

INSTITUT FRANÇAIS DE RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUE POUR LE DEVELOPPEMENT EN COOPERATION

CHRONOCULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE F1 OF 14 C AND TL DATINGS IN NORTH CAMEROON IRON AGE SETTLEMENTS A CASE REFLEXION UPON THE RELIABILITY OF ABSOLUTE DATING O.R.S.T.O.M. Fonds Documentaire N°: 256H6 cx 1 M Cote 1 6 AMAGE 101 Alain MARLIAC

> Département Société, Développement, Urbanisation AXE 1 "PATRIMOINES ET IDENTITES" DOCUMENT DE TRAVAIL N° 5 JUILLET 1988

B25646 ex1

IId International Symposium "Archaeology and 14 C" Groningen, Sept. 87 Biological Archaelogical Institute and Isotope Physics Laboratory

ľ

University of Groningen, The Netherlands.

CHRONOCULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE OF 14 C AND TL DATINGS IN NORTH CAMEROON IRON AGE SETTLEMENTS A CASE REFLEXION UPON THE RELIABILITY OF ABSOLUTE DATING

A. Marliač

ORSTOM, Institut Français de Recherche Scientifique pour le développement en Coopération, Laboratoire d'Archéologie Tropicale et d'Anthropologie Historique, 70 Route d'Aulnay, 93140 BONDY, France Abstract: Absolute datings cannot be immediately used for chronocultural purposes. From the study of the sequences obtained on Iron Age sites in North Cameroon, Central Africa, we came to the conclusion that, for archaeological objectives, an absolute dating coming or not from an archaeological context bears no significance unless analyzed from an archaeo-anthropological point of view. This conclusion is an invite for a real joint and even field approach to the problems of absolute dating in prehistory by physicists and archaeologists. Key words: 14 C dating, TL dating, Iron Age, North Cameroon, Africa, chronocultural significance.

Résumé: Les datations absolues ne peuvent être utilisées telles quelles pour dater des cultures. A partir des séquences réalisées sur des sites de l'Age du Fer au Nord du Cameroun, nous sommes parvenus à la conclusion qu'une datation absolue utilisée pour des buts archéologiques, qu'elle provienne d'échantillons dans ou hors contexte archéologique, n'a pas de signification en dehors d'une interprétation archéo-anthropologique. Cette opinion est une invite pour une approche conjointe réelle des problèmes de la datation absolue par les physiciens et les archéologues.

Mots cles: datation 14 C, TL, Age du Fer, Cameroun du Nord, Afrique, signification chronoculturelle.

The three sequences of datings (Laboratories references and calibrations in Mariiac A., 1985, 1987a, 1987b) shown Tables I, II and III come from test pits made in Iron Age settlements discovered in the Diamaré region of North Cameroon. This region was "terra incognita" before, as well as so many other vast areas of Central Africa... Roughly speaking these settlements occur as light up-raisings of river banks in the Central Diamaré and bigger up-heapings in the Logone zone (cf map 2). They can all be termed "settlement mounds" made of the piling up of varied architectural debris, refuse, sherds, ashes, pits, burials, some floors, stones and so on...

Apparently the datings cover the whole of the archaeological sequences, more regularly at Mongossi and Goray than at Salak. Does this mean that the cultures discovered, analyzed and thus defined by archaeological methods from the data collected in the pits are "dated"? In other words are the datings significant for the archaeologist's point of view which is prominently chronocultural? And this raises another question: what is really analyzed and then given a "date"? The first two questions raise the problem of the level of significance retained for archaeological purposes. The third one raises the problem of more or less strong anthropic dimension that biases the significance of the samples. From a more general (theoretical) point of view: can cultures be dated by absolute datings?

-I-

Obviously at a regional level including Northern Nigeria and Southern Chad where few datings are available, the three Tables can be taken as sets bringing chronological information totally new and relevant for general reflexions upon

the prehistoric/historic evolution of the area (Iron Age cultures/historic cultures). Thus, we can consider after a choice which is explained elsewhere at length (Marliac A., 1985,1987a, 1987b) that the time span concerned by the Mongossi culture is Xth AD-XVIIth AD, that the time span concerned by the Salak culture (Salak and Goray) is VIth AD-XIIIth AD. Clearly, these late Iron Age cultures must be relevant for the following historic human occupations of the subregion... Consequently, the sets of datings can be taken as significant and one can deduce for instance new hypotheses and explanations on the earliest historic peoplings of the area. From this angle of view, 14 C absolute datings as well as TL absolute datings can be considered reliable.

- II -

If we come to a more precise level, that of the pits in our three sites the situation becomes more complex :

a) charcoal is not regularly distributed from one end to the other end of the pit, sherds too. In effect, charcoal is sometimes unusable (quantity) or missing, and sherds have to be picked up in particular locations (Aitken M.J. 1972). Consequently in some cases datings cannot be made and the sequences exhibit "gaps".

b) Had it been regular, the distribution itself could not refer to a stratigraphic sequence as the formation of the matrix IS NOT a regular process but an anthropogenic one (and also because the pit has been dug through just a part of the mound). The site cannot be considered as a regular sequence of what could have been called "anthropic layers". It is better seen as the succession of the different parts of different habitats *stricto sensu* These successive habitats

being in rotation one above the other and, moreover, being partly mingled by intrusive structures and various takings of material (for new constructions for instance)...

E.g. : case floors, hearths, case surroundings, refuse zones, refuse natural or dug pits, kitchens, burials, etc... all this having collapsed, having been buried, dug through bottom layers, abandonned, eroded and re-scattered/re-spread, then capped by other different parts of a new occupation possibly differently organized or even culturally at variance...

c) Once the site has been abandonned (and this can occur many times before the site is actually and definitely left), it began to evolve under external and internal natural conditions, these ones being, at least partially, biased by the man-made structure of the mound...

d) Climate will either protect or modify the site depending on the type and seasonal distribution of the rains.

E.g.: we can imagine ablation of the first layers in instable topographic position then denudation of internal layers turning either to hardened soils or to guillies or possibly to sherds-protected surfaces... Also, the remnants of man-made structures as well as the possible cracking of clayed material can exaggerate water percolations.

e) The fauna (see the mounds named "hyena hole" (*ngaska fowru*: in local fulani language) and especially but not only, the microfauna, can induce internal circulation of waters and materials (including sometimes artefacts themselves)

f.) The soil itself, thanks to its special anthropic nature, will evolve through aggregations, migrations, neoformations...

We are not going to list here all the possible scenarios of intrasite evolution (bio-chemico-physicoturbations...) in a TOTALLY ANTHROPIC SITE, either all the possibilities of habitats compositions and successions. It appears clearly, however, that each sample may be polluted and that the distribution of the samples in each site can be also polluted as well as disturbed. The materials sampled for datings are complex by nature. What we date is AT THE SAME TIME under the heading of physics, natural sciences and of anthropology. It has to be grasped from these three points of view as it belongs to these different orders of phenomena.

E.g. : a piece of carbonized wood beyond its physical and botanical definition should be precisely localized in space, then localized within the structuration of the site (under, above, coming from, close to...) these structures being then interpreted in anthropological terms through models.

To identify all the parameters of even one sample (parameters of which we gave but a short list!) seems out of reach. Just a few are actually seizable.

- III -

With regard to our sequences:

a) each result has been examined within the site structuration as carefully as possible. Observations from Laboratories were taken into account too (e.g.: quantity...)

b) we decide to take a medium position taking into account that circulation of samples or of samples polluting materials in this type of site should not exceed one meter deep on an average (with some exceptions). Therefore there must be a chronological logic in the datings distribution within the pits boundaries.

6

In fact this decision was based on the observed distribution of the datings at hand from the three sites excavated. This distribution shows:

- albeit inverted according to a looping mode, the datings are organized in chronological order from the bottom up to the mougth of the pit: grosso mode the earliest are towards the bottom, the latest towards the top;

- put along a chronological line (wide diverging datings being excluded) they exhibit a continuum which gives a reasonable span of time for cultures duration: six, seven centuries.

Thus, the periods cited in part I, were retained as the most acceptable on internal site considerations. Moreover they were accepted after collation with the established cultural sequences (pottery typology).

c) The sequences were then approved on external considerations, i.e. interpreted in terms of regional prehistoric/historic cultures duration and presence.

- the sets of datings were considered reliable in comparison with regional historic datings (oral traditions) and the rare absolute datings at our disposal (P. de Maret, 1985) but;

- the diverging datings have to be interpreted in comparison with other datings (absolute for the lower limit of the sequence, historic for the upper limit);

- the sets retained as well as the diverging datings have of course to be confirmed or not by many other datings.

The two last points are far from being satisfactorily solved nowadays.

The preceding quick look at our North Cameroon situation, explained at which level of significance we chose to use absolute datings for our archaeological purposes according to the samples reliability and the overall prehistoric and historic knowledge in the area.

It is risky to bring together, from a general point of view, phenomena belonging to totally different fields of research. It has been possible in our situation - keeping in mind the necessity of further improvements - because we find ourselves at the intersection of the three fiels of research (physics, natural sciences, anthropology): common stratification-deposition. Moreover some of the samples are man-induced or man-started (burning of pottery, hearths, bush fires...). This case is far better than those where samples are not man-induced (but intimately linked with cultural vestiges) and those where samples are not man-induced and just stratigraphically linked with vestiges (the datable stratum lying for instance, two meters apart from the archeaeological horizon).

But even in our case, absolute datings do not really "date" the cultures, but, rather the time of deposition (possibly disturbed) of samples and cultures items, or the starting of individual cultural events (pottery making).

Are cultures datable in terms of a beginning or and end? Are cultures durations really measurable (e.g. : what sort of relation can exist between the date of charcoal making and the culture which made it in its hearths?)

We could conclude that absolute datings give only landmarks for cultures durations. In the best case, the more intimate and accurate their three definitions are, the more secure the landmarks are, but, also, the heavier the

cultural bias can bel The more numerous the datings are the greater the chance of approaching the chronological bounds of a culture if there are any... In the other cases, absolute datings will remain landmarks whose utilization within the anthropological interpretation is subordinate to their more or less great number and accuracy..

ζ

Références

Aitken, M; J; 1972, *Thermoluminescent dating. Notes on collection of potsherds.* Revised January.

Marliac, A., 1982a, *Recherches ethno-archéologiques au Diamaré, Cameroun Septentrional*, ORSTOM, Travaux et Documents N° 151, 91 p.

Mariiac, A., 1982b, L'Age du Fer au Cameroun Septentrional : données chronologiques nouvelles sur le Diamaré. Jour. Soc. Africanistes 52, 1-2 : 59-67.

Marliac, A., 1985, *L'Age du Fer au Cameroun Septentrional : rapport préliminaire sur le site de Salak au Diamaré.* Multigr. ORSTOM-MESRES, 235 p. (Revised version to be published).

Marliac, A., 1987a, L'Age du Fer au Cameroun Septentrional : rapport préliminaire sur le site de Mongossi dans la plaine du Logone. Multigr. ORSTOM-MESRES, December 1987.

Marliac, A., 1987b, L'Age du Fer au Cameroun Septentrional : rapport préliminaire sur le site de Goray au Diamaré. Multigr. ORSTOM-MESRES, December 1987.

De Maret, P., 1985, *Recent archaeological research and dates from Central Africa*. Journ. of African History XXVI: 129-48.



14

100 km

. :

10 °

8°

<i>S</i> 17 1			817 XI					
ile.	Tel.	Age 5.2.	ise i.D.	Ouronolog. order	Шг.	T#£.	48 2.7.	LEB AsDo .
-4500	712	385/396	1596	9 7	-6023	1012	910490	2050+90
-73	204,5,5	210260	1740.00	u				
-78	113	933	1050	6				
-116	TL	1820	•	•				
-150	3031,26	910-90	1050290	1				ł
-163	11	. 197/816	1154	•			1	
-150	T.S	354/373	1617	10			1	1
-210	1013	12802125	670g125	4				
-220	1015	1165_90	785-90	5				
-332 ·	111 112 114	1490 1380 1470	490 600 510	1 3 2				

Table Inibediute datings for Salak I and Salak XI (uncalibrated).

111.	Jel.	148 3.2.	ige i.D.	Christopical order
	TL79.5	247/241	. 1736	25.
50	TL82.1	612+43	1379443	15
	1019.3.4	290	•	· •
80	11.12.2	775+41	1204441	.13
95	1082.2	170+80	1050+50	u l
105	11.79.7 .	373/365	1605/1616	24
	19.79.8	524/559	1407/1422	. 19
106	BC42.12	610+75	1340+75	1.17
~~			-	
175	3032.6	910+180	1040-110	
	71,79.17	426/420	(555/1561	12 .
180	XC52.9	130 <u>+</u> 110	10207110	
190	1052.20	7502200	12001209	
200	1079.37	1110-120	770+120	
220	1030.6	350790	000000	J. 1
250	TL19.18 .	592/570	1349/IAII	- 18
275	TL12.9	1 604+49	1177449	12
326	1179.20	1011/1045	910/936	1. 1
329	1012.30	920+120	1030+130	1. M. 6.
	71.42.10	305+38	1175-58	1 · 11 · 1
		ISALTAR	140-105	"I' '22'
340	1012.36	1010-40	1 970+40	1 3
202	N.00.10	7454750	12054150	15.
~	1012.33	1595+450	355+450	
355	1012.34	945+75	1005+75	
			i	
415	TL42.12	, 205 30	1411733	
		525242	1456243	. 20 .
	1168.13	996253	142252	
150	1018.17	1890+245 ·	\$401245 been 10	. TIVER LAFEAGE
-	1012.375	3250	1310 5.6,	Doto Io ·

÷

Table IIIAbsolute datings for Goray 79,60 and 42(incelibrated).

SPIT								
	Jal.	λgs 5.7.	لوه لماله	Orrenolog. order	122.	Tel.	Jan B.P.	Jao J.D.
-5508	111	610 <u>+40+</u> 50 598+31+42	1171 <u>+40</u> +50 1283+31 <u>+</u> 42	(2). 12 15 13	-15 55	1015 1015	15555600 . 450195	395 <u>1600</u> 1500 <u>1</u> 95
65	TLA	548+44+60	1133744760	7,	70	125	778+36+52	1203 <u>+</u> 36 <u>+</u> 52
80 95 JID	104,4b 105 102	560±70 1905±255 440±60	1390±70 	14 16				
-140 -	1C10	915 <u>+</u> 45	1035 <u>4</u> 65	5 10	150		776 <u>+</u> 34 <u>+</u> 5I	1205254552
212	TLIS	\$Z <u>25660</u> 59	1168-664-59				ľ	
223 .	71.195 3018	851+44+60 715+85	11.30144460 12.35445	б. П				1.
560 · 410 ·	म्बर स्वर'रक	1600±60 - 1453±67±98 1483±63±96	1502-60 5382-672-68 5002-632-96	7.4. 3.		ļ 		

Table III: Absolute desings for Hongosei I and Hongosei II(unsalibrated).



×

