Reports from the Environmental Archaeology Unit, York 2000/69, 3 pp.

# Evaluation of biological remains from excavations at Goodmanham Wold (site code: TSEP 904)

by

Deborah Jaques, Allan Hall, Stephen Rowland and John Carrott

### **Summary**

A series of sediment samples from deposits revealed by excavations at Goodmanham Wold were submitted for an evaluation of their bioarchaeological potential.

A single sample was selected for investigation. The very few biological remains recovered were of no interpretative value.

No further work is recommended on the current material.

**KEYWORDS**: GOODMANHAM WOLD; EVALUATION; BRONZE AGE; CHARRED PLANT REMAINS; SNAILS

Authors' address: Prepared for:

Palaeoecology Research Services Environmental Archaeology Unit Department of Biology P. O. Box 373 University of York York YO10 5YW

Telephone: (01904) 433846/434475/434487

Fax: (01904) 433856 23 November 2000

Humber Field Archaeology The Old School Northumberland Avenue Hull HU2 0LN

## Evaluation of biological remains from excavations at Goodmanham Wold (site code: TSEP 904)

#### Introduction

An archaeological evaluation excavation was carried out by Humber Field Archaeology at Goodmanham Wold (NGR: XX), between 17 and 28 January 2000, as part of a series of interventions along the line of the British Petroleum Teeside to Humber pipeline.

A series of sediment samples ('GBA'/'BS' sensu Dobney et al. 1992) were recovered from the deposits. Preliminary investigations of the flint artefacts recovered during fieldwalking and subsequent excavation gave a Bronze Age date for the deposits.

All of the material was submitted to the EAU for an evaluation of its bioarchaeological potential.

#### Methods

Sediment samples

The sediment samples were inspected in the laboratory. One of the samples was selected for investigation and its lithology was recorded, using a standard *pro forma*, prior to processing, following the procedures of Kenward *et al.* (1980; 1986), for recovery of plant and invertebrate macrofossils. The washover and residue were examined for plant remains. The washover was also examined for invertebrate remains, and the residue was examined for other biological and artefactual remains.

### **Results**

Archaeological information, provided by the excavator, is presented in square brackets.

**Context 1007** [Primary fill of gully, possibly a natural feature. Undated]

Sample 2/T (1 kg sieved to 300 microns with washover)

Just moist, light to mid grey-brown, crumbly to unconsolidated, slightly sandy slightly clay silt. Fragments of chalk (2 to 60 mm) and fragments of snail shell were present in the sample.

The large to very large residue of about 250 cm<sup>3</sup> was of angular chalk gravel; there was a small washover consisting of a few cm<sup>3</sup> of chalk 'sand' with a few snails (mostly unidentified fragments but including one adult and one ?juvenile *Pupilla muscorum* (Linnaeus)) and a few fragments of fine charred twigs which seemed not to be from a herbaceous plant but which could not be identified further. No insect remains were recovered from the sample.

# Discussion and statement of potential

The very few biological remains recovered were of no interpretative value. Processing of additional sediment is unlikely to provide sufficient suitable charred material for radiocarbon dating of the deposit to be attempted.

#### **Recommendations**

No further work is recommended on the current material.

### Retention and disposal

All of the current material may be discarded unless the sediments are to be examined further for non-biological remains.

### **Archive**

All material is currently stored in the Environmental Archaeology Unit, University of York, along with paper and electronic records pertaining to the work described here.

### Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Ken Steedman of Humber Field Archaeology for providing the material and the archaeological information, and to English Heritage for allowing AH to contribute to this report.

### References

Dobney, K., Hall, A. R., Kenward, H. K. and Milles, A. (1992). A working classification of sample types for environmental archaeology. *Circaea, the Journal of the Association for Environmental Archaeology* **9** (for 1991), 24-6.

Kenward, H. K., Hall, A. R. and Jones, A. K. G. (1980). A tested set of techniques for the extraction of plant and animal macrofossils from waterlogged archaeological deposits. *Science and Archaeology* **22**, 3-15.

Kenward, H. K., Engleman, C., Robertson, A., & Large, F. (1986). Rapid scanning of urban archaeological deposits for insect remains. *Circaea* **3**, 163–172.