

PERIGORDIAN ELEMENTS IN THE EASTERN

————— AURIGNACIAN —————

Joaquin GONZALEZ ECHEGARAY

Following the recognition of those two different "cultural" realms in the earlier part of the Upper Palaeolithic, a distinction first made by D.Peyrony (1932, 1936, 1941) and now normally accepted in its broad outlines by all prehistorians, Aurignacian and Perigordian industries are now studied as autochthonous entities, and periodized according to the independent internal evolution of the industrial sequence contained in each phylum. But no one who has been concerned with the study of these Upper Palaeolithic industries can be ignorant of the fact that, at least to a certain extent, some of the classical Aurignacian types appear in Perigordian collections, while, conversely, "Perigordian" elements are found in Aurignacian levels; this occurs even in the best controlled modern excavations where there is no possible question of stratigraphic confusion or mixture of levels.

Spanish prehistorians know, for example, that the so-called Gravettian or Upper Perigordian of the Cantabrian Region often has a substantial contingent of Aurignacian elements: the index of Aurignacian endscrapers in Upper Level 5 at Morin on the order 12.3 (generalized) and 54.5 (restricted), while extreme, is a case in point. On the other hand, the ample Aurignacian sequence at the same site also offers important examples, such as the high value of the Perigordian index (the collection of backed elements) which rises to 4.2 in Lower Level 5, assigned to an evolved Aurignacian stage, or that of 4.2 in Archaic Aurignacian level 8b (Gonzalez Echegaray, Freeman et al., 1971, 1973).

This tendency assumes truly staggering dimensions among the Aurignacian industries of the Near East, which may have backed elements in such abundance that they occasionally give rise to indices on the order of 14.0. This is particularly surprising if we consider that true Upper Perigordian or Gravettian occupations do not exist in that part of the world. The presence of these "Perigordian" elements in the Levantine Aurignacian is the particular theme of the present communication. If we arrive at a just evaluation and adequate understanding of these facts, it may cast some other, more general, problems related to Upper Palaeolithic industries in a new light, and may help clarify the true nature of industrial complexes often thought of loosely as different "cultures".

But before proceeding further, it is essential that we arrive at some common definition of the classification of Upper Palaeolithic industries in the region, clarifying termi-

nology and establishing in general outline the chronology of those industries as a methodological starting point.

As is generally known, there is a long history of attempts on the part of prehistorians concerned with the Near Eastern Palaeolithic to establish an adequate classification of this cultural stage, and this work has shown that terms and concepts which have won general acceptance in Western Europe are not fully applicable in the other region. R. Neuvillle established (1934, 1951), for Palestine, the groundwork for future investigation along these lines.

He recognized 6 distinct and successive phases, which are conventionally designated quite simply by ordinal numbers. D. Garrod (1957, 1962) reexamined the classification, creating specific names for each of the phases, derived from what she considered to be the sites where each was best represented. After work at El-Khiam, I also undertook a critical evaluation of the problem trying to sketch a partly new scheme, correcting errors in Neuvillle's sequence (which were inevitable in his day), and collating Garrod's terminology with the results of the latest work in the region (Gonzalez Echegaray, 1963, 1978). Obviously, this is not the place to set out the new classification and its justification in detail; the interested reader should refer to the cited references. It is sufficient to establish a common base of understanding, to present here in tabular form a comparison of the stratigraphic sequences in the principal sites.

PERIODS	YABRUD II	EL-KHIAM	EL-WAD	KEBARAH	OTHER SITES
Atlitian	2	9	C	-	Ain el-Qedeirat
Antelian III	3	10	D ₁	D ₁	-
Antelian II	5-4	11b-11a	D ₂	D ₂	Erq el-Ahmar, Kafzeh
Antelian I	6	12-11d-11c	E	E	El-Quseir
Emiran	7	-	F	-	El-Emireh, Et-Tabban

As is well known, the precise nature of the Emiran is still subject at present to discussion and revision (Stekelis, 1956; Bar-Yosef and Vandermeersch, 1972), but there does not seem to be sufficient reason to reject it altogether, especially considering that it is quite clearly represented in sites in the Lebanon, such as in Ksar Akil, levels XXV-XXI (Ewing, 1947, 1948, 1949), Abu Halka, levels IVe and IVf (Haller, 1941-43) and Antelias (Copeland, 1970; Copeland and Hours, 1971). The Emiran would be the equivalent of the lower Perigordian of Western Europe, containing Chatelperron points, others types of backed blades, abundant typological "holdovers" from the Middle Palaeolithic, and the so-called "Emireh points".

However I do not propose here to enter into a lengthy treatment of the Emiran, but rather to discuss the place of Perigordian elements in true Aurignacian industries. Apparently, after the Emiran, Aurignacian industries are the only complexes known at present from Palaeolithic sites in the region. This Aurignacian, precisely by virtue of the fact that it contains numerous Perigordian elements and other peculiarities, has been given a variety of distinctive names, the most commonly used being "Levantine Aurignacian" (Hours, Copeland and Aurenche, 1973) and "Antelian" (Garrod, 1957, 1962).

We can at present distinguish three phases in this Antelian; the Antelian II, the phase in which one finds the greatest number of Perigordian elements, will be the object of our attention in this communication.

In levels 5 and 4 of Yabrud shelter II, Font-Yves points make up some 5% of the stone tool collections. There are also some Chatelperron points. Following the Antelian I (level 6), the index of so-called "Aurignacian" scrapers becomes progressively lower, and burins in general increase proportionally. In the Antelian II levels the endscraper index is on the order of 36.4 while the burin index reaches 28.7 (Rust, 1957; Sonnevile-Bordes, 1956).

In El-Khiam 11b-11a-, backed pieces amount to no less than 14% of the collection; the most abundant type is the Chatelperron. In turn, the proportion of "lamelles Dufour" reaches about 4.4%. At Khiam, too, the endscraper index has diminished, and that is particularly true for the "Aurignacian" types. Furthermore, burins on truncation (less well represented in the corresponding levels at Yabrud) increase relative to other burin types.

At Mugharet el-Wad, level D₂ has Font-Yves points and relatively few true backed pieces, a situation which is reversed in the following level D₁ (which we assign to the Antelian III) where abruptly-backed blades outnumber Font-Yves points: 1.7 and 0.3% respectively (Garrod and Bate, 1937; Garrod, 1954). Level D₂ at Mugharet el-Kebarah yielded various backed blades (2.8%) and a few Font-Yves points (0.9%), which latter disappear completely in the following level D₁, with 4.0% of backed blades (Garrod, 1954) attributed to the Antelian III. It is noteworthy that both in El-Wad and Kebarah Font-Yves points are even more numerous in the Antelian I (level E). In the last named site, they make up 14.2% of the collection and in Kebarah 7.4%.

At Erq el-Ahmar, levels F and E produced abundant backed blades and points. In overlying level D, also Antelian II, Font-Yves points abound (Neuville, 1951).

Finally, in Qafzeh, levels 9 and 8 had some 9% of Font-Yves and between 20 and 23% of bladelets (mostly backed). Endscrapers vary between 20 and 12%, while burins are from 23 to 14%, and there practically no examples of the so-called Aurignacian types (Ronen and Vandermeersch, 1972).

D. de Sonneville-Bordes (1956) was the first to call attention to the similarity between levels 5 and 4 at Yabrud II and the French site of Dufour, which considered to be "Perigordian of the second group" by Peyrony, was later reclassified by de Sonneville-Bordes as Aurignacian, along with other collections, such as Ferrassie E₁ and the sites of Bos del Ser and Font-Yves (de Sonneville-Bordes, 1960). These levels were later included in what Pradel called "Aurignacian *sensu lato*" or Correzean, which coincides in greater part with Peyrony's second Perigordian group (Pradel, 1970). Today it seems well established that industrial complexes characterized by blades and bladelets with semiabrupt retouch are not "Perigordian" at all, but Aurignacian.

Following this line of reasoning, it seems that the majority of the apparently "Perigordian" elements in the Levantine Palaeolithic, above all in Palestine, should better be considered elements of the Aurignacian "*sensu lato*". But that does not resolve all aspects of the special problem presented by the Antelian or Levantine Aurignacian, where, besides blades and bladelets with semi-abrupt retouch, there are also, as we have noted above truepoints and blades with abrupt backing sometimes in significant proportions.

When such a blend of Aurignacian and Perigordian elements occurs areas which are not too far removed from the Perigord, such as Austria or Northern Spain, it is sometimes alleged that these "peripheral" regions were influenced simultaneously by both "cultures", which maintain their separate individuality and evolve in parallel in the "nuclear" region. But in the Near East, as far as we now know the Aurignacian has no parallel Perigordian world, at least none sufficiently close for us to claim it as the source of the elements in question. Another explanatory model must be sought.

The evidence suggests that in the Eurasian earlier Upper Palaeolithic there were several different sets of techniques for stone tool production, that, when applied, yielded different kinds of retouched artifacts, which may be related to their utilization for different purposes. Thus, different types would reflect: 1) the nature of raw materials and available techniques for tool manufacture; 2) the nature of the elementary operations to be performed (slicing, perforating, shredding, etc.); and 3) the nature of the materials on which the tools were to act. Certain occupations, especially in Western Europe, show a welldefined specialization which requires the use of specific sets of tools, such as, for example,

the so-called Aurignacian endscrapers or the "Aurignacian blade" (Aurignacian industries in the strict sense); in other occupations, toolkits including relatively abundant fine laminar elements with semi-abrupt retouch were preferred (Aurignacian in the broader sense); while in others, pieces with backing and truncation predominate (Perigordian). There are now several French sites in which we find, interstratified, industries belonging to each of these three types (Piage, Roc de Combe, Laugerie Haute, Salpêtrière,...). Outside France, in certain regions there would appear to have been less "site specialization" in the sense, and for that reason it is not at all uncommon to find occupations where the various elements of these different "tendencies" are more freely combined. While in Cantabrian Spain (Cueva del Pendo) there are apparently cases of interstratification of polarized industrial types, as was the case in France, in the Near East, we have seen the regional Aurignacian is characterized, especially in particular occupations and developmental stages, by a kind of melding of all these tendencies.

In view of these observations, it seems to me that it would be more prudent in future, to think less of these manifestations as "cultures" or "civilizations" (the last a term which has incongruous connotations to English or Spanish speaking prehistorians) and to use more modest, less value-loaded designations such as "industrial complexes" or "occupations", since they express more precisely just what the archaeological levels in our sites represent, at least until someone offers convincing proof to the contrary. True, each such tool-complex may have its own "individuality", and even at times a well-differentiated, apparently intrinsic, developmental dynamism through time, which even permits informed speculation about the relative age of a given complex within its chronological trajectory. But we are nonetheless far from being in a position to say that we know all the meanings of difference between complexes in the peculiar and complicated world of the earlier Upper Palaeolithic. It seems quite clear to this writer that the terms Aurignacian and Perigordian do not refer to two "ethnically" or "culturally" distinct peoples, but rather to different sets of technological devices or different aspects of lifeways, which are found sometimes as distinct and successive, sometimes as recurrent and synchronous, and yet again in varying degrees of combination in single occupations; a close examination of these aspects will very likely also lead to a better understanding of the general outlines of their internal evolutionary trajectories. A reexamination of the Aurignacian/Perigordian manifestation in this light may well result in discoveries of extraordinary importance to Prehistory.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

- BAR-YOSEF, O., VANDERMEERSCH, B.: The stratigraphical and cultural problems of the passage from the Middle to Upper Palaeolithic in Palestinian caves. In: *The origin of Homo sapiens. Proceedings Paris Symposium*. Paris 1972, p.221-225.
- COPELAND, L.: The early Upper Paleolithic flint material from levels VII-V, Antelias cave, Lebanon. *Berytus*, vol.XIX, 1970, pp.99-143.
- EWING, J.F.: Preliminary note on the Excavations at the Paleolithic site of Ksar Akil. *Antiquity*, vol.XXI, 1947, pp. 186-197.
- EWING, J.F.: Ksar Akil. *Biblica*, vol.XXIX, 1948, pp.272-278.
- EWING, J.F.: The treasures of Ksar Akil. *Thought*, vol.XXIV, 1949, pp.255-288.
- GARROD, D.A.E.: Excavations at the Mogharet kebara, Mount Carmel, 1931; the Aurignacian industries. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, vol.XX, 1954, pp.155-192.
- GARROD, D.A.E.: Notes sur le Paléolithique Supérieur du Moyen Orient. *Bull. Soc. Préhistorique Française*, vol.LIV, 1957, p.439-446.
- GARROD, D.A.E.: An outline of Pleistocene prehistory in Palestine-Lebanon-Syria. *Quaternaria*, vol.VI, 1962, pp.541-546.
- GARROD, D.A.E., BATE, D.M.A.: *The Stone Age of Mount Carmel*. Vol.I, Oxford 1937.
- GONZALEZ ECHEGARAY, J.: Nouvelles fouilles à El Khiam. *Revue Biblique*, vol.LXX, 1963, pp.94-119.
- GONZALEZ ECHEGARAY, J.: *Excavaciones en la Terraza de El Khiam (Jordania)*. Madrid 1964-1966. Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, I: 180 p., 6 pl.; II: 266 p. 44 fig., 11 pl.
- GONZALEZ ECHEGARAY, J.: Notes toward a systematization of the Upper Paleolithic in Palestine. In: Freeman, L.G., *Views of the Past: Essays in Old World Prehistory and Paleoanthropology*. The Hague 1978, Mouton Pub., pp. 177-191.
- GONZALEZ ECHEGARAY, J., FREEMAN, L.G.: *Cueva Morin. Santander 1971-1973. Patronato de las Cuevas Prehistóricas*. I: 452 p., 174 fig., 7 pl.; II: 304 p., 93 fig., 14 pl., 5 ph.

- HALLER, J.: L'abri de Abou Halka (Tripoli). *Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth*. Vol.VI, 1941-1943, pp.1-20.
- HOURS, F., COPELAND, L., AURENCHÉ, O.: Les industries paléolithiques du Proche Orient. Essai de corrélation. *L'Anthropologie*, vol.LXXVII, 1973, pp.229-280, 437-496.
- NEUVILLE, R.: Le Préhistorique de Palestine. *Revue Biblique*, vol.XLIII, 1934, pp.237-259.
- NEUVILLE, R.: *Le Paléolithique et le Mésolithique du Désert de Judée*. Paris, 1951. Archives de l'Institut de Paléontologie humaine. Mém. 24.
- PEYRONY, D.: Les industries "aurignaciennes" dans le bassin de la Vézère. Aurignacien et Périgordien. *Bull. Soc. Préhistorique française*, vol.XXX, 1933, pp.543-559.
- PEYRONY, D.: Le Périgordien et l'Aurignacien. Nouvelles observations. *Bull. Soc. Préhistorique française*, vol.XXXIII, 1936, pp.616-619.
- PEYRONY, D.: Une mise au point au sujet de l'Aurignacien et du Périgordien. *Bull. Soc. Préhistorique française*, vol. XLIII, 1946, pp.305-328.
- PRADEL, L.: Le Périgordien, le Corrèzien et l'Aurignacien en France. In: *L'Homme de Cro-Magnon 1868-1968*. Paris 1970, Centre de Recherches Anthrop., Préhist. et Ethnograph., C.R.S. en Algérie, pp.163-171.
- RONEN, A., VANDERMEERSCH, B.: The Upper Paleolithic Sequence in the Cave of Qafza (Israel). *Quaternaria*, vol.XVI, 1972, pp.189-202.
- RUST, A.: *Die Höhlenfunde von Jabrud (Syrien)*. Neumünster 1950, Offa-Bücher.
- SONNEVILLE-BORDES, D.de : Paléolithique Supérieur et Mésolithique à Jabrud (Syrie). *L'Anthropologie*, vol.LX, 1956, pp.71-83.
- SONNEVILLE-BORDES, D.de : *Le Paléolithique Supérieur en Périgord*. Bordeaux, 1960, Delmas.
- STEKELIS, M.: *Nouvelles fouilles dans la grotte de Kebara*. Congreso Internacional de Ciencias Prehistoricas y Protohistoricas. Actas de la IV sesion, Madrid 1954. Zaragoza 1956. pp.385-389.