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II. Finds Reported under the Portable Antiquities Scheme

By SALLY WORRELL and JOHN PEARCE

The Portable Antiquities Scheme was established in 1997 as an initiative to record archaeological objects found by members of the general public and was extended to the whole of England and Wales in 2003.¹ Surveys of Roman period finds recorded by the PAS have been published in Britannia annually since 2004. This twelfth report gives an overview of the finds reported in 2014 and of their character and distribution and publishes significant individual artefacts recorded by Finds Liaison Officers in this year.

OVERVIEW

More than 50,000 metallic artefacts of Roman date were recorded on the PAS database in 2014. As in previous annual statistics, this figure includes objects to which a date is attributed spanning the late Iron Age to early Roman transition. Table 1 presents the numbers of artefacts of different categories recorded on the database by county, using older administrative boundaries for consistency with previous reports; counties are grouped by PAS region. Table 1 divides these artefacts into four principal groups, coins and brooches (the two numerically most significant categories of finds), other personal ornaments and other non-ceramic finds.² Not included in the table are the additional 4,273 fragments of Roman pottery documented in 2014 as well as ceramic and stone objects, including querns and small quantities of building material (tesserae, brick and tile, window-glass).

TABLE 1. NUMBERS OF NON-CERAMIC ARTEFACTS RECORDED BY THE PAS IN 2014 BY COUNTY AND TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Coins</th>
<th>Brooches</th>
<th>Other personal adornment</th>
<th>Other non-ceramic objects</th>
<th>All non-ceramic objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denbigh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrexham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmarthen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powys</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glamorgan</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgend</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwynedd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ S. Worrell, ‘Roman Britain in 2006. II. Finds reported under the Portable Antiquities Scheme’, Britannia 38 (2007), 303.
² This replaces the reporting scheme used between 2004 and 2011 in these summaries where data were presented according to the major functional categories typically used for the publication of Roman period small finds. Readers wishing to explore regional variability among non-brooch finds in more detail are referred to these earlier summaries.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Coins</th>
<th>Brooches</th>
<th>Other personal adornment</th>
<th>Other non-ceramic objects</th>
<th>All non-ceramic objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conwy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhondda Cynon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglesey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumbd</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyne &amp; Wear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co. Durham</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Yorks.</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Yorks.</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Yorks.</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Yorks.</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Lincs.</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Lincs.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gt. Manchester</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancs.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merseyside</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notts.</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbys.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herefs.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrops.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffs.</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Midlands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leics.</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincs.</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcs.</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwicks.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northants.</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>2047</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>2737</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambs.</td>
<td>2121</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beds.</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herts.</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucks.</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxon.</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gt. London</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hants.</td>
<td>2490</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOW</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Sussex</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Sussex</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilts.</td>
<td>5285</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glos.</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>22274</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>49108</td>
<td>2333</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>53214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As in previous years coins were by far the most common Roman artefact recorded in the database in 2014, accounting for more than 92 per cent of the total metallic finds. The total number of Roman coins documented by the scheme now stands at over 190,000, revealing the continuing impact of the initiative to record large assemblages of Roman coins in toto. The number of coins documented, the largest for any single year so far recorded, as well as the percentage of finds that they account for, is the consequence of the documentation of several very substantial hoards on the database in 2014, comprising c. 30,000 of the Roman coins tabulated in Table 1. Eight individual hoards included more than 100 coins; of the four containing more than 1,000, the most spectacular was the assemblage of 22–23,000 nummi from Seaton Down, East Devon, one of the largest hoards of Constantinian nummi documented across the Empire. Otherwise the regional distribution of the coins reported for 2014 is generally similar to that of previous years, with significantly greater quantities being recorded in the eastern and some central and southern counties of England than in northern and western England and Wales. As for 2013, large hoards explain the exceptions to this general pattern.

The 2,333 brooches recorded for 2014 account for just over 4 per cent of all finds recorded in this year, a lower than usual percentage explained by the inclusion of data from large coin hoards in the coin totals reported. The total number of brooches now documented by the Scheme since 2003 stands at well over 20,000. The distribution of brooch finds documented in 2014 also closely resembles the pattern reported in previous years. Many more brooches are documented in the counties of eastern England from North Yorkshire to Suffolk and in some central southern and south-western counties, especially Gloucestershire and Wiltshire this year, than elsewhere. The phenomenon observed in previous reports of significant regional variability in the ratio of coins to brooches is again documented in 2014; brooches recurrently make up more than 20 per cent of metal finds in the counties of the west and north-west Midlands.

Other items of personal adornment (mainly finger-rings, bracelets and beads) account on average for c. 1 per cent of all non-ceramic finds. The percentage documented for individual counties varies markedly, but without the regional patterning observed for brooch finds. Leaving aside the chance discovery of hoards, burials or related deposits (see below), the distribution of all finds generally demonstrates a similar regional variability to previous years. This pattern is now established on the basis of data collection over more than a decade and, as has been previously noted, is the product of many factors both historic and contemporary. These include the socio-economic character of Roman period societies, past and current agricultural practice and the varying intensity of metal-detector use across England and Wales, the relative significance of which continues to be assessed.

3 A selection of the most important coins is published annually in the *British Numismatic Journal* by S. Moorhead.
5 These include: Seaton Down, Devon (PAS-D7EA4C/2013 T763); Ely, Cambs. (CAM-E70314); Riddlesden, W Yorks. (SWYOR-810366); Forest of Dean (GLO-24A5E0); East Boldre, New Forest (HAMP-8C0F33); Hamering, Lincs. (DENO-6F8801/2014 T629); Ecclesfield, Sheffield (SWYOR-9E9660); Pewsey, Wilts. (BERK-637CB6).
6 Hoards continue to be published in full through the *Coin Hoards of Roman Britain* series, as well as the individual coins being reported on the PAS database. A collaborative project on hoarding between the British Museum and the University of Leicester continues; R. Bland, ‘Hoarding in Britain: an overview’, *British Numismatic Journal* 83 (2013), 214–38; idem, ‘Hoarding in Iron Age and Roman Britain 2: the puzzle of the late Roman period’, *British Numismatic Journal* 84 (2014), 9–38.
7 Worrell and Pearce, op. cit. (note 4, 2014), 399.
8 Worrell and Pearce, op. cit. (note 4, 2014), 399–400, with references to earlier reports.
In a small number of cases circumstances allowed for archaeological fieldwork associated with findspots of significant discoveries, both coin hoards and burials, shedding further light on context association and depositional process. Excavation following discovery suggested that the Seaton Down hoard (PAS-D7EA4C/2013 T763), comprising 22–23,000 copper-alloy coins, mostly Constantinian nummi struck between A.D. 330 and 341, had been deposited inside a flexible container and was associated with three likely iron ingots of Roman date. At Riddlesden, W Yorks. (SWYOR-810366), excavation and controlled detection at the site of a scatter of a small number of denarii produced 110 further examples, dated from the reign of Vespasian to that of Maximinus Thrax. The composition of the group, as well as its location, suggests that they may perhaps be coins missed when the Bingley (Elam) Hoard was discovered in 1775 in the same approximate area. A hoard from Pewsey, Wilts. (BERK-637CB6), of c. 3,000 coins was contained within a greyware jar which had been deposited in a small pit and covered with large limestone blocks. The hoard was block-lifted during excavation for further analysis; the coins so far identified are of fourth-century date. This year’s discoveries also include two significant burials found through metal-detecting and subsequently excavated. At Kelshall, Herts., three copper-alloy vessels (a dish and two jugs) found by detecting were shown to have accompanied a cremation burial with a worn bronze coin (issued A.D. 174–5) in a hexagonal glass bottle. The burial was also furnished with a rich glass vessel assemblage, including two mosaic glass dishes, as well as a lamp and hobnailed shoes.10 A burial of similar date was also excavated following the discovery of copper-alloy vessels in detecting at Creslow, Bucks.11 The furnishings include ceramic, bronze and glass vessels, and an iron object, perhaps a lamp or lamp-holder, as well as the cremated remains placed with an intaglio and hobnails in a ceramic vessel. The handle of the bronze jug is richly decorated. Both the Kelshall and Creslow burials lie on the northern and western margins of the distribution in south-east England of well-furnished cremation burials of early to mid-Roman date with similar assemblages.12

While not found during controlled excavation, other objects from likely structured deposits have also been documented. The artefacts documented during continuing cataloguing of the many Roman finds from the river Tees at Piercebridge include examples of shoes with well-preserved patterning in the hobnails embedded in the sole.13 A substantial deposit of fourth-century ironwork was found at Marlborough, Wilts. (WILT-0E9BA9), including what X-radiography has helped to reveal as c. 18 tools, including awls, a knife, a mower’s anvil, shears, lock elements and a linch pin. In its location and composition it is very closely related to the ironwork hoards in the southern group of late Roman date identified by Manning from excavated examples.14

ARTEFACT DESCRIPTIONS

The entries below set out some individual highlights of the past year’s discoveries recorded by members of the PAS and Treasure Department at the British Museum.15 These have been selected because of their contribution to the understanding of object type, distribution or

---

12 J. Pearce, Contextual Archaeology of Burial Practice: Case Studies from Roman Britain, BAR British Series 588 (2013), 111–29.
13 e.g. BM-4AD3CB. For previous work on the Piercebridge assemblage see P. Walton, ‘The finds from the river’, in H. E.M. Cool and D. Mason (eds), Roman Piercebridge. Excavations by D.W. Harding and Peter Scott 1969–81 (2008), 286–93.
15 The object descriptions present revised versions by the authors of this report of the database entries made by PAS staff and others. For almost all objects further discussion concerning their form and significance is also added here.
iconography, in some cases being items not previously recorded in the repertoire of small finds from the province. The reference number in brackets associated with each record is the PAS unique identifier, which can be used to consult these and other object records on the PAS website: www.finds.org.uk. Four items were also treated as treasure cases and their Treasure number is also given in the format of year (20XX) plus reference number (TXX).16

The objects presented below belong to various categories, including anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines, personal ornament, household objects and tools. They are mostly copper alloy, but also include occasional examples in gold, silver and lead, and some carry enamelled decoration. As in previous years they exhibit wide variety in iconography, style and technique. Their date extends from the transitional phase between the Iron Age and Roman periods to Late Antiquity. In detail they comprise the following: six anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines, including the first example from Britain of a Hellenistic genre piece, the ‘boy and goose’; personal ornament including bow brooches, zoomorphic and disc brooches, some with elaborate enamel inlay, as well as a ring with surviving intaglio; other artefacts including elements of bronze vessels, a significant medical instrument find, a knife-handle with unusual enamelled decoration, a zoomorphic châtelaine head, mounts and terrets from horse gear and furniture, a lock of a type known only from PAS finds and a unique lead container for a small coin hoard.17

NORTHUMBERLAND

(1) Whittington (NCL-2B2752) (FIG. 1).18 A copper-alloy zoomorphic brooch of a horse of second-to-third-century A.D. date, 33.7 mm long, 26.1 mm high and 4.68 mm thick. The brooch is largely complete, missing only the back leg and the pin. The horse moves right with head lowered. On the head visible features include an outsize and misplaced eye, a small slit mouth and, perhaps, an element of harness above the eye. A full mane, its strands delineated, runs from the base of the neck to the top of the head where the forelock is braided into a topknot. At the shoulder two raised lines run parallel from the mane to foreleg, perhaps rendering a harness element (a breastband?). The slender body ends in an expanded haunch and a short tail. The flank of the horse is recessed, as if for the attachment of some other element (e.g. a saddle and/or rider) but no trace of this is visible. On the reverse a hooked catchplate and a lug with a perforation for a pin survive, with traces of iron corrosion on either side of the lug. Traces of filing are also visible on the reverse.

FIG. 1. Whittington, zoomorphic brooch (No. 1). Scale 1:1. (Photo: R. Collins; © R. Collins and School of History, Classics and Archaeology, Newcastle University)

16 Throughout the year staff in the British Museum, in particular Ralph Jackson and Richard Hobbs, have provided invaluable advice in the identification of individual objects. As ever we are especially grateful to Martin Henig for comments on many objects. We also wish to record the help of Don Mackreth in identifying the Birdlip-type brooch. Janina Parol (British Museum) prepared images for publication. We thank too Barry Burnham for reading and commenting on a draft text.
17 The geographical sequence in which objects are reported follows that set out in the ‘Roman Britain in 20XX. I. Sites Explored.’ section of Britannia.
Unlike the majority of zoomorphic brooches in horse form, this example does not carry enamelled decoration. No direct parallel for this object could be found, although other horse brooches also lacking enamel decoration similarly render the mane and topknot in detail.¹⁹ These other brooches lack a breastband of the type shown on the Whittington example (if this is correctly identified as such); the same feature is, however, visible on some enamelled brooches.²⁰ It might be equivalent to the breastband of the type depicted, for instance, on cavalry tombstones, such as the monuments of the first-century A.D. equites Titus Flavius Bassus, Cologne, or Insus, Lancaster.²¹ Other well-presented mounts, for example as ridden by the rider-god in the Stow-cum-Quy figurine (Cambs.), also have a flamboyant forelock and breastband.²²

DURHAM

(2) Piercebridge (NCL-9FFE11) (FIG. 2).²³ An elaborate copper-alloy knife-handle, 85 mm long, with a maximum diameter of 16 mm. Much of the handle’s surface is decorated with a grid of narrow rectangular cells (three by eight). Enamel decoration survives in alternating cells; the others are now empty, though in some there are traces of a pale green substance, perhaps an adhesive. The enamel-bearing cells in the middle block are filled with seven bands in alternating red and blue. The outer cells with enamel are filled with three thicker bands, again alternating between red and blue. There is no reserve metal between the different coloured enamels. At one end the knife-handle terminates in a circumferential rib followed by a flanged terminal which flattens at the end. At the other, the handle extends to an hourglass moulding, beyond which extend two flat, rectangular, partially preserved plates with corrosion between them. One plate may have a rivet-hole, although this is obscured by the poor preservation of the junction with the blade; the other carries two incised diagonal lines, perhaps traces of decoration.

FIG. 2. Piercebridge, enamelled knife-handle (No. 2). Scale 1:1. (Photo: P. Walton; © P. Walton)

A substantial number of knife-handles have been documented hitherto by the PAS. Many carry figural decoration, but among these and among excavated examples geometric decoration is also

---

²⁰ Feugère, op. cit. (note 19), FIB-4182; C. Johns, The Jewellery of Roman Britain: Celtic and Classical Traditions (1996), 177, fig. 7.16.
²³ Found by B. Middlemass and R. Mitchinson. Recorded by P. Walton.
However it has not been possible so far to find a specific parallel to this decoration on a knife-handle, although enamel decoration of this kind in grid or chequerboard format is paralleled among other objects, including vessels, brooches and harness-fittings.25

EAST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE

(3) Fangfoss (SWYOR-C74924) (Fig. 3).26 The head of a copper-alloy cosmetic set (châtelaine), dating from the first or second century A.D. It is 39.6 mm long, 34 mm wide and 9.7 mm thick. The object is hollow and modelled in the form of a chicken, with neck and tail extending from either end of a low hollow base. On either side of the head is an outsise eye formed by a circle of red enamel with a blue central dot. The head carries a worn crest above and terminates in two short worn projections representing the beak and wattle. Two ridges at the base of the flattened tail separate it from the body. The upper edge of the tail is decorated on both sides with rows of small, closely-spaced punched crescents, being better preserved on the left side, where their configuration in triangles is clearer. The function of the circular hole in the centre of the body is unknown. Four prominent ridges run around the circumference of the body, except for the flattened zone beneath the tail. From the base project two sub-rectangular lugs with perforations in which remnants survive of the bar from which the toilet implements would have been suspended.

Two other châtelaines have been documented by the PAS with some or all of the associated cosmetic implements (i.e. nail-cleaner, ear-scoop and tweezers) still attached, one from Little

24 Worrell and Pearce, op. cit. (note 4, 2014), 412–14, no. 14, Dodderhill, Worcs. for figural examples; the handle from Hursley, Hants. (HAMP-7A27F3) provides a more typical example of decoration dividing the handle surface into zones.
26 Found by P. Walsh. Identified and recorded by A. Cooper and J. Coulthard.
Hadham, Cambs. (BH-1DB7F2), the other from Fincham, Norfolk (NMS-4FE992), both of the ‘bar and shackle’ type. No close parallel to the Fangfoss artefact has been found among other suspension elements. However, the existence of a suspension element whose form and decoration recall those of enamelled zoomorphic brooches representing chickens, perhaps echoes the better-documented contemporary use of enamelled plate brooches for the same purpose.

WAKEFIELD

(4) Thorpe Audlin (YORYM-D5BBD5) (FIG. 4). An incomplete copper-alloy bow Birdlip brooch, with well-preserved enamelling. It is 57.9 mm long, 15.4 mm wide and 5.7 mm thick (it weighs 14.4 g). It has a near-circular head, below which is a raised collar, and a tapering bow which is poorly preserved towards its end where most of the enamel has been lost. Reserved metal divides the head into cells laid out as a whirligig or similar shape, inlaid with coloured enamels; the cells are approximately comma-shaped and of varying size. They seem to have alternated between red and yellow, but on the top left most of the (putative) red enamel has been lost and to bottom right the red cells join at the edge. The bow is also decorated with alternating red and yellow enamel, organised in four pairs of rectangular cells which decrease in size towards the end of the brooch. Each pair of rectangular cells contains opposing semi-circular settings in different coloured enamels, surrounded by reserved metal; each semi-circular setting contains a central dot, also surrounded by reserved metal and in a different colour. The reverse is undecorated and retains the lug and a portion of the wire spring and catchplate. Although the brooch type is well known, there are no known direct parallels to the decoration of this brooch.

FIG. 4. Thorpe Audlin, Birdlip brooch (No. 4). Scale 1:1. (Photo: E. Cox; © E. Cox and York Museums Trust)

28 Eckardt and Crummy, op. cit. (note 27), 170–2 for enamelled plate brooches; for zoomorphic chicken brooches see M. Feugère, Les fibules en Gaule méridionale, de la conquête à la fin du Ve siècle ap. J.-C. (1985), 383–8, type 29c; C. Callahan, Cockerels in Romano-British Art, unpub. MA dissertation, University of Reading (2014), 34–9 (we thank Hella Eckardt for drawing our attention to this dissertation).
29 Found by W. Colbeck. Identified and recorded by D. Mackreth, E. Cox and S. Worrell.
30 D. Mackreth† (pers. comm.) suggests that the brooch belongs to the variant he identifies as Form 4.1b. D. Mackreth, Brooches in Late Iron Age and Roman Britain (2011), I.12–13, II.8, pl. 5.
(5) Marbury cum Quoisely (LVPL-39BCF5) (FIG. 5).\(^{31}\) A flat handle of a copper-alloy pan, broken in two pieces but otherwise in good condition. The handle is 155 mm long and 43.53 mm wide at the rounded terminal. From the latter the handle narrows slightly in the centre before widening and bifurcating where it grasps the rim of the bowl with two spreading arms. These arms take the form of elongated bird’s heads, separated from the rest of the handle by a triple ridge on both sides; an incised eye decorates each projecting arm before a beak-like element extends along the circumference of the now-missing pan. On the plain base of the handle is a triangular projection which would also have attached to the body of the vessel. At the terminal end were originally four perforations (of which one has been lost) perhaps related to suspending the object.

The relief decoration on the handle is very worn, with a stylised plant element nearer the terminal, with three leaves or similar emerging from its base, and a figure advancing right, separated from the plant element by a groundline. A cloak or other object hangs from the figure’s left arm; a curved object, perhaps a bow, rises from the right shoulder. Little can be identified of the facial features. The figure appears to be winged and can therefore be identified as Cupid. This identification is supported by the much better-preserved relief images on two very similar handles from Bonn and Neuss.\(^{32}\) Relief decoration documented on other copper-alloy and silver handles of this type is otherwise varied, although the rendering of the projecting arms which attach to the body of the vessel as elongated birds’ heads frequently recurs.\(^{33}\)

(6) Acton (LVPL-15E376; Treasure case 2014 T966) (FIG. 6).\(^{34}\) A conical lead-alloy container, containing a hoard of five silver denarii, issued between A.D. 194 and 198, sealed within by a plain lead disc forming a circular stopper. The container has a near-circular mouth, measuring 45.2 mm by 40.2 mm (external dimensions); the cavity within it is 33.2 mm deep (internally) and the object weighs 50.5 g. The mouth has a wide, uneven rim, apparently formed by the lead alloy being folded or pushed back on itself. The cone tapers from the mouth to a rounded flattened terminal c. 5 mm in diameter, not quite centred. The terminal may have been cut off or broken; a perforation in the cone also indicates more recent damage. Among the variety of containers used for coin hoards no direct parallel for an object of this kind is known.\(^{35}\)

(7) Horton-cum-Peel (LVPL-F1F6CC) (FIG. 7).\(^{36}\) An almost complete copper-alloy disc brooch with well-preserved complex millefiori enamel decoration. It is 29.7 mm in diameter and weighs 7.8 g. Set within a raised border, the decoration is arranged within a somewhat irregular chequerboard grid in eleven rows and eleven columns. Within each there is a maximum of eleven and a minimum of five squares. The individual squares are also in chequerboard form, with those based on larger and smaller squares set out alternately. The larger squares are laid out in a three by three grid within a red border and the smaller in a five by five grid within a dark blue border. On the back is a double-lug loop from which a stub of the hinged pin projects and a surviving catchplate.

Disc brooches of this type date to the later second and third centuries A.D. Several other brooches of this type, both whole and fragmentary, have now been documented, including PAS...
FIG. 5. Marbury cum Quoisely, pan handle (No. 5). Scale 2:3. (Photo: V. Oakden; © V. Oakden and National Museums Liverpool)
examples from Standlake, Oxon. (BERK-9EC5C6), Claverdon, Warwicks. (WAW-D50D57), and Wighill, N Yorks. (SWYOR-0F6696). An almost identical excavated example is reported from Alcester.\textsuperscript{37} They are part of a wider group of dress and harness items as well as other artefacts bearing similar decoration.\textsuperscript{38}


\textsuperscript{38} See No. 3 above with references.
HEREFORDSHIRE

(8) Stretton Grandison (GLO-B172CF) \(\text{FIG. 8}\).39 A copper-alloy strap-mounted and skirted terret of probable early Roman date. The terret is 87 mm long and 60 mm wide; it weighs 134.9 g. The terret comprises two main elements, the ‘skirt’ and the near-circular loop. The former is perforated on both sides with a pair of holes. It rises at the edge into four upward-curving triangular projections, each ending in a spherical terminal. Beneath the ‘skirt’ is an integral hoop. At the junction between ‘skirt’ and loop is a double row of stamped dots. From this and on either side further double rows of dots extend to the tip of the skirt’s side terminals. Above the loop is an integrally cast decorative element with two short angled arms forming a triangular projection. At the base of both arms is a flat round knop, at the apex is a further spherical terminal. Rows of stamped dots run along the arms of the triangle and around the collar at the base of the terminal.

This is a further example of an elaborate terret recorded by the PAS. Others include the example with horse-head terminals from Chollersbury, Bucks., and the double terret from Calbourne, Isle of Wight, with a croissant-like skirt.40

STAFFORDSHIRE

(9) Swindon (WMID-4CEB20) \(\text{FIG. 9}\).41 An incomplete copper-alloy Roman stud or mount, in the form of a human head or mask, probably from a horse’s chamfron (face-guard). It is 20.7 mm long, 22.0 mm wide and 10.2 mm deep (and weighs 6.4 g). A fringe of curls separates the head into two elements, a head piece in the form of a high cap above and a face, perhaps of a youth, below. The peaked head piece may be a ‘Phrygian’ cap of the type worn by divine or heroic figures, including Attis, Mithras and Ganymede. The features are simply rendered on a rounded face, with large round circles for the eyes or irises, a triangular nose and a crudely modelled mouth. The rear surface is uneven and corroded. At its centre an integral copper-alloy attachment spike is present, of which the end is now missing.

A mount recorded on the PAS database from Calbourne, Isle of Wight (IOW-60FC80), takes a similar form, though it may be part of a larger object. A plaque carrying a very similar motif was also found during recent excavations of a deposit of Roman military metalwork at Caerleon legionary fortress and is believed to be part of a cavalry chamfron (face-guard for a horse).42 The same motif also occurs on other military metalwork, especially parade armour, reinforcing the possible connection of the Swindon and Calbourne finds to this milieu.43

LINCOLNSHIRE

(10) Kirton in Lindsey (LVPL-1F8252) \(\text{FIG. 10}\)44 A small copper-alloy figurine of Minerva, standing 59 mm tall. One arm is broken off just below the shoulder but the object is otherwise near complete, though worn. The figure looks to her right and wears a high-crested helmet. The

39 Found by P. Gittings. Identified and recorded by K. Adams.
41 Found by C. Pearson. Identified and recorded by T. Gilmore.
42 P. Guest, ‘They came, they saw, they conquered. The Roman legionary fortress at Caerleon’, \textit{CAA History Magazine} 9 (n.d.) 6, fig. 10b, http://www.aber.ac.uk/en/caa/web-projects/historymagazine9/. An apparently similar mount is reported from Beaumes de Venise, Haute Provence, H. Rolland, \textit{Bronzes antiques de Haute Provence} (1965), 151, no. 333.
44 Found by J. Davis. Identified and recorded by V. Oakden and S. Worrell.
II. FINDS REPORTED UNDER THE PORTABLE ANTIQUITIES SCHEME

FIG. 8. Stretton Grandison, terret (No. 8). Scale 1:1. (Photo: K. Adams; © K. Adams and Bristol City Council)

FIG. 9. Swindon, stud or mount (No. 9). Scale 1:1. (Photo: T. Gilmore; © T. Gilmore and Birmingham City Council)
facial features are worn, though a linear mouth is visible. The left arm is held at an angle from the body and the hand, bent backwards at the wrist, holds a spherical object. What survives of the right arm suggests that it was extended at a right angle to the body, perhaps originally holding a spear. The goddess is clothed in a short-sleeved chiton which is secured with a belt, and also gathered below the waist. To front and rear its folds reveal the movement of the legs beneath, the left foot forward, the right turned towards the right of the figure.

Minerva is among the commonest of female deities represented as a figurine to have been documented from the province, including examples recorded by the PAS. The pose of the Kirton Lindsey figure, especially the marked twist to the right, is unusual however, and difficult to parallel in figurines of Minerva documented in Britain and beyond.

OXFORDSHIRE

(11) Beckley (BERK-F1499B) (FIG. 11). A copper-alloy figurine of Mercury wearing a silver torc and in muscular athletic form (78.24 mm high and weighing 64.8 g). The left arm has broken off above the elbow, but the figurine is otherwise in good condition. The thick-necked god stands with his weight on his right leg; his left is bent, in contrapposto pose. He is naked apart from a cloak draped over his left shoulder; its folds are more clearly visible to the rear of the figure. In the palm of his left hand he holds a purse. The facial features are worn, but modelled in some detail, including the rendering of the orbit (upper rim), lid and pupil for the eyes, long nose and full lips. The god has a luxuriant cap of hair, thicker at the fringes with its strands delineated. Two breaks on the top of the head indicate the position of the now missing wings. The silver torc around the god’s neck is a simple piece of round-sectioned silver wire, with flattened and pointed terminals decorated with hatching, perhaps recalling serpentiform

---

45 E. Durham, ‘Depicting the gods. Metal figurines in Roman Britain’, Internet Archaeology 31 (2012), 3.29, http://dx.doi.org/10.11141/ia.31.2; Worrell, op. cit. (note 40, 2009), 301, no. 17, (WAW-C54295); Folkestone, Kent (KENT-178176).
46 Found by N. Mortensen. Identified by M. Henig. Recorded by A. Byard.
The musculature is modelled in some detail, especially on the figure’s chest and abdomen, although the pectoral and trapezius muscles connect awkwardly to those of the upper arm. A fringe of pubic hair above the groin and nipples are also clearly rendered.

Mercury is the commonest occurring figurine from Roman Britain, represented by more than 100 examples in Durham’s corpus and with numerous instances now documented by the PAS. In general the Beckley figure conforms to the common iconography for Mercury but examples from the province more often show the god with petasos and cloak and the purse suspended from the right hand. The Beckley figurine conforms to a type which is better represented on the Continent, especially in northern and eastern Gaul, where the god is naked, with the occasional exception of a cloak, as in this instance, and holds the purse in the palm of the right hand rather than suspended from it.

The torc is an occasional attribute of Roman deities. Separate torcs are documented in association with two other Mercury figurines from Britain, a silver example with the well-known group from St Albans and a gold example from Richborough. They are more commonly documented as an integral part of the figure. Examples include the ‘Fortuna’ figure.

---

48 For Mercury figurines in Britain in general see Durham, op. cit. (note 45), 3.15. For examples reported to the PAS see references in the discussion of a figurine from Nettleton, Lincs. (LIN-25CC02), S. Worrell and J. Pearce, ‘Roman Britain in 2012. II. Finds reported under the Portable Antiquities Scheme’, Britannia 44 (2013), 55, no. 8.
50 Boucher, op. cit. (note 49), no. 370, documents a further example from Mathay, Doubs; Durham, op. cit. (note 45), nos 55 (St Albans) and 284 (Richborough).
from Kettlebaston, Suffolk (SF-302EF1), a ‘mother goddess’ from Henley Wood and a male deity (?) from Vevey, canton Vaud.51 The torc may complement a votive offering through embellishment of the figurine with a more costly material; it may also be an attribute inherited from a pre-Roman deity with which Mercury is assimilated in this case.52

(12) Wallingford (SUR-AC2EFB) (FIG. 12).53 An enamelled zoomorphic brooch in the form of a running stag, 29.76 mm long and weighing 4.58 g. The animal’s long head is well modelled, with open mouth and large oval eye framing a central dot. A small ear is incised below the antlers which curve together to form a crown-like loop. The neck is disproportionately large and the body elongated, expanding at the shoulder and rump; the legs are mostly missing and a triangular projection indicates the creature’s sex. The back of the curving neck is notched and the incisions extend to the back and rear haunch but the principal decoration comprises two enamelled panels. The larger extends from the head to the forelimb and along the body, the smaller is circular and fills the rump. Within the larger panel, above the forelimbs, is a reserved circular setting. On the flat back the catchplate largely survives along with the hinge, the latter containing the remains of an iron pin.

![FIG. 12. Wallingford, zoomorphic brooch (No. 12). Scale 1:1. (Photo:D. Williams; © D. Williams)](image)

Similar examples are documented from pre-War excavations in Wroxeter and widely across continental Europe; this brooch may be of Continental workmanship and of second- to third-century A.D. date.54 Other stag brooches of varying form are documented among PAS finds, though without close parallels to this.55 Similar representations of stags also occur in other media, for instance figurines; the example reported from Kirkby la Thorpe, Lincs. (LIN-E63C92) is not atypical of small-scale pieces.56

HERTFORDSHIRE

(13) Sarratt (BH-98132A) (FIG. 13).57 A largely complete copper-alloy figurine in the form of a standing bull, 58.4 mm long, 47.7 mm high, 18.3 mm wide and weighing 130.6 g. The solid-cast object is of realistic appearance, with well-modelled physique, but with little surviving surface

52 Boucher, op. cit. (note 49), 174–5, pl. 7–9, including the famous cross-legged figure from Bouray.
53 Found by D. Pearce. Identified and recorded by D. Williams and S. Worrell.
54 D. Atkinson, Report on Excavations at Wroxeter (the Roman City of Viroconium) in the County of Salop, 1923–1927 (1942), 208, H26, fig. 36; Feugère, op. cit. (note 28), 385, 405, fig. 59, Type 29, no. 12a.
55 Worrell and Pearce, op. cit. (note 48, 2013), 361–2, no. 15.
56 Worrell and Pearce, op. cit. (note 48, 2013), 356, no. 9; Durham, op. cit. (note 45), 3.35.12.
detail. Wear to the stubby head of the animal means that facial features are scarcely visible, the clearest surviving element being the eyes. The left horn is a little better presented than the right; between the horns are traces, perhaps, of tufts of hair. Below are regular oblique lines which may be further curls or a fabric band around the forehead. Beneath the lower jaw and neck sags a prominent dewlap; on the underside of the animal the penis is clearly visible. The mass of muscle at the shoulders and thick neck lend the beast a powerful appearance; the rump is similarly muscled. Shoulders and rump taper into straight legs, though only one of these (left rear leg) is complete. A tail hangs between the back legs, terminating a short distance from the surviving hoof.

Bull/bovine figurines occur sporadically among the animal figures documented as late Iron Age and Roman period small bronzes in Britain. Other standing bull or bovine figures documented by the PAS include examples in soapstone from Atcham, Shrops., and in copper alloy from Weaverham, Cheshire (LVPL-CB6114), Watlington, Oxon. (BUC-668F82), and Holbrook, Suffolk (SF-DCB627), in all three cases with three horns. Small hollow copper-alloy figures of recumbent animals have been recorded from Marple, Stockport (LVPL-904BD3), and from Calbourne, Isle of Wight (IOW-2CA926), the latter with a dorsuale. In 2014 a fragment of a white marble statue of a cow, more than 370 mm long and lacking its head, perhaps of first- or second-century date, was discovered during drainage works in Lincoln’s northern suburbs. This may be a Grand Tour souvenir rather than an ancient import (LIN-2B67D5).

WEST BERKSHIRE

(14) Winterbourne (BERK-B60E47) (FIG. 14). A near-complete but worn copper-alloy figurine of a chubby, naked, winged boy with a large bird, perhaps a goose. The statue, weighing 167 g, is 59.9 mm high and the disc that serves as the base is 35.6 mm wide. The boy, head inclined slightly to the right, holds the goose’s neck with his right hand and places his left across its shoulders. The

58 Durham, op. cit. (note 45), 3.35.2. Continental examples of bull figurines are referenced in the PAS record.
59 Worrell, op. cit. (note 51, 2010), 420–1, no. 6.
61 Found by A. Ashford. Identified and recorded by A. Byard, M. Henig and J. Pearce.
boy’s left leg bends at the knee with the lower leg beneath the upper; the right leg extends forward, bending a little at the knee. The goose, with its plumage schematically rendered, appears to stand on the boy’s left leg, its long neck reaching up towards him with its beak beneath his chin. The modelling of the pair is relatively crude, the boy being a squat figure with a broad back from which two small wings protrude below the shoulders. Shoulders and limbs are disproportionately large. The head is much worn, but the figure appears to wear a cap beneath which a fringe of curls emerges on all sides. Of the facial features, almond-shaped eyes, broad nose, and small mouth are visible. The action and mood are difficult to interpret; the boy may be struggling with the goose, trying to wring its neck perhaps, but the gesture may be more affectionate.

This is one of many Roman period copies of a well-known Hellenistic genre figure linked to the ‘Boy with Goose’ sculpture attributed by Pliny (N.H. 34.84) to Boethos of Chalcedon and of third-century B.C. date, though ancient textual sources on the identity of the sculptor are not easily reconciled. The subject group may have a longer history and the relationships between child and animal vary from the kindly to the murderous. Other versions of the pair take both monumental and smaller-scale forms, the latter including examples in silver, terracotta and bronze. Like the Winterbourne instance, some other pairings assimilate the child with the figure of Cupid through the presence of wings. Another miniature example of the same sculpture from Britain, not previously recognised as deriving from this Hellenistic genre group, also presents the child in the form of Cupid. This is one of several figurines from the Lexden tumulus, Colchester, constructed in the last decades of the first century B.C. The latter were imported, but in the case of the Winterbourne figure the style may suggest that it was made in Britain. Whatever its purpose, whether a piece for demonstrating cultivation and connoisseurship


63 Durham, op. cit. (note 45), no. 68, identified as example of Cupid; J. Foster, The Lexden Tumulus: a Re-appraisal of an Iron Age Burial from Colchester, Essex, BAR British Series 156 (1986), 52–4, fig. 20.1, pl. 8.
or an image from a household shrine, this is another significant example of an image originating in Hellenistic genre sculpture now documented by the PAS.  

MILTON KEYNES

(15) **Moulsoe** (WMID-0503C1) (FIG. 15). The base of a copper-alloy jug handle, dating to the first to second centuries A.D. The fragment is 49.9 mm long, 32.0 mm wide and 22.1 mm thick. The fragment comprises mainly the figured terminal where the handle is attached to the body of the vessel, as well as a short length of the ridged handle. The front of the terminal is cast in the form of the head of a male youth, whose eyes look outwards and downwards. The hair is curly and thick, rising in exuberant locks from the temples with its strands differentiated. The ivy leaves visible in the hair on the left and right sides of the head are part of a likely wreath. The face is full and rounded, with silver-inlaid eyes (and reserved circular depressions for the pupils) and a nose and lips in low relief, made less prominent through wear.

**FIG. 15.** Moulsoe, jug handle (No. 15). Scale 1:1. (Photo: T. Gilmore; © T. Gilmore and Birmingham City Council)

Generally similar faces and masks have been documented as handle terminals among other PAS finds, for example at Brockley, Suffolk (SF-452BA2), Codford, Wilts. (WILT-7E0308), and Chislet, Kent (KENT-6E5FE6), as well as on older finds of complete vessels from Canterbury and Stanfordbury, Beds. The masks used as vessel escutcheons for the pans associated with the workshop of the Cipii are more similar in spirit to that at the base of the Moulsoe handle. In this case the ivy leaves indicate the specifically Bacchic connotations of the object.

---

64 E. Bartman, *Ancient Sculptural Copies in Miniature* (1992), 41–2, 47; Boucher, op. cit. (note 49), 181–204, esp. 195–6, notes a widespread occurrence in Gaul, including group subjects. Other PAS examples include a figurine of a sleeping boy from Saffron Walden, Essex (ESS-6F60D3) (Worrell, op. cit. (note 1, 2007), 331, no. 26) and a pendant or steelyard weight rendered as a grotesque head, Osbournby, Lincs. (LIN-1213A7) (Worrell and Pearce, op. cit. (note 40, 2012), 365–6, no. 8).


67 Kaufmann-Heinimann, op. cit. (note 49), 21–2, Abb. 3.
(16) **Woodbastwick** (NMS-800B35) *(FIG. 16).* An unusual copper-alloy mount in the form of the bust of a youthful male. It is c. 80 mm tall and weighs 142.3 g. The youth wears a wreath of ivy leaves, with a gap at the centre and a winged cap, a *petasos*. The latter perches atop a luxuriant cap of hair, the thick curls of which frame the face. The facial features of the clean-shaven youth are well modelled. The ties of the wreath descend behind the ears to hang down as far as the folds of the tunic-like garment the figure wears. The eyes are outsize and slightly asymmetrical; their eyelids, irises and pupils are rendered in some detail. The nose is broad and the lips are full, while the ears are set a little too low on either side of the head. The flat-backed object is hollow, indicating that this was probably a furniture mount; the small hole on the top of the cap may relate to the same function.

**FIG. 16.** Woodbastwick, mount with hybrid figure (No. 16). Scale 1:1. *(Photo: A. Marsden; © Norfolk County Council)*

This is one of many recent figural finds from Roman Norfolk. The sensitive treatment of this subject, together with the emphasis on the pupils, may suggest a Hadrianic or Antonine date for the mount. The youth bears traits associated with Mercury and Bacchus, the *petasos* for the former, ivy leaves for the latter. Mounts documented from furniture and other objects occur in multiple figural forms. These are frequently divine and Bacchic in character, although generic youths

---

68 Found by G. Cook. Identified by A. Marsden.

also occur. Bacchic examples from Britain include objects from Littlecote, Berks., Tarrant Hinton, Dorset, and Heversham, Cumbria (LANCUM-1747E5). No specific parallel to this combination of attributes of both deities on an object of this type could be found.

ESSEX

(17) **Roxwell** (ESS-33D3A2) (**FIG. 17**). An incomplete copper-alloy figurine, probably of a male deity. It is 64.9 mm high, 48.1 mm wide (maximum extent) and 17.3 mm thick. It weighs 65.8 g. The figure stands with arms extended to the sides and bent at the elbows, the left upwards, and the right downwards, both broken just after the elbow. The legs are also broken below the knee but enough survives to suggest that the right leg was straight and the left leg bent. The figure wears a hooded cloak which ends in a peak or crest. The cloak is seemingly fastened at the right shoulder and hangs stiffly down the figure’s back (with a hole pierced in it at waist height on the figure’s left side). Its folds are schematically rendered by a near parallel ‘V’-like double moulding from the shoulders to the base. A zig-zag runs along both long edges, indicating a decorative pattern or fine edging. On the figure’s right shoulder is a short quiver, at the top end of which arrow feathers are visible. Beneath the cloak the figure wears a pleated tunic bound at the waist with a substantial belt. The disproportionately large head and its facial features are simply modelled; the face may be fringed with curls (or the lining of the hood).

FIG. 17. Roxwell, hunter figurine (No. 17). Scale 1:1. (Photo: K. Marsden; © Colchester and Ipswich Museum Service)

No direct parallel has been found, although in its form and attributes this object echoes the representations of several other deities, personifications and other figures. While the wearing of a hooded cloak is shared with the Genius Cucullatus, for example, and the ‘countryman’ from Trier, the cloak worn by the Roxwell figure is different and in other respects he differs

---

72 Found by D. Allen. Identified and recorded by K. Marsden and J. Pearce.
from them.73 In its arms and clothing the Roxwell figure recalls the ‘hunter god’ identified from sculptural representations in London and the Cotswolds, perhaps a syncretised version of Apollo and an indigenous god.74 However, unlike the ‘hunter god’, the Roxwell figure does not wear a Phrygian cap and the arrangement of the arms shows that he cannot have been drawing an arrow from a bow. Instead the cloak and pose recall some personifications of winter, best known in Britain from the seasons mosaic at Chedworth villa, Glos., in which the hooded figure holds a hare in its right hand and a branch raised in its left.75 The Roxwell figure may, therefore, be a variant representation of one of these divine beings, or alternatively render a local god by drawing on the traits of multiple deities. Other examples of probable divine figures documented by the PAS with attributes from varying sources include ‘Fortuna’ from Kettlebaston, Suffolk (SF-302EF1), and a ‘Minerva-Fortuna’ hybrid from Hinxworth, Herts. (BH-ED9F44).76 Alternatively the Roxwell figure may be a genre representation of a huntsman, of which other examples are occasionally recorded.77

KENT

(18) **Elmsted** (KENT-FE87D8) (FIG. 18).78 A copper-alloy tripod mount in the form of the bust of a young male figure, his head turned slightly to the right. The mount is 78.7 mm long, 37.4 mm wide, 28.5 mm thick and weighs 134.8 g. The head has finely modelled hair and facial features, supported on a thick neck. At the crown of the head is a thick cap of hair, enclosed by two rows of thickly curling locks. Strands of hair fall between ear and face and the forelock curls high above the forehead. The facial features are well-modelled but worn. The bust, flat at the back, rises from a calyx, separated from the hollow rectangular base by three transverse mouldings. There is a large irregular hole on the back, created by the breaking away of a likely integral hook which is no longer attached. The hole reveals that the mount is hollow; iron staining can be seen within where the mount connected to the leg of the iron tripod to which it would have been attached.

Other tripod mounts have been documented by the PAS across England. Examples from Pocklington, E Yorks. (YORYM-E06D2), and Greetwell, Lincs. (LIN-1632D1), represent youths with curly heads of hair who are more easily identified as divinities. Other examples are reported from Rodmell, Sussex (PUBLIC-F077EF, a male bust) and Pickhill with Roxby, N Yorks. (LVPL-CB8B04, a female bust).79 Further examples similar to the Elmsted bust are reported from Trier and Bois-et-Borsu (Liège, Belgium); the latter example is associated with a very well-preserved tripod from a rich second-century A.D. burial assemblage.80

---

73 Worrell and Pearce, op. cit. (note 43, 2011), 416–17, no. 12, describe an example of a Genius Cucullatus from Buntingford, Herts. (BH-712AC1) and similar figurines. For the countryman figurine see H. Menzel, *Die römischen Bronzen aus Deutschland II. Trier* (1966), 41, no. 86, Taf. 40.
77 Durham, op. cit. (note 45), no. 1129, huntsman with deer slung over his shoulders, London.
79 Worrell, op. cit. (note 40, 2009), 288–90, no. 6, provides references to the handful of examples discovered during excavation.
80 Menzel, op. cit. (note 73), no. 286, Taf. 92; Faider-Feytmans, op. cit. (note 49), 185, no. 380, pl. 160.
(19) **Eynsford** (LON-B48905) *(Fig. 19).* A small copper-alloy figurine of Mercury, reclining on a flat base. The figurine is 52.8 mm long, 37.4 mm tall and 11.4 mm thick; it weighs 54.9 g. The god wears a winged traveller’s hat (*petasos*), holds a caduceus in his left hand and a purse in his right. He wears a cloak over his left shoulder which extends down the left side of the rear of the figure to the feet. A fringe of curly hair emerges from beneath the cap at front and back. The facial features are crudely modelled, comprising two irregular depressions for eyes, a somewhat bulbous nose and an asymmetrical slit for the mouth. The god’s anatomy is also summarily rendered; little muscular detail can be seen on the torso, part of which is obscured by the outsize and claw-like right hand and purse. Of the left arm only the hand is visible, grasping the caduceus halfway along its shaft. The right leg covers most of the lower left. The metal on the base is slightly roughened, perhaps suggesting the figurine may have been attached to, or mounted on, another object.

Representations of Mercury are the commonest of all deities from the province. The god is usually depicted standing; seated or reclining figures such as this are rare, but other examples occur in similar forms, including some figurines from London as well as from continental Europe, although these hold a libation bowl rather than a purse in their right hand.82

---

81 Found by B. Robson. Identified and recorded by K. Sumnall.
(20) **Tangley** (HAMP-EC91E2; 2014T12) (FIG. 20). A late Roman gold finger-ring with gold filigree and nico intaglio (an onyx with a blue surface on a dark ground). The ring measures 22.3 mm by 21.6 mm and weighs 5.6 g. The bezel and hoop have broken on one side but the ring is otherwise complete. The bezel has an oval setting for the intaglio, framed by an openwork rim. The shoulders of the hoop are decorated with gold filigree ornament in the form of two volutes, each terminating in a bead. The volutes spring from the join between the shoulder and the rest of the hoop. Between them is a further bead. The hoop is otherwise decorated with two parallel grooves. Rings from hoards at Silchester and Hoxne carry similar filigree decoration.

The intaglio, which has a flat upper surface with a bevelled surround, depicts a standing naked adolescent with crossed legs, leaning on a short spiral column; the short wings which sprout from his shoulders identify him as Cupid. He leans his left arm on the column, his right being raised and holding a torch which he will later use to bum Psyche manifested as a butterfly. Martin Henig (pers. comm.) notes the similarity of the figure and his pose to that of Cupid portrayed on a first- or second-century red jasper in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna (although here Cupid leans against the column which is in front of him). He also observes similarities in the execution of the Tangley gem with that of Ring 5 from the Silchester hoard and tentatively attributes both to the

---

**FIG. 19.** Eynsford, reclining Mercury figurine (No. 19). Scale 1:1. (Photo: K. Sumnall; © K. Sumnall and Museum of London)

---

82 Durham, op. cit. (note 45), no. 35; Boucher, op. cit. (note 49), nos 403–4, pl. 81; Kaufmann-Heinimann, op. cit. (note 49), 41, no. 36, Taf. 53.
83 Found by A. Duke. Identified and recorded by K. Hinds and A. Willis.
so-called ‘style calligraphique’ characteristic of some fourth-century examples, for example a very large pale nicolo in Paris depicting Dea Roma dated to c. A.D. 330.87

DORSET

(21) Sutton Waldron (DOR-695A14) (FIG. 21).88 A copper-alloy casing for a padlock in the form of a human head. It is 31.4 mm long, 19.2 mm wide and 15.7 mm deep, and weighs 14.3 g. The front of the padlock takes the form of a crudely rendered human face or mask, probably female. Hair swept backwards is rendered by short incisions from the arched hairline. The disproportionately large lentoid eyes are thickly outlined on either side of a triangular nose. The mouth is a short horizontal slit. The keyhole is on the left side of the face and the right side is pierced by a small circular aperture below the hairline. There is a rectangular opening at the top of the head which is framed on three sides by a ridged moulding. In this opening the hinge to join the missing backplate may have sat. At the base of the casing is a small flat projection with a curved lower edge, which projects towards the front of the lock. The lock is almost identical to examples documented by the PAS in North Yorkshire and Lincolnshire.89 A small number of further casings very similar to the PAS finds are also documented in private collections.90 The close resemblance between the Sutton Waldron casing and similar examples suggests that they are the likely product of a single workshop. Being intended to house the whole of the lock mechanism, they are much deeper than other more commonly documented figural locks, on which a stylised and often elaborate mask forms the front plate of the padlock.91
(22) Somerton (SOM-6EA483) (FIG. 22).92 Part of a copper-alloy rod-shaped handle, circular in section, likely to be from a pair of Roman uvula forceps, probably from a *staphylagra*, i.e. a toothed-jaw type rather than a *staphylocaustes* (un-toothed type). What remains of the handle from terminal to break is 75.8 mm long and 5.8 mm in diameter (at its widest). The terminal takes the form of an elegant baluster finial with a circular moulding where it connects to the handle. Another circular moulding in the form of a double ridge occurs further along the handle. From better preserved examples it is likely that a two to three centimetres length of this handle has been lost beyond the break.

The forceps, which cannot be dated more precisely than to the first to fourth centuries A.D., were probably used for uvulectomy (removal of the uvula at the back of the mouth) and haemorrhoidectomy. 26 examples of forceps of this type were documented across the Empire more than 20 years ago. Other British finds include complete examples from Caerwent and Dorchester, a jaw fragment from Leicester and variants from Colchester (2) and Ancaster.93

---

92 Found by V. Macrae. Identified by R. Jackson. Recorded by L. Burnett.
93 R. Jackson, ‘*Staphylagra, staphylocaustes*, uvulectomy and haemorrhoidectomy: the Roman instruments and operations’, in A. Krug (ed.), *From Epidaurus to Salerno: Symposium held at the European University Centre for*
PAS finds comprise an increasingly important component of Roman period objects with a surgical (and toilet) function in Britain, although they have yet to be synthesised. Examples include other forceps, for example a pointed jaw forceps of which the findspot (SOMDOR-D963B7) is not far from the Somerton find, and possible scalpel handles, for example octagonal-faceted handles from Scarning and Burgh Castle, Norfolk (NMS-8801B7; NMS-4157A2).\textsuperscript{94}

CORRIGENDUM

A lead-alloy plaque from Clare, Suffolk (SF-301791) carrying a relief image of a statue within an architectural setting was interpreted as a possible representation of a shrine on a votive plaque, although no specific ancient parallels could be noted.\textsuperscript{95} The scene, however, is almost identical to a neo-Classical architectural scene on firemarks of the early nineteenth century and the Clare piece is clearly a fragment from a plaque of this type.\textsuperscript{96}


\textsuperscript{94} Worrell, op. cit. (note 1, 2007), 34–5, no. 30.

\textsuperscript{95} Worrell and Pearce, op. cit. (note 4, 2014), 421–2, no. 23.

\textsuperscript{96} We thank Laura Burnett for drawing this to our attention. The specific parallels are with early nineteenth-century Royal Assurance Society firemarks, of which an example (with a very clear online image) was sold by Bonhams in 2007: [http://www.bonhams.com/auctions/14987/lot/131/](http://www.bonhams.com/auctions/14987/lot/131/).