

GU-

RADIOCARBON DATING SUBMISSION:

AA-

SAMPLE SHEET (2009)

¹⁴C age

δ13C

PROJECT NAME Kirk Ness, North Berwick CODE / DATE SSC 99-06

SAMPLE REFERENCE SK605 CONTEXT REFERENCE.....617

COLLECTOR DATE OF COLLECTION Thomas Addyman , 21 Oct 1999

DESCRIPTION OF CONTEXT IN WHICH SAMPLE FOUND

Describe briefly what it was, what its fill was, what it cut or overlay, and what cut it or covered or sealed it.

Fill (617) of grave for skeleton 605, associated with grave cut 606.

This grave is one of the most interesting ones as the skeleton has evidence for four stabbing wounds that had been fatal. It is that of a young man, the weapon has been identified as that of a dagger or possibly a knife.

According to the stratigraphic sequence it is also one of the earliest graves on the site.

HOW THE SAMPLE RELATES TO THE CONTEXT

Describe the one or more most probable ways in which the sample material may have found its way to where it was discovered. How much time probably passed between its death and its incorporation in the context in which it was found?

The sample is from a skeleton, the body was securely found in a grave cut, associated with a graveyard assemblage of at least 19 further graves. Although only the upper torso survives, the surviving part of the grave had no sign of disturbance.

If the material could have been dead for a long time (decades / centuries / millennia) before it entered the context in which it was found, please describe how this may most probably have happened.

It is assumed that the body was buried within days of the death.

Could a post-depositional disturbance process have brought the sample material into the context? If so describe how you will interpret the resulting date

The lower half of the grave has been cut during mid-^{19th}~~20th~~ century landscaping works, but the upper torso remained completely intact with no sign of disturbance. The graveyard was abandoned c1700 and the site has seen no further use.

HOW THE SAMPLE RELATES TO WHAT IS TO BE DATED

Please ~~tick~~ **tick** out all but one of the following:

The sample is an integral part of the object to be dated (e.g. part of plank to date plank).

The sample is closely related to the object to be dated (e.g. encrustation to date an urn).

It is part of a skeleton.

The sample is part of a concentration of charcoal in the context described above (e.g. from a hearth).

The sample is part of a general scatter of material of uncertain origin (**N.B.** special justification essential)

COLLECTION METHOD

List any preservative or other treatment used on sample. n/a

How was it collected? by hand when context was under excavation

How has it been stored? Lightly washed, dried and then securely packed in finds bag, stored in cold and dry store room.

Was the sample wet or dry when collected? Dry apart from moisture of soil ...

If wet how was it dried? n/a

List any related samples sent to another laboratory n/a

Can the entire sample be used for dating? yes

SPECIALIST IDENTIFICATION OF SAMPLE TO BE DATED

=====

SAMPLE AS RECEIVED BY THE SPECIALIST: ~~Unprocessed bulk sample / Sieve flot / Sieve residue / core or Kubiena sample / hand collected / other~~ (delete all but one)

Packaging: in finds bag, padded box

Organic constituents of what you received in the laboratory, in approximate order of weight. Please mention all organics, whether amorphous or identifiable. The information here should contribute to an understanding of how the sub-sample which is to be dated might have got to where it was found.

n/a?

=====

THE SINGLE ENTITY SUB-SAMPLE SELECTED FOR DATING

Please note that Historic Scotland will not approve the dating of subsamples containing more than one entity (with the exception of pot residues, peat and the like). HS has to pay a charge for samples which are found to be too small after processing at the radiocarbon laboratory. Charred or cremated bone should be listed as a specific type of material.

Sample material (bone, charcoal etc): bone

Sample species...Human rib bone..... weight XXX

Minimum dry weights: antler: 200 mg; bone: 200 mg; shell carbonate: 15 mg; plant remains: 7 mg; wood: 7 mg; charcoal: 5 mg; charred seeds: 5 mg; peat: 7 mg

=====

Specialist evidence for age at death of the single entity chosen for dating. For charcoal, is it small roundwood (10 to 20 years old) or the outer rings of a trunk or branch?. Does it include sapwood?

Male, young adult.

Age at death summary: ~~Less than 2 yr / Up to 10 yrs / up to 20 yrs / Up to 50 yrs / Up to 100 yrs / More than 100 yrs~~ (delete all but the shortest provable estimate):

Evidence for condition of the sub-sample: Please describe any specialist evidence for what happened to the sub-sample after death. For instance, does it look fresh or abraded? Has it degraded?

Appears not to be abraded and in good condition. The human bone from the graveyard was generally hard and well preserved.

Due to the erosion of the medieval ground surface, however, many of the remains were at a level just under the turf and the weight of passers-by had caused breakage of some bones. In some very shallow graves, the roots of the grass had etched channels in the surface cortex of the bone, possibly masking some pathological lesions. *

=====

Stable isotope measurements will be obtained for all bone samples.

May SUERC use the sample residue for in-house research without consultation? Yes / No

=====

Name printed in capital letters, please Signature

Identified by David Henderson signed date

Submitted by Thomas Addyman signed *T Addyman* date *8 Feb 2010*

Authorised for HS by *Rod McCullagh* signed date

UNLESS OTHERWISE CLEARLY SPECIFIED THIS AUTHORISATION IS FOR DATING OF A SINGLE ENTITY ONLY, NOT FOR MORE THAN ONE PIECE OF ORGANIC MATERIAL.

** In this case the sample was deeply overlain by upper graveyard deposits*