Beyond the cave: the Southern Lazio Field Project

The Southern Lazio Field Project has taken its first steps in summer 2014. This collaborative research project involving the Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici del Lazio, Durham University and ‘Tor Vergata’ University in Rome aims to reassess settlement in the Apennines during later prehistory.

After Graeme Barker’s major contribution on the topic in the 1970–80s, the understanding of central Italy’s social dynamics during the Bronze Age has not advanced much. This is probably due to the lack of a wider, contextual approach. Caves are a very common feature in the geomorphology of the Apennines and often hold archaeological evidence; therefore, they have tended to monopolise scholarly attention. Conversely, settlements, which are comparatively more difficult to find and investigate extensively, are still underrepresented or overlooked. Both this imbalance and the fragmented nature of archaeological interventions in the region have generally led to the analysis of sites as isolated entities, while wider questions on the society, economy, contacts and symbolic worlds of the past population have not been addressed.

We therefore decided to explore a potentially promising area in southern Lazio by excavating three caves and one settlement, complemented by surface surveys.

**Mora Cavorso Cave**

This cave was found in the early 2000s and has been under excavation by ‘Tor Vergata’ University since 2006. The cave has a multi-tunnel structure and a complex stratigraphy, ranging from late Antiquity to the late Palaeolithic, with a more intense frequentation for burial and ritual purposes during the Neolithic and the Middle Bronze Age. This is the most important cemetery of Early Neolithic central Italy. At least 21 individuals of all age groups and both sexes were found in the inner rooms of the cave, accompanied by shell beads, flints, pottery, obsidian and a stone axe, all sourced from different parts of Italy (Apulia, Abruzzi, Sardinia and the Alps).

In the Middle Bronze Age, only the very first dark part of the cave was frequented, while its inner rooms remained unvisited. The remains of one adult woman were found in association with several piglet and lamb bones and
two pits covered with stones, one of which contained an overturned pot. Spindle-whorls and flint arrowheads were also uncovered. These finds indicate the occurrence of specific rituals, such as sacrifices of perinatal animals (inferred from the anomalous kill-off pattern and bone representation) and the deposition of special objects. Such practices may symbolise rituals associated with death and metaphorical rebirth and may be related to both the chthonic world and the deposition of the dead. Future micromorphological analyses of the soil will reveal whether the cave also served domestic purposes, such as livestock pen and shelter for shepherds along the transhumance routes from the Adriatic to the Tyrrhenian Seas.

**Pastena Cave**

Pastena Cave is a majestic show-cave, which holds a seasonal creek and an inner lake. After rescue excavation in 2008, systematic investigations were resumed in 2012 under the direction of the Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici del Lazio and ‘Tor Vergata’ University. Neolithic to Middle Bronze Age activity was revealed in the inner and dark small chambers. In particular, one of the rooms held possible secondary Middle Bronze Age burial remains, but also intact structures such as hearths, stone circles and pits containing overturned bowls, as well as rare evidence for stone pavements alternated with layers of burnt cereals and legumes. In contrast with Mora Cavorso Cave, situated in the upland woodlands, this site is located next to a fertile plain suitable for agriculture. This explains the presence of vegetal products used as ritual offerings, which appear to be cyclic and possibly seasonal. Once again, food offerings, alongside other practices related to the chthonic sphere, are associated with burial remains, indicating a symbolic link between human and natural life cycles.

**Collepardo Cave**

Durham University and the Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici del Lazio began systematic excavations at
In 1990 a wood and metal composite vessel was recovered during the course of gravel extraction from a quarry at Cromwell in Nottinghamshire. It was reported to I.M. Stead, who first identified it as a Late Iron Age or Early Roman tankard. It was subsequently sent to Lincoln Museum for conservation. The vessel is constructed from ten wooden staves secured by a copper-alloy sheathing, along with a handle which had separated from the body. As there are only ten complete Iron Age tankards known from Britain and Ireland, this example is of great importance. It was whilst undertaking research for a paper on these vessels that I stumbled upon this example and began delving deeper into this otherwise unmentioned and unpublished tankard.

There has been no systematic analysis of this artefact class since John Corcoran’s original study was published in Volume 18 of the Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society (1952). New evidence from the Portable Antiquities Scheme for England and Wales and recent excavations have more than quadrupled the number of known examples (128 currently). British tankards are therefore well overdue a complete re-examination, re-integrating them into current debates surrounding material culture in later prehistory. Tankards were first produced in Late Iron Age Britain within native workshops, and...
were probably used during communal feasting events, as is evidenced by their deposition in burials alongside other feasting equipment. The Cromwell tankard is of squat proportions, measuring approximately 15 cm in height by 15.5 cm in width, and could hold just over four pints of liquid when filled (2.27 litres). A comparable volume is noted in other examples. The decorative features of tankards vary considerably and are usually focused on or around the handle of the vessel. The Cromwell tankard is therefore striking in its simplicity. The handle is formed from copper-alloy sheet which has been shaped into a roughly rectangular form, widening laterally towards its centre. The central unit has a W-shaped cross-section. The handle terminates with flattened attachment plates, which would have secured to the vessel at each end with a single rivet. A rivet-hole remains on one end only, the other having broken off probably during retrieval.

The copper-alloy sheathing of the vessel is heavily corroded and fragmentary, though close inspection reveals two slightly raised moulded ribs which run the horizontal circumference of the vessel. This feature is also present on the tankard from the River Thames at Kew, City of London. The sheathing encases the stave-built core of the vessel, which is only visible from the underside when the vessel was being lifted. The core of the vessel was constructed using coopering methods similar to those used in modern open-topped buckets and barrels. The wood species in all tankards, where noted, is that of the European yew (Taxus baccata). The orange colouration and knotting on the Cromwell tankard suggest it is probably also of yew, though scientific identification is required. The choice of species was almost certainly significant; the poisonous qualities of yew trees were known in prehistory and had pertinent religious and votive associations.

The Cromwell tankard can be dated by comparing its form to extant examples from datable contexts. In particular the handle shares similarities with the pieces from Newstead, Scottish Borders; Seven Sisters, Neath Port Talbot; and Corbridge, Northumberland and fits into the ‘Group V’ tankard handles. This group is collectively dated to AD 70–140. Tankards were often modified, repaired or re-handled in antiquity and this should be taken into consideration when dating this vessel, as the body of the vessel may significantly predate the handle. Tankards with this particular type of handle are often found at Roman military or civilian sites or within hoards, and are strongly implicated with the Roman uptake of these native drinking vessels. There is evidence that tankards functioned as drinking vessels for locally produced alcoholic beverages and their regular appearance within Roman military contexts indicates a continuation of these drinking practices within the Roman army. In this case it is suggested that this tankard may be linked to probable Roman activity in the local area. The Cromwell tankard is currently in the possession of the Lincoln Museum.
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The importance of the hinterland: Multi-isotope analysis on animals from Neolithic lakeshore settlements in the Alpine foreland

The Swiss lakeshore settlements – dated between 4300 and 800 BC – are among the best-investigated archaeological sites worldwide due to an exceptional preservation of features and finds in waterlogged, and essentially anoxic, lake sediments. Dendrochronological investigation on timbers allows precise tree-ring dating of residential structures and in many cases the year-by-year reconstruction of settlement histories. Rich faunal remains from the settlements provide detailed insights into subsistence strategies. However, little is known about the immediate surroundings of the sites and subsistence-related activities beyond the settlement. For example, we do not know how far away from a given site animals were grazed, or what
size territory the inhabitants regularly travelled through in the course of daily subsistence strategies. A promising tool for complementing archaeological research of the settlements’ hinterland is the application of stable isotope analysis to archaeological mammal bones.

A project based at the University of Basel, Switzerland, and in collaboration with the Universities of Bristol and Southampton, United Kingdom, and the Curt-Engelhorn-Centre Archaeometry in Mannheim, Germany, aims at studying the strategies of animal management, from herding and dairying to hunting. Domestic cattle and red deer remains are analysed using a multi-isotopic approach. $^{87}$Sr/$^{86}$Sr, $\delta^{18}$O, $\delta^{15}$N and $\delta^{13}$C analyses are applied to the bones and high-crowned molars of cattle and deer to gain an understanding of short- and long-term changes in economy and land use at the lakeshore settlements.

We put a special focus on cattle mobility, i.e. transhumance, between the late 5th and the early 2nd millennia BC and on changing habitat use of red deer, which could be due to intense hunting in periods of climatic deterioration, e.g. in the 37th century BC. These research questions are approached using high-resolution laser ablation inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (LA-ICP-MS) strontium isotope measurements on domestic cattle and red deer tooth enamel to check for grazing on different geologies. In addition, strontium and oxygen isotope measurements of environmental samples from the vicinity of the studied sites have been taken and serve as a reference for the interpretation of the isotope signatures determined for the archaeological specimens. Oxygen isotopes are used as evidence for herding at different altitudes (as $\delta^{18}$O in water varies with elevation). In this way, movement detected using spatially resolved strontium data in tooth enamel can be linked to the season of the year. Furthermore, carbon and nitrogen isotope ratios inform us about changing feeding sources. The so-called ‘canopy effect’ visible in carbon values provides clues about whether plants grew in shady and forested or more open conditions, while nitrogen is also influenced by the vegetation composition of pastures. Together, these isotopes can therefore be used as additional indicators for seasonal movements.

Our research is based on data from two different areas. As our first test case, we investigate the well-known site of Arbon-Bleiche 3. This single-phase lakeshore site on Lake Constance is precisely dated by dendrochronology to 3384–3370 BC (transitional Pfyn to Horgen cultures), and was hence in use for only 15 years. The wooden remains enabled the identification of 27 house plans, providing the opportunity to study animal management on the level of houses and on a year-on-year basis. This can then be matched against archaeological evidence for different economic preferences of individual houses and house groups to see how varied landscape use actually was at a single point in time. Our second case study is a stratigraphic sequence of lakeshore settlements on Lake Zurich, which enables us to look at changes in a small region with a diachronic perspective. The settlement sites in the lower Lake Zurich region cover a chronological sequence from about 4300 to 950 BC. The vast and well-documented archaeozoological collections from these sites will enable us to sample an almost continuous sequence over more than two millennia. In this way, we can compare how people coped with climatic and environmental changes in the long term.

The project is funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation with a funding period from April 2013 to March 2016. For further information and details on the project, please visit www.i-bone.ch.

Thomas Doppler, Claudia Gerling & Jörg Schibler, Integrative Prehistory and Archaeological Science (IPAS), University of Basel
‘People in Prehistory: Building communities’ Conference
7th March 2015

On Saturday 7th March, the third Prehistoric Society conference on scales of analysis was held, focusing on the theme of ‘communities’ in prehistory, following previous conferences on the ‘individual’ and ‘households’. Appropriately, Niall Sharples opened the conference discussing the multi-faceted and all-encompassing idea of ‘communities’, which became central to all the talks that followed. Niall touched upon hillforts as a form of ‘building communities’, with their creation representing an investment in establishing and maintaining communal boundaries.

The thematic structure of the day (material culture in the morning and monumentality in the afternoon) allowed many comparable concepts to be developed across different time periods. Alison Sheridan explored how we might identify intercommunal communications across different scales in Neolithic Britain and Ireland through similarities in monument constructions and object production, such as a Late Neolithic ‘international’ community created through the two-way exchange of information between the Scottish Isles and the Boyne Valley.

Stuart Needham argued that we should avoid focusing on broad distribution maps in our study of communities, and instead look for sudden changes across a space, such as the appearance of ‘symbolically charged’ items that might be considered identity markers. Stuart emphasised the need to combine different sources of material culture and practices to help define potential territories. He suggested one possible Early Bronze Age localised territory in north-east Wales, where an interesting gap in the distribution of axe-hammers correlates with the depositional position of the Mold Cape.

A mathematical approach to understanding Late Bronze Age ‘scrap hoards’ was adopted by Ben Roberts and Rob Wiseman, who utilised a logarithmic scale to structure hoarding practices. They proposed that the hoards might not represent a centralised ‘elite’ community, but rather the collection activities of smaller farming communities over time and distance. How contemporary material evidence might fit in with this picture became a focus of discussion.

The morning closed with Ian Leins offering a new perspective on how to understand the distribution of Iron Age communities through coinage. He rejected traditional interpretations drawn from Ptolemy’s Geography and proposed that smaller, more localised Iron Age communities existed. Ian showed how different coins circulated in different spheres at different times, leading him to problematize the power of individuals using the coins and the possibility of ‘freelance’ moneyers in operation.

After lunch, Manuel Fernandez-Gotz moved us towards monumentality, re-interpreting the Iron Age oppida of central Europe. These can be seen as the central foci for community identity over time, but the diversity of such sites means that the communities operating at different oppida must have been vastly different. Many show signs of industrial, ceremonial and religious functions long before their establishment as urban centres, indicating the use of these sites as a way to establish communities through sacred and profane acts. Importantly, the religious significance might have been the cause of some oppida, such as Titelberg and Manching, rather than an effect.

Kate Waddington presented new data on the middens of Late Bronze Age and Iron Age Wessex. The huge accumulation of material and evidence for object production at these sites makes them of particular interest for understanding how communities might have operated at this time. Bayesian analysis of 14C dates from East Chisenbury found that these sites may have been used well into the Iron Age.

Chris Evans provided a summary of the ongoing excavations of Middle Bronze Age enclosures in East Anglia, in particular their long-term development. Small-scale monumentality contributed to the later larger features, with barrows feeding into ring ditches and short-lived settlements and field systems overlapping past divisions. Chris was keen to emphasise the multi-scalar formation of communities that could be visible through the settlement patterns.

The final talks of the day by Josh Pollard and Colin Richards forced us to question what exactly we mean when we say ‘community’. Josh pitted the integrated social aspects of community against the more performative processes in the Neolithic, where the establishment of long-lived enclosures and megalithic monuments perhaps indicates the first instance of extensive community networks. Colin drew on the ethnographic case of the repatriation of the Hilton stone in Scotland, which acted as an anchor of place and community for a modern society. Something similar might be visible in the composite Neolithic passage graves of Britain and Ireland, formed of stones from a variety of locations, possibly even older monuments, breaking down some communities and building others.

As with any conference, many questions were addressed and many more were raised. Due to the multi-scalar and multi-faceted nature of ‘community’, this compelling conference posed an interesting new start for considering prehistoric communities in the future.

Matthew G. Knight, University of Exeter (mgk205@ex.ac.uk)
On the 20th of April, the Prehistoric Society and Later Prehistoric Finds Group held the ‘Tales the River Tells’ conference in London. The sunny day began with a tour of the Thames foreshore, starting with a talk by Jane Sidell (Historic England) on London’s oldest prehistoric structure. Six timbers discovered in 2011, representing a structure of an unknown function, gave a radiocarbon date between 4790 BC and 4490 BC, dating it to the Mesolithic. Only visible at low tides, the timbers slowly emerged from the murky waters as our tour progressed. Gustav Milne (UCL) pointed out the dramatic erosion occurring on the foreshore due to modern intervention, such as currents caused by the passing boats and the construction of modern buildings. Jon Cotton, former curator at the Museum of London, showed us the Bronze and Iron Age timber ‘jetty’, found via the discovery of two Bronze spear heads and recorded in 1993 by the Thames Discovery Programme. Jon suggested that the jetty may have spanned part of the Thames to an ‘eyot’ or gravel island in the centre, but that modern dredging of the Thames had removed all trace. He also pointed out a timber that had been placed at the site as part of the Time Team investigation in 2003. Although originally flush to the foreshore, it now sticks out of the ground 50 cm, showing the erosion of deposits over the last twelve years.

Following our tour, the group split into three to attend artefact handling sessions at the Museum of London or the British Museum (BM). I opted for viewing the Iron Age artefacts, beginning with a tour of Room 50 at the BM (800 BC–AD 43) led by Rachel Wilkinson from the University of Leicester. Rachel showed us those artefacts recovered from the Thames, including the famous Battersea shield and the Waterloo helmet (the only horned headdress to be found in Europe). Dr Julia Farley, Curator of European Iron Age Collections, then laid out a range of Iron Age artefacts to handle, also recovered from the Thames. They included an iron dagger within a copper alloy sheath, an iron spear head and, my particular favourite, a copper alloy horse bridle, all testament to the impressive metal working skills present in Britain in this period.

In the afternoon the attendees gathered for talks on the research of prehistoric artefacts recovered from the Thames, both past and present. Jane Sidell gave an illuminating talk on the complex hydrological history of the Thames from the early prehistoric to the Roman period and highlighted potential avenues for further research through upcoming developer-funded investigations such as the Thames Tideway Tunnel and the Battersea Park project. Stuart Needham then gave an overview of ground-breaking work by himself and the late Colin Burgess in 1980 on Bronze Age metalwork in the Thames Valley. Stuart argued that the key to interpreting the deposition of metal artefacts in the Thames as purposeful and ritually motivated was to demonstrate that this assemblage did not form the ‘norm’ of Bronze Age metal deposition in the wider area. Andrew Fitzpatrick then discussed the Iron Age artefacts deposited in the Thames, describing them as ‘quality rather than quantity’. Andrew contended that items like the Battersea shield are likely not representative of the overall Iron Age assemblages from watery contexts,
which are dominated by spear heads and swords. He also offered comparisons to deposition in watery contexts on the continent, arguing for a wider tradition across southern Britain and north-west Europe.

Following a short break, three further papers examined new data on later prehistoric artefacts and the Thames. Up first was Alex Davies, who analyses the depositional practices associated with later prehistoric metalwork and the composition and location of hoards. Alex argued that the differences between deposition in the Late Bronze Age and the Middle Iron Age stemmed from a difference between the perspectives of the past in each period. While Bronze Age artefacts were regularly destroyed, suggesting a finality to their use, metalwork in the Middle Iron Age was passed down from generation to generation, leading to assemblages with finds from multiple periods – a pattern that finds parallels in the length of occupation of contemporary settlements. This was followed by Sally Worrell’s paper on recent Bronze Age metalwork recorded through the Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) in the Thames Valley. She illustrated the potential research opportunities offered by a thorough methodological analysis of this large corpus of data. The conference was brought to an end with a paper by Jennifer Wexler on the exciting new digitisation project undertaken by Micropasts. Run collaboratively by UCL and the BM, the project aims to digitise the Bronze Age index, a corpus of records of Bronze Age metalwork across the UK, collated by the BM since 1911. The project has recruited members of the public to digitise the data and hand-drawn images for each artefact, including entries by Professor C.F.C. Hawkes. While not yet complete, so far 22,000 cards have been scanned and approximately 18,000 have been digitised, illustrating the potential for the rapid digitisation of other antiquarian datasets.

The conference was a rewarding day with a great mixture of hands-on experience and academic discussion. It showed the need to update existing works on later prehistoric deposition in the Thames in light of an ever-growing dataset, produced by developer-funded archaeology and the PAS, as well as the reinvigoration of older datasets. Thanks to the Later Prehistoric Finds Group and the Prehistoric Society for putting on such an enjoyable day!

Nicky Garland, Institute of Archaeology, UCL

The Iron Age artefact handling session at the British Museum, run by Julia Farley

CBA South-East Conference
Life in the Mesolithic and new perspectives on the Mesolithic/Neolithic transition
Surrey History Centre, Woking: Saturday 14th November 2015

Our understanding of the Mesolithic in Britain has increased considerably in recent times, due to the substantial contribution of commercial and community archaeology alongside continued academic attention. This day conference brings together talks from each of these sectors, revealing new discoveries being made on the Mesolithic in the south-east of Britain and introducing some of the fascinating insights emerging from projects focussed upon the Mesolithic/Neolithic transition from other areas of the country.

Speakers include: Dr. Martyn Allen, Prof. Martin Bell, Phil Jones, Garry Mombser, Mike Donnelly, Dr. Fraser Sturt, Dr. Jodie Lewis, Dr. Rick Schulting and Don Henson.

Attendance is a very affordable £16.00 for CBA South-East members and £20.00 for non-members. A limited number of student bursaries are available to help with registration and travel costs. Please apply via the conference page on the website (see below), or, for any queries relating to the bursaries, contact Martyn Allen at m.g.allen@reading.ac.uk. For details of the programme and booking information, please visit http://www.cbasouth-east.org/events/cbase-annual-conference/
**Programme of meetings 2015–2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sat 11 July, 11am  | Ely, Cardiff               | Prehistoric Society ‘Grand days out’  
This summer’s programme includes:  
**Tour of excavations at Caerau Hillfort**  
Led by Prof. Niall Sharples (Cardiff University), a look around one of the biggest hillforts in the UK. To book, please email prehistoric@ucl.ac.uk by 4th of July |
| Sun 12 July, 2pm   | Marden, Wiltshire         | **Tour of excavations at Vale of Pewsey**  
Led by Dr Jim Leary (University of Reading), including Marden henge. Directions and details will be posted on the website. To book, please email prehistoric@ucl.ac.uk by 5th of July |
| Sun 2 August 2015, 2pm | Marlborough, Wiltshire    | **Tour of excavations at West Kennet, Wiltshire**  
Led by Dr Joshua Pollard (University of Southampton). Directions and details will be posted on the website. To book, please email prehistoric@ucl.ac.uk by 19th of July |
| Mon 3 August 2015, 7.30pm | Stonehenge                | Stonehenge  
Guided tour with Dr Heather Sebire. Includes special access within the stone circle! |
| Sat 3 October 2015, 2.30 pm | Lecture, Castle Museum, Norwich | ‘Excavations at Must Farm, Whittlesey: New Insights’ by Mark Knight (Cambridge Archaeological Unit)  
Joint Norfolk Archaeology Society / Prehistoric Society annual lecture |
| Sat 17 October 2015 | Site tour Must Farm, Whittlesey | Visit to the ongoing excavations at Must Farm  
Please contact prehistoric@ucl.ac.uk for further details. |
| Wed 28 Oct 2015, 5pm | Lecture Society of Antiquaries, Burlington House, Piccadilly, London | The 14th Sara Champion Memorial Lecture:  
‘The evolution of religious branding in later prehistoric Europe: the case of Urnfield and Hallstatt bird imagery’ by Sebastian Becker, University of Cambridge  
Followed by free wine reception and presentation of the Society Undergraduate Dissertation Prize. |
| Sat 14 November 2015 | Day conference Surrey History Centre, Woking | ‘Life in the Mesolithic and New Perspectives on the Mesolithic-Neolithic Transition’  
For programme and details, including information on student travel grants, see the Society website. |
| Mon 11 Jan 2016     | Lecture Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, Edinburgh | ‘The Bronze Age Neolithic: The reinvention of tradition?’ by Dr Alex Gibson (University of Bradford) |
| Tue 12 Jan 2016     | Lecture Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, Aberdeen | Joint Society of Antiquaries of Scotland / Prehistoric Society bi-annual lecture |
| Sat 5 March 2016, 9.30am | Day School Society of Antiquaries, Burlington House, Piccadilly, London | The Land, the Sea and the Sky  
Please check our website for further details. A booking form will be included in the autumn issue of PAST. |
| Fri 3 & Sat 4 June 2016 | Day conference & Europa lecture University of Edinburgh | Europa conference 2016: ‘Dynamics of Art, Design, and Vision in Iron Age Europe’  
This year’s recipient of the Europa Prize is Peter Wells, University of Minnesota |
| Weekly, autumn to spring | Lecture series University of Bradford | University of Bradford Archaeology Guest Lectures  
Weekly lectures on prehistoric topics open to members by kind invitation of Dr Alex Gibson. For full details please see our website. |

* Additional events, such as further Grand days out and joint lectures with the Devon and Cambridge Archaeological Societies, are being organised, but await final confirmation. For updates, please check our website or subscribe to our mailing list by contacting prehistoric@ucl.ac.uk.
Statement of financial activities for the year ended 31 December 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incoming resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>From generated funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary income</td>
<td>31,790</td>
<td>32,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>7,186</td>
<td>8,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total incoming resources</strong></td>
<td>38,976</td>
<td>40,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>From charitable activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication grants</td>
<td>6,114</td>
<td>4,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright fees</td>
<td>2,485</td>
<td>3,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>16,368</td>
<td>14,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back numbers of Proceedings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>10,299</td>
<td>8,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total resources expended</strong></td>
<td>46,060</td>
<td>48,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance costs</strong></td>
<td>6,818</td>
<td>5,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total resources expended</strong></td>
<td>59,799</td>
<td>61,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net incoming resources</strong></td>
<td>14,443</td>
<td>10,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total funds at 1 January</strong></td>
<td>166,718</td>
<td>161,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net incoming resources</strong></td>
<td>14,443</td>
<td>10,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revaluation of investments</strong></td>
<td>12,288</td>
<td>-4,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total funds at 31 December</strong></td>
<td>193,449</td>
<td>166,718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Statement of Financial Activities is an extract from the full accounts of the Society. Copies of the full accounts for 2014 are available on the website or can be obtained from Tessa Machling at the registered office.

**Report of the Treasurer**

The Society's accounts are in a healthy state as the move towards using Cambridge University Press to produce the Proceedings has taken full effect. The costs of providing hard copies of PPS and production costs of PAST have been kept well under control, and we are now really benefitting from income from royalties from CUP in respect of institutional subscriptions. We continue to be successful in obtaining grants for PPS and the Research series have also sold well, with royalties from them returning to the Society. We have also done well staying within budget for administrative and governance costs, although room hire charges have risen. Individual membership is also holding up well, which means voluntary income (subscriptions and donations) remains stable. The dip in our investments in 2013 has been rectified with them performing well in 2014. The Society was able to provide a greater level of grant assistance in 2014 than in previous years, as well as providing support for various conferences.
It is with sadness that we report the passing of our long-term member Fiona Roe. Fiona read archaeology at Edinburgh, under Stuart Piggott. This supplied the thorough grounding in the prehistory of Britain and Europe that underpinned her later career as an outstanding scholar, specialising in stone artefacts. At Newnham College, Cambridge, her post-graduate research, supervised by John Coles, led to the publication of her seminal paper on the British Early Bronze Age battle-axe series, which appeared promptly in *PPS* Volume 32 (1966). Having moved to Oxford with her husband Derek, Fiona immersed herself in the disciplines of geology and thin-sectioning, and thus was equipped to start her work as a specialist studying stone implements from all periods. Over the next four decades she prepared reports for many archaeological units and universities, especially in southern England, and was involved in major projects such as those at Hambledon Hill, Cadbury Castle, Glastonbury and Yarnton. She also worked at Çatalhöyük and on sites in Colombia.

Fiona was always keen to visit excavations and attended many conferences, where she sought out younger researchers and inspired them in their current work. She was a keen member of the Prehistoric Society, Neolithic Studies Group, Bronze Age Studies Group and Implement Petrology Group and participated in many of their field trips, at home and abroad. In recent years Fiona was a member of the Leverhulme team working on the *Ritual in Early Bronze Age Grave Goods* project. She enjoyed the teamwork and her line illustrations of stone items provided a key contribution. Her modest and quiet demeanour masked a deep and considered knowledge of prehistory. However she always found time for her grandchildren and for her beloved Cotswold garden, which was full of rock samples from all over Britain and beyond.

*Ann Woodward*

**CALL FOR PAPERS**

First Cities – An Exploration of Early Cities in Europe and Asia
Durham University, Friday 15th – Sunday 17th April 2016

There has been a loss of nerve in studies of early urbanism, with an inability to define the term leading to an analytical paralysis which has stopped archaeologists from making a strong contribution to global narratives of cultural change. Can we change this state of affairs? How can we best transcend Gordon Childe’s criteria for urban sites which still, often implicitly, dominate the urbanism agenda? Will low-density urbanism, as proposed by Roland Fletcher, make a distinctive contribution? And what is the status of the very large, if rather undifferentiated, Trypillia mega-sites of Ukraine – the largest sites in 4th millennium BC Europe, if not the world?

This conference, part of the AHRC-sponsored ‘Early urbanism in Europe’ project, aims to bring together key thinkers in recent urbanism studies to define a new agenda for urbanism and to assess the contribution of the Trypillia mega-sites to this emergent debate.

If you wish to present a paper, please send the title of your proposal and a 100-word abstract to Dr. Bisserka Gaydarska (e-mail: b_gaydarska@yahoo.co.uk).

For updates on the conference, please visit http://community.dur.ac.uk/j.c.chapman/tripillia/links/

---

**FREE TO A GOOD HOME**

A growing number of reports of museums charging for research access prompted the Council of the Prehistoric Society both to canvass opinion from outside and discuss the issue internally. As a result Council felt moved to draw up a position statement for circulation to appropriate bodies. This was duly issued and posted on our website on the 5th of March this year. The statement has already caused something of a stir both within the museum world and outside (editorial of British Archaeology, online edition of The Independent). The Society of Museum Archaeologists have just issued a detailed response which raises additional issues of serious concern within the museum sector, particularly relating to the loss of archaeological expertise. We also understand that the Museums Association Ethics Committee is due to consider the issue formally.

Although there appear to have been only a few museums charging for research access thus far, we felt it was important to nip the practice in the bud not least because it can have a dramatic effect on what students are prepared to study. We are hoping that by raising awareness of the research charges issue we may be able to arrest its spread, but in the process it may also help the museum sector to raise public awareness of broader difficulties being faced.

We do not see this as a question of ‘blame and shame’. We are deeply conscious of the financial difficulties that many museums have faced in recent years and we hope that statements such as ours may be helpful in persuading politicians and fund-dividers that squeezing museums to the point that they have to impose charges on research is counter-productive. The importance of informing people about their heritage is now widely recognised by government and funding agencies and any constraints placed on researching the material remains of the past can only serve to diminish that aspiration.

We will report again in a future issue of PAST, but in the meantime you can find the state of play thus far on the Advocacy page of the Society’s website, at http://www.prehistoricsociety.org/about/advocacy/

Stuart Needham

Protecting Rock Art

Britain, particularly in the uplands of its northern counties, is fortunate to be home to many examples of prehistoric rock art. ‘Cups’, rings, spirals and other patterns are found carved into exposed stone outcrops. The enigmatic designs are, however, as vulnerable as they are intriguing. Not only are they subject to natural deterioration through weathering and animal erosion, but few panels are protected by law and the human impact on the rock art can be severe. Recently, concerned members have contacted the council about instances of damage to panels. Especially the practice of ‘inking in’ seems to be increasing in recent years.

Preventing all injury may be impossible, but we would like to draw members’ attention to the steps they can take to help prevent further damage. The ‘Rock Art Code’ reproduced below (which was written as part of The Northumberland and Durham Rock Art project, NADRAP) sets out best practice for visiting rock art sites. NADRAP led to the creation of the English Rock Art (ERA) website (http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/era/). The website holds a growing database of over 2000 recorded rock art panels, including 500 recently added as a result of the Carved Stone Investigations: Rombalds Moor project. The site also includes advisory protocols should you be lucky enough to discover a previously unrecorded carving. Information on current and future threats recorded by the ERA has been used by English Heritage to prioritise 17 sites (covering 74 panels) in Northumberland and Durham for scheduling.
An informative brochure on the NADRAP project is available to download from the website, or in hard copy from Sara Rushton, Northumberland Conservation, Development & Regulatory Services, Northumberland County Council, County Hall, Morpeth, Northumberland, NE61 2EF (free of charge).

In cases of vandalism, or if there are any panels you are concerned about, please contact your Local Authority Archaeologist.

For information on who to contact, please see the Heritage Gateway or Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers UK, ALGAO, websites:


The Rombalds Moor project website has a rock art monitoring form if you come across any damage to panels. It can also be completed on a mobile device: www.watershedlandscape.co.uk/heritage-landscape/rock-art-monitoring
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The Rock Art Code

Always:
✓ leave the carved rocks and other archaeological features as you find them
✓ seek permission to visit sites that are not on publicly accessible land from the relevant owner or manager
✓ respect the environment and follow the Countryside Code

Never:
✖ remove turf from buried rock art panels (the freshly exposed surface will be especially vulnerable to erosive processes)
✖ remove lichen from rock art panels (you may remove part of the rock surface and the tiny root fissures left behind will fill with water and be susceptible to freeze-thaw erosion, weakening the surface matrix)
✖ attempt to remove graffiti, chalk, or anything else on the rock
✖ use any substances (including water) to ‘clean’ rock surfaces
✖ use brushes with stiff bristles (plastic or wire) to clean the rock (if you wish to remove leaf detritus or animal droppings from the carvings for your photographs then use a soft brush)
✖ use any metal tool (e.g. a trowel) to ‘clean’ the carvings
✖ add chalk or enhance the carvings using any other substance (this may interfere with accurate dating of the surface)
✖ undertake any recording technique that involves direct and/or repeated contact with the surface (e.g. wax rubbing)
✖ scratch your name or messages on or close to the carved panels
✖ walk or drive over carved panels
✖ make fires close to rock carvings
✖ light candles on the carved panels
✖ use sticky tape or other adhesives to fix scales to the rock

Landowners or land managers with rock art

If you are fortunate to have rock art on your land, then the following steps are also recommended, but always seek professional advice and obtain any necessary permission such as Scheduled Monument Consent.

✓ encourage natural turf coverage
✓ cover panels that are most at risk from impact with a protective layer of turf (e.g. those on track-ways which cannot be re-routed or where panels are at risk from vehicular and mechanical impact, or from heavy animal and human impact)
✓ gradually thin woodland and dense vegetation immediately around rock art
✓ gradually remove forestry in the immediate vicinity and prevent replanting close to carved rocks (if replanting, leave rock art in clearings and design forestry to respect the setting)
✓ lower stock levels on land with rock art to the minimum required to maintain vegetation levels
✓ remove large stock (cattle) from areas with carved panels
✓ undertake low-level maintenance and monitoring to remove leaf and vegetation litter and animal droppings from rock surfaces

The following approaches should be avoided without professional consultation:
✖ any interventionist methods that interfere with the carved rocks and invariably alter and often harm the rock art
✖ introduction of any changes that will rapidly alter the surroundings of the rock and have an impact on its surface
✖ use of artificial coverings of any form
✖ use of stabilising substances
The earliest peopling of the Americas, generally associated with the so-called Clovis tradition of lithic manufacture, is a central concern in prehistoric research. It is now debated whether the makers of Clovis technology were the first inhabitants of the Americas. Rather, some evidence from older archaeological and fossil sites, combined with genetic and linguistic data, points to an earlier migration from Asia over Beringia, possibly as far back as 36,000 years ago. The Clovis culture is hypothesised to have appeared around 13,000 years ago and spread roughly from Texas northward, westward and eastward.

Current questions for Clovis and Pre-Clovis focus on the colonisation routes of the very first Paleoindians who carried non-Clovis technologies, from Siberia and Alaska southward, either along the west coast of the U.S. or through the central plains. The central plains migration route would imply a glacier-free passage, which is not well established. In contrast, a coastal route would imply seafaring abilities, which is also not agreed by all researchers. To further complicate matters, there is sparse evidence to support both routes. Archaeological and faunal remains are key to identifying population affinities and movements, yet little is known.
from Wyoming, which is located at the interface between the central plains and the Rockies. A Prehistoric Society grant made it possible to launch the WRASP project, which is conducting the first surveys in a tract of unexplored land owned by the Wyoming Army National Guard at Camp Guernsey, USA.

The central corridor along the edge of the Rocky Mountains and the plains was a key hunting resource for Paleoindians. Wyoming sits on the edge of this ‘Clovis heartland’. Limited Pre-Clovis, Clovis and later Folsom stone tools, portable art and rock art from the period 13,000 to 10,000 years ago indicate that small groups of hunter-foragers hunted bison. The long-term site of Hell Gap, which is unique for preserving a deep stratigraphy spanning the earliest Paleoindian to Archaic occupations (13,000–7000 years ago), is located less than 7 miles’ walk away and has yielded the type specimens for many North American arrowheads. It also shows remains of living structures older than 12,000 years, as well as lithics, faunal remains, ornaments and hearths. However, while it is known that Hell Gap was an occupation site, little is known about the extent of the Paleoindians’ territory for bison hunting and lithic raw material procurement.

With the assistance of the Prehistoric Society, four volunteers and I travelled to Wyoming, where we conducted 10-metre walking transects to record artefacts using GPS, photography and notes. The area that WRASP is surveying is a key source of various raw materials for projectile points made by the Paleoindians who lived at nearby Hell Gap: Spanish Diggings quartzites, Hartville cherts and Morrison quartzites, which range in colour and granularity. These raw materials outcrop in bands along the hillsides and on the surface of hilltops. Abundant primary flakes and biface preforms are found across these areas. We located a concentration of 167 quartzite flakes and giant cores from the initial stage of biface manufacture. In addition, there are numerous lithic knapping scatters located on saddles, and stone circles on the hilltops. We also mapped in detail a possible tipi site on top of a flat hill overlooking the valley; it contains over 200 lithic pieces and stone circles. Spectacular finds include one Archaic corner-notched chert point and one fossil crinoid bead, which warrant further research to establish their provenance and age.

The results of the first field season have added important data to our limited knowledge of the wider geographic range used by the Hell Gap people for their hunting expeditions. Our surveys have also shown a preference to set up temporary camp sites on hilltops, and for stone knapping activities to occur on saddles rather than on hilltops or in valleys. The amount and type of lithic material found throughout the survey area indicate that people were indeed present here, but that Hell Gap was probably the main living area. With the finding of diagnostic tools (such as points) we will be able to date these occupations and where they fit into the context of Clovis migrations.

Due to the success of the 2014 field season, I have been invited to direct annual fieldwork at this location. This project is the start of a new partnership with the Wyoming Army National Guard’s archaeological (CRM) department. Thanks to their collaboration in providing access and logistical support, we can now study the wider movements of prehistoric populations in North America. Specifically, we are helping to bridge the gaps between different sites along the central North American corridor to complete the picture of the complex northward and southward migrations of populations from 13,000 years ago to the present. The 2015 field season will take place in July, continuing systematic surveys of the 4,000 acres as well as other sites in Wyoming which contain undocumented rock art. We will dig test pits at selected locations to determine soil depth and potential for excavation. Long-term goals include the development of a field school for students, as well as an opportunity for the public to volunteer on an archaeological dig.
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There is almost nothing that has not been found on the Iron Age Dürrnberg near Hallein in Austria. Burials containing Mediterranean imports, fantastic weaponry and affluent gold, amber and ivory jewellery stand next to organic settlement remains preserved in waterlogged contexts. Above all, the outstanding finds of leather, wood and textiles which have been preserved in the salt mines tell stories of everyday prehistoric life. However, there is one category of artefact missing from the collections; as yet, there has not been a single find of the large-scale (or at least nearly so) La Tène sculpture that occasionally figures at other central European sites. I (HW) was therefore all the more intrigued to make a casual find deep inside the stores of Hallein’s Keltenmuseum. Quite a sensation – a stone head depicting a bearded man in apparently typical La Tène style. Covered with mud and accompanied by a find sheet indicating its exact context, there should normally be no doubt of its authenticity. No doubt? Well…

I became suspicious when I realized that the head was said to have been found during Vincent Megaw’s campaigns on the Dürrnberg towards the end of the 1970s. It seemed almost incredible that Vincent (being not altogether unfamiliar with ‘Celtic Art’) should not have noticed such an extraordinary object. It was also quite odd that he didn’t mention it in a 1988 article on Celtic stone heads, published in Antiquity. My hopes on having a sensation at hand faded away. Increasingly afraid of the inevitable truth (although hope springs eternal) I emailed Vincent and soon got a message from him and Alex.

I (AG) was surprised on 8th March 2015 to find that my in-box pinged in response to an email from Vincent Megaw. Vincent was head of department during my PhD years at Leicester until he moved to Australia. Needless to say, given differing interests, not to mention distances, our paths had not really crossed since 1980, when we last excavated together on the Iron Age settlement and cemetery on the Dürrnberg. The subject of the email was a ‘remarkable stone head from the Dürrnberg’ and it was then that I was reunited with another old friend.

Vincent returned to Australia before the end of the excavation season, leaving some undergraduate student volunteers under my supervision to finish the dig. The late Kurt Zeller was excavating with an Austrian team just along the contour and, unlike ourselves, had been finding remarkably rich graves. I decided to enhance the profile of our discoveries when a strangely anthropomorphic stone was found in the fill of a feature. The stone was completely natural, but did resemble a face if seen in the right light. Yielding to trowel and stones, however, the stone developed eyes, a nose, mouth and moustache. ‘Hermann’ also found himself ‘in situ’, with a context sheet to attest to the discovery. Kurt was summoned to view ‘the find’ before it was removed from its context and although he appreciated the joke, he didn’t fall for it. Hermann presided over the closing stages of the dig and accompanied us back to Leicester, where he sat on my bookshelf for a year or so as I completed my PhD and worked on the Dürrnberg archive. Unfortunately the bogus context sheet also returned but was not quite so visible.

I don’t know when Hermann left me, but he did. I assumed that he had been stolen by a student until he reappeared as an attachment in Vincent’s email. I immediately contacted Holger at the Keltenmuseum and confirmed Hermann’s lack of antiquity. Some quizzing ensued. Why was he covered in earth? (Because the real finds had been washed and marked). Why did he have a context sheet? (Sorry). Why did he return to the Dürrnberg? (Hmmmm?). It may appear that some of my erstwhile Leicester colleagues may have been playing a joke on me.....

Holger has described Hermann as ‘remarkable’, as being ‘a piece of art (albeit not prehistoric)’ and having ‘quality and aura’. I am really quite flattered.
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