

Editor's foreword

When archaeologists compare different Neolithic potteries, they usually like to write about the chemical composition of clay, different organic additives, about different types of dung that were added to the clay, and on this material they try to conclude about more or less relatedness of different potteries.

However, the study of the chemical composition of the clay used for procuring a certain ceramics is completely useless for estimating the degrees of relatedness of different ceramic traditions since people of the same or closely related ceramic traditions living in different territories usually use the clay that was available in their area, and different types of clay existing in different areas evidently can differ in their chemical composition, and also in different territories, different additives to clay can be used.

On the other hand, estimating the degrees of resemblances of different ornamental traditions is the matter that allows us to see the degree of relatedness of different groups of people: ornamental traditions are a form of Neolithic art and the relatedness of artistic traditions directly shows the relatedness of the corresponding groups of people. By estimating the degrees of resemblance/relatedness of different ornamental traditions we can see the structures of Neolithic communities/tribes, we can draw a map of Neolithic tribes/ethnic groups, we can draw a map of Neolithic languages. And it is the matter that makes archeology the science of ancient societies, and not just the bookkeeping of potsherds and flakes.