Centre for Archaeology Report 28/2001

# Examination of Slags from Botolph Bridge, Peterborough, Cambridgeshire

David Dungworth

© English Heritage 2001

ISSN 1473-9224

The Centre for Archaeology Reports Series incorporates the former Ancient Monuments Laboratory Report Series. Copies of Ancient Monuments Laboratory Reports will continue to be available from the Centre for Archaeology (see back of cover for details).

## Examination of Slags from Botolph Bridge, Peterborough, Cambridgeshire

David Dungworth

#### **Summary**

5.6kg of iron smithing slags was recovered during the excavations of a deserted medieval village near Peterborough. The small quantity of smithing slag indicates that smithing did not form a significant part of the site economy.

#### Keywords

Metal Working-fe

#### Author's address

English Heritage, Centre for Archaeology, Fort Cumberland, Fort Cumberland Road, Eastney, Portsmouth, PO4 9LD

Many CfA 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 advised to consult the author before citing the report in any publication and to consult the final excavation report when available.

Opinions expressed in CfA reports are those of the author and are not necessarily those of English Heritage.

### Examination of Slags from Botolph Bridge, Peterborough, Cambridgeshire

David Dungworth

#### Introduction

Cambridge County Council Archaeological Field Unit carried out excavations in 1999 and 2000 on the site of the deserted medieval village at Botolph Bridge (TL 1715 9735) on behalf of English Heritage. The earliest excavated medieval features were rectangular enclosures that were deliberately filled, probably in the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries. A series of masonry buildings, consisting of a farmhouse and ancillary buildings (including a dovecote), were constructed and maintained up to the seventeenth century.

### **Iron Working Slags**

5.6kg of iron working slags was recovered during the excavation; this included 3.7kg of smithing hearth bottoms and 1.9kg of non-diagnostic iron working slag. In addition, 0.3kg of miscellaneous non-metalworking debris was identified. No smelting slags and no fragments of vitrified lining were identified. A series of soil samples was also examined to determine if hammerscale was present. In all but one case, the magnetic fraction recovered (after the soil samples had been sieved) proved to be fragments of corroded iron or pieces of naturally magnetic ironstone.

The presence of smithing hearth bottoms shows that iron smithing was carried out. The quantity of iron smithing debris is not great and is likely to have been produced by small scale smithing activity. The absence of vitrified linings indicates that the iron slags were probably not produced within the area excavated but were dumped there. The lack of substantial quantities of hammerscale also shows that very little smithing can have taken place within the area excavated. There was no evidence for iron smelting.

### Explanation of terms used

Evidence for iron smithing may be recognised in two forms, as bulk slag and as micro slags. Of the bulk slags produced during smithing only the **smithing hearth bottoms (SHB)** are unlikely to be confused with the waste products of smelting and are therefore considered to be diagnostic of smithing. Hearth bottoms are recognisable by their characteristic plano-convex form, typically having a rough convex base and a smoother, vitrified upper surface which is flat, or even slightly hollowed as a result of the downwards pressure of the air blast from the tuyère. Compositionally, smithing hearth bottoms are predominantly fayalitic (iron silicate) and form as a result of high temperature reactions between the iron, iron-scale and silica from either the clay hearth lining or sand used as a flux by the smith.

Most assemblages of slag include **undiagnostic ironworking slag**, which is also of fayalitic composition and can be formed during iron smelting or iron smithing. However, in the absence of any clear evidence for the former it is probable that the undiagnostic slag also derives from iron smithing.

In addition to bulk slags, iron smithing also produces micro-slags of two types. **Flake hammerscale** consists of fish-scale like fragments of the oxide skin of the iron dislodged during working. **Spheroidal hammerscale** results from the solidification of small droplets of liquid slag expelled during working, particularly when two components are being fire welded together or when a slag-rich bloom of iron is first worked into a billet or bar. Hammerscale is considered important in interpreting a site because it is highly diagnostic of smithing. It often builds up in the immediate vicinity of the smithing hearth and anvil and may give a more precise location for smithing than the bulk slags that may be transported elsewhere for disposal (Mills & McDonnell 1992).

#### Conclusions

The iron working slags recovered all indicate that iron smithing took place. The range and quantities of slag are limited and indicate that the smithing was most probably a minor activity and took place outside the area excavated.

#### Recommendations

The small quantity of iron working slags recovered do not warrant further study.

The iron working slags should be retained. They have already been washed. Iron working slags are stable and do not require any special storage conditions.

#### References

Mills, A. & McDonnell, J.G. 1992. The identification and analysis of the hammerscale from Burton Dassett, Warwickshire. Ancient Monuments Laboratory Report 47/92.

# Appendix

| Weights (grammes) of sla | recovered from each context |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|

| Context  | Smithing Hearth Bottom | Non Diagnostic | Other | Comments |
|----------|------------------------|----------------|-------|----------|
| 3        |                        |                | 2     | Stone    |
| 9        |                        | 22             |       |          |
| 10       | 222                    |                |       |          |
| 11       | 271                    |                |       |          |
| 25       |                        |                | 37    | Stone    |
| 52<br>69 | 489                    |                |       |          |
| 69       |                        | 15             |       |          |
| 76       | 143                    |                |       |          |
| 82       |                        | 66             |       |          |
| 83       | 412                    |                |       |          |
| 84       | 375                    |                |       |          |
| 99       |                        | 39             |       |          |
| 123      |                        | 53             |       |          |
| 171      | 285                    |                |       |          |
| 172      | 233                    | 366            |       |          |
| 177      | 68                     |                |       |          |
| 183      | 286                    |                |       |          |
| 186      | 363                    |                |       |          |
| 232      | 459                    | 179            | 293   | Brick    |
| 239      |                        | 219            |       |          |
| 336      |                        | 70             |       |          |
| 405      |                        | 147            |       |          |
| 443      | 133                    |                |       |          |
| 690      |                        | 45             |       |          |
| 924      |                        | 668            |       |          |
| 938      |                        | 14             |       |          |

| Context | Enviro | Hammerscale |  |
|---------|--------|-------------|--|
| 69      | 11     | No          |  |
| 99      | 12     | No          |  |
| 101     | 13     | No          |  |
| 76      | 14     | No          |  |
| 90      | 15     | No          |  |
| 135     | 16     | No          |  |
| 136     | 17     | No          |  |
| 142     | 18     | No          |  |
| 153     | 20     | No          |  |
| 87      | 21     | No          |  |
| 182     | 22     | No          |  |
| 171     | 23     | No          |  |
| 172     | 24     | No          |  |
| 175     | 25     | No          |  |
| 91      | 27     | No          |  |
| 185     | 32     | No          |  |
| 186     | 33     | No          |  |
| 103     | 34     | No          |  |
| 198     | 36     | No          |  |
| 134     | 46     | No          |  |
| 246     | 47     | No          |  |
| 257     | 48     | No          |  |
| 237     | 49     | No          |  |
| 240     | 50     | No          |  |
| 206     | 53     | No          |  |
| 208     | 54     | No          |  |
| 265     | 55     | No          |  |
| 291     | 56     | No          |  |
| 297     | 59     | No          |  |
| 317     | 60     | No          |  |
| 305     | 62     | Yes         |  |
| 312     | 64     | No          |  |
| 268     | 65     | No          |  |
| 271     | 66     | No          |  |
| 321     | 67     | No          |  |
| 320     | 69     | No          |  |
| 323     | 71     | No          |  |
| 295     | 72     | No          |  |
| 293     | 73     | No          |  |
| 330     | 74     | No          |  |
| 334     | 75     | No          |  |
| 336     | 76     | No          |  |
| 339     | 77     | No          |  |
| 340     | 78     | No          |  |
| 360     | 79     | No          |  |
| 366     | 80     | No          |  |
| 325     | 82     | No          |  |

List of contexts from which soil samples were processed to recover hammerscale: