

# Lucerna

Roman Finds Group  
Newsletter 46

## Contents

Finds from Piercebridge.....	1
Obituary for Nodge Nolan.....	5
Upcoming RFG meetings.....	6
Late Roman deer and antler .....	7
Meet the committee.....	9
RFG Autumn meeting 2013 .....	10
Books.....	14
Conferences.....	15

## Notes for contributors

Contributions are always welcome – particularly on new finds –so please send them to us, and share them with the rest of the Roman Finds Group!

The address for e-mailed contributions is:

emma.durham@reading.ac.uk

Contributions by post should be sent to:  
Emma Durham, Department of Archaeology,  
University of Reading, Whiteknights Box 227,  
Reading RG6 6AB.

## Editorial

*This newsletter acknowledges the contributions of two of its members:Nodge Nolan and Lyndsay Allason-Jones. Nodge died in December 2013 and his obituary is written by Chris Lydamore, Jenny Hall and Ralph Jackson. Although I did not know him myself, Nodge sounds like quite a character and someone who contributed much to the study of Roman objects through his work. We can also take this opportunity to acknowledge the work of Lyndsay Allason-Jones who was awarded an OBE in the New Year Honours List this January.*

*We welcome a new contributor to Lucerna with an article by Rebecca Dobson based on her dissertation on finds from Piercebridge, while Stephen Greep poses questions about the hunting of red deer in late Roman Britain. Two of our members, Evan Chapman and Nina Crummy, have also*

*contributed reviews of new books. Remember if you have written or read a book and want to tell members about it, please get in touch!*

*Finally, this is an exciting year for meetings, with our first sponsored session at RAC, a conference that promises to be of much interest to those working on finds, as well as our first trip as a group to Manchester in October.*

## Membership

Please remember that membership is due in October. Many thanks to those who have already paid. Membership is still only £8 (for individuals) and £11 for two people at the same address. Standing order is also available, please ask Angela for a form or print one from the website.

In order to reduce costs and keep members better informed, we would be grateful if members could provide an email address. This will only be used to relay up and coming information on events such as the study days and the newsletter will continue to be printed.

## Mystery person

Among my payments for standing orders in October was one from K. Franklin marked as a standing order for the RFG. I have no record of this person as a standing order nor has Angela Wardle as a member. Can anyone shed any light on this? For instance, has anyone changed their name without telling us? Please let me know so we can amend our records.

Jenny Hall  
jenny.m.hall@hotmail.com

## Roman Finds Group is now on Twitter!

We regularly post information that may interest people with a passion for Roman objects, as well as sharing up-to-date information on the group, and links to our website. We also interact with other people of interest on Twitter. You can follow live-tweets of our conferences under the hashtags #rfg2014 #rfg2013 #rfg2012. We recently welcomed our 100th follower! Do join us! @RomanFindsGrp

## RITUAL OR REFUSE? A SUMMARY OF AN ARTEFACT ASSEMBLAGE FROM THE RIVER TEES, PIERCEBRIDGE

Rebecca Dobson

This article provides a brief summary of the undergraduate dissertation I completed at King's College London in May 2013 on a Roman artefact assemblage found within the River Tees at Piercebridge, County Durham. It was the aim of my research to establish whether the objects discovered on the riverbed came to rest there as a result of ritual deposition or accidental loss. Casey suggested a ritual explanation for early finds from the riverbed (Casey 1992) and this is supported by Walton (2008). An assessment of the finds from the riverbed has been conducted since 1986 when two divers, Bob Middlemass and Rolfe Mitchinson, began finding objects by sight and metal detector. I subsequently became aware of the assemblage through my voluntary work with Dr Philippa Walton, who has been responsible for recording and identifying these finds. I am grateful for Dr Walton's assistance in allowing me to view and work on the objects for my dissertation.

The site of Piercebridge is located on the River Tees, and since 1969 excavations at the site have uncovered evidence for a Roman fort, villa and *vicus*. The site was also important as a crossing point for Dere Street over the River Tees (Cool & Mason 2008, 1). There were two Roman bridges across the river; the wooden bridge built in the first century AD preceded a later stone bridge constructed 200 m downstream, possibly dating to the Severan period (Fitzpatrick & Scott 1999, 117-8, 128). In a small area (*c.* 5 m<sup>2</sup>) alongside the remains of the wooden bridge approximately 1,379 small finds have been recovered by the finders, and whilst some were perhaps lost accidentally, the high concentration of objects on the riverbed requires further explanation. I wanted to see whether the nature of the site could be determined by looking at the type of objects found, their quantities and what treatment they had received. Nina Crummy's system of categorising finds by function was used for my research (Crummy 1983). This categorisation revealed that a wide range of functional groupings is represented in the assemblage.

### The Objects

Approximately 1,379 finds have been recovered from the river, although this number has increased

as the finders continue to search. Several categories of find are particularly prevalent in the assemblage, including items associated with written communication. Sixty-four objects in this category are present in the assemblage which compares to 16 found on all of the other Piercebridge sites. This is significant as Derks has suggested a concentration of finds from this category may be indicative of a ritual site where correspondence with the chosen divinity may have been conducted via written vows (Derks 1998, 229).



Figure 1

A ritual explanation for the site is supported by the 21 religious items in the river, compared to the six recovered from the terrestrial sites. These items include miniature weapons, five miniature spears, two miniature adzes and one miniature axe, which may have been deposited in place of full-sized weapons. This is thought to have resulted from the introduction of the *Lex Iulia de Vi Publica* which forbade civilians from carrying weapons (*Digest* 48.6). Such miniature weapons are found at other ritual sites including Uley (Woodward & Leach 1993). Other items include two Cupid figurines and small statuettes of a tortoise and ram, the attributes of Mercury (Fig. 1). One hundred and four rolled or folded sheets of lead-alloy have also been recovered. As it has not been possible to confidently identify these rolls they were catalogued as miscellaneous rather than religious; ongoing analysis by a postgraduate student at the University of Cardiff is testing the possibility that these might be curse tablets, which are frequently found on ritual

sites. If so the quantity of religious items recovered from the river would increase significantly.

Due to the proximity of the Roman fort, the presence of military items in the assemblage is understandable, but these too occur at cult places. Nicolay has written extensively on the deposition of military items at the cult places of the Batavians including the discovery of 80 military objects in the Waal River, Nijmegen (Nicolay 2007, 126). 247 military items have been found on the riverbed (including horse components), a large quantity compared to the 178 items on the excavated Piercebridge sites. Many of the military items found in the River Tees are small, personal objects such as strap-ends or studs which would have been readily available for deposition. These items would have been more easily and cheaply replaced than whole weapons. There are only a few whole weapons, but many sword components are present in the assemblage. Many phallic amulets were found amongst the military items, including nine strap-ends. These may have been deposited because the phallus was believed to have an apotropaic quality or be associated with good fortune.



Figure 2

Items of personal adornment comprise approximately a quarter of the assemblage. They include finger-rings, pins, earrings, bracelets and other jewellery elements. My research particularly focused on the brooches within this category and how they compared to those found on the land sites. First, the concentration of brooches and brooch fragments in the river (111) is again large compared with the quantity of brooches found in the fort and *vici* (49). Secondly, there is a difference in the types found in the river and on land. Disc and knee brooches were particularly numerous in the river. There were 25 knee brooches in the river compared to six on the excavated sites. Knee brooches are associated with the military and therefore illustrate the use of the site by soldiers and disc brooches may

have been favoured for deposition because of their decorative nature (Figs 2–3). There were 19 disc brooches found on the river-bed compared to three on land. Zoomorphic brooches, including fish and horse designs, and a horse and rider brooch have only been found in the river. Although there is only one horse and rider brooch these are known to occur on ritual sites.



Figure 3

### The Coins

1,273 coins have also been retrieved from the River Tees. The use of coins in ritual contexts has long been recognised. Smith's research show that coins are the most common find at ritual sites in southern Britain, with a recorded presence at 60 out of 75 sites (Smith 2001, 155). They are also known in large concentrations at other watery religious sites including Bath, Coventina's Well and along the line of the Roman bridge in the Thames (Rhodes 1991, 31). The pattern of deposition on land and in the river can be seen to vary when presented as Reece periods (see Walton 2012). In the river there was an emphasis on earlier coin loss peaking at period 10 but the excavated sites show a peak at periods 13 and 14. A similar pattern can be seen at other watery religious sites. The sacred spring at Bath and Coventina's Well also show high numbers of earlier coin loss rising from the Flavian period. However both sites are missing the peaks at period 10 and 11 shown at the river site. The denominational profile also differs between contexts at Piercebridge. For instance there are over 20% more *denarii* from the river than on land. Visitors were apparently not purposefully selecting low value coinage as they appeared to do at Bath. This pattern corresponds with the relative high numbers of gold and silver small finds on the riverbed. For instance, there are more precious metal items in the river than on land. There were 36 gold and 21 silver

objects in the river compared to 3 and 17 respectively on land. The presence of high value items in the river tells against their casual loss.

I also examined the treatment of coins prior to deposition. Walton has previously noted the damage to coins from the river site and has argued that it appears to be ritual. She acknowledges that coins such as *denarii* may have been cut to be used as a substitute for bronze coins, but this would not account for the other methods of mutilation such as slashing and folding. If coins were damaged for continued use in circulation the methods would have been more uniform (Walton 2012, 164). Kiernan suggests that coins may have been slashed to check their validity. However, he points out that if this was a major reason for marking the coins then their isolated presence at ritual sites and the slashing of base metal coins would be hard to explain (Kiernan 2001, 25). The failure to recognise such ritual treatment may have meant that many mutilated coins remain unrecorded. This is illustrated by a 19th-century bronze eagle whose accompanying inscription informs the viewer was constructed from 'defaced Roman coins' from Coventina's Well (Laing Art Gallery, Newcastle Pl. XIV in Allason-Jones & McKay 1985, 104). I decided to document the treatment of coins in the river in some detail. Of course many of the coins from Piercebridge displayed signs of natural wear so only those which had clearly been deliberately mutilated were considered. 133 of the 1,273 coins have almost certainly been subjected to deliberate damage, but this may underestimate the frequency of deliberate damage. The mutilated coins were categorised according to different methods of treatment. The methods of damage observed on the coins included perforation, slashing, cutting, crescent shaped cutting, bending, notching, and some coins were damaged by multiple methods. The results of this analysis show that most damaged coins were cut, however many coins were also defaced and slashed. Other items which appeared to have been subjected to special treatment are also present in the assemblage. These items included jaggedly cut fragments of pewter vessels and a spear with a perforated blade. Similar treatment to a blade can be seen on a miniature spear from Uley (SF4002) (Woodward & Leach 1993, 131). Ritual killing may have signalled the end of an object's functional life and the beginning of its ritual use.

From the evidence I have examined it seems the assemblage from the River Tees constitutes a significant ritual deposit. Although some items came

to settle on the riverbed as a result of accidental loss it seems most were purposefully deposited. If the items represented accidental loss we would expect to find a similar assemblage next to the later Roman stone bridge but we do not. The assemblages from the excavated sites and the river show distinct differences between the types of objects found, which suggests that objects were often selected rather than accidentally lost. These differences as well as the treatment that objects in the river appear to have received make a ritual explanation for the riverine assemblage seem likely.

Further information: The assemblage is currently being processed at the British Museum as potential Treasure and it is hoped that it will be acquired by a northern museum. A publication on the material is forthcoming. For further information about the assemblage, please contact Dr Philippa Walton: [Philippa.walton@ashmus.ox.ac.uk](mailto:Philippa.walton@ashmus.ox.ac.uk)

### Acknowledgements

Researching my dissertation would not have been possible were it not for the knowledge and guidance offered by Dr Philippa Walton. I would like to thank her for allowing me to work with her on an assemblage she has dedicated much time and effort to. I would like to thank Dr John Pearce for his support, patience and guidance.

### Bibliography

- Allason-Jones, L. and McKay, B., 1985. *Coventina's Well*, Oxford
- Casey, P.J., 1992. 'A votive deposit from the river Tees at Piercebridge', *Durham Archaeological Journal* 8, 63–70
- Cool, H.E.M. and Mason, D. (eds), 2008. *Roman Piercebridge: Excavations by D. W. Harding and P. Scott*, Architect. & Archaeol. Soc. of Durham & Northumberland Research Report 7, Durham
- Crummy, N., 1983. *Colchester Archaeological Report 2: The Roman Small Finds from Excavations in Colchester 1971–9*, Colchester
- Derks, T., 1998. *Gods, Temples and Ritual Practices: The Transformation of Religious Ideas and Values in Roman Gaul*, Amsterdam
- Fitzpatrick, A.P. and Scott, P.R., 1999. 'The Roman Bridge at Piercebridge, North Yorkshire-County Durham', *Britannia* 30, 111–32
- Kiernan, P., 2001. 'The Ritual Mutilation of Coins on Romano-British Sites', *British Numismatic Journal* 71, 18–33
- Nicolay, J., 2007. *Armed Batavians: Use and Significance of Weaponry and Horse Gear from Non-Military Contexts in the Rhine Delta (50 BC to AD 450)*, Amsterdam
- Rhodes, M., 1991. 'The Roman coinage from London Bridge and the development of the City and Southwark', *Britannia* 22, 179–90

- Smith, A., 2001. *The Differential Use of Constructed Sacred Space in Southern Britain, from the Late Iron Age to the 4th Century AD*, BAR Brit. Ser. 318, Oxford
- Walton, P., 2008. 'The finds from the river', in Cool and Mason, 286–93
- Walton, P., 2012. *Rethinking Roman Britain: Coinage and Archaeology*, Wetteren
- Woodward, A. and Leach, P., 1993. *The Uley Shrines: Excavation of a Ritual Complex on West Hill, Uley, Gloucestershire 1977–9*, English Heritage Archaeol. Rep. 17, London



Nodge, during a re-enactment event at the Museum of London, interacting with Rebecca, Chris Lydamore's daughter.

## NODGE NOLAN

Chris Lydamore  
with additional appreciations by Jenny Hall & Ralph Jackson on the death of Nodge Nolan, December 2013

I can't exactly remember how Nodge and I first met; I have a feeling that it was something to do with working out how to make replica Roman armour just over 20 years ago. Whatever the details, the important thing is that we met and became lasting friends. Nodge had an insatiable thirst for knowledge and a desire to experience the amazing things that the world had to offer. He was an educator, not just in the formal sense as a qualified teacher but also more generally as a conversationalist and raconteur. A chat with Nodge could travel far and wide covering everything from the challenges of Anglo-Saxon ship building through to one of my personal and often revisited favourites; the nature and nuances of a good sausage.

It was Nodge who first introduced me to the delights of Roman cuisine and showed me the miracle that is the loose pin hinge.

Nodge's reputation as a maker of fine quality archaeological reproductions was second to none; examples of his work have been commissioned by some of the greatest museums in the country. Indeed Ralph Jackson of the British Museum once commented that Nodge's work was of such a high standard, was so well researched and showed such attention to detail that it constituted research in its own right. I have often wondered how Nodge managed to apply himself so determinedly to his work, to not be tempted to cut a few corners or fudge over a detail that most people would never even know was there. I think the simple truth is that he couldn't help himself, to have done less than his best would not only have let him and his client down but more importantly, he would have felt that he had in some way cheapened the memory of the ancient craftsman whose work he was reproducing and that was something he could not countenance. His love and appreciation of the things that clever hands can make was profound. You could tell he was really impressed by a particular piece, presented in a book or displayed in a museum, when you heard him utter in a hushed tone the ultimate accolade of a true craftsman admiring the work of another – "clever bastard!".

### Jenny Hall adds:

The first time I met Nodge was when he turned up at the Museum of London wearing a 'poacher's' coat. He had made bronze military belt mounts based on Grew & Griffiths (1991, 'The Pre-Flavian Military Belt: The Evidence from Britain', *Archaeologia* 109, 47–84) and wanted to know what Francis Grew and myself thought of them – I didn't quite know what to make of him. He then proceeded to pull out a variety of replicas from the many pockets of his coat like a magician with a rabbit!! It was the start of a long association and friendship leading to a series of replicas that Nodge produced for me as part of the High Street Londinium exhibition and, to his angst, numerous sets of wax writing tablets with bronze styli and manicure sets for the 200 Roman boxes that were sent out to London schools – doing multiples of things weren't what Nodge enjoyed about his work! In return, he would ring me seeking information and published research on a variety of artefacts that he had been asked to make. I will miss those entertaining phone calls!

Working with Nodge was always a joy but it was his knowledge of how things were made that really helped

me appreciate the skill of the Roman craftsman. He also introduced me to re-enactment groups – he belonged to the Colchester Group but when I needed a team of Roman Londoners for a film for High Street Londinium and a gladiator troupe for a gladiator show, he made contact with Legio II and Britannia and drummed up an ‘army’ (not literally, although some were!) of willing volunteers and the Museum of London has continued to use them for a variety of events.

### **Ralph Jackson adds:**

I think it was in the mid-1990s that Nodge first came to see me. He brought a splendid replica of a Roman cataract-couching needle that he had made using one of my published drawings. I was impressed at the accuracy he had achieved armed only with illustrations not intended for that purpose. But, of course, I soon came to realise, as he returned with more replicas, that it was the product of focused research, perfectionist attention to detail and sheer craftsmanship. The quality of Roman instrumentation is hard to match and the standing joke with each piece Nodge made was the award of ‘marks out of ten’ against the Roman originals. 10 was out of the question so 9 was the norm. In revenge, Nodge, in his quest for the elusive 10, demanded (ever so politely!) better and fuller source material. It was a great working relationship, shared research, involving wide-ranging, entertaining and immensely enjoyable, occasionally anarchic, discussions which shed light – or disclosed areas of darkness – on many aspects of ancient medicine. While I wrote about it Nodge, with Janet, re-enacted it, spreading the word widely and enjoyably with the Colchester Group and others.

In 1999 the British Museum commissioned Nodge to make reconstructed replicas of the unique medical kit from the Stanway ‘Doctor’s Grave’ and in 2001 replicas of a wide range of Roman medical instruments. They were important and instructive additions to our collections enabling a vivid realisation of Roman medicine. The enlightenment and thirst for more knowledge that they instill in those who handle them are one of the many fitting and enduring tributes to the skill and humanity of our dear late friend, Nodge Nolan.

## **UPCOMING RFG MEETINGS**

### **RAC 11/TRAC 24**

27th–30th March, 2014

This spring we are joining the Study Group for Roman Pottery in sponsoring a session at the Roman Archaeology Conference being held at the University of Reading. Our session is titled **Roman Metal Small Finds in Context**. The speakers are:

- Ellen Swift – Design, function and everyday social practices: a case study on Roman spoons
- Emma Durham – Metropolitan styling. The figurines from London and Colchester
- Michael Marshall, Natasha Powers, Sadie Watson – ‘Treasure’, ‘trash’ and taphonomy: Approaches to the excavation and interpretation of Roman finds from the Walbrook valley
- Martin Pitts – First generation urban communities: comparing ceramic and brooch assemblages in Roman Britain
- Tatiana Ivleva – What’s in the name? ‘Britishness’ of British-made brooches abroad
- Hella Eckardt – Immigrant soldiers at Hollow Banks Quarry, Scorton? New work on crossbow brooches, burial rites and isotopes

There are many other sessions that will be of interest to members of the group including:

- Insularity and Identity in the Roman Mediterranean
- Small Finds and Ancient Social Practices
- Return to the Sauce: new investigations concerning amphorae and their contexts
- ‘Deposits Full of Character’
- Clay and Cult: Roman terracottas and their production and use in domestic, religious and funerary contexts
- Continuity and Change – the impact of foodways on provincial pottery traditions

The basic conference fee is £98 including lunches on Friday and Saturday, and there are discounts for students (-£20) and Society members (-£5). Delegates can also book in for the Conference dinner on the Friday night and a guided tour around Silchester on the Sunday afternoon. Conference details, including abstracts of all papers, can be found at: <http://www.reading.ac.uk/archaeology/Conferences/RAC2014>

## Manchester Museum

October 2014

The RFG are planning an October meeting at Manchester Museum which will probably be on Thursday 23rd October. There will be talks on a wide variety of relatively local as well as more general topics, and also opportunities to visit the galleries and to see some of the reserve collections of Roman finds. The meeting is being organised by Bryan Sitch, Curator of Archaeology at the museum, and confirmed speakers so far include Matthew Ponting, Vanessa Oakden, Justine Bayley and Bryan himself. There are still spaces in the programme so Bryan who would welcome offers of papers, particularly those that relate to northern *Britannia*; contact him on Bryan.Sitch@manchester.ac.uk. The full programme will appear in the summer issue of *Lucerna*, and also on the RFG website, but put the date in your diary now! The fee for the day will be kept as low as possible, and there will be discounted rates for RFG members and students.

## RED DEER AT THE END OF ROMAN BRITAIN – A CHANGE IN DIET, HUNTING PRACTICES OR NEW INDUSTRIAL PROCESSES?

Stephen Greep

While researching evidence for a paper on a furniture maker's workshop in the late Roman courtyard house inside the fort at South Shields, it became clear that a large collection of partially worked and waste red deer antler could be attributed to the very end of the Roman period (Greep forthcoming 2014; the material is dated post AD 388 on coin evidence). Although I have not conducted an extensive literature search, I have also noted a small number of similar late 4th-century 'dumps' of antler. For example, at Stansted Airport a later 4th-century collection of red deer antler was possibly thought to be manufacturing waste (Havis & Brooks 2004, pl.IX), while antler manufacturing waste was found in very late 4th-/mid-5th-century contexts at Binchester (Ferris 2010, 89) and over 20 antler fragments, some worked, were found in a late 4th-/early 5th-century feature at Witham (Luff, 1999, 219). At Burgh Castle, there were 153 pieces of antler, excluding worked pieces, which may all be late Roman (Grant 1983, 109), although there was also post-Roman occupation on the site, and a 'cache' of antler, probably of later Roman date was

found at Finchingfield (Coverton 1940, 310–11). Finally reference may be made to 15 fragments of red deer antler, one sawn, from a well infill at Chells, dated to the end of the 4th century (Winder & Moreno-Garcia 1999, 149–50). That such finds are rarely illustrated, often not reported, or receive only a passing mention, has probably contributed to a lack of understanding of how widespread the availability and use of this material was late in the Roman period.

One further factor of interest at Arbeia was that there was a very high ratio of antler removed *post mortem*, as against those shed naturally. Of the 17 identifiable separate antlers five had not been naturally shed and were therefore either taken as the result of the hunt or from deer that had died naturally. At Caister-on-Sea there were three skull fragments with sawn antlers attached, but only one cast antler. This led to the suggestion by Harman that 'it is obvious from the numbers of pieces of cut and sawn antler found that good use was made of this raw material, and the cast example suggests that antlers were collected, but it is clear that much of the antler used came from carcasses' (Harman 1993, 231). At Burgh Castle (see above) there were 18 shed antlers and 11 still attached to skull fragments. In early medieval Maastricht (Dijkman & Ervynck 1998, 55–7) there was a ratio of 3:1, shed to hunted animals – this is strikingly close to the South Shields ratio of 17:5. While there is evidence of antlers being taken *post mortem* earlier in the Roman period (Luff 1993, 99), such finds appear uncommon.

In her book *Eating and Drinking in Roman Britain*, Hilary Cool suggested that there are 'occasional hints that more venison was consumed in the very late Roman to sub Roman period than was the case earlier' citing evidence from Wroxeter to support this assertion (Cool 2006, 237). More recently Hammon (2011) has presented the Wroxeter evidence in more detail. Following on from the evidence from Arbeia cited above, this short note examines some of the emerging evidence to support (and contradict) this theory and is intended to provoke more thoughts on the issue.

Hunting red deer took place throughout the Roman period, continuing an existing Iron Age practice. How prevalent hunting was during the period, however, is difficult to tell; Cool summarises the material evidence (2006, 111, 116) to which we may perhaps add small bronze figurines of running stags (e.g. Worrell & Pearce 2013, 356), graffiti (Barbet and Fuchs 2008) and the reference in Columella to deer being hunted, alongside other animals, in specially

constructed parks and although he is talking generically, Columella specifically mentions Gaul in his discussion of parks (*De Re Rustica*, IX, 1, on husbandry; see also Sykes 2010, 52, 56). Despite this evidence, deer seem rarely to have formed a significant part of the diet in Roman Britain (e.g. Grant 1975, 406) and it is not uncommon for the majority of evidence of red deer on sites of the period to be antlers rather than the bones, indicating their general importance as a source of raw material rather than food. The overall picture is rather confused, however, and there has been no overall study of red deer from Romano-British sites. While it is possible to point to an increase in the presence of red deer bones in the later Roman sites at Wroxeter as well as elsewhere such as at Caister and Segontium (Cool 2006, 112), there is also evidence from earlier sites such as Beauport Park of a 'significant' red deer presence (Harman 1988, 273). Although it is not totally clear from the Beauport Park report how many of the 49 fragments of red deer bone were represented by antler and while the material is not well stratified, the overwhelming majority of finds from the site predate the 4th century. Finally, it should be remembered that the end result of hunting need not always have resulted in consumption of the meat, let alone recovery of the antlers for working and it could well be, therefore, that the hunting of deer in Roman Britain was more for pure sport than for consumption. The possible reasons for this are well discussed by Cool (2006, 112–17; see also Sykes 2008, 443).

If then, the evidence for an increase in either hunting or deer consumption is still rather unclear, how do we explain the apparent increase in the amount of red deer antler partially utilised and wasted towards the end of Roman Britain? Taking the evidence from above there is a number of possible scenarios:

- There is a change in industrial practice leading to changes in the collecting of material. Grant has previously suggested that antler working could have been seasonal (Grant 1981, 211. See also MacGregor 1985, 35–6). Red deer shed their antler naturally during the late winter/early spring. When the antler is still readily fresh it is more easily worked, although it may be stored for use at a later date, it also tends to become harder (On the working qualities of antler see, for example, MacGregor 1985, 9–14, 23–9). Perhaps then, the evidence from Arbeia, with its high proportion of non-shed antler, is a reflection of working taking place throughout the year and a fresh supply being sought particularly in the late summer/early

autumn when male deer's were at their peak condition – provided by hunters rather than a local collection of shed antler.

- Some of the very late Roman types, such as combs and bracelets required antler rather than bone (although the products at Binchester and South Shields were neither of these!). Antler combs were produced in Roman Britain (Greep, forthcoming) which could have led to a significant increase in the requirement for this material.
- There is an increase in the hunting of deer, perhaps during the late summer accounting for an increase in unshed antler, or just an increase in the number of deer in Britain leading to an increase in the availability of the raw material. Either scenario could lead to an increased availability or perhaps explain why so much of it is wasted. If there is an increase in the hunting of deer, it is just possibly linked to changes in dietary requirements, as suggested at Wroxeter, or simply just an increasing enjoyment of hunting as a sport; yet at both Binchester (where phase 9 deposits which produced the worked antler waste did produce a small number of red deer bones, but in no greater quantity than earlier deposits; Cussans and Bond 2010, 518, 520) and Witham there was no increase in the numbers of other red deer bones recovered at the period of antler deposition. Unfortunately, the animal bone material from the courtyard house at South Shields has not yet been evaluated.

If no overall pattern emerges, we should not forget that local environmental conditions will have always played a significant part in the availability of red deer for hunting as well as antlers for working. Perhaps it is not surprising, then, that no clear overall picture of hunting or venison consumption emerges, other than there seems to be a significant increase in the amount of red deer antler, collected, utilised and/or wasted. Neither is it entirely clear that the increase in use and waste of red deer antler at this period is a British only phenomenon (e.g. Mustea and Popa, 2010, 161). This short note has been prepared to bring this apparent phenomenon to a wider audience in the hope that further supporting evidence and ideas will come to light.

### Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Hilary Cool, Nina Crummy, Andy Hammon and Terry O'Connor for discussions on this subject and for useful suggestions which have helped in the formulation of this note.



## Bibliography

- Barbert, A and Fuchs, M. (eds) 2008. *Les Murs murmurent: Graffiti gallo-romains* (Gollion)
- Cool, H.E.M. 2006. *Eating and Drinking in Roman Britain* (Cambridge)
- Coverton, J. G. 1940. 'Romano-British sites at Finchingfield', *Trans Essex Archaeol. Soc.* (n.s.) 25, 309–15
- Cussans, J.E. and Bond, J.M. 2010. 'The animal bones', in Ferris 2010, 489–523
- Dijkman, W. and Eryvnc, A. 1998. *Antler, Bone, Horn, Ivory and Teeth. The use of Animal Skeletal Materials in Roman and Early Medieval Maastricht*, *Archaeologica Mosana* 1 (Maastricht)
- Ferris, I. 2010. *The Beautiful Rooms are Empty. Excavations at Binchester Roman Fort, County Durham 1976–1981 and 1986–1991* (Durham)
- Grant, A. 1975. 'The animal bones', in B. Cunliffe, *Excavations at Portchester Castle. Vol. 1 Roman*, Rep. Res. Comm. Soc. Antiq. London 32 (London), 378–408
- Grant, A. 1981. 'The significance of deer remains at occupation sites of the Iron Age to Anglo-Saxon period', in M. Jones and G. Dimbleby (eds), *The Environment of Man: The Iron Age to the Anglo-Saxon Period*, BAR British Series 87 (Oxford), 205–14
- Grant, A. 1983. 'The animal bones', in S. Johnson, *Burgh Castle: Excavations by Charles Green, 1958–61*, East Anglian Archaeology 20 (Dereham), 108–12
- Greep, S. forthcoming 2014 'A late fourth/early fifth century furniture makers workshop at Arbeia', *Arbeia Journal* 10
- Greep, S. forthcoming. 'Two unfinished double-sided composite combs from Roman Britain'
- Hammon, A. 2011. 'Understanding the Romano-British-early medieval transition: A zooarchaeological perspective from Wroxeter', *Britannia* 42, 275–305
- Harman, M. 1988. 'The animal bones', in G. Brodrigg and H. Cleere, 'The Classis Britannica bath-house at Beauport Park East Sussex', *Britannia* 19, 272–3
- Harman, M. 1993. 'The animal bones', in M.J. Darling, *Caister-on-Sea. Excavations by Charles Green 1951–1955*, East Anglian Archaeology 60 (Dereham), 223–38
- Havis, R. and Brooks, H. 2004. *Excavations at Stansted Airport, 1986–91. Vol. 1 Prehistoric and Romano-British*, East Anglian Archaeology 107 (Chelmsford)
- Luff, R. 1993. *Animal Bones from Excavations in Colchester 1971–85*, Colchester Archaeological Reports 12 (Colchester)
- Luff, R. 1999. 'Zoological and environmental evidence', in R. Turner, *Excavations of an Iron Age Settlement and Roman Religious Complex at Ivy Chimneys, Witham, Essex 1978–83*, East Anglian Archaeology 88 (Chelmsford), 204–23.
- MacGregor, A. 1985 *Bone, Antler, Ivory and Horn. The Technology of Skeletal Materials since the Roman Period* (London)
- Musteată, S. and Popa, A. 2010. 'Antler manufacturing in the Eastern Carpathian regions in the time of Sântana de Mureș-Černjachov Culture (Late Roman Period)', in A. Legrand-Pineau and I. Sidéra (eds), *Ancient and*

- Modern Bone Artefacts from America to Russia. Cultural, Technological and functional Signature*, BAR International Series 2136 (Oxford), 159-170
- Sykes, N. 2008. Review of Cool, H.E.M. 2006, *Antiq. J.* 88, 443
- Sykes, N. 2010. 'Fallow deer', in T. O'Connor and N.J. Sykes (eds), *Extinctions and Invasions: A Social History of British Fauna* (Oxford), 51–8
- Winder, N. and Moreno-Garcia, M. 1999. 'The animal bone', in C. Going and J.R. Hunn, *Excavations at Boxfield Farm, Chells, Stevenage, Hertfordshire*, Hertfordshire Archaeological Trust Report 2 (Hertford), 146–56
- Worrell, S. and Pearce, J. 2013. 'Finds reported under the Portable Antiquities Scheme', *Britannia* 44, 345–80

## RFG Committee

**President:** Roy Friendship-Taylor, Toad Hall, 86 Main Road, Hackleton, Northants. NN7 2AD  
e-mail: roy@friendship-taylor.freeserve.co.uk

### Minutes and General Secretary and Website

**Manager:** Nicola Hembry, English Heritage, Centre for Archaeology, Fort Cumberland, Eastney, Portsmouth, PO4 9LD.  
e-mail: nicola.hembrey@english-heritage.org.uk

**Treasurer:** Jenny Hall, 26 Park Hill Road, Wallington, Surrey SM6 0SB  
e-mail: jenny.m.hall@hotmail.com

**Membership Secretary:** Angela Wardle, 1 Stebbing Farm, Fishers Green, Stevenage, Herts. SG1 2JB. Tel: (work) 0207 566 9322.  
e-mail: awardle@molas.org.uk

**Publications Co-ordinators:** Gillian Dunn, Historic Environment Service, 27 Grosvenor Street, Chester CH1 2DD.  
e-mail: gill.dunn@cheshirewestandchester.gov.uk

**Newsletter Editor:** Emma Durham, Department of Archaeology, University of Reading, Whiteknights Box 227, Reading RG6 6AB.  
e-mail: emma.durham@reading.ac.uk

### Committee members:

Justine Bayley, mail@justine-bayley.co.uk  
Evan Chapman, Evan.Chapman@museumwales.ac.uk  
Stephen Greep, sjgreep@gmail.com  
Ellen Swift, E.V.Swift@kent.ac.uk  
Sally Worrell, s.worrell@ucl.ac.uk

## **CHEDWORTH AND CIRENCESTER: RFG Autumn Meeting**

(27/28th September 2013)

Angela Wardle

The first day of the meeting was held in the newly built Salway Room at Chedworth Roman Villa. Talks focused on the recently completed work prior to building a new cover building, cafe and engagement room at the villa. On Saturday the group moved to Corinium Museum in Cirencester where talks ranged more generally on themes covering the Cotswolds and south-west.

### **The redevelopment of the site at Chedworth** Martin Papworth

Excavations at Chedworth since 2008 have concentrated on the western range, where a cover building was erected in the 1860s, which while protecting the site, obscured much of the archaeology. The new building has been designed, successfully, to give an overall picture of the villa building, protect the structure and improve the visitor experience (as borne out by the RFG visit later in the afternoon).

### **Finds from Chedworth and their display** Nancy Grace

For many years the finds from Chedworth were displayed in a traditional manner in the oldest purpose-built museum on a site, Victorian in date and style. Some of the displays were in tents and sheds, giving rise to the alternative site name 'Shedworth'. The renovation of Chedworth afforded an opportunity to revamp the display, while retaining the unique atmosphere. Problems were encountered in achieving this as the collection had not been examined for a considerable time and much was stored off site beneath the old cases. Many objects were badly labelled and unprovenanced. The cover building project allowed for both the re-examination of the finds themselves and the original records, and Emma Durham is currently working on the antiquarian collections. The finds have now been redisplayed in the museum by theme rather than by object type and there is scope for updating the new displays, which have versatile back boards. Some of the unstratified objects now form part of the handling collections, and some of the loose tesserae are imaginatively used in displays in the cafe.

### **The mosaics from Chedworth**

Steven Cosh

Stephen Cosh described the sequence of mosaics from Chedworth and gave us a virtual tour of the rooms. There are three main phases: the first the corridor mosaics, the second the Corinian Orpheus group and the third and last phase those in the North Range, where the rooms duplicate those in the West Range. The earliest mosaics are geometric and are of more than one phase. The *triclinium* is the site of one of the most famous mosaics of the second phase, a figured mosaic with the four seasons in the corners, a Bacchic theme belonging to the 'Orpheus' school, familiar for example at Woodchester and Stonesfield. The badly damaged mosaic in Room 6 is of the same period as the *triclinium* mosaic, with a similar cornering technique, also seen at Woodchester.

A circular element in the corridor is probably contemporary with the Orpheus mosaic and the entrance has a scheme of running triangles and peltae, with signs of later repair. There are parallels for the design in other local villas, for example Withington and Woodchester, and the scheme is also seen in the Midlands, perhaps evidence for the movement of craftsmen north from the west country.

Specific elements of mosaic designs in the other rooms belong to the Corinian/Orpheus tradition with many parallels in the local area.

### **Early Roman quarrying and building stone** Kevin Hayward

Jurassic stone quarried in the Cotswolds supplied the south-eastern area of Roman Britain where there was no suitable high-quality stone and towns like London, Silchester and Colchester used imported stone. Little formal research has hitherto been carried out on the sources of early freestone used in Roman Britain. Entries in *RIB* describe the 600 examples of inscriptions as 'stone' or similarly imprecise terms, for example Bath oolite for the tombstones of Facilis and Longinus. The term 'limestone' says nothing about the source of the stone and evidence of Roman quarrying has been removed by later medieval quarries. Evidence for Roman quarrying has, however, been found at the Cirencester amphitheatre. This is in marked contrast with the Continent where petrological and geochemical techniques have been used in Germany and Italy.

Freestone, a type of limestone with rounded oolitic grains and formed in warm seas, is found as a

limestone outcrop from Humberside, through Cirencester down to Dorset. Thin-sectioning and geochemical analysis can narrow down the area. Archaeological samples (50 mm<sup>2</sup>) were taken for analysis and the samples were compared with geological samples taken from existing outcrops and building stone samples. Thin sections were made and XRF and stable isotope samples helped to refine the identification. Over 100 samples now form a reference collection.

Kevin has reviewed 26 tombstones (including *Facilis* and *Longinus* from Colchester and the *Classicianus* and the *Camomile Street* soldier from London) and 62 architectural fragments from south-east Britain, from Canterbury, St Albans, Fishbourne, Silchester and Cirencester. He identified 17 different types of freestone of which 11 were sourced to different parts of Britain and France. The *Facilis* tombstone came from Norroy, north-east France, and is a stone used rarely in Roman Britain. *Longinus* (AD 43–50) is made from Painswick stone from Gloucestershire, which is of very good quality for carving. *Classicianus* is an *Athlestan* oolite from the Tetbury region of Gloucestershire. The *Camomile Street* soldier is carved from a Bath freestone, a shelly banded oolitic limestone from the south Cotswolds, Bath to south Oxfordshire.

There are regional differences – at Colchester, Claudian stone came from France, Ham Hill and other places. The *Genialis* tombstone from Cirencester is a banded shelly oolitic limestone – a Bibury or Barnsley freestone. The *Geminus* tombstone from Alchester is a Forest marble from south Cotswolds. Examples from Richborough and Fishbourne came from the Oise Paris basin. Some examples from Canterbury and Kent came from Boulogne and the study of freestone in Roman Britain therefore shows the cross-channel transportation of stone.

The chronological development of the freestone industry in Britain starts at Claudian Colchester, where the earliest examples of fine limestone have links to tombstones on the Rhineland frontier. The Lothringer freestone outcrop was close to the Rhine for transportation and the stone was used at Trier, Mainz, Bonn, Cologne, Neuss, Xanten and Nijmegen.

The army was likely to be responsible for quarrying and supplying stone and the *Facilis* tombstone was carved by a continental legionary craftsman. The *Longinus* tombstone from Colchester was the

earliest native freestone (a Painswick stone from Gloucestershire) to be used prior to the colony's foundation, AD 43–50. The stone came from afar although high-quality stone was closer at Bath and Lincoln. It is a high-quality limestone chosen for its carving qualities with a paintable surface and it can be polished like a white marble. As all tombstones were military, there was a demand for stone by the army and the Painswick stone quarries were close to the Kingsholm fort while Lower Lincolnshire quarries were close to another fort (Lincoln).

### **The Cirencester cockerel figurine**

Ed McSloy

The cockerel was recovered from a cemetery site excavated at the end of 2011 prior to the construction of a new car park. Seventy-one inhumation burials and four cremations were part of the western cemetery, possibly the earliest in the Roman town of Cirencester, dating from the early Flavian period, c. AD70s. It was aligned on the Fosse Way, the burials lying in a north-south orientation. The cemetery also contained a square masonry enclosure with burials inside the structure and later graves, dated from the bracelet forms. Two distinctive burials, one inside the masonry structure, were early/mid-2nd-century AD in date.

The graves within the masonry structure contained pottery sherds that are not usually found in grave assemblages. There were examples of tazze and amphorae – perhaps from graveside rituals and libations to the dead conducted on the anniversary of the deceased.

The cockerel was found during a watching brief phase in the grave of an unsexed child aged from two to three years. It was lying near the head and had probably been placed on top of the coffin. The grave also contained a 1st-century *tettina*, made locally at one of the north Wiltshire kiln sites.

The enamelled bronze cockerel is a unique find from a burial in Roman Britain, although pipeclay figurines have been found in child burials, for example at Arrington and Godmanchester, perhaps following a Gallo-Belgic tradition. It is 125 mm in height, and is decorated in polychrome enamel in red, blue and yellow. Of the eight examples known, this is the only one to retain the tail, which is attached by solder. The figurine was cast in three separate parts for practical reasons to allow the enamelling process.

There are three main types of this figurine known:

Type 1 has lattice diamond-shaped cells on the breast and crescent-shaped cells on the wing plate and enamelling on the crest and eyes.

Type 2 is smaller with crude enamelling and a separately-moulded wattle. Examples have been found in Bedfordshire and Cumbria, with European examples from Tongeren (Belgium) and Ezinge (Netherlands).

Type 3 has an extended back-plate and crescented enamelling. The British Museum has an example from the Royal Exchange in London.

There are possible links to enamelled vessels, for example the Rudge Cup, and there is evidence for such manufacture at Castleford.

In conclusion, cockerels are popular in art and culture and are associated with Mercury. At Cirencester, with Uley close-by, there are eight stone pieces showing Mercury and he is also depicted on hairpins. Cockerel figurines are uncommon finds in burials and tend to be associated with child graves. The cockerel was probably manufactured in northern Britain in the 2nd century AD, linking to a trade route with the Rhineland. It shows evidence for the Mercury cult and funerary ritual.

### **The Roman rural settlement project**

Tom Brindle

The project started at Reading University in 2012 and is due for completion in 2015. It will provide a GIS database for searching sites. Using published and unpublished material (grey literature), it aims to produce an account of Romano-British rural settlements focusing on excavated sites, excluding military sites, major or small walled towns. It includes late Iron-Age sites, faunal remains and plant data. The complex database details the types of finds with their contexts. Some of the regions (E, SE and E Midlands) have been completed, and 2105 sites have been recorded, mostly individual settlements, representing the half-way stage of data collection.

Regional patterns are starting to emerge: 33% sites produced brooches; 45% coins; 64% small finds and 70% quantified ceramics. The drawbacks are that the data are mixed in quality and the patterns do not show the chronology of the site, the type of site or the investigation strategy. However the project is now in a position to look at regional patterns incorporating additional PAS data.

To summarise the findings so far:

There is a clear distinction between nucleated and other sites, villas and farms.

There is a real difference between enclosed and linear/developed farms, but it is as yet unclear whether this is due to size and population figures or status and identity. For example, combs and mirrors are found on villas and linear farms, but not on enclosed farms.

Villas and linear farms are associated with trackways and paddocks (for horses) and transport perhaps had better access to market centres. There is a clear distinction in burial rites, with flexed burials at enclosed farms, prone burials at linear farms, showing different cultural values and traditions.

In conclusion, the project is halfway through data collection but broader regional patterns are starting to emerge with distinctive types of finds assemblages. At the end of the project it will be possible to compare regional variations and there is the potential to aid the characterisation of individual sites (through the PAS).

### **Re-presenting Chedworth villa to the public**

Simon Esmonde Cleary

Chedworth was bought by the National Trust in 1924 by personal subscription. It has remained unpublished since 1864, but with excavations by Ian Richmond in the late 1950s, Roger Goodburn in the 70s–80s and more recent ones, Simon is preparing the academic monograph to include all the excavations up to 2010.

The most visible walls at Chedworth are 19th–20th-century in date. James Farrer, the landowner, conducted the first excavation in 1864 and set up a museum on the site, the first site museum in the country. The visitor figures are currently made up of schools, British visitors and tourists. The project was granted HLF funding, and as the brief was to produce an interesting story the team felt they had to get away from the popular view of the Romans, namely gladiators, soldiers and togas. The main problem was in presenting a complex site in an understandable way, while avoiding preconceptions about the Romans.

The villa was interpreted by examination of the topography and how the Romans accessed the complex. There were two distinct areas with the principal reception rooms built beyond the working enclosure/courtyard, which would have separated the working and family life. The project decided to create a cast of characters with scenarios representing ‘A day in the life of the villa’. The governor, Lucius Septimius, is visiting the owner who lived there with his wife, family and slave boy (Hector). It is set in the

360s during the reign of Julian, and there is a Christian connection with the villa. The stories of the various characters are recorded at different levels of information for adults and children. There is also a hands-on engagement room for children.

Three themes are covered, all designed to show why the villa takes its particular form:

1. Hunting – Roman hunting was a social event. There is evidence of spears, boar and deer bones and a sculpture showing Silvanus and Diana Venatrix. Hunting is commonly depicted in Roman art, for example on mosaics, the Seuso Treasure, the Wint Hill glass bowl and the mosaic fragment from East Coker etc. Indeed, a 19th-century shooting lodge was built on to the site museum, showing that hunting continued as a sport.
2. Bathing – the baths were a social space to improve the look of the body.
3. Dining – and social pretension – the best surviving mosaic on the site in Room 5 was designed in two sections with one area to take a late Roman curved dining bench.

### **Gods, men and ménage à trois: small finds and their iconography**

John Pearce

On studying the PAS database, John has found that there are many small finds and figurines that show how religion is reflected in even the smallest of artefacts, for example, fragments from an equestrian statue have been found from North Carlton and an eye from a bronze life-size sculpture from Molten. Over 1000 figurines have been recorded by Emma Durham. The iconography of Mars figurines varies due to the process of replication and variation of attributes, but they are clearly identifiable and John looked at a cross-section of examples. A figure of a giant from Caenby Corner is depicted with legs turning into snakes and there are other examples. Grotesques, such as on a steelyard weight/ pendant from Lincolnshire, show a marked asymmetry with lopsided eyes, mouth and cheeks.

A copper-alloy perfume jar (5 cm tall, missing its foot and stopper) from a possible burial from Petham, Kent, depicts images in relief which depict multiple participants in Bacchic revels, two groups of satyrs and musicians with a huge thyrsus, separated by a trailing plant.

A folding knife handle from *Verulamium* shows three figures – a woman leaning on a small figure with her legs around another male's shoulders. There are several similar examples of such an erotic scene. The PAS also reveals other types of knife handles – showing hunt scenes, hunted animals, gladiators, erotic images and Bacchic scenes and a range of such scenes appear on implements used for personal grooming. PAS objects tend to come from lowly rural settlements rather than major towns but show that such iconography is found even on small objects.

### **Capricornus**

Stephen Minnit

A copper alloy figurine of Capricornus was found in early 2012 by a metal-detector in Burrington, North Somerset, 4 km from the Charterhouse mine. The detector reported the find to his PAS in York and it appeared in a Christies Sale Catalogue in October 2012. It was valued at £3000–5000 but was sold for £13000 (£16000 with commission) to Somerset County Museums Service.

The figurine is a sea-goat and is an unparalleled form. It is 21 cm in height, cast in solid copper alloy and consists of the head and front legs of a hairy goat and the stumps of two horns, with the scaled body of a fish with a three-pronged ribbed tail. There is no means of attachment so it would have been freestanding.

The subject is shown on Augustan coins as Capricorn was adopted as his birth sign, representing re-birth and moral authority. Some coins show it with a globe and this is perhaps missing. It is also the emblem of the 2nd Legion Augusta which was based at Exeter, Gloucester and Caerleon so its discovery in Somerset may connect it to the legion.

### **Gill Mill: an overview and some recent finds from a minor nucleated settlement**

Paul Booth

Gill Mill lies in the Windrush valley, a tributary of the Thames. Oxford Archaeology has been working at the site for over 25 years with about 50 hectares of landscape investigated. Although Akeman Street runs to the north in the lower Windrush valley, there are only minor Roman roads in the area. It began as a small middle Iron Age settlement with activity continuing until the mid-2nd century and was a nucleated settlement of about 10 hectares with ditched enclosure and numerous pits. However, there is little structural evidence so any buildings must have been of timber or cobb. By about AD 120 it had become a

Roman settlement, covering a large area, which lasted until the mid-4th century. One building may have been a smithy with hearths. There are few finds, but these are characteristic of Roman rural sites. They include wire necklets and bone hairpins. A glass intaglio shows Jupiter with a thunderbolt. There are also jet bracelets and a rare jet lunate pendant with only three other parallels, one of which is from Scarborough. There are 716 dated coins (about 1000 in all) – a large number for the site but which were concentrated alongside a Roman road.

It is possible that there was a shrine in the area and statuary and finds include a Genius, a seated archer, Venus figurines, an uninscribed altar, and two dodecahedra, one unusually of lead as well as ceramics and animal bone. There are also three pewter vessels, eleven iron objects including tools and various other household items. The nine linch pins and part of a cartwheel show the importance of transport. A low-lying site, it would have been used for animal husbandry as it was not really a suitable site for habitation.

### **An Anglo-Saxon brooch and three millennia of art and technology**

Jörn Schuster

Jörn has been working on a Saxon brooch which he feels that it reflects past technologies. His artefact is a 61 mm high lozenge brooch with a zigzag motif. The spring was separately attached to the back-plate by rivets. There are traces of gilding (mercury fire-gilded) with a black paste that is not niello (as there is no sulphur content). Parallels date it to the 7th century and Saxon safety-pin brooches continued to evolve from the late 8th to early 10th centuries, but this example was made in a way that drew on earlier techniques and motifs.

### **Corinium Museum: a recent view from the curator**

Amanda Hart

The Corinium Project was a HLF bid in 1999. Its aims were to provide access to all, to improve education and improve care of the collections. Most of the mosaics had to stay on site during the building works but the famous hare mosaic had to be dismantled in sections as the floor was levelled for wheelchair access. The creation of a new mezzanine level allowed more space for display cases and the Cotswold Heritage Centre, the storage facility at Northleach, improved the storage of the collections.

The project cost £7.5million – HLF paid £2.5million matched by Cotswolds £2.7million.

The museum re-opened in 2004. Since then the Arts Council vision, published in 2011, has required museums to achieve excellence, inspire people and be sustainable, resilient and innovative. To achieve this, the Museum manages to attract schools, students, teachers and academics. They run a film club and take care of the collections. A Roman app was launched early in 2013 as a way of getting information about objects to the public and it also generates an income as the downloads will pay for an upgrade of the app when required. The Arts Council also requires that the workforce be diverse and highly skilled.

The Museum Trust is now rethinking the direction in which the museum should be going. They have extensive permanent galleries but with objects that are hard to change. They plan to bring in temporary displays and will be setting them up amongst the permanent displays. They have some old-fashioned reconstructions which they want to remove. They also have problems with the maintenance of hands-on displays and the interactive touch screens area already dated, with constantly failing technology. They have decided therefore that, as the museum cannot keep pace with visitors' personal technology, they will remove the technological aspects of the displays. They also need a more flexible learning space, a café area and the stores are already full – a universal problem!

## **BOOKS**

*Zeugma V, Les Objets*, by N. Dieudonné-Glad, M. Feugère & M. Önal, Travaux de la Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée 64 (Lyon), ISBN 978-2-35668-039-6, 55 €.

This volume in the Zeugma series covers the small finds from the Franco-Turkish excavations at Zeugma between 1996 and 2000. The town was founded by Seleucus I Nicator, one of the generals of Alexander the Great, and its position, where the Silk Road crossed the Euphrates, ensured that it developed a flourishing trading economy. Bronze Age burials nearby point to an earlier period of settlement in the area. Despite destruction by the Sassanids in AD 256, earthquake damage, and further raiding by eastern polities, it continued to be more precariously occupied until the Byzantine period.

The first section of the book provides an introduction to the excavations and the history of the town that they

revealed, pointing up in particular the military occupation under the Romans, when *Legio IV Scythica* were stationed there – finds of weapons and armour lost in the Sassanid attack include arms and armour, notably ring-mail. The second section is devoted to the condition, cleaning and preservation of the various materials represented in the volume – organics, minerals, metals and glass, and to the metallographic analyses undertaken on the finds.

The third and largest section is the catalogue of the objects divided by functional grouping, and the fourth is a summary of the objects by area, within area by building and within building by room, with overviews of these group assemblages and tables giving the date and context of each item. Both sections provide the basis for further analytical approaches to the data.

Some highlights deserve mention here. The thoroughness of the volume is apparent in the close studies of some types of finds. For example, items such as militaria, vehicle fittings, tools, window grilles, split-spike loops, padlocks, etc. occur in such numbers that they provide decent-sized assemblages that were used for modular analysis, while polychrome plots of their location within the site and most specifically within a row of buildings relate them firmly to their point of use. In terms of stunning objects there are several ivory dolls and a white-metal plated copper-alloy lyre body in the form of a tortoise-shell, referencing Apollo as the god of music. The individual objects are illustrated using a range of techniques, from high-quality colour or monochrome photographs to line drawings, often mixed on the page.

This brief overview of the volume does not do justice to either its quality or thoroughness. It is a book to be admired as much as used. At once both scholarly and workmanlike, it will be a valuable resource for future researchers.

Review by Nina Crummy  
(ninacrummy@yahoo.com)

*The Crosby Garrett Helmet* by D.J. Breeze & M.C. Bishop (eds). 2013. Pewsey: The Armatura Press, 48 pages, £5

This booklet was commissioned by the Tullie House Museum, Carlisle, to accompany their recent display of the Crosby Garrett Helmet, and is thus very

clearly aimed at a general readership. In reviewing it for *Lucerna* it is only fair to point out that members of the Roman Finds Group are probably not the primary audience of this booklet.

It is not a through written book, but rather a collection of seven short essays and notes (longest eleven pages, right down to little over half a page), with a certain feeling that everyone who had been involved should have a chance to contribute. This leads to a certain amount of repetition between authors and some slightly odd divisions of the ‘narrative’.

After the introductory material (Foreword, Preface, Introduction), the booklet can be seen to fall into three parts: (1) the helmet itself (M.C. Bishop, 'Description'; Dot Boughton, 'Discovery'; Darren Bradbury, 'Restoration'); (2) its archaeological context (Mark Graham and Patricia Shaw, 'Geophysical and Landscape Survey'; Chris Healey, 'Archaeological Evaluation'; (3) an explanation of why it is interesting beyond its purely aesthetic appeal (M.C. Bishop and J.C.N. Coulston, 'International Context').

The discussion of the restoration of the helmet is very short, less than half a page of text, but it does bring home to one just how much of a restoration job the helmet had, and how far such restoration is removed from the conservation archaeological objects generally receive today.

It would appear that the archaeological work on the finds spot, since the discovery of the helmet, has not produced any clear explanation for its burial some 10 km from the nearest known Roman fort. The find spot apparently has more of an Iron Age / Romano-British character, with possible hut circles within an earth-banked enclosure. Of interest is the possibility that although the helmet is dated to the late first to mid-third century, it might not have been buried until the fourth century.

The last section, 'International Context', has three distinct elements. Sandwiched between a section on Roman cavalry and one on the *hippika gymnasia*, both clearly aimed at the general reader, is a discussion of face-mask helmets (p. 34–9), which seems to have more academic appeal. I would suggest it is this section and Bishop's description of the helmet, with its fine collection of colour photographs (p. 7–16), which will attract those with a scholarly interest in the helmet.

Review by Evan Chapman

## CONFERENCES AND EVENTS

### British Museum Touring Exhibition

*Roman Empire: Power and People* brings together over 160 stunning pieces from the British Museum to explore the story of one of the most powerful empires the world has ever seen.

Highlights include sculpture from the villas of the Emperors Tiberius and Hadrian, coins from the famous Hoxne treasure, beautiful jewellery and even near-perfectly preserved children's clothing from Roman Egypt.

The exhibition has been developed in partnership with Bristol Museum and Art Gallery and explores the wealth, power and organisation of the Empire, but also how the Romans viewed their provinces and other peoples. Religious, military and personal objects give an insight into the lives of people across the Empire, from northern Britain to Egypt and the Middle East. These fascinating objects show how the influences of the many people and places that the Romans came into contact with were absorbed and adapted into the Empire.

#### Future venues

Norwich Castle Museum and Art Gallery

1 February – 27 April 2014

The Herbert Museum and Art Gallery,  
Coventry

17 May – 31 August 2014

Leeds City Museum

20 September 2014 – 4 January 2015

The McManus, Dundee

24 January – 10 May 2015

Segedunum Roman Fort and Baths

30 May – 13 September 2015

### How Roman Was Roman Britain?

10th May 2014

Chertsey Hall, Chertsey

A Day Conference organised by the Roman Studies Group of Surrey Archaeological Society

Just how 'Roman' life was in Roman Britain is still hotly debated. Issues to be covered during the Conference will include: What was the situation prior to the Roman invasion of AD 43? What did being 'Roman' involve? In what ways and to what extent were 'Roman' life styles and religious habits

adopted by the native population? How did the situation differ between the towns and the countryside? What role did immigrants play? How did these features change during the lifetime of Britannia?

Professor Michael Fulford will chair the Conference and the speakers will include:

Professor Tim Champion – Southern Britain before the Conquest

Professor Martin Millet – On Being a Roman

Philip Crummy – Large Towns and Town Life – Colchester

Paul Booth – Small Towns and Town Life

Alex Smith – The Impact of Rome on the Countryside

Dr Hella Eckardt – Immigrants and Locals

Professor Tony King – Religions in Southern Roman Britain

The Conference will be held in the Chertsey Hall, Chertsey, Surrey and will run from 9.30 until 17.15.

Tickets will cost £18 (£16 for members; £10 for students) and will include morning coffee and afternoon tea. A hot lunch will be available at the Hall for approximately £9 for two courses. Further details and an application form can be found at [www.surreyarchaeology.org.uk](http://www.surreyarchaeology.org.uk)

### Historical Metallurgy Society

31st May-1st June

Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery

'Metals used in Personal Adornment'

For many centuries metal, especially precious metals, has been the dominant material used in the construction of jewellery and other items of personal adornment. The basic form of personal adornment varies with time, location and culture, which influence not only the style of the pieces but also affects their methods of manufacture and decoration.

A good range of papers from all periods and many parts of the world have already been offered. Two specifically Roman titles are 'Metal composition of Roman enamelled brooches in Gallia Belgica and Germania Inferior' and 'How Roman brooches were decorated', but there will be many other papers with relevance to Roman finds. Full details will be available shortly from <http://hist-met.org/meetings/personal-adornment.html>