MANCETTER, BROOCHES

All are made from a copper alloy.

Colchester Derivatives.

1. 1970 sf.4 The spring is held to the body of the brooch by means of an axis bar through its coils which passes through the lower hole in a plate projecting behind the head of the bow; the chord passes through the upper hole. Each wing is slightly curved in section and has a buried ridge at its end. The plain bow is humped up over the wings and the plate behind the head is trimmed to look like the hook found on the Colchester type.

The spring-fixing arrangement is commonly found in the south-east of England and Mancetter lies on the edge of its normal territory. The system had come into being almost certainly before the Conquest and flourished in the second half of the first century and also ran on into the second. It may be noted that other specimens with the same proportions/and wing ornament seem to belong to the western edge of the southern part of the distribution and the present piece lies at the northern edge with the exception of one at Wroseter. The simplicity of the design of the Mancetter brooch does not help to provide a closer date.

2. W77 (17/23) 206 The spring is held in the Polden Hill manner: an axis bar runs through the cells and a pierced plate at the end of each wing. The chord passes through a pierced crest on the head of the bow. Each wing has a buried beaded ridge at the end and another half-way along. The latter has on each side a wide and shallow flute. The bow is plain apart from a skeuomorph of the hook of the Colchester and which has a concave cut just in front of the hole for the chord. On each side of the head is a moulding which rises from the wings and forms a step. There is a small projecting foot. The catch-plate has a large three-sided opening and a pair of cross-grooves on the top of the return and another half-way down with a pair set diagonally in each panel so formed.

This is a carefully detailed brooch which has a close parallel from Verulamium dated to before the late first century (Wheeler and Wheeler 1936, 37 fig.2,1). The ornamental characteristics, however, place the aera of manufacture somewhere in the south-west of England.

3. W71 (23) sf.2 The spring was held like that in brooch 2. Each wing has a buried ridge at its end. The pierced crest is beaded and again resembles the profile of the hook of the Colchester. The pseudo-hook is relieved by flutes which produces a bordering ridge on each edge of the

upper bow. The rest of the bow is plain and the catch-plate has two three-sided holes separated by a simple bar.

Dated parallels are wanting and it can only be suggested that the piece belongs to the second half of the first century. Again, the few and only roughly similar examples point to the south-west as having been the probable area in which it was made.

4. W77 (32) 26 sf.71 The spring was held like those in brooches 3 and 4. The brooch is badly damaged by corrosion and only the head of the bow is present. The nearly complete wing has a pair of vertical mouldings at its end. The chord of the spring was held by a rearward-facing hook which is continued as a ridge down the centre of the bow. The junction of the bow with the wings is hidden by semi-circular mouldings rising from the wings and stepped out from the bow. The under surface of the head of the bow is defined on each side by a groove.

The brooch is related to the standard Dolphin (cf., Gould 1967, 17, fig. 7,7), but is not close enough to allow the usual dating for that, c.75-125/50, to be automatically applied: it is probably early in that time band.

5. W71 (20) 30 sf.14 The very badly preserved upper part of a brooch whose spring was held like those in brooches 2-4. On the more complete wing can be seen a series of shallow mouldings with a plain zone next to the bow. The mouldings which clasp the sides of the head of the bow are less prominent than those on brooch 4.

There is little to aid dating and the most probable time-range for the brooch is c.75-125 A.D.

6. W71 (20) 9, bagged with sf.7 The pin consists of a length of wire pointed at one end and wound at the other round an axis bar cast into the wings. The surviving wing is plain. Only the very top of the bow survives and has on it the remains of a triangular boss relieved on all sides by a groove.

For discussion, see after brooch 7.

7. W70 (17) 16 The head is missing, but the brooch is of the same variety as brooch 6 as the end of the triangular boss on the head shows. The rest of the bow is plain and ends in a simple foot-knob made up of a frustrum of a cone with a cross-moulding above.

Both brooches 6 and 7 belong to a well-defined group employing a limited repertoire of motifs to create a set of variations. The chief alternative ornamental traits are a beaded ridge on the upper bow, and a fantail foot with ring-and-dot decoration. The distribution of the group is fairly tight and lies essentially between Verulamium and Wroxeter with the manufacturing centre lying most probably not too far east or north-east of Mancetter. The chronology is not well established and the few dated examples may show that it is second century: two from Verulamium date to before c.150 (Wheeler and Wheeler 1936, 206, fig.43,17), while another from Leicester was merely earlier than c.220 (Kenyon 1948, 249, fig.80,10).

8. W77 (7/20) 40 sf.48 The pin is of the same basic form as that of brooch 6. The axis bar, however, was inserted into a slot cast along the back of the wings which were then closed round it. The front of each winf has a buried ridge at the end. The bow has a bordering moulding on each side at the top. Down the centre of the upper part of the bow is a buried moulding which ends in a point. The rest of the bow is plain and distorted, but a recurve can be seen at the foot. The catch-plate has a

large three-sided piercing and the back of the return has three equally

large three-sided piercing and the back of the return has three equally spaced sunken ridges.

The style of mounting the pin belongs more to the Midlands than to any other part of the country and it may be that there is slight eastern basis to the distribution. The large hole in, and the decoration on, the catch-plate are not characteristic of the second century and, taken together, are not likely to belong to the end of the first century A.D. The brooch is larger than usual and this may point to a date before c.75.

9. W77 (7/20) 65 sf. 87 This badly corroded brooch once had a hinged pin. The form of the junction of the wings with the bow suggests that the wings may have been stepped like those in some varieties of Headstud. The absence of any trace of a stud and the presence of some form of hollow down the centre of the bow argue against this identification.

Date: possibly after c.75 A.D.

10. H60 (24) 11 (3) Only the lower, plain, part of a bow with a catch-plate survives. The type of brooch from which it came was most probably a Colchester Derivative as the catch-plates of Nauheim Derivatives tend to be formed by hammering out the bow whereas the step along the edge of the catch-plate here suggests that the item was cast. The section of the bow better suits a Colchester Derivative as well.

No comment.

11. W71 (20) 52 sf.23 The lower bow and catch-plate of either a Colchester Derivative or a Trumpet brooch. The form of the foot is, however, too bulbous to suit the latter.

No comment.

Aesica

12. W77 (17/23) 205 sf.92 The spring was held in the Polden Hill manner (see brooch 2), the only variation being that the chord was trapped under a forward-facing hook. Owing to the width of the top of the bow, each wing is short and also plain. The bow is cast in with the wings and spreads out downwards to end on each side in a boss beneath which the sides curve back to the centre to rest on a small semicircular boss. Behind this is a rivet or stud which fastened the bow to the upper part of a four-sided tapering plate which forms a fantailed foot. The plate has a projection on each side to match the bosses on the sides of the bow. The foot has a ridge along it. The catch-plate has a pin-groove. The whole is now plain, but was once covered in repoussee sheet soldered to the casting.

The type has recently (mackreth 1982) and the earliest stage in the typology of the brooch is considered to be those made in two pieces, like the present specimen. The spring-fixing arrangements vary even within constructionally similar groups thus obscuring the date to some extent. It may be noted that, however, unlike most brooches using the Polden Hill system, the chord is held by a forward-facing hook, a trait which distinctly recalls the Colchester - the chief alternatives are the pierced crest of brooch 2 here, the rearward-facing hook of brooch 4 and the hinged pin. The present example is placed within its normal area of distribution (ibid.,313) and, while dating is difficult, it seems most unlikely that the brooch was made after c.75 A.D. and is more likely to date to before c.60.

Nauheim Derivatives

13. W77 (34) 11 sf.59 Only half of the four-coil-internal-chord spring is present. The lower bow, with the catch-plate, is missing. The bow is plain and has a thin rectangular setion. For comment, see after brooch 14.

14. W77 (17/23) 151 sf.46 The spring is missing and it is only the slight upturn marking its begining which declares the type to which this brooch belongs. The bow is plain with a roughly circular section. The catch-plate is damaged.

Neither of these brooches has any characteristic which helps to place them in any particular part of the floruit of the type, although neither is likely to be pre-Conquest in date. The general date-range for most of British Nauheim Derivatives is from the Conquest to near the end of the first century. This should cover both the period of manufacture and the time subsequent during which specimens commonly survived in use.

Trumpets

Discussion will be found after brooch 20.

15. W71 (20) 104 sf.29 The spring, now missing, was once mounted on a loop behind the head. The brooch is very corroded and has lost all its original surface. The trumpet head is elongated and thim. The knop seems not to have had the petalled ornament typical of the largest groups of the type, but to have had a broad central moulding with vestiges of a thinner one above and below, the whole separated from the upper and lower bow by flutes. The lower bow tapers towards the foot, now lost along with the catch-plate.

16. M65 (V) 4 (6) The axis br through the remains of the spring passes through a pierced lug behind the head of the bow. The surface of the brooch is covered with corrosion accretions which have clogged the details of the moulded relief decoration. The head is short and parallel-sided until just before the abbreviated trumpet expansion. There seems to have been one or more ridges down the centre and the rudiments of a scroll ornament of celtic character survive on one side. The knop is made up of three pairs of cross-mouldings. The central one is more prominent than the outer ones and has some semblence of beaded decoration. In the other pairs, the inner elements are defintely beaded. The lower bow had either a median arris or a ridge. There had once been relief ornament down each side, but its form is not recoverable. There is no evidence that there had been any enamel.

17. W70 (7a) 24 sf.21 The spring is mounted like that of brooch 16. The trumpet expansion is slight and the head joins onto a head-plate with a rounded upper surface on which is cast the remains of a loop. The knop consists of a central set of three cross-mouldings divided from a single one top and bottom by flutes. Above and below these again is a pair of lenticular bosses. The upper and lower bows are plain and the latter ends in a simple strongly projecting foot.

18. W77 (17/23) sf.99 The spring is mounted like those of brooches 16 and 17. The trumpet effect is again slight and is finished at the top on each side with a pair of mouldings tucked into the angle between the head and the head-plate which is too damaged to tell if there had been a cast-on loop. The knop has a crude version of the usual petalled ornament and this is separated by flutes from a pair of cross-mouldings above and below. The lower bow is plain and the foot, along with most of the catch-plate, is lost.

19. W71 (20) 9 sf.7 The brooch is now in two pieces and its details are

19. W71 (20) 9 sf.7 The brooch is now in two pieces and its details are hidden by corrosion. The spring is mounted on an axis bar passing through pierced lugs, one on each side of the head. The trumpet is elongated but well-formed. On the head is cast a skeuomorph of the free-loop-and-collar found on standard specimens. The knop is poorly preserved and seems to have been petalled. All that survives of the lower bow is plain.

20. W77 (17/23) 3 sf.7 The knop only of a recognizable variety of Trumpet (cf., Hume 1863, 72 pl.IV,3). The fragment is made up of four cross-mouldings, the top one being larger than the others.

None of these brooches belongs to either the principal standard form or any of the chief variations of that (cf., Macdonald and Curle 1929, 553-5, fig.115,1; Wheeler 1930, 96, fig.28,30; Alexander and Bird 1980, 266). The earliest sated Trumpets remain those from The Lunt despite the best efforts of Boon and Savory (1975) and were lost before c.70-75 A.D. (Hobley 1969, 110, fig.19,9; Hobley 1973, 66, fig.19,8); both show that the type was fully fledged by then. The lack of adequate dating for different varieties prevents any seriation and all that can be offered is general floruit: c.90-5 (Potter 1979, 209, fig.84,8); c.100 (Wheeler and Wheeler 1928, 162, fig.13,14); Flavian-Trajanic (Boon ans Savory 1975, 54, fig.2,9); before c.125 (Atkinson 1942, 206, fig.36,H65); before 130 (Kenyon 1940, 224, fig.15,4); early second century (Cotton 1947, 144, fig.8,1); 110-130 (Bushe-Fox 1913, 26, fig.9,7); c.110-140? (Potter 1979, 208-9, fig.84,6); 140-c.163 (Macdonald and Curle 1929, 553-5, fig.115,1; Hartley 1972, 41); mid second century (Bushe-Fox 1913, 26, fig.9,6); Hadrianic-Antonine (Boon 1969, 47, fig.6,7); 70-180 (Pollard 1974, 138-40, fig.22,2); 150-70 (Potter 1979, 210, fig.84,12); Antonine (Stead 1976, 201, fig.101,28); 180 (Wedlake 1958, 221, fig.51,15); 150-220 (Potter 1979, 209, fig.84,5 and 9). It will be seen that a terminal date for the whole of this motley collection of about 175 would be appropriate. This should cover the time when survivors continued in use after the end of manufacture which should be close to c.150 for the latest versions. As was the case with the Colchester Derivatives, the distributional associations of these brooches is with the area local to Mancetter and running away west and south-west.

Plate

21. W69 (13) 2 sf.5 The pin was hinged. The plate is in the form of a slightly open crescent with a small boss on each point and the remains of a cast-on loop in the centre of the outer edge. There is a series of nibs running away from that, all stepped down from the main face of the plate which has a series of enamelled cells. In the middle are four lentoids lying on the circumference of a circle and on either side of that and reserved is a point which links with two lozenges surrounded by enamelling.

There is great variety in the designs of Plate brooches and it is seldom profitable to try and establish the dating of a specific pattern. The present example is no exception and the best that can be offered is that the date is likely to be second century as enamelled plate brooches are not characteristic of first century assemblages and are not to be expected in the third.

Penannular

22. (1) /H60 (1)/ The ring has a circular section. Each terminal consists of a flattened boss with a series of diagonal cuts around it. The pin has a broad wrap-round, is well humped, and has a slightly spatulate end where it seats on the ring.

A well-recognized design, its proper dating has not been established. It was popular in the second century as the examples from Newstead show and may have come into being during the first and lasted into the third. The hump in the pin would, if the type has been confirmed to the south-east, have been a sign that the brooch was very early, most probably before the first century A.D. However, it is clear that the habit persisted in the north and west of England and in a collection whose associations are so clearly not with the east and south-west, it cannot be used as a dating criterion.

Other Object

23. W77 (34) 1 sf.52 A spike with a trumpet expansion at one end which finishes in a flat face now parallel with the axis of the spike. There is no evidence for a catch-plate or for a pin-fixing arrangement.

Purpose unknown.

Bibliography

Alexander and Bird 1980 _.Alexander and _.Bird, Surrey Archaeological Collections 72, 1980, 266 .

Atkinson 1942 Report on Excavations at Wroxeter (The Roman City of Viroconium) in the County of Salop, 1923-1927, Donald Atkinson, Oxford, 1942.

Boon 1969 Belgic and Roman Silchester: the Excavations of 1954-8, with an excursus on the Early History of Calleva, George C.Boon, Archaeologia 102, 1969, 1-81.

Boon and Savory 1975 A Silver Trumpet-Brooch with Relief Decoration, Parcel-Gilt, from Carmarthen, and a Note on the Development of the type, George C.Boon and H.N.Savory, The Antiquaries Journal LV, 1975, 41-61.

Bushe-Fox 1913 Excavations on the Site of the Roman Town at Wroxeter, Shropshire, in 1912, J.P.Bushe-Fox, Reports of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries of London, No. I, Oxford, 1913.

Cotton 1947 Excavations at Silchester 1938-9, M.Aylwin Cotton, Archaeologia 92, 1947, 121-67.

Gould 1967 Excavations at Wall, Staffs, 1964-6, on the Site of The Roman Forts, J.Gould, Transactions of the Lichfield and South Staffordshire Archaeological and Historical Society VIII, 1966-67, 1-40.

Hartley 1972 The Roman Occupations of Scotland: The Evidence of Samian Ware, B.R.Hartley, Britannia III, 1972, 1-55.

Hobley 1969 A Neronian-Vespasianic Military Site at "The Lunt", Baginton, Warwickshire, Brian Hobley, Transactions and Proceedings of the Birmingham Archaeological Society 83, 1966-7 (1969), 65-129.

Hobley 1973 Excavations at "The Lunt" Roman Military Site,

Hobley 1973 — Excavations at "The Lunt" Roman Military Site, Baginton, Warwickshire, 1968-71, Second Interim Report, Brian Hobley, Transactions of the Birmingham and Warwickshire Archaeological Society, 85, 1971-3, 7-92.

Kenyon 1940 — Excavations at Viroconium 1936-7, Miss K.M.Kenyon, Archaeologia 88, 1940, 175-227.

Kenyon 1948 — Excavations at the Jewry Wall Site, Leicester, Kathleen M.Kenyon, Reports of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries of London, No. XV, Oxford, 1948.

Macdonald and Curle 1929 — The Roman Fort at Mumrills, Nr. Falkirk, Sir George Macdonald and Alexander O.Curle, Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland LXIII, 1928-1929, 396-575.

Mackreth 1982 — Two brooches from Stonea, Cambs. and Bicester, Oxon. and the origin of the Aesica Brooch, D.F.Mackreth, Britannia XIII, 1982, 310-5.

Pollard 1974 — A Late Iron Age Settlement and a Romano-British Villa at Holcombe, Nr. Uplyme, Devon, Shiela Pollard, Proceedings of the Devon Archaeological Society 32, 1974, 59-161.

Potter 1979 — Romans in North-West England, Excavations at the Roman forts of Ravenglass, Watercrook and Bowness-on-Solway, T.W.Potter, Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society, Research Series, Volume I, Kendal, 1979.

Stead 1976 — Excavations at Winterton Roman Villa, and other Roman sites in north Lincolnshire, 1958-1969, I.M.Stead, Department of the Environment Archaeological Report 9, London, 1976.

Wedlake 1958 — Excavations at Camerton, Somerset, W.J.Wedlake, privately printed, 1958.

Wheeler 1930 — London in Roman Times, R.E.M.Wheeler, London Museum Catalogues: No. 3, London, 1930.

Wheeler and Wheeler 1928 — The Roman Amphitheatre at Caerleon, Monmouthshire, R.E.M.Wheeler and T.V.Wheeler, Archaeologia 78, 1928, 111-218.

Wheeler and Wheeler 1936 — Verulamium, a Belgic and two Roman Cities, R.E.M. Wheeler and T.V.Wheeler, Reports of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries of London, No. XI, Oxford, 1936.