1,×14 364

Ancient Monuments Laboratory Report 8/93

CRUCIBLES AND MOULDS FROM COOK STREET, SOUTHAMPTON (SOU 254), HAMPSHIRE

Justine Bayley

AML reports are interim reports which make available the results of specialist investigations in advance of full publication They are not subject to external refereeing and their conclusions may sometimes have to be modified in the light of archaeological information that was not available at the time of the investigation. Readers are therefore asked to consult the author before citing the report in any publication and to consult the final excavation report when available.

Opinions expressed in AML reports are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England.

Ancient Monuments Laboratory Report 8/93

CRUCIBLES AND MOULDS FROM COOK STREET, SOUTHAMPTON (SOU 254), HAMPSHIRE

Justine Bayley

### Summary

Fourteen clay piece mould fragments and about forty crucible fragments of Middle Saxon date were examined. The crucibles were probably all thumb pots, some with thicker walls than others. Both copper alloys and silver were melted. The moulds were too fragmentary for the objects being cast to be identified. Both upper and lower valves are represented.

Author's address :-

Justine Bayley

Ancient Monuments Laboratory English Heritage 23 Savile Row London W1X 2HE

© Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England

CRUCIBLES AND MOULDS FROM COOK STREET, SOUTHAMPTON (SOU 254), HAMPSHIRE

Twenty four contexts, mostly of Middle Saxon date, produced sherds from crucibles and/or clay piece moulds. The fragments from post Conquest contexts are indistinguishable from the earlier finds and are most likely to be residual. Many of the crucible fragments were very small (under 5 mm, marked \* in Table) and appear to have been collected from samples that were wet sieved; their coloured and vitrified surfaces were easily recognised by those sorting the residues. There are no corresponding small mould fragments, probably because small lumps of fired clay were not picked out. The relative quantities of crucibles and moulds in the Table thus represent those finds identified and collected, rather than those that were present on the site.

## Crucibles

All the crucible sherds showed some vitrification and in some cases the overheating had led to bloating of the ceramic. About half the sherds showed areas of red coloration in the vitrified surface, indicating the presence of copper as a component in the metal being melted. The only crucible where a form could be determined was 1303 which was a globular thumb pot with a maximum diameter of 60-70 mm, c.60 mm high, with walls 6-8 mm thick. One non-joining rim fragment suggests it had a pinched out pouring lip. This form is similar to that of previous finds of crucibles from Hamwih (eg, Addyman and Hill 1969, Fig 25) so, although it is dated stratigraphically as pre Middle Saxon, there is nothing to suggest it is significantly earlier. Some of the other rim sherds (eg 1873), which are probably also from thumb pots, suggest crucibles with walls up to 15 mm thick.

X-ray fluorescence (XRF) analysis was carried out mainly on those crucibles where corroded metal droplets could be seen. This gives a better estimate of the composition of the

1







1873

Sketches of crucibles

metal being melted than the crucible slag where zinc and lead levels are always enhanced. The results are given in the Table where elements are listed in order of XRF signal strength; those written within brackets gave only weak signals. Item 1303 had been used to melt silver while the other analysed crucibles had been used to melt copper alloys. Those where the XRF signals were strong enough to be diagnostic were all bronzes.

#### Moulds

The moulds are in many ways more interesting than the crucibles as they are the first clay piece moulds that have been recognised from Middle Saxon Southampton and are one of only a small number of groups of clay moulds of this period known from England (Bayley 1991). Some of the fragments definitely come from the lower valve of a two-piece mould while others which are less massive and have a convex rather than flat outer surface come from the upper valve. Several pieces are from the in-gate (sprue cup), one of which (in Item 2321) is definitely part of a mould valve; the others may also be parts of valves or may have been added to the two-piece mould assembly together with the luting clay which sealed the valves together. Massive traces of the metal poured into the mould survive on the in-gate fragment 2390.

As is normal with piece moulds, the pattern in the lower valve is deep, with a less substantial impression in the upper valve. No complete impression of the object being cast survived; all that could be seen with any certainty were impressions of perforated circular discs on nos 1, 2 and 10 (see sketches of mould pieces). All the mould fragments are reduced fired all through.

XRF analysis of clay moulds is usually uninformative. The slight traces of zinc and lead detected on the modelled area of the lower valve in 2293 show that it had been used, but provide no information on the composition of the metal being cast. The metal-rich deposit on in-gate 2350 indicates a copper alloy, though the presence of zinc and absence of tin

2

# Sketches of mould pieces



- 1-3: 2293, 4-7: 2315, 8: 2321, 9-10: 2322
- upper valves: 1, 3, 7, 9, 10<sup>\*</sup> lower valves: 2, 4, 5, 6, 8<sup>\*</sup> \*=in-gate





















in detectable quantities is probably not significant.

# References

Addyman, P and Hill, D (1969) Saxon Southampton: A review of the evidence. Part II: Industry, trade and everyday life. Proc Hants Field Club, 26, 61-96.

Bayley, J (1991) Anglo-Saxon non-ferrous metalworking: a survey. World Archaeology, 23(1), 115-30.

Table of finds examined Context Crucible Comments Mould Item <u>Pre Middle Saxon</u> 2780 1303 13(7 join)Half a vessel XRF: Ag Cu Zn Pb Middle Saxon XRF: Cu Sn (Pb Zn) 1874 2378 1 \* 2846 3057 1 \* 3451 1870 1 rim/lip XRF: Zn (Cu Pb) 3535 2548 1 \* 3547 1873 XRF: (Cu Zn Pb) 1 rim 1 rim/lip?XRF: Cu Zn Sn Pb 2145 2484 12 (1 rim)1 rim XRF: Zn Cu Pb Sn 3865 2390 2465 2 2485 4 \* 4107 2963 1 \* 3(join) 4110 2191 XRF: Cu Sn Zn Pb 4401 2293 3 (1 rim) edge of 1 lower and 2 upper valves 3M XRF: (Zn Pb) on lower valve, modelled area only 2698 2 \* 4403 2294 fragment from upper valve 1M 4432 2315 2 (1 rim) 2 edges and 2 corners of lower valves 4M 4442 2321 corner of lower valve with ?in-gate 1M 4443 2322 3M(2 join) in-gate and fragment, both from upper valve 4444 2699 12 \* 4451 2964 1 \* Post Conquest 361 2962 4 \* 1 \* 1910 2388 1936 2777 1 \* 2205 2464 1 \* 2510 2778 1 \* 2 \* 3073 1290 XRF: Zn (Cu Pb) 2 2389 3120 2697 XRF: Cu Pb Sn 1 4174 2350 1M in-gate XRF: (Zn Pb Cu) Key: \* = very small fragments, M = mould fragment(s)

Ag = silver, Cu = copper, Pb = lead, Sn = tin, Zn = zinc