Fowler's Type G Penannular Brooches Reconsidered

By TANIA M. DICKINSON

BASIC, but rigorous, classificatory analysis is still a principal requirement in the archaeology of western and northern Britain in the early post-Roman period. The largest group of mainland penannular brooches — type G in Mrs Elizabeth Fowler's classification — is therefore reviewed in the light of recent discussions, and for the first time most are illustrated. Clear distinctions of type in date and distribution are confirmed, notably between those from Scotland and northern Ireland (7th to 9th centuries) and those from further south (4th (?) to 6th centuries). The latter are examined in greater detail, and consideration of their dating involves an excursus on late Roman ring brooches.

INTRODUCTION

Despite the positive efforts of the present generation,¹ the archaeology of post-Roman Britain outside the conventionally Anglo-Saxon cultural areas (essentially those characterized by 'Anglo-Saxon' cemeteries) is still beset by a dearth of recognizable evidence. There is a fundamental and two-fold difficulty in identifying and, at the same time, dating with sufficient fineness material remains from the period. Until scientific dating methods can be applied widely and accurately, the leading diagnostics will continue to be imported pottery and fine metalwork. Knowledge of the former has advanced considerably in recent years;² but as the periods and areas in which it was available have been more narrowly defined, so it has become apparent that there are other phases and localities in which imported wares are unlikely to be found.

Study of the alternative indicator — the metalwork — has not developed so successfully. It has been and still is handicapped by a general lack of good recorded contexts (in contrast with Anglo-Saxon grave goods for which the closed context of burial permits relatively controlled dating) and, probably as a consequence, by an enduring use of Montelian approaches to typological analysis and explanation. It is twenty years now since Mrs Elizabeth Fowler completed her survey of the overall corpus of post-Roman ('Celtic Dark Age') metalwork,³ in which she gave most attention naturally to the largest class of objects, the penannular brooches.⁴ The framework of reference which she provided for these has not been superseded, and subsequent commentators have been content to discuss individual new examples or particular types within her system.⁵
In the mid 1970s a number of short articles focused attention on Fowler’s type G and with good reason, for it is ‘the most numerous Dark Age penannular brooch in mainland Britain’, and in Somerset is now so well represented as to be worthy almost of the old label ‘type-fossil’. Unfortunately, although these articles exposed significant weaknesses in Mrs Fowler’s assessment (understandable given the date at which she was working) and themselves generated lively debate, they did not result in a clear or properly documented refinement of her scheme which could stand in its stead. I say this because it is the immediate explanation for the purpose and scope of what follows; for at that time (1977) I had just been invited to publish the grave goods found during rescue excavations on the edge of the large Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Bidford-on-Avon, Warks. In one grave, an apparently typical 6th-century woman’s burial, there was a type G penannular brooch (see further below: also Fig. 4, 2 and Pl. 1, B). My expectation of dealing with this quickly by reference to the established and recent literature was disappointed and instead I found myself embarking on a more extended foray into the topic.

HISTORY OF RESEARCH

Type G penannular brooches were first recognized by Dr Hubert Savory; they were distinguished by solid cast terminals, square in outline but faceted on the edges to produce a lozenge on the top, which was sometimes decorated with one or more dots. Savory, like all subsequent writers, concentrated on their cultural-historical interest. He noted their predominance in Wales, the West Country, and the West Midlands, in contexts ranging from late to post-Roman in the Celtic west to 6th century in Anglo-Saxon burials further east. He suggested that they were a Severnside innovation, and he wondered how such an essentially native brooch-form came to be used by people who were buried in Anglo-Saxon cemeteries. Mrs Fowler confirmed his late Roman starting date; she emphasized, however, the brooches’ origin in a sub-Roman milieu, since for her this better explained their diffusion both to Celtic and Anglo-Saxon areas; and she provided a range of alternative reasons for their presence in Anglo-Saxon graves — they could have been buried with ethnic Britons, acquired by exchange with British communities, or even made by Anglo-Saxon craftsmen. But she also added an important element: she included in her type G several brooches which were later in date (8th to 9th centuries) and from more distant findspots (principally Scotland and Ireland). Although Mrs Fowler could not pinpoint a clear typological difference (she noted that later brooches had grooving around the terminal ends, but rejected as significant a distinction between one and four dots on the terminal), she maintained that two discrete phases of production were represented.

The apparent inconsistency of an extended production period unmarked by typological change has been the focus of more recent comment. At first Dr Lloyd Laing followed Mrs Fowler in accepting a Midlands origin during the Romano-British period for type G, but he rejected the idea of production continuing after A.D. 700, if so late, in support of his dating of the mould from the Mote of Mark to the 6th century. Mr David Longley developed this approach: he argued for contemporar-
neous production in the Severn/Cotswolds area and in southern Scotland, facilitated by strong coastwise interconnections along western Britain, and for a starting date lowered to the middle of the 5th century; by then, he imagined, a cultural contact zone, such as the diagonal distribution of G penannular brooches across England suggested to him (cf. Fig. 1), could have existed between Britons and Saxons. Longley’s map graphically demonstrated the geographical distribution of type G and stimulated Laing to propound yet another solution. The evident density of brooches in Somerset made a sub-Roman origin in the West Country highly plausible, but the distribution pattern also suggested a progressive spread thence to the Anglo-Saxon Midlands and so to Scotland and beyond. By now Laing recognized that much later penannular brooches did exist and so he proposed a continuous development and use from the 5th to the 9th centuries.

Neither Laing nor Longley seriously examined the assumption that type G was a single compact group by returning to the raw data, the brooches themselves; nor were they much concerned with a rigorous appraisal of the find-contexts. On these grounds Mr James Graham-Campbell trenchantly criticized their work. He argued that at least four distinct groups could be detected within type G, drawing attention to the fact that nearly all those found in northern Ireland and western Scotland could be seen as developments of a later period (7th(? ) to 9th centuries), and thus leaving those brooches concentrated in Wales, the West Country, and West Midlands as an earlier, late and sub-Roman, group. In the context of a review article, he could not provide much more than a mere outline of the new groups and their key contributory attributes; but he did put his finger on the considerable variety hidden within Fowler’s type G and the potential for more rigorous definition and analysis. Since the new Bidford-on-Avon brooch clearly belongs to Graham-Campbell’s type G1, a group which still accounts for over half of the entire corpus (now more than 54 specimens) and whose definition Graham-Campbell gave only ‘in outline’, I shall concentrate on this. But since members of his types G2 to G4 have figured more extensively in recent publications, though in rather piecemeal and allusive fashion, it will be useful to clarify the state of knowledge about them too.

I must, however, make a few statements at this point about the classifications in general. Mrs Fowler, following all previous students, divided penannular brooches into groups essentially on the basis of their terminals; her criteria were few and intuitive, while she envisaged and explained relationships between groups in evolutionary (phylogenetic) terms. Although typical for the time, these methods have been thoroughly criticized by a new generation of archaeologists anxious about the conceptual bases of their subject. I have not, however, undertaken a new analysis of all penannular brooches, nor even of all type G; rather I have taken on trust that Fowler’s type G and Graham-Campbell’s types G1 to G4 do represent real non-random clusterings among penannular brooches. But until this is demonstrated by a more explicit and multivariate analysis, there will be an underlying weakness in what follows. It will also help to explain why uncertainties have arisen over the connections of particular brooches which lie apparently at the edges of clusters. In consolation, it is acknowledged that the old ‘eye-and-hand’ methods could identify key variables and thus real groups, especially when dealing with stylistic features
relevant to a time/space oriented classification; such remains unashamedly the principal concern of this article.

TYPES G2, G3, AND G4, AND RELATED TYPES (Fig. 1)

I shall begin with a resume of the characteristics and members of Graham-Campbell’s types G2 to G4. He defined G2 on the basis, in fact, of a sole (and contentious) representative, the mould from the Mote of Mark, Dumfries and Galloway (Kirkcud.; Fig. 5, 46): it has an undecorated hoop and lozenge-shaped terminals ornamented with four raised pellets. In fact, the unfaceted terminal sides are raised into a rim, so that the pellets sit in a sunken lozengiform field.

Graham-Campbell’s G3 brooches are manifestly different from this. They have plain hoops and terminals decorated with four raised pellets set within a sunken lozengiform field, but the terminals are ‘squared’, faceted on the upper sides only and flat beneath. In addition, they may have one or two raised ribs transversely demarcating each end of the terminal, and they are larger in size: the hoop diameters of those which I have examined vary between 36 mm and 43 mm, while the pin length is between 1.5 and more than 2.0 times the diameter of the hoop. Besides the famous late 9th-century silver hoard-find from Trewhiddle, Cornwall (Fig. 6, 52), the group includes unassociated brooches from Ballevuill on Tiree, Strathclyde (Argyll.; Fig. 6, 32) and Bay on Skye, Highland (Inverness.; Fig. 6, 51). Graham-Campbell has indicated that the three unprovenanced brooches in the Belfast Museum, Ulster, also belong to his type G3. These I have not seen, but Mr Graham-Campbell has kindly sent me a sketch of the only one which he has studied (Fig. 6, 43): its terminals, in fact, have faceted not flat backs. He has also drawn my attention to another Irish find, from a coastal settlement at Balynnass Bay, Cloghaneely, Co. Donegal (Fig. 6, 33): the shape of its back is not known. Other material retrieved from this site spans the 7th to 12th centuries. I think that the British Museum’s brooch from Co. Roscommon could be added to these; it differs only in its slightly smaller hoop, the absence of ribs on the flat terminal ends, and the presence of multiple cross-hatching in the central lozenge, bounded by four incised triangles (Fig. 6, 35).

Graham-Campbell’s type G4 is constituted by the brooch from Dowalton Loch Crannog 2, Dumfries and Galloway (Wig.; Fig. 7, 37). It is large, like type G3, and has a plain hoop, but its solid rectangular terminals are sharply faceted on all sides, producing a plain lozenge on each face; these polyhedral terminals are bounded at each end by a raised rib.

Now there are several other brooches and moulds from western Scotland and northern Ireland which, in my opinion, share a significant number of attributes with Graham-Campbell’s types G2 to G4. Whether they should be allocated to yet further new groups or labelled as sub-types of existing ones will depend on the purpose and mode of classification in operation. For the present, a major difficulty arises from Graham-Campbell’s selection of the distinction between a ‘squared’ (and faceted) and ‘lozenge-shaped’ terminal as an essential variable. As Longley has reminded me (in litt.), a lozenge should have sides of equal length with two opposed acute and two
obtuse angles; not even the Mote of Mark G2 mould meets this definition, strictly applied! Undoubtedly, faceting which produces a surface lozenge can delude the eye as to the basic profile, especially in the case of facets cut on either side of the junction between hoop and terminal. In general, terminals appear lozenge-shaped where there are four distinct and fairly regular sides; squared terminals have only three main external sides — the fourth being imagined as cutting across the hoop junction — though faceting of the exterior angle of this junction can produce a fourth short side, especially if viewed from the reverse.

Mrs Fowler compared a mould from an early historic site at Dooey, Co. Donegal, with the G4 Dowalton Loch brooch. Its size (37 mm) would be consistent, but without the other half of the mould it is impossible to be certain how the completed terminal would have looked; it could alternatively be for a brooch like those from Dunadd or North Uist, discussed below.

The remaining brooches are all Scottish and mostly smaller, in the 18 mm to 29 mm range. There are three further moulds from the Mote of Mark, all apparently undecorated, unfaceted, and towards the 'lozenge' end of the profile range. Two are from Curle's excavations, an unpublished fragment (Fig. 5, 48) and a double mould, the complete brooch of which may have slight protuberances on the angles of the terminals (Fig. 5, 47). Curle compared this with a Dunadd mould, which, to me, seems more appropriately discussed below. The third mould is from Laing's 1973 excavation (Fig. 5, 49); Longley tells me that it seemed to have four very faint pinpricks on the terminals. Arguably, these could all have been for brooches of G2 type, perhaps for their backs.

Several brooches share many features in common with type G3, except that they are mostly smaller and they have terminals faceted on both upper and lower sides, contrary to Graham-Campbell's suggested definition. But since he includes the Belfast Museum brooch, which does exhibit this characteristic, in his full type G3, perhaps the distinction is not after all important. The North Uist, W. Isles (Inverness.) brooch has prominent grooved ribs across the terminal ends and three raised pellets in the sunken lozenge field (Fig. 6, 50); its shortish lentoid-headed pin is like those on later 'Pictish' brooches. There is also now a substantial series of moulds from Dunadd, Highland (Argyll.), which represent comparable brooches, but without pellets ornamenting the terminals. Three come from the early excavations (Fig. 6, 38-40). Two more, but larger and complete, moulds of this type were found together with much metallurgical debris in the 1980 season of excavations, and at least four (possibly as many as eleven) others in the 1981 season, as well as three of indeterminate type G. Mr Alan Lane writes:

No independent dates are yet available for the deposits producing this material which also include some fine bird-headed brooch moulds and one mould closely related to Wilson's St Ninian's Isle types, in particular the fragment from Urquhart in Highland Region (Inverness.). This material is stratified high behind one of the lower enclosure ramparts (fort D) and so may well be quite late in the occupation of the fort, i.e. 8th or 9th century A.D.

Finally, there is the brooch from Castlehill Fort, Dalry, Strathclyde (Ayrs.; Fig. 5, 34), and two brooches from the Ludovic Mann Collection in Glasgow City Museum, probably from western Scotland (Fig. 5, 53 and 54). All have their
Terminals faceted parallel with their sides, not across the corners (like type G1), which may explain their more lozengiform appearance and so similarity to type G2. The Castlehill brooch’s terminals are ornamented with an outline relief-cast lozenge; the pin was originally quite long (more than 1.5 times the hoop diameter) and widens like a strap towards the tip, which is reminiscent of the widening on ‘Pictish’ brooch pins. The sunken lozenge in the terminals of the larger brooch from the Ludovic Mann Collection contains a rough cross or quatrefoil and possibly traces of enamel. The smaller brooch is in even worse condition; there are four raised pellets in the sunken lozenge field. But whereas all the other brooches discussed so far have plain hoops — another key index of the later types for Graham-Campbell — these two have clear traces of continuous fine grooving on the hoop. In this they compare with some of type G1, but, as I shall argue, they should still be seen as distinct from them.

**TYPE G1**

With some of the ground now cleared, Graham-Campbell’s type G1 may be more easily approached. There are currently 31 examples known to me. Given the nature of the discussion so far — and indeed the underlying fact that post-Roman and early medieval cast objects are essentially ‘one-off’ products — it will come as no surprise to discover that G1 too is a heterogeneous group. I propose simply to deal with three points: first, I shall try to redefine the predominant attributes which characterize type G1; next, I wish to show how the application of an admittedly rudimentary classification may generate patterns which are suggestive for the typology as a whole, and spatially; finally, I shall examine the evidence for dating, such as it is, which will involve a slight digression on a related brooch-form, the ring brooch.

**DEFINITION OF ATTRIBUTES**

The following is not intended to lay down the necessary requirements for inclusion in type G1 (a monothetic definition), nor, as I have said, does it arise from an objective multivariate analysis, but it does, I suspect, enumerate many attributes which are likely to be used, and emerge as significant, were such an analysis to be undertaken.

i. Terminals are square or rectangular in basic profile and cross-section.

ii. Faceting (chamfering) of either all eight or only the upper four ‘corners’ of the terminals produces lozenge-shaped planes on respectively either top, bottom, and three exterior sides, or on the top alone. Contrary to Graham-Campbell’s suggested definition, faceting of the upper face alone occurs on only four of the brooches which I have studied; they are among the smaller and slighter members of the series.

iii. Terminals may be plain, or decorated with a single impressed dot, annulet, or bull’s-eye, or with three, four or five impressed dots or annulets (four is most usual).

iv. Hoops may be plain, partially ribbed (most commonly at three points around their circumference), or continuously ribbed on the upper side only.

v. Pins have their heads bent over the hoop.
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vi. Pin heads may be decorated by ribbing or incised lines.

vii. The diameters of the 31 known examples fall in the range 16 mm to 49 mm with a mean of 26 mm; 77% fall within one standard deviation of 8 mm from the mean and 94% within two standard deviations, leaving two at the upper end.

viii. The ratio of pin length to hoop diameter, where ascertainable (though including damaged pins), lies in the range 0.95:1 to 1.47:1. While this overlaps with some of the brooches discussed above, such as the North Uist brooch (ratio of 1.38:1), on the whole it provides convincing justification for Graham-Campbell's use of this attribute to distinguish early from late type G brooches.

CLASSIFICATION

The classification with which I have experimented is very simple: it is monothetic and divisive, and utilizes only two multi-state attributes. As such it could be strongly criticized, for it is unlikely to accommodate the complex and continuous nature of archaeological data; but it is useful in that the size of my sample is small, the choice of relevant attributes uncertain, and my efforts avowedly exploratory and preliminary. The classification results from a permutation of the three states of terminal decoration (plain, single dot, etc., or multiple dot, etc.) with the three states of hoop decoration (partially ribbed, continuously ribbed, and plain), giving a potential of nine categories. These are set out graphically in Table I. Since one of the combinations is not met with, only eight groups are used, and the brooches are described according to these.

Group G1.1: Partially Ribbed Hoop/Multiple Dots, etc. on Terminals

This group consists of six brooches, four from the former county of Somerset. Two (Fig. 3, 5-6) were found at Cadbury Congresbury, Avon, in occupation layers which included both late Roman and 6th-century artefacts. Two more come from the general soil level broadly contemporaneous with the graves in the late to post-Roman cemetery at Canington, Somerset (Fig. 3, 9 and 10). On all these the ribbing is in three groups and there are four dots on the terminals, though on the smaller Canington brooch these latter are annulets, and on Cadbury Congresbury B 0657 wedge-shaped and, on one of its terminals, there are only three of them. The brooch, now lost, from a probable Roman and (?)post-Roman settlement on the foreshore north of Padstow, Cornwall, has three dots on the terminals (Fig. 3, 24); while that from an unknown site close to Trevor Rocks, Llangollen, Clwyd (Denb.), has five dots and five groups of ribbing (Fig. 3, 27).

Group G1.2: Partially Ribbed Hoops/Single Dot, etc. on Terminals

A third brooch from Cadbury Congresbury, a surface find from outside the excavated area, belongs to this group (Fig. 3, 4); it is tinned and has five groups of ribbing on the hoop. Another Avon (Somerset) find is that without any context from the Roman roadside settlement at Camerton (Fig. 3, 8): the terminals contain annulets and the hoop is marked with two groups of ribbing, though corrosion has obscured probably two other such groups on the right side. Two brooches come
from Wales. The one from Castell Collen Roman fort, Powys (Radnor.), is the largest in the series (49 mm) and has a bull’s-eye on each terminal (Fig. 3, 11). It was found with three pots, said to date from the late 3rd or 4th century, in a refuse layer sandwiched between two layers of gravel above the courtyard of the commandant’s house; the lower of these gravel layers was associated with the later extension of this house. Unfortunately, these layers cannot be related to the sequence established for the defences, but Professor Leslie Alcock warns that, because of periods of abandonment between the phases of occupation, there is a tendency to date layers too early: the site was probably still occupied in the late 4th century. The context of the brooch from Twlc Point, Llangennith, W. Glam. (Glam.), is even less secure: it was found in a midden, mainly of shells, but with butchered bone, burnt stones and charcoal, and a few Romano-British sherds dating possibly from the 2nd to 4th centuries (Fig. 3, 28). It has annulets on the terminals, and the ribbing is confined to two grooves demarcating each terminal. The fourth member of this group — from Luce Sands, Dumfries and Galloway (Wig.) — is the only Scottish GI brooch. Because it is now sealed into a perspex case, it is difficult to assess its form precisely, but its squarish terminals are faceted on the upper side only and it has the faintest of double grooves bounding each terminal (Fig. 3, 19). It too was found on a coastal occupation site of indeterminate nature, but not far from where other pen annular brooches, including Fowler’s types F3 and H3, have been found.

Group GI.3: Partially Ribbed Hoop/Plain Terminals

A single brooch, one of a ‘pair’ from grave 140 in the Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Sleaford, Lincs., is the only representative of this group, and cleaning of its corroded terminals might reveal a central dot and so transfer it to Group GI.2. This brooch is tinned, its hoop bears at least four groups of ribbing, and the terminals are faceted on their upper corners only (Fig. 3, 25). It was found with a fragment of a flat annular brooch and another GI penannular.

Group GI.4: Ribbed Hoop/Four Dots, etc. on Terminals

This group contains the other brooch from Sleaford grave 140 (Fig. 4, 26), which has annulets on its terminals. In addition, there is the brooch found during the 1805 excavations at Lydney Park, Glos. (Fig. 4, 20).

Group GI.5: Ribbed Hoop/Single Dot, etc. on Terminals

At least two members of this group were found in Anglo-Saxon cemeteries. The Bensford (Bransford) Bridge (Churchover near Rugby), Warks., example comes from an early 10th-century unearthing of a large cemetery in and along the line of Watling Street (Fig. 4, 1). Fairford grave 31, Glos., contained a pair of penannular brooches, of which only one is still associated with this grave number (Fig. 4, 13). Another G penannular brooch from Fairford, now registered as unassociated, is placed in my group GI.6 (below), though it is identical in size to the former. Whether the latter is its ‘pair’ or yet a third brooch is unknown. No other grave goods are recorded from grave 31; Mrs Fowler’s ascription to it of a pair of cast saucer brooches with linked spiral decoration (presumably the 6th-century pair from
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grave 4) is unfounded. The context of the large and poorly cast brooch from Wooler, Northumb., is unknown, though included by Mr Roger Miket in a list of actual and potential Anglo-Saxon burials: the terminals contain a bull's-eye within a slightly sunken lozenge field, while the continuous ribbing of the hoop is broken at three points by pairs of broader channels (Fig. 4, 30). The last member of this group is one of three brooches, all now lost, from Meols, Hoylake, Merseyside (Chesh.); the site is an ancient harbourage on the Wirral coast which has produced occupation debris dating from the Neolithic to the 18th century (Fig. 4, 22).

Group C 1.6: Ribbed Hoops/Plain Terminals

All but one of the five brooches in this group come from Anglo-Saxon cemeteries. One of the finest is that found on the left shoulder of the woman buried in grave 1971/HB 2 at Bidford-on-Avon, Warks. (Fig. 4, 2 and Pl. 1, b); on her right shoulder was a small-long brooch, at her neck a series of ornaments including 34 glass and 20 amber beads and twelve miniature-bucket pendants, and at her waist a purse full of oddments. I shall argue that this grave dates from the 6th century. Probably of early to mid 6th-century date, on the basis of an ansate brooch found on the left shoulder, is Harnham Hill grave 53, Wilts.; besides this and the very worn penannular brooch (Fig. 4, 16), there was a bronze buckle, finger ring, and three amber beads. The other Fairford brooch (Fig. 4, 14), with its terminals faceted on the upper sides only, is a slight piece, while the unassociated brooch from Woodston near Peterborough, Cambs. (Hunts.), is very worn too (Fig. 4, 29). The last member of this group, a miniature version of the Bidford brooch, comes from surface levels at Caerwent Eastgate, Gwent (Mon.), where it may have been connected with the use of the site as a cemetery, or merely with activity alongside the main roadway into Caerwent (Fig. 4, 7). Radiocarbon dates obtained from five skeletons in the cemetery range from a.d. 410 ± 80 to a.d. 860 ± 70.

Group C 1.7: Plain Hoops/Single Dot on Terminals

This group includes one more Somerset example, the fourth piece from Cadbury Congresbury. It was found on top of the inner bank together with Pennant tile fragments, animal bone, and a few Romano-British sherds; it is the smallest of the entire G1 series (16 mm) and its flattened terminals just show traces of faceting on their upper corners (Fig. 4, 3). The second brooch from Meols also belongs to this group (Fig. 4, 21). Graham-Campbell has drawn my attention to another example found c. 1820 in a tin stream on Goss Moor (Lanivet) in Roche Parish, Cornwall (Fig. 4, 15). The only find from an Anglo-Saxon cemetery in this group comes from Longbridge Park, Warks. (Fig. 4, 18).

Group C 1.8: Plain Hoops/Plain Terminals

Two brooches of very similar appearance but for their size, and not hitherto recognized as belonging to type G, can be included here. Both come from Anglo-Saxon cemeteries in East Yorkshire (Humberside). The larger comes from Mortimer's barrow C.38 at Driffield (= Meaney's Driffield I); it was in the fill of grave 30, an undatable grave, though the cemetery as a whole is basically 6th century (Fig. 4,
The smaller was found in a definite 6th-century burial, for it comes from Londesborough grave 7, which also contained among other things an Åberg group IV cruciform brooch, a cast omega-shaped sleeve-clasp, and a reticella bead (Fig. 3, 17 and Pl. 1, A). The third Meols brooch can be added to this group, although Mrs Fowler places it with her type H2 (Fig. 5, 23), as can, finally, the only silver brooch in the series, the find from St Kew’s Steps outside Worlebury, Avon (Somerset; Fig. 5, 31).

**DISCUSSION**

Some suggestive patterns emerge from the above classification which, though not all statistically testable because of the small sample (viz. by the *chi*-squared test), are in my opinion worthy of consideration. They are best represented by Table 1 and Fig. 2. The first set of patterns concerns the typology itself. Within my monothetic divisive system only eight of the nine potential groups were utilized, and only six substantially. This suggests that G1 brooches are distinguished by particular attributes and, moreover, by particular combinations of attributes: partial ribbing of the hoop is found primarily with one or more dots on the terminals; ribbed or plain hoops may be combined equally with plain or single dot terminals. But plain hoops with four dots on the terminals — leading characteristics of types G2 and G3 as defined by Graham-Campbell — are not met with at all, and multiple dots in general are rare except in combination with a partially ribbed hoop. For me this constitutes important evidence for justifying Graham-Campbell’s distinction between the generally southern British type G1 and the more northern and western types G2 and G3. On the other hand, the size range of G1 encompasses that of types G2 to G4; but whereas size appeared a consistent and useful variable in identifying groups within the latter series, it shows no such correlation with the sub-groups which I have produced for G1.

The other patterns to which I wish to draw attention are spatial and contextual. A first point is to confirm Longley’s observation that the distribution is markedly coastal: it is especially evident in the west, but even where findspots are more inland, in both England and Wales, most are linked to the sea by major rivers. My second point depends on a contrast between those brooches found in central and eastern England, essentially those from Anglo-Saxon burials, and those from contexts usually described as ‘late, sub-, or post-Roman’ or ‘Celtic’ further west, where Anglo-Saxons are unlikely to have been significant before the 7th century, if at all.

Table 1 can be viewed in two major sections, the upper and left-hand side (Groups 1.1–1.4) versus the lower and right-hand side (Groups 1.5–1.8). In the former, partially ribbed hoops with single or multiple dot terminals (Groups 1.1 and 1.2) are shown to be exclusively western, and predominantly south-western and Welsh, in distribution. Multiple dot terminals and partially ribbed hoops are on the whole associated with western finds. The only Anglo-Saxon exceptions to this correlation are the single non-matched pair from Sleaford grave 140. All the other Anglo-Saxon grave finds fall, on the other hand, into the second half of Table 1; there is a notable concentration in Group 1.6 (ribbed hoops with plain terminals). This
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### Table I

**Monothetic Divisive Classification of Type G1 Penannular Brooches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoop Decoration</th>
<th>Terminal Decoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple Dots</strong></td>
<td><strong>Single Dot</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partially Ribbed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ribbed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plain</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anglo-Saxon cemetery finds printed in italics.

*Find uncertainly from an Anglo-Saxon grave

Basic twofold pattern — Groups 1.1–1.4 brooches correlating with western finds, and Groups 1.5–1.8 with Anglo-Saxon finds — is statistically testable. If the Wooler brooch is included as an eastern English and Anglo-Saxon find (though the latter is uncertain), then chi-squared, using Yate's corrective, is 4.7, and the probability that the correlation is due to chance is 3%; if the Wooler brooch is excluded altogether, on the grounds that its context is not known, then the probability is 4.5%. Both results come within the normally accepted statistically significant level of 5%.

Since the distribution of type G penannular brooches has in the past provided the basis for ideas about their origin, spread, and even date, these new patterns prompt further comment. The densest area in a distribution is commonly interpreted as the centre of use and production; if so, Somerset and the lower Severn basin may be considered the homeland of G1 penannular brooches. But their spread thence may not have been uniform. If the use of multiple dots on some G1 brooch terminals and four pellets on types G2 and G3 does represent a valid typological link
between them, then the concentration of the former in western coastal districts may endorse the idea that this brooch style reached western Scotland via the Celtic seaways. In this connection, it may be relevant that the one Scottish G1 brooch (Luce Sands) belongs to a distinctively Welsh and south-western group, and that its findspot is not so far from the Mote of Mark. It is in this part of southern Scotland that the overlap between types, and especially between the southern and northern series, occurs.

The distinction observed between ‘western’ and ‘Anglo-Saxon’ finds of type G1 suggests that its occurrence further east is not a simple one of spread through trade from a single origin point. One possibility is that the typological differences reflect different sources of production: this might be true particularly for group 1.6, and perhaps for 1.5. Now could such a separate source in fact have been in the hands of Anglo-Saxon craftsmen (which was one explanation proffered by Mrs Fowler for the occurrence of G penannulars in Anglo-Saxon graves)? To answer this without making unwarranted assumptions about the ethnic and cultural distinctiveness of those buried in ‘Anglo-Saxon’ cemeteries is hard. So far I hope to have avoided this by relying simply on the fact that the overall archaeological assemblage of an ‘Anglo-Saxon’ cemetery is discrete and does have a real non-random geographical distribution. One potentially helpful approach is to consider how G1 penannular brooches were worn. Accurate information about the position of brooches in Anglo-Saxon graves is unfortunately not common. One problem is that penannular brooches were often used as secondary ornaments on necklaces or in purses, rather than for a presumed original function as dress-fasteners; this could have been the case in Londesborough grave 7, where the ring brooch (see below) was most probably part of a purse collection, and the only certainly functional brooch was the cruciform. Four graves may perhaps be used. In Bidford-on-Avon 1971/HB 2 the penannular brooch definitely helped to fasten a ‘linen’ dress; it was ‘paired’ with a brooch of different form, a characteristically Anglo-Saxon small-long brooch. The penannular brooch from Harnham Hill grave 53 may also have been ‘paired’ with an Anglo-Saxon brooch (the ansate brooch). In the other two cases, the G penannulars occurred in pairs, albeit non-matching; but regrettably little is known in detail of Fairford grave 31, nor is it known whether the flat annular brooch with the Sleaford grave 140 pair served as a third and central brooch (in Anglian fashion) or was an appendage to necklace or girdle. This evidence suggests to me that type G1 brooches could be worn like other Anglo-Saxon brooches, that is, to fasten a dress on each shoulder (in contrast with all other penannular brooches found in Anglo-Saxon graves except Fowler’s type C); but the absence of true pairs implies that they were not made with such a dress fashion in mind, unlike most characteristically Anglo-Saxon brooch-forms.

In this connection, the Anglo-Saxon funerary evidence gives no support to Mrs Fowler’s idea that very small and seemingly fragile brooches, such as Cadbury Congresbury 1968/55 (Fig. 4, 3), were suitable for wear only by small children or the dead. Admittedly, the wearer’s age is known only for the Bidford-on-Avon instance—she was an adult; while it is not known if the two very small brooches from western British cemetery sites, Caerwent and Cannington, were once placed on corpses. But
in general the brooches used in Anglo-Saxon burials were substantial enough to have been fully functional in adult life.

The distribution patterns raise the possibility that G1 penannular brooches were made at several centres, especially perhaps in the Severn basin, but that only some of these maintained exchange relationships with areas to their east. To test the idea that such connections developed in time we must turn to chronology, notoriously the most intractable aspect of the whole subject.

**Chronology**

Mrs Fowler dated G penannular brooches from the 4th century onwards, partly because of assumed associations with material of that date at Castell Collen and Lydney, and partly because she postulated their development typologically from her types D and E, concurrent with the emergence of her type F. Certain, the marked central lozenge in the terminals of some type E brooches might suggest a typological relationship between types E and G. Longley's dating of type G from the middle of the 5th century onwards was based on far less reliable principles: his use of distribution patterns involved assumptions about cultural and ethnic conditions which seem best avoided, especially in a period as poorly documented as this. Dating by association or context is by far the most reliable method, though possible in all too few cases.

In this period the closest dates are likely to come from Anglo-Saxon graves. Only three G1 brooches were found, however, in recorded grave groups, the new Bidford grave being by far the surest. All three are specifically 6th century, though the brooch from Harnham Hill grave 53 was very worn, while that in Londesborough grave 7 need not have been functioning as a brooch. The brooch from Driffield I grave 30 may also have derived from a 6th-century grave, though it was not part of the grave furnishings. None of the other brooches from Anglo-Saxon cemeteries was found associated with datable grave goods; other material from these sites confirms a general 5th- and 6th-centuries date for their use.

Of those brooches found outside the Anglo-Saxon areas, only that from Castell Collen Roman fort could have been in a sealed late Roman context. A later 4th-century date for the unstratified brooch from Lydney can no longer be assumed now that Mr John Casey has argued for the majority of the buildings there to be dated to the later 3rd and earlier 4th centuries, and Professor Philip Rahtz has pointed to a potentially prolonged period of activity into post-Roman times. The general problem of residual late Roman material on post-Roman sites, posed nicely by the excavations at Cadbury Congresbury, means that it is impossible to differentiate a 4th-century date for the unstratified brooch from this site, let alone for the unstratified examples from sites like Caerwent, Camerton, Cannington, Luce Sands, Meols, Padstow, Twlc Point, and St Kew's Steps, Worlebury. Although Rahtz has pointed out to me that type G penannular brooches have not been found in Somerset on sites assuredly occupied in the late 4th century but not beyond, I would hesitate to base a terminus post quem on such negative evidence, given the overriding problem of residuality. On the other hand, the fact that in central and
eastern England G penannulars — the Wooler brooch excepted — occur only in Anglo-Saxon cemeteries of 5th- and 6th-century date, when there is no shortage of late Roman contexts in which they might appear, does seem significant.

Explicit documentation in fact merely confirms the date-range first put forward by Savory in 1956. If the Castell Collen brooch was in a late Roman context, and was not itself residual, then manufacture must have begun before the 5th century, perhaps actually in Wales. The English material shows that the type did not become current there until later, perhaps mainly in the 6th century. Here could be evidence for a spatial and chronological spread in use and manufacture; perhaps Somerset itself was part of this eastward progression. Alternatively, the relative preponderance of evidence for a fully post-Roman dating may make Longley’s chronology more appealing, but this would be to gamble on negative evidence, as well as to ignore the typological differences between western and ‘Anglo-Saxon’ brooches, already discussed. One last fragment of evidence — for a starting date in the 4th century — can be offered.

THE KEMPSFORD RING BROOCH — A DIGRESSION

Mrs Fowler used typological as well as contextual arguments to date type G, and though the patent shortcomings of evolutionary typology make me hesitate to employ it, there is a connection with penannular brooches whose exploration may widen our chronological perception.

The key piece of evidence is a ring brooch with trapezoidal plate (Fig. 7, 55 and Pl. I, c) dredged up in recent years from the Wiltshire side of the R. Thames opposite Kempsford, Glos., together with other material of Roman, Anglo-Saxon, and later date (all now in Swindon Museum). The hoop, now a misshapen oval, is continuously ribbed, each of its faceted square terminals bears a deep hole on the top, and the plate which joins the terminals has nicked edges and also three rectangular depressions, two on the front and one on the back, which may be manufacturing faults. Essentially, the ring has the form of one of my GI.5 penannular brooches.

In fact, it belongs to a brooch-form — ring brooches with pin slots and pin stops — which is found widely scattered throughout the frontier areas of the western Roman Empire, as well as in Free Germany, in contexts of the 3rd to 7th centuries. Three different classifications have been suggested for them, and they have been the subject of several other recent but shorter discussions. Perhaps not surprisingly, there has been confusion over their classification and hence controversy over interpretation of their precise place and date of manufacture. From an insular point of view, this has centred upon an example from Londesborough grave 7 (Pl. I, A): Dr Michael Swanton’s attribution of an Alamannic context, c. A.D. 300, for this has been roundly challenged by Professor Malcolm Todd, who argues for much wider chronological and ethnic associations.

Taking the various articles together, some rationalization and so, I hope, clarification is possible. Note, however, that none of the authors makes the basis of his classification explicit, and none takes account of the essentially ‘one-off’ nature of these brooches and hence the problems confronting the classifier (cf. penannular
Koch's and Todd's schemes are the most compatible. They isolate two, or perhaps really more than two, Danubian types. One has a small rectangular plate or merely a projection around the pin slot (= Koch's 'Siscia' type and Todd's type iv; these correlate with some of Zimmerman's Form I (London Wall) and with others catalogued by him without distinction as Forms II–V); the other type has a motif of opposed dolphins or some other variety of openwork zoomorphic plate (= Koch's 'dolphin' type; Todd's type iii; Zimmermann's Form V — Intercisa grave 79). A third group, essentially Frisian, is distinguished by opposed or outward-looking animal heads (= Todd's type ii; Zimmermann's Forms VI–VIII, not discussed by Koch). This leaves the type with trapezoidal pin-slot plate, treated as one group by Swanton and Todd (his type i), but subdivided (though not with complete mutual agreement) by Zimmermann and Koch. The major grouping, characterized by bull's-eye decoration and named after the example from Böckingen (= Zimmermann's Form II), occurs primarily in south-west and middle Germany. As the typology stands at present, the Londesborough brooch does belong here (but see further below). Koch distinguishes from his 'Böckingen' class proper a few pieces which, though related, do not form a distinct group, as well as two clear variants, the 'Hameln' type of Lower Saxony and the 'Preten' type of Mecklenburg. Finally, Zimmermann is the only writer to treat of a widely scattered but small number of brooches with semicircular or nearly circular indentations in the trapezoidal plate (his Form IV).

Now while the Kempsford brooch would be best accommodated within the 'Böckingen' class and its unclassified variants, it finds no good parallels among them. Ribbed hoops are a rare feature on ring brooches, at least on those illustrated, occurring only on the examples from London Wall ('Siscia' type) and Annecy ('Böckingen' type). Hook-like raised pin stops, resembling the terminals of Fowler's type D penannular brooches, do occur, but none among those known to me again through illustrations has faceted terminals in the form of Fowler's type G, unless the lozenge-shaped stops on the plain brooch with narrow trapezoidal plate from the Gelbe Bürg, Gunzenhausen, are admitted. But the one brooch, which I have seen, that does have terminals of almost this form is that from Londesborough grave... The published drawings are not faithful to the original (cf. Pl. 1, A). The upper corners of the terminals are slightly faceted, producing an elliptical, almost lozenge-shaped, field, in the centre of which is a sunken dot, just like my group G1.7 penannular brooches. Yet more intriguing is the fact that remnants of probable casting flashes are visible on the edges of the plate, and that the rough area on its left side represents a place where the metal failed to flow evenly in the mould. The Londesborough ring brooch appears to be an unsuccessful casting and an unfinished piece, points which might have been considered in the debate over its provenance and date.

The dating of ring brooches is based on the evidence of a few closed contexts, notably late Roman and Merovingian graves, and on technological and stylistic affinities with Roman and Germanic metalwork, mainly of the later 4th and earliest 5th centuries. Zimmermann has argued that the similarity of an enamelled disc
brooch with out-turned animal heads from the Anthée villa, France (dated 2nd to 3rd century because of the dating of the workshop there), to ring brooches with out-turned animal heads implies that this form had begun in the 3rd century, or at least before the middle of the 4th century.\textsuperscript{102} The only other evidence for a 3rd-century beginning comes from two finds at the Saalburg fort, both Danubian types,\textsuperscript{103} and one of Zimmermann's Form IV from the earlier 3rd-century sector in the cemetery at Preetz, Mecklenburg.\textsuperscript{104} The bulk of the evidence indicates, however, that ring brooches were current during the 4th and earliest 5th century and that, when found in graves, they belonged to men.\textsuperscript{108} Although quite a number are found in later contexts, there is no reason — \textit{pace} Dr Nowothnig, Zimmermann, Todd, and now Dr Naber\textsuperscript{106} — to suppose continuous or resumed manufacture. Stray finds from settlements of the 5th to 7th century cannot be admissible as dating evidence — they could so easily be residual from the Roman period — nor are finds from 6th- and 7th-century graves, for in these the brooches invariably form part of a woman's girdle or purse collection and are no longer serving their original purpose as a clothing fastener.\textsuperscript{107} In fact, the latest, as well as the most northerly, evidence for the manufacture of ring brooches known to me comes from the rich female grave group found at Hol, Inderøy, Nord-Trondelag (Norway). The ring brooch (or buckle), unmentioned by other writers, has an open-work frieze of five quadrupeds around the plain ring and a maskhead on the small trapezoidal plate. It is closely linked in style to the rest of the assemblage, all of which indicate a milieu in the Sösdala and Nydam style-phases, the first half of the 5th century.\textsuperscript{109}

The Londesborough brooch comes from a 6th-century grave and, as an imperfect piece, is typical of the 'rubbish' favoured for purse collections, from which it, together perhaps with the type G\textsuperscript{1.8} penannular brooch, most probably derived. If the current state of knowledge, as reviewed above, is correct, it could have been made in southern or middle Germany during the 4th or earliest 5th century. Given its condition, however, it may never have functioned as a brooch, but, saved somehow from the melting pot, was destined to become part of a lady's purse collection. As such it could have been transferred to England at any date up to the 6th century: there is still then every reason to endorse Todd's strictures on its misuse in the writing of ethnic and political history. But given its condition and its G-penannular style terminals (and hence its links with the Kempsford brooch and G penannular brooches as a whole), the possibility might also be raised that it was made in Britain. This could make its survival and reuse in a 6th-century grave more easily intelligible, and it brings me back to the Kempsford brooch, which initiated this lengthy aside.

Whatever the circumstances of the ring brooch's deposition in the Thames at Kempsford and whatever its previous context(s), its manufacture is most likely to lie in the 4th or earliest 5th century. Its lack of good parallels with continental ring brooches and, on the contrary, its greater affinities with material found in Britain may indicate that it was an insular product. If so, and if its formal links with G\textsuperscript{1} penannular brooches are acceptable, then it may constitute evidence — at one remove — for manufacture of type G\textsuperscript{1} beginning in the same period. Its findspot is after all close to the densest concentration of these brooches and within the main area
of groups G1.5 and 1.6, for which I have raised the possibility of a separate manufacturing centre in the Severn basin area. Of course, as I have already explained, there is every indication that G1 penannular brooches, unlike the ring brooches, retained their primary function, and so could have continued to have been made, well into the 6th century.

CONCLUSION

The predominantly Germanic context of ring brooches with trapezoidal plates raises yet more issues, which can scarcely be investigated further here. Mrs Fowler did discuss, but dismissed, the idea that Anglo-Saxons brought with them the tradition of making penannular brooches, with which I concur. She also emphasized the 'Roman' as against indigenous 'Celtic' element in type G penannular brooches, mainly because of their use of white metal surfaces. The wider context of the ring brooches is undoubtedly that of the Late Empire and its vigorous metalworking traditions, which did so much to fashion those of contemporary and succeeding Germanic and Celtic peoples. The development of quoit brooches in early 5th-century England — by combining the late Roman ring brooch with the insular penannular form — seems to have been another outcome of this same tradition. This late Roman milieu, in its broadest sense, is, I am sure, the one in which type G1 penannular brooches were also developed. Only closer dating and much better documented provenances will help resolve the many problems which I have raised here.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location Details</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bensford Bridge, Warks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cadbury Congresbury 68/55, Avon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cadbury Congresbury 68/US, Avon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cadbury Congresbury 70/PO159, Avon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cadbury Congresbury B.0657, Avon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Caerwent 73.76, Gwent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Camerton, Avon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cannington no. 13, Somerset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cannington no. 14, Somerset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Castell Collen, Powys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Driffield I grave 30, Humberside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fairford grave 31, Glos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fairford 1961. 113, Glos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Goss Moor, Roche, Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Harnham Hill grave 53, Wilts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Londesborough grave 7, Humberside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Longbridge Park, Warks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Luce Sands, Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lydney Park, Glos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Meols (a), Merseyside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Meols (b), Merseyside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Meols (c), Merseyside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Padstow, Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Seaford grave 140 (262), Lincs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Seaford grave 140 (263), Lincs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Trevor Rocks, Llangollen, Clwyd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Twlc Point, Llangennith, W. Glam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Woodston, Cambs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Wooler, Northumb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Worlebury, Avon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Balevullin, Tiree, Strathclyde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ballynass Bay, Cloghaneely, Co. Donegal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Castlehill Fort, Dalry, Strathclyde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Co. Roscommon unprovenanced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Dooey, Lettermacaward, Co. Donegal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Dowalton Loch, Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Dunadd, GP 221, Highland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Dunadd, HPO 52, Highland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Dunadd, HPO 130, Highland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Dunadd, 1980/225 Highland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Dunadd, 1980/297 Highland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Ireland (Belfast Museum) unprovenanced i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Ireland (Belfast Museum) unprovenanced ii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Ireland (Belfast Museum) unprovenanced iii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Mote of Mark, HH 128, Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Mote of Mark, HH 130(?) Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Mote of Mark, HH 129, Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Mote of Mark, 1973/248, Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>North Uist, W. Isles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Skye, Highland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Trewhiddle, Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>West Scotland (?) unprovenanced i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>West Scotland (?) unprovenanced ii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Kempsford, Glos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Baginton, Warks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution map of Fowler's type G penannular brooches
(nos. 35, 43–45, and 53–54 can be located only approximately)
FIG. 2
Distribution map of type G1 penannular brooches together with possibly related ring brooches with trapezoidal plates.
FIG. 3
5, 6, 9, 10, 24, 27: type G1.1; 4, 8, 11, 19, 28: type G1.2; 25: type G1.3. Scale 1:1; 11 not to scale.
FIG. 4

20, 26: type G1.4; 1, 13, 22, 30: type G1.5; 2 (see also Pl. 1, b), 7, 14, 16,
29: type G1.6; 3, 15, 18, 21: type G1.7. Scale (15) 1:2; remainder 1:1.
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FIG. 5
12, 17, 23, 31: type G1.8; 46: type G2; 47, 48, 49: type G2 (?); 34, 53, 54: (?) type G2 related. Scale 1:1
32, 33, 43, 51, 52: type G3; 35: type G3 (?); 38, 39, 40, 50: type G3 related. Scale (33, 43) 1:2; remainder 1:1.
37: type G4; 55: Kempsford ring brooch (see also Pl. 1, c); 56: Baginton penannular brooch (not type G). Scale 1:1

FIG. 7

NOTES

1 L. Alcock, 'Celtic archaeology: fifth to twelfth centuries A.D.', in D. A. Hinton (ed.), Twenty-Five Years of Medieval Archaeology, Society for Medieval Archaeology/University of Sheffield, Department of Archaeology forthcoming.


5 I exclude from further comment H. E. Kilbride-Jones, Zoomorphic Penannular Brooches, Soc. Antq. London Res. Committee Rep. 59 (London, 1980); although this is intended as a full new study of the zoomorphic penannular brooches, it is so retrogressive in its premises and methods that it has a very limited value.


7 Longley, op. cit. in note 6, 13.


11 Fowler, 'Celtic metalwork . . .', op. cit. in note 4, 107; cf. Figs. 3-5.
they could bring the total of type G up to at least 68 specimens.

(University of St Andrews, 1979), fig. 3, SF 248.


N.B. The modern administrative county is given for each site on its first mention, but not thereafter; pre-1974 counties, if different, are added in brackets. The numbers used for the illustrations correspond with those in Table 1 and on the maps, Figs. 1 and 2, and reflect an alphabetical ordering of type G1 and types G2 to G4 instituted for convenience in this article alone. The moulds found in 1981 at Dunadd have not been included in this numerical sequence: they could bring the total of type G up to at least 68 specimens.


22 Glasgow City Mus. LMM-55-56; Laing, 'Picts, Saxons ...', op. cit. in note 6, fig. 5, 5.


24 Fowler, 'Celtic metalwork ...', op. cit. in note 4, 141.

25 Anon., 'Antiquities discovered on the shore of Ballynass Bay, County Donegal', Ulster J. Archaeol., 6 (1858), 351-53.

26 Brit. Mus. 81, 3-10, 16.


28 Fowler, 'Celtic metalwork', op. cit. in note 4, 141.


30 Curle, op. cit. in note 20, 144, fig. 13, 8.


33 Provisional identifications made by Mrs Holly Duncan; A. M. Lane, The Excavations at Dunadd, Mid-Argyll, 1980. An Interim Report, duplicated typescript (University of St Andrews, 1980), fig. 3, SF 248.


35 Nat. Mus. Antiq. Scot. GP 221, HPO 52, and HPO 130; GP 221 is illustrated in Christison, op. cit. in note 31, fig. 33.


37 Provisional identifications made by Mrs Holly Duncan; A. M. Lane, The Excavations at Dunadd, Mid-Argyll, 1980. An Interim Report, Dept. of Archaeology (University College, Cardiff, 1981), 4-7, pl. 1 Mr Lane adds (in litt.) that the Dunadd moulds do appear more like the mould from Dooey than type G3 as defined by Graham-Campbell, unless they are for the backs of G3 brooches.
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