morphological or distributional interpretation on archaeological sites and this was one of the main aims at Lejre. The production, one afternoon, by Peter Vernon Hansen, of a collection of excavated waste flakes from the site at Rends provided a chance for an instant comparison and evaluation of results although detailed analysis and publication of the experimental data will obviously take longer.

When a group of enthusiasts in any field meet there is always much information to be exchanged and at Lejre, as well as the experimental work, much time was devoted to papers and practical demonstrations of particular specialisations. Some of the topics covered included: Solutrean Laurel Leaves (J. Pellegrin), Danish Daggers (E. Callahan), Lenticular Axes (J. Weiner), and Livres de Neure and Egyptian Daggers (P. Kalterborn). The discussion generated by these sessions was found to be of far ranging value.

There was another level to the meeting, however, and this was an examination of the position and future of experimentation in archaeology with particular reference to centres such as Lejre where there is a great emphasis upon public interpretation and display as well as upon more isolated research. To this end a colloquium formed part of the seminar and was attended by many interested prehistorians. The basic premise of the meeting was that archaeology is not only fieldwork and excavation but is also interpretation. It was generally felt that, after a somewhat shaky start, experimental archaeology has matured to a point where its scientific future to aid that interpretation should be assured. Experiment has a long history but has not always been well documented and was often carried out by laymen craftsmen who acquired an image of eccentricity. This image has now been broken and, with the increasing participation of trained archaeologists, together with careful scientific control and clear and prompt documentation and publication, experimental work has a recognised place within archaeology. One point that was emphasised both at the colloquium and by the experiences of the seminar, was the necessity within any such group for more than skilled craftsmen. Those prepared to undertake the detailed recording and processing of information play a very important role.

The seminar was most beneficial to all who attended. Even those who normally work in areas to which the main topic of interest did not appear at first to be relevant were able to see their own assemblages in a wider context and to discuss, compare and develop contemporary methodologies and techniques of study. Such meetings establish valuable contacts and are a concept that should be used more in Britain. To conclude, I would like to thank those who made this meeting possible: Errett Callahan who organised the seminar, the Denmark-American Foundation who funded the stay at Lejre, the staff at Lejre who provided facilities, accommodation and food during the week and, on a personal level, the Abercromby Fund and the Russell Trust who provided financial support for my own travelling expenses.
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Postscript

The results of the experiment are being prepared for publication in Denmark by Bo Madsen and Errett Callahan but a paper is also due to be published in Britain in Scottish Archaeological Review, vol. 2, forthcoming.

MISCELLANEA

PUBLISHING SPECIALIST REPORTS: A CAUTIONARY TALE

The path of specialist reporting is fraught with dangers, not least in the act of getting into print. Lithicists, like other specialists, often find themselves contributing to large excavation reports in which their own section forms only a very small part. The complexity of such excavation reports, the demands of publication deadlines, and often the low-level of post-excavation finance available, all conspire to make it difficult for the specialist to see his or her own contribution through the press.

This happened to me recently in a situation where my text was submitted in advance of the illustrations which were prepared elsewhere.
I never saw the text and illustrations integrated before publication, and an unfortunate error slipped through whereby the numbering of the artefacts in the text does not correspond with that in the illustrations, making much of the text nonsensical.

The moral of this tale is that lithic specialists should insist, preferably before accepting an assignment, that they be permitted to check their own reports together with the illustrations in final, page-up form, before going to press. By the same token the authors or editors of excavation reports should try to ensure that some kind of proof-reading facility can be extended to their specialist contributors, even if in practice this means checking the final typescript version rather than proofs proper.

For the record a concordance is provided of the flints referred to above. The report in question is in: Hazel Wheeler, Excavation at Willington, Derbyshire, 1970-72, Derbyshire Archaeological Journal 99 (1979) 133-144. The first number of each pair is that given to the flint artefact in the text, the second is that of the same artefact as illustrated.

1a = 2a; 2a = 4a; 4a = 5a; 5a = 6a; 6a = 7a; 7a = 8a; 8a = 12a; 12a = 10a; 10a = 11a; 11a = 12a; 12a = 13a; 13a = 14a; 14a = 15a; 15a = 16a; 16a = 17a = 18a; 18a = 19a; 20a = 21a; 21a = 22a; 22a = 23a; 23a = 24a; 24a = 25a; 25a = 26a; 26a = 27a; 27a = 28a; 28a = 29a; 29a = 30a; 30a = 31a; 31a = 32a; 32a = 33a; 33a = 34a; 34a = 35a; 35a = 36a; 36a = 37a; 37a = 38a; 38a = 39a; 39a = 40a; 40a = 41a; 41a = 42a; 42a = 43a; 43a = 44a; 44a = 45a; 45a = 46a; 46a = 47a; 47a = 48a.

This concordance applies throughout the report, except that on p.141, line 23, no.15 should read no.17.

If anyone else has a lithic report which has met a similar fate, perhaps they would like to publish a correction in this newsletter?

Alan Saville

AXES IN PAPUA NEW GUINEA

John Burton has produced an informally presented draft of a paper that describes the work he conducted in the Highlands of PNG during a four-month visit in 1980. It consists of a description of the fieldwork programme, including a list of the questions asked of old men, and details of all quarry sites visited. To anyone who has attempted to understand the axe quarries of New Guinea from the anthropological literature, John's descriptions of many well-known sites, with information on location, size of pits and shafts, extent of mining area, types of rock quarried and so on, should prove invaluable. Photocopies can be obtained from N.W. Pitts, Alexander Keiller Museum, Avebury, at cost. The full title of the paper is: Axes makers of the Wahgi: oral history and archaeology of a traditional industry in highland Papua New Guinea - a look at sites in 1980 by John Burton, Dept. of Prehistory, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University. 15 typed pages.

Mike Pitts

BLINKED VISION?

The following quotation was spotted in a recent publication. It perhaps indicates just how far we have to go to achieve recognition for our branch of study. Would the DOE like to consider a similar booklet on lithic artefacts?

"Archaeology is the study of man's past as revealed by his material remains. Pottery is the only major type of artefact that has almost total survival. It has a special importance for archaeologists because of its ubiquity and quantity, and because pottery vessels remain in use for limited periods only, and change in source, style and technique through time. For these reasons pottery can, after study and interpretation, provide information on the chronology, trading contacts, function and socio-economic aspects of any site on which it is found."

Quoted from page 1 of: C.J. Young (ed), Guidelines for the processing and publication of Roman pottery from excavations, London 1980 (= DOE, Directorate of Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings, Occasional Paper No.4)

Alan Saville

LETTERS

Dear IGS

1. You may be interested to hear that a local variant of the IGS has been formed under the aegis of Surrey Archaeological Society Excavations Committee. We have called it the Lithic Tool Research Group in contrast to the other research groups in the county. The group is small, only a dozen or so strong, but is enthusiastic and hopes to stimulate interest into prehistoric studies within the county.

2. On page 11 of the IGS newsletter no.1 you invited comments on drawing conventions. It may be a little late in the day but for what