

### A1.1.0 Zooarchaeological Methods

Each bone fragment was identified where possible to element and species, or where this was not possible, to large mammal (e.g. cattle-sized), medium mammal (e.g. sheep-sized), and unidentified categories. Identification was carried out using a comparative collection and with reference to Hillson (1992), Schmid (1972), and Hillson (2005) for domestic mammals, and Yalden (2003) for small mammals. Zones were recorded for each anatomical element using the Maltby/Hambleton method (Hambleton and Maltby n.d.); this was applied where feasible to small mammals. For birds, zones were recorded using the Cohen and Sarjeantson (1986:110-112) method. Identification of sheep and goats was carried out using elements described by Boessneck (1969) and Prummel and Frisch (1986). Classification of curvature and torsion in sheep/goat and cattle horn cores follows Sykes and Symmons (2007). The presence of dental enamel hypoplasias in pig teeth was recorded after Dobney and Ervynck (1998) and Dobney *et al* (2002).

Pathological changes have been recorded descriptively by location, size, type (lytic/blastic) and a suggested differential diagnosis. These have been considered in relation to Bartosiewicz (2008); Bartosiewicz *et al* (1993; 1997); Bendry (2008), Brothwell *et al* (2005), Daugnora and Thomas (2005), Davies (2005), Manaseryan (2008), Martiniaková *et al* (2008), Mays (2005), Miklíková (2008), Murphy (2005), Ortner (2003), Udrescu (2005), and Vann (2008).

Metrical data were recorded using the measurements in von den Driesch (1976). Toothwear was recorded for cattle, pig and sheep/goat following Grant (1982) and for sheep/goat, Payne (1982). Hambleton (1999), and Halstead (1985) were also utilised. Fusion status was recorded for all epiphyseal areas present. Bone porosity was recorded for all fragments. Approximate ages from fusion data were adopted from Silver (1969). The percentage of the element present was estimated and recorded to the nearest 5% for all identified fragments. Taphonomic indicators were recorded for all fragments. Gnawing was recorded where possible by severity (minimal, moderate and severe) and location on the bone; weathering was recorded by severity on the same scale, as was eroded bone; burnt bone was recorded by colour (buff, brown, black and calcined). The condition of all fragments was assessed on a five-point scale through poor, poor-average, average, average-good and good.

Data were recorded in a series of Access relational databases. Data were sorted and extracted for further analysis in Excel which area also included.

### A1.2. 0 Ceramic analysis

The aim of the ceramic analysis carried out was to examine a sample of the pottery to obtain spot dates for contexts for which no previous dating had been suggested. Recording was a

abbreviated form of the methodology utilised for the South Cadbury Environs Project (Tabor 2002;2004), but focussed purely on diagnostic material.

Recording included:

- i. Full recording of rims, bases, decorated and other feature sherds
- ii. Briefer assessment of body sherds

Recording of rims etc combined typological detail and fabric information. This included vessel part, form, radius, maximum dimension, maximum thickness and maximum weight. Analysis of fabric was made for diagnostic sherds using the same procedure as employed by SCEP. Assessment of type was made with reference to the form series developed for SCEP (Tabor u.d.) and examples of known type held as part of the assemblage. Each sherd was assigned a date range based on the following categories: Neolithic, Early Bronze Age, Middle Bronze Age, Late Bronze Age, Early Iron Age, Middle Iron Age, Late Iron Age, 'Prehistoric', Late Iron Age/Romano-British, Romano-British, Post-Roman, Medieval, Post-Medieval, Modern. All wall sherds were sorted into broad fabric type (e.g. shell tempered, sand tempered etc), counted and the total for each fabric type entered in the appropriate column. Small indeterminate sherds were not recorded and this material was not weighed. This information was used to ascertain whether the fabrics contradicted the dates supplied by the diagnostic sherds e.g. Late Iron Age/Romano-British sand tempered Poole Harbour wares occurring in contexts where the diagnostic sherds might indicate a prehistoric date for the assemblage.

Each context was then assessed as to a date range and an assessment of residuality made. In larger assemblages, single sherds of much later data were regarded as intrusive. Date for pottery types was based on Woodward (2000), with some refinements developed by SCEP. For example PA1 forms may have had a longer currency and unbeaded and slightly out-turned rimmed BC3.3 bowls particularly in shell tempered fabrics may commence earlier (R. Tabor pers. comm.). This creates a greater overlap of Middle and Late Iron Age forms, and has the effect, once realised, of all but removing the perceived problems with residuality in the Late Iron Age deposits. Date ranges were utilised as some forms had very long duration.

### **A1.3.0 Stratigraphic analysis**

Stratigraphic information for much of the hillfort had to be reconstructed from notes in the archive and the original site records. This was entered into an Excel spreadsheet with information on the stratigraphic relationships where available. Many of the features in the interior of the hillfort had not been studied due to the fact that they comprise pits and post holes and there was little horizontal stratigraphy. Dating information from the pottery was used in combination with the available stratigraphic information, on a further Excel spreadsheet. In features where there was limited stratigraphic data the dating is largely reliant on the period assigned to the pottery.