Note on a Proposed International Code of Symbols for Use on Archaeological Maps

Author(s): John Evans

Source: *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. 5 (1876), pp. 427-436

Published by: [Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2841114>

Accessed: 15/06/2014 01:37

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

12, Southwell Gardens, Kensington ; A. L. LEWIS, Esq., 151, Church Road, Essex Road, N. ; and ERNEST WILLETT, Esq., 33, Buckingham Place, Brighton.

The following papers were read by their respective authors :—

NOTE on a PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL CODE of SYMBOLS for use on ARCHÆOLOGICAL MAPS. By JOHN EVANS, F.R.S.

At the Congress of Prehistoric Archæology and Anthropology, held at Bologna, in the year 1871, the late Count A. Przezdziecki brought the subject of adopting some international code of symbols for denoting the various kinds of prehistoric relics upon archæological maps before the meeting, and a committee was appointed to report upon it. The matter had already been, to some extent, discussed by the archæological section of the Literary and Scientific Society of Cracow, and their report will be found at p. 364 of the Bologna volume of the Congress. Owing to the untimely death of Count Przezdziecki, the committee of 1871 does not appear to have met, and the subject was again brought forward at the Stockholm Congress of last year in an able paper by Mons. Ernest Chantre.

A second committee was then appointed, consisting of Messrs. Capellini, Desor, E. Dupont, Engelhardt, John Evans, Hans Hildebrand, Leemans, Lerch, de Mortillet, Romer, and Virchow, representing the following countries :—Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, Denmark, Great Britain, Sweden, Holland, Russia, France, Austria, and Germany. The committee held a meeting in Stockholm, when the question was fully discussed, and it was resolved to add M. Chantre to its number, and to constitute him and M. Gabriel de Mortillet a sub-committee, to settle the details of the scheme, after taking into consideration such written statements as any members of the committee might address to them. Such communications were made by Messrs. Engelhardt, Evans, Leemans, Lerch, and Romer, as also by M. Dupont, who forwarded a note from M. Van der Maelen, the author of the Archæological Map of Belgium.

The report of the sub-committee has just been completed, and I take this opportunity of bringing its contents before the anthropologists of this country.

It is divided under three heads : the maps, the signs, and the colours to be employed. The general instructions are good, as to the maps illustrative of prehistoric archæology being on a moderate scale, not too full of topographical details, unless faintly engraved, but yet giving the principal roads, and sufficient indications for finding the monuments designated. It is,

however, with the second part of the subject that we are most concerned. It is pointed out that in order to be generally adopted the symbols should be—

1. *Simple*, easily drawn, and readily visible.
2. *Well defined*, and distinct the one from the others.
3. *Special*, that is to say, not already appropriated as conventional signs on common maps. For this reason a circle is inadmissible.
4. *Universal* in their application, and bearing no relation to the language of any particular country.
5. *Mnemonic*, so that their forms call to mind the objects they represent.
6. *Susceptible of multiplication*, so that they may form a sort of alphabet with which, as occasion may arise, to create new words. With this view the symbols are treated under three heads as *radical*, *derivative*, and *complementary*.

RADICAL SYMBOLS.

These are simple in character, but sufficient to denote the principal objects of prehistoric archæology on a map, and are susceptible of slight modifications and combinations, for the purpose of giving further details or meeting fresh cases.

They are nine in number.

1. Cavern, underground dwelling, rock shelter	..	
2. Menhir, standing stone, monolith		
3. Dolmen, allée couverte		
4. Tumulus, barrow		
5. Interment, human bones		
6. Camp, oppidum, entrenchment		
7. Lake-dwelling, pile-building		
8. Find, station, dwelling (foyer)		
9. Mine, quarry, excavation		

It will be seen at a glance that these signs fulfil all the principal conditions of the case, being both simple and distinct.

The slight resemblances between those for cavern and tumulus, menhir and find, dolmen and lake-dwelling, are unimportant, and the differences between the symbols is readily recognized.

The whole of the nine are also special, and such as do not occur on ordinary maps, while they are sufficiently mnemonic to remind one of the objects they are intended to designate. That they are susceptible of multiplication will be evident when we come to consider their derivatives. In their simple condition they will suffice for maps on a small scale. Where greater detail is required, slight modifications and simple combinations will serve to convey a great amount of information.

DERIVED SYMBOLS.

1. *Radical.*—*Cavern.*

Caverns and underground dwellings may be either natural or artificial. For those excavated by the hand of man the symbol may be used in its simple form, open; and for natural caverns, which are usually much larger and darker, with the hollow closed. The following derivatives are suggested:—

Artificial underground dwelling	..	..	..
Natural cavern or rock-shelter	..	..	..
Artificial cavern, sepulchral	..	..	..
Natural cavern, sepulchral	..	..	..
Cavern used as a refuge	..	..	..

These are formed, as will at once be seen, by the addition of the symbol for interment, or of entrenchment or oppidum, to the radical cavern.

2. *Radical.*—*Menhir.*

Veritable menhir or monolith	..	..	..
Alignment, or series of menhirs	..	..	..
Cromlech or stone-circle	..	..	..

Rocking-stone..	..	..	..	..	..
Cup-marked stone	..	..	..	..	..
Stone with inscription or sculpture ..	..	..	..	..	..
Legendary stone	..	..	..	..	..

The alignment is symbolized by the two lines at the base; the cromlech, or stone-circle, by the semicircle of dots; the slanting transverse bar signifies a rocking-stone; the dot on the centre of the symbol a cup-marking. A thick, square base to the symbol typifies sculpture, and the obscurity which usually attaches to stones of legendary fame is characterized by darkening the sign.

3. *Radical.—Dolmen.*

Dolmen, passage-grave, &c. ..	..	..	..	..
Dolmen covered by a tumulus	..	..	..	..
Dolmen on a tumulus ..	..	..	..	..

These symbols would presumably refer to the existing state of the monuments.

4. *Radical.—Tumulus.*

Simple tumulus or mound	..	..	..	..
Sepulchral barrow	..	..	..	..
Entrenched barrow	..	..	..	..
Long barrow ..	..	..	..	..
Barrow with wooden cist or coffin	..	..	..	..

Tumulus with statues	..	..	..	..
Pits or depressions (Mardelles)	..	..	..	..

Some of these symbols, such as that for a barrow surmounted by rude statues, would probably not be required in Britain.

5. *Radical.—Interment.*

Simple interment, or accidental burial	..	..	..	..
Interment by inhumation	..	..	..	..
Interment after incineration	..	..	..	..
Cemetery of unburnt bodies	..	..	..	..
Cemetery of burnt bodies	..	..	..	..

To these I would venture to add—

Interment in a contracted position reserving the symbol for extended burials.

Some other combinations of this symbol have already been noticed. The mark of a cemetery is made by the addition of the sign *plus* +.

6. *Radical.—Camp.*

Camp, entrenchment, fortification, &c.	..	..	..	..
Associated with a barrow or mound	..	..	..	..
Dykes, lines of defence, &c.	..	..	..	..

This sign is intended to represent all places of refuge or defence, whether wholly or partially surrounded by earth-works. Its combination with the symbol for cavern has already been noticed.

7. *Radical.—Pile-building, or Lake-dwelling.*

This symbol represents all such monuments, whether lake-dwellings, pile-works, or crannoges.

8. *Radical.—Find or Discovery.*

Of an isolated object
Of several objects together
Workshop or foundry
Station or site of human occupation
Kjökkenmödding
Terra-mara

The simple symbol is conventional rather than mnemonic. Its combinations or derivatives are, however, intended to symbolize their meaning. The discovery of several objects is indicated by doubling the sign, and this for workshops or foundries is darkened. The mark for a station approaches that for a town on ordinary maps. The mound of a kjökkenmödding and the pit of a terra-mara are indicated by the grouping of the three triangles, of which two are in the one case white and in the other dark.

9. *Radical.—Mine or Excavation.*

This sign requires no derivatives. It is suggested that it might be of service as indicating the sources from which materials found at any given spot were derived. In the case of a dolmen, for instance, in which the stones had been brought from a distance, the symbol for mine might be placed at the nearest or most likely spot from which they were brought, and connected with the sign of the dolmen by a dotted line showing the relation of the two signs.

Complementary Symbols.

These are of a simple character, and intended to complete, so far as possible, the archæological indications on a map. They come under three categories, and relate to the condition, the number, and the age of the monuments.

Category 1.—Symbols relating to the condition of monuments. These are four in number:

1. A small circle under the symbol, to denote that they have been investigated.

2. A transverse line across the symbol, to signify that the monuments are dilapidated or in bad condition.

3. Two lines crossing each other so as to cancel the symbol. These denote that the monuments have been entirely destroyed and have disappeared.

4. A small bar, like a bend-sinister, at the side of the symbol, to denote that the monuments are false, or have been wrongly indicated or determined.

			Explored.	Dilapidated.	Destroyed.	Spurious.
Cavern	..	..				
Artificial cavern	..					
Menhir	..	..				
Dolmen	..	..				
Tumulus	..	..				
Cemetery of unburnt bodies	..	..				
Entrenchment	..					
Pile-building	..					
Terra-mara	..	..				

Category 2.—Symbols having reference to number.—These are simple adjuncts placed above the principal symbol to the right. Where the exact number is known this may be indicated by a numeral; where it is unknown, but several monuments exist, it is indicated by the sign *plus* +; where the number is large this sign may be doubled. As, for example—

			Several.	Many.	A specified number.
Artificial sepulchral caves					
Depressions	..	..			
Burnt bodies	..	..			

Category 3.—Symbols relating to the age of the monuments.—The different ages may be distinguished by printing in different colours, as will be subsequently explained. On the ground of expense, however, or for other reasons, it may be desirable to print them simply in black. In this case, the following signs are to be adopted :—

Palæolithic period	..	..	..	..	..	↑
Neolithic period	..	..	..	..	..	↑
Bronze period	..	..	..	..	..	✕
Iron period	..	..	..	..	..	⚔

As a guide to memory, it may be observed that the symbol for the earliest period is the most simple, and that for the latest the most complicated. One or more such marks may be attached to each radical or derivative symbol. For instance, a cavern in which relics of the palæolithic, neolithic, and bronze ages had been found, might have superadded to the radical symbol, lines with the single barb, the double barb, and the saltire attached.

Examples.			Palæolithic.	Neolithic.	Bronze.	Iron.
Cavern	..	..
Discovery	..	..
Station	..	..

When the age is doubtful, a note of interrogation may be added.

Colours.

The use of complementary symbols to indicate the age of monuments, though simple and easy, has the disadvantage of complicating the principal signs, and of overcharging the maps with hieroglyphics. It is therefore better, where possible, to employ colours, as originally recommended by M. Chantre. Colours have also the advantage of rendering all the monuments of one age visible together at the first glance at a map. After carefully examining the advantages and drawbacks attaching to

various tints, the authors of the report recommend the adoption of the following:—

Palæolithic age	..	..	Brownish yellow.
Neolithic age	..	..	Green.
Bronze age	..	..	Red.
Iron age	..	..	Blue.

The green and the blue should be such as cannot be confounded with one another when seen by artificial light.

It is mentioned that the colours blue and red were assigned long ago by the Egyptians to the metals iron and bronze, weapons of these metals being painted in these colours by Egyptian artists. As to the colours for the two ages of stone, the ochreous tint of many palæolithic implements, and the green jade of which some of the finest polished celts are fashioned, may assist in recalling them to mind.

Such, in brief, is the report of Messrs. Gabriel de Mortillet and Ernest Chantre, and there can, I think, be but little doubt that the code of symbols recommended by the committee, of which they are the representatives, will be largely adopted on the Continent in maps illustrative of prehistoric archæology. They are brought under the notice of those who in this country are interested in prehistoric questions, in the hope—1st, that when any maps are prepared on which the use of such symbols is desirable, it may not be forgotten that a carefully prepared code is already in existence; and, 2nd, that those to whom we are indebted for so large an amount of trouble bestowed on its preparation may meet with some reward in seeing their labours bear fruit in this as well as the other civilized countries of the world.

DISCUSSION.

Mr. FRANKS took the opportunity of stating that, as reference had been made to the Prehistoric Congress at Stockholm in 1874, he regretted to have to inform the Institute that he had just heard from Stockholm that the volume of Transactions of the Congress, of which 832 pages were in type, had been totally destroyed by a fire at the printers. The reprinting is to be immediately commenced, and will, it is hoped, be completed by May next.

The PRESIDENT thought that, upon the whole, the proposed code of symbols combined simplicity with clearness as well as any that could be suggested, and he hoped they would be adopted. There were some slight omissions, however, which might be easily remedied. For example, there was no radical sign for the important class of prehistoric habitations. The sign for “find” or for prehistoric “station” did not necessarily imply that the remains of dwellings were to be found there. The following symbols, he thought,

would meet the case without interfering with those given in Mr. Evans's paper, viz. :—

Prehistoric dwelling or chamber	{	above ground	...	...	...
		half underground, or pits	...	...	...
		underground chamber or artificial cave	...	...	...

Then, again, although there was a radical for a defensive work, there was none for earthworks of a non-defensive character, which were common in all parts of the world. He thought that the annexed symbol might be employed in conjunction with any other symbol to denote that a work was defensive ; whilst the

symbol employed in the paper for "camp or defensive work" might be used merely to designate "earthwork." If the code obliged us to mark all earthworks as defensive it would lead to error.

Mr. EVANS, in reply, observed that one of the features of the proposed system of symbols was, that it gave a series of radical signs which were susceptible of modification to meet any special cases. No doubt any map on which the symbols were adopted would have some index appended, in which any special modifications would be explained. In the short paper which he had read he had not entered so fully into detail as did the original report in French, a copy of which he begged leave to present to the Institute.

RHABDOMANCY and BELOMANCY, or DIVINATION by the Rod and by the ARROW. By A. W. BUCKLAND, M.A.I.

It cannot, I think, be denied that divination in some form has been practised by every nation, civilised and uncivilised, with which we are acquainted. It doubtless had its origin in the world's infancy, when men began to see in natural objects things incomprehensible, and were led by dreams and visions to a belief in the supernatural, and by a further step in the same direction, to associate the spirits of the departed with things animate and inanimate. Hence arose an elaborate system, divided into numerous branches requiring as its exponents trained men skilled in the deep mysteries of nature, and admitted to a knowledge of those dexterous juggleries whereby natural phenomena were made to assume awful and threatening aspects in the eyes of the ignorant and superstitious multitude, in order the more securely to maintain that authority obtained by a reputation for supernatural power. Thus the magicians of Egypt, the astrologers of Chaldea, the magi of Persia, the augurs of Etruria, Greece, and Rome, the Druids of Gaul and Britain, all diviners, exercised probably more real power than the kings and chiefs of their respective countries, who were