

## Database documentation

### *Assemblage*

The basic unit of the review is the assemblage, with some sites having more than one assemblage. Assemblages from the same site are subdivided by period or site area. The assemblages included are those where the number of identified specimens (NISP) was given and also some assemblages with deposits of skeletons, part-skeletons, skulls or individual elements which were thought to be deliberate deposits. There was no cut off point for size of assemblage because many sites and assemblages have a small number only of bones.

An assemblage which could not be assigned to one of the time periods defined below was omitted from the review.

### *Site*

The name of the site as given in the excavation report

### *Catalogue number (Cat. No)*

Each site was given a separate catalogue number. The location of the Early and Middle Neolithic sites is shown in Figure 1 and the location of the Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age sites is shown in Figure 2. In a few cases, groups or pairs of sites located close together were assigned the same catalogue number.

### *Period*

Sites were assigned to time periods as follows:

PERIOD	PERIOD ABBREVIATION	APPROX DATE BC
Early Neolithic	(ENEO)	4000 – 3700
Early/Middle Neolithic	(EMNEO)	3800 – 3300
Middle Neolithic	(MNEO)	3300 – 2800
Late Neolithic	(LNEO)	2800 – 2200
Late Neolithic/Early Bronze Age	(LNEO/EBA)	2400 – 1800
Early Bronze Age	(EBA)	2000 – 1500

Assemblages were assigned to periods based on dates given in the Reviews of Bradley (2008), Garwood (2008), Healy (2008) and Needham & Weekes (2008), on recent dating programmes and research (Cleal 2005; Bayliss & Whittle 2007; Barclay and Hey In prep) and on the associated pottery. The period used here is *not* always that given in the original excavation report because of changes in our understanding of what was meant by 'Early', 'Middle', and 'Late' Neolithic and also by 'Late Neolithic' and 'Early Bronze Age'.

### *County*

Counties included in the review are:

Berkshire

Dorset

East Sussex

Gloucestershire (including Avon)

Hampshire (including Isle of Wight)

Kent

London (i.e. the former county of Middlesex)

Oxfordshire

Somerset

Surrey (including those parts once in Surrey which are now in Outer London)

West Sussex

Wiltshire

### *Pottery*

Pottery types were included where available. The abbreviations used are as follows.

*Key to pottery abbreviations in Data table 1*

PLB	Plain bowls	
IMP	Impressed wares	Peterborough, Mortlake, Ebbsfleet, etc
GW	Grooved Ware	
BEA	Beaker	
CU	Collared Urn	

The pottery type was taken into account in assigning assemblages to periods, especially for Middle and Late Neolithic assemblages. All sites with Grooved Ware were assigned to the Late Neolithic and all sites with Beaker pottery were assigned to 'Late Neolithic/ Early Bronze Age'.

*Site type*

Site types were taken from the original excavation report, and standardised if necessary with the NMR list of site types. A few changes were made to site type designations following recent Reviews.

*Feature*

Feature type was listed when known. Feature types were standardised following the NMR list.

*Total*

Total number of fragments (i.e. total including unidentified fragments) was included where it was given.

*NISP*

Number of identified elements (specimens). This is the total of the mammals (excluding micro-mammals) as listed in data table 2. Placed and possible placed deposits which were not quantified in the original report were assigned a NISP of '1'.

**Data table 2 Bibliographic references**

The bibliographic references to the bone reports, excavation reports and other relevant research papers are listed by site name.

**Data table 3 NISP data**

NISP data were included using the following criteria.

1. Data are for mammals only. Birds, fish and micro-vertebrates were not included - they are shown in separate data tables
2. Fox and badger were included unless the report indicates that they were probably intrusive
3. Red and roe deer antler was omitted from deer totals where it was distinguished from other elements
4. For skeletons and part-skeletons, the total number of elements was included.
5. With the aim of providing consistency between assemblages, ribs were excluded even where they were identified to species.
6. Isolated teeth were included, except where they were obviously from a single jaw
7. Intrusive and probably intrusive species (including all rabbit) were omitted
8. For Durrington Walls and Mount Pleasant, NISP is actually the minimum number of individuals (MNI) because NISP was not given in the published report.
9. Material from the uppermost layers of a feature was omitted if there was an admixture of later material
10. The 'comments' field indicates the presence of skeletons and part-skeletons. It also indicates doubtful identifications of key species.

NISP consequently does not always tally exactly with the NISP total in the original bone report.

**Data table 4 Cattle jaws and teeth showing eruption and wear**

This data table shows tooth eruption stages after Ewbank et al. (1964) and wear stages after Grant (1982, fig. 1) for individual jaws and molar teeth where the raw data were available either published or unpublished. These are listed by assemblage.

Jaws and teeth were assigned to nine eruption / wear stages.

The Runnymede records are unpublished and are a subsample from all Neolithic areas of the site.

**Data table 5 Pig jaws and teeth showing eruption and wear**

The data table lists pig jaws and molar teeth showing eruption after Ewbank et al. (1964) and wear stages following Grant (1982, fig. 3). Jaws and teeth were assigned to six age stages.

The Runnymede data are unpublished – see Data table 4.

Durrington Walls data are available in the CSV tables of mandible measurements at <http://dx.doi.org/10.5284/1000235>

**Data table 6 Birds**

The data table lists birds by assemblage. Note: some may not be anthropogenic and / or contemporary.

**Data table 7 Fish**

The data table lists all fish by assemblage

**Data table 8 'Placed' deposits**

The data table lists 'placed' and possible 'placed' deposits by assemblage, showing period, site type, feature, deposit type, species, element details, associated material where known and other comments.

Skulls, skeletons and part-skeletons were included if referred to in the report; other elements were included if they were identified as placed or otherwise noted as 'special' by the excavator or the bone analyst.

The list of horn cores is partial because horn cores are not routinely shown separately in animal bone reports.

**Data table 8 Micro-vertebrates**

The data table shows numbers of micro-vertebrates (amphibians, reptiles and micro-mammals) from seven sites where micro-vertebrates were studied in detail. They are not necessarily contemporary with the assemblage discussed in the report or with the main period of occupation of the site.

## Lookup and summary tables

### Table 1

Summary of periods, abbreviations and dates used in this review; pottery types, number of sites and number of sites for which NISP was given are also shown.

### Table 2

Number of sites and assemblages per county

### Table 3

Age stages for cattle used in this Review: definitions of eruption and wear stages are based on Ewbank et al. (1964) and Grant (1982, fig. 3). Age estimations are based on Jones & Sadler (In press) with some author's amendments for the youngest age-stages.

### Table 4

Age stages for pigs used in this Review: eruption and wear stages follow Ewbank et al. (1964) and Grant (1982, fig. 3). The age stages defined are after O'Connor (1988, tab. 23) and approximate ages are after Bull & Payne (1982).

### Table 5

Wild mammals: summary totals by period, including skeletons

### Table 6

Wild mammals: number and percentage (in italics) of assemblages with wild mammals in each period.

### Table 7

Placed and possibly placed deposits: summary of deposit types by period

### Table 8

Placed and possibly placed deposits: summary of species by period

## References

Albarella, U. & T. Pirnie, 2008. A Review of Animal Bone Evidence from Central England. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5284/1000317>

Bayliss, A. & A. Whittle, 2007. The times of their lives: from chronological precision to kinds of history and change. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 17 (1), 21-28.

Bradley, R., 2008. *Solent Thames Research Assessment - the Neolithic and Early Bronze Age*. [http://oxfordarch.co.uk/pdf\\_store/sthames/phase%202/Neolithic%20and%20Early%20Bronze%20Age%20Resource%20Assessment.pdf](http://oxfordarch.co.uk/pdf_store/sthames/phase%202/Neolithic%20and%20Early%20Bronze%20Age%20Resource%20Assessment.pdf)

Bull, G. & S. Payne, 1982. Tooth eruption and epiphyseal fusion in pigs and wild boar, in *Ageing and Sexing Animal Bones from Archaeological Sites*. British Series 109, eds. B. Wilson, C. Grigson and S. Payne. Oxford: BAR: 55-71.

Cleal, R., 2005. 'The small compass of a grave': Early Bronze Age burial in and around Avebury and the Marlborough Downs, in *The Avebury Landscape. Aspects of the field archaeology of the Marlborough Downs*, eds. G. Brown, D. Field & D. McOmish. Oxford: Oxbow, 115-32.

Ewbank, J. M., D. W. Phillipson, R. D. Whitehouse & E. S. Higgs, 1964. Sheep in the Iron Age: a method of study. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 30(1964), 423-6.

Garwood, P., 2008. Landscapes, monuments and social practices in the late 4th and 3<sup>rd</sup> millennia BC: a survey. *South East Research Framework*. Kent County Council.  
<https://shareweb.kent.gov.uk/Documents/Leisure-and-culture/heritage/serf-seminar-papers-neolithic-and-early-bronze-age/paul-garwood.pdf>

Grant, A., 1982. The use of tooth wear as a guide to the age of domestic ungulates., in *Ageing and Sexing Animal Bones from Archaeological Sites*. British Series 109, eds. B. Wilson, C. Grigson & S. Payne. Oxford: BAR, 91-108.

Hambleton, E. & P. Baker, 2009. A review of animal bone evidence from Southern England.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5284/1000102>

Healy, F., 2008. Causewayed enclosures and the Early Neolithic: the chronology and character of monument building and settlement in Kent, Surrey and Sussex in the early to mid-4th millennium cal BC. *South East Research Framework*. Kent County Council.  
<https://shareweb.kent.gov.uk/Documents/Leisure-and-culture/heritage/serf-seminar-papers-neolithic-and-early-bronze-age/frances-healy.pdf>

Jones, G. G. & P. Sadler, In press. Age at death in cattle: methods, older cattle and known-age reference material.

Needham, S. & J. Weekes, 2008. Late Neolithic and Bronze Age connections with Europe. *South East Research Framework*. Kent County Council.  
<https://shareweb.kent.gov.uk/Documents/leisure-and-culture/heritage/serf-seminar-papers-neolithic-and-early-bronze-age/stuart-needham.pdf>

O'Connor, T. P., 1988. *Bones from the General Accident Site, Tanner Row. The Archaeology of York. The Animal Bones, 15/2*. York: York Archaeological Trust / Council for British Archaeology.