



## Does chamber size matter? Differential bone preservation in the roman catacomb of Sts Peter and Marcellinus (1st-3rd C. AD)

Kevin Salesse, Élise Dufour, Antoine Zazzo, Matthieu Lebon, Philippe Blanchard, Jaroslav Brůžek, Dominique Castex

### ► To cite this version:

Kevin Salesse, Élise Dufour, Antoine Zazzo, Matthieu Lebon, Philippe Blanchard, et al.. Does chamber size matter? Differential bone preservation in the roman catacomb of Sts Peter and Marcellinus (1st-3rd C. AD). 7th International Bone Diagenesis Meeting, Oct 2013, Lyon, France. 2013. hal-03330752

**HAL Id: hal-03330752**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03330752>**

Submitted on 1 Sep 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# DOES CHAMBER SIZE MATTER? DIFFERENTIAL BONE PRESERVATION IN THE ROMAN CATACOMB OF STS PETER AND MARCELLINUS (1<sup>ST</sup>-3<sup>RD</sup> c. AD)

Kevin SALESSE<sup>1</sup>, Élise DUFOUR<sup>2</sup>, Antoine ZAZZO<sup>2</sup>, Matthieu LEBON<sup>3</sup>, Philippe BLANCHARD<sup>1,4</sup>, Jaroslav BRŮŽEK<sup>1</sup> and Dominique CASTEX<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> UMR 5199 PACEA « De la Préhistoire à l'Actuel : Culture, Environnement et Anthropologie », CNRS, Université de Bordeaux, 33400 Talence, France


<sup>2</sup> UMR 7209 « Archéozoologie, Archéobotanique : sociétés, pratiques et environnements », CNRS MNHN, 75005 Paris, France

<sup>3</sup> UMR 7194 « Histoire naturelle de l'Homme préhistorique », CNRS MNHN, 75005 Paris, France

<sup>4</sup> INRAP, 37000 Tours, France

<sup>5</sup> Department of anthropology and human genetics, Charles University, 12000 Prague 2, Czech Republic

Contact: k.salesse@pacea.u-bordeaux1.fr



Two principal parameters control the preservation of skeletal tissues in archaeological contexts: time and burial environment. However, in exceptional cases, when the anthropic accumulation is particularly rapid, the parameter of time can be ignored and a focus on the influence of taphonomic process on the bone preservation can be undertaken.

## INTRODUCTION & OBJECTIVE

### Does size matter?

The central area of the catacomb of Sts Peter and Marcellinus is one of these rare sites allowing this kind of investigation since all individuals buried in the different chambers of this sector died more or less contemporaneously. Before performing stable isotope analysis ( $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ ,  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ ,  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ ) to reconstruct the life histories of these individuals, we have explored the diagenesis influence on bone preservation according to the size chambers via different approaches.

## THE CATACOMB OF STS PETER & MARCELLINUS (ROME, 1<sup>ST</sup>-3<sup>RD</sup> c. AD)

### CENTRAL AREA FEATURES

- ✓ 7 funeral chambers corresponding to probably 4 multiple graves and containing several hundreds of individuals (Fig. 1)
- ✓ Highly-developed funerary treatment (Fig. 1): recalling embalming => exogenous practices?
  - ✓ Presence of expensive grave goods: high socio-economic status for most individuals?

Photo: Archeovision



Fig. 1: General view of the burial deposits in the chambers X84 (left) and X80/T16 (right)

### CHAMBER FEATURES

- ✓ Large chambers: X81, X83 and X84 (Fig. 2 & 3)
- ✓ Small chambers: X78/T15, X80/T16 and X82/T18 (Fig. 2)
- ✓ Floor levels of large chambers lower than those of small ones (Fig. 2)

Photo: D. Gliksmann



Fig. 3: Inside view of the chamber X83





Fig. 2: Volume reconstruction of the funeral chambers in zenithal (right) and lateral (left) views




CAD: G. Sachau-Carcel

### CORPUS

A total of 128 individuals were sampled for stable isotope analysis ( $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ ,  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  &  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ ) on bone collagen and bone apatite (Fig. 2)

## BONE APATITE PRESERVATION – $^{14}\text{C}$ DATING

### Inter-chamber comparison – Dating of collagen-carbonate pairs




### ✓ Small chambers ≠ Large chambers

- ✓ Small chambers:  $^{14}\text{C}$  dates of bone apatite are systematically younger indicating a possible contamination of the mineral phase
- ✓ Large chambers: no difference between  $^{14}\text{C}$  dates of bone collagen and apatite are observed

Fig. 8:  $^{14}\text{C}$  differences measured on collagen-carbonate pairs

### Intra-chamber comparison – Example of X80/T16



CAD: G. Sachau-Carcel





Fig. 9: Probability distribution (95.4%) of calibrated  $^{14}\text{C}$  dates obtained for skeletons from different layers of the small chamber X80/T16

- ✓ Maximal  $F^{14}\text{C}$  difference (collagen-carbonate)  $\approx 1.4\%$
- ✓ Contamination of  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values of the bone apatite samples varying from 0 to 0.3‰ (estimated from diagenetic pool)

## COLLAGEN PRESERVATION – DIAGENESIS INDICATORS



Well preserved  
Poorly preserved

Fig. 4: Collagen preservation according to the different burial chambers

### ✓ Small chambers ≠ Large chambers

- ✓ No variation in bone collagen preservation according to (1) the types of bone sampled and (2) the layers of osseous deposits in each chamber
- ✓ No correlation between isotopic values and bone collagen indicators

## BONE APATITE PRESERVATION – CONVENTIONAL INDICATORS




Fig. 5: Scatterplot of %Collagen versus %loss of matter during chemical treatment of apatite for all individuals

### ✓ Small chambers ≠ Large chambers

- ✓ No variation in bone apatite preservation according to (1) the types of anatomical part sampled and (2) the layers of osseous deposits in each chamber
- ✓ No correlation between isotopic values and bone apatite diagenesis indicators





Fig. 6: Boxplots representing mean  $\pm$  1SD, min and max values for each chamber

## BONE APATITE PRESERVATION – FTIR ANALYSIS



### ✓ Small chambers ≠ Large chambers

- ✓ Small chambers: bone samples have undergone an intense recrystallization and carbonate loss
- ✓ Large chambers: bone samples have undergone an important recrystallization and carbonate loss (less than small ones)

Fig. 7: IRFS versus  $\text{CO}_2/\text{PO}_4$  measured on pretreated bone apatite

The different analyses performed showed that:

- ✓ Bone samples have undergone diagenetic alteration but diagenesis influence remains limited
- ✓ The difference in bone preservation are not related to the type of anatomical part or the stratigraphic layer

Despite a differential bone preservation according to the size chambers, no significant changes of biogenic isotopic signature was observed. Stable isotopic values can be used to reconstruct the diet and mobility patterns

## DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

### Yes, size does matter!

- Human bone degradation in the central area was possibly accelerated by:
  - ✓ streaming on the wall (condensation, rains, etc.)
- ✓ trampling by grave diggers, families of deceases and/or pilgrims particularly along the catacomb walls

These processes could result in differential preservation according to the size chambers, affecting the overall chamber in the small chambers and only the periphery (along the walls) in the large ones