

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 $\frac{1}{2}$. 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 Bonnichsen (R. Bonnichsen, '*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 Bonnichsen'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..

Other points discussed in their paper are the use of cultural and functional terms and the designation of certain objects as type fossils. Full use of mechanical aids such as computers is strongly recommended.

In brief, then the authors have highlighted the urgent need for a study of the methodology of lithic analysis. They advocate the systematic recording of attributes from which typologies (which of course answer specific questions) may be built. Clearly much discussion is needed. Lists of artefact categories, perhaps wrongly called typologies, such as those presented at the Cheltenham meeting were a statement of the *status quo*; their aim was to try to point out problems; they were not necessarily intended as a blue print for the future. Indeed many of the ideas proposed in the Wickham-Jones - Hope paper have already gained some acceptance and at least one of us at Cheltenham was at pains to point out the need to record regularly and consistently non-morphological traits.

It will not of course be possible to revolutionize lithic studies overnight by the application of attribute analysis, but clearly the Society must concern itself with the systematic examination of artefacts and the on-going task of building models as best suited to Britain and to the available resources.