

Oxford
Radiocarbon
Accelerator Unit
Research Laboratory for Archaeology
6 Keble Road, Oxford OX1 3QJ, England
Tel: ++44-(0) 1865-273939

P16818

OxA- none

failed – low collagen

$\delta^{13}\text{C}$ = none

Acknowledged

QAP 01/03 Issue 2 13/12/1999

SAMPLE SUBMISSION FORM

Please provide as much information as possible for each sample submitted. It will greatly help us in publishing dates rapidly if we have the full information required for publication.

If you are submitting a series of samples, there is no need to write in repeat information for each one, but please do not overlook specific stratigraphic details (pages 2 & 3).

Suggested name for sample series: EFCHED North East Black Sea Project

Your reference no: EFD4C326

Name and location of site: Sary-Kaya, eastern Crimea

Country: Ukraine

Latitude: 45° 06.512' N

Longitude: 34° 33.537'E

(Greenwich meridian)

Grid reference (specify grid):

Type of material: tooth

Any specific identification (please indicate as precisely as possible): Equid

Family:

Genus: *Equus*

Species: *hydruntinus*

For bone, type (e.g. femur): tooth

Collector's name: R. A. Housley

Date of excavation: 14 August 2004

Sender's name: Dr R A Housley

Sender's signature:

Address:

Department of Archaeology, University of Glasgow, Gregory Building, Lilybank Gardens, Glasgow G12 8QQ

Tel: 0141 330 6873

email:

r.housley@archaeology.gla.ac.uk

Submission date: April 2005

Is the sample primarily:

archaeological

geological

other

Was the sample	(a)	sealed in a recognisable horizon	<input type="checkbox"/>
	(b)	sealed in a localised feature, e.g. grave or pit	<input type="checkbox"/>
	(c)	other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is this information known	(a)	beyond reasonable doubt	<input type="checkbox"/>
	(b)	with some possible doubt	<input type="checkbox"/>
	(c)	with major doubt	<input type="checkbox"/>

Certainty of Association

(please tick one box)

Full certainty: the sample came from the artefact itself, e.g. wagon wheel, bone pommel of dagger	<input type="checkbox"/>
High probability: there is a direct functional relationship between the sample and archaeological finds, e.g. coffin dates finds in grave, carbonised grain in rubbish pit dates sherds, charcoal dates urn	<input type="checkbox"/>
Probability: the functional relationship is not demonstrable but the quantity of organic material and size of fragments argue in favour or it, e.g. charcoal concentration in a rubbish pit or occupation layer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reasonable possibility: as above, but the fragments are small and scattered, e.g. 'dark earth' in an occupation layer, charcoal fragments in a grave	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sample age in relation to burial / discard (please tick one box)

Samples are generally **older** than their contexts:

The difference in date is so small as to be negligible (less than 20 years); e.g. twigs, grain, leather, bone, outermost tree rings.	<input type="checkbox"/>
The time difference can amount to several decades (over 20, less than 100 years), e.g. charcoal from short-lived wood species, outermost rings from long-lived wood species, objects, which might have a long period of use.	<input type="checkbox"/>
The time difference may amount to centuries, e.g. charcoal from long-lived wood species possibly subject to re-use.	<input type="checkbox"/>
The nature of the dated organic material is not precisely known, e.g. samples consisting of 'dark earth', 'ash', 'soil'.	<input type="checkbox"/>

Note: the sections above drawn from: Waterbolk, H.T. (1971) *Proc. Prehist. Soc.* 37(2), 15-33

Named stages

Local archaeological name, e.g. Maglemosian: None

General archaeological name, e.g. Mesolithic: Mousterian / Middle Palaeolithic

Local geological unit, e.g. Larmudiac Beds: NA

General geological name, e.g. Late Glacial: Late Pleistocene – mostly likely OIS 3

Stratigraphic and environmental details: (if none, write 'none')

Please give details of sample locations (including detailed site drawings on a separate sheet), describing horizons and other features relevant to sample position and condition.

Please mention possible contamination, rootlets, intrusions, disturbances, humic acids, carbonates, calcareous or volcanic environment, nearness to water table, nearness to surface, etc.

Sample comes from archaeological horizon I, which is situated in geological layer 5. It comes from a depth of 309 cm and is bracketed by two OSL samples, EFD4L244 (layer 4 at a depth of 274 cm) and EFD4L245 (layer 5 at a depth of 327 cm).

The area is limestone and so the deposits are highly calcareous. Bone preservation at the site is very poor although flint stone tools appear to be hardly worn. There are a number of animal burrows in the upper part of the section.

Optional checklist:

Sector: square 35C

layer, sub-layer: sample is from cultural horizon I, and is situated at a depth of 309 cm in geological layer 5

feature: none

phase of site: Middle Palaeolithic layer I, the latest (i.e. youngest) of 5 stone tool assemblages

Sender's comment on submission:

(i.e. comment on what date is intended to demonstrate, designed to hold good regardless of specific results)

The purpose of this sample is to cross-validate OSL samples EFD4L244 (geological layer 4, depth 274 cm) and EFD4L245 (geological layer 5, depth 327 cm). It is associated with cultural horizon I, the latest Middle Palaeolithic stone tool horizon on the site. Layer 5 is a fossil soil, which suggests that this cultural horizon occurred under interstadial conditions. There is no existing dating from the site but an age sometime in OIS-3 seems a possibility.

Sample collection and treatment

How was the sample collected ? Found during cleaning of a vertical section
(surface, trench, section, etc.)

How has it been stored ? Polythene bag
(nature of container, etc.)

Have preservatives, fungicides, etc., been used ? No

If so, please give details of any chemical treatments, identifying chemicals used.
Not applicable

Was sample wet or dry when collected ? Damp

If wet, how was it dried ? Air dried

Can the entire sample be used for dating ? Yes

Has this or a related sample also been sent to another laboratory ? OSL samples are with SUERC

If so, please give Laboratory and date numbers

SUERC samples EFD4L244 – EFD4L246, no lab or date numbers as the samples are currently undergoing OSL analysis

No other dating analyses known to date

Relevant publications

(In format: Author, initials, year, title, **Journal** (Publisher), volume, pages)

Kolosov, Yu.G., Stepanchuk, V.N., and Chabai, V.P., 1993, *The early Palaeolithic of the Crimea*, Kiev: Naukova Dumka (in Russian).