

# THE SMALL FINDS FROM SOMERFORD KEYNES

*By H.E.M. Cool*

## **Introduction**

This report deals with all the small finds from Somerford Keynes other than coins and those made of stone, and a few preliminary remarks about the nature of this material are appropriate before it is described in detail.

The archive consists of just over 1000 relevant items all of which have been inspected. Only 13% of this total came from the excavation, the remainder was the result of surface collection and metal detecting. No detailed evidence of precisely where much of the surface collected material came from appears to have been recorded, and this naturally limits to some extent the questions that can be asked of it. The methodology adopted was to inspect and catalogue appropriately all the items. Where possible they were assigned a spot date. It became apparent that by far the majority of the identifiable items were of late Iron Age to early Roman date. There was a little mid 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> century and a slightly larger amount of late 4<sup>th</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> century material. Medieval material was very rare. Post medieval and modern material consisted of the sort of items to be expected from sporadic agricultural use of the ground (horseshoes, horse fittings, buttons and other dress accessories).

The following report discusses all of the material that can be typologically assigned to the Iron Age and Roman periods, together with a few items of intrinsic interest which may be Roman but for which no dated comparanda has been found. All of the material from the excavations is included but the less diagnostic material from the surface collection has been excluded.

The collection is biased in several ways. The use of metal detectors has been shown to bias the metalwork assemblage, for example towards more 'chunky' items at the expense of long thin things, towards bow brooches at the expense of penannular brooches (Cool in Booth forthcoming). It is clear as well that on this site bone artefacts are seriously under-represented. It could be expected that they would be under-represented in the surface collection but even in the excavated material they are very rare with only two items recorded out of the total 130 stratified finds. Bone was the plastic of the Roman world, being a cheaper alternative to metal for many artefacts. On sites where bone is not well preserved, one can expect to be losing many parts of the material culture of the inhabitants. It can also be expected that items that were made of iron will also be under-represented. The iron from the site came from both the excavations and survey, but has suffered considerable post-excavation deterioration in the intervening years. As it was not X-radiographed until 2003 as part of this programme of work, there was no record of what many of the items may originally have been, as they now exist only as formless fragments.

With an assemblage subject to these biases, there are limits on the types of questions that can be asked of it. It should, and does, provide very useful dating information. The functional analysis may provide clues as to the status of the site, but it has to be appreciated that some functional categories will be under-represented. Some types of

toilet implements and personal ornaments will be missing or rare because of the way the material was collected. Some categories such as writing equipment, tools and agricultural items can be expected to be reduced in numbers because they would normally consist of large numbers of iron items. The contribution of the small finds to a detailed understanding of the excavated trenches is also limited because of the small numbers found stratified; the fact that 17% of the excavated material consisted of relatively featureless fragments of wire, sheet; and the lack of knowledge of how the unstratified material relates to the excavated trenches.

Despite all of the problems, however, the small finds do tell a most remarkable story especially when compared to the evidence of the pottery and glass vessels. Both of those categories suggest a modest rural assemblage. As may be seen by a glance at Table 1 the sheer quantity of small finds found suggests something very different. In what follows the material will be discussed first by functional category following Crummy (1983). The discussion will date the material and where possible set it in a wider context. This detailed consideration will be followed by a brief overview drawing out some important themes. A full consideration of what the small finds tell us about the site will be reserved for the overall consideration of all the small finds from all sites in this project, as it is only by considering the Somerford Keynes assemblage against a wider regional background that it becomes possible to understand it.

It should be noted that the condition of the copper alloy was variable. Some was in very good condition, some in very poor condition and many items were so thickly coated by iron pan that only the use of a magnet demonstrates that they were made of copper alloy rather than iron. It has not always been possible, therefore, to describe all of the decoration accurately.

## **Personal Ornaments**

The personal ornaments are summarised by phase in Table 2. The category is dominated by brooches to a quite an extraordinary extent. As these provide valuable dating evidence they will be discussed at length grouped according to a broadly chronological order.

### **Brooches**

#### ***3<sup>rd</sup> to 1<sup>st</sup> century BC form***

##### *Involute brooch*

The earliest brooch found was the involute brooch **321**. Brooches such as this are an Iron Age form in use during the 2nd and 1st century BC and were probably in existence by the end of the 3rd century BC (Harding 1974, 188-9). They had a variety of hinge mechanisms (see Hattatt 1985, 16-7) but the precise method used on this is unclear. An X ray shows only very slight hints that the corroded hinge plate may have been

perforated. The expanded plate over the catchplate on these brooches was sometimes decorated, but there is no evidence that it was in this case though any light incisions could have been obscured by the corrosion.

### *Early to mid 1<sup>st</sup> century forms*

#### *Nauheim Derivative Brooches – Hull Types 10 and 11*

All the one piece brooches with an internal chord in the late La Tène tradition will be termed Nauheim Derivatives here and in the CD (for general discussion see Olivier 1988, 36-8). In general a date prior to c. AD 75 can be suggested for these. Simple wire examples known as *Drahtfibel* are represented here by **984**, **5016**, **5128** and probably by the fragments **149**, **467** and **630**. Most have plain bows but one (**149**) has transverse moulding which Olivier (1988, 37 no. 14) has noted as a rare but widely scattered variant. **984** also has traces of decoration. True Nauheim Derivatives have rectangular bows, and are more common at Somerford Keynes than *Drahtfibel*. Seven examples have decorated bows (**148**, **536**, **635**, **1170**, **5002**, **5007**, **5118**, **5119**), two have plain bows (**155**, **5132**) and an additional one (**1087**) is too corroded to ascertain if there is any decoration. Mackreth (1998, 130) has suggested that the decorated ones might be considered to be early and so this could suggest a strong pre-Conquest presence. The only example of any of these from a stratified context was **630** from a Phase 1-2 pit.

There are also five examples of a variant with a thin rectangular-sectioned upper bow, a very narrow lower bow and stamped decoration on the upper bow (**142**, **151**, **165**, **997**, **5042**). This is Hull Type 10D (Hattatt 1987, 22 no. 739). It has a restricted distribution spreading from Hampshire to Gloucestershire and Mackreth (1993, 31 no. 14) has suggested it may be an Atrebatian type. There is also a single example with an expanded bow (**154**) which Olivier (1988, 37, 15) notes as having a very restricted distribution in the south-west. Neither of these variants is closely dated though the presence of one of the latter at Hod Hill (Brailsford 1958, fig. 8.2) would suggest currency during the 40s for that variant.

#### *Strip bow – Hull Type 12*

There are four certain examples of strip bow hinged brooches (Hattatt 1985, 68). In each case the hinge held by curving the head down and behind the bow (**5004**, **5023**, **5028**, **5135**). It is possible that **5009** is another example but it is so obscured by mortar that secure identification is impossible. This is a pre-conquest type that had gone of use by c. AD 75 and the concentration of the type in the Dorset / Wiltshire / Somerset area has led Mackreth (1998, 141) to see it as typical of the Durotriges. Attention may be drawn to **5028**, which is unusual in both size and catchplate design.

### *Continental one-piece – Hull Type 19*

There is one example of the continental type with a bold angle by the head. This is a mid Rhine type (Riha 1979, Type 2.6) current in the first half of the 1<sup>st</sup> century with a distribution in Britain primarily south of the Thames (Crummy 1983, 8 no. 16).

### *Langton Down – Hull Type 21*

Pieces of Langton Down brooches (Hattatt 1985, 35) are common in the assemblage but as all but **719** are relatively small fragments a precise number of brooches cannot be stated. There are 7 spring cover and upper bow fragments (**68, 71, 433, 686, 928, 936, 5106**) and three lower bow fragments (**934, 1193, 5113, 5201**) indicating a minimum of 9 and a maximum of 11. In all cases the bows are reeded and in most cases the junction of the bow and the spring cover is curved, with an angular stepped junction seen only on **686** and **5106**. Only one example (**719**) was stratified. It was recovered from a Phase 1 pit.

This is a continental brooch form whose use on the continent is placed principally in the first two-thirds of the 1<sup>st</sup> century (Feugère 1985, 266). Hattatt (1985, 35) suggests that Langton Down brooches were primarily a post conquest form in Britain, but the numbers recovered from the pre-Conquest cemetery at King Harry Lane, Verulamium (Stead and Rigby 1989, 91 type E), where they formed 12% of the large brooch assemblage, shows that numbers were entering the country in not inconsiderable numbers prior to the Conquest. The distribution is primarily an eastern one (Olivier 1988, 45) and so the strong presence of the type in this assemblage is of some note. None, for example, are recorded in the large assemblage at Kingscote (Mackreth 1998) where there is a strong presence of mid 1<sup>st</sup> century brooches.

### *Rosette brooch – Hull Types 26 and 27*

There is one fragment (**5087**) from the style of Rosette brooch where the central disc is slightly convex and leads directly to the lower bow (Hattatt 1987, 47 Class C; Feugère 1985, Type 16a2). When complete it may have been similar to one from Colchester (Hawkes and Hull 1947, 316 no. 79). On the continent the form was in use during the Augustan period and there are grounds for believing that in Britain too it had gone out of common use by the time of the Conquest (Mackreth 1999, 219). It is likely that the lower bow and perforated catchplate fragment **5104** also came from this broad form of Rosette brooch. A second form of Rosette brooch is represented by **538** which consists of a disc and fantail without the arched bow (see Stead and Rigby 286 no. 67.4, fig. 99) Originally it is likely to have been decorated with repoussé sheet (see Feugère 1985, type 20). In Britain these appear to have been in use during the second quarter of the 1<sup>st</sup> century (Mackreth 1995, 971 no. 94). This example was found in a ditch fill of uncertain date.

### *Colchester – Hull Type 90*

Thirteen examples of one-piece Colchester brooches were found (Hattatt 1989, 24), all from effectively unstratified contexts. This is an early 1<sup>st</sup> century form that was probably

no longer being made by the time of the Conquest (Mackreth 1998, 116). Most are in very poor condition and are fragmentary (**144, 145, 147, 152, 613, 1157, 1194, 5102, 5126**) which makes it difficult to assign them to particular variants. **41** and **1003** seem to have the normal rounded bow section of the Colchester. The hooks on both **143** and **303** are long and this is normally regarded as a feature more typical of the later examples (*ibid*).

In addition to the brooches that can definitely be identified as belonging to the Colchester one-piece form, there are four very fragmentary and corroded fragments (**156, 631, 1136, 5112**) that may either have belonged to that category, but which could equally have been the later two piece Colchester Derivative two-piece type (see below). The fragment **342** may also have been from a Colchester brooch with a strip bow.

### *Mid to late 1<sup>st</sup> century forms*

#### *Aesica – Hull Type 37*

Four examples of Aesica brooches (Mackreth 1982; Hattaff 1987, 54 ) were recovered. One (**58**) is the upper fragment of a two piece construction brooch and one (**1112**) is from an example with single piece construction. The other two (**97, 1140**) are represented by foot fragments decorated by ring and dot patterns. The only example to retain its spring fixing arrangement is the two-piece **58** which has the Polden Hill fastening (see p. 000 below). **1140** was found in a Phase 1 ditch, all the others were unstratified.

It is possible that the form developed prior to the conquest (Mackreth 1998, 130 no. 70) but the main currency was during the mid to late 1<sup>st</sup> century.

#### *Eye – Hull Type 40*

There is a single example of an Eye brooch (**1035**). It is very corroded and so the precise variant cannot be identified, but the profile is that of Riha (1979) Type 2.7 which would place it in the middle years of the century (Claudian to mid Flavian).

#### *Aucissa – Hull Type 51*

There is one classic form of Aucissa present (**5008**) with the hinge bar held by the head rolled forward and the fragment **158** probably also came from another example. Aucissa brooches are an Augustan to Claudian form on the Continent and most in Britain arrived after AD 43. **217**, however, comes from a form that is a very early variant (Riha 1979, 115 variant 5.2) for which Mackreth (1995, 974 no. 90) argues a date of c. 25 B.C to AD 10 early in the sequence. **217**, therefore, may be an earlier pre-Conquest find. All of the brooches from this site are unstratified.

### *Bagendon – Hull Type 52*

A single example of a Bagendon brooch was found unstratified (**5110**). These are a relatively rare Claudian form found scattered throughout southern England (Hattatt 1985, 53).

### *Hod Hill – Hull Types 60-64, 71, 71*

Hod Hill brooches (Hattatt 1985, 56) are the commonest mid 1<sup>st</sup> century form in the assemblage. These arrived in Britain at the time of the Conquest and were going out of use during the 60s. They come in a wide range of shapes and sizes but all have hinged pins, foot knobs and are frequently decorated with white metal plating.

At Somerford Keynes the commonest form is the one without side-lugs where the upper bow has vertical channels and the lower bow is triangular (Hull Type 60) There are 8 certain examples (**80, 83, 94, 161, 591, 1070, 5013, 5039**), and the fragmentary **297** probably also belongs to this variant. Mackreth (1998, 139 no. 129) has argued that the type had gone out of use by c. AD 55-60 on the grounds of its rarity at Wroxeter. **5031** is very similar but differs in that the lower bow appears to have shallow transverse ribs rather than being a flat field on which patterns could be picked out in the white metal coating.

There are two examples with side lugs placed centrally on the upper bow (Hull Type 62 - **150, 1086**). There is also a particular variety of the form (**1169**) which probably had niello decoration on the cross bar (see Hattatt 1985, 58 no. 318), though corrosion has removed all traces of this. There are also two examples with the lugs on the base of the upper bow (Hull Type 61 - **219, 1155**). The fragment **59** was probably from the variety with the lugs at the top of the upper bow (Hull Type 63). The precise form the fragments **1002, 1084** and **5123** is unclear as the edges are broken but they too can be placed in the Hull Type 60-63 range. Other forms represented include Hull Types 70 (**793**) and 71 (**881**) a type similar to a Hull Type 60 but with central button (**587**) and several fragmentary examples (**42, 57, 76, 80, 1006, 5010**) generally from the forms decorated by transverse ribs.

Four of these brooches were found stratified. **793** came from a Phase 1 pit. **587, 793** and **881** came from contexts more broadly dated to Phases 2 – 3.

### *Mid-first century disc brooches*

**197** is a fragment from a mid first century disc brooch (Hull Type 239) which when complete would have had bone bosses riveted to the circular panels (see for example Hattatt 1985, 138 no. 514). It is a continental type (Riha 1979, Type 7.8) with a distribution centring on Gaul and with most British finds found in the east. The fragmentary **178** may be another mid to late 1<sup>st</sup> century form as the central perforation is found on a variety of such brooches (cf Hattatt 1989, fig. 201). Another disc brooch is represented by **5025** but this is too corroded for any typological identification to be made as to whether it belongs to the mid 1<sup>st</sup> century or later tradition.

### *Penannular – Fowler Type D5*

Penannular brooches notoriously have long-lifespans but it is possible that the two examples of Fowler (1960) type D5 brooches with turned back notched terminals (**1082**, **5036**) should be regarded as part of the mid 1<sup>st</sup> century assemblage here. The form has been found at Usk in a pre-Flavian contexts (Manning *et al* 1995, 94 no. 76, fig. 28), and Mackreth (2000, 157) has also drawn attention to the regular occurrence of the type in mid 1<sup>st</sup> century contexts. A third Type D penannular was also found (**1166**) but was too corroded for the precise variant to be identified.

### *Mid 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> century forms*

#### *Colchester Derivative – Hull Type 92-94, 100, 103*

Two-piece Colchester Derivative brooches developed shortly before or about the time of the Roman conquest and were a common mid to later 1<sup>st</sup> century form with some continuing in use into the 2<sup>nd</sup> century. There is a range of variants often with strong regional tendencies, and the spring fixing arrangements can help to date some. The simplest form is a hook facing the rear holding the spring chord. This was an ineffective method and was only used in the mid years of the 1<sup>st</sup> century. The second type has a double perforated lug behind the head with the spring chord passing through the upper lug and the bar inside the spring through the lower. Mackreth (1998, 117) has called this the Harlow method and pointed out that it is typical of the Colchester Derivatives in tribal areas of the Catuvellauni and the Iceni, and is much commoner in that area than elsewhere. The third system, termed the Polden Hill method, has the bar inside the spring lodged in perforations in the end of the wings and the chord held by a hook or lug. This is the preferred method in the west of the country. Some Colchester Derivative brooches were hinged.

The basic Colchester Derivative brooch (Hattatt 1987, 88.) is represented by 13 examples. Only one (**81**) has the cavetto moulding typical of Hull Type 92, the rest may be placed in his Form 93 (**49**, **60**, **146**, **585**, **1001**, **1133**, **5024**, **5107**, **5111**, **5117**, **5120**, **5133**). It is not possible to date most of the examples from Somerford Keynes more closely within the mid 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> century period, though on **49** and **5120** the lug has been fashioned as a skeuomorph of the hook that held the spring in the one piece Colchesters, and **146** has an elaborately perforated catch plate. Both of these features suggest that they may have been made in the mid 1<sup>st</sup> century rather than later. The only stratified example (**585**) came from an early 2<sup>nd</sup> century well fill.

Apart from **146** where the head is too corroded to be sure of the precise spring fixing arrangements, all of the brooches have the spring held by the Harlow method. Though the eastern tendency of this method has been noted, Mackreth (1998, 117 no. 9) has drawn attention to a variant which is local Gloucestershire/Wiltshire form. This has a ridge down the upper bow which is stopped by two cross-cuts with a similar pair of grooves on the foot, and is represented here by **5024**, **5117** and **5133**. The lower body fragments **5092**, **5124** and **5127** may also belong to this type.

It is normal to consider the variant of Colchester Derivative where the head is humped over the wings as a separate type, the Dolphin (Hull Type 94). Fourteen are present in the Somerford Keynes assemblage with a variety of spring-fixing arrangements. **315**, **5006** have the rear hook method of the mid 1<sup>st</sup> century. **5006** is of particular interest because the catch-plate was obviously separately made and slotted into the groove on the back of the bow. **50**, **163**, **317**, **572**, **792**, **1173**, **5005** and **5018** all have the Harlow method of spring fixing. On **79** and **1079** the spring is held by a forward hook and **5012** is hinged. **159** and **994** are too corroded for the precise arrangement to be ascertained, but they were obviously sprung and had some form of chord hook. **572** and **5012** have large perforations which would suggest a 1<sup>st</sup> century date, though **572** together with **792** was found in a 2<sup>nd</sup> century occupation layer.

Amongst the Dolphin brooches there are four that belong to a distinctive type with elaborate flanges on the upper bow (**50**, **317**, **792**, **1173**, **5018**), with three (**50**, **317** and **792**) being very similar. All have the Harlow method of pin fixing and may be a local variant linked with the Polden Hill brooches with expanded heads (Hull Type 103) discussed below.

As is to be expected in this region the commonest type of Colchester derivative recovered was the Polden Hill with a total of 40 identified with certainty. A recurring variant has the perforated lug on the head continuing on the upper bow as a transversely notched ridge, a semi-cylindrical spring case with generally paired grooves at the ends and a perforated catch-plate. None have the semi-circular mouldings at the head/wing junction. There are five examples with a ridge (**159**, **326**, **790**, **921**, **1066**) and a further three where the ridge is suppressed but the line of transverse grooves is present (**91**, **5116**, **5137**). **1141** may also come from the ridged variety but is very corroded and the identification is not certain. This form has been associated with Hull Type 98 (Hattatt 1987, 97 no. 896), but Macreth in discussing six examples from Kingscote and Wycomb could not identify a sub type into which they fitted though he noted a distribution stretching from Wiltshire to North Wales (Mackreth 1998, 118 nos. 17-20). With these examples from Somerford Keynes, there is now a marked concentration in the Gloucestershire region. The scant dating evidence hitherto suggested it was in use during the second half of the 1<sup>st</sup> century (*ibid*). The contexts of the ones found here support this. **790** and **1141** were found in Phase 1 ditch fills whilst **326** came from a 2<sup>nd</sup> century occupation layer. Slightly different variants are represented by **664** (with a solid catch plate), **725** and **5021** (with head mouldings) and **556** with decorated wings, decorated return to the catchplate and small footknob. The decorated catch plate on **556** has been noted as a Gloucestershire trait (Cracknell 1990). Only **556** was stratified and was found in a Phase 2/3 ditch fill.

Other examples of Hull Type 98 with the classic moulding on either side of the head include **85**, **93**, **402**, **723**, **1078**, **1176**. **402** has an elaborate perforation in the catch plate suggesting a mid to late 1<sup>st</sup> century. **5131** is a very highly corroded Polden Hill brooch whose lower end is broken but which may have had a separately applied foot knob. This would be unusual but is occasionally found on Colchester Derivative brooches as may be seen on one from Wilcote (Mackreth 1993, 29 no. 10) from an early 2<sup>nd</sup> century context. The only stratified example was **723** from a Phase 1 gully fill.

The other type of Polden Hill that is common in the assemblage is the Hull Type 103 with widened panel on the upper bow (Hattatt 1985, 84 no. 382). There are three examples with a rectangular panel (**96**, **1146**, **1158**) and two where the panel is triangular (**834**, **1137**). **1076** may also belong to this variety but is much corroded and the identification cannot be certain. This type is a south-western one and a date of c. AD 65 – 125 has been suggested (Mackreth 1993, 29 nos. 6-7). The narrow lower body fragments with small projecting foot knobs (**51**, **54**, **65**, **66**, **87**, **5093**) are also likely to belong to this type (for similar lower bows see **834**, **1137**, **1146**). One of these (**87**) has a decorated catch plate. Three brooches seem to be variants of the form. Two have narrow flanges on the upper and lower bows (**201** and **1071**), and one (**1138**) which seems to be a very strange hybrid of Hull Type 103 and the T-shaped type Form 104, another lower Severn form (Hattatt 1987, 102).

Other types of Polden Hill brooch occur in far smaller quantities. **5020** has no decoration other than a pair of ribs on the wings. There is one example (**1077**) of the light Polden Hill (Hull Type 97). This is a mid 1<sup>st</sup> century form with a distribution stretching from south Wales through the middle Severn valley to Wiltshire. Webster (in Manning *et al* 1995, 74-5) has noted it is particularly popular in southern Wales. The rarity of the form in this very large assemblage might also suggest it was not made in the immediate vicinity. There is also one example of a massive embossed brooch with heavy mouldings and the chord held by a backward facing hook which should place it in the mid 1<sup>st</sup> century (**1067**). Another brooch with heavy mouldings is **78**. This has an upper bow reminiscent of the Hull Type 103 mouldings but here combined with a central button suggesting some influence from the trumpet family. Two small brooches combine Polden Hill spring fixing arrangements with bow decoration more often seen on the T-shape brooches concentrated in the lower Severn area. **5001** is enamelled and has a pronounced foot moulding while the fragmentary **314** and **5088** have stepped flat heads similar to Hull Type 110 (Hattatt 1987, 104 no. 10), a late 1<sup>st</sup> to mid 2<sup>nd</sup> century form. **5029** with a narrow head with Polden Hill spring fastening may also be a hybrid between the Colchester Derivative and the T-shaped tradition. Finally four lower bow fragments may be considered here. A Polden Hill brooch with similar transverse stepped mouldings to those on **89** and **576** has been recovered from Alchester (Lloyd-Morgan 2001, 225 no. 4). Two lower bow fragments have bows with a deep central channel running to the foot and large triangular perforations on their catchplates (**1171**, **5121**). These are very similar to a Polden Hill brooch from Wilcote in a late 1<sup>st</sup> to early 2<sup>nd</sup> century context (Mackreth 1993, 29 no. 5). The pierced catch plate would suggest a mid to late 1<sup>st</sup> century date. Both **5001** and **89** have decorated return plates which seem to be a Gloucestershire trait (Cracknell 1990).

Four other brooches belonging to the broad Colchester Derivative family but which cannot be assigned to any of the normal types are also present. On **1178** the spring chord would have been held by a vestigial forward facing hook but it is unclear whether the ends of the wings would have been perforated in the Polden Hill manner. The side flanges are similar to those on the Polden Hill brooches **201** and **1071** whilst the moulded central block is typical of the T-shaped Hull Type 107 (Hattatt 1987, 102), and this seems to be another hybrid between the two traditions. another hybrid is represented by **52** where the spring is held by the Harlow method but the sides of the head have the mouldings typical of the Polden Hill. **218** has the spring held by a rearward facing hook

and the spring axis bar would have lodged in notches in the end of the wings. this arrangement would suggest a mid 1<sup>st</sup> century date. The stepped head is reminiscent of Hull Types 109 and 110 (T shaped brooches) whilst the moulded decoration is similar to that seen on some Polden Hill brooches. Finally **43** and **880** are too corroded and fragmentary for any more precise identification .

It is likely that many of the lower body fragments came from brooches of the broad Colchester Derivative family. Eight taper to narrow pointed feet, six having solid catch plates (**598**, **679**, **1090**, **1129**, **5090**, **5092**, **5095**), and two have perforations (**90**, **1167**). Two have wider decorated bows with perforated catchplates (**550**, **1014**). **63** also has a decorated bow but has an unperforated catchplate. Several have small ribbed foot knobs (**55**, **64**, **77**, **1132**, **5125**). These are most likely to come from Polden Hill brooches or the T-shaped brooches discussed below.

### *Late 1<sup>st</sup> to mid 2<sup>nd</sup> century forms*

#### *Lower Severn T-shape brooches – Hull Types 104, 105, 110, 122, 132, 144*

T-shaped brooches, often hinged, are a local type popular on either side of the Severn estuary (Hattatt 1987, 100, fig. 36). Several types are represented at Somerford Keynes. There are three examples (**92**, **741**, **796**) of a form with sharply angled head, the Polden Hill method of spring fastening and an enamelled panel with lentoid mouldings on the upper body. This is Hull Type 110 (Hattatt 1987, 106 no. 910). There is also one complete (**1174**) and one small fragment (**933**) of Hull Type 122 (Hattatt 1987, 109 nos. 918-9), a hinged form with small lozenge on the centre of the bow and a small headloop. The hinged Hull Type 105 (Hattatt 1987, 102 fig. 35) with three lozenge cells down the front is represented by a single example (**316**), whilst **1135** seems to be a variant of Hull Type 107 (*op cit*). The dating evidence for both is sparse but is indicative of a floruit within the late 1<sup>st</sup> to mid 2<sup>nd</sup> century period (Hull 1967, 34-5). Unusually for this site two of the Hull Type 110 were found stratified. **796** was from a pit assigned to Phase 1 – 2 and **741** comes from a Phase 2 – 3 pit which also contained 2<sup>nd</sup> century pottery. There are also two examples with ribbed bows (**791**, **5134**). **791** has a perforated catchplate and has white metal coating suggesting a 1<sup>st</sup> century date.

There are also two examples of a type with a crest and ribbed unit down the front (**1172**, **5022**), one of which retains an acanthus foot knob. This is an uncommon form but a very similar example was found near Cirencester (Hattatt 1987, 113 no. 928) perhaps hinting at a Gloucestershire origin.

There are three examples of the T-shape brooch with a serrated middle section and the Polden Hill method of spring attachment (Hattatt 1987, 116). **311** and **5109** have enamelled cells centrally, **5041** is a less common variant with incised decoration centrally. A fourth fragment, heavily obscured by mortar, is also likely to have come from this type of brooch (**1131**). Mackreth (1998, 123 nos. 44-7) has reviewed the scant dating evidence and suggested a later 1<sup>st</sup> century date is most likely. It is a local type with a concentration in the Somerset/ Gloucestershire area extending into Oxfordshire and Wiltshire.

Finally, the foot fragment with circular cell (**74**) comes from the Nor'Nour brooch (Hull Type 132 – Hull 1967, 38 Type 17) and the **5108** may be an example of Hull Type 121 Which has a distribution concentrated in the Wiltshire / Dorset area (Hattatt 1987, 109)

#### *Plate-headed T-shaped – Hull type 138 /140*

Hattatt described these large ungainly brooches with good reason as ‘surely the ugliest types produced in Britain’ (Hattatt 1985, 94). An example of each type was found at Somerford Keynes (**971, 1069**). The dating is uncertain. An fragment from an example with a wide hinge cylinder like 1069 was recovered from a ditch fill with later 2<sup>nd</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> century material at Usk (Manning *et al* 1995, 91 no. 63), but whether this fragment was residual is unclear. Both types are concentrated in the Somerset / Gwent area with Gloucestershire being outside of its normal distribution area.

#### *Backworth trumpet – Hull Type 158*

Two examples (**322, 72**) of the classic Backworth brooch (Hull Type 158A) with the central acanthus button running all the way around the bow. Such brooches are clearly in use by c. AD 75 (Mackreth 1969, 110 no. 9) and continued in use into the mid 2<sup>nd</sup> century and possibly beyond. They have a nationwide distribution. At Somerford Keynes this classic form is outnumbered by the form where the acanthus moulding occurs only on the front of the bow and there is an integral cast headloop and plate (Hull Type 158D). On these the spring is held between two pierced lugs and the central mouldings are mirrored on the back by transverse ribs. Five examples are present (**95, 164, 638, 1175, 5037**). The form has a distribution centred on either side of the Severn in the Gwent, Somerset and Gloucestershire area (Hattatt 1987, 134 no. 959.). Examples from well-dated contexts are relatively rare. A complete example from the Caerleon vicus was from a late 2<sup>nd</sup> century context (Lloyd-Morgan 2000, 331 no. 8). One lacking its spring and pin from Frocester was recovered from a 3<sup>rd</sup> century context (Price 2000, 39 no. 53). There may be some hints, therefore, that the form was not in use throughout the full later 1<sup>st</sup> to later 2<sup>nd</sup> century period, but belonged to the later part of it.

#### *Chester trumpet – Hull Type 154*

The commonest trumpet brooch represented is the Chester variant (Hattatt 1985, 109). It is a late 1<sup>st</sup> century form which continued in use into the early 2<sup>nd</sup> century (Mackreth 1998, 134 nos. 102-7). Ten examples (**73, 75, 162, 710, 713, 770, 1080, 1159, 5017, 5030**) of the classic form were found and a broken fragment (**47**) may be from a related type. **770** was a complete example in good condition from a 2<sup>nd</sup> century ditch, the others were unstratified. Unlike the Backworth variant which has a nationwide distribution, this is a local variant with a distribution concentrated in the southern Severn valley into the Midlands. Mackreth (1998, 134) noted that the largest concentration of Chester brooches he knew of had been found at Kingscote with eight examples. Together with the ten examples found at Somerford Keynes, this might perhaps suggest that the workshop producing the form was in the Cirencester area.

There are also several fragments from other trumpet brooches of uncertain form. These include the head fragment (**82**), and one lower bow fragment definitely from a trumpet brooch (**5114**). The four lower body fragments consisting of flat-fronted bow with semi-circular ribbed foot knobs (**53, 88, 301, 5089**) that may also have come from trumpet brooches.

#### *Headstud - Hull Type 148*

Headstud brooches (Hattatt 1987, 120) are only represented by **5115**. It comes from the type where the front of the bow is transversely grooved and the grooves may sometimes be filled by enamel (Cool and Philo 1998, 30 Headstud type 3b and 6). This variant was in use by the 70s, and was commoner in the north than in the south-west.

#### *Keyhole – Hull Type 238*

There is one very corroded example of a hinged keyhole brooch (**593**). These seem to be ultimately derived from rosette brooches and a mid to later 1<sup>st</sup> century date would be most appropriate (Hattatt 1985, 178 no 632).

#### *Trumpet-derived*

It is difficult to place the fragment **56** because the front of the brooch has sheared off. The headloop and the expanded head with a cast hinge casing behind suggest it might come from the fantail family, not otherwise attested in this assemblage (Hattatt 1987, 148).

#### *2<sup>nd</sup> century forms*

##### *Wroxeter – Hull Type 151*

There are three examples of Wroxeter brooches (Hattatt 1987, 145) which have affinities to trumpet brooches but where the head is a flat plate rather than an expanded trumpet head (**969, 1143, 5129**). **1143** is slightly unusual as there are mouldings at the head/bow junction. As is normal with this type all the examples have very different bow decoration. Such dating evidence as there is suggests a 2<sup>nd</sup> century date (Mackreth 1995, 963 no. 27) and the context of **1143** provides useful corroboration of this as it was found in a Phase 3 ditch fill with mid to late 2<sup>nd</sup> century pottery. The type has a widespread distribution throughout the country.

##### *Plate-headed trumpet – Hull Type 159*

There are three plate-headed trumpet brooches. **40** and **5103** have the normal acanthus moulding but **5032** has an unusual spoked button. This is a local form with a distribution centred on Gloucestershire (Hattatt 1987, 125 and Table 3). It would appear to be a mid

2<sup>nd</sup> century form as Mackreth (2000, 150 no. 21) has noted that none have been found in contexts prior to the Hadrianic period.

#### *Alcester – Hull Type 162*

There was a single fragment from a very large example (**98**) of this sort of brooch probably originally decorated by silver foil. In general the form is poorly dated, though an unfinished example was recovered at Castleford in a context dated to c. AD 140-180 (Cool and Philo 1998, 49 no. 81).

#### *Pelta / half disc and trumpet – Hull type 167*

The highly corroded small brooch **69** is of considerable interest. The combination of the trumpet head, the panel on the mid bow and the applied metal trim relate it to a pair of rare variants normally decorated with either a half disc or a pelta (Hattatt 1989, 88). The central panel now appears to be triangular but this is probably the result of extreme corrosion. Only about a dozen of either type are known and the main distribution is in the east of England. Outliers in the west country are rare (*ibid.* fig. 45). By analogy to the commoner full disc and trumpet brooch Olivier (1996, 257 no. 110) suggests a date of the second half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century for the family.

#### *Plate Brooches*

There are three brooches that might fit most happily into a 2<sup>nd</sup> century milieu. None are common. The delightful **1160** imitates a salmon. It was originally coated with white metal and the cell in the eye was probably filled with enamel as was a similar one in the Hattatt collection (Hattatt 1985, 172 no. 616). Bridge brooches such as **1177** are generally considered to be a continental type but British variants are known (Hattatt 1989, 148) and the headloop on this example might suggest this is another British variant. **601** is very highly corroded but may originally have been similar to another in the Hattatt collection (1985, 158 no. 574). A fourth disc brooch is represented by **67**.

#### *4<sup>th</sup> century forms*

##### *Crossbow – Hull Type 192*

A single crossbow brooch was found (**216**). It belongs to Keller Type 3/4 and may be dated to the mid 4<sup>th</sup> century (Swift 2000, 15). Its presence on the site is interesting not only as providing evidence for 4<sup>th</sup> century activity, but also in hinting that the activity may have had an ‘official’ aspect as such brooches appear to have been part of the regalia of officers and administrators.

### *Penannular – Fowler Type E*

The fragment **291** is from a Fowler (1960) Type E brooch when complete it would have been similar to, though smaller than, one from Aldborough (Bishop 1996, 58 no. 344, fig. 33). The form is a late Roman one, in use during the 4th century and probably into the 5th century (Mackreth 2000, 158 no. 43).

### *Miscellaneous brooch fragments*

In addition to the brooches discussed above, there were four fragments from flat fronted lower bows with the stumps of catch plates centrally behind (**46, 435, 1088, 5091**). It is most likely that they belonged to the Rosette or Hod Hill families and thus might be of 1<sup>st</sup> century date. There are also fragments of corroded bows (**61**), six fragments of sprung pins (**70, 84, 628, 811, 884, 5122**), four fragments of hinged pins (**547, 616, 918, 5105**) and two fragments of catchplates (**45, 48**).

### **Brooch summary**

With so many brooches it is felt that it might be helpful to provide a summary in Table 3. This shows the examples which can be confidently assigned to the types with the types arranged in chronological order. This makes it very clear that there is a very strong pre-conquest present which is in line with the Iron Age coinage. The mid 1<sup>st</sup> century presence is very strong too especially when it is realised that many of the mid 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> century Colchester Derivatives etc have spring fixing arrangements that point to use at that time. The absence of the late 2<sup>nd</sup> century forms such as knee brooches is noticeable in an assemblage this size. Though they never occur in as large numbers as the earlier forms, they were being used in the vicinity. They are present, for example, at Kingscote (Mackreth 1998, 142 no. 147) and Uley (Butcher 1993, 153 no. 13). Though it is always difficult to argue from negative evidence, this might suggest that whatever the reason for such high brooch use at Somerford Keynes was, the impetus was passing in the mid 2<sup>nd</sup> century.

### **Bracelets**

The bracelet assemblage from the site is of considerable interest despite all the examples effectively coming from unstratified contexts. In general in Roman Britain, it is the 4<sup>th</sup> century when wearing bracelets was fashionable. Often these were worn in groups rather than as a single bracelet on each arm as may be seen in numerous graves where the body was deposited wearing jewellery, see for example graves at Rochester (Cool 1981), Winchester (Clarke 1979, 67 grave 323). As a consequence fragments of 4<sup>th</sup> century bracelets tend to be represented in large quantities. Here the only examples are **228** and **991**, both examples of light bangle forms of the ubiquitous light bangle forms. This scarcity probably reflects both the reduced level of occupation at the site during the 4<sup>th</sup> century and the method of collection as such fragments fall into the category that metal detecting frequently fails to find.

Instead the assemblage is dominated by more massive penannular bracelets which are normally much rarer (Cool 1983, 139-44). There are three examples (**249**, **262**, **5140**) of plain bracelets with simple expanded terminals (*ibid* Group 5) and a further two (**254**, **255**) where the terminal is decorated by ribs and convex units (*ibid* Group 7). On **250** such a terminal is combined with a grooved hoop (*ibid* Group 8b) and on **248** it is combined with a similar unit centrally. **1092** clearly belongs to this family but as it is represented merely by a terminal the complete decoration is unknown. The discovery of a Group 8b bracelet at Somerford Keynes is of particular interest as examples of this type show the sort of similarities to be expected of the products of the same workshop, probably based in the West country as six of the eight known in 1983 were from the Dorset / Devon / Gloucestershire / Wiltshire area (*ibid* 762-3). Dated comparanda for penannular bracelets such as these are rare. Plain penannular bracelets and ones with decorated terminals are an occasional find throughout the Roman period, but examples of Group 8b were clearly in use during the Antonine period.

Two even rarer forms are penannular bracelets are also present. **5138** is the terminal of bracelet with twisted back snakes head terminals. These have a strongly regional distribution concentrated in the Gloucestershire area (Cool 1983, 207). None have come from a usefully dated context but the style of snakes head terminal is typical of that seen on 2<sup>nd</sup> century finger-rings (see for example Johns 1997, 105 nos. 275-9), and a 2<sup>nd</sup> century date might be suggested by analogy. **310** can be almost exactly paralleled by an example from Wroxeter (Bushe-Fox 1916, pl. XVII/23), but I know of no other bracelets like these two. The Wroxeter discovery would suggest the piece is of Roman date but no closer dating than that can be advanced.

Finally **5142** amongst the copper alloy bracelets there is an example of a wide cuff bracelet (Cool 1983, Group 9), a type that was current during the mid to late 1<sup>st</sup> century with a distribution centred on the early civilian centres of London, Verulamium and Colchester (see for example Crummy 1983, 36 nos. 1586-7; Waugh and Goodburn 1972, 120 nos. 30-31). It has been noted that when they occur outside of this area the sites are often associated with evidence of military activity (Cool 1983, 146).

There is also one fragment of a glass bangle (**868**). How such items were used is the matter of some debate and they may not all have been arm ornaments in the way most copper alloy ones were (Price 1988, 354). **868** has a large diameter and so could have been a bracelet and will be discussed here. It is an example of Kilbride-Jones (1937-38) Type 2. Large examples such as this appear to be predominantly a south-western variant in use from the Claudian to early Neronian period (Manning *et al* 1995, 100-102).

## Finger rings

Seven finger rings of the typical 1<sup>st</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> century form (Henig 1974, Type II) were recovered, all from unstratified contexts. **214** retains the remnants of what appears to be a moulded green glass intaglio. This dates the ring to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century (*ibid* 164). **588** retains decayed enamel in the bezel while **207**, **1068**, and **5100** all have deep blue glass settings. The bezel of **594** is very corroded and any decoration it may have had is now

obscured. In **212** the bezel setting is empty. With the exception of **214**, here the bezel setting is present it is always decorative rather than a utilitarian intaglio. This would suggest that the rings were most likely to have been used in the 2<sup>nd</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> century than earlier. In the assemblage there are a further three finger rings with expanded bezels of broadly similar form (**204, 209, 213**), the Roman date of these is much less certain and it is probable that they are of more recent date.

There is a single example of an enamelled ring with notched shoulders (**202**). These are a relatively common 2<sup>nd</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> century form (See Cool 1983, 251 Type 13A). **1085** might also belong to this broad type but is too corroded for the identification to be certain. Another very corroded finger ring (1074) has a cable-twisted hoop and is likely to have been very similar to two silver rings from Caerwent and Silchester (Cool 2000, 31 footnotes 38 and 39) and one from the Snettisham hoard (Johns 1997, 110) which suggest the type was in use during the mid 2<sup>nd</sup> century.

## Beads

Of the three beads that were recovered, only the annular blue/green glass bead **280** is a common form. They are a 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> century type but are occasionally found later (Guido 1978, 65 Group 6iib). The other glass bead (**781**) is puzzling as annular beads made in glass that appears black are rare in the Roman period (Guido 1978, 68) but not uncommon in 5<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> century contexts (Guido 1999, 20). Given there is very late Roman material in the small find assemblage which probably indicates occupation into the 5<sup>th</sup> century, there is a possibility that a 5<sup>th</sup> century bead could be present on the site. **781**, however, came from a Phase 1 context. There is also a fragment of a large globular bead from a Phase 2/3 context. Such beads are very uncommon finds.

## Hairpin

The only example of a hair-pin in the entire assemblage is **298**. This is an example of a form that is common in the south-west during the 2<sup>nd</sup> century (Cool 1981, 164 Type 13). The fact that only a single hairpin was found is probably an example of the bias in metal detected assemblages which don't appear to locate long thin artefacts with any ease. The virtual absence of worked bone amongst the finds from Somerford Keynes also contributes to scarcity of this artefact type as in most assemblages the, presumably cheaper, bone hair pins were much commoner than copper alloy ones. Here their presence is only hinted at by the shank fragment **773** from a Phase 3 context which could as easily come from a needle as a hairpin.

## Shoe cleats

Two shoe cleats were recovered, **761** and **817** from phase 2-3 contexts. The absence of hobnails is probably due to the deterioration of the iron since excavation. They are normally recognised from X-radiography but the years in storage prior to the X-radiography here would most likely have reduced them to undiagnostic fragments or 'nail' heads.

## Buckles

Within a Roman context buckles are normally a military fitting and Roman buckles will be considered below. One buckle that may be noted here is **194** which is of 14<sup>th</sup> century date (Hinton 1990, 507). The belt plate **1057** is also more likely to be of medieval date than Roman.

## Toilet Equipment

The toilet equipment can be divided into two broad categories. By far the commonest are small implements for personal use, but there are a few examples of long-handled implements that would have had a role both in personal care and in medicine. In addition there is a single fragment of a mirror (**1091**) from an unstratified context. This seems most likely to have come from a mirror of Lloyd-Morgan Type X (Lloyd Morgan 1981, 91) which are considered to be a 3rd century type.

### *Small implements*

Most of these clearly came from toilet sets where a group of implements were held together by a fastener. The only implements found together and clearly indicating that they were part of a set were **5026** and **5027** consisting of a pair of tweezers and a nail cleaner. Tweezers tend not to be chronologically sensitive but the shape of the nail cleaner is similar to a type found in the 1st century (Crummy 2001, 3 fig. 1b - see for example Hands 1998, 60 no. 79, fig. 21) though this example lacks the central groove and has edge grooves instead. Another toilet set is probably indicated by **574** which is likely to have been the handle of a set of toilet implements which would have been threaded onto the crossbar inserted into the two perforated terminals as may be seen on an example from Colchester (Crummy 1983, 62 no. 1943, fig. 67).

Four other nail cleaners were found as individual implements but have perforated terminals indicating they were part of sets. **210** and **709** belong to the same family as the one in the toilet set. **586** is another very simple sheet implement, a similar one was found in a context of the 1<sup>st</sup> half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century (Hands 1993, 38 no. 24). It is also possible

that a late 4<sup>th</sup> century nail cleaner may be represented by **693**. In shape this is very reminiscent of late 4<sup>th</sup> century styles of nail cleaner but those normally have decorated faces, see for example one from Gestingthorpe (Draper 1985, 36 no. 77; see also Crummy 2001, 6 fig. 5). The surfaces of this one are pitted by corrosion but there is no evidence of any decoration other than the groove.

There is one example of the nail cleaner form which had a bone terminal (**1110**), see for example one from a mid 2<sup>nd</sup> century context at Wilcote (Hands 1998, 60 no 77, fig. 21). Crummy notes that this is a south-western type which comes into use in the mid 2<sup>nd</sup> century and possibly continues into the 4<sup>th</sup> century (Crummy 2001, 4).

The only certain cosmetic spoon from a toilet set is **894** from a Phase 1 context. This is a very simple form not closely dateable other than by its context. There is also one example of an implement that could either have been from a cosmetic spoon or a nail cleaner (**1094**). Cast nail cleaners with similar cross-hatched cylinders have been recovered from mid 2<sup>nd</sup> century contexts at Wilcote (Hands 1993, 38 no. 22; 1998, 60 no. 78) and again this seems to be a south-western type (Crummy 2001, 4 fig. 3b).

Tweezers are remarkably common in this assemblage with a minimum of 18 certainly present judged from the complete or fragmentary ones that retain the upper loop. In addition there are 10 fragmentary arms. Allowing for the fragmentary state of some in the first category, these arms must represent at least three others. Taken with the example in the toilet set, the entire assemblage therefore consists of a minimum of 22 or a maximum of 28.

The commonest form is a simple undecorated strip bent into shape with a closed loop (**205, 220, 730, 737, 799, 878, 955, 1151, 5073, 5074, 5075**. **294** and **5071** are similar but have diagonal grooved decoration on the arms. Open loops are less common but tend to be decorated. On **607** the decoration is on the loop whilst on **223** and **5072** there is grooved decoration on the arms. Where the shape of the loop is uncertain or only arms are present, the majority are plain (**196, 221, 222, 224, 226, 227, 229, 584, 1096**). **225** has grooved decoration and on **5076** there are grooves parallel to each edge as on the set of tweezers in the toilet set.

Tweezers such as this rely on their contexts if they are to be dated closely. Here nearly all of them were found unstratified though **799, 730** and **878** came from contexts of Phase 1, Phase 2-3 and Phase 3 respectively.

There is also one fragment from a set of tweezers of different construction (**267**) where a bar has been split and the tweezers are provided with a collar. It would have been possible to take a more precise grip with such an implement and it may have had a more specialised purpose than the tweezers discussed above but in the absence of the jaws it is not possible to explore this possibility further.

The number of tweezers in the assemblage does seem exceptional as may be seen from Table 4 where the numbers of tweezers and nail cleaners at various local sites are considered. It is possible that the large percentage from Somerford Keynes is a result of the under recovery of nail cleaners. If the examples published from Wanborough (Hooley 2001, fig. 44) can be taken as typical of the area, which seems likely, it is

noticeable that 71% are long and thin and so might be seriously under-represented in a metal-detected assemblage.

### *Long-handled implements*

These are much less common than the small implements. **86** and **208** are fragments from long-handled cosmetic spoons whilst **269** and **846** are olivary probes probably from double-ended implements. Like the nail cleaners, these belong to a shape category that can be expected to be under-represented in a metal-detected assemblage. All four of those found were unstratified and are types which are not chronologically sensitive within the Roman period.

### **Textile Equipment**

The only items that can be assigned to this category are two spindle whorls and a possible loom weight. The spindle whorls made from re-used pottery sherds, **782** from a Phase 3 context and **5045** was unstratified but has the typical narrow spindle hole typical of one of Roman date. **869** from a Phase 2a context may be a fragment of a triangular loom weight an Iron Age to early Roman form (Elsdon and Barford 1996)

### **Household utensils**

Six items of household equipment made of metal were found unstratified. Most can be dated to the Roman period with some certainty. Two are definitely of early Roman date. **629** is a broken fragment of a round-bowled spoon. Such spoons (Crummy 1983, 69 type 1) are a common 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> century form. By contrast the other item (**198**) is a much less common find. It is a flattened tankard handle (**198**) of Corcoran (1952) Class V, a type found in 1st to 2nd century contexts. An example from Newstead, for example, was recovered from a pit filled during the late 70s - 80s (MacGregor 1976, volume 2 no. 290). Tankards appear to have been a popular vessel form in the south-west, not only are wooden examples with metal fittings known but pottery examples are more regularly part of the ceramic repertoire in the region than elsewhere, for example in Severn Valley Wares (Tyers 1996, 197).

**1055** may also belong to this group of early material. It seems most likely to be the foot of a patera or bowl, certainly the differential treatment of the front and back and the shape of the piece is consistent with this interpretation. It has to be noted, however, that piece is slightly smaller than would be expected for one of these feet, and the presence of the ring and dot decoration would be unusual. Pelta feet were applied to the underside of the base to raise it slightly above the level of the surface in which it was placed. They were used on the bowls belonging to the Hagenow style of jug and patera sets of the early to mid 1st century (Nuber 1972, 38) such as that from Snailwell (Lethbridge 1953, Pl

VII). They are also known on other styles of bowls (see for example Tassinari 1993, 241).

The second spoon (**346**) from the site is of late Roman date. Spoons very similar to this have been found at Chignall was found in a context of AD 285-370 (Major 1998, 79 nos. CA69-70) and another came from Barnesley Park in a 5th century context (Webster and Smith, 1982, 110 no. 134). **346** not been scientifically analysed but the small points of green corrosion products visible here and there suggest it is of copper alloy which has been coated with white metal (silver or tin) to produce the effect of being made of silver.

The other items cannot be assigned to the Roman period with any certainty, though in the virtual absence of medieval material in the assemblage is it very difficult to argue for a later date. There is one virtually complete copper alloy dish (**5197**). This could be of Roman date but unfortunately the vessel is of such a simple form that it is impossible to date typologically. The jug handle **141** certainly does not belong to any of the well-known Roman jug handle types.

### Weighing Equipment

There are four items that can be interpreted as steelyard weights. **951** is a biconal lead weight with iron suspension loop. This is the typical Roman form as can be seen on a steelyard from the Walbrook, London which retains its weights (Merrifield 1965, pl. 128). The hemispherical lead weight (**279**) and the cylindrical weight (**614**) both have iron loops passing through them in a similar manner, and though they are not typical steelyard weight shapes, they may have functioned as such. There is also one copper alloy weight in the shape of an acorn (**5040**). In Britain items such as this are normally interpreted as steelyard weights, which the large ones such as that from Castleford in a late 1st century context (Cool and Philo 1998, 94 no. 445, fig. 35), almost certainly must be. Oldenstein (1977, 159) has argued for the smaller ones being amulets, although small ones too can have the sort of inserted iron loops typical of a range of steelyard weight types as can be seen on one from a 4th century context at Caerleon (Webster 1992, 157 no. 366).

In addition to these **947** may be noted. It is very similar to a typical steelyard weight like **951** but has what appear to be additional wire loops passing through the centre. Whether it too served as a steelyard weight is uncertain.

There is also a single weight for an equal-armed balance (**1045**). It belongs to the common cheese-shaped form and retains two dots. Such a marking would indicate that it was intended to be a weight for a *sextans* (2 *unciae*). Such a weight should weigh either 54.58gm or 54.25gm (*RIB II.2*, 2) and so the extant weight of the piece (54gm) would be appropriate allowing for the inevitable weight loss through oxidation.

## Writing Equipment

Five items may be assigned to this category. There are two styli and unusually for a Roman site neither are made from iron. Given the problems with the survival of iron on this site, such an absence is probably not significant. One (**1145**) is made of copper alloy and was recovered from a Phase 2-3 context. Copper alloy styli are generally less common than iron examples. It may be noted, however, that Wilcote has also produced two with simple grooved decoration on the eraser as seen on **1145** from 2<sup>nd</sup> century contexts (Hands 1993, 38 no. 16; 1998, 58 nos. 57), and it may be that this is a local type. The other (**803**), also from a Phase 2 -3 context, is made of bone. It is a rather roughly fashioned item but does retain both the point and the blunt eraser that would be needed.

There are also two seal boxes, both from unstratified contexts. One is a leaf-shaped box (**139**) for which a 2<sup>nd</sup> century date can be suggested as it is identical to an example from Castleford found in a mid 2<sup>nd</sup> century context (Cool & Philo 1998, 101 nos. 497). The other (**270**) was circular but is only represented by the base and so a closer date within the general 1<sup>st</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> century currency of seal boxes cannot be suggested.

The identification of the final item (**1106**) as an item of writing equipment is advanced more cautiously. It is a flaring iron blade with a narrow tang. The narrowness of the tang suggests that the handle was not expected to have to deal with a high degree of force, as might have been expected if it were to have been used as a carpentry tool for example. It can be suggested that it might have been a wax spatula used in the preparation of writing tablets. Such items are being increasingly recognised amongst the material culture from Roman Britain (see for example Crummy 203; Boon 1991 fig 4g & k). The tang would indicate that the implement had a wooden or bone handle. I have found no *comparanda* for spatulas with such handles but it might be expected that as more are recognised, some may be found as there were clearly a variety of ways of providing these items with handles.

The types of writing equipment found at this site may provide some clues as to its status. It has been shown that styli are regularly found on sites that go somewhat down the settlement hierarchy whereas seal boxes appear to be less common in the countryside (Cool and Baxter 2002, 375-6). It has been suggested that this might imply that though literacy was not uncommon, the sorts of documents that needed seal boxes were more an urban than rural phenomenon. The presence of seal boxes at Somerford Keynes, therefore, indicates that this is something more than a modest rural site.

## Transport

There are two undoubted examples of Roman transport equipment. **167** certainly and **1049** most probably are knobbed terrets (MacGregor 1976, 46 and Map 10). Though most of the forms are found in the north there is a distinct cluster around the Severn Valley into which these examples fall. There is some evidence they were in use in the later 1<sup>st</sup> century but most are of 2<sup>nd</sup> century date.

There is also a possible strap junction (**683**). A Roman date cannot be advanced with certainty for this piece as it may be a relatively modern horse-trapping. It may be noted, however, that similar, though smaller, trappings are found on Roman sites (Allason-Jones 1988, 183 no. 210).

## **Buildings and Services**

The only items considered in this section are those that were found securely stratified. They are summarised in Table 5 by Phase.

As is normal nails predominate. The L clamp (**789**) and the joiners dog fragment (**837**) would have both been used in structural carpentry. It is also possible that a drop hinge fragment is present (**819**). It should be noted that it is probable that originally more structural iron fittings were excavated but the deterioration of the ironwork in the years since excavation have reduced them to featureless bars strips and fragments.

In addition to these items there is also a large fragment of fired clay (**904**) from a Phase 1 context that *might* have come from a thatch weight.

## **Tools**

The tools that can be identified in the assemblage are summarised in Table 6 according to the craft they might have been used for and the phase of the contexts they were found in.

Of particular note is the metal-working file **575**. It has the finely cut teeth typical of files used by metal-workers tools, though the very fine cutting seen here would appear to be unusually high (Manning *et al* 1995, 249 no. 12). Traces of a white metal are clearly visible caught in the teeth. Many files have rectangular sections but one with a D-shaped section still retaining its bone handle was recovered from Catterick in a late Roman context context (Isaac and Thompson 2002, 181 no. 1). The punch **1107** has a battered head suggesting it was a smiths tool rather than a carpenters chisel (Manning 1985, 9). It is possible that **648** was originally a poker or a piece of hearth furniture that a metal smith would have used. The deterioration in the piece makes it difficult to be completely sure that the central section was twisted but, if it was, this would be a typical trait of Roman pokers and the like (*ibid*, 12).

Carpentry is represented by the firmer chisel **944** and possibly by the bar **473** which could be a bit. Leatherworking may be identified with more caution. **200** and **1199** are both very similar in shape to one of the commonest Roman awl forms (Manning 1985, 40 Type 3a), but as they are made of copper alloy rather than iron and are smaller than normal, the identification must be regarded as tentative.

Several fragments of blades can be identified. **908** from a Phase 1 is an example of a common Roman tanged knife form with a straight back (Manning 1985, 114 Type 11). **1180** has an apparent widening of the handle might suggest this was from a set of shears rather than from a knife though the handle angle would unusual in both cases. Small

fragments of blades were also found stratified (**851** and **854**) but in neither case could the form of the knife be identified.

Two fragments from iron sockets, **400** from a Phase 2/3 context and **505**, were also probably from tools originally.

## **Fasteners and Fittings**

Table 7 shows the material in this category grouped according to broad functional divisions and site phase.

There are the normal range of studs and bindings that form an appreciable part of any Roman small finds assemblage. They include part of a bell-shaped stud (**5143**) which might have been either an Allason-Jones (1985) type 2 which has a long shank with perforation at the base, or the type identified at Caerleon with a short tapering shank (Webster 1992, 136). Bell-shaped studs had a variety of uses but the ones with perforated shanks appear to have been parts of the lock fittings of large chests or boxes. The fittings on such chests often consisted of composite constructions where a stud or mount might have a copper alloy head infilled with lead and fastened by an iron shank. It is possible that the unstratified **177** came from such a stud. A similar composite construction seems probable for **617** and **1114** which might suggest they too were of Roman date. It is possible that the long-shanked copper alloy nail **266** and hollow-faced stud (**590**) and the iron mount **838** were also box fittings.

The other studs are of slighter construction and would be more appropriate to be used for upholstery or the like. Two came from Phase 1 contexts (**712**, **734**) and a third (**835**), though unstratified, may be contemporary. It is very similar to an example from Catterick (Mould 2002, 136 no. 7) again from an unstratified context. The lugs, white metal coating and possible niello inlay on both are very similar to Hod Hill brooches (see above) and suggest both pieces may be of mid to late 1<sup>st</sup> century date.

Three of the binding fragments (**302**, **325**, **813**) would appear to be edge bindings of thin leather or wood items. The fourth (**600**) was probably from a belt or strap fitting as traces of mineral preserved organic are trapped between the two layers of rivetted sheet.

A very unusual feature of the assemblage are the number of lead pottery repairs found. The different types are summarised in Table 8. The items designated clamps are frequently massive and have been fashioned with some care. (NB these are the type that in some publications are referred to as cramps). The join was made by laying two strips of lead across the break and sealing them by pouring lead into rivet holes bored in the broken fragments. **272**, **273**, **625**, **925** all retain fragments of coarse pottery vessels and a very thick vessel such as an amphora or mortaria is suggested by the thickness of **1111**. As well as the clamps there are also simple lead rivets, one of which (**927**) also retains a fragment of coarse pottery. None of the items designated plugs here have retained fragments of pottery but it seems very likely that many were originally pottery repair patches as over half (16 examples) have H-shaped profiles such as seen on ones from Caerleon (Evans 2000, 420 no. 66) and Gorhambury (Neal et al 1990, 155 no. 922) still retaining fragments of pottery.

Even allowing that some of the non H-shaped plugs may have served a different purpose, that still leaves a minimum of 32 lead pottery repairs. This seems exceptional but this may be because such items are not regularly reported on in small find reports, presumably because they are often stored with the pottery and seen by the pottery specialist rather than the small find specialist. The largest group of such items I have been able to find reported on are from Caerleon (Evans 2000, 418-20). There 17 pieces were considered covering the same range of forms found here, and significantly the specialist who reported on them was also one of the pottery specialists.

The level of riveting seen in a pottery assemblage is a feature that is increasingly being commented on, and considering the percentage of sherds showing rivets can be a useful index. Evans (in Booth *et al* 2001 382) has noted riveting rates of c. 0.05 to 0.2% in a variety of lowland sites. A higher rate (2.5%) was noted in a highland zone farm in Gwynedd (Longley *et al* 1998, 216) and it has been suggested this reflects the fact that pottery was more highly regarded because it was less easily accessible. If the number of rivets are compared to the pottery fragment count at Somerford Keynes (9874 sherds), a riveting rate of between 3.2% and 4.5% can be postulated. This may in part be due to the fact that the majority of the pottery comes from excavated contexts whereas the metalwork is overwhelmingly from the surface collection. To reduce the riveting rate to the lowland norm given the number of pottery repairs found, however, one would have to postulate that c. 15,000 pottery fragments at least had gone missing in the topsoil. There are distinct indications, therefore, that an unusually high level of pottery curation was being practised at the site. Given the proximity of Cirencester it seems unlikely that problems of supply could explain this and so others need to be sought.

It should also be noted that the type of pottery that is being riveted too is atypical. Normally it is samian that shows the highest level of riveting (see for example Booth 1997, 123; Booth *et al* 2001, 382; Bell and Evans 2002, 415), though Evans (2000, 418) has noted that the repairing of amphorae may be under-recorded rather than unusual. Samian was riveted at Somerford Keynes but as noted above there is a higher recorded incidence of coarse pottery being riveted. It should perhaps be noted that sometimes riveting was used to prolong the lives of coarse pottery vessels that appear to have had a ritual rather than utilitarian purpose. At Great Dunmow, for example, a large Alice Holt storage jar was found in a pit within a building interpreted as a shrine (Wickenden 1988, 34 fig. 54). This was interpreted as having been removed from the pit it had originally been placed in when it became damaged, repaired by riveting with clamps, and replaced in the pit. It is possible that the pot itself was intrinsically important to a rite, alternatively as the repair and replacement was dated to c. AD 390, possibly suitable large vessels were no longer available.

There are three items that indicate a concern for security. There is one slide lock bolt (**5199**) and a fragment from a barrel padlock (**1027**). Both are typical Roman forms but can not be closely dated within that period. **833** is likely to be a key handle. Copper alloy handles in the form of a fleur de lys for iron keys are quite common after the mid 2nd century (Crummy 1983, 126 no. 4161), but the pelta shape of this terminal suggests it may be of 1st century date as it is very similar to military belt-buckles of that date (see Bishop and Coulston 1993, fig. 59 nos. 15 and 19). Another key handle may be represented by the copper alloy handle retaining an iron tang **1139**. Similar, though

smaller, handles have been recovered from Roman sites such as Corbridge (Allason-Jones 1988, 168 no. 70, fig. 79) and Caerleon (Nashe-Williams 1932, 85 no. 42, fig. 34). The latter also retained an iron tang and was found in a late 1st to early 2nd century context. The elaboration and weight of the copper alloy handles would not really be appropriate for a more utilitarian tool, whereas large iron slide keys with elaborate copper alloy handles are known, see for example one from Baldock (Stead and Rigby 1986, 136 no. 370, fig. 59).

The earliest fitting present is possibly the looped toggle **306**. These were a late Iron Age form whose use continued in the 1st century AD after the Roman invasion. The distribution is concentrated in the Severn Valley area (Jackson 1990, 40 no. 87, pl. 8). Two other slightly later fittings, by contrast, are not common finds in the region as both belong to types that are more normally found in the north of Britain. A *floruit* of the late 1<sup>st</sup> to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century as been suggested for dumbbell fittings such as **290** (MacGregor 1976, 134), but it seems more likely that they had a more limited date range centring on the later 1<sup>st</sup> century. At Castleford, for example where there is a large finds assemblage much of which was found in stratified contexts dating to the century from c. AD 71 to AD 180, and the three from stratified contexts there were all in those of early to mid Flavian date (Cool and Philo 1998, 116 nos. 782, 784; 281 no. 161). There is also one dress fastener in the assemblage (**166**). It is an example of a Wild Class III (Wild 1970, 138) fastener decorated. A reappraisal of this style by Bishop (1998, 64) suggests a mid 1<sup>st</sup> to mid 2<sup>nd</sup> century date. This is an unusual find in Gloucestershire as the majority of these fasteners have been found in the north of Britain. It is possible that the loop **171** may also be from a dress fastener though it is a little small for such an identification to be certain. The enamelled looped fitting **305** is also likely to be of early to mid Roman date. The phallic mount **5015** too is clearly Roman but cannot be closely dated.

Finally the hinged fitting **1081** may be noted, though neither comparanda nor a date for it can be offered.

### **Objects associated with agriculture**

This category is poorly represented with only four items recognisable. All are unstratified so the possibility that they are of later date cannot be entirely ruled out. There are two broken spiral rings that may be ox goads (**565**, **942**). **451** is very likely to be the tine from a rake. It has the typical step seen on one side where the tine and the tang joins and is broken at the point where the tang would have been hammered back over the clog. This is the typical form of Roman rake tang (Manning 1985, 59). An agricultural purpose can only be suggested with caution for **287** as it is very fragmentary, but the features it shows would be consistent with it being some form of pruning hook.

## Military Equipment

There are two groups of military equipment in the assemblage, one belonging to the later 2<sup>nd</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries and one to the later 4<sup>th</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup>. All of the items are unstratified.

Amongst the earlier group there is a caterpillar mount (**5078**). These are a common find on mid 2<sup>nd</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> century military sites (see for example Mould 2002, 136 no. 6; Allason & Miket 1983, 237 nos 3.877-8), and may have been used as stiffeners on a variety of straps. The fragment **5149** seems very likely to come from an elongated heart-shaped mount, again a common military 2<sup>nd</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> century type (see for example Oldenstein 1977, Taf 32; Brewer 1986, 178 no. 62, fig. 58). The stud **100** may be a variant of a vulva mount. These normally have an elongate hexagonal plate around the boss and two studs on the back (Cool 1990, 86 no. 27, fig. 70). Oldenstein certainly includes a very similar stud to **100** from Niederbieber (Oldenstein 1977, 138, Taf. 34.273) when discussing vulva mounts. A similar example was also found in a late 3<sup>rd</sup> to early 4<sup>th</sup> century context at Verulamium (Waugh and Goodburn 1972, 126, no. 101, fig. 36), so a slightly later date might also be possible. The small crescentic pendant **172** is very similar to the pendants used as terminals on military harness pendants of this period (Oldenstein 1977, 252 no. 382, Taf. 40). Finally two other items may be included as tentative military fittings of this date. Barrel beads such as **1036** are certainly found predominantly on military sites (Mould 1991, 194 no. 694, fig. 97) but occasionally on apparently civilian ones (Lloyd-Morgan 2001, 230 no. 48, fig. 6.5). The strap fitting **5080** might be a military harness fitting. The loop is typical and some did have attached peripheral loops from which pendants hung as may be seen on an example Corbridge (Allason-Jones 1988, 177 no. 137)

The presence of a group of military equipment of this date at Somerford Keynes is of some interest. Bishop (1991) has noted that there is a pattern of groups of military equipment of 2<sup>nd</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> century date being found in towns in the notional civilian zone. He has suggested these relate to the presence of soldiers carrying out policing and similar tasks. In the local area, for example, there is large quantity of such equipment from Cirencester (Paddock 1998, 306). Clearly Somerford Keynes cannot be regarded as an urban settlement, but the equipment perhaps suggests that there was some activity taking place in the area that needed similar policing.

The other group includes two amphora-shaped strap ends of the late 4<sup>th</sup> century (Simpson 1976, 198), both of slightly unusual form. The upper margin of such strap-ends was normally curved but **1054** is straight and notched, but there does appear to be a large amount of variation. An example from a grave at Lankhills dated to c. 370-410, for example, has a straight irregularly notched end (Clarke 1979, 281, fig. 36.489). **1056** does not have the arched arms of the typical amphora-shaped strap-end. A fragmentary example of a very similar strap end was found residually at Canterbury and in publishing it Ager (1988, 27, fig. 1d) note continental parallels dating to the first half of the 5th century. **1064** is an example of a Hawkes and Dunning (1981) Type 1A buckle plate. There are also two fragments from contemporary belt buckles. When complete the plate would have been similar to a plate from an Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Sarre where three openwork rectangular cells were flanked on either side by three perforations, there heart-

shaped (*ibid*, 55 no. 22, fig. 18). **140** is part of the loop from a buckle with confronted dolphin heads (Hawkes and Hull 1961, 41 Type Ia or 50 type IIa). In addition to the equipment already discussed there is a simple sheet buckle plate (**5019**) that is not closely dateable but which might be part of this late group.

Paddock (1998, 307) has drawn attention to the very large amount of such very late military equipment at Cirencester and related it to a continuing military presence in the city. It has to be noted, however, that such fittings are found very commonly on sites in the region where there is no other evidence of a military presence such as at the villa at Frocester (Price 2000, 57 no. 350; 63 no. 475). Some of the belt-fittings in the south-west appear to have developed into forms that did not have a military connection (Swift 2000, 213). This late military equipment should not perhaps be taken as an automatic indication of the presence of very late troops on the site, but at the very least indicates the presence of an elite who may have taken on late military trappings as part of their costume. It certainly provides evidence to add to the very late coins of a very late Roman presence on the site.

In addition to this equipment, there is what appears to be iron arrowhead (**5025**) that is probably of Roman date (Manning 1985, 177 Type I). The broken tang appears to be unusually flat, however, and it is possible that it may have been a miniature spear (see below).

Finally there is a fragment from a fired clay sling shot. Such items have a long life in both the Iron Age and the Roman period (Greep 1987) and this unstratified example cannot be closely dated.

## Religious Items

There are five items, all unstratified, that may have had ritual or religious significance, but none have explicit religious imagery. There are some indications that lead alloy vessels are more suited to a ritual or votive context than a domestic one (Earwood *et al* 2001, 281) and so the two certain (**960**, **1026**) and one possible (**1220**) examples found here should possibly be regarded as religious items. The two securely identified examples could come from pewter trullae, and **1026** is similar to ones found in the Sacred Spring at Bath (Sunter and Brown 1988, 20 nos. 28-31) with scalloped edges. The fragment **1220** may have come from a similar vessel.

Miniature axes such as **263** were used as votive items on Roman religious establishments. Most have integral handles but pendants are known (Green 1985) This example might have been intended either as a pendant or alternately, it could have been miniature adze and the handle may have been a separate piece inserted into the broken loop.

It is also possible that the fragment **5204** came from a miniature spearhead. The identification is very tentative, but the overall shape is appropriate, and the apparent perforation would be consistent with other miniature spears which have small rings attached to act as rattles as on an iron example from Baldock (Manning and Scott 1986, 153 no. 523, fig. 66). Miniature spearheads are known to have been used as votive items on a several Roman temple sites including Lamyatt Beacon (Leech 1986, 303, nos 43-54,

figs 29-30) and Uley (Woodward and Leech 1993, 131-5). In the light of the presence of this piece, it is possible that **5025** is not an arrowhead but rather a miniature spear.

### **Miscellaneous Items**

In total there were approximately 300 items in the assemblage that could be assigned to the miscellaneous category. Of these only less than 10% were stratified. Table 9 summarises the stratified material together with some unstratified objects of intrinsic interest. It is, however, likely that many of the other fragments also originated from the late Iron Age to Roman settlement.

Within the assemblage there were 30 lead whorls, five of which were stratified. They ranged in shape from discs to truncated cylinders and their perforation diameters ranged from 2/5mm to 10mm. The range of shapes and sizes, the irregularity in shape and the size of the perforations mean that very few could have functioned efficiently as spindle whorls, and they must have had some other purpose. That function may have been the same as the 9 lead objects termed weights here. These were cylindrical with narrow central perforations. It is unlikely they were used as weights for weighing as the steelyard weights were, but they might have been used as weights for nets and the like.

There were also two pellets of Egyptian blue, one stratified within a Phase 2 – 3 context. This is an artificially produced colouring agent. It was used as a pigment in wall painting and there is also some evidence that it could occasionally be used as a cosmetic (Manning *et al* 1995, 308).

Only a single fragment from a copper alloy ring was found stratified but a further 43 rings of many shapes and sizes in copper alloy, lead and iron were recovered amongst the unstratified material.

An unidentified copper alloy object (**716**) was recovered from a Phase 2 – 3 context, and three items of intrinsic interest were found in unstratified contexts. There is a small copper alloy figurine of a dog mounted on an iron tang which may have acted as a terminal (**797**). There is also a small copper alloy fitting in the shape of a trident (**5082**) and a fired clay object that seems to have been part of a stand (**668**).

The group of material summarised as fragments consist of fragments of metal wire, sheet, bars etc.

### **Overview**

One of the most important conclusions that can be drawn from the small find evidence is that the pottery is giving a misleading picture of when the site was occupied. Brown (this volume) notes that ‘the main [pottery] assemblage can be dated from the mid-late 1<sup>st</sup> century AD to the late 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD’. The small finds, especially the brooches, give a picture of activity from at least the early 1<sup>st</sup> century AD and the presence of some Augustan forms even hint at the possibility of activity in the late 1<sup>st</sup> century BC. As can

be seen from Table 3, at least a quarter of all closely dated brooches can be assigned to the period prior to the main period of activity as indicated by the pottery. Equally early items can be seen amongst some of the other categories such as the vessel foot (1055) and the looped fitting (306). It seems highly unlikely that such a large corpus of material can all be the result of unusual long curation of objects.

The range of items present is equally at odds with the pottery and the glass vessel assemblage as far as the status of the site is concerned. They suggest a modest rural establishment, the small finds suggest wide access to resources, and a range of activities that would suggest higher status occupation. Even allowing for the fact that the population of this area of the country were voracious consumers of brooches and other ornaments, the amounts recovered at this site seem exceptional. Frocester Court (Price 2000), has produced a total of 101 brooches and brooch fragments; Kingscote a total of 196 (Mackreth 1998), but even these large numbers are small in comparison. Somerford Keynes has produced 279 brooches and brooch fragments, and amongst these disc brooches, penannulars and iron brooches are undoubtedly under-represented due to the sort of biases discussed in the introduction.

The reason for this mismatch between the different sorts of evidence needs to be addressed. The first question that needs to be investigated is whether the metal detecting might have led to a disproportionate amount of metal finds being found. Though such survey methods will naturally lead to more metal finds, it does not appear that it can be expected to inflate the quantities to the extent seen here. Metal detecting is very good at recovering bow brooches and so these are a good index of recovery. Table 10 shows the bow brooches recovered by both excavation and metal detecting on three sites where both have been carried out under controlled circumstances (based on currently unpublished data). As can be seen the proportion recovered varies but there is not normally a ratio of more than 1:10 excavated to detected as at Somerford Keynes. It does not seem likely, therefore, that metal detecting can account for the discrepancy.

Given that we do not know the precise area over which the survey material was collected, one possibility that seems very likely that the survey material came from a wider area and reflects areas of the site and types of activity that were not sampled by excavation. If the stratified and unstratified material is compared there are some grounds for thinking this might be a good explanation. Table 11 shows the brooches grouped in date categories according to whether they were stratified or unstratified. It is noticeable that the categories where more than 10% of the brooches are stratified reflect the dates suggested by the pottery. The earlier material is conspicuous by being overwhelmingly represented amongst the unstratified material.

A similar phenomenon may be observed if the functional categories are considered in the same light (Table 12). Excluding building materials, the unstratified material represents 13 categories, only half of these are represented amongst the stratified material. Sometimes there is a noticeable difference between the precise types found stratified and unstratified. In the writing equipment, for example, the stratified material consists of styli which would not be unusual on an ordinary rural site. The unstratified material, by contrast, includes seal boxes which would be unusual. The unstratified finds are probably indicating, therefore, that occupation of a different status to that uncovered by the excavations, was taking place in the vicinity.

Another feature of the finds assemblage that suggests the site may be unusual, is the origins of some of the material. The detailed discussion of the types showed again and again that types with a very local distribution were present as might be expected on a small rural site. There are also, however, things that are either some way outside of their normal range or at the edge of the distribution. Amongst the early to mid 1<sup>st</sup> century brooches, for example, there are five examples of Hull type 10D which Mackreth suggests is typical of the Atrebatian tribe and of Hull Type 12 which he suggests was a favoured form of the Durotriges. The Langton Down assemblage is also exceptional in the area. Slightly later in the 1<sup>st</sup> century we can note the presence of the dumbbell fitting and the dress fastener more typical of the north, later again there is the pelta and trumpet brooch. One might suggest that there is a strand of evidence that suggests people from outside the area were regularly attracted to the site, especially in the 1<sup>st</sup> century. Tentatively one might suggest that if the area was the location of a fair or some place of ritual activity, this might account for the range of sources present.

There is no explicit evidence of any ritual activity either in the form of buildings, in the pottery types present or in explicitly religious small finds. The types of finds assigned to the ritual category here are the sort of background 'noise' one gets on many sites. It may be noted, however, that the sort of items that are present in overwhelming numbers (personal ornaments, toilet articles) can often be observed being used as votive items. The practice is perhaps best known on late temples such as the hundreds of bracelets from Lydney (Wheeler and Wheeler 1932), but it is known earlier, for example at Harlow (France and Gobel 1985) where there were considerable numbers of personal ornaments and toilet items. Could this also be the explanation for the very high level of pottery repair and curation attested? In the absence of any contextual or locational information for so many items, it will be difficult to come to any conclusion as to whether such a hypothesis is likely.

What is noticeable from the finds is that from time to time there was an 'official' interest in the site. Strangely there is no evidence of this during the peak 1<sup>st</sup> to mid 2<sup>nd</sup> century occupation. It first becomes noticeable in the later 2<sup>nd</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> century when there are sufficient military items to suggest there may have been soldiers present on policing duty. It also becomes apparent in the mid to late 4<sup>th</sup> century. As noted when discussing the late 4<sup>th</sup> century military equipment, it is possible that this could be viewed as a fashion of the late civilian elite. Such an explanation seems less likely for the crossbow brooch (216), so on balance a late military or official presence in the vicinity can be postulated.

## Bibliography

- Ager, B.M., 1988. 'Late roman belt-fittings from Canterbury', *Archaeologia Cantiana* 104 (1987), 25-31.
- Allason-Jones, L. and Milet, R., 1984, *The Catalogue of Small Finds from South Shields Roman Fort*, Soc. Ant. Newcastle upon Tyne Monograph 2, (Newcastle upon Tyne)
- Bell, A. and Evans, J., 2002. 'Pottery from the CfA excavations' in Wilson 2002a, 352-496.
- Bishop, M.C., 1991. 'Soldiers and military equipment in the towns of Roman Britain' in Maxfield, V.A. and Dobson, M.J. (eds.), *Roman Frontier Studies 1989. Proceedings of the XVth International Congress of Frontier Studies* (Exeter), 21-7
- Bishop, M.C., 1996. *Finds from Roman Aldborough*. Oxbow Monograph 65 (Oxford).
- Bishop, M. C. and Coulston, J. C. N., 1993, *Roman Military Equipment from the Punic Wars to the Fall of Rome*, (London)
- Boon, G.C., 1991. 'Tonsor Humanus: razor and toilet knife in antiquity' *Britannia* 21-32.
- Booth, P.M., 1999. *Asthall, Oxfordshire: Excavations in a Roman 'Small Town'*, Thames Valley Landscapes Monograph 9 (Oxford).
- Booth, P.M., Evans, J. and Hillier, J. 2001. *Excavations in the Extramural Settlement of Roman Alchester, Oxfordshire, 1991*. Oxford Archaeology Monograph 1, (Oxford).
- Brailsford, J.W., 1958. *Guide to the antiquities of Roman Britain* 2nd edition (London).
- Brewer, R. J., 1986, 'Other objects of bronze', in Zienkiewicz, J. D., *The legionary fortress baths at Caerleon. Volume II the finds* (Cardiff), 172-89
- Butcher, S., 1993. 'Brooches of copper alloy' in Woodward, A. and Leach, P. *The Uley shrines*, English Heritage Archaeological Monograph 17, (London). 149-59.
- Clarke, G., 1979. *The Roman cemetery at Lankhills*, Winchester Studies 3 Pre-Roman and Roman Winchester Part II (Oxford)
- Cool, H.E.M., 1981. 'The bracelets' 125-31 in Harrison, A.C., 'Rochester 1974-75' *Archaeologia Cantiana* 97, 95-136.
- Cool, H.E.M., 1990. 'Silver and Copper-alloy objects (other than brooches)', in Wrathmell, S. and Nicholson, A., (eds) *Dalton Parlours: Iron Age Settlement and Roman Villa*, Yorkshire Archaeology 3 (Wakefield), 79-92.
- Cool, H.E.M. and Baxter, M.J., 2002. 'Exploring Romano-British finds assemblages', *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 21, 365-80.
- Cool, H.E.M. and Philo, C. (ed.), 1998. *Roman Castleford Excavations 1974-85. Volume I: the Small Finds* Yorkshire Archaeology 4 (Wakefield).
- Corcoran, J.X.W.P., 1952. 'Tankards and tankard handles of the British early Iron Age', *Proceedings Prehistoric Society* 18, 85-101.
- Cracknell, P.M, 1990. 'A group of marked brooches from Gloucester', *Britannia* 21, 197-206.

- Crummy, N., 1983, *The Roman Small Finds from Excavations in Colchester 1971-9*, Colchester Archaeol. Rep. 2, (Colchester).
- Crummy, N., 2001. 'Nail-cleaners: regionality at the clean edge of Empire', *Lucerna Roman Finds Group Newsletter* 22, 2-6.
- Earwood, C., Cool, H.E.M. and Northover, P., 2001. 'Two pewter bowls from a mire in South Wales', *Britannia* 32, 279-85.
- Elsdon, S.M. and Barford, P.M., 1996. 'Loomweights' in May, J., *Dragonby Volume 1*, Oxbow Monograph 61 (Oxford), 330-3.
- Evans, D. R., 2000. 'Objects of Lead', in Evans, 407-24.
- Evans, E., 2000. *The Caerleon Canabae: Excavations in the Civil Settlement 1984-90*, Britannia Monograph 16 (London)
- Feugère, M., 1985. *Les Fibules en Gaule Méridionale de la conquête à la fin du V<sup>e</sup> siècle après J.-C.* Revue Archéologique de Narbonnaise Supplément 12 (Paris).
- France, N.E. and Gobel, B.M., 1985. *The Romano-British temple at Harlow, Essex* (Gloucester)
- Green, M., 1985. 'A miniature bronze axe from Tiddington, Warwickshire', *Britannia* 16, 238-41
- Greep, S.J., 1987. 'Lead sling-shot from Windridge Farm, St Albans and the use of the sling by the Roman army in Britain', *Britannia* 18, 183-200.
- Fowler, E., 1960. 'The origins and development of the penannular brooch in Europe', *Proc. Prehistoric Soc.* 26, 149-77.
- Hands, A.R., 1993. The Romano-British Roadside settlement at Wilcote, Oxfordshire. I: Excavations 1990-92, BAR British Series 232.
- Hands, A.R., 1998. *The Romano-British Roadside settlement at Wilcote, Oxfordshire. II: Excavations 1993-96*, BAR British Series 265.
- Harding, D.W., 1974. *The Iron Age in Lowland Britain* (London and Boston).
- Hattatt, R., 1985. *Iron Age and Roman Brooches*, (Oxford).
- Hattatt, R., 1987. *Brooches of Antiquity*, (Oxford).
- Hattatt, R., 1989. *Ancient brooches and other Artefacts*, (Oxford).
- Hawkes, S.C. and Dunning, G.C., 1961. 'Soldiers and settlers in Britain, fourth to fifth century', *Medieval Archaeology* V, 3-70.
- Hawkes, C. F. C. and Hull, M. R., 1947. *Camulodunum: first report on the excavations at Colchester 1930-1939*, Rep. Res. Comm. Soc. Antiq. Lond. 14, (Oxford).
- Holbrook, N., (ed) 1998. *Cirencester. The Roman Town Defences, Public Buildings and Shops* Cirencester Excavations V (Cirencester).
- Hull, M.R., 1967. 'The Nor'Nour brooches' 28-63 in Dudley, D., 'Excavations on Nor'Nour, Isles of Scilly 1962-66', *Archaeol. J.* 124, 1-64.
- Isaac, A. and Thompson, A., 2002. 'Objects of bone and antler from Catterick Bypass and Catterick 1972 (Sites 433 and 434)' in Wilson 2002a, 181-92.

- Johns, C., 1997. *The Snettisham Roman Jeweller's Hoard*, (London).
- Kilbride-Jones, H. E., 1937-38. 'Glass armlets in Britain', *Proc. Soc. Antiq. Scotland*. 72, 366-95.
- Leech, R., 1986. 'The excavation of a Romano-Celtic temple and a later cemetery on Lamyatt Beacon, Somerset', *Britannia* 17, 259-328.
- Lethbridge, T.C., 1953. 'Burial of an Iron Age warrior at Snailwell', *Proc. Cambridge antiquarian Society* 46 (1952), 25-37.
- Lloyd-Morgan, G., 1981. *Description of the Collections in the Rijksmuseum G.M.Kam at Nijmegen IX: The Mirrors* (Nijmegen).
- Lloyd-Morgan, G., 2000. 'Other jewellery and dress accessories in gold, silver and copper alloy' and 'Other objects of copper alloy' in Evans, 328-86.
- Lloyd-Morgan, G., 2001. 'Objects of copper-alloy, bone, antler, jet and shale', in Booth *et al.*, 221-34.
- Longley, D., Johnstone, N. and Evans, J., 1998. 'Excavations on two farms of the Romano-British period at Bryn Eryr and Bush Farm, Gwynedd', *Britannia* 29, 185-246.
- MacGregor, M., 1976. *Early Celtic Art in North Britain*, (Leicester)
- Mackreth, D. F., 1969. 'Report on the brooches' 107-11, in Hobley, B., 'A Neronian-Vespasianic military site at 'the Lunt' Baginton, Warwickshire' *Trans. Birmingham and Warwickshire Archaeol. Soc.* 83 (1966-7), 65-129.
- Mackreth, D. F., 1982. 'Two brooches from Stonea, Cambs. and Bicester, Oxon, and the origin of the Aesica brooch', *Britannia* 13, 310-15.
- Mackreth, D.F., 1993. 'The brooches' in Hands, A.R., *The Romano-British Roadside Settlement at Wilcote, Oxfordshire. I. Excavations 1990-92*, BAR British Series 232, (Oxford), 27-37.
- Mackreth, D.F., 1995. 'Pre Roman and Roman brooches' in Blockley, K., Blockley, M., Blockley, P., Frere, S. S. and Stow, S., *Excavations in the Marlowe car park and surrounding areas*, Archaeology of Canterbury V, (Canterbury), 955-82.
- Mackreth, D., 1998, 'Copper-alloy brooches (Site 1, Site 2 and field-walking)' in Timby, J.R., *Excavations at Kingscote and Wycomb, Gloucestershire*, ( Cirencester), 113-49.
- Mackreth, D.F., 1999. 'The brooches' in Niblett, R., *The Excavation of a Ceremonial Site at Folly Lane, Verulamium*, Britannia Monograph 14 (London), 216-22
- Mackreth, D., 2000. 'The Romano-British brooches' in Ellis, P. (ed.) *The Roman Baths and Macellum at Wroxeter. Excavations by Graham Webster 1955-85* English Heritage Archaeological Report 9 (London), 144-59.
- Major, H., 1998. 'Copper alloy objects' in Clarke, C.P., *Excavations to the south of Chignall Roman Villa, Essex 1977-81*, East Anglian Archaeology 83, 71-80.
- Manning, W. H., 1985. *Catalogue of the Romano-British Iron Tools, Fittings and Weapons in the British Museum*, (London)

- Manning, W.H., Price, J. and Webster, J., 1995. *Report on the excavations at Usk 1965-1976. The Roman Small Finds* (Cardiff).
- Manning, W. H. and Scott, I. R., 1986. 'The Iron Objects', in Stead, I. M. and Rigby, V., *Baldock. The Excavation of a Roman and Pre-Roman Settlement, 1968-72*, *Britannia Monogr.* 7, (London), 145-62
- Merrifield, R., 1965. *The Roman City of London*, (London).
- Mould, Q., 1991. 'Metalwork' in Austen, P.A., *Bewcastle and Old Penrith Cumberland & Westmorland Antiquarian & Archaeological Soc Research Series* 6 (Kendal), 185-212.
- Mould, Q., 2002. 'Copper-alloy objects from Catterick Racecourse (Site 273)', in Wilson, 135-7.
- Nuber, H.U., 1972. 'Kanne und Griffschale. Ihr Gebrauch im täglichen Leben und die Beigabe in Gräbern der römischen Kaiserzeit', *Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission* 53, 1-232.
- Oldenstein, J., 1977. 'Zur Ausrüstung römischer Auxiliareinheiten. Studien zu Beschlägen und Zierat an der Ausrüstung der römischen Auxiliareinheiten des obergermanisch-raetischen Limesgebietes aus dem zweiten und dritten Jahrhundert n. Chr.', *Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission* 57 (1976), 49-366
- Olivier, A., 1988. 'The brooches', in Potter, T. W. and Trow, S. D., *Puckeridge-Braughing, Herts.: the Ermine Street excavations, 1971-1972*, *Hertfordshire Archaeology* 10, 35-53.
- Olivier, A.C.H., 1996. 'Brooches of silver, copper alloy and iron from Dragonby' in May, J., *Dragonby. Report on Excavations at an Iron Age and Romano-British Settlement in North Lincolnshire. Volume 1*, *Oxbow Monograph* 61 (Oxford), 231-64.
- Paddock, J.M., 1998. 'Military equipment' in Holbrook (ed.), 305-7.
- Price, E., 2000. *Frocester. Volume 2: the Finds* (Stonehouse).
- Riha, E., 1979. *Die römischen Fibeln aus Augst und Kaiseraugst*, *Forschungen in Augst* Band 3, (Augst).
- Price, J., 1988. 'Romano-British glass bangles from East Yorkshire', in Price, J. and Wilson, P. R. (eds), *Recent Research in Roman Yorkshire*, *Br. Archaeol. Rep. British Series* 193, (Oxford), 339-66.
- Simpson, C.J., 1976. 'Belt-buckles and strap-ends of the later Roman empire: a preliminary survey of several new groups', *Britannia* 7, 192-223.
- Stead, I.M. and Rigby, V., 1989. *Verulamium: the King Harry Lane site* *English Heritage Archaeological Report* 12 (London).
- Sunter, N. and Brown, D., 1988. 'Metal vessels' in Cunliffe, B. (ed.) *The Temple of Sulis Minerva at Bath. Volume 2: The finds from the Sacred Spring*, *Oxford University Committee for Archaeology Monograph* 16, (Oxford), 9-21.
- Swift, E., 2000. *Regionality in Dress Accessories in the late Roman West* *Monographies Instrumentum* 11 (Millau).

- Tassinari, S., 1993. *Il vasellame bronzeo di Pompei* Ministero per I beni culturali ed ambientali soprintendenz archeologica di Pompei Cataloghi 5 (Roma).
- Tyers, P.A., 1996. *Roman Pottery in Britain* (London and New York).
- Waugh, H. and Goodburn, R., 1972. 'The non-ferrous objects', in Frere, S. S., *Verulamium Excavations Volume I*, Rep. Res. Comm. Soc. Antiq. Lon. 27, (Oxford), 114-62.
- Webster, G. and Smith, L., 1982. 'The excavation of a Romano-British rural establishment at Barnsley Park, Gloucestershire, 1961-1979. Part II c. AD 360-400+', *Trans. Bristol & Gloucestershire Archaeol. Soc.*, 100, 65-189.
- Wheeler, R.E.M. and Wheeler, T.V., 1932. *Report on the Excavation of the Prehistoric, Roman, and Post-Roman site in Lydney Park, Gloucestershire*, Rep. Res. Comm. Soc. Ant. London 9 (Oxford).
- Wickenden, N.P., 1988. *Excavations at Great Dunmow, Essex*, East Anglian Archaeology 41 (Chelmsford).
- Wilson, P.R., 2002a. *Cataraetonum Roman Catterick and its Hinterland. Excavations and Research, 1958-1997 Part I*. CBA Research Report 128 (York).
- Wilson, P.R., 2002b. *Cataraetonum Roman Catterick and its Hinterland. Excavations and Research, 1958-1997 Part II*. CBA Research Report 129 (York).
- Woodward, A. and Leach, P., 1993. *The Uley Shrines* English Heritage Archaeological Report 17 (London).

**Table 1: The Iron Age and Roman Small finds from Someford Keynes according to functional categories.**

Function	1	1/2	2	2 a	2 b	2/3	3	U/S	Total
Personal	10	3	-	-	1	10	5	286	315
Toilet	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	38	42
Textile	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	3
Household	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	6
Tools	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	9	13
Weighing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	6
Writing	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	3	6
Transport	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3
Buildings	14	2	1	1	4	20	6	1	49
Tools	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	9	13
Fasteners	3	-	-	-	1	6	1	61	72
Agriculture	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	4
Military	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	13
Religion	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>550</b>

**Table 2: Personal ornaments by phase**

Simple name	1	1/2	2 b	2/3	3	U/S	Total
Brooch	8	3	1	8	4	255	279
Bracelet	-	-	-	-	-	14	14
Finger ring	1	-	-	-	-	12	13
Bead	1	-	-	1	-	1	3
Hair pin	-	-	-	-	3	1	2
Shoe cleat	-	-	-	1	-	1	2
Buckle	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>315</b>

**Table 3: a summary of the dated brooches**

Date	Brooch Name	1	1/2	2/3	3	U/S	Total	Subtotal
3 <sup>rd</sup> to 1 <sup>st</sup> century BC	Involute	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
Early to mid 1 <sup>st</sup> century	Nauheim derivative	-	1	-	-	22	23	
	Strip bow	-	-	-	-	5	5	
	One piece	-	-	-	-	1	1	
	Langton down	1	-	-	-	11	12	
	Rosette	-	-	-	-	3	3	
	Colchester	-	-	-	-	13	13	57
Mid to late 1 <sup>st</sup> century	Aesica	1	-	-	-	3	4	
	Eye	-	-	-	-	1	1	
	Aucissa	-	-	-	-	3	3	
	Bagendon	-	-	-	-	1	1	
	Hod Hill	1	-	3	-	23	27	
	Disc Brooch	-	-	-	-	2	2	
	Penannular D5	-	-	-	-	2	2	40
Mid 1 <sup>st</sup> to 2 <sup>nd</sup> century	Colchester Derivative	-	1	-	-	17	18	
	Dolphin	-	-	2	-	14	16	
	Polden Hill	3	-	1	-	36	40	
	Lower Severn T-shape	-	1	2	-	16	19	
	Plate-headed T-shape	-	-	-	-	2	2	
	Backworth Trumpet	-	-	-	-	7	7	
	Chester Trumpet	-	-	-	1	10	11	
	Headstud	-	-	-	-	1	1	
	Keyhole	-	-	-	-	1	1	115
2 <sup>nd</sup> century	Wroxeter	-	-	-	1	2	3	
	Plate-headed trumpet	-	-	-	-	3	3	
	Alcester	-	-	-	-	1	1	
	Half Disc and trumpet	-	-	-	-	1	1	
	Plate	-	-	-	-	3	3	11
4 <sup>th</sup> century	Crossbow	-	-	-	-	1	1	
	Penannular	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
		6	3	8	2	207	226	(226)

**Table 4: A comparison of the numbers of tweezers and nail cleaners found at various local sites.**

Site	Tweezers	Nail Cleaner	Tweezers percentage	Source
Somerford Keynes	22	6	79%	
Frocester Court	5	3	63%	Price 2000, 53
Wanborough	29	26	53%	Hooley 2001, 106-9
Cirencester Bath Gate	3	3	50%	McWhirr et al Mf B08
Kingscote	7	12	35%	Timby 1998, 101, 165-7
Wilcote	5	9	36%	Hands 1993; 1998

**Table 5: Stratified Building materials**

Simple name	1	1/2	2	2 a	2 b	2/3	3	Total
Drop Hinge	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Joiners Dog	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
L clamp	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Nail	13	2	1	1	4	17	6	44
Total	13	2	1	1	4	20	6	47

**Table 6: Tools**

Craft	Simple name	1	2/3	U/S	Total
Metalworking	File	-	-	1	1
	Punch	-	-	1	1
	Poker ?	-	-	1	1
Carpentry	Chisel	-	-	1	1
	Bit	-	-	1	1
Leatherworking	Awl	-	-	2	2
General	Knife	1	-	1	2
	Blade	1	1	-	2
	Socket	-	1	1	2
	Total	2	2	9	13

**Table 7: Fasteners and Fittings**

Category	1	2 b	2/3	3	U/S	Total
Stud	2	-	1	-	6	9
Binding	1	1	2	-	-	4
Pottery repairs	-	-	2	1	42	45
Locks and keys	-	-	-	-	4	4
Miscellaneous	-	-	1	-	9	10
Total	3	1	6	1	61	72

**Table 8: Types of pottery repairs present**

Type	1	2 b	2/3	3	Unstratified	Total
Clamp	-	-	1	-	11	12
Rivet	-	-	-	-	4	4
Plug	-	-	1	1	27	29
Total	-	-	2	1	42	45

**Table 9: Selected miscellaneous items**

Simple name	1	1/2	2	2 a	2 b	2/3	3	U/S	Total
Whorl	1	-	-	-	-	4	-	25	30
Weight	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	9
Egyptian Blue	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	2
Ring	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Objects	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3	4
Fragments	6	2	1	1	1	8	2	1	22
Total	8	2	1	1	1	14	2	39	68

**Table 10: A comparison of bow brooches recovered by excavation and survey**

	Excavated	Detected	Total
Ashford, Kent	9	3	12
Catterick - Bainesse	6	10	16
Somerford Keynes	23	241	264

**Table 11: a summary of the stratified and unstratified brooches by date**

Date	Strat	U/S	%Strat	Total
3 <sup>rd</sup> to 1 <sup>st</sup> century BC	-	1	0	1
Early to mid 1 <sup>st</sup> century	2	55	4%	57
Mid to late 1 <sup>st</sup> century	5	35	14%	40
Mid 1 <sup>st</sup> to 2 <sup>nd</sup> century	11	104	10%	115
2 <sup>nd</sup> century	1	10	10%	11
4 <sup>th</sup> century	-	2	0	2
Total	19	207		226

**Table 12: a comparison of stratified and surface collected material by function**

Function	Strat	U/S	Total
Personal	29	286	315
Toilet	4	38	42
Textile	2	1	3
Household	-	6	6
Tools	4	9	13
Weighing	-	6	6
Writing	3	3	6
Transport	-	3	3
Tools	4	9	13
Fasteners	11	61	72
Agriculture	-	4	4
Military	-	13	13
Religion	-	5	5
Total	57	445	501

DRAFT