

## Pictures, Jargon and Theory – Our Own Ethnography and Roadside Rock Art

JOHN CLEGG

University of Sydney,  
NSW 2006, Australia

**ABSTRACT.** The roadside pictures of an area in suburban Sydney were examined as valuable ‘things to think with’ for prehistorians in particular and other students of rock art. It was discovered that several traits which had been considered unique to, and characteristic of, European palaeolithic rock art are also characteristic of the pictures of suburban Sydney. New light is shed on the concepts of ‘art’ and ‘style’ when they are confronted with essentially familiar materials whose ethnography is at once known and intangible.

CLEGG, J., 1993. Pictures, jargon and theory – our own ethnography and roadside rock art. Records of the Australian Museum, Supplement 17: 91–103.

This paper consists of three parts: i) introduction and fieldwork: exploration of the pictures beside a kilometre or so of Sydney roads, ii) theoretical discussion, and iii) refinement of jargon and concepts in the light of contemporary picture-making and ethnographic considerations.

An invitation to offer a paper on Ethnography and Rock Art to the Australian Archaeological Association conference at Valla, November 1985, stimulated this investigation. More and more prehistorians are trying to use prehistoric pictures as relevant and valuable data. This is expressed in the literature (Conkey, 1978, 1980a, 1980b, 1982, 1984; Gamble, 1982; Jochim, 1982; Wobst, 1977) and at conferences (World Archaeological Congress, Southampton 1986; First Australian Rock Art Congress, Darwin 1988).

What prehistory means to us is strongly linked to the contrasts between prehistoric situations and our own, so studies of prehistoric and contemporary pictures reinforce and illuminate each other. Margaret W. Conkey

discovered several attributes which are characteristic of palaeolithic pictures, but which, it turns out, are also found in the pictures of our society. These will be discussed in the third section of this paper.

It may be impossible to make a satisfactory definition of ‘art’ for all purposes, but it is not difficult to recognise the sorts of things (e.g., marks on rocks) prehistorians study as ‘rock art’. There are difficulties of definition, such as the need to determine whether some marks are natural or artificial and whether they are the by-product of some other process like sharpening a tool. Such problems are not the concern of this paper.

The best-known prehistoric pictures are from the Palaeolithic of western Europe. They consist of drawings, paintings, prints and stencils, carvings, engravings and models. For analysis they are separated into two groups: mobiliary (portable pictures often made on bone, antler, or ivory), and parietal (pictures which are on rock surfaces, usually walls or ceilings of caves or rock shelters).

In studies of this art, sometimes some sorts of marks are ignored, usually for the insidious but excellent reason that there is nothing to say about them. Thus, very little attention was paid to the 'signs' of the European Palaeolithic until Leroi-Gourhan and Marshack published provocative studies of some of them. It is necessary to select the sorts of objects one studies, deliberately and with consideration. Unconscious selection is likely to introduce subjective bias.

The word 'art' is associated with (often subjective) selection of marks, tending to favour those pictures which are pretty, naturalistic or iconographic. When I study 'rock art', I do not want to discard the artefacts which are not pretty, or not well made, or for any other reason not 'Art'. Any such selection would bias the archaeological sample (Clegg, 1985:44). I have sought, accordingly, a better term for what I study. Up till the present I have used the term *prehistoric pictures*, hardly adequate for its purpose, because some people's concept of 'picture' is restricted to the subset 'representation' or 'picture of', and the term has to include three-dimensional marks, whether or not they conform to anyone's idea of 'picture'. This usage has not caught on, and I am now willing to surrender to the ubiquitous term 'Rock Art', which is all-embracing and no longer restricted to particularly pretty or naturalistic pictures.

Work with rock art requires many concepts, and workable definitions of them. Particularly difficult is *style*. Fortunately, the jargon and concepts are evolving; the multitude of meanings of *style* is settling down into one agreed meaning, which relates to manner, characteristic of a time and place.

Working with prehistoric artefacts means working from ignorance. The purpose of this paper is not to discuss appropriate words, or deal with definitions. The aim is to stimulate a wider consideration of rock art studies by drawing attention to an easily available supply of 'things to think with', whose usefulness is exemplified by a confrontation between prehistory, literature and contemporary pictures. I looked at the 'rock art' along a suburban roadside, which seems generally comparable to palaeolithic parietal art, although suburban pictures have many media (cast-iron, road-paints, printed posters and, above all, writing) which were not available in the Palaeolithic. The confrontation continually challenges definitions and theory. In the field I strove to look at the material in the ways that prehistorians (such as myself) deal with the prehistoric material, so I was generally concerned with marks on surfaces rather than the surfaces they are on. The primary objective is to clarify concepts - particularly those used in the study of rock art - by applying them to familiar objects, in a culture with whose ramifications we are all acquainted.

Additional notes are listed in the Appendix.

### Choice of Ethnographic Area

The investigation required a large quantity of pictures of a rich and complex culture which is ethnographically

well known, so that the characteristics alleged for Rock Art could be reasonably sought. I chose to study the pictures I pass twice every weekday as I drive from home in Balmain to work at Sydney University, and back again. The area is comparatively old; most of the buildings look 19th century. It is between 3 and 4 km from the city centre. The roads are secondary: The Crescent, Minogue Crescent and Ross Street in Annandale and Forest Lodge (Gregory's, 1982: maps 1, 5, 26, 28). Ross Street is the shopping centre of the suburb Forest Lodge and contains its primary school and a playground. Minogue Crescent is partly cut from a sandstone cliff, and has a small reserve with residences on one side and Harold Park horse trotting track on the other. The Crescent is bordered by a reserve, some residential property, and some waterfront industrial and railway property. The brick-facing to a railway embankment has a painting on it. The roads are amply supplied with advertising hoardings, ubiquitous road furniture and signs, and several bus stops.

The pictures belong to our culture, including subcultures. The products of one subculture may not be fully comprehensible to a member of another for one or more of the following reasons (Hunt, 1982:117):

our normal mode of communicating...with each other is highly abbreviated and elliptical; listeners and readers supply far more information than is overtly contained in the words of the speaker or writer.

This is equally true of less verbal modes of communication.

### Fieldwork

On Thursday, 17 October, 1985, I conducted a field examination. The aim of the exercise was to locate many different sorts of pictures and contemplate their ethnographic context, together with the relevant archaeological theory. Pictures were recognised by normal archaeological means: marks made on surfaces by humans (see Clegg, 1985:44 for definitions and further references). No attempt was made to take a representative or random sample.

There is an enormous number of pictures. I ordered them by the effects the pictures are intended to have, and which they sometimes achieve. The discussion begins with a list of the functions of the pictures, then mentions topics which follow from the pictures' characteristics.

**Messages.** Most of these pictures, whether or not they contain writing, are intended to be messages; the picture was produced by some person or institution for the purpose of affecting the knowledge and/or behaviour of some (usually though not always other) person or institution.

The single example where the picture-as-message was not strongly and immediately apparent was the mural in the Crescent, Annandale, where documentary evidence implied that it was Art; a notice incorporated in the

picture declares it to be the product of the CRESCENT COMMUNITY ART PROJECT. This picture is clearly intended to divert and interest. Further information about this picture and its genesis are in Architecture Department (1981). The mural has recently been partially superposed by a painted sign which expresses objection to a municipal decision to allow industry to occupy potential waterfront parkland, and continued to serve this propaganda function in 1989.<sup>1</sup>

**Identification.** Pictures name, label, and identify things and buildings, for example GIRLS SCHOOL, POLICE-CITIZENS BOYS CLUB, often implying territoriality.

**Direction.** Pictures order consumers to perform actions, e.g. STOP at a road intersection, or they indicate a route, as in the case of an arrow followed by 'Architectural Graphics', or 'Rozelle' or 'Victoria Road'. Unofficial arrows in yellow house paint on the footpath for a kilometre and more presumably once marked the course of a footrace.

**Exhortation.** This is conveyed sometimes by implication: YOU BELONG IN THE ZOO; sometimes directly: KILL THE COPS.

**Information.** Pictures inform by making statements (e.g., 'You never forget the feel of a pure cotton sheet'), as well as through labelling and direction. Simple messages are often loaded with implied meaning: 'No Cash Kept On These Premises Overnight', 'skins sucks', 'JX L KH'.

**Warning.** They also warn people of various things: a SCHOOL, NO SWIMMING SHARKS IN THIS AREA, and that there are CABLES LAID IN THIS STREET.

**Demarcation.** Pictures may demarcate territories: BUS ZONE, ANNANDALE, ROZELLE.

**Comment.** Some pictures comment on messages, or the institutions which originated them: NO STANDING - 'sit down'; BILL POSTERS PROSECUTED - 'Bill Poster is INNOCENT'; a phallus added to the image of a used-car salesman.

**Origin.** Some pictures claim authorship of an artefact: founder's name on a cast iron bubbler; masons' initials on the foundations of Forest Lodge Primary School and the cutting in the cliff by the Lewis Hoard Reserve; the sign AUSTRALIAN POSTERS at the margins of some advertisements.

**Totems.** Affiliation is sometimes conveyed by depiction of totems, like the pink panther indicating a printing company.

**Commemoration.** Some examples commemorate individuals or groups (e.g., THE LEWIS HOARD RESERVE, the Foundation plaque on the Salvation Army building,

and many of the street names).

**Agglomeration sites.** ARREDORAMA furniture showroom displays totems (and logos) of many different institutions. Grocers' and corner shops contain goods and advertisements which exhibit many different totems and, thus, indicate the varied origins of the products.

**Ethnographic parallels.** I am told (I. Davidson, personal communication) that according to Aboriginal ethnography in New England, a barred circle was a warning of a restricted dangerous site nearby. Our ELECTRICITY COMMISSION CABLES LAID IN THIS STREET is a warning that injury may befall unauthorised or ignorant interference.

### Comments on Fieldwork

**Comprehensibility.** The meanings of pictures are apparent only to those skilled in reading them. Messages are on the whole most competently understood by those of the same culture. Unacculturated people may miss the message. Some time ago large trucks used to bear the message CAUTION AIR BRAKES displayed on the back where it could be easily seen by the drivers of following vehicles, at whom it was presumably aimed. Yet some such drivers did not know whether air brakes make vehicles stop quickly or slowly, emit piercing shrieks, or release a parachute into the path of a following car.

**Private and public pictures.** Some pictures are private, individual messages; others are public, official, institutional. Posters are institutional pictures placed and constantly re-placed on sites constructed for their display. Some individual messages are at traditional locations, which are part way to being institutionalised. Bus shelters are traditional loci for private messages. On the Lewis Hoard Reserve cliff-face is an area which would be clearly seen from the stands of the Harold Park trotting track. The area of cliff-face has the illegible remains of a palimpsest of well-lettered public, but probably non-institutional, notices. Private notices are less obvious than and, perhaps for that reason, outnumbered by institutional ones. Public and private pictures seem to have similar functions. There are, for example, individual as well as institutional versions of PRIVATE KEEP OUT.

**Location on a route.** These pictures are connected with their location on a thoroughfare, where there is a large audience. Such pictures differ from those in houses or other non-public or less frequented places. The observation that public and private pictures are different and have different locations has implications for and confirmation in archaeology. The literature on Australian Aboriginal religion states that many access routes were also mythic tracks, and implies that a particular sort of picture is to be expected along them (Berndt, 1974:8-9). Smith (1983:146) has discovered material which supports the view that pictures on access routes are

different from pictures away from access routes. This observation may in turn allow the recognition of prehistoric thoroughfares and mythic tracks.

**Implied messages.** Like most artefacts, pictures carry incidental messages which are in some senses not deliberate, like information about technology (cast-iron implies industrialisation, mining, Port Kembla; paper implies forestry). Some class or sexist messages may also be unintentional, or merely incidental. Such messages are not immediately apparent to the consumers, though they become very obvious when pointed out by a knowledgeable analyst.

### Theoretical Discussion

All observation is related to some baseline.<sup>2</sup> In many disciplines the baselines are unstated derivatives of personal, idiosyncratic experiences, or equally nebulous presumed societal norms.

Inmates of mental hospitals are often encouraged to produce pictures. Some doctors think that they contain information about the disease from which the patient suffers. Increasing scientism in psychology between the world wars led to attempts to identify the aspects of pictures which are diagnostic of various mental illnesses. Considerable progress was made, and many traits were isolated: it turned out that almost every attribute which appeared in an inmate's picture but fails to appear in a photograph of a similar subject was seen as evidence of mental illness.

In 1938 an exhibition of 'Masters of Popular Painting' was shown in New York (Populistic, Naive, or Sunday painters are people without any academic training in art who paint pictures; of these, the Douanier Rousseau and Grandma Moses are well known). The artists whose pictures were exhibited in the New York show were all respectable, everyday, apparently sane people; the only unusual thing about them was their habit of making pictures. Psychologist Anne Anastasi examined the pictures in the exhibition, to find out what pictures made by normal, adult, but untrained people were like. She discovered that every single trait which had been determined as a sign of mental illness occurred in the exhibited pictures, which were produced by manifestly sane persons (Anastasi & Foley, 1940:355):

Only by observing the artistic behaviour of a wide variety of groups, each differing from the others in a different aspect, can we tease out the factors conditioning the particular behaviour. Observations limited to a single type of subject may lead to incorrect generalisations. A given characteristic of children's drawings, for example, may be superficially attributed to maturational level; or some recurrent feature in the drawings of the insane may be ascribed to their emotional disorder or mental deterioration. Examination of the drawings by untrained normal adults, however, may reveal the same features and thereby suggest that such characteristics follow only

from the lack of formal artistic training common to the three groups.

Anastasi lucidly demonstrates need for a control: if we are to learn how the mental illness of an artist affects pictures, we need a set of pictures produced by ordinary, untrained, sane people to compare with pictures produced by ordinary, untrained, ill people. Anastasi's simple lesson in scientific control has been known for some time; the coffee-room consensus places it about two millennia ago, but is non-consensual about location, for which both Greece and Egypt are suggested. My own feeling is that Erasmus, Bacon, and Jenner knew, used, and explicated it. The lesson about control was not learnt by people studying prehistoric pictures when Anastasi formulated it 45 years ago, and it is noticeably lacking in prehistorians' papers of the 1980s and the 1990s.

Prehistorians did not measure the prehistoric qualities of prehistoric pictures by comparison with the products of normal untrained adults, although they made some attempt to collect information about pictures from other cultures. Nor did they read what those who study pictures (art historians, critics, aestheticians) had to say. Instead they used their own unstated and diffuse concept of art as a norm. Perhaps their concept of art was based on the pictures they imagined they would like to make themselves. Whatever the reason, objects were classified as 'art' and investigated using an unstated set of assumptions, whose advantages, if any, have long been lost. I once tried to discover common assumptions about what art is. I asked a group of students to scribble on a bit of paper a few words associated with the concept of art, or even a description, but not to waste time trying to reach a good definition. On the other side of the paper, they were to indicate how much art education they had experienced. Of the nine students, only one had an indoctrination into art jargon, having studied art history for four years at high school, and one year at university. Her words were: "...colour, shape, contrasts, style".

The other eight had a variety of responses: "...human endeavour...nonfunctional...aesthetic"; "...way of expressing thoughts about..."; "...personal, cultural, intellectual expressions of understanding of environment"; "...ideas transformed into visual display"; "...everything"; "...item that has particular meaning to the producer"; "...representation...interprets aspect of life"; and "...original, interpretive creation".

The above responses provide the best insight I have had yet into what assumptions most prehistorians make about Art.

It is commonly thought that art can be distinguished from non-art. In a gallery, it is usually easy to distinguish the art objects from such other things as the labels or numbers which relate art objects to the catalogue, notices about exits and entrances, fire precautions, and designators of doors to private areas and toilets. Such distinctions can also usually and easily be made outside galleries, in houses, shops, factories, offices which contain art. Archaeologists, at least those who have not been led astray by too much study of the Fine Arts, can also easily distinguish art from non-art. European Prehistoric Art

was fully accepted in about 1900; it was 1960 before archaeologists were even attempting to record, let alone study, all the figures at a site. In Australia the history is slightly different: in the 1890s Campbell tried to record everything, while Mathews was selective, and published only those bits of a site about which he had something to write; in the 1950s, McCarthy tried to record everything; Mountford selected only the 'significant' figures.

As the next section will show, when, taking a leaf from Anastasi's work, I compared what I found in Sydney's roadside pictures with what Conkey reported from palaeolithic Europe, I discovered that her specifically palaeolithic attributes (iconicity, indifference to rotation and orientation, merging of levels, and extension of class) are common in contemporary roadside pictures. This demonstrates one good reason why prehistorians should use the pictures of their own society as a scientific control. Another good reason is that a constant reminder of these pictures in their known context will force prehistorians to clarify their ideas and terminology.

### Discussion of Some Jargon and Concepts

This section of the paper uses the field observations, together with other information about current picture-making, to test concepts and jargon current in the literature. I have failed to find a dictionary of technical art terms adequate for my purpose (though Adeline, n.d.; Haggart, 1962; Lucie-Smith, 1984; and Murray & Murray, 1965 are each good in their own way), and therefore rely on my understanding of the meanings, words and concepts. My understandings are largely derived from those current in the National Art School in the late 1960s. The discussion is structured around the relationships between pictures and their *style*, *function*, *medium*, *orientation*, *subject* and *maker's social group*.

**Pictures: style.** Part of style's unwieldiness relates to scale; most people who use the word or concept have a certain scale of object, range, or social group in mind, which they fail to communicate to those of us who are aware that style can apply at many ranges. Some people equate style with picture. The common meaning of style does not allow pictures or any other complete artefacts to be style; style consists of certain attributes or characteristics of made things. Wobst (1977:321) says that style is:

...that part of the formal variability in material culture that can be related to the participation of artefacts information exchange.

All artefacts participate in some form of information exchange. Most of the observed pictures were made for that purpose. All our pictures have Wobst's 'style'.

According to Sally Binford (1968), style makes it possible to distinguish one cultural group from another, because the styles of their artefacts differ. In our sample different institutions' pictures are in characteristic styles.

The Main Roads Department, Water Board, Police-Citizens Boys Club all use different letter fonts, colours, and so on. It should be possible to determine the key attributes of at least some of the various styles in the sample, which suggests that it is worth attempting to find style keys in prehistoric rock art (as has been done many times and places).

The literature mentions two distinct sorts of style. In Sackett's (1985:154) words, iconic style is:

...a kind of iconography purposefully, if perhaps not necessarily consciously, created and manipulated by artisans for social ends. Iconic style is invested in material culture as a means of transmitting to various target populations symbolically encoded information about ethnic affiliation and identity.

The other, isochrestic, style (Sackett, 1985:157):

...enters the equation when it is recognised that the choices artisans make among the range of options available to them tend to be quite specific and consistent...dictated largely by craft tradition within which the artisans have been enculturated as members of social groups.

**Iconic style.** Iconic styles are deliberate but not necessarily conscious designators of territorial belonging or allegiance. Members of a group indicate their allegiance by choosing a particular artefact. Dress provides a good example: police, nurses and bankers indicate their occupational group by their dress. Uniforms, football jerseys, and flags all contain information about the social or territorial allegiance of those who display them. Iconic styles categorise pictures in the roadside sample: commercial posters are easily distinguished from official council or Water Board notices, unofficially posted pop concert advertisements, graffiti, and so on. The styles of posters and other things fit with the institutions of origin closely enough to identify at least some of them. These roadside examples of iconic style conform well with Sackett's ideas; they refer to the affiliation and identity of their makers, but these examples do not conform to the more general archaeological idea that style marks *territories*, except in cases where territories are co-extensive with the range of makers of particular affiliation.

### Territories, Boundaries and Style

Binfordian literature is preoccupied with Art as a manifestation of Style which is alleged to have the function of territorial demarcation. The pictures observed in the field often indicate affiliation, and so may imply territoriality, by merely labelling a building or an area. Some pictures contain explicit threats: BILL POSTERS PROSECUTED, and detailed legalistic threats on a Water Board fence but territorial borders are shown by explicit notices. Territories are demarcated by the content of pictures, not their (iconic) styles. It is the central line on a road, not its style, which demarcates the territories of going and coming vehicles; the names of suburbs, on their boundaries, BALMAIN, ANNANDALE, ROZELLE are all

in the same style. The suburbs are demarcated by notices, not by styles of notices. This distinction between style and content may be obvious given ethnographic understanding, but it is no means easy to make when analysing prehistoric materials, nor is it easy to define.

Iconic styles, which distinguish between council notices and road signs, commercial from pop concert posters, are not clearly distinguishable from isochrestic styles.

**Isochrestic style.** Isochrestic styles are the results of individuals, individual groups, and individual societies, having their own ways of doing things. The different ways of doing things produce different sorts (or styles) of artefacts, which should enable identification of their makers.<sup>3</sup> The ethnographic existence of such styles is commonplace; there is usually no difficulty in recognising whether one is in France or Italy from the style of artefacts around; artificers who know each others' work can name the author of a job. The theory behind the existence of such developments has been spelt out many times: there are usually several workable solutions to any one problem (Sackett, 1985 quoted above, and many other papers); copies differ from the original; serial copying produces distinct variants in the absence of convergent pressures (Balfour, 1893; Bartlett, 1932; Clegg, 1978).

Isochrestic styles refer artefacts to their makers and, by extension, their makers' territories. In the prehistoric<sup>4</sup> text-free situation the identification of styles is not so easy. There are plenty of isochrestic styles in the study area. Some distinct styles are repeated, but severely localised: bus-stop graffiti styles, the styles of some advertisements. Others are widespread (CocaCola) or mobile (Pink Panther). The Department of Main Roads occupies the roads and has a recognisable style, or two, of road-signs, lines, and names. The Electricity Commission's artefacts are widely distributed, as are the Water Board's. This complexity is enhanced by the differential survival of old styles in artefacts which preserve well (stone lettering; some types of paint used for graffiti; cast-iron lettering). Almost every style has sub-styles: lettered notices use different fonts for headings and text; graffiti come in different colours and handwritings. If one were to draw lines round different stylistic areas on a map of the study area, it would very soon resemble the tangled product of a horde of drunken spiders. The same result would come from a correct map of territories.

**Style and social groups.** If archaeologists had access to both iconic and isochrestic style, they could discover the approximate locations of social groups' boundaries from the former, and the geographical extent of relevant groups from the latter. There are difficulties in the way of archaeological exploitation of these sorts of style: the first is the difficulty of recognition. The two sorts of style probably manifest themselves in identical circumstances. The crucial difference between them lies in the intent of the artificers who make or display the style-bearing artefact. Even in courts of law it is

notoriously difficult to infer intent and be certain that the inference is correct. It has not been possible to distinguish iconic from isochrestic styles satisfactorily in the field, even given ethnographic insight. This difficulty may be expanded to the point of impossibility in text-free, prehistoric situations, making it unlikely that we could ever accurately recognise iconic style. By contrast, it should be comparatively easy to identify boundary markers, which congregate at possible perimeters. Boundary markers are necessary where a boundary is not immediately apparent or known to all possible visitors, or where there is a continuous need to efficiently identify friend or foe, as in energetic activities such as warfare and football. Conkey (1980:231) claims to have argued in her unpublished PhD dissertation (1978) that scratched bones are more informed with messages that maintain boundaries than either stone tools or parietal pictures. Without access to the thesis it is hard to imagine what the arguments might have been, other than that she was able to discover iconic style scratches on bones. In the same year (1980b:617, table 3) she demonstrated distinct regional or local design codes or systems on scratched bones, which strongly suggests that she identified manifestations of isochrestic style, not boundary markers as she states.

Style theory once implied a simple structure in the style of artefacts, and an equally simple social structure. Both were rejected by archaeologists for theoretical and empirical reasons. The trouble with style in archaeology is with the simplistic social model which has cultures, or tribes, or ethnic groups existing as discrete human populations which have their own styles. Styles have never been found to coincide with ethnic groups. People can move from group to group, and change style as they move (Hodder, 1978), or they can carry their own style around wherever they are, perhaps transmitting it to their apprentices, as the pottery Palaeosociologists thought. There are plenty of styles, at plenty of social and non-social levels. Some styles (Gothic, Baroque, Modern, Avant-Garde, Post-Modern) may not seem to have any social group to go with them (Franklin, 1984:39; Clarke, 1968:365; Hodder, 1978).

The theory that style promotes group solidarity makes some sense of the contemporary pictures of Forest Lodge and Annandale and their ethnography, particularly the graffiti (see also Lee, in press). If a restricted repertoire of designs were used in the artefacts of one group, the members would be able to predict how their mates' things look, and feel secure. This, in turn, would contribute to a standardisation of responses within the group, which permits rapid and error-free communication, as long as people say what you expect. My experience is not that styles promote solidarity, but that the opposite is true: group members are intolerant of someone they find unpredictable. We have probably all experienced difficulty in communication with people whose language we don't speak, or a feeling of exclusion when we are not dressed suitably for some social occasion. These are examples of the converse of the usual argument. I suppose that the group's solidarity might be promoted by a feeling

that now that one of 'them' has been noticed, we meld into a previously un-noticed 'us'. Members of the newly-created 'us' group, not wishing to suffer the rejection they have themselves imposed, would learn to standardise their responses. In a roundabout way, through the catalyst of a scape-goat, standardisation of responses is thus linked to group solidarity.

Nonstandard responses make communication less easy, if more interesting. Hence, the constant tension between clichéists, who ease communication along, and poets (and comics like Spike Milligan) who draw attention to exact meanings with subtle use and play of words. There are similar tensions, for the same reason, between the bland commercial arts, and the Arts.

This paper's ethnographically-informed archaeological glance at a large sample of pictures provides plenty of examples which support some archaeological assumptions about style. There are difficulties inherent in the diagnosis of iconic as opposed to isochrestic styles, and it is necessary to distinguish satisfactorily content from style. If the archaeological use of pictures depends on such capacities, it has a long way to go before it can hatch from the universe of gobbledegook to that of usefulness. A more optimistic view is that both sorts of style should permit study of social or territorial entities at some level, but even that simplified task needs the patient skills of a kitten-loving knitter.

### Pictures: Function

Pictures in the ethnographic sample have one basic function: the sending of messages. All sorts of such messages are sent from all sorts of producers to all sorts of consumers, deliberately, accidentally and inconsequentially. Domestic pictures differ from those in public places. Pictures on routes differ from those in less-frequented areas. Pictures to be seen from a distance are different from ones to be seen close-up. Pictures attract attention. They also display information about the best place to display YOUR message, so traditional and institutional display-places arise. In some instances the place is reused, and a new poster replaces the old one. In other cases the new pictures are superimposed on or incorporate the old ones, with or without referring to them. Some of these ideas, particularly the question of whether superimposition is accidental or deliberate and meaningful, are under investigation in the Palaeolithic context; others, particularly the ideas of private and public, might bear more intensive investigation.

### Pictures: Medium

Margaret W. Conkey (1978, 1980a, 1980b, 1982, 1984) published a series of valuable papers which explored new ways of exploiting the palaeolithic pictures of Western Europe. She discovered that there were at least four attributes characteristic of palaeolithic pictures:

*iconicity* (1980a, 1982), *indifference to rotation and orientation* (1980a:233) and *two important principles of Upper Palaeolithic conceptual orientation* (1980a:232): a) *merging or non-differentiation of levels* (i.e., no explicit design fields, borders, or frames), and b) *extension of class*.

The present paper does not question the occurrence of these attributes in the palaeolithic pictures of Western Europe; rather it questions the significance of Conkey's term 'characteristic', for the same four attributes occur in 20th century Australia.

**Merging or non-differentiation of levels.** In our society (and many others) the processes of design and execution, or of making and decoration, are commonly separated. An architect designs a building, a builder builds it. The processes of stretching a canvas are conceptually distinct from those of painting a picture on the canvas. Often two processes and two artificers are involved, working at two 'levels'. Conkey (1980a:233) asserts that in palaeolithic art there is not the same differentiation of levels, as there is no apparent preparation; pictures are applied directly to natural surfaces. This may be true of palaeolithic parietal pictures, although I have the impression that at least some of them have prepared (painted) grounds, but it is apparently not true of harpoons and other artefacts where the tool was made first, and the engravings were added at a second stage or level. Nor is there always clear differentiation of levels in our pictures. In the footpath surface there are several cast-iron lids which provide access to taps which control the supply of domestic gas. They are labelled appropriately enough with the relief lettering GAS. The enclosed section of the letter A is an elongated piercing which allows insertion of the t-shaped tool employed to lift the lid. Around the lettering is a series of raised lozenges which effectively make the lid less slippery than a uniform surface, presumably for the benefit of pedestrians. In this case the levels of casting, piercing and labelling are merged, not distinguished.

**Design fields and borders.** According to Schapiro (1969:223):

The [palaeolithic] artist worked then on a field with no set boundaries and thought so little of the surface as a distinct ground that he often painted his figure over a previously painted image as if it were invisible to the viewer.

Schapiro is a specialist in Art, and his vision of the normal in pictures applies to what might be called 'Gallery Art', strictly in the Western tradition. His work on frames is in the context of the picture plane, an invention which preceded the European renaissance's idiosyncratic perspective (Deregowski, in press; Clegg, 1981:138-161). In such a context, the pictures of the Sydney suburbs seem as nonconformist as palaeolithic pictures.

Like our posters and graffiti, prehistoric pictures are found on the bit of wall they occupy. If that section of

wall is naturally distinct from the rest of the wall, the portion of wall is bounded, and the picture exists within those bounds, like ours. The Peche Merle Spotty Horse and Mammoth panels come to mind; it is easier to think of Franco-Cantabrian pictures which are bounded by the bounds of their supports, like our posters and graffiti, than examples which lack frames.

**Frames.** Presumably a 'frame' is an object (including line) placed around a picture during or after the picture's making. A frame is an object interposed between a picture and the non-picture around it. Framing excludes the placing of pictures into pre-existing spaces surrounded by something else. This is the practice of contemporary advertising, and was the practice of all other artists who make pictures on pre-existing surfaces which have any sort of edge, as most surfaces do.

Schapiro (1969:223) is authoritative on the ideas of Field and Vehicle in Image-Signs:

Certain of them, like the frame, are historically developed, highly variable forms; yet though obviously conventional, they do not have to be learned for the image to be understood; they may even acquire a semantic value.

The claim that frames 'do not have to be learned' is erroneous. My children report that, when looking at a picture of an animal surrounded by a rectangle, they had to learn whether it was a picture of an animal in a box or a picture of an animal in a frame, i.e., whether the rectangle surrounds the animal or the picture (personal communication from Jack up to age four and Harry, up to nearly two).

I did not at first notice any frames (as distinct from bordered supports) in the field sample. On re-examination (waiting at traffic lights), I noticed that official road-signs have lines round the message, a thumb's breadth in from the edge of the sign. These lines are neither frames (made after the picture) nor borders to supports, but they lie somewhere within the category of interest.

I am not ethnographically informed about this sort of 'framing'. My guess (aided by an anonymous reviewer of an early draft of this paper) is that neat lines drawn round pictures or notices, inside or outside the edges of their support, reinforce the integrity of individual notices or posters, and enhance their distinction from things outside the particular notice or poster. Such frames are most obvious on objects designed some time ago by committees of officials. They are an isochrestic stylistic attribute of official road-signs in the culture whose pictures I have been studying.

**Models of concepts and cultural matrices.** Conkey (1980a:233) argues that because there is no preparation of the support for a painting, there are no explicit design fields, borders or frames. She also says that the study of pictures' frames and borders informs us about prehistoric cognition (Conkey, 1982:119):

in the construction of the field in which a visual image is placed, a field that corresponds to a segment of space, we can expect to find models of

some aspects of the cognitive and cultural matrix of the makers and intended viewers.

This insight is confirmed by the study of roadside pictures. People whose environment or conceptual universe is well structured may impose more frames or boxes on their artefacts than do people in an unstructured, flowing environment or conceptual universe. Should a social situation change from one of these states to the other (e.g., become more structured, with marked discriminators between social entities) a concurrent change in the conceptual universe may occur, and be expressed in the framing of pictures. This makes sense in the ethnographic example: the social structure of Australia has become much freer in the last two decades; it is quite likely that a high proportion of the framed pictures were designed long ago, whereas posters, which are not framed, must be recent, as they last only a few months. Equally consistent with the evidence, we might expect frames on pictures and notices which have legalistic importance, or are produced by bureaucracies.

Another possibility was suggested to me in discussion with Ed Roper. He has some training and experience as a draughtsman, and tells me that when making technical drawings he always puts lines round the drawing; if he does anything arty, he probably does not. This raises the possibility of convention associated with function as a source of 'frames'.<sup>5</sup>

The above discussion proposed several candidate causes of a framing habit: culture, technical function, habit based on education, a smell of personality, and implications of world-view. Some of the possibilities are testable in our society by historical and psychological investigation, which could demote the insights from the domain of High Fantasy.

**Conkey's iconicity.** Conkey (1980a, 1982) refers to iconicity as a quality which is marked in palaeolithic pictures, and characteristic of them. She uses the terms iconic and iconicity to study the relationship between the material of which a picture is made, and the picture itself: a figure and/or the marks of which it may consist. The material often has a particular shape and texture, like the grain of wood, cellular structure of bone and antler, fracture patterns of rock, the plasticity of clay, to which the picture may or may not conform. It is possible to imagine a link of derivation between Conkey's usage of 'iconic' and the more generally accepted meaning of resemblance between representation and its subject, but the two meanings are so different that a meaning which encompasses both would be too vague to carry useful meaning.

Conkey's idea of iconicity is linked to her non-differentiation of levels. She refers to a piece of engraved reindeer antler from Laugerie-Basse, where a natural protuberance in the raw material is used for the depiction of a reindeer's rack (1980a:234-235):

Here and elsewhere in Paleolithic art, the iconic element is striking. A strong case can be made for an element of iconicity among these engravings. We can identify attributes such as elongation,



longitudinality, or zigzags that characterise both the morphological form and the incisions on that form. The replication of these features in the incisions makes them characteristic of the whole artefact, not only of the incisions...shows recognisable shapes that replicate the shapes of the engraved surface...clearly correspond to the elongations, indentations, and protrusions of the engraved surface. The three-dimensional morphology of the incised piece provides a directionality for the two-dimensional incising: this relationship is thus not differentiation of level but continuation of level through decorative emphasis.

Non-differentiation of levels relates to stages of manufacture, but is tied into merging of object, raw material, and finished work, or at least failure to distinguish between them.

**Extension of class.** Extension of class seems to be about the relation of medium to picture. The natural support can resemble the picture it is turned into. The subject of the picture can be long and thin, and the picture may consist of lines which are also long and thin, parallel to the main axis of the picture (longitudinal hatching) or transverse to the main axis (transverse hatching). The lines of which the picture is composed may be transverse or longitudinal with respect to the grain, or surface texture of the material.

Conkey (1982:118) uses the term 'iconic congruence' to refer to a close relation between medium and picture:

Two examples of iconic congruence in Palaeolithic art are: i) the edge of the scapula on which this cervid is engraved 'stands for' the snout of the engraved figure (Altamira, Spain), and ii) the antlers or horns [or ears] of the cervid(?) depicted here 'take off', as does the barb of the harpoon on which it is engraved, from the body (Rascano, Spain).

Another example of non-differentiation of levels, or iconic congruence is a spatula made from a rib out of which a fish emerges (El Rey, France).

It is tempting to suggest that much of Palaeolithic art is characterised more by what Jakobson has called effective relationships among its component parts than by designated ones (Jakobson, 1960). That is, the attributes of the parts are in the whole, the subject matter is in the media and vice versa, such as in the case of the many animals whose shapes are the natural protuberances of cave wall surfaces. It is not an applied art in which arbitrary designated subjects are created apart from the context of the media.

In the field sample, as in palaeolithic pictures, there are plenty of examples of congruence between support and picture, and there are plenty of examples of arbitrarily designated subjects 'created apart from the context of the media'. The founder's name is cast into the cast-iron bubbler; square letters are arranged in a square block on square notices; the message 'sit down' was added to the official NO STANDING.

The brick retaining wall to a railway embankment in the Crescent was used as the support for a mural. Above the embankment are some cycad-like plants which

resemble the tops of palm trees, although they grow at ground level. There is also a railway signal mast. Both are clearly visible from the road. In front of one section of the embankment was a rectangular bus shelter, built close to the wall. These three features were incorporated into the mural: the plant had a palm-tree trunk painted up to it; the signal mast appears to have a crane's cable hanging from it, and a large aeroplane was depicted above the bus shelter, which thus became its open bomb-bay. After completion of the mural, the authorities removed the bus shelter, leaving a rectangular bare brick wall beneath the aeroplane. Later still, the bare bricks were roughly painted blue which goes quite well with the surrounding parts of the mural. In 1986 a large triangular notice appeared, which superimposes some of the plane, and most of the area which was occupied by the bus shelter. The notice says NO M.S.B., and refers to a proposal for the Maritime Services Board to construct a docking facility opposite the site.<sup>1</sup>

The practice of turning pre-existent objects into parts of a picture, known as 'collage' in Art terminology and as a merging of levels, iconicity, or iconic congruence in Conkey's language, is thought to be characteristic of palaeolithic pictures. There are many other examples in the contemporary suburbs.

There is one very clear example of a medium specially created for its subject. Conkey perceives this phenomenon as characteristic of palaeolithic pictures, and (presumably) lacking in ours. I suspect in this case she is thinking of portable bone, ivory, or antler objects, not the parietal pictures which she says have no prepared support. In any case, observation belies her assertion.

The example is the Weber billboard. Attached to what at first seems to be an ordinary, flat billboard with the message 'Weber The best way to barbecue anything' is a large red hemisphere, with its lower margin between the words 'Weber' and 'The'. While one watches, the hemisphere emits a sighing noise, and lifts itself up, clearly a flying saucer about to take off. It is hinged to the upper margin of the billboard, and rises only until it is horizontal, displaying its insides: a cooking meal of yabbies, chops, mushrooms, steaks and other barbecue delicacies. The barbecue lid sighs again, and slowly shuts over the meal, before recommencing its cycle. The exploited media include movement and sound, as well as the excursion into a third dimension.

Although Conkey's statements about the characteristics of palaeolithic rock art turn out not to distinguish it from the sample from suburban Sydney, I do not wish to suggest that Conkey is wrong. On the contrary, her work has pioneered new ways of using what may be observed in rock art.

Some artisans are very sensitive to their medium, and influenced by it, others make the medium seem almost irrelevant to the artefact produced. The more direct (more hand-done, less mechanical or machine-made) things are, also the less skilful the artisan is, the more important and influential is the medium. Some traditions respect and admire an artisan whose tool-marks are an intrinsic part of the finished work; in other traditions, the merest

trace of tool or technique is shameful. In the palaeolithic corpus, one example comes to mind where brush-marks are an intrinsic and important constituent of the completed work – the so-called Chinese Horse in Lascaux, drawn with a small number of apparently unapologetic brush-strokes. There must be others of the opposite school, where a palaeolithic air-brush is used to conceal all art. My own preferences lead me to hope that almost all prehistoric pictures were made by competent craftspeople, whose products were sensitive to the medium, but not dominated by it. Sensitivity to medium is characteristic of both our pictures and palaeolithic ones.

### Orientation Features

Conkey (1980a:233) claims the lack of consistent, explicit orientation features, such as a ground line, and the need for rotation of engraved pieces in order to observe all of the design seem not to affect the recognisability or interpretability of the art. From that observation, she infers that the producers and/or consumers of palaeolithic pictures were indifferent to rotation and orientation.

The Universal Self-Instructor (Berg, n.d.), a 19th century compendium on how to do things and become middle-class, contains a section on how to draw using ground lines. Figures in a picture by an artist who lacked control of perspective often seem to float without their feet on the ground. The recommended cure was to draw an horizontal line for the figures to walk on.

Ground-lines are a step in the evolution of renaissance perspective (see Baines, 1985; Clegg, 1981:138-161; Eastham & Eastham, 1979; Gowans, 1979; Kemp, 1978; Schafer, 1974; and the various dictionaries of art mentioned above). The only possible ground lines in my observed sample were some words which had been underlined. I have seen ground lines on road signs in USA and at the University of New England. In both cases pedestrians depicted on signs which warned of pedestrian crossings were provided with ground lines to walk on.

It seems a trivial observation that all truly three-dimensional objects have to be rotated (or walked round) to fully appreciate them. Less trivially, the fact that different points of view produce different views may be deliberately exploited. The coffee mug 'Momcat' has two pictures of a cat with a kitten in her pouch (Kliban, n.d.); the Opera House, all coins, most sculpture, pages and pencils all exploit the phenomenon for different purposes. None of them need explicit features for us to orient them correctly. Nor are we indifferent to their orientation; we turn them the right way up to examine them. Some palaeolithic engraved pieces need to be rotated to see the whole of their pictures: our books need to be opened to see their pictures, our cans, bottles and teacups and cutlery have to be rotated in order to inspect the other side.

In our society there is evidence that we are indifferent to orientation; some of our carpets, mosaics and road signs are horizontal, yet contain pictures which would

be correctly oriented in a vertical plane. In contrast Franco-Cantabrian palaeolithic pictures are almost always oriented correctly: even the Altamira ceiling animals are lying on an horizontal surface, which is seen from below. Figures on near-vertical surfaces look as though they are walking, or standing, and so on. Attention to rotation and orientation seem to be more marked in palaeolithic pictures than in ours. I am not convinced that levels are merged, orientation ignored, or borders are missing more in palaeolithic pictures than ours.

Neisser (1967:56) reports some experiments where children were asked to discriminate between a figure in a particular orientation, and the same figure tilted:

However, the rotations...showed a clear developmental trend. Preschool children found them difficult to distinguish from the standards, while older children had much less trouble.

This result fits well with the general observations about preschool indifference to rotation and makes it clear that a confusion, a lack of discrimination, is involved.

Such considerations might lead towards the conclusion that palaeolithic artists worked at the cognitive level of our four-year-olds (see Gowans, 1979 for something of the same patronising sort, this time based on ground-lines. Such ideas should be tempered with a dose of Moorhouse (1971), where the characteristics of Aboriginal Art which are often considered 'primitive' are shown to be similar to conventions used in Engineering Drawing). The interesting and worthwhile search for an undeveloped beginning of picturing behaviour should be tempered through study of our own pictures.

### Form and Picture-generation

The technical term 'form' is akin to the common word 'shape'. All objects have their own geometric shape, but they can also be more (or less) shapely. Panel-beaters refer to the process of 'adding shape' (usually making a previously flat sheet of metal convex or concave). Sculptors add or subtract form by subtracting or adding material. Apparently adopting this usage, Conkey (1980a:233) makes a distinction between *adding form to* and *removing material from* as different cognitions which are alleged to affect practitioners of art processes. I can understand an onlooker's interest in such a distinction, but I do not believe that many practitioners would agree with Conkey's usage. I think that they would state that the two processes, of adding form and subtracting material, can be the same, both in their cognitive and their mechanical aspects; it is only the verbal expression which differs. Those practising artists who allow that the alleged difference exists, would probably not believe that it matters. I am personally able to operate (though not well) in at least three of the two modes Conkey isolates. I can envisage a shape on a page and then draw a line round it; I can envisage a shape and add plasticine until the shape appears; I can project a shape into a piece of wood or stone and remove material till all the waste

is cut away. More often, I add or subtract material or lines in the preliminary stages, until form becomes apparent. Sophisticated questioning would probably elicit similar information from most picture-producers.

Conkey writes as though it is possible to distinguish between a sculptured animal made by adding form through the removal of material, and one made by 'releasing the enclosed animal from its material'. I suspect that we lack the crucial capacity to distinguish between the products of the two modes.

### Picture: Subject

**Iconicity.** Iconicity, iconic and their derivatives are words which are now current in the literature with many different, sometimes competing meanings. The general understanding is that iconicity refers to representations, and occurs in degrees. A picture is very iconic if it bears a close resemblance to its subject, and less iconic if it does not look like the subject. A linguist's view (Harris, 1986:56) is:

...since we do not wish to pre-judge the questions of whether or to what extent a pictorial sign always bears a recognisable visual resemblance to what it stands for, it will be useful to reserve the terms iconic and iconicity for that visual relationship. This will leave us free to allow that a pictorial sign is not necessarily iconic, or that the degree of its iconicity may be open to doubt.

Neisser (1967) used iconic to label a sort of memory where a direct image is retained for a short time while it is analysed. The existence of an iconic memory which persists for longer than the stimulus is demonstrated by many phenomena, most clearly by experiments in which subjects are shown words for a measured short time (less than they would take to read the word). Subjects can correctly report words longer than they had time to read (Neisser, 1967:15).

**Totems and mythic beings.** The following discussion is not intended to suggest that the particular relationship between people and objects referred to as totemism is current in our society. My point is rather that some of our pictures have characteristics which might be expected of 'real' totems. I referred above to the Pink Panther as a totem, and observed that Pink Panther Instant Printing Proprietary Limited uses the symbol many times on its buildings, as well as on their vehicles, letterhead, advertisements and so on. The Pink Panther, whether in words or pictures, identifies the institution. It also identifies the people who belong to the institution by association, at least during working hours, or while they are in the building or vehicle. Another institution (Australian Consolidated Industries) produces fibreglass insulation and uses the Pink Panther motif to market their ACI PINK BATTs, so the pink panther picture appears in hardware shops and other outlets (Telecom, 1984:965,1371). Yet the Pink Panther has an existence independent of the two institutions. He is the subject of

stories and films (Graham & Baker, 1975; Scheuer, 1980:558,559) I am not certain whether widespread appearance in many media including various stories is sufficient to qualify a character for the status of Mythic Being, but I doubt that the Pink Panther could be satisfactorily distinguished from mythic beings, or that it is possible to demonstrate that the Pink Panther does not appear in myths. I leave the thought, with its need to recognise religious implications and associations – or their absence – to specialists. Pending their comments, it seems that if our culture can be said to have totems, the term 'totem' is appropriate for the Pink Panther. Pictures of totems in aboriginal societies in Australia, British Columbia and Alaska's panhandle may have analogues with pictures of the Pink Panther, but I lack the skills to sort out their relationship to other types of institutions, for example sections, moieties, proprietaries, companies, tribes and individuals.

### Ethnographic Analysis and Complexity

The further this essay into ethnography is pursued, the more complex it gets. One might be inclined to insist that the full import of roadside pictures can be known only to someone who belongs to the pictures' society. But this is not true of other cultures whose ethnographies, collected by Social Anthropologists, contain many subtleties and even gross features which are apparent (and meaningful?) only to an outsider, or to etic analysis. Of the total amount of information, a prehistorian has access to only a little. But not all the many meanings are relevant to the questions asked by prehistorians, so perhaps it does not matter that a prehistorian is unlikely to recognise them all. If prehistorians were, through ignorance or stupidity, to believe that prehistoric pictures have only a small number of meanings or functions, they would probably be wrong. Some prehistorians argue the other way; that prehistoric pictures are so rich that almost every theory ever proposed must be true of at least one example (Ucko & Rosenfeld, 1967:238-239; Moore, 1977). But we have to work with models which are simple enough for us to understand, and those which can be expressed clearly are best. We must continue to develop and use comparatively simple models, but let us not believe that the real situation was ever so simple.

Five important points arise from the clash between observations of an ethnographic sample of pictures and the literature about palaeolithic 'art'.

1. The word 'art' or even 'Art' impedes the study of palaeolithic pictures, for the concepts which prehistorians generally associate with art are not only selective, they are also so full of waffle-waffle and gobbledegook that they are unusable.

2. The models currently used to deal with pictures are inadequately founded and understood.

3. Meaning is complex, and not easy to locate; as Elkin (1961:56) said:

...Meaning is not obtained by asking the artist or a bystander what a certain pattern indicates, nor

merely by getting the myth it represents. Meaning comes after much travail out of the functional relationship of philosophy, belief, ritual, social structure, and the general heritage of culture.

4. The word 'style' should be used with informed caution (or abandoned altogether). It must be possible, for instance, to distinguish style from content. Studies of territoriality and affiliation could proceed without 'style' through definition of the attributes invoked, and argument for their relevance.

5. We who study prehistoric pictures should examine the pictures of our own culture, to sharpen analyses and concepts, and make us aware of unnecessary assumptions we may carry (Clegg, 1987, 1989).

The pictures along Ross Street, Minogue Crescent and The Crescent in Annandale, Forest Lodge and Rozelle leave the impression that the pictures of our society do not differ very much from palaeolithic pictures. Conkey (1982:121) may be correct in saying:

It would not be disputed that in most Palaeolithic art there are no set boundaries or contrasting backgrounds, no explicit groundlines or orientational features, no framing of images, no cropping. ... .. Even the natural boundaries suggested by artefact edges are often not respected, and decorations frequently spill over the side of the artefact.

and

Those attributes have the potential to draw out what may be structural features of the operational and, perhaps, conceptual systems underlying the art.

While it may not be disputed that all these statements are true of 'most palaeolithic art', they are equally true of the pictures in our own society. I suspect that our 'structural features of the operational and conceptual systems underlying the art' are the same as those of the palaeolithic. This idea provokes an important and interesting set of research questions. But there are some trivial possible causes of the phenomena, such as that Palaeolithic Artists foreshadowed our art, or that 20th century picture-makers have adopted many of the palaeolithic practices, which should be dealt with before taking it all too seriously. It might be best to start by tackling my suspicion that Conkey has identified some universals of human picture-making behaviour. This could be easily falsified by examining a fair sample of pictures from some other time or place.

## References

- Adeline, J., n.d. *The Adeline Art Dictionary*. Frederick Urgan, New York.
- Anastasi, A. & J.P. Foley, Jr., 1940. The study of "populistic painters" as an approach to the psychology of Art. *The Journal of Social Psychology* 11: 353-368.
- Architecture Department, Sydney University, 1981. *The Whole Picture*. 47-minute videotape, University of Sydney Television Service: V1399/60.
- Baines, J., 1988. Theories and universals of representation: Heinrich Schafer and Egyptian art. *Art History* 8 (1): 1-25.
- Balfour, H., 1893. *The Evolution of Decorative Art*. Percival, London.
- Bartlett, F.C., 1932. *Remembering: a Study in Experimental and Social Psychology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Berg, A.E. (ed.), n.d. *The Universal Self-Instructor and Manual of General Reference etc.* Thomas Kelly, New York.
- Berndt, R.M., 1974. *Australian Aboriginal Religion*. E.J. Brill, Leiden.
- Binford, S.R., 1968. Variability and change in the Near Eastern Mousterian of Levallois facies. Pp. 49-60. *In* S.R. Binford & L.R. Binford (eds). *New Perspectives in Archaeology*. Aldine, Chicago.
- Clarke, D.L., 1968. *Analytical Archaeology*. Methuen, London.
- Clegg, J., 1978. The meaning of 'schematisation'. Pp. 260-277. *In* P.J. Ucko (ed.). *Form in Indigenous Art*. Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, Canberra.
- Clegg, J., 1981. *Notes Towards Mathesis Art*. Clegg Calendars, Balmain.
- Clegg, J., 1985. Comment. *Rock Art Research* 2(1): 35-45.
- Clegg, J., 1987. Human picturing behaviour and the study of prehistoric pictures. *Rock Art Research* 4(1): 29-35.
- Conkey, M.W., 1978. Style and information in cultural evolution: toward a predictive model for the Paleolithic. Pp. 61-85. *In* C.L. Redman *et al.* (eds). *Social Archeology: Beyond Subsistence and Dating*. Academic Press, New York and London.
- Conkey, M.W., 1980a. Context, structure, and efficacy in Paleolithic art and design. Pp. 225-247. *In* M. LeCron Foster & S.H. Brandes (eds). *Symbol as Sense: New Approaches to the Analysis of Meaning*. Academic Press, New York.
- Conkey, M.W., 1980b. The identification of prehistoric hunter-gatherer aggregation sites: the case of Altamira. *Current Anthropology* 21(5): 609-620.
- Conkey, M.W., 1982. Boundedness in art and society. Pp. 115-128. *In* I. Hodder (ed.). *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Conkey, M.W., 1984. To find ourselves: art and social geography of prehistoric hunter gatherers. Pp. 253-276. *In* C. Schrire (ed.). *Past and Present in Hunter Gatherer Studies*. Academic Press, New York.
- Deregowski, J.B., in press. The eye, pictures and cognition. *In* J.K. Clegg (ed.). *Pictures and Behaviour: Proceedings of Symposium L, First AURA Congress*. AURA Occasional Papers.
- Eastham, A. & M. Eastham, 1979. The wall art of the Franco-Cantabrian deep caves. *Art History* 2(4): 365-387.
- Elkin, A.P., 1961-1962. Art and meaning: a review article. *Oceania* 32: 54-59.
- Franklin, N.R., 1984. *Of macropods and men: an analysis of the simple figurative style*. B.A.(Hons.) thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of Sydney.
- Gamble, C., 1982. Interaction and alliance in Paleolithic society. *Man* 17: 92-107.
- Gowans, A., 1979. Child art as an instrument for studying history. *Art History* 2(3): 247-274.
- Graham, K., 1975. *The Pink Panther in the Haunted House*. Golden Press, Racine, Wisconsin.
- Gregory's, 1982. *Street Directory Sydney*. Gregory's, Sydney.
- Haggart, R.G., 1962. *A Dictionary of Art Terms*. Hamilton Books Inc., New York.
- Harris, R., 1986. *The Origin of Writing*. Duckworth, London.

- Hunt, M., 1982. *The Universe Within*. Harvester, Brighton.
- Hodder, I., 1978. The maintenance of group identities in the Baringo District, W. Kenya. Pp. 47-73. *In* D. Green *et al.* (eds). *Social Organisation and Settlement: Contributions from Anthropology, Archaeology, and Geography*. British Archaeological Reports International Series (Supplementary) 47.
- Jochim, M., 1982. Palaeolithic cave art in ecological perspective. Pp. 212-219. *In* G. Bailey (ed.). *Hunter-gatherer Economy in Prehistory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Kemp, M., 1978. Science, non-science and nonsense: the interpretation of Brunelleschi's perspective. *Art History* 1(2): 134-161.
- Kliban, B., n.d. *Momcat. Kilncraft Tableware*, Staffordshire.
- Layton, R., 1992. *Australian Rock Art: a New Synthesis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge & Melbourne.
- Lee, A.K., in press. Hip-hop graffiti. *In* J.K.Clegg (ed.). *Pictures and Behaviour: Proceedings of Symposium L, First AURA Congress*. AURA Occasional Papers.
- Lucie-Smith, E., 1984. *The Thames and Hudson Dictionary of Art Terms*. Thames & Hudson, London.
- Moore, D.R., 1977. The hand stencil as symbol. Pp. 318-324. *In* P.J. Ucko (ed.). *Form in Indigenous Art*. Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, Canberra.
- Moorhouse, C.E., 1971. Some aspects of aboriginal art. A description in engineering terms. *The Journal of the Institution of Engineers, Australia* 43(12): 3-5.
- Murray, P. & L. Murray. 1965. *Dictionary of Art and Artists*. Thames & Hudson, London.
- Neisser, U., 1967. *Cognitive Psychology*. Appleton, New York.
- Sackett, J.R., 1985. Style and ethnicity in the Kalahari: a reply to Weissner. *American Antiquity* 50(1): 154-159.
- Schafer, H., 1974. *Principles of Egyptian Art*. Clarendon, Oxford.
- Schapiro, M., 1969. On some problems in the semiotics of visual art: field and vehicle in image-signs. *Semiotica* 1: 223-242.
- Scheuer, S.H. (ed.), 1980. *Movies on TV*. Bantam Books, New York.
- Smith, L-J., 1983. What's in the size of a macropod? Unpublished B.A.(Hons) thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of Sydney.
- Telecom, 1984. *Sydney Yellow Pages*. Telecom Australia, Sydney.
- Ucko, P.J. & A. Rosenfeld, 1967. *Palaeolithic Cave Art*. Weidenfeld & Nicholson, London.
- Wobst, H.M., 1977. Stylistic behaviour and information exchange. Pp. 317-342. *In* C.E. Cleland (ed.). *For the Director: Research Essays in Honor of James B. Griffin*. Anthropological Papers, No.61. Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Accepted October 22, 1991

## APPENDIX

### Additional notes

1. In 1993, the objection has been carefully painted over, as though it never existed, presumably at the behest of the Maritime Services Board, about whom the graffiti originally objected.
2. The Theoretical Archaeologists version about observation being "theory-laden" wrongly makes the process of observing seem entirely cerebral and rational.
3. 'Types', which are categories of artefacts sorted out by archaeologists, may be functional or stylistic.
4. Some archaeology is ethnography-driven and behaves as though it were neither prehistoric nor text-free. For an interesting example, see Layton, 1992.
5. Some individual people who draw have a fetish about frames. The compulsion to make things square is anal-retentive; it may reflect a lack of confidence. If a picture needs a frame, it's not a very good picture (Svend Helms, 1993, personal communication).

### NOTE ADDED IN PRESS

The fieldwork for this paper was done in 1985, and many of the field observations no longer hold. The text was revised in 1991, and minor corrections made (and additional notes added) in 1993, when I was sorry to discover that neither the academic environment which the paper is addressing nor my own opinions have altered significantly since 1985. JKC.

# F.D. McCarthy, Commemorative Papers (Archaeology, Anthropology, Rock Art)

Edited by  
**Jim Specht**

Frederick David McCarthy: an appreciation .....	Kate Khan	1
Frederick David McCarthy: a bibliography .....	Kate Khan	7
Sesqui-centenary to bicentenary: reflections on a museologist .....	D.J. Mulvaney	17
Something old, something new: further notes on the aborigines of the Sydney district as represented by their surviving artefacts, and as depicted in some early European representations .....	J.V.S. Megaw	25
Ethnographic artefacts: the iceberg's tip .....	Tania Konecny	45
Archaeological studies at Bomaderry Creek, New South Wales .....	R.J. Lampert & D. Steele	55
The Terramungamine incident: a double burial with grave goods near Dubbo, New South Wales .....	Dan Witter, Richard Fullagar & Colin Pardoe	77
Pictures, jargon and theory – our own ethnography and roadside rock art .....	John Clegg	91
The depiction of species in macropod track engravings at an Aboriginal art site in western New South Wales .....	Josephine McDonald	105
F.D. McCarthy's string figures from Yirrkala: a Museum perspective .....	Stan Florek	117
The status of the horsehoof core .....	Kim Akerman	125
'...lost in the <i>Sirius</i> ...'? – Consideration of the provenance of the hatchet head recovered from the <i>Sirius</i> wreck site, Norfolk Island .....	Isabel McBryde & Alan Watchman	129
Additional evidence for pre-1788 visits by Pacific islanders to Norfolk Island, South-west Pacific .....	Jim Specht	145
Six pots from South Sulawesi .....	C.C. Macknight	159

All archaeology and anthropology published by the Australian Museum has been digitized and made freely available at our website. Search by author, title or year at: [www.australianmuseum.net.au/JournalFinder](http://www.australianmuseum.net.au/JournalFinder)

Full text PDF of each one of the works in this volume are freely available at the following links :

Khan, 1993. *Rec. Aust. Mus., Suppl. 17*: 1–5  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.17.1993.54>

Khan, 1993. *Rec. Aust. Mus., Suppl. 17*: 7–15  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.17.1993.55>

Mulvaney, 1993. *Rec. Aust. Mus., Suppl. 17*: 17–24  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.17.1993.56>

Megaw, 1993. *Rec. Aust. Mus., Suppl. 17*: 25–44  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.17.1993.57>

Konecny, 1993. *Rec. Aust. Mus., Suppl. 17*: 45–53  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.17.1993.58>

Lampert and Steele, 1993. *Rec. Aust. Mus., Suppl. 17*: 55–75  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.17.1993.59>

Witter et al., 1993. *Rec. Aust. Mus., Suppl. 17*: 77–89  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.17.1993.60>

Clegg, 1993. *Rec. Aust. Mus., Suppl. 17*: 91–103  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.17.1993.61>

McDonald, 1993. *Rec. Aust. Mus., Suppl. 17*: 105–115  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.17.1993.62>

Florek, 1993. *Rec. Aust. Mus., Suppl. 17*: 117–124  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.17.1993.63>

Akerman, 1993. *Rec. Aust. Mus., Suppl. 17*: 125–127  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.17.1993.64>

McBryde and Watchman, 1993. *Rec. Aust. Mus., Suppl. 17*: 129–143  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.17.1993.65>

Specht, 1993. *Rec. Aust. Mus., Suppl. 17*: 145–157  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.17.1993.66>

Macknight, 1993. *Rec. Aust. Mus., Suppl. 17*: 159–171  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.0812-7387.17.1993.67>