

*Reports from the Environmental Archaeology Unit, York 97/1, 3 pp. + 1p.
Appendix*

**Evaluation of biological remains from excavations at
3-7 Coney Street, York (site code: 1996.409)**

by

John Carrott, Michael Issitt, Deborah Jaques, and Frances Large

Summary

Two samples of sediment from deposits revealed by excavations at 3-7 Coney Street, York, were submitted for an evaluation of their bioarchaeological remains. A small quantity of animal bone was also submitted.

The sediment samples warrant no further analysis, though any future excavations should include bulk-sampling and analysis of layers likely to give larger concentrations of biological remains.

The bones formed too small an assemblage for useful interpretation, but it is possible that further excavation, with adequate recovery, might yield interpretatively valuable groups.

Keywords: CONEY STREET;YORK; NORTH YORKSHIRE; EVALUATION; CHARCOAL; BONE; MOLLUSCS

Authors' address:

Palaeoecology Research Services
Environmental Archaeology Unit
University of York
Heslington
York YO1 5DD

Prepared for:

York Archaeological Trust
Cromwell House
11-13 Ogleforth
York
YO1 2JG

Telephone: (01904) 434485/433843/434487
Answerphone: 433846
Fax: 433850

10th January 1997

Evaluation of biological remains from excavations at 3-7 Coney Street, York (site code: 1996.409)

Introduction

Excavations were carried out by York Archaeological Trust at 3-7 Coney Street, York, during December 1996. Two General Biological Analysis samples ('GBAs' *sensu* Dobney *et al.* 1992), and a small quantity of animal bone, were submitted for an evaluation of their bioarchaeological potential.

Methods

The samples were initially inspected in the laboratory and described using a *pro forma*. A 2 kg subsample was taken from each of the samples for extraction of macrofossil remains, following procedures of Kenward *et al.* (1980; 1986). The remaining unprocessed sediment was retained as voucher samples. The residues resulting from processing were examined for their content of plant and invertebrate macrofossils, and animal bone. Notes were made on the quantity of fossils and principal taxa.

All the hand-collected bone was examined; records were made of preservation, quantities, and identifications where appropriate.

Results and discussion

Sediment samples

Neither flots nor 'washovers' were produced from the samples as it became apparent during processing that the organic content of the samples was so low that even a washover would not be worthwhile.

Questions posed by the excavator are in square brackets.

Context 1005, Sample 1/T

[Is this a garden soil or dumped material?]

Moist, mid to dark brown, crumbly (working slightly sticky when wet), sandy silt. Mortar, brick/tile, charcoal, and mammal bone were all present throughout the sample.

The small residue was composed mainly of sand, stones and brick/tile fragments (some of which were burnt). Small pieces of coal, mortar, charcoal, and a few fish and mammal bones (see Appendix) were also present. A single *Pisidium* sp. and an unidentifiable fragment of another freshwater mollusc were noted.

These sparse remains are compatible with either of the postulated origins, but have little interpretative significance.

Context 2006, Sample 2/T

[Is this redeposited natural?]

Moist, mid brown, unconsolidated, very slightly silty sand, with some lumps mid brown to grey which may be more silty. Modern rootlets were present.

The residue was very small (approximately 0.1 litres) for the quantity of material processed. It consisted of sand and small stones together with small fragments (to 4 mm) of brick/tile, mortar, and charcoal. A single rootlet fragment was also present.

These remains give no useful information concerning the origin of the material.

Bone

A very small assemblage of hand-collected animal bones was recovered from the limited excavations. This consisted of material from only four contexts, providing a total of only six identifiable (175 g) and six unidentifiable (63 g) fragments.

Preservation of the material was good, with the broken surfaces, for the most part, appearing 'spiky' and the colour being recorded as brown or fawn. Few of the bones showed evidence of dog gnawing or fresh breakage. Butchery was evident on a small number of cattle fragments.

Most of the identifiable fragments represented the remains of cattle and caprovid (see Appendix). In addition, a single chicken sternum was present.

Recommendations

Further work on the bioarchaeological material from these contexts is not considered worthwhile, although some further useful information might conceivably be obtained from Context 1005 by processing a much larger subsample. In particular, there appears to be no potential for ecological or land-use reconstruction, and little for determining the means of formation of the deposits.

The vertebrate assemblage is of little interpretative value and no further analysis of this material is recommended. On the basis of such a limited assemblage and, with no information regarding the date of the deposits, it is impossible to make further recommendations regarding the potential of the material still unexcavated.

If further excavations take place at this site then every effort should be made to investigate any revealed deposits, including an intensive regime of sampling, and commensurate funding for post-excavation analysis should be made available.

Retention and disposal

The bones and the sediment remaining from the selected samples need not be retained.

Archive

All extracted fossils and the residues are 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 York Archaeological Trust for providing the material and archaeological information.

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 macrofossils from waterlogged archaeological deposits. *Science and Archaeology* **22**, 3-15.

Appendix

Bones from 3-7 Coney Street.

Context 1002

Preservation: good
Colour: brown
Angularity: spiky

Cattle - 1 first phalanx fragment, unfused
Unidentified - 2 cow-sized vertebra and rib fragments

Weight of identified fragment - 8g
Weight of unidentified fragments - 24g

Context 1005

Preservation: fair
Colour: brown
Angularity: spiky

Unidentified - 1 fragment

Weight of unidentified fragment - 2g

Context 1005

Sample 1

Preservation: good
Colour: dark brown
Angularity: variable

Caproid - 1 distal tibia, scorched and chopped
Fish - five fragments, including a ?herring (cf. *Clupea harengus* L.) vertebra
Unidentified - 13 fragments

Weight of identified fragments - 9g
Weight of unidentified fragments - 4g

Context 1006

Preservation: good
Colour: brown
Angularity: variable

Cattle - 1 maxillary molar
Caproid - 1 metacarpal shaft fragment
Chicken - 1 sternum fragment, showing a healed fracture
Unidentified - 3 fragments, including cow-sized rib and cranium fragments

Weight of identified fragments - 32g

Weight of unidentified fragments - 37g

Context 1009

Preservation: good
Colour: brown
Angularity: spiky

Cow - 1 first phalanx and 1 pelvis (chopped around the acetabulum)

Weight of identified fragments - 135g