Welcome to the December edition of the LPFG newsletter.

To bring a little seasonal cheer, this issue contains plenty of colourful finds and features: we present new research into stylistic variation in Iron Age enamelling, an intriguing Iron Age patterned glass bead from London — with ring attached — and revisit Glyn Daniel’s *Archaeology and the History of Art*. Plus PAS highlights, news and announcements, and more!

Late Iron Age copper-alloy head, possibly part of a vessel, from Wetwang, East Yorkshire. Read more on page 6.
LPFG news and updates

The LPFG’s second annual meeting and conference took place in October, and was held at WISE in Hull. Thank you to all of those who were involved in organising such a stimulating and enjoyable event! We are now already looking ahead to the spring. Our first planned event for 2015 is “Tales the River Tells”, in association with the Prehistoric Society, which will focus on prehistoric finds from in and around the Thames. It will take place on 20th April at the Museum of London and the British Museum, and will involve a mix of talks, guided walks along the Thames foreshore and handling sessions at both museums. Please see the advertisement on page 20 for more details.

Further information and details about how to book will be distributed through the mailing list in due course, but if you have any queries please contact organiser Michael Marshall direct at mmarshall@mola.org.uk.

*

The Later Prehistoric Finds Group was established in 2013, and welcomes anyone with an interest in prehistoric artefacts, especially finds from the Bronze and Iron Ages. We hold an annual conference as well as other occasional events, and produce two newsletters a year. Membership is currently free; if you would like to join the group, please e-mail LaterPrehistoricFindsGroup@gmail.com.

We are a new group, and we are hoping that more researchers interested in prehistoric artefacts will want to join us. The group has opted for a loose committee structure that is not binding, and a list of those on the steering committee, along with contact details, can be found on our website: https://sites.google.com/site/laterprehistoricfindsgroup/home. Anna Booth is the Chair for 2014/2015, and Sophie Adams is Deputy. Elizabeth Foulds is Treasurer.

If you would be interested in helping to run the group, we would love to have you on the steering committee. It is open to anyone who would like to be involved. If you are interested, please e-mail us at the address given above.

*

The LPFG newsletter is published twice a year. To submit articles, notes or announcements for inclusion, please e-mail Anna Lewis at asgl1@le.ac.uk.

This issue sees the first of what is hoped will be a regular series of “recommended reads”: many thanks to Brendan O’Connor for bringing to our attention “Archaeology and the History of Art”, a lecture given by Professor Glyn Daniel at the University of Hull in 1969 (page 16). Contributions to the series, long or short, are very welcome! Please e-mail Anna Lewis at the above address.
Any new iron, any new iron… (well, copper-alloy actually!)

Sally Worrell

New finds of Late Iron Age date continue to be reported to the Portable Antiquities Scheme in considerable number. This article first gives an overview of recent Iron Age artefacts recorded between October 2013 and October 2014, and presents the latest highlights among the objects seen by Finds Liaison Officers. Readers interested in fuller details and parallels can find out more by going to finds.org.uk and entering the reference numbers given here.

A significant quantity of Iron Age brooches – 257 – was recorded. Among these the vast majority (226 examples) are of Late Iron Age to early Roman date, highlighting once more the popularity of brooch-wearing (and deposition) from the 1st century BC. The distribution of these is skewed to Britain’s eastern counties (101 examples from the PAS Eastern region); elsewhere, 51 were documented from the South West, 47 from the South East, 18 from the Midlands and nine from the North. The increase in the quantity and variety of harness and vehicle equipment in the Late Iron Age is also documented among recent finds, including 40 terrets (of simple, miniature, flat-ring, lipped and knobbled varieties) and nine linchpins. The linchpin from Temple Bruer with Temple High Grange, Lincolnshire (LVPL-6801D6) is of particular interest since it has a copper-alloy ‘wheel’ head. This motif can be compared to miniature examples such as that recorded in 2014 from Roxby cum Risby, North Lincolnshire (NLM-EBBF3A).

An incomplete copper-alloy three-link bridle bit, dating from the Late Iron Age (100 BC-AD 80 AD) from Melbourn, Cambridgeshire (BH-9EDAF7) is another unusual piece (Figure 1). The central link comprises two circular loops joined by a bar with three mouldings. In order to link these central loops to those of the two side links, it was necessary to leave a gap in their circumference. Each of these gaps was subsequently filled by a piece of copper/lead-alloy. The two side links in the chain would originally have been of the same form. On the left side there is a cylindrical sleeve which held the now-missing rein ring. The terminal at the right side is missing the sleeve. Although no exact parallel could be found, a group of similar three-link bridle bits was found in a ritual deposit of Mid to Late Iron Age metalwork at Llyn Cerrig Bach, Anglesey (Fox 1946, 80 – 83, nos. 50-51, pl. xxiii and xxiv). The earliest examples of three-link bridle bits date from the 4th to 3rd centuries BC and the type continued in use to the 1st century AD.
A rare triangular mount with openwork decoration was found at Over Kellett, Lancashire (LANCUM-DC3370) dating to c. 100 BC–AD 200 (Figure 2). On the upper surface are knops with carved or incised crosses at the terminals of both long sides, with a perforated fitting below each. There are three spikes on the underside. Similar strap fittings are known from Willow, Nottinghamshire (DENO-B67153) and Dragonby, Lincolnshire (May 1996, 278, no.83, fig 11.26).

Strap distributors or junctions formed from three rings joined with a central boss decorated with a stylised human head in relief are a characteristic find of the later Iron Age and early Roman periods. A newly reported example from Lockinge, Oxfordshire (BERK-D68FC4), 35mm long, typifies finds of this kind (Figure 3).

A recent find from Barton Bendish, Norfolk (NMS-C04BC6) illustrates another type of Late Iron Age or Early Roman copper-alloy strap distributor (Figure 4). It consists of a triangular arrangement of three globular elements conjoined by short bars. One globe is attached to and partly enclosed within a casting sprue which terminates in a flat-based jet. This example is a rare piece of direct evidence of the manufacturing process. Another undecorated example from Towersey, Oxfordshire (Figure 5) is of the same type (BH-D51A07).
Eleven fragments of components from metal vessels were recorded in 2014. Particularly noteworthy is the copper-alloy spout from a late Iron Age strainer bowl found at Cranfield, Bedfordshire (BUC-FBC5A5; Figure 6). This takes the form of a mythical sea creature, with fish-like head, oval bosses for its protruding eyes, and what appears to be a projecting tongue emerging from its cylindrical mouth. The finders of this object generously donated it to Bedford Museum. A close parallel is known from Felmersham (also Bedfordshire), and it is possible that both objects were made by the same workshop.

Other examples of metal vessels include a Late Iron Age copper-alloy bowl from Ropley, Hampshire (SUR-8EA776; Figure 7), which was found in association with a pair of fragmentary ceramic pedestal beakers and cremated human bone; the latter was probably originally deposited within the bowl. The profile of the vessel is typical of Rose Ash bowls from southern Britain. In addition, the tankard fragments found at Hambledon, North Yorkshire (SWYOR-BEC04D) and Wellingborough, Northamptonshire (NARC-708393) make significant additions to the corpus of vessels of this type.
For Late Iron Age iconography perhaps the most striking object is the seemingly complete copper-alloy head, 34mm tall, dated to the Late Iron Age/Roman interface from Wetwang, East Yorkshire (YORYM-C0BAAA), perhaps a vessel mount (Figure 8). It is hollow and spherical with stylised features rendered by moulding and incisions. The large oval eyes, perforated perhaps for inlay with enamel or glass, are framed by thick lids. Below these is a large triangular flaring nose, with a small downturned mouth beneath. The hair is swept back in braids from the temple in parallel raised ridges. A jawline is indicated by a raised curving moulding on both sides, above which are small stylised ears. On the back of the head is a large rectangular perforation with a small projecting knop. Similar heads are known from other objects, such as the North Grimston sword. A figurine with very similar facial features is known from Winterbourne Monkton, Dorset (SOMDOR-DC9D32), although no reverse slot is present. A mount which depicts an anthropomorphic head from Kent (KENT-9AF2C1), with a perforation at the back of the head with a bent shank slotted through, suggests that the head from Wetwang could have been attached to a vessel.
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An exciting new Iron Age glass bead from London

Dr Elizabeth Foulds

A recently recorded glass bead from the Portable Antiquities Scheme provides valuable insight into how late prehistoric beads were used. LON-041951 (Figure 1) is a large translucent blue bead with a number of opaque white spirals that sit on protrusions in the glass. These spirals alternate between single occurrences and pairs along the circumference of the bead. It is reported to measure 25.60 mm in diameter, 16.37 mm in thickness and with a perforation diameter of 9.24 mm. It weighs 15.67 grams.

This type of glass bead is well known in Britain and can be attributed to the Iron Age. Many examples, and those of a similar type, were recorded in Margaret Guido's (1978) catalogue, while new examples have been discovered and subsequently recorded by the author (Foulds 2014). Guido classified these beads as her Class 6 Oldbury type. Many of the known examples are similar in appearance to the London example. However, a very small number present differences in colour, the complexity of the motif, and differences in the placement of the spirals.

Further examination by the author (ibid.) has shown that, despite exhibiting similar characteristics in the use of colour and decoration, there are some differences in the appearance of these beads that cannot be quantified. For example, the execution of the spirals and the presence or degree of the raised protrusions varies. No two examples found in Britain look truly the same. However, the 31 examples made from a combination of blue and white glass (including the London find) cluster tightly based on the diameter and height dimensions. This suggests that there is some degree of cohesiveness to the type. A refinement in the typology has been suggested by classing all beads with spiral decorations together in Class 6g and then further sub-dividing the beads into specific types based on the number of spirals and placement on the surface, and the colours used. The presence or degree of protrusion has not been used as an attribute in the classification because its significance is unclear. The majority of examples fall into Type 1407, although in cases where the placement of the spiral is different, or the colours are different, the beads would be classed differently.

Very few of the Type 1407 beads were found through excavation, as most were found as stray finds. A handful of examples have been recently discovered through excavation, but most are found accidentally, or through non-extraction processes. Out of all the beads that may date to the Iron Age on the Portable Antiquities Scheme database, this type of bead is the most
commonly reported after plain undecorated beads (many of which probably date to a later period). There are currently five other examples that are published on the database (SWYOR-EBF2F4, LVPL-26BA21, YORYM-7DAAE6, SF-62EB92, LIN-3A9556). It is interesting that out of all the possible types of Iron Age beads found in Britain and recorded through the Portable Antiquities Scheme, Type 1407 is the most abundant. This could be in part due to their large size or reflective surface sheen, as some examples exhibit remarkably little or minimal weathering that dulls the surface. However, it may be that this was a very abundant type of bead, but that their popularity in the Iron Age is not accurately reflected in the number of excavated examples.

In comparison to most other Iron Age glass beads from Britain, Type 1407 is very large and has a very large perforation varying from 4.1 to 12.6 mm. The London bead is particularly exciting because a copper alloy ring is threaded through the perforation. Exceptionally few beads are found in circumstances that demonstrate how they were used. In the case of these large beads, it has been unclear whether they were strung onto material of a correspondingly large diameter. If material of a smaller diameter was used, it would have to have been strong enough to withstand the weight of the bead. A thin organic thread made from wool or linen may not have been strong enough, but a thick woollen thread or leather thong would have been able to withstand the weight, especially if several were strung together.

Judging from the image, the wire that forms the copper alloy ring is only a few millimetres in diameter. There is a small area where the two ends of wire overlap. The perforation displays a considerable amount of wear, which was probably caused by long-term abrasion against the copper alloy. This suggests that the bead may have been allowed to dangle freely. The implication is that the wire ring attached the bead to something else, although to what is unclear. The overlapped wire may mean that the bead could be attached and later detached if needed.

Despite the importance of the copper alloy ring, it remains unclear whether it attached the bead to something that allowed it to be worn on the human body as a part of dress. Although the rings could have been removed from a bead prior to deposition, most beads do not exhibit the same extent of wear as is visible on the London example. Only one out of more than 50 examples of Type 1407 was found on a metal ring, suggesting that this is highly unusual and potentially even unique. This further reinforces the idea that all beads from a single type cannot be said to have been used in one particular way, as each example could be used differently and that use could change throughout its life.
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Stylistic variation in enamelled metals from Late Iron Age south-east Britain and north-west France

Ben Paites

Although there has been some contention over the date for the inception of enamelling in Britain, it is generally believed to have become popular in the 3rd century BC, following on from the use of coral as a decorative element for metalwork (McIntosh 2009, 3). The earliest enamelled metalwork from France in this study dates to the 4th century BC (Challet 1992). The stylistic devices used on these objects are often distinct and regionally variable, though some motifs appear to be universally adopted. The selection of motifs as a reflection of social and cultural identity is therefore something that ought to be considered when looking at Late Iron Age metalwork.

Roman authors, such as Caesar and Livy, described north-western Europe as culturally homogenous. However, studies of material cultural in Germany have shown far greater diversity than was believed (Wells 1995, 174). Not only is there variation seen between regions but also development throughout time.

Through the work of the Portable Antiquities Scheme there are over 500 Iron Age objects recorded on the database that have evidence of enamelling. In south-east Britain there are around 58 enamelled objects, with a further six from published sources used in this study. The 47 examples of Iron Age enamelling from north-west France are all from the catalogue produced by Virginie Challet (1992). Dating these objects is difficult, with many having very broad date ranges. For the purposes of this study the objects have been grouped by century.

Spatial and temporal variation of motifs

A typology for Iron Age decorative motifs has already been established (MacGregor 1976; Joy 2008, 81-3). These motifs range from simple shapes to representative designs, often with multiple motifs on a single object. This is particularly clear in 4th century BC France, where bracelets commonly have figure-of-eight motifs on the rounded sections (Figure 1). In these examples, one is formed of an S-shape whilst the other is formed of two opposing swirls. These decorations appear to indicate a stylistic tradition which has been adapted by the craftsmen making them.
Such traditions would be expected within a region, but these similarities can also be observed when compared with material from across the Channel. In Britain the figure-of-eight motif is also seen, though found more often on later Iron Age horse metalwork. Only two examples are found in south-east Britain but seem to indicate an evolutionary change in the use of this particular motif (Figure 2). Thus, the “figure-of-eight” motif appears to have been adapted from one region to the next.

Figure 1: 4th century BC bracelets from Northern France (after Challet 1992, 51)

Figure 2: Left: 4th century BC bracelet from France with figure-of-eight design (after Challet 1992, 51); Right (top): Early 1st century AD strap fitting (IOW-300471); Right (bottom): Late Iron Age tankard handle fragment (SOM-D3B3D1)
Previous research has noted that the selection of colour reflects different technological abilities between these two regions, as well as different sources of enamel (Freestone, Stapleton and Rigby 2003, 149). The technological difference becomes most pronounced in the Late Iron Age. In Britain, elaborate moulded designs continue to be used, whereas in France engraved lines are filled with enamel (Figure 3). There could be many reasons for this change, although this would need further discussion.

When considering which types of object were decorated in enamel, it is clear that in Britain horse equipment dominates the assemblage (Bateson 1981). In France, there is a shift towards the end of the 2nd century BC. Studs begin to dominate the enamelled metalwork assemblage, probably linked to increasing militarisation. This is likely in response to an ever-increasing Roman threat, with military material becoming generally more abundant. Further changes are observed in funerary practices. In France, chariot burials became more common but less elaborate towards the end of the Iron Age (Büchsenschütz 1995, 553). Thus, we see a decrease in the amount of horse equipment and an increase in objects associated with the military. This change may therefore be a reflection of wider social change rather than a change in enamelling practices.

Conclusion

There are some strong parallels seen in the Late Iron Age metalwork of France and Britain. In Britain, ceremonial and religious equipment dominate the assemblages throughout the Iron Age, with an increasing elaboration of design around the early 1st century BC. This may indicate British craftsmen emulating earlier Continental decoration. In France, personal ornament was most commonly decorated in enamel, with military equipment most abundant in the 1st century BC.

Although this study focuses on the regions that border the English Channel, there is the potential for widening the research to see how far these similarities can be observed. It is clear that certain styles of decoration were used throughout the Iron Age, being formed...
differently from one region to the next. Equally, there are many motifs that are unique to one region, indicating a more localised distribution. An initial foray into the study of motifs across Britain, using PAS data, has shown that there are some regionalised patterns visible across the country. Due to the limitations of this article, it is not possible to delve into this any further. However, it is clear that this approach to studying decoration has the potential to highlight important patterns in the cultural and technological variation in north-west Europe during the Late Iron Age. This will allow us to gain a better understanding of the complex nature of what the Romans perceived to be a culturally distinct group of peoples.
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Four recent finds of Early Iron Age winged chapes

Dot Boughton

Out of over 300 chapes recorded on the Portable Antiquities Scheme’s database only four date from the Early Iron Age (800-600BC). These are the so-called ‘winged chapes’, a name derived from their two symmetrical wings. Winged chapes evolved from Atlantic Late Bronze Age bag- or purse-shaped and boat-shaped chapes (Gerloff 2004, 142) and spread into Central Europe during the Earliest Iron Age where they are are normally found accompanying Gündlingen and related sword types in inhumation and cremation graves (Schauer 1971; Schauer 1972; Gerloff 2004). The traditional view was that these chapes and the accompanying swords were of Central European origin and a Leitfund for the Early Iron Age Hallstatt C period, but Continental scholars such as Rieth (1942) and, more recently, Gerloff (2004) have argued against this, suggesting an Atlantic origin instead. This is because the predecessors of the winged chapes – the above-mentioned bag-shaped or purse-shaped chapes – were predominantly found in Britain and North West France. The very latest specimens of the group of Early Iron Age winged chapes, however, come from Central European grave assemblages rather than British contexts (Gerloff 2004, 142-143).

Burial evidence from the British Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages is extremely sparse, and thus no bag-shaped or winged chapes have ever been found in association with a Late Bronze Age Ewart Park-type sword or an Early Iron Age Gündlingen-type sword. In Britain, most of the chapes have been either found singly or in association with other metalwork in hoards. In the Late Bronze Age, bag-shaped chapes predominantly occur in metalwork hoards with objects belonging to the Ewart Park/Carp’s Tongue metalwork assemblages, while in the Early Iron Age they are only found in multi-period assemblages such as the hoards from Salisbury (Wiltshire) and Tisbury (Vale of Wardour, Wiltshire). Typically, Early Iron Age metalwork hoards are predominantly made up of bronze axes, but the small group of Wiltshire and West Hampshire multi-period hoards displays a much greater spectrum of finds, typologically as well as chronologically.

In addition to the specimens from these two Early Iron Age hoards, there are only four single finds of winged chapes recorded on the Portable Antiquities Scheme’s database. The first chape, which is the first recorded Early Iron Age chape from Wales, is the earliest in Rieth’s (1942) typology (Type Siems), while those from Oxfordshire and Cambridgeshire are of the more evolved type Barriere (Indre) (Gerloff 2004, 143, fig. 17.9.1).

NMGW-99C455 Llantrisant Fawr, Monmouthshire
Length: 99mm; Width: 44mm; Thickness: 12.2mm; Weight: 28g
(Figure 1)

Cast copper-alloy winged chape dating from c. 800 - 600BC. Part of the Llyn Fawr metalworking tradition corresponding to Needham’s (1996) Period 8. The chape is near-complete with some peripheral loss but is in two conjoining fragments. The wing terminals converge to a point, now corroded on both ends. The underside of each wing is gently convex but showing no sign of recurving. The chape gradually narrows to the tips, being thickest at its midpoint. One face has a
near-complete section near the chape base and displays a slight, outward-turned lip or flange. The encircling lip would have continued around the mouth of the chape, which is of pointed-oval form. The chape has broken at the end of the mouth on one side. Beneath the mouth lip the chape is flat; the upper part has been perforated with two holes on each side to facilitate attachment to the scabbard. Beneath the flat upper part is a stepped moulding to the rounded basal section. There is no applied decoration on the chape.

Type: Siems; Prüllsbirkig (Cowen’s 1967 Type A1)

**SUR-05401D (Crowmarsh, Oxfordshire)**
Length: 50.41mm; Width: 14.31mm; Thickness: 8.1mm; Weight: 12.39g
(Figure 2)
Fragment of a cast copper-alloy winged chape dating from the Early Iron Age, c. 800-600BC. Only half of the chape survives, but is in good overall condition. The surviving 'wing' is slightly bent and the break shows a ragged edge. The chape is undecorated except for a very narrow mouth moulding and a slightly more bulbous moulding on the lower part of the body.
Type: Barrières (Indre) (Rieth 1942; Gerloff 2004, fig. 17.9.1).

**CAM-9B8BB8 (Soham, Cambridgeshire)**
Length: 32mm; Width: 18mm; Thickness: 6.3mm; Weight: 6.55g
(Figure 3)
Fragment of a cast copper-alloy winged chape, dating from c. 800-600BC (Rieth 1942; Gerloff 2004, fig. 17.9.1). Both ends have breaks: one is a slightly irregular transverse break and the other very irregular. The break at the thinnest end shows that this end is solid. The break at the widest end reveals that part of the object was hollow, the remains of the cavity extending into this fragment for a depth of approximately 17.4mm. Some dried mud has fallen out of this cavity and it is uncertain whether any more mud remains adhering to the walls, which could affect the weight and measurable depth of the cavity. This fragment has a lozenge-shaped or 'kite-shaped' cross-section, the thickest part being set approximately one third of the way along the width. A ridge is present, on both surfaces, laterally along the axis of this thickest part of the fragment. The ridge has an angled step-in
below to reach the surface of the remaining two thirds of the surface.
Type: Barriere (Indre)

**CAM-DD5580 (Little Thetford, Cambridgeshire)**
Thickness: 12.24mm; Weight: 45.6g
(Figure 4)
A complete cast copper-alloy winged chape dating from the Early Iron Age, c. 800-600BC (Rieth 1942; Gerloff 2004, fig. 17.9.1). The chape is almost complete and in very good condition. Only the outer tips of the wings are missing. It has a smooth surface with no visible damage or corrosion. The artefact has two long swept-back wings and is hollow in the centre. There are four small perforations (blocked up through corrosion) which were needed to attach the artefact to the sheath which was made from an organic material, e.g. leather. The upper edge of the chape displays a sharp angle while the bottom is rounded in cross-section. The outer edge of the chape forms an angle of just less than 45 degrees. The semi-circular opening 28.38mm wide reveals a hollow centre to the chape, including the wings. This opening has a slight rim 0.80mm wide.
Type: Barriere (Indre)
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Recommended Reads:

Archaeology and the History of Art: an inaugural lecture delivered in the University of Hull on 21 January 1969 by Glyn Daniel

University of Hull 1970

Brendan O’Connor

“…archaeology is not the taxonomy of dull objects, although dull objects must constantly be studied.” - Glyn Daniel, Archaeology and the History of Art

Glyn Daniel (Figure 1) may now be a somewhat overlooked figure in British archaeology, although especially during the 1950s and 60s he was prominent as a populariser of the subject through television appearances and as editor of both the journal Antiquity and the Ancient Peoples and Places series of books published by Thames and Hudson. Apart from service in the Royal Air Force during World War II his entire career was at Cambridge, where he was Disney Professor of Archaeology from 1974 to 1981, between Grahame Clarke and Colin Renfrew. When I heard that the Later Prehistoric Finds Group’s 2014 conference was to be held in Hull, I remembered that on a previous visit I had bought a copy of a lecture Daniel had given there. His subject seemed relevant to the Group, although the booklet is not readily available outside libraries.

Thomas Ferens, founder of the University of Hull and of the art gallery that bears his name, had established a fund to encourage appreciation and study of the fine arts, which supported annual public lectures that continue to this day. In 1959 the University instituted a Visiting Professorship in the Fine Arts in the name of Ferens. Glyn Daniel was later elected to this post and he delivered his inaugural lecture (as part of a series of five lectures) on 21 January 1969, and this was published as a booklet (Daniel 1970; 1986, 213, 348). In his autobiography, Daniel describes prehistoric art as his ‘third great interest in archaeology’ after megalithic monuments and the history of archaeology (Daniel 1986, 347). He published less on art than on those other subjects, though with Stuart Piggott he had produced a slim volume of photographs of objects ‘illustrating the artistic achievements of the pre-Roman inhabitants of the British Isles’ (Piggott and Daniel 1951).

Daniel argued that the contemplation of art was ‘one of the greatest privileges of the archaeologist’ and that human artistic attainment was ‘one of archaeology’s highest themes’. He began by explaining what he meant by archaeology: ‘to write history from the surviving material sources’, employing scientific methods without necessarily being a science. In this context, he
mentioned the article by Jacquetta Hawkes reacting to some of the more explicitly scientific developments of archaeology in the 1960s, which had recently appeared in *Antiquity* and provoked extensive discussion (Hawkes 1968). This led Daniel to consider the future of archaeology and to emphasise two of his particular interests: the history of archaeology and the study of art. He was especially critical of the editor of *Current Archaeology* for belittling the study of antiquarian thought. The significance of art in prehistoric archaeology was threefold, showing, first, ‘the artistic endeavour of early people’, secondly that this endeavour was ‘a permanent achievement’, and thirdly that it was ‘in itself an important document about the past.’ Various examples were quoted, and illustrated to the audience. Only six appear in the published lecture, including two from East Yorkshire: the (censored) wooden figurines from Roos Carr in Holderness and one of the chalk drums from a barrow near Folkton Wold Farm, another of which is reproduced here (Figure 2).

![Figure 2](Image © Trustees of the British Museum)

Like us, Daniel was pleased to be able to look forward to an exhibition of Celtic art in London and Edinburgh (Piggott and Allen 1970). While acknowledging that archaeologists cannot necessarily explain prehistoric art, he emphasised that they could still enjoy it; indeed enjoyment was another of Glyn Daniel’s themes, exemplified by his guidance on eating and drinking among the cave art of the Dordogne and the megaliths of Morbihan and by a chapter in his autobiography (Daniel 1963; 1986, 271-96). The final paragraph of his lecture contains the quotation above, which might be the motto of the Later Prehistoric Finds Group, but he continued that archaeology was ‘also the study of lovely things that can enrich not only our understanding of the past but our spiritual life at the present.’
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Investigating the social context of Bronze Age and Iron Age metalworking

Leo Webley, Joanna Brück and Sophia Adams

Metalworking has long been central to interpretations of European later prehistory. More than any other craft, the manufacture of metal objects is thought to have been bound up with political power, prestige and ritual. Yet much of the discussion has been based more on ethnographic parallels than on the actual residues of prehistoric metalworking practices.

A major new three-year project, based at the University of Bristol and funded by the Leverhulme Trust, will address this issue by reassessing the evidence for non-ferrous metalworking across Britain, Ireland and the near Continent during the Bronze Age and pre-Roman Iron Age. The focus will be on bronze-working, which dominates the evidence for non-ferrous metallurgy, though the crafting of other metals such as gold, silver, tin and lead will also be considered. The central questions are: what was the social significance of metalworking, and what roles did metalworkers play? How did this vary regionally and change over time, particularly across major transitions such as that from the Bronze Age to the Iron Age?

A key element of the research will be to systematically examine the find context of metalworking remains from excavated sites. These remains include slag, casting waste, crucibles, moulds and smithing tools. The analysis will identify places where metalworking occurred, and explore what the treatment and deposition of metalworking remains can tell us about the meanings and values ascribed to this craft. Specific themes include:

- Did metalworking occur at ordinary or high-status settlements, defended sites, ritual sites, or isolated places? Was it dispersed across these sites or restricted to specific areas? This can inform us about the status and role of metalworking, and whether it was subject to social control or taboos.

- What other practices took place at locations where non-ferrous metalworking was carried out? Was it associated with domestic activities, or other crafts such as ironworking? What does this imply for relationships between craftworkers?

- Did metalworking, or the deposition of its residues, involve ritual?

- What does the use of metalworking tools as grave goods suggest about the identity of craftworkers?

We would be interested in discussions and collaborations with other researchers examining similar issues. In particular, we would be very grateful to learn of any unpublished finds or analyses of non-ferrous metalworking remains from ongoing or completed excavations. We are of course happy to share information in return, and will fully acknowledge any assistance. Please contact leo.webley@bristol.ac.uk.

The project team comprises Leo Webley, Joanna Brück and Sophia Adams.
Announcements

European Bronze Age Gold in the British Museum. The British Museum’s new catalogue of gold objects is now available online. It presents the earliest gold objects from Britain, Ireland and continental Europe in the Museum’s collection, dating from c. 2500-700 BC. The catalogue can be accessed at: http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/online_research_catalogues/bag/bronze_age_gold.aspx.

TALES THE RIVER TELLS
Later prehistoric finds from in and around the Thames
Monday 20 April 2015, Museum of London / The British Museum

Tickets are £15 and include Guided foreshore walk with Thames prehistorians Jane Sidell (EH), Jon Cotton (MOLA), Gustav Miine (UCL) and Courtney Niumura (MOLA). Thames artefacts handling sessions with British Museum curators Neil Wilkin and Julia Farley, and Museum of London curator Caroline McDonald. Six afternoon lectures at the British Museum.

For more information visit us on facebook, on the web prehistoricsociety.org or email mmarrshall@mola.org.uk.

The Prehistoric Society is a registered charity (no. X300567) and company limited by guarantee (no. 293346).

Keep up with us online at:
https://sites.google.com/site/laterprehistoricfindsgroup/

E-mail us at:
laterprehistoricfindsgroup@gmail.com

Or find us on Facebook