

APPENDIX 1 - METALWORK

1.1 Metalwork

by H. E. M. Cool

Introduction

1.1.1 This assessment considers the metalwork recovered from the excavations at South of Snarkhurst Wood. All of the material came from hand excavation.

1.1.2 The fieldwork event aims that the material can be expected to contribute to are as follows:-

- To determine the function of the late Iron Age / Romano-British settlement
- To recover artefact assemblages to refine understanding of the development of the settlement

Methodology

1.1.3 A basic archive catalogue following the guidelines set out by the Roman Finds Group and Finds Research Group (RFG & FRG 1993) was entered into an Excel spreadsheet. This records context, small find number (if assigned), material, count, simple name and a brief description.

1.1.4 Information about context description and date has been taken into consideration in the assessment that follows.

Quantification

1.1.5 Thirteen items of ironwork and one item of copper alloy were recovered. The ironwork included a modern bolt from the topsoil. The metalwork is listed on Table 4.1.

1.1.6 There are no items that from a typological point of view must be of late Iron Age or early Roman date and as with much ironwork, the date of the individual artefacts will have to be derived from the contexts in which they are found. The horseshoe comes from a ditch filling which also included post medieval pottery and thus is likely to be of post-medieval date even though horse-shoes are occasionally recovered from secure early Roman and even late Iron Age contexts.

1.1.7 The copper alloy fragment is featureless and cannot be identified

Provenance

1.1.8 With the exception of a featureless iron fragment from context 138 (a pit fill) and a strip from context 247 (kiln fill), all of the metalwork came from the upper fills of ditches.

1.1.9 The metalwork is in moderately good condition, so it may be assumed that the small size of the assemblage reflects the level of discard and is not the result of poor preservation on the site.

Conservation

1.1.10 Conservation will be required on small finds 101, 117, 118 (two separate items) and 119 to fully identify them. The current packaging is adequate for long term storage. The bolt from the topsoil could be discarded.

Comparative material

- 1.1.11 Given the limited potential of this assemblage, the presence or absence of comparative material is irrelevant and will not be further considered.

Potential for further work

- 1.1.12 The potential of this assemblage is limited and confined to the original Fieldwork Event Aims. The material itself suggests no new research aims.
- 1.1.13 As this material cannot be independently dated, its contribution to investigating the function of the site and its development must depend on the integrity of the contexts in which it was found. The (?) wall-hook from context 120 (sf 101) and the strip from context 247 (sf119) come from insecure contexts. They are both from the upper silting fills of ditches, and could have been deposited after the abandonment of the site. It seems likely that after investigative conservation, these would be informative artefacts, which could have the potential to contribute to the fieldwork event aims. The possible cleaver, chain and rake prong from context 161 (sfs 117-8) might have potential. They too come from the upper silting fills of a ditch, but later boundary ditches succeed this feature, and therefore context 161 may be a secure context from the first phase of occupation.
- 1.1.14 The main potential of the assemblage would be to help characterise the nature of activity at the periphery of this late Iron Age and early Romano-British settlement, in accordance with the original Fieldwork Event Aims. The presence of the cleaver may be related, for example, to butchery being carried on in this area, and Bethan Charles (Appendix 7) has noted the presence of sheep feet, which are also indicative of butchery.
- 1.1.15 Within a wider regional setting, however, the small assemblage from this site may be a useful indicator of the range and number of items that can be expected as 'normal' on different types of sites at different times. Snarkhurst Wood would suggest very little metalwork in the late Iron Age / early Roman period on a site of this type. This is negative evidence, but may be useful in wider studies.

Bibliography

RFG & FRG, 1993 Roman Finds Group & Finds Research Group AD 700-1700, 1993 *The guidelines for the preparation of site archives and assessments for all finds other than fired clay vessels*

Table 4.1: Details of metalwork

Context	Sf	Material	Count	Name	Period	Comments
1		Iron	1	Bolt	Modern	Broken, square-sectioned retaining small head
24		Iron	1	Nail	2nd C AD	shank, length 85mm
26		Iron	1	Nail	AD40-70	shank, length 55mm
26		Iron	1	Nail	AD40-70	shank fragment, length 42
26		Iron	1	Nail	AD40-70	shank fragment, bent , length c 55
109	100	Copper alloy	1	Fragment	LIA	
120	*101	Iron	1	Wall hook?	AD40-60	Varying section
134	102	Iron	1	Fragment	?	
138		Iron	1	Fragment	2nd C AD	
161	*117	Iron	1	Blade	Phase 1	One end broken, other tapering point
161	*118	Iron	1	Chain	Phase 1	3 pieces currently, possibly chain or element of swivel
161	*118	Iron	1	Rake prong	Phase 1	2 pieces, tang? bent over at top
247	*119	Iron	1	Strip	LIA-AD70	4 pieces, joining, tapering to both ends; uniform section
312		Iron	1	Horse shoe	LIA-AD70	Complete with nails visible on X-ray

* Require investigative conservation- Slag and Metalworking Debris