

*Reports from the Environmental Archaeology Unit, York 94/35, 3 pp.*

**Evaluation of biological remains from excavations in Flaxby,  
North Yorkshire (site code FB94)**

by

John Carrott, Allan Hall, Michael Issitt, Frances Large and Annie Milles

**Summary**

*Twelve samples of sediment from Iron Age/Romano-British deposits from excavations at Flaxby, North Yorkshire, were supplied by MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd for an evaluation of their content of biological remains.*

*None of the samples contained sufficient biological remains to be of interpretative value.*

*No further work on this material is recommended.*

Authors' address:

Environmental Archaeology Unit  
University of York  
York YO1 5DD

Prepared for:

MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd.  
39 Greengate  
Malton  
North Yorkshire YO17 0EL

Telephone: (0904) 433843-51  
Fax: (0904) 433850

24 June 1994

## Evaluation of biological remains from excavations at Flaxby, North Yorkshire (site code FB94)

### Introduction and methods

Twelve samples of sediment ('GBAs' *sensu* Dobney *et al.* 1992) from excavations of Iron Age/Romano-British deposits from Flaxby, North Yorkshire, were supplied by MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd. for an evaluation of their content of biological remains.

### Methods

All of the samples submitted were described (using a *pro forma*) and two were selected for processing. A 3 kg subsample was taken from one of the selected samples (context 8032) to be processed for biological remains following techniques of Kenward *et al.* (1980; 1986). A 27 kg subsample was taken from the other selected sample (context 8022) to be bulk-sieved to 1 mm.

### Results

Results of the analyses of biological remains are given in the Appendix.

### Discussion and statement of potential

Ten of the samples submitted had no bioarchaeological potential. The remaining two contained only trace amounts of charcoal of no interpretative value.

### Recommendations

No further work on this material is recommended.

### Retention/disposal

The remaining samples can be discarded.

### Archive

All biological remains, samples of processed and unprocessed sediment and paper and electronic archives relating to the work discussed here are currently stored at the Environmental Archaeology Unit, University of York.

### Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Paula Ware, MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd., for making this material available and for archaeological information and to English Heritage for allowing Allan Hall and Annie Milles to contribute to this work.

### 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., Engleman, C., Robertson, A., and Large, F. (1986). Rapid scanning of urban archaeological deposits for insect remains. *Circaea* **3** (for 1985), 163-72.
- Kenward, H. K., Hall, A. R. and Jones, A. K. G. (1980). A tested set of techniques for the extraction of plant and animal microfossils from waterlogged archaeological deposits. *Science and Archaeology* **22**, 3-15.

## Appendix

The two samples processed are discussed in context number order. Archaeological information provided by the excavator is presented in square brackets.

**Context 8022** [Compact fill of hearth 8021]

Sample 5: Just moist, mid brown, crumbly and moderately stony (stones from 2 to 60 mm present) sandy silt with some charcoal.

The modest residue was mostly angular to rounded micaceous sandstone (to 60 mm) with some other lithologies, including quartzite, present. A trace of charcoal was also present including one fragment (to 15 mm) of ?*Alnus*.

**Context 8032** [Pit fill]

Sample 7: Almost dry, mid brown, crumbly sand with some charcoal.

The washover was approximately 10 cm<sup>3</sup> of charcoal (to 15 mm diameter) with some sand and a few fragments of modern rootlet. The largest fragments of charcoal were *Fraxinus* and *Corylus* and two fragments of *Veronica hederifolia* L..

The small residue was mostly sand with some angular micaceous sandstone ( to 15 mm).

The samples not selected for processing were mostly stony, mid to dark orange-brown or purplish-brown, sandy silt or silty sand, some having an appreciable clay component. After the initial examination and description of these samples no further analysis was undertaken as their bioarchaeological content was clearly negligible. A checklist of these samples is presented below.

Context	Sample
2806	1
1801	2
1803	3
3009	4
8029	6
8003	8
8059	9
8054	10
2103	1
8038	8