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## 1 INTRODUCTION

Six samples were selected for insect analysis. Insect analysis is just one strand of a multidisciplinary approach being taken to understand the local environment of the area, which also includes pollen, bone, mollusca, wood and plant-macrofossil analyses.

Samples for insect analysis were selected from the pre-ditch ground surface, possible old stream channel and fills from two phases of the medieval ditch (see Section 3 below for full description).

## 2 METHODOLOGY

Samples were 10 litres in volume. Sub-samples of $4-5$ litres were analysed. The remaining material was retained for potential future use.
All samples were subject to the paraffin flotation method of extracting insect remains from archaeological deposits, devised first by Coope and Osborne (1968) and later modified by Kenward (1980), with further refinements by Kenward et al (1986). The samples were disaggregated using water and washed over a $300 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ sieve. The retent in the sieve was then treated with paraffin and cold water added. The paraffin concentrates the insects by adhering to the waxy cuticle of the insect exoskeleton. The flot was then poured through a $300 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ sieve, washed with detergent in hot water to remove the excess paraffin and stored in $70 \%$ ethanol. Processing took place at the flotation facility of Margaret Gowen and Company Ltd, Merrion Square, Dublin 2.
Flots varied in size between 100 and 200 ml . All were fully sorted and insect sclerites extracted onto wet filter paper. Identifications were carried out using published keys and the writer's own reference material. Table 6.1 details the full species list. Species marked with '?' indicate identifications that require further checking. The species list was then entered into Bugstats, part of BugsCEP, the Coleopteran Ecology Package devised by Philip and Paul Buckland (Buckland \& Buckland 2006). This allowed for analysis of the insect data by producing a multi-sample environmental summary diagram using coded habitat data. This diagram should aid identification of environmental changes through
time, in the case of stratified sequences, or spatial analysis in the case of dispersed archaeological samples. The package uses 22 EcoCodes derived from the work of various authors (Kenward 2001; Ponel 1995; Robinson 2001) and the ecological codes assigned by Koch (1989-92). Each taxon (or individual) may be assigned to more than one habitat but will only be assigned to one 'indicator' class, where appropriate. Illus 6.1 shows two EcoGraphs, one displaying the raw counts per habitat group and the other the percentage presence of each habitat as a proportion of the total number of taxa ('environmental representations') in that sample. Illus 6.2 shows the summary statistics for the data. The analysis and discussion (Sections 3 and 4) are based on the results of these graphs.

The index of diversity for the assemblages was also calculated (see Section 4 below). Fisher's alpha is a mathematical model used to measure diversity in ecological communities (Fisher et al 1943).
In addition, NMS (non-metric multi-dimensional scaling) ordination of the data was carried out, using PC-Ord 5.0 (McCune \& Grace 2002). Ordination is used to summarise complex relationships, extracting one or a number of dominant patterns from an infinite number of possible patterns (ibid). It is used here to examine underlying variance/similarities in the insect assemblages between deposit types (illus $6.3 \& 6.4)$. NMS is well suited to data that are nonnormal or on arbitrary, discontinuous, or otherwise questionable scales, particularly data sets that have upwards of $70 \%$ zeroes.


Illus 6.1 Graph of habitat groups indicated for all insects identified - raw counts and percentage presence of each

habitat group (source: created by BUGSCEP)


Illus 6.2 Summary data - total number of species, individuals and sum abundance per sample for insect remains identified (source: created by BugsCEP)

## 3 ANALYSIS

Samples are analysed in chronological order.

### 3.1 Context [142], sample 110

Context 142 is described as a blackish-brown peaty deposit, gritty and organic. The clay and charcoal content was high. Animal bone and shellfish were visible during processing.
This produced an interesting, albeit small, assemblage $(\mathrm{MNI}=41$, illus $6.1 \& 6.2$, Table 6.1). Many of the sclerites were fragmented and identification past genus level was not always possible. This resulted in a mixed signature within the assemblage, with many species assigned to multiple habitats. However, generally, foul habitats/dung/pasture indicators were very common, as well as wetland/ marsh indicators. The most commonly encountered beetles were Helophorus spp., generalist water beetles found in a wide variety of aquatic environments, and Aphodius luridus, a dung beetle found in sheep, horse and cow dung in both open and shaded (wooded) locations (Jessop 1986). A small number of arable/disturbed ground species also occurred including Harpalus affinis, a generally xerophilus ground beetle found in weedy, agricultural ground and dry grassland (Lindroth 1985; Luff 1998) and Ceutorhynchus erysimi, which occurs on Shepherd's Purse (Capsella bursa-pastoris) (Bullock 1993). There were no indicators of moving water or specific indicators of wetland plant communities (except one undiagnostic fragment of Plateumaris spp.), which might have been expected in an in-filled streamchannel. Overall, the assemblage represented damp, foul ground conditions with occasional representations from nearby agricultural (both pasture and arable) land.

### 3.2 Context [070], samples 55/56

Context [070] is described as mid-grey silty clay, with lots of pebbles and small stones. It was highly inorganic with few insect remains observed during processing. Lots of small charcoal fragments and a small plant-macrofossil component were also observed.
Two samples were submitted for insect analysis from this deposit. Unfortunately, sample 55 produced only three identifiable fragments, while sample 56 was similarly poor at just sixteen identifiable insects. This was due primarily to the inorganic nature of the deposit. For the purposes of illus 6.1-6.4, these samples are combined. The assemblage indicated mixed origins, with a small number of water beetles
(Limnebius sp., Helophorus sp.) and one possible indicator of flowing water, Oulimnius sp., present. The latter beetle is generally found under stones or on moss in fast-flowing, shallow streambeds (Koch 1989-92) and is one of the few species present that suggests the presence of a stream in the locality. A number of species present suggest that, once again, dung/foul-indicating habitats prevailed. The carrion feeder Necrophorus humator was identified, as well as Aphodius spp., Anotylus tetracarinatus and A. complanatus. These beetles probably represent the beginnings of accumulated rubbish associated with the growth of the medieval town. In addition, the disturbed waste ground and/or arable signature present in context [142] is also visible in this assemblage through species such as Otiorhynchus sulcatus, Chrysolina sp. and Phyllotreta sp. (Table 6.1). O. sulcatus (the 'vine' weevil) is generally closely associated with humans (Morris 1997). Along with other beetles identified in this assemblage, such as Ptinus fur, it suggests the beginnings of a synanthropic (ecologically associated with humans) element in the local insect fauna (also vaguely suggested in context [142]), prior to the digging of the town ditch.

### 3.3 Context [090], samples 86/68

Context [090] is described as blackish-brown silty clay with wood, marine molluscs, land/freshwater molluscs, plant macrofossils and animal bone present. A small silt and charcoal component was visible during processing. This is the primary fill of the original medieval ditch cut.
Two samples from context [090] were analysed for insect remains, sample 86 and sample 68 (see illus 6.1, 6.2 and table 6.1). Both produced large species-rich assemblages. The most frequently occurring species were Helophorus spp., Megasternum obscurum, Ceutorhynchus contractus, Ophonus rufibarbis, Philonthus spp. and Phratora vugatissima. This mix of species is indicated in the habitats represented in illus 6.1, with general aquatics, wetland/marsh, pasture/dung and disturbed/arable (combined) dominant. Also well represented is wood/ trees, for example, P. vulgatissima generally occurs on willow and poplar (Bullock 1993).
There are also a number of ground beetles within the assemblages that can be indicative of carr woodland, such as Leistus spinibarbis, Trechus rubens and Pterostichus madidus. However, many of these species are equally likely to occur in humusrich soils in pasture/cultivated land (Lindroth 1974) and the wet ditch fill may have provided an ideal habitat. Other beetles and one fly species recorded
in the assemblages suggest that wood/leaf litter may have formed part of the fill, possibly fuel or fodder waste. Species such as Phyllobius oblongus, P. pyri, Cryptocephalus sp. and Dorytomus sp. occur on the leaves of a variety of tree and shrub species. The puparia of Minettia ?lupulina, a leaf miner in alder and fruit tree species (Smith 1989), were recorded in moderate numbers from sample 68.
In addition, Rhizophagus sp., which occurs under bark, and some unidentifiable fragments of Anobids ('woodworm' beetles) were present but in very small numbers. This is somewhat surprising for the fill of a medieval ditch, where species associated with wooden buildings might expect to become incorporated into ditch fills. The 'synanthropic' element of the fauna is generally very small (no more than $8 \%$ of the overall assemblage in each sample). Typical species of this habitat group, such as Cryptophagus dentatus, Ptinus fur, Tipnus unicolor, Mycetaea hirta, Atomaria spp. are present but in small numbers. These species are common in medieval house floor layers and pit fills of this period (Hall \& Kenward 1995; Reilly 2003). Along with the lack of structural wood pests, it suggests that waste from houses was not the primary material making up the ditch fill.
An interesting dry/disturbed/arable ground fauna is present in the assemblages. Species indicative of weeds include Sitona sp., Rhinoncus sp., Chaetocnema concinna and Chrysolina fastuosa. The digging of the ditch would have caused significant ground disturbance that probably eventually resulted in a diverse weed-plant community growing locally, on which many of these beetles are to be found. Two curious finds, Batophia rubi and Byturus tomentosus, occur on raspberry and blackberry and may indicate the presence of brambles growing in close proximity to the ditch. However, it is the ground beetle (Carabidae) fauna indicative of disturbed ground that is particularly interesting and diverse. Species such as Ophonus rufibarbis, Harpalus affinis, Pterostichus madidus, Anchomenus dorsalis, Amara familiaris and A. equestis all point to mixed local ground conditions from dry, disturbed, sandy ground to cultivated ground/garden soils. The ditch probably acted as a large pit-fall trap, resulting in diverse ground beetle fauna becoming incorporated into this fill. Undoubtedly, many of these species were attracted to the disturbed ground surface
generated by the digging of the ditch but may reflect the landscape surrounding the town at this time also.
The fauna associated with material thrown into the ditch generally indicates foul origins. In particular, the dipterous (fly) fauna, along with elements of the beetle fauna, such as carrion and dung feeders, suggests that fermenting food waste, animal dung/ manure and remains of carcasses ended up in the ditch.

### 3.4 Context [089], sample 67

Context [089] is described as blackish-brown silty clay, with visible wood, animal bone, plant macrofossils, land/freshwater molluscs and frequent stones. Pottery fragments were also recovered. This deposit overlay [090].

While not as numerically rich as either sample 86 or sample 68, sample 67 proved to be just as species-rich. It contains a similar habitat range as the earlier fill, but with a proportionally smaller synanthropic element. Dung/pasture and foul (including carrion) habitats are again wellrepresented, with a number of species of Aphodius present, as well as common 'cess-pit' species like Oxytelus sculptus, Megasternum obscurum and Xylodromus concinnus. In addition, puparia of flies such as Sepsis spp., Drosophila spp. and Musca domestica clearly indicate the presence of dung, including human excrement/urine, fermenting vegetables/fruit and general decaying animal and plant matter (Smith 1989).
The disturbed ground/arable indicators are again well-represented in this deposit. Ophonus rufibarbis, Pterostichus madidus, Phyllotreta undulata, Sitona sp. and Ceutorhynchus sp. all suggest locally open/disturbed ground with associated weeds. In addition, there is a proportionally larger representation of species associated with heath/moorland. These include the ground beetle Amara lunicollis, which only occurs in this deposit and is generally indicative of heath (Lindroth 1986). Dumped peat or turf used for roofing or fuel may possibly be the source for such beetles in the ditch fill.
The woodland/dead wood element of the fauna is proportionally similar to [090], with a similar range of species present.

## 4 DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Diversity and ordination

Three of the six samples examined, the ditch fills, produced rich, diverse insect faunas. The wet nature of ditches, the associated ground disturbance, the fact that ditches were regularly used for dumping and the 'pit-fall trapping effect' of open-cut features means that ditch fills tend to be species-rich. The index of diversity (Fisher's alpha) for the ditch fills was between 44-60, which is extremely high (Kenward 1978). 12th-13th century midden deposits at Gallowgate Middle School, Aberdeen produced similar high diversity indices (Hall et al 2004). The least species-diverse deposit was context [142] (sample 110) with an alpha value of only 23.
The ordination of the samples produced an interesting pattern with the three ditch fills clustering together (illus 6.3). The species diagram (illus 6.4) suggests that the clustering is not due solely to numerical or species richness but species diversity and relatedness between the deposits. The three
ditch fills contain a similar range of species, and there is more overlap between these three assemblages and the assemblage present in Context [142] than in Context [070].
Very few contemporary sites in Edinburgh, or Scotland as a whole, have been analysed for insect remains. A number of medieval-dated sites in Aberdeen (Hall et al 2004; Kenward \& Hall 2001) will be referred to below but otherwise comparisons are mainly with Iron Age to medieval-dated sites with prominent cut features in other parts of Britain and in Ireland.

### 4.2 Local and wider environment

4.2.1 Dry/disturbed/arable ground and dung/pasture

There is some overlap between these groups and those of 'meadowland' and 'heathland/moorland'. Numerically, species belonging to these groups make


Illus 6.3 NMS ordination (1-axis solution) for samples examined from insect remains, St Patrick's Church, Cowgate, Edinburgh


Illus 6.4 NMS ordination (1-axis solution) for species distribution in samples from St Patrick's Church, Cowgate, Edinburgh
up the largest part of the ditch-fill assemblages and form a large proportion of the Context [142] assemblage. It is not unusual for enclosing ditches of settlement sites to contain a large 'outdoor' element in the assemblage. Ditches by their nature are an interface between the settlement space and the surrounding landscape. Therefore, both allochthonous and autochthonous insects will generally be represented. Sources of the disturbed ground/arable and dung/pasture species, however, can be mixed with insects being introduced directly (ie by pitfalltrapping effect) or indirectly in fodder residues and manure (Hall \& Kenward 1998).
Similar faunas, rich in ground beetles, weed/ meadow plant feeders and dung beetles are present in the ditches of Iron Age sites like Mingies Ditch, Oxford (Robinson 1993), Fisherwick, Staffordshire (Osborne 1979), and Roman-age sites like Alchester (Robinson 1975) and Drayton (Robinson 2003). Equally, many Roman well sites produce similar mixed signatures and have a similar pitfalltrapping effect, particularly for many xerophilous ground-dwelling beetles (ie species that would not usually be found in wet ditches). Roman wells such as Appleford, Oxford (Robinson 1981), Rudston, Yorkshire (Buckland 1980), Dragonby, Lincolnshire (Buckland 1996), Dalton Parlours, Yorkshire (Sudell 1990) and Wheatpieces, Tewkesbury (Tetlow 2006a)
have many species in common with the ditch-fill assemblages at the Cowgate, including Harpalus affinis, Amara familiaris, A. lunicollis and dung beetles like Aphodius luridus. In addition, common ruderal plant feeders like Ceutorhynchus concinna, Rhononcus spp. and Ceutorhynchus contractus, $C$. ersymi and C. hirtulus were recovered from Iron Age, Roman and medieval ditch, pit and well fills at Sutton Common (Roper \& Whitehouse 1997) Bancroft, Buckinghamshire (Pearson \& Robinson 1995), Chichester (Girling 1989), Piddington (Simpson 2001) and Aberdeen (Kenward \& Hall 2001). Curiously, the most common ground beetle indicative of disturbed/dry ground encountered in the ditch fills, Ophonus rufibarbis, does not appear to have been recorded before from a British prehistoric or medieval site. It is generally confined to coastal locations in Britain and Ireland today (Luff 1998).

### 4.2.2 Foul habitats and the 'human factor'

Analysis of all deposits suggested the presence of 'foul' conditions at all times in the past but this was particularly clear from the ditch fills. This is unsurprising as ditches regularly fulfilled the role of unofficial rubbish dump for medieval town
residents. Even after the ditch went out of use, the excavation revealed a large midden of material had built up in this part of the old town of Edinburgh, on top of which later post-medieval structures were built (Jones 2007).
The pre-ditch 'foul' element of the old stream channel was made up primarily of indicators of wet decaying vegetation, which probably represented in situ decay rather than dumped material. The synanthropic element of the fauna was very small, again suggesting autochthonous sources for the foul indicating beetles. However, the puparia of the fly genus Scathophaga sp. were frequently encountered in this sample and suggest the presence of dung, human excrement and carrion (Smith 1989). It is possible that animals grazed this area prior to the digging of the town ditch, which would account for the puparia and the presence of Aphodius luridus (Section 3).
The foul element in the ditch fills is likely to come from two main sources - the ground conditions prevailing within the ditch itself and dumped or slowly accumulating debris. Ditch fills from sites like the Bronze Age-dated enclosure at Chancellorsland, Co. Tipperary (Reilly 2008b), Iron Age-dated Haughey's Fort, Co. Armagh (Anderson 1989) and Mingies Ditch, Oxford (Robinson 1993) and Roman period Alchester (Robinson 1975) generally have this feature in common. Ditches regularly cut the water table and permanently hold water at the base so that both slow accumulating autochthonous plant matter and dumped organic material are well preserved. Surprisingly, the synanthropic element of the ditch fills is very small. 'House fauna' often makes up a significant proportion of deposits in cut features, like pits and wells, in Roman and medieval sites due to their location within the settlement (Girling 1989; Kenward and Hall 1995; Reilly 2003). However, analysis of fills from Roman wells in Wheatpieces, Tewkesbury (Tetlow 2006a) and Piddington, Northhamptonshire (Simpson 2001) produced quite restricted synanthropic faunas. Tetlow (2006a) suggests that the well at Wheatpieces, in common with pit and ditch features examined at Heathrow Airport (Tetlow 2006b), may not have been used for deliberate dumping and were set in a largely pastoral landscape.

While the Cowgate has a similar range of pasture/ disturbed ground indicators in the ditch fills to that of Wheatpieces, it is clear from archaeological evidence that the ditch location was the site of deliberate dumping. However, the quantity and range of dung beetles, meadow plant indicators, carrion feeders, and fly species indicative of dung and carcasses suggests that the dumped material was waste from agricultural and/or butchering activity, rather than domestic activity. Of course, the line between these types of activity may have been somewhat blurred in a medieval town. Similar assemblages indicative of very foul conditions were noted from midden and floor deposits in the heart of the medieval town of

Novgorod at the site of a possible leather workshop (Reilly 2008a).

### 4.2.3 Further afield? Haleotolerant and heath/ moorland indicators

Two other interesting elements of the fauna are species indicative of coastal/salt marsh environments and heath/moorland (see Section 3). Given the coastal location of Edinburgh, some halaeotolerant beetles are to be expected in the deposits. In particular, marine shell was recorded in Context [090] (primary ditch fill) and the presence of seaweed is suggested by the finding of Cafius sp. in sample 86. Seaweed may also have been brought into the town for use as either animal fodder or manure. Salt-tolerant species were also noted in a number of Dublin sites by the author and others (Reilly 2003; Whitehouse 2007).
As discussed in Section 3, the presence of the ground beetle Amara lunicollis and a small group of other beetles is suggestive of heath or moorland. Their presence in the ditch fills may be due to the use of turf in floors, roofs or for fuel within the town. However, the range of species is more limited than that identified from midden deposits in Galloway Middle School, Aberdeen (Hall et al 2004) or from 17th-century pit/latrine fills in Newmarket, Dublin (Whitehouse 2007). In both these cases, the presence of peat appeared to be indicated by the range of water beetles, plant feeders and ground beetles present as well as the plant macrofossil evidence. The evidence is somewhat more tentative in the Cowgate due to the fact that many beetle species are not identified beyond genus. Bugstats assigns such genera to multiple-habitat categories to reflect the full range of habitats they may potentially represent. This can lead to an over-representation of some habitat categories in the final graph (illus 6.1).

### 4.3 Conclusions

The four contexts examined for insects cover the period prior to the digging of the town ditch and the primary and secondary phase of ditch use. The insects reflect the change in environment from wet in-filled stream channel, with its limited fauna largely indicative of the decaying accumulating vegetation and surrounding pasture/arable landscape, to inorganic water-deposited clay layer, to the rich diverse communities of the ditch fills, reflecting both the surrounding landscape and the dumped waste of the urban environment. The poor synanthropic element in the assemblages suggests household waste was not the primary source of the ditch fills. Rather, the assemblages are reflective of fouler material, such as butchery waste, animal dung and rotting vegetables/fruit, suggesting market/industrial rather than domestic sources.
Table 6.1 Species list for insects from St Patrick's Church excavations, Cowgate, Edinburgh (nomenclature after Lucht 1987) (Syn = 'synanthropic': in close association with humans/human habitation)

| Sample No. | 110 | 55 | 56 | 68 | 86 | 67 | Habitat | Distribution status in |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Context No. | 142 | 70 | 70 | 90 | 90 | 89 |  | Great Britain (Red Book Status if known) |
| Description of context | Peaty deposit | Accumulated midden |  | Primary fill of ditch |  | Fill of ditch above [090] |  |  |
| Genus/Species |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Carabidae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Carabidae (indet.) |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Carabus cf. violaceus (L.) |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | Grassland, woodland | Common |
| Carabus sp. |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | Eurytrophic (ie occurs everywhere) | Common |
| Leistus spinibaris (F.) |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | Woodland litter, cultivated soils | Local (esp. in Scotland) |
| Nebria brevicollis (F.) | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | Humus-rich soils, gardens, woodlands | Common |
| Dyschirius globosus (Hbst.) |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | Disturbed ground, water-tolerant | Common |
| Trechus rubens (F.) |  |  |  | 1 | 3 |  | Damp litter near water | RDB Notable B |
| T. quadristriatus (Schrank) |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | Open ground, cultivated soils etc. | Common |
| T. obtusus (Er). |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | Damp litter, open ground, water tolerant | Common |
| Bembidion sp. |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | Eu | Varied status |
| Patrobus assimilis (Chaud.) |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | Usually upland bogs, heaths, moors | Northern distribution |
| Harpalus affinis (Schrank) | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | Disturbed ground, prefers dry places | Common |
| Harpalus sp. | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | Eu | Varied status |
| Ophonus rufibaris (F.) |  |  |  | 9 |  | 3 | Disturbed ground, prefers dry places | Locally abundant |
| Pterostichus niger (Schall.) |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | Damp meadowland, woodland | Common |
| P. madidus (F.) |  |  |  | 5 | 2 | 4 | Disturbed/arable ground, woodlands | Common |
| Pterostichus sp. |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | Eu | Generally common |
| Anchomenus dorsalis (Pont.) |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | Disturbed/arable ground | Locally abundant |
| Amara lunicollis (Schiödte) |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | Heaths, moors, generally dry ground | Very local |
| A. familiaris (Duft.) |  |  |  | 2 | 2 |  | Sandy, dry disturbed ground | Common |
| A. cf. equestris (Duft.) |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | Dry heath, sandy ground | RDB notable B |
| Dysticidae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hydroporus spp. |  |  |  | 3 | 2 | 2 | Aquatic (various) | Varied status |


| Sample No. | 110 | 55 | 56 | 68 | 86 | 67 | Habitat | Distribution status in Great Britain (Red Book Status if known) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Context No. | 142 | 70 | 70 | 90 | 90 | 89 |  |  |
| Description of context | Peaty deposit | Accumulated midden |  | Primary fill of ditch |  | Fill of ditch above [090] |  |  |
| Agabus bipustulatus (L.) |  |  |  | 3 | 1 |  | All kinds of aquatic environments | Common |
| Agabus/Ilybius sp. |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | Aquatic (various) | Varied status |
| Hydraenidae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ochthebius minimus (F.) |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | All kinds of aquatic environments | Common |
| Ochthebius sp. | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | Aquatic (various) | Common |
| Limnebius sp. |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | All kinds of aquatic environments | Varied status |
| Hydrophilidae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Helophorus spp. | 7 |  | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | All kinds of aquatic environments | Varied status |
| Cercyon impressus (Sturm) |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | Dung, decaying vegetation | Common |
| C. unipunctatus (L.) |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | Dung, decaying vegetation, carrion (Syn) | Common |
| C. atricapillus (Marsh.) |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | Dung, decaying vegetation, carrion (Syn) | RDB notable |
| C. analis (Payk.) |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |  | Dung, decaying vegetation | Common |
| Cercyon sp. | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | Generally foul habitats | Varied status |
| Megasternum obscurum (Marsh.) |  |  |  | 1 | 5 | 3 | Dung, decaying vegetation | Common |
| Hydrobius fuscipes (L.) | 1 |  |  | 3 | 2 | 1 | Aquatic, standing water (ditches etc.) | Common |
| Laccobius minutus (L.) |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | All kinds of aquatic environments | Common |
| Histeridae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Histeridae sp. indet. |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | Generally foul habitats | Varied status |
| Siliphidae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Necrophorus humator (Gled.) |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | Carrion | Widespread |
| Thanatophilus sinuatus (F.) |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | Carrion | Widespread |
| Catopidae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Catops sp. |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | Generally associated with carrion | Varied status |
| Staphylinidae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phyllodrepa sp. |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | Generally in decaying vegetation (some Syn) | Varied status |
| Omalium sp. |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | Dung/foul habitats | Varied status |


| Sample No. | 110 | 55 | 56 | 68 | 86 | 67 | Habitat | Distribution status in Great Britain (Red Book Status if known) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Context No. | 142 | 70 | 70 | 90 | 90 | 89 |  |  |
| Description of context | Peaty deposit | Accumulated midden |  | Primary fill of ditch |  | Fill of ditch above [090] |  |  |
| Xylodromus concinnus (Marsh.) |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | Dung/foul habitats (Syn) | Common |
| Olophrum piceum (Gyll.) |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | Wetland, marsh, heaths in plant debris | Common |
| Geodromicus nigrita | 1 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | Open wet habitats in moss | Very local |
| Carpelimus sp. |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  | Damp locations, mosses, foul habitats | Varied status |
| Anotylus rugosus (F.) |  |  |  |  | 3 | 1 | Dung, decaying vegetation, damp environments | Common |
| A. sculpturatus (Grav.) | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | Dung, carrion | Common |
| A. complanatus (Er.) |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | Dung/foul habitats | Common |
| A. tetracarinatus (Block) |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | Dung, carrion, foul habitats | Common |
| Oxytelus sculptus (Grav.) |  |  |  | 2 | 4 | 2 | Damp decaying vegetation, dung | Common |
| Platystethus arenarius (Geoff.) |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | Dung, plant and animal debris | Common |
| Stenus spp. |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | Meadows, woodland, marshes | Varied status |
| Rugilus sp. |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | Dung/foul habitats, wet environments | Varied status |
| Leptacinus sp. | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | Generally dung/foul habitats | Common |
| Gyrohypnus leibei (Scheer.) |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | Dung/foul habitats, decaying vegetation | Common |
| Gyrohypnus sp. | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | Generally dung/foul habitats | Varied status |
| Xantholinus sp. |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | Generally dung/foul habitats | Varied status |
| Atrecus affinis (Payk.) |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | Woodland litter, under bark | Widespread |
| ?Cafius sp. |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | Tidal debris, under seaweed | Very local |
| Philonthus politus (L.) |  |  |  | 2 | 2 |  | Dung, carrion, foul habitats | Common |
| Philonthus spp. (poss. Cafius) | 1 |  |  | 10 |  | 1 | Plant debris/foul habitats in wetlands/woodland | Varied status |
| Quedius spp. |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | Eu (generally decaying vegetation) | Varied status |
| Tachinus rufipennis (Gyll.) |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | Woodland litter, heath/moor litter (dung/carrion) | RDB rare |
| Tachyporus / Tachinus spp. | 1 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | Many species indicative of foul habitats | Varied status |
| ? Atheta spp. |  |  |  | 6 | 6 |  | Eu (generally decaying vegetation/foul) | Varied status |




| Sample No. | 110 | 55 | 56 | 68 | 86 | 67 | Habitat | Distribution status in Great Britain (Red Book Status if known) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Context No. | 142 | 70 | 70 | 90 | 90 | 89 |  |  |
| Description of context | Peaty deposit | Accumulated midden |  | Primary fill of ditch |  | Fill of ditch above [090] |  |  |
| A. lapponum (Gyll.) | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | Sheep/deer dung, uplands | Very local (common in Scottish Highlands) |
| Aphodius sp. | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 3 | Dung | Varied status |
| Chrysomelidae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plateumaris spp. | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  | Wetland plants | Varied status |
| Cryptocephalus sp. |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | Leaf beetles in wide variety of trees/shrubs | Varied status |
| Chrysolina ?fastuosa (Scop.) |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | On Galeopsis spp. (hemp nettle), heath/ moor, marshes | Very local |
| Chrysolina sp. |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | On leaves of wide variety of ground herbs | Varied status |
| Phaedon sp. |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | On leaves of marsh, meadow plants | Varied status |
| Prasocuris phellandri (L.) |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | On leaves of various wetland plants | Widespread |
| Chrysomela sp. |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | On Populus / Salix spp. | Generally rare |
| Phratora vulgatissima (L.) |  |  |  | 5 |  | 3 | On Populus / Salix spp. | Probably widespread |
| Phyllotreta undulata (Kuts.) |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | Disturbed/arable ground on Brassica spp. | Common |
| Phyllotreta sp. |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | On ground herbs, various environments | Generally common |
| ?Batophila rubi (Payk.) |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  | On Rubus spp., brambles, weedy locations | Very local |
| Chaetocnema concinna (Marsh.) |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | Leaves of various herbs/trees, disturbed ground | Common |
| Chaetocnema sp. | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | Leaves of various herbs/trees, disturbed ground | Common |
| Curculionidae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apion sp. |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | Various ground herbs | Varied status |
| Otiorhynchus cf. sulcatus (F.) |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | On roots/leaves of various plants, disturbed ground (Syn) | Common |
| Phyllobius pyri (L.) |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | On leaves of various tree species | Common |
| P. oblongus (L.) |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | On leaves of various tree species | Common |
| Phyllobius sp. | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | On leaves of various tree species | Varied status |
| Sitona sp. |  |  |  | 1 |  | 3 | Clover, Vetch, ground herbs, disturbed ground | Varied status |


| Sample No. | 110 | 55 | 56 | 68 | 86 | 67 | Habitat | Distribution status in Great Britain (Red Book Status if known) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Context No. | 142 | 70 | 70 | 90 | 90 | 89 |  |  |
| Description of context | Peaty deposit | Accumulated midden |  | Primary fill of ditch |  | Fill of ditch above [090] |  |  |
| Dorytomus sp. |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | On Populus / Salix spp. | Varied status |
| ?Pelenomus sp. |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | On various wetland plants | Varied status |
| Rhinoncus spp. |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | On Rumex, Polygonum spp., disturbed ground | Varied status |
| Ceutorhynchus contractus (Marsh.) |  |  |  | 5 | 6 |  | On various Crucifereae | Common |
| C. erysimi (F.) | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | On Capsella bursa-pastoris, disturbed/ damp ground | Common |
| C. hirtulus (Germ.) |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | On wetland/disturbed ground herbs | RDB notable B |
| Ceutorhynchus sp. |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | On various ground herbs | Varied status |
| Total | 41 | 3 | 16 | 152 | 108 | 77 |  |  |
| Other Insect Orders |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hemiptera |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bugs (nymphs?) |  |  |  |  |  | * |  |  |
| Siphonaptera |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flea body parts |  |  |  | * | * | * |  |  |
| Sample No. | 110 | 55 | 56 | 68 | 86 | 67 | Habitat | Distribution status in Great |
| Context No. | 142 | 70 | 70 | 90 | 90 | 89 |  | Britain (Red Book Status if known) |
| Genus/Species |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diptera (True flies) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diptera indet. |  |  | * |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lauxaniidae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ?Minettia lupulina (F.) |  |  |  |  |  |  | Leaf miners in various tree species |  |
| Sepsidae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sepsis spp. |  |  |  |  |  | * | All types of dung including human excrement |  |
| Sphaeroceridae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



