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## INTRODUCTION

The animal remains described are from four sites:
(a) The Roman Encampment at Corstopitum
(b) An Iron Age - Romano British Site at Catcote near Hartlepool in County Durham
(c) A Well discovered on the site of Benwell Fort now the site of Condercum House, Benwell, Newcastle upon Tyne,4. The filling of the well contained Roman material, but the animal bones could be of Roman or later date.
(d) Tynemouth Priory from a recent excavation by Mr.George Jobey, F.S.A., of the Department of Adult Education, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, dated to the Mediaeval period

The metrical data so obtained are compared with published material from other ancient sites.

## Procedure

Identifications were made by direct comparison with recent defleshed specimens and with disarticulated skeletons now stored in the Hancock Museum, Newcastle upon Tyne.

Expert advice was sought on several occasions and acknowledgements are made in the text to the authorities consulted.

Tentative diagnoses are noted by use of a question mark. Each identified bone from a given site was, where appropriate, designated as either right or left and then assigned a serial reference number, egg. left scapula $1,2,3$. right scapula $1,2, \ldots . .$. The labelled identified material is now stored in the Hancock Museum, Newcastle, for reference purposes.


Metacarpall-1. length (L)
2. maximum width of proximal articulatory surfaces (Prox)
3. maximum width of distal articulatory surfaces (dist)
4. Metapodial indices (Howard, M.M. 1962)
(a) the $\frac{\mathrm{DB}}{\mathrm{L}}$ index.
(b) the $\frac{\text { M.B. }}{\mathrm{L}}$ index
$\frac{\text { Distal breadth }}{\text { Length }} \times \frac{100}{1}$
$\frac{\text { Mid-breadth }}{\text { Length }} \times \frac{100}{1}$

Os Coxae - maximum diameter of acetabulum
Femur - 1. length between the two articulatory surfaces
2. Maximum width between medial and lateral condyles

Tibia - 1. length between the two articulatory surfaces (excluding the medial condyles).
2. Maximum width of proximal articulatory surfaces (Prox.)
3. Maximum width of distal articulatory surfaces (dist.)

Fibula - no measurements taken
Astragalus - extreme length
Calcaneum - Maximum width
Metatarsal - 1. length (L)
2. maximun width of proximal articulatory surfaces (Prox)
3. maximum width of distal articulatory surfaces (dist.)
4. Metapodial indices
(a) the $\frac{\text { D.B. index }}{L}$ $\frac{\text { Distal breadth }}{\text { Length }} \times \frac{100}{1}$
(b) the $\frac{\text { M.B. }}{L}$ index
$\frac{\text { Mid-breadth }}{\text { Length }} \times \frac{100}{1}$

Proximal )
Middle ( Phalanges 1. length
Terminal ) 2. maximum width
Measurements were taken in the manner described by Brothwell, D.R. (1963) Measurements are recorded in c.m.

## CHAPTER TWO

## CORSTOPITUM - DESCRIPIION OF SKELETAL RBMAINS

The material described is from two sources -
(a) from the excavation site at Corstopitum - obtained during 1966 excavation.
(b) from the Department of Archaeology, Durham University - material stored there since being excavated at Corstopitum in previous years.

For discussion purposes the material may all be considered to be Romano-British. Excavation reference numbers are not published but these are available.

## Minimum numbers of Animals

For purposes of estimating minimum numbers of animals it was necessary to follow the procedure used in the 1911 excavation report (Meek \& Gray 1911) of considering only entire long bones or the distal articulatory surfaces. The proximal fragments were retained, measured and data recorded, hence the different figures in Appendices 'A' and 'B'. Appendix 'A' records all fragments identified. Appendix 'B' records either whole bones or those showing a distal surface.

A bone may be recorded in Appendix ' $B$ ' but be so eroded that no measurement appears for it in the appropriate table.

Relative abundances of bones from each species may be significant, therefore, they are recorded. (Field, N.H. 1964).

Minimum number of Animals (See Appendix 'B' for animals of food value)

Ox (based on skuils) 192

Horse (based on skulls) 13
Sheep (based on right mandibles) 37* (based on left metacarpals) 30

Pig (based on right mandibles) 27*
(baqed on right scapulae) 13
Red Deer (based on antlers associated with bony pedicle of skull) 5

* May be high estimate because not all mandibles are entire.

Species other than those listed in Appendix ' $B$ ', but remains of which were recovered in 1966, were considered along with 1911 material to arrive at an estimate of the minimum number of animals. The estimate is as follows -

Dog (based on skull) 13

Fox (based on ramus of lower jaw, radius, femur) 1 Roe Deer (based on antlers associated with bony

```
pedicle of skull) l
```

Relative frequencies of bones from different species
Relative frequency of bones (based on either entire bones or those showing distal ends) of various food bearing species were -

Ox $71.0 \%$ Sheep 14.4\% Pig 6.9\% Horse 6.6\% Red Deer 1.1\% Validity of treating the metrical data from 1911 report together

WITH THE DATA FROM 1966 EXCAVATIONS
It would have been ideal for the author to have measured the material
described in the 1911 report, thereby eliminating a possible source of error. Despite a thorough search of the Hancock Museum, Newcastle, the Zoology Departinents of The Univdrsitg of Newcastle upon Tyne and of Durham University little of the material was found and is presumed to be lost. A few skulls of the so called Bos longifrons (Bilton 1957 for discussion) bearing alleged javelin marks (Meek \& Gray 1911) were found in the Hancock Museum. Whilst it is realised that the validity of treating both sets of measurements (1911 and the present report) together for statistical purposes is open to question, Jewell (1962) has shown the value of taking metrical data from various authorities and appertaining to different archaeological sites, and comparing them.

Often for histogram purposes, the data have been grouped in $2 \mathrm{~m} . \mathrm{m}$. intervals, the material having been measured to 0.1 cm . It is thus hoped to reduce the margin of error inherent in two people measuring material. Further, where possible, the standard deviations and mean values of series of measurements are recorded separately for the two sources of data as well as conjoinitly.

In order to compare the measurements taken for metapodial distal widths by Meek \& Gray (1911) with those in the present report a statistical test was sought to evaluate the similarity of the two sets of data. The statistical tests are discussed in Appendix ' $D^{\prime}$. is The tests offer some support for the author/ using the data from the 1911 report along with modern data, for there seems to be no significant difference in the two sets of data referring to metapodials.

These tests appertain only to a normal distribution, therefore it was thought worthwhile to see if the distribution of the measurements about their mean values was similar to a normal curve. Cornu's criterion (Brooks \& Caruthers 1963) was applied. This compares the standard deviation with arithmetic mean deviation from the average values.

$$
\frac{\text { s.d. }}{e}=1.25 \text { where } e=\frac{\sum|x-\bar{x}|}{n}
$$

The values obtained for metapodials were -
(a) Metatarsals $\frac{\text { sod. }}{e}=1.35$
(b) Metacarpals $\frac{\text { s.d. }}{e}=1.18$.

We can expect at a given age class a normal distribution of any single dimension; likewise for the whole age range, provided that equal numbers are present in each age class. If there had been a preference for killing at a given age class this would skew distribution to give a peak at a bone dimension specific to that preferred age class, egg. veal. The Cornu values obtained; 1.35 for metatarsals, indicate a skew with peak above the mean (for normal distribution) ie. positive skewing, and 1.18 for metacarpals conversely indicate a skew with peak below the mean (for normal distribution) i.e. negative skewing respectively. As it is not possible to consider bones of specific age groups it can only be assumed that the sum total of bones covers the sum total of age groups at which they were killed. If the sample were larger it would seem probable that a normal distribution in population would have been found and hence for these two values deviating on either side

# of Cornu's criterion it seems justifiable to apply statistical tests based upon normal distribution. Thus the students 't' test sigherfic action ifformene? <br> for small samples has been applied indicating no significance between the metapodial material measured by Meek \& Gray and the.. metapodials measured by the author. 

## Bos taurus CORBRIDGE TYPE

Horn Cores and Skulls
Data Sheets No. 1 and No. 2
Only four skulls (fragmented) were recovered. Because of their eroded and fragmentary nature it was decided to abandon the series of measurements taken by Meek \& Gray (1911) and instead to take the measurements made on the Windmill Hill material (Grigson,C. 1965). No hornless skulls were found although in some cases the horn cores were often mere scurrs, being almost as small as the horn cores of some present day sheep.

Specimen No. 2 possessed a slight medial prominence, in the other specimens there was no prominence, i.e. frontal crest was flat. The significance of this and of horn core sizes is discussed later in the thesis.

## Maxilla - Data Sheet 3

Fourteen fragments were retrieved. Lengths of molar area were not recorded, instead the actual dentition was recorded in the hope that ageing techniques based on tooth eruption sequence will become available in the near future. (Higgs, E.S. personal communication) The data recorded may then be useful in discussing Autumn killing.

Mandibles - Data Sheet 4.
Forty-five specimens were identified. Two of these showed the complete absence of the first cheek tooth, which is P.M.2 (P.M. 1 being lacking in sheep and cattle - see Cornwall (1956) for discussion).

This "five toothed" condition was noted by Meek \& Gray (1911) as being typical of some of the mandibles recovered from Corstopitum and was alleged to be a characteristic of the Chillingham Cattle. The Chillingham cow's skull in the Hancock Museum shows this condition but Bilton, L. (1957) does not refer to it in his monograph on the Chillingham Cattle. Of the ten specimens of Chillingham Cattle present in the British Museum (Natural History) two specimens (Reference numbers 1890.3.12.1 Male and, $1953 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{i}} 22-4$ ) appear to have the dentition P3,2,1 P.M.4,3,2 on both left and right mandibles while the deformed mandibles of specimen 18903.10 .2 (female) also appear to have P.M.2
present. The Specimen $1953 \mathrm{~L} / 4$ 22.3.10. has a right mandible bearing a socket large enough to accommodate the permanent premolar P.M. 2 although the left mandible lacks it. (See Appendix 'E'). On this basis it appears that the absence of the permanent premolar P.M. 2 from lower jaws cannot be claimed as being a diagnostic characteristic of Chillingham Cattle.

The lengths of molar area were not recorded, instead, the dentition is given. Deciduous teeth are signified by small letters. Where a tooth is being shed this is indicated by a vertical arrow:

## Atlas - Data Sheet 5.

Ten specimens were identified, only four permitted width. $\div$ length index to be measured (Jope, M.1960)
Index values range from 1.32-1.57

## Axis - Data Sheet 5

Twelve specimens were identified, no measurements were taken because of erosion and butchering damage.

Scapulae - Data Sheets No. 6 \& 7
Ninety specimens were identified. In only two was it possible to measure length. All the measurements of minimum width of neck and maximum glenoid diameters fell within the Meek \& Gray ranges (1911). (a) Minimum width of neck

Meek \& Gray Report 229 specimens.
Mean $=4.8 \mathrm{c.m}$.
Standard deviation $=0.48$.
1966 Report
75 specimens.
Mean $=4.5 \mathrm{c.m}$.
Standard deviation $=0.3$
Combined material . 304 specimens.
Mean $=4.75(4.8) c . m$.
Standard deviation $=0.5$.
(b) Maximum diameter of glenoid

Meek \& Gray Report 138 specimens
Mean $=5.09$ (5.1) c.m.
Standard deviation $=0.447$.

1966 Report
51 specimens
Mean $=5.04(5.0) \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}$.
Standard deviation $=0.374$.

Combined material
189 specimens.
Mean $=5.07$ (5.1) c.m.
Standard deviation $=0.424$.

Humerus - Data Sheet No. 8.
Of the eight specimens recovered five permitted measurement of distal surface. All fell within the Meek \& Gray range except one which exceeded the width by $0.1 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}$.

Ulna - Data Sheet No.9.
Four specimens from right side were retrieved. Erosion prevented measurement of lengths. Maximum widths are recorded.

Radius - Data Sheet No. 10.
Of the nineteen specimens only four permitted measurement of either length or distal width. These all fell within the Meek \& Gray range. Meek \& Gray Report 63 specimens.

Mean distal width $=5.89$ (5.9) c.m.
Standard deviation $=0.64$

1966 Report
4 specimens.
Mean distal width $=6.13(6.1) \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}$.
Standard deviation $=\mathbf{0 . 6 3}$.
Combined material 67 specimens.
Mean distal width $=5.91(5 . \theta)$ c.m.
Standard deviation $=0.58$.

Metacarpals - Data Sheet No. ll.
Twenty-two left and ten right specimens were identified along with six specimens which it was impossible to diagnose as being either right or left on the accepted criterion of relative sizes (widths) of distal condyles. (McFaydean 1884). Sixteen specimens permitted measurement of length and or distal width. All fell within the Meek and Gray ranges.

Meek. \& Gray Report 116 specimens
Mean distal width $=5.4(4) \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}$.
Standard deviation $=0.6$
1966 Report
16 specimens
Mean distal width $=5.2(1)$ com.
Standard deviation $=0.54$
Combined material 132 specimens

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Mean distal width }=5.4(2) \mathrm{c} \cdot \mathrm{~m} \\
& \text { Standard deviation }=0.51
\end{aligned}
$$

Figure No.l shows the scatter of metacarpal distal widths. Figure No. 3 shows the scatter of the values obtained for the metapodial index.
$\frac{\text { Distal Breadth }}{\text { Length }} \times \frac{100}{1}$, (Howard, M.M. 1969) with possible sex
determinations based on Howard's data.
In the case of only six specimens was it possible to calculate the second metapodial index $\frac{\text { Mid breadth }}{\text { Length }} \times \frac{100}{1}$ (Howard, M.M. 1968).

The values of the $\frac{\text { M.B. }}{\text { L }} \times \frac{100}{1}$ index are -

$$
\begin{array}{rlrl}
\text { left } \quad 2 & =15.8 & \text { right } 10=14.8 \\
\text { " } \quad 5 & =15.2 \\
\text { " } \quad 8 & =16.5 \\
\text { " } \quad 9 & =14.7 \\
\text { " } 15 & =14.6
\end{array}
$$

These values seen to confirm the tentative sex diagnoses based on the first metapodial index $\frac{\text { D.B. }}{\bar{L}} \times \frac{100}{1}$, there being five cows and possibly one steer present. No data are available to calculate $\frac{\text { M.B. }}{\text { L }} \times \frac{100}{1}$ index for the Meek \& Gray (1911) specimens. (Howard 196\&) Os Coxae - Data Sheet No. 12.

In six specimens it was possible to méasure the maximum diameter of the acetabulum. Two of these are considerably in excess of specimens measured by Meek and Gray.

Femur - Data Sheet No.13.
Only three specimens permitted measurement of length and or distal articulatory surface. The latter measurements all fell within the Meek \& Gray range but one specimen was shorter than those previously recorded.

Tibia - Data Sheet No.14.
Ten specimens permitted measurement of distal width and all fell within the Meek \& Gray range. One complete bone was shorter than those previously found.

One specimen found in clay was associated with a quantity of a bright blue powder, identified as vivianite. (Provenance number 0W64). Meek \& Gray Report 78 specimens

Mean distal width $=5.35 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m} .(5.4 \mathrm{c.m}$.
Standard deviation $=0.539$.
8 specimens
Mean distal width $=5.25 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m} .(5.3 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}$.
Standard deviation $=0.346$
Combined material
86 specimens
Mean distal width $=5.34$ c.m. ( $5.3 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}$.
Standard deviation $=0.52$.

Astragalus - Data Sheet No. 15.
Overall lengths of ten of the eleven specimens recovered are recorded.
They range from 5.3-6.3 c.m.
Figure 8 compares the astragalus length ranges for cattle from various ancient sites.

Calcaneum - Data Sheet No. 16.
Erosion made measurement of the fourteen specimens recovered difficult. Maximum width is reported for several of these.

Metatarsals - Data Sheet No. 17.
'Twenty five right and twenty five left specimens were identified. In one case it was not possible to assign it either to left or right (see previous note on metacarpals). Proximal widths are again recorded. Of the twenty three specimens which permitted measurement of length and or distal articulatory surface width, only one fell beyond the Meek \& Gray ranges and this specimen exceeded the upper limit by only 0.1 cam.

Meek \& Gray Report 127 specimens
Mean distal width $=5.03 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}$.
Standard deviation $=0.529$
1966 Report
23 specimens
Mean distal width $=5.02 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}$.
Standard deviation $=0.575$
Combined material
150 specimens
Mean distal width $=5.03 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}$.
Standard deviation $=0.52$

Figure 2 shows the scatter of the metatarsal distal widths.

Figure 4 shows the scatter of values obtained for metapodial index. $\frac{\text { Distal breadth }}{\text { Length }} \times \frac{100}{1}$ with possible sex determinations based on the work of Howard, M.M. (196Q).

In the case of only five specimens was it possible to calculate the second metapodial index $\frac{\text { M.B. }}{\mathrm{L}} \times \frac{100}{1}$ (Howard. 196Q)

The values are -

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { left } 10 & =11.1 & \text { right } 1 & =11.9 \\
\text { " } 13 & =12.6 & \text { " } 17 & =11.7 \\
" 19 & =13.6 & &
\end{aligned}
$$

These values seem to confirm the tentative sex diagnoses based on the first metapodial index $\frac{\text { D.B. }}{\text { L }} x \frac{100}{1}$, there being three cows and two possible steers present (Howard, M.M. 1960).

Phalanges - Data Sheets No. 18, 19 and 20.
The following lengths + maximum widths are given:-
53 proximal phalanges
25 middle phalanges, (figure 10 compares measurements of them with those from other sites)

22 terminal phalanges
Figure 10 shows the scatter of measurements made of the middle phalanx (phalange) for cattle from certain ancient sites.

## CORSTOPITUM

Sheep - Ovis aries

Because of the difficulty in distinguishing between the bones of sheep and goat, and in the absence of any direct evidence (skulls and horns) that goat remains are present it is assumed that all the specimens belong to sheep, although recent work (Boessneck, J. 1964) may offer means of distinguishing between sheep and goat metapodials.

Data Sheets No. 21 - 34 refer to the specimens recovered. They include a mutilated skull, specimens of mandible, maxilla, scapula, humerus, ulna, femur, tibia, astragalus, calcaneum, metacarpals, metatarsals and phalanges. Hammond, $J$. (1962) has commented on the change in shape of bones of sheep and pigs under domestication. This, and the lack of parity in size between the larger modern day defleshed specimens, and the small Roman material has made comparisons difficult. I am grateful, therefore, to have received confirmation of some identifications of sheep, pig and dog scapulae by Dr.Cornwall at the Archaeological Institute, London, and for his confirmation of sheep pelvic fragments.

Skull - Data Sheet 21.
A mutilated specimen, showing part of parietal, occipital bones and foramen magnum, compares in size and nature with the single skull of a Soay sheep in the Hancock Museum. The occipital bone is sliced through and the parietal bone is broken so that horn cores are absent. Maxilla - Data Sheet 22.

The dentition of four gragments are reported.

Mandibles - Data Sheet No. 23.

The twenty-one mandibles recovered were examined for tooth eruption pattern and assigned to stages of age in accordance with the criteria laid down by the Cambridge School (Higgs, Ewbank, Phillipson and Whitehouse, 1964). Higgs, E.S. has confirmed some of the queries raised in the implementation of this classification. (Dr.E.S.Higgs - personal communication). Cumulative evidence of this sort, gathered at the annual excavation at Corstopitum, should throw considerable evidence on the whole problem of Autumn killing. The classification of ageing the sheep at their time of death by this method has been preferred to earlier classifications (Higgs, E.S., Silver, I.A., White, P. 1963). Its use, however, implies that the method used on Iron Age sheep may be adopted for sheep from the Romano-British period. This material is discussed in detail later.

Os Coxae
Fifteen fragments displayed acetabulum, Identifications confirmed by Dr.Cornwall. No measurements were recorded because of erosion, therefore no data sheet is included.

## Other Bones

Specimens of humerus (8), ulna (12), femur (10), maxillae (4), scapulae (14), metacarpals (18), metatarsals (36), (numbers of each listed in brackets) have not extended the size ranges of Roman sheep to any grdat extent. For the most part they fall within the limits published (Meek \& Gray 1911) but metatarsal

L10 is curious in that it is stained with a green dye, and the end is worn, this may have been used as a spatula or mixing instrument.

All the radius specimens (Data Sheet 27 ) which permitted measurement of the distal width and the twelve tibia specimens (Data Sheet 29) which permitted similar measurement were all in excess of the Meek and Gray range, as were some of their lengths.

## CORSTOPITUM

Pig - Susscrofa
Evidence of several animals was discovered. On the basis of right mandibles bearing the third molar the minimum number of animals must have been seven, while on the evidence of right scapulae there were at least six animals.

Most of the long bones were of immature animals, e.g. articulatory processes seldom fused. Most specimens were heavily eroded. Data are listed on data sheets 35-46.

## CORSTOPITUM

## Horse - Equus caballus

Data Sheets No. 47. - 58 refer.
Meek \& Gray (1911) concluded that there were three "types" of horse present in the Corstopitum material, corresponding in size to a horse skeleton ( $141 / 2$ hands) located in the Natural History Department of Armstrong College (now The University of Nंewcastle upon Tyyne), and to data published privately, Pittof-Rivers (1888) with regard to -
(a) New Forest Pony
(b) The smaller Exmoor Pony

Permission was received to disarticulate the skeleton of a draught horse housed in the Zoology Department at Newcastle University. The skeleton was remeasured in the belief that this was the same skeleton referred to by Meek \& Gray (1911) in the hope it would give some idea of the degree of agreement between measurements made by the author and by Meek \& Gray. The disappointing measure of agreement may in fact be due to the skeleton having been previously measured in an articulated form.

Measurements made on material excavated in 1966 and on modern comparative material support the view that there was a range in size of horses from a small pit pony to a horse of some fourteen and a half hands.

Skulls - Data Sheet 47
Two specimens. The measurements taken fit into the ranges published for eleven specimens except that condyle width is slightly extended.

Maxilla \& Mandibles - Data Sheets 48 \& 49
Dentition is reported.
Scapula - Data Sheet 50
One specimen - From a large horse comparable to the College specimen is described. The glenoid cavity range is slightly exceeded. Radius - Data Sheet 51

Twelve specimens - All the distal widths fall within the previously published range. One specimen bore a circular hole.

Metacarpal - Data Sheet 52
Five specimens - Two extend the distal width range while one exceeds even the College horse specimen in length.

One specimen is heavily arthritic.
Os Coxae - Data Sheet 53
One right, one left and one complete specimen were measured.
Maximum diameter of acetabulum ranges from 5.6-5.8 c.m. all within previous range. The occurrence of a circular hole is again noted on one specimen.

Tibia - Data Sheet 54
Of the seven specimens measured one extends the length range and all exceed the distal width. Three specimens bear circular holes.

Metatarsal - Data Sheet 57
Of the five specimens measured, all lie within the distal width range but two extend the length range. One specimen which cannot be assigned to left or right, is curious in that it is smooth and polished. It has been suggested by Mr.Tait of the Archaeology Department, Newcastle University, that this may have been used to "bone leather".

## Phalanges -. Data Sheet 58

Of the twelve measured one bears a circular hole.
An examination of the circular holes reported above suggests that they are recently made and may have been made by the point of a pick or trowel during excavation.

## CORSTOPITUM

## Red Deer - Cervus elaphus

Data Sheet 59
One fine specimen of a metacarpal was recovered. Many fragments of antler were recovered but only those bearing the bony pedicle were catalogued for purposes of estimating minimum numbers of animals. The tines appear to be much larger than modern specimens in the custody of the Hancock Museum.

In discussion Dr. Cornwall has suggested that it is not uncommon to find large tines from ancient sites when as forest dwelling animals the deer would enjoy nutritional advantages as regards phosphorus and calcium over their modern counterparts which are forced to live on acid and nutritionally impoverished land.

The sparse representation of deer bones in the Corstopitum material was remarked upon by Meek \& Gray (1911) and is again strikingly evident in the 1966 material. Possibly this animal was not prized greatly as a source of meat! or other foods may have been more easily obtained, see (Roche, G. and Stelfox, A.W. 1936) and (Jackson, J.W. 1923) for discussion. Many of the dder antler fragments have been sawn through, presumably with a metal saw.

## CORSTOPITUM

Roe Deer - Capreolus caprea
Two single antlers each bearing part of the bony pedicle are recorded.

## CORS'ROPITUM

Dog - Canis familiaris
A few specimens of mandible, humerus, radius and a single scapula are catalogued on Data Sheets 60-63, but no attempt is made to relate them to present day types of dog owing to the shortage of comparative material.

## CORSTUPITUM

Fox - Vulpes vulpes
A single humerus and a radius match very well two specimens of two modern dog foxes recently defleshed.

## CORSTOPITUM

## Aver

Several bird bones are identified. The single ulna corresponds well with that of domestic fowl (Gallus gallus), and this diagnosis has been preferred to that of pheasant, (Phasianus colchicus) by Mr.G.S. Cowles, Experimental Officer, of the Bird Section, British Museum. The bones are catalogued on Data Sheets 65-69.

## CORSTOPITUM

Pisces
Two eroded fish vertebrae are recorded. (Data Sheet 70 refers).

## CHAPTER 3

## CATCOTE - Description of Skeletal Remains

In this chapter all the data are included with the description of the material.

## CATCOTE

Bos taurus - "Catcote Type"
Skulls
Two skulls were recovered. The first of these displays a prominent mesial prominence in the middle of the intercornual ridge. (See discussion in Chapter 6)

Measurement taken

1. Least breadth of frontal
2. Greatest diameter of horn core at base
3. Least diameter of horn core at base
4. Circumference of horn core at base
5. Length of outer curvature

Skull 1 (H13) Sku11 2 (U/qr3)
$7.9 \times 2$
$3.7+3.6 \quad 3.7$
$2.7 \times 2.1$
$10.5 \times 2$
$8.5+7.0$

## Horn Cores

Thirteen cores were examined but few measurements could be made because of erosion.
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}\text { Measurement taken } \\ & \frac{l_{\text {left }}^{2}}{2} & 4 & 1 & \frac{\text { right }}{3}\end{array} 4$

1. Greatest diameter at base 4.8 - - - $4.63 .4+12.513 .0+$
2. Least diameter at base 3.7 - $-\quad-\quad 3.82 .8 \quad 10.511 .5+$
3. Circumference at base - - - - - 12.510 .0
4. Length outer curvature

Provenance numbers are -
Left 1 (012)
Right 1 (H22)
2 (Kl5)
2 (P/U3)
3 (I3)
3 (Q3)
4 (O12)
4 (VI N?)
Five specimens were not assigned to either right or left because of erosion. No measurements were taken about these specimens.

Maxilla
Two fragments from each side are reported upon.

| Left |  |  | Right |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Site No. |  | No. | Site No |  |
| 1. | (U7) | M2, 1 | 1. | (II) | M3 |
| 2. | (H15) | M2 | 2. | ( H 13 ) | M3,2 |

+ Eroded:


## Catcote - Bos taurus

Mandibles
Thirteen fragments from the left side and nine from the right were Identified. The dentition associated with each fragment is listed.


* So called Chillingham feature (Meek \& Gray 1911)
(See also discussion in previous chapter)
$\mathrm{dm}=$ deciduous molar. Accorging to Sissons, $S$. (1948) these should be properly designated deciduous premolars but more recent publications
(Higgs 1964) and Cornwall 1956) designate them as deciduous molars.
No. Site No. Lenght Breadth

| 1. II |
| :--- |
| + eroded |
| Axis |

No. Site No. Length Breadth
$1 \quad \mathrm{U} \mathrm{gr} \quad 10.8$ -
2 H3 10.7 app .

3 . $11.3 \mathrm{app} . \quad-$
4 Pit VII - -
5 H3 - -
6 U VII - -
app. = approximate
Other Vertebrae
Twenty-one all eroded.

Remains of nine left and ten right recovered. In no case was it possible to measure length.

| Left |  |  |  | Right |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Site No. | Min. width neck | Max. width glenoid | No. | Site No. | Min. width neck | Max. width glenoid |
| 1 | 012 | 5.9 | - | 1 | H22 | 4.5 | - |
| 2 | II | 4.8 | 4.4 app. | 2 | N12 | 4.9 | - |
| 3 | J13 | 4.5 | - | 3 | 012 | 5.0 | 5.6 |
| 4 | H15 | 4.2 | - | 4 | N12 | 5.7 | 6.1 |
| 5 | 13 | $3.9+$ | - | 5 | N? 12 | 5.9 | $6.0+$ |
| 6 | N12 | 5.1 | 5.5 | 6 | N12 | - | - |
| 7 | P2? | - | - | 7 | U7 | 4.6 | 4.8 |
| 8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U3 } \\ & \text { qr } \end{aligned}$ | 4.7 | - | 8 | 13 | 4.7 | - |
| 9 | U7 | - | - | 9 | I3 | - | 4.6 |
|  |  |  |  | 10 | - | - | - |
| + = eroded. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Catcote - Bos taurus

Humerus
Remains of nineteen left fifteen right were identified. None was entire. All displayed distal articulation or were distal portions of $a$ fractured shaft, that is, no two specimens belonged to the same bone. No proximal articulations were recovered.

Measurement taken was maximum distal width between medial and lateral condyles.

|  | Le |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Site N | Distal wid |  | Site N |  | Distal width |
| 1 | II | 7.5 | 1 | 13 |  | 7.0 |
| 2 | N12 | 6.8 | 2 | U24 |  | - |
| 3 | N12 | $6.0+$ | 3 | J/P3 |  | 6.2 app . |
| 4 | H3 | 6.0 app. | 4 | II |  | 6.5 |
| 5 | K3 | - | 5 | H3 |  | 6.6+ |
| 6 | 012 | - | 6 | 13 |  | - |
| 7 | J/P3 | - | 7 | N13 |  | 6.4 app. |
| 8 | B? 3 | - | 8 | Uqr3 | ) |  |
| 9 | H13 | 6.8 | 9 | 03 | ) |  |
| 10 | 13 | - | 10 | P/DZ7 | ) | distal |
| 11 | 13 | - | 11 | I3 | ) |  |
| 12 | 13 | 6.7 | 12 | H13 | ) | shafts |
| 13 | B3 | - | 13 | E3 | ) |  |
| 14 | $\mathrm{T}^{1111} 12$ | - | 14 | 012 | ) | only |
| 15 | P?/L3 | - | 15 | Q3 | ) |  |
| 16 | U VII | - | 16 | - |  | - |
| 17 | U7 | - |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | 012 | 7.2 app. |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | Q 13 | - |  |  |  |  |
| $t=$ eroded |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| app. = approximate |  |  |  |  |  |  |

```
Catcote - Bos taurus
```

Radius
Twelve fragments of the left bone and nine of the right were identified on the basis of either proximal or distal articulatory processes. It is' possible that two specimens come from the same bone. No specimen was entire. Measurements recorded are maximum distal width and maximum proximal width.

Left

| No. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Site } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | Prox. width | Distal <br> width |  | Site No. | Prox. <br> width | Distal <br> width |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| 1 | R/K3 | - | - | 1 | U7 | 6.4 | - |
| 2 | x3 | - | - | 2 | 028 | - | - |
| 3 | U/P3 | $6.4+$ | - | 3 | P/DZ7 | 6.1 app. | - |
| 4 | H16 | 6.1 app. | - | 4 | B3 | - | - |
| 5 | 13 | - | - | 5 | II | 6.0 | - |
| 6 | U3 | - | - | 6 | H/gj3 | - | 6.0 |
| 7 | N13 | - | - | 7 | U/03 | - | 6.0 |
| 8 | N12 | - | - | 8 | 028 | - | - |
| 9 | I 13 | - | 6.8 | 9 | $\mathrm{T}^{1} 3$ | - | * |
| 10 | 13 | - | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1 | N12 | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | U3 | - | - |  |  |  |  |

$+=$ eroded
app. = approximate

## Catcote - Bos taurus

Ulna
Five right specimens and five left are catalogued although in two of the latter specimens erosion makes it difficult to distinguish between pony, horse and ox. On the basis of the relative absence of horse bones it is preferred to diagnose them tentatively as ox. No measurement was taken. They all approximate in size to the ulna of the Chillingham cow in the Hancock Museum.

## Left

No. Site No.
1 II
2012
3 B3
$4 \mathrm{~K} / \mathrm{kn} 4$
5 U7

Right
No. Site No.
1012
2 U/03
3 U/P3
4 N/13
$5 \quad 1 / t(2)$
-33-


Catcote - Bos taurus
Metacarpals
Butchered shafts assigned neither to right nor left.
No. Site No.
$1 \quad 0 / \mathrm{K} 3$
2012
$3 \quad H 13$
4 13?F
$5 \quad H 13$
$6 \quad \mathrm{Nl} 3$
$7 \quad Y 1$
$8 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{p} 3$

The metapodial index $\frac{\text { distal breadth }}{\text { length }} \frac{100}{1}$ values would seem to indicate the presence of three cows and three possible steers (Howard, M.M. 1968).

Figure 9 compares the scatter of metacarpal distal widths for cattle at Catcote with those from several other ancient sites.


```
Catcote - Bos taurus
```

Os Coxae

Six fragments bearing part or complete acetabulum are recorded. Maximum diameter of acetabulum was measured.

Left $\quad$ Right
No. Site No. Max. Diam. Acet. No. Site No. Max. Diam. Acet.

| 1 | ( $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{P} 3$ ) |  |  | 5.8 | 1 | ( II) | 5.8 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | (Q3) | Ilium | fragment | - | 2 | ( $\mathrm{Hl7}$ ) | Ilium | fragment | - |
| 3 | (H15) | Ilium | fragment | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | (N12) | Ischiu | $m$ fragmen |  |  |  |  |  |  |

app. = approximate

## Catcote - Bos taurus

Femur
Specimens displaying either distal or proximal articulatory surfaces were identified as were three distal portions of shaft lacking the distal articulatory processes. In all, seven fragments of the left bone and four of the right were catalogued.

Measurements taken -

Length. between the two articulatory surfaces.
Distal width. maximum width between lateral and medial condyles.
Left $\quad \underline{\text { Right }}$

| No. Site No. Length Distal width | No. Site No. Length Distal width |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | II | - | - | 1 | P7DZ | - | - |
| 2 | II | - | - | 2 | H17 | 27.9 | 7.9 |
| 3 | 012 | - | - | 3 | N13 | - | 8.1 |
| 4 | H3 | - | 8.7 app. | 4 | II | - | - |
| 5 | H/Fj3 | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | U7 | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | II | - | - |  |  |  |  |

app. $=$ approximate

## Catcote - Bos taurus

Tibia
No complete specimens were described. In all, eleven fragments of left specimens and twelve of right specimens were identified. Measurement taken was the maximum distal width.
Left
Right

No. Site No. Distal width
No. Site No. Distal width

| 1 | N12 | 515 | 1 | I3 | 5.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 03 | $5.5+$ | 2 | U7 | 5.5 |
| 3 | Uqr3 | $5.7+$ | 3 | N13 | - |
| 4 | Uqr3 | 5.8 | 4 | H3 | - |
| 5 | 0/y3 | 5.8 | 5 | R3 | 5.4 |
| 6 | UT | 5.5 | 6 | II | 5.8 |
| 7 | U?2 | - | 7 | $012 ?$ | - |
| 8 | I3 | 5.3 | 8 | Q6 | $\dot{7}$ |
| 9 | N12 | - | 9 | K18 | - |
| 10 | U. 7 | 5.4 | 10 | U7 | - |
| 11 | I/Gq3 | - | 11 | J3 | - |
|  |  |  | 12 | N13 | - |

$$
+=\text { eroded }
$$

-38-

 рәролә $=+$ *Assigned to right or left on basis of inner condyle being wider than outer condyle (McFaydean 1884).
 Not assigned to either right or left - One distal end. Distal width 4.8. Site No. U3





## Catcote - Bos taurus

## Astragalus

Eighteen specimens were identified, where possible the overall maximum length and maximum width are recorded.

Left
Right

app. = approximate
Catcote - Bos taurus

## Calcaneum

Sixteen specimens, eight left and eight right are catalogued. No measurement was taken due to erosion

|  | Left |  | Right |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| No. Site No. | No. Site No. |  |  |  |
| 1 | U7 | 1 | N12 |  |
| 2 | H3 | 2 | N12 |  |
| 3 | - | 3 | H14 |  |
| 4 | H14 | 4 | I3 |  |
| 5 | P/27 | 5 | I 13 |  |
| 6 | Q3 | 6 | I3 |  |
| 7 | P3 | 7 | Q3 |  |
| 8 | K18 | 8 | I3 |  |

## Catcote - Bos taurus

## Phalanges

Thirty-six Phalanges I )
Twenty-two Phalanges II) maximum length and maximum width recorded Eighty Phalanges III - No measurement taken.

Phalanges I
Not assigned to either right or left

| No. | Site No. | Sagittal Length | Proximal Width | No. | Site No. | Sagittal Length | Proximal Width |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | K3 | 6.6 | 2.9 | 19 | 012 | 5.5+ | 2.8 |
| 2 | K3 | 5.7 | 3.2 | 20 | I3 | 5.2+ | - |
| 3 | P7XV | 5.9 | 2.9 | 21 | U/K3 | 5.6 | 2.8 |
| 4 | K3 | 5.2 | 2.7 | 22 | U/K3 | 5.4 | 2.8 |
| 5 | P/DZ7 | 5.4 | $3.0+$ | 23 | R/6 | - | - |
| 6 | J3 | 5.1+ | 2.7+ | 24 | U/K3 | 5.0 | 2.3 |
| 7 | K3 | 5.2 | 2.6 | 25 | 012 | 4.8app. | 2.2 app. |
| 8 | K3 | 5.4 | 2.4 | 26 | N12 | 5.0 | 2.8 |
| 9 | P/DZ7 | 5.4 | 2.7 | 27 | II | $5.4+$ | 2.8 |
| 10 | J3 | - | - | 28 | $T^{11} 3 / 12$ | 4.8 | 2.5 |
| 11 | N12 | 5.2+ | $2.6+$ | 29 | 012 | 5.4 | 2.7 |
| 12 | K VI | 5.8 | 2.9 | 30 | K18 | 5.6 | 3.1 |
| 13 | H3 | 5.4 | 3.3 | 31 | H3 | 5.3 | 2.4 |
| 14 | K18 | 5.9 | 3.1 | 32 | J/t27 | - | - |
| 15 | N12 | 5.4 | 2.7 | 33 | II | 5.2 | - |
| 16 | N13 | 5.6 | 2.9 | 34 | H3 | - | - |
| 17 | U7 | 5.3 | 2.4 | 35 | U(3) | 7 | - |
| 18 | K18 | 5:6 | 2.9 | 36 | H16 | - | - |

$+=$ eroded
app. = approximate

```
Catcote - Bos taurus
```

Phalanges II
Not assigned to either right or left

| No. | Site No. | Sagittal Length | Proximal Width | No. | Site No. | Sag!ttal Length | Proximal Width |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q3 | 3.7 | 2.6+ | 12 | 012 | 3.7 | 2.7 |
| 2 | K3 | 3.6 | 2.9 | 13 | II | 3.9 | 2.7 |
| 3 | P/27 | - | - | 14 | J3 | 3.4+ | - |
| 4 | Q3 | 3.8 | 2.8 | 15 | K/HL2 | 3.8 | 2.9 |
| 5 | 04 | - | - | 16 | N12 | 4.0+ | $2.8+$ |
| 6 | P3 | 3.6 | 2.5 | 17 | U/K3 | 3.7 | 2.5 |
| 7 | Q/Xj3 | 3.7 | 2.7 | 18 | U/K3 | 3.7+ | 2.8 |
| 8 | K3 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 19 | U/K3 | 3.8 | 2.7 |
| 9 | II? | 3.5 | 2.4 | 20 | H3 | 3.7 app . | 2.5+ |
| 10 | $\mathrm{T}^{\mathbf{1}} / 12$ | 3.4 | 2.6 | 21 | N12 | 4.2 | 3.3 |
| 11 | Uqr3 | 3.7 | 3.0 | 22 | U/K3 | 3.7 | 3.1+ |

app. = approximate

Phalanges III
No. Site No. No. Site No.
1035
$2 \quad \mathrm{P} / 27$
$6 \quad$ N12

3 H3 7 L/KL6
$4 \mathrm{~T}^{11} 3 / 12 \quad 8 \quad-$
Catcote - Ovis aries

Skull
Ihree eroded specimens were examined. No. Site No. Lamda to Basion Width Condyles Length Condyles

| 1 | $(J 3 / 1)$ | 7.3 | 4.2 | 2.1 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | $(\mathrm{KVIN})$ | - | 4.4 | - |
| 3 | $(\mathrm{H}$ III $)$ | - | - | - |

Horn Cores
Six specimens were examined.
Measurement taken
Left $\underline{\text { Right }}$
$1 \quad 2 \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4$

1. Greatest diameter at base $\begin{array}{lllll}3.6 & 2.4 & 2.8 & -2.9\end{array}$
2. Least diameter at base 2.81 .2 1.3 1.8 - 1.9
3. Circumference at base $+\quad 9.06 .0 \quad 6.58 .0-8.5$
4. Length of outer curvature+ - - - - 8.5 app.

+ = approximate measurement.
The words diametei and circumference are misnomers in so far as the horn cores are not round in cross section but are "D" shaped. The flat surface facing backwards as in the Soay sheep skull present in the Hancock Museum, Newcastle.
Catcote - Ovis aries

Atlas Vertebra
No. Site No. Max. Length Max. Breadth

* 1 K VI N $4.6+\quad 5.8+\quad$ - In articulation with thirteen
2 K VI N 4.0+ 4.8+

Axis Vertebrae
No. Site No. Max. Length Max. Breadth

* K VI N 5.8 +
- 

$2 \quad \mathrm{~K} V I$
$5.4+$
$3.7+$
$3 \quad H \quad 17$
$5.3+$
$4.0+$
4 K VI
$5.3+$

Other Vertebrae
Forty-nine other vertebrae (all eroded) tentatively assigned to Ovis.
$+=$ eroded

* = in articulation with each other.


## Maxilla



## Catcote - Ovis aries

Mandibles
Left
Right


* Stage assigned according to Ewe bank, Phillipson, Whitehouse and Higgs classification (1964).
$m=$ Deciduous Molar. $\quad M=$ Permanent Molar. $\quad \mathbf{P}=$ Premolar
- = socket $\boldsymbol{P}=$ being shed


## Catcote - Ovis aries

Scapula
Left $\underline{\text { Right }}$
No. Site No. Length Min. Max. No. Site No. Length Min. Max. width diam. width diam. neck glenoid neck glenoid

app. = approximate
Catcote - Ovis aries

Humerus
Remains of fifteen left and fifteen right bones were identified. Few were entire but all displayed distal articulatory surfaces or were distal portions of fractured shaft. No two specimens belonged to the same bone. Also catalogued are six fragments of shaft assigned neither to right or left sides.

Measurements taken were (a) length, (b) maximum distal width between medial and lateral condyles.

Great difficulty in distinguishing between this bone of ovis and Sus was experienced.

The use of a question mark in front of the serial number indicates author's doubt.

Humerus

## Left $\quad$ Right



## Catcote - Ovis aries

Radius
Nine fragments of the left bone and eighteen of the right are recorded. In only three cases is the distal articulation present. It is possible that two specimens come from the same bone.

No. Site No. Length Prox. Distal No. Site No. Length Prox. Distal width width width width

| Left |  |  | Right |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | U7 | -. shaft only - | 1 | KVI | - | 2.5 | - |
| 2 | H3 | - shaft only - | 2 | KVI | 14.3 | 2.6 | 2.2 |
| 3 | K VI | 13.82 .62 .1 | 3 | K VI N | - | 2.7 | - |
| 4 | K VI N | 2.7 - | 4 | U/03 | - | - | 2.3 |
| 5 | I/Fp3 | - shaft only - | 5 | U3 | - | $2.5+$ | - |
| 6 | N3 | 2.4 - | 6 | 03 | - | 2.5 | - |
| 7 | II | - shaft only - | 7 | 113 | - | 2.6 | - |
| 8 | U3 | - shaft only - | 8 | $T^{111} 3$ | - | 2.4 | - |
| 9 | U3 | - shaft only - | 9 | $\mathrm{T}^{11} 3 / 12$ | - | 2.7 | - |
|  |  |  | 10 | U3 | - | 2.6 | - |
|  |  |  | 11 | $\mathrm{T}^{12}$ | shaft | ragme | only |
|  |  |  | 12 | U7 | shaft | agmen | only |
|  |  |  | 13 | 13 | shaft | ragmen | s only |
|  |  |  | 14 | - U7 | shaft | ragme | s only |
|  |  |  | 15 | U7 | shaft | ragmen | s only |
|  |  |  | 16 | II | shaft | ragmen | s only |
|  |  |  | 17 | - * P | oximal | end - | roded |
|  |  |  | 18 | I3 * d | stal a | ticula | ion 2.3 |

[^0]Catcote - Ovis aries

Ulna
Eleven left specimens and four right are catalogued. No measurement was taken because the shaft is often broken and the bone eroded.

|  | Left | Right |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Site No. | No. | Site No. |
| 1 | (II) | 1 | (II) |
| 2 | ( $\mathrm{U} / \mathrm{P} 3$ ) | 2 | (U7) |
| 3 | (II) | 3 | ( K VI ) |
| 4 | (UT) | 4 | (K VI N) |
| 5 | (K VI N) |  |  |
| 6 | (K VI) |  |  |
| 7 | (H13) |  |  |
| 8 | ( 17 ) |  |  |
| 9 | (II) |  |  |
| 10 | (K VI) |  |  |
| 311 | (H13) |  |  |

```
Catcote - Ovis aries
```

Femur
Difficulty was encountered in distinguishing between eroded specimens of Ovis and Sus.

$$
\text { Left } \quad \text { Right }
$$

No. Site No. Length Distal width No. Site No. Length Distal width
1 K VI 15.5 app. $\quad 1 \quad$ K VI $\quad-\quad 3.6$ app.
$2 \quad \mathrm{~T}^{\mathrm{I}}{ }_{3 / 12} \quad 16.3 \quad 3.4 \quad 2 \quad \mathrm{~K}$ VI
3 K VI shaft and proximal end 3 K VI
4 K VI N shaft and proximal end
4028 - -

| 5 | $H 15 / 16$ | - | - |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | $H 15 / 16$ | - | - |
| 7 | K VI | - | - |
| 8 | 028 | - | - |
| 9 | K VI | - | - |

app. = approximate
Catcote - Ovis aries

Tibia
Only one complete specimen was recovered. In all fifteen fragments of left specimens and sixteen of right were identified.
Left
Right

No. Site No. Length Max.dist.width No. Site No. Length Max.dist.width

| 1 | K VI | - | 2.2 | 1 | K VI | - | 2.0 app. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | K VI | - | - | 2 | K VI N | - | - |
| 3 | U/O3 | - | - | 3 | K VI | - | - |
| 4 | K VI N | - | 2.3 | 4 | B3 | - | - |
| 5 | K VI N | - | 2.1 | 5 | Q28 | - | - |
| 6 | 13 | - | 2.3 app. | 6 | $\mathrm{T}^{11} 3 / 12$ | - | - |
| 7 | R6 | - | 2.3 | 7 | Uqr3 | - | - |
| 8 | 012 | - | 2.2 | 8 | U7 | - | - |
| 9 | P/xj3 | - | 2.2 | 9 | 012 | - | - |
| 10 | 028 | - | - | 10 | S/t3 | - | - |
| 11 | K VI N | - | - | 11 | U VII | - | 2.4 |
| 12 | E3 | - | - | 12 | K VI N | - | 2.4 |
| 13 | U3 | - | - | 13 | $\mathrm{T}^{11} 3 / 12$ | - | 2.0 |
| 14 | DZ7 | - | - | 14 | K VI | - | - |
| i5 | JI | - | - | 15 | 028 | - | - |
|  |  |  |  | 16 | P3 | - | - |
|  |  |  |  | 17 | P3 | - | 2.3 |
|  |  |  |  | 18 | K VI | - | - |

app. = approximate

$$
\begin{gathered}
-54- \\
\text { Catcote - Ovis aries }
\end{gathered}
$$

Os Coxae
Fragments displaying acetabulum cavity.
Left
Right

No. Site No.
No. Site No.
1 II
$1 \quad$ Nl3
2 N12
2 H3
3 -
3 R3
$4 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{qr} 3$
4 KYII
5 HKl4
35 J3
6 K VI
$77 \quad 03$
No measurements taken because of erosion.
Catcote - Ovis aries

Metapodials
(a) Metacarpals

## Left

## Right

No. Site No. Length Distal Proximal No. Site No. Length Distal Proximal

| 1 | KVI | 13.4 | 2.4 | $2.1+$ | 1 | KVIN | 13.4 | 2.4 | 2.1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | U7 | 11.8 |  | - | 2 | P/DZ(7) | - | - | $2.1+$ |
| 3 | KVI | 12.1 | 2.1+ | $1.9+$ | 3 | II | $11.1+$ | 2.1 | - |
| 4 | $\mathrm{T}^{11_{3 / 12}}$ | - | - | 2.0 | 4 | II | - | - | - |
| 5 | 012 | 11.8 | - | $2.1+$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | KVI | - | - | $1.9+$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Not assigned to either right or left.
No. Site No. Length Distal Proximal

| 1 | KVI | - | 2.2 | 1.8 app. |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 012 | - | - | - |
| 3 | I/t3 | - | - | - |
| 4 | KVI | - | 2.3 | - |
| 5 | $\mathrm{I} / \mathrm{Gq}(3)$ | - | - | - |
| 6 | KVI | - | 2.3 | - |
| + | Eroded |  |  |  |

app. = approximately

## Catcote - Ovis aries

Metapodials
(b) Metatarsals

No. Site No. Length Distal Proximal No. Site No. Length Distal Proximal

## Left

| 1 | KVI | 14.5 | 2.3 | 1.9 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | II | 12.2 | 2.0 | 1.7 |
| 3 | O(3) | 13.1 | 2.1 | 1.7 |
| 4 | II | - | - | 1.9 |
| 5 | Uqr3 | - | - | 1.9 |

Not assigned to either left or right.
No. Site No. Length Distal Proximal

| $\mathbf{4}$ | N12 | - | 2.1 | - |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| 2 | UVII | - | - | - |
| 3 | I/Fp3 | - | - | - |
| 4 | H3 | - | - | - |
| 5 | Ol2 | - | - | - |
| 6 | Il3? | - | - | - |
| 7 | P3 | - | - | - |
| 8 | Dl2 | - | - | - |
| 9 | KVIN | - | 2.3 | - |
| 10 | KVI | - | $2.0+$ | - |
| 11 | I (19)? | - | 2.0 | - |

$+=$ eroded.

Catcote = Ovis aries

## Astragalus

Six left and six right specimens were identified. Maximum lengths and maximum breadths are recorded.

One specimen is not assigned to either right or left and is only tentatively diagnosed as belonging to Ovis.
Left
Right

| 1 | 012 | - | - | 1 | B3 | 3.4app. | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 03 | 3.6 | - | 2 | KVI | 2.8 | 1.8 |
| 3 | KVI | 2.7 | 1.8 | 3 | KVI | 2.4 | 1.8 |
| 4 | - | $2.4+$ | 1.6app. | 4 | N12 | 2.3 | 1.6 |
| 5 | KVI | $2.3+$ | 1.7app. | 5 | KVI | 2.4 | 1.7 |
| 6 | 012 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 6 | P/xj3 | 2.4+ | $1.6+$ |
|  | erod |  | pp. = app |  |  |  |  |

## ?Ovis

X1 U/O3 - No measurement possible.
-58-
Catcote - Ovis aries

## Calcaneum

Eleven left specimens, six right were identified.
No measurements taken.

Catcote - Sus scrofa

Mandibles

| Left |  |  | Right |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. Site No. Dentition |  |  | No. Site No. Dentition |  |  |
| 1 | (H16) | M2,1 P.M. 4 | 1 | U7 | M3,2 d.m.3,2,1 |
| 2 | (II) | d.m.4,3,2 | 2 | $\mathrm{T}^{11} 3 / 12$ | M2,1 |
| 3 | (N13) | M2,1 P.M.4,3 \& root | 3 | U/K3 | M3 |
| 4 | (012) | M2, 1 | 4 | K18 | M2,1 P.M.4,3 |
| 5 | ( H 3 ) | C | 5 | H2 | M3. roots of M2 |
| 6 | (U/P3) | C broken, P.M. 3 | ? 6 | 012 | ? M2 |
| 7 | (HIII) | C P.M. 2 | 7 | I3 | M2, 1 |
| 8 | (II) | M2? | 8 | J13? | M2, 1 |
|  |  |  | 39 | U7 | M2, ? M |

## Catcote - Susscrofa

Left
No. Site No. Dentition

| 1 | Ol2 | M2, 1 P.M.4? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | H3 | M3,2,1 |
| 3 | P/U3 | P.M.4,3,2 |
| 4 | P/9 | M2,1 P.M.4,3 |
| 5 | II | M2, 1 P.M.4 |
| 6 | Il3 | C |
| 7 | I/t2 | P.M.4 |

7 I/t2 P.M.

Right No. Site No. Dentition

* Apparently from same maxilla although.fracture lines are not an exact fit.
$I=$ Incisor $\quad C .=$ Canine. $\quad P=$ Premolar $\quad M=$ Molar.
dm = Deciduous molar - see Volume $I$, p27 for discussion.
Catcote - Sus scrofa

Scapula


Humerus
Three possible specimens are catalogued. Erosion made certain identification difficult.

Left $\quad$ Right
No. Site No. Distal width No. Site No. Distal width
? 13 2.9 app. $\quad 11$ H3/17 2.9 app.
72 I/t3 Shaft only
Catcote - Sus scrofa

Femur

Left

NIL

Right

| No. | Site | No. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | $\mathrm{~T}^{1} 12$ | 3.9 |

Catcote - Sus scrofa
Tibia

$$
\text { Left } \quad \text { Right }
$$

No. Site No. Distal width
31 U/P3 2.6 NIL

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text {-61- } \\
\text { Catcote - Sus scrofa }
\end{gathered}
$$

Metapodials
Not assigned to front or hind limb. Nor assigned to left or right. No measurements taken due to butchering and erosion.

No. Site No.
1 I/Fp3
2 II
3 H3
4 T/Gq(3)
5 U7
6 B3
$7 \quad 1 ? 3$
8012
Catcote - Sus scrofa

## Os Coxae

Fragments displaying acetabulum cavity.

| $\frac{\text { Left }}{}$ | Right |
| :---: | :---: |
| No. Site No. |  |
| 1 J/P3 | $\frac{\text { No. Site No. }}{1}$Ni2 |

Catcote - Equus caballus

The remains of one large horse, found in a rectangular pit, were thought by the excavator to be intrusive and are thought by the present author to be probably modern. They are not described here. Skulls

| No. Site No. | Length occipital <br> condyle | Width condyle | Crest to basion |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | U7 | 2.8 | 7.3 | 5.0 |

Catcote - Equus caballus
Axis vertebra
No. Site No. Length Breadth
1 R25 13.0 app . - In articulation with three other vertebrae.

> Catcote - Equus caballus

Scapula
Left
No. Site No. Length Min.width neck Max.glenoid diameter
$1 \mathrm{Hl} 3 \quad-\quad 5.8 \quad 4.7 \mathrm{app}$.

Right
No. Site No. Length Min.width neck Max.glenoid diameter

| 1 | Nl 2 | - | 5.3 | $5.0+$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | N 12 | - | 5.4 | 5.2 |
| + |  |  |  |  |

Catcote - Equus caballus
Humerus
One left specimen only.

1. (E3) Distal width $=5.4$ approx.

## Catcote - Equus caballus

Radius

| Left |  |  | Right |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Site | Leng th | Prox. <br> width | Dist. width | No | Site | No. Length | Prox. width | Dist. width |
| 1 | 012 | 29.8 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 1 | P/xv7 | - | 5.9app | - |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2 | P/DZ7 | - | 6.8app | - |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | U/P3 | - | - | - |

Catcote - Equus caballus

Tibia
No entire specimens, distal ends only.
Lefit Right
No. Site No. Distal width
No. Site No. Distal width
$\begin{array}{llllll}1 & \text { II } & 5.8 & 1 & \mathrm{~N} 13 & 5.4\end{array}$
2 N13 -

Metapodials
(a) Metacarpal

One broken right specimen.
1 (H3) Proximal width $=4.5$ approx.
(b) Metatarsal

Left $\quad$ Right
No. Site No. Length Dist Prox No. Site No. Length Dist. Prox. width width
width width
$\begin{array}{llllllllll}1 & \mathrm{~J} 3 & 24.0 & 4.1 & 4.3 & 1 & \mathrm{Hl3} & - & - & 3.9\end{array}$
(c) Metapodials

Not classified.
No. Site No.
1 Hl5/16 No measurement.
2 K3 Distal width $=4.7$
3 H3 Distal width $=4.0$ approx.
4 Q3. Distal width $=4.2$ approx.
5 N13 No measurement.

Catcote - Equus cabalius
Astragalus
Three specimens were identified. Maximum lengths and widths are recorded

Catcote - Equus caballus

## Calcaneum

One certain and one possible specimens are reported. No measurement taken due to erosion.

1 | $\frac{\text { Left }}{(\mathrm{B} 3)}$ | 17 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\frac{\text { Right }}{\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Z7}}$ |  |

Catcote - Equus caballus

## Phalanges I

Not assigned to either right or left.
No. Site No. Length Width

| 1 | H 23 | 7.9 | 5.2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | N 12 | 7.3 | 4.9 |
| 3 | L6 | 7.1 | 4.2 |
| 4 | N 13 | 7.3 app. | $4.5+$ |
| 5 | H 2 | $7.4+$ | $4.9+$ |

app. = approximate. + = eroded.
Phalanges II
Not assigned to either right or left.
No. Site No. Length Width
1 Q3 $4.3 \quad 4.9$
2 K3
3 H15 - 4.5

## Phalanges III

$1 \quad \mathrm{Hl7}$
2 U/P3

$$
\begin{gathered}
-66- \\
\text { Catcote - Cervus elaphus }
\end{gathered}
$$

Metapodials
One broken shaft.
Catcote - Canis familiaris

Scapula
One possible fragment of shoulder blade is reported on.
No. Site No. Diam. glenoid Width neck
$\begin{array}{llll} & \mathrm{Nl3} & 2.2\end{array}$
Maxilla

| Left | $\frac{\text { Right }}{}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NIL | No. Site No. | Dentition |  |
|  | 1 | H3 | M2, 1 P.M.4 |
|  | 2 | N12 | M2,1 P.M.4 |

Mandibles
Left
Wight
No. Site No. Dentition No. Site No. Dentition
*1 H18 M2,1 P.M.4,3 *1 H17 M2M1 P.M.3,2,1 C., I3,2.

* Two rani fit together.
Catcote - Vulpes vulpes

Ramus

## Left

No. Site No. Dentition
1 N12 M2,1 P.M.4,3

## Catcote - Pisces

One eroded vertebra

## Catcote - Aves

Seven eroded bones five humerus, two radius and ulna fused and three possible fragments of tibio-tarsus.

Catcote - Mollusca
Four specimens of common winkle, Littorina littorea plus the eroded columella of another specimen.

Catcote - Human remains
Human remains were discovered. The description of them is by Miss R. Powers of the Department of Anthropology, British Museum. - "The bones are those of the right arm of a youngiindividual, and consist of humerus, radius and ulna, and the shaft of a metacarpal. The epiphyses are open, and that of the humerus head is the only one preserved. Two teeth, an upper right molar and premolar, are also from the right side of a young individual. The state of wear and root formation of the teeth agree with the size and development of the bones to give an age of about twelve to fourteen years. The sex is uncertain but most likely male."

## Chapter 4

BENIELL FORT Contents of Well
Bos taurus - "Benwell Type"
Maxilla

| Left |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 M2,I P.M. 3 | Right |
| NIL |  |

Mandible
$\frac{\text { Left }}{\text { M2 and severa }}$
$1 \quad$ Atlas vertebrae

Length
Width
19.1 com .

2 -

Other vertebrae

Right
NIL

- (eroded but smaller than specimens)

Seven eroded specimens - probably Bos.

## Scapula

One left and two right specimens are catalogued.
No measurements possible due to erosion.
Humerus
One left specimen. Minimum distal width $=7.6 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}$.
Os Coxae
One fragment of left side displaying acetabulum.
Calcaneum
Two left specimens.
1 Length $=10.4$ c.m. Breadth $=4.4 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}$.
2 No measurement possible.
Tarsal/Carpal
Fused masses - four retrieved.

Phalanges I
No. Length Breadth
1 - 2.3 cm .

2 - 2.2 cm .

Phalanges II
No. Length Breadth
$13.5 \mathrm{c.m} .2 .3 \mathrm{c.m}$.
Two rib fragments.

## Benwell - Ovis aries

Skull
None.

Vertebrae
Other than atlas or axis.
Nine tentatively assigned to Ovis.
Mandible

|  | Left <br> M2,1 P.M.3,2. | Right |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NIL |  |  |

Humerus
Left
Right

No. Distal width (Minimum) No. Distal width (Minimum)
12.8 cm.

| 1 | $2.9 \mathrm{c.m}$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $3.3 \mathrm{c.m}$. |
| 3 | 3.1 cm. |
| 4 | 2.4 cm. |

Metatarsal
Left Right
No. Proximal width
12.6 cm.

Calcaneum
One right specimen. Length $=5.1 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}$.

Ribs
Four recovered and assigned to Ovis

Benwell - Sus scrofa
Mandible
One right specimen - dentition $=M 3,2,1$

## Benwe 11 - Cervus elaphus

Twenty-five fragments of antler. The points of several tines are included. Some specimens are much more massive than their present day counterparts. Only one specimen bears fragments of skull.

Benwell - Canis familiaris?
Canid Mandibles
Left
1 M2,1 P.M.4,3,2,1
2 M2,1 P.M.-,3,2.

Benwell
Other bones and antier.
Also present are thirty-one fragments of skull (not assigned to species) and fifty-five splinters or fragments of antlers and long bones respectively. The antler fragments are much more massive in diameter than those specimens displayed in the Hancock Museum, Newcastle. Many of the antlers have been sqwn through.

One unidentified fragment of os Coxae displaying left acetabulum is believed to be from a large dog. Absence of a range of comparative material makes diagnosis uncertain.

## CHAPIER 5

TYNEMOU'TH PRIURY - 1966
Ox - Bos taurus (Tynemouth Type)
(a) Minimum number of animals is two, three or four based on horn cores, depending on assignation of these to left or right.

Horn Cores

| No | Site No. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rig } \\ & \text { Le } \end{aligned}$ | Grea diam base | Leas at ba | Circum at ba | Length of outer curvature |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | T/63/92 | L | 5.2 | 4.1 | 15.0 |  |
| 2 | T/78 | ? $\mathbf{L}$ | - | - | $>20$ | - |
| 3 | T/63/84 | ? L | 5.3 | 3.8 | $>16$ | 15.5 |
| 4 | T/63/64A | L | - | - | - |  |

Mandibles
Left
No. Site No. Dentition
$1 \mathrm{~T} / 63 / 10$ M2,1 d.m. $\frac{4}{3}, \mathbf{2}, 1$

Vertebral column
Mediall: sacral crest of several fused sacral vertebrae T/2l or T/28

## Single teeth

The selenodont molar like teeth assigned to Ox in view of known species present.

T/63/47A
T/63/47A

# Tynemouth - Bos taurus (Tynemouth Type) 

## Metacarpal

Proximal end only.
Left $\quad$ Right
No. Site No.
NIL 1 T/55 Proximal width $=5.4 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}$.

Tibia
Left
No. Site No. Distal width
1 T/63/64A 5.2 c.m.

## Carpals

Fused mass. (Cuneiform, unciform, lunate, scaphoid, magnum)
Left
No. Site No.
$1 \mathrm{~T} / 63 / 10$
NIL
2 T/63/69 (eroded)

## Phalanges

lst Phdlanx.
One only. Length $=5.9 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m} . \mathrm{T} / 63 / 59$

## Tynemouth - Ovis aries

(b) Minimum number of animals equals two. In the absence of any evidence of goat (Capra) remains it is assumed that the remains belonged to sheep.

Horn cores
$1+T / 74$
$+=$ eroded.
Mandibles
Left
1 T/223 Assigned to stage "f", therefore, three months old (Ewbank, Phillipson, Whitehouse, Higgs 1964)

2 T/63/31 Fragments.

Scapula
Left
1 T/63/82. Neck eroded+

## Humerus

Fragment

> Right $\begin{array}{ll}1+T / 74 \\ (T / 74) & \\ & \text { Also one distal condyle with } \\ & \text { distal width of } 2.7 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m} .\end{array}$
$+=$ eroded.

## Radius

Distal ends missing.
Let゙t
Right
NIL

$$
1+T / 74
$$

Tynemouth - Ovis aries
Ulna
Measurement taken is (U \& Ll) (Brothwell, D.R. 1963)
$\underline{\text { Leff }}$
1 T/223 $10.9 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}$.

Metacarpal
Left
No. Site No. Length Proximal width Distal width

| 1 | $\mathrm{~T} / 63 / 2$ | $12.3 \mathrm{c.m}$. | $2.3 \mathrm{c.m}$. | $2.4 \mathrm{c.m}$. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | $\mathrm{~T} / 63 / 20$ | - | - | $2.4 \mathrm{c.m}$. |

Tibia
Left Right
No. Site No. Dist.width No. Site No. Dist.width

| 1 | T/63/20 | 2.4 cm . | 1 | T/74 | Shaft only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2* | T/63/20 |  |  |  |  |

Astragalus
Left Right
No. Site No. Length
No. Site No. Length
$1 \mathrm{~T} / 63 / 2 \quad 2.9 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}$.
1 T/63/20 2.7 c.m.
$2 \mathrm{~T} / 63 / 2 \quad 2.7 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}$.

## Tynemouth Priory - Ovis aries

## Phalanges

Sagittal

No. Site No. Length
1 T/63/49 3.4 c.m.
$2 \mathrm{~T} / 63 / 105$ 3.6 c.m.

Os Coxae
T/63/49 Left acetabulum

Thoracic vertebrae
Tentatively assigned to sheep.
1 T. 223
2 T. 21
3 T.22?

## I'ynemouth Priory - Sus scrofa

(c) Minimum number of animals equals four.

Mandibles
Left

## Right

No. Site No. Dentition
$1 \mathrm{~T} / 21$
M3,2,1 P.M.4,3
2 T/21 M3,2,1 P.M.4,3
3 T/21 M3,2,- P.M. 4
4 T/21
M3,2,1 P.M.4,3

Maxilla

## Left

Right
No. Site No. Dentition
1 T/255 Fragment NIL

Single teeth

| No. Site No. | Type |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $(T 223, T Y 63 / 10)$ | Lower Incisors |
| 2 | $(T / 63 / 2, T / 63 / 49)$ | Upper Incisors |
| 1 | $(T / 63 / 31)$ | Canine |

## Metatarsal

No. Site No. Length
1 T/255 8.5 cm. (excluding plantar projection)

Vertebrae
Three

Atlas
No. Site No.
1 (T/63/2) - fragment only

Tynemouth Priory - Sus scrofa

Phal anges
No. Site No. $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sagittal } \\ & \text { Length }\end{aligned}$
1 T/63/105 1.8 c.m.
$2 \mathrm{~T} / 63 / 2 \quad 3.3 \mathrm{com}$.

## Tynemouth Priory - Aves

(d) Minimum numberof animals equals two. Lengths where given are maximum lengths.

Fore Limbs
Humerus
Left
Right
NIL
$1 \mathrm{~T} / 63 / 17$ Length $=6.7 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}$.
2 T/255 Incomplete but exceeds $15 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}$.

Ulna
Left
1 T/63/105 Length $=10.7$ c.m.* $1 T / 223$ Length $=13.2 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{*}}{ }^{*}$

II Mebacarpal Bone
1 T/63/90 Fragment only
2 T/78 Fragment only

Hind Limb

## Femur

Left
Right
$1 \mathrm{~T} / 63 / 20$ Incomplete proximal 1 T. 223 Length $=8.3 \mathrm{cm}$. .
end only

## Tibio-tarsus

| No. Site No. Length | No. Site No. |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | $\mathrm{~T} / 223$ | $13.6 \mathrm{c.m}$. | 1 |
|  |  | $\mathrm{~T} / 63 / 20$ Incomplete, distal |  |
|  |  |  |  |

* Identified by G.S.Cowles, ExperimentalmOfficer, Bird Section, British Museum, and thought to be from domestic fowl (Gallus gallus dom.)


## Tynemouth Priory - Aves

## Tarsometatarsus

Left
NIL

## Right

$1 \mathrm{~T} / 63 / 20$ Length $=8.0 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{m}$.

Sacrum
T/223 Fragment

Tracheal bony rings
Ten of these were found, each ring being oval in shape, forming a series in descending order of size. Maximum diameter $=12.8 \mathrm{~m} . \mathrm{m}$.

All are $T / 63 / 2$.

## CHAPTER 6

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

From excavation so far, the site at Catcote seems to be dominantly a village of the Roman period, although it may have started before this. It is clearly a civilian settlement comparable with other Iron Age and Native Roman Period sites in Britain. It seemed worthwhile, therefore, to compare the animal remains from Catcote with those from the Roman garrison site at Corstopitum. The first comparison is of the ages of the animals when slaughtered.

## (a) <br> AGES OF ANIMALS ON SLAUGHTER

## 1 Sheep

The mandibles were allocated to eruption stages a - $z$ in accordance with the method described by Ewbank, J.M., Phillipson, D.W., whitehouse, R.D. and Higgs, E.S. (1964). They were then assigned to the appropriate three month age group ranging from birth to two years. Assuming that the Iron Age lambing season corresponded in time with the present one, and that it took place in February and March, and also that the rate of development of sheep varies little from Catcote to Corstopitum, a comparison of the percentages of sheep in each age group may be made. However, the rate of development of sheep may vary from site to site because of differences in breed and in the levels of nutritional status of the sites due to soil, climate and altitude. In these cases comparisons cannot be exact.

In the report on sheep mandibles from Barley (Ewbank, J.M., Phillipson, D.W., Whitehouse, R.D., Higgs, E.S., 1964) have suggested that it may
be impossible to draw valid conclusions from samples of less than one hundred mandibles. The distribution of ages of mandibles on death is as follows.

Corstopitum
Sheep mandibles - Twenty-one specimens

| Lambing in February |  |  |  |  | Lambing in March |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage | Number |  |  | Gtoup |  | Number | Percentage |
| 0 | 0 | I | Feb. <br> March <br> April | - March <br> - April <br> - May | I | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | II | May June July | - June <br> - July <br> - Aug. | II | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | III | Aug Sept Oct | - Sept <br> - Oct <br> - Nov | III | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | IV | Nov <br> Dec <br> Jan | - Dec <br> - Jan <br> - Feb | IV | 0 | 0 |
| 4.8\% | 1 | $V$ | Feb March April | - March <br> - April <br> - May | V | 1 | 4.8\% |
| 42.9\% | 9 | VI | May June July | - June <br> - July <br> - Aug | VI | 9 | 42.9\% |
| 4.8\% | 1 | VII | Aug Sept Oct | - Sept <br> - Oct <br> - Noy | VII | 1 | 4.8\% |
| 14.3\% | 3 V | VIII | Nov <br> Dec <br> Jan | - Dec <br> - Jan <br> - Feb | VIII | 3 | 14.3\% |

Seven specimens were older than two years

Catcote
Sheep mandibles - Forty specimens
Lambing in February Lambing in March
Percentage Number Group Group Number Percentage

| 2.5\% | 1 | I | Feb <br> Mar <br> Apr. | - | March <br> April <br> May | $1 \text { I }$ | 1 | 2.5\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.0\% | 2 | II |  | - | June <br> July <br> Aug | II | 2 | 5.0\% |
| 0.0\% | 0 | III | Aug Sept Oct | - | Sept Oct <br> Nov | III | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 0.0\% | 0 | IV | Nov Dec Jan | - | Dec Jan Feb | IV | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 7.5\% | 3 | V | Feb Mar Apr | - | March April May | V | 3 | 7.5\% |
| 25.5\% | 10 | VI | May June July | - | June <br> July <br> Aug | VI | 10 | 25\% |
| 7.5\% | 3 | VII | Aug <br> Sept Oct | - | Sept <br> Oct <br> Nov | VII | 3 | 7.5\% |
| 20.0\% | 8 | VIII | Nov <br> Dec <br> Jan | - | Dec Jan Feb | VIII | 8 | 20.0\% |

Thirteen specimens were older than two years $32.5 \%$

At both sites only a very small percentage of sheep died or were killed during the first year of life; $0 \%$ at Catcote and 7.5\% at Corstopitum. It could be argued from this that the inhabitants had little preference for lamb but it is more likely that under the comparatively rigorous conditions obtaining at both sites they were unlikely to have produced fat lamb within six months of birth on spring and early summer grazing.

The high percentage in group VIII for each site may be due to early winter killing of animals brought in from the summer grazing. Such summer grazing, particularly in the case of Corstopitum, may have been on upland pasture and it would have been logical to have brought the sheep back from such pasture before the full rigours of winter. It is interesting to note that about one third of all sheep survived into their third year of life at Catcote (32.5\%), Corstopitum (33.2\%) and
 sites considered here that sheep were being kept to an advanced age. Watson and More (1962) have pointed out that under comparatively rigorous conditions the death rate among ewes tends to rise after the age of five years. It seems likely, therefore, that the Catcote and Corstopitum sheep were lambing in the third year and were dying or were culled in subsequent years before they became aged, flocks, therefore, being kept at optimum production.

## II. Cattle

On the basis that the third permanent molar erupts between two and two and a half years of age (Sisson, S. 1910), and assuming the same eruption times for earlier cattle, thirty-one of the forty-two cattle
mandible fragments retrieved from Corstopitum were from animals at least two to two and a half years old. Three quarters of the animals had already survived two winters.

At Catcote only five out of twenty-two mandible fragments possessed the third permanent molar, but on this site the mandibles were much more fragmentary. Although we do not know at what age before two and a half years they were dying or being killed, there appears to be a high percentage of animals not reaching the optimum age of meat or calf production at Catcote. Our knowledge of this herd is incomplete and this may not have been a self contained herd. The small percentage of old animals may represent the breeding stock from which were derived younger animals for slaughter locally, or to supply a market at some distance away.
III. Horse

At Corstopitum all six maxillae fragments displayed either the first pre molar and/or a Canine. On the basis of tooth eruption in their modern counterparts this gives them a minimum age at death of five years (Sisson, S. 1910).

At Catcote there were no horse teeth associated with bone except for the almost complete skeleton of a large draught horse probably recent, and mentioned earlier in this thesis. The data from this horse are not included in this report.

IV Pig
In modern pig the time of eruption of the third permanent molar is about from eighteen to twenty months after birth. (Sisson, S. 1910). It is assumed that eruption times have remained constant it appears, as at Windmill Hill (Jope, M. \& Grigson, C. 1965), that there was no preponderance of young animals at Corstopitum. At this site six out of seven maxillae fragments displayed the third permanent molar as did seven out of seventeen mandible fragments. Some of the fragments may lack the third permanent molar only because they are incomplete and not because the tooth had not erupted by the time of death. On the other hand, at Catcote, there is some evidence of younger animals being killed than at Corstopitum.

Of the Catcote material there were seventeen mandible fragments, only three of which display the third permanent molar, and eleven maxillae fragments, only one of which bears this tooth.

At neither site is there any evidence of old animals such as may have been expected from a boar kept for breeding purposes, nor were there any remains obviously belonging to wild pig.

A comparison of the relative abundance of some of the food forming species may shed some light on the economy of ancient sites. It may reflect the extent to which certain animals were hunted or reared. For the following reasons comparison cannot be exact:
(a) excavations at several sites are not complete, e.g. Catcote and Corstopitum.
(b) Some reports include all identified fragments in assessing the relative abundance of species so that the proximal and distal fragments of the same bone may count as two (Ryder, M.L., 1961). The author felt obliged in the case of Corstopitum and Catcote to follow the example set by Meek and Gray (1911) and count only entire bones and fragments displaying a distal articulatory process. Chaplin, R.E. and Atkinson, J. (1966) in their report on the Animal Bones from The Roman Villa at Twyford have maintained that comparisons of the relative abundance of different species can only realistically be achieved by comparing the minimum numbers of each species. The minimum numbers of the various food species found at Corstopitum, Catcote and Tynemouth are included in this thesis. However the comparison has been made on totals of fragments identified, since minimum numbers have not been published for most sites. In many cases only descriptive comments have been published and there are no metrical data. The species are, therefore, listed in order of abundance. In some cases a significant phrase or adjective is quoted from the text so that a better idea of the
frequencies of tihe species is given. Where it is not possible to judge which species was most abundant the various species are placed in brackets to signify this uncertainty.
(c) The data concerning bones from Tynemouth are only from the most recent excavation.
(d) The data from Windmill Hill (Jope, M. 1965) concerning food animals does not include red deer. Red, and other, deer are included for those sites for which data are available.
(e) The data for Puddlehill have been recalculated to include only ox, pig and sheep. Red and roe deer have been excluded as they were represented only by shed antlers.
(f) Not all reports on animal bones include data about horse remains. Opinions vary as to the extent to which ancient peoples ate horse. Despite the lack of any evidence of cracking of horse bones for marrow at either Catcote or Corstopitum, the bones of horses have been included in the calculations to arrive at frequencies of each species.
(g) The data for Les Camps Des Matignons (Poulain-Josien, T., 1966) have been recalculated so that the so called Bos taurus $L$ (boeuf) and Bos primigenius $L$ (Le grand boeuf) are treated together as are roe and red deer. Sheep and goat have been grouped together and the distinction between domestic pig (le pore - Sus domesticus $L$ ) and wild pig (le sanglier - Sus scrofa L) has been abandoned for this comparison. This bulking of wild and domestic animals, although useful from the food point of view, cuts across the
distinction between hunting and farming.
(h) Data dealing with skeletal remains from several Irish sites are expressed in terms of weight (Roche, G., Stelfox, A.W., in Hencken, H., 1936, 1942, 1950).
(i) Data for the Roman levels at Upton, Gloucestershire, (Yealland, S. and Higgs, E.S., 1966) refersf to percentages calculated on numbers of bone fragments counted and does not include loose teeth.

RGLATIVE FREQUUENCIES OF FOOD FORMING SPECIES AT CERTAIN
ANCIENI SITES
Mesolithic sites
Star Carr

Roe \& red deer, elk, ox, pig, no sheep

Ox, sheep, pig, roe and red deer, horse teeth

Ox $51.7 \%$, sheep- $24.1 \%$, pig $18.1 \%$, roe \& red deer 6.1\%, horse teeth nil.

Ox $68.1 \%$, sheep $14.6 \%$, pig $14.3 \%$, roe \& red deer $3.0 \%$, horse teeth nil.

Pig $43.2 \%$, sheep $33.8 \%$, ox $23 \%$
Pig $60.0 \%$, ox $40 \%$, sheep nil.
Pig 65.5\%, ox 33.3\%, sheep 1.2\%
Ox, sheep, pig
Ox, sheep, pig rare, red deer
Ox, red deer, sheep scarce, few pig remains, horse absent.
(Ox), sheep, pig scanty, red \& roe deer, horse (R).

Ox, pig, sheep, roe deer, no horse or red deer.

Ox very abundant, sheep \& pig scanty roe and red deer.

Ox $70.3 \%$, pig $17.2 \%$, sheep $12.5 \%$
Ox $60 \%$, sheep $24.8 \%$, pig $15.2 \%$
Ox $61.2 \%$, pig $24.5 \%$, sheep $14.3 \%$
Ox, pig, sheep scanty.

## Bronze Age Sites

Boscombe Down
Castle Hill Newhaven

Jarlshof Sumburgh
Lowes Farm Littleport
Maiden Castle II Bronze levels
Milden Hall Fell

Minnis Bay
Ogbourne West Enc.
Overton Hill Avebury
Ratfyn Amesbury
Skendlebury Lincs.

## Iron Agd sites

All Cannings Cross
Camerton
Catcote

Glastonbury

High Field Pit Dwelling
Little Woodbury
Llyn Cerrig Bach Anglesey
Uydney I

Ox, sheep, goat, pig, horse Ox, sheep, pig, horse, red \& roe deer

Sheep, ox \& pony, pig, walrus, whale, no deer.

Report on cattle skeleton only. $0 x$

Ox, sheep, pig, roe \& red deer, no horse.

Ox, sheep \& horse.
Ox, sheep
Ox, horse 틀 pig. No sheep.
Ox, pig, bear and deer
Ox, pig \& sheep, horse \& 3 kinds deers
(Ox, sheep), horse, pig, red deer.
Ox, sheep, horse, pig (few)
Ox $54.6 \%$, sheep $39.6 \%$, pig $9.1 \%$, horse 5.5\%, red deer 0.2\%

Sheep \& Ox, pig (fairly numerous), horse.

Present - horse, ox, sheep, pig
Ox, sheep, horse, pig
Ox, sheep, horse
Ox, pig, rabbit, sheep, fallow deer.

Maiden Castle II
Staple Howe

Trundle II - Iron Age

Ok, (horse, sheep, pig)
Ox, sheep, pig were most abundant, horse.

Ox, sheep, (pig \& roe deer), horse.

Ox, pig, horse
Ox, sheep, pig, horse, red deer
Ox $51 \%$, pig $23 \%$, deer (?red) $8.0 \%$, horse 5.7\%, sheep 4.6\%
"numerous" remains of pig, ox, roe deer, sheep, horse \& whale

Ox $65 \%$, pig $20.2 \%$, sheep $10.7 \%$, red deer $3.1 \%$, horse $1.0 \%$

Ox $71 \%$, sheep $14.4 \%$, pig $6.9 \%$, horse 6.6\%, deer $1.1 \%$

Ox $60.5 \%$, pig $18.7 \%$, sheep $14.6 \%$, horse 6.2\%

Ox $56 \%$, sheep $27 \%$, horse $13 \%$, pig $4 \%$
Ox, sheep, pig, horse. "No deer present"
"Horse exceptionally numerous", "Ux very numerous". Sheep \& pig.

Ox, sheep, horse, pig, deer Ox, pig, sheep, horse, red deer.

Ox, horse, pig, sheep, red \& roe deer elk.

Sheep $42.2 \%$, ox $34.7 \%$, horse $19.1 \%$, pig $3.0 \%$, red \& roe deer $1.0 \%$

Ox, (pig, sheep, horse), red deer
(Ox, sheep, pig "all very numerous"), horse, roe deer

Upton
The Rumps *
Twyford 'I'

Woodcuts

Woodyates

Sheep $\mathbf{7 2 \%}$, ox $21 \%$, horse $5 \%$, pig $2 \%$
Sheep 68\%, pig 18\%, ox $14 \%$
Sheep $35.8 \%$, ox $26.9 \%$, pig $17.9 \%$, horse $13.5 \%$, red deer $5.9 \%$

Ox $41.8 \%$, sheep $30.8 \%$, pig $13.6 \%$, horse $10.7 \%$, roe \& red deer $3.2 \%$

Ox $37.7 \%$, sheep $33.8 \%$, horse $26.2 \%$, pig 2.1\%, roe deer 0.2\%

Mediaeval sites

Kirkstall
Pontefract

Tynemouth
Well Street, Coventry *
WharramPercy
York

Ox $90 \%$, sheep $5 \%$, pig $3 \%$, red deer $2 \%$ Sheep $45 \%$, ox $30 \%$, pig $20 \%$, red deer $5 \%$ Sheep $50 \%$, pig $26.6 \%$ ox $24.4 \%$, deer nil. Ox $72 \%$, sheep $13.3 \%$, pig $10.7 \%$, horse $4.0 \%$ Sheep $60 \%$, ox $30 \%$, pig $9 \%$, red deer $1.0 \%$ Ox $60 \%$, sheep $30 \%$, pig $10.0 \%$, red deer nil

* calculated on the basis of minimum number of animals.

The types of animals at both Catcote and Corstopitum in order of abundance were -

Ox, sheep, pig, horse, red deer.

The frequencies of the animals at Catcote are strikingly akin to the frequencies calculated from Pitt-Rivers' (1888) report on the RomanoBritish village at Woodcuts.

The relative order of abundance of species at Corstopitum is similar to that calculated for Woodcuts (Pitt-Rivers, M.L., 1888) and to those inferred for Barr Hill (Bryce, T.H., 1906), Exeter (Fraser, F.C., 1952), Segontium (Watson, D.M.S.) and Silchester (Jones, H., 1891), (Newton, E.T., 1904).

It is striking that Corstopitum has the highest percentage of ox bones recorded for any of the Roman sites discussed here.

Proudfoot (1961) has commented on the danger of underestimating the extent to which sheep were kept by considering only the faunal evidence from sites, i.e. the bones found being essentially those of the animals eaten and not those of animals kept to grow wool.

Yealland, S. and Higgs, E.S. (1966) have very properly shown that these percentage frequency figures may not accurately indicate the amount of meat which each species supplies. Accepting their estimated weights, a sheep weighs 125 lbs., a cow 900 lbs., a horse 800 lbs , and a pig 200 lbs. and making their assumption that all these domestic animals were eatenthe percentages of meat supplied by each species would be
 tithat freanam if the ne othensis?
as follows -

| CORSTOPITUM |  | CATCOTE |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Ox | $88.3 \%$ |  | Ox |
| Sheep | $2.5 \%$ |  | Sheep |
| Pig | $2.0 \%$ |  | $9.5 \%$ |
| Horse | $7.2 \%$ | Pig | $3.5 \%$ |
|  |  | Horse | $8.4 \%$ |

At Catcote and Corstopitum as at Windmill Hill (Jope, M., 1965) domestic animals, especially cattle, play an important part in the economy. The higher percentage of sheep at Tynemouth is similar to those reported at Pontefract (Ryder, M.L., 1961) and Larrybane (Proudfoot, B.B. and Wilson, B.C.S., 1961). The relative scarcity of Red Deer bones has been remarked upon in the description of the Corstopitum material and it may be that other food was more easily procured (compare Roche, G. \& Stelfox, A.W. in Hencken, H. 1936). The almost complete absence of bird and fish bones from Catcote and Corstopitum is striking but this may be due to their rapid erosion in soils of this type.

Proudfoot (1961) in commenting on the paucity of fish bones from Irish sites has suggested that it may be misleading for fish bones, like many bird bones, would disintegrate more quickly than animal bones and might also have been eaten by dogs or cats. However none of the bones from Corstopitum or Catcote show signs of gnawing.

## (c) TYPES OF CATTLE FOUND ON ANCIENI STMES

In reviewing the evidence of cattle remains from British Archaeological sites, Jewell (1962) has referred to the difficulty in distinguishing the types that are present. The types present are, in Jewell's view, Bos primigenius, the wild aurochs, and a number of varieties of

Bos taurus, the domestic ox. Of the latter Jewell discusses the Neolithic Ox which had close affinities with Bos primigenius, and the Celtic Shorthorn, Bos longifrons, notable for its diminutive form. The detailed archaeological reports for Neolithic and Early Bronze Age sites in Britain provide descriptive, if not metrical evidence, of two kinds of ox, one being undoubtedly, the wild aurochs or Bos primigenius, the other, believed by many authors to be a domesticated Neolithic longhorned ox. Trow Smith (1957) recalls Pigiott's (1954) contention that there were two types of Bos primigenius in Britain, one smaller than the other and forming a prototype for the Neolithic Ox. Jope (1960) describes remains in Irish Quaternary deposits as belonging to "a breed of Ox other than what has been called Bos primigenius" and compares it to the small types described at Star Carr (Fraser 1954) Juliet Clutton-Brock has similarly described, from an almost certain pre-Neolithic context, the remains of $O x$ smaller than the usual Bos primigenius (Bellamy et al. 1966 and personal communication). There is therefore some evidence of variation in size of indigenous cattle before the Neolithic period so that it becomes increasingly difficult to determine the course of cattle domestication in Britain. Trow Smith (1957) contends that the two types of Bos primigenius discussed by Pigott, would interbreed from time to time producing a wide range of intermediate types, while Jewell (1962) has speculated that Neolithic Oxen, brought as domestic stock from the continent, could Gave cross-bred with wild indigenous cattle and that these crosses would have shown hybrid vigour and would have given rise to some of the large remains such as are found at Maiden Castle (details are discussed later). He dismisses the speculation, however, with the
conclusion that all the large specimens are probably the remains of wild Bos primigenius. Trow Smith (1957) has revived Pigott's (1954) notion that domestication need not initially have produced animals as docile as our present domestic stock, and suggests that the first Neolithic settlers did not necessarily bring their own domesticated stock with them but that they may have taken the wild auroch calves of Britain and tamed them to their purpose. To avoid the confusion of referring to Bos primigenius (wild aurochs), and to a possible near relative of it, i.e. a domesticated longhorned Neolithic $0 x$ of "primigenius" type, Howard (1962) has revived the nomenclature Bos taurus frontosus, first used by Nilsson in 1849, to describe the Neolithic domestic ox.

Thus according to Miss Howard, there are three types to consider -
(a) Bos taurus primigenius - the wild aurochs or URUS
(b) Bos taurus frontosus - domesticated Neolithic Ox
(c) Bos taurus longifrons - Celtic Shorthorn

Jewell (1962) describes the probable decline in Bos primigenius during the late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age but we know from the work of Higgs and Shawcross (1961) that it persisted until the Early Bronze Age. It was formerly generally agreed that the Celtic Ox, Bos taurus longifrons, did not appear at British sites for some centuries after a form of Neolithic domestic ox, having some of the features of Bos primigenius, was established, i.e. the Bos taurus frontosus of Howard. (See Trow-Smith (1957) and Jewell (1962) for discussion). However, the report on the cattle remains from Neolithic pits at Puddlehill (Field, Mathews and Smith,l日64) reporting a small domestic variety
of oxen along with a larger creature, possibly a female Bos primigenius, may cause us to revise this opinion. Certainly when discussing continental sites, Zeuner (1963) has recalled the finding by Dottrens (1948) of "longifrons" cattle at the lowermost stratum of the Neolithic site at Saint-Aubin, on Lake Bienne in Switzerland. Jewell (1962) has remarked upon the lack of metrical data about cattle from early sites but the published accounts give an impression of a type of apparently domestic animal, intermediate in stature between the wild aurochs (Bos taurus primigenius) and the later (?) Celtic Shorthorn (Bos taurus longifrons). Of remains at Stonehenge and Maiden Castle (Jackson 1935 and 1943) and at Windmill Hill (Jewell 1962), oxen are claimed to be of a "primigenius" type.

Of the Skara Brae cattle (Watson 193i), Jewell (1962), discounts Watson's claim that they were larger than other Neolithic cattle and presumes them to be of a "primigenius" type. It is interesting to note that Watson felt he was dealing with "only one breed of larger cattle" despite sexual Trimorphism due to alleged castration. Of cattle at Hoodhenge (Jackson 1929), we are told "The domestic ox does not conform to Bos longifrons. It is more robust and having a different type of horn. Inhabitants of this site possessed domesticated long horned cattle allied to the Urus but smaller than that species". He claimed that there were dwarf forms of a primigenius race.

Of the Whitehawk Bay cattle, Jackson (1934) states "The Oxen are not Bos longifrons, being more robust with larger horns and a wider skull". While of the Thickthorn Down (Jackson 1936) he says "they are not Celtic Shorthorn but rather animals with long robust horns". At

Trundle (Watson 1928 and 1930) the remains are described as being from a small ox with powerful horns.

The case appears to be made that there was, on Neolithic sites, in addition to the wild aurochs, a domestic type of oxen of robust proportions. The specialist reports of material from Bronze Age levels contain similar descriptions. Jackson (1931) said of aattle remains found at Overton Hill "all the others are larger and more robust and agree closely with the remains of the large ox at Woodhenge. They indicate a bigger ox than the typical Bos longifrons of early Iron Age sites". At Jarlshof Sumburgh, Shetland, Platt (1933) described remains of Shetland $O x$ and the presence of a larger ox. Cattle bones from Castle Hill (Hackson 1934) are said to be more robust than those attributed to Bos longifrons, while a horn core from Boscombe Down is said by the same author (Jackson 1936) to be "larger and much coarser, and fluted and belonging to another type". Of a horn core from Ratfyn, Jackson (1935) says "It is Bos primigenius kind but smaller than the true Urus". Of the bones, he says "It is clear that the ox bones do not belong to the small Celtic ox of the old Iron Age sites". He claims that "The oxen of Ratfyn, Stonehenge, Windmill Hill, Woodley and Whitehawk Camps appear to have been of a robust type with large horn cores derived, possibly, from a Bos primigenius stem".

A large horn core is reported by Jackson (1936) at Mildenhall Fen, while robust horn cores from Minnis Bay (Jackson 1943) are attributed by him to Bos taurus frontosus.

The published references for Mesolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age sites
suggest that there were present cattle which were clearly not the diminutive Celtic Shorthorn (Bos longifrons) nor the large Urus (Bos primigenius). It would appear reasonable, therefore, to group such remains together and consider the Neolithic domestic ox as a successor to the smaller Mesolithic $0 x$. How it was domesticated and whether it was a distinct breed, i.e. Bos taurus frontosus, will remain a matter of speculation in the absence of fresh material and metrical data. At Catcote and Corstopitum, however, all the material appears to belong to Celtic Shorthorn (Bos taurus longifronsl.

## (1) Diversity of Size

Jewell (1962) has commented on (1) the gradual diminution in size of cattle from British ancient sites from the Neolithic Ox of the earlier sites to the Celtic Shorthorn so common in the Iron Age and (2) the diversity of types of cattle from Roman sites with the emergence of beasts larger than those which commonly existed in the preceding centuries. Jewell's (1962) work has been extended to include the new data from Corstopitum and from Catcote along with data recorded for sites not included in Jewell's comparison. Figures No.5-9 refer and are discussed in turn.

## Figure No. 5.

This compares the metacarpal length ranges of cattle remains reported from twenty-nine sites.

The six specimens from Catcote fall within the lower part of the Corstopitum range and the ranges for other Romano-British sites. The range of the Catcote material compares well with the Iron Age materialfrom Glastonbury and All Cannings Cross as well as with Bronze

Age material from Jarlshof. It is apparently shorter than modern material except for Kerry Cow and Chillingham cattle. The paucity of collections of modern material makes it dangerous to draw exact comparisons with modern breeds. The top part of the Corstopitum and other Romano-British ranges must represent animals with substantially bigger metacarpals than those found among Iron Age animals. Possibly these bones belonged to bulls or they represent a bigger variety of cattle.

Figure No. 6.
This compares the distal width ranges of aattle remains reported from twenty-three sites.

The range for Corstopitum is very great. Some of the bones are as narrow as anything published for British sites and almost as narrow as a specimen of Chillingham bull, while others are as wide as much of the modern material in The Royal Veterinary College except for a Chartley Bull specimen; indeed they are wider than any clearly domesticated prehistoric animals.

The Catcote material shows a smaller range which fits into the middle range of Iron Age Glastonbury and Roman Corstopitum. The Catcote range is similar to that of the mediaeval material from Petergate, tending to be narrower in extent than the ranges reported for Windmill Hill and Woodhenge and being made up of bones which were themselves narrower than similar bones reported at either of these sites.

## Figure No.7.

This compares the distal width ranges of cattle humens bones recovered
from seventeen sites.
. The Corstopitum material has the widest range for any site except Star Carr. The narrowest bones being narrower than even modern Chillingham bull while the widest bones reach well into the modern ragne. The widest specimens are not as wide as some reported from Mesolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age sites.

The few specimens fromCCatcote lie in the middle range of the Corstopitum material and compare well with mediaeval and some modern material, especially Jersey and Chillingham specimens.

## Figure No. 8.

This compares the astragalus length ranges for cattle remains from eighteen sites.

At both Corstopitum and Catcote astragalus lengths are shorter than most of the modern material in the Royal Veterinary College but not as short as much of the Iron Age Glastonbury material: If we assume a general dimunition of cattle bones in time down to the Iron Age then the Catcote and Corstopitum materials may represent a start of an increase in size reflected in the longer astragalus bones reported for the Roman site of Highdole Hill and the Mediaeval site at Northolt.

Figure No.9.
This compares the scatter of cattle metacarpal distal widths from mesolithic, neolithic, Iron Age, Roman and mediaeval sites with those of sune modern material.

The Corstopitum range is again great, on the one hand overlapping into the wide specimens of Bos primigenius from Star Carr and the wide
specimens from mediaeval and modern times, on the other hand the bulk of the specimens are more gracile than either the smallest Neolithic or mediaeval material.

The Catcote range is small but it fits into the Corstopitum range. Grígson, C. (1965) has attempted comparisons of cattle on the bases of measurements of sagittal length and proximal breadth of the second phalanx. This has been extended to include the Catcote and Corstopitum data.

Figure No. 10 (a)

## Scatter of sagittal lengths of middle phalanx

The Corstopitum material shows a wider range than the Catcote material. There is some evidence of a bigger boned animal present at Corstopitum and absent from Catcote; an animal comparable in size with some of the Bos primigenius specimens from Star Carr as regards this particular measurement.

Figure No. 10 (b)

## Scatter of proximal breadths of middle phalanx

The Corstopitum and Catcote specimens are substantially narrower than the Wild Danish Maglemosian material and the Star Carr Bos primigenius but are not very different in size from the Windmill Hill material. With shortage of Iron Age material it is difficult to discern whether the biggest specimens from Corstopitum are a survival of prehistoric bigness or the advent of increase of size which continues into mediaeval and modern times.

Published references to larger animals on Roman sites are frequent, Bryce (1906), speaking of cattle remains from Bar Hill Fort says "The Romans here had a larger, probably mixed breed of oxen, besides the Celtic Shorthorn".

At Clausentum (Cornwall 1958) reference is made to "one larger specimen of cattle possibly a throwback". Of the earlier Corstopitum material Meek \& Gray (1911) commented יNumerous variations in size seem to us to indicate the many different types of domesticated Bos that existed in Britain during the Roman period." In the first report on animal bones from Silchester (Jones 1891) it is suggested that possibly two sub-varieties of ox are present. At Colchester (Jackson 1958) a larger ox is reported upon and it is likened to the Woodhenge type. The same author reporting on cattle from Highdole Hill (Jackson 1936) mentions cattle larger than the Celtic $O x$ and suggests that they may have been imported to this country and used for draft purposes. Two breeds of cattle, one large and the other small, are reported from the Roman levels at Lydney (Watson 1932), while at Newstead, Ewart (1911) speaks of bones belonging to "cross bred animals" heavily built animals used for transport. McKenny Hughes (1896) in his review of breeds of cattle from British archaeological sites concludes that the Romans improved the Celtic Shorthorn by crossing it with cattle importdd from Italy. The same author cogently argues the case that the Celtic Shorthorn stock found here by the Romans, was improved by them, and that this improved stock was the basis of our present varieties of cattle.

Against this is Bryner Jones (1942) evidence that a wide variety of cattle breeds, similar and ancestral to our present breeds, is found on Irish Early Christian Period sites. This variety can scarcely be the result of imports of fresh stocks of cattle from the Roman world.

## (ii) Variations in horn size

At Corstopitum, of the few skulls retrieved in 1966 there are some where the horn cores are reduced to mere scurrs but none of which is polled. It will be recalled that at Glastonbury (Dawkins, Boyd and Jackson 1917) the horn cores are reported as being mere scurrs while at Bar Hill (Bryce 1906) and All Cannings Cross (Jackson 1923) a new phenomenon, the polled animal is reported. Whether the polled cattle are a genetic reversion or are due to an influx of Scandinavian stock is discussed by Proudfoot (1961). Most modern authorities would suppose polled cattle to be a genetic reversion.

Speaking of cattle in Britain during the eighteenth century, TrowSmith (1959) says "Most of these black cattle were long-horned, but there was a polled strain running through them, particularly in northern Britain®, and although this hornless characberistic was very ancient - indeed, probably synchronous with the beginnings of pastoral husbandry in Britain - it had rarely, if ever, yet been bred for and its carriers deliberately multiplied." Possibly people from the ancient sites described in the reports considered in this thesis, prized horn and actually selected against the polled form, so that only rarely would it appear among cattle remains.

## (iii) Types of dentition

The variant bearing only five premolars and molars has been discussed in the detailed report of the Corstopitum material earlier in this thesis, but it is interesting to note that similar ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ five toothed types have been reported at several sites, Maiden Castle (Jackson 1943), Woodhenge (Jackson 1929), and Glastonbury (Dawkins, Boyd \& Jackson 1917) as weil as at Corstopitum (Meek \& Gray 1911). Jackson, J.W. (1929) recalls the fact that this "five toothed" condition was known to Rütimeyer (1862) who regarded it as unimportant while we have already noted the variable occurrence of this feature in Chillingham cattle.

## (iv) Development and variability of a mesial prominence

The development of a "mesial prominence" along the inter-cornual ridge was formerly supposed to be one of the attributes of domestication. The presence of such a prominence is recorded in the reports from Whitehawk Bay (Jackson 1934), Minnis Bay (Jackson 1943), Glastonbury (Dawkins, Boyd \& Jackson 1917), Maiden Castle (Iron Age levels) (Jackson 1943), and has been reported earlier in this work for one of the skulls from Catcote. Jewell (1962) re-examining the Star Carr material, detected the presence of a mesial prominence in undoubtedly wild material so this criterion of domestication is rejected and was, therefore, not invoked previously in discussion of Neolithic Ox.

## (d) CONCLUSIONS

The skeletal remains from Benwell Fort Well tell us little about the animals kept or hunted by our ancestors because the bone material was dug out and no record of depth or horizon was kept. It is known that the atlas of one cow is from Roman times because it was associated with Roman pottery similar to that described by Charlesworth (1960) and belonging to the same Well. The massive red deer antlers are presumed, from their great size, to be ancient.

The animal remains from Tynemouth Priory are somewhat unlike the remains from several mediaeval sites in that Ox remains are fewer than sheep or pig. Here, as at WharramPercy and Pontefract (Ryder 1959) sheep bones are in the majority. It may be that this is due to sampling difficulties, i.e. the material comes only from the most recent excavation. The bones appear to have been cracked as if for marrow extraction.

The animal remains from Catcote and Corstopitum are similar in both the frequency of the different animal species present, and in the types of species present. The higher percentage of cattle bones at Corstopitum compared with the lower percentage at Catcote may reflect the difference between a garrison town and an agricultural settlement. Haverfield (1920) in arguing that in the Early Empire, the Roman army was fed mainly on cereals, and ate comparatively little meat, concedes the point that in the later Empire the consumption of flesh increased. He claims that the prata or territoria attached to fortresses or forts were at least to some extent grazing grounds for regimental cattle
which the soldiers called pequarii herded. The same author refers to an inscription in Cumberland which mentions certain venatores and suggests that they "saw to the provision of fresh meat". In commenting upon the absence of byre like buildings in the Roman forts of Housesteads and Gellygaer, Haverfield maintains that if the garrisons lived on fresh beef or mutton they must have pastured their herds somewhere outside the forts. He doubts whether the Romans $c$ ould have grazed their cattle in safety outside the ramparts and suggests that either another method for getting meat must have been adopted or that the Roman garrisons depended for their food on something else than a supply of fresh meat. Possibly it was part of the economy of Catcote and similar settlements to supply beef and mutton to garrisons such as Corstopitum!

At Catcote and Corstopitum the bones are broken and split as if for marrow. The Catcote material often having the bone shafts broken several times.

Of the Corstopitum animals it appears that the sheep were slender legged somewhat similar to the Soay sheep, while the horses were small as compared to modern day standards ranging in size from that of a pit pony to a small horse of fourteen and a half hands. The Corstopitum pig remains are heavily eroded and very different from recent defleshed specimens. They hint of a longer legged animal; possibly they correspond to the so called Irish Grehound pig which figures so frequentiy in reports from Irish sites. (See Roche, G. \& Stelfox, A.W. 1936 also Proudfoot, V.B. 1961 for discussion). This
type of pig was of an athletic type being free to forage about in scrubland. The main intereist rests on the cattle remains from Corstopitum. The measurements of bones discussed in detail show a large range of size, often including bones as short or as narrow as anything reported from other sites, and others as long and as wide as. some mediaeval and modern material. It remains difficult to $e$ Suminal: ascertain whether this largiess is a hangover of ancient massiveness from a Bos taurus primigenius stock or wlether it is the beginning of a new increase in size culminating in the large types of the mediaeval period. Jewell's (1962) contention that there was a gradual dimunition in size of cattle from Neolithic times to Iron Age is sustained by comparison of the published data. His claim that there was a diversity of types of cattle from Roman sites and the emergence of larger beasts seems to be bonne out by the large ranges of bone sizes of the Corstopitum material and the descriptions of material from other sites quoted in this thesis. The large amount of data we have for the Corstopitum cattle bones taken together with the data gained from future annual excavations there should permit the application of statistical methods. It may be that by these means we shall be able to throw some light on the origin of these larger forms.
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[^0]:    + = eroded. * = incinerated or burnt so as to be brittle.

