CONTENTS


List of Figures vii-viii
List of Tables ix

Acknowledgements x-xi

**1 Introduction 1-49**

**1.1 RESEARCH QUESTIONS…….. 1**
1.1.1 Why Danebury? …… 2
1.1.2 Why butchery? …….. 3
1.1.3 Why spatial patterning? ……... 4
1.1.4 Models for the identification of consumption activities and social structures…….. 6
1.1.4.1: Feasting or 'household' scale consumption…… 6
1.1.4.2: Hierarchical or egalitarian society…… 7
1.1.4.3: Specialised or unspecialised activity……... 8
1.1.4.4: Immediate or 'structured' deposition…… 8
1.1.5 Conclusions…… 10

**1.2 THESIS STRUCTURE…… 10**

**1.3 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE…….. 12**
1.3.1 Hillforts And The Iron Age…… 12
1.3.1.1: Danebury and its interpretation…… 12
1.3.1.2: Differences between regions in the Iron Age…… 15
1.3.1.3: The Danebury Environs project…… 16

1.3.2 Animal Husbandry In The Iron Age…… 20
1.3.3 Spatial Patterning…… 22
1.3.4 Structured Deposition……... 30
1.3.5 Butchery Methods…… 38
1.3.5.1: Archaeological evidence for cooking and eating in the Iron Age…… 42
1.3.5.2: Animal bones in funerary contexts……... 43

1.3.6 Animal Symbolism…… 44
1.3.7 Conclusions……... 48

**2 Methodology 50-61**

**2.1 SAMPLE AREA…… 51**

**2.2 DATING THE BONE MATERIAL…….. 51**

**2.3 THE EXISTING DATA SET…… 52**
2.3.1 Feature selection……... 52
2.3.2 Bone selection……... 52
2.3.3 Grant's bone records…… 53
2.3.4 Knight's reanalysis of butchery mark incidence……... 54

**2.4 BONE CONDITION AND TAPHONOMY…… 56**
2.4.1 Bone recovery……... 56
2.4.2 Bone condition……... 56
2.4.3 Fragmentation of bone……. 57
2.4.4 Bone working……... 60
2.4.5 Possible effects of cooking on bone survival at Danebury……... 61

**2.5 CONCLUSIONS…….. 61**

**3 Iron Age Butchery at Danebury 62-166**

**3.1 METHODOLOGY…… 62**
3.1.1 Existing Butchery Records…… 63
3.1.2 Interpreting Butchery Marks…… 64
3.1.3 Coding Butchery Marks…… 65
3.1.3.1: Slaughter…… 67
3.1.3.2: Primary butchery…… 68
3.1.3.3: Preparation and portioning…… 69
3.1.3.4: Consumption and other activities…… 71
3.1.3.5: Industrial activity…… 72

3.1.4 Tools used for butchery…… 73
3.1.5 Unmarked bone…… 73
3.1.6 Summary…… 73

**3.2 PIG BUTCHERY AT DANEBURY…… 74**
3.2.1 Incidence of butchery marks…… 74
3.2.2 Butchery incidence by bone element…… 75
3.2.3 Pig butchery: pits…… 76
3.2.3.1: Pig butchery in pits: early phase…… 76
3.2.3.2: Pig butchery in pits: middle phase…… 78
3.2.3.3: Pig butchery in pits: late phase…… 80
3.2.3.4: Pig butchery in pits: summary…… 82
3.2.3.5: Change over time…… 82
3.2.3.6 Pig carcass divisions from pits…… 83
3.2.3.7 The sequence of dismemberment of pigs from pit deposits…… 84

3.2.4 Pig butchery: layers…… 86
3.2.4.1: Pig butchery in layers: early phase …… 88
3.2.4.2: Pig butchery in layers: middle phase …… 88
3.2.4.3: Pig butchery in layers: late phase …… 89
3.2.4.4: Pig butchery in layers: summary…… 89
3.2.4.5: Pig carcass divisions from layers…… 91

3.2.5 Differences between features: pit and layer comparisons…… 91
3.2.5.1: Differences between features: early phase…… 91
3.2.5.2: Differences between features: middle phase…… 92
3.2.5.3: Differences between features: late phase…… 93

3.2.6 Pig butchery conclusions…… 94
3.2.7 Biasing factors: age of pigs that had been butchered…… 95
3.2.8 Biasing factors: ages of pigs in pits and layers…… 97
3.2.9 Contemporary butchery of pigs…… 98
3.2.9.1: Primary butchery…… 99
3.2.9.2: Secondary butchery…… 99
3.2.9.3: Tertiary butchery…… 100
3.2.9.4: Comparison with Danebury…… 101
3.2.9.5: Conclusions…… 103

**3.3 CATTLE BUTCHERY AT DANEBURY…… 104**
3.3.1 Incidence of butchery marks…… 104
3.3.2 Types of mark…… 105
3.3.3 Cattle butchery: pits…… 105
3.3.3.1: Butchery incidence by bone element…… 105
3.3.3.2: Cattle butchery in pits: early phase…… 106
3.3.3.3: Cattle butchery in pits: middle phase…… 108
3.3.3.4: Cattle butchery in pits: late phase…… 110
3.3.3.5: Cattle bone in pits: summary …… 112
3.3.3.6: Cattle carcass divisions from pits…… 115

3.3.4 Cattle butchery: layers…….. 116
3.3.4.1: Cattle butchery in layers: early phase…….. 117
3.3.4.2: Cattle butchery in layers: middle phase…….. 117
3.3.4.3: Cattle butchery in layers: late phase…… 117
3.3.4.4: Cattle butchery in layers: summary…….. 118
3.3.4.5: Cattle carcass divisions from layers…… 118

3.3.5 Sequence of dismemberment: pits and layers…….. 119
3.3.5.1: Sequence of dismemberment: early phase…… 119
3.3.5.2: Sequence of dismemberment: middle phase…… 120
3.3.5.3: Sequence of dismemberment: late phase…….. 120

3.3.6 Differences between features: pit and layer butchery comparisons…….. 121
3.3.7 Differences between features: pit and layer carcass divisions …… 122

**3.4 COMPARISON OF CATTLE AND PIG BUTCHERY…….. 123**

**3.5 BUTCHERY FROM THE DANEBURY ENVIRONS SITES…… 124**
3.5.1 Recording methods…… 124
3.5.2 Nettlebank Copse…….. 124
3.5.2.1: Incidence of butchery…….. 124
3.5.2.2: Pig butchery at Nettlebank Copse…… 126
3.5.2.3: Cattle butchery at Nettlebank Copse…… 128

3.5.3 Suddern Farm…… 130
3.5.3.1: Incidence of butchery…….. 130
3.5.3.2: Pig butchery at Suddern Farm…….. 131
3.5.3.3: Cattle butchery at Suddern Farm…….. 132

**3.6 BUTCHERY FROM BALKSBURY CAMP…… 135**
3.6.1 Archives and recording code…… 136
3.6.2 Butchery marks in the early phase…….. 136
3.6.2.1: Pigs…… 136
3.6.2.2: Cattle…… 137

3.6.3 Butchery marks in the middle- late phase…….. 137
3.6.3.1: Pigs…… 137
3.6.3.2: Cattle…… 138

**3.7 BUTCHERY COMPARISONS BETWEEN DANEBURY, BALKSBURY AND THE DANEBURY ENVIRONS SITES…… 139**
3.7.1 Comparison of Nettlebank Copse and Suddern Farm…… 140
3.7.1.1: Pigs…… 140
3.7.1.2: Cattle…… 141

3.7.2 Comparison of the Environs sites to Danebury…… 143
3.7.2.1: Pigs…… 143
3.7.2.2: Cattle …… 144
3.7.2.3: Summary…….. 146

3.7.3 Comparison of Balksbury to the Danebury Environs sites …… 147

3.7.4 Comparison of Balksbury and Danebury…….. 148

**3.8 CONCLUSIONS OF BUTCHERY ANALYSIS…… 150**

**4 Spatial patterning: two dimensional** **167-206**

**4.1 METHODOLOGY FOR SPATIAL INVESTIGATION……..**
4.1.1 Selecting the bone elements to investigate spatially…… **167**
4.1.1.1: Pig bone elements…….. 167
4.1.1.2: Cattle bone elements…….. 168
168
4.1.2 Possible bias from young bone……
4.1.3 Possible bias from fragmented bone…….. 169
4.1.4 Spatial data manipulation: the use of a GIS for intra-site analysis…… 169
4.1.4.1: Theoretical issues…… 169
4.1.4.2: Practical application…… 169
170

**4.2 INVESTIGATION OF SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF PIG BONE IN PITS……..**
4.2.1 Early Phase…… **174**
4.2.2 Middle Phases…… 174
4.2.3 Late Phase…….. 177
178

**4.3 INVESTIGATION OF SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF CATTLE BONE IN PITS….**
4.3.1 Early Phase…… **179**
4.3.2 Middle Phases…… 179
4.3.3 Late Phase…….. 181
4.3.4 Conclusions **……..** 182
182

**4.4 DIFFERENCES IN DISTRIBUTION BETWEEN CATTLE AND PIG BONES……**
**183**

**4.5 TWO DIMENSIONAL ANALYSIS OF CAT, DOG, BIRD AND DEER BONES AND SPECIAL ANIMAL DEPOSITS……**
4.5.1 Early phase…… **184**
4.5.2 Late phase…….. 184
4.5.3 Comparison of animal bone distribution between phases…….. 184
184

**4.6 TWO-DIMENSIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF LAYER MATERIAL……..**
4.6.1 Late phase…….. **186**
4.6.1.1: Pig…….. 186
4.6.1.2: Cattle…… 186
186
4.6.2 Early phase……
4.6.2.1: Pig…….. 187
4.6.2.2: Cattle…… 187
4.6.2.3: Comparison between species …….. 187
187
4.6.3 Summary of pig and cattle bone in layers……
188

**4.7 CONCLUSIONS OF TWO- DIMENSIONAL SPATIAL ANALYSIS ……**
**188**

**5 Spatial patterning: three-dimensional 207-252**

**5.1 METHODOLOGY…… 208**

**5.2 LATE PHASE…… 210**
5.2.1 Analysis of individual pits…… 210
5.2.1.1: Case study: pit 23…… 210
5.2.1.2: Conclusions of case study analysis…… 215

5.2.2 Comparison of late phase layers within one grid…… 217
5.2.3 Comparison of deposit types: pit 507 and Circular Structure 20…… 219
5.2.3.1: Contexts with high proportions of meat bearing bones…… 220
5.2.3.2: Contexts with a mixture of high and low meat-bearing bones…… 220
5.2.3.3: Contexts with high proportions of low meat-bearing bones…… 221
5.2.3.4: Conclusions…… 221

5.2.4 Conclusions …… 222

**5.3 EARLY PHASE…… 222**
5.3.1 Analysis of individual pit layers…… 222
5.3.2 Comparison of early phase layers within one grid…… 224
5.3.3 Conclusions …… 224

**5.4 THREE DIMENSIONAL ANALYSIS OF BONE AT DANEBURY: CONCLUSIONS…… 224**

**5.5 DANEBURY ENVIRONS THREE DIMENSIONAL SPATIAL ANALYSIS…… 225**
5.5.1 Pit 87…… 225
5.5.2 Pit 92…… 226
5.5.3 Conclusions…… 227

**5.6 CONCLUSIONS OF THREE DIMENSIONAL SPATIAL ANALYSIS…… 227**

**6 Discussion: meat consumption and disposal of animal bone at Danebury hillfort 253-288**

**6.1 INTRA-SITE CONSUMPTION AND COOKING ACTIVITY…… 253**
6.1.1 Cooking…… 254
6.1.2 Preservation…… 255
6.1.3 Consumption…… 256
6.1.3.1: Size of meat parts…… 257
6.1.3.2: Intensity of use…… 259

**6.2 INTRA-SITE DEPOSITIONAL ACTIVITY…… 260**
6.2.1 Identifying ritual deposits…… 261
6.2.2 Zoning of areas…… 265
6.2.3 Evidence of area segregation at Danebury…… 266
6.2.4 Possible deposition scenarios…… 269

**6.3 INTER-SITE CONSUMPTION ACTIVITY…… 275**

**6.4 INTER-SITE DEPOSITIONAL ACTIVITY…… 279**

**6.5 CHANGE OVER TIME…… 284**

**6.6 A SPECIAL STATUS FOR DANEBURY?…… 287**

**7 Conclusions** **289-299**

**7.1 DANEBURY IN THE IRON AGE** ..... **289**

**7.2 APPRAISAL OF METHODOLOGIES USED**..... **293**
7.2.1 Butchery..... 293
7.2.2 Deposition ..... 295
7.2.2.1: Geographic Information Systems..... 295
7.2.2.2: Three-dimensional analysis..... 295

**7.3 FURTHER WORK**..... **296**
7.3.1 Consumption activity..... 296
7.3.2 Butchery..... 296
7.3.3 Spatial distribution..... 297
7.3.4 Inter-site studies..... 298

**7.4 CONCLUDING REMARKS**..... **299**

**A1 APPENDIX 1 Coding of butchery marks** **300**

**A2 APPENDIX 2 Butchery marks** **301-319**

A2.1 Coded butchery marks from pig bone in pits..... 301
A2.2 Coded butchery marks from pig bone in layers ..... 306
A2.3 Coded butchery marks from cattle bone in pits ..... 308
A2.4 Coded butchery marks from cattle bone in layers..... 317

**A3 APPENDIX 3 Butchery experiment** **320-336**

**A3.1 INTRODUCTION**..... **320**

**A3.2 BACKGROUND**..... **321**

**A3.3 METHODOLOGY**..... **323**

**A3.4 RESULTS**..... **324**
A3.4.1 Comparison of knife and flint..... 324
A3.4.2 Comparison of the experimental cuts and those observed at Danebury..... 325
A3.4.3 Meat and bone weights from the head and hock..... 328

**A3.5 CONCLUSIONS**..... **329**

**A4 APPENDIX 4 Glossary** **337-338**

**A5 APPENDIX 5 Skeletal element diagram** **339**

**Bibliography** **340-353**

**Ancient Sources**..... **340**
**Modern Works**..... **340**

# FIGURES

Page Number

## Chapter 1

1.1: (in text) Monetary value of different pig carcass parts. 3

## Chapter 2

2.1: (in text) Functional areas in the early and later phases at Danebury. 51
2.2: (in text) Relative sizes of modern domestic animals with Iron Age Danebury. 53

## Chapter 3

3.1: Image of an original catalogue card for butchery recording, completed by Annie Grant 152
3.2: Codes for bone element zones: head. 152
3.3: Codes for bone element zones: torso. 153
3.4: Codes for bone element zones: forelimb. 154
3.5: Codes for bone element zones: hindlimb. 155
3.6: Flesh covering on bone elements of a horse hind limb. 156
3.7: Positions for scoring the hide of a modern ox in preparation for skinning. 156

3.8: Butchery marks in the early phase and cp 4 at Danebury 157
3.9: Butchery marks in the middle phases cp 5 and cp 6 at Danebury 158
3.10: Butchery marks in the late phase at Danebury 159
3.11: Carcass divisions in the late phase at Danebury 159
3.12: Carcass divisions in the early phase and cp 4 at Danebury 160
3.13: Carcass divisions in the middle phases cp 5 and cp 6 at Danebury 161

3.14: A cattle scapula, with the positions of longitudinal filleting marks. 162
3.15: Filleting the meat from the outside of a lamb ribcage. 162
3.16: Filleting the meat from a sawn-through pig ribcage. 163
3.17: Pig head, halved and with the mandible removed. 163
3.18: Divisions of the carcass and filleting prior to cooking of pig bone from late Iron Age pit deposits and modern traditional butchers. 164
3.19: (in text) Bodily distribution of butchery marks by phase: cattle. 112
3.20: Butchery at Suddern Farm. 165
3.21: Butchery at Nettlebank Copse and Balksbury. 165

## Chapter 4

4.1: Positions of pits and pig bone cranial fragments in the early phase. 190
4.2: Positions of pig mandible, tooth and atlas and axis fragments in pits in the early phase. 191
4.3: Positions of pig torso bone fragments in pits in the early phase. 192
4.4: Positions of pig forelimb bone fragments in pits in the early phase. 193
4.5: Positions of pig hindlimb bone fragments in pits in the early phase. 194
4.6: Positions of late phase pits, pig bone fragments and pig vertebral fragments. 195
4.7: Positions of pig forelimb bone fragments in late phase pits. 196

4.8: Positions of complete pig bone in late phase pits, Cunliffe's use areas and cattle bone fragments in early phase pits. 197
4.9: Positions of cattle head and forelimb bones in early phase pits. 198
4.10: Positions of cattle hind limb bones in early phase pits. 199
4.11: Positions of cattle first phalanges in early phase pits and all cattle bone, occipital condyles and first phalanges in late phase pits. 200
4.12: Positions of cattle distal scapula, distal humerus, distal femur and pelvic acetabulum in late phase pits. 201

4.13: Positions of bird and dog bones in early and late phase pits. 202
4.14: Positions of red deer and articulated bones in early and late phase pits. 203
4.15: Location of grid squares and positions of pig bone in early phase layers. 204
4.16: Positions of cattle bone in late phase layers. 205
4.17: Positions of cattle bone in early phase layers. 206

## Chapter 5

5.1: Bone elements in Pit 23, layers 1 and 2. 231
5.2: Bone elements in Pit 23, layers 3 and 4. 232
5.3: Bone elements in Pit 23, layers 5 and 6. 233
5.4: Bone elements in Pit 23, layers 7 and 8. 234
5.5: Bone elements in layers 5 and 122. 235
5.6: Bone elements in layers 9 and 35. 236
5.7: Bone elements in layers 7 and 65. 237

5.8: (in text) Pit 507 in section. After: Cunliffe 1984a, fiche 5. 219
5.9: Bone elements in layer 13 and all layers of pit 507. 238
5.10: Bone elements in all layers of circular structure 20. 239
5.11: Bone elements in Pit 507, layers 1 and 5. 240
5.12: Bone elements in Pit 507, layers 2 and 3. 241
5.13: Bone elements in Pit 507, layers 4 and 6. 242

5.14: Bone elements in Pit 44, layers 1 and 2. 243
5.15: Bone elements in Pit 44, layers 3 and 4. 244
5.16: Bone elements in Pit 44, layers 5 and 6. 245
5.17: Bone elements in layers 41 and 45. 246

5.18: Bone elements in Suddern Farm Pit 87, layers 1 and 2. 247
5.19: Bone elements in Suddern Farm Pit 87, layers 3 and 4. 248
5.20: Bone elements in Suddern Farm Pit 92, layers 1 and 2. 249
5.21: Bone elements in Suddern Farm Pit 92, layers 3 and 4. 250
5.22: Bone elements in Suddern Farm Pit 92, layers 5 and 6. 251
5.23: Bone elements in Suddern Farm Pit 92, layers 7 and 8. 252

## Appendix 3

A3.1: Iron knives 2.13 and 2.28, from Danebury, used as prototypes for the experimental tools. 331
A3.2: Iron knives produced for the experiment. 331
A3.3: Flint tools being knapped by Linden Cooper. 332
A3.4: Three of the flint tools used in the experiment. 332

A3.5: Cut marks observed on the bones of the experimental pig heads. 333
A3.6: Splitting the skull with an iron knife and hammerstone. 333
A3.7: Disarticulating the mandible from the cranium using an iron knife. 334

A3.8: Marks made on the cranium of pig number 1 with a flint tool. 334
A3.9: Marks made on the mandible of pig number 1 with a flint tool. 335
A3.10: Marks made on the cranium of pig number 2 with an iron knife. 335
A3.11: Marks made on the mandible of pig number 2 with an iron knife. 336
A3.12: A split skull at Danebury from a late phase pit. 336

# TABLES

Page Number

## Chapter 2


2.1: The dating at Danebury, as defined by Cunliffe 1995: 18. 51
2.2: An example of the database entries for cattle bone, available for use in this study. 53
2.3: Incidence of butchery marks on pig, cattle and sheep bone by Grant and Knight. 55
2.4: Percentage of complete long bones by phase and feature type. 58
2.5: Frequency of different bone elements identified as worked at Danebury. 60


## Chapter 3


3.1: Coding for recording the position and purpose of butchery marks on pig bone. 66
3.2: Pig butchery incidence by phase. 74
3.3: Pig butchery: incidence of types of mark. 75
3.4: Pig butchery in pits at Danebury by bone element. 76
3.5: Pig butchery in layers at Danebury by bone element. 87
3.6: Fusion status of butchered pig pelves (pits and layers). 96
3.7: Age at death of pigs from pit deposits at Danebury. 97
3.8: Age at death of pigs from layer deposits at Danebury. 98

3.9: Cattle butchery incidence by phase. 104
3.10: $\chi^2$ testing of similarity in cattle butchery incidence between phases and features. 104
3.11: Cattle butchery at Danebury: incidence of types of mark. 105
3.12: Cattle butchery in pits at Danebury by bone element. 106
3.13: Cattle butchery in layers at Danebury by bone element. 116

3.14: Incidence of butchered pig bone at Nettlebank Copse 125
3.15: Butchery incidence on pig bone from Nettlebank Copse. 126
3.16: Butchery incidence on cattle bone from Nettlebank Copse. 128
3.17: Incidence of butchered pig bone at Suddern Farm. 130
3.18: Incidence of butchered cattle bone at Suddern Farm 131
3.19: Incidence of cuts to cattle bone at Suddern Farm from all Iron Age phases. 132

3.20: Cattle butchery from early Iron Age Balksbury: pits. 137
3.21: Pig butchery from middle-late Iron Age Balksbury: pits. 138
3.22: Cattle butchery from middle-late Iron Age Balksbury: pits. 139
3.23: Comparative chronologies for selected sites. 139
3.24: Pig butchery from Nettlebank Copse and Suddern Farm: types of marks. 141
3.25: Cattle butchery at Nettlebank Copse and Suddern Farm: types of marks. 142


## Chapter 5


5.1: Categories of bone element determined from meat covering of bones. 209
5.2: High, medium and low meat categorisation of bone from individual layers in pit 23 211
5.3: Summary of (non-bone) finds and excavation information from pit 23 212
5.4: Ages, in months, of the minimum numbers of individuals in pit 23, by layer. 214
5.5: Numbers of bones per individual by pit layer. 215

5.6: High, medium and low meat categorisation for late phase layers in grid D12 218
5.7: High, medium and low meat categorisation for layers in pit 507 219
5.8: High, medium and low meat categorisation for layers in pit 44. 223
5.9: High, medium and low meat categorisation for early layers 41 and 45. 224
5.10: High, medium and low meat categorisation for layers in pit 87, Suddern Farm 225
5.11: High, medium and low meat categorisation for layers in pit 92, Suddern Farm 226


## Appendix 3


A3.1: Mandibular Wear Stages of the two pigs used in the butchery experiment. 323
A3.2: Meat and bone weights from the butchery experiment, to 5 grams. 328

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

NERC provided funding for this research project. Without their financial assistance this thesis could not have been produced, so I would like to take this opportunity to gratefully recognise their contribution.

Many thanks are due to the staff at the School of Archaeology and Ancient History for their continued support, especially Dr Annie Grant, my supervisor, whose practical and level-headed advice (and her time) was invaluable. Annie also made available her database and butchery archive material. I would also like to thank Dr Mark Gillings who was always willing to help with technical matters, discuss ideas and read through drafts, and also Dr Jeremy Taylor for comments on previous drafts and providing friendly advice. Professor Graham Shipley gladly assisted with the Greek and Latin translations, and Tony Gouldwell was happy to help with methodological and identification matters, and provided technical support during the preparation of the bones from the experiment. Alex Mosely also deserves a mention, for never being too busy to help with computer problems, and Deirdre O'Sullivan, for providing encouragement (and accommodation) in the final stages.

Collecting primary data was made very much easier and more enjoyable by the helpful and enthusiastic people I continually besieged for information. Professor Barry Cunliffe permitted access to the records and use of some diagrams for publications, and referred me to Dr Richard Osgood, who provided updated records of pit reliability and phasing, and enabled me to briefly join in the excavation of a Danebury Environs site at Grately. Also, I would like to express my appreciation to Kay Ainsworth, for access to the Danebury archive in Winchester; Dr Gary Lock for information on the computerised Danebury records, and the experience of digging at Alfred's castle; and Dr Mark Maltby for the explanation and use of his recording conventions for Balksbury butchery marks.

Julie Hamilton freely provided access to her records of butchery from the Danebury Environs sites, in addition to cups of tea and many e-mailed files; Dr Jaco Weinstock located and made available the relevant paper archive at the Southampton Faunal Remains Unit; Laura Pugsley took the time to discuss her experience of pig butchery; Rachael Pope permitted my use of her draft paper on Iron Age cooking methods; and Joan Segui provided

a home video of traditional Catalan pig slaughter. Staff at the Hampshire County Council sites and monuments records office cheerfully took the time to check whether any finds from field walking had been recovered in the vicinity of the hillfort.

For help with the butchery experiment, many people are due thanks. Dr Peter Crew, in conjunction with Hector Cole the blacksmith, produced iron knives for our use, modelled to our specifications. Linden Cooper and Jodie Humphrey knapped flint tools, and Jodie deserves special mention for the use of her kitchen to boil the pig heads. For his enthusiasm and willingness to assist and demonstrate techniques (despite bad health) Richard Wood has been invaluable. Andrew Worden, whose patience after two false starts with the experiment was never rewarded, since his herd of boar finally succumbed to foot and mouth, and Robert Boulton, who showed me how to spit roast a pig, also have my gratitude.

Dr Alan Outram and all at the University of Exeter Archaeology Department helped immeasurably through their optimism and entreaties to ‘get it done’. Thanks also to all the postgraduates at Leicester, whose company, advice and tolerance I greatly appreciate!

Family and friends (you know who you are), thanks for your support and understanding. Special thanks go to Cain Hegarty, who transformed many of my drawings into computer images worthy of inclusion, for his patience and quiet encouragement.