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Chronology of the burials

This report synthesises the information on the stratigraphy, chronological constraints and radiocarbon dating of the skeletons excavated at Palace Green Library in 2013 to give the best estimate of their date given all the chronological evidence.

1. Stratigraphic sequence

For the purposes of dating the skeletons the relevant stratigraphic information is the sequence of
- a waterlogged deposit (context 508 overlying context 520) which has been radiocarbon dated, followed by
- a sterile sand deposit, into which were cut
- the burial pits (contexts 512, and 514),
- a later pit (context 510), cutting one of the burial pits, which contained clay pipes and glass, and
- the foundations of
  - the southern block of the Bishop’s stables, (currently the Library’s Learning Centre and part of the Music Department), which was present on this site by 1754 (see report on History and topography of the site).
  - the wall adjoining Windy Gap into which some of the bones have been mortared, with the upper part of the wall probably being 19th century in date.

The arrangement of the human remains in the pits and their co-mingling is indicative of two single occasions of burial, and therefore that the individuals died within a very short space of time. The common features of the two pits suggest that they are also close together in time, and, given the resolution of radiocarbon dating, can be treated as a single event.

2. Radiocarbon dates

Initially, four dates were obtained, two on the waterlogged materials (samples 5 and 6) and two on the skeletal remains (samples Sk9 and Sk16A). Although other evidence suggested that these remains should be associated with the prisoners from the Battle of Dunbar, the dates on the skeletons fall slightly before 1650, even when other dating evidence is included (see below). However, these samples were chosen to establish the broad dating of the site and not to obtain results which would resolve chronological questions within a few decades. Therefore, further dating of four samples carefully selected to maximise the precision of the result was undertaken, along with detailed consideration of possible confounding factors (see below).

3. Evidence of pipe smoking

Two skeletons (Sk12 and Sk21) showed clear pipe-facets in the teeth which can only arise from a long-term habit of holding a pipe in the teeth. Two others (Sk2 and Sk25) potentially had this wear though the dentition is too incomplete to be certain (see Skeletal Catalogue). The evidence of pipe use is strong evidence about the dating.

If the skeletons are prisoners from the Battle of Dunbar then they come from Scotland, otherwise they are likely to be from north-east England. Both possibilities need to be considered.

Tobacco smoking is first documented in Scotland in the first decade of the 17th century and pipes became common in domestic accounts after c.1640 (Gallagher 1987). Tobacco imports were taxed
Table 1: Radiocarbon measurements and simple calibrations assuming terrestrial samples. Calibrated ranges are rounded out to the nearest decade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Δ^13C (% PDB)</th>
<th>Δ^15N (% AIR)</th>
<th>C/N atomic</th>
<th>Lab code</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Simple terrestrial calibrated range (95.4% probability, years AD)</th>
<th>% marine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F512</td>
<td>Sk9</td>
<td>Human right femur</td>
<td>-20.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>SUERC-54228 (GU34490)</td>
<td>389±30</td>
<td>1440-1530 (68.6%) 1550-1640 (26.8%) 1570-1630 (21.2%)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F514</td>
<td>Sk16A</td>
<td>Human right tibia</td>
<td>-20.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>SUERC-54229 (GU34491)</td>
<td>397±30</td>
<td>1430-1530 (74.2%) 1570-1630 (21.2%)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F520</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Uncharred <em>Corylus avellana</em> nutshell</td>
<td>-26.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>SUERC-54230 (GU34492)</td>
<td>793±30</td>
<td>1190-1280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F508</td>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>Quercus</em> sp. bark</td>
<td>-30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>SUERC-54231 (GU34493)</td>
<td>830±30</td>
<td>1160-1270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F512</td>
<td>Sk12</td>
<td>Human lower left first molar, upper half of root</td>
<td>-20.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>SUERC-58783 (GU36756)</td>
<td>358±30</td>
<td>1450-1530 (46.5%) 1540-1660 (48.9%)</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F512</td>
<td>Sk12</td>
<td>Human lower left third molar, upper half of root</td>
<td>-19.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>SUERC-58784 (GU36757)</td>
<td>358±28</td>
<td>1450-1530 (47.0%) 1540-1640 (48.4%)</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F512</td>
<td>Sk21</td>
<td>Human lower right first molar, upper half of root</td>
<td>-20.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>SUERC-58788 (GU36758)</td>
<td>298±30</td>
<td>1490-1660</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F512</td>
<td>Sk21</td>
<td>Human lower right third molar, upper half of root</td>
<td>-20.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>SUERC-58789 (GU36759)</td>
<td>292±27</td>
<td>1490-1660</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tobacco was introduced into England by John Hawkins in 1565 (Morgan 2007). In 1612, a monopoly on the import of tobacco was granted to Lord Kincleven under which William Banks operated in Edinburgh from 1622 to 1629, and there is a report in 1655 of seven barrels of Dutch-made pipes being plundered from a shipwreck near Dunbar (Gallagher 1997). Clay pipes are common in archaeological contexts from the 1630s onwards (Gallagher 2011). In the north-east of England there is evidence for pipe manufacture on Tyne-side from c.1630 (Edwards 1981), and the expenses of the Sheriff for the production of clay pipes in Northumberland and Assises at Gosforth in 1628 and 1629. In 1616, clay pipes became widely available from c.1620, with a monopoly on production granted in 1619 to Lord Kincleven under which William Banks operated in Edinburgh from 1622. In a collection of clay pipes from Harlepool there is a single example of a pipe dated 1580-1610. In many small towns from the early 17th century (Cowen 1975), and gradually grew in popularity, with a twenty-fold increase in the import of tobacco from the 1580s onwards (Oswald 1975). In 1612 the first imports from Virginia arrived, and the period 1614 to 1621 saw a twenty-five-fold increase in the import of tobacco. Archaeological evidence for clay pipes is known in London from the 1580s, but smoking was an activity of the upper classes as tobacco was expensive. Archaeological evidence for tobacco use is known in London from the 1580s, and gradually grew in popularity, with a twenty-fold increase in the import of tobacco from the 1580s onwards (Oswald 1975). In 1612 the first imports from Virginia arrived, and the period 1614 to 1621 saw a twenty-five-fold increase in the import of tobacco. There is evidence for the manufacture of clay pipes in Northumberland and Assises at Gosforth in 1628 and 1629, and the expenses of the Sheriff for the production of clay pipes in Northumberland and Assises at Gosforth in 1628 and 1629. In 1616, clay pipes became widely available from c.1620, with a monopoly on production granted in 1619 to Lord Kincleven under which William Banks operated in Edinburgh from 1622. In a collection of clay pipes from Harlepool there is a single example of a pipe dated 1580-1610. In many small towns from the early 17th century (Cowen 1975), and gradually grew in popularity, with a twenty-fold increase in the import of tobacco from the 1580s onwards (Oswald 1975). In 1612 the first imports from Virginia arrived, and the period 1614 to 1621 saw a twenty-five-fold increase in the import of tobacco.
though the remainder are from after 1660 (Brown and Gallagher 1980). In Yorkshire, White (2004:24) reported 14 known pipes from 1580-1610, but 523 from 1610-1640, indicating the rapid expansion of smoking. The earliest pipes recorded from Durham City are of styles dated c.1610-1640 and c.1620-1640 (Edwards 1993) and until c.1635 London was the only production centre supplying pipes to Durham.

The presence of pipe facets therefore places these individuals certainly after 1565, almost certainly after 1612 and probably after 1620, whichever part of Great Britain they come from.

4. **Mathematical modelling**

The Bayesian paradigm is adopted here to combine all the chronological evidence (Buck et al. 1996). Bayes Theorem provides a logical framework for the modification of current beliefs in the light of new evidence. Prior dating information, in the form of stratigraphic constraints, known chronological relationships and sample reliability, is incorporated into a mathematical model. This prior information is then combined with the probability distributions that arise from radiocarbon calibration to given posterior probability estimates for the dated samples, but it also allows the estimation of probability ranges for events which have not been directly dated. In practice the calculations for such a model are not suitable for algebraic methods and are conducted in a probabilistic manner on a computer. Using a method known as Markov Chain Monte Carlo, the computer randomly generates a large number of possible scenarios which take account of the radiocarbon dates, the calibration curve and the stratigraphic information, thus deriving probability distributions for the events of interest which take account of all available information. All estimates of calibrated and modelled dates were made using OxCal 4.2 Build 86 (Bronk Ramsey 2009a) and the IntCal13 and Marine13 International Calibration Curves (Reimer et al. 2013). OxCal calculations were performed using OxCal default settings except the use of a resolution of one year and model-dependent increases to the minimum number of iterations to achieve convergence to a stable result. The OxCal code used is given as an appendix.

a. **Initial radiocarbon dates**

When the first set of dates on the skeletal remains were obtained, they were modelled with a terminus post quem of 1612, and varying fractions of marine input in the diet (0%, 10%, 20%). This led to date estimates at 95.4% probability of 1610-1635, 1610-1640, and 1610-1645 respectively (the dates are rounded out to the nearest 5 years). As a marine component to the diet of more than 20% was considered very unlikely on the basis of the δ¹³C and δ¹⁵N values, this seemed to show that the date of death was before the Battle of Dunbar. However, the dates are very close to that event, other evidence seemed to point to these being prisoners from the Battle. Further measurements were therefore undertaken to improve the resolution of the dating.

b. **Second set of dates**

In order to refine the dating, samples were chosen with the clearest possible relationship to the other dating evidence and to maximise the information that the radiocarbon dates can provide. To do this the two individuals with clear evidence of pipe-smoking were sampled in order to maximise confidence that these men died after 1612. A method for maximising the information from radiocarbon dates that is often used with wood samples is wiggle-matching (Bronk Ramsey et al. 2001), where samples separated by a known number of rings are dated and by using the known separation in time of the samples the precision of the calibrated age can be improved by matching the pattern of dates to the calibration curve. To transfer this idea to human remains,
tooth roots which form at specific ages in childhood were sampled. The upper half of the root of the first molar forms at 4-6 years of age and the upper half of the root of the third molar forms at 14-16 years of age (AlQahtani et al. 2010), so they are separated by approximately 10 years. Sk12 was aged 19-23 years and Sk 21 was aged 21-25 years (see the Skeletal Catalogue). As the individuals involved are relatively young, the time from the third molar formation to death can be estimated fairly precisely thus giving the date of death.

Two sets of models have been used. The first set (A and C models) ignores the uncertainties in the ages of tooth formation and of death, and assumes that there is exactly 10 years between the dates on the two teeth and a further 6 and 8 years to death for Sk12 and Sk21 respectively. The second set (B and D models) treats these gaps as uncertain, expressing that uncertainty as normal distributions of 10±1 years between the teeth and then 6±1 and 8±1 years until death, respectively.

With the models for the second set of dates, the first two dates on Sk9 and Sk16A were included, and allowance was made for the fact that the bone sampled would have formed over a period of time before death. The data of Gosman et al. (2013) were used to calculate approximate turnover times for the midshaft femur of a 17 year old (Sk9) and the midshaft tibia of a 14 year old (Sk16A). From Gosman et al. (2013) Figure 7, the medullary area at the respective ages was taken and the age found at which total cross-sectional area of the bone corresponded to that value. The difference between the two values gives the maximum age of any part of the bone. This value was halved and rounded down to the nearest year to provide average offsets for use in OxCal of 5 years and 4 years respectively. In the B and D models these were assumed to have uncertainties of ±2 years.

c. Marine dietary input

A major difficulty with radiocarbon dating human remains is that humans may consume a mixture of terrestrial foods and marine foods. Because there is a difference in 14C content between the ocean and atmosphere, marine organisms have an apparent radiocarbon age of about 400 years, but with regional variations (Reimer et al. 2009). Thus dates on human bone and dentine require correction for the marine reservoir effect, using knowledge of the local offset from the global marine calibration curve, known as ΔR, and the proportion of marine foods consumed.

A recent estimate of ΔR for the eastern coast of Scotland (and possibly north-eastern England) is -62±53 (Russell et al. 2011), but a more general one for UK waters which is applicable to England is -33±90 (Barrett et al. 2004). These values are very comparable, but in order to account for the range of possible values, Models I and II use ΔR=62±53 while Model III investigates the effect of using ΔR= -33±90.

The proportion of the carbon in the sample derived from marine sources can be estimated from the ratio of stable carbon isotopes (δ13C values), using recently established best practice methodology for calibration mixed terrestrial/marine samples procedures (Cook et al. 2015). This involves defining endpoints for human collagen δ13C values for 100% terrestrial and 100% marine diets, using the fact that human δ13C values are approximately 1‰ above the δ13C values of the diet, and allowing a ±10% uncertainty on any computed marine percentage.

The terrestrial diet endpoint varies with climatic and other influences, but can be estimated from herbivore collagen δ13C values. The equation of van Klinken et al. (2000), which is based on a large dataset of European animal collagen values gives average values of -22.1 to -21.8‰ for Scotland
based on the range of July mean temperature for the four mainland stations reported in Müller (1982). This would imply human terrestrial values of -21.1 to -20.8‰. Montgomery et al. (2013) report a large number of human bone and incremental dentine samples from Neolithic Orkney with varying amounts of marine input. The lowest value was -21.1‰, consistent with their ungulate mean of -22.0‰. Terrestrial endpoints for England are generally slightly higher: Roberts et al. (2013) used a value of -20.0‰ for central England, which places four of the six measurements here outside the possible range of values. Likewise the terrestrial animal and bird values from Roman to Late Medieval York (Müldner and Richards 2007) average -21.5‰, suggesting a human 100% terrestrial signal of -20.5‰. As part of this study we have analysed some 16th to 18th century animal bones from Durham, which yielded mean and standard deviations of -21.3±0.6‰ (n=17) for cattle, -21.1±1.0‰ (n=4) for pigs, and -21.5±0.8‰ (n=15) for sheep, giving an average of -21.3‰ across species (see appendix to report on Isotopic studies of the skeletons). This small sample has thus yielded values very close to the York fauna, but inconsistent with the skeletons’ δ13C values. A value of -21.1 for 100% terrestrial diet based on Scottish material therefore seems plausible and the uncertainty of ±10% on the calculated % marine values as recommended by Cook et al. (2015) and Hedges (2004) allows for the variability in this value.

For the marine diet endpoint, cod are reported to have δ13C of -13.4‰ (Russell et al. 2011). The same value was obtained by Montgomery et al. (2013) in Neolithic Orkney based on average values for seal, seabird and cockle in equal proportions. This gives a human collagen endpoint of -12.4‰ which is used here. However, marine fish from York (Müldner and Richards 2007) average -14.5‰. If this value was used the estimated marine contribution to the diet would be increased for a given δ13C value in human bone and the calibrated dates would be slightly younger. The % marine values would shift by 0.6 to 2.4%, which is negligible compared to the ±10% uncertainty assigned to these values.

The marine contributions to diet have thus been computed using a terrestrial endpoint of -21.1‰ and a marine endpoint of -12.4‰, and are shown in Table 1.

d. Outlier analysis

The initial dates gave slightly different results to the full set, and there is always the possibility of an outlier in radiocarbon dating due to a lack of stratigraphic integrity of the samples or laboratory errors. The models were therefore run a second time (C and D models) with outlier analysis (Bronk Ramsey 2009b) to test for samples which do not fit with the rest of the information. OxCal’s General Outlier model was used with default settings and a prior probability of being an outlier of 5% for all dates.

5. Results and discussion

The B models proved to be computationally unstable when the terminus ante quem of 1754 was used, failing to converge on a stable estimate. As the radiocarbon dates and the results of other models showed clearly that there could be no probability of dates in the 18th century, an earlier terminus ante quem was used to make each model computationally stable without affecting the results, and these are shown in Table 2.

The results of modelling are summarised in Table 2, and OxCal multiplots of all parameters in each model are presented in the Appendix. Ranges are presented to the nearest year but because of rounding and interpolation of values a variation of one year either way may occur on repeated calculations of the same model. Outlier analysis showed no significant increase from the starting
value of 5% for any sample and thus provided no evidence that any of the measurements is an outlier or fails to fit within the model. The results of the outlier models C and D are only marginally different to the models without outlier analysis. Adding uncertainty to the gaps in the chronological sequence (models B and D) consistently shifts the results a year or two later but makes no substantial difference. The choice of 1612 (model I) or 1620 (model II) as a terminus post quem also makes little difference. It is conventional to round the ranges outward to avoid a spurious appearance of precision (Millard 2014), and as the calibration curve data is presented at 5 year intervals, the minimum appropriate rounding is outwards to the next 5 years. On that basis the results for the date of death from the 12 models presented in Table 2 may be encompassed within the range 1625-1660, with a very small probability of 1610-1620.

6. Conclusion

Considering all the possible influences on the radiocarbon dates and the other constraints on dating, the chronological evidence suggests the burials took place between 1625 and 1660 and is consistent with the most likely historical context for these burials: the imprisonment of Scots soldiers from the Battle of Dunbar in 1650.
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