Archaeobiology 4

Cattle and People

Interdisciplinary Approaches to an Ancient Relationship

edited by Elizabeth Wright and Catarina Ginja



LOCKWOOD PRESS

CATTLE AND PEOPLE

Interdisciplinary Approaches to an Ancient Relationship

Archaeobiology

Series Editors

Sarah Whitcher Kansa
Justin Lev-Tov

Number 4

CATTLE AND PEOPLE

Interdisciplinary Approaches to an Ancient Relationship

CATTLE AND PEOPLE

Interdisciplinary Approaches to an Ancient Relationship

Edited by

Elizabeth Wright and Catarina Ginja



LOCKWOOD PRESS
Columbus, GA • 2022

CATTLE AND PEOPLE

Interdisciplinary Approaches to an Ancient Relationship

Copyright © 2022 by Lockwood Press

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to Lockwood Press, PO Box 1080, Columbus, GA 31901, USA.

ISBN: 978-1-948488-73-0

Cover design by Susanne Wilhelm.
Cover image and interior artwork by Pedro Salvador Mendes.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Wright, Elizabeth (Archaeologist), editor. | Ginja, Catarina, editor.
Title: Cattle and people : interdisciplinary approaches to an ancient relationship / edited by Elizabeth Wright and Catarina Ginja.
Description: Atlanta : Lockwood Press, [2022] | Series: Archaeobiology ; number 4 / series editors, Sarah Whitcher Kansa, Justin Lev-Tov | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2021059737 (print) | LCCN 2021059738 (ebook) | ISBN 9781948488730 (Hardcover : acid-free paper) | ISBN 9781948488747 (PDF)
Subjects: LCSH: Human-animal relationships. | Animal remains (Archaeology)—Case studies. | Cattle—Social aspects. | Cattle—Religious aspects.
Classification: LCC GN407.6 .C37 2022 (print) | LCC GN407.6 (ebook) | DDC 590—dc23/eng/20220120
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2021059737
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2021059738

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper.

CONTENTS

List of Figures VII
List of Tables IX
Supplementary Material X
Editor Biographies XI
List of Contributors XI

Preface XV
Elizabeth Wright and Catarina Ginja

Acknowledgments XVII

Foreword XIX
Simon Davis

Introduction XXI
Elizabeth Wright and Catarina Ginja

Section 1: Prehistoric Human-Cattle Interactions: Aurochs Hunting and Early Husbandry

1. The Aurochs in the European Pleistocene and Early Holocene: Origins, Evidence and Body Size 3
   Elizabeth Wright
2. The Cattle of Ludwinowo 7: Death, Dinner, and Deposition in the Linearbandkeramik Culture 29
   Emily V. Johnson, Rosalind E. Gillis, Joanna Pyzel, Arkadiusz Marciniak, and Alan K. Outram
3. Origin and Diffusion of Cattle Herding in Northeastern Africa 45
   Joséphine Lesur
4. A Potential Early Cattle-Based Faunal Economy from the Indus Valley Civilization: Evidence from the Harappan Settlement of Bhirrana in Northern India 63
   Arati Deshpande-Mukherjee and Pankaj Goyal

Section 2: Historical Improvement and Intensification

5. On the Improvement of Cattle (*Bos taurus*) in the Cities of Roman Lusitania: Some Preliminary Results 91
   Cleia Detry, Silvia Valenzuela-Lamas, Simon Davis, Ana Elisabete Pires, and Catarina Ginja
6. Change and Regionalism in British Cattle Husbandry in the Iron Age and Roman Period: An Osteometric Approach 111
   Colin Duval and Umberto Albarella
7. Cattle Husbandry in Late- and Postmedieval England: A Zooarchaeological Investigation of the Relationship between Town and Country 143
   Tamsyn Fraser and Idoia Grau-Sologestoa

8. An Archaeogenetics Study of Cattle Bones from Seventeenth Century Carnide, Lisbon, Portugal 169
Irene Ureña, Sílvia Guimarães, Simon J. M. Davis, Cleia Detry, Gülşah M. Kılınç, Rute da Fonseca, Nicolas Dussex, Luciana Simões, Ludmilla Blaschikoff, Umberto Albarella, José Matos, Anders Götherström, Ana Elisabete Pires, and Catarina Ginja

Section 3: Symbolic and Ritual Importance

9. Bison and Aurochs, Emblematic Figures of the Upper Paleolithic in Southwestern Europe 183
Carole Fritz, Jean-Philip Brugal, Philippe Fosse, and Gilles Tosello

10. Emerging Inequalities at Animal Farm: Tracing the Symbolic Use of Cattle from the Late Neolithic to the Middle Bronze Age in Southern Portugal 203
António Carlos Valera

11. Cattle for the Ancestors at Neolithic Çatalhöyük, Turkey 225
Nerissa Russell

12. The Bovine Deposits from the Chalcolithic Ditched Enclosure of Camino de las Yeseras (Madrid, Spain) 241
Corina Liesau, Patricia Ríos, Jorge Vega, Concepción Blasco, Roberto Menduiña, María de los Ángeles de Chorro, Cristina Cabrera, Eva-Maria Geigl, and Carlos Arteagai

Section 4: Socio-Political Importance

13. Ethnoarchaeology of Cattle and Humans among Selected Communities in Manicaland, Eastern Zimbabwe 265
Plan Shenjere-Nyabezi

14. Cattle and People in China: From the Neolithic to the Present 281
Katherine Brunson, Brian Lander, and Mindi Schneider

15. Cattle, Yaks, Traction, and the Bronze Age Spread of Pastoralism into the Mongolian Steppe 303
Tuvshinjargal Tumurbaatar, and Cheryl A. Makarewicz

Index 327

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1.	Map of Middle Pleistocene sites mentioned in the text.	7
Figure 1.2.	Map of Upper Pleistocene sites mentioned in the text.	9
Figure 1.3.	Map of Early Holocene sites mentioned in the text.	11
Figure 1.4.	Astragalus measurements from European Mesolithic aurochs.	12
Figure 1.5.	Log ratio plots showing postcranial measurements.	14
Figure 1.6.	The range in size of astragali from Solana del Zamborino compared.	15
Figure 2.1.	Simplified map of Ludwinowo 7.	31
Figure 2.2.	Fracture history profile of cattle marrow-bearing bone.	36
Figure 2.3.	Proportion of the total assemblage weight in each size class.	36
Figure 2.4.	Correspondence analysis of the age-at-death data.	38
Figure 2.5.	Percentage of fused elements per age stage for each context type.	39
Figure 3.1.	Map showing all the sites mentioned in the text.	47
Figure 3.2.	Map of northeast Africa showing sites from seventh to sixth millennium BC.	49
Figure 3.3.	Painted cow from Laas Geel rockshelter, Somaliland.	52
Figure 3.4.	Decorated cattle from Hamar, Omo Valley, Ethiopia.	54
Figure 4.1.	Humped cattle from Haryana, Northern India.	64
Figure 4.2.	Map of Indus valley civilization showing Harappan settlements.	65
Figure 4.3.	Terracotta wheels from Bhirrana.	68
Figure 4.4.	Excavated trenches at Bhirrana.	69
Figure 4.5.	View of Hakra Ware period subterranean pits.	71
Figure 4.6.	Relative proportion of charred bones in different cultural periods at Bhirrana.	71
Figure 4.7.	Domestic versus wild fauna in all the periods at Bhirrana.	73
Figure 4.8.	Relative proportion of cattle in different periods at Bhirrana.	73
Figure 4.9.	Bifid thoracic vertebrae of cattle.	74
Figure 4.10.	Distal trochlea of humerus with cut mark.	74
Figure 4.11.	Frontal view of bovid skull from trench ZD10/1 at Bhirrana.	74
Figure 4.12.	Lateral view of bovid skull from trench ZD10/1 at Bhirrana.	74
Figure 4.13.	Proximal metatarsal of gaur (Indian bison).	75
Figure 4.14.	Metatarsal of gaur (Indian bison).	75
Figure 4.15.	Charred horn core fragments (wild cattle?).	76
Figure 4.16.	Terracotta bull figurines from Bhirrana.	78
Figure 4.17.	Stylized terracotta buffalo horns.	78
Figure 4.18.	Log ratio diagram: cattle length measurements.	81
Figure 4.19.	Log ratio diagram: cattle breadth measurements.	81
Figure 5.1.	Map showing the location of the archaeological sites considered in this study.	93
Figure 5.2.	Triplot depicting the proportions of the main domesticates.	98
Figure 5.3	Boxplots calculated with log ratios of the bone widths referred in this article.	99
Figure 5.4.	Boxplots calculated with log ratios of the bone lengths referred in this article.	100
Figure 5.5.	Stacked histograms of the log ratios calculated from the bone widths of several assemblages.	101

Figure 5.6. Stacked histograms of the log ratios calculated from the bone lengths of several assemblages. 102
Figure 5.7. Scatterplot combining measurements of the astragalus of cattle. 103
Figure 6.1. Location of the archaeological sites and study areas 1 to 8. 113
Figure 6.2. Sample size categories for all archaeological sites. 114
Figure 6.3. Evolution of cattle bone length measurements. 116
Figure 6.4. Log size index histograms for length measurements by period. 117
Figure 6.5. Size of the astragalus by period, from areas 2, 4, 5, and 8. 118
Figure 6.6. Comparison of cattle size index from different British sites and study areas. 120
Figure 7.1. Map showing the location of the sites and geographical regions. 147
Figure 7.2. Kill-off patterns according to mandibular wear stage, based on site type. 151
Figure 7.3. Kill-off patterns by fusion stage of the epiphyses, based on site type. 152
Figure 7.4. Kill-off patterns according to mandibular wear stage based on geographical region. 152
Figure 7.5. Box-plots showing the log ratios of cattle postcranial bones for each period-site. 153
Figure 7.6. Box-plots showing the log ratios of cattle postcranial bones according to types of site. 153
Figure 7.7. Box-plots showing the log ratios of cattle postcranial bones according to geographical region. 154
Figure 7.8. Histograms with cattle sexually dimorphic measurements, by period and site type. 158
Figure 8.1. Location of Carnide within the Lisbon city area, in relation to Portugal and the Iberian Peninsula. 170
Figure 8.2. Staked histograms depicting the variation of cattle size in southern Portugal. 171
Figure 8.3. Photographs of the set of cattle metacarpals from Carnide. 173
Figure 8.4. Maximum-likelihood phylogeny of cattle mitogenomes. 174
Figure 8.5. Biological sex determination of the Carnide specimens. 175
Figure 9.1. Skull of *Bison priscus* and *Bos primigenius*. 184
Figure 9.2. Upper Pleistocene *Bison priscus* skeleton (Trois Frères cave, Ariège). 184
Figure 9.3. Regional frame used in this study. 185
Figure 9.4. Graphic features for bison in the Magdalenian in portable and parietal art. 189
Figure 9.5. Bison and aurochs in Paleolithic rock and cave art. 190
Figure 9.6. Bison hunting in Paleolithic portable art. 191
Figure 9.7. Bison hunting scenes in rock and cave art. 192
Figure 9.8. Bisons and aurochs iconography interpretable on the basis of ethology. 193
Figure 9.9. Chauvet cave (Ardèche). Salle du Fond. 194
Figure 9.10. Bison and humans in cave art and portable art. 195
Figure 9.11. Association of bison, aurochs and woman in rock and cave art. 196
Figure 10.1. Bovid representations from the fourth and third millennium BC. 206
Figure 10.2. Distribution of Bronze Age hypogea with depositions of bovid limbs in the Serpa area. 209
Figure 10.3. Distribution of the Alentejano Stelae in Alentejo region and of the Bronze Age hypogea with depositions of bovid limbs. 213
Figure 10.4. Southwest stelae with representations of warriors with horned heads. 214
Figure 11.1. Location of sites mentioned in text. 226
Figure 11.2. Proportions of major ungulate taxa through time. 227
Figure 11.3. Bucranium and aurochs horns in bench in burnt Building 52. 228
Figure 11.4. Aurochs horns on pillars on northeast platform in burnt Building 77. 230
Figure 11.5. Tightly grouped stack of at least 13 aurochs horns in burnt Building 52. 231
Figure 11.6. Painting on north wall of Building F.V.1 from Mellaart excavation. 232
Figure 12.1. Map showing the location of Camino de las Yeseras and plan of the site. 242
Figure 12.2. Excavation of the bovine deposits in process. 244
Figure 12.3. A. Radiocarbon dating of bovine skulls, A-60 and A-22. 245

Figure 12.4. Histograms with relative NISP and WISP values for the main taxa. 248
Figure 12.5. Selection of remains recovered from the Aurochs deposit A-60. 249
Figure 13.1. Map of the study area. 269
Figure 14.1. A cow sacrifice, Shang Dynasty oracle bone, and Han Dynasty stone carving depicting cattle pulling a plow. 287
Figure 14.2. Cultural Revolution era propaganda poster. 290
Figure 15.1. Distribution of main sites discussed in the chapter. 304
Figure 15.2. An estimated timeline for the initial incorporation of modes of traction in the Altai Mountains, alongside the cultural chronology. 305
Figure 15.3. Cattle traction images. 306
Figure 15.4. Yak carrying a pack as part of the family move to their winter camp in the Khuvsgul region, Mongolia. 307
Figure 15.5. Cattle riding in Central Mongolia. 308
Figure 15.6. Potential yak and khainag images depicted in rock art. 312
Figure 15.7. A horse in the middle of traction cattle circle at Tsagaan Salaa and Baga Oigor. 313
Figure 15.8. Cattle riding image from unnamed rock art site in Taishir sum, Gobi-Altai aimag. 315

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. Features studied in the fracture/fragmentation and age-at-death analysis. 32
Table 2.2. Age classes used for dental age-at-death data. 34
Table 2.3. Summary of age-at-death based on eruption, wear, and replacement of both mandibular (inf) and maxillary (sup) dental rows for each feature type. 37
Table 2.4. Summary of bone fusion data for each feature type. 39
Table 4.1. Chronology of the Indus Valley civilization (Kenoyer 1998; Possehl 2002). 66
Table 4.2. Cultural sequence at Bhirrana (after Rao et al. 2005; Dikshit and Mani 2012; Sarkar et al. 2016). 70
Table 4.3. NISP distribution of animals during the Hakra Ware period (IA), by trench. 72
Table 4.4. Epiphyseal fusion of *Bos indicus* bones from the Hakra Ware period (IA) at Bhirrana, grouping early, intermediate, and late fusing bones according to Silver 1969. 75
Table 4.5. Cranium of the ancient bovid from trench ZD10/1 (pit DP7). 75
Table 4.6. NISP distribution of animals in period IB: Early Harappan; period IIA: Early Mature Harappan; and period IIB: Mature Harappan. 77
Table 4.7. Numbers of fused and unfused bones from each period at Bhirrana. 77
Table 4.8. Estimation of cattle withers height (cm) using astragali for Harappan sites. 80
Table 4.9. The minimum, maximum, median, and mean log ratio values for different skeletal elements. 82
Table 5.1. List of sites from the Roman period from Lusitania with zooarchaeological data—number of identified specimens (NISP). 94
Table 7.1. Period-sites considered. 148
Table 7.2. Relative frequency (% NISP) of the main domestic taxa from study sites through time. 150
Table 7.3. Observed changes in the size of cattle at different types of sites through time, and summary of the results of the statistical analysis. 154

Table 7.4. Observed changes in the size of cattle postcranial lengths at different types of sites, and summary of the results of the statistical analysis. 155
Table 7.5. Observed changes in the size of cattle postcranial widths at different types of sites, and summary of the results of the statistical analysis. 155
Table 7.6. Observed changes in the size of cattle across different regions and summary of the results of the statistical analysis. 156
Table 7.7. Observed changes in the size of cattle postcranial lengths across different regions, and summary of the results of the statistical analysis. 156
Table 7.8. Observed changes in the size of cattle postcranial widths across different regions, and summary of the results of the statistical analysis. 157
Table 8.1. Sample information and whole-genome resequencing summary statistics. 172
Table 9.1. Number of Large Bovid sites, levels and taxa in southwestern Europe. Data from Brugal and Yravedra 2005. 186
Table 9.2. List of sites with Paleolithic art mentioned in the paper. 186
Table 9.3. Upper Paleolithic rock and cave art sites with bison and aurochs images in southwestern Europe. 188
Table 11.1. Presence of taxa in Çatalhöyük commemorative deposits (see Russell et al. 2009). 229
Table 12.2. Characteristics of the features and results of the archaeological, archaeozoological, archaeobotanical, and sedimentological studies of two bovine deposits. 246

Appendix 6.1. Chronology and sample size at different archaeological sites. 136

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Supplementary Open Access material can be found online at
DOI: https://doi.org/10.6078/M75H7DCN

The material includes:

High-resolution, full-color versions of figures 3.3–3.4, 5.3–5.4, 11.3–11.6, 12.1–12.5, 14.1–14.2, 15.1, and 15.8.

The associated database for Chapter 6, "Cattle Husbandry in the Iron Age and Roman Britain."

Supplementary figures S1–S6 for Chapter 8, "Typical Ancient DNA Deamination Patterns for Samples CAR002, CAR008, CAR009, CAR014, CAR016, and CAR021."

Supplementary table S1 for Chapter 8, "Metacarpals with Osteometric Measurements from Carnide Published by (Davis et al. 2018)."

EDITOR BIOGRAPHIES

Lizzie Wright (she/her) is a zooarchaeologist whose work has often focused on ancient cattle. Her PhD looked at the morphological variability of the European aurochs (*Bos primigenius*), and this project took her to many different European countries to study wild cattle remains. She has subsequently worked on projects based in the UK, Portugal, and Switzerland, with her most recent project investigating Swiss Neolithic cattle husbandry. She has been based at the University of Nottingham (UK), the University of Basel (Switzerland), and has also worked in developer-funded archaeology in the UK. She is currently a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Fellow at the University of York (UK).

Catarina Ginja (she/her) is the Principal Investigator of the Archaeogenetics research group at CIBIO/InBIO, University of Porto (Portugal). Following her PhD research at the Veterinary Genetics Laboratory, University of California-Davis, she returned to Portugal as a Marie Curie Welcome II Research Fellow to launch an innovative archaeogenetics investigation at the Faculty of Sciences of the University of Lisbon. She is interested in understanding the origins, evolution, and modes of improvement of domestic animals from the Iberian Peninsula and North Africa using genomics, with emphasis on extant breeds of native cattle from this region aiming at their conservation.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Umberto Albarella
Department of Archaeology, University of Sheffield, Minalloy House, 10–16 Regent St, Sheffield, S1 3NJ, United Kingdom. u.albarella@sheffield.ac.uk.

Carlos Arteaga
Dpto. Geografía. Facultad Filosofía y Letras, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Calle Francisco Tomás y Valiente, 1, 28049 Madrid, Spain.
carlos.arteaga@uam.es.

Ludmilla Blaschikoff
CIBIO/InBIO-Centro de Investigação em Biodiversidade e Recursos Genéticos, Universidade do Porto, Campus de Vairão Rua Padre Armando Quintas, nº 74485-661, Vairão, Portugal.
ludblaschikoff@gmail.com.

Concepción Blasco
Dpto. Prehistoria y Arqueología. Facultad Filosofía y Letras, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Calle Francisco Tomás y Valiente, 1, 28049 Madrid, Spain.
concepción.blasco@uam.es.

Jean-Philip Brugal
Aix Marseille Université, CNRS, Minist. Cult., UMR 7269 LAMPEA, Aix-en-Provence, Maison méditerranéenne des Sciences de l'Homme, 5 rue du Château de l'horloge, BP 647, F-13094 Aix-en-Provence, France. brugal@mmsh.univ-aix.fr.

Katherine Brunson
Archaeology Program, Wesleyan University, 294 High Street, Middletown CT, USA.
kbrunson@wesleyan.edu.

Cristina Cabrera
Dpto. Prehistoria y Arqueología. Facultad Filosofía y Letras, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Calle Francisco Tomás y Valiente, 1, 28049 Madrid, Spain.
cristina.cabrera@uam.es.

Rute da Fonseca
Center for Macroecology, Evolution and Climate, Universitetsparken 15, Bld. 3, 2nd floor DK-2100 Copenhagen. rute.r.da.fonseca@gmail.com.

Simon J. M. Davis
Laboratório de Arqueociências— Direcção Geral do Património Cultural, Calçada do Mirante à Ajuda, nº 10A, 1300-418, Lisbon, Portugal.
CIBIO/InBIO-Centro de Investigação em Biodiversidade e Recursos Genéticos, Universidade do Porto, Campus de Vairão Rua Padre Armando Quintas, nº 74485-661, Vairão, Portugal.
simonjmdavis@gmail.com.

María de los Ángeles de Chorro
Centro de Biología Molecular Severo Ochoa (CSIC--UAM), Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Calle Nicolás Cabrera, 1, 28049 Madrid, Spain.
mdechorro@cbm.csic.es.

Arati Deshpande-Mukherjee
Department of Ancient Indian History Culture and Archaeology, Deccan College Post Graduate and Research Institute, Yerawada, Pune 411006, Maharashtra, India. adm.muk@gmail.com.

Cleia Detry
UNIARQ, Centro de Arqueologia da Universidade de Lisboa, Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa, Alameda da Universidade 1600-214. Lisbon, Portugal. cdetry@letras.ulisboa.pt.

Nicolas Dussex
Centre for Palaeogenetics, Stockholm University, SE-106 91, Stockholm, Sweden.
nicolas.dussex@gmail.com.

Colin Duval
UMR 7324 CITERES/CNRS—Laboratoire Archéologie et Territoires—Université de Tours, 33-35 allée Ferdinand de Lesseps, BP 60449–37024 Tours Cedex 03. duval.colin@gmail.com.

Philippe Fosse
Aix Marseille Université, CNRS, Minist. Cult., UMR 7269 LAMPEA, Aix-en-Provence, Maison méditerranéenne des Sciences de l'Homme, 5 rue du Château de l'horloge, BP 647, F-13094 Aix-en-Provence, France. fosse@mmsh.univ-aix.fr.

Tamsyn Fraser
Department of Archaeology, University of Sheffield, Minalloy House, 10–16 Regent Street, Sheffield S1 3NJ, United Kingdom. tamsynfraser@gmail.com.

Carole Fritz
CNRS, directrice du CREAP, Maison des Sciences de l'Homme et de la Société, Toulouse et UMR 5608 TRACES, 5 allées Antonio Machado, F-31098 Toulouse cedex 9. carolefritz@me.com.

Eva-Maria Geigl
Institut Jaques Monod. Dpt. Epigenome and Paleogenome. 15, Rue Hélène Brion, 75205 Paris, France. eva-maria.geigl@ijm.fr.

Rosalind E. Gillis
ICArEHB, Faculdade de Ciências Humanas e Sociais, Universidade do Algarve, *Campus* de Gambelas, 8005-139 Faro, Portugal.
CNRS—Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle—Sorbonne Universités, Archéozoologie, Archéobotanique: Sociétés, Pratiques et Environnement (UMR 7209), CP56, 55 rue Buffon, F-75005 Paris, France. roze.gillis@gmail.com.

Catarina Ginja
CIBIO/InBIO-Centro de Investigação em Biodiversidade e Recursos Genéticos, Universidade do Porto, R. Padre Armando Quintas, 7, 4485-661 Vairão, Portugal. catarinaginja@cibio.up.pt.

Anders Götherström
Centre for Palaeogenetics, Stockholm University, SE-106 91, Stockholm, Sweden.
anders.gotherstrom@arklab.su.se.

Pankaj Goyal
Department of Ancient Indian History Culture and Archaeology, Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute, Yerawada, Pune 411006, Maharashtra, India. pgalmora@gmail.com.

Idoia Grau-Sologestoa
Integrative Prähistorische und Naturwissenschaftliche Archäologie (IPNA), University of Basel, Spalenring 145, 4055 Basel, Switzerland.
idoia.grau@unibas.ch.

Sílvia Guimarães
CIBIO/InBIO-Centro de Investigação em Biodiversidade e Recursos Genéticos, Universidade do Porto, R. Padre Armando Quintas, 7, 4485-661 Vairão, Portugal.
CSIC-IMF, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas-Institució Milà i Fontanals, C/Egipcía-

ques 15, 08001 Barcelona, Spain.
silvia.guimaraes@cibio.up.pt.

Emily V. Johnson
Archaeology South-East, UCL Institute of Archaeology, Units 1 & 2, 2 Chapel Place, Portslade, East Sussex, BN41 1DR, United Kingdom.
Department of Archaeology, University of Exeter, Laver Building, North Park Road, Exeter, Devon EX4 4QE, United Kingdom. e.v.johnson@outlook.com.

Gülşah Merve Kılınç
Department of Bioinformatics, Graduate School of Health Sciences, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey. gulsahkilinc@hacettepe.edu.tr.

Brian Lander
Department of History, Brown University, 79 Brown Street, Providence RI, USA. brian_lander@brown.edu.

Joséphine Lesur
Unité Archéozoologie, Archéobotanique: Sociétés, Pratiques, Environnements (AASPE), Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, CNRS; C.P. 55, 55 rue Buffon 75005 Paris, France. jolesur@mnhn.fr.

Corina Liesau
Dpto. Prehistoria y Arqueología. Facultad Filosofía y Letras, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Calle Francisco Tomás y Valiente, 1, 28049 Madrid, Spain. corina.liesau@uam.es.

Cheryl A. Makarewicz
Institute for Prehistoric and Protohistoric Archaeology, Johanna-Mestorf Strasse 2-6, Kiel University, D-24118, Kiel, Germany.
c.makarewicz@ufg.uni-kiel.de.

Arkadiusz Marciniak
Faculty of Archaeology, Adam Mickiewicz University, ul. Uniwersytetu Poznańskiego 7, 61-614 Poznań, Poland. arekmar@amu.edu.pl.

José Matos
Unidade Estratégica de Investigação e Serviços de Biotecnologia e Recursos Genéticos, INIAV—Instituto Nacional de Investigação Agrária e Veterinária, Av. Da República, Quinto Marquês, 2780-157 Oeiras, Portugal.
cE3c-Centro de Ecologia, Evolução e Alterações Ambientais, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade de Lisboa, Campo Grande, 1749-016 Lisboa, Portugal.
jose.matos@iniav.pt.

Roberto Menduiña
Argea Consultores S.L., C/San Crispín, 1, 2dcha. 28011 Madrid, Spain. rmenduina@hotmail.com.

António Muñoz-Merida
CIBIO/InBIO-Centro de Investigação em Biodiversidade e Recursos Genéticos, Universidade do Porto, Campus de Vairão Rua Padre Armando Quintas, nº 74485-661, Vairão, Portugal. amunoz@cibio.up.pt.

Alan K. Outram
Department of Archaeology, University of Exeter, Laver Building, North Park Road, Exeter, Devon EX4 4QE, United Kingdom. a.k.outram@exeter.ac.uk.

Ana Elisabete Pires
Laboratório de Arqueociências—Direcção Geral do Património Cultural, Calçada do Mirante à Ajuda, nº 10A, 1300-418, Lisbon, Portugal.
CIBIO/InBIO-Centro de Investigação em Biodiversidade e Recursos Genéticos, Universidade do Porto, R. Padre Armando Quintas, 7, 4485-661 Vairão, Portugal. ana.elisabete.pires@gmail.com.

Joanna Pyzel
Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology, University of Gdańsk, ul. Bielańska 5, 80-851 Gdańsk, Poland. joanna.pyzel@ug.edu.pl.

Patricia Ríos
Dpto. Prehistoria y Arqueología. Facultad Filosofía y Letras, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Calle Francisco Tomás y Valiente, 1, 28049 Madrid, Spain. patricia.rios@uam.es.

Nerissa Russell
Department of Anthropology, Cornell University, McGraw Hall, Ithaca, NY 14853 USA.
nr29@cornell.edu.

Mindi Schneider
Sociology of Development and Change Group, Wageningen University, P.O. Box 8130, 6700 EW, Wageningen, The Netherlands. mindi.schneider@wur.nl.

Plan Shenjere-Nyabezi
University of Zimbabwe Archaeology Unit, History Heritage & Knowledge Systems Department, P O Box MP 167, Mt Pleasant, Harare, Zimbabwe.
University of Pretoria, Department of Anthropology & Archaeology, Private Bag X20, Hatfield 0028, Pretoria, South Africa. pshenjere2000@yahoo.co.uk.

Luciana Simões
Department of Organismal Biology, Uppsala University Norbyvägen 18 A, 752 36 Uppsala, Sweden.
lucianagasparsimoes@gmail.com.

Gilles Tosello
Chercheur associé CREAP, Maison des Sciences de l'Homme et de la Société, Toulouse, 5 allées Antonio Machado, F-31098 Toulouse cedex 9, France.
gilles.tosello@wanadoo.fr.

Tuvshinjargal Tumurbaatar
Institute for Prehistoric and Protohistoric Archaeology, Johanna-Mestorf Strasse 2-6, Kiel University, D-24118, Kiel, Germany.
ttuvshinjargal01@gmail.com.

Irene Ureña
CIBIO/InBIO-Centro de Investigação em Biodiversidade e Recursos Genéticos, Universidade do Porto, R. Padre Armando Quintas, 7, 4485-661 Vairão, Portugal. irene.u.h@gmail.com.

Silvia Valenzuela-Lamas
CSIC-IMF, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas-Institució Milà i Fontanals, C/ Egipcíaques 15, 08001 Barcelona, Spain.
svalenzuela@imf.csic.es.

António Carlos Valera
Era Arqueologia S.A. Cç St. Catarina 9c 1495-705 Cruz Quebrada-Dafundo, Portugal.
ICArEHB, Faculdade de Ciências Humanas e Sociais, Universidade do Algarve, *Campus* de Gambelas, 8005-139 Faro, Portugal.
antoniovalera@era-arqueologia.pt.

Jorge Vega
Argea Consultores S.L., C/ San Crispín, 1, 2dcha. 28011 Madrid, Spain. jorge.vega@argea.es.

Elizabeth Wright
BioArCh, University of York, Environment Building, Wentworth Way, Heslington, York YO10 5NG.
Department of Classics and Archaeology, University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD, UK.
lizzieewright@gmail.com.

PREFACE

We set out on the road that led us to this book in 2018, when we decided to organize a session at the International Council for Archaeozoology meeting in Ankara, entitled "Understanding Cattle-Human Interactions: Interdisciplinary Approaches to an Ancient Relationship." We had both been working on ancient cattle for much of our careers, although with different methodological approaches, one of us being a geneticist and the other a zooarchaeologist, and we saw this as a great opportunity to bring together colleagues working on past cattle-human interactions using a variety of different techniques.

The session had a fairly wide geographical and temporal scope, although the majority of papers were focused on Europe, and almost all covered the (relatively short) time span from the Neolithic to the Roman period. All of the contributors to the session were invited to submit a paper for the edited volume, but additionally we approached a number of other colleagues in order to try to fill gaps in our coverage. In particular we wanted to include some more chapters on the aurochs and early human-cattle interactions, as well as some from the continent of Africa. The result is that approximately half of the final version of the volume is made up of papers from contributors to the conference session, with the other half from new ones; a balance that we are actually quite pleased with. There are, of course, still some gaps in time and geography, which is frustrating but relatively unavoidable in a volume of this kind.

During the editing process we tried to constantly have in mind the representation of women, early career researchers, and colleagues from the Global South, and it became clear (unsurprisingly) that a truly intersectional and decolonized volume is incredibly difficult to achieve (also bearing in mind that we are both white women based at European institutions). A number of potential contributors that we approached representing areas or profiles that are underrepresented in archaeology were unable to contribute, or had to withdraw from the process for various reasons. Added to this is the precarious situation that many of us find ourselves in. A number of potential contributors could not be involved because they had no income for their archaeological work, or needed to instead dedicate their time to highly sought after high-impact papers and grant applications in order to have a chance of finding employment in the longer term. These issues also affected us as editors—both of us undertook this work while on fixed term contracts, one of us moved institutions twice during the lifetime of the book and the other spent most of this time struggling for her contract to be renewed. These are by no means new issues in archaeology and archaeogenetics, but we do feel that it is important to reflect on the atmosphere in which we are working. At the moment archaeology is facing a particular crisis, in that academic departments are facing increased threats of closure.

In the end our attempts to include a wider variety of contributors did mean that it took longer to deliver the book than we had hoped, and also that ultimately the volume does not have the wide-ranging coverage we would have liked. One might argue that this was therefore a failed approach, but there were many successes: all but two of the papers in the book have at least one female author, and a notable proportion of the papers were written by early career researchers without permanent academic positions. (It is not unsurprising to us that there may be a correlation between these two things, as men tend to occupy most permanent professorships the world over.) Although most of the papers are still Europe-focused, there are a number of contributions representing other areas of the world including northeastern Africa, Zimbabwe, China, Mongolia, and India, and although we would have liked even more areas to be included, we are fairly happy with this achievement.

After we started work on the book, the global Covid-19 pandemic hit. This of course provided a number of challenges to the completion of the volume; care-giving responsibilities increased, particularly for women, and the situation became even more precarious for early career researchers, but it

also highlighted to us the importance of our work on the relationship between humans and animals in the past. It is so vitally important to have a better understanding of the process that has led us to this place, and we hope that these papers will help us to do that.

While working on this project each of us lost a parent. Fiona Wright and Jorge Ginja, this volume is dedicated to you.

Lizzie Wright and Catarina Ginja

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The editors would like to thank Sarah Kansa and Justin Lev-Tov for their patience and advice while we were working on this volume, and to Idoia Grau-Sologestoa and Umberto Albarella for their advice at various stages of the project. Thanks also go to Gwilym Lawrence and Joe Edwardes-Evans for their English language editing of a number of the papers, and to Pedro Salvador Mendes for the wonderful illustrations representing each of the sections of the book. Special thanks also go to Simon Davis for writing the Foreword.

The editing of this book was supported by funding from the Portuguese FCT-Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (project UIDB/50027/2020, Catarina Ginja); through the Project grant LEAP-AGRI 326 LEAPAgri/0003/2017 – OPTIBOV (Catarina Ginja); and through a European Commission Marie Skłodowska-Curie European Fellowship (Elizabeth Wright 2018–2020, grant no. 792076).

Much of the preparation of this book took place during the global Covid-19 pandemic, which of course added extra challenges to the process, and to the lives of all of our contributors. We are very grateful to all of the contributors, reviewers, our book series editors, and the publisher for bearing with us through this crazy time.

FOREWORD

From *Bos primigenius* to the Durham Ox: Some of the Things We Have Done to *Bos*

Simon Davis

Bos primigenius, the aurochs or wild cattle, a very large and no doubt beautiful animal known to the Romans as the Urus, is now sadly extinct. The last one died in eighteenth century Poland. It was supposedly descended from the north Indian *B. planifrons*, which probably first appeared some two million years ago (Auguste and Patou-Mathis 1994). However, around eight or ten thousand years ago, probably in the Near East, the aurochs was domesticated by Neolithic people. Whether this event happened only once or was repeated independently in other places remains one of the great enigmas confronting aficionados of the bovine world. Another wild bovine, *Bos primigenius namadicus*, also descended from *Bos planifrons*, once inhabited India and was the ancestor of the humped Indian zebu.

Today cattle (domestic aurochs) are one of our most important farm animals—they provide us with milk, meat, fat, and dung. Moreover, they have for long been an important source of power both for transport and plowing, not to mention their bones, horns, and skin used for making various kinds of instruments and clothing. There are well over a billion cattle worldwide and according to the FAO commission on genetic resources assessment (FAO, 2015) these form over 1,000 breeds.

Zooarchaeologists ask not only when and where aurochs were first domesticated, but once domesticated, how they were spread across the globe. In Europe and the Near East at least, the possibility that these early domesticated animals may have crossed, purposefully or accidentally, with local aurochs makes archaeogenetical studies all the more complicated.

In this book edited by Catarina Ginja and Elizabeth Wright the reader will find much food for thought. Topics like the dwarf Sicilian aurochs, the south to north size increase of European aurochs in accordance with Bergmann's rule, the presence of these animals right across North Africa during the last Ice Age, are just some subjects that the reader may discover concerning the wild form of *Bos*. The especial treatment these animals received in central Anatolia in Neolithic times and genetical evidence for an African ancestry in our modern European cattle are also discussed.

Their domestication and subsequent evolution and even ritual practices form the subjects of many of the chapters. Mongolian and Chinese cattle are also considered. In Africa it seems cattle spread slowly from the north to the southern cape where they only appeared a mere 2,000 years ago!

Another area of investigation that is of great interest is the improvement of cattle in different places in the course of time. The Romans, for example, are often credited with improving cattle with substantial size increases being recognized in the archaeological record. But this long-held view is now being revised as more, and larger, samples of archaeological animal bones are studied. It seems that improvements may have preceded the Romans. Following a post-Roman decline in cattle stature, recovery occurred in many parts of Europe in medieval or postmedieval times. The late Eric Kerridge's (1967) suggestion that agricultural improvements in England happened much earlier than had been previously thought are corroborated here. One truly amazing giant was Charles Colling's famous "Durham ox" born in 1796 and which weighed well over 1,000 kg when it died.

There is much of interest in this collection of articles and it should prove a useful source for bovinophiles for many years to come!

References

Auguste, P., and M. Patou-Mathis

1994 L'aurochs au Paléolithique. In *Aurochs, le retour: Aurochs, vaches & autres bovines de la préhistoire à nos jours*, pp. 13–26. Musée

d'archéologie, Centre Jurassien du Patrimoine, Lons-le-Saunier.

Food and Agriculture Organization of The United Nations

2015 The Second Report on the State of the World's Animal Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, edited by B.D. Scherf and D. Pilling. FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture Assessments. Rome. https://reliefweb.int/report/world/second-report-state-worlds-animal-genetic-resources-food-and-agriculture.

Kerridge, Eric

1967 *The Agricultural Revolution*. London, Allen & Unwin.

INTRODUCTION

People and Cattle: A Long History

Elizabeth Wright and Catarina Ginja†*

Introduction

Humans have a long history of interaction with cattle. Cattle have been hunted, domesticated, exploited for their meat and other products, and have had symbolic importance for many different human groups. Cattle domestication, which occurred approximately 10,000 years ago, alongside that of the pig (*Sus domesticus*), sheep (*Ovis aries*), and goat (*Capra hircus*) was a pivotal moment in human subsistence which saw a shift from foraging and hunting to agriculture—a process often referred to as the Neolithic revolution.

The history of our relationship with this animal is studied by people from many different research areas, including archaeology, history, genetics, and anthropology, and we now know an awful lot about the evolution of our relationship with this animal across time and space. A field in which a considerable amount of work focuses on this relationship is zooarchaeology—the study of animal remains from archaeological excavations. Zooarchaeologists collect data from ancient cattle bones and teeth, which provide information about how humans were interacting with them. Through this work we know that not only have cattle and their products been an important part of the human diet for hundreds of thousands of years, but also when and where they are likely to have been domesticated, the varied ways in which different communities have lived with and managed them, and the symbolic role that these animals may have played for many different people. It makes sense, then, that this volume was conceived at an international zooarchaeology conference where we were sharing our work on these animals from across of the world. The chapters in this volume highlight the important work that zooarchaeologists are doing on the history of the human-cattle relationship, as well as the valuable collaborations with other fields that enhance and contextualize our work. This introductory chapter provides a description of the different themes covered in this volume and considers how the papers published here are taking us forward in our quest to understand cattle and people in the past.

Earliest Cattle Interactions

It would not be right to have a book on human-cattle interactions without any chapters focusing on the aurochs (*Bos primigenius*), the wild ancestor of domestic cattle. This species was present across much of Europe, Asia, and Africa from the Middle Pleistocene onward, and was widely hunted by humans both before and after its domestication. It even continued to live in the wild in some areas of central and eastern Europe until relatively recently—AD 1647, when it finally became extinct. Chapter 1 of this volume (Wright) focuses on the presence and body size of this animal in Europe from its first appearance until the end of the Mesolithic period, and provides some background on its origins and taxonomy.

The aurochs clearly formed a part of the diet of humans during the Paleolithic and Mesolithic periods. Their remains are found in Europe at sites with

* *Department of Classics and Archaeology, University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD, UK, and BioArCh, University of York, Environment Building, Wentworth Way, Heslington, York YO10 5NG (lizzie.wright1@nottingham.ac.uk)*

† *CIBIO/InBIO-Centro de Investigação em Biodiversidade e Recursos Genéticos, Universidade do Porto, R. Padre Armando Quintas, 7, 4485-661 Vairão, Portugal (catarinaginja@cibio.up.pt)*

Acheulean technology as far back as Marine Isotope Stage 16 (Pereira et al. 2015), but the nature of the relationship between humans and this animal at this time is still quite unclear, with question marks around when our hunting of the aurochs first began, as opposed to scavenging, for example. But the aurochs were not only important in terms of diet, it likely had a deeper meaning beyond this, as indicated by its regular appearance in European Paleolithic cave art (Sauvet and Wlodarczyk 2000). This is the topic of chapter 9, in which Carole Fritz et al. explore the potential symbolism behind these depictions.

Domestication

The domestication of cattle was revolutionary for human diet and economy, but also represents a transformation in human-cattle interactions. There were at least two independent domestications of cattle worldwide; one that led to the European humpless *Bos taurus*, which took place in the Near East approximately 10,000 years ago, and another that produced the humped zebu cattle (*Bos indicus*) of Asia and Africa, which took place on the Indian subcontinent a couple of millenia later (Chen et al. 2010; Loftus et al. 1994; Troy et al. 2001).

The ability to distinguish between the bones and teeth of wild and domestic cattle is key to our understanding of the domestication process; however, this is often not easy, due to an overlap in size between aurochs and domestic cattle, and few morphological differences. A large body of work has focused on this issue over the past 60 years or so, and in particular a study undertaken by Magnus Degerbøl (1963; Degerbøl and Fredskild 1970) on the Danish aurochs has formed an important baseline for this. In this work measurements from aurochs and domestic cattle from sites in Denmark were presented, and the difference between the wild and domestic forms as well as the sexual dimorphism in the wild form was clearly demonstrated.

Geneticists and archaeologists have worked together to explore cattle domestication, and our understanding of this complex process is now much clearer. Previous analysis of mitochondrial DNA retrieved from archaeological remains indicated that, following the primary domestication of cattle in Anatolia, their expansion toward Europe occurred without significant maternal interbreeding with local aurochs (Scheu et al. 2015). However, maternal lineages only tell us about half the story, and during the last decade there has been an enormous increase in genome-wide data available for domesticated animal species, including cattle (Frantz et al. 2020). Recently, a genome-wide study of cattle remains from the Near East revealed regional variation and admixture that could not be inferred simply by analyzing the genomes of extant cattle (Verdugo et al. 2019). These authors also reported that a widespread male-mediated zebu introgression was initiated in the Late Bronze Age about 4,200 years BP, much earlier than previously thought. The phenomenon was likely associated with climate change and is consistent with archaeological evidence for westward human migration. The affinity observed between ancient Levantine cattle and the single North African aurochs for which genomic data is available suggests a possible origin for African taurine cattle in the southern Fertile Crescent (Verdugo et al. 2019).

Several chapters in this volume present data on some of the earliest domestic cattle. In chapter 2 Emily Johnson et al. describe a case study from the early Neolithic European Linearbankeramik culture. In chapter 3, Joséphine Lesur describes some of the earliest evidence for cattle herding in northeastern Africa, and in chapter 4, Arati Deshpande-Mukherjee and Pankaj Goyal provide a case study of a potentially very early cattle-based economy predating the Indus Valley Civilization in northwestern South Asia. The various human groups described in these chapters were dealing with very different cultural and environmental conditions, yet they all chose cattle to be an important part of their economy—demonstrating the versatility, resilience, and reliability of this animal for many different uses in a wide variety of contexts.

Use of Secondary Products

Domestication allowed for a degree of control over livestock animals that meant they could be exploited more easily for certain products beyond their meat, and there is now clear evidence for the use of these so-called secondary products such as milk, dung, and labor shortly after the establishment of domestic cattle within human economies. In Europe, for example, dairy is now considered to have played an important part at many sites dated to the early Neolithic Linearbandkeramik culture (Gillis et al. 2017; Kovačiková et al. 2012). Cattle remains can give us some insights into the types of products that were

used at different sites, and mortality profiles—built using information on bone fusion and tooth eruption and wear—are of particular use for this (e.g., Legge 1981). Chapter 2 (Johnson et al.) in this volume presents a case study from the Polish Linearbandkeramik site of Ludwinowo 7, which brings together butchery, fracture, and fragmentation analysis with mortality data, in order to provide a picture of consumption practices at this site.

Other types of evidence can also be used to explore for which products cattle were being used. In chapter 3, Lesur describes the early evidence for milk exploitation in northeastern Africa from the fifth millennium BC, which includes depictions in rock art, as well as pottery residue analysis. Similarly, in chapter 15, Tuvshinjargal Tumurbaatar and Cheryl Makarewicz show how Bronze Age petroglyphs in Mongolia have provided important evidence on the use of cattle and yak for riding and carrying loads, as part of herding activity.

Prehistoric Cattle Symbolism

In addition to forming an important part of the prehistoric economy in many communities, there is clear evidence that cattle had a deeper symbolic meaning to many human groups. In recent years these kinds of relationships have been increasingly studied, in part due to the growth of a newer strand of zooarchaeology dealing with social aspects of human societies, sometimes referred to as social zooarchaeology (see, e.g., Overton and Hamilakis 2013; Russell 2011). Ethnoarchaeology (or ethnozooarchaeology) has also been used to explore the potential symbolic meanings of animals in the past—and this is the approach taken by Plan Shenjere-Nyabezi in chapter 13.

In chapter 11, Nerissa Russell discusses the evidence for the relationship between humans and aurochs at Neolithic Çatalhöyük in central Anatolia. She argues that parallels in the way that the dead of both humans and aurochs were treated suggest that aurochs were considered ancestral to humans. Two chapters also discuss human-cattle symbolic relationships in Neolithic, Chalcolithic, and Bronze Age Iberia. In chapter 12, Corina Liesau et al. present a case study from the Spanish Chalcolithic site of Camiño de las Yeseras, where two particular bovine deposits seem to have been subject to special treatment, highlighting the symbolic importance of cattle for the local community and wider Chalcolithic Iberia. In chapter 10, António Carlos Valera concentrates on southern Portugal, and uses pictographic, material, and zooarchaeological evidence to argue that the symbolic role of cattle was transformed at the transition between the Chalcolithic and Bronze Age in this region.

In chapter 13 Shenjere-Nyabezi presents her ethnographic work with a number of groups in Manicaland, eastern Zimbabwe, highlighting a number of ritual uses of cattle related to many aspects of life, including marriage, death, appeasement, and chief installation. She discusses how these kinds of ritual activities must be taken into account in the interpretation of animal bone assemblages, and their relevance in particular to Iron Age Zimbabwe.

Improvement and Intensification

Over time people began to select for specific traits in their cattle and started using them for different purposes—the process that eventually led to the establishment of our modern-day breeds. Some of the classic evidence often cited for the beginning of this process in Europe is the introduction of larger cattle across the Roman Empire (Albarella et al. 2008; Breuer et al. 1999; Fremondeau et al. 2017; Groot 2017; Groot and Deschler-Erb 2015; Lauwerier 1988; Lepetz 1996; Pigiere 2017; Teichert 1984; Valenzuela-Lamas and Albarella 2017), although some recent work has suggested that some kind of selection or improvement may already have been happening during prehistory (Trentacoste et al. 2018; Wright 2021). The European Roman cattle were larger, and able to work longer and harder in the fields, but also provided more meat than earlier smaller cattle. Two papers in this book focus on this aspect. In chapter 5, Cleia Detry et al. lay out the current evidence for the appearance of larger cattle in newly founded cities and urban areas of Roman Lusitania (the area now occupied by modern day Portugal and western Spain). Colin Duval and Umberto Albarella (chapter 6) present a large body of Iron Age and Roman data from Britain, where this pattern has been long established, providing an in-depth study on the nature and pace of this change in different regions. This is a pattern that has only recently been established in that region, in contrast to the situation in other areas of the Empire, such as Britain.

The process of improvement continued to evolve, with increasing focus on more specific traits through

time. This was not a linear process and varied according to geography, climate, and political context. Particular moments have seen surges in this activity, with one such moment being the transition between the late medieval and early modern eras in Britain which saw a transformation in farming practices often referred to as the British agricultural revolution (Davis 1997). This transition is the focus of chapter 7, in which Tamsyn Fraser and Idoia Grau-Sologestoa draw on a large dataset to trace the variations in change between urban, rural, and manorial sites.

Archaeogenetics studies have been of utmost importance to assert the independent domestication of taurine and indicine cattle (Pitt et al. 2019; Verdugo et al. 2019), but genomic analyses can also be incredibly useful to understand the modes of improvement and to describe some phenotypic traits of past animals (McHugo et al. 2019; Frantz et al. 2020). In chapter 8, Irene Ureña et al. present the results of a genomic study of well-documented cattle remains from the seventeenth century retrieved from silos in Carnide, Lisbon (Portugal), and provide clues on whether these cattle were improved locally (and for what purpose) or if, alternatively, new stock was introduced from elsewhere. In addition, consistency between the biological sex determination using osteometric and genomic methods further validated previous findings on the measurements that provide a good distinction between the sexes (Davis et al. 2012, 2018).

The social and political context of cattle selection and breeding in China is also laid out very well in chapter 14 by Katherine Brunson et al. Here the authors highlight how documentary evidence is integral to our understanding of cattle husbandry over the last 2,000 years, for example, through agricultural and medical manuals that advised on livestock management, processes for making different dairy products, and the medicinal uses of cattle products. This chapter also takes us up to the modern day, highlighting the impacts of the introduction of Western dairy cattle breeds after the end of the Second Opium War in 1860, leading to the establishment of companies that managed the production of dairy products and finally to a full-blown dairy and meat industry with intensive commercial breeding.

Today, after poultry and pork, beef is the third most widely consumed meat in the world. In 2018 it accounted for about 20% of meat production worldwide—amounting to 72 million tonnes of beef in total).[1] Milk production is also a massive industry, and production continues to increase faster than that of meat, due in part to rising demand in countries such as China (Bai et al. 2018). Between 2005 and 2015, for example, milk production grew by approximately 30%, and the global dairy herd increased by 11% (FAO 2019). Now more than 80% of the world's population (about 6 billion people), regularly consumes milk or other dairy products (FAO 2019).

Unsurprisingly this level of production has a very large environmental impact, with beef production being responsible for approximately 41% of the global emission of greenhouse gases from livestock animals (Opio et al. 2013), as well as a driver of deforestation-caused land degradation (Cederberg et al. 2011). Humans have responded to this issue in a variety of ways. The increasing popularity of vegetarianism and veganism in many areas of the world (particularly the Global North) is a good reflection of the way in which people are starting to think more about their personal relationships with the meat and dairy products they consume, as well as their impact on the climate and on animal welfare. International bodies such as the United Nations as well as the meat and dairy industries themselves are also now attempting to tackle these problems through encouraging more sustainable farming practices aimed at increasing efficiency and reducing emissions (see, e.g., FAO 2019).

Despite the need to reduce the impacts of industrial cattle production, many people rely on cattle for their livelihoods, and for their status in society. More than 150 million farmers across the world today are thought to keep at least one milk animal, with local cattle being by far the most common, and in about 25% of cattle-keeping households dairy cows are directly owned or managed by women (FAO 2016).[2] In addition, it is widely recognized that local farm animal genetic resources hold greater levels of genomic diversity when compared to commercial breeds. These animals are more sustainably raised and contribute to fighting fires in temperate to dry climate regions, as well as increasing soil fertility. These aspects are key to our ability to respond to the chal-

1 Data taken from FAOSTAT–2018 dataset, and OurWorldInData.org, includes both cattle and buffalo.

2 For more on this topic see, e.g., Njuki and Sanginja 2013 for perspectives from Kenya, Tanzania, and Mozambique.

lenges imposed by imminent climate changes, and have therefore highlighted the importance of retaining local, smaller-scale cattle husbandry going into the future (Bruford et al. 2015; FAO 2011, 2015).

Conclusion

The chapters in this volume provide an important snapshot of the work being undertaken on cattle-human relationships in the past. In particular we present the work of zooarchaeologists and their collaborators, but it is clear that this work is highly relevant to many other fields. Zooarchaeology, and archaeology more broadly, is often at the forefront of multidisciplinary research that is both accessible and has the ability to reach large audiences. We are able to use this platform to provide key explanations about our past and how we became what we are, and through this to help plan for the future. The papers in this volume are a fantastic demonstration of this. These case studies provide examples of our relationships with cattle across approximately 650,000 years, from scavenging and hunting, to domestication, to the building and growing of cattle herds for increased production, to deliberate selection for different traits and products. They deliver insights into the contexts in which different husbandry strategies were adopted and the way that different environmental and climatic conditions in the past affected herding. But most of all they highlight how unbelievably important these animals have been for humans at different times, in different places, and in many different realms of life—including both the economic and the spiritual. Only through a better understanding of the ways in which cattle-human relationships were formed and evolved in the past can we truly understand the opportunities possible for sustainable and ethical relationships in the future.

References

Albarella, Umberto, Cluny Johnstone, and Kim Vickers
2008 The Development of Animal Husbandry from the Late Iron Age to the End of the Roman Period: A Case Study from South-East Britain. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 35:1828–1848. DOI:10.1016/j.jas.2007.11.016.

Bai, Zhaohai, Michael R. F. Lee, Llin Ma, Stewart Ledgard, Oene Oenema, Gerard L. Velthof, Wenqi Ma, Mengchu Guo, Zanqing Zhao, Sha Wei, Shengli Li, Xia Liu, Petr Havlík, Jiafa Luo, Chunsheng Hu, and Fusuo Zhang
2018 Global Environmental Costs of China's Thirst for Milk. *Global Change Biology* 24:2198–2211. DOI:10.1111/gcb.14047.

Breuer, Guido, André Rehazek, and Barbara Stopp
1999 Grössenveränderungen des Hausrindes: Osteometrische Untersuchungen grosser Fundserien aus der Nordschweiz von der Spätlatènezeit bis ins Frümittelalter am Beispiel von Basel, Augst (Augusta Raurica) und Schleitheim-Brüel. *Jahresberichte aus August und Kaiseraugst* 20:207–228.

Bruford, Michael W., Catarina Ginja, Irene Hoffmann, Stéphane Joost, Pablo Orozco-terWengel, Florian J. Alberto, Andreia J. Amaral, Mario Barbato, Filippo Biscarini, Licia Colli, Mafalda Costa, Ino Curik, Solange Duruz, Maja Ferenčaković, Daniel Fischer, Robert Fitak, Linn F. Groeneveld, Stephan J. G. Hall, Olivier Hanotte, Faiz-ul Hassan, Philippe Helsen, Laura Iacolina, Juha Kantanen, Kevin Leempoel, Johannes A. Lenstra, Paolo Ajmone-Marsan, Charles Masembe, Hendrik-Jan Megens, Mara Miele, Marcus Neuditschko, Ezequiel L. Nicolazzi, François Pompanon, Jutta Roosen, Natalia Sevane, Anamarija Smetko, Anamaria Štambuk, Ian Streeter, Sylvie Stucki, China Supakorn, Luis Telo Da Gama, Michèle Tixier-Boichard, Daniel Wegmann, and Xiangjiang Zhan
2015 Prospects and Challenges for the Conservation of Farm Animal Genomic Resources, 2015–2025. *Frontiers in Genetics* 6. DOI:10.3389/fgene.2015.00314.

Cederberg, Christel, U. Martin Persson, Kristian Neovius, Sverker Molander, and Roland Clift
2011 Including Carbon Emissions from Deforestation in the Carbon Footprint of Brazilian Beef. *Environmental Science & Technology* 45:1773–1779. DOI:10.1021/es103240z.

Chen, Sanyuan, Bang-Zhong Lin, Mumtaz Baig, Bikash Mitra, Ricardo J. Lopes, António M. Santos, David A. Magee, Marisa Azevedo, Pedro Tarroso, Shinji Sasazaki, Stephanie Ostrowski, Osman Mahgoub, Tapas K. Chaudhuri, Ya-ping Zhang, Vânia Costa, Luis J. Royo, Félix Goyache, Gordon Luikart, Nicole Boivin, Dorian Q. Fuller, Hideyuki Mannen, Daniel G. Bradley, and Albano Beja-Pereira
2010 Zebu Cattle Are an Exclusive Legacy of the South Asia Neolithic. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 27:1–6. DOI:10.1093/molbev/msp213.

Davis, Simon
1997 The Agricultural Revolution in England: Some Zooarchaeological Evidence. *Anthropozoologica* 25–26:413–428.

Davis, Simon, Umberto Albarella, Cleia Detry, Catarina Ginja, Anders Götherström, Ana Elisabete Pires, Alfredo Sendim, and Emma Svansson
2018 An Osteometrical Method for Sexing Cattle Bones: The Metacarpals from 17th Century Carnide, Lisbon, Portugal. *Annalen des naturhistorischen Museums in Wien, Serie a* 120(120):367–387.

Davis, Simon, Emma Svensson, Umberto Albarella, Cleia Detry, Anders Götherström, Ana Pires, and Catarina Ginja
2012 Molecular and Osteometric Sexing of Cattle Metacarpals: A Case Study from 15th Century AD Beja, Portugal. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 39:1445–1454.

Degerbøl, Magnus
1963 Prehistoric Cattle in Denmark and Adjacent Areas. In *Man and Cattle*, edited by Arthur E. Mourant and Frederick E. Zeuner, pp. 68–79. Royal Anthropological Institute, London.

Degerbøl, Magnus, and Bent Fredskild
1970 *The Urus (Bos primigenius bojanus) and Neolithic Domesticated Cattle (Bos taurus domesticus linne) in Denmark*. The Royal Danish Academy of Science and Letters, Copenhagen.

FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations)
2011 *Molecular Genetic Characterization of Animal Genetic Resources*. FAO Animal Production and Health Guidelines 9. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome.
2015 *The Second Report on the State of the World's Animal Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture*, edited by B. D. Scherf and D. Pilling. FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture Assessments. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome. https://reliefweb.int/report/world/second-report-state-worlds-animal-genetic-resources-food-and-agriculture.
2016 *The State of Food and Agriculture. Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security*. Rome. https://www.fao.org/3/i6030e/i6030e.pdf.
2019 *Climate Change and the Global Dairy Cattle Sector: The Role of the Dairy Sector in a Low-Carbon Future*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome.

Frantz, Laurent A. F., Daniel G. Bradley, Greger Larson, and Ludovic Orlando
2020 Animal Domestication in the Era of Ancient Genomics. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 21:449–460. DOI:10.1038/s41576-020-0225-0.

Frémondeau, Delphine Pauline Nuviala, and Colin Duval
2017 Pigs and Cattle in Gaul: The Role of Gallic Societies in the Evolution of Husbandry Practices. *European Journal of Archaeology* 20:494–509. DOI:10.1017/eaa.2016.10.

Gillis, Rosalined E., Lenka Kovačiková, Stéphanie Bréhard, Emilie Guthmann, Ivana Vostrovská, Hana Nohálová, Rose-Marie Arbogast, László Domboróczki, Joachim Pechtl, Alexander Anders, Arkadiusz Marciniak, Anne Tresset, and Jean-Denis Vigne
2017 The Evolution of Dual Meat and Milk Cattle Husbandry in Linearbandkeramik Societies. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 284. DOI:10.1098/rspb.2017.0905.

Groot, Maaike
2017 Developments in Animal Husbandry and Food Supply in Roman Germania Inferior. *European Journal of Archaeology* 20:451–471. DOI:10.1017/eaa.2016.31.

Groot, Maaike, and Sabine Deschler-Erb
2015 Market Strategies in the Roman Provinces: Different Animal Husbandry Systems Explored by a Comparative Regional Approach. *Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports* 4:447–460. DOI:10.1016/j.jasrep.2015.10.007.

Kovačiková, Lenka, Stephanie Bréhard, Radka Šumberová, Marie Balasse, and Anne Tresset
2012 The New Insights into the Subsistence and Early Farming from Neolithic Settlements in Central Europe: The Archaeozoological Evidence from the Czech Republic. *Archaeofauna* 21:71–97.

Lauwerier, Roel C. G. M.
1988 *Animals in Roman Times in the Dutch Eastern River Area*. Nederlandse Oudheden 12. Project Oostelijk Rivierengebied 1. Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek, Amersfoort.

Legge, A. J.
1981 Aspects of Animal Husbandry. In *Farming Practice in British Prehistory*, edited by Roger Mercer, pp. 169–181. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.

Lepetz, Sébastien
1996 Effets de la romanisation sur l'élevage dans les établissements ruraux du nord de la Gaule: L'exemple de l'augmentation de la stature des animaux domestiques. *Revue archéologique de Picardie: Numéro spécial* 11:317–324.

Loftus, Ronan T., David E. Machugh, Daniel G. Bradley, Paul M. Sharp, and Patrick Cunningham
1994 Evidence for 2 Independent Domestications of Cattle. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 91:2757–2761. DOI:10.1073/pnas.91.7.2757.

McHugo, Gillian P., Michael J. Dover, and David E. MacHugh
2019 Unlocking the Origins and Biology of Domestic Animals Using Ancient DNA and Paleogenomics. *BMC Biology* 17(1):98. DOI:10.1186/s12915-019-0724-7.

Njuki, Jemimah, and P. C. Sanginja
2013 *Women, Livestock Ownership and Markets: Bridging the Gender Gap in Eastern and Southern Africa.* Routledge, London.

Opio, Carolyn, Pierre Gerber, A. Mottet, A. Falcucci, G. Tempio, M. Macleod, T. Vellinga, B. Henderson, and H. Steinfeld
2013 *Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Ruminant Supply Chains—A Global Life Cycle Assessment.* Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome.

Overton, Nick J., and Yannis Hamilakis
2013 A Manifesto for Social Zooarchaeology: Swans and Other Beings in the Mesolithic. *Archaeological Dialogues* 20:159–173. DOI:10.1017/S1380203813000214.

Pereira, Alison, Sébastien Nomade, Pierre Voinchet, Jean Jacques Bahain, Christophe Falguères, Henri Garon, David Lefèvre, Jean Paul Raynal, Vincent Scao, and Marcello Piperno
2015 The Earliest Securely Dated Hominin Fossil in Italy and Evidence of Acheulian Occupation during Glacial MIS 16 at Notarchirico (Venosa, Basilicata, Italy): Earliest Acheulean Occupation of Italy. *Journal of Quaternary Science* 30:639–650. DOI:10.1002/jqs.2809.

Pigière, Fabienne
2017 The Evolution of Cattle Husbandry Practices in the Roman Period in Gallia Belgica and Western Germania Inferior. *European Journal of Archaeology* 20:472–493.

Pitt, Daniel, Natalia Sevane, Ezequiel L. Nicolazzi, David E. MacHugh, Stephen D. E. Park, Licia Colli, Rodrigo Martinez, Michael W. Bruford, and Pablo Orozco-TerWengel
2019 Domestication of Cattle: Two or Three Events? *Evolutionary Applications* 12(1):123–136. DOI:10.1111/eva.12674.

Russell, Nerissa
2011 *Social Zooarchaeology: Humans and Animals in Prehistory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Sauvet, Georges, and Andrés Wlodarczyk
2000 L'art pariétal, miroir des sociétés paléolithiques. *Zephyrus: Revista de prehistoria y arqueología* 53:215–238.

Scheu, Amelie, Adam Powell, Ruth Bollongino, Jean-Denis Vigne, Anne Tresset, Canan Çakırlar, Norbert Benecke, and Joachim Burger
2015 The Genetic Prehistory of Domesticated Cattle from Their Origin to the Spread across Europe. *BMC Genetics* 16:1–11. DOI:10.1186/s12863-015-0203-2.

Teichert, Manfred
1984 Size Variation in Cattle from Germania Romana and Germania Libera. In *Animals and Archaeology 4: Husbandry in Europe*, edited by Caroline Grigson and Juliet Clutton-Brock, pp. 93–103. British Archaeological Reports International Series 227. BAR, Oxford.

Trentacoste, Angelica, Ariadna Nieto-Espinet, and Silvia Valenzuela-Lamas
2018 Pre-Roman Improvements to Agricultural Production: Evidence from Livestock Husbandry in Late Prehistoric Italy. *PLOS ONE* 13:e0208109. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0208109.

Troy, Christopher S., David E. MacHugh, Jillian F. Bailey, David A. Magee, Ronan T. Loftus, Patrick Cunningham, Andrew T. Chamberlain, Bryan C. Sykes, and Daniel G. Bradley
2001 Genetic Evidence for Near-Eastern Origins of European Cattle. *Nature* 410:1088–1091. DOI:10.1038/35074088.

Valenzuela-Lamas, Silvia, and Umberto Albarella
2017 Animal Husbandry across the Western Roman Empire: Changes and Continuities.

European Journal of Archaeology 20:402–415. DOI:10.1017/eaa.2017.22.

Verdugo, Marta Pereira, Victoria E. Mullin, Amelie Scheu, Valeria Mattiangeli, Kevin G. Daly, Pierpaolo Maisano Delser, Andrew J. Hare, Joachim Burger, Matthew J. Collins, Ron Kehati, Paula Hesse, Deirdre Fulton, Eberhard W. Sauer, Fatemeh A. Mohaseb, Hossein Davoudi, Roya Khazaeli, Johanna Lhuillier, Claude Rapin, Saeed Ebrahimi, Mutalib Khasanov, S. M. Farhad Vahidi, David E. MacHugh, Okan Ertuğrul, Chaido Koukouli-Chrysanthaki, Adamantios Sampson, George Kazantzis, Ioannis Kontopoulos, Jelena Bulatovic, Ivana Stojanović, Abdesalam Mikdad, Norbert Benecke, Jörg Linstädter, Mikhail Sablin, Robin Bendrey, Lionel Gourichon, Benjamin S. Arbuckle, Marjan Mashkour, David Orton, Liora Kolska Horwitz, Matthew D. Teasdale, and Daniel G. Bradley

2019 Ancient Cattle Genomics, Origins, and Rapid Turnover in the Fertile Crescent. *Science* 365(6449):173–176. DOI: 10.1126/science.aav1002.

Wright, Elizabeth

2021 Investigating Cattle Husbandry in the Swiss Neolithic Using Different Scales of Temporal Precision: Potential Early Evidence for Deliberate Livestock "Improvement" in Europe. *Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences* 13:Article no. 36. DOI:10.1007/s12520-020-01252-6.

Section 1

Prehistoric Human-Cattle Interactions: Aurochs Hunting and Early Husbandry




Illustration by Pedro Salvador Mendes

1 | The Aurochs in the European Pleistocene and Early Holocene

Origins, Evidence and Body Size

Elizabeth Wright*

Abstract

This chapter presents an overview of osteological evidence for the aurochs in the European Pleistocene and early Holocene. Some of the most important aurochs assemblages from Pleistocene and early Holocene Europe are described, from the time of the earliest evidence of this species on the continent, at around 650,000 years ago, through to the end of the Mesolithic period, setting them within their climatic and cultural context. Information on body size is also presented with a reassessment of previous data using new dates for some sites. Limitations are discussed and possible directions for future research proposed.

Keywords

aurochs, Europe, Pleistocene, early Holocene

1.1. Introduction

The aurochs, *Bos primigenius* (Bojanus 1825, previously 1827; see Daszkiewicz and Samojlik 2019) is thought to be the extinct ancestor of modern domesticated cattle (Chaix 1994; Clutton-Brock 1999; Poplin 1983). This large bovid was present across much of Europe, Asia, and Africa from the Middle Pleistocene, and finally went extinct in Poland in AD 1627. Humans have long been fascinated with this animal, perhaps due to its large size and distinctive horns, and we know that human populations were interacting with it from very early times, first through its appearance in faunal assemblages bearing butchery marks at hominin sites, and later through depictions of it in Paleolithic cave art.

The aim of this chapter is to present some of the most important evidence for the aurochs in Europe from the Pleistocene and early Holocene (broadly encompassing the Paleolithic and Mesolithic cultural periods), focusing on origins, distribution, and body size. Some background on taxonomy and identification will also be set out. The aim is not to provide a comprehensive list of all aurochs finds, but some of the most important assemblages will be described and set within their climatic and cultural context. Current information on body size is presented with a reassessment of previous data using updated dating information for some Pleistocene sites. An in-depth discussion on the topic of cave art is not included here, as this is dealt with in another chapter of this volume (Fritz et al., chapter 9). At the end of the chapter, I reflect on the limitations of the current evidence and suggest possible directions for future research.[1]

1 N.B. Pleistocene dates are provided in years before present (BP), whereas Holocene dates are provided as cal BC.

* *Department of Classics and Archaeology, University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD, UK, and BioArCh, University of York, Environment Building, Wentworth Way, Heslington, York YO10 5NG (lizzie.wright1@nottingham.ac.uk)*

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5913/archbio04.001

1.2. Taxonomy

The genus *Bos* falls within the family Bovidae, the subfamily Bovinae and the tribe Bovini. Extant members of the tribe Bovini include a number of wild species, including the American bison (*Bison bison*), the European bison or wisent (*Bison bonasus*), the wild yak (*Bos mutus*), the Gaur (*Bos gaurus*), the African buffalo (*Syncerus caffer*), and the Kouprey (*Bos sauveli)*, as well as a number of domestic species, including the domestic water buffalo (*Bubalus bubalis*), the domestic yak (*Bos grunniens*), and domestic cattle of which there are two recognized forms: the humpless taurine cattle of Europe, West Africa, and northern Asia, *Bos taurus*, and the humped zebu cattle of southern Asia and Africa, *Bos indicus* (nomenclature according to Gentry et al. 2004).

The origin of *Bos primigenius*, and indeed the whole of the genus *Bos,* continues to be an issue of debate. The current earliest fossil evidence for *Bos* is in the African Pliocene, where it was represented by the species *B. turkanensis* (Harris 1991; Martínez-Navarro et al. 2007). In the early Pleistocene two species have been recognized: *B. oldowayensis* and *B. buiaensis*, with the latter present into the Middle Pleistocene. Both of these species are present in northeastern Africa and the Middle East (Martínez-Navarro et al. 2010). A cranium at Wadi Sarrat (northeastern Tunisia) is thought to be the earliest record of *B. primigenius*, dated to around 700,000 years ago (Martínez-Navarro et al. 2014), shortly before its spread into Europe at the end of the early Middle Pleistocene (Martínez-Navarro et al. 2007). The first European record of *Bos* (*B. primigenius*) was in Italy at Venosa-Notarchirico at around 650,000 years ago (Cassoli et al. 1999; Lefèvre et al. 2010; Pereira et al. 2015). An older record of *Bos*, assigned *B. galerianus*, at Ponte Galeria (also in Italy) at around 800,000–700,000 years ago (Petronio and Sardella 1998) has been reassigned as *Hemibos* (Martínez-Navarro and Palombo 2004).

The relationship between the Indian form, *B. acutifrons* (Lydekker 1878) and *B. primigenius*, is still unclear, due to debates around its date of origin. This species is often considered an ancestor of *B. primigenius*, due to similarities in its frontal and occipital anatomy (Haowen et al. 2018), and was initially thought to have originated from the early Pleistocene Pinjor formation (Pilgrim 1939), which has a date range of 2,580,000–600,000 years ago for its mammalian fauna (Nanda 2008). This has led to many suggesting an Indian origin for *B. primigenius*. However, it has also been suggested that it actually has post-Villafranchian origins, and comes from the sandy layers of the Tavi formation in the Boulder conglomerate in Italy, dated to the Middle Pleistocene (Azzaroli and Napoleona 1982). In this case *B. acutifrons* could be a descendent of *B. buiaensis,* the African species mentioned above, indicating African rather than Indian origins for the genus *Bos* (Martínez-Navarro et al. 2010). This is, of course, an issue that continues to be debated and our understanding continues to evolve as new material is recovered. *B. primigenius* has only been recorded in the early Middle Pleistocene in southern Europe and finally reached northern Europe in Marine Isotope Stage 11 (Currant 1989; Schreve 2001).

Bos is thought to have spread from Africa into Eurasia as part of an Early/Middle Pleistocene transition "out of Africa" dispersal event (Martínez-Navarro and Rabinovich 2011) likely related to a shift to Middle Pleistocene colder climates (Shackleton 1995). This event also saw the dispersal into Eurasia of other species such as the spotted hyena, *Crocuta crocuta*, (García 2003), the elephant, (*Palaeoloxodon antiquus)*, the lion, (*Panthera leo)*, and the leopard (*Panthera pardus*) (Lister 2004; Sala 1990). The dispersal of *Bos* into Eurasia took place around the same time as the dispersal out of Africa of developed Acheulean technology and *Homo heidelbergensis* (Martínez-Navarro et al. 2007, 2010).

Three subspecies of *B. primigenius* have been suggested, based on differences in horn shape and body size in different geographical areas, although these are not universally recognized: *B. primigenius primigenius* has been assigned to the form found in Europe and the Middle East, *B. primigenius namadicus* to the form found in South Asia, and *B. primigenius opisthonomous/mauritanicus* to the North African group (Epstein and Mason 1984; Grigson 1980; Payne 1970).

The phylogeny of the tribe Bovini continues to be debated, and the relationship between *Bos* and *Bison* is especially problematic (see, e.g., Duvernois 1990; Grange et al. 2018; Martínez-Navarro et al. 2007; Massilani et al. 2016; Soubrier et al. 2016). Individuals from these genera are able to interbreed and produce fertile female hybrids, but sterile males (Krasińska 1971; Życzyński et al. 2019), leading some to argue that they should in fact be included as the

same species or at least the same genus (Gee 1993; Grange et al. 2018). The close genetic relationship between *Bos* and *Bison* is reflected by their close morphology, which can lead to identification issues for zooarchaeologists and palaeontologists.

1.2.1. Issues of Identification: Bos *versus* Bison

Although *Bos* and *Bison* have distinctive cranial morphologies, differences between postcranial elements are far less clear cut. Additionally, the morphological variation and sexual dimorphism within both genera, as well as the fragmentary nature of most assemblages, means that the distinction of postcranial remains can often be very difficult, and in some cases impossible.

Two species of bison coexisted with the aurochs at different times during the time it lived in Europe. The longer-horned *Bison priscus*, also known as the steppe bison is the older form, thought to have become extinct in Europe at the end of the Pleistocene (Pfeiffer 1999), with just a few surviving in Siberia into the Holocene (Boeskorov et al. 2016; Kirillova et al. 2015). The shorter-horned *Bison bonasus*, often referred to as the European bison, or "wisent" is thought to have been the Holocene species (although see Grange et al. 2018, which discusses earlier genetic evidence for this species), which still has representatives living today across areas of eastern Europe.

Bison priscus had a wide distribution across Europe, from Spain to Russia, and also traveled further east across Siberia and across the Bering Strait into North America (Kahlke 1994). *Bison priscus* appears to have been more ecologically flexible than *B. primigenius*; it was able to cope with harsher climate and increased humidity and appears in both glacial and interglacial faunas. *Bison bonasus* has always had a smaller distribution area than *Bison priscus*. In most parts of Europe *Bison bonasus* was also rare compared to *B. primigenius*, except in some areas of Eastern Europe.

Of the two bison species, *Bison priscus* is the closer in size to *B. primigenius*, and therefore causes more problems in terms of identification. This issue is enhanced by the fact that *Bison priscus* was relatively abundant in the Pleistocene and appears alongside *B. primigenius* at quite a few sites. The distinction between these two species is also further complicated by sexual dimorphism. Many studies have attempted to find reliable morphological characteristics to enable a distinction of the two genera (Bibikova 1958; Brugal, 1983, 1985; Degerbøl and Iversen 1945; Gee 1993; Lehmann 1949; Martin 1987, 1990; Olsen 1960; Reynolds 1939; Sala 1986; Stampfli 1963), however it is clear that, although the same morphological features are discussed repeatedly, the variation displayed is so great that very few are consistently reliable. Additionally, material from Pleistocene large bovids is often highly fragmented, often making distinction even more difficult. As a result, remains from large bovids are often combined into a "*Bos/Bison*" category, meaning that the analysis of the different roles of the two species has been restricted.

1.3. The Aurochs in the Pleistocene and Early Holocene of Europe

During the time that the aurochs was living in Europe, the continent was subject to a number of climatic shifts, which often had a heavy impact on the environment in which it was living. Its survival throughout this period indicates that it was a relatively versatile animal, although it was not able to continue living in very cold conditions. This is particularly clear during the Pleistocene, where it tended to retreat to southern refugial areas such as the Italian and Iberian Peninsulas during glacial periods but then moved north again during interglacials. This section aims to lay out the most important aurochs assemblages dated to the Pleistocene and early Holocene in Europe and set them within their climatic and cultural context.

1.3.1. The Pleistocene

The Pleistocene is split into three stages: The Lower Pleistocene (ca. 2,580,000–774,000 years ago) the Middle Pleistocene (ca. 774,000–129,000 years ago) and the Late or Upper Pleistocene (ca. 129,000–11,000 years ago). The earliest evidence of *Bos* in Europe is therefore in the early Middle Pleistocene.

The arrival of *Bos* should be considered within both its climatic and cultural context. The pattern of climatic change over the last 2–3 million years shows major climatic oscillations between cold glacials and warmer interglacials (Adams et al. 1999), within which there were minor climatic fluctuations involving cold stadial and warm interstadial episodes. Over the past 800,000 years, the global climate has been

fluctuating in a cyclical manner, ranging in length from 80,000–120,000 years, with a large amount of complexity and inconsistency within them (Wanner et al. 2011). These climatic cycles had a profound impact on the environment within Europe, with very cold conditions, particularly in northern areas during glacial periods, making them uninhabitable for many animal and plant species. This seems to have been the case for the aurochs, whose remains do not tend to be found in glacial faunas in Northern Europe. Its presence during glacial times in southern areas such as Italy, Iberia, and Greece indicate that it was retreating to these refugial areas during cold periods (von Koenigswald 2007; Mona et al. 2010).

Culturally, *Bos* arrives in Europe during the Lower Paleolithic, around the same time as the arrival of *Homo heidelbergensis* and Acheulean technology. At several Paleolithic sites aurochs remains are found with butchery marks, indicating their clear exploitation by humans, however in many cases such evidence does not exist. Even at sites where both lithic tools and aurochs remains have been recovered (see below), we often cannot be sure that those remains are the direct result of human exploitation. Additionally, many sites are considered to be the result of carnivore (such as hyena) accumulations, rather than human activity. Assemblages from a diversity of context types have been included here, in part because sites with large numbers of confidently identified aurochs remains from the European Pleistocene are relatively few, but also because excluding those from unclear or nonanthropic contexts presents only part of the picture. Here aurochs finds have been presented according to Marine Isotope Stage (MIS), as these broadly align with the fluctuating climate upon which its dispersal relied so heavily. Some information about the cultural context of the finds is also included where possible.

1.3.1.1. Middle Pleistocene: MIS 16–12 (676,000–478,000 years ago)

The current earliest evidence for *Bos primigenius* in Europe is in the Venosa Basin in Italy, at the site of Venosa-Notarchirico, around 650,000 years ago, during MIS 16 (Cassoli et al. 1999; Lefèvre et al. 2010; Pereira et al. 2015) (Figure 1.1). Its movement out of Northern Africa, alongside a number of other species such as the hyena and lion, is concurrent with a change to colder climates in the Middle Pleistocene compared to the early Pleistocene (Martínez-Navarro and Rabinovich 2011). Very little data are available from this early period, making it difficult to assess the role that *B. primigenius* had in the lives of the hominins that were living alongside it. However, Acheulean technology was also found at this site and others in the Venosa Basin, as well as hominin remains identified as *Homo heidelbergensis* (Pereira et al. 2015). Other previously identified *B. primigenius* finds from this period have subsequently been refuted. For example, a specimen at the site of Ponte Galeria, also in Italy, dated to 800,000–700,000 years ago (Ambrosetti 1967), was later reassigned as bison (Sala 1986), and evidence in Spain about 700,000 years ago at the site of Cúllar Baza (Estévez and Saña 1999) seems to have been misreported, as in the original site report (Bustos 1976) the only large bovid listed is *Bison priscus*.

1.3.1.2. MIS 11–9 (424,000–300,000 years ago)

During the second half of the Middle Pleistocene, from around MIS 11 onward we see the first evidence for *B. primigenius* moving into Northern Europe. The period covering MIS 11 to MIS 9 coincides roughly with the end of the Lower Paleolithic, in cultural terms, and Acheulean tools continue to be found alongside aurochs remains or in nearby localities. Both MIS 11 (ca. 424,000–374,000 years ago) and MIS 9 (337,000–300,000 years ago) represent some of the warmest interglacials of the last 800,000 years (Lang and Wolff 2011), which perhaps provides some explanation for the increased geographical range of the aurochs, including its movement into northern areas. The fauna from both of these interglacials is similar, and in some cases it is difficult to assign sites to one or the other if stratigraphic information is unclear.

In Britain, the first evidence for *B. primigenius* is during MIS 11 in the Thames Valley, at Swanscombe. This area of the Thames Valley in Essex has yielded some of the largest Pleistocene aurochs assemblages in Northern Europe, particularly during the period spanning from MIS 11–7. In Germany the earliest evidence is also from MIS 11, at Steinheim-an-der-Murr (Adam 1954), where fluvial sequences are well correlated with those from Swanscombe (Schreve and Bridgland 2002). At Swanscombe Acheulean technology has also been found dating to this period (White et al. 2018), but not at Steinheim, although tool technology has been found at other sites with a similar date (Haidle and Pawlik 2010).



Figure 1.1. Map of Middle Pleistocene sites mentioned in the text.

1. Venosa-Notarchirico
2. Ponte Galeria
3. Cúllar Baza
4. Thames Valley sites: Swanscombe, Grays Thurrock, Ilford
5. Steinheim-an-der-Murr
6. Nice sites: Terra Amata, Lazaret Cave
7. Lunel-Viel
8. Solana del Zamborino
9. Ambrona
10. Castel di Guido
11. Biache-Saint-Vaast
12. Petralona

In Southern Europe there is evidence from France, Italy, and Spain, such as at Terra Amata, and Lunel-Viel in southeast France (Brugal 1984, 1985; Valensi 2009), Solana del Zamborino (Botella et al. 1975) and Ambrona (Soto et al. 2001) in Spain, and Castel di Guido in Italy (Saccà 2009; Sala and Barbi 1996). At the majority of these sites both aurochs remains and Acheulean tools have been reported. There has been some debate over the date of Solano del Zamborino, with suggestions ranging from 760,000 (Scott and Gibert 2009) to 200,000 years ago (Botella et al. 1975), but the most recent study has given it a date from 480,000–300,000 years ago (Álvarez-Posada et al. 2017), which coincides with the period encompassing MIS 11–9.

The assemblage from Castel di Guido is of real importance due to its large size. This site is also one of very few open-air Middle Pleistocene sites with fossil fauna present alongside both hominin remains and Acheulean tools, some of which are made from bone (Mallegni et al. 1981, 1983; Mallegni and Radmilli 1988; Radmilli et al. 1980). This site was previously assigned to MIS 9, but recent work has now suggested that it originates from MIS 11 (Ceruleo et al. 2019; Petronio et al. 2019). Extensive taphonomic work has been undertaken on the fauna from Castel di Guido, which has confirmed evidence for the deliberate processing of animal carcasses by local hominins, although it is still a matter of debate if they represent the remains of hunting or scavenging behavior (Boschian and Saccà 2010, 2015; Saccà 2009, 2012). The faunal remains at the site of Ambrona in Spain were also difficult to interpret in terms of clear hunting or scavenging behavior, but it is clear that animal carcasses were also being deliberately processed here (Villa et al. 2005).

In Northern Europe there are large assemblages from MIS 9, one example of which is at Grays Thurrock, in the Thames Valley, Britain (Morris 1836), which has a rich fossil assemblage including a relatively large number of aurochs remains. Many of these remains also display cut marks (Schreve personal communication), indicating that they were processed by hominins, but a thorough modern analysis of this assemblage has not yet been published.