

moulting earwig and so remained attached to the host until it attained the adult condition and eventually died; its decomposing remains then furnished food for the different stages of the mite.

A fuller account of the taxonomy, life-history and feeding of the mite and its association with *F. auricularia* will be published elsewhere.

I am indebted to Mrs. A. M. Hughes, of the London School of Medicine for Women, for her kind help in the determination of the mite.

B. K. BEHURA

Department of Zoology,
University of Edinburgh.

¹ Michael, A. D., "British Tyroglyphidae", 1 (1901).

² Oudemans, A. C., *Ber. Ned. Ent. Ver.*, 4, 72 (1914); *Ent. Ber.*, 's Gravenhage, 7 (167), 449 (1929).

³ Vitzthum, H. G., *Arch. Hydrobiol., Stuttgart*, Suppl. 9, 117 (1932).

⁴ Solomon, M. E., "Tyroglyphid Mites in Stored Products", I, Survey of Published Information. (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1946.)

South African Stone Age Terminology

THE correspondence between Mr. B. D. Malan and Mr. M. C. Burkitt on this subject¹ calls for comment.

The crux of the matter lies in the sentence (par. 3 of Mr. Malan's letter): "it would have been difficult to justify the coining of a new name for the South African discoveries". There are two implications here: (i) that there was a recognizable difference between the Ladybrand assemblage and the type Magosian of Kenya, but insufficient to justify a new local term; (ii) that no South African term exists covering the Middle to Later Stone Age transition. The first implication cannot be judged as no full account of the excavations is yet published. The second is wholly misleading, as the term Howieson's Poort (Howiesonian) from the type-site excavated and published by Stapleton and Hewitt² has been in generally accepted use since 1928³.

Burkitt himself discussed the apparent mixed origin of the Howiesonian material in a footnote to Stapleton and Hewitt's paper (*op. cit.*, p. 587).

My attention has been directed to the fact that Mr. Neville Jones described an analogous assemblage from Sawmills in 1926, and that in 1947 he renounced any claims to priority in favour of 'Magosian'. The position is rendered the more difficult as in 1947 the term Howiesonian had been in accepted usage for nineteen years. It would seem reasonable for Mr. Malan to turn first to local terminology for his comparisons, and only then to turn to Kenya (two thousand miles away) for an alternative. It is clear from my knowledge of the facts that the Magosian and Howiesonian are not identical if judged from type-sites, but that the cultural variations intervening have led to the terms being used as synonyms.

Leaving aside Mr. Neville Jones's prior (but renounced) claim for the moment, usage has made 'Howiesonian' the acceptable term for the southern region, while 'Magosian' more clearly fits the northern and equatorial region.

While those of us (Neville Jones and myself) who first analysed our regional prehistoric cultures and gave them names have been (probably wisely) eliminated from any further say in terminology, the claims for regional terms (where these terms have been accepted by usage) still remain until sufficient identity of assemblages can be established.

Without wishing to add further claims to any priority, may I add that, on re-analysis, the upper-

most deposit recognized at Montagu Cave can now be assessed as of Howiesonian type. It was originally regarded as a large variant of the normally microlithic Wilton when I described the work in the cave in 1924 (published in 1929 by the South African Museum).

A. J. H. GOODWIN

University of Cape Town,
Rondebosch.
April 20.

¹ *Nature*, 165, 204 (1950).

² *S. Afric. J. Sci.*, 24 (1927) and 25 (1928)

³ See Goodwin, *S. Afric. J. Sci.*, 25 (1928), and *Ann. S. Afric. Mus.*, 27 (1929).

I WISH to give wholehearted support to Mr. B. D. Malan in his use of the term 'Magosian' with the qualifying regional prefix 'South African' for the industry to which he has applied it. Industries of Magosian culture are now known from Abyssinia and Somaliland in the north, through Kenya, Uganda, and Tanganyika, to the two Rhodesias and then to South Africa.

I have examined material of all these industries and I can allay Mr. Burkitt's fears that they may not, in fact, belong to one and the same culture. They undeniably do so, in exactly the same way that industries of the great Chelles-Acheul culture do over an even wider area.

Confusion, as Mr. Burkitt so rightly says, comes in when prehistorians wrongly use *cultural terms* like Clacton and Levallois for *techniques* which have a wide distribution in time and space, and we in Africa have now set our face sternly against confusing cultural terms and words describing techniques.

I agree with Mr. Burkitt in doubting the validity of using simple typology by itself to determine the culture to which any industry belongs. But if an industry is found to have in its total assemblage all the essential cultural elements of a similar industry of a known culture elsewhere, and more particularly if a series of sites with similar industries link these two together, then there is every justification for regarding the industries as belonging to the same culture, rather than invent a new name.

L. S. B. LEAKEY

Coryndon Museum,
Nairobi. May 3.

I AM glad my letter has proved of interest, and I am content to have one of my old pupils on my side, even if the other, Dr. Leakey, opposes. There is one comparison he makes which I do feel calls for comment. It is true that the Chelleo-Acheulean (Stellenbosch) industries, whether in Western Europe, East or South Africa, closely resemble one another; but that is not why I suggest a similarity of culture. The point is that the evolution of these industries in the various regions is well-nigh identical, although the environment and materials used were different. The fact that an industry in Somaliland resembles one in Uganda and another in South Africa is not quite enough to satisfy me of the identity of the culture throughout the continent. I am not convinced that a single culture ever occupied such wide areas in Africa in later prehistoric times. I may be wrong; but I still feel that it is safer for the present to use regional names for the various cultures, and to await a time in the future when further information will enable surer correlations to be made.

M. C. BURKITT