

# North Worcestershire Archaeology Group



Olivers Mound, Shrawley, Worcestershire. Phases 1, 2, & 3 Animal Bone Report.

No. 100:5001

WSM 48065

NGR: 8133 6547

October 2010

#### Oliver's Mound - Medieval Castle, Shrawley, Worcestershire

Phase I, II, and III.

## Animal Bone Report.

#### <u>Contents</u>

- 1. Animal Bone Report phase I by Sheila Hamilton-Dyer
  - 1.1.1. Introduction and Methodology
  - 1.1.2. Results
  - 1.1.3. References
  - 1.2. Tabulated Results
    - 1.2.1. Species Total
    - 1.2.2 DATA
    - 1.2.3. Species Codes
    - 1.2.4. Anatomy Codes
- 2. Animal Bone Report phases II & III by Sylvia Warman
  - 2.1.1. Introduction and Methodology
  - 2.1.2. Results
  - 2.1.3. Discussion
  - 2.1.4. Summary
  - 2.1.5. References

- 2.2. Tabulated Results
  - 2.2.1. Results Table
  - 2.2.2. Results by possible periods
  - 2.2.3. Results Table with possible periods
  - 2.2.4. Element Codes
  - 2.2.5. Species Codes
  - 2.2.6. Animal Bone Data
- 3. Fig. 1. Plan of site and trench positions 1 to 12 incl.
  - 3.1. Summary of reports

# 1. Animal Bone Report – Oliver's Mound phase I - by Sheila Hamilton-Dyer

# 1.1.1. Introduction and Methodology

Fieldwalking and excavation of 2 trenches recovered a small assemblage of animal bones. In total 132 individual bones were made available for analysis. Taxonomic identifications were made using the author's modern comparative collections. All fragments were identified to species and element with the following exceptions: ribs and vertebrae of the ungulates (other than axis, atlas, and sacrum) were identified only to the level of cattle/horse-sized and sheep/pig-sized. Unidentified shaft and other fragments were similarly divided. Any fragments that could not be assigned even to this level have been recorded as mammalian only. Where possible sheep and goat were separated using the methods of Boessneck (1969), Payne (1985) and Halstead & Collins (2002). Recently broken bones were joined where possible and have been counted as single specimens. Tooth eruption and wear stages of cattle, sheep and pig mandibles were recorded following Grant (1982). Measurements follow von den Driesch (1976) and are in millimetres unless otherwise stated. The archive includes details of metrical and other data not presented in the text.

# 1.1.2. Results

The majority of the bones (98 of 132) are from 11 stratified contexts; the remaining 34 bones were from unstratified deposits. Most of these closely resemble the stratified material. The condition of the bone is mixed, varying from poor to excellent. Most of the bones can be identified to broad taxon. The majority can be identified as cattle, sheep/goat and pig. Most if not all the indeterminate fragments are also likely to be of these taxa. In total, nine different taxa are present; besides cattle, sheep/goat and pig there is one bone of horse, one of roe buck, four of fallow and 17 of birds. No dog bones were recovered but several bones show indirect evidence in the form of gnaw marks. A summary table of the taxa distribution is given in Table 1.

Bones of cattle are the most common and were found in most contexts. All areas of the body are represented but most of the bones are elements of the foot. Butchery marks were observed on several bones, both from jointing and from meat removal. Several of the indeterminate (but probably cattle) vertebrae and ribs had also been chopped. Sheep and goat bones are notoriously difficult to separate; in the 11 ovicaprid bones found, one could be positively identified as sheep but the others are undiagnostic. Most are limb bones and some of these also have butchery marks. Pig is represented by 12 bones and loose teeth. One of the teeth is a canine that can be identified as being from an adult sow; other remains include those of immature pigs. The single horse bone is from the ankle.

Roe buck is represented by a modified antler; it has been cut off just above the bur, the side tine and tip have been removed and this part whittled to a point (photo). When held in the hand it forms a comfortable tool, which may have been used for scribing, perhaps for leather. Because this antler is cut above the bur, it is not possible to tell whether it was collected loose after shedding or taken from a carcase. The fallow remains are all metapodia (foot bones) and must have been from carcases. One is a metatarsus (hind foot), the other three are metacarpals (fore foot). These have no meat value and would have been discarded when the carcase was trimmed, either when killed or later on in the kitchen.

The 17 bird bones could not all be identified but are mainly of domestic fowl (10) with two of goose and one of duck. Domestic goose and duck are difficult to separate from their wild progenitors, greylag and mallard. These bones are judged to be probably from domestic birds, based on the size of the bones. Three of the indeterminate bird bones are small shaft fragments, the other is a large rib probably of goose. Two of the fowl bones have cut marks; on a humerus and a tibiotarsus, this last indicates where the foot was cut off.

The sample here is too small to draw any firm conclusions but the mix of bones is typical of medieval material in general. The high proportion of bird and the presence of several deer bones in a small collection is, however, likely to be significant. The amount of these is usually higher in castle and other 'high status' sites. Interestingly several castle sites show a preponderance of hind leg bones from deer, which has been suggested as indicating a deliberate selection and supply of prime joints (Albarella & Davis 1996). This site has more front feet, and the cattle bones are mainly of the lower value feet too. A much larger assemblage from this site might confirm whether this is a true reflection of the anatomical distribution or is a statistical artefact of a small sample size.

# 1.1.3 References

- Albarella, U. and Davis, S. (1996) Mammals and birds from Launceston Castle, Cornwall: decline in status and the rise of agriculture. <u>Circaea</u>, **Vol 12**, No.1
- Boessneck, J. (1969) Osteological Differences between Sheep (*Ovis aries* Linné) and Goat (*Capra hircus* Linné) in (D. Brothwell and E.S. Higgs) <u>Science in Archaeology</u>, London, Thames and Hudson, p 331-358
- Driesch, A. von den (1976) A guide to the measurement of animal bones from archaeological sites, <u>Peabody Museum Bulletin</u> **1**, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge Massachusetts
- Grant, A. (1982) The use of tooth wear as a guide to the age of domestic ungulates, in (B. Wilson, C. Grigson and S. Payne) <u>Ageing and Sexing Animal Bones from</u> <u>Archaeological Sites</u>, British Archaeological Reports (British series), **109**, Oxford, p 251-254
- Halstead, P. and Collins, P. (2002) Sorting the Sheep from the Goats: Morphological Distinctions between the Mandibles and Mandibular Teeth of Adult *Ovis* and *Capra*, Journal of Archaeological Science, **29**, 545-553
- Payne S. (1985) Morphological distinctions between the mandibular teeth of young sheep, *Ovis*, and goats, *Capra*. Journal of Archaeological Science, **12**, London, p 139-147

# **1.2.** Tabulated Results:

- 1.2.1. Species Total
- 1.2.2. DATA
- 1.2.3. Species Codes
- 1.2.4. Anatomy Codes

			sheep/				cattle-	sheep/	indet.				indet.				
Context	horse	cattle	goat	pig	fallow	roe	size	pig-size	mammal	fowl	goose	duck	bird	Total	birds	deer	
1\002	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	´ 1	. 1	L
1\003	-	7	4	6	-	1	7	9	4	2	2	-	-	42	´ 4	. 1	L
1\004	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	´ 0	0	1
1\006	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	´ 0	0	1
1\008	-	-	2	1	1	-	3	5	-	-	-	-	-	12	´ 0	1	L
1\013	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	1	. 2	-	-	-	-	7	Ó 0	0	1
1\u/s	-	2	2	-	-	-	6	6	3	8	-	-	4	31	12	0	1
2\002	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	´ 0	0	1
2\004	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	1		-	-	-	-	5	Ó 0	0	1
2\005	1	2	-	-	-	-	2	-		-	-	-	-	5	´ 0	0	1
2\006	-	5	1	1	2	-	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	15	Ó 0	2	2
2\009	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	́ 0	0	1
2\u/s	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	2	´ 0	0	1
u/s fieldwalk	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	Ó 0	0	1
Total	1	23	11	12	4	1	28	24	11	10	2	1	4	132	17	5	;
percent	0.8	17.4	8.3	9.1	3.0	0.8	21.2	18.2	8.3	7.6	1.5	0.8	3.0		12.9	3.8	T
% identified	1.5	35.4	16.9	18.5	6.2	1.5				15.4	3.1	1.5		65	26.2	7.7	ſ
% cattle, sheep,	pig	50.0	23.9	26.1										46			

1.2.1. Species Total

Record SITE	Context	Count Species	Element	Side	SHD co-	ć% :	Size PRC	)XDIST	Poro	BUTCH	GR ANT	Frag	5 Bun	r Ivor	iGnav	VCON	Comments	G	Bp	BFp	SD	Bd	Dd	BFd
5 OMS08	1\002	1 ANA P/D	HUM	R	MP 0	40	2		1		1	Y	1			1		1						
4 OMS08	1\002	1 FALLOW	MT	1	MF	5	2	1	1			1	1	1	1	1	OR POSSIBLY VERY SMALL RED	1	1					
78 OM \$08	1\008	1 COW	CAL	R	MT	50	3		1	MG&OFF	1	1	1	*****	C1	1		1	<u>.</u>	·				
80 OMS08	1\008	1.00 %	CIB	R	າກລ	95			1				· · · · · ·	·†·····	1	R1			<u>.</u>	·			·	·
01 01/000	11.009	1 00 10	T A 102	Ţ.	A00	1			÷	•	*	÷	÷		+	· · ·		·†·····						
20M200	11,000	1.0010	DW1	÷	10270	- 2			÷	•	÷	÷.	÷		÷	1 DAV		·						
@ OM500	11,005	1.000	111	. <b>.</b>	V0/0		2 5									K11	FL AP-C 1		<b>.</b>					·
94 OMS08	1\008	1,COW	PH1		MT	50	3 F		ļ	SPLIT									<b>.</b>	ļ			ļ	
98 OMS08	1\008	i 1.cow	PH2		W	98	2 F		ļ				ļ		įC1				ļ	ļ			ļ	į
88 OMS08	1\008	1 COW	R AD		MT0	20	4			SPIRAL		Y		1	1				ļ				l	ĺ
111 OMS08	1\008	1 FOW	HUM	R.	W	98	3		H	K*+MB							SLIGHTLY DAM ATURE	74	19.5		6.9	15.9		
112 OMS08	1\008	1 FOW	HUM	L	PM	50	2	Ì	H			1		Ì	Ì	1	P AIR		19.5					í
84 OMS08	1\008	1 600	CMC	L	DM	75	3		H		1	1	1		1	Ì		1						
81 OMS08	1\008	1 600	TMT	L	MD	<b>5</b> 0	S.		1			1	1	-	1	1	LARCE	1			•••••			[
106 OMS08	1\008	1 L AR	FR AG	7	м	•	2		†			÷	· • · · · · · · · ·	Y	1	••••••		·	1		•••••			Í
80,000508	11008	1 T. AD	LED AC.	·†	LOT	·†······†			÷	•	÷	÷	· † · · · · · ·	÷.	······	÷		·			•••••			
	11,000		DID. NO.		200				•					· • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	÷				<u> </u>	•			••••••	f
04 UM500	11,005		<u>к</u> пр	·	MI								· · · · · · · ·		÷				÷					
95 UMS 08	11008	1 L AK	KIB		M	- 40				CCH*				. I					ļ					
95 OMS08	1\008	1 L AR	RIB.		PO	10	2		ļ			Y	ļ		ļ				ļ	ļ			ļ	<b>.</b>
85 OMS08	1\008	1 L AR	I VL	.i	M	. 60	3 J	U	Į	CHT		.i			<u> </u> C1			.i						
86 OMS08	1\008	1 LAR	VT	1	s	10	3		1	CHT	1	1	<u>.</u>			1	i	1						
76 OM S08	1\008	3 MAM	FR AG				2																	
102 OMS08	1\008	1 MAM	FR AG	1	MT	Ì	2		Ì		1	1	Ϋ́		1	Ì	SMALL CALCINED FRAG	1	-					
97 OMS08	1\008	1 PIG	FIB	L	DM7	75	4	υ	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1				•••••	[
29 OMS08	1\008	1.013	HIDA	R	MD	30	8		1	C SPIR ALMI	.: R	1	1	Ŷγ		1		1		•••••				
100:000508	1\008	1 213	HIM	T.	MD	50	3			KRAMDE	<b>.</b>			+	101	·			<u>.</u>	•			·	
0.01608	11,008	1.0172	T A107	5	14	10	5					·	·	••••••••		·			÷	·				
90:0M300	11,000	1 7 1.5	JAW	а; •	. ML	- 10			÷		<i>n</i>	÷	÷			÷		+	<u> </u>					
96 UMS08	11008	1 115	116		M	- 2			÷		÷	. <b>.</b>			<u>, cı</u>									
99 OMS08	1\008	1 PJG	UM	. <b>.</b>	, W	. 95	2				ADULT	. <b>.</b>			. <b>.</b>				ļ					
																	WORKED, CHOP WHITTLED OFF BASE AND							
113 OMS08	1\008	i 1 ROE	ANT		WZ	75	4								ļ		SHAPED AT TIP, BG LEATHER SCRIBING TOOL?		Į				ļ	<b>.</b>
107 OMS08	1\008	1 S/G	HUM	L	MDB	20	3							Υ.	[C1				ļ				l	ĺ
77 OMS08	1\008	1 S/G	JAW	1	MT0	15	2		1			Y												
92 OMS08	1\008	1 S/G	SCA	R	MA	10	3	1	1	CH*M	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1				••••••	[
108 OMS08	1\008	1 S/G	TB	L	DF	10	2	F	1				1	ŶY	C1	1				•••••			•	
87 OMS08	1\008	1 SAR	LFR AG	1	MT	11	s		1	•	1	*****	°		C1	1	•	1			•••••			
109 OMS08	1\008	2 S AR	LFR AG	·†·····	MT	÷	2		÷			·*····	· • · · · · · · ·		1	· • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1		•••••			í
110 0048.08	11,008	1 6 40	I FD AC	·†	1.07	·+·····			÷		÷	·	÷	-	·	·		·						
100.000000	1,000	1:5AB	DIA NG						·			·	·	÷.		•			÷	·			·····	
103:000300	11,005	I SAK	<u>к</u> тр		M									÷1	÷-1				÷					
104:OMS08	1\008	2:SAR	KIB		M	15			ļ						<u>, C1</u>								ļ	
105 OMS08	1\008	1 SAR	RIB.		M	15	2		ļ				ļ		ļ				ļ	ļ			ļ	<b></b>
101;OMS08	1\008	1 S AR	VT		M	. 30	2	U	ļ	CH*M		.i												<b>.</b>
9 OMS08	1\004	1 PIG	SCA	L	M	. 38	3		ļ		ļ	.i	Į		C1	Į			l					L
37 OMS08	1\006	1 COW	R AD	L	PMB	20	3 F		1	SPLIT		1			1				80.5	74.5				
36 OMS 08	1\006	2 L AR	LFR AG	1	MT0	1 1	2		1		1	1	Y		1	1	C ALCINED PROBONE BONE	1						
29 OMS08	1\008	1 FALLOW	MC	L	PMF	30	4		1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1					
22 OMS08	1\008	1 L AR	LFR AG	1	MT		2		1				1		1	1			<u>.</u>	•••••			•	
24 01/15/08	11008	1 T. AD	PTR	1	3.00	an i	5		†		1	÷v	†	•••••••	÷	101	COW, IN SPIECES		<u>.</u>	·			·····	
24 OMS08	11008	1 T. AD	SC 4	·					·	CH*		÷	·		÷		PROBCOW		<u> </u>	·			·	<u>.</u>
2 01600	11,000	1.073	TC	÷	1020	00			÷		·	·	÷	· • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	÷	·}·····	OPVP	•	÷	·····			·····	·
A OMSUS	11000	1 7 1 5				73			ł		+	·	÷		ł		PEAF	+						<u> </u>
21 UMS08	1\008	1.5/G	TIB	. <b>.</b>	M	- B				÷		. <b>.</b>				R1	ļ		ļ					
25;UMS08	1/008	3 SAR	LFRAG		MTU		2					. <b>.</b>				R1			ļ					
28 OMS08	1\008	1 S AR	<u>;</u> RB		м	50	3		ļ						Ļ		S/G		Ļ	ļ			ļ	į
27 OMS08	1\008	1 SAR	RIB		M	30	2				<u>.</u>				ļ		PIG		ļ					
20 OMS08	1\008	1 SHE	RAD	R.	PM	20	2 F			CH*PJ, C,CH	[*+)MPE	1	1	Y	C1		LARGE, NOT SAME PRESERV AS REST		36.5	32.3				1
28 OMS08	1\013	1 L AR.	LFR AG	1	MT		2		1			1	1	T	1	1			ľ	1			[	[
32 OMS08	1\013	1. LAR	RIB	1	м	20	3		1		1	1	1		1	1	cow	1	<u>.</u>	°i			•	

1.2.2. /1 DATA

Record SITE	Context	Count Species	Element	Side	e SHD cov	%	Size PR0	D) DIST	Por	C BUTCH	GRANT	Frag Bur	m Ivor	i Gna	w CON	E comments	GL	Вр	BFp	SD	Bd	Dd	BFd
35 OMS 08	1\013	2 MAM	FBAG		MT0		2								B1	ALSO 1 PIECE SANDSTONE		-			_	_	
30 OMS 08	1013	1 PIG	JAW	в	M	10	3	_	-							ADULT BUT NO TEETH PRESENT							
31 OMS 08	1013	1 PIG	JAW	1	MAV	10	3	_								HEOLTEOTHO TEENT HEOLINT							
34 OMS 08	1013	1 SAB	LEBAG	-	MT	10	2						×			PROB SIG HUM OB FEM							
72 OMS 08	10.05	3 BIB	LEBAG		MT		2	_								THOS GIGHON ON EN							
69 OMS 09	10.00	1 BIB	BIR			75	2						V			GOOSE SIZE							
66 OMS 09	10.00	1 COV	HUM	1	MT	10	2	_		SDIDAL			÷.			0003E 312E							
62 OMC 00	1010	1 COV	DU2	-	1411 172	- 00	2 5	_		OF IT IOL			÷										
74 OMC 00	100ro	1 50%	PFH2	D	NINA	30	2 F	_															
74 UMB 00	100ro	1 50%	CVNCAC	n	NIMI A	40	2																
73 OMS 00	MURO 1	1 50%	TID	B	A DMZ	75	2			K.DD						CMANU				4.0	0.1	<u> </u>	
70 UMS 00	NUIS	1 FOW	TLAT	<u> </u>	DIVIZ	- 70	0	_		N+UB			1			SIMALL				4.0	3.1		
71 UNIS 08	NUrS	1 FOW		<u>-</u>	W9				н														
75 UNIS 08	11075	4 FUW	15510	-	W	30	2	_															
65 UMS 08	11/075	1 LAR	LERAG		MI		2						Ŷ										<u> </u>
54 UMS 08	1075	3 LAR	RIB		M	40	5	_		C,CH*					_							_	
55 OMS 08	14075	1 LAR	RIB		M	20	3			CH.			Y		_								
63 OMS 08	14U/S	1 LAR	VX		M	50	2 U	U		MG&OFF			_										
61 OMS 08	14U/S	1 MAM	FRAG		MT		2							C2		DIGESTED							
68 OMS 08	1\U/S	2 MAM	FRAG		MT		2																
64 OMS 08	14U/S	1 S/G	MT		MB	20	3			SPLIT			Y										
67 OMS 08	14U/S	1 S/G	PH1		P	30	2 U							C1		DIGESTED?							
60 OMS 08	1\U/S	2 SAR	LFRAG		MT		2						Y	C1									
56 OMS 08	1\U/S	1 SAR	RIB		M	40	3			CH.			Y	C1									
57 OMS 08	1\U/S	1 SAR	RIB		M	50	3																
58 OMS 08	1\U/S	1 SAR	RIB		M	10	2						Y	C1									
59 OMS 08	14U/S	1 SAR	VT		S	10	2																
8 OMS 08	2\002	1 COV	PH1		V	98	3 F																
7 OMS 08	2\002	1 COV	PH3		V	98	3																
6 OMS 08	2\002	1 MAM	FBAG		MT0		2								B1								
10 OMS 08	2\004	1 COV	JAW	в	AS0	10	4					Y			B1K	POOR, IN 3 PIECES							
14 OMS 08	21004	1 LAB	LEBAG		MT0		2					Ŷ			B1K								
11 OMS 08	21004	1 S/G	FEM	-	PE0	5	2	_				Ŷ			BIK								
12 OMS 08	21004	1 S/G	MC	-	M0	20	2		-			Ŷ		-	B2K								
13 OMS 08	21004	1 SAB	LEBAG		MT0		2		-			Ŷ			B1K								
16 OMS 08	2,005	1 COV	FEM	в	MDB0	20	3	_	-		_	Ŷ	-	C1	B1K								
15 OMS 08	2,005	1 COV	PH1		W90	85	3 E	_			_	Ŷ			B1K								
19 OMS 08	21000	1 HOB	AST	1	W00	- 85	3					v v			THIS		59.5	5					515
17 OMS 08	21005	1148	LEBAG	-	MT		2											-					01.0
12 OMS 02	21005	1148	LEBAG		MTO		2					v			B1K								
29 0540 00	21000	1 COV	ACT	D	M70	60	2					v			D1V								
40 OMS 09	21000	1 COV	CAL	1	M	75	2	_					_		D1K								
40 OMS 00	21000	1 COV	1000	1	MO	75	5	_			VVEVVO	v	_		D1V	ELAKEY WITH MANY EDAGS							
42 OMC 00	21000	1 COV	00	1	DM0	20	4				O.WENNG	V			D1K	FLAKET WITH MARTERAGO							
42 UMB 00	21006	1 COV	ULN	<u>-</u>	E IVIU M	45	- 4					1 V			DIK								<u> </u>
41 UMS 00	21006	1 540.092	MC		DN40	20		-				1			DIK								
43 UMS 00	21006	1 FALLOW	MC	<u> </u>	DIVI0	20	5	F				1			DIK								
50 UMS 08	21006	1 FALLOW	MC .	L	MITO MATO	79	0	_			_	T U	_		DIK								
48 UIVIS 08	21006	3 LAR	FRAG		IVITO MATO		2	_				Υ U	_		BIK								
43 UMS 08	21006	1 LAR	LERAG		IVITU MO	50	3	_				Υ U	_		BIK	POUR IN SEVERAL FRAGS							
38 UMS 08	24006	1 PIG	LIMU		MU	50	2	_				Υ U			ВК								
44 UIVIS 08	24006	1 5/G	UC DID	н	MP0	15	3 F	_			_	Ϋ́	_			DIO					<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
45 UIVIS 08	24006	1 SAR	HIB		P	15	2						_		Endle.	Pig		+			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
46 DMS 08	24006	1 SAR	VI.	-	MU	30	20	U				Ϋ́	_		B1K								
1 OMS 08	24009	1 COV	UM	R	M0	50	2	_				Υ	_		B1K								
3 OMS 08	24009	1 MAM	FRAG	-	MT0	• 5	2					Y	_		B1K						<u> </u>		
2 OMS 08	24009	1 PIG	JAW	R	M0	25	3				F	Y	_										
52 OMS 08	24U/S	1 COV	MT	L	DM0	40	4	F				Y	_		B1K						—	<u> </u>	
53 OMS 08	24U/S	1 COV	PH3	-	P0	15	2		_			Y			R1K						<u> </u>		
51 OMS 08	U/S	1 LAR	LFRAG	_	MT		3		_	K+											<u> </u>		

1.2.2. /2 DATA

Common name	Species
horse	HOR
cattle	COW
sheep/goat	S/G
sheep	SHE
pig	PIG
fallow deer	FALLOW
roe	ROE
large mammal, cattle-sized	LAR
large mammal, sheep/pig sized	SAR
mammal, indeterminate	MAM
goose, graylag/domestic	GOO
domestic fow1	FOW
duck, mallard/domestic	ANA P/D
bird, indeterminate	BIR

1.2.3. Species Codes

SCA	scapula
COR	coracoid
FURC	furcula
OC	pelvis
FEM	femur
TIB	tibia/tibiotarsus
MC	metacarpus
CMC	carpometacarpus
MT	metatarsus
TMT	tarsometatarsus
AST	astragalus
CAL	calcaneum
CUB	cuboid/centroquartal
PH1	phalanx 1
PH2	phalanx 2
PH3	phalanx 3
VT	thoracic vertebra
VL	lumbar vertebra
VX	vertebra not assigned
RIB	rib
LFRAG	limb shaft fragment
FRAG	fragment

# 1.2.4 Anatomy Codes

#### 2. Animal Bone Report – phases II & III – by Sylvia Warman

### 2.1.1. Introduction and Methodology

Animal bone was recovered during Phase 2 excavations in 2009 from Trenches 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10. Animal bone from a single Phase 3 context (012) is also included. A total of 464 fragments of animal bone were recovered and are reported on (Table 1). All fragments were identified to species and element with the following exceptions: ribs and vertebrae of the ungulates (other than axis, atlas, and sacrum) were identified only to the level of cattle/horsesized and sheep/pig-sized. Unidentified shaft and other fragments were similarly divided. Any fragments that could not be assigned to this level have been recorded as mammalian only. Taxonomic identifications were made using the author's modern comparative collections and those at University of London Institute of Archaeology. Recently broken bones were joined where possible and have been counted as single specimens. Tooth eruption and wear stages of cattle, sheep and pig mandibles were recorded following Grant (1982). Estimation of age at death was also made using epiphyseal fusion of long bones following Silver (1969) Measurements follow von den Driesch (1976) and are in millimetres unless otherwise stated. The archive includes details of metrical and other data not presented in the text. Animal bone from the Phase 1 excavations has previously been reported on by Hamiton-Dyer (2008).

#### 2.1.2. Results

The assemblage totals 464 bones of which 156 were identified to species. The majority of the bones are from 21 stratified contexts, these are thought to be mostly medieval in date (late 12th to mid 14th centuries) although a brief period of post-medieval activity associated with the English Civil War is also recorded (Sproat, in Clarke 2010). The remainder of the animal bones were from unstratified deposits. The animal bone from the unstratified deposits closely resembles the stratified material. The condition of the bone is mixed, varying from moderate to excellent. The species identified were; cattle, sheep/goat, pig, dog, deer (red, roe and fallow), badger, hare, hare/rabbit, goose, and domestic fowl. More fragmented material was classified by size as large mammal (cow-sized), large mammal (sheep/pig sized) and small mammal (dog/cat sized). Some identified bird and fish bone fragments were also present in the assemblage.

#### Cattle

Cattle make up over half of the identified bones (Table 1). It is the most numerous of the domestic stock species with a wide range of elements present including meat-bearing bones. Most cattle bones were from fully adult animals, with a few sub-adults and juveniles present. Butchery is evident on many of the limb bones, with the shafts chopped through. Dog gnawing is noted occasionally particularly on ankle bones. No mandibles were sufficiently well preserved to enable dental ageing methods to be used.

#### Pig

Pig is the second most numerous of the domestic mammals but only contributes 13% of the identified bones (Table 1). The pig remains are predominantly jaws teeth and skull fragments, although hind limb and forelimb bones are also present. The evidence from tooth eruption and wear suggests both adults and sub-adults are present. The dentition specifically the canine teeth indicate that both male and female animals are present within the assemblage. The limb bones present also enabled estimates of age-at-death based on epiphyseal fusion. The fusion data indicated that mostly individuals were juvenile or sub-adult in contrast with the dental data. Taken together the age at death information suggests pigs were killed at a range of different ages presumably for a range of different pork products. Gnawing by dogs was occasionally seen on pig limb bone fragments.

#### Sheep/goat

This taxon made up a surprisingly small part of the identified assemblage at just 7% (Table 1). The sheep/goat assemblage comprised meat-bearing limb bones with very little cranial material. Epiphysis fusion indicates a mixture of adult and sub-adult animals. The presence of a restricted range of body parts largely meat-bearing limbs bones is consistent with the import of joints of meat or dressed carcasses rather than live animals. Gnawing by dogs was occasionally seen on sheep/goat limb bones. Evidence of butchery was rare.

#### Sheep

A small number of specimens (7) were positively identified as sheep rather than sheep/goat. These comprised, a tibia, a skull fragment some metapodials and a phalange. Considered with the sheep/goat material the range of body parts increases with metapodials and toes now present; but the bulk of the material remains the meat-bearing limb bones. The sheep specimens were aged using epiphyseal fusion; with sub-adult and adult specimens present.

#### Dog

Just two dog specimens are present, a skull and a mandible. The advanced tooth wear seen on the teeth within the mandible is consistent with an aged individual.

#### **Domestic Birds**

Chicken bones make up just one percent of the identified assemblage. The elements present are largely meat-bearing ones as well as a single phalange. A single goose bone was identified, a humerus from deposit 7/003 a soil horizon. The unidentified bird bones total just six from the whole assemblage.

#### Deer

Three deer species are potentially present red, roe and fallow. The red deer specimens comprise antler, skull and a pelvis fragment. The latter is very weathered and within a post-medieval deposit thus the possibility that it has been redeposited from an earlier layer must be considered. A single specimen a mandible identified as Roe deer was recovered from deposit 4/003. Fallow deer which is generally accepted as a Norman introduction was the most numerous of the deer species (6% of the identified assemblage) and bones were present in deposits of potentially medieval, post-medieval and modern date. This species shows a wider range of elements present but is dominated by ankle and foot bones peripheral to the carcass

as well as a single tooth. One bone, a metatarsal from deposit 4/002 had been chopped vertically, consistent with the butchery practise associated with the extraction of marrow.

#### Leporid

A single toe bone identified as hare was recovered from deposit 7/002, a rubble deposit. In addition, bones identified as leporid (rabbit/hare), were recovered from deposits of medieval and modern date. These comprised both cranial elements and meat-bearing limb bones, although no evidence of butchery was observed.

#### Badger

A single specimen a humerus from deposit 6/003, a loose gravel spread.

#### Unidentified large mammal cattle-sized (LAR)

This category accounts for almost 40% of the assemblage and is likely to comprise cattle, horse and red deer.

#### Unidentified large mammal sheep/pig sized (SAR)

This category accounts from 16% of the assemblage and is likely to be composed of pig, sheep, goat, fallow and roe deer. The elements present are mostly limb shaft fragments and ribs although vertebra and skull fragments are also present.

#### Unidentified small mammal dog/cat sized.

Just two vertebrae were identified to this category from deposits 7/002 and 7/005.

#### Fish

A single unidentified fish bone was recovered from deposit 7/002. More fish bones would be expected from a medieval assemblage, but the lack of sampling may account for this.

#### Unidentified mammal bone

A small amount of bone was so fragmented that identification could not be taken beyond mammal. This accounted for 9 % of the assemblage (Table 1).

#### 2.1.3 Discussion

The assemblage is assumed to be largely medieval in date, but the historic records of Civil War activity at the site and the early excavations by the Mastermans are at least two known periods of disturbance, with redeposition of disturbed medieval material very likely. For the purposes of this report the group of bones is treated as a single assemblage.

The assemblage is dominated by cattle which accounts for 69% of the domestic stock bones identified to species. The presence of a range of body parts including both meat-bearing and non-meat-bearing elements suggests cattle arrived as livestock rather than joints or carcasses and were butchered and consumed on site. The next most numerous livestock species is pig; which comprises both meat-bearing limb bones and skulls and mandibles with just a few peripheral elements from the lower limb and foot. Pigs, it could be argued, are most likely to have arrived as either dressed carcasses or live animals. Taking both epiphyseal fusion data and tooth eruption and wear into account; the age at death for pigs is from 2–3.5 years. This suggests that animals were not killed until they had achieved maximum meat-weight. Sheep and sheep/goat make up a small part of the assemblage less than 5% even when considered together. The restricted range of elements seen – largely meat-bearing long bones is consist with the import of joints of lamb/mutton as required rather than the live animals or dressed carcasses. None of the domestic stock species include very young animals so there is no evidence for the rearing or breeding of livestock at the site.

The two dog specimens are the only examples of this species in the entire assemblage. The heavily worn teeth in the mandible from deposit 4/002 suggest this was an animal of advanced age, or that the animal had an extremely abrasive diet. Dogs would be expected in a medieval assemblage such as this, having been used both as hunting dogs and companion animals. The skull and mandible are both quite large consistent with a hound rather than a terrier or lap-dog.

The fallow deer bones are largely from the head and feet with very few meat-bearing bones present. For this species bones from both the forelimb and hind limb are present with a slightly higher proportion of hind limb bones, this contrasts with the results from the Phase 1 excavations where the forelimb was more common (Hamilton-Dyer 2008). A larger assemblage of fallow deer would be expected at high status site such as this. This species was a Norman introduction and by the time of the main period of occupation at the castle, would be been extensively hunted by the nobility. Thus the remains do not reflect that expected for consumption of venison but may reflect butchery or the import of skins with peripheral elements still attached. If feasting on prime cuts of venison was taking place at the castle, the food waste must have been discarded elsewhere. The red deer assemblage is not consistent with consumption on site, the lack of foot bones suggests it is not the result of on-site butchery, or the import of skins with heads and toes attached. Little can be said about the exploitation of roe deer as it is represented by a single specimen, a mandible.

Goose and chicken are present in small numbers of largely meat-bearing bones, suggesting they made some contribution to the diet. The lack of bones from the head and feet might suggest that dressed carcasses were brought in rather than the birds having been dispatched on site. However the lack of these smaller, more fragile bones could be due to the fact the assemblage was entirely hand-collected with no bulk samples taken. It is striking that no other bird species are present in the Phase 2 assemblage. The Phase 1 assemblage included duck (Hamilton-Dyer 2008). A medieval assemblage from a castle site normally contain a range of wild fowl as well.

#### 2.1.4. Summary

The animal bone assemblage is broadly consistent with what would be expected from a medieval high status site such as this. The lack of any new born domestic stock is consistent with a consumer rather than producer assemblage which is what would be expected at a castle. Cattle were the main source of meat consumed at the castle, whilst the body parts within the pig assemblage are consistent with the consumption of whole spit-roasted pigs. Sheep/goat contributes quite a small amount of meat, likely to have been brought in as joints. The assemblage includes some species which might be indicative of high status such as fallow deer but not in great numbers. Venison it appears was not consumed at the site, although there is limited evidence for the butchery of fallow deer on-site. The Phase 2 assemblage displays many similarities with the smaller assemblage from the Phase 1 excavations (Hamilton-Dyer 2008) as well as some differences, for example fallow deer show a greater proportion of hind limb bones in Phase 2 whilst forelimbs predominate in Phase 1. The Phase 2 assemblage lacks many other species than would be expected at higher status sites, particularly wild birds.

#### 2.1.5. References

- Driesch, A. von den (1976) A guide to the measurement of animal bones from archaeological sites, Peabody Museum Bulletin 1, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge Massachusetts
- Grant A. 1982 'The use of tooth wear as a guide to the age of domestic ungulates'. In Wilson *et al.* 1982, Wilson, B. Grigson, C. and Payne, S. 1982 *Ageing and Sexing Animal bones from archaeological sites* Brit Archaeol. Rep. Brit. Series **109** Oxford, British Archaeological Reports, 91–108

Hamilton-Dyer, S. 2008 Shrawley Castle/Oliver's Mound, Worcs. Animal Bones

Unpublished report prepared for NWAG 14 November 2008

- Silver, I. A. 1969 'The ageing of domestic animals' in Brothwell, D.R. and Higgs E.S. (eds.) 1969 *Science in Archaeology* Thames and Hudson, London, 283–302
- Sproat, R. D. 2010 'Archaeological and Historical Background' in Clarke, C. 2010 Oliver's Mound, Shrawley, Worcestershire. Archaeological Excavation report Phase 2 and 3, 7– 10.

- 2.2. Tabulated Results:
  - 2.2.1. Results Table
  - 2.2.2. Results by possible periods
  - 2.2.3. Results Table with possible periods
  - 2.2.4. Element Codes
  - 2.2.5. Species Code
  - 2.2.6. Animal Bone Data

Sum of Count	Sp 🔻	es																		
Context	BAD	BIR	сош	DOG	FALLOW	FIS	FOW	600	HAR	LAR	LEP	MAM	PIG	RED	ROE	s/G	SAR	SHE	VSAR	Grand Total
10/001			1		1					5						1	5			13
10/002							2			2										4
3/002										1							1	1		3
3/004			1							2										3
3/005										2				2						4
4/001			1							5							3			9
4/002			10	1	2		1			21		2	2			2	7	1		49
4/003		1	7		1		2			25		10	4		1	1	13			65
4/004			1		1					11				2			12			27
4/009		1	1																	2
4/US													1							1
6/002			9							12			3				2	1		27
6/003	1	1	21		3					21			1	1		2	4	3		58
7/002		1	7		1	1			1	29		6	2			1	15	1	1	66
7/003		1	3	1				1		11		1				2	3			23
7/004			3							3			2				4			12
7/005		1	2		1					4	1	1							1	11
8/001											1									1
8/002			1								2									3
8/003											2									2
9/002			10							18		12	3			2	5			50
9/US			1										1	1						3
US										2			1							3
THE WELL CONTEXT 12			5				1			7		11					1			25
Grand Total	1	6	84	2	10	1	6	1	1	181	6	43	20	6	1	11	75	7	2	464
percent	0.2	1.3	18.1	0.4	2.2	0.2	1.3	0.2	0.2	39	1.3	9.3	4.3	1.3	0.2	2.4	16.2	1.5	0.4	100
percent identified	0.6	3.8	53.8	1.3	6.4	0.6	3.8	0.6	0.6	116	3.8	27.6	12.8	3.8	0.6	7.1	48.1	4.5	1.3	156
percent cattle sheep pig			68.9										16.4			9		5.7		122
- ×	-	-	-		-	-		-				-			-		-			

2.2.1. Results Table by possible Periods

Medieval																	
Context	BIR	cow	DOG	FALLOW	FOW	600	LAR	LEP	MAM	PIG	RED	ROE	s/G	SAR	SHE	VSAR	Grand Total
4/002 4/003 4/004 4/009 7/003 7/004 7/004	1 1 1	10 7 1 3 3	1	2 1 1	1 2	1	21 25 11 11 3		2 10 1	2 4 2	2	1	2 1 2	7 13 12 3 4	1		49 65 27 2 23 12
77005	4	27	2	5	3	1	4 75	1	14	8	2	1	5	39	1	1	189
Post-medieval	BAD	BIR	cow	FALLOW	FIS	FOW	HAR	LAR	MAM	PIG	RED	s/G	SAR	SHE	VSAR	Grand Total	
6/002 6/003 7/002 9/002 THE WELL CONTEXT 12	1	1 1	9 21 7 10 5	3 1	1	1	1	12 21 29 18 7	6 12 11	3 1 2 3	1	2 1 2	2 4 15 5 1	1 3 1	1	27 58 66 50 25	
	1	2	52	4	1	1	1	87	29	9	1	5	27	5	1	226	
Context	cow	FALLOW	FOW	LAR	LEP	PIG	RED	s/G	SAR	SHE	Grand Total						
10/001 10/002 3/002 3/004 3/005 4/001 4/US 8/001 8/002 8/003 9/US US	1 1 1 1 1	1	2	5 2 1 2 2 5 2	1 2 2	1	2	1	5	1	13 4 3 3 4 9 1 1 3 2 3 3 3 3						
	5	1	2	19	5	3	3	1	9	1	49						

2.2.2. Results by possible Periods

Sum of Count	Spe 🔻	S																		
Context	BAD	BIR	cow	DOG	FALLOW	FIS	FOW	600	HAR	LAR	LEP	MAM	PIG	RED	ROE	S/G	SAR	SHE	VSAR	Grand Total
10/001			1		1					5						1	5			13
10/002							2			2										4
3/002										1							1	1		3
3/004			1							2				2						3
3/005			1							2				2			2			4
4/001			10	1	2		1			21		2	2			2	7	1		49
4/003		1	7	- ' - I	1		2			25		10	4		1	1	13	1.1		65
4/004			1				-			11			1.1	2	1.1		12			27
4/009		1	1																	2
4/US													1							1
6/002			9							12			3				2	1		27
6/003	1	1	21		3					21			1	1		2	4	3		58
7/002		1	7		1	1			1	29		6	2			1	15	1	1	66
7/003		1	3	1				1		11		1				2	3			23
7/004			3							3			2				4			12
7/005		1	2		1					4	1	1							1	11
8/001											1									1
8/002			1								2									3
8/003			10							40	2	40	2			0	-			2
9/002			10							10		12	J 1	1		2	э			20
119			'							2			4							2
THE WELL CONTEXT 12			5				1			7		11					1			25
Grand Total	1	6	84	2	10	1	6	1	1	181	6	43	20	6	1	11	75	7	2	464
percent	0.2	1.3	18.1	0.4	2.2	0.2	1.3	0.2	0.2	39	1.3	9.3	4.3	1.3	0.2	2.4	16.2	1.5	0.4	100
percent identified	0.6	3.8	53.8	1.3	6.4	0.6	3.8	0.6	0.6	116	3.8	27.6	12.8	3.8	0.6	7.1	48.1	4.5	1.3	156
percent cattle sheep pig			68.9										16.4			9		5.7		122
	medie	val																		
	post-m	nedieva																		
	moder	n																		

2.2.3. Results Table with possible Periods

Element Codes	Anatomy
SKL	skull
ANT	antler
JAW	mandible
LM	lower molar
LPM	lower premolar
LC	lower canine
LI	lower incisor
UM	upper molar
UPM	upper premolar
HUM	humerus
RAD	radius
ULN	ulna
R+U	radius+ulna
SCA	scapula
COR	coracoid
FURC	furcula
00	pelvis
FEM	femur
TIB	tibia/tibiotarsus
MC	metacarpus
MC4	4th metacarpus
CMC	carpometacarpus
MT	metatarsus
MP	metapodial
TMT	tarsometatarsus
AST	astragalus
CAL	calcaneum
CUB	cuboid/centroquartal
TAR	tarsal
С/Т	carpal or tarsal
PH1	phalanx 1
PH2	phalanx 2
PH3	phalanx 3
PH	phalange
VAT	atlas
VC	cervical vertebra
VT	thoracic vertebra
VL	lumbar vertebra
VX	vertebra not assigned
RIB	rib
LFRAG	limb shaft fragment
FRAG	fragment

# 2.2.4. Element Codes

Common name	Species
cattle	COW
sheep/goat	S/G
sheep	SHE
pig	PIG
red deer	RED
fallow deer	FALLOW
roe	ROE
dog	DOG
badger	BAD
hare	HAR
rabbit/hare	LEP
large mammal, cattle-sized	LAR
large mammal, sheep/pig size	SAR
small mammal, dog/cat size	VSAR
mammal, indeterminate	MAM
goose, graylag/domestic	GOO
domestic fow1	FOW
bird, indeterminate	BIR
fish, indeterminate	FIS

# 2.2.5. Species Codes

	Context	Count	Species	Element	Side	SHD code	×	Size	PROX	DIST	Porosity	BUTCH	GRANT	Fragmented	Burnt	lvoried	Gnawed	CONDIT	comments	GL	e B	BFp	S	Pa	P	BFd	FRAG COUNT
167 OMS	64003	1 6	an	ылм	l. –		30	2		F		SPIRAL							BADGER DISTAL HUMERUS							.	
300 OMS	7/005	1 6	BIR	COR	lū –	M	30	3		F	<u> </u>	SFINAL							PROB CHICKEN BU DIAGS	+	+	+		+	$\rightarrow$	-+	
																			HUMERUS FROM SMALL BIRD		$\square$	1					
168 OMS	6/003	1 E	3IR	HUM	R	M	65	3											DIAG AREAS MISSING	+'	$\vdash$	<u> </u>				$ \longrightarrow $	
142 UMS	4/009	井튼	3IR SID	LEBAG		M	10	3										DI	LUNGFRAGUELB	+'		+	<u> </u>	-			
266 OMS	7/002	1 6	BIB	LEBAG	Hi -	M	4	3												+	+	+	-			$ \rightarrow $	
76 OMS	4/003	1 6	BIR	TIB	Ū	M	15	3											SHAFT FRAG NOT DIAG	+	<u> </u>	-	-	1			
351 OMS	THE VELL CONTEXT 12	1 C	COV	AST	R	D	45	4											ASTAGALUS			-					
145 OMS	6/002	10		AST	10	M	30	3											FRAGIOF ASTRAG MOD DAMAGE	+'	—		<u> </u>			$ \rightarrow $	
267 OMS	7/003	+16	20%	AST	le le	W W	100	4												+'	+	+	<u> </u>	-		$ \rightarrow$	
146 OMS	6/002	10	:ov	CAL	L	M	65	4	U								C1P		CAL WITHOUT EPIPH	+	<u> </u>	-		1			
288 OMS	7/004	1 C	COM .	CAL	B	V	100	4	F										COMPLETE								
215 OMS	7/002	10			Ľ	V9	80	4						Y 5PCS			C2 P		MODERN BREAK	+'	—		<u> </u>	-		$ \rightarrow $	
200 01/13	71003		.0w	CAL		wa	00	4	0								02 F		UNFUSED SOME MODERN	$\vdash$	┼──	+	<u> </u>	-		$ \rightarrow $	
317 OMS	9/002	1 0	:ov	CAL	B	V9	75	4	U									B1	DMAMAGE	1						.	
125 OMS	4/004	1 C	COM 1	CAR	B	V	100	3											SEMILUNAR CARPAL								
30 OMS	4/002	10	:ov	CAR	R	V	100	3											GRAND CUNI	—	—		<u> </u>	-			
170 OMS	6/003	110	ov I	FEM	в	м	55	5				н І							POROUS PROB J OR SA						. !	, I	
216 OMS	7/002	10	cov.	FEM	L	M	10	4				H							SHAFT FRAG SPLIT VERT	+	-	-		1			
289 OMS	7/004	1 C	COM	FEM	R	M	40	5				Н					C1D		CHOPPED ALSO MOD BREAK								
210 0540	0.000	10	0.0		l.	D.M.				-								<b>D</b> 1	MOD BREAK TO SHAFT AND	1						.	
218 OMS	7/002	10	.0.W :0.W	JAV		M	40	5		F								ni -	NO TEETH BUT SOCKETS	$\vdash$	┼──	+	-	-		$ \rightarrow$	$\vdash$
					-	1.1													CHECK AREA M3 SOCKET VISIBLE	-	<u> </u>	+					
217 OMS	7/002	10	COV .	JAW	L	P	15	4				С							CHOPPED								
201 0540	71005	1		144	l. –	6	20											<b>D</b> 1	CHEEK AND ARTIC VITH SKULL	-						.	
301 01415	77005		.0w	JAW		F	30	5										ы	ANTERIOR PART OF MANDIRI F	$\vdash$	┼──	+	<u> </u>	+	$ \rightarrow$	$ \rightarrow$	$\vdash$
31 OMS	4/002	1 0	cov 🛛	JAW	L	P	5	3											VITH SOCKETS FOR INCISORS							.	
																			VENTRAL FRAG RUNING LENGTH								
																			OF TOOTH ROW HAS BEEN							.	
302 OMS	7/005	10	:ov	JAV	в	V	15	5				н							NO SOCKETS LEFT							.	
352 OMS	THE VELL CONTEXT 12	10	:ov	LM	B	W9	90	4											SINGLE MI OR M2 WORN								
171 OMS	6/003	1 C	:ov	MC	B	D	25	4	-	F		Н							SHAFT CHOPPED THROUGH								
353 UMS	THE VELL CONTEXT12	1	:UW	MC	в		35	5	F					Ŷ						+'	—	+	<u> </u>	-			
32 OMS	4/002	10	:ov	мс	L	PM	75	5									C3D		TO GNAVING							.	
					-										WHITE/						-						
77 OMS	4/003	10	COM 00	MP	U	м	10	3							BLACK				MID SHAFT FRAG BURNT	+'	$\vdash$	<u> </u>				$ \longrightarrow $	
147 OMS	61002	110	-014	мт	lu –	M	25	4									C2P	<b>D</b> 2	SHAFT V VEATHERED ALSO MOD	1						.	
143 OMS	4/009	10	cow Voc	MT	lŭ –	P	20	3						Y 2PCS	BLACKA	WHITE	021	115	BURNT MT PROX END IN 2 PCS	-	+	+	-	-	$\rightarrow$		
319 OMS	9/002	10	COV	MT	B	P	35	4	F										MODERN BREAK TO SHAFT								
172 0140	61000	1	-ov	NAT.	L	DM		-	-									<b>D</b> 2	VERY VEATHERED CAN'T SEE						I T	<sub>I</sub> T	
172 0148	bruus		.UW	1911	<sup>ri</sup>	I MI	- <sup>/5</sup>	- 9		<u> </u>	<u> </u>						<u> </u>	nia	FRAG OF ISHIUM AND PUBIS MOD	+	┼──	+	-	+	<del> </del>	<del> </del>	$\vdash$
148 OMS	6/002	1 0	ov	oc	L	м	10	3				c							BREAK	1	1			1	,	, I	
																			CHOPPED THROUGH PROX ALSO								
173 OMS	6/003	10		000	<u>l</u>	M	35	4		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	н					<u> </u>			+		+	-	<u> </u>	<b></b>	<b>⊢</b>	$\vdash$
149 OMS	6/002	16	.0.w :0.w	PH1	Hi -	M	70	4	F										MOD BREAK PROX	+	┼──	+	<u> </u>	-	$ \rightarrow$		
78 OMS	4/003	10	:OV	PH1	Ū	V	100	3											CHIPPED DISTAL SO NOT							$ \rightarrow $	
321 OMS	9/002	1 C	COV	PH2	U	M	55	3	F										MODERN BREAK			1					
219 OMS	10/002	16	VU:	PH2	<u>Hi</u>	1V9	85	3	F	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			Y 2PCS			<u> </u>		MUDERN DAMAGE	+		+	-		<b> </b>	<b>⊢</b>	$\vdash$
79 OMS	4/003	10	20W	PH3	lŭ –	V V	100	4		<u> </u>	<u> </u>						<u> </u>			+	+	+	-	+	$ \rightarrow$	-+	$\vdash$
220 OMS	7/002	10	:ov	PH3	Ú	W9	90	4											MODERN CHIPPED								
33 OMS	4/002	10	:OV	R+U	R	P	45	5			R2	Н							SHAFT CHOPPED THROUGH			$\square$					
322 OMS	97002	110	:UV	HAD	l –	M	35	4				н							HADIUS PROXIMAL SHAFT	+		+	-		<b></b>	<b>⊢</b>	$\vdash$
22 OMS	4/001	110	ov I	BAD	L	Р	5	4	F										ARTICULATION VITH MODERN						. !	, I	
		-1-			ľ	1	t – Ť	· · ·											RADIUS ARTICS WITH ULNA NEXT		1	+		1	-+	-+	
34 OMS	4/002	10	:ov	RAD	R	P	45	5		L	L	н					L		SPEC SHAFT CHOPPED TROUGH	<b> </b>		+		-			$\square$
80 OMS	4/003	1 0	ov I	RAD	L	Р	40	5	F			н							THROUGH							, I	

2.2.6. /1 Animal Bone Data

Record ID	SITE	Context	Count	Species	Element	Side	SHD code	×	Size	PROX	DIST	Porosity	BUTCH	GRANT	Fragmented	Burnt	lvoried	Gnawed	CONDIT	comments	GL	Bp	BFp	sD	Pa	PO	BFd	FRAG COUNT
174	OMS	6/003	1	cov	RAD	в	Р	30	5				н						B2	CHOPED VERTICALLY ALSO VEATHERED								
22	IOMS	7/002	1	cov	BAD	L	Р	25	4	F			н							PROX RAD SHAFT CHOPPED THROUGH								
254	InMs	THE VELL CONTEXT 12	1	COV	BAD		P		5	F			ц		V2PCS			C2P		CHOPPED RIGHT THOUGH SHAFT								_
		1000		cov	000				5						12100			Can		CENTRE OF BLADE AND SPINE								—
82	OMS	4/003	1	COV	ISCA	10	M	25	4									1.20		FRAG OF SCAPULA A WITH SPINE			+				-	
175	OMS	6/003	1	COV	SCA	R	P	10	4	F			Н							ARTIC AND PART OF NECK								
323	OMS	9/002	1	COV	SCA	U	P	5	4											JUST GELNOID MODERN BREAKS								
150		67002	1	COV	SKL	В	BASE	15	4						ZPUS					PARTOFIACYMAL BONE 2			+					
180	IOMS	6/003	1	COV	SKL	li –	l.	5	3											PART OF TEMPORAL BONE			+-+				-	
						-	-		-											PART OF RIGHT MAXILLA VITH								
18	IOMS	6/003	1	COV	SKL	B	L	4	4											SOCKETS								
183	IOMS	67003	1	COV	SKL	в	L	10	4										l	ERAGE OF NASAL PONE VITH			$\vdash$				$\rightarrow$	
35	OMS	4/002	2	cov	SKL	lu	м	5	3											MOD BREAKS								
			-			-														2 FRAGS OF BASAL PART MOD							-	
177	OMS	6/003	1	COV	SKL	в	M	5	3											BREAK								
175		6/003	1	COV	SKL	Ľ.	M	3	3											FRAGIOF PALATE	-		$\vdash$					
102		bruus	-	COw	JONL .	<u> </u>	IM		4											BIGHT AND LEFT NASAL BONES			+					
176	OMS	6/003	1	cov	SKL	в	P	10	5											NOT FUSED BUT REFIT								
																				FLAT FRAGS OF SKULL FRONTAL								
184	OMS	6/003	1	COV	SKL	U U	P	5	4											OR TEMP/MAX								
15		8/002	$\frac{1}{1}$	COV	TAR	B	W	100	3												-		+					
324	IOMS	9/002	1	COV	TAB	B	Ŵ	100	4											SCAPHO-CUBOID			+			-	-+	
																				SCAPHO-CUBOID MOD DAMAGE								
265	OMS	7/003	1	COV	TAR	R	W9	95	4											SLIGHT CHIP			$\square$					
																				I DISTAL TIB UNFUSED SHAFT								
83	OMS	4/003	1	cov	тів	lı.	lo 🛛	35	4		lυ									CHOPPED								
						_														DISTAL TIBIA SHAFT CHOPPED								
355		THE VELL CONTEXT 12	1	COV	TIB	R	D	30	5		F	н											$\vdash$					
36	OMS	4/002	1	cov	тів	в	P	30	5	F					н І					THROUGH								
153	OMS	6/002	1	COV	ULN	U	D	15	3											SMALL FRAG OF DISTAL SHAFT								
152	OMS	6/002	1	COV	ULN	L	M	20	4				К					C2 P		CUT MARK ALSO MOD BREAKS								
37		4/002	1	COV				40	5				C						l				$\vdash$				$\rightarrow$	
101	01413	01003	-	0.0		P	China	00												2 UPPER MOLAR BOTH VITH			++			-	-+	
																				ROOTS MISSING AND UPPER			1 1					
																				SURFACE OF CROWN MISSING SO								
325		9/002	2			IL.	M M	55	3									+			+		$\vdash$		$ \rightarrow $			
105	000	01000	-	00%	000	-		00										+		SOME DAMAGE TO TIPS OF	+		+				-+	
38	OMS	4/002	1	COV	UM	U	W9	75	3											ROOTS CROWN IN WEAR								
186	OMS	6/003	1	COV	UM	N	W9	80	3											PROB M1 V HEAVILY VORN								
188		6/003	1	COV		l-	V V	100	3														$\vdash$				-+	
290	IOMS	7/004	$\frac{1}{1}$	COV		lî –	v v	100	3									-		UPPER P2 WORN	+		+					
348	OMS	9/US	1	COV	UPM	L	V	100	3											UPPER P2 OR P3 VORN								
16	OMS	3/004	1	COV	VAT	L	L	50	4	F	F									LEFT HALF OF ATLAS								
	1				1	1	1											1										
39	loms	4/002	1	DOG	JAV	l.	W9	80	4									1		OLD? CHECK HILSON								
	1		·		1	1		1				1						1		RIGHT MAXILLA VITH P2 P4 M1								
270	OMS	7/003	1	DOG	SKL	R	L.	15	4		L									AND M2 PRESENT BUT NOT			$\vdash$					
40		47002	1	FALLO	AST	<u> </u> └───	W	100	3			<u> </u>						+	l	ASTRAGAULS	+		$\vdash$		+ +			
2	OMS	10/001	1	FALLON	CAL	IL I	lv .	100	4	F								C1		MARKS AORUND HEAD								
						1														UNFUSED PROX BUT ALSO MOD								
126		4/004	1	FALLO		R	W9	80	4	U										BREAK	+		$\vdash$					
190	lows	6/003		FALLON	MC.	в	Рм	70	5	F	lu –							1		MOD DMADGE VENTRAL								
303	OMS	7/005	1	FALLO	MP	tü –	0	15	4		lū –	1						1	l	1/2 OF DISTAL SHAFT UNFUSED			+			-	-	
222	OMS	7/002	1	FALLO\	MT	L	D	35	4		F									MOD BREAK TO SHAFT								
4	IOMS	4/002	1	FALLO	MT	R	PM	45	5				н							CHOPPED VERT								

2.2.6 /2 Animal Bone Data

CI Poo SITE	Context	Count	Species Flement	Cido	side SHD code	×	Size	PROX	DIST	Porosity	BUTCH	GRANT	Fragmented	Burnt	lvoried	Gnawed	CONDIT	comments	ы ы	đ	BFp	SD	Bd	РО	BFd	FRAG COUNT
191 OMS	6/003	1 FALL	румт	L.	lv -	99	5	F	F									COMPLETE APART FROM SMALL CHIP DISTAL DEF MEASURABLE	216	25	;	15.1	28.6	18		
192 OMS	6/003	1 FALLO	DW RAD	B	РM	70	5	F								C2 D										$\square$
223 OMS	47003	1 FALL	DMOM		W	100	2											FISH BONE - NOT IDENTIFIED	┝─┤	<u> </u>	+					<u> </u>
85 OMS	4/003	1 FOV	COR	B	V9	95	3												$\square$							$\square$
11 OMS	10/002	1 FOW	HUM		MD	70	4											MODERN BREAK	┝─┤	<u> </u>	+					<u> </u>
356 OMS	THE VELL CONTEXT 12	1 FOV	HUM	B	V9	95	5											ADULT HUMERUS	$\square$							$\square$
42 OMS	4/003	1 FOV	ULN	B	W W9	85	4											BUT MOST OF PROX ARTIC	+	<u> </u>	+					<u> </u>
271 OMS	7/003	1 GOO	HUM	B	P	10	3												$\square$							$\square$
326 OMS	9/002	1 LAB	C/T	U U	M	45	3											FRAMENT OF CARPAL OR	╧	<u> </u>	+					<u> </u>
222 0140	01000	1.140	- CEA		_													PART OF ONE CONDYLE MODERN								
327 01415	37002	I LAN	FEM	<u> </u>	P			<u> </u>										SHAFT CHOPPED THROUG	¢−+	<u> </u>	+					<u> </u>
42 0140	41002	1 1.40	EEM.			200										COD.		GNAVED DISTALLY PROBICOVIAS	4							
304 OMS	7/005	1 LAB	FEM	10	P	10	4									1020		PROX FEM	+ +	<u> </u>	+					<u> </u>
97 0646	41002	2 1 40	EDAG		-													FRAGMENTS OF COV SIZED FLAT								
or UNIS	41003	3 LAN	FRAG	10	- F													POSS SCAP SPINE OR PART OF	++		+					
225 OMS	7/002	1 LAB	FRAG	U	F	3	4			C								VERT POSSIBLY PART OF MANDIBLE	—┦	⊢	+					<u> </u>
220 0110	11002	1 6011	- Hou	1°														FLAT BONE FRAG PART OF	+-+		+					$\vdash$
227 OMS	7/002	1 LAR	FRAG		F	3	3			C								MAND OR PELVIS?	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	+					<u> </u>
44 OMS	4/002	1 LAR	FRAG	Ŭ		Ĭ	-											POTENTIALLY MANDIBLE FRAG								
45 OMS 46 OMS	4/002	1 LAR	FRAG	U	-														$\square$	<u> </u>	$ \rightarrow $					<u> </u>
228 OMS	7/002	4 LAB	FRAG	Ŭ		5	4											FRAGS OF FLAT BONE CSZ								
272 OMS	7/003	1 LAB	ним	h.	In	25	4		lu –	lc .			Y 2PCS			C2D		DISTAL SHAFT UNFUSED ALSO								
				1					-									CHOPPED MID SHAFT MOD	+-+		+					-
193 OMS 194 OMS	6/003	1 LAB	HUM	0	P	25	4	F		н						C1P	нт	BREAK PROX ALSO ROOT	+	<u> </u>	+					<u> </u>
229 OMS	7/002	1 LAB	JAV	Ū	P	10	4			С						C2 P		CHEEK AREA SOME GNAWING								
273 OMS 195 OMS	7/003	1 LAR	JAW	10	V V	10	4											CHEEK AREA MOD BREAK	╉╾┥	<u> </u>	+ +					─
234 OMS	7/002	1 LAB	LFRAG	a U	F	1	2											SMALL FRAG MOD BREAK	$\square$							$\vdash$
360 UMS 361 OMS	THE WELL CONTEXT 12	1 LAB	LFRAG	a I à I	F	15	3						Y Y					FRAGMENT OF CARPAL OR	┝─┤	<u> </u>	+					<u> </u>
12 0140	101000	2 1 40	LEDAG															LONG BONE FRAGMENTS SPLIT								$\square$
12 01915	10/002	2 LAR	LERAC	10	1111	20	0 0				н							FRAG OF CSZ LB WITH MODERN	+ +	<u> </u>	+					<u> </u>
19 OMS	3/005	1 LAB	LFRAG	3 U	м	10	3											BREAKS	+	⊢	+					_
																		CHAFR SMOOTH FROM USE AT								
20 0149	24005	1 1 48	LEDAG	<u>.</u>		20					0							OP ROUGHER LOVER DOWN?								
20 01410	01000	I LAN	LC-HAC	1		20	1				n n							6 FRAGS OF CSZ LB WITH	+	<u> </u>	+					$\vdash$
47 OMS	4/002	1 LAB	LFRAG	a U	M	15	3	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	-								FREQUENT MOD BREAKS	+ - 1	-	+					<u>6</u>
48 OMS	4/002	1 LAB	LFRAG	a U	м	10	4				н					C1D		RIGHT THROUNG ALSO DGO								
49 OMS	4/002	1 LAR	LFRAG	<u>i U</u>	M	5	4				н							SHAFT CHOPPED THROUGH	+	⊢	+					—
50 OMS	4/002	1 LAB	LFRAG	a U	м	10	4				н							CHOPPED THROUGH								
51 OMS	4/002	1 LAR	LFRAG	a U	M	15	4						Y2PCS					IN 2 PCS MOD BREAK	╉╾┥	<u> </u>	┥─┤					—
52 OMS	4/002	2 LAR	LFRAG	a U	м	10	4											MODERN BREAKS		<u> </u>						$\vdash$
53 OMS	4/002	1 LAB	LEBAG	alu	м	10	4											MOU BREAK EITHER DISTAL HUM		1						
54 OMS	4/002	2 LAR	LFRAG	a Ū	M	5	3											2 FRAGS WITH MOD BREAKS	Ħ		⇇					$\square$
55 OMS	4/002	1 LAB	LFRAG	alu	м	2	2											FRAGIUF LB POSSIFEM WITH MOD	1	1						
88 OMS	4/003	1 LAB	LFRAG	a Ū	M	5	4				С							LONG BONE FRAG CHOPPED	$\square$		$\square$					$\vdash$
90 OMS	4/003	1 LAB	LFRAG	3 U	M	4	3	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>							<u> </u>	SMALL FRAG MUDERN BREAK	+ - +	<u> </u>	+ +					—
	41000																	FRAG OF LONG BONE SHAFT								
92 OMS	4/003	1 LAB	LFRAG	3 U	M	10	4				Н								+	<u> </u>	+ +					$\vdash$

2.2.6. /4 Animal Bone Data

ę			ų		ž		ebe					2	L I	E	ented		_		Ę	ents								COUNT
ŭ site	Context	Count	Snecie		Elemer	Side	ů – Š		Size	PROX	DIST	Porosi	BUTCH	GRAN	Fragm	Burnt	lvoried	Gnawe		Ē	5	ß	BFp	ß	Pa	8	BFd	FRAG
93 OM:	4/003	1	LAR	LFR	RAG	U	М	1	0 :	3			н							SHAFT FRAG CHOPPED								
95 OM: 96 OM:	4/003	5	LAR	LFR	AG BAG	U	IM M		5 3	2										FRAG OF LONG BONE CHOPEPD								
97 OM:	4/003	i	LAR	LFR	AG	Ŭ	M			3			-															
127 OM	41004	1	IAB	LEB	200		м		5											LONG BONE FRAG SPLIT								
128 OM	4/004	1 i	LAR	LFR	AG	Ŭ	M		5 3	3			l <del>c</del>					<u> </u>		CHOPED FRAGS OF LB						_		
129 OM:	4/004	1	LAR	LFR	RAG	U	м		5 :	3			С							POSSIBLYPELVIS								
130 UM	4/004	2	LAR	LEB	AG BAG	0	M		3 3	2										SMALL EBAGS OF LB								
154 OM:	6/002	2	LAR	LFR	RAG	Ũ	M		5	4			С							CHOPPED UP L;B FRAGS								
155 OM:	6/002	1	LAR	LFR	RAG	U	м	1	0 4	ŧ			IC						R2	MOD DAMAGE								
196 OM:	6/003	1	LAR	LFR	AG	υ	м	1	5 4	4			H,C							MULTIPLE CHOP MARKS								
197 OM:	6/003	1	LAR	LFR	RAG	U	M		5	3			C						B1	ALSO MOD BREAK								
198 UM	6/003	$\frac{1}{1}$	LAR		AG AG	0	M		5 5	4		C	U I							CHOPED UP LONG BONE FRAGS								
230 OM:	7/002	1	LAR	LFR	RAG	Ū	M		5 4	4		Ĥ								CHOPPED FRAG OF LB								
231 OM:	7/002	1	LAB	LFR	AG	U	M	1	0 4	4		C			Y 3PCS					IN 3 PCS DUE TO MOD BREAKS								
232 OM	7/002	H	LAB	LFB	AG	U	M		4 4	4		ic i								CHOFFEDERAGIOFEB								
235 OM:	7/002	3	LAR	LFR	RAG	Ū	М		5 :	3		Ċ								CHOPPED UP 3 FRAGS								
236 OM	7/002	1			AG bag	0	M		3 3	3		lc -																
214 010	11000	1	10011	-	100	•												<u> </u>		CHOPPED THROUGH ALSO								
275 OM:	7/003	1	LAR	LFR	RAG	U	м		5 4	4		н							R2	VEATHERED								
276 014	74002	1	1.40				5.4	.												LONG BONE FRAGMANET								
291 OM:	7/004	Ιi	LAR	LFR	AG	Ŭ	M		3 3	2		c						<u> </u>		ALSO MOD BREAKS						_		
305 OM:	7/005	1	LAR	LFR	RAG	U	м			2																		
306 UM	77005	1	LAR		(AG	U	M		4 ;	1										LONG BOEN FRAGMANETS								
328 OM:	9/002	1	LAB	LFB	AG	Ш	м		5 :	3			С							MODERN BREAKS								
329 OM:	9/002	1	LAB	LFR	AG	U	M		3 3	2										FRAGMENT OF SPONGEY BONE								
331 OM	9/002	1	LAB	LFR	AG	0	M		4 4	4			c					-								_		
332 OM:	9/002	7	LAB	LFR	RAG	U	м		5 ;	3			с							LONG BOEN FRAGMENTS MODERN BREAKS								
357 OM:	THE WELL CONTEXT 12	1	LAR	LFR	RAG	I	м	1	5 !	5					Y					SHAFT FRAGMENT ALSO ROOT ETCHED								
050 014		Ι.								-										CHOPPED THROUGH AND								
359 OM	THE WELL CONTEXT 12	H	LAB	LFB	AG	1	M		5 4	4		-			Ý					MODERN BREAK								
		<u> </u>																		FRAGMENTS OF CHOPPED UP								
366 OM:	US	2	LAR	LFR	3AG	U	м		5 :	3		IC .																
94 OM:	4/003	1	LAB	LFR	AG	υ	Р		5 :	3								C2 P		SMALL FRAG OF								
277 OM:	7/003	1	LAR	LFR	RAG	U			3 :	3																		
56 OM	4/002	1	LAB	loc.		υ	P		5 :	3								C1P		ICOM OPPER PART PROB COV								
158 OM:	6/002	1	LAR	RIB		Ū	D	1	5	4			К							KNIFE CUTS TRANSVERSE								
3 OM:	10/001	3	LAB	RIB		U	M	1	5 4	4								CID										
5 OM:	10/001	H	LAB	RIB		U	M	- 1	0 4	4																		
13 OM:	3/002	1	LAR	RIB		Ū	M	3	0 4	4		м							R2	FLAKEY								
18 OM:	3/004	1	LAR	RIB		U	M	2		3		HT								RIB FRAG WITH MODERN BREAKS								
23 OM	4/001	2	LAB	RIB		Ŭ	M			4										RIB FRAG WITH MODERN BREAKS							_	
25 OM:	4/001	1	LAR	RIB		U	М		2 2	2										V SMALL RIB FRAG MOD BREAK								
57 OM:	4/002	++		RIB		0	M	+ 3	5 4	1						<u> </u>		<b> </b>	<b> </b>	ANC BREAK BUT NOT CHOPPED								
59 OM	4/002	1	LAR	RIB		Ŭ	M	1	ŏ :	3						WHITE/F		+	<u> </u>	POSSIBLY BURNT	+							
98 OM:	4/003	1	LAR	RIB		U	М	1	5 4	4										COV SIZED RIB FRAG								
99 OM: 100 OM	4/003	$\left  \frac{1}{1} \right $	LAR	RIB		0	IM M	5	2	2		-				-		+	-	COW SIZED RIB FRAG SMALL FRAG MOD BREAK	+							
101 OM:	4/003	ĹΪ	LAR	RIB		Ŭ	M	3	ō t	4																		
102 OM	4/003	1	LAR	RIB		U	M	2	0 4	1			н															
103 OM3 104 OM3	4/003	$\frac{1}{1}$	LAR	BIB		0	M		5	3						WHITE			<u> </u>	BUBNT WHITE	+							
105 OM:	4/003	1	LAR	RIB		U	M		3 3	2																		
132 OM	4/004	1	LAR	RIB		U	M		5 4	4											p							
133 UN	41004	1 1	LAD	INB		0	104	-	<u>د</u>	2			-			1	1				1							

2.2.6. /5 Animal Bone Data

D booat SITE	Contest	Count	Species	Element	Side	SHD code	×	Size	PROX	DIST	Porosity	BUTCH	GRANT	Fragmented	Burnt	lvoried	Gnawed	CONDIT	comments	GL	Bp	BFp	S	PB	P	BFd	FRAG COUNT
134 OMS	4/004	1	LAR	RIB	U	M	4	3						Y 2PCS					IN 2 PCS MOD BREAK								2
156 UMS 157 OMS	6/002	4	LAR	RIB		M	15	3											MID SECTION RIBS						-+		
200 OMS	6/002	1	LAB	RIB	lŭ –	M	20	5															-	-	-+-	-	-
237 OMS	7/002	1	LAR	RIB	Ū	M	15	4											MOD BREAKS								
238 OMS	7/002	1	LAR	RIB	U	M	10	4			-								MOD BREAK								
239 OMS 240 OMS	7/002	1		RIB		IM M	5	4			C								MOD BREAK ALSO CHOPPED	+ +					$\rightarrow$	_	
278 OMS	7/002	1	LAB	BIB	lü –	M	15	5											HIB HAGS MOD BHEAKS	+ +					+		_
292 OMS	7/004	1	LAR	RIB	Ū	M	25	5																			
307 OMS	7/005	1	LAR	RIB	U	M	30	5										R3									
333 UMS 262 OMS	9/002 THE VELL CONTENT 12	1		RIB		IM M	2	3						<u> </u>					DIDERN BREAKS	+ +					$\rightarrow$		
363 OMS	THE WELL CONTEXT 12	1	LAR	RIB	li –	M	5	4						<del>i</del> l					TOWARDS STERNAL END	+ +					+	-+	-
242 OMS	7/002	1	LAR	SCA	Ü	CRN	5	4			С			-					FRAG OF SCAPULA								
243 OMS	7/002	1	LAR	SCA	U	L	3	2						Y					MOD BREAK						_		
159 OMS	47002 6/002	2	LAR	ISCA		M	5	4											EBAGS OF SCAPILIA MOD								
334 OMS	9/002	1	LAR	SCA	Ŭ	M	15	4											MODERN BREAK		_	†	— <u>ì</u>		-		
335 OMS	9/002	1	LAR	SCA	U	M	15	4											MODERN BREAKS			Ĩ	Ξï				
241 0142	74002		LAB	80 A	6	Б	15				_								FRAG OF NECK CHOPPED ALSO								
241 01415	71002	-	LAR	SUA	P	F	ci	4			U .								FLAT SKULL FRAGS PROB PART	+ +					-+-	-	
201 OMS	6/003	11	LAR	SKL	U	F		3											OF CATTLE SKULL								
202 OMS	6/003	1	LAR	SKL	U	F	3	3											SMALL FRAGS OF SKULL								
279 OMS	7/003	1		SKL		F	15	- 4										R2	FRAG OF NASAL BONE	+ +					_		
244 OMS	7/004	2	LAB	SKI	Hi -	r -	5	4											FBAG OF SKULL	+ +			-		+	-	_
		-			-														DISTAL SHAFT CHOPPED AND								
245 OMS	7/002	1	LAR	TIB	L	DM	30	4			н						C2 D		GNAVED								
160 OMS	6/002	1				IP ICAU	25	4	U										FRAGIOF PROXISHAFT UNFUSED	+ +					-		
203 OMS	6/003	1	LAR	VC'	10	L	30	4											FRAG OF CERVICAL VERT						+	-	
61 OMS	4/002	1	LAR	VC	В	M	80	4											CERVICAL VERT								
017 0140	71000			0							2								CUTS ACROSS OUTSIDE OF								
247 UNIS 281 OMS	7/002	1	LAB		B	F	4	4			ĸ								FBGA OF NEUBAL SPINE	+ +			-		-		
201 0110		· ·	2		<u> </u>	·		`											BASE OF NERUAL SPINE ANCINET	·		-	-		-		-
26 OMS	4/001	1	LAR	VT	в	S	25	4											BREAKS BUT NOT BUTCHERED								
200 05.40	74002	1	1.40	VT .	6		20	Б																			
336 OMS	9/002	1	LAB	1VX	10	F	30	3											LATERAL ARTIC FACET	+ +					+	-	-
315 OMS	8/003	1	LEP	FEM	B	M	60	4	U	U									RABBIT/HARE BOTH EPEIPHS								
308 OMS	7/005	1	LEP	HUM	R	D	40	4											RABBIT OF HARE DISTAL								_
313 OMS 316 OMS	8/002	1	LEP		IR II	IPM IPM	65 80	4		F									RABBIT/HARE HUMERUS								
314 OMS	8/002	1	LEP	JAV	L	W9	90	4	· ·										IN VEAR LOOKS LIKE RABBIT	+ +			-		-+		
																			RABBIT/HARE SKULL FEELS QUITE	E							
311 OMS	8/001	1	LEP	ISKL	lu –	P	65	4											MODERN	+					-+		
309 OMS	7/005	1	MAM	FBAG	lu –	F		1						1					TINY FRAG	+				-+	+		-
337 OMS	9/002	12	MAM	FRAG	Ű	F		1											TINY FRAGMENTS								
62 OMS	4/002	1	MAM	FRAG	U										WHITE				BURNT WHITE CALCNIED								
63 OMS	4/002	10	MAM	FRAG	10										WHITE					+					-+	_	
248 OMS	7/002	5	MAM	FBAG	lu –			2											FRAGS VITH MOD BREAKS	+ +					+		_
282 OMS	7/003	1	MAM	FRAG	Ū			3							WHITE				BURNT								
249 OMS	7/002	1	MAM	LFRAG	U	F	2	3										R2	SMALL VEATHERED FRAG								
107 OMS	4/003	1	PIG	1.054	h –	ANT	25		_										ANTERIOR PART OF MANDIBLE	, I					- 1		
	1000	-	10	190 W	-	CADL	20	4											MANIBLE VITH INCISOR AND	1-1				-+	+	-+	-
339 OMS	9/002	1	PIG	JAV	R	ANT	10	3											CANINE LOOKS FEMALE								
	4000		DIC	1002			10				T								MANIBLE WITH P2-M2 AND 1/2 OF			T	T				
64 UMS 338 OMS	9/002	1	PIG	JAV	B	M	40	4					LICA 1	ι.					PA MI AND M2 PRESENT	+				$\rightarrow$	+		
000 0140	VIVV6	-	. 104	1.0.1	''	1													MANDIBLE FRAGMENT WITH P4					-+	+	-	-
349 OMS	9/US	1	PIG	JAV	R	м	35	4					ag						AND M1PRESENT								
287 0649	ue		PIG	1.652	h.		46				_		(112						MANDIBLE VITH M2 AND M3						- 1		
144 OMS	4/US	1	PIG	JAV	lî 👘	P	10	4			~		dE	Y7PCS					M2 AND M3 PRESEMNT	+							
294 OMS	7/004	1	PIG	LC	R	W9	70	4											MALE CANINE IN VEAR								
250 OMS	7/002	1	PIG	LI	R	V	100	3											LOWRE INCISOR UNWORN						T	T	

2.2.6. /6 Animal Bone Data

₽				10			ode						_		ented				<b>⊢</b>	ste								COUNT
Record	SITE	Context	Count	Specie:	Elemer	Side	- B	×	Size	PROX	DIST	Porosi	BUTCH	GRAN	Fragme	Burnt	lvoried	Gnawe		E Oo	5	සි	BFp	8	B	8	BFd	FRAG
108	OMS	4/003	1	PIG	LPM	R	V	100	2	2										P3IN VEAR		_						
161	IOMS	6/002	1	PIG	MC4	L	P	45	3	3 F											+		—		+	—		
295	IOMS	7/004	1	PIG	MP	lu l	PM	75	3	3										MISSING								
162	OMS	6/002	1	PIG	RAD	Ř	P	25	3	<u>i</u> u										UNFUSED PROX RAD	+		+	<u> </u>	+	<u> </u>		$\vdash$
																				FRGMANE OF MAXILLA WITH								
340		9/002	1	PIG	SKL	L	L	5	3	3										MOLAR M10R 2 PRESENT JUST IN	4		—	—	+	_		_
204		6/003 7/002	1	PIG	TID	L B	M	55			0								D1	IIB SHAFT	+		—	—	+	—		—
109	IOMS	4/003	1	PIG	ULN		M	45	4									C2P		UNFUSED OLEC BUT ALSO	+ +		+	+	+-	<u> </u>		$\vdash$
163	OMS	6/002	1	PIG	ULN	R	M	40	4	1										MOD BREAK SO CAN'T SEE	+		+	-	+	<u> </u>		$\vdash$
65	OMS	4/002	1	PIG	ULN	L	P	45	4	ιU		L						C1P				_						
110	IOMS	4/003	1	PIG	VAT	L	L	45	3	3										LEFT HALF OF ATLAS	+		—	—	—	—		—
																				DUBE TEO MOD BREAK								
21	IOMS	3/005	2	RED	ANT	L	M	15	l ε	5			CV							CHOPPED ON LOWER REAR								
135	OMS	4/004	1	RED	ANT	U	P	5	4	ł			C 2							TINE WITH 2 CHOP MARKS								
050		0.000			1									Ι.						MANDIBLE WITH M2 AND M3								
350	UNIS	9/05	1	RED	JAW	В	M	30	4	•				ac						CHECK WITH DEER	++		+		+	—		{──
205	OMS	6/003	1	RED	loc	L	м	20	4	L I									R3	BUT CHECK						'		1
136	OMS	4/004	1	RED	SKL	В	BASE	10	4	ł												-					Ĩ	Ϊ
11	OMS	4/003	1	ROE	JAW	L	ANT	40	4	l .												_	$\square$	$\square$	$\square$			
206	0.49	61002	1	90	LUINA	6		25		,	-								D2	VEATHERED AND SHAFT								
341		9/002	1	S/G	HUM	L	Б	10	3	3	F		п						112	PART OF TROCHLEA	++		+	+	+	<u> </u>		$\vdash$
			· ·		1.121.1	-	-													JUST SHAFT LIGHT GNAVED	+		+	-	+	<u> </u>		-
66	OMS	4/002	1	S/G	MT	R	M	55	4	l I		_						C1PD		BOTHENDS					+	$\vdash$		
283	OMS	7/003	1	S/G	MT	U	P	15	4	•		S								SPIRAL FRACTURE	+		—	—	+			
342	OMS	9/002	1	S/G	BAD	L.		15	3	3	J									BREAKS								
6	OMS	10/001	1	S/G	SCA	L	M	25	4	i									нт	JUST BORDER AND BASE OF	+		+	-	+	<u> </u>		$\vdash$
207	OMS	6/003	1	S/G	SCA	L	P	35	4	F									-	PROXIMAL SCAP		-		$\square$				
284		7/003	1	S/G	SCA	l <u>l</u>	P	40	4	I F									R2		+		+	+	+			<u> </u>
112	OMS	4/003	1	S/G	TIB		M	40	4											FRAGOF HIGHT TEMPORAL	+		+	+	+-	<u> </u>		<u> </u>
					1.2	-				1										HARD TO TELL FUSION LOOKED	+ +		+	-	+	<u> </u>		$\vdash$
						I.	_													UNFUSED BUT ALSO LIGHT								
67		4/002	1	S/G				35	4									CIP			+				+	—		
101	01413	1001	'	200	HOIM	<u> </u>		20	<u> </u>											DISTAL HUM SHAFT PROB PIG	+ +		+	+	+	<u> </u>		$\vdash$
27	OMS	4/001	1	SAR	HUM	B	D	15	4	L I					Y					CHOPPED RIGHT THROUGH								
343	OMS	9/002	1	SAR	HUM	L	м	30	4	ł 📃	U		С							DISTAL SHAFT MODERN BREAKS			-	$\vdash$		$\square$		
68		4/002	1	SAH	JAW LEBAG		M	5	2							WHITE		-		FRAG IN 3 PCS CALCINED	++		+	–	+	—		<u>3</u>
<u> </u>	0110	101001	-	2011	LI HOU	<u>ا</u>		10	<u> </u>	1										FRAG OF POSS TIB SHAFT	++		+	<u> </u>	+	<u> </u>		<u> </u>
14		3/002	1	SAR	LFRAG		M	5	2	2			н							CHOPPED THROUGH								
	0.40	44001	Ι.Ι	CAR	IFRAC			-		J _										LONG BONE SHAFT FRAG VITH	ΙŢ			1				_
28		4/002	+	SAR	LEBAG	Hi	M	5			<u> </u>									LB SHAFT POSS TIR	+ +		+-	+	+	<del>                                     </del>		├──
113	OMS	4/003	1	SAR	LFRAG	1ú	M	15					н								+		+	<u> </u>	+	<u> </u>		$\vdash$
114	OMS	4/003	1	SAR	LFRAG	U	М	10	3	3						WHITE/G	BY			BURNT		_						
115	I OMS	4/003	1	SAR	LEBAG	10	M	3	2							WHITE/G	iRY			BURNT	$+ - \overline{1}$		+	+	+	<u> </u>		<u> </u>
115		4/003	4	SAR	LEBAG	Hi -	M	5	2	1				-				-		OMALL FRAUD OF SSZLB	+ +		+	+	+	<u> </u>		<u> </u>
138	OMS	4/004	1	SAR	LFRAG	tŭ 👘	M	3	2	2				1		WHITE		1		BURNT	+		+	+	+	+		-
139	OMS	4/004	8	SAR	LFRAG	U	M	4	3	3									R3	VERY WEATHERED		_						
164	OMS	6/002	1	SAR	LFRAG	10	м	10		3			н	<u> </u>				<u> </u>		SPILIT VERT	+		+	+	+	<u> </u>		<u> </u>
208	InMs	6/003	1	SAB	IFRAG	lu –	м	15	, F	5										MTP								
			· ·		1	1 <sup>-</sup>				1								1		SMALL FRAGS OF SHEEP SIZED	+		+	<u> </u>	+	<u> </u>		$\vdash$
								_				_								LB CHOPEPD BUT ALSO MODERN								
253		7/002	5	SAR	LFRAG	10	M	5	- 3	4								+			+ +		+		+			—
254	OMS	7/002		SAB	LEBAG	lu	м	5	•	l I		н		1				1	BI	VEATHERING			1	1		1		1
255	OMS	7/002	1	SAR	LFRAG	Ū	M	10		3		H								SPLIT VERTICALLY		_						
285	OMS	7/003	1	SAR	LFRAG	Ú	M		3	3									R2	MOD BREAK		_	1		1			
296		7/004		SAR	ILFRAG		M	35			<u> </u>	H-	<u> </u>	<b> </b>		VUITE					+ + +		+	+	+			
287		9/002	$\left  \frac{1}{1} \right $	SAR	LEBAG	<del>li –</del>	M	3			<u> </u>	l-	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		WHITE		+			+ +		+	+	+	<u> </u>		<u> </u>
345	OMS	9/002	1	SAR	LFRAG	1ú	M	5					н								+		+	<u> </u>	+	<u> </u>		$\vdash$
346	OMS	9/002	1	SAR	LFRAG	U	M	10	3	3										MODERN BREAKS		_						

2.2.6. /7 Animal Bone Data

		Ŭ	1	es	ue		code			x	-	sity	л	Ę	nented	y	P	8	E	, nents								a COUNT
S SITE		Context	Cour	Speci	Eleme	Side	ġ.	×	Size	С Б Н О	DIST	Poro:	BUTC	GRAI	Fragn	Burnt	lvorie	Gnaw		L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L	5	8	BFp	ß	B	3	BFd	FRA0
69 OM	S I	4/002	1	SAR	LFRAG	υ		5	2									н		FRAG OF SSZ LB						_		_
256 OM:	s i	7/002	1	SAR	RAD	U	M	20	4			н								SPLIT VERTICALLY								
286 OM:	S T	7/003	1	SAR	RAD	U	M	20	4											SECTION WITH ULNA SCAR								_
8 OM:	S i	10/001	2	SAR	RIB	U	M	10	4																			
71 OM:	S ·	4/002	1	SAR	RIB	U	M	20	4											SHEEP SIDE RIB DARK BROWN								
121 OM:	s i	4/003		SAR	RIB	U	M	10	3																			
140 OM:	s i	4/004	1	SAR	RIB	U	M	3	2																			
209 OM:	S I	6/003	1	SAR	RIB	U	M	30	4												<u> </u>						$\rightarrow$	
257 UM	S I	7/002	-1	SAR	RIB	U	IM	10	3												<u> </u>						$\rightarrow$	
298 UM	s l	77004	+	SAR	RIB DID	0	IM M	10	3												<b>—</b>						<u> </u>	
365 UIVI:	2	THE WELL CONTEXT 12	+	SAR	RIB DID	1		30	0						ř						<del> </del>							
23 OM	<u> </u>	4/002	+	CAD		0	6	10	2												<u> </u>							
119 OM	<u> </u>	4/002	+	CAP		<u>.</u>	6	10		5											<u> </u>						$\rightarrow$	
120 OM	š l	4/003	÷	SAR	BIB	ü –	P	10	2												<u> </u>						$\rightarrow$	_
258 OM	š	7/002	i	SAB	BIB	ŭ	P	10	3	F										PBOX BIB FBAG	<u> </u>					-	$\rightarrow$	
119 OM	š	4/003	i	SAB	BIB	ŭ	PM	15	3											SHORT BIB	<u> </u>						$\rightarrow$	
259 OM	ŝ	7/002	1	SAR	SCA	Ū	CRN	5	3			С													_			
73 OM	ŝ	4/002	i	SAR	SCA	Ŭ	M	5	3			-								FRAG OF SCAP BLADE AND					_			
74 OM:	ŝ l	4/002	1	SAR	SCA	Ū	M	5	3											SCAP BLADE FRAG	<u> </u>						-+	
260 OM:	s i	7/002	1	SAR	SCA	U	M	3	3										HT	SMALL FRAG OF SCAP BLADE								
165 OM:	s i	6/002	1	SAR	SKL	R	ANT	5	3											FRAG OF NASAL BONE							$ \rightarrow $	
122 OM:	s i	4/003	1	SAR	TIB	U	M	20	4				Н							SHEEP SIZED TIB								
123 OM:	s i	4/003	1	SAR	TIB	U	M	50	4											SHEEP SIZED TIB SHAFT								
261 OM:	S	7/002	1	SAR	TIB	U	M	30	4																			
287 OM:	s	7/003	1	SAR	ТΙΒ	υ	м	25	4			н								DISTAL PART OF SHAFT CHOPPED THROUGH								
210 OM	s	6/003	1	SAR	VL	в	W9	85	4	υ	υ									LUMBAR VERT MINUS PROCESSED UNFUSED CRAN								
124 OM:	s i	4/003	1	SAR	٧T	U	D	10	3											BASE OF DORSAL SPINE								
9 OM:	s i	10/001	1	SAR	VT	в	S	15	3											DORSAL SPINE							$ \rightarrow $	
299 OM:	S	7/004	1	SAR	٧T	В	S	5	3							WHITE				JUST NEURAL SPINE								
262 OM	s	7/002	1	SAR	VT	в	W9	85	3	υ	υ									ONLY NEURAL SPINE MISSING MOD BREAK								
141 OM:	s l	4/004	1	SAR	VX	U	M	15	2	F	F									FRAG OF CENTRUM							$\rightarrow$	
211 OM:	s l	6/003	1	SAR	٧X	F	M	35	3	U										VERT FRAG								
263 OM:	S	7/002	1	SAR	٧X	в	M	25	2	U	U									UNFUSED CENTRUM								
347 OM:	S I	9/002	1	SAR	VX	в	M	25	3							WHITE				JUST CENTRUM								
166 OM:	S I	6/002	1	SHE	LM	L	V	100	3					g						LOWER M3								_
212 OM:	S I	6/003	1	SHE	MC	R	D	20	3		U									DISTAL EPIPH ONLY								
15 OM:	s :	3/002	1	SHE	мс	L	DE	20	2		U		к							GOOD COND KNITE CUT ACROSS CONDYLES								
213 OM:	s	6/003	2	SHE	PH1	υ	v	100	3	F										LARGE BUT MORPH IS SHEEP NOT DEER								
264 OM:	s	7/002	1	SHE	SKL	в	L	5	3	υ										FRAG OF ORBIT NOT FULLY FUSED WHERE MEETS PARIETAL								
75 OM	s l	4/002	1	SHE	TIB	в	мп	45	4		F									DISTAL HALF OF TIB ANC BREAK								
265 OM	š	7/002	1	VSAB	VT	B	W9	80	2	F	F									DOG/CAT SIZE VEBT	1					-	$\rightarrow$	
200 011	-		÷			-				· ·	r I									VERT FROM DOG OR CAT SIZED	<u> </u>				-		$\rightarrow$	
310 OM:	s	7/005	1	VSAR	٧T	в	W9	70	3											ANIMAL								

2.2.6. /8 Animal Bone Data



3. Fig. 1. Plan of site and trench positions 1 to 12 incl.

## 3.1. Summary of Reports

The broad taxon of bone has been identified as cow, sheep/goat, and pig, with lesser fragments of horse, Roe buck, fallow, and birds. Gnaw marks show the existence of dogs. Butchery marks show both jointing and meat removal with some limb bones being chopped. Pig bones have been identified as from an adult sow and immature juveniles or suckling pig. Bird bones have been identified as goose and domestic duck.

The evidence of deer testifies that Shrawley Wood was once connected to the great Wyre Forest to the north. Wyre forest was owned by the Mortimers, the Earls of March, and is best described as a chase. A forest was a royal domain where only the king hunted game. The nobility were allowed to hunt game in their chases. Fallow deer represent 6% of the assemblages and is the most numerous. Fallow deer is widely accepted to have been introduced by the Normans. Only the nobility ate meat.

By the 1300s Shrawley wood would have become isolated from Wyre Forest as the peasantry assarted parcels of land from the forest. Also with the increase of forestry, Shrawley Wood was becoming a valuable source of fuel for the brine boiling at Droitwich, that what game was present disappeared. With over half of the bones identified as cow this indicates that cattle were the main diet of the castle. Shrawley Castle controlled the ancient fording place for cattle droves from Wales and no doubt cattle due was levied on the drovers for allowing their herds to cross the River Severn. Indeed the quarry site to the south of the castle has been reputed to have been an overnight holding pen for herds waiting to cross the river, with other beasts corralled in the fields next to the river. Pack horse teams were also regular visitors to the crossing.

A smaller percentage of the bones were pig bone with the animals probably killed within the site of the castle. Suggestions are that the pigs were spit roasted. Of the sheep/goat bones butchery marks are rare showing that the animals were not kept on site but were butchered elsewhere and joints brought to the castle. Two bones of an aged dog were present, perhaps a family pet or a hunting hound. What the bone assemblages reveal is there was no evidence of livestock being reared, or bred for meat at the site. Consumer rather than producer products were placed on the table of the residents. This shows that the occupancy of the lords of the manor, the le Poers, used Olivers Mound as a residence or manor house for administration of the river and the crossing, not as a fortified castle. In the last years of the castle's occupancy by Aline le Poer the bone assemblages' show that it was still regarded as a high status site, perhaps finishing its life as a hunting lodge for visitors and dignitaries.

As a postscript, Trench 12 was investigated as a high reading on the resistivity on the geophysical survey and a depression in the ground. An 18<sup>th</sup> century account mentions a well. What was found was no well but an assemblage of bone. Silvia Warman has identified badger bone, and the scenario is that after the castle was demolished and abandoned sometime in the 1350s, a badger took up residence and uncovered the refuse pits on site. The animal then dragged the bones down into its den.

For this report I wish to thank Sheila Hamilton-Dyer who carried out the bone analysis, and who wrote the phase I report, and for Sylvia Warman who carried out the bone analysis, and wrote the phase II & III report. Also I wish thank for Diana Huston for her photograph on the front page. This was taken at the time of the phase I excavation, soon after the finds were removed from the trenches, and were being washed ready for storage and investigation.

R.D. Sproat. B.Phil. MIED