

2007

EPV NOTES 01-58 Burial Analysis 2007 PLG

Pamela Geller

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.kenyon.edu/honduras>



Part of the Archaeological Anthropology Commons

Recommended Citation

Geller, Pamela, "EPV NOTES 01-58 Burial Analysis 2007 PLG" (2007). *Four Valleys Archive*. Paper 95916.
<https://digital.kenyon.edu/honduras/95916>

This Field Notes is brought to you for free and open access by the Anthropology at Digital Kenyon: Research, Scholarship, and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Four Valleys Archive by an authorized administrator of Digital Kenyon: Research, Scholarship, and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact noltj@kenyon.edu.

PAREP 2007
Burial Analysis by PLG [#6]
2-3 July 2007

Op 01/58/01
11 June 2007

Burial was found during the course of construction. A townsperson, Eli Surrian, was putting in the foundation for a new home and came across the human remains. His house is currently located NW of El Paraíso (S-004), Patio 4. Human remains were presented to Ellen Bell and Santiago Escobar Morales as fragments and without context or associated artifacts. They were found approximately 80cm bgs. While it is possible the human remains are modern, it is more likely they are ancient in date given that they were found in the vicinity of a well-crafted chert biface.

PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

POSTCRANIAL

- Scapula fragment – this appears to be non-human. The anterior side seems to flat with little concavity.
- Rib fragment about 3cm long; there also seems to be a bit of fragment that looks like the angle of a rib
 - Body near the sternal end as smooth and flat
 - No observable pathology no healed fracture or porosity
- Two vertebrae neural arches
 - The two halves may fuse as late as the seventh year (Bass 1994:99)
 - Look cervical
 - Just superior articular processes; no spinous process, inferior articular process, or body
- Three Metacarpal? Metatarsal? – there are no articular surfaces
 - Leaning towards metacarpal as seem smaller than metatarsals
- LONG BONES
 - Shaft of distal fibula L?
 - No observable pathology
 - While no ends were found this fibula does not have a sub-adult feel to it
 - Even though the proximal end was missing and the distal was badly eroded this fragment measured 15.9cm
 - Nutrient foramen observed
 - Shaft fragment of radius in two parts
 - Measures about 8cm
 - Proximal? end
 - Shaft fragment of radius
 - Measures 3.5cm
 - Poorly preserved
 - Shaft fragment of ulna in two parts
 - Proximal? without end
 - Shaft fragment of ulna

- Shaft of femur
 - L? Proximal?
 - Round in cross-section
- Shaft of tibia
 - Poor preservation
 - Possible nutrient foramen
- Shaft of tibia
 - Teardrop in cross-section
- Shaft of humerus in two parts – about 6cm in length
 - Distal?
 - No observable nutrient foramen (which is usually located in the center 1/3)
 - Poorly preserved
 - Diameter of shaft about midsection is 4.5cm
- Assorted long fragments bagged together when fits were found
 - Nutrient foramen on one long fragment

CRANIAL

- Parietal fragments (2) – these appear to be the only cranial fragments recovered
 - Could be anterior or middle fragments because is thin
 - External surface of smaller fragment has uneven surface that may be preservation (photo)
- Dentition – 8 teeth total; all adult
 - 4 incisors
 - LI¹ – root tip just a pinprick open still
 - This is 9±24 months
 - There also seems to be the lightest of pitting on this tooth's labial surface
 - The root is about 1.35cm long
 - LI₂ (photo)
 - LI₁
 - Pathology – slight calculus on all
 - RI₁ – minimal dental wear (3rd to last photo taken)
 - 1 canine
 - LC₁ – root ¾ of the way complete
 - This is 9±24 months
 - 1 premolar (last photo taken)
 - LP₁ – root 2/3 of the way complete
 - This is 9±24 months
 - 2 molars
 - L and R M₁ with Y-5 pattern (photo)
 - root 2/3 of the way complete
 - This is 5±16 months (first lower molar roots seem to be complete by 6±24 months according to Ubelaker (1978))

2 July 2007 - However, there is something strange about the development of the teeth. The first molars are fully developed by 7ish according to Ubelaker. But at the same age the upper first incisors are not fully developed. This does not occur until around 10. For the individual in question, the molars have roots that are only 2/3 complete but the upper incisor is entirely complete; the lower canine and first premolar also do not have complete roots. Maybe I am mistaking this upper incisor for an adult when it really is deciduous. Or maybe the person's age range is 6-10 yo. What is going on?

3 July 2007 – after going back and reexamining the teeth, the teeth the molar looks a bit young still. I would put this individual at between 5-9, though leaning towards the end of that range. Thus, a preliminary analysis determines that this individual was a sub-adult ranging in age from 5-9 yo at the time of death. Dental development was the best indicator of age. The long bones that are present are shafts; no distal epiphyses were recovered. This could be a consequence of preservation, development, or both. There are also no observable markers of pathology with the exception of slight calculus on the incisors. Human remains were fragmentary and about 25% of the individual is represented.