The research on Roman period archaeozoology is rarely discussed in Slovakia. So far, data suggest the great importance of cattle and pigs in the meaty diet and the focus on exploitation of caprines for the secondary products such as wool and milk. During the 3rd and 4th c. AD, an increasing role of pigs in the subsistence has been noted at Germanic sites in the vicinity of Bratislava. The analysis of a small bone assemblage recovered during the rescue excavation of the Late Roman period settlement at Veľké Zálužie (Nitra district), offered a similar results. The taxa representation as well as the sex and age assessment attested the leading role of cattle (33.6 % by NISP) among the main meat suppliers. A balanced proportions of pig (15.3 %), caprines (13.4 %) and cervids (10 %) pointed out their minor, but not negligible importance of pork, lamb/mutton and venison in subsistence of the local Germanic peoples. Scarcely presented dog and horse bones provided no indices of butchery registered elsewhere in barbaric milieu (e.g. Veľký Meder). Bones of birds or fish were not found in the material either due to hand-recovery of analysed samples or restricted role within the diet. The calculated withers height of cattle (113.7 cm) and morphology of the horn-core showed that the local animals were small to medium sized with short horns. The simple tools made of worked animal bones/antlers offered the evidence on processing the pottery and/or leather or gaming. The partially preserved skeleton of a fawn red deer aged 3–4 months was found in one of the settlement pits.
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INTRODUCTION

Although Roman period archaeozoology is rarely discussed in Slovakia, previous analyses provided some insight into the animal husbandry and subsistence of communities inhabiting the south-western region of the modern day Slovakia during the first four centuries AD. In this time the area evidenced the vanishing of Celtic and arrival of Germanic peoples, who settled here and from the 1st c. onwards established tight political and commercial relations with the Romans through the neighbouring provinces (e.g. Kolník 1971). Like in other Danubian regions, gradual cultural changes impacted the way of life and the economy of these local ‘barbarian’ tribes. The increased trade and mobility, documented also by remnants of the Roman-style architecture, the pottery and other forms of material culture of Roman origin (e.g. Beljak 2010; Elsche 2017; Kolník 2010; Varsik 2011; Varsik/Kolník 2013) provoke the question whether these are ‘improvements’ and how they influenced the people’s daily-life including the main means of subsistence – farming. The archaeological excavations, usually not concentrating on the collection of ecofacts, provide little evidence on activities connected with food production. This was, according to the ancient writers, based mainly on keeping domestic livestock and hunting (e.g. Tacitus, Germánia 15, 23) and was rarely affected by ‘civilised’ Rome. Although there are today variable ways to test this statement – like isotope analysis of human remains, and genetic studies of animal in addition to traditional archaeobotany and archaeozoology – in Slovakia such attempts are rare (Čejka/Hajnalová 2000; Fabiš 2003; Fabiš/Bielichová 2014; Hajnalová/Varsik 2010; Hajnalová et al. 2018; Hlavatá 2017; Krčová 2016).

Yet, the existing results of archaeobotany provide evidence on cultivation of fairly diverse cereal spectra including ‘archaic’ einkorn and emmer wheats as well as the ‘new’ free-threshing bread wheat and rye that are more typical for the Roman Provincial world (Hajnalová et al. 2018, 65). Though it is not clarified if the wide assortment of crops recorded in Germanic settlements from the south-western Slovakia is a result of surviving ‘Celtic’ tradition, the introduction of new staples from the Roman provinces, or a combination of the two (Hajnalová/Varsik 2010). Except for the Roman provincial sites (Hlavatá 2017) and a single site in the Roman period Barbaricum (Hajnalová et al. 2018) located in the southernmost limits of the Slovakian territory – and
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1 This paper was written in the frame of two research projects: ’Process and regularities of the settlement development in mountain and foothill regions of Western Slovakia’ (APVV-15-0491) and ‘Celts, Romans and Germanic people. Rural settlements and the seats of nobility’ (VEGA 1/0243/17).
immediately on or very close to the Limes, there were no exotic or (imported) luxurious plants identified. Archaeozoological research indicates that new species – such as cat, donkey and pigeon – first occur at Roman military or civilian sites and only later, if at all, at barbaric settlements (Ambros 1986a; Fabiš/Bielichová 2014; Šefčáková 2011). It is clear that Germanic animal husbandry was, similarly to Celts in previous period, based on the keeping of domestic livestock with little additional supply from hunting and fishing. The NISP, WISP, ageing and butchery data suggest that the most significant animal was cattle, intensively exploited for its meat and labour. The MNI results indicate that on the majority of the settlements cattle and pigs were slaughtered in equal numbers. Meat consumption dominated by the most common domesticates was sometimes enriched by horses, chicken or goose. These animals were also being exploited for secondary products such as labour, transport, feathers, or eggs. The variability of local patterns in the exploitation of animals suggests, that there is a potential for further investigation of inter-site or regional differences connected with the economic and social status of inhabitants. For instance, the increase of pigs towards the 3rd and 4th c. AD, at least in the region of Bratislava (Šefčáková 2011) has been explained by an increase in the local population and/or the Romanization of the diet (Hajnalová et al. 2018, 66). Similar diachronic changes from La Tène to Late Roman period has been recorded for the body size of the main livestock species, cattle and sheep and were related to the Roman influence on local husbandry practices and/or imports of ‘improved’ breeds to the region (e.g. Bielichová 2017; Fabiš 2003; Fabiš/Bielichová 2014).

This paper aims to contribute new information to the knowledge summarized above. It is based on the analysis of a bone assemblage retrieved during the excavation of a site at Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad, that brought to light another Germanic settlement of the Nitra region and southwestern Slovakia. In spite of the rescue character of the excavation, it provided well preserved material with the known context and chronology (3rd–4th c. AD), the measurable elements and small collection of bone artefacts. Its complex analysis includes the study of taphonomy, species, skeletal elements, sex, age, butchery profiles, and animal morphology on an intra- as well as inter-site level. The comparative material from the southwestern Slovakia include yet unpublished results recorded by C. Ambros and M. Fabiš in the largest bone assemblages dated to the Roman period in Slovakia – Roman military camp at Iža and Germanic settlements in Cífer-Pác, Štúrovo and Veľký Meder. In order to evaluate the size of animals in a wider regional perspective, data from the Roman town Tác-Gorsium (Hungary) and Germanic settlements in Bernhardstahl, Bruckneudorf and Nickelsdorf (Lower Austria) will be discussed.

SITE INFORMATION

The municipality of Veľké Zálužie is located in central western Slovakia, approximately 10 km south-west from Nitra and 80 km north of the Danube. It is situated within the contact zone of the southern border of Nitra Highlands and the adjacent Danubian Lowland that, with its fertile soils and favourable climatic conditions, has attracted settlers.
since prehistoric times. The first settlement dated to the Roman period has been documented in the location Na Horných Zalamínách where potsherds dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD were collected during the field survey (Žaár/Poláková/Bielich 2009). The new Roman period settlement was discovered in winter 2007 at location Ďuriho sad (Kuzma/Bielich 2009). It is situated on the slightly elevated right bank terrace of the stream of Dolný kanál that meandered through the village in a north-south direction and further south joins the Nitra River (Fig. 1: 1, 2). In the past, the vegetation was dominated by autochthonous alluvial forests. At present, the most common trees are oak which together with hornbeams and black locusts represent the main elements of the forest in the municipality (Bielich 2008).

The archaeological rescue operation was limited by a shortage of time, severe weather conditions, a high groundwater level and area planned for construction of a new building of the Immora Company (Žaár/Poláková/Bielich 2009). The sunken structures (58 in total), mostly represented by pits of various forms, were clearly identifiable within the yellow soil matrix by the contrasting dark-brown infill (Fig. 2: 1). A single dwelling with sunken floor (feature 47) and a six-post construction, had a rectangular ground plan and dimensions of 4.2 x 3.6 m, with the floor area of 13.5 m². The entrance was situated in the southern, longer wall and remains of an open fireplace were found in the central part (Žaár/Poláková/Bielich 2009, 128; fig. 2: 2, 3). Other excavated structures included storage pits located east of the dwelling (features 22, 24–26 and 54). The post-holes (features 34–46) are considered to be remnants of unspecified above-earth structure(s), most possibly related to household or agricultural works (Žaár/Poláková/Bielich 2009, 129). Further to the south, the system of clay extraction pits was revealed (features 4–9). An outside oven was located (features 1–2) approximately 35 m south-east of the dwelling.

The preliminary artefactual and stratigraphic analysis suggested that, with a single exception², all structures are datable to the Late Roman period (Eggers stage C1–C2; Kuzma/Bielich 2009, 161). The earliest occupation phase is denoted by the shards of terra sigillata of the late Antonine and Severus periods and the pottery design from features 47 and 5 (AD 170/178–200/210; Žaár/Poláková/Bielich 2009, 302). A distinct pottery shape and the presence of glazed mortars in features 6, 16 and 19 indicated that the late phase of occupation is related to the beginning of the 4th c. AD (Žaár/Poláková/Bielich 2009, 314). Most of the finds in the remaining features, however, do not allow dating other than the Late Roman period. The register includes ceramic shards, clay weights, bone artefacts and animal remains. According to analysis of 840 pottery fragments (Žaár/Poláková/Bielich 2009, 302, fig. 6), 91 % display attributes of
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² Structure 30 was dated to the Bronze Age Čaka culture (Žaár/Poláková/Bielich 2009).
Germanic ware, 4% represent the import from the Roman provinces (Pannonia) and 5% is of prehistoric origin, an intrusion from older occupational strata. It has been assumed that the excavated area most probably represents the southern border of a large settlement area which had been abandoned peacefully (Žáár/Poláková/Bielich 2009, 312).

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Archaeozoological material

Analysis of the collected animal bone material was done shortly after the end of the fieldwork (Miklíková 2009). In total, 32 samples of 22 settlement features were hand collected (Tab. 1). It included moderately fragmented bone material with well preserved surfaces. In total 321 specimens were provided for the laboratory analysis of which 80% (NISP = 238) were taxonomically identified. The remains are dominated by bones of large and medium sized mammals, as a consequence of size-related recovery bias. Due to lack of time, no archaeobotanical, malacological or microfaunal samples were taken. The infills of explored features were taken out by artificial layers\(^3\). According to the depth indicated, the uppermost strata (down to 35 cm) provided minimum amount of bone finds (8% of the total). The rest originated (in similar portion) from the mid (35–100 cm) and lower strata (100–150 cm). In the case of sunken dwelling, specimens were collected from the floor. The comparison of the number of bones to that of pottery shards in particular showed negative correlation (Fig. 3). In contrast to shards, the largest number of bones were recovered from waste pit 5 and clay extraction pit 6. Unspecified Roman period pits 10 and 15 were rather rich in bone and also yielded more pottery. Considerable numbers of bones and pottery were retrieved from the floor of a sunken hut.

Regarding the relative dating of bones, the relative chronological data based on the study of pottery and small finds, suggest their date to the 3rd and 4th c. AD (see above). No finer diachronic division of the analysed features was stated, so the assemblage is considered whole as being of the Late Roman period. With regard to the very low proportion of prehistoric pottery in the assemblage, we presume that the majority of animal bones was related to human activity that took place during the existence and/or last phases of the site’s occupation. However, the formation processes were not studied in sufficient detail to support this assumption by field observations. Moreover, as we deal with multi-period occupation (the Bronze Age feature 30), the possibility of intrusion from older periods cannot be ruled out. There are no absolute chronological data available at the moment.

Research methods

The analysis consisted of the identification of taxa and skeletal elements, assessment of sex and age-at-death of animals, taking biometric data, and
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\(^3\) M. Bielich, pers. comm. 2018.
recording modifications such as gnawing, burning and butchery. The primary analysis included also the identification of osteopathologies and bone working. All investigations were carried out on the basis of visual comparative using the reference collection housed in the archaeozoological laboratory at the Institute of Archaeology in Nitra and the relevant literature (e.g. Hrudka/Popesko/Komárek 1962; Kolda 1936; Komárek/Štěrba/Fejfar 2001; Schmid 1972). The anatomical nomenclature was adopted from the Nomina Anatomica Veterinaria authorized by I.C.V.G.A.N. (Popesko et al. 1974). The naming of zoological taxa followed the propositions of A. Gentry, J. Clutton-Brock and C. P. Groves (2004).

The identification was made on a species (e.g. Equus caballus), genus (e.g. Equus sp.), family (e.g. Equidae) or class level (e.g. Mammalia). It was limited by the preservation of bones and available reference collection. The problems occurred while distinguishing sheep and goat bones (Ovis/Capra), domestic and wild forms (e.g. pigs and wild boar) and identifying members of Bovinae subfamily (cattle, aurochs and bison). Taxonomically unidentified specimens were classified according to the size of the animal they might represent (e.g. large mammal).

In domestic ruminants sex has been assessed on the basis of horn-core shape/size, the relative width of metapodials (e.g. Luff 1994; Novotný 1966; Schmid 1972) and pelvic bone formation. In pigs, the sex has been determined according to canine morphology, in deers it was done on the basis of antlers. Criteria used in age assessment were long bone epiphyseal fusion and the eruption/abrasion of teeth (e.g. Habermehl 1975; Reitz/Wing 1999, 76, tab. 3.5; Silver 1969). The mandibular teeth were sorted into categories suggested by L. Peške (1994, 308, 309). The age and season of death of red deer were assessed according to K.-H. Habermehl (1985, 25–27) and V. Komárek, O. Štěrba and O. Fejfar (2001, 80, 426).

The description of butchery marks followed the categories set in the archaeozoological database (see below) and reconsidered through works of D. Rixson (1988) and K. Seetah (2006a; 2007). Burning, gnawing, and bone artefacts were evaluated according to E. J. Reitz and E. S. Wing (1999, 133–135) and R. L. Lyman (1994, 205–219, 384–392). The palaeopathological alterations were classified after J. R. Baker and D. R. Brothwell (1980) and L. Bartosiewicz/W. Van Neer/A. Lentacker (1997). Measurements were taken after A. von den Driesch (1976). The withers height of cattle was calculated using coefficients established by J. Matolcsi (1970, 113, tab. 14) and V. I. Calkin (1960; in Matolcsi 1970, 113, tab. 14). The total live weight of cattle has been calculated on the basis of method proposed by J.-D. Vigne (1991). The evaluation of skeletal elements followed the ‘qualitative’ classification suggested by H.-P. Uerpmann (1973) and the weight difference method (Kunst 2002).
All primary and secondary data are recorded in the database established for archiving and evaluation of faunal remains from archaeological sites\(^4\). For basic quantification the number of identifiable specimens (NISP) and weight of identifiable specimens (WISP) were used. These mean simple counts and weights of each bone, antler, or teeth specimen. Glued fragments were counted and weighed together. The minute undetermined bone fragments from the same context (sample) were counted and weighed as 1. The minimum number of individuals MNI was estimated separately for features and for the total assemblage (Kyselý 2004, 286). Bones were weighted on a Kern laboratory scale with the accuracy of 0.1 g. The measurements were taken with Insize digital callipers with an accuracy of 0.1 mm. The specimens were examined using an unaided eye or simple hand lenses, but some butchery marks and surfaces of bone artefacts have been investigated using a Zeiss Discovery V.12 stereo-microscope (5–50×). Photographs of selected cases were taken and edited by the author using a Sony Cybershot DSC (7.2 MP) digital camera, a Zeiss Discovery V.12 stereo-microscope and Keyence VHX-700F 3D digital microscope. Bone artefacts were drawn by Beata Arvaiová from the Institute of Archaeology of the SAS in Nitra.

Regional comparative data

In the course of past centuries several papers and research reports offered new data on animal bones found at the Roman period sites in Slovakia. So far available analyses provide published and unpublished results of 22 investigated settlements (Fig. 4; Tab. 2). The Roman-Provincial milieu is represented by the military camps/forts in Bratislava-Rusovce, on the right bank of the Danube, being an integral part of the Roman Pannonia (ancient Gerulata; Kraskovská 1990; Kuzmová/Rajtár 1996) and in Iža-Leányvár on the left bank of the Danube, in the territory of the Barbaricum, and functioning as a bridgehead of Brigetio (ancient Celemantia – Hajnalová/Rajtár 2009; Kuzmová/Rajtár 1986a; 1986b; Rajtár 1992). With regard to the Roman-barbaric culture, the Germanic settlements in Cífer Pác (Kolník 1975; Varsik/Kolník, forthcoming), Veľký Meder (Hajnalová/Varsik 2010; 2015; Varsik 2004), Nitra-Chrenová (Březinová et al. 2003), Nitra-Párovské háje (Pieta 1993; Pieta/Ruttkay 1997), Most pri Bratislave (Turčan 1995), Bohdanovce nad Trnavou (Turčan 1995; 1996), the eastern forelands of Bratislava (Varsik 2003b; 2011), Malá nad Hronom (Oziáni 1984), Trnava (Pavík 1977), Biely Kostol (Bartík/Farkaš/Turčan 1995; Bartík et al. 1995), Bohdanovce nad Trnavou (Turčan 1995; 1996), Jakubov (Varsik 2003c), Štúrovo (Bohíček 2008; 2010; Kolník 1962) and Želiezovce (Novotný 1984) have all been studied archaeozoologically.

The resulting data, diverse from the social, chronological, and cultural point of view, hide multiple archaeozoological problems that limit their interpretative value. One of these problems is the insufficient number of identifiable bone specimens. Very few assemblages analysed to date provide more than 500 identifiable specimens per site that used to be considered a representative sample.\(^5\) This condition was fulfilled only at Bratislava-Trnávka, Cífer-Pác, Nitra-Chrenová, Štúrovo, Veľký Meder and Iža. In addition, the results of analyses have been published for just three of them (Fabíš 2003; Fabíš/Bielichová 2014; Seďáková 2011). The largest and most representative assemblages from Cífer-Pác and Iža have not yet been published and data exist only in the form of manuscripts or research reports. Other settlements listed in this paper (Tab. 2), such as Jakubov, Ivánka pri Dunaji, Bohdanovce nad Trnavou, provided very small numbers of bones for the study (NISP less than 50), so their information value is negligible in terms of relative proportion of taxa or skeletal elements. The second major problem with regard to the dataset from Slovakia is the sampling and recovery methods of ecofacts in general. Except for the recent case of a settlement pit from Hurbanovo, all remains were retrieved by hand, without systematic sieving or flotation.

Therefore fish, birds or molluscs are rarely present and their roles within the subsistence or economy cannot be appraised. Among the documentary sources, there is one special paper devoted to archaeoichthyology and the Roman period (Hensel 2004).

The third major problem is rooted in the quality and complexity of data and/or analyses. In many cases, the literature provides only simple summary tables of taxa and/or skeletal element representation or vice versa, simple listings of taxa and skeletal elements per site/feature, without providing the quantification tables. This situation precludes the evaluation of records within the spatial, chronological and archaeological context. In connection to this, another big problem is caused by missing
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\(^{4}\) The application of MS Access has been established by the archaeozoologist R. Kyselý (Institute of Archaeology of the Czech Academy of Sciences in Prague) and is currently used as a standard recording procedure in the Institute of Archaeology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Nitra.

\(^{5}\) For comment on sample size and inter-site comparisons see S. Bökönyi (1974, 18).
or unpublished raw data including sex, age and osteometrics which exclude interpretations on local animal husbandry regimes and palaeoeconomy. With a few exceptions (e.g. Fabiš 2003; Šefčáková 2011), Slovakia has no representative and complex analyses published till the present day hampering inter-site comparisons.

In order to reveal at least preliminary regional patterns, sites providing at least 200 NISP will be included in the comparative evaluation of new data from Veľké Zálužie. Other aspects of the material such as butchery, age, sex, modifications, morphology or pathology will be discussed mainly in terms of presence/absence. The relative quantitative data will be compared only if substantial numbers of finds are available. Due to the scarcity of data from southwestern Slovakia, the studied site will be reviewed with regard to particular finds (or aspects) of large assemblages from the Lower Austria and Hungary (Fig. 4). The Germanic settlement in Bernhardstahl is situated at Thaya (Dyje) River approximately 60 km north of the Roman Limes of the Danube and dates to the 2nd and 3rd c. AD (Riedel 1996). The analysis of more than 14 thousand bone specimens indicated the local economy based on domestic animals, with cattle comprising nearly 70 % of NISP. The Germanic settlement within the Roman sphere of control in Bruckneudorf lies 40 km southeast from Vienna and dates to the 1st and 2nd c. AD (Pucher 2016). Almost half of 11 thousand specimens belonged to cattle, while small ruminants, pigs and equids each contributed 14 % to the NISP. Poultry as well as game were of minor importance in the diet. The profound morphometric examination showed the co-existence of at least two types of cattle with different modes of exploitation. A mixed-purpose use was typical for domestic cattle, whereas Roman cattle was not raised in the settlement itself but was gathered and delivered only for the purpose of meat supply (Pucher 2016, 317). The Roman villa at Nickelsdorf is situated 60 km away from Vienna, eastern Austria and dates from 2nd to 3rd c. AD (Riedel 2004).

Fig. 4. The geographic position of the Roman period sites from southwestern Slovakia and adjacent areas discussed in the paper. For the site codes see Tab. 2. Legend: a – Germanic; b – Roman; c – Roman frontiers.
Tab. 2. The Roman period settlements from southwestern Slovakia with analysed animal bones. Abbreviations: BA – Bratislava; KN – Komárno; TN – Trnava; SC – Senica; MA – Malacky; NZ – Nové Zámky; NR – Nitra; DS – Dunajská Streda; LV – Levice; E – Early; L – Late; F – Final; MP – Migration period; a – NISP; b – WISP; c – MNI; d – MNE; e – DZF; x – present; * – data available; p – data partially available.

| ID | Site          | Location             | District | Chronology | Number of features | Context of | Raw data | Quantification | Tissue | Anatomy | Sex | Age | Osteometrics | Modifications |
|----|---------------|----------------------|----------|------------|-------------------|------------|----------|----------------|--------|---------|-----|-----|--------------|---------------|
| ROMAN-PROVINCIAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BR | Bratislava-Rusovce | Gerulatská ul., Bergl | BA | 1–2, 4 | E–L | – | – | – | – | – | 232 | – | – | a | * | – | – | – | p | Šefáková 1993 |
| iž | Iža | Leánvyár | KN | 1–2 | E | x | – | – | – | – | x | 6147 | * | – | a, b, e | * | – | – | p | Ambros 1996a; 1996b |
| ROMAN-BARBARIC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Biely Kostol | Spodky – Medzháje | TN | 2–4 | L | – | x | x | x | x | 10 | 200 | * | – | a | * | * | p | p | – | Šefáková 1996b |
| 2 | Bohdanovce nad Trnavou | Hrubé pole | TN | 2–3 | L | 1 | – | – | – | – | 2 | 50 | * | – | a? | * | * | – | – | – | Šefáková 1996a; 1996b |
| 3 | Bratislava-Tmávka | Zadné | BA | 2–3, 4 | E, L | x | x | x | x | x | x | 1335 | * | p | a, c, d | * | – | – | p | Šefáková 2011 |
| 4 | Bratislava-Tmávka | Šajba I | BA | ca 2 | E | x | x | x | – | – | 21 | * | p | a, c, d | * | – | – | p | Šefáková 2011 |
| 5 | Bratislava | Silínčné | BA | 3 | L | x | x | – | – | – | 92 | * | p | a, c, d | * | – | – | p | Šefáková 2011 |
| 6 | Bratislava-Vajnory | Pri Víšku | BA | 3–4 | L | x | – | – | – | – | 152 | * | p | a, c, d | * | – | – | p | Šefáková 2011 |
| 7 | Ciferný-Páč | Nad mlýnom | TN | 3–4 | L–F | 4 | 1 | – | 2 | – | 3754 | * | – | a, c | * | p | p | p | Ambros 1976; 1977b; 1977c; 1978 |
| 8 | Hurbanovo | Štrkovisko | KN | 1–2 | E | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | 112 | * | a, b, c | * | * | * | * | * | * | Hejnalová et al. 2018 |
| 9 | Ivanka pri Dunaji | Barnák | SC | 3–4 | L | x | – | – | – | – | 29 | * | p | a, c, d | * | – | – | p | Šefáková 2011 |
| 10 | Jakubov | Fosaláň | MA | 4 | L | – | 1 | – | – | – | 13 | * | – | a, b | * | * | p | p | p | Mílková 2004 |
| 11 | Malá nad Hronom | Róvid föld | NZ | 1–2 | L? | – | – | – | – | – | 4 | – | * | – | a | * | * | – | – | – | Ambros 1986c |
| 12 | Most pri Bratislave | Za Frivaldš京žiarske | BA | 2–3 | E–L | 1 | 2 | – | – | – | 191 | * | – | a? | * | – | – | p | Šefáková 1996a; 1996b |
| 13 | Nitra-Chrenová | Shell and Bauma x | NR | 2–4 | L–F | 2 | 7 | 3 | 1 | – | 4974 | * | a, b | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | Fabši 2003; Janeczek et al. 2010 |
| 14 | Nitra-Párovské háje | Starba plynovodu | NR | 4–5 | F–MP | – | – | – | – | – | 4 | – | * | – | a | * | * | p | p | – | Ambros 1986b |
| 15 | Štúrovo | Military training ground | NZ | 2, 4–5 | E, L–F | x | x | x | – | – | 42 | 976 | – | a | * | * | p | p | p | Ambros 1984 |
| 16 | Trnava-Modranka | Highway km 36,2 | TN | 3 | L | x | – | x | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | Ambros 1979a |
| 17 | Trnava | Horné pole | TN | 2 | L | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | 149 | * | a, b, c | * | * | * | * | * | * | Bielichová 2017 |
| 18 | Veľký Meder | Vámovske | DS | 2–4 | L–F | 18 | 14 | 1 | – | – | – | 2521 | * | p | a, b | * | – | – | p | Fabši 1980; Fabši/Bielichová 2014 |
| 19 | Veľké Zálužie | Žurho sad | NR | 3–4 | L–F | 1 | 19 | 1 | – | – | – | 238 | * | a, b, c | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | Mílková 2009; this work |
| 20 | Želiezovce | ? | LV | 3 | L | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | a | * | * | p | p | – | Ambros 1966; Ambros 1984 |
ARCHAEOZOOLOGY OF THE LATE ROMAN PERIOD SETTLEMENT AT VEĽKÉ ZÁLUŽIE

It lies only few kilometres from Carnuntum, the capital of the Roman province of Upper Pannonia. The analysis of more than six thousand specimens revealed the importance of domestic livestock in the economy, with the dominance of cattle (ca 33 % of NISP) and considerable portion of horse (20 %) and dogs (13.5 %). The morphometric study of two well preserved skeletons of oxen revealed their affiliation to the Italic ‘improved’ type of cattle (Pucher 2006). The Roman town of Tác-Gorsium was an important military, commercial and religious centre of Upper Pannonia province situated 80 km south of the Roman Limes of the Danube. The long-term excavations yielded more than 50 thousand identified bone specimens that are crucial for understanding animal-human relationships within the urban provincial setting. The material dates back to the 1st–4th c. AD and suggested persisting importance of cattle together with caprine and pig. The co-existence of two cattle and three sheep ‘breeds’ together with new species such as donkey, cat, goose, pigeon and perhaps equid hybrids attested Roman influence on the local husbandry practices (Bökönyi 1984).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Bone modifications

Modified bone elements are important indicators of the taphonomic history of archaeozoological assemblages (e.g. Lyman 1994; Reitz/Wing 1999). This study focuses on those characterizing past human activities and the natural environment of the site. Bones in the mixed settlement refuse result from similar activities including killing, skinning and butchering of animals, cooking/curing of meat, consumption including gnawing and digestion by humans, working of bone/antler, and discard followed by animal gnawing, trampling, fragmentation, weathering, deposition and even redeposition (Reitz/Wing 1999, 124–139). Each specimen may have been multiply modified – at first during carcass partitioning, then gnawing by carnivores and pigs, and again during trampling and weathering. Recognizing causalities is thus a difficult task. The studied material, however, provided some good examples of taphonomic factors that illustrate the following stages of carcass processing: primary butchery represented by slaughter and initial dressing off including killing, blood removal, skinning, evisceration and removal of the head and feet (1), secondary butchery represented by the gross dismemberment of the carcass at joints/main muscle attachment sites aimed at removing major cuts/portions (2), tertiary butchery represented by reduction of chops into smaller portions for cooking purposes (3), marrow extraction (4) and bone working (5). Butchery and gnawing marks were recorded frequently on the bones, while traces of bone working noted only sporadically.

Butchery marks

Butchered bones were registered in nearly all settlement features recovered, but in relatively small numbers (Fig. 5). They were most frequent were in cattle (62 % of total NISP), where they occurred with a relative frequency of 31.5 % of total NISP of cattle (Tab. 3). Some marks of butchery have been registered in sheep/goats (18.2 % of total; 23.3 % of sheep/goats), pigs (9.1 % of total; 10.2 % of pigs) and deer (3.6 % of total; 6.3 % of deer). A higher occurrence of butchery in cattle is related to significantly...
larger carcass size as well as culinary practices. There were no butchery marks observed on horse and dog bones which supports the presumed exploitation of these two species for labour, transport or companion rather than meat.

Traditional ways of slaughtering animals were stable and characteristic in time and region. Osteological evidence of killing animals, however, seems rare (Reitz/Wing 1999, 127). The farmers usually cut the throat with a knife, which brings the fast and painless death to the animal. If the cut is deep enough, marks occur on the ventral or dorsal plane of the first cervical vertebra and/or in the occipital region. Such a find occurred in the studied assemblage: a sheep first cervical vertebra (atlas) bears a few short and shallow, transversally oriented cut marks on the ventral arch (Fig. 6: 1) which clearly documents the use of a sharp, metal implement (knife?) from the ventral (lower) plane of the body. Another example of this type is seen on the second cervical vertebra (Epistropheus) of a deer. In this case, depth and direction of marks are different, indicating the post-mortem decapitation of the carcass (Bartosiewicz/Vaughan/Tóth 2013, 303). The bone had been multiply chopped through the vertebral tooth (dens epistrophei) and the force was clearly directed from the dorsal (upper) plane of the body (Fig. 6: 2).

Although skinning may not always leave a trace, sometimes marks occur on elements where the skin is tightly attached to the bone and uncovered with flesh (Reitz/Wing 1999, 128). Transversally or obliquely oriented cut marks of light to moderate intensity used to be located across the head, mandible, distal limb bones and tail skeleton (e.g. Lapham 2005; Val/Mallye 2011).

Primary butchery also includes evisceration during which edible internal organs and mesenteric fat of the thorax and abdomen are removed. Marks of such activities are almost invisible but may sometimes be found on the medio-ventral (inside) part of the ribs or vertebral corpus (Chaix/Méniet 1996, 47). In this sense, none of recorded cut marks can be ascertained as clear skinning and evisceration mark. However, the extraction of brain may be suspected on the basis of highly fragmented cattle skull bones with clear chop marks (Fig. 6: 9). Most probably, cattle and sheep horn-cores were cut-off during primary butchery (Fig. 6: 3). The following stages of butchery (see above) are well-documented by characteristic marks of cuts, chops, hacks, slicing, point/blade insertions or knicks. A case of deliberate disarticulation was recorded on a cattle mandible, in which the tip of the coronoid process had been chopped off in order to separate the jaw from the skull. In the same specimen wide cut marks are visible across the vertical ramus, perhaps as remnants of cheek meat removal (Fig. 6: 4). Usually knife cut marks at the points of muscle insertions are indicative of the removal of meat i.e. groups of muscles and further sectioning of the carcass parts.

Fig. 5. Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad. The incidence of butchered bones in the studied features.

For explanation and detailed description of butchery marks see work of K. Seetah (2006a; 2007).
Fig. 6. Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad. A selection of butchery marks. 1 – multiple fine cuts (detail in black square) on the ventral arch of the first cervical vertebra of a sheep, ventral view; 2 – cut/chop through dens vertebrae of the second cervical vertebra of a red deer, dorsal view; 3 – cut/chop through the base of a sheep horn-core, view from above; 4 – cattle mandible with chopped off coronoid process and deeper cuts on ramus mandibulae, lateral view; 5 – cattle rib chopped off on both ends, anterior view; 6 – cattle scapula with chopping through collum scapulae and tuberositas supraglenoidalis and a series of fine short cuts, lateral view; 7 – chopping through the cattle (?) thoracic vertebral body close to its medial axis, upper view; 8 – partly preserved cattle metatarsal bone showing spiral fracture, perhaps as a consequence of intentional opening of the shaft, dorsal view; 9 – cattle skull fragments with traces of chopping.
Traces of filleting were not noted. The pot-sizing or breaking of bones in order to exploit marrow and prepare portions of vessel size or a particular type of a meal includes the fracturing of bones with a cleaver (Fig. 6: 7) and chopping into regular sized units (Fig. 6: 5). As for kitchen equipment, the use of metal implements with a fine blade, most probably of small to medium sized knives, seems most probable. Cuts displaying shallow and sharply grooved V cross-sections support this hypothesis. However, deeper cuts with wider cross-section also occurred, indicative of heavier implements with larger blades. Some of the large and robust skeletal elements or cancellous bones were smoothly chopped through (Fig. 6: 6, 7) indicating the impact of such larger and heavier blades. Small-sized knives, with the blade up to only 10 cm in length, belong to the most common finds at sites in the adjacent Barbaricum in southwestern Slovakia (e.g. Beljak 2008, 76, fig. 13: 3; Varsik 2011, 121, 122, fig. 61: 7–12; Kolník/Varsik/Vladár 2007, 178, tab. 26: 7, 8). An example of a large knife or a ‘cleaver’, resembling the Romano-British large blades (cf. Seetah 2006a, 41, fig. 7: 2, 3), has been reported from the Germanic residence in Cifer-Pác (Fig. 7: 1).8 Another metal knife with larger and longer blade was also retrieved at the recently explored settlement in Beladice (Ruttkayová/Ruttkay 2015, 51, fig. 68). The ‘butchers’ of the Roman period and the Middle Ages used ‘large blades’ for slicing the meat after its removal from the bone (for more see Seetah 2006a; 2006b; 2007). Such blades represent the most used implement in the butchery trade, however, they are the least likely to leave a mark on the bone itself. This is in contrast to the cleavers or small knives that leave chop and cut marks during portioning the carcass into more manageable or saleable joints and for deboning these joints (Seetah 2007, 6). Nevertheless, also large blades may have been used for chopping.9

The frequency of bones chopped by ‘large blades’ and/or cleaver/axe in the studied assemblage (ca 24 % of butchered bones) is comparable with the butchery pattern and intensity recorded in the small assemblage from the Germanic settlement at Beluša, located in northwestern Slovakia (Miklíková 2003a). Here, a high incidence and wide variety of chopped bones were registered. Interestingly, at both sites the use of heavy metal tools with large blades (cleaver/axe?) was indicated by the placement of cuts (in the articular regions of long bones) and implement signature (smooth entry and fractured points of a cut plane). On the other hand, other Germanic assemblages from the region, if analysed for butchery marks, did not include such heavily butchered bones (e.g. Trnava-Horné Pole – Bielichová 2017). There the patterns mostly include shallow or fine cut marks and the smashing of bones for marrow, similarly to prehistoric assemblages. Previous research at Roman period sites revealed that large mammal bones with clear chops by large blades, filleting and scoop marks result from organized meat supply and processing of large amounts of meat typical of Roman-provincial sites (e.g. Choyke 2003; Lyublyanovics 2010; Seetah 2006b). Despite more common ‘prehistoric butchery manners’ including the smashing of bones, people from Veľké Zálužie frequently used large blade implements. This may be related to a higher consumption and demands for meat or local culinary practices.

**Burning**

Cooked meat is usually boiled, baked, stewed or roasted. When meat is roasted, bone parts most thinly covered by flesh will be exposed to the flame and may burn (Reitz/Wing 1999, 131). Burning, however,
may also have resulted from other than anthropogenic factors, when it happened accidentally (Lyman 1994, 388). In the studied assemblage, clear traces of burning have been recorded in a single case – the small fragment of a femur shaft from a medium size mammal was retrieved from house 47. The inflicted area is located at the bone’s margins and has red-brownish to black coloration. This suggests short time exposure to open fire (ca 250–550 °C according to the Shipman’s scheme in Lyman 1994, 386, fig. 9). This points to its possible relationship with food preparation on site. No other specimen showed discoloration by fire or other marks of alternative heat exposure. This may suggest that the roasting over open fire was not a ‘preferred’ method of meat preparation. The observed butchery patterns are also congruent with boiling (in the pots?), baking or roasting meat without attached bones. On the other hand, the general lack of burned specimens in the assemblage may also indicate that bones were not used as a fuel or discarded in the fire. Most probably, after the removal of edible soft tissues, bones were accessible to scavengers (dogs or domestic pigs?). Subsequently they may have been cleaned out from the inhabitation area intentionally – into open refuse pits or abandoned habitation areas. Such a scenario is supported by frequently recorded marks of carnivore gnawing.

**Gnawing**

Approximately one third of the assemblage bears signs of gnawing (32.4 % of NISP). These specimens occurred in most features and in all species identified (Fig. 8). Except for dogs, other domestic or wild scavengers such as pigs, wolves, cats or rodents may contributed to the destruction and scattering of animal bones. The typical marks of mid- to large-sized carnivores include shallow or deep pits and punctures of circular/irregular shape, broad grooves and ragged ends (after Lyman 1994, 205–216; see also Binford 1981; Reitz/Wing 1999, 133–135). Similar pattern may be produced by pigs (Greenfield 1988), but the absence of marks left by their long, shovel-shaped lower incisor teeth on bones indicates that canids were the main scavengers at Veľké Zálužie. It is clear that dogs were present at the site and fed on human leftovers, which is also supported by the mutual occurrence of butchery and gnawing marks in most of specimens. Nevertheless, the studied assemblage did not provide examples of digested bones, so the direct evidence on feeding the dogs with human food refuse is not available.

The investigated bone material bears no signs of rodent gnawing. Was the access to the garbage restricted for small scavengers or were they missing

---

10 The overall proportion of gnawed specimens in the studied assemblage may be underrepresented, since only clear marks of carnivore teeth were recorded. The questionable bone splinters that may also have resulted from carnivore activity were not quantified.
at the site? Hard to decide, because when dogs can ‘play with food leftovers’, it is usually accessible for rodents too.

**Worked bones**

The animal bones, teeth, antlers and horns are common raw materials used in manufacturing tools and decorations in the Late Roman period and Germanic cultural milieu (e.g. Hrnčiarik 2014; 2015; Zeman 2001). Research on locally produced items suggested that manufacturing techniques were very similar to those used by Romans and that variety of saws, knives and drills had been employed (Hrnčiarik 2015, 21). Simple implements were usually made at home from animal skeletal elements whose shape best suited the desired function. Such objects accompanied people of all social levels as a part of their lives, households and workshops equipment (Zeman 2001, 140). At Veľké Zálužie, a small collection of worked bones has been registered (1.6% of total NISP; Tab. 4). Their taxonomic and anatomic identifications suggest the preference and/or availability of large mammal bones – red deer antlers and postcranial elements of cattle. One antler fragment bears signs of manufacturing, while other ‘worked’ bones display only use-wear.

The worked antler fragment 17/20 has already been registered during field work (small find nr. 7). The cut-off tine originated from the beam of a hunted red deer or a shed antler. Its greatest length is 61.2 mm and the object shows notable polishing on all surfaces (Fig. 9: 1). On the proximal end of the fragment, parallel striations caused by cutting/sawing off the beam, perhaps by a metal implement, are clearly recognizable (Fig. 9: 2). On the other side, the object ends by a highly polished and slightly flattened tip, whose surface is disrupted by grooves caused by root etching (Fig. 9: 3). The remaining surface bears multiple, randomly oriented scratches/grooves of either natural in vivo abrasion of the antler (1)\(^{11}\), the handling/use of the implement during unspecified human activity connected to craft or household work (2), or weathering/trampling of object after its discard (3). The object most probably represents rejected waste or a half-finished tool of unknown function. Therefore, the recorded scratches and polishing may have had multiple causes. Similar objects made of deer antlers are regularly present at Germanic sites in the southwestern Slovakia and used to be interpreted as waste material and half-finished products of local antler crafting (cf. Bíró et al. 2012; 38; Březinová et al. 2003, 57; Hrnčiarik 2014, 153, 154, fig. 3; Varsik 2011, 124; Zeman 2001, 138). Examples are known from Nitra-Chrenová, location Shell (Březinová et al. 2003, 182, tab. 30: 13, 14, 16), Branč (Koluhňik/Varsák/Vladár 2007, 154, tab. 2: 2), Bratislava-Vajnory, location Pri Visáku (Víškov 2011, 374, tab. 64: 12–15), or Dunajská Lužná (Vladovský 2010, 21, fig. 6: 9–18). Similarly modified antler fragments were registered at Roman-provincial sites, for instance in Aquincum (e.g. Bíró et al. 2012, 29, fig. 14) or Iža (Hrnčiarik 2017, 83, 134, 135).

Other examples of bones probably modified by humans have been identified during analysis because they represent non-manufactured objects with only slight modifications. It seems that only one of them (specimen 23/5) shows clear use wear and traces of human handling (Fig. 9: 4, 5). The item is made of complete talus (syn. astragalus) of an adult cattle and bears two types of modifications. Multiple parallel cut marks, oriented transversally to the long axis of a bone are visible on the trochlea tali distalis. These may be related to carcass partitioning. In this case, the effector was a metal knife and the likely purpose was disarticulating the hock-joint of the

\(^{11}\) Unless artificial modifications (i.e. scratches, polishing, deformation, or fracture) recorded in archaeological antlers are not clearly human induced and may arose from natural activity of a deer (e.g. rubbing against tree bark, male-male competition etc.), their origin or nature of the tool remain questionable (Jin/Shipman 2009).
Fig. 9. Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad. Worked bones. 1 – a cut/sawn-off antler tip (specimen 17/20); 2 – detail of the cross-section (proximal end) with multiple parallel cuts made by an metal implement (knife/saw); 3 – a detail of the antler very tip (distal end) with polished surface and grooving (imprints of plant root?); 4 – four views of cattle talus with the use wear facets; 5 – detail of highly polished facets and butchery marks on trochlea tali proximalis et distalis; 6 – parallel striation on the dorsal plane directed across the longer axis of a rib (specimen 17/1); 7 – parallel striation on the dorsal plane directed almost across the longer axis of a rib fragment (specimen 19/11).
hind-foot that is separating the dry limb from the meaty parts of the carcass. Further, four oval facets are located on the protruding condyles of *trochlea tali proximalis* and *trochlea tali distalis* and cause flattening of the bone. All are highly polished and under the microscope reveal randomly oriented striations indicating the movement of the bone in multiple directions on a solid, perhaps soft support (made of wood, leather, or clay). The small extent of wear suggests short time use (e.g. *Sidéra/Vornicu 2016*). The artificially smoothed edges of this bone, probably resulting from handling, are also notable.

This object is reminiscent of a similarly modified astragalus (*talus* or knuckle bone), known from archaeological, iconographic as well as documentary sources as game pieces (e.g. *Bartosiewicz 1999; Hrnčiarik 2015*, 64–66). Nevertheless, such finds are rarities in the studied region and period. A single case from Dunajská Lužná includes 17 knuckle bones and the bone counter (*Bazovský 2010; Mikliková 2010*). Their analysis revealed slight overall polishing of the margins, indicating tossing and turning that are different from what we observed in the find from Veľké Zálužie. By the type of modifications, our specimen shows parallels to worked knuckle bones from early medieval Pohansko (*Švecová 2001*, 150–152, fig. 1: 2; 2: 3) or the prehistoric finds from Pavlovac-Kovačke Njive in Serbia (*Vitezović 2014*). There revealed astragali showed strong flattening and abrasion of the condyles. In Pohansko, astragali were interpreted as game pieces, in Pavlovac (the bones were also perforated) as tools used in textile/leather or pottery production. The use of tali as scrapers or burnishers of ceramics and/or hide has been suggested elsewhere (e.g. *Buko 1990*, 129, fig. 54c; *Meier 2013; Rogatko 1994*). However, similarly modified tali appeared also in connection with rituals, functioning as amulets, fortune-telling and magic devices (e.g. *Bartosiewicz 1999; Birtalan 2003; Lehmkuhl 1984; Švecová 2001; Trantalidou/Kavoura 2008*). Unless experimental work (e.g. *Meier 2013; Sidéra/Vornicu 2016*) will bring significant and specific results, the interpretation of recorded use-wear will remain open and new finds should be classified simply as objects of ‘special use’ (after *Vitezović 2016*, 116, tab. 4).

The remaining ‘worked’ bones within our collection represent rather questionable such objects. The first item is a circa 26 cm long cattle rib fragment (specimen 17/1). It has a smooth, polished surface and broken edges. Microscopic inspection of the surface revealed an isolated area of fine oblique striations located on the lateral side. The scratches are oriented transversally to the bone’s long axis (Fig. 9: 6). The proximal end of this rib fragment is rounded, perhaps intentionally, and does not show specific use wear. The distal end is damaged by carnivore gnawing. Similar modifications were observed on another, but shorter rib fragment (specimen 19/11). The surface showed a slight polish and one of its partially destroyed ends is (intentionally?) rounded. The area on its lateral side shows parallel and oblique striations, oriented more-or-less transversally to the long axis of the rib (Fig. 9: 7). The opposite end cannot be studied since it has been recently broken off. Both rib fragments bear similar modifications – the shape and extent of striations (oblique, located on the dorsal side of the bone) – suggestive of similar use. Similar cattle ribs with use-wear including striations on the surface and smoothed edges with oblique file marks have been described for instance from Roman Virunum in southern Austria as the textile implements used for the loom work, for beating the weft (*Gostenčnik 2010*). In beaters, the file-marks were also partly running along the edges that were first rounded and smoothed so that the working of threads was not impaired (see *Gostenčnik 2010*, 154, fig. 8f). However, these implements differ from our finds. Our specimens do not have distinctive worked tips and show a different manufacturing process (beaters were made from split ribs). Similar items from Iža were brought into connection with household and/or crafting activities including work with textile, hide, plant, or pottery (*Hrnčiarik 2015*, 76, 77; *Zeman 2001*, 138). These functions, however, remain questionable, similarly to the last item from Veľké Zálužie (specimen 23/6). This piece is a large cattle radius shaft fragment (13 cm long) with some polishing at one of its ends and general smoothening or rounding of the fragment edges and fractured margins. In contrast to the rib fragments, during microscopic inspection no specific use-wear has been recognized on the surface of this bone. It may thus represent a ‘pseudo-tool’ or a tool used very shortly.

**Weathering and fragmentation**

After the human processing of animal carcasses, the assemblage enters into following taphonomic phases of its history which, among others, includes weathering and the further fragmentation of bones. The examined specimens had only slightly weathered bone surfaces (stage 1 after *Behrensmeyer 1978*). This condition has been recorded also in bones of juvenile individuals that are most vulnerable to the water activity, precipitation, freezing, plant root etching and the acidity (pH) of the surrounding sediment. It points either to generally favourable conditions of soil at the site or rapid burial, i.e. the limited time between the discard and deposition.
of kitchen waste (ca 0–3 years after the animals’ death). It also indicates that the bones had a similar taphonomic history including near-identical depositional circumstances which, at the end shows that the assemblage was accumulated during similar phases of settlement use. It seems that the majority of bone refuse was thrown into the pits intentionally or fell there accidentally shortly after being exposed on the ground surface. There was variation in the bone colouration recorded – from bright beige to dark brown that most probably relate to the colour and composition of immediate soil matrix.

It is clear that during and after deposition, bones were further fragmented and disintegrated by human (e.g. trampling on the ground surface, etc.), and animal action or soil. All these factors resulted in the overall moderate fragmentation of bones. Half of the assemblage consisted of bone fragments (50.8 % of total NISP). The other half is composed of complete (13.4 %) or partially broken skeletal elements (35.8 %). Regarding bone fragmentation across the site, no significant differences in the proportion of complete elements per feature were observed (Fig. 10). However, some differences are recorded when fragmented material distribution is studied. Pits 10, 15 and 58 yielded much more fragmented material than other features that can suggest a slow, multi-phased formation of their infill. On the other hand, a high proportion of complete and partially preserved bones in storage pit 54 is caused by the presence of a deer skeleton, most probably dumped into the pit during a single event. The variation in the preservation of bones of identified species is given in Tab. 5. The variations observed perhaps reflect the differential preservation of bones from large and medium sized mammals but may also be related to food preparation practices.

Animal taxa and dietary patterns

At least seven species and 29 individuals were present in the assemblage (Tab. 6). Domestic taxa included cattle (Bos taurus L.), pig (Sus domesticus Erxl), sheep (Ovis aries L.), horse (Equus caballus L.) and dog (Canis familiaris L.). Bones or teeth of a goat were not identified, but their presence among caprine (Ovis/Capra) remains cannot be excluded. Wild animals were represented by red deer (Cervus elaphus L.) and roe deer (Capreolus capreolus L.). In some cases, the wild and domestic forms of animals could not be distinguished, so specimens were attributed to wider taxonomic groups (3.4 % NISP). Unidentified specimens made up 20.2 % of the total number of finds. This group of finds was classified according to the size of the animal they possibly represented.

---

12 The recovery circumstances of partial deer skeletons, including the exact position of bones in the pit and degree of articulation remain unclear.
Tab. 5. Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad. The bone fragmentation degree.

| Bone fragmentation             | Cattle | Pig | Sheep | Caprines | Horse | Dog | Red deer | Cattle/aurochs/bison | Cattle/red deer | Cattle/horse size | Caprines/roe deer | Pig/wild boar | Large mammal | Medium mammal | Mammal | NISP |
|--------------------------------|--------|-----|-------|----------|-------|-----|---------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|---------|------|
| Complete                      | 14     | 1   | 1     | 1        | 1     | 1   | -       | -                    | -               | -               | -                | -             | -           | -            | -       | 19   |
| Complete (disrupted)          | 9      | 4   | 2     | -        | 2     | 2   | -       | -                    | -               | -               | -                | 1             | -           | 1            | 21      |
| Complete (without epiphysis)  | 11     | 5   | 4     | 3        | 1     | 1   | -       | -                    | -               | -               | -                | 5             | -           | -            | 3       |
| Half (ca. 1/2)                | 13     | 7   | 2     | 6        | 1     | 2   | -       | -                    | -               | -               | -                | 1             | 1           | 7            | 96      |
| Less than half (ca. 1/4)      | 11     | 9   | 1     | 8        | 1     | 6   | -       | -                    | 1               | 1               | -                | 3             | 1           | 4            | 42      |
| Fragment                      | 34     | 17  | -     | 11       | -     | -   | 2       | 1                    | 1               | 1              | 4                | 11            | 7           | 5            | 96      |
| Small fragment                | 16     | 5   | -     | 4        | -     | -   | 3       | -                    | 1               | -              | 1                | 10            | 14          | 8            | 62      |
| Very small fragment           | -      | -   | -     | -        | 2     | -   | -       | -                    | -               | -              | -                | 1             | -           | 2            | 5       |
| Total                         | 108    | 49  | 10    | 33       | 2     | 4   | 31      | 1                    | 1               | 4              | 2                | 10            | 22          | 25           | 18      | 321  |

Tab. 6. Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad. The representation of animal taxa according to three quantification methods: NISP – number of identifiable specimens; MNI – minimum number of individuals; WISP – weight of identified specimens.

| Animal taxa                        | NISP | %  | % of domestic | MNI | %  | % of domestic | WISP | %  | % of domestic |
|------------------------------------|------|----|---------------|-----|----|---------------|------|----|---------------|
| Horse                              | 2    | 0.6| 1.0           | 2   | 6.9| 8.3           | 294.2| 3.2| 3.7           |
| Cattle                            | 108  | 33.7| 52.4         | 7   | 24.1| 29.2           | 5688.9| 61.5| 70.7          |
| Pig                                | 49   | 15.3| 23.8         | 9   | 31.0| 37.5           | 1336.0| 14.4| 16.6          |
| Caprines                           | 33   | 10.3| 16.0         | 4   | 13.8| 16.7           | 501.7 | 5.4 | 6.2           |
| Sheep                              | 10   | 3.1 | 4.9          | 1   | 3.4 | 4.2           | 207.7 | 2.2 | 2.6           |
| Dog                                | 4    | 1.3 | 1.9          | 1   | 3.4 | 4.2           | 14.9  | 0.2 | 0.2           |
| Domestic total                     | 206  | 64.2| 100.0        | 24  | 82.8| 100.0          | 8043.4| 86.9| 100.0         |
| Red deer                           | 31   | 9.7 | –            | 4   | 13.8| –             | 527.2 | 6.2 | –             |
| Roe deer                           | 1    | 0.3 | –            | 1   | 3.4 | –             | 7.0   | 0.1 | –             |
| Wild total                         | 32   | 10.0| –            | 5   | 17.2| –             | 579.2 | 6.3 | –             |
| Cattle/aurochs/bison               | 1    | 0.3 | –            | –   | –   | –             | 9.9   | 0.1 | –             |
| Cattle/red deer                    | 4    | 1.3 | –            | –   | –   | –             | 73.1  | 0.8 | –             |
| Pig/wild boar                      | 1    | 0.3 | –            | –   | –   | –             | 10.7  | 0.1 | –             |
| Caprines/roe deer                  | 10   | 3.1 | –            | –   | –   | –             | 50.4  | 0.5 | –             |
| Cattle/horse size                  | 2    | 0.6 | –            | –   | –   | –             | 17.2  | 0.2 | –             |
| Domestic/wild total                | 11   | 3.5 | –            | –   | –   | –             | 61.1  | 0.7 | –             |
| Large mammal                       | 22   | 6.9 | –            | –   | –   | –             | 338.0 | 3.7 | –             |
| Medium mammal                      | 25   | 7.8 | –            | –   | –   | –             | 112.7 | 1.2 | –             |
| Mammal                             | 18   | 5.6 | –            | –   | –   | –             | 122.8 | 1.3 | –             |
| Unidentified                       | 65   | 20.2| –            | –   | –   | –             | 573.5 | 6.2 | –             |
| Identified                         | 256  | 79.8| –            | –   | –   | –             | 8683.7| 93.8| –             |
| Total                              | 321  | 100.0| –           | 29  | 100.0| –             | 9257.2| 100.0| –             |
(e.g. large mammal, medium sized mammal). All quantitative methods clearly indicated the pre-dominance of domestic animals in the assemblage. Their proportion ranges from 64.2 % by NISP to 86 % by WISP. The remaining portion belonged to the wild animals – from 6.2 % by NISP to 17.2 % by WISP (Tab. 6). We observe a similar order of species when considering number and weight of specimens: cattle – pig – caprine – red deer. In contrast to that, MNI ranks pig as the species best represented in the studied assemblage (31 % MNI). According to this method, cattle belong to the second (24.1 %) and caprines together with deer to the third most common taxa (17.2 %). The relatively high representation of cervids (mostly Cervus elaphus) is marked by mostly postcranial skeletal elements represented in the assemblage (see next chapter). The bones of horse and dog occurred in incomparably smaller quantities (0.6 % and 1.2 % of NISP; 8.3 % and 4.2 % of MNI). Considering the spatial distributions, the balanced importance of cattle and pig at the site is suggested by the regular presence of both species in the settlement features (cattle bones presented in 18, pig in 15 features; Tab. A1). The single hut with sunken floor, however, yielded no cattle bone, only pig and caprine remains were found in this feature. This is perhaps the consequence of discarding large bones outside the immediate direct habitation space. Deer bones were scattered among seven of the explored features. Nevertheless, their abundance notably differs from those of the main domesticates since the majority of finds belonged to more or less complete deer skeletons in the refuse/storage pits 50 and 54.

As far as taxonomic composition is concerned, the studied assemblage showed a complete absence of bird and fish bones. The question is why since the proximity of water bodies (small river channels, lakes) suggests that people living here could have exploited all available food resources. Moreover, the keeping of domestic birds, mainly chicken and goose, was common practice already during the Late Roman. (Ambros 1970, 11; cf. Benecke 1994; Vörös 2002). In the case of Veľké Zálužie the most possible cause behind the absence of fish and birds is a recovery bias consonant with the small number of analysed finds. Also the recent archaeozoological analysis of other Germanic sites from the region (Hurbanovo) showed that if water flotation and sorting of hard residues is carried out, a greater variety of taxa are recovered in the assemblage (e.g. fish bones and scales, insects fragments, mol-lusc or coprolites; Hajnalová et al. 2018). At Veľké Zálužie the bones were only hand-retrieved which probably caused that gracile and small bones were overlooked. A look at regional data reveal general scarcity of fish or bird bones (Tab. 7). Both vertebrate classes are poorly represented even in large hand-retrieved assemblages, for instance Veľký Meder, where over three thousand identified specimens yielded only nine bird and 16 fish bone fragments (Fabiš/Bielichová 2014, 173, tab. 2). The emphatically interdisciplinary focus of research carried out at this site in 2003 included systematic sampling of the infill of three houses with sunken floors, however, suggested a far richer taxonomic diversity of fish, reptiles or birds (Váršik 2003a). The absence of fish was also reported from the Germanic sites situated on the Danube (Štúrovo – Ambros 1984). Poultry, although more regularly reported (e.g. in Štúrovo n = 7; Čifer-Pác n = 13), occurred usually in very low numbers which sending us back to the basic question if it is a result of recovery bias or what exactly the role of breeding birds and fishing for Germanic people. To judge this part of animal economy on the basis of the scant bone evidence available is impossible in the absence of fine recovery methods. So far, the representation of both taxa on Germanic sites (birds 1 %, fish 0.2 % of NISP in average; see Tab. 8) support the idea of a minor role in the subsistence.

Last but not least, possible effects of scavenger activity, widely recorded at the site, must also be taken into account. The bones of small species and young individuals are ingested by dogs or pigs with much greater probability.

The proportion of wild mammals at Veľké Zálužie is rather striking. By NISP they comprise 10 %, by WISP 6.3 % while by MNI 17.2 %. Compared to other Germanic sites from southwest Slovakia (Tab. 7) this proportion is the highest recorded yet. Similarly to the absence of birds and fish remains, this result may also be multicausal. At first we need to look at the quantification methods. If the NISP is considered, it is clear that the proportion of wild mammals is over-estimated due to the inclusion of elements from the partial red deer skeleton. On the other hand, the WISP and MNI quantification methods balance for this bias and indicate directly the amount of meat and number of individuals provided by deer. On the basis of these results we can assume that wild mammals (especially cervids) played a similarly significant role in meat supply as caprines. Although small

---

13 One of the aims of this project was to show how recovery methods and sampling strategy can affect archaeozoological analysis. Archaeobotanical samples were already analysed and evaluated (Hajnalová/Váršik 2010; 2015), while 100 flotation and 97 hand-retrieved archaeozoological samples still await the analysis.
Tab. 7. The assortment of animals from Roman period sites of southwestern Slovakia. Quantified after NISP. Abbreviations: a – antler; f – Final Roman/Migration period; n – number of finds not clearly specified; s – skeletons included; x – present; () – approximately.

| Animal taxa          | Roman period settlements, SW Slovakia |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
|                      | Bratislava-Ruzovce | Iza | Biely Kostoľ | Bratislava-Trnávská (Zadná) | Bratislava-Trnávská (Šajna) | Bratislava-Sličný | Cífer-Pác | Ľubovňa | Irašove pri Dunaji | Most pri Bratislave | Nitra-Chrenová | Nitra-Párovské hýľo | Šilovce | Trnava-Modranka | Trnava | Veľký Meder | Veľké Žaltie | Žilinszcze |
| Cattle (Bos taurus)  | 53              | 415 | 87              | 25              | 511              | 11              | 30              | 92              | 2377              | 27              | 11              | 2              | x          | 89              | 253              | x          | 438              | x          | 69              | 1205           | 108 x           |
| Pig (Sus domesticus) | 47              | 1646 | 65              | 3              | 425              | 4              | 37              | 29              | 900              | 2              | 8              | 2              | x          | 24              | 184              | x          | 200              | x          | 33              | 402           | 49 x           |
| Caprines (Ovis/ Capra) | 93              | 3930 | 29              | 5              | 166              | 4              | 19              | 13              | 311              | 19              | 3              | 8              | x          | 34              | 135              | x          | 172              | –          | 15              | 526           | 33 x           |
| Sheep (Ovis aries)   | –                | –              | 2              | –              | 1               | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –          | –              | –                 | –          | –                 | –          | –                 | –             | –             |
| Goat (Capra hircus)  | –                | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –          | –              | 16              | –                 | –             | (11)            | –              | 22            |
| Horse (Equus caballus) | 21              | 1              | 5              | 8              | 43              | 1              | 1              | 12              | 113              | 3              | 2              | –              | x          | 23              | 134              | x          | 53              | x          | 11              | 64            | 2 x           |
| Donkey (Equus asinus) | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –          | –              | –              | –                 | –             | 6              | –              | –             |
| Horsedoneky/mule (Equidae) | –            | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –          | –              | –              | –                 | –             | 30             | –              | –             |
| Dog (Canis familiaris) | 4              | 16             | 2              | 5              | 71              | –              | –              | 3              | 15              | 3              | –              | –              | 6          | 105             | x              | 14             | –              | 54            | 4              | –            |
| Cat (Felis catus)    | –                | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –          | –              | –              | –                 | –             | 6              | –              | 4             |
| Aurochs (Bos primigenius) | –           | –              | 3              | –              | 1              | –              | –              | –              | (1)             | –              | –              | –              | 1          | –              | –              | 4                 | –             | –              | –              | 4             |
| Red deer (Cervus elaphus) | 7               | –              | 2              | 4              | 12              | 1              | 1              | 1              | 1 + 3a           | 1a             | 1              | –              | –          | 7              | 98a             | –              | 7a             | –              | 15             | 31            |
| Roe deer (Capreolus capreolus) | –           | –              | –              | –              | –              | 2              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –          | 1              | 2               | x          | 1a              | –              | –                 | 1             | –            |
| Wild boar (Sus scrofa) | –              | –              | 2              | –              | 10             | –              | –              | 1              | 1              | 2              | –              | –              | x          | 1              | 11              | x            | –              | –              | 4              | –            |
| Hare (Lepus europaeus) | –              | 7              | –              | –              | 3              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –          | 2              | x              | –              | –              | 1              | –              | –            |
| Wolf (Canis lupus)   | –                | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –          | –              | –              | x            | –              | –              | –              | –            |
| Fox (Vulpes vulpes)  | –                | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –              | –          | –              | –              | –          | –              | –              | –              | –            |

Abbreviations: a – antler; f – Final Roman/Migration period; n – number of finds not clearly specified; s – skeletons included; x – present; () – approximately.
| Animal taxa          | Iža | Biely Kostol | Bratislava-Trnava nad Tnávou | Bratislava-Trnava (Zadné) | Bratislava-Slavkov | Bratislava-Vajnory | Číč-Poľí | Humenné | Ivanka pri Dunaji | Jálské | Malý nad Hornom | Most pri Bratislave | Nitra-Chrenová | Nitra-Plavecké břehy | Štítnik | Šútov | Trnava-Modranička | Trnava | Veľký Néder | Veľké Zálužie | Zeliezovce |
|---------------------|-----|--------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------|--------|-----------------|-------|----------------|---------------------|---------------|----------------------|--------|-------|----------------|--------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| Weasel (*Mustela sp.*) | –   | –            | –                            | –                         | –                 | –                  | –         | –      | –               | –     | –              | –                   | –             | –                    | –      | –     | –              | –      | –         | –           | –         |
| Beaver (*Castor fiber*) | –   | –            | –                            | –                         | –                 | –                  | –         | –      | –               | –     | –              | –                   | –             | –                    | –      | –     | –              | –      | –         | –           | –         |
| Rodent, small (*Rodentia*) | –   | –            | –                            | –                         | –                 | –                  | –         | –      | –               | –     | –              | 1                   | –             | –                    | –      | –     | –              | –      | –         | –           | –         |
| Chicken (*Gallus domesticus*) | 1   | 119         | –                            | (12)                      | –                 | 1                  | 13        | –      | (3)             | 1     | 2              | 1                   | 1             | –                    | 7      | –     | –              | –      | –         | –           | –         |
| Goose (*Anser domesticus*) | –   | –            | –                            | –                         | –                 | 1                  | 4         | –      | –               | –     | –              | –                   | 3             | –                    | –      | –     | –              | –      | –         | –           | –         |
| Duck (*Anas domesticus*) | 1   | –            | –                            | –                         | –                 | –                  | –         | –      | –               | –     | –              | –                   | –             | –                    | –      | –     | –              | –      | –         | –           | –         |
| Pigeon (*Columba livia f.*) | –   | –            | –                            | –                         | –                 | –                  | –         | –      | –               | –     | –              | xf                  | –             | –                    | –      | –     | –              | –      | –         | –           | –         |
| Stork (*Ciconia sp.*) | –   | –            | –                            | –                         | –                 | –                  | –         | –      | –               | –     | –              | –                   | –             | –                    | –      | –     | –              | –      | –         | –           | –         |
| Bustard (*Otis tarda*) | –   | –            | –                            | –                         | –                 | –                  | –         | –      | –               | –     | –              | –                   | –             | –                    | –      | –     | –              | –      | –         | –           | –         |
| Bird (*Aves*) | 2   | 6            | –                            | –                         | –                 | –                  | –         | 10     | –               | –     | –              | –                   | –             | –                    | –      | –     | –              | –      | –         | –           | –         |
| Pond turtle (*Emys orbicularis*) | –   | –            | –                            | –                         | –                 | –                  | –         | –      | 2               | 6     | –              | –                   | –             | –                    | –      | –     | –              | –      | –         | –           | –         |
| Frog (*Anura*) | –   | –            | –                            | –                         | –                 | –                  | –         | –      | 1               | –     | –              | –                   | –             | –                    | –      | –     | –              | –      | –         | –           | –         |
| Wels catfish (*Silurus glanis*) | –   | –            | –                            | –                         | –                 | –                  | –         | –      | –               | –     | –              | –                   | –             | –                    | –      | –     | –              | –      | –         | –           | –         |
| Cyprinid fish (*Cyprinidae*) | 1   | –            | –                            | –                         | –                 | –                  | –         | –      | –               | –     | –              | –                   | –             | –                    | –      | –     | –              | –      | –         | –           | –         |
| Esocid fish (*Esocidae*) | 1   | –            | –                            | –                         | –                 | –                  | –         | –      | 5               | –     | –              | –                   | –             | –                    | –      | –     | –              | –      | –         | –           | –         |
| Fish (*Piscis*) | 1   | 3n           | 2                            | –                         | –                 | 1                  | 5         | –      | –               | –     | –              | –                   | –             | –                    | –      | –     | –              | –      | –         | –           | –         |
| Mollusks (*Mollusca*) | –   | 4            | 6                            | 73                        | –                 | 1                  | –         | –      | –               | 18    | –              | –                   | –             | 30                    | –      | 1     | –              | –      | –         | –           | –         |

Tab. 7. Continuation.
Tab. 8. The representation of basic taxonomic groups at Roman period sites from the southwestern Slovakia (sites with less than 200 identified fragments not reconsidered). Remains of turtle, small rodents and unidentified specimens excluded from the calculation. * – quantification include antlers.

| ID | Site            | Domestic mammal | Wild mammal* | Domestic bird | Wild Bird | Fish | Mollusc |
|----|----------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|-----------|------|---------|
|    |                | NISP  | %    | NISP  | %    | NISP  | %    | NISP  | %    | NISP  | %    |
| IŽ | Iža            | 6008  | 97.7 | 7     | 0.1  | 119   | 1.9  | 6     | 0.1  | 3     | 0.0  | 4     | 0.1  |
| BR | BA-Rusovce     | 219   | 94.4 | 7     | 3.0  | 1     | 0.4  | 2     | 0.9  | 3     | 1.3  | –     | 0.0  |
| ROMAN-PROVINCIAL (average) | – | 96.1 | – | 1.6 | – | 1.2 | – | 0.5 | – | 0.7 | – | 0.1 |
| 1  | Biely Kostol   | 190   | 95.0 | 4     | 2.0  | –     | –    | –     | –    | –     | –    | 6     | 3.0  |
| 3  | BA-Trnávka     | 1217  | 91.2 | 30    | 2.2  | 12    | 0.9  | –     | –    | 2     | 0.1  | 73    | 5.5  |
| 7  | Cifer-Pác      | 3716  | 99.0 | 10    | 0.3  | 17    | 0.5  | 10    | 0.3  | 1     | 0.0  | –     | –    |
| 13 | Nitra-Chrenová | 855   | 88.1 | 115   | 11.8 | 1     | 0.1  | –     | –    | –     | –    | –     | –    |
| 15 | Štúrovo        | 901   | 92.9 | 17    | 1.8  | 10    | 1.0  | 11    | 1.1  | 1     | 0.1  | 30    | 3.1  |
| 18 | Veľký Meder    | 2446  | 98.0 | 24    | 1.0  | 6     | 0.2  | 3     | 0.1  | 16    | 0.6  | 1     | 0.0  |
| 19 | Veľké Zálužie  | 206   | 86.6 | 32    | 13.4 | –     | –    | –     | –    | –     | –    | –     | –    |
| ROMAN-BARBARIC (average) | – | 93.0 | – | 4.6 | – | 0.5 | – | 0.5 | – | 0.2 | – | 2.9 |

Sample size distorts the resulting picture, we presume that deer hunting played an important role in meat provisioning for the locals or at least for some of them. The data support the hypothesis that red deer was the most hunted game in southwestern Slovakia during the Roman period (Tab. 7). In some settlements, however, the contribution of red deer may be overestimated due to including all antler fragments into the total NISP. Antlers may also be collected when shed, without killing the whole animal for meat. An example is the settlement at Nitra-Chrenová where red deer remains comprise only antler fragments, likely related to the crafting of tools or decorations (Fabiš 2003). This must be born in mind when judging the ratio of wild to domestic animals and their role in the diet. In general, wild mammals do not contribute more than 5 % to total NISP at Roman-provincial sites in the region and the adjacent Barbaricum (Tab. 8). To add the picture, the diet was sporadically enriched by meat of wild boar, roe deer, and aurochs (the latter being the least represented). A wolf, fox, beaver or weasel also occurred among the prey but their dietary exploitation remains questionable. Domestic mammals make up more than 90 % of the NISP at both Roman-provincial sites and in the Barbaricum. Domesticates were undoubtedly of the highest significance to the animal economy of the region. The species kept included cattle, sheep, goat, pig, horse, donkey, dog and cat, but their roles played in food provisioning (meat, milk) were different. Clearly, the dietary significance of the latter four species is questionable and should be assessed in light of eventual butchery marks as well as circumstances of recovery. At Veľké Zálužie, marks of defleshing or narrow exploitation are absent on horse and dog bones. This supports the hypothesis that neither of them formed a (regular) part of the menu. On the other hand, the absence of butchery marks does not exclude the possibility of their consumption (e.g. due to loss of primary function or shortage of meat for example), mainly if we remember fragmentary character of finds and immature age of one of the horse individual (see next chapters).

The possibility of hippophagia is supported by the presence of butchery marks reported from other contemporaneous sites (e.g. Fabiš/Bielichová 2014). In Hurbanovo for instance, cut/chop marks on a mandible fragment of a horse have been registered (Hajnalová et al. 2018). The strikingly larger proportion of horse bones at Nitra-Chrenová, on the other hand, is not a result of increased horse meat consumption but counting all elements of an intact single skeleton found in a pit (Fabiš 2003, 114, tab. 12a).

Regarding main farm animals, it can be assumed that inhabitants of Veľké Zálužie relied on beef and other edible parts of cattle including blood, fat and intestines. This is in accordance with previous results from Roman period assemblages in Slovakia where cattle bone finds dominate (Fig. 11). Although NISP values vary from site to site, the general ‘cattle pattern’ is evident. If available, additional quantification results (WISP, MNI) and the butchery data support the highest importance of cattle not only for the diet but also for the animal economy. The Germanic sites where sufficient numbers of finds were analysed clearly show a smaller representation of beef in meat provisioning at Biely Kostol,
Bratislava-Trnávka, location Zadné and Nitra-Chrenová. It seems that at first two sites more pork than beef was consumed, while at the third site more caprine (sheep?) remains were identified. When available, MNI results also suggest that beef was usually complemented with pork at the majority of sites. Cattle and pigs were slaughtered in equal numbers at Veľké Zálužie, Bratislava-Trnávka and Trnava-Horné pole. The growing popularity of pork towards the 3rd and 4th c. AD in the region of Bratislava was recently interpreted as resulting from an archaeologically detected increase in the local population and/or the Romanization of the diet (Hajnalová et al. 2018, 66; Šefčáková 2011, 392). However, since pigs are better comparable to caprines in terms of individual meat output (Bartosiewicz 1993, 126, 127) we excluded cattle from the comparison of the regional data (Fig. 12). A diagram then shows that pigs outnumber caprines at Biely Kostol, Bratislava-Trnávka and Cifer-Pác, while in Most pri Bratislave and Veľký Meder the caprines predominate. There are also sites such as Veľké Zálužie, Nitra-Chrenová and Štúrovo where the pig/caprine ratio is balanced. It is a question, what was the reason for this variability – whether pork consumption is indicative of a more stable, rich economy and general population increase, persisting or adopted tradition or it was related more to the local environmental conditions. The only clear ‘outliers’ in Fig. 11 or 12 are represented by food refuse from Roman-provincial military sites, such as Iža-Leányvár and Bratislava-Rusovce. The dominance of caprine and/or pig bones within the material (by count and weight of identifiable specimens) clearly points to different cultural (culinary) tradition (e.g. King 2001). However, it is hard to explain why at similar Roman-provincial sites from the Middle Danube beef and pork usually prevail (cf. Bökönyi...
Regarding a ‘Germanic dietary pattern’, the continuity or change in time still cannot be fully studied due to the limited number of analyses carried out for early historic periods. So far, the composition of domestic species points to the persisting importance of cattle and caprines (sheep) from the Iron Age to the Early Roman period and the gradually increasing importance of pork during the Late Roman period (Hajnalová et al. 2018, 66). A ‘beef and pork’ pattern of the latter period has also been attested by our data.

**Skeletal element representation: a meat consumed?**

Several taphonomic factors, species diversity in skeletal anatomy, differential preservation as well as cultural factors (including transport, food preparation, disposal practices, activity areas, site status and animal trade) may have contributed to the representation of skeletal elements (e.g. Kyselý 2004; Lyman 1994). In principle, animals kept in the proximity the site should display better skeletal representation because they were slaughtered locally or transported from shorter distance prior to consumption/deposition (Reitz/Wing 1999, 203). The occurrence of all main body parts at the studied settlement seems thus be indicative of local keeping, slaughtering or short-distance delivery (transport) of cattle, pig, caprines and red deer. According to NISP, the assemblage is dominated by rib and mandible fragments (Tab. A2). Relatively frequent are metacarpus, metatarsus, tibia, and radius. Other elements including vertebrae, humerus, femur or pelvis occurred least frequently. A similar pattern can be observed in all main domesticates – cattle, pig and caprines. Among the 108 cattle remains ribs, metapodials and mandible fragments prevail. In pigs and caprines the data are rather few but show the same trend. As far as differential preservation and anatomy is concerned, the prevalence of ribs can be explained by their anatomical multiplicity, high degree of butchery and fragility together with fair durability in large mammals. Mandibles were highly fragmented and heavily butchered too, but in contrast to the maxilla for example, the jaw is a more durable skeletal element guaranteeing a higher probability of survival both during deposition and recovery. On the other hand, the relative lack of humerus and femur fragments, bones also intensively butchered, may be attributed to their smaller degree of natural fragmentation as well as smaller number (only two each in the skeleton).
Regarding the quantity and quality of meat associated with different skeletal elements, there is a predominance in the number of bones associated with low and medium value meat in the refuse. The elements with medium- and low-value meat are most typical of cattle (B = 43.6%; C = 37.9%) and caprines (B = 10.0%; C = 75.0%).

Elements bearing high beef portions such as backbone, shoulder and thigh bones (A category) occur in 18.5% by cattle and 15.0% by caprines. A similar pattern is recorded in the group of non-identifiable large mammals. On the other hand, pigs are mostly represented by elements with medium meat value (B = 73.8%). The high quality pork adds another portion (A = 11.9%), while meatless elements make up only (C = 14.3%). These differences are indicative of the use of animals. Pigs were mostly kept for meat (and fat) production in the village. However, the assortment of elements may also indicate some cultural practices, such as meat distribution along the village or the food preferences. The spatial distribution of bones cannot be really investigated in this study due to the limited excavation area and small sample size. However, there are some indicators for disposal habits in relation to the presumed function of the settlement features. The skeletal elements of all species grouped according to the meat value clearly show that the habitation space of a hut and the storage pits yielded mainly remains of meaty carcass parts (all species considered together in Fig. 13). On the other hand, the largest portion of primary butchery refuse had been deposited in the waste pits. Other features such as a single pit in front of the oven, five clay extraction pits and ten non-specific pits yielded bones predominantly representing the meaty parts of the skeleton.

A similar pattern of skeletal element representation, including the dominance of ribs and mandibles, has been recorded in other large assemblages dated to the Roman period. At Nitra-Chrenová (Fabiš 2003) cattle was represented mainly by ribs, tibiae, mandible, and scapula fragments, while in pig ribs and mandibles prevailed. At Bratislava-Trnávka (sub-assemblages A + B; Šefčáková 2011) cattle and pig elements included mostly mandible, maxilla and phalanges. Compared to the smaller assemblages, for instance coming from a single pit (e.g. Trnava-Horné pole – Biédichová 2017), the representation is different and the studied assemblage contain elements of all body parts of the main livestock. To avoid the problem caused by differential fragmentation, the weight of identifiable specimens (WISP)

---

**Fig. 13. Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad. The representation of skeletal elements according to their ‘meat value’ (Uerpmann 1973) in identified types of settlement features. The quantification exclude horn-cores, antlers, teeth and anatomically unidentified specimens. Legend: a – high; b – medium; c – low meat value.**

| Type of Settlement Feature | a | b | c |
|----------------------------|---|---|---|
| Sunken house               | 2 | 8 | 1 |
| Pit in front of the oven   | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| Waste pits                 | 60| 18| 8 |
| Storage pits               | 4 | 24| 22|
| Clay exploitation pit      | 55| 40| 22|
| Undetermined pit           | 22| 22| 22|

---

14 According to H.-P. Uerpmann (1973, 316) the high value meat (A category elements) is attached to the vertebral column (excluding tail), upper leg bones, and bones of the shoulder and the pelvic girdle. Medium value meat (B category) relates to the lower leg bones and skull (with brain and jaw musculature) and mandible (jaw musculature and tongue), ribs and sternum. Lowest meat value (C category) is attached to the face bones, tail, and feet (including ankle joints).
was used instead of NISP in this comparison. The weight difference method assesses the representation of cattle skeletal elements at Veľké Zálužie and Nitra-Chrenová (Fabiš 2003, 115, tab. 12b) and compares it to the reference individual (Fig. 14; Tab. A3). In contrast to NISP results commented above, this method revealed a significant under-representation of ribs. As far as the mandible is concerned, this method confirmed their large over-representation in the assemblage. Together with mandibulae, the metapodials and somewhat radius with ulna were also over-represented. Vertebrae were the most significantly under-represented in the collection. Although there are rib fragments and single vertebrae available in the group of unidentified large mammal bones, it is only partly explanation for their distinctive under-representation at Veľké Zálužie. In contrast to metapodials, basipodium or mandibulae, these elements bear the best quality meat and perhaps were most intensively butchered, prepared as human food and subsequently thrown to dogs, which limited their survival and exacerbated post-mortem disturbances. Problems with the precise identification of ribs and vertebrae may have contributed to their under-representation. As already suggested by NISP, the under-represented were also femur and pelvis which bear the high value meat. Comparing the recorded pattern to the situation at Nitra-Chrenová, similarities in the representation of particular elements are obvious. There is also a significant under-representation of ribs, vertebrae and femur in terms of WISP. In contrast to Veľké Zálužie, however, the metapodials were only slightly over-represented. The other elements reflect their natural weight distribution within the complete reference skeleton. We presume that rather than anthropogenic or cultural factors the differences are caused by the large number of specimens available from Nitra-Chrenová.

Horse is represented in the assemblage by elements providing both high- (scapula) as well as the low-value meat (phalanx 3). The same applies to dog, whose meaty (vertebra, radius) as well as meatless elements (metacarpus) were present. Regarding red deer (MNI = 4), approximately 66 % of NISP comprises of elements bearing medium- and high-value meat. This variability also stems from the partially preserved individual deposited in pit 54, whose remains included elements indicated in Fig. 15. The details on age and modifications will be discussed in the next chapter. There were no butchery marks recorded, just perimortal fractures and a few traces of carnivore gnawing (teeth punctures) on the humerus, innominate, metapodials, scapula and a cervical vertebra. The second immature individual was represented by part of the right hindlimb including the distal part of the tibia, and the completely preserved talus, calcaneus and
centrotarsale. These remains were found together in the pit 50 and represent meatless part of the carcass, perhaps refuse from the primary butchering. The tibia which showed some clear post-mortem (fresh) fractures had the adjoining fragment recovered from pit 58 which suggests either contemporaneous use of both pits or post-recovery bias. The other deer individuals are represented by antler (feature 15, see above), two metatarsal fragments (feature 30) and a partly preserved axis (feature 5). A small fragment of roe deer metatarsal bone represents a meatless body region.

Husbandry practices:
the age and sex of animals

In a rural economy, females are expected to prevail in the living herd. They are economically more valuable than males which are not producing either offspring or milk. In the ‘production sites’ the multi-purpose use of cattle and caprines is expected (e.g. Uerpmann 1973). On the other hand, pigs are primarily kept for meat and fat, and in this type of economy they tend to be slaughtered earlier (the ideal culling age is 1.5 year). Male pigs may be overrepresented or equally represented in the cull. The wide range of age classes recorded in all three domesticates suggests their local keeping and the aforementioned multi-purpose use of cattle and caprines (Tab. A4). At least 240 specimens could be aged with more-or-less precision. The best represented age cohort was that of subadult/adult animals (66.7 % of NISP), although only half of them (30.4 %) could be safely identified as adults. A similar portion of bones represented immature animals (33.3 %), of which nearly half belonged to very young individuals – categories ‘neonatal’ and ‘very juvenile’. This general picture therefore supports the idea of the multi-purpose exploitation of domesticates. Additional efforts in sexing and ageing of available material, however, helped to shed light on the culling strategies of particular species and the food production at the site.

In cattle, the size and shape of horn-cores and metapodials provided some clues to sex determination. A completely preserved horn-core (specimen 7/1; Fig. 6:3) has small dimensions, slightly oval
diameter and small curvature. Its porous surface suggests that the individual was not fully grown when slaughtered (subadultus?). The studied site did not yield other cattle horn-cores, so it is impossible to make an intra-population comparison. However, on the basis of small dimensions, we presumed that the horn represents a female individual. The comparison of basal circumferences of available cattle horn-cores from Roman period sites support this assumption (Fig. 16). There are two clearly separated clusters: the first (in the left of the diagram) which represents the small-horned, most probably female individuals and the second one representing the large-horned cattle, most possibly males or castrates. According to the data available from Roman period sites, the basal circumference of female horn-cores ranges between 107 to 150 mm. In the group of the putative cows the values also vary which indicates large heterogeneity of cattle and possible existence of several regional forms. The specimen from Veľké Zálužie correlates with the group of small-horned females, although its flatness index reach 77.8 which points to a slightly oval cross-section of the horn, a feature pronounced in males or castrates (Armitage/Clutton-Brock 1976). Nonetheless, presumed male/castrated individuals are distinctively separated in the diagram (Fig. 16) by their basal circumference that ranges from 180 to 210 mm. Cattle with very big horn-cores occurred at Nitra-Chrenová or Cifer-Pác, one of them even reaching the size of the Roman oxen from villa rustica at Nickelsdorf (Fig. 16; Riedel 2004). The specimen from Veľké Zálužie with its basal circumference 113.4 mm represents the second smallest specimen within the group of cattle horn-cores from Roman period sites. It is much smaller than the average of cows from Cifer-Pác (128 mm; Bielichová/Ambros, forthcoming) or cows of the ‘small form’ cattle from Bernhardstahl (123.9 mm; Riedel 1996, 67, 68, tab. 7). Therefore, it support aforementioned assumption on subadult age of the individual.

Additional information on the sex of culled cattle was provided by five well preserved metapodials. The relation of the length and width-length ratio was initially compared to the medieval dataset published by B. Novotný (1966) and enabled to recognize two males and three females (Tab. 9). However, like with the single horn-core, metric data from Roman period sites were assembled to sex the metapodials within the contemporaneous context (Fig. 17; 18). It is known that “the horn-cores and pelvic bones are secondary sexual characteristics but those on metapodia

Fig. 16. A scatter plot of cattle horn-core finds from the Roman period sites in southwestern Slovakia. Legend: a – Veľké Zálužie (Tab. A7); b – Nitra-Chrenová (Fabiš 2003); c – Veľký Meder (Fabiš 1980); d – Nickelsdorf (Riedel 2004); e – Cifer-Pác (Ambros 1977a; 1977b). Abbreviations: LD – least diameter of the horn-core base (M46); GD – greatest diameter of the horn-core base (M45 after A. von den Driesch 1976).
are tertiary. Their size is related to the greater body weight of males and the sexual dimorphism manifest later in age which makes sexing metapodials extremely difficult.” (Uerpmann 1973, 314). Therefore, we must bear in mind that, without possibility of ageing the compared specimens, it is also possible that subadult individuals (aged from 2 to 4 years) were included. Sexual dimorphism is still developing at that age.

Age differences and the possible admixture of various cattle forms, attested at Roman period sites in the wider region (e.g. Bökönyi 1974; 1984; Pucher 2016) may complicate the final sex-determination of our finds.

The metacarpals of Roman period cattle vary in gracility and total length, although they did not form clearly separated clusters (Fig. 17). Specimen 32/1 from Veľké Zálužie most probably belonged to a female (GL = 183.7 mm; index = 14) and specimen 19/6 to a male cattle (GL = 183 mm; index is 16.3). In general, robust animals with higher index values are presumably males and the more gracile individuals showing smaller values, are likely to represent females. However, as is clear from the diagram, there are many specimens that show intermediate values. Opposite to females, there are metacarpals of castrated individuals which are significantly longer and show intermediate slenderness index values. The distinctive robustness and size of two Roman oxen from Nickelsdorf is clearly illustrated by their far right position in the diagram. The distribution of metacarpal dimensions also offers evidence that some very large and robust males/castrates were slaughtered on Germanic sites in present day Slovakia, for example at Štúrovo. This difference may alternatively be explained – by a different culling strategy and cattle exploitation – working oxen slaughtered or keeping of larger form of cattle. Bearing in mind the size of Roman cattle (in the diagram represented by oxen from Nickelsdorf and the individual from Iža; Fig. 17), it may be assumed large cattle (oxen?) were also kept also in Germanic settlements in Trnava and Cífer-Pác (but not at Štúrovo) In order to compare cattle from the territory of the Barbaricum (southwestern Slovakia) and adjacent areas under the influence of the Roman Empire (Pannonia), data from the Roman town Tác-Gorsium have been added to the diagram (Bökönyi 1984; 28, 36, tab. 7). It has been assumed that improved animals imported from Italy contributed a substantial portion to beef supplies in that city.
Compared to them, bones from Veľké Zálužie represented significantly more gracile animals. A similar variability can be seen in metatarsal measurements (Fig. 18). Two of three specimens from Veľké Zálužie, showing smaller dimensions most probably represent females of different sizes. The third specimen 22/10 is more robust and possibly belonged to a male (Tab. 9). Like in the case of metacarpals, the average slenderness indices of metatarsals from the Roman town Tác-Gorsium (indicated by dashed lines in the diagram), illustrate the smaller size of Germanic cattle in both sexes. On the other hand, rather large animals can be found at Germanic settlements, either located along the Danubian Limes (Štúrovo) or further north (Cífer-Pác). The latter settlement provided a few examples of extraordinary large and robust individuals (two empty dots in the upper right section of the diagram; Fig. 18). The 268 mm long specimen exceeds the values recorded for the Nickelsdorf oxen.

At Veľké Zálužie, but also in other Germanic sites, the sexing of metapodials suggested the over-representation of females in the cull which is in accordance with expected rural economy, where cows are most important to maintain the herd reproduction and producing the milk. Results also supported the idea of slaughtering (exporting?) the male offspring before reaching adulthood, or castration due to the bad temper and aimed at producing working oxen. Nearly all sites considered in the diagrams showed this trend, although more male/castrated cattle is noticeable in Štúrovo or Cífer-Pác. This may indicate the higher status of inhabitants (wealth), imports of animals due to higher demand, different slaughter strategy or greater size variability within the living herd.

Although limited, absolute ageing of cattle adds further evidence on the use of animals at the studied site. Dental data (Tab. A5) suggested that at least three individuals were slaughtered very early, before reaching an ideal age for the meat production, i.e. before 2.5–3.5 year of life. Two younger calves (mandible 28/18 and 29/1) died at age of 2–4 months and older one (mandible 30/2) in its 4th–6th month. A single adult individual (mandible 20/10–11) with moderately worn permanent dentition attested the

\[^{15}\text{This find should be re-measured in the deposit.}\]
death above the 4th year (category E in Peške 1994). Additional data on age at slaughter in cattle were provided by the state of epiphyseal fusion (Tab. A6). According to them, cattle were killed in their 2nd and 2.5 year, but mostly before reaching the adulthood (between 3.5–4th year). Thus, in contrast to general results presented above, absolute ageing points to the predominance of immature cattle within the assemblage and slaughter of individuals in their ideal age for the meat production (2–4 years). Such results are in contradiction with the culling strategy assumed for cattle from Nitra-Chrenová, where, according to the epiphyseal data, animals were killed later in their age. Figure 19 shows a significantly larger portion of animals surviving the adulthood in here (cattle above 4th year in Nitra = 70 %; in Veľké Zálužie = 20.8 % of NISP) and maturity (around 7 years old in Nitra = 36.7 %; not recorded in Veľké Zálužie). Although the calves’ slaughtering in Nitra-Chrenová has been also documented (a single individual in 5–6 months; Fabiš 2003, 107), the predominance of adult and mature individuals was attested through dental ageing, therefore focus on milk and labour exploitation assumed (Fabiš 2003, 108). The sample size of both Roman period settlements is far from representative, however, the combination of sex and age data, at least for particular areas explored, indicated different husbandry strategies and/or slaughtering of cattle. In Veľké Zálužie, the exploitation of younger animals is approved if meat production concerns. The milk production, on the other hand, can be proposed on the basis of higher presentation of calves in the cull.

Regarding other domestic species kept at the site, the information is even more limited. Sexing pigs on the basis of canine teeth indicated the predominance of males in the cull (12 : 2 by NISP). The dental data suggest that three individuals were killed between 0.5 and 1 year (category D and E; Tab. A5) and two others, showing partially abraded third molars, shortly after reaching 2nd year (category H and I). The epiphyseal data indicated a survival of early juvenile pigs and the slaughter between 1 and 2.5 years, i.e. at most ideal time for the meat production (Tab. A6). These data are in accordance with relative ageing that showed higher representation of juveniles and subadult pigs in the cull (Tab. A4). A similar age and sex of the pigs were reported at other Germanic settlements. In Nitra-Chrenová for instance, the slight overrepresentation of males and the absence of earliest age categories was recorded. Most pigs were killed here between 1.5–2.5 years and so just some animals survived until the adulthood and maintain the reproduction (Fabiš 2003, 110).

In caprines the sex was not securely determined. A single sheep horn-core was relatively long, but gracile and nearly circular in the cross section. Its small dimensions, compact surface and developed curvature suggest it belonged to an adult female. Regrettably, there are very few regional data for comparisons of sheep horn core morphology, so the sex determination stays tentative only. In three sheep specimens from the Roman military settlement at Iža, a basal circumference of the sheep horn-cores ranged from 149 to 167 mm, its least diameter from 36 to 44 and largest diameter from 50 to 60 mm. A single horn-core from Cífer-Pác had the basal circumference of 158 mm, smaller diameter of 42 mm and larger diameter of 55 mm. So these animals had much bigger horns in comparison to our specimen. The relative ageing data revealed little information for caprines, although the presence of variety of classes can be observed (Tab. A4). This suggest the local keeping/breeding of sheep (goats). The dental data attested the slaughter in 6 months (specimen 16/11) and between 0.5 and 1 year (specimen 31/2). Two other individuals were killed between 2 and 4 year (Tab. A5). The epiphyseal data, on the other side evidence survival of juvenile and subadult animals (above 3 year) as well as killing young (before 3 year; Tab. A6). So animals in 1–2 year or the most ideal age for meat exploitation (Uerpmann 1973, 316), seems to be the least represented in the assemblage. A similar pattern, but attested on larger sample size, has been noted at Nitra-Chrenová. The majority of caprines died before and after this age category which was interpreted as focus on exploitation of the secondary products – wool/milk. The possible seasonal surplus of male offspring that could be sell elsewhere (export) was hypothesised too (Fabiš 2003, 109).
Concerning dog bones from Veľké Zálužie, the fused distal epiphyses of a radius and fused vertebral apophyses point to the fact that animal died was an adult (pet, working dog naturally died?). The size and porous character of the bones surface in horse specimens, on the other hand, indicated that one of two presented individuals may have died still immature (naturally or killed intentionally). The missing dental or epiphyseal data complicated further interpretation of horse and dog remains. The site revealed a relatively large portion of red deer individuals (MNI = 4) in different age – at least two of them still immature at death. The first one, represented by articulated heel bones, belonged to a subadult and according to the unfused epiphysis of distal tibia and tuber calcanei it was killed between first and second year of life (deposited in pit 50). The partially preserved red deer skeleton (deposited in pit 54) represents an even younger animal. The state of milk dentition and epiphyseal fusion shows that fawn deer was killed between 3rd and 4th month. If the animal was born in May–June, when a standard calving season of the European red deer is reported (Komaterek/Stöhr/Fejar 2001), it died or was killed during the late summer or autumn, i.e. in August–October same year. Very young age of red deers and preservation of partial skeletons evoke the idea of keeping deers alive at (or near) the site, but there is no hard evidence on such speculation. Most probably, all deer remains represent the hunted animals killed by man in order to obtain meat. Further two red deers died as subadult or adults. The roe deer specimen belonged also to the subadult/adult individual.

Livestock body size and shape

The assemblage yielded a small collection of measurable bones that provided few indicators on animals’ morphology (Tab. A7). Largest amount of data concerns cattle whose completely preserved metapodials and tali represent valuable size indicators (e.g. Albarella 2002; Davis et al. 2012). The previous research on the Roman period husbandry suggested that there were two morphologically distinctive populations of cattle present in Pannonia: the brachyceros with short horns and withers height of 100–120 cm, and improved Italian, the primigenius type with long horns and withers height of 120–140 cm (Bökonyi 1974). For instance, the average withers height of cattle from Tác-Gorsium points was 125.9 cm (range of 104.6–143) based on metacarpals and 126.8 cm (107.4–143.3) based on metatarsals. It has been assumed that “cattle exceeding 125 cm in withers height can be considered improved Italian breed” (Bökonyi 1984, 28). In another Roman settlement, in villa rustica at Nickelsdorf, the imports of cattle from central Italy was argued on the basis of analysis of two complete oxen skeletons (Pucher 2006). Their withers height was approximately 134 cm with the body mass of 550 to 630 kg. Moreover, in Germanic Bernhardstahl a profound morphometric study revealed the hybridization of aforementioned populations and possible existence of new, mid-sized cattle ‘breed’ or type (Pucher 2016; Riedel 1996). In the eastern Austria, the coexistence of different cattle has been presumed already from the Late Iron Age (Pucher/Saliari/Ramsl 2015). Similar to other ‘innovations’, it was hypothesised that observed size changes of cattle or sheep were related to the Romans and their economic and/or cultural influence within the region (see also Bielichová 2017; Fabiš/Bielichová 2014; Šefčáková 2011).

At Veľké Zálužie, limited number of measurable elements do not allow to reveal complete picture of the local cattle variability. Considering the head, a single well preserved horn-core of subadult female suggest keeping of the short-horned, perhaps small sized cattle which is in accordance with majority of finds from the Middle Danube area (e.g. Bökonyi 1974; 1984; Pucher 1999). The horn-core (specimen 7/1; Fig. 21: 1) is short, relatively robust and compact, slightly flattened in the cross-section with the small basal circumference (see previous chapter and Fig. 16). Regrettably, other finds that would help us to shed more light on the head morphology of local cattle are not available. On the other side, the assemblage provided complete metapodials that enable the calculation of the withers height of at least here individuals (Tab. 9). According to Matolcsi coefficients the average withers height of cattle was 113.7 cm. By metacarpals it was 113.3 cm (range of 110.4–116.3) and by metatarsals 113.9 cm (109.3–119.1). If our determination of sex is considered, the average withers height of female was 110.9 cm (109.3–112.7) and 115.9 cm of male (115.8–116). If Calkin’s coefficients are used, the average withers height of cattle was very similar and made 113 cm. By metacarpals it was 112.2 cm (109.4–114.6) and by metatarsals 113.6 cm (109.5–118.1). The average height of females was 110.8 cm (109.5–113) and of males 114.6 cm (114.2–115). Combining results of both methods, the average withers height of cattle was 113.4 cm, where females had 110.9 cm and males 115.3 cm in the withers. These results again points to the small-bodied ‘breed’ of cattle. According to the body mass indices (Vigne 1991) and reduction suggested for primitive breeds (Kyselý 2016), the local cattle from in average 350 kg of live weight – in females 333 kg, males 367 kg. The meat and work utility of such small cattle was small, but it might had been
The information on the body size/mass of the Roman period cattle from the territory of southwestern Slovakia is scarce and only few sites provided statistically representative data (Tab. 10). Based on the metapodials of unknown sex and new calculations, the average withers height of ‘Germanic’ cattle was 117.1 cm which corresponds to the body mass of 382 kg. This is the cattle within the variation range of small-sized breed as suggested by S. Bökönyi (1974; 1984). However, results are changing from site to site. Clearly, some finds of metapodials (e.g. Bratislava-Vajnory, Štúrovo, Trnava, Veľký Meder) points to the animals exceeding the range of the small ‘Celtic-Germanic’ cattle. It is evident, that larger cattle occurred in Štúrovo, where sufficient number of metapodials is on disposal. The average withers height of cattle was 120.8 cm that is around 6 cm more than at Veľké Zálužie. It can be explained by different slaughter and husbandry practices (e.g. larger portion of oxen in the cull; Fig. 17; 18) or the imports of larger ‘breed’ and hybridization (?). The immediate vicinity of the Roman province would support the latter interpretation, mainly if we look at the 10–12 cm difference in between Štúrovo and other Germanic sites, However, the scarcity of data do not allow the test both hypothesis properly. The representation of solitary individuals with higher withers height was recorded at settlements further north from the Roman Limes, in Trnava or Veľký Meder, but those may represent male individuals.

If sex determination is taken into consideration, the calculations provide more specific results. A cattle metacarpal from Nitra-Chrenová points to the body height of 106.4 cm (300 kg) in females. The greatest length of metapodials of known sex from Cífer-Pác (Bielichová 2017; Bielichová/Ambros, forthcoming). Here the average withers height of cows was 108.9 cm (with range of 103.6–115.4 cm) and of males 119.8 cm (113.6–123.2) that correspond to the live weight of 318 kg in females (281–368) and 405 kg in males (354–436). An extremely large metatarsal (Fig. 18; see above) would even point to a male/castrate with the withers height of 147 cm and the body mass of 700 kg, which is very large cattle reaching the parameters of females of modern breed (see above). If the measurements are correct, this individual may represent either large-sized Iltalic type of cattle or other wild bovid, for instance aurochs and it must be re-examined. Two sexed metacarpals from Trnava (Bielichová 2017) suggested that rather large individuals – a cow with body size 119.4 cm (402 kg) and the castrate with body size 128.8 cm (490 kg). Both would be significantly

### Tab. 9. Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad. Sex and size of cattle according to the metapodials. Abbreviations: GL – greatest length; Bp – (greatest) breadth of the proximal end; SD – smallest breadth of the diaphysis; Bd – (greatest) breadth of the distal end; WRH – withers height.

| Specimen | Feature | Side | Sex assessed | GL  | Bp  | SD  | Bd  | (SD*100)/GL | (Bp*100)/GL | (Bd*100)/GL | WRH (Matolcsi 1970) | WRH (Calkin 1960) |
|----------|---------|------|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|
|          | Metacarpus |      |             |     |     |     |     |             |             |             |                  |                  |
| 19/6     | 10      | d m | 183.0       | 52.5| 29.8| 52.3| 16.3| 28.7        | 28.6        | 110.4       | 115.8           | 113.0           |
| 19/7     | 10      | d m | 50.5        | 28.1|     |     |     |             |             |             |                  |                  |
| 23/3     | 9       | d m | 55.8        |     |     |     |     |             |             |             |                  |                  |
| 23/4     | 9       | s m | 61.2        |     |     |     |     |             |             |             |                  |                  |
| 32/1     | 9       | d f | 183.7       | 52.1| 25.8| 51.2| 14.1| 28.4        | 27.9        | 110.8       | 116.3           | 113.4           |
|          | Metatarsus |      |             |     |     |     |     |             |             |             |                  |                  |
| 12/1     | 6       | d f | 211.6       | 39.6| 20.5| 45.6| 9.7 | 18.7        | 21.6        | 112.7       | 119.1           | 116.5           |
| 22/9     | 8       | d f | 205.1       |     | 22.4| 47.8| 10.9| 23.4        | 109.3       | 115.4       | 112.9           | 109.5           |
| 22/10    | 8       | s m | 206.1       | 45.7| 26.3| 12.8| 22.2|             | 109.8       | 116.0       | 113.5           | 110.1           |

For comparison, a cow of the recent Slovak Simmental breed (slovenský strakatý dobytok) reaches such weight in her first year of life (Strapáč et al. 2013; 330, tab. 9.46–9.47). The live weight of modern Simmental cattle ranges from 550 to 800 kg in cows and from 1100 to 1300 kg in bulls, but in the past, the sexual dimorphism of primitive cattle was decreased due to the isolation and inbreeding (Uerpmann 1973). We may expect that also at Veľké Zálužie the differences in the withers height as well as body mass were not large.
larger than what we found at Veľké Zálužie or other Germanic sites. In Bruckneudorf, where hybridization and co-existence of several cattle breeds was observed, such castrate would be considered a cow of the large-sized Italic type of cattle (Pucher 2016; 260, diagram 8).

To retrieve more information on the body size of cattle, the metric data of astragals from the Roman period sites were collected and evaluated (Fig. 20; Tab. 11). A large heterogeneity is shown, without possibility of clustering the finds according to sex or cattle type. The specimens of Veľké Zálužie fit to the variation range. Two specimens (28/19 and 23/5) represent significantly larger individuals and may represent male or oxen, while remaining two (16/1 and 28/20) perhaps belonged to females or subadult cattle. The average lateral length (GLl) of tali from Veľké Zálužie is 62 mm with range of 55.3–67.2 mm. Most of the sites where cattle tali were found show similar results. The largest tali in the group belong to Roman oxen from Nickelsdorf and an individual from Štúrovo (GLl = 72 mm). More specimens located in the upper limit

**Tab. 10.** The size of the Roman period cattle according to the metapodials from sites in southwestern Slovakia. Except WRH all measurements in mm. Abbreviations: n – number of finds; GL – greatest length; Min – minimum; Max – maximum; WRH – withers height. The Matolcsi’s coefficients for the metapodials of unknown sex was used in the calculation (Matolcsi 1970). The live weight was calculated after J.-D. Vigne (1991) and its value reduction of 13 % suggested by R. Kyselý (2016).

| Site                                      | Cattle metapodials |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------|
|                                           | n      | GL [average] | Min | Max | WRH [cm] |
| Nitra-Chrenová, Shell, Baumax             | 1      | 176.4        | –   | –   | 109.0    |
| Bratislava-Trnávka, Zadné B               | 1      | 182.0        | –   | –   | 112.5    |
| Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad                   | 2      | 183.4        | 183.0 | 183.7 | 113.4    |
| Bratislava-Trnávka, Zadné A               | 1      | 186.0        | –   | –   | 115.0    |
| Cifer-Pác, Nad mlynom                     | 39     | 188.4        | 171.0 | 206.0 | 116.5    |
| Veľký Meder-Vámostelek                    | 2      | 190.6        | 190.0 | 191.1 | 117.8    |
| Štúrovo-Military training ground          | 8      | 195.4        | 177.0 | 215.0 | 120.8    |
| Trnava-Horné pole                          | 2      | 203.3        | 197.9 | 208.6 | 125.7    |
| Metacarpus                                | 56     | 188.2        | 183.8 | 200.9 | 116.3    |
| Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad                   | 3      | 207.6        | 205.1 | 211.6 | 113.7    |
| Bratislava-Trnávka, Zadné A               | 1      | 208.0        | –   | –   | 113.9    |
| Cifer-Pác, Nad mlynom                     | 24     | 212.5        | 200.5 | 267.0 | 116.4    |
| Bratislava-Trnávka, Zadné B               | 5      | 209.2        | 180.0 | 238.0 | 114.6    |
| Štúrovo-Military training ground          | 10     | 220.7        | 199.0 | 249.0 | 120.9    |
| Veľký Meder-Vámostelek                    | 1      | 220.6        | –   | –   | 120.8    |
| Bratislava-Vajnory, Pri Visáku            | 1      | 228.0        | –   | –   | 124.9    |
| Metatarsus                                 | 45     | 215.2        | 196.2 | 241.4 | 117.9    |
| WRH (average; SW Slovakia)                | 101    | –            | –   | –   | 117.1    |
| LW (average; SW Slovakia)                 | 101    | –            | –   | –   | 382 kg    |

**Tab. 11.** The size of the Roman period cattle according to the knuckle bones (talus) from sites in southwestern Slovakia. Bone measurements in mm. Abbreviations: n – number of finds; Min – minimum; Max – maximum; GLl – greatest length of the lateral half; Dl – depth of the lateral half.

| Site                                      | Cattle talus |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------|
|                                           | n  | Mean | Min | Max |
| Veľký Meder-Vámostelek                    | 20 | 61.4 | 54.7 | 68.1 |
| Nitra-Chrenová, Shell, Baumax             | 5  | 61.5 | 51.1 | 67.2 |
| Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad                   | 4  | 62.0 | 55.3 | 67.2 |
| Štúrovo-Military training ground          | 11 | 63.1 | 52.5 | 72.0 |
| Trnava-Horné pole                          | 6  | 64.7 | 59.1 | 69.7 |
| GLl                                        | 26 | 62.5 | 54.5 | 68.8 |
| Nitra-Chrenová, Shell, Baumax             | 5  | 34.2 | 28.4 | 37.0 |
| Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad                   | 4  | 34.7 | 31.6 | 37.3 |
| Štúrovo-Military training ground          | 11 | 35.6 | 29.0 | 41.0 |
| Veľký Meder-Vámostelek                    | 20 | 34.3 | 29.6 | 37.7 |
| Trnava-Horné pole                          | 6  | 36.0 | 33.2 | 40.0 |
| Dl                                         | 41 | 35.0 | 30.4 | 38.6 |
of observed range support the previous observations of larger cattle in Štúrovo and Trnava, but in average the length of cattle tali from Germanic sites is 62.5 mm. For comparison, in Bernhardsthal the average GL1 was comparable – 60.8 mm (range 53.2–72.0; Riedel 1996, 122, tab. 47). Larger tali with the average of 67 mm (53.5–80) were reported for the mixed cattle population from Tác-Gorsium (data adopted from Benecke 1994, 372, 373, tab. 43). The talus dimensions from Germanic Bruckneudorf speak for two coexisting populations. The one representing smaller type of cattle had its peak of GL1 between 60–63.5 mm and the second, representing larger type, between 68.0–71.5 mm (Pucher 2016, 280, diagram 24). Considering these results, the bigger tali from Veľké Zálužie represent the ‘intermediate’ middle-sized cattle. Similar to the withers height, more sexually determinable bones and more assemblages need to be analysed to attest our ‘preliminary’ observations.

For other domesticates, the assemblage provided very limited information (up to ten measurable elements). Few better preserved mandible fragments of pigs suggested their ‘small size’ typical for the Roman period sites (e.g. Bőkönyi 1974; 1984; Fabiš 2003; Riedel 1996). As for the caprines, the horned form of sheep was evidenced. The visual comparison of partially preserved ulna of an adult sheep 23/9 to the reference material in the laboratory (male of modern ‘Valaška’ breed) showed that it belonged to a larger and more robust animal, perhaps ram. The other possibility is larger type (breed) of a sheep. It has been argued that Germanic sheep from Nitra-Chrenová was significantly larger than the sheep from the Iron Age settlements in Nitra and fits very well to the variation range of Roman sheep kept in Pannonia (Fabiš 2003). Unfortunately, there are not enough data to study this species in more details. A few data on sheep/goat ulnas can be retrieved from Germanic settlement in Bruckneudorf, indicating that the animals were of similar dimensions as specimens from Veľké Zálužie (compare data from Tab. A7 to Bruckneudorf sheep average – SDO 24.4; DPA 28.8; SLC 20.4; Pucher 2016, 351, tab. 50). Dog remains from Veľké Zálužie most probably represent small to mid-sized animal (female?) with narrow and gracile limbs. The visual comparison of horse scapula showed that the size and robustness is similar or slightly larger in comparison to the reference horse individual in the laboratory (stallion recovered at early medieval cemetery in Dubovany-Pápež with the withers height of 133 cm). If recorded measurements are compared to other contemporaneous
finds, similar dimensions are seen for instance in the male individual from Nitra-Chrenová (Fabiš 2003, 126, tab. 12f). The horses from Germanic Bruckneudorf, a settlement within the Roman sphere of control, show slightly lower average for the scapula. Compared to specimen from Veľké Zálužie (SLC = 66.8; GLP = 94.1; LG = 55.9; BG = 50.4) dimensions of the Bruckneudorf horses were as follows: mean SLC = 60.3 mm (range 53.5–67.5 mm), mean GLP = 88.1 (77.5–100), mean LG = 53.9 (47–59) and mean BG = 46.1 (40.5–52.5 mm; adopted from Pucher 2016, 363, tab. 77).

Skeletal pathologies and anomalies

Two types of pathological conditions have been recorded in the studied assemblage: joint disease and developmental tooth anomalies (Baker/Brothwell 1980). The first group is represented by an example of distinctive deformities of a cattle *phalanx* (specimen 14/2). The chronic proliferative processes resulted in the development of exostoses altering the natural shape of the bone (Fig. 21: 2). The changes are visible mainly on the dorsal edge of the articulation, but a single osteophyte occurred also on the *tuberculum flexiorum*. The comparative study of modern draught cattle in Romania relates such deformations to the age of the individual and the extensive use of animals in lumbering operations (Bartosiewicz et al. 1997). According to the classification proposed by the study, our specimen represents an advanced 4th stage (Bartosiewicz et al. 1997, 56, fig. 39.4). Similar arthropaties are widely found in archaeozoological assemblages and are usually explained by the exploitation of animals for labour (e.g. Ambros et al. 2011; Fabiš 2005). However, as similar changes may occur also spontaneously with age or due to other causes (e.g. localized inflammation), identifying a working animal on the basis of a single case would be difficult (e.g. Bartosiewicz 2013).

Following with bone changes that may be caused by work, the find of a deformed cattle horn-core deserves attention. The specimen 7/1 – presumably a subadult female (see above) is unilaterally compressed in the middle. Looking from above on the skull, this ‘flattening’ noticeably narrowed the middle of the core’s circumference (Fig. 21: 1). Moreover, there is a unilaterally developed, ring-shaped depression on the nuchodorsal part of the base circumference. Similar impressions in cattle horn-cores have been attributed to harnessing using horn-yokes (e.g. Bartosiewicz 2013, 133, fig. 109; Peške
As far as tooth anomalies are concerned, a cattle mandible (specimen 20/11) showed abnormal attrition of permanent teeth. In the left side of the mandible the third permanent molar is clearly overgrown and projects above the normal occlusal level of the tooth row (Fig. 21: 3). This state known as malocclusio, being mostly registered in herbivores. It may have many causes including the congenital absence of the opposing tooth, premature loss of teeth due to trauma or partial destruction (Baker/Brothwell 1980; Bartosiewicz 2013). It may also lead to the chronic irritation and inflammation of the adjacent gum area. Similar finds have been reported from other sites in Slovakia, such as early medieval Bajč (Mikliková 2008, 67, fig. 9.9) or prehistoric Svodín (Ambros et al. 2011, 197, 198, fig. 2.3.1.15, 1.16). In addition to malocclusio, two cases of oligodontia occurred in two of ten presented pig mandibles. The first permanent premolar was bilaterally absent in specimens 10/1 and 12/9.16 Oligodonty is widespread among pigs and is usually considered a symptom of domestication (Bartosiewicz 2013, 197, 198). The congenital absence of teeth is usually a family linked feature displaying different frequencies among populations (Baker/Brothwell 1980, 137).

CONCLUSIONS

Excavations at the Late Roman period settlement at Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad yielded animal bones (n = 321) that represent mixed household waste resulting from butchery, consumption and craft activities. The material was found deposited within the excavated area and the strata of a single hut with sunken floor, three storage pits, two waste pits, four clay extraction pits, and eleven non-specific settlement pits. Complex intra- as well as inter-site evaluation clearly indicated that local economy and subsistence were based on the farming of domestic animals. The main food (meat) providers was cattle and pig. In terms of diet, some wild animals (especially red deer) and caprines represented the second major source of meat, while horse and dogs were probably not consumed. It seems that deer hunting was a common and regular part of daily-life. The most significant results on particular species and the studied aspects are summarized as follows:

1. The assemblage showed predominance of domestic animals (64.2 % of NISP; 82.8 % of MNI; 86 % of WISP) suggesting their importance for local husbandry and economy. So far similar results were obtained at all investigated Roman period settlements from southwestern Slovakia (Tab. 6; 8) or beyond (e.g. Benecke 1994; Bökonyi 1974; Vörös 2002).

2. Domestic animals kept at Veľké Zálužie were cattle, pig, caprines (only sheep identified), dog and horse. Remains of poultry including chicken, goose or duck that have been sporadically reported from the sites within the studied region (Tab. 7), were not identified at Veľké Zálužie. Similarly, cat or donkey, introduced by Romans to the region during the Early Roman period, did not occur at the studied site.

3. Regarding meat consumption, the WISP clearly shows that cattle was the most important provider of meat (61.5 %). Additional sources of meat were represented by pigs (14.4 %) that clearly outweighed caprines (7.6 %) and cervids (6.3 %). The minimal number of individuals (MNI) further indicated, that pigs (31 %) were most frequently slaughtered for meat, as a consequence of their higher reproduction rate, availability and exclusive meat exploitation (cattle and caprines were also kept for secondary products, see below). Cattle (24.1 %), caprines (17.2 %) and deer (17.2 %) were slaughtered less common. In accordance with the increase of pork consumption observed at sites in the Bratislava region (Šefčáková 2011) the studied assemblage points to the importance of pork within the meat diet. The ‘cattle and pork’ dietary pattern has been attested at the majority of Germanic sites from southwestern Slovakia or Middle Danube region (Fig. 11; Tab. 7). However, regarding to ratio of pig to caprines, results vary from site to site (Fig. 12). At some sites caprine bones occurred in equal number with (Veľké Zálužie, Nitra-Chrenová, Štúrovo) or even outnumbered those of pigs (Most pri Bratislave, Veľký Meder). The reasons may have cultural or environmental origins. A clear ‘caprine or caprine/pork dietary pattern’ was observed at Roman provincial sites located in the territory of Slovakia (Fig. 11; Tab. 7).

4. Large game from Veľké Zálužie included two species – red deer and roe deer. Together their bones made up notable proportion of finds (10 % of NISP; 17.2 % of MNI; 6.2 % of WISP) which indicated the importance of hunting in provision of food (meat). The age of a partial skeleton

---

16 The X-ray for distinguishing real oligodontia from the state of tooth retention was not yet applied for the find.
of a red deer fawn found in pit 54, if killed during the hunt (see below), helps to providing the information on the season of the ‘event’ – late summer/early autumn (August–September). Records of wild animals hunted during the Roman period in southwestern Slovakia showed that red deer as the most important prey of hunters. Other wild mammals such as wild boar, aurochs, hare, roe deer, wolf, fox, and beaver were hunted by the local Germanic populations. Wild birds and fish were, however, identified only rarely (Tab. 7). Interestingly, the studied site showed the largest NISP of wild mammals recorded yet (Tab. 8).

- The study of body parts and skeletal element representation indicate that cattle, pig, caprines (at least sheep) and red deer have been kept alive or transported to the site as complete carcases. The presence of a nearly intact, partially preserved red deer fawn skeleton in one of the pits also points to the possibility of keeping wild animal alive at the site (Fig. 15). This finds may represent naturally died animal, but also remnants of successful hunt and a delicate ‘meat dish’ for more people. The possibility of being a part of some ‘ritual’ (as a food?) cannot be verified due to missing recovery documentation. As for the representation of meaty and meatless skeletal elements in particular species it has been shown that while in cattle low and medium ‘quality’ elements prevail, pig was mostly represented by high and medium quality body parts. Bone refuse from the house had the largest proportion of elements associated with high quality meat, while the highest percentage of primary butchery waste was deposited in two waste pits (Fig. 13). The weight difference method showed similarities in skeletal element distribution in cattle from two Late Roman settlements at Veľké Zálužie and Nitra-Chrenová (Fig. 14; Tab. A3).

- The absence of information on the type of this site (seasonal/year round?) and socio-economic status of inhabitants as well as limited demographic data on animals prevent the assessment of slaughter and stock breeding practices in the studied village. The regional data in this respect point to the controlled kill-off of livestock in line with traditional peasant practices where females are kept in higher numbers. Some indices revealed by the analysis of age and sex suggest that Germanic people at Veľké Zálužie followed the same strategy. In cattle, a single horn-core find and a few metapodials pointed to the expected predominance of females (cows) in the cull (Tab. 9) and vice-versa males in pigs. Although limited, ageing data help deducing primarily meat exploitation in cattle with most slaughter taking place before reaching adulthood (mostly in 2–6 months and 2–4 years; Tab. A4–6). This result is slightly different from what was observed in the contemporaneous settlement at Nitra-Chrenová, where a clear predominance of adults and mainly dairy and draught purpose cattle could be presumed (Fig. 19). The absence of clear examples of castrated cattle (oxen), present at Nitra-Chrenová, provides another indicator of different modes of livestock exploitation at these two sites. In pigs, slaughter during the first or second year was observed. In caprines all kinds of age categories except the 1–2 years age category, that is the most ideal for the slaughter, were recorded. This may indicate keeping sheep (and goats) primarily for secondary products such as milk and wool/hair or exporting mutton outside the village (same also observed at Nitra-Chrenová site – Fabiš 2003).

- At Veľké Zálužie, measurable skeletal elements indicated that local cattle most possibly belonged to a small-bodied and short-horned (brachyceros) type. The withers height, estimated according to the metapodials and Matolcsi’s coefficients, was between 109.3–112.7 cm in females (average 110.9 cm, n = 3) and 115.8–116 cm in males (average 115.9 cm, n = 2). The average for the site was 113.7 cm that corresponds to 350 kg of the live weight (333 kg in females; 367 kg in males). Compared to cattle sizes calculated on the basis of finds from Germanic sites from southwestern Slovakia (117 cm; 382 kg) these cattle were slightly smaller, which may be seen as a logical consequence of having more females represented in the sample (Tab. 10). Additional investigation of talus bone of cattle (Tab. 11), however, revealed that some cattle from Veľké Zálužie reach the size parameters of Germanic middle-sized cattle from Bruckneudorf (Austria), where the coexistence of several types, perhaps autochthonous and Italic forms, was reported (Pucher 2016).

- The traces of slicing, chopping and breaking of bones, attesting the human manipulation of animal carcases, were frequently recorded in cattle, caprines, pigs and deer (Tab. 3). Their absence in dog and horse bones points to the different modes of exploitation and at best sporadic contribution to the diet. Clear examples of initial stages (e.g. killing/removal of the head), the secondary and tertiary butchery (e.g. dismembering of joints, reduction of bigger parts to smaller pot-sized portions) and marrow extraction have been identified...
Although a general pattern cannot be clearly recognized in the small assemblage, we observed more intense butchery with metal tools at Veľké Zálužie than in other Germanic assemblages from southwestern Slovakia (e.g. in Trnava-Horné pole – Bielichová 2017). Even if no metal artefacts were found during excavation, the use of large-bladed implements (axe/cleaver) was attested (Fig. 7).

- The lack of burning (recorded on a single specimen) support the idea of peaceful abandonment of the settlement with no ‘fire’ events. Most probably, quantities of food refuse were intentionally discarded into one of the used waste pits (and not thrown into the fire). Absence of burning can point to local food preparation, perhaps boiling, baking or roasting the meat without bones. Restricted access to the garbage (at least at this part of settlement) is also shown by the absence of rodent gnawing. On the other hand, gnawing of bones by dogs occurred across the whole area (Fig. 8). Human and dogs contributed significantly to the overall fragmentation of skeletal elements (Fig. 10; Tab. 5).

- A small collection of bone artefacts included two clearly and three tentatively worked items (Fig. 9; Tab. 4). The recorded modifications offered evidence of the exploitation of domestic raw materials – cattle and deer skeletal elements (talus and costae fragments). The implements can be connected with crafts, most probably textile and pottery production. Four (out of five) of the items originated from two pits – no. 9 and no. 15. An intentionally modified knuckle bone (talus) of cattle could be interpreted as a game piece, although its connection to pottery craft cannot be ruled out (Fig. 9: 4, 5).

- Archaeozoological data from Roman period sites of southwestern Slovakia, shortly reviewed in this paper, provide limited but important evidence of cultural contacts between Barbarians with the Roman-provincial world and the ‘romanization’ of the region. In this respect, most convincing are the finds of newly introduced domestic animals such as donkey, cat or pigeon on Germanic settlements. The scarcity of butchery, age, and sex or osteometric data still hampers information on continuity or change in subsistence and husbandry regimes of individual settlements. The complexity of Roman period socio-economic changes, presumably involving animal keeping, may be further elucidated only through more elaborated analyses of reasonably large bone assemblages with clear chronological context (cf. Albarella/Johnstone/Vickers 2008). In Slovakia it is inevitable to unify and standardize the methodology of archaeozoological research and publish full raw data in order to building up a sufficiently large study collection of Roman period zoological information (see Atici et al. 2013).17

APPENDIX

The supplementary material, providing additional archaeozoological data on the studied assemblage, is attached to this paper in the form of tables. It includes information on taxonomic identification within settlement features (Tab. A1), the representation of skeletal elements in identified animal taxa (Tab. A2), the representation of skeletal elements in cattle from Veľké Zálužie and Nitra-Chrenová on the basis of the weight difference method (Tab. A3), the distribution of age categories within the identified taxa (Tab. A4), the distribution of dental age categories in cattle, caprines and pig (Tab. A5), the epiphyseal ageing in cattle, caprines, pig and deer (Tab. A6) and full osteometric data (Tab. A7).

---

17 Acknowledgements: The author is grateful to all colleagues who contributed to the final state of the paper. Mário Bielich and Zuzana Poláková provided archaeozoological material and details on recovery methods as well as data from pottery analysis. Marián Fabiš, Alena Šefčáková and Cyril Ambros provided unique unpublished data from their analysis of the Roman period animal bone material. Vladimír Varsík commented on dating of sites and provided information on unpublished metal finds from Cífer-Pác. Valuable comments on earlier drafts and English revision of this paper were provided by Mária Hajnalová and László Bartosiewicz. Peter Červeň helped to assemble the map and figures.
Tab. A1. Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad. Representation of taxa in the studied features. Abbreviations: NISP – number of identifiable specimens; MNI – minimum number of individuals counted for the feature; MNI* – minimum number of individuals counted for the whole assemblage.

| Animal taxa                        | 2  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 7A | 8  | 9  | 10 | 11 | 14 | 15 | 18 | 19 | 22 | 23 | 24  | 30 | 33 | 47 | 50 | 54 | 58 |
|-----------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Cattle                           | –  | 15/3 | 22/3 | –  | 1/1 | 3/2 | 8/3 | 10/3 | 1/1 | 1/1 | 11/1 | 2/1 | 4/1 | 1/1 | 2/1 | 1/1 | 1/1 | 2/1 | –  | 2/1 | –  | 21/2 | 108/7* |
| Pig                              | 3/1 | 9/3 | 5/3 | 1/1 | 1/1 | 2/1 | 4/2 | 2/1 | –  | 3/1 | –  | 1/1 | 2/1 | –  | 1/1 | –  | 1/1 | 7/2 | –  | –  | –  | 49/9* |
| Sheep                            | –  | 2/1 | 1/1 | –  | –  | 1/1 | 1/1 | 1/1 | –  | –  | –  | –  | 2/1 | –  | –  | –  | –  | 1/1 | –  | –  | 1/1 | 10/1* |
| Caprines                         | –  | 3/1 | 9/1 | 1/1 | –  | 1/1 | 2/1 | 4/1 | –  | 1/1 | 3/1 | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | 1/1 | 5/1 | 3/1 | –  | –  | 33/5* |
| Horse                            | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | 1/1 | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | 2/1 | 2/2* |
| Dog                              | 4/1 | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | 4/1* |
| Red deer                         | –  | 1/1 | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | 1/1 | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | 2/1 | –  | –  | 4/1 | 22/1 | 1/1 | 31/4* |
| Roe deer                         | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | 1/1 | 1/1* |
| Cattle/aurochs/bison             | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | 1 | 1/1* |
| Cattle/red deer                  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | 1 | –  | –  | 4/– |
| Cattle/horse (size)              | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | 2 | 2/– |
| Pig/wild boar                    | –  | –  | 1 | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | 1/– |
| Caprines/roe deer                | –  | 5 | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | 3 | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | 1 | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | 1 | 10/– |
| Large mammal                     | –  | 3 | 3 | –  | –  | –  | 1 | 3 | 1 | –  | 8 | –  | 2 | –  | –  | 1 | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | 22/– |
| Medium mammal                    | 1 | 2 | 4 | –  | –  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | 1 | 4 | 7 | –  | –  | –  | 25/– |
| Mammal                           | –  | 6 | –  | –  | –  | –  | –  | 3 | –  | –  | 1 | –  | 2 | –  | –  | 2 | –  | 1 | –  | –  | 3 | 18/– |
| Total                            | 8/2 | 46/9 | 45/8 | 2/2 | 2/2 | 10/5 | 19/7 | 29/7 | 5/3 | 5/2 | 27/4 | 2/1 | 12/4 | 3/2 | 2/1 | 4/2 | 9/3 | 12/3 | 19/4 | 6/2 | 22/1 | 32/6 | 321/30* |
Tab. A2. Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad. The skeletal element representation according to taxa. Quantified after NISP.

| Skeletal element | Animal taxa |
|------------------|-------------|
|                  | Cattle      | Pig         | Sheep       | Caprines    | Horse       | Dog         | Red deer    | Roe deer    | Capreolus capreolus | Domestic sheep size | Cattle/horse size | Pig/sheep boar | Caprines/sheep | Large mammal | Medium mammal | Mammal | NISP |
| Processus cornuallis | 1 | – | 1 | – | – | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 | – | 2 |
| Neurocranium | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 | – | 2 |
| Cranial element | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 | – | 2 |
| Occipitale | – | 2 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 | – | 2 |
| Frontale | 2 | 2 | – | 1 | – | – | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 | – | 2 |
| Temporale | 2 | 2 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 | – | 2 |
| Zygomaticum | 3 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 3 |
| Nasale | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 2 | – | 2 |
| Palatum | 2 | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 2 | – | 3 |
| Parietale | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 2 | – | 1 |
| Praemaxilla | – | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 |
| Incisivus | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 |
| Maxilla | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 |
| Maxilla + dens | 1 | 3 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 4 |
| Mandibula | 5 | 7 | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 15 |
| Mandibula + dens | 5 | 10 | 3 | 4 | – | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 23 |
| Canine inf. | – | 2 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 | – | 3 |
| Caninus decid. | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 |
| Caninus sup. | – | 2 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 2 |
| Incisivus 2 inf. | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 |
| Premolar sup. | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 |
| Molar 3 inf. | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 |
| Molar 3 sup. | – | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 |
| Molar sup. | 2 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 2 |
| Atlas | – | 1 | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 2 |
| Axis | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 |
| Costa | 15 | – | 5 | – | – | 4 | – | – | 2 | 1 | – | 8 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 50 |
| Hylodermum | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 2 |
| Ossified cartilago | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 |
| Vertebral column | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 |
| Vertebral column cervicis | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 3 |
| Vertebral column lumbalis | 2 | – | – | – | – | 2 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 4 |
| Vertebral column thoracis | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 | – | – | 1 |
| Humerus | 5 | 2 | 1 | – | – | 2 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 | 11 |
| Radius | 16 | 1 | 5 | – | 1 | 2 | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 | – | – | 16 |
| Scapula | 5 | – | – | – | 1 | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 | 8 |
| Ulna | 12 | 5 | 3 | 2 | – | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 |
| Pelvis | – | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 | – | 2 |
| Pelvis + acetabulum | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 |
| Ilium + acetabulum | – | – | – | – | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 1 |
| Ischium | 2 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | 2 |
Tab. A2. Continuation.

| Skeletal element | Animal taxa |
|------------------|-------------|
|                  | Cattle | Pig | Sheep | Horse | Dog | Red deer | Roe deer | Cattle/horse size | Cattle/Red deer | Pig/wild boar | Caprines/roe deer | Large mammal | Medium mammal | Mammal | NISP |
| Ischium + acetabulum | 1 – – 1 – 1 – – – – – – – 3 |
| Femur             | 3 1 3 – 1 – – – – – – – 1 1 10 |
| Tibia             | 5 3 – 6 2 – – – – 2 1 1 1 – 20 |
| Fibula            | – 1 – – – – – – – – – – – – 1 |
| Metacarpus 3/4    | 11 – – 1 – – 1 – – – – – – 1 1 – 13 |
| Metacarpus 5      | – – – – 1 – – – – – – – – – 1 |
| Phalanx I ant.    | 1 – – – – – – – – – – – – – 1 |
| Calcaneus         | 2 – – – – – – 1 – – – – – – 4 |
| Talus             | 4 1 – – – – – 1 – – – – – – 4 |
| Metatarsus 3/4    | 7 – 2 – 3 1 – – – – – – – 13 |
| Centrotarsale     | – – – – – – – 1 – – – – – – 1 |
| Phalanx I post.   | 2 – – – – – – 1 – – – – – – 4 |
| Metapodium        | 1 – – – – – – 1 – – – – – – 1 |
| Metapodium lat.   | – 1 – – – – – – – – – – – – 1 |
| Phalanx I         | – – – – – – – 1 – – – – – – 1 |
| Phalanx II        | 1 – – – – – – – – – – – – – 1 |
| Phalanx III       | 3 – – – – 1 – – – – – – – 4 |
| Unidentified      | – – – – – – – 1 – – – – – – 38 |

Tab. A3. Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad. The cattle skeletal element representation at Veľké Zálužie and Nitra-Chrenová sites. WISP diff. = difference from the reference skeleton values (after Kunst 2002). Quantified after WISP.

| Skeletal element | Weight of element [%] in the reference individual | Veľké Zálužie [% of WISP] | Nitra-Chrenová [% of WISP] | Veľké Zálužie [WISP diff.] | Nitra-Chrenová [WISP diff.] |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Cranium          | 8.41                                       | 7.26            | 10.01           | –1.15           | 1.60            |
| Mandibula        | 4.81                                       | 18.91           | 13.70           | 14.10           | 8.89            |
| Vertebrae        | 18.79                                      | 2.61            | 5.97            | –16.18          | –12.82          |
| Costae           | 13.86                                      | 5.20            | 7.43            | –8.66           | –6.43           |
| Scapula          | 4.74                                       | 2.81            | 4.98            | –1.93           | 0.24            |
| Humerus          | 6.17                                       | 5.95            | 3.69            | –0.22           | –2.48           |
| Radius + ulna    | 5.51                                       | 7.74            | 12.17           | 2.23            | 6.66            |
| Metacarpus       | 2.04                                       | 16.51           | 5.58            | 14.47           | 3.54            |
| Pelvis           | 8.26                                       | 15.33           | 7.22            | –6.73           | –1.04           |
| Femur            | 9.9                                        | 3.04            | 4.34            | –6.86           | –5.56           |
| Tibia            | 6.69                                       | 5.41            | 12.89           | –1.28           | 6.20            |
| Basipodium       | 4.64                                       | 6.86            | 3.39            | 2.22            | –1.25           |
| Metatarsus       | 2.83                                       | 13.86           | 4.98            | 11.03           | 2.15            |
| Phalanges        | 3.36                                       | 2.31            | 3.64            | –1.05           | 0.28            |
### Table A4. Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad. The relative ageing. Quantified after NISP.

| Age category     | Cattle | Pig | Sheep | Caprines | Horse | Dog | Red deer | Roe deer | Cattle/aurochs/bison | Cattle/horse size | Cattle/red deer | Caprines/roed deer | Pig/wild boar | Large mammal | Medium mammal | Mammal | NISP |
|------------------|--------|-----|-------|----------|-------|-----|----------|----------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------|------|
| Neonatal         | 2      | 1   | 1      | 7        | 1     | 1   | 2        | 1        | 1                     | 1                | 0             | 0                 | 0             | 0            | 0             | 0      | 2    |
| Neonatal/juvenile| 1      | 1   | 1      | 7        | 1     | 1   | 2        | 1        | 1                     | 1                | 0             | 0                 | 0             | 0            | 0             | 0      | 1    |
| Very juvenile    | 1      | 1   | 1      | 7        | 1     | 1   | 2        | 1        | 1                     | 1                | 0             | 0                 | 0             | 0            | 0             | 0      | 26   |
| Juvenile?        | 1      | 1   | 1      | 7        | 1     | 1   | 2        | 1        | 1                     | 1                | 0             | 0                 | 0             | 0            | 0             | 0      | 15   |
| Juvenile/subadult| 1      | 1   | 1      | 7        | 1     | 1   | 2        | 1        | 1                     | 1                | 0             | 0                 | 0             | 0            | 0             | 0      | 24   |
| Subadult         | 1      | 1   | 1      | 7        | 1     | 1   | 2        | 1        | 1                     | 1                | 0             | 0                 | 0             | 0            | 0             | 0      | 9    |
| Subadult?        | 1      | 1   | 1      | 7        | 1     | 1   | 2        | 1        | 1                     | 1                | 0             | 0                 | 0             | 0            | 0             | 0      | 1    |
| Subadult/adult   | 35     | 14  | 3      | 2        | 1     | 1   | 2        | 1        | 1                     | 1                | 3             | 2                 | 87            | 0            | 0             | 0      | 87   |
| Adult            | 28     | 9   | 2      | 9        | 1     | 1   | 2        | 1        | 1                     | 1                | 1             | 3                 | 1             | 1            | 0             | 0      | 54   |
| Adult?           | 7      | 1   | 1      | 7        | 1     | 1   | 2        | 1        | 1                     | 1                | 0             | 0                 | 0             | 0            | 0             | 0      | 14   |
| Adult/mature     | 2      | 1   | 1      | 7        | 1     | 1   | 2        | 1        | 1                     | 1                | 0             | 0                 | 0             | 0            | 0             | 0      | 5    |
| Undetermined     | 14     | 6   | 8      | 2        | 1     | 1   | 7        | 1        | 1                     | 1                | 7             | 8                 | 19            | 16           | 16            | 16     | 81   |

### Table A5. Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad. The dental ageing data in main economic species. Categories A–L according to L. Peške (1994). Quantified after NISP.

| Skeletal element          | Cattle | Pig | Caprines | Deer |
|---------------------------|--------|-----|----------|------|
| Acetabulum                | 1      | 1   | 2        | 1    |
| Humerus distal            | 1      | 1   | 1        | 2    |
| Radius proximal           | 1      | 1   | 1        | 2    |
| Phalanx 1, proximal       | 1      | 1   | 1        | 1    |
| Phalanx 2, proximal       | 1      | 1   | 1        | 1    |
| Early fusing              | 7      | 1   | 3        | 6    |
| Calcaneus proximal        | 4      | 1   | 1        | 1    |
| Metacarpus distal         | 3      | 1   | 1        | 2    |
| Metatarsus distal         | 3      | 1   | 1        | 2    |
| Tibia distal              | 3      | 1   | 1        | 2    |
| Middle fusing             | 7      | 1   | 3        | 3    |
| Tibia proximal            | 7      | 1   | 3        | 3    |
| Radius proximal           | 1      | 1   | 1        | 3    |
| Ulna proximal             | 1      | 1   | 1        | 1    |
| Femur proximal            | 1      | 1   | 1        | 1    |
| Vertebral centrum         | 2      | 1   | 1        | 1    |
| Late fusing               | 3      | 1   | 2        | 2    |

### Table A6. Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad. The epiphyseal fusing data. F – Fused; O – open. Quantified after NISP.

| Dental age category | Cattle | Pig | Caprines | Total |
|---------------------|--------|-----|----------|-------|
| A                   | 2      | 1   | 1        | 4     |
| B                   | 1      | 2   | 2        | 5     |
| C                   | 1      | 1   | 1        | 3     |
| D                   | 1      | 1   | 1        | 3     |
| E                   | 1      | 1   | 2        | 4     |
| F                   | 1      | 1   | 1        | 3     |
| G                   | 1      | 1   | 1        | 3     |
| H                   | 1      | 1   | 1        | 3     |
| I                   | 1      | 1   | 1        | 3     |
| J                   | 1      | 1   | 1        | 3     |
| K                   | 1      | 1   | 1        | 3     |
| L                   | 1      | 1   | 1        | 3     |
| Total               | 4      | 5   | 5        | 14    |
Tab. A7. Veľké Zálužie-Ďuriho sad. The osteometric data. All measurements in mm. Abbreviations and numbers according to A. von den Driesch (1976). M – Measurement; s – left; d – right; n – not sided; f – female; m – male.

| Specimen | Skeletal element | Side | Measurements after A. von den Driesch (1976) | Sex |
|----------|------------------|------|--------------------------------------------|-----|
| Cattle (Bos taurus) |                  |      |                                            |     |
| 7/1      | processus cornualis | s    | M44 = 113.4; M45 = 43.3; M46 = 33.7; M47 = 114.5 | f?  |
| 17/14    | mandibula         | d    | M11 = 12.0                                   |     |
| 20/10    | mandibula         | d    | M7 = 127.7; M8 = 77.4; M10(L) = 33.1; M10(B) = 14.7; M11 = 15.1; M15a = 65.2; M15b = 45.9; M15c = 33.5 |     |
| 3/2      | scapula           | s    | GLP = 63.7; LG = 52.1; BG = 43.6               |     |
| 28/1     | humerus           | s    | SD = 33.0; Bd = 81.1; BT = 71.8                |     |
| 24/4     | radius             | s    | Bp = 81.4; BFp = 73.3                         |     |
| 24/10    | ulna               | s    | SDO = 54.8; DPA = 64.0; LO = 41.7              |     |
| 23/1     | tibia              | s    | Bd = 55.0; Dd = 40.6                          |     |
| 16/1     | talus              | s    | GLI = 59.5; GLm = 53.8; Bd = 38.7; Dl = 32.9  |     |
| 26/19    | talus              | d    | GLI = 66.0; GLm = 59.4; Bd = 38.7; Dl = 43.4; Dm = 37.8 |     |
| 28/20    | talus              | d    | GLI = 55.3; GLm = 50.5; Bd = 34.4; Dl = 31.6; Dm = 31.5 |     |
| 23/5     | talus              | s    | GLI = 67.2; GLm = 60.3; Bd = 44.9; Dl = 37.3; Dm = 37.6 |     |
| 19/6     | metacarpus         | d    | GL = 183.0; Bp = 52.3; SD = 29.8; Bd = 52.5   | m   |
| 19/7     | metacarpus         | d    | Bp = 50.5; SD = 28.1                          |     |
| 24/9     | metacarpus         | d    | Bp = 48.6; SD = 26.6                          |     |
| 29/4     | metacarpus         | s    | SD = 29.2                                     |     |
| 23/3     | metacarpus         | d    | Bd = 55.8                                     |     |
| 23/4     | metacarpus         | s    | Bd = 61.2                                     |     |
| 32/1     | metacarpus         | d    | GL = 183.7; Bp = 52.1; SD = 25.8; Bd = 51.5   | f   |
| 16/2     | metatarsus         | s    | SD = 23.8                                     |     |
| 12/1     | metatarsus         | d    | GL = 211.8; Bp = 39.6; SD = 20.5; Bd = 45.6   | f   |
| 24/8     | metatarsus         | s    | Bp = 38.0; SD = 24.1                          |     |
| 22/9     | metatarsus         | d    | GL = 205.1; SD = 22.4; Bd = 47.8              | f   |
| 22/10    | metatarsus         | s    | GL = 206.1; Bp = 45.7; SD = 26.3              | m   |
| 6/1      | phalanx 1, anterior | n    | GLpe = 41.1; Bp = 30.8; SD = 24.7; Bd = 25.1  |     |
| 17/6     | phalanx 1, posterior | n    | GLpe = 48.5; Bp = 24.8; SD = 20.6; Bd = 23.4  |     |
| 24/18    | phalanx 1, posterior | n    | GLpe = 52.6; Bp = 25.9; SD = 22.4; Bd = 23.9  |     |
| 8/1      | phalanx 3          | n    | DLS = 71.1; Ld = 56.5; MBS = 22.8             |     |
| 14/2     | phalanx 3          | n    | DLS = 65.9; Ld = 45.1; MBS = 23.7* deformed by pathology |     |
| 12/7     | phalanx 3          | n    | MBS = 22.4                                    |     |
| Pig (Sus domesticus) |                  |      |                                            |     |
| 16/9     | maxilla            | d    | M30 = 27.5; M31 = 17.4                        |     |
| 24/2     | mandibula          | s    | M10(L) = 29.6; M10(B) = 14.1                 |     |
| 22/7     | mandibula          | s    | M10(L) = 25.4; M10(B) = 14.1                 |     |
| 30/1     | pelvis             | d    | LAR = 30.3                                    |     |
| Sheep (Ovis aries) |                  |      |                                            |     |
| 3/3      | processus cornualis | n    | M44 = 105.1; M45 = 30.7; M46 = 30.0; M47 = 111.7 | f?  |
| 19/8     | mandibula          | s    | M8 = 51.8; M15b = 23.4                        |     |
| 16/10    | mandibula          | s    | M7 = 71.9; M8 = 49.7; M15b = 23.6             |     |
| 29/2     | atlas              | s + d| BFcr = 44.4; BFcd = 48.0                      |     |
| 22/1     | humerus            | s    | Bd = 31.5; BT = 29.6                          |     |
| 10/2     | radius             | d    | Bd = 31.5; BFd = 22.2                         |     |
| 23/9     | ulna               | s    | SDO = 24.9; DPA = 29.6; LO = 23.1              | m?  |
Tab. A7. Continuation.

| Specimen   | Skeletal element | Side | Measurements after A. von den Driesch (1976) | Sex |
|------------|------------------|------|---------------------------------------------|-----|
| Caprines (Ovis/ Capra) |                  |      |                                             |     |
| 26/1 mandibula d | M7 = 74.0; M8 = 47.0; M9 = 26.0; M11 = 8.4; M15a = 41.0; M15b = 24.9; M15c = 17.1 | –    |
| 26/2 mandibula d | M7 = 74.4; M8 = 51.8; M9 = 22.1; M11 = 8.7; M15b = 24.1; M15c = 19.8 | –    |
| 22/8 mandibula d | M7 = 46.2; M8 = 46.2; M9 = 23.2; M11 = 8.5; M15b = 22.3; M15c = 21.2 | –    |
| 24/19 pelvis s | LA = 29.1 | –    |
| 12/3 metatarsus d | Bp = 21.5; SD = 13.4 | –    |
| 24/5 metatarsus s | SD = 13.4 | –    |
| 24/6 metacarpus s | SD = 15.5 | –    |
| Horse (Equus caballus) |                  |      |                                             |     |
| 11/2 scapula s | SLC = 66.8; GLP = 94.1; LG = 55.9; BG = 50.4 | m?   |
| Dog (Canis familiaris) |                  |      |                                             |     |
| 9/4 radius s | SD = 10.0; Bd = 21.4; BFd = 17.7 | –    |
| 9/6 metacarpus 5 s | GL = 52.0; Bd = 9.5 | –    |
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Archeozoológia sídliska z obdobia mladšej doby rimskej vo Veľkom Záluží v kontexte regionálnych dát

Zora Bielichová

SÚHRN

Príspevok predstavuje výsledky analyzy archeozoologického materiálu (n = 321) získaného počas výskumu sídliska z mladšej doby rimskej na polohovej Veľkej Záluží-Dúriho sad. Lokalita sa nachádza na juhozápadnom Slovensku v okrese Nitra, približne 80 km severne od Dunaja (obr. 1; 4) a bola čiastočne preskúmaná v rámci krátkodobého záchraného výskumu na prelome rokov 2002/2003. Okrem ostatných druhov materiálov spomenutej kultúry sa z odkrytých objektov – čiastočne zahlabená chatra, tri zásobné jamy, dve odpadové jamy, štyri hlínky a jedna plugňa bližšie neurčených jám (obr. 2; 3), podarilo vy zdvihnúť aj nálezy zvieracích kostí a zubov. Ich analýza naznačila, že predstavujú zmiestaný, jatočný, konzumný a remeselný odpad súvisiaci so stravovaním a pracovnými aktivitami obyvateľov osady. Druhová skladba za stúpených zvierat, hodnotená v rámci archeozoologického kontextu, umožňuje predpokladať, že jedným zo zdrojov obživy miestnej komunity bol chov domácich zvierat. Ich zvyšky v súbore tvoria viac ako polovicu nálezov (% NISP, resp. % MNI a % WISP). Podobne sa v súbore nenašli ani hlavne druhy kura a husa domáca, neboli vo Veľkom Záluží, Nitre-Chrenovej a Štúrove sa javí konzumácia hovädzieho mäsa bolo zaznamenané aj na germánskych lokalitách v okolí Bratislavy, v mladšej fáze osídlenia v 3. – 4. stor. n. l. (Šefčáková 2011). Vo všeobecnosti však na väčšine územia juhozápadného Slovenska pozorujeme prevahu konzumácie hovädzieho mäsa (obr. 11). Ak však porovnáme zastúpenie veľkostne porovnatelných stredne veľkých druhov – ošípanej a ovce/kozy, preferencie bravčového alebo ovčiho/kozieho mäsa sa na niektorých sídliskách doby rimskej na sledovanom území vymykajú z všeobecného obrazu a NISP výsledkov (obr. 12). V Moste pri Bratislave a vo Veľkom Mederi sa ukazuje, že konzumácia bravčového tu bola v porovnaní s baranim/jahňácim (kозím) nižšia. Naopak, vo Veľkom Záluží, Nitre-Chrenovej a Štúrove sa javí konzumácia oboch druhov mäsa vyrovnaná. Pozorované rozdiely zatiaľ nemôžu uspokojivo vysvetliť. Nedovoľuje to nižšie počet nálezov z niektorých porovnávaných sídlisk a absencia citlivejšej chronológie. Ako už bolo uvedené, do úvahy zatiaľ pripadajú kultúrne, socioekonomické a ajazda aj environmentálne vplyvy. Výrazný odlišný stravovací režim je zatiaľ možné pozorovať iba na rímskych lokalitách z územia Slovenska – vo vojenských táboroch v Iži a Rusovciach. Tu dominuje mäso malých prežúvavcov (obr. 11; 12).

Dvoj zvíere využívané vo Veľkom Záluží zvyškuje dva druhy vysoké zvierat – jeleňa (Cervus elaphus) a srnco (Capreolus capreolus). Ich kosti a zuby tvoria v analyzovanom súbore relatívne vysoký podiel (10 % NISP; 17,2 % of MNI; 6,2 % of WISP), čo poukazuje na význam loveckých aktivít v obžive obyvateľov sídliska. Určenie veku (3 – 4 mesiace) čiastočne zachovaného zvieratca je lepšie konzumácia bravčového na úkor kultúrne preferencii alebo zvýšený dopyt po (bravčovom) mäse obyvateľmi tejto lokality tiež nemožno vylišiť. Naše dáta súdza o tom, že tur (24,1 % MNI), malé prežúvavce (17,2 %) a jelení (17,2 %) boli na sídlisku porážané v menšej miere. Lokálne zvýšenie konzumácie bravčového na úkor hovädzieho mäsa bolo zaznamenané aj na germánskych lokalitách v okolí Bratislavy, v mladšej fáze osídlenia v 3. – 4. stor. n. l. (Šefčáková 2011). Vo všeobecnosti však na väčšine územia juhozápadného Slovenska pozorujeme prevahu konzumácie hovädzieho mäsa (obr. 11). Ak však porovnáme zastúpenie veľkostne porovnatelných stredne veľkých druhov – ošípanej a ovce/kozy, preferencie bravčového alebo ovčieho/kozieho mäsa sa na niektorých sídliskách doby rimskej na sledovanom území vymykajú z všeobecného obrazu a NISP výsledkov (obr. 12). V Moste pri Bratislave a vo Veľkom Mederi sa ukazuje, že konzumácia bravčového tu bola v porovnaní s baranim/jahňácim (kозím) nižšia. Naopak, vo Veľkom Záluží, Nitre-Chrenovej a Štúrove sa javí konzumácia oboch druhov mäsa vyrovnaná. Pozorované rozdiely zatiaľ nemôžu uspokojivo vysvetliť. Nedovoľuje to nižšie počet nálezov z niektorých porovnávaných sídlisk a absencia citlivejšej chronológie. Ako už bolo uvedené, do úvahy zatiaľ pripadajú kultúrne, socioekonomické a ajazda aj environmentálne vplyvy. Výrazný odlišný stravovací režim je zatiaľ možné pozorovať iba na rímskych lokalitách z územia Slovenska – vo vojenských táboroch v Iži a Rusovciach. Tu dominuje mäso malých prežúvavcov (obr. 11; 12).
Napriek tomuto celkovo nízkemu počtu nálezov Veľké Zálužie, v porovnaní so súvukými sídliskami, vykazuje najvyššie zastúpenie divých cifcov.

Anatomická skladba kostí v súbore svedčí o prítomnosti živých jedincov, prípadne transportu/spracovania celých tiel u tura, ošípanej, ovce a azda aj jeleňa na skúmanom sídlisku. Kostra nedospelého jelaňa, do jamy 54 pravdepodobne uloženého (obr. 15), vyvoláva otázky ohľadom možného držania (chovu?) živého zvierata v areáli osady. Žiaľ, bližšie nálezové okolnosti nálezu neboli v rámci terénného výskumu zachytené, a preto ho nemožno interpretovať v profánom ani rituálovom kontexte. V každom prípade bolo toto mláďa, či už živé alebo mŕtve, na sídlisku pritomné.

Poreovanie zastúpenia osvalených a neosvalených častí krovy bolo konzumovaných domácich druhov ukázalo, že zatiaľ čo tura prevážne reprezentuje mäso a stredne osvalené časti, u ošípanej prevážajú stredné a kvalitné osvalené časti tej. V jedinej preskúmanej chate dominujú fragmenty z osvalených partií, zatiaľ čo v odpadových zámeru prevážajú najmä bezmäsité časti (v dnešnej dobe tzv. jatočný odpad; obr. 13). Podobná anatomická skladba u tura, s prevážným zastúpením dolnej čeľuše a metapodí a chýbaním rebiertov, možno pozorovať aj v iných sídliskách z doby rímskej (napr. v Nitre-Chrenovej; obr. 14).

Znázorňuje informácie o type sídliska (sezónne/celoročne osídlené?) a socioekonomickom statuse obyvateľov (roľníci/ remeselníci/vyššia vrstva?) nedovoloju, spolu s nedostatkom dát o poháli a veku jatočných zvierat, vývozuľov sa jednoznačné závery o chovateľských praktíkách miestnej komunity. Výsledky však naznačujú, že i na tomto sídlisku sa s najvšasťou pravdepodobne horsko uplatňovali tradičné vidiecké postupy, keď sa v stáde i na tomto sídlisku sa s najväčšou pravdepodobnosťou nariešková miestná komunita, čo už výsledkom sa v porovnaní s inými germánskymi lokálami. Výsledky však naznačujú, že i na tomto sídlisku sa s najväčšou pravdepodobnosťou nariešková miestná komunita, čo už výsledkom sa v porovnaní s inými germánskymi lokálami.
alebo pečenie/grilovanie mäsá bez kosti. Na obmedzený prístup hlodavcov k odpadu, minimálne v preskúmanej časti areálu, poukazuje absencia stôp po hryzení alebo hlodaní. Avšak krímenie (domáčich) másožravcov (psov) kuchynským odpadom možno na základe častých stôp po zuboch *Canidae* predpokladať (obr. 8). Lvidia a psi sa zrejme najviacšou mierou pričinili o stav zachovania analyzovalých zvyškov a ich fragmentáciu (obr. 10; tabela 5).

Časť materiálu nesie aj iný typ modifikácií, súvisiacich s remeselnými aktivitami obyvateľov sídliska. Kolekcia členkových a parohových artefaktov zahŕňa dva jednoznačné a tri otázne predmety (tabela 4; obr. 9). Surovina na ich výrobu bola čerpaná z domáceho prostredia – sídliskového odpadu (členková kost a rebrá tura), prípadne z jeho prírodného zázemia – okolitých lesov (parožie jeleňa). Interpretácia funkcie predmetov označených predbežne ako artefakty zostáva otázná. Paralely naznačujú spojenie s domácími remeselnými aktivitami (odpadová surovina zo spracovania parožia jeleňa, predmety s použitím pri textilnej/keramickej výrobe) alebo hrou a veštením (ohladená členková kost tura). Zaujímavosťou je koncentrovanie týchto nálezov v jamách 9 a 15.

Je zrejmé, že aj analýza menších súborov, pokiaľ je komplexná, môže významne obohatíť doposiaľ sporé poznatky o živočišnom hospodárstve a stratovacích zvyklostiach obyvateľov Slovenska v dobe rímskej. Dostupné archeozoologické analýzy z germánskych sídlisk na juhozápadnom Slovensku, ktorých výsledky boli stručne zhodnotené a využité v tomto príspevku, poskytujú dôležité doklady kontaktov barbarských germánskych kmeňov s „kultivovanou“ Rímskou ríšou. Medzi tie najpresvedčivejšie možno zaradiť osteologické nálezy nových, na území severne od Dunaja, nepôvodných domáčich druhov zvierat (napr. osol, mačka, holub). Na druhej strane, málo preukazné dáta o veku, pohlaví a morfológii v tom čase chovaných zvierat, stále neumožňujú skúmať vo väčšom meradle kontinuitu a chovateľstvo či lovectvo v časopriestore. Väčšina záverov, uvedených alebo sumarizovaných v tejto práci, tak zostáva v rovine hypotéz. Jedine ďalšie prepracované analýzy dostatočne veľkého počtu ručných i preplavených archeozoologických vzoriek s jasným archeologickým a chronologickým kontextom a dokumentáciou v teréne umožnia skúmať detaily socioekonomických zmien v dobe rímskej a ich možné prejavy v poľnohospodárstve (napr. Albarella/Johnstone/Vickers 2008). Podmienkou je dobudovanie databázy výsledkov analýzy kostí zvierat z doby rímskej a unifikácia metodických postupov (viac Atici et al. 2013). Primárne dáta získané počas analýzy materiálu zo sídliska vo Veľkom Záluží sú pripojené k textu príspevku formou apendíxu (tabela A1–A7).