

A GENERAL SCHEME FOR LOCAL INVENTORIES

by
R.A.Pryor

Project for Archaeonomic Study and Training

Abstract

A system of field recording using record cards and source sheets is described. Provision for extension and computerisation has been made. The need for a national system for field recording is put forward.

It may seem odd that someone, whose knowledge of computers is limited to the reading of a couple of books (Laver, 1965; Eyre and Tonks, 1971) and who is only in the loosest sense an archaeologist, should be contributing to this conference. So I will start with a brief explanation of the circumstances which led to the setting up of the Project for Archaeonomic Study and Training, PAST, at present purely and simply a one-man band without endowment or subsidy, but full of missionary zeal.

About a year ago, I became unemployed as a result of the financial difficulties of a charitable trust known as the Archaeological Centre. One of the aims of the Centre - and the one in which I became principally interested - was that it should develop new channels through which the increasing numbers of ordinary people interested in archaeology might add their spare time and energy, as well as their spare cash, to the ever more hard-pressed resources of the State, the Universities and other institutions.

A possible opening up of a market appeared in RESCUE's appeals for help with the disappearance of archaeological sites through the increasing use of modern earth-moving machinery (*Current Archaeology*, 23 (Nov.1970) - 25 (Mar.1971)). The account, given at the Inaugural Meeting of RESCUE, of archaeological work on the routes of the M4 and M5 Motorways, particularly that required before the bull-dozers moved in, is especially impressive (Fowler, 1971; 1972a). The objectives were made clearer by several contributions to the CBA's Southampton Conference on Field Survey in British Archaeology, not least by the statement that responsibility for the recording and surveillance of archaeological sites should be placed squarely on local archaeological groups, because - quite apart from the fact that there are insufficient professionals to do this work - no one is better qualified to look after sites in a particular area than the interested person who lives there (Fowler, 1972b). This statement reinforced an opinion which I had had for some time, that more activities should be organised for people interested in archaeology but unable or disinclined to take part in excavations: field surveys based on lists of known sites seemed to be the sort of thing that they should be doing.

So, as it seemed to me that an archaeological inventory of the Bournemouth area, where I live, might be financed partly by running holiday-courses based on it, I decided to have a go at getting one started.

I was already aware that this would not just be a question of making lists, and that some sort of system would be needed for recording information in such a way that it could be retrieved without too much difficulty. But, in my innocence, I thought that a generally accepted system of this kind would

already exist, ready for use. I soon found, through the CBA, that this was not the case; the usual procedure was to make up one's own system as one went along. So I might either make use of a system, which had come into existence in this way, or make up a system for myself. Dubious about my abilities, I began to make enquiries about systems already in use.

An account of these enquiries could easily be the subject of a paper in itself. Suffice it to say that every Inventory, Survey or Record, which I looked at, differed markedly from every other one: all had their good points and some were outstanding, but none had a very high proportion of the total of desirable features, which I collected in the course of my travels (Benson, 1972; Emery, 1972; Sheppard, 1972). I hope that that remark does not sound ungrateful, because the people concerned with these projects were unfailingly kind and devoted hours to explaining the details of their activities and to answering my letters. Their helpfulness and interest have been most encouraging during the past year (see Acknowledgments).

Faced with the alternatives of making use of the most suitable of the systems already in operation, despite its apparent defects, and setting up yet another new system, I chose the latter, for this reason: it occurred to me that the fulfilment of my original need for a generally applicable system, available for use by any group which might be persuaded to start work on an inventory of their area, might bring benefits which would far outweigh the trouble involved. These benefits would not be limited to the direct contribution which the establishment of such a system would make towards reducing the *Crisis in Archaeology*; my train of thought took me a long way on from there. For a generally applicable system might one day become generally applied: a series of local inventories might one day become a national inventory: a national archaeological index was on the cards - if the cards were properly designed. This thought brought me back to earth.

System design

The design of the system has proved much more difficult and taken much longer than expected. The result so far is a mass of delicate compromises, balancing acts which would take much time to explain. It is only possible here to outline the basic requirements, as I see them, and then describe briefly the system intended to satisfy them, as it stands at present. I am aware that I have not yet solved all the problems - there may indeed be some of which I am not yet conscious. The system is still very much in the prototype stage and improvements are being actively sought. Suggestions for changes will be gratefully received. I must also make it clear that much of the system is as yet untried in practice; I will try to indicate this as I proceed with the description of it.

The requirements of the system, then, appear to me to be as follows:

1. It must be applicable, without restriction as to period or region to all remains, which are known or thought to exist or to have existed, of human activities which are no longer current.
2. It must tend to locate the most reliable sources of information about such remains and

permit the recording of the principal conclusions from these sources.

3. The records must be amenable to constant correction and expansion throughout the foreseeable future. An inventory should not be conceived as a finite project with a possible completion-date.
4. The compilation and maintenance of the inventory must not require more than a minimum of training; the time required for these tasks is of secondary importance, due to the use of the cheapest possible form of labour and the open-ended nature of the project.
5. Access to the records and obtaining information from them must be quick and easy for the following groups of users:
 - a. Those working on the compilation and maintenance of the records.
 - b. Those concerned with land use: conservationists, planners and developers.
 - c. Those involved in archaeological research, both locally and further afield.

To describe the system intended to satisfy these criteria, I shall deal briefly with territories and workers, before turning to the records themselves.

Territories

Territories must be clearly defined, in order to ensure that no areas are inadvertently left uncovered. For this purpose, there is, as a basis at least, no practicable alternative to the administrative areas of national and local government: the County, the District and the Civil Parish and its urban equivalent, the Electoral Ward. In addition to these the scheme calls for another unit, consisting of three to five districts, *i.e.* between a third and a fifth of an average-sized county, which I shall refer to as an Area.

Workers

The labour force, as I have said several times, is to be recruited mainly from among those who are or may be prepared to work in their spare time for other reasons than financial gain. To obtain and retain their services is more difficult than it would be if the workers were to be paid wages or a salary, but the difficulties are greater only in degree; to obtain the quality of work required by an Inventory, it would be necessary, in any case, to offer a good deal more than just money. Other inducements are needed such as

- a) the pleasure of activities suited to the individual's abilities and inclinations;
- b) the satisfactions provided by concrete results of work involving individual responsibility;
- c) the reassurance derived from participation in a group able to provide the resources which are needed to back up individual efforts;
- d) the sense of fulfilling a duty to the

community as a whole.

For the compilation and maintenance of a local inventory, workers would be required in the following categories, which need not, of course, be rigidly applied, though I feel that each volunteer should have a primary responsibility for a particular activity:

1. *Field-workers* or, as I prefer to call them in the context of this scheme, *Surveyors*: It is intended that each of these should be responsible for a particular Parish or Ward, preferably that in which he or she lives, but that this responsibility should be shared with an assistant, to ensure continuity in case either should leave the district, lose interest or die. Abnormally large or small Parishes and Wards might be combined or subdivided.
- The other categories would probably function best on an Area basis:
2. *Readers*, working at home, in Libraries or other archives.
3. *Museum Visitors*, who would also investigate private collections.
4. *Clerks*, whose functions will become clear when we turn to consideration of the Records.
5. *A Secretary*.

Ideally the Secretary would not be a volunteer. Someone is needed to do the jobs, which can't be fitted into the spare time available to the normal volunteer, such as those which can only be done in office-hours or which necessitate journeys to London or other centres distant from the locality of the Inventory. These include consulting different archives, seeking advice from experts and dealing with local authorities, land-owners' representatives, developers, contractors and so on. Someone is also needed to co-ordinate the work of the volunteers. For both these purposes, a person with something more than a minimum of training and experience is needed, and also one free to devote most of his or her time to the Inventory. Ideally, then, both functions would be undertaken by one person on a full-time, paid basis. The obvious source of the necessary finance is the local authority; indeed, the job-specification, which is emerging and which will become clearer as I continue, seems close to that which should be laid down for the Archaeological Officers now being appointed by the more enlightened local authorities. Judging by schemes which are already in operation, however, it looks as though a *County* would be too large an area for one person to look after on this basis, while a full-time salary would probably impose too heavy a burden on the rates, if it were drawn wholly from those of one *District*. It would seem, therefore, that the right territory for a Secretary to administer is an *Area*.

Now, although an *Area* is of a convenient size for many of the needs of this scheme, it is not a generally recognised unit, as the *District* will become in 1974. And the size of a *District* also has advantages: for one thing, it is suitable both geographically and in respect of the number of volunteers likely to be needed (two to three dozen) for the arrangement of regular meetings to discuss Inventory business. For these reasons, the *District* has been chosen as the basic unit of the project;

each Inventory will be confined to the archaeology of one District; and each District will have its own Inventory. The Secretary will administer not an Area Inventory as such, but the District inventories of his Area. For this, the District Meetings would provide the best means of communication, so the Secretary would attend as many of them as possible.

The ideal Area would consist of an urban District and the neighbouring rural ones; this would allow some transfer of resources to sparsely populated bits of country, where it might be difficult to recruit sufficient volunteers. Material preserved in Museums and archives is unlikely to be restricted to one District, so Readers and Visitors would usually work on an Area basis and in close co-operation with neighbouring Areas. And, as the Secretary would find it easier if all the master records and other paperwork were maintained in one place, so Clerks would normally be Area people too.

Record card design

Having told you something of the proposed geographical and organisational framework of the scheme, I will now show you the picture which it is meant to support (Figure 1). The form of record, which appears to satisfy best the requirements described earlier, is a card suitable for duplication or some other sort of means of reproduction. As can be seen from Figure 1, the record card refers not to a site in the conventional sense (if this sense is definable), but to yet another unit of area - the hectare or 100m square of the National Grid. The subject of the card is further defined by period. One object of using the Grid Hectare is to provide the volunteer Surveyor with an instant yet permanent means of referring to a new discovery, without imposing on him or her *either* the need to decide whether the new discovery forms a new site or merely part of one already known (which would conflict with the requirement for minimum training) *or* the obligation to refer to higher authority before completing a card and adding it to the inventory. The true beauty of using the Grid Hectare cards, however, lies in their ease of reference. To make this clear, I must explain how the Card Number is read, particularly where the Grid Numbers are concerned. In the case of Figure 1 the full reference is as follows: Do - for the County of Dorset; Bo - for the District of Bournemouth; W1 - for Winton Ward. Then 73 - for the km square and 98 for the hectare. This is followed by Ne for Neolithic, the purpose of defining the period being to increase the space available for records when the remains of several periods are found in one hectare, without introducing the problems of continuation cards. Finally the full reference includes the date of issue of the card, to distinguish it from earlier and later versions. Use of the hectare Reference in this fashion instead of the way now customary (complete eastings followed by complete northings) means that all the cards for the same km square are grouped together when the cards are arranged in Grid Reference order, a convenience in itself, but most valuable in the case of large and ill-located sites, as I shall show. It also means that maps may be dispensed with except as supporting documents. Although suitably annotated maps are far and away the best means of geographical reference, the difficulty and expense of reproducing them and of keeping such reproductions up to date makes it impracticable to use them as part of the fundamental records of a system, which calls for distribution of these records (as this one does). The cards may also be referred to simply by the whole Grid Reference, by Feature Index Number, which

I shall explain shortly, by Period, by name, or by a combination of these, depending on the preference of the user.

The treatment of the information on the card is a compromise between the 'boxes', felt by some to be essential when cards are to be completed by the minimally trained, and the virgin expanse preferred by others. The headings are intended to be both comprehensive and self-explanatory, with the exception of those referring to large sites, which will be explained below. It is intended, at the next printing of the card, to sub-divide heading B, 'Archaeology' into 'History', 'Features on site', 'Collected Material' and 'Significance' (see lower half of Figure 6).

The back of the card (shown in the upper half of Figure 1) is also intended to be self-explanatory, though I shall say a little more about the entry 'Feature Cards Punched' later. Another alteration is contemplated here: the transfer of information about sources and collections from the front to the back of the card, since experience has shown that, sources and collections being all too often unpublished, the same entry must frequently be made on both sides of the card. At the same time, the lower part of the back of the card will be arranged in the way at present used on the front, *i.e.* with a lettered list of headings, including references, collections, availability of photographs etc., and space below for correspondingly lettered entries (see upper half of Figure 6).

Sites, of course, do not always fit neatly into grid hectares; even small ones may lie at the point where four hectares meet. In such cases, a card must be made out for each hectare, to provide an answer for the user who needs to know whether anything of archaeological interest has been found in any one of them. However, to save a lot of repetition, the complete information is entered only on the south-western Card, which would be the front one, when the cards are arranged in hectare reference order. This card will show the numbers of other hectares as 'subsidiary cards' under Heading A. The subsidiary cards are completed only as far as the first item of Heading B, which consists simply of the Reference Number of the south-western card, unless there is some feature of the site peculiar to one of the subsidiary hectares, in which case the details will be entered on that subsidiary card.

This method, if employed for all large sites, would necessitate the production of large numbers of cards bearing little or no information. To avoid such waste, sites impinging on more than four hectares are recorded on what are known as A-cards (Figure 2). These are given reference numbers in the same way as the ordinary cards up to and including grid numbers for the appropriate km square, which are followed by a letter A and a single figure, a letter B being used if more than 10 A-cards are required for one km square and so on. A-cards, as can be seen, bear the numbers of the hectares over which the site lies, but subsidiary cards are not made out for these, unless, as is the case with many in this example, information peculiar to a particular hectare is known. The fact that cards are not made out for all subsidiary hectares, complicates slightly the task of the user: to find out whether any information is recorded about a particular hectare, it is necessary to search all the A-cards for the relevant km square, to see whether the number of the hectare is mentioned. In practice this should not prove very burdensome, as there will seldom be more than two or three A-cards to a km

Field	By	C.Garner								Card No.		
	On	14. 1. 73								Do	Bo	W1
Checks:	By									7/	9/	
	On									3	8	
Feature Cards punched:		Winton, Neolithic, Flint, Implements, Published, Red House Museum, Bagshot Beds, Development proposed.								Ne	2 / 73	
Distribution of this card:		NR; OS; Planning Authorities: Do, Bo; Libraries: Ch, Bo, Po, W1; Museums: DC, RH, RC, PG, PH.										
Availability of unpublished matter	MS notes etc.	J.B.Calkin, 6 th Maps and Catalogue of Druitt Coll., Red House Museum, Christchurch.										
	Plans and drawings											
	Photographs (b & w)											
	Aerial photographs	Bournemouth Central Library (Vertical).										
	Slides											

District Inventory Address: Bournemouth Central (Reference) Library. Tel. Bournemouth 26603.

Card No:	Co:	Dist:	Ph/Ward:	Do	Bo	W1	Entries below (those after colon in right-hand col.):	EDo	0	0	0	2	Feature Index No.
100m Nat. } Grid sq./ } SZ Site ref.: }				0/	7/	9/	A.Type of site, name, location: subsidiary cards (large site). B.Archaeology/SW card (large site): a.Sources; b.Collections. C.Topography. D.Geology: sources.	E.Land use, vegtn.: F.Protection: G.Owner. H.Occupier: date. I.Action required: Reader/Surveyor, date of report.					last check date.
Period:				Ne	2 / 73								
A	Chance find.			Boundary Road.			Near Fernside Road.						
B	Fine rhomboidal flint lance-head, 13.1 cm long, found July 1927												
C	On surface, in slight hollow of plateau c 43 m OD.												
D	Bagshot Beds.			E. Unmetalled road, overgrown.									
F	None. Road may be made up and widened as part of proposed Route 12.												
G	Bournemouth Corporation.			H. Public highway.									
I	Check progress of Road proposals.												
	a.1. OS Card SE 4: 1. J.B.Calkin, 6 th Map (1949). 11. Book of Bournemouth (1934) 101. 111. BM Guide to Brit. Antiquities (1920) 92. b. Red House Museum, Christchurch (Druitt Coll.) OS 1:25,000, 1962. FC 1. GS 1 st Drift Map. 1893. FC 1. 12. 1.73 (Bo. Town Planning Dept.). 12. 1.73. R.A.Pryor, Jan. 1973.												

Archaeonomic Card (AS/Svo: 1972): PAET, 6a Queens Park West Drive, Bournemouth BH8 9BY. (Tel. 0202 36540).

Figure 1

Record card for a 'simple' site. The lower half of the figure is the front of the card, the upper half the back.

Computer Applications in Archaeology 1
Science and Archaeology no. 9 (Jan. 1973)

square. Another point to note on Figure 2 is that the site in question actually impinges on four km squares, of which this card refers to the south-western one. The A-cards for the other km squares are treated in the same way as ordinary subsidiary cards. It would, in theory, be possible to extend this method to cope with sites covering many square kilometres, but this does not seem worthwhile.

Figure 3 shows a subsidiary card bearing information peculiar to its hectare and, in entry B (general information about the site), the number of the A-card to which it is subsidiary. This is the number of the *south-western* A-card, not the A-card for the km square in which this hectare lies, which would bear no information about the site under consideration. Large sites which transgress Parish or Ward boundaries are treated, as far as this method is concerned, as two (or more) separate sites.

Another sort of 'awkward site' is one which cannot be accurately located (Figure 4). The method of dealing with this type of site is similar to that used for large sites, except that letters from Q onwards are used in the reference number instead of the letters from the beginning of the alphabet.

The way in which cards are prepared for typing is illustrated on Figure 5. A draft card in pencil is prepared by a Clerk from information received from a Reader or Visitor, usually on a standard form (see Figures 7 and 8). This draft is given to the Parish or Ward Surveyors for checking in the field and against their fund of local knowledge. Sometimes information about a new site will be received from the Surveyors themselves, already entered on a card, which will be given to a Reader or Visitor for checking of references or collections. The card is returned to the Area Clerks and the entries for the Area Index are then made (Figure 1). The Area Index is kept on Feature Cards on which are printed 10,000 spaces, each of which is reserved to a hectare. If the Hectare Reference Number were to be used for indexing, a set of Feature Cards would only suffice for a 10km square of the National Grid. This would make the Index unduly cumbersome; hence the need for a Feature Index Number on the front of the card. This is simply the 'next unused number' and is applied by the Clerk, when first indexing a new card which bears information. All such cards have separate numbers, including cards for different periods on the same hectare and subsidiary cards, but subsidiary cards which bear no additional information to that on the south-western card are not indexed. It can be seen for the entry for 'Feature Cards Punched' (Figure 1) which is completed as the indexing is done, which Feature Cards have been punched in respect of this Hectare Card. This entry not only enables checks on indexing to be made, but allows other users to maintain their own indexes - and to point out where features have been omitted.

There is another problem in indexing the cards, which I have not been able to overcome as easily as the problem of numbering. This occurs when a user wishes to count the number of times a particular feature occurs in a District or other area. The index will tell the user quickly enough how many hectares there are in which barrows, for instance, are found. But there may be three or four barrows in one hectare and this the Feature Cards will not reveal, unless separate Feature Cards are kept for hectares with two barrows, hectares with three barrows and so on, which seems a bit cumbersome, especially if flint implements are to be counted instead of barrows. At present it is hoped that no

such requests will be required or that users will be prepared to go through the cards for such details. Counts of this nature are bound to be unrealistic anyway.

Once the entries for distribution have been made, the cards are typed out on a sheet on which both front and back of the card are printed, as in Figure 1. The information on the lined parts of the card is actually typed on a separate sheet of plain paper, cut out and gummed over the lines, which would make the text difficult to type neatly and harder still to read. From the master thus produced stencils are cut; copies of the cards are then duplicated. It is intended that they should be issued ten times a year in batches of 50 or so for each Area, together with lists of new abbreviations and index numbers and a covering newsletter. Some of these packages may be sold, many will be given away to volunteers, local libraries, museums, and other bodies listed under distribution, while a few will be smuggled into the offices of recalcitrant local authorities.

And, one day, a set may be coded for computer input.

One set of Feature Cards can, as we have seen, provide an index for up to 10,000 items, in this case, Hectare Cards. If one wishes to index up to 20,000 items, one must have two sets of Feature Cards, and so on. Furthermore, the more items one is dealing with, the greater the detail required: if one is looking for coins of a particular Roman Emperor, it is not too difficult to look through the cards indicated for Roman coins in a particular district; it is a very different matter if one wants the answer for the country as a whole. In fact, there is a level at which the combination of numbers of sites and the salary levels of researchers makes it cheaper to put the information into a computer than on to feature cards. From the findings of my 'survey of Surveys', it seems that this critical point will occur somewhere about County level, with a number of sites of the order of 50,000. To put that another way, one set of Feature Cards should suffice for an Area administered by a Secretary and it would be feasible to use the Feature Cards for all such areas in a County as a County Index.

Supply of record cards

Record cards, on either card or paper, both of size A5 and 8vo, punched for standard loose-leaf binding if required, and Source sheets, both of size A4 and 4to, are available for anyone who wishes to make use of them. A handbook is also in course of preparation. Further information and prices may be obtained from:

PAST, 8a, Queen's Park West Drive, Bournemouth BH8 9BY (Tel.36540).

Computer work

Provision has been made in a small way on the record cards for computerisation, - the 80 numbered spaces on the two lines at the foot of the front side of the cards (Figures 1-6). I must confess that the purpose of these is principally to show that I have thought about computers - it is certainly not possible to make use of them at present except as useful additional space for drafting purposes. However, I will explain, for what it is worth, that they are intended to allow the encoding of informa-

Card No:	Do			Bo			Wi			Entries below (those after colon in right-hand col.):			EDo	Feature Index No.		
Co: Dist: Ph/Ward:													0	0	0	7
100m Nat. } Grid sq./ } Site ref.: }	SZ	0/9	6/3	A/1	/	/				A.Type of site, name, location: subsidiary cards (large site). B.Archaeology/SW card (large site): a.Sources; b.Collections. C.Topography. D.Geology: sources.	E.Land use, vegtn.: F.Protection: G.Owner. H.Occupier:	I.Action required: Reader/ Surveyor, date of report.				
Period:			C19			2 / 73										
Date of issue:																
A	Settlement Talbot Village Wallisdown Road (For further detail, see subsidiary cards marked 'x').									63 89x, 99, 64 A1 (80x, 81x, 90x, 91), 73 A1 (08, 09x, 18, 19x, 28x, 29, 38x, 39, 48x, 49, 57x, 58, 59, 67x, 68-9, 77-8, 79x, 86-9, 98-9), 74 A1 (00-1, 10-2, 20-1, 30-1, 40, 50). a.1. OS 1:10,560, 1963.						
B	Model Village begun by Miss Georgina Talbot and completed by her sister Marianne c 1870 'to better the condition of the poorer classes'. Originally 19 dwellings 'straight from the Loudon pattern-book' (and most with 1 acre of ground, pig-sty, cow-shed and well), church, almshouses and school. Also 6 farms (2 in Do Po BV), of which only White Farm buildings are included in this area. Vicarage is c 1930. One dwelling demolished c 1960.									2. N.Taylor in Buildings of England (Hants), Pevsner and Lloyd (1967) 130. 3. Mr Armitage (see over). 4. Anon., The History of Talbot Village, 1873. 5. Anon., The Talbot Village and Almshouse Trust, ND.						
C	On slight rise in plateau c 50m OD									OS 1:25,000, 1962.						
D	Plateau Gravel with exposures of Bagshot Beds.									GS 1 st Drift Map, 1893.						
E	Residential, social and agricultural with woodland. Redevelopment expected.									3.10.72 (Public Meeting).						
F	All buildings except Vicarage and 6 other dwellings (but only house at White Farm) proposed for listing under T & CP Act, 1971. Conservation Area proposed by Bo. and District Civic Society.									29.11.72 (Do. Planning Dept.). 3.10.72 (Public Meeting).						
G	Trustees of Talbot Village Estate.									H. Various. 14.1.73.						
I	Check progress with protection and development.									R.A.Pryor, Jan. 1973						

Archaeonomic Card (A5/Svo: 1972): PAST, 8a Queen's Park West Drive, Bournemouth BH8 9BY. (Tel. 0202 36540).

Figure 2

Record card for a 'large' site (A-card)

Card No:	Do			Bo			Wi			Entries below (those after colon in right-hand col.):			EDo	Feature Index No.		
Co: Dist: Ph/Ward:													0	0	1	6
100m Nat. } Grid sq./ } Site ref.: }	SZ	0/9	7/3	2/8	/	/				A.Type of site, name, location: subsidiary cards (large site). B.Archaeology/SW card (large site): a.Sources; b.Collections. C.Topography. D.Geology: sources.	E.Land use, vegtn.: F.Protection: G.Owner. H.Occupier:	I.Action required: Reader/ Surveyor, date of report.				
Period:			C19			2 / 73										
Date of issue:																
A	Two Dwellings 112 and 122 Wallisdown Road Talbot Village									a.1. DoE, Prov. LBAHI (Bo), 1972.						
B	63 A1. Both cottages of c 1850, of one storey with attic, brick-built with scallop-tiled roofs.									OS 1:25,000, 1962. GS 1 st Drift Map, 1893. 14. 1.73.						
C	Level ground, beside main road, c 53 m OD.									D. Plateau Gravel.						
E	Residential in woodland.									29.11.72 (Bo. Town Planning Dept.). 14. 1.73.						
F	Both proposed for listing (Grade II) under T & CP Act, 1971.									14. 1.73.						
G	Trustees of Talbot Village Estate.									Kelly's Directory, 1972. 14. 1.73. R.A.Pryor, Jan. 1973.						
H	112: Mr A.E.L.Glyde. 122: Mr Armitage.															
I	Check progress with development and protection.															

Figure 3

Archaeonomic Card (A5/Svo: 1972): PAST, 8a Queen's Park West Drive, Bournemouth BH8 9BY. (Tel. 0202 36540).

Record card for a constituent hectare of a 'large' site, with information peculiar to the hectare

Computer Applications in Archaeology 1
Science and Archaeology no. 9 (Jan. 1973)

Card No:	Co: Dist: Ph/Ward:	Do	Bo	W1	Entries below (those after colon in right-hand col.):	EDo	0 0 0 3	Feature Index No.			
100m Nat.	SZ	0/	8/	Q/	A.Type of site, name, location:	E.Land use, vegtn.:	}	last			
Grid sq./		/9	/4	/1	subsidary cards (large site).				F.Protection:	}	check
Site ref.:		B.Archaeology/SW card (large site): a.Sources; b.Collections.							G.Owner. H.Occupier:		
Period:	Date of issue: Ne 2/73				C.Topography. D.Geology: sources.	I.Action required: Reader/Surveyor, date of report.					
A	Chance find		Namu Road		Imprecise	00, 10, 20, RP B4 Q1 (20, 30-4, 42-4).					
B	Polished discoidal flint knife.					a.1. OS Card SE 3: i. J.B.Calkin, Oral (1949). ii. Bo. Nat. Sci. Soc. Map. b. Russell-Cotes Museum, Bournemouth. OS 1:25,000, 1962. OS 1" Drift Map, 1893. 11.12.72.					
C	Plateau c 35 m OD.		D. Plateau Gravel.			R.A.Pryor, Jan. 1973.					
E	Residential on C19 heathland.										
F	None		G,H. Not traceable (Imprecise location).								
I	Check B.a.ii and b.										

Figure 4

Record card for an ill-located site (Q-card)

Card No:	Co: Dist: Ph/Ward:	Do	Bo	W1	Entries below (those after colon in right-hand col.):	EDo	0 0 1 0	Feature Index No.			
100m Nat.	SZ	01	71	11	A.Type of site, name, location:	E.Land use, vegtn.:	}	last			
Grid sq./		/19	/4	/1	subsidary cards (large site).				F.Protection:	}	check
Site ref.:		B.Archaeology/SW card (large site): a.Sources; b.Collections.							G.Owner. H.Occupier:		
Period:	Date of issue: (19) /				C.Topography. D.Geology: sources.	I.Action required: Reader/Surveyor, date of report.					
A	7 Dwellings		The Almshouses Talbot Village								
B	63 A1. One-storey building with attic, of 1862, of course		a.1. DoE, Prov LBAH1 (Bo), 1972			2. N.Taylor in Pevsner & Lloyd 'Buildings of England, Hants. (1967), 130 11893					
	rubble with slate roof with finials and kneelers to gables (a.1) "... by C.C.Creeke in a coarse and ignorant white-brick Rundbogenstil" (a.2)		D. Plateau Gravel			OS 1:25,000, 1962 OS 1" Drift Map,					
C	Slight slope c. 49 m OD										
E	Residential in pine woods										
F	Proposed listing (Grade II) under Td (P Act. 1971)		29.11.72 (Bo Town Planning Dept.)								
G	Talbot Village Trustees		H. Multiple								
I	Check progress with protection and development.					R.A.P. Dec. '72					
B	Stone building Also has 'diamond-quarred spanrels to 2-light windows' credited to school next door. Outbuildings of stone, probably coal-sheds for original 2-ton allowance		a.3. Anon., Hist. of Talbot Vill., 1873 ^x			a.4. Anon., The TV and Almshouse Trus. ND					
C	Level ground facing E on to public open space.		a.5. Mr Armitage, HM of Talbot Village School, 112 Walkisdown Road			C. Garner, 14 Jan. 73 ^{oo}					
E	Mixed woodland		G. Trustees of Talbot Village Estate			x In local pamphlet box at Central Library					

Figure 5

Draft record card, with field worker's comments

Field Checks	By									Card No.
	On									
Distribution of this card	By									Index No.
	On									
Sources & other material										
Entries below: O.MS notes. R.Photographs & prints. U.Films. M.Publications. P.Oral information. S.Transparencies. V.Tapes. N.Maps. Q.Plans & drawings. T.Aerial photographs. W.Collections.										

Contributors:

District Inventory Address:

Card No.	County:	Dist:				Entries below (sources & contributors: see over):		Feature Index No.
	Parish/Ward:							
Nat. Grid	Hectare/ Site ref.:	Period: Date of issue				A.Site-types, names, locations, subsidiary areas (large site).	F.Topography and geology.	
						B.SW card (large site), history.	G.Land use and vegetation.	
						C.Features on site. D.Collected material. E.Significance.	H.Protection. I.Action reqd. J.Owners. K.Occupiers. L.Compiler. date.	

Archaeonomic Record Card (AS/8vo: 1973): PAST, 8a Queen's Park West Drive, Bournemouth BH8 9BY (Tel.: Bournemouth (0202)36540).

Figure 6

Revised version of record card.
The lower half of the figure is the front of the card, the upper half the back.

tion by the local volunteers. Once the labour of coding has been thus economically completed, the card - bearing both the code and the information needed for checking it - would be despatched to a regional or national centre for transfer of the code to punched cards or tape.

I understand that coded input is going out of favour at present for this sort of purpose. However, it seems to me that it would offer important advantages for this particular scheme: first, it would offer economies on the computer side - in operators' time, programming and memory-space; more fundamentally, the national code, which would be needed, would impose a valuable discipline on those compiling and maintaining the Inventories - and it might effect a much-needed tidying-up of archaeological terminology. The institution of such a national code would, of course, be an immense task and one requiring the authority and resources of an organisation of national standing - which the Project for Archaeonomic Study and Training cannot yet claim.

Conclusion

The backing, at least, of a national organisation is really needed for the whole of the scheme, which I have described. I would end therefore with a plea.

British Archaeology may be likened to a wood, in which many different lines of research stand as magnificent, well-tended trees. But the wood also includes large areas of tangled, rotting vegetation. Those who use this wood for their instruction and entertainment could perform many of the simpler tasks required to improve its general condition - but they must be told what to do and how to do it. I have been trying to work out one way of doing this. It may well have fatal flaws, of which I am not yet aware, but if it proves to be a step on the way to the institution by a national body of a better method of using the same resources to fulfil the same needs, I would regard it as a most successful enterprise.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Among those to whom I am indebted are Miss Elizabeth Adams of the Bristol Archaeological Research Group; Don Benson, Field Officer, and Mick Aston, his Assistant, of the Field Department, Oxford City and County Museum, Woodstock; John Dockerill, Curator of the Guildhall Museum, Poole; Victor Emery, Rural Officer of the Hampshire Council of Social Service (Hampshire County Council); Chris Garner of the Dept of Liberal Studies, Bournemouth College of Technology; Felix Holling, Curator of Guildford Museum (Guildford Corporation/Surrey Archaeological Society); John Lavender, Curator of the Red House Museum, Christchurch; G.D.Lewis, Director of Liverpool City Museums; Frank Regan, Deputy Librarian, Bournemouth Central Library; Peter Sheppard and Professor Charles Thomas of the Cornwall Archaeological Society; Graham Teasdill, Curator of the Russell-Cotes Museum, Bournemouth; the Staff of the National Monuments Record, especially Mrs Drummond and Neil Beacham; the Staff of the Archaeology Division, Ordnance Survey; and many members of the South Wessex Archaeological Association, Bournemouth, especially Andrea Butler, Peter Gallop, June Smale and Ken Standing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Benson, D.G., 1972
A Museum: Oxfordshire (Sites and Monuments Record) in Fowler, E. (ed.), 1972 *Field Survey in British Archaeology* 16-23
- Current Archaeology*
23 (Nov.1970), 343-5, 24 (Jan. 1971) 4-6, 25 (Mar.1971) 50
- Emery, V., 1972
The Survey of Hampshire Treasures (Lecture to the CBA Council's Summer Meeting, 1972) Hampshire Council of Social Service, unpublished
- Eyre, J. and Tonks, P., 1971
Computers and Systems: an introduction for Librarians Clive Bingley, London
- Fowler, P.J., 1971
M4 and M5 *Current Archaeology* 25 (Mar.1971) 50-51
- Fowler, P.J., 1972a
Field Archaeology on the M5 Motorway in Fowler, E. (ed.) 1972 *Field Survey in British Archaeology* CBA 28-38
- Fowler, P.J., 1972b
Aspects of Field Archaeology in Fowler, E. (ed.), 1972 *Field Survey in British Archaeology* CBA 66-68 (particularly p.67 para.4).
- Laflin, S., 1971
Computer Applications *West Midlands Archaeological News Sheet* 14 (CBA Group 8) 2-5
- Laver, F.J.M., 1965
Introducing Computers HMSO, London
- Sheppard, P., 1972
A County Society: The Cornwall Check-lists in Fowler, E., (ed.), 1972 *Field Survey in British Archaeology* CBA 13-16
- © R.A.Pryor
Project for Archaeonomic Study and Training