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, paginated 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) 133-146. 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.

1=1: 2=3; 4=5; 5=6; 6=7; 7=8; 9=10; 10=11; 12=13; 14=15; 16=17; 17=18; 19=20; 21=22; 23=24; 25=26; 27=28; 29=30; 31=32; 33=34; 35=36; 37=38; 39=40; 41=42; 43=44; 45=46; 47=48; 49=50; 51=52; 53=54; 55=56; 57=58; 59=60; 61=62; 63=64; 65=66; 67=68; 69=70; 71=72; 73=74; 75=76; 77=78; 79=80; 81=82; 83=84; 85=86; 87=88; 89=90; 91=92; 93=94; 95=96; 97=98; 99=100.

This concordance applies throughout the report, except that on p.141, line 25, no.13 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 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 areas, types of rock quarried and so on, should prove invaluable. Photocopies can be obtained from M.W. Pitts, Alexander Keiller Museum, Avebury, at cost. The full title of the paper is: Axe makers of the Waragi: 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, Australia National University. 15 typed pages.

Mike Pitts

BLINKERED 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 ISS

1. You may be interested to hear that a local variant of the ISS 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 ISS newsletter no.1 you invited comments on drawing conventions. It may be a little late in the day but for what