

#### Gesture variation in the use of Palaeolithic bulb-retouchers. Application to the late Acheulean site of Jaljulia (Israel)

Cyrielle Mathias, Cristina Lemorini, Flavia Marinelli, Sol Sanchez-Dehesa

Galan, Ran Barkai

#### ▶ To cite this version:

Cyrielle Mathias, Cristina Lemorini, Flavia Marinelli, Sol Sanchez-Dehesa Galan, Ran Barkai. Gesture variation in the use of Palaeolithic bulb-retouchers. Application to the late Acheulean site of Jaljulia (Israel). 6th International Congress of Experimental Archaeology, Oct 2022, Pézenas, France. . hal-03840602

#### HAL Id: hal-03840602 https://hal.science/hal-03840602v1

Submitted on 10 Jan2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

## GESTURE VARIATION IN THE USE OF PALAEOLITHIC BULB RETOUCHERS. APPLICATION TO THE LATE ACHEULEAN SITE OF JALJULIA (ISRAEL).

Mathias C.\*, Lemorini C., Marinelli F., Sánchez-Dehesa Galán S., Shemer M., Barkai R.

cyrielle.mathias@gmail.com



- Bulb retouchers (« éclats à bulbes piquetés ») were identified by Semenov and Praslov within Middle Palaeolithic assemblages in the 1950's.
- ♦ These pieces present percussion marks (pits) on the ventral surface of flakes (directly on the bulb but not only), similar to those found on bone retouchers.
- Bulb retouchers were since then recognised in numerous contexts, almost only dated to Middle Palaeolithic in Eastern and Western Europe, North Africa. They were recently identified in the Levant, where their use seems very systematic, especially in Nesher Ramla (Centi et al., 2019).
  Most of the bulb-retouchers blanks are retouched flakes, such as side-scrapers or convergent tools (Adler, 2002; Centi et al., 2019).

♦ The first use hypothesis of A. Semenov was the use in pression/flexion of retouchers. Since then, several experiment have shown their use in direct percussion (Adler, 2002; Mathias & Viallet, 2018; Centi et al., 2019).



g. 2. Flint retouchers from Vorontsovskaya cave. A – photo of flint retouchers, B – drawing of the same retouchers, B – hotomicrograph of use-wear traces on a flint retoucher (magnification of x100),  $\Gamma$  – a way of using a flint retoucher.

Semenov, 1970, 1972

• Objective: Test the impact of various gestures in the use of bulb-retouchers and on the traces produced.

## EXPERIMENT

Test of 2 motions (tangential, perpendicular), by mid-experienced knappers, following a number of strokes; 1 withouth count to produce side-scrapers; 1 by "pressure"
4 pieces for each stroke number (100, 200, 400, 800).

$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	N (	ength (mm)	Width (mm)	Thick. (mm)	Thick. bulb	Weight (g)	Angle bulb/butt	Angle ventral surface/butt	Raw material type	Retouch gesture	N strokes	Observation
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1	77,8	45	17,7	17,7	62	122	110	Mishash	Tangential	200	-
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	2	52,4	31	9,5	6,1	18	126	123	Mishash	Perpendicular	100	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	3	54,9	48,3	17,5	15,6	64	126	112	Mishash	Tangential	200	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	4	57,5	48,2	17,2	17,2	43	128	128	Mishash	Perpendicular	600	Bad gripping
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	5	54	42,9	12,1	12,1	27	124	124	Mishash	Tangential	600	
7 $46,3$ 59 $18,5$ $18,5$ $128$ $130$ Mishash       Flexion/pressure       -       For two flakes. Difficient and not efficient and and not efficient and and not efficient and and and efficient and and and and efficient and and and and and efficient and and and efficient and and and efficient and and and and efficient and and and and efficient and and and and and and and and and efficient and	6	53,5	36,6	14,9	10	34	114	114	Mishash	Perpendicular	460	Initially for 600 strikes, but fracture
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	7	46,3	59	18,5	18,5	43	128	130	Mishash	Flexion/pressure		For two flakes. Difficult and not efficient
9 $43,7$ $28,5$ $12,7$ $12,7$ $19$ $109$ $92$ Mishash       Tangential $100$ $-$ 10 $34,3$ $48,9$ $9,1$ $9,1$ $15$ $113$ $95$ Mishash       Perpendicular $200$ $-$ 11 $50,8$ $36,1$ $9,6$ $7,8$ $19$ $122$ $117$ Mishash       Tangential $400$ $-$ 12 $60,4$ $50,2$ $14,4$ $14,1$ $54$ $122$ $113$ Mishash       Perpendicular $400$ Lateral fracture (miske) of the bulb-return (miske) of the	8	54,6	37,4	15,4	15,4	30	120	114	Mishash	Perpendicular	200	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	9	43,7	28,5	12,7	12,7	19	109	92	Mishash	Tangential	100	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	10	34,3	48,9	9,1	9,1	15	113	95	Mishash	Perpendicular	200	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	11	50,8	36,1	9,6	7,8	19	122	117	Mishash	Tangential	400	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	12	60,4	50,2	14,4	14,1	54	122	113	Mishash	Perpendicular	400	Lateral fracture (notch- like) of the bulb-retoucher
14       66       42       19,9       14,3       74       120       120       Mishash       Tangential       > 400       Retouch of several during a long per during a lon	13	32,7	36	10,2	9,8	11	110	107	Mishash	Tangential	400	Difficult to handle
15 31,5 31,3 12,2 12,2 12 124 124 Turonian Tangential 100 -	14	66	42	19,9	14,3	74	120	120	Mishash	Tangential	> 400	Retouch of several tools during a long period
	15	31,5	31,3	12,2	12,2	12	124	124	Turonian	Tangential	100	
16 35 30 16,8 16,8 11 128 128 Turonian Perpendicular 400 -	16	35	30	16,8	16,8	11	128	128	Turonian	Perpendicular	400	
17 76,4 47,2 12,2 11,9 55 122 110 Mishash Tangential 600 Difficult to hand	17	76,4	47,2	12,2	11,9	55	122	110	Mishash	Tangential	600	Difficult to handle
18 47,6 28 8,1 8,1 10 131 114 Mishash Perpendicular 100 -	18	47,6	28	8,1	8,1	10	131	114	Mishash	Perpendicular	100	



Tangential

Perpendicular

Observation with stereomicroscope (Zeiss Axio Scope A1, Nikon SMZ-U), metallographic microscope (Nikon Eclipse ME 600).

RESULTS





• The experimental feeling is that the use of a bulb retouchers in tangential

percussion is much more effective than using a perpendicular gesture. This may be due to the mass and dimensions of the tools involved in the experiment.

Main traces identified are elongated pits (a-d), incipient cones –
 half, whole (b, c, e) and striae (f, g).

# MISHASH & TURONIANT MISHASH & TURONIANT MISHASH & MISHAS





Perpendicular gesture: more incipient cones in general, and more circular (full) incipient cone; Tangential: more pits, and more linear pits. Still sometimes numerous incipient cones.

Tang.	Semi-circular incipient cones	Elongated pits (++), punctiform pits	1 breakage	
Gesture	Incipient cones	Pitting	Breakage	Observation
	Real Prese			100um
	C.A.			
	Les Aret			
			27 . 19	Exer Same

	1	Tang.	Semi-circular incipient cones	Elongated pits (++), punctiform pits	1 breakage	
	2	Perp.	Semi-circular, full incipient cones	1 elongated pit		
				Some pits (amorphous, punctiform		
	3	Tang.	Numerous incipient cones (all)	and elongated) & small pitting		Bulb very convex
				concentrated areas		
	4	Perp.	Incipient cones (all)	Some linear pits		
						Flat bulb, less silica in the RM / Crushing marks on
	5	Tang.	Few incipient cones	Few pits		the ridge between the ventral surface and the
						striking platform
						Fracture close to the bulb linked to repeated
	6	Perp.	Numerous incipient cones (all)	Few pits (including linear)	1 breakage	impact / Crushing marks on the ridge between the
						ventral surface and the striking platform
	7	Flexion		1 or 2 linear pits		Almost no traces
	8	Perp.	Semi circular, circular incipient cones	Few pits (including linear)		
				Pits (mostly linear)		
	9	Tang.	Small incipient cones (very rare)			
				1 area with intense very small pitting		
e	10	Perp.	Numerous incipient cones (semi circular, circular)	Few pits (including linear)		Crushing marks on the ridge between the ventral surface and the striking platform
				Some nite (meetly amorphous four		Crushing marks on the ridge between the ventral
S	11	Tang.	circular, circular)	linear)		surface and the striking platform / Irregular bulb surface. 2 large " <i>lancettes</i> "
					1 breakage	
	12	Perp.	Numerous incipient cones (all)	Few pits (amorphous, linear)	(notche-like)	Fracture near to the impact area
	13	Tang.	Incipient cones (semi-circular)	Numerous pits (mostly linear)		
	14	Tang.	Incipient cones (semi-circular)	Numerous pits (mostly linear)		
	15	Tang.		Small pittings		Small crushing marks on the ridge between the ventral surface and the striking platform
	16	Perp.	Few incipient cones (semi circular)	Rare pits (amorphous)		Crushing marks on the ridge between the ventral surface and the striking platform
	17	Tang.	Numerous incipient cones (semi circular)	Numerous pits (mostly linear)		Crushing marks on the ridge of the bulbar scar
	18	Perp.	Small incipient cones	Rare pits (amorphous)		Small crushing marks on the ridge between the ventral surface and the striking platform

◆ The intensity of traces in not always correlated with the number of strikes. Other factors may have an impact, such as the energy transmitted, the convexity of the ventral surface or the flint quality.

Similar elongated pits and incipient cones (mainly semi-circular), and sometimes striae, can be identified on the lithic material.

• But, more incipient cones produced during the experiment (contrary to what was published before): caused by the skills of the knappers (here, knappers not familiar to



### JALJULIA LATE ACHEULEAN



## the use of retouchers) or a gesture?

♦ At Jajulia, at least 2 of the 5 pieces with percussive marks on the ventral surface can be described as a classic bulb-retoucher, with an intensive use. It constitutes so far the oldest evidence of such pieces, ca. 500 ka in the Levant.

♦ A first examination of the lithic material from Qesem cave show their use during the Acheuleo-Yabroudian, with a much better preservation of lithic material and thus a potential to study the microwears and tool functions (cutting-edges).

Aknowledgements: We are greatful to the Sonia and Marco Nadler Institute of Archaeology, Tel-Aviv University, for the research funding with a postdoctoral fellowship. We also thank colleagues who share information about their experimental or archaeological material: D. Adler, O. Jöris, M. Massoulié, M. Prévost, C. Viallet.

• <u>References</u>: Adler, D.S., 2002. Late Middle Palaeolithic Patterns of Lithic Reduction. Mobility and Land-Use in the Southern Caucasus. Harvard University, Cambridge. / Centi, L., Groman-Yaroslavski, I., Friedman, N., Oron, M., Prévost, M., Zaidner, Y., 2019. The bulb retouchers in the Levant: New insights into Middle Palaeolithic retouching techniques and mobile tool-kit composition. PLoS ONE, 14, e0218859. / Mathias, C., Viallet, C., 2018. On the possible use of flake-bulbs for retouch during the Early Middle Palaeolithic in Southeastern France: First results of an experimental approach. Butlletí Arqueològic V, 323–328. / Semenov, S.A., 1970. Production and functions of stone tools. Kamennnyi vek na territiri SSSR. Materialy i issledovania po arkheologii 166, 7–18. / Semenov, S.A., 1972. Concerning the traces of use on mousterian artifacts from Vorontsov cave. Materialy i issledovania po arkheologii SSSR. 185, 20–24. / Tixier, J., 2000. Outils Moustériens a bulbe "piqueté" (Retaimia, Algérie). In: Otte M, editor. À la recherche de L'Homme préhistorique. ERAUL 95. Liège; 2000. p. 125–30.

