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Animal Bone<br>By Sheila Hamilton-Dyer

## Introduction and methods

[Note: All tables are grouped together at the end of this report]
Following assessment, assemblages from the main sites were selected for analysis. Just over 10,000 individual bone specimens were recorded, at two levels of analysis.

For contexts analysed at the higher level all bone was recorded in detail, including the small amounts recovered by sieving. Each bone was identified to taxon as closely as possible, using the author's modern comparative collections. All individual bone specimens were identified to element with the following exceptions: ribs and vertebrae of the ungulates (other than axis, atlas, and sacrum) were identified only to the level of cattle/horse-sized and sheep/pig-sized. This restriction does not apply to burials and other associated bones where ribs and vertebrae were assigned to species. Unidentified shaft and other fragments were similarly divided. Any fragments that could not be assigned even to this level have been recorded as mammalian only. Where possible, sheep and goat were separated using the methods of Boessneck (1969), Payne (1985) and Halstead and Collins (2002). Recently broken bones were joined where possible and have been counted as single specimens. Tooth eruption and wear stages of cattle, sheep and pig mandibles were recorded following Grant (1982). A suite of measurements was taken on bones with at least one fused epiphysis, or with a mature appearance for non-fusing bones such as the astragalus. These mainly follow von den Driesch (1976) for mammals and birds and are in millimetres unless otherwise stated. Withers height calculations of the domestic ungulates are based on factors recommended by von den Driesch and Boessneck (1974). Shoulder heights of dogs are calculated using the factors of Harcourt (1974). Other information such as preservation, gnawing, butchery and abnormality was recorded as appropriate.

The second group of material was recorded at a lower level of detail. For the main (domestic) taxa the taxon, measurements and mandibular aging only were recorded. Minor species such as birds were recorded in detail as in the first group. Notes were also made of any unusual bones or special groupings in the main taxa. Supporting tables not given in text form part of the archive.

## Results

The total of individual bone specimens recorded at the higher level of detail is 5573 (Group A). The total recorded at the lower level is 4482 (Group B, scan). The selection was split as evenly as possible between the phases. The bones from the smaller sites of Knapwell Plantation (KP), Jeavons Lane (JL) and Little Common Farm (LCF) were all recorded at the higher level, as was a selection from Lower Cambourne (LC; also referenced here as LG). The bone selected for the lower level of detail is the remainder from this large site (LC/LG scan). The small amount of bone from other sites was not examined.

Bone from sieved samples offers two main types of data: the smallest elements of large mammals and the remains of small fauna such as fish. These are less likely to be fully collected by hand and may even be missed completely. Animal bone from sieved samples thus provides a check on the possible biases in the hand collected assemblage and can also provide significant information on the smaller fauna. All the sieved samples were examined from the contexts selected for detailed analysis (Group A). Not all contexts were sampled and not all samples produced animal bone. There is bone from 113 samples, but totalling only 1014 bone specimens. These include a few bones of voles and mice and some of cattle, sheep and pig. There are no bones of fish or birds. The vast majority of the remains ( $71 \%$ in Phase 2 and $91 \%$ in Phase 3) were undiagnostic fragments of large mammals, often no more than a couple of centimetres in size. Most samples offered less than 10 specimens in total and were added to the context totals, but a summary of the taxa by context is given in archive. Although the contribution is minor, it is worth noting that several of the smaller foot elements of sheep/goat are mainly from these samples and, for Phase 2 , all four of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ phalanx and all five of the $3^{\text {rd }}$ phalanx. Any samples from the Group B contexts were not closely examined but appeared to be similar in character.

## Material from minor phases

There are just 34 fragments from contexts assigned to Phase 1 (Bronze Age), which includes material from features classified as natural. As there are so few, these are mainly excluded from the analysis detailed below. The taxa counts are listed in those tables that give all phases and are fully detailed in archive. Similarly there is a small amount of material from Phases 4 (Saxon), 5 (medieval) and 6 (post-medieval) and some unphased material, these are treated in the same way and the majority of the analysis concentrates on Phases 2 and 3, the Iron Age and Romano-British material respectively.

## Taphonomic considerations

With such a large excavation area covering several separate sites it is particularly important to examine the preservation of material prior to other analysis; differing condition is likely to affect, among others, taxa representation, ageing data and measurements and therefore introduce bias into the analysis.

The overall preservation state of each context group was classified to one of five categories:

| 1 | Good |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Quite good |
| 3 | Fair |
| 4 | Poor |
| 5 | Very poor |
| 6 | Mixed |

To be classed as 1 (good) almost all bone fragments in the context were required to have intact surfaces with no erosion or breakage. Class 2 (quite good) was assigned to contexts where most bones had slight surface damage but where fine details such as butchery are still visible. Class 3 (fair) contexts contain bones where at least half have
such a degree of surface damage that some details are obscured and measurements are restricted. Contexts classed as 4 (poor) contained many bones that were damaged enough by breakage and attrition to prevent detailed recording, while in the case of 5 (very poor) the bones are much eroded and few can be identified beyond a general grouping. Class 6 (mixed) was used where contexts contain bones with several different individual states of preservation and no clear overall category. In addition the individual records of Group A material give further details of the condition of each specimen. These include erosion, gnawing, burning and other aspects of appearance such as flaking and staining.

Most of the bones are lightly soil-stained and with a chalky appearance where broken. Many have poor mechanical integrity and were often recorded as brittle, fragmenting along natural weaknesses. The bone surfaces frequently show meandering 'root' marks where plant roots and/or fungal hyphae have chemically eroded the bone (Plate Animal Bone 1). Although many contexts have been classed poor or fair, there is an enormous amount of variation both within and between contexts. Regardless of condition, it was usually possible to classify the majority of fragments to taxonomic group and anatomical element. Where bone surfaces were not intact fine details (such as butchery, gnawing and pathology) were difficult to see and sometimes all details were obliterated entirely. This must inevitably bias results at an individual bone and context level. If these effects apply to equal proportions of assemblages (e.g. to both Iron Age and Romano-British) then overall analysis will remain valid, if not then this bias must be taken into account during analysis. Comparisons were thus made between sites, phases, context types and taxa to establish whether there were any patterns to the preservation state.


Plate Animal Bone 1. 'Root' marks on surface of bone

In total there are 10,055 bone specimens from 1072 contexts, of which $92 \%$ is from Phases 2 and 3, Iron Age and Romano-British respectively. The Lower Cambourne material combined accounts for $69 \%$ of the contexts and almost $73 \%$ of all bone. Over a third of contexts $(36.6 \%)$ were classed as fair and a further $28 \%$ as quite good. Contexts classed as poor account for $25 \%$. Little Common Farm and Lower Cambourne have the highest numbers of quite good contexts and the lowest number of poor (Table Animal Bone 1). Contexts and fragments classed as mixed or at either extreme are relatively few from any of the sites. If fragment counts are examined the results are similar for overall percentages: $36 \%$ fair, $29 \%$ quite good and $20 \%$ poor. There are, however, marked differences between the sites (Table Animal Bone 2). Knapwell Plantation and Little Common Farm have the highest proportion of quite good and the lowest for poor. Jeavons Lane has the lowest value for quite good, most fragments being classed as fair or poor. The two groups of material from Lower Cambourne are similar but not as close as might be expected; the Group B, scanned, material is slightly less well preserved. This difference appears to be relative to the amounts of bone from the two main phases. In both groups Phase 2 material is better preserved than Phase 3 and a much higher proportion of the Group B material is from this phase. For Group B $60 \%$ of the bone is from Phase 3 and $31 \%$ from Phase 2 whereas this is almost reversed for the Group A material - $60 \%$ from Phase 2 and $27 \%$ from Phase 3 (Table Animal Bone 3). This might also explain the results for Jeavons Lane as this too has a higher proportion of material from Phase 3. Again, Little Common Farm has quite well preserved material and almost all from this site is from Phase 2. Although this difference is not large it appears to be consistent and cannot be due to recorder bias as the material was recorded prior to phase assignment.

Context type can also affect preservation; shallow features often contain less wellpreserved material than ditches and pits. Overall the best preserved bone is from well fills, with $87 \%$ of the bone from contexts classed as quite good, but this feature type accounts for only 98 bones, just $1 \%$ of the total. The majority of the bone is from ditch fills, 6224 specimens and $63 \%$ of the total (Table Animal Bone 4). For ditch fills $30 \%$ of the bones are from fills classed as quite good, $36 \%$ as fair and $16 \%$ poor. Pit fills are the next highest contributor of bones at 1579 specimens, $16 \%$ of the total. These fills are similar in preservation class as the ditch fills but with a slightly higher proportion of quite good (39\%). The smallest site, Knapwell Plantation, has the highest proportion of material from pits ( $487,56 \%$ ). The number of pit fill fragments equals that from Lower Cambourne, but at that site this type contributes only $20 \%$. Jeavons Lane is the only site with significant amounts from other feature types, in this case spreads account for $17.4 \%$ of the bone (Table Animal Bone 5). The difference already noted between the phases, however, does not reflect feature type; most bone from both main phases is from ditches, $50 \%$ in Phase 2 and $46 \%$ in Phase 3 (Tables Animal Bone 6 and 7).

The proportions of the taxa can also be affected by preservation; large bones are more likely to survive and be collected than small ones. It can be seen that there is a higher proportion of cattle specimens than sheep/goat from Phase 3. This might be related to survival but first a check must be made on the size of the cattle bones; if they are more broken or butchered than from Phase 2 then the fragment count will be higher although the number of originating bones may not be. The approximate sizes of all
specimens of the main taxa are shown in Table Animal Bone 8. It can be seen that, although there is an expected size difference between taxa, there is no significant difference in the cattle or sheep/goat fragment size between the phases. The representation of phalanges was also examined; due to preservation and recovery bias it is normally expected that those of cattle will be better represented than those of sheep/goat and that the large first phalanx will be more frequent than the smaller $2^{\text {nd }}$ and $3^{\text {rd }}$ within the taxa. This inequality is likely to be greater in poorly preserved material. It can be seen that there is a difference for both cattle and sheep/goat in the representation of the individual phalanges (Table Animal Bone 9). As expected there are more cattle phalanges and less bias towards the first phalanx. There is also a phase difference in both taxa; the proportion of the larger first phalanx in Phase 3 is greater for both taxa, but not markedly so. There may well have been a greater number of sheep/goat phalanges preserved but not collected, as it has already been noted that most of the smaller ones were from sieved samples. Summaries of the taphonomic traces recorded for the bones by phase and by taxon are given in Tables Animal Bone 10 and 11. Half of all the specimens have recent breaks; it has already been noted that the mechanical strength of the bones is often weak. Some bones were often almost intact in the ground but were very soft and recovered in pieces. The large bones of cattle and horse suffered more than those of sheep/goat. Almost $69 \%$ of cattle bones had recent breaks whereas $47 \%$ of sheep/goat had breaks. Gnawing affected around $18 \%$ of both cattle and sheep/goat bones but both gnawing and breakages were more commonly observed on the few horse bones. Phase differences are negligible. It would therefore appear that, although there is a preservational difference between the two phases this is not related to context type, breakage, gnawing or any other obvious taphonomic factors and the affect on taxa representation seems to be minor.

The assemblage overall is typically dominated by bones of the domestic ungulates: cattle, sheep/goat and pig. Other taxa present in small numbers are horse, deer, dog, cat, mustelids (weasel, badger etc), hedgehog, small rodents, birds and an amphibian. The distribution of taxa in the two main phases is summarised in Tables Animal Bone 12 and 13. Archive tables detail taxa distribution by context, site and phase.

## Cattle

Cattle bones dominate the identified assemblage, both in terms of fragment numbers (almost $50 \%$ ) and in physical mass. Cattle-sized bones also dominate the undiagnostic fraction ( $25.7 \%$ ) and, given that there are few horse bones or red deer bones, almost all of these indeterminate large mammal fragments will be of cattle. There is a slight difference between the two main phases in the proportion of cattle bones to those of sheep and pig. In Phase 3 the proportion of cattle and of cattle-sized fragments is higher, $56.5 \%$ compared with $49 \%$ in Phase 2 (Table Animal Bone 14). There are more pig bones in Phase 2 and when cattle is compared to sheep/goat alone the difference is smaller but still present, $58.9 \%$ compared with $54.8 \%$. The proportion of cattle-sized fragments is also higher. It has already been discussed that this might well include a taphonomic element but seems to be a genuine, if small, difference.

All parts of the carcase are represented from the best meat cuts, such as shoulder and rump, to the low value or waste parts of the head and feet. There is inequality in the representation, with the expected taphonomic bias against small bones such as carpals. There are just 13 of these from the entire Group A material, barely enough for a single
animal. The larger and the most sturdy elements such as metapodia, tibia and humerus are much more frequent. Loose teeth account for just over $15 \%$ of the count in both Phase 2 and Phase 3. Any differences in the anatomical distribution between these two phases are negligible (Table Animal Bone 15).

## Butchery

The poor surface condition of many of the bones obscures fine details and precludes detailed analysis. Some specimens, especially those from better preserved contexts, do however show butchery marks. Just 81 specimens in total from all of the detailed analysis (from 5573 bones) were recorded as having tool marks of any kind. Most of these ( 63 marks on 55 bones) were on cattle and cattle-sized fragments (10). It is probable that some of the breaks observed on limb bone shafts were also the result of butchery but breaks, including the spiral type often resulting from a chop to the bone, can also result from trampling and other post-mortem damage. These were, therefore, not recorded as butchery unless damage from the originating implement could be observed and, as has already been noted, few bones were sufficiently preserved. The marks were observed on a wide spread of anatomical elements and were probably made by two different types of implement. The finer marks, probably made by knives, were more frequent in Phase 2, on 13 bones compared with just two in Phase 3. Several of these are consistent with disjointing the ankle to remove the foot, two with separating the humerus and radius at the elbow. Knife marks round two metatarsals and a $1^{\text {st }}$ phalanx would have been made when skinning. Two mandibles from Phase 2 had been cut, one on the inside (tongue removal) and one on the lateral side (skinning or cheek meat removal). The remaining marks also from Phase 2 are on radius, scapula and pelvis and were probably made when removing pieces of meat from the bone. The other, more frequent, type of mark would have been made by a heavy blade, a cleaver or axe. Some of these marks are similarly from removal of feet and joint separation but are much heavier and have often resulted in removal of parts of the bones. Of particular interest are marks on five scapulae from Phase 3 contexts at Jeavons Lane. These include the removal of the process spina and/or shave marks along the edges. These have been reported from many Romano-British assemblages, sometimes in considerable numbers from large-scale butchery dumps. Only one example was observed in a Phase 2 context (5604).

## Ageing

There are very few complete cattle mandibles but there are several with at least one recordable tooth. The distribution of toothwear stages is broadly similar for the two phases, most mandibles are from subadult, adult or even aged animals (Table Animal Bone 16). There are a few of younger animals but none are from young calves. For Phase 2 the distribution, while not even, is well spread out over the stages present but with a peak at the final, adult but not elderly, stage. Loose teeth from this phase include five deciduous $4^{\text {th }}$ premolars and eight $3^{\text {rd }}$ molars, one of which is from an elderly animal. For Phase 3 the distribution is less even with two peaks; one at the subadult stage and another at the adult/elderly stages. For this phase there are no loose $4^{\text {th }}$ deciduous premolars but there are nine $3^{\text {rd }}$ molars, two of which are from elderly animals. Epiphysial fusion data is likely to be less reliable (due to taphonomic factors) and can only give information up to the age of about 4 years when all bones have fused. However, the limited amount of data does offer a similar pattern of mainly
adult and subadult animals. There are only two unfused acetabulae in all of the group of bone elements that fuse by about 10 months. There were, however, a few porous bones as well that probably match the juvenile mandibles in age. In addition there are one or two bones of neonates in both phases. The epiphysial data are similar for the two phases except for the final fusion stage; there are more unfused specimens from Phase 3, $69.6 \%$ compared with $56.8 \%$ in Phase 2 (Table Animal Bone 17). As the poorer state of preservation would, if anything, produce a bias against unfused bones this difference implies that more cattle were killed under 4 years old in Phase 3, matching the mandible data.

Breakages, erosion and unfused epiphyses reduce the number of bones that offer metrical data. A total of 174 specimens were measured, 157 from the two main phases. Measurements are mainly of the elements that have early fusing epiphyses such as scapula, humerus, tibia and metapodia. A summary of the most frequent is given in Table Animal Bone 18. Withers height estimates, mostly but not exclusively from metapodia, range from 1.032 m to 1.322 m with a mean of 1.169 from 30 specimens (Table Animal Bone 19). The metacarpal index was also calculated and gives six as probably male (index value of over 30 ) and four as probably female (index under 30). There is a slight but discernable increase in the measurements and the withers heights between Phase 2 and Phase 3.

## Pathology

Pathologies and non-metrical variations were recorded on 27 specimens, mainly on mandibles, feet and pelvis. Oral pathologies and abnormalities are the most commonly observed. One loose $3^{\text {rd }}$ molar is of the type with a very small final column; not a disease but a variation that may be more prevalent in material of Romano-British date (O'Connor 1989). One mandible exhibits the other non-metrical trait commonly seen in cattle: absence of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ premolar. Other mandibles show evidence of periodontal disease with swelling, erosion and porosity around the molar/premolar gum line. One jaw has a noticeable depression in the probable region of the $4^{\text {th }}$ premolar root (all teeth had been lost), which is probably the site of an abscess with a healed drainage sinus (Plate Animal Bone 2). A maxilla has two abnormalities, the $4^{\text {th }}$ premolar impacted on the $1^{\text {st }}$ molar and a mis-worn $3^{\text {rd }}$ molar. This tooth projects at the rear, probably indicating that the corresponding lower molar is absent or lacks the final column (Plate Animal Bone 3). An astragalus from Lower Cambourne Phase 2 (context 90449) has eburnation (polishing) of the distal lateral face. This part articulates with the distal part of the calcaneum and indicates breakdown of the cartilage. Eburnation is often seen on the pelvic acetabulum and there are two examples here. In the specimen from Phase 2 context 90046 the wear is so severe that the underlying cancellous tissue is exposed (Fig AB4). One metacarpus and two metatarsi are slightly lopsided; this may be an indication of a plough or cart animal. Two other metacarpi, both from Phase 3 contexts, are slightly expanded laterally. One of these also has some eburnation of the distal joint, both further indications of possible draught animals. That particular bone, from Jeavons Lane, was very large (i.e. probable bull or castrate), but was so fragmented that measurement was not possible. Three phalanges also exhibit changes that might indicate working animals; they all have flared or spread proximals. One also has bone extensions involving the shaft (Plates Animal Bone 5 and 6). The cattle include at least some horned animals. Although mainly fragmented, it can be observed that the horn cores are rather
variable. They include short, dense specimens and longer, thinner ones, one of which was noticeably grooved. While age and sex strongly influence horn cores one specimen shows that they can vary individually; this bucranium had both cores, one shorter than the other and down-turned while the longer one was grooved and more horizontally positioned.


Plate Animal Bone 2. Cattle mandible, with probable site of abscess with a healed drainage sinus


Plate Animal Bone 3. Cattle mandible, with the $4^{\text {th }}$ premolar impacted on the $1^{\text {st }}$ molar and a mis-worn $3^{\text {rd }}$ molar


Plate Animal Bone 4. Cattle pelvic acetabulum, with severe eburnation which has exposed underlying cancellous tissue


Plate Animal Bone 5. Cattle phalange, with flared proximal and bone extension involving the shaft


Plate Animal Bone 6. Cattle phalange, with flared proximal and bone extension involving the shaft

Sheep and goat
Of the large number of ovicaprid bones (1373 from the two main phases) relatively few could be distinguished to sheep or goat, partly because they are undiagnostic elements but also because most bones are incomplete. In total 134 could be identified, five as goat and 128 as sheep. There are three fragments of definite goat horn cores; from Phase 2 Lower Cambourne contexts 1143 and 2783, and a piece from a large (male) specimen from Jeavons Lane context 80227 in Phase 2. A frontal bone from
the Lower Cambourne Phase 2 context 90453 can also be identified as goat from the position of the horn core bases and the cranial sutures. One mandible from a goat kid could be identified in the Phase 2 Lower Cambourne context 90040. In contrast 16 mandibles could be identified as being from young lambs. Other positively identified sheep bones include elements of the foot, humeri, radii, scapulae, skull fragments, horn cores and loose deciduous premolars (Table Animal Bone 20).

Just five sheep/goat bones had any observable butchery marks. The partial, horned, goat skull from Phase 2 context 90453 had been axially divided (either to more easily access the horns for working, or to extract the brain). There was a similar example for sheep in Phase 3 context 241. The three remaining marks were made by finer, probably knife, blades on an astragalus, distal tibia and humerus, all consistent with disarticulation.

Ageing data from toothwear and eruption is a little more frequent than for cattle but again there are few complete mandibles. Very few mandibles (or loose teeth) were of young lambs, but there is a wide spread of other stages equating to animals from nine months upwards and including elderly stock. There is a slight difference between the phases, most of the mandibles from Phase 2 fall between stages 3 and 5 and represent subadult and adult animals but not aged ones (Table Animal Bone 21). Phase 3 on the other hand has many mandibles of these stages but also has a peak of mandibles at stages 6 and 7. These mandibles with well-worn teeth came from animals between about four to eight years old at death (Zeder 2003).

Bones with epiphysial fusion data are rather few considering the number of bones; this reflects the number of shaft fragments in comparison with surviving epiphysial ends. As this is likely to be biased against the latest-fusing, least-dense epiphyses the data is less reliable than that from mandibles. Again, although the numbers are small, there does seem to be a distinct difference between the phases (Table Animal Bone 22. Of the bones that have early fusing epiphyses most (over $90 \%$ ) are fused in both phases and represent animals that had survived at least the first 7-10 months. After this stage there are fewer fused bones and a steady decline in the survival percentage. In Phase 2 over $80 \%$ of the bones that fuse last are still unfused; representing animals killed before about 3-4 years. For Phase 3 there are comparatively more old animals; a third of the bones in this final fusion stage had fused epiphyses and were therefore from animals over four years. As with the mandibles there are a few bones that represent neonatal mortalities.

Metrical data is available for some (68) of the bones, although these are biased in favour of the most sturdy and early fusing elements (a summary of the most frequent is given in Table Animal Bone 23). Withers height estimates could be calculated for just 10 bones, as these were the only ones both complete and fused. They include six metatarsi, two metacarpi, a radius and a humerus, and are from various sites and phases. These 10 values range from 0.508 m to 0.672 m with a mean of 0.579 m (Table Animal Bone 24).

Abnormalities were observed on three horncores and 13 mandibles; none were recorded on postcranial elements, although this lack might in part reflect the poor surface condition of many bones. The three horncores are all of sheep and from Phase 3. They have the 'thumb' marks probably related to a period of malnutrition
(Albarella 1995). The oral abnormalities include malocclusion of the $1^{\text {st }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ molars and the $4^{\text {th }}$ premolar and $1^{\text {st }}$ molar. There are two instances where the deciduous $4^{\text {th }}$ premolar is impacted on the fully erupted permanent premolar, with associated periodontal erosion (Plate Animal Bone 7). In one specimen the whole mandible is swollen in the midregion, perhaps the result of an abscess. The $1^{\text {st }}$ molar is absent and the alveolus is beginning to infill, the premolars are also absent but may have fallen out post-mortem. Similarly there is a pair of mandibles with a porous swelling below the deciduous $4^{\text {th }}$ premolar on both sides that might indicate an underlying infection.


Plate Animal Bone 7. Sheep mandible, with the deciduous $4^{\text {th }}$ premolar impacted on the fully erupted permanent premolar, with associated periodontal erosion

## Pig

There are only 269 pig bones, and consistently fewer in each phase than either cattle or sheep, with the exception of the statistically unreliable handful of bones from Phase 1. Overall pig bones constitute only $7.3 \%$ of the cattle/sheep/pig total. In Phase 2 pig remains are at $10.5 \%$ while they reach only $4.1 \%$ in Phase 3 .

All areas of the body are represented with a bias in favour of the head. Loose teeth and foreleg also appear to be frequent in Phase 3, but as the total for this phase (for the Group A, detailed, material) is just 14 bones this is unlikely to be very reliable. For Phase 2 less than $10 \%$ are loose teeth but $21 \%$ of the remains are of mandibles (Table Animal Bone 25). These jaws are mainly of sub-adult or adult animals with the $3^{\text {rd }}$ molar visible or in wear; very few are of young piglets. There are few other bones of young piglets either - although it should be remembered that the poor preservation in some contexts will have reduced the likelihood of their survival. Almost all of the epiphysial fusion data comes from Phase 2 material; only two bones from Phase 3 had recordable data. In Phase 2 just over $11 \%$ of the bones with early fusing epiphyses were unfused and were, therefore, from animals killed under a year
old. In contrast over $83 \%$ were unfused at the next stage (animals of under 2-3 years old) and all the bones from the last fusion stage were unfused, implying that none of the remains were from pigs over three years (Table Animal Bone 26).

Just 11 pig bones were measured, no large values were recorded and the appearance of all bones is of domestic animals. Even fewer had visible butchery marks. One skull and two jaws evidenced the typical axial division of the head, another jaw (from Phase 3, context 5722) had been chopped though ventrally near the rear, perhaps when cutting the whole head off.

## Other taxa

## Horse

There are 233 equid bones in total, less than $3 \%$ of all bone and under $6 \%$ of identified bone. All the teeth and phalanges are definitely of horse, the remainder are indeterminate but probably also horse. Most occur as single bones or small groups of teeth. None of the remains are from clear associations beyond two or three elements, but as several of the remains are from segments of ditches they may belong to partial or complete skeletons not fully excavated. Most, but not all, of the horse bones are fused. One tibia from Phase 2 context 5064 at Lower Cambourne and two (not a pair) from Jeavons Lane Phase 3 context 80205 have unfused epiphyses, ie, are from animals under two years old and therefore not yet old enough for work. Most of the teeth are the permanent set and are in wear, but are not often of aged animals. Approximate ages range from 3 to 14 years based on crown heights (Levine 1982). In comparison to the other ungulates measurable bones are relatively frequent at 39 specimens. This is undoubtedly due to the difference in purpose; horses tend to be kept well beyond the age at which the epiphyses are fused and are less commonly butchered. The bones include 11 complete specimens from which withers height estimates could be made. These range from 1.154 m to 1.417 m , ie, pony-sized ((Table Animal Bone 28). One horse bone is butchered and in an unusual manner; this is a $1^{\text {st }}$ phalanx from Phase 2 context 90009 at lower Cambourne that has been chopped in half axially. Two trial chop marks are also visible on the plantar side. This type of butchery was extremely common at the Roman quarry site of Mons Claudianus in Egypt (Hamilton-Dyer 2001a) and was suggested as reflecting an industrial use, for glue for example, but this author does not know of any examples from Britain. Another phalanx, this time a $2^{\text {nd }}$, is one of two horse bones exhibiting pathology. It has considerable extra growth around but not affecting the articular surfaces. The other specimen is a metacarpus with the lateral metacarpus fused to it on the medial side.

Dog
Dog bones at 232 specimens are numerically as frequent as those of horse, but $75 \%$ (174) are from a single animal from Phase 3 pit 1550. The remaining 58 occur mainly as single bones.

Despite the fragility of the remains almost the entire skeleton from context 1550 at Lower Cambourne was recovered, including most of the phalanges and carpals. In view of the excellent recovery, the lack of an os penis probably indicates that this was
a female. The skull is extremely fragmented and only the maxillary tooth row was measurable. The teeth in both the maxilla and mandibles are the permanent dentition and are well worn. The teeth and jaw fragments have no visible abnormalities, however, and the teeth are well spaced and not crowded. Few bones were sufficiently complete to allow measurements but a humerus and radius do offer shoulder height estimates of 0.539 m and 0.544 m respectively . A femur and tibia were also largely complete but much fragmented; estimates of shoulder height from these were calculated at 0.535 and 0.552 m respectively. Several of the postcranial bones show pathological changes that are commonly seen in old dogs. These include extra bone growth around the elbow joint and on some vertebrae, as well as fusion of the fibula with the tibia shaft. In addition the left calcaneum is unusually thickened and has a perforation in the proximal surface. Two ribs also have extra bone growth on the shaft, which might indicate reaction to an injury.

A high proportion of the remaining 58 dog remains are of skull or mandible fragments. Few are substantially complete, although most of a skull from Phase 3 context 5647 at Lower Cambourne could be reconstructed. The wear on the teeth of this individual suggests an old dog and the $2^{\text {nd }}$ upper molar had been lost and part healed over before death. The limb bones and mandibles range in size and shape from 'small terrier' to animals of retriever size. A humerus and $4^{\text {th }}$ metacarpus from Phase 3 context 1952 are from an extremely small dog similar in size to recent types such as Yorkshire terrier. The estimate of shoulder height from the humerus gives a value of just 0.244 m . Bones of larger dogs include a complete ulna from Phase 2 context 2811 that offers a shoulder height estimation of 0.578 m .

The dog remains all have fused epiphyses except for an isolated foetal or neonatal humerus from Phase 2 context 5212.

Cat remains are more rare than dog but present; a complete fused radius from the scanned Phase 2 context 2792 and a partial femur and tibia from the scanned Phase 3 context 2507.

## Wild mammals

Red deer remains number 15. Just one of these is a postcranial element, a partial humerus from Jeavons Lane Phase 3 context 80763 with a distal trochlea breadth of 51.6 mm . Although this is quite large there is no certainty that it is from a male. Antler pieces, however, can be identified as stag. There are eight contexts with antler fragments. The remains from Lower Cambourne Phase 2 context 509 are much fragmented but are assumed to be from what must have been a complete, large, shed antler. A partial shed antler was also found in Phase 3 context 162. This specimen had the brow tine chopped off. The four large beam fragments from Phase 2 context 128 are probably from a single antler, whether shed or not cannot be determined. The two fragments of antler from Phase 2 context 5064 are probably from the partial cranium in the same context, which included part of an antler pedicle. The remaining find is a jaw from Jeavons Lane Phase 3 context 80313 with the $3^{\text {rd }}$ and $4^{\text {th }}$ premolars in full wear.

Remains of roe are less frequent, just four bones. Two of these are antler pieces, one from Jeavons Lane Phase 2 context 80768 and one from Lower Cambourne Phase 3
context 1983. Neither is complete and it cannot be determined whether these were naturally shed or from carcasses. The radius from the Lower Common Farm Phase 2 context 90036 and the metatarsus from Lower Cambourne Phase 3 context 1738 may well be from hunted animals. The metatarsus is worked, with the proximal end sawn off and the shaft slightly polished.

A badger radius and ulna were recovered from the scanned Phase 2 context 1990. Without butchery evidence it is impossible to ascertain whether these are from a natural mortality of this common burrowing animal, or the remains of a utilised one.

A radius of a smaller mustelid was recovered from 2032, also a scanned Phase 2 context. This matches pinemarten, a valuable fur species but one that has also been regarded as vermin for predating domestic poultry.

Smaller mammals were recovered from a few of the sieved samples and also from two contexts by hand. Water vole is the most frequent species and is present in four Phase 2 contexts. Field vole occurs in one Phase 3 sample and an unphased context. A hedgehog ulna was recovered from scanned Phase 3 context 2666. Until recently the watervole was a common sight along reedy stream banks and water meadows. Field voles can also be found in water meadows and also along wood and field margins. Hedgehogs prefer bushy areas such as hedges, orchards, gardens and woodland margins.

## Birds

Bird bones are rare, just 77 in total, less than $1 \%$ of the remains and over half of these came from one context. Domestic fowl bones are the most frequent of the remains (53 bones). Most of these are a large group of 40 bones recovered from unphased context 2638. These are not from a single burial but are from at least two birds of differing sizes. Both spurred and unspurred metatarsi are present and it seems probable that the remains are of at least one male and one female. No head elements are present but there are some toes and other small bones. The remaining 13 bones are scattered across sites and phases as one or two bones per context. Just one bone, a humerus from context 147 , has butchery marks. These are repeated small cuts near the distal joint, consistent with removal of the lower part of the wing.

Birds other than domestic fowl number 24 of at least eight species, mainly from Lower Cambourne. The largest of these is swan, two partial bones from Phase 2 context 1339. The only bone of goose is a cut ulna shaft from 5258. The smoothed end forms a tube that might have been intended for use as a flute. Ducks are represented by three bones from Phase 3 contexts; a carpometacarpus and a coracoid comparable with mallard from 1234 and 2308 respectively and a tibiotarsus from a slightly smaller duck of wigeon/gadwall size in 1953. Two wader ulnae of plover size occur in separate contexts - Phase 2 context 1943 and Phase 3 context 1234. The ulna of a corncrake was recovered from the scanned Phase 3 context 1738. This small migratory bird is now absent from most of Britain (Snow and Perrins 1998) but was once a common summer visitor to damp hay meadows (Reid-Henry and Harrison 1988). There are three separate occurrences of raven, from Phase 2 contexts 1943 (Lower Cambourne) and 90404 (Little Common Farm) and context 5057 (Lower Cambourne) in Phase 3. This species is also now much reduced in its range but was
once a familiar bird, scavenging dead sheep and stillborn lambs. The final bird bone is the femur of an owl. This comes from the Phase 3 context 1877 at Lower Cambourne and matches the genus Asio rather than those of the tawny and barn owl families. Two Asio species are currently present in Britain, A. otus, the long-eared owl, and A. flammeus, the short-eared. Both are resident in the north but the latter is only a winter visitor to the southern half of Britain (Snow and Perrins 1998). While long-eared therefore seems the most likely, the bones are too similar to distinguish the species from a single damaged bone.

No fish remains were found, even in the sieved samples. One amphibian fragment was recovered from Phase 3 context 2308.

## Discussion

The animal bone assemblages are derived from a wide area and certainly from the activities of more than one farmstead or settlement (although they may be closely connected). Although the total amount of bone seems large (NISP 10,055 from all phases) over half is indeterminate and the average number of specimens per context is just 10.7 in total. Hambleton (1999) considers that a minimum of 300 specimens of the main taxa (cattle, sheep, pig) is needed for useful analysis. Here, therefore, it has been necessary to analyse the data in large groupings, mainly by phase. As a result any subtleties of the data between individual areas of each site are subsumed in the overall picture. Although this is not ideal it has the advantage of a broader view not possible at smaller sites where individual peculiarities can over-emphasise certain aspects of the assemblage.

The overall taxa representation is similar for both the Iron Age (Phase 2) and Romano-British (Phase 3) assemblages. The material is typically dominated by the bones of cattle and sheep/goat with a lesser amount of pig. Horse is a minor but consistent component. Both assemblages have a few occurrences of dog, cat, domestic fowl, watervole, and one bone each of raven and plover. Other species are so rare that their distribution may be random. In Phase 2 there is pinemarten, badger, and swan, in Phase 3 there is hedgehog, duck, owl, corncrake and an amphibian.

Cattle are more prominent than sheep/goat and the larger carcase would have provided more meat. There is just a hint that cattle is more important in the later phase and for both there seems to be a shift towards older stock, perhaps a greater interest in secondary products. This has been noted at other local Cambridge sites such as Orton Hall Farm (King 1996) and Tunbridge Lane, Bottisham (Baxter 2001) and may indicate that the younger beasts were being sent to supply the towns. Larger individuals of both taxa are also present in Phase 3, again something that has been noted locally and further afield (Dobney 2001).

There is, however, almost no difference in the carcase distribution between the two phases. In particular there are none of the bulk beef butchery dumps often seen in many urban and military assemblages (Hamilton-Dyer 2001b, 2005; Maltby 1989, 1994; O'Connor 1986). Pig is also very minor at this site, even in the later phase; again it is more frequent at some Romanised sites.

Evidence for bone and antler working is negligible but present. One of the few pieces of antler found had the brow tine chopped off. This is a shed antler and therefore presumed to have been deliberately collected (context 162). The roe deer metatarsus from context 1738 seems to have been deliberately worked; this is the distal half of the bone and, although rather eroded, appears to have been sawn mid-shaft and has a slight polish. A sheep/goat metacarpus from context 2874 has similar polish; it is unknown whether this was a complete bone as it has a recent break at the polished area. A cattle femoral caput from Little Common Farm (context 90447) was both chopped off and centrally pierced, perhaps intended as a spindle whorl. The bone is, however, just the unfused epiphysis and it is possible that this was not realised until the two parts separated. No doubt some of the cattle, sheep and goat horns were also made use of but no evidence has survived. One fragment of cattle metatarsal shaft from context 90453 had been sawn and is therefore probably an offcut from working, as saws were not used in butchery.

## Site specifics

Although this analysis has mainly concentrated on the assemblages as a whole, there are some differences between the individual sites.

Knapwell Plantation is the smallest assemblage with a few hundred specimens, divided almost equally between the two main phases. Comparatively little bone was found in the densely packed Phase 2 Iron Age features, and pits contributed a higher proportion of the total than from other sites. The number of cattle bones is the same for both phases but there are many more sheep/goat bones from Phase 2.

Little Common Farm and Jeavons Lane both contribute just over 1000 specimens from the two phases. At Little Common Farm almost all of this bone is from Iron Age contexts, mainly ditch segments. All of the minor mammal taxa are present except cat; raven is also present.

Jeavons Lane generally has the least well preserved material but, as already mentioned, this seems related to the phase and most of the bone is from Phase 3 Romano-British contexts. Much of the bone comes from linear ditches, perhaps animal enclosures, and a spread and pit within these enclosures. The cattle bones from this site and phase include several larger than from the other sites. In addition the few butchery marks include 'classic' Roman style trimming of scapulae, considered to represent cured shoulders. These findings most commonly occur in urban deposits but also at some other sites such as villas and roadside settlements (Dobney et al. 1996; Hamilton-Dyer 2001b, 2005; Lauwerier 1988; Maltby 1989, 1994; O’Connor 1986).

## Associated bones and special deposits

There are very few instances of associated bones and partial skeletons at Cambourne but they are present. The dog in Phase 3 pit 5550 at Lower Cambourne is the most complete example. No other remains were in this feature and it seems likely that the pit was dug specifically for disposal of this old dog. In another Phase 3 pit (1308) at Lower Cambourne the 20 bones of a partial lamb are mixed with other, domestic-type waste and are assumed to be disposal of a natural mortality. With a few exception cattle skulls are mainly found in association with other bone waste and do not seem to
be specially placed. There is an example of a partial skull with little else in one fill of pit 140, but with mixed material in the other. A similar candidate for possible ritual is pit 90149 at Little Common Farm. From the top fill of this feature came a sheep/goat axis and the very fragmentary remains of a cattle skull and maxillary teeth. At the time of excavation this could be seen as a mostly complete skull placed upside down in the centre of the top of the pit. This might go unremarked except that four large stones and two late Iron Age pot rims had been placed on the base of the pit.

The remains of a horse skull and mandibles were found together with a red deer antler but no other bone in ditch segment 80351 at Jeavons Lane. These last were in poor condition and much fragmented. Ditch segment 5259 at Lower Cambourne contained many cattle and cattle-sized bones, but apparently no skull (this was dug in two parts with a smaller amount within the scanned bone; a pair of scapulae were noted in this but no mandibles or obvious skull). At least some of these bones are probably from one, apparently unbutchered, carcase but other, butchered, bones are also present. Similarly there are several cattle bones that may be from one carcase in fill 60295 of pit 60282 at Knapwell Plantation and another possible grouping in fill 60322. It is quite common to find complete or partial carcasses in ditches, as these are convenient places to dispose of large, noxious, waste (Wilson 1996). Dumps of stripped carcases can also be found in pits (Maltby 1985a). While special deposits can be found in Iron Age ditches, particularly at the terminals (including two horses at nearby Love's Farm, St Neots, Ian Baxter pers comm.), these are more usually found in pits, for example the deposits in grain pits at Danebury hillfort (Grant 1984b). At Fordham, near Newmarket, several associated bone groups were found in this large Early Iron Age assemblage (Baxter 1998). Such structured deposits, such as skulls and skeletons at pit bottoms associated with other non-faunal remains, may be more frequent at some site types and in some regions than others. Hill (1995) considers that all structured deposits should be regarding as having some symbolic content, as secular and profane activities may not have been separate.

The tripole graphs and division of settlement types of King (1988) are probably an oversimplification but they give a useful guide for comparisons. For both phases the relative percentages of cattle, sheep and pig at Cambourne fall well within the polygon for unromanised settlements. The percentages also fall just inside the polygons for vici and villas, although in this case the earlier Phase 2 is very much on the edge as might be expected.

## Comparison with other sites regionally and further afield

The area in the vicinity of Cambourne is generally low-lying and open, and the whole region lies outside the zone dominated by hillforts such as Danebury, so perhaps it is not unexpected that the Iron Age animal bone assemblages are not quite like that found there.

The proportions of the main taxa are quite close to the Romano-British site at Orton Hall Farm near Peterborough (King 1996). Cambourne is also similar in this respect to Haddon, Cambridgeshire, especially the very low pig, but with slightly less sheep (Baxter 2000). Haddon, however, has relatively high horse not seen at Orton Hall Farm. The Romano-British villa/farmstead at Bottisham, Cambridgeshire, had a much higher proportion of cattle and horse and very little sheep and other taxa (Baxter
2001). This may be a combination of taphonomy and disposal practises as much of the bone was from metalled surfaces (counting against the smaller and more fragile bones) and the excavation site seems peripheral to the main occupation (large waste is often disposed of in peripheral features - see Wilson 1996). Sites around Norman Cross on Ermine Street also had high levels of horse, perhaps because of their roadside position (Albarella 1997). A Middle Iron Age site at Fen Ditton is similar to Cambourne in that it has a high level of cattle, rather than sheep, and other taxa representations are also similar (Baxter 1999). Associated bones were rare and there were no complete skeletons. Middle Iron Age Haddenham on the fen edge has, among others, a high level of beaver and seems a special case (Evans and Serjeantson 1988). Wardy Hill nearby is Late Iron Age; it has a very high amount of sheep and also has pike and otter (Davis 1999), again rather different from sites away from the fens.

The very low level of pig at Cambourne and at other local sites could in part reflect the local environment - lacking extensive woodland for pannage (Albarella 1998). There may also have been little interest in pig from the local inhabitants. The owl, if the long-eared, may indicate stands of conifers or scattered deciduous trees rather than dense woodland. The low amount of bird generally is typical, poultry seem to become more frequent when associated with 'Roman' (eg, urban) rather than 'native' sites and wild birds are often restricted to a few waterfowl, waders and scavengers. The swan, ducks, plover and raven are therefore to be expected from this area. Corncrake is uncommonly identified even from sites that might be expected to offer a suitable habitat - damp hay meadows, but this is almost certainly because its small bones do not survive or are overlooked, particularly if there was little or no sieving. An almost complete carcase was recovered from Romano-British deposits at Bottisham (Hamilton-Dyer 2003).

Fish is completely absent at this site; Saxon and later sites in Cambridgeshire usually offer quite a few bones of fresh and marine species but it seems typical that Iron Age sites have very few, and those usually restricted to local freshwater species such as eels. Romano-British sites sometimes have a better representation of fish, but usually only from urban/military settlements.

These results, although not exactly the same as others from the immediate area, do seem to fit a regional pattern. The usual Iron Age dominance of sheep is rather less in this rather wet, low-lying region than at the 'classic' chalk downland sites. The proportion of cattle increases in the Romano-British period, especially at certain sites, probably with a higher degree of Roman influence and increased demand for beef. Sheep in the later material are often older than in Iron Age assemblages, probably kept for wool. Pig, a notable feature of some, mainly urban, sites elsewhere (for example Dorchester, Maltby 1985b; 1994) is at a low level in all of these sites; Cambourne is no exception. Remains of hunted animals are rare, a finding also not restricted to Cambridgeshire. Poultry and wild birds are present but infrequent. In conclusion these assemblages appear to represent local Iron Age farmsteads that continue into the Romano-British period with only minor changes.

There does seem to be some improvement of animal husbandry, or introduction of some larger stock. There is also a change of emphasis to more and older cattle and older sheep. At least one site, Jeavons Lane, indicates influence of Roman butchery
style with evidence of cured beef shoulders, although these were probably traded in for consumption rather than produced on site.

It is curious that the later, Phase 3, material is generally less well preserved than the earlier, Phase 2 even in the same context type. It is perhaps possible that local environmental conditions were different, i.e. drier or wetter, while the material was accumulating, but before it had stabilised within the burial environment.

## SPECIES LIST AND ABBREVIATIONS USED IN TEXT, TABLES AND ARCHIVE

| HOR | domestic horse, Equus caballus |
| :--- | :--- |
| COW | domestic cattle, Bos taurus |
| SHE | domestic sheep, Ovis aries |
| GOA | domestic goat, Capra hircus <br> sheep, Ovis aries and/or goat, Capra hircus <br> S/G |
| PIG | domestic pig, Sus domesticus |
| RED | red deer, Cervus elaphus |
| ROE | roe, Capreolus capreolus <br> LAR |
|  | large ungulate size (probably mostly cattle but may also include <br> some horse) |
| SAR | small ungulate size (probably mostly S/G and PIG) <br> MAM |
| unidentified bone, probably mostly SAR and/or LAR |  |

Table Animal Bone 1. Bone preservation by site and context totals

| site | Good | Quite good | Fair | Mixed | Poor | Very poor | Total | $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lower Cambourne | 8 | 92 | 68 | 6 | 39 | 4 | 217 | 20.2 |
| Lower Cambourne scan | 3 | 130 | 203 | 21 | 175 | 31 | 563 | 52.5 |
| Jeavons Lane | 4 | 14 | 50 | 0 | 28 | 11 | 107 | 10.0 |
| Knapwell Plantation | 9 | 17 | 33 | 1 | 19 | 2 | 81 | 7.6 |
| Little Common Farm | 7 | 45 | 38 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 104 | 9.7 |
| Total contexts (no.) | 31 | 298 | 392 | 28 | 270 | 53 | 1072 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| site | Good | Quite good | Fair | Mixed | Poor | Very poor |  |  |
| Lower Cambourne | 3.7 | 42.4 | 31.3 | 2.8 | 18.0 | 1.8 |  |  |
| Lower Cambourne scan | 0.5 | 23.1 | 36.1 | 3.7 | 31.1 | 5.5 |  |  |
| Jeavons Lane | 3.7 | 13.1 | 46.7 | 0 | 26.2 | 10.3 |  |  |
| Knapwell Plantation | 11.1 | 21.0 | 40.7 | 1.2 | 23.5 | 2.5 |  |  |
| Little Common Farm | 6.7 | 43.3 | 36.5 | 0 | 8.7 | 4.8 |  |  |
| Total contexts (\%) | 2.9 | 27.8 | 36.6 | 2.6 | 25.2 | 4.9 |  |  |

Table Animal Bone 2. Bone preservation by site and fragment totals

| site | Good | Quite good | Fair | Mixed | Poor | Very poor | Total | $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lower Cambourne | 76 | 916 | 886 | 206 | 350 | 28 | 2462 | 24.5 |
| Lower Cambourne scan | 53 | 895 | 1489 | 674 | 1172 | 199 | 4482 | 44.6 |
| Jeavons Lane | 106 | 113 | 502 | 0 | 366 | 49 | 1136 | 11.3 |
| Knapwell Plantation | 75 | 466 | 235 | 6 | 83 | 5 | 870 | 8.7 |
| Little Common Farm | 19 | 516 | 492 | 0 | 53 | 25 | 1105 | 11.0 |
| Total contexts (no.) | 329 | 2906 | 3604 | 886 | 2024 | 306 | 10,055 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| site | Good | Quite good | Fair | Mixed | Poor | Very poor | Total |  |
| Lower Cambourne | 3.1 | 37.2 | 36.0 | 8.4 | 14.2 | 1.1 |  |  |
| Lower Cambourne scan | 1.2 | 20.0 | 33.2 | 15.0 | 26.1 | 4.4 |  |  |
| Jeavons Lane | 9.3 | 9.9 | 44.2 | 0 | 32.2 | 4.3 |  |  |
| Knapwell Plantation | 8.6 | 53.6 | 27.0 | 0.7 | 9.5 | 0.6 |  |  |
| Little Common Farm | 1.7 | 46.7 | 44.5 | 0 | 4.8 | 2.3 |  |  |
| Total contexts (\%) | 3.3 | 28.9 | 35.8 | 8.8 | 20.1 | 3.0 |  |  |

Table Animal Bone 3. Bone preservation by site and phase

| phase | Good | Quite good | Fair | Mixed | Poor | Very poor | Total | $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lower Cambourne |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 215 |
| 0 | 0 | 21 | 56 | 52 | 86 | 8.7 |  |  |
| 2 | 25 | 703 | 576 | 9 | 151 | 7 | 1471 | 59.7 |
| 3 | 51 | 144 | 186 | 142 | 113 | 21 | 657 | 26.7 |
| 4 | 0 | 48 | 68 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 4.8 |
| Total (no.) | 76 | 916 | 886 | 206 | 350 | 28 | 2462 |  |
| Lower Cambourne |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 9.8 | 26.0 | 24.2 | 40.0 | 0 |  |  |
| 2 | 1.7 | 47.8 | 39.2 | 0.6 | 10.3 | 0.5 |  |  |
| 3 | 7.8 | 21.9 | 28.3 | 21.6 | 17.2 | 3.2 |  |  |
| 4 | 0 | 40.3 | 57.1 | 2.5 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Total (\%) | 3.1 | 37.2 | 36.0 | 8.4 | 14.2 | 1.1 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lower Cambourne scan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 32 | 65 | 0 | 153 | 15 | 265 | 5.9 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 0.3 |
| 2 | 10 | 321 | 622 | 130 | 276 | 44 | 1403 | 31.3 |
| 3 | 43 | 464 | 801 | 544 | 723 | 128 | 2703 | 60.3 |


| phase | Good | Quite good | Fair | Mixed | Poor | Very poor | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 0 | 78 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 92 | 2.1 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0.1 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0.1 |
| Total (no.) | 53 | 895 | 1489 | 674 | 1172 | 199 | 4482 |  |
| Lower Cambourne scan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 12.1 | 24.5 | 0 | 57.7 | 5.7 |  |  |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |  |  |
| 2 | 0.7 | 22.9 | 44.3 | 9.3 | 19.7 | 3.1 |  |  |
| 3 | 1.6 | 17.2 | 29.6 | 20.1 | 26.7 | 4.7 |  |  |
| 4 | 0 | 84.8 | 1.1 | 0 | 1.1 | 13.0 |  |  |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |  |  |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |  |  |
| Total (\%) | 1.2 | 20.0 | 33.2 | 15.0 | 26.1 | 4.4 |  |  |
| Jeavons Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 2 | 28 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 45 | 4.0 |
| 2 | 1 | 3 | 44 | 0 | 31 | 42 | 121 | 10.7 |
| 3 | 105 | 108 | 409 | 0 | 321 | 6 | 949 | 83.5 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 1.8 |
| Total (no.) | 106 | 113 | 502 | 0 | 366 | 49 | 1136 |  |
| Jeavons Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 4.4 | 62.2 | 0 | 31.1 | 2.2 |  |  |
| 2 | 0.8 | 2.5 | 36.4 | 0 | 25.6 | 34.7 |  |  |
| 3 | 11.1 | 11.4 | 43.1 | 0 | 33.8 | 0.6 |  |  |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Total (\%) | 9.3 | 9.9 | 44.2 | 0 | 32.2 | 4.3 |  |  |
| Knapwell Plantation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 3 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 3.0 |
| 2 | 60 | 165 | 145 | 6 | 72 | 2 | 450 | 51.7 |
| 3 | 15 | 298 | 67 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 394 | 45.3 |
| Total (no.) | 75 | 466 | 235 | 6 | 83 | 5 | 870 |  |
| Knapwell Plantation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 11.5 | 88.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 2 | 13.3 | 36.7 | 32.2 | 1.3 | 16.0 | 0.4 |  |  |
| 3 | 3.8 | 75.6 | 17.0 | 0 | 2.8 | 0.8 |  |  |
| Total (\%) | 8.6 | 53.6 | 27.0 | 0.7 | 9.5 | 0.6 |  |  |
| Little Common Farm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 9 | 20 | 40 | 3.6 |
| 2 | 19 | 516 | 475 | 0 | 44 | 4 | 1058 | 95.7 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0.6 |
| Total (no.) | 19 | 516 | 492 | 0 | 53 | 25 | 1105 |  |
| Little Common Farm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 27.5 | 0 | 22.5 | 50.0 |  |  |
| 2 | 1.8 | 48.8 | 44.9 | 0 | 4.2 | 0.4 |  |  |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 85.7 | 0 | 0 | 14.3 |  |  |
| Total (\%) | 1.7 | 46.7 | 44.5 | 0 | 4.8 | 2.3 |  |  |
| Grand total (no.) | 329 | 2906 | 3604 | 886 | 2024 | 306 | 10,055 |  |
| Total (\%) | 3.3 | 28.9 | 35.8 | 8.8 | 20.1 | 3.0 |  |  |

Table Animal Bone 4. Bone preservation by site and context type

|  | Good | Quite good | Fair | Poor | Very poor | Mixed | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \text { NISP } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | total \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ditch/ segment | 280 | 1848 | 2226 | 1105 | 187 | 688 | 6334 | 63.0 |
| gully/ segment | 5 | 131 | 172 | 158 | 5 | 59 | 530 | 5.3 |
| spread intervention |  | 3 | 242 | 222 | 9 |  | 476 | 4.7 |
| pit | 44 | 611 | 587 | 235 | 15 | 87 | 1579 | 15.7 |
| plough scar |  |  |  | 6 |  |  | 6 | 0.1 |
| pond |  | 24 |  | 1 |  |  | 25 | 0.2 |
| posthole |  | 85 | 130 | 28 |  | 40 | 283 | 2.8 |
| scoop |  |  |  | 28 | 58 |  | 86 | 0.9 |
| tree throw/hollow |  | 36 | 33 | 32 |  |  | 101 | 1.0 |
| well |  | 85 | 1 |  | 12 |  | 98 | 1.0 |
| waterhole |  |  | 69 |  |  |  | 69 | 0.7 |
| kiln/ oven |  |  | 2 | 7 |  |  | 9 | 0.1 |
| grave |  | 1 | 8 | 82 |  |  | 91 | 0.9 |
| unknown/ no data |  | 106 | 110 | 120 | 20 | 12 | 368 | 3.7 |
| Total (no.) | 329 | 2930 | 3580 | 2024 | 306 | 886 | 10,055 |  |
| \% | 3.3 | 29.1 | 35.6 | 20.1 | 3.0 | 8.8 |  |  |
|  |  | Quite good | Fair | Poor | Very poor | Mixed |  |  |
| \% of context type in each category |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ditch segment | 85.1 | 63.1 | 62.2 | 54.6 | 61.1 | 77.7 |  |  |
| gully/ segment | 1.5 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 7.8 | 1.6 | 6.7 |  |  |
| spread intervention | 0 | 0.1 | 6.8 | 11.0 | 2.9 | 0 |  |  |
| pit | 13.4 | 20.9 | 16.4 | 11.6 | 4.9 | 9.8 |  |  |
| plough scar | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| pond | 0 | 0.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| posthole | 0 | 2.9 | 3.6 | 1.4 | 0 | 4.5 |  |  |
| scoop | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.4 | 19.0 | 0 |  |  |
| tree throw/hollow | 0 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 1.6 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| well | 0 | 2.9 | 0 | 0 | 3.9 | 0 |  |  |
| waterhole | 0 | 0 | 1.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| kiln/ oven | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| grave | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 4.1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| unknown/ no data | 0.0 | 3.6 | 3.1 | 5.9 | 6.5 | 1.4 |  |  |
| \% of category for each context type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ditch/ segment | 4.4 | 29.2 | 35.1 | 17.4 | 3.0 | 10.9 |  |  |
| gully/ segment | 0.9 | 24.7 | 32.5 | 29.8 | 0.9 | 11.1 |  |  |
| spread intervention | 0 | 0.6 | 50.8 | 46.6 | 1.9 | 0 |  |  |
| pit | 2.8 | 38.7 | 37.2 | 14.9 | 0.9 | 5.5 |  |  |
| plough scar | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| pond | 0 | 96.0 | 0 | 4.0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| posthole | 0 | 30.0 | 45.9 | 9.9 | 0 | 14.1 |  |  |
| scoop | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32.6 | 67.4 | 0 |  |  |
| tree throw/hollow | 0 | 35.6 | 32.7 | 31.7 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| well | 0 | 86.7 | 1.0 | 0 | 12.2 | 0 |  |  |
| waterhole | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| kiln/ oven | 0 | 0 | 22.2 | 77.8 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| grave | 0 | 1.1 | 8.8 | 90.1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| unknown/ no data | 0 | 28.8 | 29.9 | 32.6 | 5.4 | 3.3 |  |  |
| \% | 3.3 | 29.1 | 35.6 | 20.1 | 3.0 | 8.8 |  |  |

Table Animal Bone 5. Totals by site and fragment totals

|  | LC | LC scan | JL | KP | LCF | Total <br> NISP | total \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ditch/ segment | 1665 | 3253 | 484 | 170 | 762 | 6334 | 63.0 |
| gully/ segment | 49 | 236 | 28 | 181 | 36 | 530 | 5.3 |
| spread intervention |  | 275 | 198 | 3 |  | 476 | 4.7 |
| pit | 486 | 261 | 179 | 487 | 166 | 1579 | 15.7 |
| plough scar |  | 6 |  |  |  | 6 | 0.1 |
| pond |  | 6 | 19 |  |  | 25 | 0.2 |
| posthole | 118 | 81 | 11 | 11 | 62 | 283 | 2.8 |
| scoop |  | 86 |  |  |  | 86 | 0.9 |
| tree throw/hollow | 64 | 28 | 2 | 7 |  | 101 | 1.0 |
| well |  | 88 |  | 10 |  | 98 | 1.0 |
| waterhole |  |  | 69 |  |  | 69 | 0.7 |
| kiln/ oven |  | 9 |  |  |  | 9 | 0.1 |
| grave | 6 | 1 | 84 |  |  | 91 | 0.9 |
| unknown/ no data | 74 | 152 | 62 | 1 | 79 | 368 | 3.7 |
| Total | 2462 | 4482 | 1136 | 870 | 1105 | 10,055 |  |
| \% | 24.5 | 44.6 | 11.3 | 8.7 | 11.0 |  |  |
| \% of site contribution to each context type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ditch/ segment | 26.3 | 51.4 | 7.6 | 2.7 | 12.0 |  |  |
| gully/ segment | 9.2 | 44.5 | 5.3 | 34.2 | 6.8 |  |  |
| spread intervention | 0 | 57.8 | 41.6 | 0.6 | 0 |  |  |
| pit | 30.8 | 16.5 | 11.3 | 30.8 | 10.5 |  |  |
| plough scar | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| pond | 0 | 24.0 | 76.0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| posthole | 41.7 | 28.6 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 21.9 |  |  |
| scoop | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| tree throw/hollow | 63.4 | 27.7 | 2.0 | 6.9 | 0 |  |  |
| well | 0 | 89.8 | 0 | 10.2 | 0 |  |  |
| waterhole | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| kiln/ oven | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| grave | 6.6 | 1.1 | 92.3 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| unknown/ no data | 20.1 | 41.3 | 16.8 | 0.3 | 21.5 |  |  |
| \% | 24.5 | 44.6 | 11.3 | 8.7 | 11.0 |  |  |
| \% of context type at each site |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ditch segment | 67.6 | 72.6 | 42.6 | 19.5 | 69.0 |  |  |
| gully/ segment | 2.0 | 5.3 | 2.5 | 20.8 | 3.3 |  |  |
| spread intervention | 0 | 6.1 | 17.4 | 0.3 | 0 |  |  |
| pit | 19.7 | 5.8 | 15.8 | 56.0 | 15.0 |  |  |
| plough scar | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| pond | 0 | 0.1 | 1.7 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| posthole | 4.8 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 5.6 |  |  |
| scoop | 0 | 1.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| tree throw/hollow | 2.6 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0 |  |  |
| well | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1.1 | 0 |  |  |
| waterhole | 0 | 0 | 6.1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| kiln/ oven | 0 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| grave | 0.2 | 0 | 7.4 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| unknown/ no data | 3.0 | 3.4 | 5.5 | 0.1 | 7.1 |  |  |

Table Animal Bone 6. Totals (Phase 2) by site and context type

|  | LC | LC scan | JL | KP | LCF | Total | total \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase 2 |  |  |  |  |  | NISP |  |
| ditch/ segment | 1133 | 1134 | 66 | 113 | 729 | 3175 | 70.5 |
| gully/ segment | 46 | 182 | 10 | 160 | 36 | 434 | 9.6 |
| spread intervention |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| pit | 174 | 67 | 24 | 158 | 166 | 589 | 13.1 |
| plough scar |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| pond |  |  | 19 |  |  | 19 | 0.4 |
| posthole | 78 | 11 |  | 11 | 58 | 158 | 3.5 |
| scoop |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| tree throw/hollow | 34 | 1 |  | 7 |  | 42 | 0.9 |
| well |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| waterhole |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| kiln/ oven |  | 7 |  |  |  | 7 | 0.2 |
| grave | 6 | 1 | 2 |  |  | 9 | 0.2 |
| unknown/ no data |  |  |  | 1 | 69 | 70 | 1.6 |
| Total | 1471 | 1403 | 121 | 450 | 1058 | 4503 |  |
| \% | 32.7 | 31.2 | 2.7 | 10.0 | 23.5 |  |  |
| \% in each site |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ditch/ segment | 35.7 | 35.7 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 23.0 |  |  |
| gully/ segment | 10.6 | 41.9 | 2.3 | 36.9 | 8.3 |  |  |
| spread intervention |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pit | 29.5 | 11.4 | 4.1 | 26.8 | 28.2 |  |  |
| plough scar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pond | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| posthole | 49.4 | 7.0 | 0 | 7.0 | 36.7 |  |  |
| scoop |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tree throw/hollow well | 81.0 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0 |  |  |
| waterhole |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| kiln/ oven | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| grave | 66.7 | 11.1 | 22.2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| unknown/ no data | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.4 | 98.6 |  |  |
| \% | 32.7 | 31.2 | 2.7 | 10.0 | 23.5 |  |  |
| \% of each context type by site |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ditch segment | 77.0 | 80.8 | 54.5 | 25.1 | 68.9 |  |  |
| gully/ segment | 3.1 | 13.0 | 8.3 | 35.6 | 3.4 |  |  |
| spread intervention | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| pit | 11.8 | 4.8 | 19.8 | 35.1 | 15.7 |  |  |
| plough scar | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| pond | 0 | 0 | 15.7 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| posthole | 5.3 | 0.8 | 0 | 2.4 | 5.5 |  |  |
| scoop | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| tree throw/hollow | 2.3 | 0.1 | 0 | 1.6 | 0 |  |  |
| well | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| waterhole | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| kiln/ oven | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| grave | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.7 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| unknown/ no data | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 6.5 |  |  |

Animal Bone Table 7. Totals (Phase 3) by site and context type

|  | LC | LC scan | JL | KP | LCF | Total | total \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase 3 |  |  |  |  |  | NISP |  |
| ditch/ segment | 409 | 2064 | 408 | 54 | 7 | 2942 | 62.5 |
| gully/ segment |  | 41 | 15 | 1 |  | 57 | 1.2 |
| spread intervention |  | 275 | 198 |  |  | 473 | 10.0 |
| pit | 243 | 147 | 142 | 329 |  | 861 | 18.3 |
| plough scar |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| pond |  | 6 |  |  |  | 6 | 0.1 |
| posthole |  | 61 |  |  |  | 61 | 1.3 |
| scoop |  | 86 |  |  |  | 86 | 1.8 |
| tree throw/hollow |  | 14 | 2 |  |  | 16 | 0.3 |
| well |  |  |  | 10 |  | 10 | 0.2 |
| waterhole |  |  | 69 |  |  | 69 | 1.5 |
| kiln/ oven |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 0 |
| grave |  |  | 82 |  |  | 82 | 1.7 |
| unknown/ no data | 5 | 7 | 33 |  |  | 45 | 1.0 |
| Total | 657 | 2703 | 949 | 394 | 7 | 4710 |  |
| \% | 13.9 | 57.4 | 20.1 | 8.4 | 0.1 |  |  |
| \% in each site |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ditch/ segment | 13.9 | 70.2 | 13.9 | 1.8 | 0.2 |  |  |
| gully/ segment | 0 | 71.9 | 26.3 | 1.8 | 0 |  |  |
| spread intervention | 0 | 58.1 | 41.9 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| pit | 28.2 | 17.1 | 16.5 | 38.2 | 0 |  |  |
| plough scar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pond | 0 | 100 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| posthole | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| scoop | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| tree throw/hollow | 0.0 | 87.5 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0 |  |  |
| well | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |  |  |
| waterhole | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| kiln/ oven | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| grave | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| unknown/ no data | 11.1 | 15.6 | 73.3 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | 13.9 | 57.4 | 20.1 | 8.4 | 0.1 |  |  |
| \% of each context type by site |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ditch segment | 62.3 | 76.4 | 43 | 13.7 | 100 |  |  |
| gully/ segment | 0 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 0 |  |  |
| spread intervention | 0 | 10.2 | 20.9 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| pit | 37 | 5.4 | 15 | 83.5 | 0 |  |  |
| plough scar | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| pond | 0 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| posthole | 0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| scoop | 0 | 3.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| tree throw/hollow | 0 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| well | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.5 | 0 |  |  |
| waterhole | 0 | 0 | 7.3 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| kiln/ oven | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| grave | 0 | 0 | 8.6 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| unknown/ no data | 0.8 | 0.3 | 3.5 | 0 | 0 |  |  |

Table Animal Bone 8. Fragment sizes for cattle, sheep / goat and pig

| Taxon | Phase | size $<10 \mathrm{~mm}$ | $10-50 \mathrm{~mm}$ | $50-100 \mathrm{~mm}$ | $100-150 \mathrm{~mm}$ | $>150 \mathrm{~mm}$ | total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cattle | 2 | 0 | 161 | 181 | 125 | 106 | 573 |
|  | 3 | 0 | 119 | 112 | 76 | 75 | 382 |
|  | $\%$ | 2 | 0.0 | 28.1 | 31.6 | 21.8 | 18.5 |
| sheep/goat | \% 3 | 0.0 | 31.2 | 29.3 | 19.9 | 19.6 |  |
|  | 2 | 10 | 274 | 156 | 31 | 5 | 476 |
|  | 3 | 0 | 88 | 56 | 13 | 3 | 160 |
|  | $\% 2$ | 2.1 | 57.6 | 32.8 | 6.5 | 1.1 |  |
| pig | $\% 3$ | 0.0 | 55.0 | 35.0 | 8.1 | 1.9 |  |
|  | 2 | 3 | 43 | 54 | 10 | 0 | 110 |
|  | 3 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 14 |
|  | $\% 2$ | 2.7 | 39.1 | 49.1 | 9.1 | 0.0 |  |
|  | $\% 3$ | 0.0 | 50.0 | 35.7 | 14.3 | 0.0 |  |

Table Animal Bone 9. Cattle and sheep / goat phalanges by phase

| phalanges cattle |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Ph1 | Ph2 | Ph3 | total ph | total bones |
| Ph 2 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 573 |
| Ph 3 | 14 | 5 | 3 | 22 | 382 |
| \% Ph 2 | 50.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 3.5 |  |
| \% Ph 3 | 63.6 | 22.7 | 13.6 | 5.8 |  |
| phalanges sheep/goat |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ph1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ph 2 | 14 | 4 | Ph3 | total ph | total bones |
| Ph 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 476 |
| \% Ph 2 | 60.9 | 17.4 | 21.7 | 4.8 | 160 |
| \% Ph 3 | 71.4 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 4.4 |  |

Table Animal Bone 10. Bone condition by species

|  | recent breaks | butchered | gnawed | eroded | charred | calcined | ivoried | loose teeth | total excl.teeth | overall total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| horse | 61 | 1 | 17 | 62 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 70 | 100 |
| \% | 87.1 | 1.4 | 24.3 | 62.0 | 1.0 | 0 | 0 | 30.0 |  |  |
| cattle | 600 | 55 | 161 | 379 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 152 | 872 | 1024 |
| \% | 68.8 | 6.3 | 18.5 | 37.0 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 14.8 |  |  |
| sheep/goat | 236 | 5 | 89 | 206 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 186 | 504 | 690 |
| \% | 46.8 | 1.0 | 17.7 | 29.9 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 27.0 |  |  |
| pig | 45 | 6 | 17 | 34 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 17 | 117 | 134 |
| \% | 38.5 | 5.1 | 14.5 | 25.4 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 12.7 |  |  |
| cattle-sized | 949 | 10 | 38 | 835 | 22 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1416 | 1416 |
| \% | 67.0 | 0.7 | 2.7 | 59.0 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0 |  |  |
| s/g/pig-size | 188 | 3 | 38 | 186 | 31 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 739 | 739 |
| \% | 25.4 | 0.4 | 5.1 | 25.2 | 4.2 | 5.4 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| indet. mammal | 396 | 0 | 19 | 376 | 55 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 1236 | 1236 |
| \% | 32.0 | 0 | 1.5 | 30.4 | 4.4 | 7.2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| dog | 111 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 193 | 197 |
| \% | 57.5 | 0 | 0 | 8.1 | 0 | 0 | 1.0 | 2.0 |  |  |
| birds | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 11 |
| \% | 9.1 | 9.1 | 0 | 9.1 | 0 | 0 | 27.3 | 0 |  |  |
| other | 9 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 26 | 26 |
| \% | 34.6 | 0 | 0 | 23.1 | 0 | 0 | 3.8 | 0 |  |  |
| Total | 2596 | 81 | 379 | 2101 | 128 | 135 | 9 | 389 | 5184 | 5573 |
| \% | 50.1 | 1.6 | 7.3 | 37.7 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 0.2 | 7.0 |  |  |

calculations of butchery and gnawing exclude loose teeth
Table Animal Bone 11ba Bone condition by phase

|  | $\underset{\sim}{\text { İ }} \underset{\sim}{\infty} \underset{\sim}{\infty} \text { N }$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{6}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| ভ゙ | ভై |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}$ | $\underset{0}{3}$ |
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| fragments | unaffected | recent breaks | butchered | dog gnaw |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| unphased | 39 | 213 | 1 | 8 |
| Ph 2 | 1493 | 1160 | 51 | 258 |
| Ph 3 | 758 | 1164 | 28 | 106 |
| Ph 4 | 59 | 43 | 1 | 6 |
| Ph 6 | 0 | 16 | 2 | 1 |
| Total | 2432 | 2596 | 83 | 379 |



Table Animal Bone 11b. Bone condition by phase


Table Animal Bone 12. Cattle, sheep / goat and pig (Phase 2) by site

| site | sheep/ |  |  |  |  |  |  | red |  | cattlesized | $\begin{aligned} & \text { s/g/pig } \\ & \text {-size } \end{aligned}$ | indet. mammal | dog | other |  | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { other } & \text { indet. } \\ \text { fowl birds } & \text { bird }\end{array}$ |  |  | amphib. | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | phase | horse | cattle | goat | sheep | goat | pig |  |  | cat |  |  |  | mammal |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lower Cambourne | total | 30 | 265 | 166 | 21 | 0 | 74 | 4 | 0 |  | 259 | 204 | 437 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1471 |
|  | \% | 2.0 | 18.0 | 11.3 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 17.6 | 13.9 | 29.7 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| \% cattle, sheep, pig |  |  | 50.4 | 31.6 | 4.0 | 0 | 14.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 526 |
| \% of identified |  | 5.3 | 46.6 | 29.2 | 3.7 | 0 | 13.0 | 0.7 | 0 |  |  |  | 1.1 | 0 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 | 569 |
| Jeavons Lane | total | 2 | 28 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 48 | 6 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |
|  | \% | 1.7 | 23.1 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 39.7 | 5.0 | 24.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| \% cattle, sheep, pig |  |  | 82.4 | 8.8 | 0 | 2.9 | 5.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 34 |
| \% of identified |  | 5.3 | 73.7 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 5.3 | 2.6 | 2.6 |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Knapwell Plantation | total | 1 | 49 | 53 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 102 | 122 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 450 |
|  | \% | 0.2 | 10.9 | 11.8 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.7 | 22.7 | 27.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| \% cattle, sheep, pig |  |  | 42.6 | 46.1 | 6.1 | 0 | 5.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 115 |
| \% of identified |  | 0.8 | 39.5 | 42.7 | 5.6 | 0 | 4.8 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0.8 | 0 | 5.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |
| Little Common Farm | total | 17 | 231 | 202 | 21 | 2 | 28 | 1 | 1 | 238 | 235 | 71 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1058 |
|  | \% | 1.6 | 21.8 | 19.1 | 2.0 | 0.2 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 22.5 | 22.2 | 6.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |  |
| \% cattle, sheep, pig |  |  | 47.7 | 41.7 | 4.3 | 0.4 | 5.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 484 |
| \% of identified |  | 3.3 | 45.1 | 39.5 | 4.1 | 0.4 | 5.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 |  |  |  | 1.4 | 0 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0 | 512 |
| Lower Cambourne scan | total | 33 | 289 | 215 | 19 | 2 | 74 | 4 | 0 | 355 | 249 | 142 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1403 |
|  | \% | 2.4 | 20.6 | 15.3 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 5.3 | 0.3 | 0 | 25.3 | 17.7 | 10.1 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 |  |
| \% cattle, sheep, pig |  |  | 48.2 | 35.9 | 3.2 | 0.3 | 12.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 599 |
| \% of identified |  | 5 | 44 | 32.7 | 2.9 | 0.3 | 11.3 | 0.6 | 0 |  |  |  | 1.5 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0 | 0 | 657 |
| Phase 2 | total | 83 | 862 | 639 | 68 | 5 | 184 | 10 | 2 | 1002 | 796 | 801 | 24 | 1 | 16 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 4503 |
|  | \% | 1.8 | 19.1 | 14.2 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 4.1 | 0.2 | 0 | 22.3 | 17.7 | 17.8 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| \% cattle, sheep, pig |  |  | 49.0 | 36.3 | 3.9 | 0.3 | 10.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1758 |
| \% of identified |  | 4.4 | 45.3 | 33.6 | 3.6 | 0.3 | 9.7 | 0.5 | 0.1 |  |  |  | 1.3 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0 | 1904 |

Table Animal Bone 13. Cattle, sheep / goat and pig (Phase 3) by site

| site | phase | sheep/ |  |  |  |  |  | red |  | cattlesized | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { s/g/pig } \\ & \text {-size } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | indet <br> mammal | dog | other |  | fowl $\begin{aligned} & \text { other } \\ & \text { birds }\end{aligned}$ |  | indet. <br> bird | amphib. | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | horse | cattle | goat | sheep | goat | pig |  |  | cat |  |  |  | mammal |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lower Cambourne | total | 11 | 73 | 47 | 11 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |  | 69 | 62 | 201 | 175 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 657 |
|  | \% | 1.7 | 11.1 | 7.2 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.5 | 9.4 | 30.6 | 26.6 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 |  |
| \% cattle, sheep, pig |  |  | 53.7 | 34.6 | 8.1 | 0 | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 136 |
| \% of identified |  | 3.4 | 22.6 | 14.6 | 3.4 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 54.2 | 0 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0 | 323 |
| Jeavons Lane | total | 26 | 260 | 82 | 10 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 446 | 41 | 67 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 949 |
|  | \% | 2.7 | 27.4 | 8.6 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 47.0 | 4.3 | 7.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 |  |
| \% cattle, sheep, pig |  |  | 72.0 | 22.7 | 2.8 | 0 | 2.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 361 |
| \% of identified |  | 6.6 | 66.3 | 20.9 | 2.6 | 0 | 2.3 | 0.5 | 0 |  |  |  | 0.8 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 392 |
| Knapwell Plantation | total | 2 | 48 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 9 | 222 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 394 |
|  | \% | 0.5 | 12.2 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 26.9 | 2.3 | 56.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| \% cattle, sheep, pig |  |  | 87.3 | 12.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55 |
| \% of identified |  | 3.5 | 84.2 | 12.3 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| Little Common Farm | total | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | \% | 0.0 | 14.3 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| \% cattle, sheep, pig |  |  | 25.0 | 75.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| \% of identified |  | 0.0 | 25.0 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Lower Cambourne scan | total | 80 | 565 | 462 | 39 | 0 | 54 | 3 | 2 | 668 | 485 | 297 | 24 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 2703 |
|  | \% | 3.0 | 20.9 | 17.1 | 1.4 | 0 | 2.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 24.7 | 17.9 | 11 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0 |  |
| \% cattle, sheep, pig |  |  | 50.4 | 41.3 | 3.5 | 0 | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1120 |
| \% of identified |  | 6.4 | 45.1 | 36.9 | 3.1 | 0 | 4.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 |  |  |  | 1.9 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 1253 |
| Phase 3 | total | 119 | 947 | 601 | 60 | 0 | 68 | 5 | 2 | 1290 | 597 | 789 | 202 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 4710 |
|  | \% | 2.5 | 20.1 | 12.8 | 1.3 | 0 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 0 | 27.4 | 12.7 | 16.8 | 4.3 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0 |  |
| \% cattle, sheep, pig |  |  | 56.5 | 35.9 | 3.6 | 0 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1676 |
| \% of identified |  | 5.9 | 46.6 | 29.5 | 2.9 | 0 | 3.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  | 9.9 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0 | 2034 |

Table Animal Bone 14. Species total by phase

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | all bones in |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table Animal Bone 15. Cattle anatomy

| NISP | unphased | Ph 2 | Ph 3 | Ph 4 | Ph 6 | Total |  | all |  | Ph 2 |  | Ph 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% | Total | \% | Total | \% |
| horncore | 4 | 7 | 14 | 1 |  | 26 | area |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| skull | 4 | 28 | 18 |  |  | 50 | head \& neck | 236 | 23.0 | 126 | 24.2 | 91 | 23.8 |
| skull fragment |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| maxilla | 2 | 14 | 3 |  |  | 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mandible | 4 | 69 | 47 | 4 |  | 124 | teeth | 152 | 14.8 | 81 | 15.6 | 59 | 15.4 |
| lower premolar | 1 | 8 | 6 |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lower dp4 |  | 5 | 1 | 1 |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lower molar | 1 | 22 | 8 | 2 |  | 33 | shoulder | 59 | 5.8 | 33 | 6.3 | 20 | 5.2 |
| lower molar 3 |  | 6 | 4 |  |  | 10 | pelvis | 63 | 6.2 | 34 | 6.5 | 26 | 6.8 |
| lower incisor |  | 3 | 1 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| upper premolar | 2 | 6 | 10 |  |  | 18 | foreleg | 127 | 12.4 | 66 | 12.7 | 51 | 13.4 |
| upper deciduous premolar |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| upper molar | 5 | 24 | 29 |  |  | 58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tooth frag |  | 5 |  |  |  | 5 | hindleg | 130 | 12.7 | 76 | 14.6 | 49 | 12.8 |
| humerus | 3 | 31 | 28 | 2 | 1 | 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| radius | 2 | 21 | 16 |  |  | 39 | hindleg (small bones) | 10 | 1.0 | 5 | 1.0 | 5 | 1.3 |
| ulna | 1 | 14 | 7 |  | 1 | 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| scapula | 2 | 33 | 20 | 2 | 2 | 59 | feet | 194 | 18.9 | 99 | 19.0 | 81 | 21.2 |
| pelvis |  | 29 | 26 | 1 | 1 | 57 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| sacrum | 1 | 5 |  |  |  | 6 | other | 53 | 5.2 |  |  |  |  |
| femur | 1 | 32 | 27 |  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tibia | 3 | 44 | 22 | 1 |  | 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| fibula |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| patella |  | 3 | 5 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| metacarpus | 1 | 11 | 19 | 1 |  | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| carpal | 1 | 7 | 5 |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| metatarsus | 1 | 27 | 13 | 1 |  | 42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| astragalus | 2 | 12 | 6 | 1 |  | 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| calcaneum |  | 13 | 8 |  |  | 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cuboid/centroquartal | 1 | 8 | 1 |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tarsal |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| sesamoid |  |  | 4 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| metapodial | 1 |  | 3 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| phalanx 1 | 1 | 10 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| phalanx 2 |  | 5 | 5 |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| all |  | Ph 2 |  | Ph 3 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total | $\%$ | Total | $\%$ | Total | $\%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1024 | 100 | 520 | 99.9 | 382 | 99.9 |
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| NISP | unphased | Ph 2 | Ph 3 | Ph 4 | Ph 6 | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { all } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | \% | Ph 2 <br> Total | \% | Ph 3 Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| metatarsus | 2.3 | 4.7 | 3.4 | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| astragalus | 4.5 | 2.1 | 1.6 | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| calcaneum | 0.0 | 2.3 | 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cuboid/centroquartal | 2.3 | 1.4 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tarsal |  | 0.2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| sesamoid | 0 | 0 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| metapodial | 2.3 | 0 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| phalanx 1 | 2.3 | 1.7 | 3.7 | 10.5 | 16.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| phalanx 2 | 0 | 0.9 | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| phalanx 3 | 0 | 0.9 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| atlas | 0 | 0.3 | 1.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| axis | 0 | 0.9 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| thoracic vertebra | 0 | 1.7 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lumbar vertebra | 0 | 1.0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| caudal vertebra | 0 | 0.7 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| sternebra/sternum | 0 | 0.2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| rib | 0 | 3.5 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| sesamoid rib | 0 | 2.1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table Animal Bone 16. Cattle ageing (toothwear) by phase (no jaws)

| Stage | $N$ | $J$ | $I$ | SA | A1 | A2 | A3 | $E$ | total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Ph 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 25 |
| Ph 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 6 | 29 |

Cattle toothwear stages from O'Connor 2003

| N |  | neonatal | dp4 not in wear |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| J |  | juvenile | dp4 in wear, LM1 not |
| I |  | immature | LM1 in wear LM2 not |
| SA |  | subadult | LM2 in wear LM3 not |
|  | SA1 |  | LM3 forming |
|  | SA2 |  | LM3 erupting |
| A |  | adult | LM3 in wear |
|  | A1 |  | LM3 Grant stage a-b |
|  | A2 |  | LM3 Grant stage c-d |
|  | A3 |  | LM3 Grant stage e-h |
| E |  | elderly | LM3 Grant to or beyond j |




Table Animal Bone 17. Cattle ageing (bone fusion) by phase

|  | element | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Ph } 2 \\ \text { epiphysial state } \\ \text { fused } \end{array}$ | unfused | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Ph } 3 \\ \text { epiphysial state } \\ \text { fused } \end{array}$ | unfused |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| group 1 | distal scapula | 11 | - | 12 |  |
|  | pelvis acetabulum | 21 | 2 | 15 |  |
| group 2 | proximal radius | 12 | 1 | 10 |  |
|  | distal humerus | 19 | - | 11 | 3 |
|  | proximal phalanx | 14 | 1 | 17 | 1 |
| group 3 | distal metapodial | 12 | 3 | 14 | 3 |
|  | distal tibia | 14 | 3 | 9 | 2 |
| group 4 | femur | 8 | 12 | 10 | 14 |
|  | proximal tibia | 3 | 5 | 2 | 5 |
|  | proximal calcaneus | 3 | - |  | 2 |
|  | distal radius | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
|  | proximal humerus | 1 | 3 |  | 5 |
|  | ulna |  | 4 | 1 | 3 |
|  | totals | 122 | 35 | 102 | 41 |
|  | survival \% cattle age (months) |  |  |  |  |
| group 1 | 7-10 | 94.1 | 5.9 | 100 | 0 |
| group 2 | 12-18 | 95.7 | 4.3 | 90.5 | 9.5 |
| group 3 | 24-36 | 81.3 | 18.8 | 82.1 | 17.9 |
| group 4 | 42-8 | 43.2 | 56.8 | 30.4 | 69.6 |

Age classes adapted from Silver (1969) and Moran \& O’Connor (1994)

Table Animal Bone 18. Cattle measurements

| phase 2 | humerus BT | scapula <br> GLP | tibia Bd | astragalus GLl | metatarsus $S D$ | metatarsus Bd |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 72.7 | 56.9 | 63.1 | 62.9 | 28.7 | 56.9 |
|  | 70.0 | 69.0 | 53.5 | 57.1 | 30.5 | 59.6 |
|  | 69.4 | 67.4 | 56.8 | 60.9 | 27.8 | 54.8 |
|  | 76.6 | 66.4 | 56.4 | 60.3 | 24.0 | 45.7 |
|  | 73.5 | 59.2 | 54.5 | 59.9 | 22.8 | 46.0 |
|  | 69.0 | 57.1 | 61.1 | 61.2 | 22.8 | 46.8 |
|  | 73.5 | 62.6 | 51.1 | 61.5 | 24.7 |  |
|  | 63.1 | 58.5 | 59.0 | 57.5 |  |  |
|  | 61.9 | 66.2 | 67.4 | 58.1 |  |  |
|  | 65.1 |  | 53.7 | 53.2 |  |  |
|  | 66.5 |  | 60.3 | 58.4 |  |  |
|  | 66.8 |  |  | 58.2 |  |  |
|  | humerus | scapula | tibia | astragalus | metatarsus | metatarsus |
|  | BT | GLP | Bd | GLl | Bp | Bd |
| MAX | 76.6 | 69.0 | 67.4 | 62.9 | 30.5 | 59.6 |
| MIN | 61.9 | 56.9 | 51.1 | 53.2 | 22.8 | 45.7 |
| $N$ | 12 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 7 | 6 |
| MEAN | 69.0 | 62.6 | 57.9 | 59.1 | 25.9 | 51.6 |
| SD | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 5.6 |
| Co.Var. | 6.2 | 7.2 | 7.9 | 4.2 | 11.2 | 10.9 |
| phase | humerus | scapula | tibia | astragalus | metatarsus | metatarsus |
| 3 | BT | GLP | Bd | GLl | SD | Bd |
|  | 86.0 | 81.3 | 52.4 | 73.7 | 30.0 | 63.0 |
|  | 75.1 | 83.7 | 56.8 | 59.8 | 28.7 | 51.7 |
|  | 72.2 | 63.7 | 66.6 | 63.8 | 30.2 | 57.0 |
|  | 79.2 | 71.7 | 64.5 | 57.3 | 29.5 | 60.9 |
|  | 67.0 | 84.2 | 55.4 | 77.0 |  | 53.0 |
|  | 78.4 | 67.6 | 62.4 | 71.4 |  | 56.5 |
|  | 66.0 | 69.9 | 65.8 | 67.5 | 24.8 | 50.0 |
|  | 65.0 | 64.1 | 48.8 | 61.5 | 27.0 |  |
|  |  | 70.7 | 68.2 |  | 24.7 | 51.0 |
|  |  |  | 57.8 |  | 22.5 | 49.4 |
|  |  |  | 71.7 |  |  | 61.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 52.1 |
|  | humerus | scapula | tibia | astragalus | metatarsus | metatarsus |
|  | BT | GLP | Bd | GL1 | Bp | Bd |
| MAX | 86.0 | 84.2 | 71.7 | 77.0 | 30.2 | 63.0 |
| MIN | 65.0 | 63.7 | 48.8 | 57.3 | 22.5 | 49.4 |
| $N$ | 8 | 9 | 11 | 8 | 8 | 11 |
| MEAN | 73.6 | 73.0 | 60.9 | 66.5 | 27.2 | 55.1 |
| $S D$ | 7.0 | 7.6 | 6.9 | 6.6 | 2.7 | 4.7 |
| Co.Var. | 9.5 | 10.4 | 11.3 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 8.5 |

Measurement codes as per von den Driesch (1976)

Table Animal Bone 19. Cattle withers heights

| phase | context | anatomy | measurement <br> Gl $($ mm $)$ | withers <br> height $(m)$ |  | Bd | index | ?sex |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| 0 | 2263 | metacarpus | 195 | 1.194 |  | 68.8 | 35.3 | M |
| 1 | 1811 | metacarpus | 195 | 1.194 |  | 54.1 | 27.7 | F |
| 2 | 90203 | tibia | 300 | 1.035 | estimated |  |  |  |
| 2 | 90401 | tibia | 326 | 1.125 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 90107 | radius | 240 | 1.032 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 90507 | radius | 252 | 1.084 | estimated |  |  |  |
| 2 | 5243 | metacarpus | 180 | 1.103 |  | 53.9 | 29.9 | F |
| 2 | 2573 | metacarpus | 170 | 1.041 |  | 60.9 | 35.8 | M |
| 2 | 80455 | metacarpus | 200 | 1.225 |  | 63.5 | 31.8 | M |
| 2 | 1382 | metatarsus | 225 | 1.226 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 80493 | metatarsus | 190 | 1.036 | estimated |  |  |  |
| 2 | 90383 | metatarsus | 205 | 1.117 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 90450 | metatarsus | 208 | 1.134 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 2413 | femur | 381 | 1.322 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 80763 | femur | 320 | 1.110 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 2443 | tibia | 320 | 1.104 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 80391 | tibia | 362 | 1.249 | estimated |  |  |  |
| 3 | 2413 | humerus | 295 | 1.407 | estimated |  |  |  |
| 3 | 1846 | radius | 296 | 1.273 |  | 51.9 | 27.3 | F |
| 3 | 1234 | metacarpus | 190 | 1.164 |  | 51.8 | 35.9 | M |
| 3 | 2413 | metacarpus | 200 | 1.225 |  | 71.8 |  |  |
| 3 | 2415 | metacarpus | 206 | 1.262 |  | 67.4 | 32.7 | M |
| 3 | 5647 | metacarpus | 198 | 1.213 |  | 54.8 | 27.7 | F |
| 3 | 80186 | metacarpus | 197 | 1.207 |  | 66.1 | 33.6 | M |
| 3 | 242 | metatarsus | 226 | 1.232 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 1446 | metatarsus | 206 | 1.123 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 2413 | metatarsus | 240 | 1.308 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 2678 | metatarsus | 226 | 1.232 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 80763 | metatarsus | 216 | 1.177 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 2552 | radius | 290 | 1.247 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ph 2 |  | Total | max wht | min wht | mean | sd | cv |  |
| Ph 3 |  | 11 | 16 | 1.226 | 1.032 | 1.105 | 0.067 | 6.1 |
| All |  | 30 | 1.407 | 1.104 | 1.225 | 0.083 | 6.8 |  |

Table Animal Bone 20. Sheep/goat anatomy

| NISP | unphased | Ph 2 | Ph 3 | Ph 4 | Ph 6 | Total |  | Total | \% | Ph 2 |  | Ph 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% | Total | \% |
| horncore |  | 3 | 3 | 1 |  | 7 | area |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| skull | 1 | 5 | 6 | 1 |  | 13 | head \& neck | 121 | 17.5 | 77 | 16.2 | 31 | 19.7 |
| maxilla |  | 4 | 2 | 1 |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mandible | 3 | 60 | 20 | 3 |  | 86 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mandibular tooth group |  | , |  | 1 |  | 2 | teeth | 188 | 27.2 | 120 | 25.2 | 44 | 28.0 |
| lower premolar |  | 7 |  |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lower deciduous premolar | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lower dp4 |  | 5 | 1 |  |  | 6 | shoulder | 20 | 2.9 | 15 | 3.2 | 4 | 2.5 |
| lower molar | 3 | 30 | 16 | 3 |  | 52 | pelvis | 14 | 2.0 | 9 | 1.9 | 3 | 1.9 |
| lower molar 3 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 1 |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lower incisor | 2 | 5 | 4 | 1 |  | 12 | foreleg | 90 | 13.0 | 69 | 14.5 | 14 | 8.9 |
| upper premolar |  | 2 | 2 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| upper deciduous premolar |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| upper molar | 8 | 59 | 12 | 1 |  | 80 | hindleg | 111 | 16.1 | 84 | 17.6 | 23 | 14.6 |
| upper molar 3 | 1 |  | 3 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tooth frag |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 | hindleg (small bones) | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.6 |
| humerus | 1 | 23 | 7 | 2 |  | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| radius | 3 | 41 | 7 |  | 1 | 52 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ulna |  | 5 |  |  |  | 5 | feet | 145 | 21.0 | 102 | 21.4 | 37 | 23.6 |
| scapula |  | 15 | 4 | 1 |  | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pelvis | 1 | 9 | 3 |  | 1 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| femur | 2 | 19 | 5 |  |  | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tibia | 1 | 65 | 18 | 1 |  | 85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| patella |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| metacarpus | 1 | 26 | 11 | 2 |  | 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| carpal |  | 3 | 3 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| metatarsus |  | 29 | 12 | 1 |  | 42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| astragalus |  | 8 | 1 |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| calcaneum |  | 6 | 2 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cuboid/centroquartal |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| metapodial |  | 3 | 1 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| sesamoid |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| phalanx 1 |  | 14 | 5 |  |  | 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| phalanx 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| phalanx 3 |  | 5 | 1 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| atlas |  | 1 | 3 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| axis |  | 4 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 32 | 476 | 160 | 20 | 2 | 690 |  | 690 | 99.8 | 476 | 100 | 157 | 99.8 |


| NISP | unphased | Ph 2 | Ph 3 | Ph 4 | Ph 6 Total | Ph 2 |  |  |  | Ph 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% | Total | \% | Total | \% |
| Percent | unphased | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| horncore | 0 | 0.6 | 1.9 | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| skull | 3.1 | 1.1 | 3.8 | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| maxilla | 0 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mandible | 9.4 | 12.6 | 12.5 | 15.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mandibular tooth group | 0 | 0.2 | 0 | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lower premolar | 0 | 1.5 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lower deciduous premolar | 3.1 | 0 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lower dp4 | 0 | 1.1 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lower molar | 9.4 | 6.3 | 10.0 | 15.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lower molar 3 | 6.3 | 1.5 | 3.1 | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lower incisor | 6.3 | 1.1 | 2.5 | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| upper premolar | 0 | 0.4 | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| upper deciduous premolar | 0 | 0.2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| upper molar | 25.0 | 12.4 | 7.5 | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| upper molar 3 | 3.1 | 0 | 1.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tooth frag | 0 | 0.6 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| humerus | 3.1 | 4.8 | 4.4 | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| radius | 9.4 | 8.6 | 4.4 |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ulna | 0 | 1.1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| scapula | 0 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pelvis | 3.1 | 1.9 | 1.9 |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| femur | 6.3 | 4.0 | 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tibia | 3.1 | 13.7 | 11.3 | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| patella | 0 | 0 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| metacarpus | 3.1 | 5.5 | 6.9 | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| carpal | 0 | 0.6 | 1.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| metatarsus | 0 | 6.1 | 7.5 | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| astragalus | 0 | 1.7 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| calcaneum | 0 | 1.3 | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cuboid/centroquartal | 0 | 0.4 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| metapodial | 0 | 0.6 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| sesamoid | 0 | 0.4 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| phalanx 1 | 0 | 2.9 | 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| phalanx 2 | 6.3 | 0.8 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| phalanx 3 | 0 | 1.1 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| atlas | 0 | 0.2 | 1.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| axis | 0 | 0.8 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table Animal Bone 21. Sheep ageing (toothwear) by phase

| Maltby Stage | 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  | 4 |  | 5 |  | 6 |  | 7 | total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No of jaws | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 11 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 18 | 101 |
| Ph 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 52 |
| Ph 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 11 | 49 |
| stages : 1 <br>  2 <br>  3 <br>  4 <br>  5 <br>  6 <br>  7 | Maltby 1993 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | M1 not in wear, dp4 in wear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | M1 in wear, M2 not in wear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | M2 in wear, M3 not in wear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | M3 in wear, M1 not in heavy wear (Grant H) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | M1 in heavy wear, M2 not |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | M1 and M2 in heavy wear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

sheep toothwear (phase 2)

sheep toothwear (phase 3)


Table Animal Bone 22. Sheep ageing (bone fusion) by phase

|  |  | Ph 2 |  | Ph 3 |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  | epiphysis state | epiphysis state <br> fused |  |  |
|  | unfused | fused | unfused |  |  |

Age classes adapted from Silver (1969) and Moran \& O'Connor (1994)

Table Animal Bone 23. Sheep measurements

| $\text { Ph } 2$ | radius | humerus | tibia | metatarsus | astragalus |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| measurement (mm) | Bp | BT | Bd | Bd | GLl |
| value | 27.3 | 23.8 | 23.9 |  | 24.8 |
|  | 24.5 | 27.7 | 22.3 | 20.3 | 23.9 |
|  | 26.4 | 22.9 | 23.4 | 20.3 | 25.4 |
|  | 25.6 | 27.8 | 23.2 | 20.8 |  |
|  | 25.4 | 25.0 | 22.1 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 22.9 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 22.9 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 22.7 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 22.0 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 22.2 |  |  |
| MAX | 27.3 | 27.8 | 23.9 | 20.8 | 25.4 |
| MIN | 24.5 | 22.9 | 22 | 20.3 | 23.9 |
| N | 5 | 5 | 10 | 3 | 3 |
| MEAN | 25.8 | 25.4 | 22.8 | 20.5 | 24.7 |
| SD | 0.9 | 2 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.6 |
| Co. Var. | 3.5 | 7.9 | 2.6 | 1 | 2.4 |
| Ph 3 | radius | humerus | tibia | metatarsus | astragalus |
| measurement (mm) | Bp | $B T$ | Bd | Bd | GLl |
| value |  | 29.8 | 24.9 | 24.4 | 23.7 |
|  |  | 26.0 | 25.6 | 24.2 |  |
|  |  | 25.0 | 26.2 | 21.9 |  |
|  |  |  | 20.3 | 25.4 |  |
|  |  |  | 25.2 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 22.8 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 25.7 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 22.7 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 28.1 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 28.2 |  |  |
| MAX | 0 | 29.8 | 28.2 | 25.4 | 23.7 |
| MIN | 0 | 25.0 | 20.3 | 21.9 | 23.7 |
| N | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4 | 1 |
| MEAN |  | 26.9 | 25.0 | 24.0 | 23.7 |
| SD |  | 2.1 | 2.3 | 1.3 | 0 |
| Co. Var. |  | 7.8 | 9.2 | 5.4 | 0 |

Measurement codes as per Von den Driesch (1976)
Table Animal Bone 24. Sheep withers heights

| phase | context | anatomy | measurement <br> Gl (mm) | withers <br> height $(\mathrm{m})$ |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| 0 | 2839 | metacarpus | 120.1 | 0.587 |  |  |
| 2 | 2137 | radius | 143.0 | 0.575 |  |  |
| 2 | 5209 | metatarsus | 128.4 | 0.583 |  |  |
| 2 | 2914 | metacarpus | 108.8 | 0.532 |  |  |
| 2 | 2838 | metatarsus | 129.9 | 0.590 |  |  |
| 2 | 60256 | metatarsus | 112.0 | 0.508 |  |  |
| 3 | 80190 | humerus | 129.0 | 0.552 |  |  |
| 3 | 241 | metatarsus | 123.0 | 0.558 |  |  |
| 3 | 2299 | metatarsus | 140.0 | 0.636 |  |  |
| 3 | 80229 | metatarsus | 148.0 | 0.672 |  |  |
|  | Total | max wht | min wht | mean | sd | cv |
| Ph 2 | 5 | 0.590 | 0.508 | 0.558 | 0.032 | 5.7 |
| Ph 3 | 4 | 0.672 | 0.552 | 0.605 | 0.051 | 8.4 |
| All | 10 | 0.672 | 0.508 | 0.579 | 0.045 | 7.8 |

Table Animal Bone 25. Pig anatomy

| NISP | unphased | Ph 2 | Ph 3 | Ph 4 | Total | Total |  | Ph 2 |  |  | Ph 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% | Total | \% | Total | \% |
| skull |  | 9 | 1 |  | 10 | area |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| maxilla |  | 7 |  |  | 7 | head \& neck | 47 | 35.1 | 40 | 36.7 | 5 | 35.7 |
| mandible | 1 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lower premolar |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lower molar | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 | teeth | 17 | 12.7 | 10 | 9.2 | 4 | 28.6 |
| lower deciduous incisor |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lower incisor | 2 | 2 | 1 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lower canine |  | 2 | 1 |  | 3 | shoulder | 11 | 8.2 | 11 | 10.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
| upper molar |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | pelvis | 5 | 3.7 | 5 | 4.6 | 0 | 0.0 |
| upper incisor |  | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| upper canine |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | foreleg | 17 | 12.7 | 14 | 12.8 | 3 | 21.4 |
| tooth frag |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| humerus |  | 2 | 3 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| radius |  | 7 |  |  | 7 | hindleg | 8 | 6.0 | 7 | 6.4 | 1 | 7.1 |
| ulna |  | 5 |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| scapula |  | 11 |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pelvis |  | 4 |  |  | 4 | feet | 23 | 17.2 | 22 | 20.2 | 1 | 7.1 |
| sacrum |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| femur |  | 2 |  |  | 2 | other | 5 | 3.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| tibia |  | 3 | 1 |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| fibula |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| metacarpus |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| metacarpal 4 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lateral metacarpal |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| carpal |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| metatarsus |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| metatarsal 3 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lateral metatarsal |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| astragalus |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| calcaneum |  | 3 | 1 |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| metapodial |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lateral metapodial |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| phalanx 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| phalanx 2 |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| phalanx 3 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


0.9
1.8
0.9
0.9
0.9
0.9
55.6
phalanx 1
lateral phalanx 2
limb shaft fragment

Table Animal Bone 26. Pig ageing (bone fusion)

|  |  | Ph 2 |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | epiphysial state |  |
|  | element | fused | unfused |
| group 1 | distal scapula | 2 |  |
|  | pelvis acetabulum | 2 | 1 |
|  | proximal radius | 4 |  |
|  | distal humerus |  | 2 |
| group 2 | distal metapodial |  | 2 |
|  | proximal calcaneus |  | 2 |
|  | distal tibia | 1 | 1 |
| group 3 | femur |  | 1 |
|  | proximal tibia |  |  |
|  | distal radius |  | 2 |
|  | proximal humerus |  |  |
|  | ulna |  | 3 |
|  | totals | 9 | 12 |
|  | survival percentages |  |  |
|  | pig |  |  |
| age (months) | 88.9 | 11.1 |  |
| group 1 | 12 | 16.7 | 83.3 |
| group 2 | $24-30$ | 0 | 100 |

Age classes adapted from Silver (1969) and Moran \& O'Connor (1994)

Table Animal Bone 27. Horse withers heights

|  |  |  | measurement <br> Gl/Ll $(\mathrm{mm})$ | withers <br> height $(\mathrm{m})$ |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| 0 | 80206 | metatarsus | 244.0 | 1.301 |  |
| 2 | 646 | tibia | 325.0 | 1.417 |  |
| 2 | 5638 | tibia | 285.0 | 1.243 | estimated |
| 2 | 90401 | metatarsus | 224.0 | 1.194 |  |
| 2 | 1654 | metacarpus | 190.0 | 1.218 |  |
| 2 | 2849 | metacarpus | 187.0 | 1.199 |  |
| 2 | 90206 | metacarpus | 185.0 | 1.186 |  |
| 3 | 664 | femur | 335.0 | 1.176 |  |
| 3 | 80391 | tibia | 320.0 | 1.395 | estimated |
| 3 | 5647 | humerus | 270.0 | 1.315 |  |
| 3 | 2408 | metacarpus | 180.0 | 1.154 |  |
| 3 | 2412 | metacarpus | 206.0 | 1.320 |  |
|  |  | Total | max wht | min wht | mean |
|  |  | 12 | 1.417 | 1.154 | 1.260 |

Marine Shell<br>By Sarah F. Wyles

An assemblage of 79 shells (MNI) was recovered from 53 contexts across seven sites at Cambourne (Table Marine shell 1), with $63 \%$ coming from Lower Cambourne. The majority of the shells $(95 \%)$ are oyster, Ostrea edulis, with the remainder being mussel, Mytilus edulis. The shells were recorded by species, and also measurable and unmeasurable left and right oyster valves, by context. This data is available in archive.

Most of the shells were retrieved from Romano-British contexts (64\%), while the rest came from later Iron Age (17\%) or undated (19\%) contexts. The average number of shells recovered from each context was around 1.5.

The shells vary in size and condition, with a few being rather large. Some are weathered and fragmented, possibly an indication of redeposited midden material. Some shells have notches on them, as a result of opening. A single shell from the Romano-British period has a round hole through the heel of the shell. These holes have been seen at Carisbrooke Castle, Isle of Wight, Fulston Manor, Kent, and Tolpuddle Ball, Dorset, and may be a result of depositional processes.

Traces of the infesting polychaetic worm Polydora ciliata were recorded on about a quarter of the shells and of the boring sponge Cliona celata on a single shell from the Romano-British period. Both these infestors are common and widespread on both the south and east coasts of England.

The small quantity of shell recovered from the sites is an indication that shellfish was not a significant part of the diet during any period at Cambourne.

Table Marine Shell 1. Marine shell by species and phase

| Phase | No. of sites | No of contexts | Oyster (mni) | Mussel | Total shell |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Later Iron Age | 2 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 11 |
| Romano-British | 5 | 34 | 52 | 0 | 52 |
| Undated | 4 | 10 | 13 | 3 | 16 |
| Total | 7 | 53 | 75 | 4 | 79 |

Twelve excavations were carried out by Wessex Archaeology within the Cambourne Development Area. Situated on the clay uplands west of Cambridge, which have seen little previous archaeological investigation, the results presented here are important in demonstrating the ebb and flow of occupation according to population or agricultural pressure.

Short-lived Bronze Age occupation was followed in the Middle Iron Age by small farming communities with an economy based on stock-raising and some arable cultivation. The Late Iron Age seems to have seen a recession, perhaps partly due to increased waterlogging making farming less viable

From the mid-1st century AD new settlements began to emerge, possibly partly stimulated by the presence of Ermine Street, and within a century the area was relatively densely occupied. Several farmsteads were remodelled in the later RomanoBritish period, though none seems to have been very prosperous.

Dispersed occupation may have continued into the early 5th century at least, followed by a hiatus until the 12th/ 13th century when the entire area was taken into arable cultivation, leaving the ubiquitous traces of medieval ridge and furrow agriculture.
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