The Excavation of a Romano-Celtic Temple and a Later Cemetery on Lamyatt Beacon, Somerset

By ROGER LEECH

SUMMARY

The summit of Lamyatt Beacon was totally excavated. The earliest structure was a Romano-Celtic temple, built in the late third century, in use into the early fifth century, and of square plan with two annexes on the east side. To the south was a sunken-room. Finds from related features and from looting of the site included many votive objects. Probably of later date than the temple were a small building to the north and a cemetery of at least sixteen burials, aligned east-west with heads to the west.

INTRODUCTION

LAMYATT Beacon forms part of the Oolitic Limestone escarpment, a little to the north of Bruton in south-east Somerset (FIG. 1). The summit of the hill is 220 metres (720 feet) above sea level, and from the narrow ridge there are extensive views in all directions, most especially to the south and west. The now wooded hilltop is a prominent landmark, easily identifiable from much of Somerset and west Wiltshire.

Excavations on Lamyatt Beacon were first carried out c. 1955–60 partly under the direction of Mrs C.M. Bennett. The excavations described below took place in September, October and November 1973, to examine completely the Romano-Celtic temple and cemetery before treasure-hunters finally destroyed all remaining archaeological information.

PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL HISTORY

The 1958–60 excavations (FIG. 2), directed by Mrs C.M. Bennett, were begun after superficial digging by boys of King’s School, Bruton had produced eight very small pots, probably votive, and a quantity of coins c. A.D. 250–380, and after a half-buried bronze statuette had been discovered on the eastern slope below the sunken room.1 Pottery and some small finds (the latter returned to King’s School, Bruton and now lost) deposited in

1 Information from Mrs C.M. Bennett; Ordnance Survey records; Haverfield Archive, letters of 2 April 1956 and 15 February 1957 from G.S. Sale to Miss Taylor and Western Gazette 27 June 1955.
FIG. 2. The 1958–60 excavations and subsequent disturbance to the site.
the Somerset County Museum (abbreviated to S.C.M. hereafter) in February 1958 (Acc. No. 58.A.2) probably came from the School’s excavations. Some finds in private possession also date from this period. Finds from Mrs Bennett’s excavations c. 1958–60 were loaned to the writer for subsequent deposition in Bristol City Museum and Somerset County Museum. After the conclusion of Mrs Bennett’s excavations c. 1960, digging by boys of King’s School continued in the area around the small east-west building. In the early 1970’s, the site became increasingly threatened by treasure-hunters; and, although it was scheduled as an Ancient Monument, the cover provided by trees on the hilltop made it impossible to deter illicit digging.

In 1973 the Somerset Archaeological and Natural History Society agreed to support the full publication of Mrs Bennett’s excavations and any further survey or excavation that was necessary. A later survey of the site and an assessment of the information from the 1956–8 excavations showed that the parts not seriously eroded by treasure-hunting were crucial to understanding the already excavated material. Subsequently, the Department of the Environment made a major grant to the Society towards the cost of the excavation, which was directed by the writer.

THE 1973 EXCAVATIONS (FIG. 3)

A total area of c. 550 m² was examined between September and November 1973. The area occupied by Building 2, the temple and the sunken-room was excavated almost entirely by hand. After excavation of these areas was completed, areas to the south and north previously sealed by spoil-heaps were examined, with the new spoil being deposited between; here, the uppermost 50–60 mm of soil, mainly roots and vegetation, was removed mechanically; after the excavations were completed, soil to a depth of over 1 m was redeposited over wall F30, the best preserved section of masonry.

The records and finds from the 1973 excavations are deposited in the Somerset County Record Office and the Somerset County Museum, Taunton. Most of the excavation records, and a fuller version of this report, may also be consulted through microfiche copies at the National Monuments Record. Most finds noted as unprovenanced come from private collections, the location of which is given in the excavation records.

DESCRIPTION OF THE EXCAVATIONS

1. THE ROMANO-CELTIC TEMPLE, AND THE AREAS TO THE EAST, SOUTH AND WEST
   (FIGS. 4–7; PLS. XVIII–XIX)

The plan of the main part of the temple, c. 11 m square, was of conventional Romano-Celtic type, consisting of a central cella enclosed by an ambulatory (PL. XVIII). Symmetrically positioned on the east side were two square annexes, while on the south side was a small sunken room, approached only from the ambulatory of the temple itself.

The walls of the cella were constructed of mortared horizontally laid Oolitic Limestone blocks, survived to two courses (in 1958), and were 0.6 m wide. The west, south and probably the north walls extended beyond the cella to the ambulatory wall, dividing the ambulatory into four parts. These extended walls perhaps formed buttresses to the cella

2 Information from Mrs Besly.
3 On the narrow ridge, spoil disposal presented considerable problems.
FIG. 3. The 1973 excavations.
The interior of the *cella* was heavily robbed and there was no evidence for the nature of the flooring. The roof was presumably similar to that of the adjacent parts of the temple (below) being tiled with Lias Limestone slates. Five pits (F28, F46, F86, F87, F123) were possibly contemporary with the use of the *cella* and were the only features recognised within it. Of these, the only one (F87) which remained unexcavated by 1973 was filled with brown clayey soil; there were no artifacts.

The temple was probably entered from the east side, where two courses of a series of steps remained. Alternatively, these may have formed part of a statue base. Within the short length of the ambulatory between the north and south continuations of the *cella* walls, no features were recognised.

In contrast, the remaining lengths of the ambulatory, possibly three separate rooms, each contained features that were possibly contemporary with the use of the temple. The northern ambulatory contained several pits, but by 1973 only one of these remained unexcavated. This was possibly a votive pit (F59), for within the fill of compacted clayey brown soil were vertically set animal bones, some of them burnt. The southern ambulatory also contained, by 1973, one undisturbed pit (F54). The relationship of this pit to the *cella* was identical to that of Pit F59. Pit F54 was also filled with compacted brown clayey soil and contained shells and animal bones.

Possibly Pits F54, F59 and F87 were contemporary and of votive origin. They were approximately in line with the north-south axis of the temple, with Pits F54 and F57 being equidistant from Pit F87 which was itself in the centre of the *cella*. Each was filled with clayey brown soil and none contained any artifacts.

The western part of the ambulatory had been less disturbed prior to 1973, which may account for the greater number of features recorded there. In the centre of the room, against the west wall of the *cella*, was a hearth (F119) filled with dark, blackened soil with flecks of charcoal. Extending over much of the room was a layer of brown mortary soil, reaching its maximum depth against the west wall, perhaps intended to create a level surface for the floor. The floor itself had possibly been paved, but no slabs remained *in situ*. Beneath the floor, in the north part of the room, was a small pit (FIG. 22 NO. 65, see also FIG. 4) sealed by a Lias Limestone slab and containing burnt soil and one coin of Faustina II (A.D. 161–80). The room was possibly entered from the south side, where part of an entrance was indicated by the construction of the south wall.

The walls of the ambulatory were of similar width to those of the *cella*. The lowest courses were of Oolitic Limestone blocks laid horizontally or pitched at an angle. On the west side, the wall stood six courses high in places, the upper courses being laid in herringbone bond. In the lee of this wall was a tumbled mass of hexagonal Lias Limestone roofing-slates; similar slates were found scattered elsewhere in and around the temple and probably accounted for most of the Lias Limestone fragments found during the excavations.

The two annexes on the east side of the temple were heavily robbed; of the southern annexe, only the foundation-trenches and small parts of the north and south walls remained. In the northern annexe, part of the floor make-up remained, containing a coin of A.D. 291–93, giving a *terminus post quem* for the construction of the annexes, and possibly for that of the temple itself. Much wall plaster came from inside the southern annexe, indicating that the walls were part timber-framed and painted white. A stack of roofing-slates against the short east wall, recorded c. 1960, was possibly placed there when the temple was demolished (PL. XIXB).

On the south side of the temple was the sunken room first excavated in 1958–60 (FIGS. 6, 7; PL. XIXA). The fill was totally removed at that time and no records survive of the strati-
FIG. 4. The temple.
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FIG. 5. Sections.
FIG. 6. The sunken room, plan.

FIG. 7. The sunken room, sections and elevations.
graphy and artifacts found within the building. Discussion must, therefore, be restricted largely to the nature of its construction and its possible function.

On the north, west and south sides, the internal wall was constructed of unmortared Oolitic Limestone blocks forming a revetment to the edge of a large rectangular pit cut 1-1 m below the surface of the bedrock. On the east side, there was no revetment wall, so that here the face of the bedrock also formed the wall of the room. On the south side, there was a niche, formed when the wall was constructed and much reddened and blackened by fire. On the north side was a flight of four steps leading into the room, indicating that entrance could only be obtained from the south ambulatory of the temple. Any evidence for the nature of the upper walls and roof had been removed before the 1973 excavation took place.

Outside the temple, excepting the area to the north, few areas remained archaeologically undisturbed by 1973. To the south of the sunken room, no archaeological features were recognised in an area 25 m by 15 m which was excavated to the surface of the bedrock. Still further south, five trenches along the summit ridge revealed no features.

On the west side of the temple, only a narrow strip was excavated. The slope was so steep that the former presence of buildings was considered unlikely; excavation was also technically very difficult here. To the west of the west wall of the temple, a thin layer of yellow mortar (F71) was probably contemporary with the construction of the temple itself, and had since remained undisturbed. From this came four sherds, three of which were fragments of probably pre-Roman shell-tempered ware. Sealing Layer F69 was an expanse of building rubble, dating from the demolition of the temple and including, amongst only 25 sherds, fragments of three votive pots. There was no layer of debris, which could be argued to be contemporary with the use of the temple.

On the east side of the temple, a similar stratigraphic sequence was observed in the two areas which had remained archaeologically undisturbed, being sealed by the spoil heaps from the 1958–60 excavations. In both, a thin layer of yellow mortar and brown soil, a little occupation debris with material originating from the construction of the temple, was sealed by a thick layer of rubble containing much building stone and some fragments of plaster, all probably dating from the destruction of the temple. Most of the large number of objects found on the eastern slope of the hill possibly came from the uppermost part of this layer.

Lying 3-5 m to the east of the north-east annex was a flat-bottomed ditch (F131) cut 0.3–0.4 m into the bedrock. There were no finds from its fill, and its function remains uncertain.

2. THE AREA TO THE NORTH OF THE TEMPLE (FIGS. 8–10)

To the north of the temple, the summit ridge widened slightly. On the north-east slope was a substantially flatter area, which was examined both by trenches and area excavation.

Over this area, the present topsoil consisted entirely of humus and worm-sorted soil 50–100 mm in depth (F139). The buried surface beneath a large bank (F150) was similar in appearance. The principal features recorded in this area were a group of antler burials, Building 2, at least thirteen human burials and the boundary bank and ditch.

Pits and antler burials (FIG. 8)

To the north of the temple were at least nine antler burials; further antlers came from this area in the 1958–60 excavations. Two antlers were buried in a shallow pit (F136) which was cut from the base of a larger pit (F130) which contained burnt soil, charcoal and pottery of the fourth century. This pit was in turn sealed by Building 2 (below). Another eight antlers were in shallower pits, which were sealed only by the thin layer of topsoil which extended over this area.
FIG. 8. The area to the north of the temple.
Only the two antlers sealed by Building 2 could be securely dated. The individual antlers were of insufficient weight for C14 dating to be applied.

Two other shallow pits (F88, F135) were recorded to the north of the temple, one of which contained a large boulder of Forest Marble Limestone.

Building 2 (Fig. 9; Pl. XXA)
A small building was situated immediately to the north of the temple, but was not aligned upon it. A terminus post quem of A.D. 291 is given by a coin sealed in the mortar underbedding of the floor (F68).

The building was extensively excavated in 1958–60, and, apart from structural features, very little of archaeological interest remained undisturbed by 1973. The walls were constructed of mortared Oolitic Limestone blocks set both horizontally and pitched at the angle. Inside the three surviving external walls was an offset or bench wall (F51) 0·3–0·5 m wide which sealed the remains of the paved floor (F67). This was constructed of Lias Limestone slabs and was laid on a layer of soft, yellow, sandy mortar (F68), which in turn sealed pit F130 (above). Sealing part of the floor was a thin layer of soil (F66), from which no finds came. No evidence was obtained for the nature of the roof of the building.

The building was entered from the east end, which was excavated in 1958–60. By 1973, this part of the building had been totally removed, and the information on Fig. 9 is derived from photographs of the earlier excavations.

The human burials (Fig. 10)
To the north of Building 2 was a small cemetery, consisting originally of at least sixteen inhumations.4 Thirteen of these were excavated in 1973. They included eleven females and one male. Not all were complete, and one was a reburial made c. 1960. All the undisturbed

4 These are described below, pp. 325f.
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FIG. 10. The cemetery to the north of the temple.
burials were in unlined graves cut 0.1–0.35 m into the bedrock, and consisted of extended inhumations aligned east-west (or south-west to north-west) with head to the west. The graves of Burials F25, F142, F143, F144 and F147 contained Romano-British or possibly later (F143, F144) pottery. Burials F159 and F165 were dated by C14 assays to A.D. 559±90 and A.D. 782±90 respectively.

The boundary bank and ditch (FIG. 10, section on FIG. 5) Sealing Burials F159, F160 and F165 was a bank c. 2.5 m wide and 0.5 m high (F150), sealing a buried soil (F163), and terminating inside the excavated area north of Building 2. The material forming the bank was taken from the ditch (F162) running parallel to it on the west side.

The bank extended down the hill to the north-east of the excavation, but could not be traced beyond the wood. Its former line is possible perpetuated by field boundaries to the east.

CONCLUSIONS

1. THE PRE-ROMAN OCCUPATION

The evidence for the pre-Roman use of the hilltop came from two pre-Roman coins and a small quantity of pottery possibly dating from the Early Iron Age (pp. 285–293). No features belonging to this period were recognised and the origin of the finds remains obscure.

2. THE ROMANO-CELTIC TEMPLE

That the principal building excavated was a Romano-Celtic temple may be argued both from the similarity of its plan to others known elsewhere a.d. from the presence there of a quantity of votive objects generally found only on temple sites. The evidence both from the coins and from the pottery indicates that the temple was constructed towards the end of the third century and remained in use into the early fifth century.

The evidence does not permit more than a general reconstruction of the temple. The walls were of mortared stone, except those of the annexes, which were timber-framed. The interior was at least partly paved, whilst the roof was tiled with hexagonal Lias Limestone slates. Built into the walls were shallow niches or aediculae containing figures carved in relief. A larger than life-size statue, probably of Mars, stood within the temple or upon a podium on its east side.

Whether the annexes were original to the temple must remain uncertain. They related in plan to the main building, their inturned exterior walls forming buttresses to its internal walls and cella. The planning of the ambulatory is also of interest for it clearly consisted of four separate parts, possibly linked by doorways. Compartmentalisation of this type can be discerned in the plans of many Romano-Celtic temples.5

The precise plan of the temple, with a square cella, ambulatory and two side annexes was strikingly similar to that of the temple on Brean Down, also in Somerset.6 Although the exact relationship of the annexes to the main structure differed, each shared the same symmetry, demonstrated in the alignment of the annexe walls both on those of the ambulatory and those of the cella. Both temples were of broadly similar date, although the

Brean Down temple was possibly built as long as 40 years after that on Lamyatt Beacon. Moreover, although 45 km apart, both would have been intervisible on a clear day; at each, the temple apparently stood in isolation, in contrast to other temples surrounded by elaborate complexes of buildings, as for instance at Lydney and Pagans Hill. At Lamyatt Beacon, complete excavation of the only flat area along the ridge to the north, and trial excavations along the very narrow ridge to the south produced no evidence for further buildings.

The votive objects found at Lamyatt Beacon may be briefly compared with those from other known temple sites. One would wish to be able to make comparisons with the material from Brean Down, but the excavations there produced almost no votive objects, the contents of the temple either having been thoroughly removed or summarily thrown over the edge of the cliff. The one certainly votive deposit found in situ at Lamyatt Beacon was the small jar buried in the north ambulatory, containing one coin of 161–80. Possibly many of the coins found were originally contained in the numerous small jars, but no evidence for this could be discerned.

Comparisons may, however, be most usefully made with the assemblage from Cold Kitchen Hill, Wiltshire, intervisible with and only 17 km to the east of Lamyatt Beacon. The existence of a Romano-British building on Cold Kitchen Hill was first recorded in the early nineteenth century. Subsequent excavations in 1892–3, 1896 and 1924–6 produced large quantities of finds, but failed to recognise any evidence of structures. Pottery and coins from the site indicate that, unlike Lamyatt Beacon, its use extended from the pre-Roman Iron Age to at least the early fifth century. Nevertheless, the objects found form an assemblage remarkably similar to that from Lamyatt, including miniature axes and spears, votive pots, beads, a horseman-brooch and antlers. From this similarity, it may be argued that not only was the site at Cold Kitchen Hill that of a temple, but also that the cult worshipped there was the same as at Lamyatt Beacon.

Items amongst those listed above have also been found in combination at other temple sites; for instance, at Hockwold, Iislip and Woodeaton. To list these fully would, however, involve much exhaustive research and has in any case already been partly undertaken.

Of particular interest are the antler burials, especially since the significance of these has not always been fully recognised. At Brean Down, deer antlers were found in the ambulatory of the temple, in its south annexe and in late layers within the small east-west building. It was suggested by the excavator that these antlers were stone-robbers’ tools, but this is hardly likely to have been so with well-mortared stone walls where individual stones could have been dislodged more easily in other ways. Deer antlers have scarcely been recorded at all on other late Romano-British settlement sites in Somerset, such as Bradley Hill, Catsgore and the Fosse Way suburb of Ilchester, all of which were quarried by stone-robbers at some time, and all of which have been extensively excavated.

Moreover, antlers have been recorded from other certain or probable temple sites; indeed, ApSimon noted that they had been found both at Maiden Castle and Woodyates. At Maiden Castle, the two antler picks, together with parts of cult statuettes, were found in

---

7 Cf. Rodwell, op. cit. (note 5), 233.
9 V.C.H. Wiltshire I, part 1, 47–9.
11 Green, op. cit. (note 10).
a building which has recently been interpreted as a temple. At Woodyates, an antler burial came from Pit 3, close to the area most likely to have contained a temple. At Lydney, finds from the late fourth-century temple also included ‘bones of red deer (represented in some cases by sawn antlers)’. At Hole Ground, Wookey, immediately above the possible religious centre of Wookey Hole, an infant burial was accompanied by ‘the sharply pointed tine of a deer’s antler placed alongside the skull’. Together, all this evidence indicates that antlers may justifiably be regarded as cult objects.

It may be tentatively argued that the principal deity worshipped at Lamyatt Beacon was Mars, conflated with a Cernunnos-type deity. Dr Henig’s report on the statuary indicates that Mars was a major deity at the temple. The other votive objects would certainly be appropriate to this cult. Horseman-brooches and model weapons could be associated with Mars the Warrior-god, while the antler burials could be linked to the worship of the horned god, perhaps Cernunnos, who was often conflated with Mars.

3. THE TEMPLE IN ITS WIDER SETTING

The temple was probably approached from the west by a road leaving the Fosse Way at the top of West Pennard Hill, 5.5 km west of the temple (FIG. 1). The road is marked by a continuous straight line of parish boundaries as far as Lamyatt and was first noted by the Ordnance Survey Archaeological Division. It was thought to continue eastwards as far as Semley in Wiltshire, but beyond Lamyatt its course is very uncertain. It is possible that it was a road leading directly to the temple from the Fosse Way. If so, the construction of the road itself would be dated to c. A.D. 300, and would indicate both the importance of the temple and the existence of a situation where it was possible for a road to be laid out along a new straight line, either across uncultivated land or cutting existing field-boundaries and trackways.

The distribution of Romano-Celtic temples in Somerset has been discussed by a number of writers. Most temples were at least 10 km from their nearest neighbours. In certain parts of Somerset, for instance north of Ilchester, where many settlements are known, the density of temple sites is no greater. It is thus unlikely on present evidence that temples such as Lamyatt Beacon were always merely estate temples. Alternatively, they may have been local cult centres which differed from those such as Pagans Hill or Lydney in not requiring ancillary buildings such as guest houses or baths.


The cemetery of east–west burials possibly post-dated the abandonment of the temple by more than 200 years, the two C14 dates obtained for burials being centred upon A.D. 559 and A.D. 782 (for C14 dates, uncalibrated, see p. 270). Comparisons may be made with other temple sites in the south-west where similarly situated post-Roman cemeteries have been noted. At Nettleton, the burials were close to a temple of octagonal plan which was

19 Ordnance Survey Records RRX 37.
20 Rahtz and Watts, op. cit. (note 18); P. Rahtz and P.J. Fowler in P.J. Fowler (ed.), *Archaeology and the Landscape* (1972).
21 Rodwell, op. cit. (note 9), 233.
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LAMYATT BEACON

The east-west building and some comparisons

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e) (f)

FIG. 11. East–west buildings, Lamyatt Beacon and elsewhere. (a) Brean Down; (b) Lamyatt Beacon; (c) Ardwall Island, phase 1; (d) Church Island, phase 1; (e) Ardwall Island, phase 2; (f) Church Island, phase 2.

converted in the late Roman period into a cruciform shape by the blocking up of four of the ambulatories.22 At Henley Wood, c. 50 east-west burials were secondary to a Roman temple, and were not earlier than the late fourth century.23 At Maiden Castle, four east-west burials were found in the fill of the south ditch of the ‘long mound’, close to and within the suggested precinct of the late fourth-century temple.24 At Woodyates, a possible temple site of the fourth century was close to a cemetery of east-west burials within a square enclosure.25 Possibly, these cemeteries were deliberately sited close to what was known to have once been a sacred place.

Also of interest, but at present unexplained, is the ratio of females to males: eleven females to one, or at the most three, males. Other cemeteries of east-west burials in the south-west can be dated to as early as the fourth century, for instance those at Poundbury, Dorset and Bradley Hill, Somerset.26 It has been argued elsewhere that such cemeteries are possibly, though not certainly, of Christian origin.27

23 D.R. Wilson, Britannia i (1970), 296.
24 R.E.M. Wheeler, Maiden Castle (1943), pls. III, V.
26 (a) C.J.S. Green. Excavations at Poundbury, Dorset (forthcoming) (b) Leech, op. cit. (note 17).
The small east-west building at Lamyatt Beacon may be compared to a similar example at Brean Down. There, the small building was demonstrably later than the demolition of the temple, incorporating reused fragments of its masonry in the walls. At Lamyatt Beacon, it was impossible to establish the chronological relationship between the small building and the temple, although it was later than one pit containing an antler burial.

It is difficult to find any parallels for these buildings from a Romano-British context. The closest comparisons may be made with early Irish oratories such as those on Church Island, Co. Kerry28 and Ardwall Island.29 Although of timber, these buildings were similar in size and plan to the stone structures at Brean Down and Lamyatt Beacon. The earliest oratories of stone construction at Church Island and Ardwall Island, and others such as that a St Ninian’s Isle were much larger (FIG. 11). Thus, the Lamyatt Beacon and Brean Down buildings, although built in stone, resemble most closely the earliest timber oratories.30

5. THE BOUNDARY BANK AND DITCH

The boundary bank and ditch, recorded to the north of the temple still survives as a substantial earthwork. It is most probably a Saxon boundary bank, similar to those recorded around Bradley Hill, Somerset by Hoskins.31 It terminated on the summit of the hill at the temple, which was presumably still a recognisable landmark. Whether the ditch then continued to the south or west is uncertain.

THE FINDS

THE STATUARY AND FIGURINES by Martin Henig

Stone (For Nos. 2–8 see Figs. 12, 13)

1. (Pl. XXB–C) Male figure, Oolitic Limestone, height 30 cms. Found in the late 1950’s on the hilltop, now in private possession. The figure, almost complete but for his head, stands towards the front. He wears a tunic and a long cloak hangs behind him from his shoulders. His right arm is lowered towards his belt and a tall shield, its internal grip clearly indicated, rests by his left side. This last feature identifies the figure as Mars. The back of the stone is only roughly blocked out, and the statuette, which clearly stood against a wall, may in fact have been a relief within an aedicula.

Mars is generally depicted holding a spear in his right hand and the arm action here is thus somewhat unusual, but in general terms the figure may be compared with representations of Mars on altars from Lypiatt Park near Stroud, Glos.32 Despite the coarse stone, the work here is vigorous and accomplished.

2. Relief male figure, Oolitic Limestone, height 19 mm, within the bank north of Building 2, F150. Of the figure, only the left leg and slight indications of a right leg are preserved, but a shield seems to be portrayed on the left side. If so, then this is another representation of Mars.

The back is rough and the god seems to have stood in a shallow niche or aedicula against a wall.

FIG. 12. Stone statuary, Nos. 2–6.
3. (PL. XXIB) Relief male figure, Oolitic Limestone, height 24 mm, disturbed layer east of the temple, F20 (FIG. 2). The carving is very worn, but seems to portray a nude male figure three-quarters turned towards the right, and with his left leg crossed behind his right leg. His right arm is crossed in front of his body and holds some object which cannot be identified with certainty.

The head, the right leg below the thigh and the left foot are missing. The arm action probably identifies the subject as Apollo playing his lyre.

4. (PL. XXIC) Oolitic Limestone, height 100 mm, disturbed layer east of the temple, F20 (FIG. 2). Foot from free-standing statue; part of the base survives towards the back, but the toes are missing at the front.

Fairly careful work with competent modelling of the ankles.

5. (PL. XXIB) Oolitic Limestone, height 150 mm, layer east of the temple, F110(?). Foot and lower part of leg from free-standing statue. The front of the foot is missing.

6. (PL. XXIA) Oolitic Limestone, height 110 mm, layer east of the temple, F97. Middle leg from free-standing statue.

7. (PL. XXIB) Oolitic Limestone, height 130 mm, disturbed layer within temple, F73 (FIG. 2). Right thigh with part of edge support of statue. The lower part of the buttock at the back is well modelled and the work must have been free-standing and not a relief. It is likely that the support comprised drapery of some sort.

---

FIG. 13. Stone statuary, Nos. 7–8.
8. (pl. xxiii) Relief, Oolitic Limestone, height 135 mm, found c. 1958–60. The legs of the figure only survive, within a shallow aedicula. No attributes are indicated, but it is probable that the relief portrayed a male deity, possibly Mars or Mercury.


**Bronze**

1. (Pl. xxiiiA) Found c. 1958–60. Jupiter, bearded and wearing a mantle. He stands with right hand on hip, attribute in left hand missing. No drawing is included as the piece had been temporarily mislaid in the Museum.

2. (Fig. 14; pl. xxiiiB). Found c. 1958–60. Mercury (Hermes) wears winged hat (petasos) and shoes; body enveloped in a mantle (chlamys) fastened at right shoulder. He holds a money-bag in his right hand, but the caduceus (kerykeion) in his left hand is now missing. The bronze is in good condition and of relatively high quality.

3. (Fig. 15; pl. xxiiiC). Found c. 1958–60. Mercury (Hermes). Type as last but with caduceus, otherwise not so fine either in execution or state of preservation.

4. (Fig. 15; pl. xxiiiD). Found c. 1958–60. Mars, nude apart from plumed helmet. His right arm is raised and originally held a spear. The figure may also be compared with the well known statuette of Mars from the Foss Dyke.

5. (Fig. 16; pl. xxiiiE). Found c. 1958–60. Minerva, wearing aegis and tunic with overfold. Her right arm is raised and held a spear, and her left hand is lowered to hold the rim of a shield.

6. (Fig. 17; pl. xxivA). Found c. 1958–60. Hercules, nude apart from lion-skin draping the upper part of his body; holds a wine cup in his right hand, and a club in his left hand.

7. (Fig. 16; pl. xxivB). Found c. 1958–60. A Genius, togaed with his head partially covered, holds a patera in his right hand and a cornucopia, of which the end alone remains, in his left hand.


**OBJECTS OF STONE, OTHER THAN STATUARY (FIG. 18)**

**Whetstones**

1. From F27.

2. From F152.

3. From the 1958–60 excavations.

---

33 For a draped Jupiter holding a patera cf. R. Fleischer, *Die römischen Bronzen aus Österreich* (Mainz, 1967), 29, pl. 6, no. 9.

34 For the type cf. A. Leibundgut, *Die römischen Bronzen der Schweiz*, 2, *Avenches*, (Mainz 1976), 20f. pl. 4, no. 5, and references cited. The figurine is evidently derived from a work by Polykleitos.


37 For the type cf. Fleischer, op. cit. (note 33), 41f, pl. 20, no. 23 (although the figure is draped differently).


39 For the type cf. Fleischer, op. cit. (note 33), 115, pl. 77, no. 147.

FIG. 14. Bronze figure No. 2. (Scale 1:1)
FIG. 15. Bronze figurines, Nos. 3-4. (Scale 1:1)
FIG. 16. Bronze figurines, Nos. 5, 7. (Scale 1:1)
Other objects
4. Spindlewhorl or bangle, F50.
5. Bracelet, Kimmeridge Shale, unprovenanced.
6. Handle of stone vessel, Oolitic Limestone, F1.

Other objects of stone included many fragments of hexagonal Lias Limestone roofing-tiles, a perfect rectangle of unworked Lias Limestone 230 mm by 170 mm by 27 mm thick, ten worked flints including two blades, one Oolitic Limestone counter, and part of an Oolitic Limestone mortar.

SOIL SAMPLES

The contents of two complete votive pots, from F76, west of the temple, were examined by Justine Bayley of the Ancient Monuments laboratory. Neither pot contained any seeds. A few fragments of snail shell and occasional fragments of small bones were noted under low power microscopy.

A FRAGMENTARY CLAY STATUETTE By Frank Jenkins (FIG. 19)

From F14 (disturbed layer, see FIG. 2). This piece of moulded pottery appears to belong to a statuette of a ram which has tightly curled wool and a long tail, very similar to a more complete example which lacks the feet and the base, found at Saint-Pourcain-sur-Besbre (Allier) in central France. 41

Two moulds were used to cast the left and right sides of the animal respectively, and then the two casts were luted together. The vertical joint is clearly seen within the fragment, but has been obscured on the outside by trimming with a blade of some kind, the marks of which are on the tail of the animal. The detail of the tight curls of the wool is not so distinct as on the Saint-Pourcain example but this may be due either to inefficient moulding or abrasion when lying in the soil.

All that remains of the animal are the hind legs, the long tail and the rear end of the rectangular base on which it was mounted. Frequently, when the legs of animals were cast in the round, the bases were made separately, but in this case no attempt has been made to show the legs naturally and in consequence the base was cast with the body in one operation.

The fabric is white chalky clay which contains specks of ferrous material and minute particles of stone (quartz ?). This is consistent with manufacture either at Saint-Pourcain-sur-Besbre or at any one of the several officinae known to have existed in the Allier valley in Central Gaul.

As the industry in Central Gaul ceased production about the turn of the second to the third century, and it seems that no supplies reached Britain after that date, it is virtually certain that this statuette was made and exported to this country at a date somewhere between A.D. 110–200 and no later. This date conflicts with the date of the founding of the temple at Lamyatt Beacon, which, on the evidence of the coinage, was C. A.D. 300. The only explanation I can offer is that ex voto clay statuettes being sacrosanct had a long life, and this one may have belonged to an earlier temple and was transferred to the one where it was

FIG. 18. Objects of stone, other than statuary. (Scale 1:2)
found, or is it possible that a primitive shrine had existed on the site prior to the founding of the temple?

This is one of a very few clay statuettes which have been definitely found at temple sites in Britain, but there is indisputable proof of the use of clay statuettes of all types as ex votos at numerous temples of Romano-Celtic style on the continent.

OTHER OBJECTS OF CLAY (None illustrated)

Other objects of clay, including combed flue tiles, tegulae, imbrices and burnt daub, are listed in detail in the excavation archive.

THE POTTERY

The pottery from the 1958–60 and the 1973 excavations was classified by fabric and form within each feature, and was quantified by sherd count (the detailed statistical analysis may be consulted in the excavation records). The pottery from the Somerset County Museum collection (Acc. no. 58.A.2) and from private collections was examined but not quantified. Owing to the extensive recent disturbance to the site, no significant closed groups were obtained, and, therefore, the pottery is discussed mainly as one corpus.

*The fabrics and forms*

The majority of the pottery was of the 3rd and 4th centuries A.D., some shell-tempered wares possibly being of the Iron Age or post-Roman periods, and a small quantity being of post-medieval origin (a report on the post-medieval pottery is in the excavation records).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sherd no.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman and shell-tempered types</td>
<td>5363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. 19. Clay statuette. (Scale 1:1)
Amongst the Roman, and shell-tempered fabrics (Table 2), the BB1 and grey coarse wares represented over 90%, fine wares accounting for less than 7% of the total. Prior to extensive looting of the site, the proportion of fine wares was probably higher, for it was noted that private collections tended to include a preponderance of fine wares, particularly the more glossy New Forest and Rhenish fabrics. Votive pots are likely to have accumulated within the temple: out of only twenty-five sherds in a deposit dating from the demolition of the temple, three were of votive pots.

**TABLE 2: ROMAN AND SHELL-TEMPERED FABRICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sherd no.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BB1</td>
<td>3200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>1637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Jar</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Forest</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samian</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhenish</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell-tempered</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint-gritted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very abraded</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amongst the coarse wares (Table 3), BB1 and grey wares accounted for a little less than two thirds and one third of the total respectively. The preponderance of BB1 was less at Lamyatt Beacon than at the settlements at Catsgore and Bradley Hill, 20 km to the south-west, and considerably less if the BB1 sherds with limestone temper (below) are discounted. The source for BB1 was possibly the Poole Harbour area of Dorset and access to central Somerset was probably via Ilchester, to which Catsgore and Bradley Hill were much closer. At Lamyatt Beacon probably locally-produced grey wares were obtaining a greater share of the market.

**TABLE 3 COARSE WARES (%) AT LAMYATT BEACON, CATSGORE AND BRADLEY HILL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lamyatt Beacon</th>
<th>Catsgore (after c. 320)</th>
<th>Bradley Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BB1</td>
<td>65.12</td>
<td>87.15</td>
<td>85.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>33.31</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>8.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage jar</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell-tempered</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amongst the fine wares (Table 4), New Forest and Oxfordshire fabrics were equally dominant, in contrast to the situation closer to Ilchester where Oxfordshire fabrics were predominant. This reflects the much closer proximity and ease of access to the New Forest production centres.
TABLE 4 FINE WARES (%) AT LAMYATT BEACON, CATSGORE AND BRADLEY HILL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lamyatt Beacon</th>
<th>Catsgore (after c. 320)</th>
<th>Bradley Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Forest</td>
<td>46.51</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>17.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>45.96</td>
<td>64.68</td>
<td>71.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samian</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>23.95</td>
<td>10.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhenish</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CATALOGUE OF FABRIC TYPES AND FORMS

Black burnished ware (abbreviated to BB1)\[42\]
The forms represented at Lamyatt Beacon (Table 5) were almost entirely of the third or fourth centuries. Possibly as much as 25% of the BB1 sherds were from a source other than south Dorset, since they contained limestone fragments. Chemical analysis of 969 sherds from F20 showed that at least 25% contained limestone temper.

**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sherd nos.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jars with bead rims or slight everted rims</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jars with everted rims</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishes with straight sides</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowls with flanged rims</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaker with indented sides</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Illustrated vessels** (FIGS. 20, 21):

1–3. Jars with slight everted rims, from F20, F151, F152.
20–23. Dishes with straight sides, from F14 (20), F20 (21), F151 (22–3).

**Grey wares**
The grey wares were wheelthrown in quartz sand-tempered fabrics, but never with such quantities as were present in BB1 products. Most were probably of local origin. The difficulty in recognising differences between local grey wares has been emphasised in the study of New Forest products.\[43\] Forms represented were predominantly jars (Table 6). The large everted rim jars were most numerous, but the small votive pots also accounted for a

---


FIG. 20. Pottery, Nos. 1–23. (Scale 1:4)
FIG. 21. Pottery, Nos. 24–48. (Scale 1:4)
considerable proportion. These did not occur at all at the settlements of Catsgore and Bradley Hill.44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sherd nos.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jars with everted rims</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jars with double beaded rims</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jars with flanged rims</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jars with hooked rims</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jars, small and probably votive</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vessels</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Illustrated vessels (FIGS. 21, 22):**

26. Jar with applied cordon, as 25.
27. Jar, carinated with everted rim, as 25.
28–32. Jars with everted rims, F20 (28, 29, 32), F151 (30-1).
34–39. Jars with hooked rims, from F20 (34–7, 39) and S.C.M. 58.A.2 (38), No. 37 has combed decoration.
40–41. Jars with hooked rims and lid grooves, F20 and F58.
42–44. Jars with hooked rims, from F20 (34–7, 39) and S.C.M. 58.A.2 (38). No. 37 has combed decoration.
51. Colander, unprovenanced.
52–63. Small votive jars with everted rims, from F76 (52–3), F20 (54), F151 (56), S.C.M. 58.A.2 (57–61), 1958–60 excavation (62) and unprovenanced (63). Fragments of at least another 60 similar vessels are not illustrated.
64–66. Small votive jars with upright rims, from F20, F31 and F131. No other vessels of this form were noted.
67–71. Small votive jars with flanged rims, from F76, F20, F72, S.C.M. 58.A.2 (70–1). No other vessels of this form were noted.
72–74. Bases of small votive jars, from F27 (72) and F76 (73–4).
75. Base of small votive jar with indented sides, F31.
76. Lamp/burner fragment, oxidised red, F14.
77. Two fragments of a second lamp/burner, F14.

**Storage-jar fabric**

Used exclusively for hand-made large storage jars was a fabric which was very coarse, tempered with quartz sand and grog, varying in colour from almost black through grey to reddish-brown, possibly very local in origin.

**Illustrated vessels (FIG. 22):**

78. Jar, from F119.
79. Jar, stabbed decoration on the inside edge of the rim, from the 1958–60 excavations.

44 Leech, op. cit. (note 17).
FIG. 22. Pottery, Nos. 49–93. (Scale 1:4)
THE EXCAVATION OF A ROMANO-CELTIC TEMPLE ON LAMYATT BEACON

80. Jar, from F181.

Oxford region products
The Oxfordshire fabrics were examined and identified by Dr C.J. Young.45

Illustrated vessels (FIG. 22)
(a) White ware mortaria
82–83. Type M18, 240–300, F20 and F27.
(b) Colour-coated wares
84. Bottle, probably type C2, 300–400, F20.
88–89. Bowls, very worn and type not identifiable, F3 and F144.

New Forest products
These have been categorised according to the types and fabrics classified by Fulford (cf. fn. 43), the fabrics present at Lamyatt Beacon being 1a (98.8%) and 2a (1.2%).

Illustrated vessels (FIG. 23):
(a) Fabric 1a
93–98. Indented beakers, type 27, c. 270–400, F20, F151.
99. Globular or bag beaker, F151.
100–1. Bag beakers, F20, F58.
(b) Fabric 2a
105. Lid, type 87, 1958–60 excavations.

Other types (FIG. 23)
106. Rhenish or Lezoux, globular jar, fragments of a jar with indented sides are probably of the same vessel, F151 and unprovenanced.

Shell-tempered wares
Fifty two sherds of shell-tempered fabrics were recorded, within which vessels of differing type and date were clearly present. Nine of these sherds, eight from one vessel with grey and limestone temper added, came from the fills of Burials 143 and 144. A detailed analysis was not undertaken because of the small total sample, the difficulties of assigning most of the sherds to an Iron Age, late Roman or post-Roman date, and because of the absence of any large published groups of these periods from close to Lamyatt Beacon (the publication of the South Cadbury pottery will here be of great importance). Further west in Somerset, shell-tempered ware is rare on Romano-British sites, occurring only in the very late Roman

period. At Catsgore, c. 25,000 sherds included one shell-tempered sherd. At Bradley Hill, a total of 3,472 sherds included 17 of shell-tempered fabrics. Further study of the shell-tempered ware from the site could well be most profitable at a later date.

Illustrated vessels (FIG. 23)

110. Jar with pronounced shoulder, reduced, dense shell-temper, F1.
111. Jar, grooved sides, reduced core, oxidised exterior, F1.
112. Jar with upright, notched rim, reduced, F4.
113. Base of jar, reduced core, oxidised exterior, F4.
Base of jar, reduced, F20.
Situlate (?) jar of early Iron Age date, F71. Nos. 109–15 are handmade.
Jar, reduced core, oxidised exterior, wheelthrown, the rilling is characteristic of late Roman shell-tempered ware, 46 1958–60 excavations.

Plaster

All wall plaster fragments recovered in the excavations of 1973 were retained, almost all coming from the two annexes to the temple. No wall plaster from earlier excavations was examined. That from the 1973 excavations formed a total weight of 8.15 kg. Apart from the fragments with traces of red paint and one fragment of cream plaster, an inside corner-moulding, all were fragments of cream plaster with one smooth surface. Many fragments bore the impressions of wattling, which apparently consisted of bundles of reeds, bound at intervals with straw or grass (PL. XXIVc). No fragments bore the impressions of masonry, indicating that the upper walls of the annexes were timber-framed, resting on stone foundations.

The Glass Beads (Based on comments by Margaret Guido)

Over 100 beads came from the excavations of 1973. None were included in the collections of material from the 1958–60 excavations, but over 100 were noted in the collections made by various treasure-hunters. Since most of the beads were common late Roman types, either segmented or square-sectioned, only a small representative sample is illustrated and described (FIG. 24).

1. Segmentated beads, found immediately next to one another, both bottle-green, F6.
2. Segmentated bead, bottle-green, F57.
5. Small bead, dark blue, F124.
7. Segmentated bead, black, F20.
8. Square-sectioned bead, blunt end, bottle-green, F20.
12. Small cylinder beads, yellow/green, translucent, part of the fragmentary remains of a necklace with beads of one type strung on thin bronze wire, F129.
13. Cable bead, blue with white inlay, unprovenanced.

Other Objects of Glass By Dorothy Charlesworth

Most of the glass found in the 1973 excavations was modern in date. Of the small number of Romano-British pieces, the following are worthy of comment:

14. (FIG. 18) Part of a bangle in dark (?)black glass, F50.

46 For instance at Uley, Gloucestershire. Information from P.J. Leach.
FIG. 24. Glass beads and other objects of glass. (Scale 2:1)
A BRONZE RING WITH INTAGLIO By Martin Henig

The intaglio, from F31, is of glass imitative of nicolo, an onyx with an upper blue layer and a lower dark one, (dimensions c. 12 × 10 mm). It is set in a bronze ring with a ribbon hoop that expands towards the bezel (diameter c. 22 mm, width across bezel 14 mm), a type common in the third century. Our example has (?) engraved decoration on the shoulders (FIG. 35. No. 5).

The moulded device of the intaglio, when seen in impression, is a Cupid riding on a dolphin towards the right. Cupid holds a little whip in his right hand with which to urge his mount. Nicolo glass intaglios displaying the same subject are recorded from Farley Heath temple in Surrey, Water Newton in Huntingdonshire and Silchester in Hampshire. Another glass gem (about two centuries earlier in date) was found in the Roman fort at Waddon Hill, Dorset.

Although we cannot be sure what significance the owner of this signet attached to it, he may have regarded the device as a reference to the journey of the soul over the sea to the Islands of the Blessed.

OBJECTS OF IRON

Implementation (FIGS. 25, 26)

1–2. Ox goads, from F73 and unprovenanced.
4–8. Knives, all unprovenanced.
10. Gouge or chisel, socketed, unprovenanced.

Chains etc. (FIG. 26)

16. Possibly a long chain link, F58.

Structural fittings (FIGS. 26, 27)

21–3. Hinges, unprovenanced and F1 (23).

Nails and studs (FIG. 27)

28–9. Decorative nails or studs, unprovenanced.
30–1. Studs with opposite mounts, possibly modern, unprovenanced.

47 F. H. Marshall, Catalogue of the Finger Rings, Greek, Etruscan and Roman in the Departments of Antiquities, British Museum (London, 1907), No. 1352, and A. Furtwangler, Königliche Museen zu Berlin. Beschreiben der geschnittenen Steine (Berlin, 1896) No. 6352, with the same device as ours. Also cf. Oxoniensia, xiv (1949), 22, No. 16; fig. 5. No. 13, from Woodeaton.
FIG. 25. Objects of iron, Nos. 1–8. (Scale 1:2)
FIG. 26. Objects of iron, Nos. 9–21. (Scale 1:2)
FIG. 27. Objects of iron, Nos. 22–32. (Scale 1:2)
FIG. 28. Objects of iron, Nos. 33–40. (Scale 1:2)
FIG. 29. Objects of iron, Nos. 41–48. (Scale 1:2)
FIG. 30. Objects of iron, Nos. 49–59. (Scale 1:2)
FIG. 31. Objects of iron, Nos. 60-69. (Scale 1:2)
FIG. 32. Objects of iron, Nos. 70–74. (Scale 1:2)

*Probably votive objects* (Figs. 27–30) (some of which may have been included in 1–31 above).

32. Sceptre or elaborate spearhead, unprovenanced.
33–8. Miniature sickles, F14 (37) and unprovenanced.
39–42. Miniature axes or choppers, F20 (40, 41) and unprovenanced.
47–53. Miniature spearheads, socketed, F151 (48), F76 (49), F50 (50) and unprovenanced.
54. Miniature spearhead, fragmentary, tripartite section to blade, unprovenanced.

*Miscellaneous* (Figs. 30–32)

55. Ringheaded pin, unprovenanced.
56. Buckle, unprovenanced.
57. Purpose unknown, unprovenanced.
58. Part of a tripod base, F20.
59. Purpose unknown, unprovenanced.
60. Needle, unprovenanced.
61. Purpose unknown, unprovenanced.
62. Circular object, unprovenanced.
63. Circular disc, F20.
64. Square plate with circular boss, unprovenanced.
65. Circular plate with four attachment points, unprovenanced.
66. Wrought bar, twisted, unprovenanced.
67. Wrought bar, twisted, unprovenanced.
70. Wrought bar, twisted and notched, unprovenanced.
73. Wrought bar, twisted, with terminal, F20.
74. Terminal, possibly of a votive sceptre, unprovenanced.

THE COINS By E.M. Besly

Introduction

This section lists and discusses 1,378 coins, most of them definitely but some only presumed to have been found at Lamyatt Beacon between 1958 and 1977. Because of the exceptional nature of Lamyatt Beacon as an archaeological site, two points must be made at the outset concerning assumptions made when considering the coins from this site.

Firstly, due to the extent of unofficial diggings on the site, it is not clear from which parts of the site the majority of the coins listed below come. The exceptions are Group E (the 1973 excavation – see Table 7 and FIG. 33) and Group A (Table 7), where the systematic technique of the searcher has left characteristic traces (F47/73). It will be assumed that the excavations of 1958 and 1960 concentrated for the most part on the temple structures but for the remainder of the coins no certain provenance is known, although the gaps in FIG. 33 give an idea of the extent of disturbance prior to 1973. As a result, any conclusions drawn from the coins themselves can only be suggestions.

Secondly, it is possible that a number of coins from the private collections may not come from this site at all. The general consistency of patination between groups and the popularity of the site among local people as a prolific source of coins make it likely that the vast majority of the privately held coins do indeed come from the site: in particular, Groups A and C (Table 7) can be said with confidence to come from the site. However, there is a marked difference in the chronological distributions of the coins in Groups A, E, H and those of the remainder. While this may have an archaeological significance (see below), it may in some cases be coloured by admixture of material from other sources. In particular, Groups J and M have to be treated with some caution: these comprise a single collection formed by a local resident who subsequently moved to central Southern England where he was at the time of writing known to be an active treasure-hunter. Since this group was not examined until late 1977 (J) and 1978 (M), there is a genuine possibility of some adulteration in this case, although this adulteration is not considered likely to be on a sufficient scale to affect significantly the conclusions drawn below.

The Coins

Table 7 gives a period-by-period summary of the coins found during excavations in 1958 and 1960 (Group H) and 1973 (Group E); of seven groups acquired unofficially from the site (A, B, C, D, F, G, J, M of which J and M are separate parts of a single collection) and of two single finds (K, L). These coins are catalogued in detail in Table 8. The coins remain in private hands except for Groups E and H, which have been deposited in Taunton Castle Museum. Two coins (Nos. 503 and 822) have been presented to the National Collection.

Almost all of the coins are the commonly found types of the late-third and fourth centuries and almost all are of the lowest denominations commonly in use. While this
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Fig. 33. Distribution of coins from 1973 excavations.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD/GROUP</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K/L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durotrigan/1st cent.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd cent.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd cent.-259</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Emp, 260-70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallic Empire</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central 270-96</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Empire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 3rd cent.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular radiate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K/L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>296-317</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317-330</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330-335</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335-341</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341-348</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348-354</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364-378</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378-388</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388-402</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th cent. irreg. (not FT)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fel Temp (FH) irreg.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain/clippings</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modern</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 7**

298 43 106 11 197 85 28 387 108 2 113 1378 100.00

KEY: A, B, C, D, F, G, J, M: local collections
E: 1973 Excavation (Leech)
H: 1958 and 1960 Excavations (Bennett)
K, L: single finds

reflects the position as a whole for British non-religious sites the absence of silver coins of the later fourth century from a group of this size and the relative abundance of the low denomination *FEL TEMP REPARATIO* (Phoenix) types of A.D. 348-50 (generally rare as site finds) may both be noted; it is possible that coins of any intrinsic value were removed from deposits by temple officials.

The temple dates from the last decade of the third century, evidence for which is presented below. The numbers of late third-century coins and of those struck between A.D. 296 and 317 reinforce this dating and argue against a significantly later foundation. The coinage was reformed in 318, after which earlier issues, even those struck until 317, disappeared rapidly from circulation, perhaps due to their demonetisation. This is attested by many hoards; Bland and Carson cite a number of examples. Provided that the assumption that the bulk of the coinage arriving at a site comes from the current material applies also to a religious site, those sites founded after c. A.D. 320 might be expected to produce very few coins dating before 318. At comparable local temples, the following numbers of these coins have been found;

---

These produced temple The contemporary first period (a) suggesting Down relatively half the site. If figures, which represent only material for which both mint and date are known, are representative, the Lamyatt material is seen to be relatively weak up to c. 348 and relatively strong thereafter. The period 348–64 is strongly represented; not only is there not the dip in the regular coinage commonly found but also the FEL TEMP REPARATIO (fallen horseman) copies form the largest single group of coins from the site, as at the Brean Down temple. Arrival of coin at the site continues strongly through the Valentinianic period and down to the end of the century, with the wear on some of the Theodosian coins suggesting continued use into the early fifth century.

Numismatic evidence for post-Roman activity is confined to a small group dating to the first half of the seventeenth century. The discovery of a 1971 Half New Penny during the 1973 excavation should not, however, go unremarked, if only as a further reminder of contemporary activity on the site.

The Date of the Temple
(a) The Structures
The archaeological evidence from the 1973 excavation points to the construction of the temple and annexes as a single phase (p. 270), followed after an undefined interval by the construction of the small building to the north of the main structure. The excavation produced two securely sealed coins which may be used to date these structures. The sealed coins are:

(i) catalogue number 299, 1973 SF 148; antoninianus of Carausius, RIC 897, sealed by the floor of Building 2, F68;

(ii) catalogue number 294, 1973 SF 224; antoninianus of Carausius, RIC 364, sealed by the make up for the floor of the north annexe (annexe 1 on FIG. 4), F 90.

These coins may be dated, respectively, before 291 and to 292–3. Both are in good

condition, the earlier coin being completely unworn, the later showing very slight wear on the obverse. The fundamental reform of the currency by Diocletian in 294 and the suppression of the British Empire coinage after the reconquest in 296, together with their lack of wear, suggest that neither coin is likely to have been deposited after c. 300. A date for the structures during the period of the British Empire (287–296) is possible.

(b) The Possibility of Earlier Activity
Although the structures date to the end of the third century, the possibility of coin deposit during the period 270–90 which has left no structural traces should be considered. The principal evidence in favour of such activity is the number of coins of the period 260–74 and the unworn state of some of them. The Lamyatt material of the period 260–90 reflects the composition of many British hoards buried during the period 275–90, during which time the composition of the currency changed very little in Britain. Coins of the period 260–74 may predominate in hoards deposited as late as 296, a celebrated example being the Blackmoor hoard. The absence of wear on some of the coins struck before 275 seems to be typical as late as the mid-280’s to judge by Rome coins of Gallienus and Claudius II from the Much Wenlock hoard, although many of the coins from this hoard are corroded, enough could be examined to show that at the least about 20% of the coins of 260–70 show little or no wear in a hoard deposited c. 285. It cannot be proved that the Lamyatt material was deposited earlier than the construction of the temple; rather it would appear that it represents the first fruits of the newly-established temple around the end of the third century.

(c) Coins struck before 260
The site has produced only 20 coins struck before 260, or 1.45% of the total. The two Durotrigian coins fall within the normal area of discovery of this type but in the absence of other contemporary material their significance is uncertain. All of the other coins of the first two centuries are sestertii, dupondii and asses and all of those examined are heavily worn. Such coins formed the normal bronze currency in Britain during the third century down to c. 270 but are here likely to have been deposited during the fourth century. A parallel for the deposit of obsolete coins in a late context is found at the Brean Down temple, while the temple at Maiden Castle (built after 367) produced a worn coin of Commodus. While a clustering of the early bronze coins may be noted to the north of the temple buildings (FIG. 33), possibly the scattered remains of a single deposit, the only such coin found in situ inside the main temple building was contained in a votive pot (see below p. 310).

Archaeological Evidence from coins excavated in 1958 and 1960
The coins from the 1958 and 1960 excavations retain their original envelopes with small find and trench numbers and occasional supplementary comments. In the absence of the site notebooks, it was hoped that arrangement of the coins by trench and feature number might provide some information. Many of the coins are from topsoil or from layers described variously as collapse, destruction or tumble but two small groups may be singled out for comment here.

57 See G.C. Boon in ApSimon, op. cit. (note 52), 236–7
58 R.E.M. Wheeler, Maiden Castle, Dorset; Reports of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries of London XII (1943) 133.
The envelopes of three coins found in 1960 were marked by the excavator with asterisks; all were found in the same part of the site and are presumably of some special significance, perhaps in connection with the date of the temple. The coins (all from Trench FI – East) are of Tetricus II (Layer 3), Maximian (Layer 4) and an irregular radiate (Layer 6). Layer 3 is described as ‘tumble’ and contained 22 coins dating from c. 270 to after 388. If the above assumption is correct the other two coins (the only coins from the layers in question) give convincing support to a date c. 290 for the temple. That of Maximian, which shows a little wear, was struck at Lyons late in 286 while the irregular radiate is described by the excavator as ‘dropped by builders’ and Layer 6 as ‘yellow mortary sand’.

Nine envelopes bear information suggestive of constructional activity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench and Feature</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
<th>Date of feature</th>
<th>No. of coins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FI, West Extn., 2</td>
<td>Soli Invicto Comiti</td>
<td>‘Builder’s Infill’</td>
<td>367+</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vota (323-4)</td>
<td>‘Builder’s Infill?’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fel Temp (353-7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FII Ext. West, 3</td>
<td>Gallienus (JR)</td>
<td>‘Yellow sandy Mortar’</td>
<td>341+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoriae (341-8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIII, Central, 11</td>
<td>Constantinopolis</td>
<td></td>
<td>330+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIII, Central, 14</td>
<td>Fel Temp (phoenix)</td>
<td>‘From post hole in wall’</td>
<td>348+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI, West Extn., 4</td>
<td>Valentinian I</td>
<td>‘Yellow sandy mortary’</td>
<td>364+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valens (worn)</td>
<td>&quot; Mortar’</td>
<td>364+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evidence of FI West Extn. 2 may be discounted as it stands, since other coins from this feature are described as from ‘collapse’ and cover a wide date range. The remaining coins may once again be noted to be the only coins from their respective features. Although the evidence is slender it seems that some building activity may have taken place c. 350, while the evidence of a worn coin of Valens (admittedly tenuous) suggests that the structure may have been maintained in some form to the end of the fourth century (see also comments below on the distribution of the Theodosian coins).

Deposit and Distribution of Coins

It remains to consider what information can be extracted from the distribution of coins on the site, granted that little stratigraphical information is available. The only coins for which locations are certain are those from the 1973 excavation (Fig. 33), while those from 1958–1960 for which some evidence of layers and deposits is available cannot be located on the site plan, apart from the assumption that the 1958 and 1960 excavations concentrated on the temple structures. The coins from Group A are thought to have come from the SW quarter of the temple; the efficiency of this collector and the lack of coins found in this part of the site in 1973 tend to confirm this impression. For the remaining groups no certain provenance is known. Assuming them to be from Lamyatt, the pattern they present suggests a different part of the site from the coins of Groups A, E and H; also, therefore, away from the temple buildings. If this assumption is valid, it must be concluded that at some point the earliest deposits were removed from the temple and thrown away.

Of the votive deposits themselves, none can be identified with certainty. The following groups may, however, represent the remains of such deposits:

(i) 1973: five worn coins of the first and second centuries scattered to the north of the temple buildings (FIG. 33; discussed above).

(ii) 1973: a single worn sestertius of Faustina II found in a small votive pot within the temple (FIG. 33, see also p. 308).

(iii) 1958: Trench BII, 1: among the 32 coins from this layer were seven coins all dating from the period 317–324, all un worn and similarly patinated.

(iv) 1973: eighteen coins were discovered when a small tree was uprooted, ranging from 260/70 to a coin of 364–78; whether these formed the remains of a deposit or a random accumulation is not clear (FIG. 33, ‘H’).

(v) 1960: Trench Z III Central, 8 (described variously as a pit or posthole): this feature produced nineteen coins: one irregular radiate; one irregular Urbs Roma; ten irregular ‘fallen horseman’ and seven regular Theodosian coins.

If earlier deposits were periodically removed from the temple, it is likely that not only were coins of intrinsic value removed (the site has produced no silver coins and no early follis) but that some of the earlier coins may have been ‘recycled’ to form parts of new deposits. Deposit (v) above may illustrate this feature, consisting of one coin of a type which circulated principally c. 275–90, one imitating a type of 330–5, ten which circulated c. 354–64 and seven not struck until after 388. For votive purposes, however, such a group would have been fairly suitable, since the Theodosian issues and most of the irregular fourth-century types are of similar module and weight.

One final illustration emphasises the uncertainty surrounding so much of the numismatic evidence from this site. Although the 1958 and 1960 excavations seem to have taken place in the region of the temple structure, the coins they produced differ in one important respect: the 1958 excavation produced no coin later than 378, while that of 1960 produced 44 coins later than 378, or half the total from the site for this period. Taken with the figures from Groups A and E, this fact suggests that most of the Theodosian material is highly localised, perhaps as deposits within the temple building; in other words, the temple may have remained in active use until the end of the fourth century, in contrast to both Brean Down (no longer used as a temple) and Pagans Hill (where the coin series falls off after 378) but paralleled in the area by the temple sites of Jordon Hill and Maiden Castle. Such a conclusion must remain tentative. We can be certain that four Theodosian coins come from within the temple walls (FIG. 33) and can guess that a further 70 (Groups A and H) come from the temple itself; this cannot be proved, nor can the nature of the deposits of this material or of the latest Roman activity be determined.

Notes to Table 8

14. Presumably a sestertius: described as ‘second brass’60. No asses or dupondii of this type are recorded in RIC, BMC or Cohen.61

311. ‘Antoninianus’ with RSR signature and die-axis . Die axis on RSR coins (which are principally silver denarii) vary considerably. The BM possesses a small number of antonini with the RSR signature: it cannot be said with certainty whether these coins are regular products or imitations.

503. Lyons follis listed as RIC VII, 40; the obverse bust is a cross between Bruun’s (RIC VII) types G1 (dr.) and G2 (cuir.). To judge by the shape of the drapery on

the left shoulder, a bust with spear and shield may have been intended but altered as a result of an engraving error.

822. *FEL TEMP REPARATIO* (Phoenix on pyre) of Constans, minted at Lyons, 348–50, mintmark PLG*. Not in LRBC (ii);62 there is a specimen in the Ashmolean Museum from the same pair of dies.

**Abbreviations used in Table 8**

Denominations:  
- S – sestertius;  
- Dp – dupondius;  
- Den – denarius;  
- Ant – antoninianus;  
- Quin – quinarius.

Emperors/obverses (4th cent.)

| C | Constante | CsG | Constantius Gallus |
| L | Licinius | V | Valentinian |
| Cr | Crispus | Vn | Valens |
| Cs | Constantius | G | Gratian |
| Cn | Constans | T | Theodosius |
| Mag | Magnentius | A | Arcadius |
| Dec | Decentius | H | Honorius |
| UR | Urbs Roma | Cp | Constantinopolis |

Mints:  
- LON – London;  
- AM – Amiens;  
- TR – Trier;  
- LY – Lyons;  
- ARL – Arles;  
- AQ – Aquileia;  
- SIS – Siscia;  
- TIC – Ticinum;  
- THESS – Thessalonica;  
- NIC – Nicomedia;  
- HER – Heraclea.  
- U – Uncertain mint.

**TABLE 8**

A: COINS STRUCK BEFORE 296

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>OBVERSE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DENOMINATION</th>
<th>REFERENCE, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Durotriges</td>
<td>1st c. A.D.</td>
<td>Stater</td>
<td>Mack 318: base AR (1); AE (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Irregular Claudio</td>
<td>41+</td>
<td>'As'</td>
<td>– (heavily worn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VESPASIAN</td>
<td>69-79</td>
<td>Dp</td>
<td>RIC 567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>HADRIAN</td>
<td>117-38</td>
<td>As; S</td>
<td>834; illeg. sest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>ANTONINUS PIUS</td>
<td>138-61</td>
<td>Dp; S</td>
<td>993; illeg. sest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>FAUSTINA I</td>
<td>138-61</td>
<td>S (2)</td>
<td>1143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>MARCUS AURELIUS</td>
<td>161-80</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>836; cf. 1227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>FAUSTINA II</td>
<td>161-80</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M.A. 1716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LUCIUS VERUS</td>
<td>161-9</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M.A. 1461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>DIVUS M.AURELIUS</td>
<td>180-5</td>
<td>As/Dp</td>
<td>types as Commodus 659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Uncertain Empress</td>
<td>2nd cent.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>2nd/3rd c.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>illeg., punch-marks in form of a square, obv. + rev.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 17     | Caracalla | 3rd cent. | 'Den' | Plated forgery of RIC 240 | 1 |
| 18     | GORDIAN III | 238-44 | As | 303b | 1 |
| 19     | GALLIENUS (JR) | 253-60 | Ant | JR 44 | 1 |
| 20     | SALONINA (JR) | 253-60 | Ant | JR 29 | 1 |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>REVERSE TYPE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MINT</th>
<th>OBERVERSE TYPE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56-8</td>
<td>SALONINA (SR)</td>
<td>260-8</td>
<td>Ant</td>
<td></td>
<td>13, 31; uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-110</td>
<td>DIVUS CLAUDIUS</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>Ant</td>
<td></td>
<td>257(2), 259(4), 260, 261(3), 263(3), 266(2), 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111-17</td>
<td>QUINTILIUS</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>Ant</td>
<td></td>
<td>9(2), 19, 20, 29, 31, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118-21</td>
<td>POSTUMUS</td>
<td>260-9</td>
<td>Ant</td>
<td></td>
<td>67, 74, 80, 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>MARSIUS</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>Ant</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123-58</td>
<td>VICTORINUS</td>
<td>269-71</td>
<td>Ant</td>
<td>57, cf. 57, 69, cf. 59, 61(3), 67(2), 71, cf. 74, 78(3), 109, 114(8), 116, 117, 118(9), 122, 124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159-237</td>
<td>TETRICUS I</td>
<td>271-4</td>
<td>Ant</td>
<td></td>
<td>56(3), 59, 69(3), 76, cf. 76, 80(5), 86(2), cf. 86(2), 87(2), 88(11), 90(7), 100(6), cf. 100(6), cf. 100(4), 106, cf. 106, 126(3), 127, 132(2), 136(4), 140, 141(9), cf. 141, 145, 146(2), 148; uncertain Spes; uncertain (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238-80</td>
<td>TETRICUS II</td>
<td>271-4</td>
<td>Ant</td>
<td></td>
<td>248(2), cf. 248, 255, 258, 259(2), 260(5), 267, 270(16), 272(4), cf. 272; uncertain Spes; Spes rev. brockage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281-2</td>
<td>AURELIAN</td>
<td>270-5</td>
<td>Den; Ant</td>
<td>72; 149</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>TACITUS</td>
<td>275-6</td>
<td>Ant</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>FLORIAN</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>Ant</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>PROBUS</td>
<td>276-82</td>
<td>Ant</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>DIOCLETIAN</td>
<td>284-305</td>
<td>Ant</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>MAXIMIAN</td>
<td>284-305</td>
<td>Ant</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288-302</td>
<td>CARAUSUS</td>
<td>286-7-93</td>
<td>Ant</td>
<td></td>
<td>58, 98 (2 – one L –/–ML), 101, cf. 209 (obv. IMPCARAVSVSAVG), 339, 364, 475, 880(2), 883, 897, 916, cf. 1037, 1038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>MAXIMIN (Car.)</td>
<td>c. 292-3</td>
<td>Ant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Car., Dio. &amp; Max. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304-10</td>
<td>ALECTUS</td>
<td>293-6</td>
<td>Ant; Quin</td>
<td>28, 86, 55(4), 125</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311-16</td>
<td>Irregular Carausius</td>
<td>'Ant'</td>
<td></td>
<td>Felicitas (SR) – cf. 607, cf. 982, Fortuna, Pax (2), uncertain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317-24</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>late 3rd c.</td>
<td>Ant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gallic? (3); other (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325-7</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>3rd/4th c.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328-480</td>
<td>Irregular Radiate Gallienus</td>
<td>c. 270-90</td>
<td>'Ant'</td>
<td></td>
<td>Animal, Hilaritas, Pax, Salus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gallienus Claudio II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ceres, Fortuna, Providentia (2-die duplicate), uncertain (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divo Claudio Quintillus Postumus Victorinus Tetricus I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Altar (4), Eagle (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tetricus II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Providentia (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertain ob.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oriens (?), uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Altar, Invictus (2), Jupiter (2), Pax (2), Virtus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ceres (2), Comes, Fides Miliutum, Hilaritas (3), Laetitia (4), Pax (8), Salus (2), Sol, Spes (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria (2), uncertain (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pax (4), Pietas implementus (2), Salus (2), Spes, uncertain (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aeteritas, Fortuna, Laetitia (2), Pax (5), Pietas implementus, Spes (3), Virtus, uncertain (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blank, diam. 10 mm x thickness 2 mm for irreg. radiate?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## B: The Fourth Century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Obverse Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>GENIO POPVL ROMANI</td>
<td>305-7</td>
<td>LON</td>
<td>MAXIMINUS II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>482</td>
<td>HERCVL CONSERVATORI</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>LON</td>
<td>MAXIMIN I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483-6</td>
<td>GENIO POP ROM</td>
<td>307-12</td>
<td>LON</td>
<td>C I; MAXIMINUS II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487-8</td>
<td>PRINCIPI IVVENTVIS</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>L I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489-91</td>
<td>SOLI INVICTO</td>
<td>310-11</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>C I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>MARTI CONSERVATORI</td>
<td>314-5</td>
<td>LON</td>
<td>C I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>IOVI CONSERVATORI</td>
<td>313-5</td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>C I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494-509</td>
<td>SOLI INVICTO COMITI</td>
<td>310-17</td>
<td>LON</td>
<td>C I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LY</td>
<td>C I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510-17</td>
<td>VICTORIAE LAETAE PRINC PERP</td>
<td>318-20</td>
<td>LON</td>
<td>C I(3); C II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518-9</td>
<td>Irregular Victoriae</td>
<td></td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>C I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520-1</td>
<td>VIRTVS EXERCIT</td>
<td>320-3</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>L I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Irregular Virtus Exercit</td>
<td></td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>L I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523-37</td>
<td>BEATA TRANQVILLITAS</td>
<td>321-4</td>
<td>LY</td>
<td>C I; Cr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>C I(5); C II; Cr(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538-42</td>
<td>Irregular Altar</td>
<td></td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>LON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>SARMATIA DEVICTA</td>
<td>323-4</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>C I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>VOT XX/DN CONSTANTINI AVG</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>C I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545-51</td>
<td>VOT X/CAESARVM NOSTRORVM</td>
<td>321-4</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>C II(3); Cr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>C II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>C II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>Irregular VOT V/wreath</td>
<td></td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>C I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>PROVIDENTIAE AVGG</td>
<td>324-5</td>
<td>LON</td>
<td>C I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554-7</td>
<td>PROVIDENTIAE CAESS</td>
<td>324-50</td>
<td>LON</td>
<td>C II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Cs III(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Cs II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>C I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558-9</td>
<td>VIRTVS AVGG</td>
<td>325-6</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>C I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>SALVS REIPVBLCÆ</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>FAUSTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>SECVRITAS REIPVBLCÆ</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>HELENA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562-92</td>
<td>GLORIA EXERCITVS (2 std.)</td>
<td>330-5</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>C I(6); C II(4); Cs II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LON</td>
<td>C I(2); C II(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>C II; Cs II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>Cs II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NIC</td>
<td>C I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>C I; C II(2); (?)4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593-600</td>
<td>Irregular Gloria Exercitus (2 standard)</td>
<td>330+</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>UR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-10</td>
<td>Wolf and twins</td>
<td>330-5</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>UR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>UR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROME</td>
<td>UR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>UR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611-22</td>
<td>Irregular wolf and twins</td>
<td>330+</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>C I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>‘UR’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623-40</td>
<td>Victory on Prow</td>
<td>330-5</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Cp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>REVERSE TYPE</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>MINT</td>
<td>OBVERSE TYPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641–58</td>
<td>Irregular victory on prow</td>
<td>330+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>659–76</td>
<td>GLORIA EXERCITVS (1 std.)</td>
<td>335–7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>677–96</td>
<td>GLORIA EXERCITVS (1 std.)</td>
<td>337–41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>697–710</td>
<td>Irregular Gloria Exercitus (1 standard)</td>
<td>335+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711–15</td>
<td>PAX PVBICA</td>
<td>337–41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716–23</td>
<td>PIETAS ROMANA</td>
<td>337–41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724–5</td>
<td>Quadriga</td>
<td>337–41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726–32</td>
<td>GLORIA EXERCITVS (1 std.)</td>
<td>335–41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733–97</td>
<td>VICTORIAEAVGGQNN</td>
<td>341–8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>798–805</td>
<td>Irregular victoriae</td>
<td>341+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806–35</td>
<td>FEL TEMP REPARATIO Galley</td>
<td>348–50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>836</td>
<td>Irregular Fel Temp Galley</td>
<td>348+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>837</td>
<td>FELICITAS REIPVBICA</td>
<td>351–3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>838</td>
<td>Irregular Felicitas</td>
<td>351–3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>839–43</td>
<td>VICTORIAEAVGGQNN</td>
<td>351–3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>844–56</td>
<td>Irregular victoriae</td>
<td>351+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>857–8</td>
<td>SALVSDNNAVGETCAE(S)</td>
<td>351–3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>859</td>
<td>Irregular Salus</td>
<td>351+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td>FEL TEMP REPARATIO Fallen horseman</td>
<td>348–60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>861–88</td>
<td></td>
<td>353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>889–1081</td>
<td>Irregular Fel Temp (Fallen horseman)</td>
<td>c.354–7</td>
<td></td>
<td>'Cs II' (193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>REVERSE TYPE</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>MINT</td>
<td>OBVERSE TYPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1082–3</td>
<td>SPES REIPVBLICE</td>
<td>355–61</td>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>Cs II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1084</td>
<td>VOT/X/MVLT/XX</td>
<td>361–3</td>
<td>THES</td>
<td>Cs II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JULIAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1087–1141</td>
<td>GLORIA ROMANORVM</td>
<td>364–78</td>
<td>LY</td>
<td>V I (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>V I(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vn(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>V I; Vn(2); G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>V I(6); Vn(3); G(2); V II; ?(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1142–1225</td>
<td>SECVRITAS REIPVBLICAE</td>
<td>364–78</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Vn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LY</td>
<td>Vn(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>V I(3); Vn(13); ?; G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROME</td>
<td>V I; Vn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>V I; Vn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>V I(7); ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>V I(5); Vn(13); G; V II; ?(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1226–41</td>
<td>GLORIA NOVI SAECVLI</td>
<td>367–78</td>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>F (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1242–3</td>
<td>Uncertain reverse</td>
<td>364–78</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>?(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1244–5</td>
<td>VOT/X/MVLT/XX</td>
<td>379–82</td>
<td>LY</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1246–9</td>
<td>SPES ROMANORVM</td>
<td>387–8</td>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>MAXIMUS (2); VICTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>MAXIMUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>Irregular Reparatio Repub</td>
<td>378+</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1251</td>
<td>VICTORIA AVGGG</td>
<td>388–402</td>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>V I(2); A(2); ?(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A(4); ?(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1295–1320</td>
<td>SALVS REIPVBLICAE</td>
<td>388–402</td>
<td>ARL</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1321</td>
<td>SPES ROMANORVM</td>
<td>392–4</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322</td>
<td>Obverse brockage</td>
<td>388–402</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1323–32</td>
<td>Uncertain reverse</td>
<td>388–402</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1333</td>
<td>Irregular Salus</td>
<td>388+</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1334–65</td>
<td>Irregular, uncertain types</td>
<td>4th c.</td>
<td>4th c.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366–73</td>
<td>Clippings, fragments</td>
<td>388+</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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C: MODERN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>COUNTRY/AUTHORITY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DENOMINATION. REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1374</td>
<td>NÜRNBERG, Hans Krauwinkel</td>
<td>c. 1580–1610</td>
<td>Rechenpfennig (jetton), Neumann 32233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375</td>
<td>UNITED KINGDOM, James I</td>
<td>1603–25</td>
<td>Lennox farthing (1614–25), Peck 63 (same dies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376</td>
<td>UNITED KINGDOM, Charles I</td>
<td>1625–49</td>
<td>Richmond farthing type 1A (c. 1625–34; altered obv. die of James I Lennox farthing), Peck 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377</td>
<td>UNITED KINGDOM, George III(?)</td>
<td>(1760–1820)</td>
<td>farthing (heavily worn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378</td>
<td>UNITED KINGDOM, Elizabeth II</td>
<td>1952–</td>
<td>½ New Penny, 1971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE BROOCHES By S.A. Butcher (FIG. 34) (Report last revised 1981)**

Several of the objects were not available for study and have been described from drawings. The metal analyses of the others have been carried out by Justine Bayley, A M Laboratory.

**Bow brooches**

1. Bronze. Surviving length 60 mm. Unprovenanced. A strip-bow brooch folded twice, possibly to form a finger-ring. Sufficient of the head-plate remains to show that it was similar to some hinged brooches from Hod Hill.\(^6^4\) The type belongs to the earlier part of the first century A.D.

2. Bronze. Length 53 mm. F14. A T-shaped brooch with long narrow head-tube, in which the pin was hinged. Its characteristics are common to many brooches found in south-western Britain (and rarely elsewhere). A generally similar brooch was found in a context of A.D. 55–90 at Camerton\(^6^5\) and a date in the later first century A.D. is likely.

3. (Drawing only seen). Length 75 mm plus headloop. Unprovenanced. This belongs to a type of brooch found almost exclusively in south-western Britain. The closest parallel is from Catsgore.\(^6^6\) None are from closely dated contexts but a late second-century date is suggested. Some are from religious sites (Cold Kitchen Hill, Jordan Hill) and the diagonal cross motif occurs on several (Cold Kitchen, Catsgore, Chew Valley, and on a related brooch from Cirencester).

**Penannular brooches**

4, 5. Unprovenanced. Two similar brooches, both with the terminals turned back over the ring; those of No. 4 have an incised diagonal cross as decoration (cf. No. 3 above). The general type occurs in first-century contexts (eg. Bagendon, Camulodunum and Hod Hill) but is not closely datable.

**Five brooches in the shape of a horse and rider (all unprovenanced)**

6–10. Of the brooches discussed here only No. 9 was available for inspection; XRF analysis by Justine Bayley showed that it was made from a heavily leaded bronze and that the surface was tinned. All the brooches seem to have had the pin sprung on a single lug at the back.

Numbers 7, 9 and 10 belong to a standard type. The rider is a squat figure with head thrown back. No legs are indicated and the triangular shape of the body, which has patches of enamel (red on No. 7, blue on Nos. 9 and 10) probably indicates that he is wearing a short cloak. The head is disproportionately large yet hardly rises above that of the horse; the face

---


\(^{6^5}\) W.J. Wedlake, *Excavations at Camerton, Somerset* (Camerton Excavation Club 1958), No. 43, fig. 53.

\(^{6^6}\) R.H. Leech, *Excavations at Catsgore, 1970–1973* (Bristol, 1982), where the type is discussed 105, fig. 76, No. 176.
is shown in profile with slight projections for nose and chin and a dot to indicate the eye. The high crested outline of the top of the head seems to represent hair *en brosse* rather than a helmet or cap. There is no indication of a weapon or a shield. The horse is shown in a prancing attitude with hind legs higher than the front; its head is up and there is no suggestion of a bridle; the nose is curiously pointed and the mouth is open. The mane forms a crest similar to the rider’s hair. The tail is raised and the legs are very short. There is a long curved cell of enamel running from the flank to the hindquarter which is red at the front and blue at the back on No. 7 and all red on No. 10; only some blue remains on No. 9, at the front. There is also a roundish patch of enamel on the chest of each horse. These patches of enamel may be simply abstract colour decoration or they may be the vestiges of harness or trappings.

It may seem rash to analyse the features of such a poorly executed object in detail but they can be seen to be deliberate when they occur on a better-made prototype: eg. a brooch of unknown provenance in the British Museum (1915-12-8-119) and another from Corbridge.67 In these brooches the general outline is exactly the same, there is some moulding of the figures and the engraving on the rider’s head is seen to represent hair. The same patches of enamel occur and there is a suggestion of reins in a bar crossing the front enamel field. It is clear that no weapon or shield was intended.

Several brooches virtually identical with Nos. 7 and 9 have been found in southern England, where they occur in two main groups: in Wessex and East Anglia, with outliers at Woodeaton,68 Nornour, Isles of Scilly69 and Hayling Island, Hampshire (shown to me by Mr G. Soffe). Of the Wessex group, one was found ten miles from Lamyatt at Cold Kitchen Hill, Brixton Deverill, Wiltshire70 and another on the Roman road at Woodyates, Dorset.71 The rest were found within a few miles of each other on the Norfolk-Suffolk border: at Brettenham,72 Undley73 and at Hockwold where six were found on a site which had produced a group of ritual crowns.74 Thus twelve of the seventeen known examples come from sites with pagan religious associations: Lamyatt, Cold Kitchen, Woodeaton, Hayling Island, Hockwold and, probably, Nornour. None of the others is so well dated as Lamyatt although one of the Hockwold brooches was in a fourth-century deposit; the other sites all have fourth-century material but also much that is earlier. (Above, p. 39).

Brooch No. 6 has all the characteristics of the standard type but is larger and the outline, though close, is not identical. The rider’s head is even more out of proportion and the horse’s mouth even wider open. The enamelled cells are similar and have the same colours: red on the rider’s body, blue on the horse’s chest; the long bar is red at the front and blue behind.

Brooch No. 8 is an extremely crude version of the same figure. The outline is badly distorted but the notches for hair and mane survive and have spread on to the tail where they run in quite the wrong direction, showing that their purpose was not recognised. The horse is still distinguishable but the rider has become a meaningless knob and the dot for his eye has slipped. A groove in the flank follows the line of the long bar of enamel on the others.

67 F. Haverfield, *Arch. Ael.* 3 viii (1911), 186, fig. 27.
71 British Museum, *Guide to the Antiquities of Roman Britain* (London, 1958), No. 41, fig. 11.
72 R.R. Clarke, *Norfolk Archaeology* xxvi (1938), 26, fig. 2 9.
73 Cambridge University Museum.
74 S.A. Butcher, ‘Enamels from Roman Britain’ in Apted, Gilyard Beer and Saunders, *Ancient Monuments and their Interpretation* (1977), 54, fig. 7. 11.
FIG. 34. Brooches, Nos. 1–10. (Scale 1:1)
It is clear that Brooches 6 and 8 are copies of the main type: so poor in the case of No. 8 that it could only have had a symbolic value, which reinforces the suggestion that all these brooches were made for visitors to a cult centre: intended either as votives or as souvenirs.

It has been shown that the brooches of this particular sub-type cluster quite significantly in southern Britain, but the prototypes are more widely distributed and there are continental examples to which these are probably related. One from Besançon\(^75\) has the relative proportions of horse and rider more correct, a bridle is clearly shown and the horse has its head down in a docile attitude. Its body is decorated with spots of enamel suggestive of a piebald, although similar spots occur on other animal brooches. There is a non-enamelled type where again the bridle is emphasised and the horse and rider are moving sedately rather than in the flamboyant style of the British examples. One of these is from the votive deposit at the Pyrmont spring\(^76\) and another from Osterburken.\(^77\)

None of the parallels helps to identify the horseman. The general type is of course well-known from the period but the attributes of each classical personage are clear and our figure does not possess them. The major Roman sculptures usually portray an armed horseman; he is either in combat or has already vanquished his antagonist who lies prostrate below, and he may personify the victorious emperor or the army, or if there are two noble horsemen they represent the Dioscuri. Minor sculpture and provincial figurines in bronze or clay tend to follow these models, although they may have a more local reference, such as the Thracian Rider-god. There are two well-defined mounted cult-figures which are local to north-west Europe in the Roman period: the horse-goddess Epona and the ‘Brigstock’ type of warrior.\(^78\) The essential difference between these and the figure on the Lamyatt brooches is that he is not armed. Nevertheless, our figure has clear characteristics and, as already suggested by Anne Ross\(^79\) ‘some legend clearly underlies this graphic representation.’

**Religious significance of the brooches?**

There seems little doubt that the horseman brooches were associated with the temple cult. The others are less clearly connected but brooches of types in general ‘secular’ use seem to have been used as votives.\(^80\) The early date of some of the Lamyatt brooches may be explained either by the presence of an earlier shrine nearby or by survival in use. Brooches are often found in much later contexts than their date of manufacture, and if these had acquired some ‘holy’ association they might well have been cherished. The presence of the diagonal cross on two of them may be significant, although it is also found on brooches from secular contexts.

**OTHER OBJECTS OF BRONZE** By R.H. Leech (FIGS. 35–7)

**Pre-Roman**

1. Cast bronze, part of a socketed axe, F3.

**Bracelets**

2. Bracelet, flat section, F158.
3. Bracelet, flat section, unprovenanced.
4. Bracelet, flattened fragment, two twisted strips, unprovenanced.

---


\(^76\) R. Ludwig, *Jahrbücher des Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden im Rheinlande* xxxviii (1865), Taf 1, 5.


\(^80\) Cf. temple sites at Uley, Thistleton and Hayling Island, Butcher, forthcoming in site reports.
FIG. 35. Other objects of bronze, Nos. 1–10.
Rings

Toilet articles
9. (Not illustrated). A holder for toilet implements in the form of a recumbent lion, almost identical to the one from Wroxeter.\textsuperscript{81} Unprovenanced, S.C.M.58.A.2.
10. Nail cleaner, unprovenanced.

Pins and needles
11. Pin, the head is decorated with transverse mouldings, unprovenanced.
12. Pin, head broken, unprovenanced.

Spoons
14. Spoon, part of the bowl only, possibly a Germanic type,\textsuperscript{82} unprovenanced.
15. Spoon, bowl and part of handle, a typical R.B. type, unprovenanced.

Items possibly of military equipment
16. Bronze plate, incised zoomorphic representation of a running animal, possibly a dog, unprovenanced. Probably part of a Type 13 buckle.\textsuperscript{83}
17. Oval stud with a square pin, unprovenanced. Similar types, with two pins have come from military contexts.\textsuperscript{84}

Votive objects
20. Five sided plaque, repoussé decoration, possibly part of a votive crown, F14.
21. Model shield, pierced with two holes, unprovenanced.
22. Possibly part of a votive letter, unprovenanced.
23. A cast fragment, part of a larger plaque with repoussé decoration of Celtic form, F1.

Miscellaneous objects
26. Terminal of a larger object, similar to one from Fishbourne, unprovenanced.\textsuperscript{85}
27. Split pin and ring, unprovenanced.
28. Curved and pierced plate, unprovenanced.

\textsuperscript{81} The reference to the Wroxeter report is from the S.C.17. catalogue; the reference is clearly to J.P. Bushe-Fox, \textit{Second Report on the Excavations on the Site of the Roman Town at Wroxeter, Shropshire 1913} (1914), fig. 5, no. 19.
\textsuperscript{82} Wheeler, op. cit. (note 16), fig. 19, No. 19.
\textsuperscript{84} V.J. Oldenstein, \textit{Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission} livii (1972), 188–90.
FIG. 36. Other objects of bronze, Nos. 11–24. (Scale 1:1)
FIG. 37. Other objects of bronze, Nos. 25–28; and tin, No. 30. (Scale 1:1)

FIG. 38. Objects of bone. (Scale 1:1)
TIN (FIG. 37)

29. Tinned bronze or silver disc (could not be retained for analysis), repoussé decoration, unprovenanced.

OBJECTS OF BONE (FIG. 38)

Counter

1. Concave upper surface with one incised dot, unprovenanced.

Pins

2. Pin with flat head and collar, F14.
3. Pin with cone-shaped head and collar, unprovenanced.
7. Pin with transverse mouldings on head, unprovenanced.
15. Pin with flat head, unprovenanced.

Handle

16. (Not illustrated). Fragment of handle, unprovenanced, S.C.M.58.A.2,

THE ANIMAL BONE By R.F. Everton.

It would be inappropriate to present a formal bone report on this material, derived as it is mainly from disturbed areas. Also, the amount submitted for examination was relatively small.

The animals identified are those commonly encountered in a Romano-British context, namely Sheep,86 Cattle, Pig, with very little Horse, Rabbit, Hare and Chicken. Red deer was represented mainly by antler fragments, Roe deer by one antler fragment, one phalanx and a fragment of scapula. There was a large number of human bone fragments, derived from the disturbed burials but it was impossible to associate any of them with the burials. Oyster shells, some 50 valves in all, were relatively common in each context.

There was a general scatter of anatomical elements in each of the three main species of animal, which would favour their being food residues.

Butchery procedures were not common,87 and were:-

(1) Ox. Femoral Head: chopped off transversely.88
(2) Sheep. Young adult: Femoral head and great trochanter chopped off.
(3) Sheep. Pelvis: Ilium chopped off obliquely.
(4) Sheep. Humerus: Distal end chopped off transversely.
(5) Sheep. Tibia; Ends chopped off transversly.
(6) Sheep. Skull: Chopped in sagittal plane.89
(7) Sheep. Scapula: Knife cut marks about the neck. Most likely to have been produced by the carver of the meat.

86. Goat was not identified, see J. Boessenck and E. Higgs (eds.), Science in Archaeology Vol. 2 (1969), 311–338.
89. ibid., 53.
(8) Ox. Talus: Knife cuts on both sides – were most likely to be the result of skinning process.

No Pig bone showed any knife cuts or chop-marks but a large number of sharp edged fragments were derived from ox-sized longbones and appear to have been produced deliberately.

The estimation of minimum numbers and carcass weights was not attempted.

**Age of Animals.**

Sheep ranged in age from 6 months to three years: 65% were younger than 2½ years.

Cattle age extended from perinatal to mature: 80% were over 2 years of age and 40% were adult/mature.

The age of pigs varied from perinatal (2-9%) to over 3 years: 91-1% were older than 18 months.

These age ranges appear to confirm the hypothesis that the bones were food residues and the absence of perinatal lambs would indicate that sheep were not bred on or near the site.

**Red Deer**

Red deer were represented almost entirely by antler fragments, which were apparently deliberately buried in the cemetery in close proximity to the inhumations.

In those antlers possessing a base, there was no evidence of attached skull fragments. In fact, the antler had been cast in all cases, showing that deer had not been deliberately killed, born out by the almost complete lack of other anatomical elements.

No antler was complete. Some of the antler burials were merely collections of fragments which did not necessarily conjoin. Circumference of the beam, just above the burr (Table 9) shows these deer to be of small to medium size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Circumference of Beam above Burr</th>
<th>Circumference of Burr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB. F154</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB. F154c</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box S (1)</td>
<td>178*</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMB. 1957</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various, windmill Hill (92)</td>
<td>115–228</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Circumference of this Beam was taken midway between Burr and Brow Tine.

**Conclusions**

The relatively small quantity of bone, and its character suggest residues of food brought to the site, and not the remains of sacrificial animals as at the Romano-British Temple at Uley where large numbers of goat bones were excavated. Venison did not appear to be part of

---

80 I. Silver in Brothwell and Higgs, op. cit. (note 86), 282–322.
the diet but Red deer antlers appeared to have been deliberately buried after some, as yet undetermined use.

THE HUMAN BURIALS By R.F. Everton

There were no complete skeletons. All the bones were fragmentary and none of the skulls was in a condition to warrant any attempt at reconstruction but some of the long bones were reconstructed.

Methods
The criteria for age and sex, were those advocated by Genoves,94 and Brothwell.95 The regression formula of Trotter and Gleser,96 was used to estimate stature, and in one case, where only incomplete long bones had survived, Steele and Mckern’s method,97 was applied to estimate max. long bone length.

Sex
Ten females were positively identified and one infant of between one and two years was probably female.98 Only one male was definitely identified and there were two probables. In two burials, there was insufficient evidence, one a ten-year old child and the other an ‘adult’.

Age.
Female age ranged from over 45 years to 17–25 years (three burials), an infant burial of between one to two years was probably female. The average age was 32 yrs, excluding the infant and those ‘adults’ bones whose epiphyses had fused but had no specific evidence of age. Only one male skeleton could be aged, F165, to about 40 to 50 years, the other two, probable males were ‘adult’ and could not be used in the determination of the average. Taking the average male age as 40 to 50 may well be grossly inaccurate.

Stature.
Male stature varied from 1·842m (6’ 6½”), to 1·770 m (5’ 8½”), with a mean of 1·799 m (5’ 11¼”), All the males were tall and slender with gracile hands and feet. Female stature ranged from 1·780 m (6’ 1¾”), a very tall woman, to 1·530 m (5’ 0½”), with a mean of 1·625 m (5’ 4”), which is still quite tall.

General Pathology
There was no evidence of ante-mortem injury. Vertebral Osteo-arthritis was noted in only three skeletons,99 one a probable male and the other two females. In all of these, the condition was only of moderate severity. The male, F165 had Osteo-arthritis of the right first metatarso-phalangeal joint (bunion). Chronic suppurative Otitis-media was noted in

TABLE 10. THE BURIALS AT LAMYATT BEACON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Stature Metres</th>
<th>Pathology</th>
<th>Teeth</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F25</td>
<td>Fragmentary Incomplete</td>
<td>“Adult”</td>
<td>?Male</td>
<td>1·786 Ti*</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No Teeth</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F26</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Lumbar Arthrosis</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Very few bones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F26</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>?Male</td>
<td>1·770 H</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Frag. extra left humerus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F141</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>25–30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1·780 F+Ti+H</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No caries some Calculus</td>
<td>Enamel Dysplasia. Tall, slender, square chin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F142</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>17–20</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1·571 F</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No Caries No Calculus</td>
<td>2 foetal femora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F143</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>45+</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No Teeth</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F144</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>45+</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No Teeth</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F145</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>17–25+</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1·664 F+Ti+H</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>One abscess No Caries</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F147</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Suppurative Otitis Media</td>
<td>Normal dent' for age</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F159</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>17–18</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1·583 F</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Few lower teeth only</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F165</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>45–50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1·842 F+Ti</td>
<td>O/A 1st MT/P Joint</td>
<td>5 teeth lost AM. 4PM</td>
<td>Very tall slender man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F160</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>35–45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1·638 H</td>
<td>Vertical Arthrosis</td>
<td>Retained lower left 2nd dec. molar. Bifid roots canine</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMB1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>“Adult”</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No Teeth</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMB2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>“Adult”</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMB3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>17–25+</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1·530 F+Ti</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No Teeth</td>
<td>Two boxes combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cmb Inf.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>?Female</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H = Humerus  F = Femur  Ti = Tibia

* Maximum tibial length by Steel and McKernis method.

the fragmentary temporal bone of the ten-year-old. Most of the mastoid cells had been destroyed and the bone surrounding the external meatus had also been eroded. This suggests a Cholesteatoma of some large size. Chronic Otitis media could have lead to the child’s death by spreading to the surrounding soft tissues and possibly by the production of a cerebral abcess, although, due to the fragmentary nature of the skull, there is no confirmation of this.

100 W. McKenzie and D. Brothwell in Brothwell and Sandison, op. cit. (note 99).
Skeletal and Cranial Variations
Due to the fragmentary nature of the skulls and bones, and the incomplete skeletons, comparison and correlation of these variations was impossible.

The Teeth
Half the burials had no surviving jaws, of the remainder, caries was uncommon and only one abscess was noted. There was only moderate calculus and very little periodontal disease, in fact, there was a surprisingly high degree of oral hygiene. F496, a female, had a retained left lower deciduous second molar, and the roots of the lower canine were bifid.101 In only one burial was enamel dysplasia found.

Conclusions
The sex ratio of eleven females to one male is very significant and remains so even when the two putative males are included. The average stature of these people, male 1·799 (5' 11") and female, 1·628 m (5' 4"), is greater than those of Modern British males, 1·676 m (5' 6"), and females, 1·575 m (5' 2"),102 and must also be highly significant. In spite of the advanced age of some of these people, there are only three cases of mild vertebral osteo-arthritis, and this comparative absence of spinal arthritis points to a non-arduous life style.
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A. Lamyatt Beacon. The temple as excavated in 1973, looking south. (p. 262).

A. Lamyatt Beacon Sunken room to south of temple, as excavated c. 1958–60, looking north, scale in feet. (p. 264).

B. Lamyatt Beacon, Annexe I, roofing slates stacked against west wall, scale in feet. (p. 264).
A. Lamyatt Beacon. Building 2, Pit F130 sectioned. (p. 268).


A. Lamyatt Beacon. Stone Statuary No. 2. (p. 274).

B. Lamyatt Beacon. Stone Statuary No. 3. (p. 276).


D. Lamyatt Beacon. Stone Statuary No. 5. (p. 276).
PLATE XXII


C. Lamyatt Beacon. Wall plaster from F90, with impressions of wattles of tied reeds. (p. 293).