

Reports from the Environmental Archaeology Unit, York 98/8, 3pp.

**An evaluation of biological remains from excavations
at Slingsby, North Yorkshire (site code: S97)**

by

John Carrott, Deborah Jaques and Darren Worthy

Summary

Eight samples of sediment from deposits, of ?Romano-British to modern date, excavated at Slingsby, North Yorkshire, were submitted for an evaluation of their potential for bioarchaeological analysis.

The sediment samples were barren of interpretable ancient plant and invertebrate remains and of dateable remains.

Keywords: SLINGSBY; NORTH YORKSHIRE; EVALUATION; ?ROMANO-BRITISH; MEDIEVAL

Authors' address:

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

Prepared for:

MAP Archaeological Consultancy
39 Greengate
Malton
North Yorkshire YO17 0EL

Telephone: (01904) 434485/433843/434487/434486
Answerphone: 433846
Fax: 433850

18 February 1998

An evaluation of biological remains from excavations at Slingsby (site code: S97)

Introduction

Excavations at Slingsby, North Yorkshire (NGR SE 6970 7485), undertaken in late 1997 by MAP Archaeological Consultancy, revealed deposits of ?Roman-British to modern date. Eight samples of sediment from these deposits have been examined to evaluate their bioarchaeological potential.

Methods

Eight samples of sediment ('GBAs' *sensu* Dobney *et al.* 1992) were submitted. The samples were inspected in the laboratory and a description of their lithologies recorded using a standard *pro forma*. A subsample of 3 kg was taken from one of the samples and two other samples were bulk sieved (to 500 µm), for extraction of macrofossil remains, following procedures of Kenward *et al.* (1980; 1986).

Plant macrofossils were examined from the residues and washover resulting from processing, and the washover was examined for invertebrate remains.

None of the samples were deemed suitable for examination for microfossils.

Results

The results of the investigations are presented in context number order with information provided by the excavator in brackets.

Samples 4 to 8 (Contexts 7020, 7028, 7031, 7040

and 7003 respectively) were all very similar in composition, being moist, mid grey brown, crumbly to unconsolidated, slightly clay sandy silts with very small to medium-sized stones (2 to 60 mm) present and abundant modern rootlets. No further analysis of these samples was undertaken.

Context 8033 [Primary ditch fill]

Sample 1 (9 kg bulk sieved)

Just moist, light to mid brown, crumbly to unconsolidated (working soft when wet), moderately stony (stones 2 to 60 mm) slightly clay sandy silt with modern rootlets present.

There was no washover from this sample. The residue was mostly sand with some stones (to 10 mm) and small lumps of undisaggregated sediment (to 1mm).

No dateable remains were recovered from the sample.

Context 8037 [13th/14th century primary ditch fill]

Sample 2 (10 kg bulk sieved)

Moist, mid brown, crumbly to unconsolidated (working soft and slightly sticky when wet), sandy clay silt with very small to medium-sized stones (2 to 60 mm) and modern rootlets present.

There was no washover from this sample. The residue was mostly sand with some stones (to 60 mm) and small lumps of undisaggregated sediment (to 1mm).

No biological remains were recovered from the sample.

Context 8046 [Ditch fill]

Sample 3 (GBA 3 kg - washover)

Description as for Sample 1.

The washover was composed of modern rootlets and sand. The residue was mostly sand with some stones (to 35 mm) and a few modern rootlets.

No dateable remains were recovered.

Discussion and statement of potential

The samples were processed in an attempt to recover any dateable material that they might have contained (e.g. artefacts or radiocarbon dateable biological remains). No such remains were recovered.

There is no potential for additional useful work on this material.

Recommendations

No further work is recommended on this material.

Retention and disposal

All remaining sediment samples may be discarded unless they are to be sieved to recover any artefacts.

Archive

Paper and electronic records pertaining to the work described here are currently stored in the Environmental Archaeology Unit, University of York.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to MAP Archaeological Consultancy for making this material available.

References

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

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.