

CONVENTIONS

H.S. Green and E. Healey
(National Museum of Wales)

A number of varying conventions are already in use by Lithic Analysts (see for example M. Bell's 'Bishopstone' report in *Sussex Archaeol Coll.* Vol. 115, 1977. The list below summarises those in common use (we are grateful to Hazel Martingell for her comments on an earlier draft) and is currently undergoing trials with the illustrations for the National Museum of Wales Catalogue of the Stone Age Collections. It is hoped that eventually the Society will publish its recommendations, and comments are invited.

SYMBOLS.

- | | |
|---|---|
|  | bulb removed. (Lehraset Key symbols sheet 2453) |
|  | bulb present. (Lehraset Key Symbols sheet 2453) |
|  | thermally fractured piece. |
|  | burin facet. |
|  | cortex, usually irregular stipple but more regular if cortex is smooth. |
|  | struck flake scar, flint and smooth stone. |
|  | struck flake scar, other stone. |
|  | thermal fracture, evenly spaced conchoidal rings. |
|  | polish or areas worn smooth, blacked in, on small implements, but left blank on axes. |
|  | gloss, light regular stipple (slightly denser on edge). |

ORIENTATION AND VIEWS OF ARTEFACTS.

1. Axes: Butt to top of page. Transverse section at maximum width and longitudinal profile.
2. Maceheads: Narrow end to top of page. Transverse and longitudinal sections.
3. Scrapers: Scraping edge at top longitudinal view.
4. Arrowheads: Point up. Longitudinal section.
5. Burins: Burin edge at top and face view if necessary.
6. Awls: Point at top.

Other artefacts are drawn with the butt at the bottom.

Position of sections and profiles.

1. Transverse section - below.
2. Longitudinal profile. To right and located adjacent to edge drawn.
3. View of striking platform (e.g. if faceted, but rarely done) below.
4. Sections, 'diagonally hatched ///// or left open.

If both sides of a flake are drawn, the ventral surface is always to the right.

Scales.

All artefacts are drawn at 1:1 for reduction to $\frac{1}{4}$. except microliths which may be drawn at 2:1 for publication at 2:1.

A REVALUATION OF THE APPROACH TO LITHIC STUDIES IN BRITAIN TODAY.

In a paper entitled '*A Consideration of Lithic Studies in Britain*', a revised version of their lecture, Caroline Wickham-Jones and Rosemary Hope (National Museum of Antiquities of Scotland, Edinburgh) have highlighted the lack of methodology shown by British lithic analysts. Their main criticism is of what they call the 'morpho-taxonomic' approach shown at earlier meetings of the Lithic Studies Society and the fact that so called cultural types are isolated, often without references to the activities of a particular site and the assemblages as a whole. Instead they emphasise the need to go back to first principles and for careful assessment of the information potential of stone tools. They examine, at some length, the work of Bonnicksen (R. Bonnicksen, '*Models for Deriving Cultural Information from Stone Tools*' Archaeological Survey of Canada, Paper No.6, National Museums of Canada, Ottawa 1977) as a model for the establishment of a methodology and consequent construction of a typology. The main lines of Bonnicksen's argument is that lithic assemblages must be examined comprehensively on an intra-site level before any attempts are made at comparisons on inter-site levels. Intra-site analysis involves the examination of lithic industries both as entities in themselves and also in relation to other information from the site. The method of analysis is based on systems of attributes (some of which are mentioned in the paper but see also *Analytical Archaeology* by D.L. Clark). These can be combined to form a number of predetermined but interdependent levels or modes which in turn can be built into typologies.

Attributes pertaining to the following interdependent levels are suggested:-

- (i) raw material
- (ii) general technology and metrical data
- (iii) morphology
- (iv) function

Typologies can then be constructed as circumstances demand..