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Abstract

Canteen Kopje has yielded rare in-situ assemblages of the Fauresmith, a poorly defined industry often associated with the later Acheulean. The Fauresmith contains precocious developments in technology as early as ~0.5 Ma–features which only become widespread in the ensuing Middle Stone Age. The Fauresmith as a regional industry provides insight into technological practices during the period of significant behavioural diversification associated with archaic Homo sapiens. Previous excavations were conducted with relatively low spatial resolution. A new excavation, Pit 4 West, was conducted to investigate the spatial, stratigraphic and contextual association of the Fauresmith horizon in more detail. A multi-disciplinary fine-resolution geoarchaeological approach was applied. A nuanced assessment of the Fauresmith’s context was developed, with macroscopic and microscopic analyses allowing for the identification of site formation processes influencing assemblages. The artefact sample size for the site was increased and the presence of diagnostic tools has aided in formally defining the Fauresmith at Canteen Kopje.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

In this dissertation the author investigates the context and technological validity of the Fauresmith stone tool industry at Canteen Kopje, Northern Cape Province, South Africa (28°32′35″ S, 24°31′51″ E) (Figure 1.1). Canteen Kopje, near the town of Barkly West, has yielded lithic assemblages from the Later Stone Age through to the Early Acheulean in a sequence of sand and gravel deposits (McNabb & Beaumont 2011 a, b; Leader 2014; Lotter et al. 2016). The represented industries include the Fauresmith, and the Victoria West which is an Early Acheulean industry that features prepared core technology (McNabb 2001; McNabb & Beaumont 2011 a, b; Leader 2014; Lotter et al. 2016). In the Pit 6 excavation at Canteen Kopje (Figure 1.2) there is mixing between the Fauresmith and the Victoria West within a Mixed Contact Zone at the interface between the gravels and the Hutton Sands (Lotter et al. 2016).

The Fauresmith is traditionally described as a regional industry that is associated with the Middle Pleistocene, particularly the late Earlier Stone Age (ESA) and the transition to the early Middle Stone Age (MSA) which is suggested to have occurred ~0.5-0.3/0.25 Ma in South Africa (Porat et al. 2010; Herries 2011; Underhill 2011; Lotter et al. 2016). Lithic material proposed to be Fauresmith has been of interest to many researchers over the past 100 years as it falls into a special ‘gap’ in our understanding of the African Stone Age. This gap is filled with both typical ESA Later Acheulean large cutting tools (LCTs) and stratigraphically-associated diagnostic MSA tool types (Underhill 2011; Herries 2011).

Historical examination of Stone Age material in southern Africa was predominantly based on ex-situ or surface-scattered material, which lacked contextual integrity and limited studies regarding site context and formation (Goodwin 1927, 1929, 1934; Goodwin & van Riet Lowe 1929; van Riet Lowe 1937; Underhill 2011; Wilkins & Chazan 2012). The Fauresmith still remains a relatively poorly defined and dated industry, primarily due to the limited rare in-situ assemblages of Fauresmith material found in South Africa and many of which have contexts that limit dating opportunities (Herries 2011; Underhill 2011). There is an on-going debate regarding the accurate techno-typological description of the industry, with some researchers proposing that the Fauresmith is an ESA to MSA transitional industry, and others suggesting that the Fauresmith is a regional industry belonging to the Later Acheulean techno-
complex (Herries 2011; Underhill 2011; Chazan 2015b). Difficulties in dating the open-air Fauresmith-bearing units in the interior of South Africa have led to further confusion and discrepancies between sites (Herries 2011; Underhill 2011; Chazan et al. 2013; Evans & Cunningham 2013; Lotter et al. 2016).

New research and data from Kathu Pan, a site in interior southern Africa with a stratified sequence of material including Fauresmith levels, have provided an age estimate of ~511-435 thousand years (ka) for this contentious, yet significant cultural tradition (Porat et al. 2010, Herries 2011). This age now places at least one Fauresmith site within the Later Acheulean, well before the accepted appearance of
the MSA in South Africa. Canteen Kopje, with MSA, Fauresmith and Early Acheulean assemblages offers an opportunity to further assess the place of the Fauresmith within the Stone Age in South Africa (McNabb 2001; McNabb & Beaumont 2011a; Lotter et al. 2016).

Figure 1.2: The location of Canteen Kopje (from Google Earth 2018) and a map of all excavations and relevant features at Canteen Kopje.

Peter Beaumont began the first controlled excavations at Canteen Kopje in the late 1990’s (McNabb & Beaumont 2011a), but the site has been referred to in many research outputs—with more recent ones being based on excavated assemblages

This dissertation is the result of one of the many research projects that have been conducted by the WITS team that began research at Canteen Kopje in 2007 under the guidance of G.M Leader, R. Gibbon and K. Kuman. The first geoarchaeological study to be conducted on Canteen Kopje Fauresmith material (from Pit 6; Figure 1.2) was published by Lotter et al. (2016). However, the research presented in this dissertation is the first to apply a stratigraphically-sensitive multidisciplinary high-resolution approach combining geoarchaeological and typological studies at the site. A new excavation (extended from the existing squares of Pit 4; Figure 1.2), henceforth referred to as ‘Pit 4 West’ (P4W), was conducted from the landscape surface in 2016. This allowed the application of the above-mentioned approach to a sequence that included the Hutton Sands and the top of the gravels, yielding primary data required for both the geoarchaeological and typological analyses conducted for this research.

1.1 Research question

This project attempted to answer the following research question:

*Is the integrity of the Fauresmith assemblage in Pit 4 West affected by what previous researchers have described as a mixed contact zone (MCZ) that exists at the interface between the Hutton Sands and the gravels?*

1.2 Aims

- The first aim of this research was to excavate a new sample of the Fauresmith industry from the Pit 4 West trench at Canteen Kopje while applying a high-
resolution approach to spatial and sedimentological documentation to provide greater contextual sensitivity than previous studies at the site.

- The second aim was to improve our understanding of the integrity of the Fauresmith assemblage from Pit 4 West by analysing the spatial data on artefacts and the sedimentological data. To further clarify the context of the Fauresmith, multiple samples were taken from the exposed sequence of Pit 4 West for OSL dating.

- The third aim was to conduct a typological study (and in future a technological study) of all excavated material from Pit 4 West. This typological analysis, combined with the high-resolution spatial data, has the potential to help the author determine the cultural stratigraphy of Pit 4 West and the Fauresmith’s place within this sequence.

1.3 Organisation of the thesis

There is a total of five chapters in this dissertation.

Chapter 1 has provided the research questions and aims.

Chapter 2, Literature Review, describes the historical, archaeological, and geological background of Canteen Kopje and the surrounding Vaal River Basin. This chapter includes a thorough description of the early and more recent archaeological research at the site. The purpose of this chapter is to also provide detailed information pertaining to the Stone Age in South Africa, with specific focus on the Fauresmith industry and the debate over its place within the Stone Age.

Chapter 3, Methodology, introduces the reader to the analytical techniques that were used in this project. This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section provides a description of excavation and recording protocols, geographic information system (GIS) modelling (for fabric analysis) and laboratory-based sedimentological and geochemical analyses. The section also includes discussion of the optically-stimulated luminescence (OSL) dating protocol applied to samples from P4W. The
second section provides a description of the typological approach applied to all excavated artefacts yielded from P4W.

Chapter 4, Results, is a report of the geoarchaeological and site formation results, followed by the typological analysis conducted by the author, detailing the lithic study results for the Fauresmith, the Victoria West and other industries/techno-complexes found in P4W.

Chapter 5, Discussion and Conclusion, is the final chapter of the dissertation and provides interpretations of both the geoarchaeological and lithic study results, and the combination of the two datasets to provide a multi-disciplinary study. The Conclusion section specifically summarises the project results, as well as the achievements and the limitations of this research project. Furthermore, the author considers future research directions regarding P4W and new methodologies that can be applied to promote more high-resolution multi-disciplinary research at the Canteen Kopje site.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section is mainly an overview of the South African Stone Age, with some East African and Middle Eastern studies included for comparative purposes. Canteen Kopje is a remarkably rich archaeological site with an extensive sequence that spans >1.5 Ma (Leader 2014). Earlier Stone Age (ESA), Middle Stone Age (MSA), Later Stone Age (LSA) and historical material from the site has been excavated and studied over the past century (Goodwin 1927, 1929, 1934; Goodwin & van Riet Lowe 1929; van Riet Lowe 1937; Partridge & Brink 1967; Helgren 1977, 1979; De Wit 1996, 2008; Beaumont & McNabb 2000; McNabb 2001, Beaumont 2004; Beaumont & Vogel 2006; Gibbon et al. 2008, 2009; Forssman et al. 2010; Lotter 2010a, b; Sarupen 2010; McNabb & Beaumont 2011 a, b; Chazan et al. 2013; Lotter et al. 2016). However, emphasis here is placed on the Later Acheulean and the early MSA (eMSA) periods of the Stone Age, because in the debate over the age and classification of the Fauresmith industry, it is associated with one or the other of these periods or considered to be an industry transitional between them (Underhill 2011).

The second section is an overview of the Vaal River Basin geology and past research at Canteen Kopje with focus on the stratigraphy and site formation processes. Lotter et al. (2016) recently published the first geoarchaeological study at Canteen Kopje, on the Pit 6 trench. This paper is discussed in detail as it serves as the reference study most relevant to this research project and its aims (clarifying the context of the stone tool assemblages from P4W).

In the third section of this chapter a description of sedimentological, geochemical and dating techniques used in this project is presented, with some South African case studies for reference. The use of these techniques is demonstrated in the chapters that follow. Sedimentological analyses were conducted as a means of describing the macroscopic and microscopic environment in which the stone tools (lithics) from the Canteen Kopje site are preserved. The results of these analyses were used to elucidate the context of artefactual material in P4W.
2.1 Archaeology

2.1.1 The African Earlier Stone Age

The ESA is a prehistoric period that preserves the earliest known evidence of lithic production. It represents a significant cognitive and behavioural threshold that was crossed by past species to become cultural-material-producing hominids. There are three technological complexes associated with this period: the Lomekwian (Harmand et al. 2015), the Oldowan (Leakey 1967, 1971; Semaw 2000; Kuman 2014; Kuman & Field 2009) and the Acheulean (Leakey 1967, 1971; Semaw 2000; Lepre et al. 2011).

The Lomekwian

The Lomekwian techno-complex from the Lomekwi 3 (LOM3) site, West Turkana, Kenya is the earliest known evidence for lithic manufacturing and is dated to ~3.3 million years (Ma), (Harmand et al. 2015). The Lomekwian has been stratigraphically associated with the *Kenyanthropus platyops* species (Harmand et al. 2015: 310). This industry is characterised by core reduction dominated by a battering and/or pounding approach, particularly using bipolar and/or passive-hammer techniques. However, free-hand percussion is also evident (Harmand et al. 2015). The assemblage from LOM3 is primarily made up of percussors and passive tool types (e.g. anvils), cores, intentional flakes and worked (knapped or battered) cobbles (Harmand et al. 2015: 312).

The Oldowan

The Oldowan techno-complex from Gona, Ethiopia is the earliest evidence for Oldowan cultural behaviour and is dated to ~2.6 Ma (Semaw 2000). In South Africa, there are two large Oldowan assemblages. First published is the Oldowan from Sterkfontein Caves site—the richest Oldowan locality in southern Africa— which has been recently dated to ~2.18 Ma (Kuman & Field 2009; Granger et al. 2015). Swartkrans now also has a large Oldowan assemblage ca 2.19/1.8 Ma (Sutton 2012; Kuman 2016). Mary Leakey (1967, 1971) ascribed the Oldowan to the *Homo habilis sensu lato* species.
The Oldowan spanned roughly a million years and Oldowan-producing hominids are suggested to have applied knowledge about raw material exploitation and procurement as well as effective flaking techniques (Semaw 2000; Delagnes & Roche 2005; Stout et al. 2005). This industry can be described as simple (relative to subsequent industries) core-flake technology with the primary lithic types being cores (knapped cobbles) and sharp-edged flakes (Kuman 2014: 5561).

The Early Acheulean

Unlike the Oldowan the Acheulean represents a progressive period in technological developments and is the longest practiced lithic techno-complex in human prehistory (Semaw 2000; Sharon et al. 2011; Kuman 2014). The Early Acheulean is suggested to span between ~1.7 and ~0.9/1.0 Ma and is associated with the Homo ergaster species (de le Torre 2009). Mary Leakey (1971) was the first to describe the Early Acheulean based on the EF-HR assemblage from Olduvai Gorge, Tanzania. It is techno-typologically characterised by the practices associated with the development of bifacial (and non-bifacial) large cutting tools, henceforth referred to as ‘LCTs’ (Leakey 1971; Kuman 2016).

LCTs include the following tool types: handaxes, cleavers and pick-like heavy-duty tools >10 cm in length (Stout 2011; Kuman 2014). Figure 2.1 shows examples of southern African Early Acheulean LCTs, from the Rietputs ACP assemblage (Kuman & Gibbon et al. 2018). Raw material influenced the shape and morphology of LCTs, with production being associated with large flake blanks and/or slab/cobble blanks (Jones 1994; Kuman 2014). The handling and manipulation of larger cores by hominids during the manufacture of LCT blanks would have required perceptual-motor organisation more developed than that of preceding techno-complexes (Stout 2011). LCTs represent more standardised core reduction techniques for flake production, as well as the intentional shaping of flakes (Stout 2011).

The earliest evidence for the Acheulean is from the Kokiselei (KS4) site, West Turkana, Kenya and is dated to ~1.76 Ma (Lepre et al. 2011). Major Acheulean localities in South Africa include the Vaal River basin cluster of sites such as the Rietputs Formation, dated to ~1.57-1.26 Ma (Gibbon et al. 2009; Kuman & Gibbon et al. 2018); Leader et al. 2018) and Canteen Kopje, dated to >1 Ma (Leader 2014).
The Cradle of Humankind includes sites that have yielded Early Acheulean material. The major sites are Sterkfontein Caves and Swartkrans with dates ranging between ~1.6 and 1 Ma (Kuman 1998; Kuman and Clarke 2000; Clark 1993; Field 1999). Maropeng also has an expansive Early Acheulean deposit within a deflated (undated) deposit (Pollaro et al. 2010; Moll 2017).

New lithic production techniques appear during the Acheulean, and these demanded more preconception of the finished artefact than Oldowan lithics (Stout 2011: 1053). The Acheulean is a relatively complex technological period as hominids made use of multiple reduction strategies simultaneously. De la Torre’s (2009) comparative study between assemblages from the Northern Escarpment (Muguland) and the Peninj sites, Tanzania (~1.5-1.4 Ma), describes the fluid nature of the Acheulean, with two co-existing reduction strategies used to produce different types of lithics. The first is one focused on small-sized flake production (debitage) that includes a hierarchical bifacial centripetal method. The second is focused on LCT production and reduction (chaîne opératoire) (de la Torre 2009). Stout (2011) further identifies a distinct strategy at Koobi Fora, Kenya that lacks handaxes, but was focussed on the production of single-platform ‘Karari scraper cores’.

The advent of the Acheulean is suggested to have “marked a new adaptive grade in human evolution” (Plummer 2004:127) and has been found associated with the hominid species Homo ergaster (Kuman & Clarke 2000). Homo ergaster is described as having ‘sapient-like’ post-cranial anatomical features and proportions (Kuman 2014: 8). This development is associated with a shift in behaviour and particularly that of land use by hominids. Unlike preceding periods, the Acheulean is characterised by greater concentrations of artefacts at larger sites over a broader range of more open environments (Kuman 2014). This period of diversification is marked by evidence for the first controlled and deliberate use of fire (Alperson-Afil & Goren-Inbar 2010; Berna et al. 2012; Pickering et al. 2012). This activity has been identified at East African and South African Early Acheulean sites. Fire use is dated to ~1.5 Ma at Koobi Fora, Kenya (Alperson-Afil & Goren-Inbar 2010) and ~1.1-1.5 Ma and ~1 Ma at Swartkrans and Wonderwerk Cave, respectively (Berna et al. 2012; Pickering et al. 2012; Kuman 2014).
Figure 2.1: Early Acheulean LCTs from the Rietputs ACP assemblage: 1-hornfels handaxe on side-struck flake, 2-lava handaxe, 3-lava pick on cobble, 4-lava handaxe on flake, 5-lava unifacial cleaver on flake (trimming on left bulbar surface), 6-lava handaxe on cobble, 7-lava pick on cobble (from Kuman & Gibbon et al. 2018)., Figure 3 & 4).
The Middle Acheulean

The Middle Acheulean is a period that is suggested to exist between ~1-0.6 Ma (Stout 2011; Kuman 2007). During this period, hominids began to produce LCTs in greater proportions and show increased technical knapping skill (Stout 2011; Kuman 2007). The first use of soft-hammer flaking, and the oldest known prepared core production, occur during the Middle Acheulean (Sharon 2007; White et al. 2011; Kuman 2014).

The first prepared core industry, the Victoria West, is dated to older than 1 Ma and has been found in interior South Africa (Stout 2011; Leader 2014). Many researchers have noted the similarity of the Victoria West to the Levallois technique (Clark 2001: 4; McNabb 2001; Beaumont & Vogel 2006; Kuman 2014; Kuman 2016).

The Later Acheulean & Final ESA

The Later Acheulean is suggested to span between ~0.6/0.5 to 0.3/0.25 Ma. This period is marked by greater general knapping skill and more refined techniques (Kuman 2014; Kuman 2016). Later Acheulean producing hominids seem to have been more focused on LCT production and demonstrated greater capacity for identifying and exploiting the best available raw material (Clark 2001). LCTs were more intensively shaped and more standardised and symmetrical (Klein 2000; Kuman 2016). The symmetrical shaping (lateral and bifacial) of some LCTs suggest an understanding of the concept of symmetry at this time (McNabb 2001; De Lumley 2009).

This stage of the Acheulean is associated with archaic Homo sapiens, a more evolved species than Homo ergaster which is associated with the preceding Earlier and Middle Acheulean (Clark 2001; Stout 2002; Kuman 2014; Kuman 2016). Archaic Homo sapiens appears to have matured more slowly, which had implications for human behaviour (Kuman 2014). The number of known Late Acheulean sites is significantly higher than sites from earlier stages of the ESA, suggesting that hominids at this time were more successful than their ancestors (Kuman 2014). The first known occupation of caves occurs in the Later Acheulean. Some of the earliest sites (all in South Africa) include: Cave of Hearths at ~0.45 Ma, Montagu Cave <0.6
Ma, and the Olieboompoort rockshelter <0.6 Ma (Kuman 2016). Wonderwerk Cave may also have been inhabited around the same time (Clark 2001; Kuman 2016).

**Variability at the end of the ESA**

Throughout the Acheulean, hominids were primarily focused on the production of LCTs and (relatively) simple sharp flakes (McPherron 2000; Sharon et al. 2011). Although the technical skill of knappers increased during the Acheulean, the same broad technique was used to produce LCTs throughout this period (McPherron 2000; Sharon et al. 2011). Variation between assemblages was largely in the form of type proportions and the raw material used (Sharon et al. 2011). The morphology of LCTs was often controlled by raw material properties and form (the morphology of available natural material), and by the degree of use, as evidenced by re-shaping due to continued sharpening of pieces (Wynn & Tierson 1990; McPherron 2000).

A higher degree of technological variation is evident in assemblages dating to the late Acheulean, particularly in the production of LCTs (Wynn & Tierson 1990; Clark 2001). Some of this variation is likely due to spatial and temporal differences in the function/use of artefacts, probably driven by environmental conditions (Clark 2001: 7). However, differences in the raw material available at different sites is considered to be a major factor influencing the variety of technological approaches and production techniques utilised during this period (McPherron 2000; Clark 2001: 1). Towards the end of the Acheulean, hominids had the ability to produce lithics on a wide variety of raw materials, including soft and hard rocks with vastly different mechanical properties (Clark 2001).

2.1.2 The Fauresmith & regionalisation

Some intermediate industries that can be viewed as transitional technological traditions develop towards the end of the Acheulean and represent the start of regional specialisations. Some assemblages from the period at the end of the ESA and the ESA/MSA transition are characterised by accelerated changes in human behaviour, as evidenced by greater technological complexity (Kuman 2016).
Regional industries of this kind provide a unique glimpse of the cognitive and behavioural qualities that archaic *Homo sapiens* displayed.

Numerous researchers have debated the place of the Fauresmith within the southern African Stone Age sequence (see Underhill 2011). The ‘Fauresmith’ was described by Goodwin in 1925 as an “archaeological industry or culture intermediate between the Earlier Stone Age and Middle Stone Age” (Underhill 2011: 15). Clark (1970) placed the Fauresmith within the ‘first intermediate’, which falls between the ESA and MSA. Mason (1961) considered the Fauresmith to be a part of the later Acheulean. Peter Beaumont is one of very few researchers to suggest that at least the final stages of the Fauresmith are related to, if not part of, the MSA (Beaumont & Vogel 2006).

Recent dating of the Fauresmith at Kathu Pan yielded a date of ~500 ka (Porat et al. 2010). This suggests an association with the Later and Final Acheulean (Herries 2011; Lotter et al. 2016). This makes the Fauresmith contemporaneous with the Kapthurin Formation regarding innovative developments such as blade production (Porat et al. 2010). Traditionally, researchers believed blade production to be a development only associated with modern humans (McBrearty & Brooks 2000). It is suggested that the cultural and behavioural advancements represent an increase in more complex skills evidenced for example by the strategy of exploiting organised cores to systematically remove blades (Porat et al. 2010: 269; Wilkins & Chazan 2012; Kuman 2014: 16).

It is agreed that the Fauresmith provides insight into the specific (and in this case more precocious) technological practices (van Riet Lowe 1927; 1945; Goodwin 1929; Herries 2011; Underhill 2011) associated with archaic *Homo sapiens* (Herries 2011), which directly preceded modern humans in the archaeological record—a period of significant diversification in both anatomical and behavioural/cultural developments (McBrearty & Brooks 2000). Smaller handaxes, large and/or average sized cleavers, points, blades and prepared cores are the major, but not the only, diagnostic features of assemblages claimed to represent the Fauresmith stone tool culture (Sampson 1974; Herries 2011; Underhill 2011; Wilkins & Chazan 2012; Wilkins 2013; Wilkins et al. 2015; Lotter et al. 2016). Blades, points and prepared cores appear as early as ~0.5 Ma (Porat et al. 2010), but only become widespread in
the ensuing Middle Stone Age (MSA) ~0.3/0.2 Ma (McBrearty & Brooks 2000; Lombard 2012; Wurz 2013, 2014; Wadley 2015).

The Sangoan techno-complex is argued by some researchers to be contemporaneous with the Fauresmith, although it is presently very poorly dated (Barham 2000, 2001; Clark 2001; Kuman 2016). It has been found at sites across south central Africa and is best known at Kalambo Falls in Zambia from an assemblage dating to ca. 0.2 Ma (Barham 2000, 2001; Clark 2001; Kuman 2016). It is characterised by several types of artefact categorised as ‘heavy-duty tools’ along with limited LCTs (Clark 2001; Barham & Mitchell 2008). The ‘heavy-duty tools’ include picks (broadly similar to those found in the Acheulean) and core-axes (Clark 2001; Barham & Mitchell 2008). Sangoan assemblages have yielded the oldest known bifacial points (Barham & Mitchell 2008). This techno-complex has been considered to represent a technological/cultural adaptation to forested areas in contrast to the Fauresmith, which largely appears in grassland areas (McBrearty & Brooks 2002). However, it is likely that during the drier periods associated with the Sangoan, the currently forested areas where it is found would have been more open woodland areas (Barham 2000, 2001).

The South African sites (Figure 2.2) described below provide most of the published information on the Fauresmith industry. Some of the assemblages from these sites are small, and the published data are limited. However, these sites yield enough information to be used as reference sites for the Fauresmith industry:

**Kathu Pan 1**

Stratum 4a of Kathu Pan 1 has yielded a large Fauresmith assemblage which has been dated to 682–417 ka using both OSL and U-series-ESR (Porat et al. 2010; Underhill 2011). The age of the assemblage suggests an association with the later Acheulean rather than the MSA for this assemblage, and perhaps for the Fauresmith as a whole (Herries 2011; Lotter et al. 2016). In general, the Fauresmith material yielded from Stratum 4a is dominated by banded ironstone raw material and includes Levallois points, convergent or laterally retouched side-scarpers (made on flake blanks), prepared cores, a small number of handaxes, and blades (Beaumont 1990b; Porat et al. 2010; Chazan 2015a). The high degree of blade production represented
in the assemblage is significant as this technological practice has previously been described as a modern *Homo sapiens* innovation (specifically associated with the MSA) (McBrearty & Brooks 2000).

Figure 2.2: The location of known Fauresmith sites in South Africa (from Google Earth 2018).

Technological analysis for the KP-1 Fauresmith blade production was adapted from MSA blade assemblage studies by Villa *et al.* (2005) and Soriano *et al.* (2007). A comparative study with published material from the Kapthurin Formation, East Africa and Qesem Cave, Israel found some similarities between the Kathu Fauresmith and
the industries at these sites (Wilkins & Chazan 2012). The reduction strategies that dominate the Kathu Pan assemblage differ from those utilised in the Fauresmith at Canteen Kopje (based on the large Pit 6 assemblage; see Figure 1.2), which appears to be the result of significant raw material differences. Kathu Pan is dominated by banded ironstone, which may present more favourable flaking qualities (Wilkins & Chazan 2012).

**Wonderwerk Cave**

Wonderwerk Cave Excavation 1 is an extraordinary site as it provides a single *in-situ* stratified sequence representing the full extent of the southern African ESA (Chazan 2015a). Wonderwerk is the only cave context to yield Fauresmith material (Beaumont & Vogel 2006). The concept of inter-assemblage variability is obvious when one compares Wonderwerk to surrounding sites, such as Kathu Pan 1 (Chazan 2015a). Excavation 1 at Wonderwerk Cave contains handaxes which do not decrease in size relative to earlier levels and no associated blade technology (Chazan 2015a). It appears that the Fauresmith is absent from this excavation (Chazan 2015a). However, the Excavation 6 assemblage, which is described as being Fauresmith, contains blades, bifaces and prepared cores (Chazan 2015a). A date of 286-276 ka, using U-series dating, has been suggested for Wonderwerk Cave Excavation 2 (Beaumont & Vogel 2006), which has yielded Fauresmith material comprised of “blades together with large bifaces, prepared cores and unifacial Levallois points” (Porat *et al.* 2010: 270).

**Rooidam 1 & 2**

Rooidam 1, a pan site which was first excavated in 1964-65 by G.J. Fock (Fock 1968; Butzer 1974), has >18 000 artefacts (classified as Fauresmith based on the presence of handaxes and their morphology), yielded predominantly from Stratum 9 within a 5 m sequence (Beaumont & Vogel 2006). Flakes with faceted platforms and broad bifaces are present at Rooidam 1, along with small numbers of cleavers and choppers (Porat *et al.* 2010). Beaumont & Vogel (2006) suggest that the overlying Stratum 1 does not belong to this regional Fauresmith industry but rather represents a Late Acheulean assemblage based on the presence of prepared cores and blades and the absence of Levallois points. Instead they posit different phases of the
Fauresmith, with Stratum 1 of Rooidam 1 yielding ‘Middle Fauresmith’, and the nearby site of Rooidam 2 being suggested to have yielded ‘Early Fauresmith’ evidenced by “a reduced range of scraper and other retouched forms” (Beaumont & Vogel 2006: 223). U-series dating of Rooidam 1 provided a date >174 ka (Szabo & Butzer, 1979), which is suggested to be too young for this Fauresmith site by Beaumont & Vogel (2006) based on their interpretation of the age range of the Fauresmith. Clark (2001) suggests a date of 300-200 ka.

Bundu Farm

Bundu Farm, also a pan site, was excavated from 1998-2003 (Kiberd 2006). Group 4-6 strata are described as containing either a Final Acheulean or ESA/MSA intermediate industry (Kiberd 2006). The flakes from these strata have an average length of 50 mm and are described as mainly end- or side-struck and rhomboid shaped, with radial cores mainly used for flake production (centripetal reduction) (Kiberd 2006; Porat et al. 2010). Group 5-6 strata contain an assortment of core tools, in contrast to the overlying MSA Group 2-3 strata, but have also yielded the largest prepared cores compared to other levels, with examples of this core-type displaying extensive preparation and “main striking flake scars” (Kiberd 2006: 195). Group 6 yielded a single biface artefact, with ‘flake-blade’ sections evident in this horizon and a total of 51 flake-blade artefacts from Group 4-6. Other lithic components recovered from these horizons include “Levallois, irregular and discoidal cores, a small conical core/core tool, modified pebbles, a flat-based high-backed core tool, spheroids, unmodified flakes, bifacially worked points…laterally retouched flakes and chunks, some of which were notched” (Kiberd 2006: 196). Whilst Kiberd (2006) does not classify the assemblage as Fauresmith, it is considered to possibly fit within the industry by other authors (Underhill 2011).

2.1.3 The Early MSA

The MSA is a period of technological developments such as widespread production of blades and points. Although such MSA elements exist as early as ~0.5-0.3 Ma (McBrearty & Brooks 2002; Wurz 2013, 2014; Wadley 2015), they only become widespread in the MSA. In South Africa, the earliest MSA assemblages (dating
between ~0.3-0.13 Ma) are included in the informal designation of the early MSA (eMSA) (Lombard et al. 2012). The main defining artefact types of the eMSA are discoidal and Levallois prepared cores and blades (Lombard et al. 2012; Wurz 2013). Typical Acheulean tool types, such as handaxes, disappear from the human toolkit and are replaced by a variety of prepared core technologies focused largely on blade and point production (McBrearty & Brooks 2002).

The eMSA sites in South Africa include Border Cave, Bundu Farm, Elands Bay Cave, Florisbad, Kathu Pan, Lincoln Cave, Pinnacle Point, Sterkfontein Caves, and Wonderwerk Cave (Lombard et al. 2012:139; Schmid et al. 2016). The eMSA assemblages from these sites generally have small sample sizes and have seldom been analysed thoroughly (Wurz 2014: 6895).

With regard to East Africa, the Kapthurin Formation, Kenya has yielded eMSA points dated to >285 ka (Henshilwood & Lombard 2013). In Central Africa, the Lupemban Industry is known from several sites dating from ca. 300 ka onwards (Barham 2000, 2002). Lupemban assemblages include bifacial lanceolate points and a range of tools for heavy-duty and light-duty work as well as the first appearance of geometric backed lithics (Barham 2002; Wurz 2014).

2.1.4 Lithic Typology: An Overview

Typology is used for the grouping of lithic artefacts into several types and can be based on their morphology (Krieger 1944), raw material characteristics, size and/or function (Andrefsky 2005: 63). The purpose of a typological approach in stone tool analysis is to diagnostically identify tool types using attributes and thus develop a system to compare assemblages from different sites (de la Torre & Mora 2009: 16). Depending on the focus of the study, and the chosen attributes, typologies can be used, to a certain degree, to interpret or understand the functional and cultural chronology of a region, evidenced by stone tools (Andrefsky 2005: 5).

Francois Bordes’ (1961) typology was central to developing typological approaches to lithic studies globally and influenced various researchers working in Africa, including Kleindienst (1962), Clark et al. (1966) and Leakey (1967). This led to the
seminal typologies for the East African Earlier Stone Age, developed by Leakey (1971) and Isaac (1977).

Mary Leakey (1971: 3) applied typological classifications to Oldowan and Early Acheulean material from Olduvai Gorge Beds I and II, Tanzania. She divided lithic artefacts into three groups: tools, utilised material and debitage. Leakey (1971) further divided tools by size, with material $\geq 50$ mm being termed ‘heavy-duty’ tools and those $\leq 50$ mm were termed ‘light-duty’ tools, with some tool types being exempted from this grouping. Leakey (1971) also created categories of tools based on their morphology and other attributes, some of which were used for the typological study conducted for this research and thus will be discussed in further detail in chapters to follow.

Leakey’s (1971) typology remains at the core of ESA studies, particularly in East and South Africa, and has been adapted by many researchers. South African examples of typology based on Leakey’s work include Kuman’s (1994) and Field’s (1999) work at Sterkfontein and Swartkrans, Gauteng Province, and Beaumont and McNabb’s work on ESA to MSA material in the Northern Cape Province (Beaumont and McNabb 2000; McNabb 2001; Beaumont 2004; McNabb & Beaumont 2011a, b).

The author wishes to stress that the purpose of the typological analysis applied to all excavated lithics from the new Pit 4 West trench was to provide a dataset, based on artefact types, to use for the geoarchaeological study of the stratigraphy at this pit. As mentioned previously, Fauresmith technology is highly debated, and the contexts of many recorded assemblages suggested to belong to this industry are also often disputed. The author had to analyse all material to 1) identify typological trends present throughout the Pit 4 West sequence, and 2) observe if these trends could be stratigraphically isolated and understood within their individual contexts using geoarchaeological data.

A technological study (which considers the production, use and reuse of a tool i.e. behavioural developments) in the lithic assemblage from P4W was not required to complete the above-mentioned goals. However, the author acknowledges and appreciates the importance of a techno-typological approach within lithic studies and the limitations of a purely typological approach for understanding human behaviour.
and cognition from a lithic assemblage. Therefore, a technological study of the Pit 4 West assemblage will be conducted and published after the submission of this dissertation.

2.2 Geological context

2.2.1 The Vaal River Basin

“No archaeologist can appreciate the stratigraphy and chronology, nor indeed the lithology and typology revealed in the Vaal River valley, if he [or she] is not familiar with the general geological background.” ~ van Riet Lowe (1952: 135)

The first survey of the Vaal River basin, which included reporting on both the geological and archaeological nature of its terraces and the associated artefact-bearing stratified sequence, was conducted in 1936 and 1937 (van Riet Lowe 1952: 135). The geological history of the Vaal River itself is fundamental to understanding the movement of raw material in the system, the original locations of these materials and the most recent context and condition of these materials.

The author primarily provides sedimentological descriptions from van Riet Lowe (1952). Although his interpretations of the fluvial history and formation of the Vaal River are debated, his sedimentological descriptions of the various deposits are still used by researchers and are thus relevant. More recent interpretations regarding the history, formation and chronology of the Vaal River deposits are considerably more nuanced (e.g. Partridge & Brink 1967; Helgren 1977, 1979; De Wit et al. 2000; Gibbon 2009; Gibbon et al. 2009).

The regional geology of the Vaal basin provides general context to archaeological deposits. However, it is important to note that there is a great deal of variation in the specific geological sequence of any particular location within the basin, and stages may be absent or limited (Gibbon 2009; Gibbon et al. 2009). The author recognises the need to balance the broader regional context with site-specific interpretations of context (see sections below). Below the author provides a description of the Vaal River Basin that includes both van Riet Lowe’s (1952) original interpretation of the broader geomorphological model of the region, as well as more recent revisions and
corrections pertaining to his original model on the fluvial evolution of the Vaal River, by other researchers (Helgren 1979; De Wit et al. 2000; Gibbon 2009).

**Pre-Quaternary Period:**

The term pre-Quaternary here refers to the geological period/s prior to ~2.5 Ma (Walker 2005). During this time the Vaal River began migrating in a southward direction. This migration was primarily due to the erosion of deposits of the Karoo system, located to the south, that are less resistant than the northern Ventersdorp diabase which underlies the Karoo system (van Riet Lowe 1952: 135). These more resistant sheets of Ventersdorp diabase are gently south-sloping, a characteristic which further aided in the southerly movement of the Vaal River (van Riet Lowe 1952: 137).

The southward migration of the river system resulted in the removal of softer material present in the conglomerates and shales associated with the Karoo sediments to the south (left) bank of the river (van Riet Lowe 1952: 137). This led to residual material remaining, such as ‘quartzite, quartz, chert, agate, jasper, banded ironstone and chalcedony rocks’ that were far more resistant (van Riet Lowe 1952: 137).

The lithological composition of the Vaal River gravels differs between the upper and lower sections of the system (van Riet Lowe 1952: 138). The geological transformation of the landscape during both tertiary and early quaternary glacial periods (glacial-action) and the post-glacial periods (specifically referring to river-action) resulted in conglomerates containing different components (such as boulders, pebbles or gravels) existing either within the system or near its catchment area. De Wit (2008: 53) states that the dominant andesite component of the gravels is linked to the weathering of Ventersdorp lava bedrock in hills along the Vaal resulting in the colluvial deposition of clasts ranging in size up to large boulders. These conglomerates are often composed of reworked material and thus the source of some of the conglomerates in the river deposits are in regions that are not directly associated with the current river catchment (van Riet Lowe 1952: 137).
**Quaternary Period:**

The Quaternary is the most recent geological period spanning the last \(~2.6\) Ma of Earth’s history, up until and including present day (Lowe & Walker 1997: 1; Walker 2005). The Quaternary period is made up of two epochs. The first is the Pleistocene, which is the earliest period—beginning \(~2.5\) Ma and ending \(~11,700\) thousand years ago (ka) (Walker 2005). This period is most relevant to this research project as the earliest known date for stone tool production by past hominids in South Africa is \(~2.18\) Ma from the Sterkfontein Caves, Cradle of Humankind, Gauteng Province (Granger et al. 2015). The second and shorter epoch of the Quaternary is the Holocene, which begins at \(~11,700\) ka and is the interval that extends to the present day (Lowe & Walker 1997: 1).

**The Vaal River Sequence**

Van Riet Lowe (1952) describes the landscape of the Vaal River Valley as containing two main shelves that were cut into the valley over time. The terraced aggradations associated with these shelves are of great significance as they are composed of both coarse and fine deposits that contain stone tool material of different ages. Gibbon (2009) emphasises that the poor chronological framework and lack of absolute dates for the terrace deposits associated with the Vaal River brings earlier fluvial history models into question. The sequence of these terraces will be described below from the oldest, gravel, deposits. Van Riet Lowe (1948) proposed a stratigraphic sequence for the gravels made up of three levels: ‘Older’, ‘Younger’ and ‘Youngest’ gravels. The more recent Hutton/Kalahari Sands have been recognised as the youngest stage of the sequence, overlying the Youngest gravels, and will also be described below. It must be noted that the chronology of local deposits may differ from this sequence and thus an understanding of the local geological context is vital (Gibbon et al. 2009).

**The Basal Older Gravels and the Older Gravels:**

Subsequent to a period of tectonic uplift and wetter conditions during the Miocene (23.03-5.33 Ma) a period marked by “river rejuvenation/incision” (Gibbon 2009: 10) occurred. After the arid period that marked the end of Miocene, another period of
incision occurred during the Pliocene (5.33-2.58 Ma), specifically leading to the deposition of large-scale gravel deposits (De Wit et al. 2000; Gibbon 2009).

The ‘Older Gravels’ associated with the Vaal River are divided into two aggradation types by van Riet Lowe (1952: 141). The first form of aggradation is the in-situ ‘Basal Older Gravels’. This deposit is primarily made up of 90-95% of heavily rolled diabase pebbles and boulders. The diabase pebbles are generally a few centimetres in diameter with the larger boulders reaching much larger dimensions. Quartzite, quartz, indurated-shale, chert, banded-ironstone, jasper, chalcedony and agate primarily constitute the remaining 10-5% of raw material, and are also heavily rolled (van Riet Lowe 1952: 141). The size and shape of the non-diabasic raw material can be compared to that of a ‘potato’. In general, it is suggested that this basal level is archaeologically sterile.

The ‘Older Gravels’ that overlie the basal levels described above are characterised primarily by residual, more resistant non-diabasic raw material, such as quartzite, quartz, indurated-shale, chert, banded-ironstone, jasper, chalcedony and agate. The proportions of these materials contrast greatly to the lower basal gravels, as it is the disintegration and decay of the basal diabase and indurated-shale material that results in the increased presence and redistribution of non-diabasic material in the form of eluvial concentrations (‘Older Gravels’), which are associated with a notable increased ‘trace’ of diamonds (van Riet Lowe 1952: 141 & 142). The term ‘eluvial’ refers to material being ‘in-situ’ or material remaining relatively close to its source, as opposed to being transported by a water, such as in an alluvial deposit. Helgren (1977) describes the Older Gravels as being erratic in expression as they reflect the few depositional remnants of an extended period of time dominated by erosion. Helgren (1977) acknowledges that climate may have been a driver of these events, but that various other factors may have played a larger role.

Over time, the exposed surface of the more resistant Older Gravels (pebble-sized) that were not chemically weathered, or removed previously, became oxidized, leading many researchers to also describe the ‘Older Gravels’ as either ‘Red’ or ‘Potato’ Gravels. In some places, the Older gravels are associated with aeolian-derived Hutton/Kalahari Sands that would have naturally filtered into the gravels.
during coverage and were also reddened due to oxidation over long periods of exposure (van Riet Lowe 1952: 142).

Historical mining excavations of these Older Gravels, due to its diamondiferous nature, led not only to a profitable diamond-boom but also the destruction of stratigraphy at mined sites and the exposure and removal of prehistoric stone tools.

The Younger Gravels:

The Younger Gravels are made up of deposits of the Riverton and Rietputs Formations (Helgren 1979; De Wit et al. 2000; Gibbon 2009). Partridge & Brink (1967) suggest that the Rietputs Formation was formed during a period of semi-arid climate in which multiple shorter humid events occurred (Partridge & Brink 1967). The Younger gravels are divided into three groups: Younger Gravels I, Younger Gravels IIA & B and Younger Gravels III (van Riet Lowe 1952). Helgren (1977) also divides the Younger Gravels into three groups, albeit with different numbering.

Similarly, to the above Basal Older Gravels, The Younger Gravels are primarily made up of 90-95% of heavily rolled diabase pebbles and boulders. The diabase pebbles are generally a few centimetres in diameter with the larger boulders reaching much larger dimensions. Quartzite, quartz, indurated-shale, chert, banded-ironstone, jasper, chalcedony and agate primarily constitute the remaining 10-5% of raw material and are heavily rolled and sub-spheroidal in shape (van Riet Lowe 1952: 143). Similarly, to the description of the Older Basal Gravels, the size and shape of the non-diabase raw material can be compared to a ‘potato’.

Helgren (1977) attributes the large-scale deposition of gravels to a very humid environment with high rainfall, thus resulting in higher river runoff.

Partridge and Brink (1967) have been one of the major critics of the climate-based interpretations provided by researchers such as Söhnge et al. (1937); Riet Lowe (1952) and Helgren (1977). In contrast, they suggest that the variations associated with the river deposits are a result of the normal differences that are associated with different stages of a river system, in this case a mature stage. Furthermore, they suggest that a variety of factors including the geomorphic and geological characteristics of the river system at the time influenced the nature of the deposits.
Factors including “tectonics, river capture, variable lithologies and the cyclic passage of knickpoints” (Gibbon 2009: 25).

The Younger Gravels are characterised by a high proportion of stone tool implements. The assemblages associated with Younger Gravel I aggradation are characterised by handaxes and were thus described as being associated with the ‘African Chelles-Acheul culture’—what we now refer to as the African Acheulean (van Riet Lowe 1952).

The Youngest Gravels:

After the deposition of the Younger Gravels, heavily calcified sand and limestones covered their upper surface on a regional scale to varying depths (van Riet Lowe 1952: 144). These deposits became eroded, leaving an erosional platform at varying heights above the Younger Gravels. The Youngest Gravels were then deposited on this platform. Van Riet Lowe (1952) associates the appearance of the Fauresmith stone tool culture with this erosive surface of the Youngest Gravels. Note that the Youngest Gravels and the associated erosional surface are not found at Canteen Kopje. The appearance of this deposit is controlled by local palaeo-geomorphology and so may be absent in locations within the Vaal Basin.

The Youngest Gravels are described as ‘tributary gravels’ and differ lithologically and in form from the Older and Younger Gravel aggradations, as these gravels are derived from Vaal tributaries with different bedrock types (van Riet Lowe 1952: 143). In contrast to the Older and Younger Gravel levels, the Youngest Gravels are primarily made up of 50% diabase material and 50% non-diabasic (mainly indurated shale) raw material. Unlike the Younger Gravels, the constituent material associated with the tributary gravels are either slightly rolled or not rolled and are sub-angular in shape.

Hence the Youngest Gravels, are notably different from the underlying gravel levels described above. They are characterised by the sub-angular shape of constituent material (van Riet Lowe 1952: 144). Considering the sedimentological observations of the Youngest deposits, it is suggested that the conditions associated with its formation was not one of alluvial aggradation but rather “strong sheet erosion or violent eluvial” (van Riet Lowe 1952: 144) aggradation.
The Hutton/Kalahari Sands:

As well as being associated with the Youngest Gravels, the Fauresmith is also found within red aeolian-derived sands, referred to as the Hutton Sands or Kalahari Sands, which densely covered the upper surface of exposed gravels Van Riet Lowe (1952: 144). Chazan et al. (2013: 4) describe the Hutton Sands as “yellow to red silty sand” with the latter grain component being derived from the nearby Vaal River. The Hutton Sands contain stone tool implements associated with the ESA, MSA and LSA as well artefacts associated with the historical period in the region, at Canteen Kopje and a handful of other sites.

2.2.2 Canteen Kopje: History of Research

Canteen Kopje is an archaeological site that is situated near Barkly West in the Northern Cape Province, South Africa (Figure 2.3). The illustrious Abbé Henri Breuil, with reference to Canteen Kopje, stated: “You not only have enough artefacts to fill a museum here, but also enough to build the museum” (Clark 1959: 127). The archaeological significance represented by the rich deposit of well-preserved Earlier Stone Age (ESA) artefacts at Canteen Kopje was first recognised in the late 1800’s when it was exposed during the historical diamond mining rush that began in the region in 1869 (de Wit 2008). Subsequently, Canteen Kopje was declared a national monument in 1948 because of both the historical diamond mining activity and the geological and archaeological importance of the site (de Wit 2008; Lotter 2010a, b; Kuman 2012).

Since the start of the 20th century numerous researchers have studied the artefactual material yielded from Canteen Kopje (Goodwin 1927, 1929, 1934; Goodwin & van Riet Lowe 1929; van Riet Lowe 1937; Partridge & Brink 1967; Helgren 1978, 1979; De Wit 1996, 2008, Beaumont 2004; Forssman et al. 2010; Lotter 2010a, b; McNabb & Beaumont 2011; Lotter et al. 2016). However, it was only in 1997 that Peter Beaumont conducted the first controlled excavations of what is described as ‘Area 1’ and ‘Area 2’ at Canteen Kopje (McNabb & Beaumont 2011a). Beaumont excavated in 1999 again, and in 2000 with John McNabb. Michael Chazan and his team began
excavations at Canteen Kopje in 2007, focusing on the younger levels of the Stone Age sequence (Chazan 2013; Chazan et al. 2013) (Figure 2.3).

Research at Canteen Kopje by a University of the Witwatersrand (WITS) team led by G.M Leader, R. Gibbon and K. Kuman began in 2007 (Gibbon et al. 2009; Leader 2014). This led to new excavations at the site, to increase lithic samples and improve/refine interpretations regarding stratigraphy and site formation processes (Gibbon et al. 2008; Gibbon et al. 2009; Leader 2014; Lotter et al. 2016; Li et al. 2017). These investigations into both the context of artefacts as well as the techno-typological descriptions of the lithics, provide insight into the technological practices and behaviour of hominids on the landscape that we now refer to as Canteen Kopje.

Beaumont (2004a) first recorded diagnostic Fauresmith artefacts in the top 30 cm of the gravel levels that underlie the unconsolidated Hutton Sands in a pit at the site. He also stated that at Canteen Kopje the industry described as Fauresmith has received little attention and required more in-depth investigation.

A geoarchaeological study conducted by Lotter (2010a, b) and Lotter et al. (2016) was the first to specifically focus on site formation at Canteen Kopje using some high-resolution techniques. The study was on Pit 6 (Figure 1.2), which comprises a 7 m stratified sequence consisting of aeolian-derived Hutton Sands underlain by earlier alluvial gravels (Beaumont 1999; Gibbon et al. 2009; Leader 2014; Lotter et al. 2016). A mixed contact zone (MCZ) (approximately 35 cm thick in Pit 6) has developed at the unconformable contact or interface between the Hutton Sands and gravels (Beaumont 2004; McNabb & Beaumont 2011a, b; Lotter et al. 2016). The Fauresmith is associated with the MCZ and the base of the overlying Hutton Sands (Lotter et al. 2016).

The research completed for this dissertation built on the above past site formation work at Canteen Kopje particularly in Pit 6, by applying a broader multi-disciplinary and more fine resolution approach to the study of the site formation patterns associated with the proposed Fauresmith industry, in a new area of the site.

The gravel deposit that characterises the Canteen Kopje site is suggested to belong specifically to the Younger Gravels aggradation of the Vaal River Basin and is a component of the Rietputs Formation (de Wit 2008). The palaeo-channel to the east
of the site (Figure 2.3) is suggested to be responsible for the deposition of the Younger Gravels present in the Canteen Kopje area which contain the early Acheulean layers of the site (Söhnge et al. 1937; Helgren 1977; Leader 2014).

There are six cultural layers evident in Pit 6. Figure 2.3 shows the fine sediments, a mixed contact zone (MCZ) at the interface of the fine sediments and the top of the underlying alluvial gravels, which contain the first sands to accumulate at the site ca 0.3 Ma (Chazan et al. 2013). A preliminary age for the top of the alluvial gravels is >1 Ma (Beaumont and Vogel 2006; Leader 2014).

The deposit that was most relevant to Lotter et al.’s (2016) research was the unconsolidated Hutton Sands (devoid of clasts) which is approximately 2.1 m in thickness (Leader 2014). In Pit 6, the Hutton Sands yielded LSA material from 70-140 cm and MSA material from 140-170 cm (Forssman et al. 2010; Sarupen 2010; Lotter et al. 2016). Below 170 cm, Fauresmith material is present, with the MCZ extending from 195 cm to 230 cm. Below the MCZ is ca 2 m of an unmixed alluvial gravel that has yielded both the Victoria West Acheulean industry, and below that two Early Acheulean layers >1.5 Ma (Gibbon et al. 2013, Leader 2014; Lotter et al. 2016).

There are four phases of the Acheulean industry represented by Canteen’s archaeological sequence. The fourth and youngest phase of the ‘Acheulean’ is the in-situ Fauresmith horizon which is associated with the basal level of the fine Hutton Sands, resting on and including the mixed contact zone (MCZ) (Lotter et al. 2016: 305). The third phase is the Victoria West prepared Core industry—the most widely known industry from Canteen Kopje (Leader 2014)—with an age of >1 Ma. The first two phases are >1.5 Ma and belong to the Early Acheulean (Beaumont & Vogel 2006; Leader 2014).

The Victoria West levels are characterised by rolled artefacts, pebbles and andesite cobbles and boulders (Leader 2014). In contrast, the Fauresmith artefacts are in much fresher, unrolled condition. For the MCZ, Lotter et al. 2016 suggest that the irregular top surface of the gravels and bioturbation (insect activity, root growth and possibly tree-throw) are responsible for the mixing of some Fauresmith artefacts into the top 35 cm of the gravels in Pit 6.
Figure 2.3: The stratigraphic profile of the Canteen Kopje deposits from Pit 6 (left) and a description of the mixed contact zone (right) (from Lotter et al. 2016, Figure 2, 306).

**Pit 6 lithic assemblages**

Artefacts retrieved from Pit 6 and included in the geoarchaeological study by the WITS team were not discussed in any detail in Lotter *et al.* (2016) but were noted as a Fauresmith assemblage. However, the techno-typological description of this assemblage is under way and the material is confirmed as Fauresmith in nature.

A total of 3335 artefacts was yielded from the Pit 6 excavations at Canteen Kopje (Figure 2.4). The LSA assemblage is made up of 869 artefacts. The MSA assemblage is made up of 806 artefacts. An assemblage of 603 artefacts was recovered from the Fauresmith horizon within the base of the Hutton Sands, with an additional 943 artefacts (potentially Fauresmith) from the mixed contact zone (MCZ). The alluvial gravels assemblage is made up of 194 artefacts excavated from a small portion of the gravel sequence (Lotter *et al.* 2016).
Size profiles

Assemblage completeness can be determined by the different size profiles represented at a site (Schick 1987; Kuman et al. 2005). Size profile data can be used to determine whether artefact patterns are associated with hominid behaviour and activity, such as technological manufacturing and use practices, and/or or site formation processes such as post-depositional disturbances (Schick 1991: 79-105). The lithic data from the various Pit 6 assemblages, discussed below, show a difference in size profiles stratigraphically (Figure 2.5). The LSA assemblage is comprised of more than 70% of material <20 mm, and no artefact in the LSA level is recorded as being >160 mm (Forssman et al. 2010). Within the MSA assemblage, artefacts <20 mm in size make up almost 70% of the assemblage and are defined as small flaking debris (SFD) (Sarupen 2010). The Fauresmith in Pit 6 is dominated by 59% SFD which, in addition to the well-preserved condition of artefacts, suggests that the integrity of the assemblage has not been heavily compromised by post-depositional process (Lotter et al. 2016). Within both the MSA and Fauresmith levels, some artefacts are >180 mm, although these are rare occurrences. In contrast to these overlying assemblages, the MCZ assemblage comprised only 29% of material.
<20 mm and the assemblage yielded from the alluvial gravels contained only 8% of material <20 mm (Lotter et al. 2016). Within the gravels, artefacts >200 mm are common. Figure 2.5 demonstrates the size profiles of the various assemblages excavated in Pit 6 through the Hutton Sands and into the underlying gravels.

![All Pit 6 assemblages size profile](image)

Figure 2.5: A bar graph showing the <20 mm and > 20 mm size profile categories present in each assemblage yielded from Pit 6.

**Raw material**

Figure 2.6 demonstrates the different raw material proportions of the various assemblages excavated in Pit 6 as reported in the above references. Raw material is one of the single most significant factors influencing tool production. The availability of raw material on the landscape and its structural attributes (mineralogy, size and shape) affects the form and size attributes of artefacts (Sharon 2008: 1329-1343). The LSA is made up of 56% fine-grained raw materials, 37.1% Ventersdorp lava and 5.2% quartz. The MSA assemblage is made up of 49.5% ‘fine-grained’ raw material, 31.8% Ventersdorp lava and 11.5% quartz. At both Canteen Kopje and other sites, the Fauresmith has been associated with a diverse range of raw material types including quartz, quartzite and ‘finer-grained’ raw material (crypto-crystalline rocks, hornfels, cherts, agates, chalcedonies and banded ironstone) (Wilkins & Chazan 2012; Lotter et al. 2016). The Pit 6 Fauresmith assemblage (excluding artefacts from the MCZ) comprises 45.9% ‘fine grain’ material and 41.8% Ventersdorp lava. Within
the MCZ assemblage, 37% of artefacts are on Ventersdorp lava and 49.5% are on ‘fine-grained’ materials. In the gravels, Ventersdorp lava makes up 61.2% of the assemblage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSA: 70-140 cm</td>
<td>(n = 8352)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA: 140-170 cm</td>
<td>(n = 806)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauresmith: 170-195 cm</td>
<td>(n = 603)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed contact zone: 195-230 cm</td>
<td>(n = 943)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alluvial gravels: 230-240 cm</td>
<td>(n = 134)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Votersdorp lava  Quartzite  Quartz  Fine-grained materials

Figure 2.6: Raw material proportions for the respective assemblages from Pit 6 (from Lotter et al. 2016, Figure 6.314).

Artefact condition

Figure 2.7 demonstrates the different proportions of artefact conditions in the various assemblages excavated in Pit 6. The concept of ‘artefact condition’, in both Lotter et al.’s (2016) study and in this research, relates to the surficial weathering states of lithic artefacts. The degree of abrasion of an artefact’s surface can be linked to potential post-depositional mechanisms associated with the movement of artefacts (Shea 1999: 192).

Lotter et al. (2016) only provide artefact condition data for the Fauresmith, MCZ and alluvial gravel levels in Pit 6. Within the Fauresmith-bearing portion of the Hutton Sands, only 2% of artefacts were described as heavily weathered/abraded. The majority (56%) of Fauresmith artefacts are classified as fresh/unabraded. The assemblage extracted from within the MCZ comprised 51% heavily weathered/abraded. The slightly weathered/abraded proportion was 24%, and fresh/unabraded proportion constituted 25%. The degree of weathering/abrasion
increased notably with depth below surface. The alluvial gravel assemblage is characterised by a large proportion of heavily weathered/abraded artefacts (76%), with only 6% of the assemblage classified as fresh/unabraded (Lotter et al. 2016: 312-315). A high percentage of heavily abraded at this stratigraphic level suggests the ‘movement and mixing’ (of an abrasive-nature) within the gravels.

![Artifact condition distributions for the Fauresmith, mixed contact zone and alluvial gravel assemblages from Pit 6.](from Lotter et al. 2016, Figure 7., 315).

**2.3 Sedimentological and geochemical methods: An overview**

**2.3.1 Sedimentological analysis**

The analysis of sediments in the field (*in-situ*) is a vital component of understanding the context of an archaeological deposit (Goldberg & MacPhail 2006). The evaluation of site stratigraphy and the sedimentological properties of stratigraphic units provide the researcher with valuable data on site formation. Data collected in the field include colour, texture, sorting, erosive and depositional structures, sediment composition, and many other properties (Goldberg & MacPhail 2006).
The collection of sediment samples from various strata at an archaeological site allows for further data to be obtained in a laboratory environment—data that is not easily observed in the field. Types of data analysed in the laboratory include mineralogy, particle shape and particle size and the proportion of moisture, organic and inorganic content within samples. These attributes, along with the field data, provide the researcher with an insight into the depositional environment of and post-depositional processes affecting sediments. This in turn allows the determination of potential modifications to archaeological assemblages and thus an understanding of their integrity.

Geoarchaeological studies combining field and laboratory methods have been applied to few open-air sites in southern Africa but have yielded important contextual data for those sites. South African sites to which these methods have been applied include: Doornlaagte and Rooidam (Butzer 1974), Florisbad (Kuman et al. 1999), Kudu Koppie (Pollard et al. 2010), Canteen Kopje (Chazan et al. 2013; Lotter et al. 2016), and Maropeng (Morrissey 2015; Morrissey et al. in prep.)

2.3.2 X-ray fluorescence (XRF)

XRF analysis is focused on geochemical compositions. The purpose of using XRF is to statistically understand the different proportions of different geochemical components present in a sediment samples.

Pillay et al. (2000) serve as an example of the application of XRF at a South African site. Iron Age pottery samples from two coastal sites, Mzonjani and Emberton Way, and two inland sites Nanda and KwaGandaganda, were used. The result of the study concluded that specimens recovered from coastal locations and associated with coastal populations originated from an inland source based on the comparison of the chemical composition of the clay in the pottery to known clay-beds (Pillay et al. 2000: 61). Whilst this example is based on ceramics, the concept of provenance studies is relevant to this research project. The presence and proportions of minerals within a stratigraphic profile can be used to identify the source/s—or the provenances—of the sediment (Pillay et al. 2000; Shackley 2011: 36) and be used to inform us on site formation processes.
The differences between geochemical components/elements can be suggestive of varying depositional environments, as well as the extent of mixing stratigraphically. Therefore, XRF analysis has the potential to provide important information about the similarities and differences between environments represented in sediment samples taken from various levels in a sedimentary profile, as well as the contextual integrity of the deposits.

### 2.3.3 Optically-stimulated Luminescence (OSL) dating

Optically stimulated luminescence (OSL) dating has become a common and often essential aspect archaeological research. OSL dating makes use of quartz and/or feldspar in sediments and serves as an alternative option for dating sites that lack preserved organic material that would be used for relative or radio-carbon dating (Chazan et al. 2013: 12).

There have been two attempts at yielding OSL dates from Canteen Kopje, by Evans & Cunningham (2013) and Chazan et al. (2013). Evans & Cunningham (2013) previously dated samples from Pit 6; however, due to the poor conditions of the samples taken from the Hutton Sands (which were also not collected by Evans & Cunningham but by G. Susino), the dating process was not successful. A high over-dispersion rate was recorded in the samples and indicated heavy bioturbation.

Chazan et al. (2013) had more success with dating sediments in the unstructured Hutton Sands at Canteen Kopje because they applied single grain analysis. The dating of samples from Pit CK-21 yielded results that were not able to provide a date for the late MSA to early LSA located at the ‘lower component’ of the Hutton Sands sequence, which was the main aim of their dating attempt. This was due to high over-dispersion in the samples associated with these levels. However, sampling from the interface between the Younger Gravels and the overlying Hutton Sands did provide a dominant age population of ~300 ka (Chazan et al. 2013: 12). This provides a minimum date for the Younger Vaal gravels at this location and, potentially, a date estimate for the Fauresmith, which has been associated with this interface or ‘mixed contact zone’ in past studies (Beaumont 2004; Lotter et al. 2016).
As is clear from this discussion, besides the Fauresmith being poorly defined, it is also poorly dated. Therefore, the author pursued OSL dating to gain some chronological control for the ESA to MSA archaeological levels in the new Pit 4 West excavation, with the primary aim being to obtain a date for the Fauresmith. This could help to supplement the date obtained by Chazan et al. (2013) for Canteen Kopje and provide further data towards an age range for the Fauresmith across interior southern Africa.
Chapter 3: Methodology

The Methodology chapter is divided into four sections. The first section, ‘Excavation methodology’, is an in-depth description of the fine resolution excavation protocol applied to the Pit 4 West (P4W) excavation. The second section, ‘Recording methodology’, is a detailed description of the various techniques used to document the excavation and artefact extraction both geoarchaeologically and archaeologically, in the effort to optimise geospatial control. The third section, ‘Lithic analysis methodology’, provides the reader with the typology used to analyse and classify the stone tool material yielded. The final section, ‘Sediment sampling and analyses’, provides the various protocols followed for the different sampling and analyses of sedimentary material at various resolutions for a diverse range of data.

3.1 Excavation methodology

As mentioned in previous chapters, earlier excavations at Canteen Kopje have been conducted at relatively low resolution. Macroscopically, the sands capping the gravels contain little visible stratigraphy. In addition to this, a high rate of bioturbation, principally from root growth and insect activity, has affected assemblage integrity to some degree, especially at the contact between the sands and the gravels. However, despite these factors, there is a clear archaeo-stratigraphy in which different techno-complexes are evident within the sequence. The presence of three different industries in sequence in the sands conforms to identification of Fauresmith, MSA, and LSA.

The degree of resolution applied to an excavation and the documentation of a site is directly correlated to the quality and quantity of yielded data (Lyman 2012: 212). In order to investigate the context of the ‘Fauresmith’ and the other excavated industries from the new excavation. A finer resolution approach (than previously used) was adopted. This approach has allowed the author to yield macro-stratigraphic data, micro-stratigraphic data and geochemical data. The combination of which provides a dataset that shows diverse depositional and post-depositional features affecting assemblages in various ways and at different scales. The finer the resolution used to document an excavation, the more precise information regarding
the provenience of the artefact/s, features and strata will be. The term ‘provenience’ referring to the ‘x, y’ and ‘z’ dimensions of an artefactual or depositional feature, as well as its association within the geological/stratigraphic sequence at a site (Lyman 2012: 212). The new excavation was conducted with fine geospatial resolution in a multi-disciplinary, stratigraphically sensitive approach, particularly in the contact zone between the upper sedimentary unit (sands) and the lower sedimentary unit (alluvium), to provide greater contextual control over this important stratigraphic feature. This feature, referred to as a ‘mixed contact zone’ in previous studies (Lotter et al. 2016), has yielded Fauresmith artefacts in Pit 6. These artefacts are described in Chapter 2.

3.1.1 Excavation protocol

The new excavation that was conducted for this research project will henceforth be referred to as ‘Pit 4 West’ (P4W). P4W is a rectangular trench that was dug using the southern wall of the previously excavated Pit 4 (unpublished). The choice to investigate P4W for this project was guided by the discovery of a small refined handaxe in fresh condition that was excavated from the top of the gravels, suggesting the Fauresmith may be present there (Leader & Kuman, pers. comm. 2015). The extension of the existing excavation began in May and June of 2016.

May and June 2016

On May 25th the vegetation and miners’ debris were removed from the landscape surface to expose a 3 m² area on the southern edge of Pit 4, and a 2x1 m line grid was laid down and divided into two 1x1 m squares named ‘Square 1’ and ‘Square 2’, respectively (see Figure 3.1 & 3.2).

This first phase of the P4W excavation focused on digging the upper sedimentary unit at the site, which is the Hutton Sands. As described in Chapter 2, other excavations at Canteen Kopje have yielded LSA and MSA material from the Hutton Sands (Partridge & Brink 1967; Butzer et al. 1973; Helgren 1978, 1979; Beaumont 1990a, 2004; De Wit et al. 1997; De Wit 2008; McNabb & Beaumont 2011). Based on personal communication with Leader & Kuman about the adjacent Pit 4 excavation, it was agreed that the LSA and MSA sample in that particular locality was not very rich compared to Pit 6. Hence the author adopted a lower-resolution
approach for these levels of the Hutton Sands, digging in 10 cm spits with artefacts and/or features being documented stratigraphically. However, artefacts (>20 mm) and natural rock (>40 mm) were recorded *in-situ* using the total station and then removed and stored as per the protocol discussed in the following sections. The Hutton Sands is massive in structure and this approach allowed the author to record artefact horizons and isolated artefacts at fine resolution despite the unit they were contained in being visibly unstratified.

![Figure 3.1: A photograph of Pit 4 west showing each excavation square.](image)

Sieving and sorting of collected sediment in buckets were conducted 10 m from the site on a spoil heap. Each bucket of excavated material was dry sieved through 2 mm mesh once the excavator filled the buckets. Sieve residue was hand-sorted to optimise the recovery of any small flaking debris (<20 mm). No wet sieving was conducted due to the lack of biological material (such as bone) and the consolidated nature of the sediment at the site. Sieved artefacts were placed in individual bags, which were labelled according to their excavation date, square and spit level. The screening of all material was conducted and overseen by both the author and her supervisors.
October 2016

The second phase of the P4W excavation was conducted from 1st-10th October and focused on excavating and recording the denser gravel horizon below the Hutton Sands, which has yielded stratigraphically associated Fauresmith and Victoria West material at Canteen Kopje (Leader 2014; Lotter et al. 2016).

The vertical limit of the excavation was determined by observing the maximum depth of the MCZ as indicated by the presence of relatively ‘fresh’ artefacts associated with the rounded gravels containing the Victoria West industry (Leader 2014; Lotter et al. 2016). The excavation then continued 20cm below the depth of the last ‘fresh’ artefact found in the gravels to ensure the MCZ was spatially constrained (Figure 3.2).

![Figure 3.2: A schematic view of the exposed alluvial gravel unit in Pit 4 west and the excavation walls and squares. The angle of the photograph results in some dimension distortion, however this is not the case.](image)

### 3.2 Recording methods

This section will provide the protocols followed by the author to document and manage the archaeological and geospatial (stratigraphic) digital datasets for this research project.
3.2.1 Total station

The total station protocol used for this research project was slightly modified from that presented in McPherron (2005) (Figure 3.3). This project made use of a Nikon Nivo 5C total station to digitally document the distribution of all artefacts >20 mm recovered, including those assigned to the Middle Stone Age and Fauresmith, and rolled/abraded Victoria West material within the potential MCZ excavated from P4W (Figure 3.4).

Specific criteria were adhered to in order to yield as fine resolution in-situ data as possible. The primary focus of this research project was one of context (of the Fauresmith). Context is associated with and influenced by site formation processes at Canteen Kopje. Below are the categories of features that were recorded using a total station, some of which will be discussed in further detail in following subsections:

- Both natural stones, and unnaturally occurring anthropogenically transported or modified stones, henceforth referred to as ‘artefacts’ or ‘lithics’, were recorded using the total station. Each category has its own size thresholds (≥20 mm for artefacts and ≥40 mm for natural clasts) that allowed the author to standardise the data being collected.
- Importantly, as described in the previous section, stratigraphic boundaries and features (e.g. concentrations of clasts) were recorded, particularly within the Hutton Sands (when visible) and at the interface between the sands and the underlying alluvial gravels.
- Each bucket of sediment was documented as a single point using the total station. The point was recorded at the central depth of the relevant square after the bucket was filled. This allowed for the SFD collected from each sieving batch to be related to the depth and spatial data of its relevant bucket point.
- Sediment samples were recorded by the central depth of each sample. Multiple samples were taken from along and across the sands and gravel unit. Sediment sampling and analysis is discussed in detail in Section 3.5.
- Other non-artefactual plotting categories not discussed above included: the excavation grid, datum levels, daily depths, and bioturbation features such as roots, termite and bird tunnels, and cracks. Recording features indicative of
Bioturbation is important because it is these features that can affect the weathering and movement of artefactual material within the deposit. By recording these data, the author was able to identify the relationship between macroscopically obvious areas of bioturbation and artefacts in the same area.

**Geographic information system (GIS)**

Artefact orientation and gradient data were collected to better understand the fabric of the different deposits in P4W and how they are potentially related. Points recorded by the total station were plotted on a local grid. All artefacts were plotted and thus provide the first ‘x’, ‘y’ and ‘z’ model for material at various stratigraphic contact points. This was done to help determine the exact position of fresh vs. abraded artefacts in the potential MCZ, where some Fauresmith artefacts may occur in the top of the gravels (as in Pit 6) (Lotter *et al.* 2016). High resolution ‘z’ (vertical position) readings are necessary for understanding the position of lithic industries within P4W in the broader Canteen Kopje geomorphological model.

**Fabric Analysis**

In this section, the term ‘clast’ is used as a collective term to refer to both natural stones and artefacts alike. The orientation and dip of clasts within a deposit are affected by a range of depositional mechanisms, such as colluvial or alluvial activity (Goldberg & MacPhail 2006: 42-71, 88-89).

High resolution recording has provided new insight into the mixed context of P4W, as clast organisation within the deposits not only indicates if there is bioturbation (as in Pit 6) (Goldberg & MacPhail 2006: 24), but it also clarifies the extent of the mixing by identifying the clast organisation of Fauresmith material in the MCZ in the top of the alluvial gravels.

For this reason, deposit fabric data were collected by recording the dip and orientation of clasts. A single point (P) was plotted for artefacts <40 mm and a maximum of 6 points (A, B, C, D, P, TP) was plotted for artefacts >40 mm. Clasts that were ≥40 mm in length with a ≥1.6:1 elongation index (maximum length (points A to B) /maximum width ratio (points C to D)) were specifically recorded for fabric analysis, following Stratford (2011) and Bertran & Texier (1995).
Figure 3.3: An example of the application of the formula adapted from McPherron (2005) used to calculate the bearing and gradient of the example CLAST1 (from Shadrach 2015).

![Table and formula image]

Figure 3.4: Total station recording at Pit 4 West: a) the Nikon total station over the master datum; b) the master datum; c) a view of the total station in relation (general distance and depth) to the excavation.

![Images of total station recording]
3.3 Lithic analysis method

Stone artefacts, or what has traditionally been described as ‘chipped stone’ (Holmes 1894), serve as a proxy for hominid behaviour (see Chapter 2). Yerkes & Kardulias (1993: 90) describe the four primary objectives of lithic technologists as follows:

1) Identifying artefacts which have been produced by hominids.
2) Developing a timeline of stone tool production, which includes the procurement and transportation of raw material as well as the manufacturing and use of tools.
3) Identifying and documenting the changes associated with tool morphology and function through time.
4) Recognising and promoting stone tools as cultural material, indicative and representative of human development and chronology.

3.3.1 General attributes

The quantitative and qualitative attributes that were recorded for each artefact excavated from P4W by the author are presented in Table 3.1. Table 3.2 provides the specific tool type classifications used in the typological study for this project that were applied to artefacts from all industries and stratigraphic units.

Table 3.1: Quantitative and qualitative lithic attributes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Cores</th>
<th>Flakes</th>
<th>Formals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum length</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum thickness</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological length</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological width</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facets</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of flake scars</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of flake scars ≥10 cm</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium-carbonate coating</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface condition</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge length</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butt plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tip plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw material</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.3.2 Typological classification

Table 3.2: Lithic typology classifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool type</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cores</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single platform</td>
<td>Flaked unidirectional using a single surface as a flaking platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyhedral</td>
<td>Flaked from three or more platforms from different directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kombewa flake-core</td>
<td>Contains two platforms or two ventral surfaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>Have one or two flake removals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split cobble</td>
<td>A broken cobble, potentially through bipolar percussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core fragment</td>
<td>Broken pieces of core missing diagnostic information regarding what type of core it belonged to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifacial</td>
<td>Multiple removals from different faces and directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidirectional</td>
<td>Flaked from two directions only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flakes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Maintains all technological features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Usually maintains a platform or enough for a measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flake fragment</td>
<td>Pieces of flakes that generally lack a platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split</td>
<td>Split down the centre or laterally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Débordant</td>
<td>Also referred to a core-edge flake, it is associated with platform rejuvenation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kombewa</td>
<td>Contains two platforms or two ventral surfaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blades</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Flake length=Width x 2 minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Usually maintains a platform or enough for a measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade fragment</td>
<td>Flakes that generally lack a platform but maintain enough length to be a blade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal tools</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaver</td>
<td>Generally has a wide/broad straight cutting edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handaxe</td>
<td>Bifacial with a convergent tip shape (pointy) due to shaping and thinning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retouched flake</td>
<td>Secondary trimming on one or more edges of a flake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retouched kombewa flake</td>
<td>Secondary trimming on one or more edges of a kombewa flake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retouched débordant</td>
<td>Secondary trimming on one or more edges of a débordant flake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retouched incomplete flake</td>
<td>Secondary trimming on one or more edges of an incomplete flake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retouched blade</td>
<td>Secondary trimming on one or more edges of a blade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chunks</strong></td>
<td>Blocky, angular form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small flaking debris (SFD)</strong></td>
<td>Lithic material (debitage) with dimensions less than 20 mm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of conducting a lithic typological study was to try to isolate the different industries that were within the P4W excavation and, based on these observations, compare the lithic dataset to the spatial dataset produced for this research. This was done based on past studies such as Sarupen (2010) who describes the Middle Stone Age (MSA) from the site, Leader (2014) who discusses the Victoria West industry from the site, and Lotter et al. (2016) who attempted to distinguish the Fauresmith from the Victoria West. Lotter et al. (2016) primarily distinguish between the Fauresmith and the Victoria West based on artefactual abrasion/weathering states, suggesting that more heavily weathered/abraded artefacts were Victoria West-derived and fresher pieces belonged to the Fauresmith. For this research project, the author used Lotter et al.’s (2016) criteria.

3.4 Sediment sampling and analytical methods

In this section the author describes the sampling methods and analyses that are focused on sedimentary deposits in Pit 4 West (P4W). Bulk sediment samples were taken for laboratory-based sedimentological and geochemical analysis. Sediment cores were taken from the main western profile of P4W as dating samples. Block sediment samples were taken as micromorphology samples. In the sections below, an in-depth description of the protocols for each sedimentary technique and study, described above, is provided.

3.4.1 Macroscopic (in-situ) analysis

Sediment samples were collected to provide fine granulometric data pertaining to visible facies and potentially non-visible microfacies in P4W (Goldberg & MacPhail 2006: 38-40). A combination of the two datasets has the potential to provide fine resolution information regarding the depositional and post-depositional (e.g. erosion, bioturbation) processes, often associated with sandy terrains, affecting the integrity of artefactual material (Goldberg & MacPhail 2006: 140-150).

The standard in-situ description of the following visible variables/properties of sediment was recorded for all stratigraphic units and facies using a customised recording sheet (see Table 3.3): colour, texture, moisture, structure, consistency,
voids, stratigraphic contact, clast size and shape, sorting, bioturbation. The macroscopic description of these attributes follows Goldberg & MacPhail (2006: 321-328). Documentation procedures for each of these are described below:

- **Colour**: Documented by using the Munsell description. The moist colour was recorded for each sample, as opposed to their dry colour.
- **Texture (grain size (Goldberg & MacPhail 2006: 13))**: Documented by using “finger texturing” (Goldberg & MacPhail 2006: 327). Texture descriptions include one or a combination of the following terms: silt, clay, loam, sand.
- **Moisture**: Documented by describing the deposit as moist or dry. This could also be included in the ‘consistency’ column on the recording sheet (Table 3.3).
- **Structure**: Structure descriptions include one or a combination of the following terms: granular, blocky, prismatic, columnar, platy, single grained, massive.
Table 3.3: In-situ field recording sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deposit Name/Location</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Sediment/Horizon 1</th>
<th>Sediment/Horizon 2</th>
<th>Sediment/Horizon 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exavator Name:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colour</strong></td>
<td>Dark Brown Red</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Munsell</strong></td>
<td>10R 3/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
<td>clast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Void space</strong></td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td>granular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistency</strong></td>
<td>loose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stratified</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sorting</strong></td>
<td>poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper contact</strong></td>
<td>conformable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower contact</strong></td>
<td>erosion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clasts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size range (mm)</strong></td>
<td>30-400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shape</strong></td>
<td>angular/subangular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fragmentation?</strong></td>
<td>highly fragmented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Association</strong></td>
<td>irregular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grading</strong></td>
<td>regular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matrix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Origin</strong></td>
<td>allageneic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texture</strong></td>
<td>sil: loam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consolidation</strong></td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grading</strong></td>
<td>inverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artefacts/Fossils/Roots/Burrows</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presence</strong></td>
<td>artefact &amp; fossil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size range (mm)</strong></td>
<td>&lt;50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max root depth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bone fragmentation</strong></td>
<td>highly fragmented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Consistency: Consistency descriptions include one or a combination of the following terms: loose, friable, firm, extremely firm.

• Voids: Documented by describing visible pore space or porosity.

• Stratigraphic contact: Contact descriptions include one or a combination of the following terms: nonconformity, angular unconformity, disconformity, conformable, gradational contact.

• Clast size: Documented by using the total station. However, macroscopically, clast size was determined using the following grade terms (Table 3.4):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Pieces</th>
<th>The Aggregate</th>
<th>The Indurated Rock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowlder 256 mm.</td>
<td>Bowlder gravel</td>
<td>Bowlder conglomerate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobble 64 mm.</td>
<td>Cobble gravel</td>
<td>Cobble conglomerate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pebble 4 mm.</td>
<td>Pebble gravel</td>
<td>Pebble conglomerate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granule 2 mm.</td>
<td>Granule gravel</td>
<td>Granule conglomerate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very coarse sand grain 1 mm.</td>
<td>Very coarse sand</td>
<td>Very coarse sandstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse sand grain 1/2 mm.</td>
<td>Coarse sand</td>
<td>Coarse sandstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium sand grain 1/4 mm.</td>
<td>Medium sand</td>
<td>Medium sandstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine sand grain 1/8 mm.</td>
<td>Fine sand</td>
<td>Fine sandstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very fine sand grain 1/16 mm.</td>
<td>Very fine sand</td>
<td>Very fine sandstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silt particle 1/256 mm.</td>
<td>Silt</td>
<td>Siltstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay particle</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Claystone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4: Wentworth scale (from Wentworth 1922, Table 1, 381).

• Clast shape: Documented by using the following categories (see Figure 3.5):

Figure 3.5: The categories used to classify in-situ clast angularity (from Mazzullo & Graham 1988, Appendix I: Figure 3, 54).
• Sorting: Documented by identifying the proportions and number of various size classes within a deposit. See Figure 3.6 below:

![Sorting categories](image)

Figure 3.6: Sorting categories: (a) well-sorted sand; (b) well-sorted silt; (c) bimodal: well-sorted silt and sand; (d) well-sorted sand of varying composition; (e) moderately sorted sand; (f) poorly sorted silt; (g) bimodal: poorly sorted sand in a well-sorted silt; (h) unsorted (from Goldberg & MacPhail 2006, Figure 1.2., 17).

• Bioturbation: Documented by describing potential post-depositional features. This description generally includes a variation or combination of the following features: animal and/or insect burrows and/or tunnels, root activity, cracks.

• Erosional features: The presence (or absence) of features indicative of erosional events caused by any natural or anthropogenic process. The identification of such features is important as they indicate the removal and redistribution of material and the potential creation of “gaps” in the sedimentary and archaeological sequences.

3.4.2 Laboratory analysis

Laboratory analysis of the samples follows various authors (Heiri *et al.* 2001; Goldberg & MacPhail 2006) and includes loss on ignition (LOI), granulometry (sediment particle size) and particle shape, and x-ray fluorescence (xrf) geochemical analysis.
Sampling

A total of 20 bulk samples from P4W were taken for this project over three trips to Canteen Kopje between June 2016 and March 2017. The protocol for taking sediment samples and analysing them primarily followed Goldberg and MacPhail (2006). In regard to extracting bulk samples, loose sediment from various locations in the excavation was collected, using a trowel, and placed into transparent plastic bags. Each sample location was recorded using a total station and each bag was labelled with the date, deposit, square and relevant total station details. This ensured that any data collected in the laboratory could be related to a specific vertical and horizontal location within the excavation.

Moisture content preparation

Moisture content analysis followed a standard protocol that is generally used by most laboratories. The following sediment preparation protocol was applied for the moisture content analysis of all 20 samples (see Table 3.5 for recording sheet):

1) Each sediment sample was sieved through 1mm mesh.
2) Each foil container was weighed and documented.
3) Approximately 15 g was taken from each sample and transferred into individual foil containers.
4) The sediment-bearing foil containers were placed in an oven set to 90 ºC for 18 hours. The main purpose for using this protocol was to extract moisture from the samples using a relatively low temperature over a long period of time to avoid removing anything other than water.
5) Once each foil container was removed from the oven, each one was weighed, and each weight was documented.

Organic content preparation

The LOI protocol, pertaining to organic carbon used for this research project was adapted from Heiri *et al.* (2001). The samples that had undergone moisture content analysis where used in this analysis. The steps that were followed for sediment preparation are presented below and were conducted in the Sediment laboratory in the Bernard Price building at the University of the Witwatersrand (see Table 3.3 for recording sheet):
1) After all moisture content samples were weighed, the samples were transferred from their foil containers into ceramic crucibles, which were weighed prior to the transfer.

2) The combined weight of the crucibles and their contents was recorded, as some sediment loss would have occurred during the transfer.

3) Heiri et al. (2001: 108) proposes that 550ºC be the set temperature for the muffle furnace. The recommended period for samples to be exposed to 550ºC is a minimum of 4 hours.

4) The author would like to state that, based on previous experience, the muffle furnace’s internal temperature increases notably once the set temperature is reached. In order to avoid the material being unnecessarily exposed to temperatures significantly high than required, the sediment-bearing crucibles were placed into a muffle furnace that was set to 450 ºC for eight hours.

5) In total the samples were in the muffle furnace for 11 hours. It took approximately one hour for the muffle furnace to reach 450 ºC. Once 450 ºC was reached the samples remained in the muffle furnace for eight hours at this temperature. After these eight hours, the muffle furnace was switched off and the samples remained inside for two more hours as the muffle furnace was too hot to remove the crucibles immediately.

6) Once each crucible was removed from the muffle furnace, each one was weighed and the LOI (grams and percentage) was documented.

**Inorganic carbon content preparation**

Analysis of inorganic carbon followed an adapted form of the protocol developed by Heiri et al. (2001). The samples that had previously undergone moisture content analysis and organic carbon content analysis were used in this analysis.

1) Heiri et al. (2001) proposes that 950 ºC be the set temperature for the muffle furnace. The recommended period for samples to be exposed to 900 ºC is two hours (Heiri et al. 2001: 108). As stated above, based on the author’s previous experience, the muffle furnace’s internal temperature increases notably once the set temperature is reached. In order to avoid the material being unnecessarily exposed to temperatures significantly high than required,
the sediment-bearing crucibles (air-cooled after the organic content analysis) were placed into a muffle furnace that was set to 900 °C.

2) In total the samples were in the muffle furnace for 5 hours. It took approximately one hour for the muffle furnace to reach 900 °C. Once 900 °C was reached the samples remained in the muffle furnace for two hours at this temperature. After these two hours the muffle furnace was switched off and the samples remained inside for two more hours, as the muffle furnace was too hot to remove the crucibles.

3) Once each crucible was removed from the muffle furnace, each one was weighed and the LOI (grams and percentage) was documented.

Table 3.5: Loss on ignition (LOI) recording sheet for inorganic content for all nine XRF samples. All weights were recorded to the first two decimal places.

| Pit 4 West XRF samples - LOI Inorganic Content |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Sample | Crucible weight (g) | Sub-sample weight (g) | Combined weight (g) | After LOI combined weight (g) | Weight lost (g) | LOI % |

**Particle size: Mastersizer 3000 protocol**

Identifying particle size distributions is significant because inferences regarding the level of sorting (uniformity of particle size) in a deposit can be made, particularly informing us about the depositional or post-depositional processes (e.g. erosion and/or transportation) that may have resulted in said distributions (Goldberg & MacPhail 2006: 89, 336).

A Mastersizer 3000 laser diffraction particle size analyser was used to analyse particle size for this research project. The Mastersizer is located in the Sediment laboratory in the Bernard Price Building at the University of the Witwatersrand and was used by the author in May 2017.

The sub-samples used for particle size are the same samples that underwent both moisture and organic content analysis. These samples were already unconsolidated and as mentioned in the previous section, were originally sieved through a 2 mm
sieve, so any gravel particles that may have resulted in a major size or weight difference were removed (as to not clog the Mastersizer’s tubes).

Presented below is the preparation protocol followed by the author:

1) A small amount of the sediment was placed into a small beaker.
2) Water was added using a syringe to make a paste.
3) The sediment paste was slowly added to a large beaker of water on the Mastersizer platform until the required obscuration was reached.
4) The Mastersizer software was run.

There are 18 lasers in the Mastersizer 3000. The dispersant used was unpurified tap water. The Mastersizer was set on five measurement cycles (five “snapshots” provide a better representation). Three cycles of cleaning are conducted after the measurement cycles are completed. The process ends on a single degasing cycle.

The Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) properties are presented in Figure 3.7 below:

![Figure 3.7: The Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) used for Pit 4 West samples.](image)

**Microscopic sediment analyses**

Particle shape, specifically angularity/roundness and sphericity (Figure 3.8), can be relevant in determining the source and transport processes of the material (Bullock
et al. 1985: 29). The term sphericity refers to the overall form of a particle, not necessarily its edges (Bullock et al. 1985: 32). The roundness or smoothness of a particle refers to the surface of the particle. This is significant because the surface of a particle could determine various processes that may have affected a particle. For example, a rough surface may indicate weathering, whereas smoothness may indicate depositional, erosional or transportation processes (Bullock et al. 1985: 32).

Angularity/roundness and Sphericity were documented using a customised recording sheet, designed specifically for this research project by the author (Table 3.6). Analysis of all twenty bulk sediment samples was conducted by the author in the microscope room in the Origins Centre at the University of the Witwatersrand. An Olympus BX41 microscope was used for this analysis. Below is a description of the data recorded for each microscopic sample (see Table 3.6):

- **Particle size range**: Size descriptions was provided using the scale on the microscope, in microns.
  - Percentage (proportion) of the clast ranges.

- **Angularity/roundness**: Angularity/roundness descriptions include one or a combination of the following terms (Figure 3.5 & 3.8): rounded, sub-rounded, sub-angular, and angular.
  - Percentage (proportion) of the shape angularity/roundness categories.

- **Sphericity**: Sphericity descriptions include one or both of the following terms (Figure 3.8):
  - High sphericity percentage (proportion).
  - Low sphericity percentage (proportion).

- **Percentage (proportion) of grains cemented onto one another.**

- **Lithology**:
  - Percentage (proportion) quartz.
  - Percentage (proportion) feldspar.

- **Sorting category**

- **Organic Material**: Presence or absence.
  - Percentage (proportion) of organic material presence.
Figure 3.8: Sphericity and roundness categories combined with roughness versus smoothness categories (from Bullock et al. 1985, Figure 31, 31).

Table 3.6: Microscope recording sheet for Pit 4 West samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Sample:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clast</td>
<td>Shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size range</td>
<td>Angularity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.3 X-ray Fluorescence (XRF) Spectrometry

X-ray fluorescence spectrometry (XRF) was applied to nine sediment samples extracted from the nine OSL core holes (CNK1-CNK9) in P4W, discussed previously. The author felt that geochemical analysis of the sediments directly associated with the OSL samples would serve as supporting data for interpretations made based on any OSL dates yielded. In addition to this, mineralogy was also applied as a means of identifying the constituent material in various deposits, which could provide an indication of possible sources for this material.

XRF is generally a non-destructive form of chemical composition analysis (Shackley 2011: 8-9). “X-rays are a short wavelength (high energy-high frequency) form of electromagnetic radiation inhabiting the region between gamma rays and ultraviolet radiation” (Shackley 2011: 16).

Sampling protocol

The preparation of the samples before XRF analysis was conducted by the author. Prior to XRF analysis, the inorganic content (calcium carbonate (CaCo$_3$)) of each sample was recorded. The loss on ignition (LOI) protocol used for this research project was adapted from Heiri et al. (2001). The protocol followed for XRF organic content sample preparation is the same as that presented in the previous ‘Inorganic carbon’ section, with slight differences presented below:

1) Each sediment sample was sieved through 106 μm mesh, as opposed to a 1 mm mesh.
2) A total of exactly 5 g, as opposed to 15 g, from each sample was transferred into individual crucibles.
3) The last step in this protocol was to transfer a total of between 0.9-1g of each sample to a new individual labelled bag for XRF analysis.

The recording sheet presented as Table 3.5 was used to document all XRF LOI measurement.

The XRF analysis of the sediment samples was conducted by Marlin Patchappa from the Earth Lab associated with the School of Geoscience and will be presented in the Results Chapter of this dissertation. The data was collected and the recorded chemical element/compound proportions were compared between samples using bar graphs.
3.4.4 Optically Stimulated Luminescence (OSL) dating

Optically Stimulated Luminescence (OSL) dating was attempted on samples from P4W. Previous attempts for different stratigraphic levels and areas of the site have varied in success (Chazan et al. 2013; Evans & Cunningham 2013). Providing a date for the Fauresmith horizon would help contextualise the Fauresmith chronologically and clarify the relationship between what has been suggested to be the Fauresmith, the overlying Middle Stone Age and the underlying early Acheulean (Victoria West) (Sarupen 2010; Leader 2014; Lotter et al. 2016).

Furthermore, a date for the Canteen Kopje Fauresmith would allow for more meaningful comparison with other dated sites, particularly Kathu Pan, which is also in the Northern Cape Province and is suggested to contain a Fauresmith horizon (Wilkins & Chazan 2012; Porat et al. 2010). A successful date was achieved for the Kathu Pan 1 site by pursuing single grain luminescence measurements, “using the OSL signal and the single aliquot regenerative dose (SAR) protocol” (Porat et al. 2010: 282), as opposed to multiple grain luminescence measurements.

Sampling protocol

In total nine sediment cores were extracted by M. Evans and C. Stewart (both of whom conducted the dating), with assistance from the author, from along and across the western profile of P4W in March 2017. The sampling technique for this section followed Duller (2008) and is presented below (see Figure 3.9 a, b):

1) Samples were taken from locations with limited visible bioturbation and other disturbances. This included root activity, termite activity, bird burrows, cracks and leaching and bleaching.
2) The profile was cleaned to remove the outer 5 cm layer of sediment, in order to reduce any contamination.
3) The outer end of each sample tube (roughly 30 cm in length) was plugged with bubble-wrap and covered with duct-tape to stop the sediment from being exposed to sunlight, whilst the inner end was in the profile.
4) The tubes were hammered into the selected sample locations. This was done as carefully and quickly as possible to limit sediment displacement within the profile due to the impact.
5) Once the length of the tubes was in the profile their positions were documented and then they were removed by loosening the sediment around the tubes to make pulling each tube out easier.
6) The inner end of each tube was plugged with bubble-wrap and heavily duct-taped to stop the sediment from being exposed to sunlight.
7) Each tube was labelled, and an arrow was drawn to show the orientation (exposed end versus unexposed end) of the sample.
8) *In-situ* gamma-ray spectrometry measurements were yielded from each sample hole using a gamma-ray spectrometer subsequent (see Figure 3.9 a, b).

*Figure 3.9: a) OSL sample holes CNK1-CNK9 in the western profile of Pit 4 West as well as the gamma-ray spectrometer in CNK5 b) all nine OSL samples subsequent to removal. The profile wall is 163.25 cm.*
Chapter 4: Results

The Results chapter is divided into five sections. The first section, ‘Stratigraphy and Spatial Results,’ is a description of the stratigraphic characteristics of the sequence in Pit 4 West (P4W) and the spatial distribution and orientation (fabric data) of clasts extracted from it. The second section, ‘Sedimentological Results,’ provides results of both the macroscopic and microscopic analysis of collected sedimentary material. The third section, ‘Lithic Typological Results,’ is a description of the typological data pertaining to all excavated artefacts and industries from P4W. The fourth section, ‘Lithic Spatial Results,’ provides the spatial distribution of artefacts and the position and contact points of various stone tool industries, which was used to aid in the analysis and classification of all stone tool material yielded. The fifth and final section, ‘OSL Dating Results’ is a report on the outcomes of the multi-grain dating of the nine relevant sediment samples described in Chapter 3.

4.1 Stratigraphy and Spatial Results

The reason that the location of P4W was chosen for this project, and the research purpose of excavating the site, have been described in both the previous Introduction (Figure 1.2) and Methodology Chapters (Figures 3.1 and 3.2).

The excavation of P4W that was conducted for this research project has exposed a stratigraphic sequence that differs from those described in published studies on the Canteen Kopje site. As stated in the previous chapter, the term ‘clast’ is used as a collective to refer to both natural stones and lithics, unless stated otherwise. All clasts ≥4 cm were recorded using a total station (refer to section 2.3.1 for detailed protocol) to collect deposit fabric data (dip and orientation), to gain insight and an understanding of the site formation process associated with P4W.

4.1.1 Pit 4 West Stratigraphy Results

Four sedimentary units were identified in P4W. All of these were studied and sampled. Figure 4.1 shows the four stratigraphic units that were exposed and excavated from the P4W site for this project. The units are named as follows: The
Hutton sands (HS), Pebble Layer 1 (PL1), Pebble Layer 2 (PL2) and Gravel Unit (GU).

Figure 4.1: The completed Pit 4 West excavation: a) the main, western profile, b) the plan view of the two excavated squares 1 and 2 c) the southern profile. The measurements pertain to the depth of the upper surface of each deposit relative to the landscape surface. The full excavation depth is 155 cm.
The full excavation depth reached for this research project was 155 cm, and the units identified by the author differ in regard to both sedimentary and archaeological material. No faunal material was identified or extracted from P4W due to the unfavourable preservation conditions at the Canteen Kopje site.

- The HS extend from the top of the excavation (0 cm) to 72 cm below the surface. The sands are characterised by aeolian-derived fine to coarse sands. The artefactual material recovered from HS increases with depth but is not significant within the top 72 cm of P4W. Bioturbation, in the form of plant root and animal (bird and insect) activity, is pronounced in this unit as it is associated with the landscape surface and is therefore not heavily consolidated.

- At 72 cm below the surface PL1 is found. It is characterised by granule and pebble-sized gravel. This pebble unit is thin and clasts within the layer are relatively dispersed, with minimal overlapping of material. The pebble unit, although scant, did occur across the full lateral extent of the excavation and was thus identified as a layer rather than a lens. Artefact concentration is low within this unit.

- The HS continue beneath PL1, and extend to a depth of 117 cm.

- Underlying the sands at 117 cm deep is PL2, which is the third sedimentary unit identified. It is primarily characterised by pebble-sized gravel with a high concentration of artefactual material. Bioturbation is pronounced in this unit, due to this sedimentary unit being characterised by uncemented clasts and soft sediment infilling (associated with the pebble pieces), as well as its paraconformable lower contact surface with GU.

- The fourth and final sedimentary unit identified in P4W is GU, which starts at 141 cm below surface. This unit is characterised by cobble and boulder gravels with a high concentration of larger artefactual material. Bioturbation within this unit is present, but due to the highly consolidated and, for the most part, heavily cemented nature of the gravels, root and animal activity is limited.
4.1.2 Deposit Fabric Results

As mentioned in the previous Methodology Chapter, the purpose of collecting and analysing fabric data is to 1) identify artefact orientation and gradient trends and 2) using this data to try improve interpretations of the fabric of the different deposits in the P4W excavation and how these deposits relate to one another which provides further insight into the site’s formation processes.

The fabric data results presented in Figure 4.2 shows the data associated with the recorded dip of clasts that had the dimension requirements needed to record fabric data (refer to the previous Methodology Chapter for the protocol associated with collecting fabric data).

Figures 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 provide different visual representations of the dip and orientation of clasts in P4W. They show that there are multiple peaks in the orientation. There is no dominant trend in the orientation of the clasts. The dominant trend is that the dip of the clasts is relatively shallow but a significant number of clasts have a steeper dip. No vertical clasts were recorded. The data suggests that the fabric is relatively disorganised with the dip and orientation varying greatly.

![Figure 4.2: Clast fabric data from Pit 4 West shown in the form of a Stereonet showing dip and orientation (left), a Rose diagram showing orientation (middle) and a quarter Rose diagram showing dip angle (right).](image)

(N=335)
Figure 4.3: The dip of natural and artefactual clasts from the Pit 4 West Western Profile. Each line corresponds to the long axis of a clast (A-B total station points).

Figure 4.4: The orientation of natural and artefactual clasts from the Pit 4 West excavation. Each line corresponds to the long axis of a clast (A-B total station points).
4.2 Sedimentology

4.2.1 Macroscopic (in-situ) Results

The macroscopic descriptions of the excavated deposits are presented in Table 4.1. As stated previously, four sedimentary units were identified in P4W: The units are named as follows: the Hutton sands (HS), Pebble Layer 1 (PL1), Pebble Layer 2 (PL2) and the Gravel Unit (GU).

All the sedimentary units identified in P4W are the same colour according to the Munsell colour chart. None of the units are stratified or graded. The finer sediment within the HS, PL1, PL2 deposits is of aeolian origin, whereas the lowest unit, GU contains sediment that is alluvial in nature. The lower contact of the overlying HS with PL1 and the lower contact of PL1 with the underlying HS component is conformable. The lower contact between PL2 and the GU is para-conformable due to the irregular surface of the GU deposit. The void space present in each deposit also increases stratigraphically, with it being limited in the HS but fairly high in the GU. The frequency and size of clasts increase drastically moving downwards through the units. The shape of clasts is generally either sub-rounded or well-rounded in PL1, PL2 and GU. The consistency of all the deposits is high except for PL2 in which the matrix is loose. Bioturbation occurs in all four units at varying degrees. Artefacts are present in all units, but the density increases stratigraphically, with a low density in the HS and a very high density in the GU.

4.2.2 Laboratory Results

Loss on Ignition

A total of 18 sediment samples were taken in the field and analysed for this research project, as shown in Figure 4.5 and described below (see Methodology Chapter for all the protocols followed for the different sedimentological analyses used).

Moisture was noticeably present in all samples and throughout all stratigraphic units. However, it varied in proportion stratigraphically. PL2 (117-141 cm) has the highest proportion of moisture. Organic material is present in all samples and stratigraphic units, and is relatively consistent throughout. Inorganic carbon is present in all samples and units but has the greatest proportion in GU (144-155 cm).
Table 4.1: Macroscopic sedimentary properties of the units identified in Pit 4 West.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Munsell</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Void space</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Stratified</th>
<th>Clast Sorting</th>
<th>Upper contact</th>
<th>Lower contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Dark Red</td>
<td>2.5YR 4/8 RED</td>
<td>Matrix</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Massive</td>
<td>Compacted</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>Conformable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL1</td>
<td>Dark Red</td>
<td>2.5YR 4/8 RED</td>
<td>Matrix</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sorted Gravel</td>
<td>Compacted</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>Conformable</td>
<td>Conformable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL2</td>
<td>Dark Red</td>
<td>2.5YR 4/8 RED</td>
<td>Matrix</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Massive</td>
<td>Loose</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>Conformable</td>
<td>Para-conformable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU</td>
<td>Dark Red</td>
<td>2.5YR 4/8 RED</td>
<td>Clast</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>Gravel</td>
<td>Cemented</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>Para-conformable</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clasts</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Size range (mm)</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Grading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>0.25-64</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL1</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>5-64</td>
<td>Sub-rounded</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Well Rounded</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>≥256</td>
<td>Sub-Rounded</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Consolidation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Aeolian</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL1</td>
<td>Aeolian</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL2</td>
<td>Aeolian</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU</td>
<td>Alluvial</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artefact/ bioturbation</th>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Artefact size range (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Artefact</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL1</td>
<td>Artefact</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL2</td>
<td>Artefact</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU</td>
<td>Artefact</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.5: Shows the moisture, organic carbon and inorganic carbon content of each of the 18 sediment samples taken from the Pit 4 West excavation.
Particle size

For all 18 samples and across all stratigraphic units the textural classification of the sediment samples varies mainly from very coarse sand to medium silt, as shown in Figure 4.6 (see the Methodology Chapter for the Mastersizer 3000 protocol, which was used to collect the particle size data for this project).

The samples are dominated by sand sized grains, especially medium and fine sand, with limited silt and clay proportions (Figure 4.6). In terms of textural classification, the samples are all either Fine Sand or Medium Sand and range from moderately to poorly sorted. The distribution curves for all the samples are presented in Appendix 1.

Particle shape

Table 4.2 displays the particle shape data for all 18 sediment samples in stratigraphic order (see the Methodology Chapter for the microscopic protocol which was used to collect this data).

The major particle shapes were sub-angular and sub-rounded within all samples. There was little variation between sedimentary units. With regard to the proportions of sphericity (high vs. low) and texture (smooth vs. undulating) there is great variation but no discernible trend. For all samples quartz was the only mineral identified. This is mentioned because different mineral grains are associated with different shape and textural characteristics.

4.2.3 X-Ray Fluorescence Results

Figure 4.7 shows the results from the nine samples (CNK1-CNK9) that were geochemically analysed using X-Ray Fluorescence (XRF). The nine samples were taken from across and along the western profile of P4W. XRF samples could not be taken from with the GU level but two samples were taken from the interface between PL2 and GU, and thus sediments from GU were sampled to a degree. Therefore, all the stratigraphic units are represented to some degree.
The major components throughout all nine samples and stratigraphic units are the following, in order of dominance: SiO2 (Silicon dioxide), Al2O3 (Aluminium Oxide), LOI (loss on ignition: including organic and inorganic carbon) and FeO (Iron Oxide).
Figure 4.6: Sediment particle size data for all 18 samples taken from Pit 4 West. Note that the samples have been presented in stratigraphic order.
Table 4.2: Sediment particle shape data for all 18 samples taken from Pit 4 West. Note that the transition of colours from the top down represent the change in the stratigraphic units: Hutton Sands, Pebble Layer 1, Pebble Layer 2 and the Gravel Unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Size range (µm)</th>
<th>Angularity/Roundness</th>
<th>Sphericity (high) %</th>
<th>Sphericity (low) %</th>
<th>Texture (smooth) %</th>
<th>Texture (undulating) %</th>
<th>Lithology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS1</td>
<td>10-300</td>
<td>Sub-angular</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNK1</td>
<td>10-300</td>
<td>Sub-angular</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNK2</td>
<td>10-400</td>
<td>Sub-rounded</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNK3</td>
<td>10-500</td>
<td>Sub-angular</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNK4</td>
<td>10-300</td>
<td>Sub-rounded</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH21 (J)</td>
<td>10-200</td>
<td>Sub-angular</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH22 (J)</td>
<td>10-200</td>
<td>Sub-angular</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNK5</td>
<td>10-200</td>
<td>Sub-rounded</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNK6</td>
<td>10-200</td>
<td>Sub-rounded</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNK7</td>
<td>10-500</td>
<td>Sub-rounded</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNK8</td>
<td>10-300</td>
<td>Sub-angular</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNK9</td>
<td>10-150</td>
<td>Sub-angular</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH1</td>
<td>10-300</td>
<td>Sub-angular</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH2</td>
<td>10-350</td>
<td>Sub-angular</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH3</td>
<td>10-200</td>
<td>Sub-rounded</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH4</td>
<td>100-200</td>
<td>Sub-rounded</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH5</td>
<td>10-200</td>
<td>Sub-rounded</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH6</td>
<td>10-200</td>
<td>Sub-rounded</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.7: X-Ray Fluorescence data for only nine samples (CNK1-CNK9) taken from the Pit 4 West Western profile.
4.3 Lithic Results

The following results relate to the typological and raw material data collected from all excavated and recorded artefacts from P4W (Table 4.3) The sub-sections in this section include information on the full P4W assemblage, individual industries and their respective attributes. As mentioned in the Literature Review and Methodology Chapters, the author acknowledges that a typological study limits data collection, particularly that which is associated with statistical validity. However, to successfully meet the objectives of this project only a typological study was required to aid in answering the research question.

Table 4.3: The full Pit 4 West assemblage (n=1201 lithics) industries, tool types and size profiles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artefact Type ≥ 20 mm</th>
<th>MSA %</th>
<th>Fauresmith %</th>
<th>Victoria West %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chunks</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flake fragments</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>30.72</td>
<td>26.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split flakes</td>
<td>18.64</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete flakes</td>
<td>101.66</td>
<td>31.66</td>
<td>42.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete flakes</td>
<td>103.00</td>
<td>42.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete Blades</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete blades</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retouch pieces</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cores</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core fragments</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyhedral</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single platform</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fractured Cobbles</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifacial</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kombewa</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidirectional</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large cutting tools</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handaxes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleavers</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥20 mm Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>319.00</td>
<td>243.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Flaking debris &lt;20 mm</th>
<th>Hutton Sands</th>
<th>PL2</th>
<th>GH1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20 mm Total</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total assemblage 1201
A total of 1201 lithic artefacts (see Table 4.3 above) were yielded from P4W. Of the 1201 lithic artefacts yielded, 575 are ≥20 mm. A total of 13 lithics ≥20 mm were identified as belonging to the Middle Stone Age (MSA), based on the raw material and lithic descriptions provided by Sarupen (2010). This MSA assemblage primarily comprised flake fragments and complete flakes. A total of 319 lithics ≥20 mm were identified as belonging to the Fauresmith industry (see Chapter 3, Section 3.3). These are primarily complete flakes, flake fragments and incomplete flakes. A total of 243 ≥20 mm lithics were identified as belonging to the Victoria West stone tool industry. The majority of these are complete flakes and flake fragments.

Small flaking debris (SFD) could not be allocated to specific industries as it was collected in sieved material. Although there are total station points for each sieved bag, the points do not represent the quantity of artefacts recovered (e.g. one total station point for one bucket of excavated material does not provide enough spatial resolution as there may be numerous SFD pieces within a bucket). For this reason the author has provided the SFD data in Table 4.3 using stratigraphic allocations as the spatial data only allows for that limited relation to be made. Of the 1201 lithic artefacts yielded from P4W, a total of 526 lithic artefacts are <20 mm. The Hutton Sands yielded 506 <20 mm pieces. Pebble Layer 2 yielded 75 pieces <20 mm, and the Gravel Unit yielded 45 <20 mm pieces.

4.3.1 MSA

As mentioned above the total MSA assemblage is 13 artefacts. The most common type is complete flakes (n=6). There are four flake fragments and two incomplete flakes. A single blade completes the assemblage. No cores or retouched pieces were excavated from the MSA. Figure 4.8 shows some of the complete flakes from this level and provides an indication of the size range of MSA complete flakes from P4W.
4.3.2 Fauresmith

Cores

A total of eight cores/core fragments excavated from P4W were classified as belonging to the Fauresmith Industry. The most common type is single platform cores (n=3), followed by core fragments (n=2). One of each of the following types were recovered: polyhedral core, fractured cobble and multifacial core. Figure 4.9 provides several examples of cores from the Fauresmith level as well as an idea of the size range of Fauresmith cores.
**Flakes and Blades**

The total number of flakes (complete, fragmented and incomplete) from the Fauresmith is 280. This includes 101 complete flakes and 98 flake fragments. Incomplete flakes and split flakes are less numerous, at 63 and 18 respectively. Seven blades, including five complete blades and two incomplete blades, were assigned to the Fauresmith. Figure 4.10 provides an example of some of the different flakes recovered and recorded, as well as an example of a Fauresmith blade.

![Image of flakes and blades](image-url)

*Figure 4.10: Examples of Fauresmith ≥20 mm complete flakes. Numbers clockwise from top-left: 98, 168, 411, 91, and 669.*

The author has included the débordant (core edge) complete flake (Figure 4.11) as this type is diagnostic of either Levallois reduction or the presence of radial cores and thus is a significant type to have yielded. All nine excavated débordant flakes were included under the general complete flakes category provided in Table 4.3. All débordant flakes recovered from P4W were assigned as belonging to the Fauresmith industry based on analysis and provenance. Figure 4.11 provides an example of the different forms of débordant flakes as well as their size range.
Formals

LCTs

Four Fauresmith LCTs were recovered from P4W. This included two cleavers, a single ‘small’ handaxe and a single ‘small’ cleaver. The LCTs presented in Figure 4.12 differ in visual presentation as they were 3D scanned rather than photographed, due to their diagnostic significance for the classification of the assemblage as Fauresmith. Figure 4.12 shows all four Fauresmith LCTs and highlights the difference in their dimensions and morphology.

Retouched pieces

There is a total of seven retouched pieces that were assigned to the Fauresmith. These retouched pieces include: two retouched flakes, two retouched blades, one
retouched kombewa flake, one retouched débordant and one retouched incomplete flake. Figure 4.13 provides two examples of retouched pieces from the assemblage.
Figure 4.12: All Fauresmith large cutting tools. Clockwise from top-left: cleaver (no. 74), cleaver, (no. 133), cleaver (no. 593), and a small handaxe (no. 113).
Figure 4.13: Examples of ≥20 mm retouched Fauresmith pieces. No. 129 (left), and No. 105 (right).
4.3.3 Victoria West

Cores

In total, 13 cores/core fragments excavated from P4W were classified as belonging to the Victoria West industry. The most common type is casual core (n=4), followed by core fragment (n=3). Two of each of the following types were excavated: bidirectional cores and multifacial cores. One fractured cobbles and one kombewa core were also recovered. Figure 4.14 (left) provides an example of a Victoria West core (bidirectional) and illustrates the large volume of these cores compared to the previously described Fauresmith cores (see Figure 4.9 above).

Flakes and Blades

The total number of flakes (complete, fragmentated and incomplete) from the Victoria West is 210. This includes 103 complete flakes and 64 flake fragments. Incomplete flakes and split flakes constitute 39 and 4, respectively. Only one blade was recovered from the Victoria West. Figure 4.14 (right) shows several Victoria West flakes, and as with the cores, reflects the larger dimensions of these flakes compared to the previously described Fauresmith flakes (Figures 4.10 and 4.11).

LCTs

Only two Victoria West LCTs were recovered from P4W. Both of which are cleavers, included in Figure 4.15. Compared to the Fauresmith LCTs (see Figure 4.12 above), one notices a difference in preservation, shape and the possible improvement in the quality of LCT production in P4W.
Figure 4.14: An example of a Victoria West core (left, no. 371): and examples of ≥20 mm Victoria West complete flakes (right). From left to right: no. 585, no. 465, no. 335.
Figure 4.15: All Victoria West cleavers, left to right: no. 475 and no. 260.
4.3.4 Artefact Condition

≥20 mm Artefact Raw Material Results

For the overall P4W assemblage Ventersdorp lava is the dominant raw material type (Figure 4.16). The raw material most dominant in the MSA is Quartzite, followed by Ventersdorp Lava and cryptocrystalline silicate (CCS). The Fauresmith is dominated by Ventersdorp lava, with 298 of the 319 artefacts in the assemblage being produced from this raw material. The Victoria West, similarly to the Fauresmith, is almost exclusively Ventersdorp lava, with 233 of the assemblage’s 243 artefacts being produced on this material.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Material ≥ 20 mm</th>
<th>MSA %</th>
<th>Fauresmith %</th>
<th>Victoria West %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ventersdorp Lava</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>93.42</td>
<td>95.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartzite</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartz</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornfels</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.16: The proportions for the MSA, Fauresmith and Victoria West of the five lithic raw material types identified in the combined Pit 4 West assemblage.
≥20 mm Artefact Abrasion Results

In general, the abrasion state of artefacts degrades from fresh to heavily weathered moving down stratigraphically (see Figure 4.17 below). The MSA, which as previously discussed is not dominated by Ventersdorp lava, is relatively fresh. The Fauresmith is dominated by Ventersdorp lava and includes almost 80% fresh or slightly weathered artefacts. In contrast, the underlying Victoria West industry has a more than 90% of weathered and heavily weathered artefacts collectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abrasion State ≥ 20 mm</th>
<th>MSA %</th>
<th>Fauresmith %</th>
<th>Victoria West %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fresh/unabraded</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>30.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Weathered/abraded</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>48.59</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weathered/abraded</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td>49.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavily Weathered/abraded</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>44.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.17: The proportions of different artefact weathering states within the different assemblages excavated from Pit 4 West.

≥20 mm Artefact Exfoliation Results

The proportion of exfoliation of artefacts varies considerably by industry as shown in Figure 4.18. Exfoliation is entirely absent in the MSA assemblage and is the highest in the Victoria West assemblage at almost 42%. Only 12% of Fauresmith artefacts are exfoliated.
The number of exfoliated and non-exfoliated artefacts within the MSA, Fauresmith and Victoria West from Pit 4 West.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artefact Damage ≥ 20 mm</th>
<th>MSA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Fauresmith</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Victoria West</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exfoliated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>41.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Exfoliated</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>87.77</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>58.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.18: The number of exfoliated and non-exfoliated artefacts within the MSA, Fauresmith and Victoria West from Pit 4 West.

≥20 mm Artefact coating calcium-carbonate (CaCo3) Results
The amount of calcium-carbonate coating (henceforth referred to calcrete) present on artefacts yielded from P4W increases stratigraphically moving downwards as shown in Figure 4.19. It is limited in the MSA, increases significantly in the Fauresmith and sees another marked increase in the Victoria West, which contains the largest number of artefacts that are heavily cemented.
Figure 4.19: The proportion of artefacts within Pit 4 West that fall within the five categories of calcrete presence and coverage.

4.4 Lithic Spatial Results

The following GIS models are specifically associated with the lithic industries in P4W (Figure 4.20). The main purpose of these results is to present the reader with the stratigraphic relationship between the different technological industries from P4W. The spatial models provide the reader with a geographically-accurate visual representation of how the different industries have interacted or mixed with one another, as well as the provenance and placement of different types of stone tool technology (≥20 mm) within P4W.

**All P4W Lithic Industries: Western Profile**

In profile shown in Figure 4.20, there is a clear separation between an upper level containing MSA and some Fauresmith artefacts, and the lower PL2 and GU which
contain Fauresmith and Victoria West. The industries appear mixed in the lower part of the profile, but this is partly due to the undulating surface of the contact between GU and PL2.

Figure 4.20: A GIS model of the vertical and horizontal distribution of MSA, Fauresmith and Victoria West artefacts within Pit 4 West.

**All P4W Fauresmith and VW Lithic Types: Western Profile**

Victoria West incomplete flakes and Fauresmith incomplete flakes are dominant types stratigraphically (Figure 4.21). Victoria West cores and Fauresmith cores occur sporadically and are rare features. There is no discernible spatial change in artefact types.
A GIS model of the distribution of different artefact types within the Fauresmith and Victoria West industries in Pit 4 West.

**P4W Fauresmith Abrasion Model: Western Profile**

The abrasion state of Fauresmith artefacts generally degrades moving down through the profile (Figure 4.22). However, there is still a great deal of ‘mixing’ in terms of the presence of different abrasion states within the same part of the profile despite the trend towards greater abrasion nearer the base of the excavation. The only heavily abraded artefacts are near the lower limit of the Fauresmith.

**P4W Victoria West Abrasion Model: Western Profile**

The GIS model of Victoria West abrasion state shows the co-occurrence of artefacts with various degrees of weathering (Figure 4.23). There is no clear vertical trend in abrasion, largely due to the limited number of unabraded artefacts.
Figure 4.22: A GIS model of the distribution of Fauresmith artefacts within Pit 4 West according to abrasion state.

Figure 4.23: A GIS model of the distribution of Victoria West artefacts within Pit 4 West according to abrasion state.

**P4W Fauresmith Exfoliation Model: Western Profile**

The exfoliation of Fauresmith artefacts in Pit 4 West is rare and largely constrained to the lower reaches of the Fauresmith industry (Figure 4.24). There is no obvious horizontal spatial pattern in the distribution of exfoliated artefacts.
Figure 4.24: A GIS model of the distribution of exfoliated and non-exfoliated Fauresmith artefacts within Pit 4 West.

**P4W Victoria West Exfoliation Model: Western Profile**

As with the Fauresmith artefacts, exfoliated and non-exfoliated Victoria West artefacts are found throughout the extent of the industry in Pit 4 West (Figure 4.25). The entire Victoria West assemblage is heavily affected by exfoliation.

Figure 4.25: A GIS model of the distribution of exfoliated and non-exfoliated Victoria West artefacts within Pit 4 West.
P4W Fauresmith Calcrete Model: Western Profile

The presence and coverage of calcrete on Fauresmith artefacts in P4W varies considerably (Figure 4.26). Within PL2 and GU, there is no discernible spatial patterning in calcrete presence and coverage as a variety of states are found in association.

Figure 4.26: A GIS model of the distribution of Fauresmith artefacts within Pit 4 West according to categories of calcrete coverage.

P4W Victoria West Calcrete Model: Western Profile

The proportion of calcrete on Victoria West artefacts varies greatly as shown in Figure 4.27.
Figure 4.27: A GIS model of the distribution of Victoria West artefacts within Pit 4 West according to categories of calcrete coverage.

**All P4W Fauresmith & Victoria West ≥20mm Artefacts: Plan view**

Figure 4.28 shows the plan view of the surface of the Fauresmith and Victoria West artefacts. This plan view does not include any MSA artefacts. The purpose of this model is to provide a visual understanding of the stratigraphic positioning of Fauresmith and Victoria West artefacts relative to one another. Whilst there are notable clusters of Fauresmith artefacts around some Victoria West artefacts, the overall pattern is relatively mixed in plan view.
Figure 4.28: A plan-view GIS model of the distribution of Fauresmith and Victoria West artefacts (>20 mm) in Pit 4 West.
4.5 OSL Dating Results

Figure 4.29: Optically stimulated luminescence (OSL) dating samples holes with their corresponding multi-grain OSL dates for Pit 4 West.
The results of OSL dating, presented in Figure 4.29 above, of the P4W excavation show a general increase in age moving down through the sequence. The ages are younger than the Fauresmith is suggested to be associated with. As mentioned in Chapter 3, no dating sample could be taken from within the Gravel Unit. However, CNK8 and CNK9 were both taken within PL2 as close to the top of GU as possible. Sample CNK9 provides a date of 64.30±13.79 ka for the lower part PL2 where the Fauresmith is found. These multi-grain dates are being used as minimum dates for P4W.
Chapter 5: Discussion & Conclusions

5.1 Discussion

A Fauresmith level does exist in Pit 4 West (P4W) and artefacts were identified as belonging to this industry through typological analysis, the results of which were presented in Chapter 4. It was possible to distinguish Fauresmith from Victoria West artefacts based on several properties (see Chapter 3, Section 3.3) and the associated provenance of the artefact.

The Fauresmith at P4W does not represent a knapping workshop due to the lack of cores present at the site, this contrasts with the Fauresmith assemblage from Pit 6 which has yielded many cores. However, unlike Pit 6, P4W has yielded four relatively fresh and complete large cutting tools (LCTs): two large cleavers and a ‘small’ handaxe and cleaver. Smaller LCT’s have been typically described as being associated with the Fauresmith in literature (see Chapter 2 and references Goodwin 1925, 1929; van Riet Lowe 1927, 1945; Herries 2011; Underhill 2011; Wilkins & Chazan 2012).

The mixed contact zone (MCZ), which is described as associated with the lower Fauresmith material in Pit 6 by Lotter et al. (2016), is located between Pebble Layer 2 (PL2) and the Gravel Unit (GU) in P4W not between the Hutton Sands and the GU like in Pit 6. The presence of Pebble Layer 1 (PL1) and PL2 provides a new, different stratigraphic model than those previously described from other pits, which may suggest extremely localised depositional events and thus greater variability (refer to Chapter 4, Figure 4.1. for a visual aid).

The surface integrity or preservation of the Fauresmith artefacts has been affected by chemical weathering that occurs particularly with artefacts that are stratigraphically associated with the irregular surface of the gravels. Lotter et al. (2016) emphasises the role that the irregular surface of the gravels (and bioturbation) has on the mixing of artefacts in Pit 6’s MCZ.

In P4W, the Fauresmith is not always characterised by fresh artefacts and not all Victoria West artefacts are heavily weathered/rolled. Exfoliation affects both Fauresmith and Victoria West artefacts lower down in the sequence but both industries are less effected by exfoliation higher up in the deposit. The exfoliation of,
and presence of calcium-carbonate coating (described as calcrete in this dissertation) on, artefacts increases drastically as one moves down into the GU. The most consistent and rational reason for an increase in chemical weathering which led to high proportions of exfoliation, as well as an increase in calcrete that cemented most of the material between 117-155 cm, is the presence of water. It is possible that rain would have leached (and could continue to leach) the CaCO₃ from the overlying softer Hutton Sands (HS). The reprecipitation of the CaCO₃ results in the coating of the surface of artefacts, particularly collecting at the largely impenetrable Gravel Unit (GU) contact due to gravity. The Middle Stone Age (MSA) assemblage seems to not be affected by exfoliation or abrasion/weathering, suggesting that the HS associated with it had either not been deposited during periods of significant leaching or during periods of the water table level fluctuating. The water table is still visible at Canteen Kopje and one can occasionally find open pits at the site that have a higher water level than other locations of the site, where the water table is not exposed. With regards to the possibility of an increasing water table level, the MSA level may have already been established during these periods of fluctuation but it remained stratigraphically higher than the water table. It is important to note, however, that the MSA assemblage from P4W is small and thus interpretations regarding technological and site formation processes associated with it, is limited.

Overall, the author suggests that continuous leaching of CaCO₃ and multiple phases in which the water table would have risen and submerged the GU and PL2 deposits and then dropped again over many episodes over a very long period, is responsible for the heavy calcification present in P4W. This explanation not only clarifies the high proportion of exfoliation and calcrete coverage of P4W lithics, but it also explains why the assemblage from Pit 6 does not reflect these same trends despite the pits being only several hundred meters away from one another (pers.obvs and K. Kuman pers.comm. 2018).

Despite the surface condition of Fauresmith artefacts being affected by their stratigraphic position and contact with water, the high proportion of calcrete, compression from the HS sediment above the Fauresmith level and the large gravels below it, have provided enough support for minimum displacement of artefacts.

Macroscopic analysis and GIS data support the above statement. The data collected regarding organic material (microscopic and loss on ignition data) suggests that the
possibility of vertical or horizontal displacement due to bioturbation or root activity was in fact limited, a conclusion that macroscopically seemed unlikely but at a finer resolution proved correct.

The young OSL dates reflect a very high overdispersion which indicates the mixing of sand grains within the deposit. However, any mixing of artefacts within the HS appears to be limited. It is possible that there is a selective movement of smaller sediment particles by bioturbatory processes that does not seem to displace larger clasts (including lithic artefacts).

Bioturbation is a major issue at Canteen Kopje, with many publications attributing poor data to the influence of bioturbation. The author suggests that PL1 has formed as the result of bioturbation, specifically termite activity. Termites displace sediment as they move, creating tunnels in the sedimentary structure. Although sediment particles are removed and redistributed, larger clastic material, such as the angular gravels in PL1, are not removed but are redistributed. These clasts do not remain in-situ and accumulate as the sediment is removed, forming a thin, poorly sorted clast-supported pavement (D. Granger pers.comm. 2018).

However, bioturbation does not seem to be a major factor that has influenced the Fauresmith assemblage in P4W. The author suggests that perhaps the HS and PL2 deposits served as a barrier that protected the Fauresmith from being displacement by bioturbation processes.

Bioturbation in the form of animal activity or root activity is most likely to occur in soft, unconsolidated units. Naturally, the processes or energies associated with deposition of the HS and PL2 deposits would affect the degree of bioturbation that occurs. There is little evidence for root activity and thus any bioturbation that occurred seems to have been at a relatively minor scale. Unlike Pit 6, which is suggested to potentially have been influenced by tree-throw, there is no evidence for this in P4W, with no major sediment displacement.

The author suggests that PL2 is an alluvial lag deposit, as the clasts found within this deposit are classified as alluvial pebbles based on their size, shape and rolled surface texture. The following sequence of depositional and erosional events is what we interpret for the formation of the current PL2 deposit (D. Granger pers.comm. 2018):
PL2 represents a relatively low energy deposit (compared to the underlying Victoria West-bearing gravels).

This alluvial layer was deposited on top of the GU and consisted of alluvial sands with a pebble component.

After this deposition, the alluvial sands originally associated with PL2 were eroded away.

The larger clasts within the deposit, namely the pebbles, were left as a lag deposit and thus are still present.

Over time, the HS that is now present across the site, was deposited over the residual pebbles. This has formed the matrix that is currently associated with PL2 and Fauresmith artefacts, as the more recent sand filled into voids between pebbles and artefacts and onto the underlying GU’s irregular surface.

This theory is further supported by the macroscopic and microscopic data presented in Chapter 4. PL2 is unstratified, has a loose consistency, with clasts being well-sorted and the matrix being poorly sorted. The low energy deposition of the HS on top of PL2 would have covered the deposit with minimal disturbance to the artefactual assemblage. The author emphasises the significant unconformity at the lower contact of the HS with the upper contact of the PL2.

Based on the above sequence of events and the described macro- and microscopic data, the author proposes two scenarios for the chronology of the Fauresmith level vs. PL2:

1) Fauresmith artefacts were deposited onto the irregular surface of the Victoria West-bearing alluvial gravels (GU) and thereafter, the initial deposit of alluvial sand with a pebble component was deposited onto the Fauresmith level. Over time, the erosion of the alluvial sands not only removed this element but resulted in the formation of a deflated surface, that comprised Fauresmith artefacts being stratigraphically associated with the alluvial lag (pebble) deposit. The Hutton Sands was deposited onto this deflated surface and sand filtered down and filled in voids within the lag.

2) The alluvial deposit (that comprised both sands and a pebble component) was deposited onto the irregular surface of the Victoria West-bearing alluvial
gravels (GU) and during this deposition, Fauresmith artefacts were intermittently discarded onto this new alluvial surface. Over time, the erosion of the alluvial sands not only removed sediment but also resulted in the formation of a deflated surface. This deflated surface or pavement comprised stratigraphically associated Fauresmith artefacts and alluvial pebbles (lag deposit). This deflation resulted in not only the pebble component being heavily exfoliated, but also the exfoliation of some artefacts. Over time, the Hutton Sands was deposited onto this deflated surface and sand filtered down and filled in voids within it.

Despite the matrix in both the HS and PL2 being aeolian-derived (according to past literature), the author suggests that a significant thickness of HS was deposited on top of PL2 within a relatively short period of time. This rapid deposition would have provided a compact deposit that also provided enough deposit above the Fauresmith (and stratigraphically associated Victoria West material to a certain degree) to reduce the influence of bioturbation (refer to Chapter 4, Figure 4.1. for a visual aid). The HS at Canteen Kopje is not stratified, which may be due to post-depositional mixing. The HS would have been deposited over multiple episodes to develop the depth that it is currently at, which has further protected the lower deposits/artefacts from the effects of bioturbation.

The author, based on the field and laboratory data, suggests that the HS represent a low energy deposit; PL1 represents a high energy deposit of very short duration that introduced limited material to P4W; PL 2 is a relatively high energy deposit, which is likely to have occurred over a longer period than PL1 due to it being considerably thicker; the GU represents a very high energy deposit that was capable of moving and depositing boulder-sized clasts. This deposit was accumulated over a relatively long period of time.

5.2 Conclusion

The data that were collected, analysed, and presented by the author in the previous Results Chapter provide a conclusive but complex answer to the research question for this project. Yes, the integrity of the Fauresmith has been, and is potentially still
being, affected by the ‘mixed contact zone’ at the interface between the Hutton Sands and the underlying gravels in P4W.

However, the author believes that the term ‘integrity’, based on this research, pertains to a myriad of factors (which can be present/relevant at varying degrees), some of which have become clearer and others that were not initially anticipated. Furthermore, the term ‘mixed contact zone’ (MCZ), although first used by Lotter et al. (2016) to describe the Pit 6 stratigraphy, can be used at the Canteen Kopje site to not only describe the Pit 6 stratigraphy (described in Chapter 2) but also an interface that involves different deposits than it was previously used for, as in the case of P4W.

The integrity of the Fauresmith has been affected by several processes. However, the effects of these processes have been limited by a combination of factors relating to the depositional environment and post-depositional (after the deposition of the Fauresmith) processes.

1) The undulating surface of the gravel unit at the interface between PL2 and the GU influenced the position of Fauresmith material when it was deposited. Vertical and horizontal displacement of artefacts would have been limited by the presence of the irregular surface and large size of the gravels, preventing a high degree of filtration of Fauresmith material into the gravels.

2) The rapid deposition of PL2 onto the Fauresmith may have slightly redistributed some artefactual material within the deposit. However, it effectively capped the Fauresmith, constraining the potential vertical movement of lithic artefacts through bioturbation and thus providing an environment conducive to maintaining the integrity of the assemblage.

3) The gentle deposition of the HS above PL2 would have caused little to no disturbance to PL2 and the underlying artefactual material. The thickness of the sands, built up over multiple events over a long period of time, would have further protected the Fauresmith from the effects of bioturbation.

4) Chemical processes at the interface between the gravels and PL2 caused some chemical damage (exfoliation) to Fauresmith artefacts. This is related to the movement of water within the deposit because of changes in the position of the water table and the percolation of meteoric water.
The data suggest that the Fauresmith from P4W is (for the most part) in, or very near, primary context. Although this assemblage has been influenced by site formation processes, it maintains a fairly high degree of integrity and can be considered representative of human activity at this location.

Despite the success of this project in providing sedimentary context to the Fauresmith Industry (and other Industries/techno-complexes) in P4W, further research is needed at this location. The planned micromorphological analysis of thin section samples will provide an even greater understanding of the context. Multi-grain OSL dating has been shown to be largely ineffective in the Hutton Sands due to their mixed nature (see Evans & Cunningham 2013; Porat et al. 2013). The application of single-grain OSL dating to the samples from P4W is likely to provide a better estimate for the age of the Fauresmith (Chazan et al. 2013). Given the poor state of dating of the Fauresmith (Herries 2011), a date from P4W will be extremely valuable.

A technological analysis, to be conducted by this author on the Fauresmith assemblage, will allow the characterisation of the Fauresmith from P4W. This will allow the comparison of the P4W assemblage with other technologically-analysed Fauresmith assemblages, namely from Kathu Pan (Wilkins & Chazan 2012) and Canteen Kopje Pit 6 (currently being analysed by M. Lotter and K. Kuman).

It is important to note that Canteen Kopje is a seemingly complex site with localised site formation processes and thus a single project, based on a single excavation, cannot provide adequate geoarchaeological context for the entire site. The author suggests that a landscape scale test-pitting study be conducted to understand variation in site formation processes at Canteen Kopje.
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Appendix A

Line graphs showing the particle size distribution of all sediment samples from the Hutton Sands deposit from Pit 4 West analysed using the Mastersizer 3000.
Line graphs showing the particle size distribution of all sediment samples from the Pebble Layer 1 deposit from Pit 4 West analysed using the Mastersizer 3000.
Line graphs showing the particle size distribution of all sediment samples from the Pebble Layer 2 deposit from Pit 4 West analysed using the Mastersizer 3000.
Line graphs showing the particle size distribution of all sediment samples from the Gravel Unit deposit from Pit 4 West analysed using the Mastersizer 3000.