Research Report March 2002

Strongholds and chiefly residences in the Mandara mountains of N. Cameroon

Nicholas David
Gerhard Müller-Kosack
Judith Sterner

The so-called strongholds of the Arrondissements of Koza and Mayo Moskota in the Extreme North Province of Cameroon are sites of unknown function and age built of the local granites and related rocks. Prior to our research, only one, the most impressive, had been the subject of a note published by the geographer Christian Seignobos in 1982. Neither have we as yet identified any references in archives or other sources on the history and ethnology of the region. This is the more surprising as the ruins are, to the best of our knowledge, the most remarkable indigenous stone-built structures in sub-Saharan Africa outside the Horn and the southern African Zimbabwe complex. We use the term *stronghold* (and *place forte* in French) not because they are fortresses, *oppida* or keeps but because, whatever their use(s), they are strongly built and, we infer, were strongly held as potent elements in the production of space by the communities responsible for their construction.

This report describes fieldwork undertaken by the authors between 15th December 2001 and 8th February 2002 in the Extreme North Province. This was intended as preliminary to, and successfully sets the scene for, a longer field season, planned for September-December 2002, during which we will conduct the first archaeological excavations on strongholds and undertake complementary ethnohistoric and ethnoarchaeological research.

Preliminary survey work and comparative ethnography

David and Sterner arrived in Gousda on 15th December and spent several days familiarizing themselves with the vicinity besides setting up an expedition base, obtaining the – enthusiastically given – cooperation of local authorities, and hiring an assistant. However, our main task in these early days was to locate or relocate the stronghold sites identified to, but not in all cases visited by, Müller-Kosack during his earlier work on the ritual reenactment of Gousda settlement history (Müller-Kosack 2001). The not unreasonable concerns of Mafa residents in the vicinity of the sites regarding strangers walking their land and taking notes and photographs required us to visit elders and village and quarter chiefs (lawans and bulamas) to explain our work and obtain their permission, a process completed during later phases of research. As the Mafa refer to the sites as *Diy-gid-biy* (lit. eye-head-chief), we adopted DGB plus a number as a convenient means of site designation. In the event, eight of the ten sites (DGB-1,2,3,4,6,7,8, and 9) described to Müller-Kosack had been precisely located and summarily described and planned by December 30th (Table 1). We were beginning to appreciate the characteristics that link them together as a set of sites: highly characteristic walling styles used to build platforms and terraces, similar construction techniques and sequences, and a prominent setting in the landscape overlooking the seven

kilometer long Shikewe watershed.[1] At the same time extensive foot survey beyond that valley provided no evidence of further sites.

A second aspect of the planned research required comparison of stronghold and other architectures in the northern Mandara mountains region. With this in mind we accumulated a record of Mafa and other stone walling styles in the form of standardized pictures amenable to quantitative analysis of absolute and relative sizes of elements, their orientation and coursing and other features. We also, in the first days of January 2002, visited chiefly residences, the successively occupied "chateaux" (Vincent 1991) of the Mofu "princes" of Duvangar and Wazang (Arrondissement de Meri). We had initially supposed that there might be stylistic and/or functional parallels between these sites and the strongholds, but, apart from the existence of covered passages giving entrance to certain of these sites and one of the strongholds, this proved not to be the case. By the time that Sterner returned to Canada on 6th January it had become abundantly clear that the importance and unique characteristics of the strongholds demanded that by far the larger part of our research effort be directed to its archaeological component.

Site planning and field archaeology

Gerhard Müller-Kosack's arrival on 6th January 2002 enabled us to begin a new phase of research during which we made detailed plane table surveys of the three largest sites, beginning with DGB-2, continuing with the neighboring DGB-1 and its northern outlier, and finally DGB-7 on the eastern rim of the valley. Planning of the first two sites required considerable clearing of bush, and, together with partial collapse of the structures, extensive terracing and stone piling by Mafa subsequent to abandonment by the builders, and the sites' steep sides and considerable heights – a difference of 15m between the highest and lowest points plotted on DGB-1 – turned planning into a painstaking process of discovery as we sought to distinguish fragments of *in situ* walling and other features, and relate them to the structures of which they formed part.[2]

As the landscape is littered with granite boulders and blocks of all shapes and sizes, construction materials required only to be collected in the immediate vicinity of the sites, and in some cases outcropped on their surfaces. DGB-2 was, like most if not demonstrably all the sites, built in stages (Fig. 1). First a large platform was built some 18 by 13 m in lateral dimensions and over 2¾ m high. In this case the platform is oval; in plan they are always rounded or curved, never rectangular. This and other sites then grew by the addition of further platforms, abutting those previously built[3] and exteriorly rounded, a pseudo-organic process comparable to the proliferation of tubercles or the budding of sea anemones. At several sites including DGB-1 and 2, later additions, usually to the west of earlier built platforms, take the form of terraces that are lower than the platforms themselves. Wall abutments provide critical evidence of construction sequences, but are not always identifiable due to collapse, burial under rubble, or subsequent Mafa terrace construction, or are interrupted by the incorporation of natural boulders into the

[1] Shikewe is a local name for the stream that, when it debouches onto the Koza-Mozogo plain, becomes the Mayo (Fulfulde for watercourse) Mozoua (cf. Fig. 7 based on the Mokolo 4c-d 1:50,000 map). It is conveniently applied to the short watershed near the margins of which all but one (DGB-10) of the DGB sites are located.

[2] Uncertain of the reliability of a total station or differential GPS survey equipment under dusty harmattan conditions and in the absence of mains power, we finally opted for the plane table and alidade method of survey, which served very well.

[3] With the exception of the south platform (S) on DGB-1 which was constructed as an independent unit at some time before platform SC2.

structure. In the long period since construction, primarily natural processes, including the growth of trees with sturdy root systems, have caused platforms to collapse to a greater or lesser extent. This often provides evidence that, below a superficial layer of rocky earth some 20-30 cm thick, platform filling is of granite blocks packed together in an openwork structure with very little matrix.

Collapse also reveals how walls were built. A primary concern of the DGB builders was that their dry stone walling present an even, slightly curved, exterior surface. This was achieved not by the carving of blocks – though some were broken – but by careful selection and placement. The wall is stabilized by orienting the long axis of a large proportion perpendicular to the wall face, and overall smoothness of the wall face is obtained by the use of smaller stones as chocks to tilt the facing rocks to the appropriate orientation, a technique known as keying in (Fig. 2). Gaps between larger blocks were minimized and, where necessary, filled with chinking stones carefully chosen to maintain the regularity of the surface. These practices result in a tendency for walls to show a degree of coursing even though courses do not extend over any distance and coursing does not appear to have been a sought after effect. The average size of building blocks tends to decrease upwards; wall bases often incorporating boulders, always carefully placed to present a flat surface, a meter or more in visible maximum dimension. Upper parts of platform and some probable free standing walls were in at least some cases built with inner and outer faces separated by rubble infill. Maximum wall height was over six meters (Fig. 3). The (existing) uppermost parts of walls are often of a poor quality lacking DGB characteristics. This is an indication that they have been partially rebuilt by later inhabitants probably in the course of terracing for agriculture. Partly for this reason and partly out of respect for the builders of structures, the Mafa tend to repair at least some of the walls and platforms. They firmly designate the small DGB-9 as a *Diy-gid-biy* site although none of the extant walling is of the characteristic style.

We will seek qualified advice before making judgements regarding the architectural and engineering skills demonstrated by the builders of the monuments. However, it seems to us that taller walls and features such as the covered entrance of DGB-1, and the skirting walls and buttressing “bastions” (Fig. 4) added at a late stage in its construction, imply the existence of a cadre of professionals to manage the labor force required to assemble the raw materials, to sort them into categories – stabilizing and other wall facing elements, wall infill, platform infill, etc. – and especially to set wall elements in place. An understanding of basic engineering principles would also seem evident in their interruption of stretches of straight walling with mutually supportive curved elements, and their placement of a massive retaining wall below DGB-2 (Fig. 5).

Figure 6 shows six main stages of construction inferred for DGB-1 primarily on the basis of wall abutments and under the assumptions that (a) a larger plan underlies the addition of specific elements, and (b) that no structure was built before it became necessary in terms of the larger plan. Thus after the initial raising of the north-central (NC) platform, construction along the ridge proceeded with the building of lobe C with the original sunken (if not necessarily at this time covered) entrance and interior sunken courtyard, and of the southern platform (S) which incorporates many natural boulders. Platform S *might* have been built before NC, but it *must* have been constructed prior to the linkage of C and S by the intercalated SC1 and SC2 elements. The next phases involved the building of platforms and terraces to the west, and, in a final phase, of an extension to the entrance and of other supporting elements around the margins of the complex. The covering of the entrance passages may have occurred at this time. Not shown on the simplified plan are the skirting walls around the north end of the site, and the many now fragmentary walls that once helped stabilize its steep eastern and south western slopes.

Our work at other sites revealed the presence, often in miniature, of all the features present at DGB-1 excepting only the covered entrance and interior courtyard. Entrances, now blocked, are however evident at DGB-2, 4, 8, and perhaps 7, though there is no evidence that any of these were ever covered. Apart from DGB-5, where no characteristic walling is present, and the small DGB-9, maintained and rebuilt by Mafa, the physical evidence is everywhere sufficient to assign the sites to a coherent set. On February 6th, the penultimate day of fieldwork, we located our first entirely new site, DGB-11, and we have received indications that there may be as many as four others, three of which would be located to the west and south beyond the Shikewe watershed. At present only DGB-10, high on the eastern ridge of Oupay massif, at 1494 meters the highest in the Mandara mountains, is located beyond the margins of the Shikewe basin, which it nonetheless overlooks (Fig. 7).

Wild goose and other chases

Seignobos in his 1982 note had suggested that there might be another site at Vurkasa some 10 km north in the Moskota mountains and that there were possible architectural parallels to the DGB sites among the Muktele and Podokwo in the northern part of the Centre Massif. We felt obliged to follow up these clues and went to Vurkasa where we interviewed an elder and some younger men who, despite some knowledge of our work at Kuva, unanimously denied the existence of DGB sites in the locality. And indeed since all the DGB sites as yet identified are located in close proximity to broad ridges suitable for agriculture and the Vurkasa locality is characterized by steep, rocky mountains and a fertile main valley, we were, after inspecting potential sites with binoculars, quite prepared to accept their assurances. The elder did tell us that there might be DGB sites at Vreke further to the north and west, and, since we had intended to make contact with the Biy Vreke, perhaps the most important traditional chief in the sub-region, we followed this lead. After hiking up to his residence, we learned that there were no such sites in or around Vreke, and that the Mafa, who had here displaced the Glavda, had no knowledge of any earlier inhabitants. Our visit resulted in an invitation to Sterner to participate in the Matami Vreke ceremony of purification that takes place in October, at which time she will be able to work on other aspects of the project, and in particular on the distribution of different kinds of power in the northern Mandara mountains.

Müller-Kosack and David also drove (along execrable tracks) through the Centre Massif, stopping to study walling and stone construction among the Zulgo, Muktele, and Podokwo. We found nothing comparable among the Zulgo or Podokwo,[4] although traditional Muktele tomb superstructures show a concern for smooth exterior walling that is of interest since the Mafa residents around several of the DGB sites are of the Golda clan and claim a Muktele connection. This requires follow up.

Some but by no means all Mafa in the general vicinity of DGB sites attribute them to *ndodiy*, legendary cannibalistic beings to whom are sometimes attributed long hair, red eyes, and shining skins or clothing.[5] Since a Gousda story attributed a tomb at Vouzod, some eight km south of the Shikewe stream, to *ndodiy*, we felt obliged to follow it up. There appears to be nothing to it. The bulama and elders of Vouzod questioned stated that the grave is of a no longer identifiable Mafa elder and is located in an area in which elders are regularly buried. This is supported by characteristically Mafa pottery found on the tomb and, a few meters away, in the form of pot

[4] The closest similarity to DGB walling was found in the cemented rather than dry stone walling of the Catholic and Protestant churches at the Podokwo village of Oujila!

[5] DGB sites are also variously attributed to whites, sometimes specifically to Germans, and to Arabs; in fact there is no generally accepted Mafa explanation or attribution of the ruins.

necks on a shrine used in the curing of earache. We conclude that the site is unrelated to the DGB complex.

Questions

Date and cultural affiliation

While the strongholds are certainly earlier than the expansion of Mafa into the region – or more probably its Mafa-ization – and must therefore be at least three centuries old (Müller-Kosack 2001), we have no clear idea of their age, nor of the cultural affiliations of their makers. Iron objects of forms unfamiliar to the Mafa have previously been found in the proximity of DGB-10 and the dubious DGB-5, and we collected a ground greenstone ax on DGB-2 in a position consistent with its incorporation in the original rubble fill of the SE lobe. We have noted the presence on the sites of occasional upper grindstones, quartz hammerstones likely used for pecking lower grindstones, and grindstone-mortars (David 1998). The ceramics present on the sites are sparsely distributed and appear little if at all differentiated from recent Mafa wares. Certainly they all fall within the stylistic range of montagnard pottery made during the regional Iron Age (Walde, David and MacEachern 2000), and we have seen no exotic artifacts of any kind.

It is difficult to be more precise regarding date since the Stone Age of the immediate region, including any manifestations of early food-production, is unknown, as is the early Iron Age although we may reasonably extrapolate from the work of the Projet Maya-Wandala (MacEachern 1996; Jones 2001 MA) around the northern fringes of the Mandara mountains to suggest that iron technology reached this area around the middle of the first millennium BC. Resulting socio-economic transformation is inferred from changes in the ceramic repertory from a limited typological range of thin, comb-decorated ware to a variety of thicker, often roulette-decorated ceramics. Evidence of early occupation in the vicinity of the DGB sites is limited to grinding hollows of the basin, mortar, (iron) fining, and grindstone-mortar types defined by David (1998), besides the poorly developed facets and miscellaneous small rounded hollows that are inevitably (it seems) associated. Because grindstone-mortars on small blocks are prized and frequently taken to people's compounds, their distribution is of very limited chronological significance, but large examples and basin and mortar hollows on bedrock or large boulders are clearly associated with higher parts of the landscape, never occurring on the plain (i.e., below 500 m), and with only two of 24 mapped examples below 600 m. They are found to above 1100 m. Because ceramic evidence of the Later Stone Age is lacking in the mountains, and because people nowadays use flat querns set into grinding stands, we suppose that most basin and mortar grinding hollows can be attributed to the Iron Age. However comparative study of their distribution and that of DGB sites demonstrates an absence of correlation, some sites having numerous hollows nearby, and others few or none. Thus *either* the makers of the hollows and the builders of strongholds lived at different times, *or* they are contemporary but stronghold and hollows sites are not functionally related. (In only one instance, at DGB-11, have we as yet noted a basin hollow on a small rock built into a DGB wall fragment, but our attention has been thus far directed elsewhere.)

The state of preservation of the strongholds is also evidence of their age. Our inexpert view is that, given the damage demonstrably being done by vegetation, and especially tree roots, it is improbable that the sites are much more than 500 years old. Scott MacEachern (pers. comm.) reminds us that around five centuries ago, many mound complexes around the northern edges of the Mandra were abandoned. It is possible that the appearance of the DGB complex is in some way related. While we would argue for a pre-Mafa *montagnard* rather than plains and a later than

early Iron Age cultural affiliation of DGB builders, such an inference can be challenged on the grounds that DGB walling is the most sophisticated ever seen in the mountains (or indeed elsewhere in Central Africa), and has no known local ancestors. And yet a search for any other origin would lead us beyond the precolonial state societies of the northern plains, who built in mud and fired brick, to societies living further north in the Sahara. A literature search is indicated for, despite the lack of exotics, the location of the sites in the mountain region located closest to the southern terminus of a major trans-Saharan trade route is suggestive.

Site functions

We have puzzled long over site functions and are convinced that this issue cannot be determined without excavation. Granite rocks and blocks are present in large numbers on the surfaces of most sites, mostly in the form of modern agricultural terraces and rock piled to facilitate agriculture (for which the Mafa have a term, *ńhishhish*). Structural remains on platform surfaces inferred to contemporary with the platforms themselves are very rare and limited to the partial outlines, probably foundations, of room-sized structures (Fig. 8 - 3:62). While these suggest that the platforms on which they are found were never much higher than the highest points still surviving, they are not otherwise informative. What original purposes were served by the substantial volumes, sufficient in some instances to discourage agriculture, of granite present on the surfaces of several of the monuments? What proportion of the surficial rock and that incorporated in Mafa terraces derives from platform collapse, and how much from other structures? We hope to have sufficient data to answer these questions after the next field season. Did the platforms and terraces serve any other functions besides supporting structures? What were the broader functions of the sites, and how may we account for their existence? the following paragraphs approach these questions from various perspectives.

Although Mafa cultivate on DGB sites and may live adjacent to them, they do not build compounds on them, in part out of a certain awe, in part for practical reasons: some are too small, others too exposed to wind. Although household debris occurs on the surface of DGB sites it is, as noted above, sparse. There is for example a marked contrast between the slim pickings on DGB-1 and the abundant ceramics, ashy deposits and other domestic materials, found just off the site to the southeast, where diagnostically Mafa pot types indicate that a Mafa *gay* was once sited. Nor have we detected middens associated with DGB sites. It would seem therefore that either DGB sites were not normal residential structures (or parts of such structures), or at best that they were in use only for a brief period – an inference at variance with the structural evidence from larger sites.

Were they special purpose sites associated with the living? The paved ways of Sukur were public works associated with its thriving iron trade; its chief's residence and megalithic throne room were also linked to this trade in that they would have impressed traders with the substance of Sukur and its leader (David and Sterner 1996; Smith and David 1995). The larger DGB sites are certainly imposing, and the remodeling of the entrance to DGB-1 seems designed to impress. The location of the DGB complex, and especially of DGB-1 and 2 overlooking a valley extending north towards Kerawa, the first Wandala capital, and the northwestern tip of the Mandara mountains, is not dissimilar from that of Sukur in that access from the plains is both relatively easy and relatively easy to control. But if they were involved in a trading relationship with northerners, what might they have traded? This is not a part of the Mandaras noted for its iron production; in fact during almost two months fieldwork in the sub-region ND noted no furnace remains, no spreads of magnetite (the ore used in montagnard furnaces), very little slag, and only a single entirely convincing example of the pock-marked boulders that at Sukur testify to the

mechanical fining of bloomery iron (David 1998). Other commodities sought by plains societies in the mountains include slaves, livestock, hides, and other agricultural products. Of these the only commodity of a sufficient value to transport cost ratio on which to found a trading center is slaves, but, quite apart from the lack of any supporting evidence, from smallest to largest the sites seem unsuited for the exercise of any of the internment, commercial, and other functions presumably associated with a slaving entrepôt.

If not for the living, then for the dead? The accretionary nature of DGB construction is compatible with the suggestion that the sites are cemeteries of important personages, and that successors' tombs were constructed against that or those of one or more predecessors. If this is the case then at least some platforms would have been built over a grave or mortuary structure or, minimally, the body. The subsequent collapse of such structures might account for the depressions noted on the NE and SE lobes of DGB-2 and at DGB-11. But it is hard to account in terms of mortuary practice for the western extensions of DGB-1, 2, and 7, the SE extensions at DGB-1, the major retaining wall below DGB-2, or at other sites, notably DGB-10, terrace features located at some little distance from platforms but clearly relating to them – unless, that is, we resort to the stereotypic archaeological gambit of attributing to them some unspecified ritual function. Nonetheless the mortuary hypothesis appears at the present time the least unlikely, and we might suggest that the highly visible location of the sites on the rim of the watershed shows some similarity to the placement of Neolithic collective tombs in Western Europe. However this may be, we must admit that, as in the case of the entrepôt theory, we are quite unable to account in economic terms for the concentration of resources that the larger sites would seem to require for their construction.

The next field season (September – December 2002)

In the next field season we will focus on (a) regional history and in particular the history of power relations, and (b) on the archaeology of DGB sites. Judy Sterner will concentrate on the former, and we have already arranged for her to work with the modern representatives of the three prime foci of traditional power in this heterarchic region: the traditional Mafa chief of Vreke, the Mafa rain chief of Moudoukwa, and the Wandala Lamido of Mozogo.

As to the archaeology, we are concerned to answer the questions raised above regarding age, functions, and cultural affiliations of the DGB complex. At the same time we will avoid a too hasty campaign of excavation on the prime site, DGB-1, that, unsupported by the advice of a conservation architect[6] and the very considerable resources required for effective stabilization of the monument, might result in its damage to its heritage and tourist potential. Thus we will proceed cautiously, first excavating the small and conveniently sited DGB-8 which shows in miniature many of the features that characterize the larger sites. This excavation will be near total, though we intend to preserve the fragments of DGB walling still extant. Armed with the knowledge gained at this site, we will proceed to work at DGB-2. While part of the same complex as DGB-1, located only 100 meters distant, DGB-2 is less well preserved and yet shows interesting indications in the probable blocked entrance and surface depressions of subterranean features not inconsistent with the mortuary hypothesis. Besides investigating these features, we also intend to excavate on the western terrace in the hope that, at the foot of the wall of the central platform, we may find archaeological remains contemporary with its construction. Other smaller "forensic" excavations, here and on DGB-1, will be directed to the resolution of specific questions of structural/chronological relationships.

[6] Though we intend to recruit a conservation architect to the team if at all possible.

Dissemination of Results

Use in the field of the digital camera and laptop computer purchased for the project enabled us to develop a Powerpoint slide show while still in Cameroon. This was shown to authorities in the Mokolo region and, in Yaoundé, to Dr Raymond Asombang, the Director of Cultural Heritage. Dr Asombang, who is also a Senior Lecturer at the University of Yaoundé, is extremely interested in our project and we intend to collaborate as closely as time and funds allow, including our training of their students in the field.

In Canada N. David has presented a revised version of the slideshow to the University of Calgary's African Studies Research Group and the African studies seminar (AFST 500). He will present a paper, coauthored with Müller-Kosack, at the meeting of the Society of Africanist Archaeologists to be held in Tucson in May 2002.

References cited

David, N. and J.A. Sterner. 1996. Constructing a historical ethnography of Sukur, part II: the 'classless industrial' society. *Nigerian Heritage* **5**: 11-33.

Jones, Kimberley 2001. *The archaeology of Doulo, Cameroon.* MA Thesis, University of Calgary.

Jouaux, Catherine 1989. Gudur: chefferie ou royaume? *Cahiers d'Études Africaines***114** (29-2): 259-88.

MacEachern, Scott 1996. Iron Age beginnings north of the Mandara mountains. In *Aspects of African archaeology. Papers from the 10th Congress of the PanAfrican Association for Prehistory and Related Studies*, G. Pwiti, and R. Soper (eds.). Harare: University of Zimbabwe Publications.

Müller-Kosack, G. 2001. *The way of the beer. Ritual re-enactment of history among the Mafa. Terrace farmers of the Mandara Mountains (North Cameroon).* London: Mandaras Publishing

Seignobos, C. 1982. Note sur 'les ruines du Mudkwa' en pays Mafa. *Revue Géographique du Cameroun* **3**: 41-45.

Smith, A. and N. David. 1995. The production of space and the house of Xidi Sukur. *Current Anthropology* **36** (3): 441-71.

Vincent, J.-F. 1991. *Princes montagnards du Nord-Cameroun. Les Mofu-Diamaré et le pouvoir politique*. Paris.

Walde, D., N. David, and S. MacEachern. 2000. Style and the identification of artifact-production systems: an explicitly scientific approach. *Clay and fire: pottery in Africa*, C.D. Roy (ed.), pp. 77-108. Iowa Studies in African Art: the Stabley Conferences at the University of Iowa, 4. Iowa City: School of Art and Art History, the University of Iowa.

Table 1

***Diy-gid-biy* site number**	**Alternative designation by village**	**Main characteristics**	**Other features**	**Comments**
DGB-1	Kuva-1	Very large complex of platforms and terraces; sunken interior courtyard with covered entrance built in two phases; western extension present	Northern outlier; nearby staircase	The most important and best preserved site, and the one studied by Seignobos (1982). Sequence of construction largely recoverable without excavation. Detailed plan made.
DGB-2	Kuva-2	Large complex of platforms, at least one probable entrance; western extension present	Staircase nearby; massive retaining wall to south	Less well-preserved but sequence of construction largely recoverable without excavation. Depressions on surface of two platform lobes might suggest presence of collapsed chambers. Ground and polished stone ax found in rubble of platform. Selected for excavation. Detailed plan made.
DGB-3	Kuva-3	Smaller complex of platforms		Poorly preserved. Detailed plan made.
DGB-4	Kuva-4	Smaller complex, two probable entrances		Very poorly preserved; only fragments of DGB walling. Sketch plan.
DGB-5	Mondossa	Largely natural hill with terraced sides, located in col		Physical characteristics compatible with DGB complex but no terrace walls demonstrably of DGB style. Attribution based on oral tradition and discovery nearby of iron artifacts, identified as probable currency bars of hitherto unknown type. Gross dimensions measured.
DGB-6	Bigide-1	Smaller complex	Staircase nearby to be confirmed	Very poorly preserved; only fragments of DGB walling. Gross dimensions measured.
DGB-7	Bigide-2	Medium large complex of platforms with western extension; possible entrance feature	Two staircases below site	Poorly preserved, sequence of construction not recoverable without excavation. Rock outcrops on surface and probable lack of depth of archaeological deposits counsel against excavation. Detailed plan made.
DGB-8	Mtskar-1	Probably a single platform, one probable entrance		Relatively well-preserved; selected for excavation. Sketch plan.
DGB-9	Mtskar-2	Single small platform		Physical characteristics compatible with but not demonstrably of DGB complex. Attribution based on oral tradition. Gross dimensions measured.
DGB-10	Oupay	Single small platform combining DGB walling with natural outcrop	Adjacent massive retaining wall	Series of iron bracelet-like forms, some linked into chains found nearby. Sketch plan.
DGB-11	Bigide-Warkama	Small platform complex	Adjacent terrace walls in DGB style; possible	Preservation of platform complex appears mediocre (site not cleared of bush). Much rubble on top of platforms and two depressions (cf. DGB-2). Detailed sketch plan.

Figure 1. Plan of DGB-2. The walling outlined in black is well-preserved and of characteristic DGB style. Surface features – rubble spreads, depressions (D), an entrance into the central platform – are sketched in. Our excavations in Fall 2002 will focus on this site which forms part of a complex with DGB-1,the largest and most impressive ruin.

Figure 2. Detail of the walling of the DGB-1 Northern Outlier showing the rubble core with selected rocks keyed in to form a smooth exterior face.

Figure 3. DGB-1. The tall North Central platform, first to be built at the site, and, to the left, the late East Central addition, incorporating an extension to the original entrance.

Figure 4. The north end of DGB-1 showing how a smaller “bastion” (left) buttresses the North Central and North 1 platforms (see the much simplified Figure 6 plan which omits the low “skirting” wall around this part of the edifice. Note the rubble core of the North 1 platform.

Figure 5. The massive retaining wall over 3 m tall built in characteristic DGB style below and to the south of DGB-2. Photographed from DGB-1 before the clearance of vegetation.

Figure 6. Simplified plan of DGB-1 showing inferred sequence of construction (from darker to lighter). Arrows indicate wall abutments. The NE bastion is shown in Figure 4.

Figure 7. Map showing the distribution of DGB sites around the small Shikewe drainage and on the eastern ridge of the Oupay massif. DGB-1 and 2 are the northernmost sites. DGB-8, to be excavated in Fall 2002, is the second site from the east on the southern rim of the drainage.