

## APPENDIX 6: ASSESSMENT OF METALWORK

Jackie Keily

Conservation by Liz Barham

### 1. Introduction

1.1 Nine metal artefacts were found; all are iron.

1.2 All of the artefacts were recovered by hand excavation or metal-detection.

1.3 The following fieldwork event aims may be addressed by the accessioned finds:

- To recover dating evidence from the features located to enable a chronology for the division of the landscape to be established
- To determine the form, function and chronology of occupation

### 2. Methodology

2.1 The metal finds were accessioned in accordance with the Museum of London system.

2.2 The records have been entered onto the Oracle relational database and have been transferred to RLE Datasets.

2.3 No sampling of the metal accessions was undertaken.

### 3. Quantifications

*Table 1: Assessment of Metalwork from ARC 330 98*

Context	Special Number	Material	Count	Period	Comments (Description)
373	66	Iron	3	PR	2 x narrow shafts – nails?; 1 x triangular fragment – arrowhead/spear tip? Conservation to clean
373	90	Iron	2	IA	Brooch (in two pieces) with a straight bow; probably a La Tène I, ‘Swallowcliffe’ type (Hattatt 1985, 10-1). This, however, would date the brooch to the 3 <sup>rd</sup> century BC, later than the pottery from the context. More work required on the identification of this brooch. Conservation to do investigative cleaning
741	25	Iron	2	PR?	A plain open ring; one end is broken and the other end turns outwards at a right angle to the ring; function?

<b>Context</b>	<b>Special Number</b>	<b>Material</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Period</b>	<b>Comments (Description)</b>
538	76	Iron	2	UN	Possible arrowhead? Very corroded; clean? ?; found with abraded Roman pottery (AD 120-300)
811	33	Iron	1	UN	Swivelling fitting; ring with a hooked nail attached
863	48	Iron	1	UN	Part of a flat strip with its long edges turned up at right angles to it; part of a fitting for something.
988	57	Iron	2	UN	Two joining flat fragments
862	47	Iron	1	UN	Long tapering bar
1149	24	Iron	3	UN	Two lumps of slag and a possible nail.

#### **4. Provenance**

4.1 Most of the metal finds were recovered from pits:

- <66> and <90> [373] (sub-group 4082), fill of prehistoric pit [374] (Figure 7)
- <25> [741] sub-group 4085, fill of prehistoric pit [740] (Figure 6)
- <48> [863] sub-group 4207, fill of Roman pit [861]
- <47> [862] sub-group 4207, fill of Roman pit [861]
- <24> [1149] sub-group 4125, fill of medieval pit [1148] (Figure 9)

4.2 The only finds not to come from pits were:

- <76> [538] sub-group 4166, fill of Roman well cut [539] (Figure 10)
- <33> [811] sub-group 4104, fill of post-medieval ditch [810] (Figure 8)
- <57> [988] sub-group 4193, Roman trackway [933] wheel rut in [990] (Figure 10)

4.3 All of the iron was in a very corroded state and, for the most part, could only be identified with the aid of X-radiography.

#### **5. Conservation**

5.1 This assessment considers requirements for finds analysis, illustration and investigative conservation of the metal finds from CTRL Area 330 Zone 4. It also includes work necessary to produce a stable archive in accordance with MAP2 (English Heritage 1992), and to the level required by the Museum of London's standards for archive preparation. (Museum of London 1999).

5.2 Treatments are carried out under guiding principles of minimum intervention and reversibility. Whenever possible, preventative rather than interventive conservation strategies are implemented. Procedures aim to obtain and retain the maximum archaeological potential of each object.

5.3 All conserved objects are packed in archive quality materials and stored in suitable environmental conditions. Records of all conservation work are prepared on paper and on the Museum of London collections management system and stored at the Museum of London.

5.4 Investigative cleaning has been requested for three items [373] <66>, [373] <90> and [538] <76> to assist with their identification. The X-radiograph suggests that some consolidation of [373] <90> and [538] <76> may be necessary during cleaning, particularly as they have been recommended for illustration. It may also be necessary to apply a tannic acid solution corrosion inhibitor to these finds, post cleaning.

5.5 One item [811] <33> requires a gap-fill to protect it from physical damage.

5.6 All the metal items are stable and packed appropriately for long term storage.

#### **6. Comparative material**

6.1 The material was recovered from features ranging in date from the prehistoric to the medieval, with the majority dating to the prehistoric and Roman periods. The

material from the prehistoric contexts, particularly the possible arrowheads and ring fittings, should be compared with other sites of a similar date range (for example, Meare Village East, Somerset & Danebury, Hampshire).

6.2 The La Tène brooch is of particular interest and is nearly complete. It is very corroded but investigative cleaning by the conservation department may be able to identify further features on it. It is similar to examples illustrated by Hattatt (1985, 11, fig 3, nos 219 & 224) and dates generally to the 4<sup>th</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries BC. The terminal is missing but the bow, pin and spring appear to be complete (the pin is in two pieces). The straight bow may indicate that this is a 'Swallowcliffe' type of La Tène brooch, a type which dates to around the mid-3<sup>rd</sup> century BC on, but this identification will need to be confirmed once the brooch has been cleaned. Further research is required to try and refine the dating.

6.3 Comparison should be made with the finds assemblages from the other surrounding sites to see what other material dating to this period has been found and what activity it may relate to. Comparison should also be made with other CTRL Iron Age assemblages in the area to see if this type of brooch is a common type of find in this area (for example Area 330 Zone 3).

## 7. Potential for further work

7.1 The metalwork assemblage is quite small and therefore, its potential is limited, however, the following fieldwork event aims may be addressed:

- *To recover dating evidence from the features located to enable a chronology for the division of the landscape to be established*

7.2 The brooch is of use for dating purposes and it is hoped that it may be possible to refine its dating after investigative cleaning by the conservation department. Comparison with other dated assemblages from similar sites may be able to aid the identification and dating of a number of the accessioned finds.

- *To determine the form, function and chronology of occupation*

7.3 A number of the finds, such as the rings, may come from household fittings or horse harness. The possible arrowheads and the brooch may also be able to add to an overall understanding of the form and function of the occupation at the site.

- *The character, function and development of the Roman rural urban fringe*

7.4 A number of accessioned finds were recovered from features dating to the Roman period but the only identifiable object is the possible arrowhead. The object will require further work before it can be identified and dated more precisely.

7.5 The following further work is recommended:

- Further analysis of the brooch after cleaning by conservation; and research on its form

- Further analysis of the two possible arrowheads, after cleaning by conservation
- Comparative work on the remaining accessioned finds
- Finds catalogue
- Finds text
- Conservation

7.6 The following objects are recommended for illustration:

- The brooch
- Potentially the two arrowheads
- The two ring fittings (depending on dating)

## **8. Bibliography**

Hattatt, R, 1985 *Iron Age and Roman Brooches*, Oxford

English Heritage 1992 *Management of Archaeological Projects II*

Museum of London 1999 *General standards for the preparation of archaeological archives to be deposited with the Museum of London*