

**YCCART 2015/Y 10
North Somerset HER 2015/50**

**Iwood (Collins 2).
Excavation July 2015.**

**YATTON, CONGRESBURY, CLAVERHAM AND CLEEVE ARCHAEOLOGICAL
RESEARCH TEAM (YCCART)**

General Editor: Vince Russett



Measuring the sondage!

Page	Contents
3	Abstract Acknowledgments Introduction
4	Site location Land use and geology
5	Historical & archaeological context Excavation objectives Methodology
7	Results
15	Finds
17	Conclusions Recommendations for further work References
18	Appendix A. Photographs of selected finds
21	Appendix B. Site Report
22	Appendix C. Context Record
28	Appendix D. Resistivity Day Report for June 2015
30	Appendix E. Spur found during excavation: Preliminary findings.
33	Appendix F. Bones – preliminary report

Abstract

In 2010 a resistivity survey revealed anomalies worthy of trial excavation. This limited excavation confirmed the resistivity results and revealed what may be the foundations of a wall / structure and pottery suggesting an occupation site dating between 1580 and 1650.

Acknowledgements

This excavation was undertaken with the help of a Heritage Lottery Grant which enabled YCCCART to purchase a Bartington 601 Gradiometer and Geoscan RM 15 Resistivity meter.

The excavation would not have taken place without the authorisation of the landowner Mr Alan Collins.

The authors are also grateful for the hard work by the members of YCCCART in performing and recording the excavation and to Vince Russett for helping with the excavation, providing professional advice and editing this report.

Introduction

Yatton, Congresbury, Claverham and Cleeve Archaeological Research Team (YCCCART) is one of a number of Community Archaeology teams across North Somerset, supported by the North Somerset Council Development Management Team.

The objective of the Community Archaeology in North Somerset (CANS) teams is to carry out archaeological fieldwork, for the purpose of recording, and better understanding of, the heritage of North Somerset.

Site location



Figure 1: Site location, indicated by arrow.

The site lies in Iwood a hamlet on the eastern edge of the parish of Congresbury. GPS co-ordinated are provided in the Site Records included in the Appendix.

The field is privately owned but crossed by a public footpath.

Land use and geology

The north end of the field lies on the Keuper Marl, which is overlain in the southern part by the alluvial clays of the Northmarsh. The current course of the Yeo runs along the southern boundary of the field.

The field is used for grazing cattle.

Historical & archaeological context

Please see the YCCCART reports 2010/Y16, 2010/Y32, 2012/Y14 and 2013/Y1 for the historical & archaeological context.

Excavation Objectives

The excavation had the following objectives.

- 1) To attempt to identify and date the nature of the anomalies revealed by the resistivity surveys undertaken during the period 2010 to 2013.
- 2) To use the excavation to train YCCCART members in excavation techniques.

Methodology

The excavation took place from the 6th to 10th July 2015 and on the 5th and 6th August 2015.

- 1) Prior to the excavation, a resistivity survey was undertaken to reproduce the 2 grids 22 July G2 & 29 July G1 from the resistivity survey reported in YCCCART 2010 / Y16 and 2013/Y1. The result is illustrated on the right in Fig 2 below.




Fig 2: Resistivity results from the full survey (left) and current survey results (right).

2. In order to investigate a section of a possible leat and building, it was decided to lay out a 12m by 1.5m trench to the east of the red line illustrated in Fig 2 above. This trench 1 is shown in the excavation plan at Fig 3 below.
3. A second trench 2.7 m long by 1m wide was dug at right angles to trench 1, 0.5 m each side of the mid-point of the 20 x 20m grid. See Fig 3 below. This trench 2 was to investigate a feature revealed in Trench 1.
4. Trench 3 was dug south of the 2nd trench. See details in Fig 3 below. A sondage 0.5 m deep was cut on the south side of this trench in the search for significant features.
5. Trench 4 was a 1m by 1m exploratory trench, dug to a depth of 0.75m, to identify the extent of a possible building. See details in Fig 3 below.
6. A sondage 1.5m wide by 2m long was dug at the southern end of Trench 1 to try and find evidence of the leat




Fig 3: Excavation plan.

This report was written in Microsoft Word 2013.

Current photographs were taken by members of YCCCART, and remain the copyright of YCCCART.

Results

TRENCH 1

A) There was a scatter of large stones running at an angle south to north. Across the 1.5m trench the scatter varied from 0.9m to 1.3m in width. These stones were not bonded and consisted of only a single layer. See Fig 4, 5 and 6 below.



Fig 4: Trench 1. General view of large stones looking north




Fig 5: Trench 1. Large stones – north to left



Fig 6: Trench 1. Large stones – showing soil beneath the initial layer

B) To the north of A there was a band of small rounded stones / pebbles running at right angles across the trench. These were directly opposite trench 2 and approximately 0.5m wide, forming what may be a path or floor. See Fig 7 below.



Fig 7: Trench 1. Band of small round stones

C) Immediately to the north of B was an area of fine stone fragments forming a hard surface. See Fig 8 below.



Fig 8: Area of fine stone fragments (south of photo). Looking south. The lower darker area is the result of rain.

D) The sondage revealed large stones which seem to run south into a wet area (leat?)



Fig 9: Sondage in trench 1 looking north.

The large stones on the west side of the sondage were removed and this revealed the layer of stones were without mortar or structure and were laid horizontally up to 4 layers in depth. See Fig 10, 11 and 12 below.



Fig 10: Sondage with stones removed on western side.



Fig 11: Sondage showing layers of stone.



Fig 12: Sondage showing horizontal nature of stones.

The stones in the sondage had rounded edges, perhaps caused by weathering or water erosion. See Fig 13 below.



Fig 13: Stones showing rounded edges

E) Large amounts of pottery covering the 16th c to 17th c was located across the whole of the excavated area.

F) Small deposits of charcoal were found spread mainly on the southern half of the trench (including in the sondage).

TRENCH 2

This revealed a continuation of the trench feature described in Trench 1 (B above). However, at the far east of the trench the stones became more compact, larger and irregular. This latter feature ended 0.2m from the eastern end of the trench, where it reverted to finer stone particles / soil. The area of larger stones, 3.5 feet in width, had discernible edges indicating a possible wall /structure running north south. Large amounts of pottery covering the 16th c to 17th c were revealed across the whole of the excavated area. See Fig 13 below.



Fig 13: Trench 2. Wall area centre.

TRENCH 3

Abutting Trench 1 a single layer of large scattered stones was revealed. Large amounts of pottery covering the 16th c to 17th c were revealed across the whole of the excavated area. See Fig 14 below.



Fig 14: Trench 3 looking east from trench 1.

TRENCH 4

Revealed scattered stones and pottery dating from the 16th to 17th c. See Fig 15 below.



Fig 15: Trench 4 looking east

Finds

Item	Description	Trench	Quantity / Weight	Total
Flint		1	3 pieces (<i>Bronze Age?</i>)	
		3	1 piece	4
Bone		1	110 pieces	
		2	15 pieces	
		3	6 pieces	
		4	13 pieces	144
Iron Work	a) Nails	1	38	
		2	5	
		3	7	
		4	5	55
	b) Iron spur	1	1	1
	c) Iron rowel	1	1	1
	d) Ox shoe	1	9	9
	e) Buckle	3	1	1
	f) Part of hinge?	2	1	1
	g) Knife	1	1	1
	h) Part of buckle	2	1	1
Pewter	Buckle	1	1 part	1
Copper	Thimble	1	1	
	Thimble open top.	4	1	2
	Wire	1	1	1
Glass		Top soil	1 sherd	
		1	14 sherds	
		3	2 sherds	15
Slate		1	9 pieces	9
Stone	Piece of limestone	1	1	
	Large worked stone	1	1	
	Pennant stone	1	2	4
Mortar		1	1 piece	1
Roof tile		1	1 piece	1
Shell		1	16 pieces	

		3	1 piece	17
Clay pipe		1	25 pieces	
		3	2 pieces	27
Pottery	Wanstrow	1	162 sherds	
		3	72 sherds	
		4	12 sherds	235
	Nether Stowey	1	8 sherds	
		4	1 sherd	9
	Somerset Red Ware	Top soil	8 sherds	
		1	72 sherds	
		2	9 sherds	
		3	3 sherds	
		4	12 sherds	96
	Somerset Red Ware (Donyatt?)	1	32 sherds	
		2	5 sherds	37
	Donyatt	4	8 sherds	8
	Devon Gravel Tempered Ware	1	5	
		3	1	6
	Devon Gravel Tempered Ware (Gravel free)	1	4	4
	Cistercian Ware	2	2	2
	Stoneware (German?)	1	2	2
	Frechen Ware	1	3	
		2	1	4
	Combed and trailed slipware	1	1	1
	Late medieval	2	3	3
	Medieval	1	1	1
	White glazed – 19 th c	1	1	1
	Unknown	3	8	8

Conclusions

The results of the excavation bore out the resistivity surveys.

The large quantity of pottery sherds and other finds suggest the presence of a domestic building/s. Analysis of the pottery sherds revealed that they mainly consisted of Wanstrow, Donyatt and Somerset Red Wares dating occupation to a period from 1580 to 1650.

Trench 1 sondage revealed a scatter of large stones probably from a structure which seems to have tumbled into the possible leat.

Trench 2 revealed a likely structure / base of wall

Recommendations for further work

Further excavation to the north and west may well reveal the extent and nature of the possible settlement.

References

Please see the YCCART reports 2010/Y16, 2010/Y32, 2012/Y14 and 2013/Y1 for the historical & archaeological context.

Authors: Peter English & Chris Short

Date: September 2015

Appendix A

Photos of selected finds




Iron spur (left) and rowel (right).



Thimbles



Part of buckle



Wanstrow Ware. Sherd from pipkin.



Sherd of decorated Wanstrow Ware.



Sherd of Somerset Red Ware.

Appendix B

Site Report

Site Report	
Site Name	Collins Field Iwood
Project Code	Cong 15
Date of Excavation	4th to 10 July 2015 and 5 th and 6 th August 2015
Attendees	<p>July 4th: Chris Short, Pete Wright, Alan Collins (field owner), Vince Russett, 6th: Pete English, Chris Short, Geoff Pearson, Arthur Langley, Dave Long, Clive Nunn, Anne Dimmock, Pete Wright, David 7th: Peter English, Chris Short, Anthony Palmer, Janet Dickson, Clive Nunn, Vince Russett, Pete Wright, John Wilcox 8th: Peter English, Chris Short, Pete Wright, John Wilcox, Arthur Langley, Janet Dickson, Anne Dimmock, David, Ian Morton 9th: Peter English, Chris Short, Peter Wright, Anthony Palmer, Janet Dickson, Philippa Cormack, Arthur Langley, Janet Burdge, John Wilcox, Geoff Pearson, Dave Long, Ferdi, Clive Nunn 10th: Peter English, Chris Short, Peter Wright, Arthur Langley, Clive Nunn, Ferdi, David Long Aug Chris Short, Pete English, Arthur Langley, Clive Nunn, John Wilcox, John Haynes.</p>
Weather	<p>July Mixed, rain on Tuesday delayed start till 1400, Thursday and Friday hot and sunny Aug Warm and dry</p>
Size of excavation	Trench 12m long (north/south) 1.5m wide (east/west) with two side trenches 2.5m long to east and one trial hole 1m x 1m placed 5m to the East of the South end of the trench
Location	See Context Records

Appendix C Context Record

Trench	Context No	Description	Date	Associated contexts	Coarse components	Consistence	Finds
1	Top soil						Somerset Red Ware - 8 sherds (minimum of 5 vessels) 2 joining pieces of window glass
1	101	Whole trench	4/7/15		95% soil <1% tile <1% coke clinker <1% limestone pebbles	Hard, lumpy	Nail: 1 Bone: 72 pieces. Pottery Somerset Red Ware 1 sherd Wanstrow 17 th c : 6 sherds (2 join)
1	102	Whole trench	6/7/15	Under 101	37.5% Soil 12.5% - Band larger stones 4.16% - Band of smaller rounded stones 45.83% Band of very small stones	Crumbly	1) Bone: 15 pieces 2) Glass: 8 pieces. 3) Fresh water shells: 4 pieces. 4) Iron: • Nails: 35 • Ox shoe fragments: 9 5) Clay pipe: 19 pieces. 6) Slate: 7 pieces. 7) Flint: 3 pieces. Bronze Age? 8) Roof tile: 1 piece. Later Medieval 9) Pottery : • Wanstrow 106 (one marked with a W) • Nether Stowey 6 sherds • Devon Gravelled Tempered Ware 5 sherds

							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devon Gravel Tempered Ware (Gravel Free) 1 sherd • Medieval 1 sherd • Frechen Ware 3 sherds • Somerset Red Ware (Donyatt?) 8 sherds (2 pieces fit) • Somerset Red Ware 71 sherds • Staffordshire Slip Ware • (Comb Ware, 1680-1750) 1 sherd • Stoneware (German?) 2 sherds • White Glazed 19th c 1 sherd <p>12) Thimble: 1 13) Iron Spur 14) Loop and part twisted wire in copper alloy 15) Piece of pewter buckle</p>
1	103	Under large stones and smaller stones	8/7/15	Under 102	95% soil <1% tile <1% coke clinker <1% limestone pebbles	Crumbly	Glass 1 piece Wanstrow 1 sherd
1	Sondage 101	South of trench 1	9/7/15 10/7/15	Soil above stone rubble	95% soil <1% tile <1% coke Clinker <1% limestone	Crumbly	Large worked stone Piece of limestone Piece of mortar Iron knife: 1 Iron Rowel from spur:1 Bone: 23 pieces Slate 2 pieces


					pebbles		<p>Nail: 1 + 1 Glass: 5 sherds. 1 = window glass, 1 = from shoulder of small bottle, 1 = apothecary bottle Clay pipe stem: 6 pieces Shell: 6 fragments Pottery 1) Wanstrow: a) 4 sherds from large bowl b) 6 sherds from black glazed tankard or small jug c) 1 rim sherd and 3 pieces (2 of which are joined) from late 16th /early 17th c jugs d) 1 sherd from Pipkin e) 34 sherds – Misc 2) Nether Stowey: 2 sherds from late 16th c bowls 3) Somerset Red Ware (probably mainly Donyatt): 24 sherds, late 16th c 4) North Devon Ware (gravel free) : 2 sherds</p>
1	Sondage 102			Under 101 In stone rubble	90% stone 10% soil	Crumbly and wet	6 pieces of shell
1	Sondage 103			Under 102 – south side			2 pieces of Pennant stone
2	101	East of trench 1	8/7/15		50% stone 50% soil	Hard, lumpy	<p>1) Bone: 10 pieces 2) Nails: 4 3) Metal: 1 piece of hinge? 4) Pottery: a) Donyatt/ Somerset Red Ware 17th c: 9 sherds</p>

							b) Misc Somerset Red Ware: 9 sherds c) Frechen Ware (stoneware, part of 17 th c tankard): 1 sherd d) Cistercian Ware (possibly earlier than 17 th c): 2 sherds e) Donyatt /Somerset Red Ware with pressed strap design: 1 sherd f) Late Medieval pottery: 3 sherds 5) Part of Buckle
2	102	East of trench 1	9/7/15 10/7/15	Under 101	Mainly stone	Band larger stones about 1m wide on top of area of smaller stones running out to soil of eastern end	Bone: 5 pieces Nail:1 (horse show nail) Pottery: Somerset Red Ware (probably Donyatt & 17 th c), 1 sherd from the shoulder of a bellied pot, 1 sherd from glazed bowl and 2 odd sherds, total 5 sherds
3	101	South of trench2	9/7/15		Soil about 90% Large stones about 10%	Hard. lumpy	Nails: 7 Buckle:1 Shell:1 Glass:2 (1=neck of bottle 1680-1700) Bone: 6 Clay pipe:2 Flint:1 Pottery: a) Somerset Red Ware 16/17 th c Scraffito: 1 sherd b) Somerset Red Ware: Unglazed rim (from same pot) : 2 sherds c) Wanstrow: 5 sherds (3 large pieces join, 2 pieces of strap handle) d) Wanstrow: Handle (which join) : 2

							sherds e) Wanstrow: 36 sherds sherds f) Wanstrow: Green glazed / abraded / part of handle? 1 sherd g) Wanstrow: Unglazed terracotta: 7 sherds (6 from one vessel) h) Wanstrow : Thumb decoration, 2 sherds i) Wanstrow: Brown ware: 2 sherds (1 handle of tig) j) Wanstrow: 2 sherds which join. Base of internally glazed jar k) Wanstrow: 10 sherds l) Wanstrow: 5 sherds, one glazed both sides, 4 sherds same pot? m) Devon tempered gravel ware early 17 th c :1 sherd n) Unknown: Sandy colour (all fit together): 7 sherds, small bowl o) ? 1 sherd
4	101	East of trench 1 and south of trench 3	9/7/15		Few large stones – 5% 95% soil	Hard, lumpy	Thimble: 1 (Copper alloy/hole at top). Nails: 5 Bone: 13 pieces Pottery: a) Wanstrow, 12 sherds (some decorated & 2 fit) b) Donyatt, 8 sherds c) Somerset Red Ware, 12 sherds d) Nether Stowey, 1 sherd from spouted bowl.

Context chart

Harris Matrix




Appendix D – Resistivity Day Report for 18th June 2015

YCCCART Site Survey		
Project: Survey prior to excavation		
Survey date	18 June 2015	
Report date	18 June 2015	
Type /Instrument	RM15	
Location	Collins2@Iwood	
Ref		
Site name	Collins 2	
Landowner	Alan Collins	
Tenant	None	
HER ref	TBC	
Site type	Arable	
Description	Large grassed field	
Period		
Geology		
Land use	Grazing	
Survey team and conditions		
18 June 2015	Team	David Long, Pete English, Vince Russett, John Wilcox & Chris Short. <i>Weather sunny, hot & very dry.</i>

Survey area		Notes	
		Size	Walk direction
18 ne	2 grids – 1 & 2 Repeat of previous grids 22 July G2 & 29 July G1	20x20m	W

Grid Layout & GPS



Appendix E

Spur found during excavation at Iwood, Congresbury, July 2015: Preliminary findings.

Two separate pieces of a spur were identified, from separate locations within the trench. It is possible that the two pieces belong to the same spur. They comprise a heel band/yoke and shank, and a separate rowel (Figure 1, A and B).




Figure 1: A, the heel band / yoke and shank; B, rowel (one of the 'points' has a separated fragment).

The outlines of both pieces were indistinct due to adherent, dried mud and possibly rusting. The heel band (with the shank) measured approx. 110mm (maximum length) and was approx. 70mm long; at its open end the outer width was 55mm and the inner width 45mm. At the open end, the heel band was approx. 15mm wide, increasing to approx. 20mm at the level of the shank. The shank was irregular and approx. 40mm in length and 10mm wide. The star shaped rowel was approx. 40mm wide with 8 points (one slightly damaged, with the detached fragment measuring approx. 4mm diameter). A central depression (approx. 3mm diameter) was present on one facet (Fig.1 B) but did not extend to the opposite facet (Fig.2)



Figure 2. Rowel. Opposite facet to that shown in Fig 1A.

The heel band and rowel were examined by X-ray imaging. The outline of both pieces could be clearly seen (Figs. 3A, 4 and 5).

The open end of each 'arm' of the heelband had a rounded, indented edge, (Fig. 3) corresponding to two circular holes (estimated to be approx. 5mm diameter) arranged vertically (Figure 3A), which could just be discerned in the original spur (Fig.3B). The shank had two 'arms' for holding the rowel. However, one of these was shorter than the other, presumably broken (Figure 4). This might explain the separation of the rowel.




Figure 3: A, Curved, slightly indented edge of the open end of the heelband (arrow), corresponding to two vertical holes in each 'arm' (X-ray image); B, similar orientation of original spur, showing a less distinct appearance.




Figure 4: The broken edge of the shank can be clearly identified (arrow). X-ray image.




Figure 5: Rowel with central hole. The small broken fragment can also be seen (arrow). X-ray image.

The period in which the spur was forged has not been determined and requires further research.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Kate Bradley and Lindsay Crane, Langford Veterinary Services, for the X-ray images.

Geoff Pearson
21/10/15

Appendix F

Bones – preliminary report

Methodology A textbook of veterinary anatomy, and some comparisons with bovine, ovine and porcine skeletons were used. For many fragments, it was not always possible to identify the bone of origin, or species. Occasionally, definite bone fragments could be identified, but not the species. Loose teeth were identified as pig or ruminant; ruminant teeth varied in size, and some could be identified as bovine – smaller ones could have been calf or sheep.

Results

Trench 1, Context 1, Sondage, SW corner (bones 23). [Table 1, figure 1]

Table 1. Trench 1, Context 1, Sondage, SW corner. Number of bones, identification A – F, and species

No.	Description	Species
5 (A)	Variably –sized, flat – ribs?	4 Bovine?; 1, Porcine / ovine?
5 (B)	Mandible - one with a molar tooth; one (right) with premolars 6 and 7*; one with left canine tooth; one with 2 molar teeth; one of mandible body.	Porcine
2 (C)	Teeth – canine (right); Molar, small ruminant	Porcine Ovine?
3 (D)	Distal, left humerus; Distal femur, (without condyles)? Fragment, large bone, shaft, unidentified	Bovine Porcine? Species?
3 (E)	2 flat fragments with partial articular surfaces – radius?; 1, rectangular, multifaceted –tarsus/carpus	Species? Species?
5 (F)	Fragment of rib (including head); 2 flat fragments - rib?; Small bone – shaft?; Small, irregular fragment?	Porcine/ ovine? Species? Species? Species?
Total 23		

*, counted from the first incisor on the same side (Sisson, 1966).



Figure 1A. Trench 1, Context 1, Sondage, SW corner. Bones with identification, A – F.



Figure 1B: Trench 1, Context 1, Sondage, SW corner. Bones. Identification A- F, reverse side from figure 1A.

Trench 1, Context 2 (Bones 15). [Table 2, Figure 2]

Table 2. Trench 1, Context 2. Number of bones and species.

No.	Description	Species
4	Shaft bone fragments	3 Bovine ?; 1, Porcine/ovine?
4	Flat bone fragments - 2 large; 2 small – rib/pelvis?	Bovine ?; Porcine/ovine?
5	Teeth – Molar, with attached fragment of mandible; Molar (crown only, roots absent); Large molar; Small molar (ruminant); Small incisor tooth (ruminant)	Porcine Porcine Bovine Bovine (calf) /ovine? Bovine (calf) /ovine?
2	Small irregular fragments, each with an articular edge. Olecranon process, ulna?	Species?
Total 15		



Figure 2: A, Trench 1, Context 2. Bones.



Figure 2: B, Trench 1, Context 2. Bones, reverse side of fig. 2A.

Trench 1, Context 2, [6/7/15] (Bones 71). [Table 3, Figures 3 - 9]

Table 3. Trench 1, Context 2 [6/7/15]. Number of bones and species.

No.	Description	Species
4 (A)	Distal, right? femur plus detached, medial? condyle [post mortem or, more likely, damaged during dig?]; Fragment, distal tibia; Fragment of shaft, femur?	Bovine
6 (B)	2 fragments of proximal metatarsus; 2 fragments comprising a distal metatarsus, with a separate condyle (broken off the metatarsus) - [Post mortem cut marks on the metatarsus suggest butchering?]; 2 first phalanges.	Bovine
3 (C)	Right mandible with 1 canine, 3 premolar and 3 molar teeth; 1 fragment with 2 premolar teeth; 1 fragment with a large molar tooth and part of a molar;	Porcine
8 (D)	Teeth – 1 complete molar and 2 large molar fragments; 1 small, molar fragment; 2 small molar fragments; 1 crown of a molar tooth with missing roots. 1 fragment, canine tooth	Bovine Bovine Bovine/ovine? Porcine Porcine
3 (E)	Flat, bone fragments	Bovine/ovine? / porcine
8 (F)	Various, shaft fragments	Bovine/ovine? / porcine
2 (G)	2 irregular fragments –scapula/ pelvis	Porcine / ovine
38 (H)	37, irregular, small fragments, not otherwise identified; 1 fragment, canine tooth	Species? Porcine
Total 72		



Figure 3. Trench 1, Context 2 [6/7/15]. Bones (A) [showing one side and the reverse side]



Figure 4. Trench 1, Context 2 [6/7/15]. Bones (B). [showing one side and the reverse side]



Figure 5: Trench 1, Context 2 [6/7/15]. Bones (C, D and E) showing one side and the reverse side.



Figure 6. Trench 1, Context 2 [6/7/15]. Bones (F and G) showing one side and the reverse side.



Figure 7. Trench 1, Context 2 [6/7/15]. Bones (H). Fragment of porcine, canine tooth (arrow).



Figure 8: Trench 1, Context 2 [6/7/15]. Bones (A). [Distal femur and 'detached' condyle; evidence of butchering/damaged during dig? (arrows)]



Figure 9: Trench 1, Context 2 [6/7/15]. Bones (B). [Distal metatarsus; evidence of butchering? (arrows)].

Trench 2, Context 1 (Bones 10). [Table 4, Figure 10]

Table 4. Trench 2, Context 1. Number of bones and species.

No.	Description	Species
6	Shaft Fragments	Species?
1	Irregular fragment, not otherwise identified	Species?
1	Femoral head fragment	Porcine?
1	Premolar tooth	Porcine
1	Carpus ?/tarsus ? bone	Porcine/ ovine?
Total 10		



Figure 10: Trench 2, Context 2 (Bones 5). Bones. [showing one side and the reverse side]

Trench 2, Context 2 (Bones 5). [Table 5, Figure 11]

Table 5. Trench 2, Context 2. Number of bones and species

No.	Description	Species
1	Fragment of olecranon process ulna	Porcine?
1	Short bone, damaged. Not otherwise identified.	Porcine/ ovine?
3	Fragments of unidentified, small, bone shafts	Species?
Total 5		



Figure 11: Trench 2, Context 2 (Bones 5). Bones. [showing one side and the reverse side]

Trench 3, Context 1 (Bones 6). [Table 6, Figures 12 - 14]

Table 5. Trench 3, Context 1. Number of bones and species.

No.	Description	Species
1	Fragment of flat bone- rib?	Species?
1	Fragment of left mandible with premolar teeth 6 and 7 and molar tooth 8*	Porcine
1	Small fragment, dorsal arch with spinous process missing – proximal thoracic vertebra	Porcine/ovine?
1	Damaged molar tooth ruminant	Bovine / ovine?
1	Olecranon process, ulna	Species?
1	Triangular fragment – proximal tibia	Porcine /ovine? [slender shaft – possibly deer?]
Total 6		

*, counted from the first incisor on the same side. (Sisson, 1966)



Figure 12: Trench 3, Context 1 (Bones 6). [showing one side and the reverse side]



Figure 13: Trench 3, Context 1. Tibia, anterior aspect. Proximal (P); slender shaft (arrow).



Figure 14. Trench 3, Context 1. Vertebra, dorsal arch. Distal (D); origin of posterior, sloping (arrow), dorsal spine (missing) indicates this is from an anterior thoracic vertebra.

Trench 4, Context 1 (Bones 13). [Table 7, Figure 15]

Table 7. Trench 4, Context 1. Number of bones and species.

No.	Description	Species
6	Flat, variable size	Bovine/ovine/porcine?
2	Part phalanx, with separated proximal head, separated at the epiphysis	Species?
1	Semicircular, flat bone – carpal/tarsal	Species?
4	Irregular fragments, not otherwise identified	Species?
Total 13		



Figure 15: Trench 4, Context 1 (Bones 13). Bones. [showing one side and the reverse side]

Summary

A summary of the locations and number of bone fragments (including separate teeth) is shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Summary of locations and numbers of bone fragments (including teeth)

Location	Number of bone fragments
Trench 1 - Context 1 [Sondage, SW corner]	23
Trench 1 - Context 2	15
Trench 1 – Context 2 [6/7/15]	72
Trench 2 – Context 1	10
Trench 2 – Context 2	5
Trench 3 - Context 1	6
Trench 4 – context 1	13
Total	144

The bones were greyish / golden brown / dark, dull brown in colour. A breakdown of their types is shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Summary of bone (including separate teeth) types and number.

Type	Number	Species
Irregular fragments, NOI (includes scapula and pelvis?)	47	Bovine / porcine/ ovine?
Limb bones, (Humerus; ulna; femur; carpus/tarsus; phalanges) including 3 fractured fragments from an identified bone	24*	Bovine / porcine/ ovine?
'Flat' bone (fragments of rib?)	21	Bovine / porcine/ ovine?
Shaft fragments	24	Bovine / porcine/ ovine?
Teeth (separate from the mandible) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ruminant molar - Ruminant incisor - Canine - Premolar - Molar 	(9) (1) (3) (1) (3) 17	5 Bovine; 4 ovine? Ovine? Porcine Porcine Porcine
Mandible, including teeth (NOR)	8	Porcine
Rib (including head)	2	Porcine / ovine
Vertebral fragment (anterior thoracic)	1	Ovine/ porcine?
Total	144	

NOI, not otherwise identified; NOR, not otherwise recorded; *, includes a fragment of proximal tibia (trench 3, context 1), which was not positively identified. It had a slender shaft, not obviously porcine or ovine. The possibility of deer was suggested (Dr P Watkins).

Conclusions

144 bone fragments (including teeth) were identified.

They comprised a large variety of fragments from cattle sheep and pigs, along with occasional, complete, small bones of the lower limbs (phalanges).

Mandibles of pigs only were identified, i.e., there was no evidence of cattle or sheep mandibles, despite finding ruminant teeth.

Two bones (Trench 1, Context 2 [6/7/15]) had possible evidence of butchering; one had cut marks into the bone (distal metatarsus); the other (distal femur and separated condyle) was 'cleaved'. It was not possible to be certain whether this latter case may represent butchering, or may have been caused by damage during the excavation.

A single portion of a vertebra was identified, possibly porcine or ovine.

One fragment of proximal tibia (trench 3, context 1), was found, which was not positively identified. It had a slender shaft, not obviously porcine or ovine, when compared with porcine and ovine skeletons. The possibility of this representing deer was suggested (Dr P Watkins).

Reference

Sisson, S. (1966). The Anatomy of the Domestic Animals, revised by Grossman, JD., 4th Edn. W B Saunders Company, Philadelphia and London.

Scientific background

The author of this report is a retired veterinary surgeon with no specialist knowledge of osteology. Therefore, frequently a '?' is used in the tables to express uncertainty. Thus, this report represents an informed estimate of the findings. A qualified osteologist / veterinary anatomist would be required to review the bones for definitive results.

Acknowledgements

Dr C Fuller, MRCVS, University of Bristol, Department of Veterinary Anatomy, Southwell St, Bristol, for access to the bone archive; and Dr P Watkins MRCVS for helpful comments.

G R Pearson FRCVS
28th November, 2015