>Giant deer (S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lemmus lemmus</em></td>
<td>Lemming (H.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the _Meles meles_ specimen in the above list is described as 'a complete skull in perfect condition'. Reynolds' opinion was that the skull was contemporary with the Late Pleistocene fauna and was not intrusive. But the remains of the other animals, as shown by the extant faunal remains, are fragmentary. So some doubt must arise over Reynolds’ conclusion.
Though the fauna is a typical cold one of the Last Glaciation (Devensian) there is a hint of more temperate and perhaps even forest conditions within the time span represented by the deposits. The two most numerous species were Equus and C. crocuta. The fauna is, with the exception of Canis Lupus, identical with that from the ‘A2 Loamy Cave Earth’ at Kents Cavern, Devon, as determined from Pengelly’s diary (Campbell and Sampson, 1971). There also Equus and C. Crocuta were the two most common species.

Uphill 9 and 10.

These two caves were explored by a committee set up by the British Association under the Chairmanship of C. Lloyd Morgan. This Committee which included W. Boyd Dawkins and S. H. Reynolds, was formed after the death of Edward Wilson, to examine further the caves at Uphill Quarry.

Brief reports of their activities appeared in the British Association Reports for 1899, 1900 and 1901. Two new caves were opened, Uphill 9 and Uphill 10. Work on Uphill 9 was unproductive and digging was abandoned. Uphill 10 produced “fragments of mammalian bones, gnawed bones, hammerstones and pot-boilers” and “a piece of black Roman pottery”.

Although none of the material traced can be attributed at the moment to either of these caves, it is possible that further research may make this possible and for this reason it was thought worthwhile to number these two caves.

Possible material from Uphill 10 are the thirteen sherds of Roman pottery in Taunton Museum, “from a cave at Uphill”.

No information about the location of these caves within the quarry has been traced.

Uphill 11.

The entrance to Uphill 11 is about 6m up the quarry face and faces south (fig. 56). The opening is roughly square and about 1m across, it leads into a fissure, the roof of which becomes higher as the fissure descends at an angle of about 20° along the bedding plane for a distance of 6m. It is blocked at its distal end by rubble and recent rubbish which may cover undisturbed deposits.

It is just possible that this cave represents the remains of one of the fissures which led off the main chamber of Uphill 2 but in the absence of sure evidence it has been numbered separately.

Uphill 12.

This is the largest of the caves still extant in Uphill Quarry. It is located towards the southern end of the quarry face at its base. The entrance is 5m wide, 2m high and faces west. The width is maintained for most of the 10.5m length but roof height of most of the cave averages
only 1m. The floor of the cave is composed of fine reddish sand in which are embedded several large blocks of limestone.

There are no references in the literature which can definitely be associated with this cave.

It has been suggested (Barrington and Stanton, 1970) that this cave may be part of the lower chamber of Williams’ Cave i.e. Uphill 2. Parker’s scale plan of the quarry however, places Uphill 2 at 45m northwest of the mouth of Uphill 12. In any case the cliff face was, in 1863, 25m west of the present mouth of Uphill 12 and to have opened onto the nearest part of the 1863 cliff, would have needed to be 35m long and to have faced due west. In fact Uphill 2 was only 12m long and opened towards the south. For these reasons it is not possible for Uphill 12 to be a remnant of Uphill 2.

Uphill 13.

This is a small cave in the cliff above the ‘Uphill Boat Services’. The cave entrance faces SSW, is 2.3m high and 3.0m wide. The cave narrows rapidly and is only 4m long. Some of the deposit is still intact beneath the remains of stalagmite floor. The stalagmite in places is 70mm thick and beneath this is a layer (400mm thick) of sharp angular fragments of limestone (diameter 25mm-40mm), cemented together by stalagmite. Beneath this there is a layer of apparently sterile, yellow, silty sand of undetermined thickness (about 0.5m is exposed, December 1976).

The Stone Artifacts from Uphill 8.

The artifacts described below are to be found in three Collections,
    The Montague Porch Porch Collection, (The British Museum).
    The G. S. Weare Collection, (Woodspring Museum, Weston-super-Mare).
    The Uphill Collection, (The Bristol City Museum).

Garrod (1926) illustrated five flints and Davies (1926) illustrated and described four but most of the material has been neither described nor illustrated.

Garrod (1926) implies that there is no record of the finding of flints at Uphill. In her description of the implements in the Bristol and British Museums she says “nothing is known of the circumstances in which they were found.” Fortunately this is not correct.

Apart from the flints found in Uphill 8 by Wilson there is no other reference to the finding of flints in the other caves. Williams (1829) records no flints from either Uphill 1 or 2 and Parker states that he found no flints (i.e. in Uphill 3, 4 or 5). Garrod (1926) says that Dr. H. Bolton (secretary of the British Association Committee) did not recollect the finding of flints, (i.e. from Uphill 9 or 10).

Unfortunately Reynolds did not give the number of implements found in Uphill 8 or indicate their form, except in the case of one implement. This is a reference to “a spearhead of rude character”,
which is almost identical wording with Dawkins' description of the often-illustrated implement from The Hyaena Den, Wookey Hole (Dawkins 1874), an implement familiar to both Wilson and Reynolds. Reynolds was probably referring to either (i) or (ii) below in the Porch Collection.

All the implements described below are of flint unless otherwise stated.

THE MONTAGUE PORCH COLLECTION (BRITISH MUSEUM)

This collection comprises four implements,

(i) A small handaxe.
(ii) A point unifacially worked on a large flake.
(iii) A blade.
(iv) A fragment of an Early Upper Palaeolithic point.

When Garrod (1926) described the site of Uphill she mentioned two small handaxes of Mousterian type which she implied were in The British Museum. There is no record at The British Museum of a second handaxe and the 1926 (3rd Edition) of the British Museum's "Stone Age Antiquities" mentions only the four items above. It seems probable that the second handaxe mentioned by Garrod was the point (ii) above.

1. British Museum, P1919.12.27.70. (fig. 59.1). A small triangular handaxe of chert with a greyish white patina and some iron staining on one face. The surface shows small discrete patches of dark grey, about 2mm × 3mm, which seem to represent inclusions in the chert. There are traces of reddish earth still adhering. The edges are dulled and the implement is weathered but there is no macroscopic evidence of rolling.

Some of the larger flake scars show prominent ripples and these show that the points of percussion were well outside the present outline of the implement. Other of the large flake scars are shallow and show no rippling. There are small scars of secondary intentional flaking and use around the periphery. At one point superimposed step flaking has produced a ridge making further sharpening at this point impossible.

This implement is markedly similar to the handaxes from The Hyaena Den, Wookey Hole, which lies 23km. ESE of Uphill.

2. British Museum, P1919.12.27.71. (fig. 60.2). A point unifacially worked on a large flake of chert. The raw material and the technique of flaking are the same as those for the preceding implement. It is grey with a 'basket' patina. The implement is weathered and the the flake ridges are dulled. The striking platform is at 135° to the main flake surface and although largely obliterated by a red accretion, appears to be plain. This implement would be acceptable under Bordes definition as a Mousterian point (Bordes, 1961 p.22).

3. British Museum, P1919.12.27.72. (fig. 62.3). A thick sectioned blade with a plain striking platform and a prominent bulb of percussion; made of chert. It is patinated grey speckled with a darker grey and bears traces of red earth. It is weathered but has not been rolled and has small flake scars down both edges consistent with use.

4. British Museum, P1919.12.27.73. (fig. 62.4). A piece of a blade, greyish-white and patinated, with reddish earth still adhering. This is the tip of a blade which was fractured in antiquity, the end having the same patina as the other surfaces. Bulbar and dorsal surfaces both have shallow flaking of the type typical of the bifacial and unifacial points characteristic of the Early Upper Palaeolithic in Britain (Campbell 1970). Along both edges there is bruising due to use.
THE G. S. WEARE COLLECTION (WOODSPRING MUSEUM, WESTON-SUPER-MARE)

5. WSM 01/16. (fig. 60.5). Figured by Davies (1926, p.272, 6). Inscribed 'Uphill' in pencil. A thick bifacially worked implement with one border steeply retouched to form a 'back'. It is patinated bluish-white with patches of iron staining. There is one small patch of brownish white cortex. It is presumably made on a flake, although none of the main flake surface remains to verify this. Many of the secondary flake scars are deeply rippled and end as hinge fractures. Some of the flake scars show that the flakes were struck well outside the border formed by the back. In fact no flake scar takes origin from or near this border. This suggests that this implement is part of an originally much larger one and the back was worked after it had been reduced in size, possibly by accidental fracturing. The technique is consistent with this having formed part of a small handaxe of Mousterian type.

6. WSM 01/17. (fig. 59.6). Figured by Davies (1926 p.272/6). Bifacial implement, chalky-white and slightly patinated. Two patches of bluish-white cortex remain. Most of both surfaces consist of large flake scars, some of which are deeply concave and most of which have pronounced ripples. The main flake surface ends abruptly at a curved fracture which is of such a shape that it could only have been caused by an incipient fracture plane in the raw material. There are some smaller scars of intentional secondary flaking and some scars and bruising which are probably due to use on a hard material. Form and technique point to this being part of a broken and possibly unfinished Mousterian biface which was subsequently used as a scraper.

7. WSM 01/18. (fig. 62.7). Figured by Davies (1926, p.272/4). Inscribed 'Uphill 4' in pencil. A thick triangular sectioned blade patinated creamy-white with patches of iron staining. The material has inclusions which show as grey, slightly translucent, patches a few millimetres across. There is steep retouch down one edge which also has a notch. There is shallow flaking along both edges on the bulbar surface which are probably due to use. The striking platform is plain and a series of small hinge fractures below it on the dorsal surface probably represent abortive attempts by the maker to strike the blade from the core.

8. WSM 01/19. (fig. 63.8). Figured by Davies (1926, p.272/3). A large yellowish-white, lightly patinated flake with some iron staining. Recent damage shows the flint to be pale brown. The bulbar surface has no retouch and the few shallow flake scars on this surface are probably due to use. The dorsal surface consists of long flake scars which are parallel to the long axis of the implement. One edge has a steep retouch and just below its centre shows about 15mm of bruising. Damage to the striking platform makes it impossible to say whether this was originally plain or faceted. The distal end of the flake has been snapped off in antiquity. This piece in form and technique seems to belong with the Early Upper Palaeolithic implements. The form of the dorsal surface, the damaged and subsequently used ends of the flake together with the steep retouch down one edge, recall the E.U.P. implement from the Hyaena Den, Wookey Hole (Tratman, Donovan and Campbell, 1971, p.262/12).

9. WSM 01/20. (fig. 60.9). A thick bladelet with a patch of cortex similar to that on WSM 01/26. Inscribed 'Uphill' in pencil. Whitish grey with some darker grey patches, bears traces of red earth. It has a plain striking platform and no retouch.

10. WSM 01/21. (fig. 59.10). A thin, curved, blade-shaped flake with no striking platform but some bruising at the bulbar end. It is patinated a bluish-white and has no retouch or wear marks.

11. WSM 01/22. (fig. 61.11). A small blade, greyish-white with darker grey patches, patinated. It has a plain striking platform, moderate rippling on the bulbar surface and no intentional retouch or signs of use.

12. WSM 01/23. (fig. 59.12). A small blade-shaped flake with a white patina, shows traces of red earth. The flake ends in a hinge fracture and has a deeply rippled bulbar surface. Damage to the striking platform reveals a greyish-brown flint similar to WSM 01/16.

13. WSM 01/24. (fig. 60.13). A small thin flake with a white patina. It has no striking platform, no retouch or wear marks but has bruising at its bulbar end. The scars on the dorsal surface are deeply rippled.
Fig. 61.
14. WSM 01/25. (fig. 60.14). Part of a flake, patinated white but showing small grey inclusions. The damaged edge shows that weathering has proceeded almost to centre of the flake which is of dark grey flint. There is no retouch and the part of the flake which would have borne the striking platform is missing.

15. WSM 01/26. (fig. 59.15). Inscribed ‘Uphill’ in pencil. A triangular sectioned blade with a natural back. It has a bluish-white patina and a back of reddish-brown stained cortex. Recent damage shows it to be made of dark grey flint. It has a pronounced bulb and heavy rippling and there is some damage to the edge which is consistent with use. This implement is technically a knife with a natural back (couteau à dos naturel) as defined by Bordes (1961, p.33). The cultural implication of this is consistent with the Mousterian as represented on Mendip being Mousterian of Acheulean Tradition.

16. WSM 01/27. (fig. 61.16). A white patinated flake with a plain striking platform, a prominent bulb of percussion and bearing traces of red earth. There is minute secondary retouch along two edges. The larger shallow flake scars on the bulbular surface are probably due to use.

17. WSM 01/28. (fig. 60.17). A roughly circular flake, with a chalky white weathered surface which is abraded in places. There is a small patch of stalagmite on the bulbular surface. There is secondary intentional flaking around the periphery.

THE UPHILL COLLECTION (THE BRISTOL CITY MUSEUM)

The artifacts in the Bristol Museum comprise 25 chert flakes and 5 flint flakes. Of these thirty items four are labelled ‘Uphill 1889’ in faded black ink but the rest of the material has no identification marks (with the exception of three pieces which have recently been numbered F2538-40). The chert is probably the same material as that used for the Voorhies implements. Most of the material bears traces of red earth which seems to be the same as that on the implements from the other collections. Some of the flakes have patches of brown stained cortex which shows that they were struck from ferruginous stained pebbles.

This material consists of ‘waste’ which is probably the product of making implements. Some of the smaller flakes are possibly trimming flakes from the manufacture or sharpening of handaxes, (e.g. fig. 61.23 and .24). Some of the larger flakes show signs of use in the form of secondary flaking, (e.g. fig. 61.25 and .26). The four flints from Uphill which were illustrated by Garrod (1926) are not now in the Bristol Museum having been destroyed by bomb damage during the Second World War. These four items have been redrawn, after Garrod. These are obviously pieces of Early Upper Palaeolithic implements.

18. (Fig. 62.18). Figured by Garrod (1926, fig. 22/1). “A graver on a pointed blade with Solotran retouch on the bulbular face”.

19. (Fig. 62.19). Figured by Garrod (1926, fig. 22/3). A piece of an E.U.P. point retouched on the bulbular surface.

20. (Fig. 62.20). Figured by Garrod (1926, fig. 22/4). A piece of a large blade with shallow retouch on both surfaces.

21. (Fig. 62.21). Figured by Garrod (1926, fig. 22/5). A piece of an E.U.P. point retouched on the bulbular surface.

22. (Fig. 61.22). F.2538. Part of a large blade made of good quality flint with a white porcelainous patina and traces of red earth adhering to it. Measurements suggest that this may be part of P1919.12.27.73. in The British Museum (fig. 62.4) but I have not had the opportunity to try them together.

23. No Museum number. (fig. 61.23). A small flake of chert with a patch of brown stained cortex, probably a handaxe trimer flake.

24. No Museum number. (fig. 61.24). Similar to 23.

25. No Museum number. (fig. 61.25). Large flake of chert, white with some iron-staining. It has some secondary flaking on its periphery and has probably been used as a scraper.

26. No Museum number. (fig. 61.26). A small thick flake of chert with a pronounced bulb shows flaking on its periphery consistent with its use as a scraper.
Fig. 62.
In addition to the material described above, there is from Uphill 8, a collection of other stones and pebbles. There are three brown stained nodules of flint, and various other pebbles and stones. Three of the pebbles show unmistakable signs of their use as hammerstones. These items are part of the G. S. Weare Collection, Woodspring Museum, Weston-super-Mare.

The Middle Palaeolithic Material (Nos. 1, 2, 5, 6, 15, ?17, 23, 24, ?25, ?26).

Published Middle Palaeolithic material from Mendip is limited to that from Hyaena Den, Wookey Hole. In his reappraisal of this material, Donovan (1971) has drawn attention to the similarity between the Hyaena Den handaxes and those from Oldbury, Kent. Collins and Collins (1969), have proposed that the Oldbury culture be regarded as Mousterian of Acheulean Tradition.

Far larger numbers of implements than are at present available from Mendip sites would be needed before a statistical analysis and comparison would be valid but the latest Middle Palaeolithic find from Mendip of a handaxe of classic bout coupé outline at The Rhinoceros Hole, Wookey, gives support to Donovan’s comparison (Tratman et al. Excavation Report in preparation).
The handaxe from Uphill would not be out of place among the group of handaxes from Hyæna Den and the material, technique of manufacture, preferred size and refinement are all consistent with its having been made by the same cultural group. (For definition of preferred size and refinement see Roe 1968, p.24).

The other two implements of well-defined Mousterian type i.e. the point and the naturally backed knife are not represented in the Hyæna Den assemblage.

The naturally backed knife is represented by only one example at Oldbury, this was found in the 1890 excavation and is now in the British Museum (B. Harrison Collection). This is larger than the Uphill example, being 10.2cms in length, but this reduction in size of the Mousterian implements as represented on Mendip seems to be typical and may be due, in part, to a lack of suitable raw material.

Indirect evidence of the scarcity of good quality flint is the frequent use of chert and the refashioning and use of broken or damaged implements. Donovan (1971) has commented upon the excessive resharpening of the Hyæna Den implements and it has been noted above that the Uphill handaxe shares this characteristic.

Unpromising raw material in the form of small brown-stained pebbles of river gravel flint have been found both at Hyæna Den (Donovan 1971) and at Uphill, where some attempt to utilise them had been made.

*The Early Upper Palaeolithic Material* (3, 4, 78, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22).

The Uphill 8 material has several items which can be assigned with confidence on typological grounds to the British Early Upper Palaeolithic (E.U.P.). These implements are described above but it is worth noting that almost without exception they are made of good quality flint which is in contrast to the Middle Palaeolithic material from this site.

The E.U.P. material from the Mendip sites of the Badger Hole and Hyæna Den, (Wookey Hole) and from Soldiers' Hole, (Cheddar) has been summarised by Campbell (1970).

**COMMENTARY**

Because of the ‘disturbed’ nature of the deposits and the lack of adequate stratigraphical information, Uphill 8 throws no new light on the relationship of the faunal remains to E.U.P. and Middle Palaeolithic assemblages. An attempt to establish these relationships at Hyæna Den, Wookey Hole proved abortive because earlier excavators had removed most of the deposit from the cave floor (Tratman, Donovan and Campbell, 1971).

The reconstruction of the stratigraphy of the cave earth at Kent’s Cavern, however, showed that E.U.P. and Middle Palaeolithic material were both contained in the same cave earth (A2 Loamy Cave Earth), but whereas the E.U.P. implements were confined to the top of the
deposit, the Mousterian occurred throughout the body of the deposit (Campbell and Sampson, 1971), which varied in thickness in different parts of the cave between 1m and 8m. This may have been the case at Uphill 8 since the cave earth was 2.0m-2.5m thick and Wilson noted only the layers in which the finds were made and not their positions within the layers. Reynolds says that Wilson considered that the deposits were disturbed but gives no reason for this. It is worth noting, perhaps, that Balch (1937) was not convinced that there had been disturbance.

Present opinion places the E.U.P. before the last Full Glacial advance. Radiocarbon dates put this around 28,000 BP. The Middle Palaeolithic is placed with less confidence around 30-40,000 BP. and probably corresponds with the amelioration in climate during the Upton Warren “Interstadiial” complex.

Until new sites can be found and explored, every attempt should be made to extract as much information as possible from existing material. For example Campbell has hinted that a more detailed study of the Pengelly diaries could possibly enable the fauna of the ‘A2 Loamy Cave Earth’ to be separated into two groups to correspond with the two occupation periods at Kent’s Cavern. Lack of excavation notes make any such analysis at Uphill impossible.

Forty years ago H. E. Balch (1937) said “‘Everything points to the desirability of more work in the Hutton-Banwell-Uphill area, whenever the opportunity occurs.’” This is as true now as it was then.

This reappraisal of the Uphill site has shown that at least thirteen caves have been discovered spread out over 200m of the old cliff face. Of these at least seven contained deposits of archaeological interest ranging from Pleistocene to Recent.

To the south of the quarry, the old cliff face continues for at least another 100m largely hidden by ‘hillwash’ and a covering of shrubby trees. This area was marked by Parker on his 1863 elevation of the cliff as ‘Copse’ and it seems likely that this area has never been disturbed. Other caves may await discovery there.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. E. K. Tratman for his help and advice during the preparation of this paper.

My thanks are also due to the staff of the various museums who have provided information and who have been so helpful to me on my visits. I would particularly like to thank Dr. A Sutcliffe (British Museum, Nat. Hist.) for providing information and comments on the Pleistocene fauna, Mr. C. Bonsall (British Museum) and Miss J. Evans (Woodspring Museum) for their help and hospitality.

The photograph used in plate 19 appears by permission of Dr. M. L. K. Curtis (Bristol City Museum). Hitherto unpublished material
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cave</th>
<th>Fauna</th>
<th>Presence of <em>Homo</em></th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Late Pleistocene</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No remains known to exist, 1976. But see p. 233.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Holocene</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Roman coins.</td>
<td>No remains known to exist, 1976.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Only location known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Only location known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Late Pleistocene</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Middle and Early Upper Palaeolithic stone implements.</td>
<td>The deposits in 7, as recorded, differ entirely from those in adjacent 8, where the cave earth contained all the stone implements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Late Pleistocene</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Only location known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Hammerstones and 1 shard of Roman pottery.</td>
<td>Roman pottery, possibly from 10, is in Taunton Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. &quot;Fragments of mammalian bones&quot;</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Some deposits remain in the cave, 1976.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Remnants of stalagmite floor, with deposits below, which seem to be archaeologically sterile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from the Parker documents used in the preparation of figs. 56-58 is
included by permission of Dr. W. J. Kennedy (University Museum,
Oxford).
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