

**DATING THE STONE AGE  
AT ROSE COTTAGE CAVE  
SOUTH AFRICA**

**An exercise in optically dating cave sediments**

**BY**

**Marc Pienaar**

Submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of Master of Archaeology  
in the Faculty of Humanities  
University of Pretoria  
Supervisor: Dr S Woodborne

6 October 2005

## **ABSTRACT**

Results and analysis of Optically Stimulated Luminescence (OSL) dating of the Middle Stone Age (MSA) and Later Stone Age (LSA) sediments at Rose Cottage Cave (RCC) are presented. Seventeen luminescence samples taken over the last decade were used in this study. Fourteen of these samples were dated (eight in Pretoria and six in Risø, Denmark by A. S. Murray). The samples were taken from the entire sequence and gave age ranges from the bottom of the sequence up until the Oakhurst LSA industry.

The protocol that was used is the conventional single-aliquot regenerative (SAR) protocol, due to its ability to correct for behavioural problems associated with OSL dating. This study is primarily concerned with testing the validity of the conventional SAR protocol applied to South African archaeological sites. RCC presents problematic sediments for OSL dating because of a high feldspar component in the sediments at the site (OSL dating is preferably done on quartz grains due to a better understanding of the mechanisms of OSL production). Assessing the radiation dose samples received during their burial period was problematic due to the large presence of potassium rich feldspars. Assessing the radiation dose was problematic because the measurement of potassium (K) returned different values using several independent techniques. The mode of sediment deposition via different depositional mechanisms such as, fluvial, and clast spalling present difficult challenges in assessing the zero age value of a sample.

OSL ages were compared to a well defined radiocarbon chronology from RCC, and any inconsistencies would motivate closer sorting of the different dating techniques. In this study it was found that not all feldspar grains were removed from the quartz extracts during pretreatment procedures. The ability of the SAR protocol to pick out feldspar contamination was therefore not conclusive, and single grain measurements had to be used to differentiate quartz and feldspar grains.

The likelihood of age contamination from problematic depositional events was not supported and the results suggest that aeolian deposition was the main mechanism at the site. The vertical separation of depositional events i.e. the varying archaeological events, is very dense at RCC and this introduces the possibility of sample mixing during collection. For a few samples it is shown that sample mixing has occurred as mixing is usually evident in the degree of scatter in the OSL results.

After all the inconsistencies in OSL/Radiocarbon age correlations were worked out, a coherent OSL chronology was obtained. Certain issues surrounding dosimetry however, are still not resolved. These issues are beyond the scope of this study and so caution is advised when using OSL dates done with little or no dose-rate analysis.

The resulting dates provide a useful dataset for archaeologists who now have added resources to assess the Middle Stone Age (MSA) and better compare synchronous evidence from different sites in order to contribute to the debate surrounding the origins of modern humans and modern human behaviour. These results combined with the well established radiocarbon chronology give age ranges as follows: The Pre-Howiesons Poort (Pre-HP) MSA IIb industry is between 94 and 68 thousand years ago (ka); the Howiesons Poort (HP) industry is between 68 and 55 ka; the Post –HP MSA III dates to between 55 and 48 ka; the 'almost sterile sands' (which include the MSA IV industry) are between 48 and >27 ka; the MSA/LSA transition is between 27 and 20 ka; the Robberg LSA industry is between 20 and 10.5 ka; the Oakhurst LSA industry ranges from 10.5 to 8.5 ka; and the Wilton LSA industries are <8.5 ka.

## OPSOMMING

Uitslae en ontleding van Opties-gestimuleerde Ligtingsdatering of “Optically-stimulated Luminescence Dating” (OSL) van die middel steentydperk (MSA) en latere steentydperk (LSA) sedimente by Rose Cottage Cave (RCC) word voorgelê. Sewentien ligtingsmonsters wat oor die afgelope dekade geneem is was in hierdie studie gebruik. Veertien hiervan was gedateer (agt in Pretoria en ses in Risø, Denemarke deur A.S. Murray). Die monsters was geneem uit die hele volgreeks en het ouderdomsreeks opgelewer vanaf die bodem van die reeks tot en met die Oakhurst laatsteentydperk (LSA) bedryf.

Die protokol wat gebruik is, is die konvensionele enkel-alikwot herskeppende of “single-aliquot regenerative” (SAR) protokol vanweë dié se vermoë om gedragsprobleme met OSL datering te korrigeer. Die studie is hoofsaaklik gemoeid met toetsing van die geldigheid van die konvensionele SAR protokol soos toegepas op Suid-Afrikaanse argeologiese terreine. RCC bied problematiese sedimente vir OSL datering as gevolg van ‘n groter feldspar komponent in die sedimente van die terrein (OSL datering word verkieslik gedoen op kwartskorrels as gevolg van ‘n beter begrip van die meganismes van OSL produksie). Raming van die bestralingsdosis wat monsters ontvang het in die tyd wat hulle begrawe was, is vergemoeilik deur die teenwoordigheid van groot hoeveelhede kaliumryke feldspar. Raming van die bestralingsdosis was problematies want die meting van kalium (K) het verskillende waardes gelever wanneer verskeie onafhanklike tegnieke gebruik is. Die wyse van neerlegging van sedimente deur middel van verskillende neerleggingsmeganismes soos fluviale en klast afsplintering bied moeilike uitdagings vir raming van die nul ouderdomswaarde van ‘n monster.

OSL ouderdomme is vergelyk met ‘n goedgedefinieerde radiokoolstof kronologie vanaf RCC en enige teenstrydighede sou dan motivering wees vir ‘n nadere sortering van die verskillende dateringstegnieke. In die studie is gevind dat nie alle feldsparkorrels uit die kwartsuittreksels verwyder is tydens

voorafbehandelingsprosedures nie. Die vermoë van die SAR protokol om felsparbesoedeling uit te lig is derhalwe nie onbetwisbaar bewys nie en enkelkorrel metings moes gedoen word om te onderskei tussen kwarts- en feldsparkorrels.

Die waarskynlikheid van besoedeling van ouderdomme in problematiese neerleggingsgebeurtenisse is nie ondersteun nie en die uitslae dui daarop dat eoliese neerlegging die hoof meganisme was by dié terrein. Die vertikale skeiding van neerleggingsgebeurtenisse dit wil sê die veranderende argeologiese gebeurtenisse is baie dig by RCC en dit bring die moontlikheid van monstervermenging tydens insameling te weeg. Vir 'n paar monsters word daar getoon dat sodanige vermenging wel plaasgevind het want vermenging is gewoonlik duidelik uit die mate van spreiding in die OSL uitslae.

Nadat al die teenstrydighede in OSL/Radiokoolstof ouderdomskorrelasies uitgewerk was, was 'n samehangende OSL kronologie verkry. Sekere kwessies rondom doseringsmeting ("dosimetry") is egter nog nie opgelos nie. Daardie kwessies val buite die omvang van hierdie studie en omsigtigheid word aangeraai waar OSL daterings gedoen word met min of geen doseerverhoudingsontleding ("dose-rate analysis").

Die resultate van die daterings lewer 'n bruikbare datastel vir argeoloë wat nou bykomende hulpbronne het om die middelsteentydperk (MSA) te assesser en beter vergelykings te tref tussen gelyktydige bewysmateriaal vanaf verskillende terreine en daardeur by te dra tot die debat rondom die oorsprong van die moderne mens en sy gedrag. Hierdie resultate gekombineer met die goedgevestigde Radiokoolstof kronologie lewer ouderdomsreekse soos volg: Die Pre-Howiesons Poort (Pre-HP) MSA IIb bedryf tussen 94 en 68 duisend jaar gelede (ka); die Howiesons Poort (HP) bedryf tussen 68 en 55 ka; die Post-HP MSA III tussen 55 en 48 ka; die 'amper steriele sandlae' (wat die MSA IV insluit) tussen 48 en >27 ka; die MSA/LSA oorgang tussen 27 en 20 ka; die Robberg LSA bedryf tussen 20

and 10.5 ka; die Oakhurst LSA bedryf wissel van 10.5 to 8.5 ka; en die Wilton LSA bedrywe is <8.5 ka.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The direction of study that all students decide upon when confronted with the task of doing a Masters degree is a difficult one. This was a situation I found myself in, when the phone rang, and Dr. Stephan Woodborne asked if I was interested in being supervised in a field related to archaeological dating. All of a sudden a variety of study options presented themselves. Needless to say luminescence dating was the one that caught my attention.

I don't know how to thank Stephan enough. Not only has he shown the way that research should be done, but he has helped mould my life. Stephan has helped in getting financial aid, and has taught me life skills that have had profound effects during the last three years. Marrying my beautiful wife Fiona, and having our precious daughter Imogen Rose would not have been possible without financial support, life skills training and encouragement from the staff at QUADRU. To Fiona, her parents (Bob and Bev Harris), and my parents (Jacus and Fay Pienaar): I know it took a little longer than you expected, but I hope you will be proud. To Jason, my brother: sorry you beat me and finished your thesis first, but don't worry I'll beat you at something else (such as marriage).

Then there are the people who helped me gain the skills to understand and apply the dating technique. This is a huge thank you, Gill and Zenobia. Maybe someday I'll also have that sort of patience. Also to Lynn Wadley, who took the time to visit Rose Cottage Cave and help with the sampling. Thank you to Andrew Murray, who dated Rose Cottage Cave and in doing so provided a correlation dataset. Lastly I would like to thank the University of Pretoria and my fellow students from the Department of Anthropology and Archaeology for all the insight provided, and the fun we had together.

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

## **ABSTRACT**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Purpose of study	1
1.2 Rose Cottage Cave	1
1.3 What is OSL?	2
1.4 Dating argument	3
1.5 Importance of study	6
<b>2 ROSE COTTAGE CAVE</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 General Background	8
2.2 Palaeo-environmental reconstruction at Rose Cottage Cave	12
2.3 The archaeology of Rose Cottage Cave	14
2.4 Sampling strategy of Rose Cottage Cave sediments	18
2.5 Isolation of quartz from Rose Cottage Cave	20
<b>3 OSL THEORY AND EQUIPMENT</b>	<b>21</b>
3.1 OSL Theory	21
3.2 Calculation of the depositional age of sediments	24
3.3 Determination of trapped electron populations in the laboratory	24
3.4 Problems associated with OSL dating	26



<b>3.5 OSL Instrumentation</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>3.6 <math>D_e</math> Determination</b>	<b>32</b>
3.6.1 Additive and Regenerative dose protocols	32
<b>3.7 The SAR Protocol</b>	<b>33</b>
3.7.1 Advantages of the SAR protocol	37
<b>3.8 <math>D_e</math> Distributions</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>3.9 Age models</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>4 OSL DOSIMETRY: THEORY AND EQUIPMENT</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>4.1 Dose rate determination</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>4.2 Alpha particle contribution</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>4.3 Beta, gamma and cosmic radiation</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>4.4 Instrumentation used to determine dose rates</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>4.4 Calculation of dose-rates</b>	<b>54</b>
4.5.1 Dose-rate calculation – A worked example	55
<b>5 THE SAR PROTOCOL APPLIED TO THE ROSE COTTAGE CAVE SAMPLES</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>5.1 Sample overview</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>5.2 Rejection criteria</b>	<b>58</b>
5.2.1 Dose recovery experiment	58
5.2.2 Partial bleach test	61
5.2.3 IR-OSL depletion ratio test	63
5.2.4 Sensitivity change	68
5.2.5 Recycling Ratio (R-Ratio) test	73
5.2.6 Recuperation	77
5.2.7 $D_e$ versus $T$ – Preheat Plateau	78
<b>6.3 Analysis of <math>D_e</math> values</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>6 DOSE RATE ANALYSIS</b>	<b>92</b>

<b>6.1 Introduction</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>6.2 Thorium and Uranium analysis</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>6.3 Potassium analysis</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>6.4 Dose-rates for Rose Cottage Cave</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>7 RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>7.1 Results</b>	<b>101</b>
7.1.1 Resolving age discrepancies between OSL and radiocarbon	106
<b>7.2 Discussion</b>	<b>108</b>
<b>7.3 Conclusion and recommendations</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: RADIOCARBON AGE CHRONOLOGY OF ROSE COTTAGE CAVE</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTIONS OF RCC SAMPLES</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: RADIOACTIVITY AND DOSE-RATE DATA</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>C.1 TSAC calculation</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>C.2 Radioactive Decay chains</b>	<b>121</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>124</b>

# LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1. 1	LOCATION OF ROSE COTTAGE CAVE	2
FIGURE 1. 2	DIFFERENT AGES OF THE HOWIESONS POORT	6
FIGURE 2. 1	PLAN OF ROSE COTTAGE CAVE	11
FIGURE 2. 2	INTERPRETATIONS OF ROSE COTTAGE CAVE LITHOSTRATIGRAPHY	12
FIGURE 2. 3	SEA LEVEL CHANGES FOR THE LAST 150 KA	14
FIGURE 2. 4	CROSS SECTION OF MSA LEVELS FROM THE HARPER EXCAVATION	16
FIGURE 2. 5	LSA STRATIGRAPHY OF ROSE COTTAGE CAVE	18
FIGURE 3. 1	AITKEN'S ENERGY LEVEL DIAGRAM	22
FIGURE 3. 2	REPRESENTATION OF DECAY CURVES USING DIFFERENT PREHEAT TEMPERATURES.	25
FIGURE 3. 3	$D_E$ DETERMINATION	26
FIGURE 3. 4	SCHEMATIC OF THE RISØ TL/OSL DA-15 READER	29
FIGURE 3. 5	SCHEMATIC OF SINGLE-GRAIN OSL ATTACHMENT	29
FIGURE 3. 6	RESULTS OF CALIBRATION QUARTZ	30
FIGURE 3. 7	HEATER PLATE TEST, SHOWING CHARGE TRANSFER	31
FIGURE 3. 8	GENERALISED SAR MEASUREMENT SEQUENCE	35
FIGURE 3. 9	A TYPICAL SAR GROWTH CURVE ( $L_x/T_x$ )	36
FIGURE 3. 10	SENSITIVITY CHANGES MONITORED BY THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN $L_x/T_x$ AND $T_x/T_N$ VS. SAR CYCLE NUMBER	37
FIGURE 3.11	GENERAL PRINCIPLE OF THE RADIAL PLOT	42
FIGURE 3.12	OVERDISPERSION VALUES FOR SAMPLE RCC 9	43
FIGURE 4. 1	AVERAGE ALPHA DOSE FOR QUARTZ GRAINS EMBEDDED IN A MATRIX THAT CONTAINS THORIUM AND URANIUM	47
FIGURE 4. 2	AVERAGE BETA DOSE FROM SURROUNDING MATRIX TO SPHERICAL GRAINS	49
FIGURE 4. 3	VARIATION OF GAMMA DOSE IN SOIL, EXPRESSED AS A % OF THE GAMMA DOSE AT INFINITE DEPTH	49
FIGURE 4. 4	SELF DOSE AT THE CENTRE OF A SPHERE FOR GAMMA RADIATION WITH ENERGY 2MEV	50

FIGURE 4. 5	VARIATION OF THE INTENSITY OF COSMIC RAYS WITH ALTITUDE, EXPRESSED AS A RATIO FOR WHICH THE CORRESPONDING ANNUAL DOSE IS 185 $\mu\text{Gy/a}$	50
FIGURE 4. 6	SPECTRUM DERIVED FROM A PORTABLE GAMMA SPECTROMETER	53
FIGURE 5. 1	VALUES OF RECOVERY DOSES OBTAINED BY SAR PROTOCOL	61
FIGURE 5. 2	$D_E(T)$ PLOTS DISPLAYING $D_E$ VALUES QUOTED IN Gy OBTAINED AT DIFFERENT INTEGRATION CHANNELS	62
FIGURE 5. 3	IR OSL DEPLETION RATIO TESTS PERFORMED ON ALIQUOTS USING 5MM AND 2MM MASK SIZES AT DIFFERENT PREHEAT TEMPERATURES.	67
FIGURE 5. 4	SENSITIVITY CHANGES MONITORED BY THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN $L_x/T_x$ AND $T_x/T_N$ VS. SAR CYCLE NUMBER	72
FIGURE 5. 5	LOW AND HIGH DOSE RECYCLING RATIO (R-RATIO) TESTS PERFORMED ON ALIQUOTS USING DIFFERENT MASK SIZES	77
FIGURE 5. 6	PREHEAT PLATEAU RESULTS FOR RCC SAMPLES	81
FIGURE 5. 7	RADIAL PLOTS AND PD PLOTS SHOWING THE $D_E$ DISTRIBUTIONS FOR THE RCC SAMPLES	90
FIGURE 6. 1	TH/U RATIOS FOR RCC SAMPLES	94
FIGURE 6. 2	TH/U RATIOS FOR RCC SAMPLES, ACCORDING TO DEPTH	94
FIGURE 6. 3	CONTRIBUTION OF $^{40}\text{K}$ , $^{232}\text{Th}$ AND NATURAL U TO THE BETA AND GAMMA DOSE RATES OF ROSE COTTAGE CAVE	98
FIGURE 6. 4	DOSE-RATES OBTAINED FOR RCC USING ALL THE AVAILABLE TECHNIQUES	99
FIGURE 7. 1	COMPARISON BETWEEN OSL DATING AND OTHER DATING TECHNIQUES PERFORMED AT RCC	104
FIGURE 7. 2	AGE SEQUENCE FOR RCC	105
FIGURE 7. 3	RADIAL PLOTS SHOWING ALL THE GRAINS FROM SAMPLE RCC 21	106
FIGURE 7. 4	THE EFFECTS OF MOISTURE CONTENT AND %K ON A SAMPLE	109

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 2.1	SAMPLING STRATEGY	19
TABLE 4.1	CONVERSION FACTORS USED FOR DOSE RATE CALCULATION	54
TABLE 4.2	EXTERNAL ATTENUATION FACTORS	54
TABLE 4.3	RAW DATA FOR SAMPLE RCC 10	55
TABLE 4.4	DRY DOSE-RATES (G <sub>y</sub> /ka) FOR SAMPLE RCC 10	55
TABLE 5.1	RCC SAMPLES IN DEPTH ORDER	58
TABLE 5.2	VALUES OF RECOVERY DOSES OBTAINED BY SAR PROTOCOL	59
TABLE 5.3	SUMMARY OF D <sub>E</sub> VALUES OBTAINED FROM RCC SAMPLES	91
TABLE 6.1	TH AND U PPM COMPARISONS	93
TABLE 6.2	RATIOS OF %K FROM XRG AND FGS MEASUREMENTS	95
TABLE 6.3	FRACTIONAL COMPONENTS OF DOSE-RATES TO ROSE COTTAGE CAVE	97
TABLE 6.4	DOSE-RATES OBTAINED FOR RCC USING THE BEST TH/U RATIO AND BOTH (WHEN AVAILABLE) MEASUREMENTS OF K%	100
TABLE 7.1	D <sub>E</sub> VALUES AND DOSE-RATES USED IN AGE DETERMINATION FOR ROSE COTTAGE CAVE	102
TABLE 7.2	PRELIMINARY RESULTS FOR ROSE COTTAGE CAVE	103
TABLE 7.3	MOST PROBABLE AGE RANGES FOR THE ROSE COTTAGE CAVE SEQUENCE	110
TABLE 7.4	RESULTS FOR ROSE COTTAGE CAVE	111

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<b>Bq:</b>	Becquerel, 1 Bq = 1 decay/sec
<b>Ci:</b>	Curie, 1 Ci = $37 \times 10^9$ Bq
<b>CW-OSL:</b>	Continuous-wave optically stimulated luminescence
<b>D<sub>e</sub>:</b>	Equivalent laboratory dose
<b>ELSA:</b>	Early Later Stone Age
<b>ESA:</b>	Early Stone Age
<b>FBP:</b>	Fast bleaching TL peak
<b>FGS:</b>	Field gamma spectrometer
<b>Gy:</b>	Gray, 1 Gy = 1 joule/kg
<b>HF Acid:</b>	Hydrofluoric acid
<b>HP:</b>	Howiesons Poort
<b>IR:</b>	Infrared
<b>IRSL:</b>	Infrared Stimulated Luminescence
<b>K:</b>	Potassium
<b>ka:</b>	kilo year (1 year $\times 10^3$ )
<b>LED:</b>	Light Emitting Diode
<b>LGM:</b>	Last Glacial Maximum
<b>LSA:</b>	Later Stone Age
<b>L<sub>x</sub>:</b>	Luminescence regenerative dose
<b>MeV:</b>	Mega Electron-volt
<b>MSA:</b>	Middle Stone Age
<b>mW:</b>	Mega-watt
<b>OIS:</b>	Oxygen Isotope Stage
<b>OSL:</b>	Optically Stimulated Luminescence
<b>ppm:</b>	Parts per million
<b>Rb:</b>	Rubidium
<b>RCC:</b>	Rose Cottage Cave
<b>SAR:</b>	Single aliquot regenerative (protocol)
<b>SBP:</b>	Slow bleaching TL peak
<b>Th:</b>	Thorium
<b>TL:</b>	Thermoluminescence
<b>TSAC:</b>	Thick Source Alpha Counting
<b>T<sub>x</sub>:</b>	Luminescence test dose
<b>U:</b>	Uranium
<b>WAV:</b>	Weighted average
<b>α:</b>	Alpha (radiation)
<b>β:</b>	Beta (radiation)
<b>γ:</b>	Gamma (radiation)