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A Newsletter of Southwest Asian Lithics Research
Report on the Second Workshop on PPN Chipped Lithic Industries, held in Warsaw, 3rd-7th of April, 1995

More than 30 colleagues were able to attend the workshop hosted by the Institute of Archaeology, in collaboration with the Polish Center of Mediterranean Archaeology, of the University of Warsaw. Organized by Stefan K. Kozlowski and Hans Georg Gebel, financial and technical support was provided by the Polish Ministry of Education and the University of Warsaw. The attendance would have been significantly higher, but several colleagues had to cancel their participation for a variety of reasons.

The major topics of the papers included discussions of taxa problems; the presence of EPPNB sites in the southern Levant; pre-PPN lithics traditions; specialization in raw materials, industries and tool kits; and reports on new studies of PPN assemblages. The Warsaw venue also permitted presentation of studies of contemporaneous industries from Central Asia, northeastern Africa and southeastern Europe to provide comparative evidence from regions adjacent to the PPN Near East (see below).

Reports were also given on the Points/Bcrers, Microliths, Glossy Tools, and Technology working groups, all of which had convened in Jäles the previous week; these reports are printed in this issue of NEO-LITHICS.

The scheduled presentations occasionally ran far over their allotted times, and accordingly the Closing Session was very brief. There was, as a consequence, no time for “Final Discussions” or “Conclusions”, although several final announcements were made.

The first of these was in response to many comments that the biennial schedule of the PPN workshops was too short for meaningful research, and that a triennial format would provide more adequately to address lithics problems between the meetings. The acceptance was announced of the gracious invitation by the University of Rome (passed on by Isabella Careva) to host the 3rd PPN Workshop in Rome in 1998.

Secondly, it was regrettable that last-minute technical problems at the printer had delayed the appearance of the volume of the Berlin workshop proceedings and prevented its distribution to the participants of the Warsaw meeting. It is hoped that the book will be in the mail to the subscribers by the time the current issue of NEO-LITHICS is received by its subscribers.

Finally, the proceedings of the Warsaw meeting will also be published as a SENEPSE volume as soon as possible. Manuscripts and diskettes should be sent to Stefan K. Kozlowski (see letter enclosed) not later than 31 July 1995. Note, all colleagues are invited to submit manuscripts for publication in this volume, including those who had to cancel their participation or where unable to attend the workshop, as well as other contributions on lithics analysis dealing with the PPN of the Near East and related techno-taxe.

In the following we present contributions given at the Warsaw meeting:

1st Day: Workshop Opening
Piotr Bieńkiewski, Dean of the History Faculty of Warsaw University; Opening Address.
Stefan K. Kozlowski and Hans Georg Gebel: Welcome to Warsaw; Research De-
velopments.
Warsaw University: Reception.

2nd Day: Section I: Taxa Discussions (Chair: Vadim Masson)
Frank Hole (New Haven): A Syrian Bridge Between the Levant and the Zagros?
Nigel Goring-Morris (Jerusalem): The Harifian: Epipalaeolithic or Neolithic?
Michal Kubeslavicius (Poznan): Early Holocene Industries of NE. Africa.
Galina Korobkova (St. Petersburg): Chipped Industry of Jeltun Culture, Southern Turkmenistan.
Vadim Masson (St. Petersburg): Cultural Zones of Central Asia and the Variety of Chipped Neolithic Lithic Industries.
Klaus Schmitz (Heidelberg): Helwan in Egypt: A PPN Site?
Kari Szymsczak (Warszawa): PPN Flint Assemblages with Microliths: What Do We Find, What Do We Loose?

Section II: EPPNB-Probams (Chair: Avi Gopher)
Avi Gopher (Tel Aviv): What Happened to the EPPNB? An Introduction.
Gary O. Rollefson (Wernbach): A Brief Note on the EPPNB Abu Hujud in the Wadi el-Hassan, Jordan.
Avi Gopher (Tel Aviv): EPPNB Sites in Isreal, Flint Tool Assemblages and a Note on Obsidian.
Avi Gopher (Tel Aviv): EPPNB. The Cultural Aspect.

3rd Day: Section III: Pre- and Post-PPN Traditions (Chair: Deborah Olszewski)
Stefan Kozlowski: From Zawi Chemi to Mefeta.
Deborah Olszewski (Tucson): A Consideration of a Transition from the Zarzian to the Mefetaian Industries in the Zagros.
Ofer Bar-Yosef (Cambridge, USA): Late Pleistocene Lithic Traditions in the Near East and Their Expression in Early Neolithic Assemblages.
Anna Balfet-Cohen and Nigel Goring-Morris (Jerusalem): The Late Epipalaeolithic as the Precursor of the Neolithic: The Lithic Evidence.
Tamar Noy (Jerusalem) and Stefan K. Kozlowski (Warsaw): PPNB Technology in the PPNB Context. The Gilgal Example.

Section IV: Specializations in Raw materials, Industries, and Tool Kits I (Chair: Frank Hole)
Patrik Andersson (Jäles), Eric Coqueugniot (Lyons), Avi Gopher (Tel Aviv), and Frank Hole (New Haven): Reports from the Jäles - Sub-Group Meetings.
Leslie A. Quintero (Riverside): The Role of Flint Mining in the Pre-Pottery Neolithic.
Elisabeth Hildebrand (St. Louis): Changes in Blade Core Technology in the Zagros Mountains during the Epipalaeolithic/PPNB.
Leslie A. Quintero and Phil J. Wilke (Riverside): Technological Analysis of Debitage from Naftilom Core Reduction. (Discussion of the Poster)
Leslie A. Quintero and Phil J. Wilke (Riverside): Pre-Pottery Neolithic Blade Technology and the Origins of Craft Specialization in the Levant.
Phil J. Wilke (Riverside): Derivation of Bullet-Shaped Microblade Cores in Prehistory: Preliminary Results of Experimental Replicative Studies. (Discussion of the Poster)

Workshop Dinner.

3rd Day: Section IV: Specializations in Raw materials, Industries, and Tool Kits II (Chair: Ofer Bar-Yosef)
Lorisa Helmer (Tocano) and Marc Verhoeven: Bitumen-Coated Sickle Blade Elements at Tell Sabi Abyad II, Northern Syria. (Lecture text distributed for discussion)
Manuela Beile (Heidelberg): The S molded Blades from Nevalli Çorî: Prel. Results.
Patricia Anderson (Jäles): On Overview of Similarities and Differences in Activities from the Natufian to PPNB, according to Functional Analysis.
Patricia Anderson (Jäles) and François Villa (Paris): Insights into Activities of Hayonim Terrace Natufian. / Les pie ces lustr es de la Terrace de Hayonim (Natufien évolu), des fa cicles ?
Klaus Schmidt (Heidelberg): Nevalli Çorî: Intrasite Distribution of Lithic Tool Classes. Preliminary Results.

Free afternoon.

4th Day: Section V: Industries Reconsidered/ New Industries
Isabella Caneva, Cristina Lemorini, Daniela Zampetti (Roma): Nore on the Lithic Production From Aceramic Çayönü.
Eric Coqueugniot (Lyon): Industrie Khamian d'Aqul el-Safa à l'est de Jebel Drouze en Syrie. (read by François Valla)
Section VI: Cleaning Session
Stefan K. Kozlowski (Warsaw) and Gary C. Rollefson (Wenback): Final Discussion and Decisions.

Presentation at the Jalès Sub-Group Meetings, held at the Institute de Préhistoire Orientale, 28th-31st of March, 1995

A joint meeting of the Microliths, Points/Borers, Glossy Tools and Technology working groups was hosted by the Institute de Préhistoire Orientale in Jalès from 28-31 March 1995 before the Warsaw workshop. In addition, here is a series of informal presentations on various topics of lithics analysis which was presented, and the titles are given below:

Marie-Claire Cauvin (Jalès): Introduction
Jacques Cauvin (Jalès): Place de la typologie au Néolithique - La séquence de Mureybet.
Frank Hole (New Haven): Strategies for analyzing microliths.
Elizabeth Hildebrand (St Louis): Changes in core-reduction in the Zagros from the Epipaleolithic to the Early PN.
François Valla: Choix des supports dans une industrie noutulienne (Hayonim Terrace, Israel).
Anna Effer-Cohen and Nigel Goring-Morris (Jerusalem): The Natufian and Harifian of the Central Levant.
Monique Lechevallier (Paris): Rémarques sur la sélection des points de flèche à Hatoua (Israel).
Frédéric Abbès (Jalès): Evolution du débitage bipolaire à travers la séquence de Mureybet et Chalil Hassan, c'est à dire les caractéristiques à travers le PPNA par rapport au PPNB.
Frédéric Abbès, Patricia Anderson, Marie-Claire Cauvin, Juan-José Ilanez-Estevez and Jesus Gonzales (Jalès): Cycle de production, transformation et utilisations d'outils PPNB ancien de Mureybet.
Eric Coqueugniot (Lyon): L'industrie à D'ade (Syrie).
Isabella Caneva (Roma): Lithic industries from aceramic Çayönü.
Yoshhiko Nishiaki (Tokai): Additional notes on the naviform method at Douara, Syria.
Jacques Pélegrin: Elements de reconnaissance des techniques de taille.

Overall, technological questions were handled in three ways: a) informal presentations and discussions involved participants in other working groups so that the latter had the opportunity to express their questions about techniques and blanks used for tool production; b) there were also more specialized exchanges among knappers and other technology specialists that entailed replication experiments with regard to specific archaeological pieces and c) particular technology problems were discussed among the members of the Technology Sub-Group.

To summarize the first part, methods must be deduced from the observation of the archaeological material. Conversely, the identification of techniques is based on knapping experiments that permit comparisons of archaeological pieces with experimental ones. Secondly, a knapping method is often an ordered sequence or process carried out with different techniques used sequentially; for example, the shaping of a core by hard hammer and blade debitage with a soft hammer.

In the case of a "predetermined" debitage, whose aim is to produce standardized pieces, it is an absolute necessity to look for tools needing such blanks, for prehistoric knappers didn't develop specialized and elaborate patterns simply for the pleasure of knapping!

During the sub-group meeting, the following problems were considered:
- "Naviform debitage" is an excellent chronological marker for the PPNB even if, in the northern Levant, it appears in the preceding Mureybetian period. This debitage method is part of the "opposed platform, bidirectional blade debitage", with one debitage surface and two opposed striking platforms. Nevertheless, naviform debitage is defined by knapping patterns and not just by the appearance of the core. It also seems that the particular knapping methods may have differed from one region to the next during the PPN.

Report of the Technology Sub-Group

Eric Coqueugniot, Lyon

Marie-Louise Inizan (the Technology Sub-Group coordinator) and Jacques Pélegrin asked me to make a synthesis of the activities of the Technology Sub-Group (including Marie-Louise Inizan, Jacques Pélegrin, Phillip Wilke, Leslie Quintero, Frédéric Abbès, Monique Lechevallier, Kats Ohnuma, Yoshhiko Nishiaki, and Elizabeth Hildebrand) that was held in Jalès. I myself did not participate in all of the meetings, and they sent me notes in French, translated by Patricia Anderson and read by Leslie Quintero.
• Pressure-flaking of blades and bladelets characterizes the Zagros region, and during the PPN period it also occurs in Nemrik, Mlefa'at, Jarmo, and in East Anatolia at Çafèr Harabesi, Çayönü, Hallan Çemi, etc.
• It was suggested that samples of raw material used by Neolithic knappers be curated at central locations in the Near East where researchers could study them. Such lithic resource collections could also contain experimentally heat treated specimens so that the effects of varying heat ranges could be recognized in archaeological collections. Such reference collections for the Middle Euphrates are already being assembled in Jalès, for example. Exchanges of reference collections among different centers must be developed into a true network. For old and new collections, the exact geological origins of the raw material, its availability (rare/abundant, easy/difficult to extract), and the shapes and sizes of the blocks or nodules must be specified.
• Groundstone (milling stone) quarries and production sites should be sought throughout the Near East. Previous field work and replication studies in America by Phil Wilke and Leslie Quinero have established the characteristics of such sites and the knapping processes that led to the production of milling equipment.

During the session, experimental knapping of flint was undertaken by Jacques Pélegrin in order to answer questions and needs of members of other sub-groups meeting at Jalès (e.g., to recognize hard hammer vs. soft hammer percussion, pressure flaking, microburin technique, etc.). Phil Wilke and Leslie Quinero showed examples of their own replication experiments.

If I may add some personal observations, first I think that the meeting was a very good opportunity to discuss problems, even if it was not possible to resolve them. Secondly, the integration of this session with the typological and function sub-groups was fundamentally sound. Prehistoric knappers never knapped simply to pass the time: they had constraints linked to the suitability of raw material, and they also made cultural choices between the tools they wanted and the methods to produce the appropriate balns. We simply cannot separate technological questions from other aspects of lithics studies. Finally, the Levant is a huge region, so it is expected that we will find variability within the same general technological pattern, as we have seen concerning naviform debitage.

Strategy
The principal reason to systematize lithics is to recognize how they vary in time and space. Once variability has been accurately observed and described, we can use it as a tool to help define "cultural" boundaries and to set sites into their correct temporal position. Secondly, we can use a knowledge of variability to infer different ways of life. However, such inferences come not from classification of lithics alone, but rather from analysis of use-wear and associations of the lithics with fauna, plant remains and types of sites.

Following this rationale, our tasks are a) define the subject of our inquiry e.g., "microliths"; b) review the time/space coordinates of artifacts that have been called microliths; c) decide on what criteria (e.g., size, form, type of retouch) are important in time and space; d) develop consistent definitions that should be used in any description; e) for each geographical region, construct a chart that shows the time and space distributions of each variant; f) develop a protocol for illustrating and describing the variability and g) conduct experiments and use-wear analyses that will help explain variability and give insight into prehistoric ways of life.

General Conclusions
1. Microliths are an Epipaleolithic legacy that continues into the Neolithic, so that to properly describe them we must extend our temporal range into the Epipaleolithic period.
2. Microliths disappear for the most part when arrowheads appear; therefore in some sense they may relate to similar functions, such as hunting but with different techniques and equipment.
3. By the PPNB microliths are generally absent from assemblages except in the Zagros.
4. Microliths last longest in the region where there is also a micro-core tradition, i.e., the Zagros and regions to the north and east.

Report on the Microliths Sub-Group
Frank Hole (Coordinator), Yale University

The following members of the Microlithic sub-group met at Jalès in March: Frank Hole (coordinator), Michael Rosenberg, Avi Gopher, Anna Belfer-Cohen, Marie-Claire Cauvin, François Valla, Deborah Oliszewski, and Nigel Goring-Morris. Following an initial presentation of a "strategy for analysis of microliths" by Frank Hole that helped to establish an agenda, the sub-group met two days later for a half-day session.

Agreements and Future Activities
1. Definitions of microliths: a) the size follows Tixier, namely width <12 mm for unretouched pieces and <9 mm for retouched and backed pieces, and length <50 mm; b) only geometric
and various retouched and backed pieces are included; c) bladelets and flakes that are in the microlithic size range are excluded; d) also excluded are microlithic-size types such as borers, points, microscrapers, etc.

2. How to describe the types: a) geometric shape, such as scallene triangle, trapeze, lunate; b) type of blank, such as bladelet, blade, flake; c) how standardized the artifacts are; d) type of retouch, such as backed (unipolar, bipolar, anvil), alternate-opposite, Helwan, nibbling, Ouchtata, sur enclume, microburin technique.

3. Each member of the sub-group agreed to construct a techno-typological chart or framework for his/her geographic region in order to map change and variability through time and space. At the end of the meeting, I received a list of terms and some information on dating, but I have not had time to compile them into a comprehensive framework. More needs to be done with this, particularly on spatial and chronological variability.

4. We did not have time at Jalès to debate ways to define a) shape categories with reference to actual examples; b) blank types; c) various types of retouch or backing or d) how to express variability except through illustrations.

Definitions to be written and illustrated

Geometric forms: lunate, triangle (equilateral, isosceles, scalene), rectangle, trapeze.

Non-geometric forms: backed bladelet, "Gravettian", Hagedud truncation.

Type of retouch: abrupt-backed, semi-abrupt, mixed abrupt, sur enclume/anvil, Helwan, inverse, alternate, nibbling.

Other: dimensions, blank type.

Request

Members of the sub-group are urged to complete the task we began in Jalès by providing definitions and illustrations for the above terms (and any others that may have been overlooked), as well as the chronological and spatial frameworks. The terms should be translated into their equivalents in each of the relevant languages. Frank hole will collect these contributions and distribute them to other members of the sub-group (and others interested) for further comment and finally consensus that can be used as the basis for our "dictionary" contribution.

Report of the Points/Borers Sub-Group

Avi Gopher, Marie-Claire and Jacques Cauvin (Coordinators), Tel Aviv and Jalès

The Points/Borers Sub-Group met in Jalès on 30 March 1995, an afternoon devoted mainly to discussing matters of projectile point typology. A typology of points based principally on material from northern Syria was presented by Jacques Cauvin, followed by a discussion of specific arrowhead assemblages, including Mureybet, el-Kowm, Tell Ramad, etc., and general issues of classification.

It was generally accepted that the basic criterion for point classification is "form". For J. Cauvin, such formal expression can be grouped into "family" variants, subdivided into subfamilies according to specific features of retouch, blank characteristics, and metrical relationships.

Cauvin's families include:

- Points with a truncated base (pointes à biseau)
- Notched points with a truncated base (pointes à encoches et base tronquée)
- Tanged points (pointes pédonculées)
- Notched and tanged points (pointes à pédoncles et encoches)
- Points with a lozenge base (pointes à base losangique)
- Oval points (pointes ovalaires)

Within these "point families", types were defined by secondary details of form, including tang shape; number of notches and their location, etc.; retouch variations; and blank characteristics. These characters (and the types) have definite chronological, regional and/or cultural significance. For example, the "Notched Point" family includes two types: the Aswad point (shaped by flat bifacial retouch, and, most frequently, with several pairs of notches) and the Helwan point (abrupt retouch only). The latter seems to characterize the end of the Khamian period in the whole Levant, while the Aswad point is typical of the Aswadian industry of the Damascus basin. Another example is the change in basal shaping in points with a truncated base, from abrupt and direct retouch (Khamian) to bifacial semi-abrupt or flat retouch (Mureybetian) to flat covering retouch (PPNB), as shown in the sequence at Mureybet. Different types were also suggested for tanged arrowhead families.

Several aspects of classification could not be fully addressed due to the lack of time. It would be profitable to hold discussions of classification systematics, including the relative merits of type definitions based solely on form versus those based on retouch type. Differentiation by blank and metrics was only briefly mentioned, as were the effects of stylistic attributes, such as symmetry. Topics that received no discussion included a) production stages of arrowheads, which is relevant to distinctions between point families such as points with truncated bases and the notched points; b) problematic of point hafting; c) arrowheads on blanks in secondary use (on gessed pieces, for example); and d) arrowhead breakage and reuse. These problems will be dealt with in a future meeting, when a basic typological list for arrowhead types is finally developed.
Report of the Glossy Tools Sub-Group

Patricia Anderson (Coordinator), Jäès

An expanded meeting of the Glossy Tools Sub-group included Patricia Anderson (coordinator), Deborah Oliszewski, Isabella Caneva, Avi Gopher, Frank Hole, Michael Rosenberg, Jacques and Marie-Claire Cauvin, Monique Lechevallier, Anna Belfer-Cohen, Marie-Louise Inizan, Alison Betts, Eri: Coqueugniot, Nigel Goring-Morris, François Valla and Gary Rollefson. They were joined by George Willcox (archaeobotanist) and Sylvie Philibert, Laurence Astruc and Juan-Jose Ibanez (micro-wear analysts).

The size of the group was helpful to broaden the discussion of various problems and issues inherent in a tool class defined by the presence of use-traces (gloss). Nomenclature, drawing conventions, and functional interpretation were all addressed.

Regarding the “glossy tool” designation, it was recalled that this term should be used in preference to “sickle”, since gloss can develop on blanks in ways other than harvesting, such as working stone, clay or ochre-impregnated hide. The presence of gloss is the sine qua non for inclusion in this class, regardless of the presence or absence of retouch. (Incidentally, experiments show that any systematic use of a blank for cereal harvesting will produce gloss visible to the eye). It was also decided that abraded obsidian pieces ("Çayönü tools", backed blades) should not be included in the Glossy Tool class.

* Retouch should be drawn carefully in order to show, if possible, whether gloss has formed inside retouch scars or if the retouch instead removed gloss traces. Retouch should be described according to the conventions defined by the Non-Formal Tool Sub-Group (NEO-LITHICS 294).

* It is vital to describe the blank so that relationships to debitage "strategy" can be determined.

* Microwear studies on glossy tools conducted between the Berlin and Jäès meetings suggest the following tendencies for the FPN: 1) retouch on a non-active edge usually is a modification for insertion of the pieces into haft slots; 2) retouch on an active edge was for either resharpening or for modification of the edge for secondary use not associated with the activity that produced the gloss and 3) the hafting of tools used for harvesting is usually lateral and the use-motion longitudinal.

* Patricia Anderson urged members to continue to submit samples to her for wear analysis to help clarify issues and define tendencies.

* A date for a future meeting of the Glossy Tools Sub-Group has not yet been set.

Note on the Non-Formal Tool Sub-Group

Gary O. Rollefson (Coordinator), Wembach

Invitations for the third meeting of the NFT Sub-Group will be held at the ‘Ain Ghazal Research Institute in Wembach on 17-18 June 1995 were sent out in mid-May. The group will consider the following issues: 1) Should NFTs and Mixed/Multiple Tools be considered as separate tool classes? 2) The development of coding systems for the description of NFTs and Mixed Tools and 3) Discussion of available spreadsheet/database and statistical processing programs. A report on this meeting will appear in NEO-LITHICS 295.

Other agreements reached by the Sub-Group include:

* After reviewing a partial bibliography compiled by D. Oliszewski that dealt with illustrations of glossy pieces, it was agreed that the location and extent of gloss be indicated precisely using shaded or colored areas or by using dashes to outline the glossed areas; the use of dots or small circles along the length of the edge is not sufficiently informative.
'Ain Darat. A PPNA Site in the Judean Desert

Avi Gopher, Tel Aviv University

The PPNA site of 'Ain Darat lies at an elevation of 510 m asl. on a narrow, steep-cliffed ridge ca. 16 km west of the Dead Sea shore about 12 km east of Hebron. Scattered finds and features cover an area of some 700-900 m² and includes about 15 stone-built structures and installations badly disturbed by robbers, several of which were excavated in two short seasons in 1994.

All structures were circular (3-4 m diameter) built in natural bedrock basins or dug into sedimentary pockets on the rocky ridge. Walls were constructed of many courses of small stones and preserved up to one meter in height; some structures show phasing, and some wall repairs included groundstone material.

Fig. 1. 'Ain Darat. Location

Fig. 2. 'Ain Darat. View of the site looking north.

Fig. 3. 'Ain Darat. Structure 18.

Fig. 4. 'Ain Darat. Arrowheads.

Recovered artifacts include a rich variety of stone bowls, cupmarks on blocks, mortars and pestles, and grinding slabs often bearing a central cupmark. Pendants and other items of greenstone, beads of a variety of materials, marine shells, and soem bone tools were also recovered. The analysis of faunal remains has not been finished.

A preliminary study of the lithics reveals a broad and relatively unspecialized tool inventory. The total of 550 retouched elements is dominated by retouched blades (148) and flakes (55), and other tools include 41 arrowheads (mainly Khiam points), 26 glossy tools (including one Beit Tsamir knife), 14 Hagdud truncations, and 10 microliths (mostly retouched bladlets, a few backed pieces and some isolated lunates). A single and dubious pick/axe is the only representative of the bifacial class, and it comes from the surface.

Cores reveal no indication of bidirectional knapping; C.T.E.s are mainly crested elements. Flakes heavily dominate the debitage (>6:1 flake:blade ratio). Bladelets occur in only minute amounts in the various locus assemblages. In contrast to the cores, the presence of bidirectional blades may indicate that they were imported onto the site.

In summary, the context of 'Ain Darat on an isolated spur overlooking the confluence of several drainages in the modern desert area makes it an intriguing example of PPNA exploitation of this ecological setting. More detailed study of the lithics and associated cultural and natural features will provide a clearer insight into PPNA adaptations in the arid zones of the Levant.
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Comments:

The photos in this issue were taken during the Jals (pages 2-4 upper right) and Warsaw meetings (pages 4 bottom right - 6). Except for the photos page 4 (bottom) and page 5 (left) (done by Bernd Müller-Neuhof) all photos were done / provided by Frank Hole. To both photographers many thanks!
Contributions to

Neolithic Chipped Stone Industries of the Fertile Crescent II
(Warsaw Proceedings)

8. Juni 1995

Dear

this is a gentle reminder on the

deadline of 31st of July, 1995

for your contribution(s) to the second volume of Neolithic Chipped Stone Industries of the Fertile Crescent, the Warsaw proceedings. In the closing session of the meeting, this deadline already had been announced.

If you had been unable to attend the Warsaw meeting, we kindly invite you to send us a contribution, too. In case you will be unable to meet the above deadline, please, contact us (Stefan K. Kozlowski) for a special agreement on a "personal" deadline.

Please, mail your contribution to Stefan K. Kozlowski (above Warsaw address), and do not hesitate to approach us for any questions you might have.

Cordially yours,

[Signature]

PS. Please, find the regulations for contributions to the proceedings on the reverse.
Wir erbitten die Beachtung folgender Punkte: We kindly ask for your attention to the following points:

1. Es werden nur solche Beiträge angenommen, die muttersprachlich editiert wurden. We only accept contributions edited by a native speaker.

2. Die Hierarchie von Zwischenüberschriften sollte höchstens drei Abstufungen umfassen. The hierarchy of subtitles only should consider three stages.

3. Fußnoten stehen am Seitenende und werden je Seite neu beginnend durchnummeriert; zusätzlich müssen alle Fußnoten nochmals ein zweites Mal am Textende aufgelistet werden. Footnotes should be at the end of each page, numbered separately on each page. In addition, all the footnotes should be listed in a separate text file at the end of the text.

4. Fotos dürfen nicht innerhalb der Folge der Abbildungen nummeriert sein und müssen als Tafeln zusammengefaßt und separat nummeriert werden. Photos should not receive serial numbers within the figures list. They should be listed separately and grouped as plates.

5. Manuskripte sollten als Ausdruck und als Mac- oder DOS-Diskette eingereicht werden; das verwendete Programm soll WORD sein. Manuscripts should be delivered on a Mac- or DOS-disk; the program used should be WORD.
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The Yarmukian Culture. Jerusalem, Carta.
# Workshops on PPN Chipped Lithic Industries

**The Green List of Cooperation**

**Among PPN Flint Specialists and Colleagues Related to this Field of Research (by 25/5/95)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Country/City</th>
<th>Tel.</th>
<th>Fax / e-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frédéric Abbas</td>
<td>Institut de Préhistoire Orientale</td>
<td>Jales</td>
<td>F- 07480 Berrias</td>
<td>0033 75 39 31 61</td>
<td>0033 75 39 37 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrud Albrecht</td>
<td>Institut für Urgeschichte</td>
<td>Schloß</td>
<td>D- 72072 Tübingen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Anderson</td>
<td>Institut de Préhistoire Orientale</td>
<td>Jales</td>
<td>F- 07480 Berrias</td>
<td>0033 75 39 31 61</td>
<td>0033 75 39 37 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolai Bader</td>
<td>Institut Archeologii RAN</td>
<td>ul. Dm. Ulianov 19</td>
<td>Russia- Moscow 117</td>
<td>039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Baird</td>
<td>University of Liverpool, School of Archaeology, Classics and Oriental Studies (SACOS)</td>
<td>14, Abercromby Sq, POB 147</td>
<td>GB- Liverpool L69 38X</td>
<td>051-7942467</td>
<td>051-7942442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nur Balkan-Atli</td>
<td>Istanbul Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Prehistorya Anabilim Dali</td>
<td>TR- 34459 Istanbul</td>
<td></td>
<td>0090 212 5194592</td>
<td>0090 212 5194592 e.mail: prehist. @itu.edu.tr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofer Bar- Yosef</td>
<td>Harvard University, Dept. of Anthropology, Peabody Museum</td>
<td>11 Divinity Ave.</td>
<td>USA- Cambridge MA 02138</td>
<td>001 617 495 2252/ 1279</td>
<td>001 617 496-8041 e.mail: <a href="mailto:OBARYOS@HUCS.HARVARD.EDU">OBARYOS@HUCS.HARVARD.EDU</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romain Beck</td>
<td>8452 Salizar Court</td>
<td>USA- San Diego, CA 92111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuela Bello</td>
<td>Institut fur Ur- und Phugeschichte</td>
<td>Marstallhof 4</td>
<td>D- 69117 Heidelberg</td>
<td>0049 6221 542552</td>
<td>0049 6221 411721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0049 6221 542526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Beller-Cohen</td>
<td>Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University</td>
<td>Mt. Scopus</td>
<td>Israel- Jerusalem 91905</td>
<td>00972 2 682413</td>
<td>00972 2 825548 e.mail: <a href="mailto:BELLER@HUM.HUJI.AC.IL">BELLER@HUM.HUJI.AC.IL</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Betts</td>
<td>School of Archaeology, Classics anc Ancient History (A14), University of Sydney</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>Australia 2006</td>
<td>0061 2 692 2759/ 692 2090</td>
<td>0061 2 692 4899 e.mail: <a href="mailto:ALISON.BETTS@ANTIQUITY.5U.EDU.AU">ALISON.BETTS@ANTIQUITY.5U.EDU.AU</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda and Bob Braidwood</td>
<td>Oriental Institute</td>
<td>1155 East 58th St.</td>
<td>USA- Chicago IL, 60637</td>
<td>0454 E- Joon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Byrd</td>
<td>c/o Brian F. Mooney Associates</td>
<td>3905-B Businesspark Ave.</td>
<td>USA- San Diego, CA 92131-1120</td>
<td>001 619 578-8964</td>
<td>001 619 579-0573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella Caneva</td>
<td>Universita di Roma &quot;La Sapienza&quot;, Dipartimento di Scienze Storiche, Archeologiche e Antropologiche, Sezione di Paletologia</td>
<td>Via Palestro, 63</td>
<td>I- 00185 Roma</td>
<td>0039 6 4454503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario Claire et</td>
<td>Institute de Préhistoire Orientale</td>
<td>Jales</td>
<td>F- 07480 Berrias</td>
<td>0033 75 39 31 61</td>
<td>0033 75 39 37 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacques Cauvin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Conolly</td>
<td>Institute of Archaeology</td>
<td>31-34 Gordon Square</td>
<td>GB- London WC1H OPY</td>
<td>0171-387- 7580x3038</td>
<td>e.mail: <a href="mailto:J.Conolly@ucl.ac.uk">J.Conolly@ucl.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Copeland</td>
<td>Chateau de Marouste</td>
<td>Grand Brassac</td>
<td>F-24350 Yoos St. Apre</td>
<td>0033 53 034 279 or</td>
<td>033 53 074 717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Coqueugni</td>
<td>Maison de l'Orient</td>
<td>7, rue Raulin</td>
<td>F- 69007 Lyon</td>
<td>0033 78 72 02 53 p. 355</td>
<td>0033 78 88 12 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneviève Dollus</td>
<td>Paléontien</td>
<td>Paleontien</td>
<td>P- 57005 Paris</td>
<td>0033 1 44 27 86 86</td>
<td>0033 1 43 42 22 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Forstadt</td>
<td>Dept. of Anthropology, Arizona State University</td>
<td>POB 15409</td>
<td>USA- AZ 85287</td>
<td>00972 2 854212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosef Garfinkel</td>
<td>Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University</td>
<td>Mt. Scopus</td>
<td>Israel- Jerusalem 91905</td>
<td>00972 2 854212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Garrard</td>
<td>Institute of Archaeology, Univ. College London</td>
<td>31-34 Gordon Sq.</td>
<td>GB- London WC1H OPY</td>
<td>0044 71 3870705</td>
<td>0044 71 3872572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Georg Gebel</td>
<td>Free University of Berlin, Seminar für Vorderasiatische Allertumskunde</td>
<td>Bitterstr. 8-12</td>
<td>D- 14195 Berlin</td>
<td>0049 30 638 6747</td>
<td>0049 38 31 4252 e.mail: contact HGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avi Gopher</td>
<td>Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University</td>
<td>Ramat Aviv 66978, POB 39040</td>
<td>Israel- Tel Aviv</td>
<td>00972 3 64049277</td>
<td>00972 3 6407237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Gatov</td>
<td>Institute of Archaeology, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>ul. Suborna 2</td>
<td>Bulgaria- Sofia</td>
<td>003592 705986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Goring-Morris</td>
<td>Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University</td>
<td>Mt. Scopus</td>
<td>Israel- Jerusalem 91905</td>
<td>00972 2 854224</td>
<td>00972 2 825548 e.mail: <a href="mailto:GORING@HUM.HUJI.AC.IL">GORING@HUM.HUJI.AC.IL</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabeth Hildebrand</td>
<td>Dept. of Anthropology, Washington University</td>
<td>Campus Box 1114, One Brookings Drive</td>
<td>USA- St. Louis, MO 63130</td>
<td>001 314 454-9618</td>
<td>e.mail: ehieldebr@arts. wust.edu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank H. Lens</td>
<td>Dept. of Anthropology, Yale University</td>
<td>POB 8277</td>
<td>USA- New Haven, CT 06200-8277</td>
<td>001 203 432-6688</td>
<td>001 203 432-6688 e.mail: FTHOLE@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie-Louise Inzian</td>
<td>CNRS, ERA 28</td>
<td>1 rue Ariste Brand</td>
<td>F- 92195 Meudon</td>
<td>0033 1 45 07 50 50</td>
<td>0033 1 45 07 54 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeljana Kafaf</td>
<td>Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Yarmouk University</td>
<td>Jordan- Irbid</td>
<td>00962 2 274272</td>
<td>00962 2 274272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michal Koubisiewicz</td>
<td>Archeologii Wiatrpolaki</td>
<td>ul. Zierzynecko 20</td>
<td>PL- 60-814 Poznan</td>
<td>0061-649 Poznan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zaycicza 21 m.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>