



# New Discoveries Relating to the Planning of the Antonine Wall in Scotland — ERRATUM

By JOHN POULTER

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0068113X18000284> published online by Cambridge University Press, 19 July 2018.

The name of the fort at Castlehill was wrongly printed as Castle Hill on pages 116 and 136. The relevant paragraphs should read:

Page 116

For completeness, the inter-visibilitys were also checked with those forts which might appear to have been peripheral to the Antonine Wall, i.e. those at Bishopton, Camelon and Carriden. While the results will be addressed in detail later in the paper, in advance it is worth noting the exceptional range of inter-visibilitys which Camelon appears to have possessed. From the fort's south gate, all the known military installations at the eastern end of the Antonine Wall, from Kinneil to Rough Castle, would have been inter-visible with it. At a much greater distance, the fortlet on Croy Hill and the stations on Bar Hill would also have been inter-visible with it. This appears to mirror the situation near the western end of the Wall, where, as indicated in ONLINE TABLE 1, a tower located at the fort at Castlehill would have been able to observe not only most of the installations along the western half of the Wall, from Duntocher up to Bar Hill, but also many of the installations beyond, up to and including the fort at Rough Castle. This raises the possibility that Castlehill and Camelon might have been able to serve as communications hubs for the western and eastern ends of the Wall respectively.<sup>14</sup>

Page 136

The fort at Bishopton, sometimes known as Whitemoss, was located south of the river Clyde at OS grid reference NS 418 721, from where it would have been inter-visible at a viewing height of 7.6 m with Old Kilpatrick, Duntocher, Cleddans and Castlehill. As far as is known, the Antonine Wall is believed to have terminated at Old Kilpatrick and not to have continued along

<sup>14</sup> In comparison with the Antonine period fort at Camelon, the fort at Castlehill was not especially large, but it is not necessary for a fort to be of outstanding size to act as a communications hub.

the southern side of the Clyde. Even so, with these levels of inter-visibility, there would appear to be good grounds for considering that Bishopton could have been seen by the Romans as part of the Antonine Wall system.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

Poulter, J. 2018: 'New discoveries relating to the Planning of the Antonine Wall in Scotland'. *Britannia* 49, 113–46.