

buried Late Glacial sites, particularly if they are in regions of known sites such as South Devon or Northern Somerset/Avon.

Bearing in mind the above comments it is very pleasing to note the interim report by Lewis on the work carried out at Three Ways Wharf, Uxbridge. Earlier research had indicated the presence of early Flandrian sites in the Colne Valley, and an appropriate strategy was employed to investigate the area. The scatters of lithic and faunal material that were eventually uncovered make it potentially one of the key sites in Britain for understanding the changes taking place during the transition from the late Devensian to the early Flandrian. Having stated that, it is not surprising to find Uxbridge discussed by Barton in his paper on exactly this subject. Barton's contribution undoubtedly represents a major advance in establishing the changing nature of lithic assemblages around 10,000BP. It should be remembered, however, that Barton is forced to extrapolate from the evidence of only 12 sites. This lack of sites is even more striking if the two radiocarbon compressions discussed by Becker and Kromer are taken into account.

The paper by Jacobi is, for the lithic specialist, one of the two key papers presented in the volume (the other being Barton's). Jacobi considers the term 'Creswellian', first proposed by Garrod in 1926, with special reference to the sites at Creswell Crags and Cheddar Gorge. Jacobi's conclusion is that use of the term 'Creswellian' as synonym for the British Later Upper Palaeolithic is no longer valid. There are certainly a group of sites that can be linked by the presence of 'trapezoidal side-blades' ('Cheddar points'), but these now seem likely to be one aspect of a typological and technological diversity current at the time. Jacobi therefore maintains that the term 'Creswellian' should be used to describe a specific industry. There certainly seems to be a strong case for describing assemblages purely in terms of their typological and technological features in order to understand the overlapping distributions in time and space of the various traits.

The last paper to mention is that by Speth concerning the implications of nutritional constraints on Late Glacial hunter-gatherers. As he says "most studies of prehistoric foraging adaptations assume that protein, especially the protein from animals, was the single most important nutrient and that foraging strategies were primarily directed towards maximising the acquisition of meat". This however may not in fact be the case, as diets containing an excess of protein can have serious detrimental effects. A prolonged diet involving a protein intake that represents more than 50% of the daily caloric intake can cause liver and kidney impairments as well as other problems. The human body appears to be severely limited in the rate at which it can effectively metabolise protein. Near recent or modern hunter-gatherers have tended to overcome this problem by selectively seeking out fatty meat and marrow (see Speth for references). Similar

strategies to deal with this nutritional constraint would have been employed by hunter-gatherers of the Late Glacial in Europe, and Speth discusses what these might have been. This has important implications when attempting to reconstruct subsistence patterns as well as directly interpreting traces found on archaeological sites.

In this review I have unashamedly touched on those papers that have caught my attention, or which I think are of the greatest importance to lithic studies. Another reviewer would have almost certainly highlighted a different selection of papers given the broad range of topics covered in the volume. It is quite clear that these conference proceedings represent a major contribution to Late Glacial studies not only in Britain but in the whole of Northern Europe. Given the relative dearth of books dealing with this period it is almost certainly going to become one of those classic works that are so eagerly sought after by students in second-hand bookshops long after it is out of print.

References

- Barton, N. 1990. The en éperon technique in the British Late Upper Palaeolithic. *Lithics* 11, 31-33.
- Campbell, J.B. 1986. Hiatus and continuity in the British Upper Palaeolithic: a view from the Antipodes. In Roe, D.A. (ed) *Studies in the Upper Palaeolithic of Britain and Northwest Europe* (Oxford, BAR S296), 7-42.
- Garrod, D.A.E. 1926. *The Upper Palaeolithic Age in Britain* (Oxford, Clarendon Press).
- Wheeler, R.E.M. 1925. *Prehistoric and Roman Wales* (Oxford).

NOT JUST A BOOK ABOUT NOMADS

Nomads in Archaeology by Roger Cribb. Cambridge New Studies in Archaeology. 1991. 253pp £35.00

A. J. Schofield

A historical perspective

Occasionally (and, sadly, all too infrequently) a book or research paper comes along which challenges us to review the way we analyse and interpret data, whether artefacts, artefact collections, artefact distributions or the cultural context within which any of the above occur. This, of

course, is progress and, as progress, it can and often will involve a radical review of methodology, theory or both. Within archaeology as a whole, David Clarke's *Analytical Archaeology*, and Lewis and Sally Binford's *New Perspectives in Archaeology*, both published in 1968, had a major and profound influence on the way the past was understood and researched (Shennan 1989). Subsequently various papers (many by Binford) have appeared which further develop these themes: Binford's various "Greatest Hits" collections contain many of these and certainly reference the best of the rest.

One of the more influential contributions relevant to lithic studies and how lithic distributions are understood (at least beyond the level of recording and artefact analysis) was produced by Foley (1981a; 1981b) over a decade ago. In his off-site model, Foley developed the notion of human behaviour being spatially continuous rather than confined to specific places or "sites". These arguments (expressed most succinctly in his 1981b article) have been widely used in survey methodology and extensively quoted in survey reports and related literature covering all periods. Yet how frequently are such works used by lithics analysts, those whose specialism will determine the value and validity of survey or excavation results and their influence on land-use models, settlement distributions and intra-site spatial behaviour? Infrequently I suspect. To this end, I pose a series of questions: Are such references regarded as *relevant*? Or is their relevance seen as peripheral to lithic studies? What types of reference or source material do lithic analysts commonly use? Should we be reading more widely and making ourselves more aware of the behavioural context within which lithic artefacts occur?

Presumably, for example, lithics specialists involved in, say, sourcing, see a relevance in reading Binford's various studies of Nunamiut procurement strategies (to use one of many examples)? I would argue that the relevance here is considerable: the patterns of procurement are a reflection of large-scale land-use strategies, the dynamics of which are studied most comprehensively and, arguably, most effectively through ethno-archaeological research. Similarly those interested in use-wear and its behavioural implications at either intra- or inter-site levels, would presumably find many of the papers in recent edited volumes by Gamble and Boismier (1991) and Kroll and Price (1991) of relevance? Take Boismier's paper (1991): this considers the extent to which a sexual division of labour is visible through the analysis of material remains from middens and dwellings in a sub-Arctic village. Similarly, Whitelaw's (1991) paper explores the relationship between site arrangements among foraging communities and social behaviour under environmental selection. But how often will these references be cited (or even read) as theoretical background to the preparation of a lithics report relating to intra-site patterning on a Mesolithic habitation site?

As a crude measure of this (lack of) awareness, an analysis of how

frequently contributors to *Lithics* have used some "key" references was conducted. The results may, of course, be biased or even unfair, as many contributions to *Lithics* are technical or typological and the use (or quotation) of these references would not be relevant in such cases. However the results do appear to tell a story. In eleven volumes containing sixty-four articles or notes, Foley (1981) and Binford (any reference) are each referred to once (both in Schofield 1986!). Furthermore, in the lists of "Recent Publications Relevant to Lithic Studies", neither Foley nor Binford are referenced. Indeed the only occasion where Binford's work is referenced is in Knight's (1990) "Australian Lithic Bibliography" where four references are quoted, and this during a decade when the relevance of Binford's work to lithic studies was arguably at its height.

Although Binford and Foley's references are only a very small sample of those relevant to lithic studies, the results of this simple analysis suggest that certain key references are underused [or at least underquoted] in publications dealing specifically with lithic studies (assuming here that articles published in *Lithics* reflect the nature of lithics publications in general). This implies that, either the references are not being used because lithic studies are too narrowly focussed [i.e. we see the artefacts as important but not their behavioural context]; or the references are being read and discarded on the basis that they have little or no relevance. Both explanations are potentially disturbing (with the proviso relevant to *Lithics* quoted above). There is a third possibility of course, and that is that my perception of what lithic studies should concern bears little relation to that of others. This I doubt, however; take the following quotation:

"It is more important to understand the colluvial sequence from which an industry came, and the landscape in which it was formed, than to know whether the leaf-shaped arrowhead in that assemblage is of Green's type 3A or 3B. It is more important to be familiar with and to contribute to the current balance of evidence for Mesolithic subsistence and settlement than it is to distinguish unhesitatingly between a retouch chip and a debitage chip" (Healy 1989, 52).

I (and I hope many other lithics specialists) share that view. But I do have a concern that we aren't as aware as we should be of the "bigger picture". Related to that is the additional concern that in ten years time the key references of today, some of which are quoted above and one is briefly reviewed below, will be similarly neglected.

"Nomads in Archaeology" IS relevant

In my opening sentence I suggested that contributions [like Foley's] come along occasionally and infrequently and cause us to rethink our approaches to artefacts and human behaviour. Roger Cribb's *Nomads in Archaeology* is the latest and, like those quoted above, will make a substantial contribution to understanding the nature and spatial organisation of prehistoric as well as historic communities. But why a review in *Lithics*?

The book is concerned exclusively with the Near East [in geographical and political terms], it contains no references to flint and only two references to stone artefacts or tools in 229 pages of text. Is it relevant?

Two general statements serve to address this point: First, that for much of later British prehistory, for example the Early Neolithic (Thomas 1991) and Bronze Age periods (Fleming 1971), a nomadic existence has been suggested. Yet we know next to nothing about nomadism as an archaeological concept. Second, we have very little developed Middle Range Theory from which to make the link between the archaeological correlates of a nomadic existence and the meaning of patterning in prehistoric material culture. As lithics form the bulk of material culture for these periods, the issue *should* be of concern and relevance to us. A selection of Cribb's main points and an outline of his methodology illustrates the relevance; the concern must come from within.

Cribb begins with the underlying premise that archaeologists have had great difficulty in pinning down ancient nomads, quoting, for example, Childe's statement that, "pastoralists are not likely to leave many vestiges by which the archaeologist could recognise their presence" (1936, 81). Cribb counters this with one of the most effective and enlightening ethnoarchaeological studies written to date, an attempt, in his own words, to "understand nomadism as a phenomenon, as a system with its own underlying dynamics and its correlates in space and time". For example, (and taking Childe's statement as a yardstick) he noted the following about nomadic culture: first, the structures and features observed in the course of fieldwork *were* recoverable archaeologically; second, that there were distinct levels of organisation which determined the structure and design of campsites, and third, that the pattern was deductible from that is known about the social and economic organisation of pastoral peoples. In short (and this is Cribb's main thesis), the reason why nomadic groups had not been identified in purely archaeological research, was not that they were "invisible" but that the methodology was inappropriate. Indeed, even surveys conducted in areas such as southwest Iran where nomadism is conspicuous today, have generally failed to detect nomad settlements (p68).

So where are we going wrong? Why have we not been able to use lithics to locate and research early nomadic settlement sites? Cribb's book doesn't give the answer although it does contain it in the form of observations regarding material culture, intra-site patterning and the settlement/subsistence system, all of which have clear archaeological correlates. For example, Cribb defines three variables in an attempt to distinguish nomadic material culture:

* the degree to which items exist permanently on a site or are circulated from one site to the next (i.e. FIXTURES vs. PORTABLES).

* the likelihood of items deteriorating through time (i.e. DURABLES vs. PERISHABLES), and

* the value of items, measured in terms of the difficulty or cost of acquiring or replacing them (i.e. VALUABLES vs. EXPENDABLES).

Thus, items which are portable, perishable and valuable (e.g. carpets) will have virtually no archaeological visibility; fixtures which are durable and expendable and of low intrinsic value (e.g. hearths) will be site-specific and highly visible.

Cribb then considers spatial organisation within camp sites and the distribution of material remains likely to result. To achieve this, the author combined observing human behaviour during the sites' occupation with archaeological research in the form of gridded surface collection following abandonment. Quantitative analysis of results from three such sites or groups of sites was conducted and these produced clear and strong indications of both structured deposition among artefact classes and their relationship to the spatial organisation of the sites' inhabitants. General rules do apply here and Cribb develops the notion of a "domestic complex" (Cribb's fig.9.5a) to illustrate this, in particular highlighting the regularities in layout and the clear distinction between living and discard zones. The archaeological implications here are obvious and mirror the results of a large body of ethnographic data relating to many types of social organisation. One graphic illustration (p183) illustrates this point: Cribb suggests that if a nomad campsite were investigated archaeologically and without the ethnographic background (as was the case for example at Tepe Tula' in southwest Iran), the last place one would locate test-pits in order to locate ceramics and household debris would be in the tentsite itself.

Finally, nomadic subsistence and the settlement distribution is assessed in the terms of an "unstable mode of subsistence". Of particular interest here is Cribb's comparison between hunter-gatherer and nomad mobility (pp20-22) and his assessment of the locational requirements of nomad groups and their seasonal variation.

Simple. Material culture, if appropriate questions are asked of it, can and will bear the hallmarks of a nomadic existence. Human behaviour within nomad campsites is highly structured and distinctive; that structure is visible archaeologically and the patterns are recoverable assuming an appropriate methodology is adopted, using, for example, refitting as a means to reconstruct discard behaviour (but cf. Gamble 1991, 17). Settlement systems are equally distinctive so long as we can read the contemporary landscape in the appropriate terms, for example in terms of summer pasture rather than arable potential. Our problem to date is that what was appropriate for studying nomadic society was a virtual unknown, a concern shared in some aspects of forager mobility (Gamble 1991,17).

Cribb's work opens that door and provides the background from which questions, and the field methods necessary to answer them, should now emerge.

Summary

This brief review hardly does Cribb's work justice. Suffice it to say that the significant result was that nomad campsites are structured in a distinctive way, a way that bears the imprint of "an inherently unstable mode of subsistence" (p228) whether in terms of architectural features (Chapter 6), the positioning of tentsites (Chapter 8) or campsite location (Chapter 10). If we are to begin finding (or rather identifying) nomad campsites, for example among lithic scatters (e.g. Schofield forthcoming), we must develop a better understanding of the processes by which their material remains are distributed and the factors which control this distribution (p83). Cribb's book goes far in that direction and deserves a wide and attentive audience. It will be interesting to look back in ten years time, and count the number of times Ali's Camp, Sariaydin Yayla and Nemrut Dag are referenced. More than once I would hope.

References

- Boismier, W.A. 1991. Site formation among sub-arctic peoples: an ethnohistorical approach.
- Childe, V G 1936. *Man Makes Himself* (London, Watts and Co.).
- Fleming, A 1971. Territorial patterns in Bronze Age Wessex. *Proc Prehist Soc* 37, 138-66.
- Foley, R 1981a. *Off-site archaeology and human adaptation in Eastern Africa: an analysis of regional artefact density in the Amboseli, Southern Kenya* (Oxford, BAR Intl Series 97).
- Foley, R 1981b. A model of regional archaeological structure. *Proc Prehist Soc* 47, 1-17.
- Gamble, C 1991. An introduction to the living spaces of mobile peoples. In C. Gamble and W.A. Bosmier (eds) *Ethnoarchaeological Approaches to Mobile Campsites*, (Michigan, International Monographs in Prehistory: Ethnoarchaeological Series 1) 1-23.
- Gamble, C. and Bosmier, W.A. (eds) *Ethnoarchaeological Approaches to Mobile Campsites*, (Michigan, International Monographs in Prehistory: Ethnoarchaeological Series 1).
- Healy, F 1989. Exit, pursued by colleagues. *Lithics* 10, 52-3.
- Knight, J 1990. Australian Lithic Bibliography. *Lithics* 11, 51-62.
- Kroll, E and Price, T D (eds) 1991. *The Interpretation of Archaeological Spatial Patterning* (New York, Plenum Press Interdisciplinary Contributions to Archaeology).
- Schofield, A J 1986. The "ASDA Factor": core reduction, resource stress and the nature of lithic assemblages in central-southern England. *Lithics* 7, 17-29.

Schofield, A J forthcoming. Settlement and land-use among stone-using communities: evidence from lithic analysis. In Keay S and Millett M, *The Ager Tarraconensis Survey. Generalitat de Catalunya*.

Shennan, S J 1989. Archaeology as archaeology or as anthropology? Clarke's Analytical Archaeology and the Binfords' New Perspectives in Archaeology 21 years on. *Antiquity* 63, 831-35.

Thomas, J 1991. *Rethinking the Neolithic* (Cambridge, University Press).

Whitelaw, T 1991. Some dimensions of variability in the social organisation of community space among foragers. In C. Gamble and W.A. Bosmier (eds) *Ethnoarchaeological Approaches to Mobile Campsites*, (Michigan, International Monographs in Prehistory: Ethnoarchaeological Series 1) 139-188.