

NOTES TO CONTRIBUTORS

ARC acts as a forum for debate and the interchange of ideas arising from the study of archaeology. We welcome relevant contributions from workers in any field. Such contributions might include critical essays, interviews, commentaries and discussion. Contributions discussing specific research notes must also develop wider theoretical implications and issues of debate. Articles should not normally exceed 3000 to 4000 words in length. The major focus for 9.1 will be Technology in the Humanities. The focus for 9.2 will be Aesthetics in Archaeology. Non-thematic contributions of general interest are also welcome. Shorter presentations on topical subjects are invited for Commentary and General Perspectives, as well as comments on the previous issues. Unsolicited manuscripts will not generally be returned unless accompanied by a stamped self-addressed envelope, or International Postal Coupon. The editors will attempt to ensure, but cannot always guarantee, that copy-edited versions of accepted manuscripts will be returned to authors before publication. Manuscripts should be clearly typed, double spaced, and follow the format of this issue. Illustrations should be A4 (210 x 297 mm) (or reduction to B5 (148 x 210 mm)). A style sheet is available on request.

ARC has a policy of non-sexist usage of language, and contributors are requested to conform to this policy. The editors are most willing to assist with any enquiries which arise on this point.

To save production time and costs, ARC will only accept articles and reviews if the contributor can send us the relevant file on a floppy-disc (once their paper has been accepted for publication). Exceptions may be made for articles longer than 10 sides of typed A4, if a clean, crisp, machine readable script can be sent.

Do not send any discs until your contribution has been accepted by the editorial committee.

The text of the journal is prepared on IBM compatible micro-computers, using a Wordstar package. However, we can deal with virtually any type of disc and computer code.

It will also be helpful if you follow the following simple rules in preparing your ms. on a computer:

1. Align all text with the left margin, leaving the right edge ragged!
2. Do not centre headings or use indents or tabs anywhere.
3. Do not use any automatic footnote features your word-processor may use.
4. Turn off any headers, footers and automatic footnote facilities.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW FROM CAMBRIDGE

Volume 8

Number 2

Winter 1989

ISSUE THEME: WRITING ARCHAEOLOGY

Anthony Sinclair	
Introduction: Writing <i>Arc</i> -haeology	159
Mary-Anne Owoc	
Reading, Writing and the Resurrection of the Subject	165
Ian Bapty	
The Meanings of Things.....	175
Christopher Evans	
Digging With The Pen.....	185
Anthony Sinclair	
This is an article about archaeology as writing.....	212

GENERAL PERSPECTIVES

Frederick Baker	
Making Producers Out of Consumers.....	234
Philip J. Wise	
"Go and Build an Iron Age House", They Said.....	239

COMMENTARY

John Carman	
Archaeologists as Politicians	246
Simon Coleman	
In Search of the Sacred...?	251
Frederick Baker	
News From the Actives Museum, Berlin	255

BOOK REVIEWS

Lewis R. Binford <i>Debating Archaeology</i>	
Reviewed by John Carman	257
A. Agnew and James S. Duncan (eds.) <i>The Power of Place</i>	
Reviewed by Simon Kaner	261
Clive Bonsall (ed.) <i>The Mesolithic in Europe</i>	
Reviewed by Anthony Sinclair	263
William N. Morgan <i>Prehistoric Architecture in Micronesia</i>	
Reviewed by Peter Gathercole	267
Rodney Castleden <i>The Knossos Labyrinth: a new view of the 'Palace of Minos' at Knossos</i>	
Reviewed by John Carman	269

ARCHAEOLOGICAL REVIEW FROM CAMBRIDGE

Theme Editor	Anthony Sinclair
General Perspectives Editor	Ian Bapty
Reviews Editor	Bill Sillar
Chair	John Carman
Production Team	Zoe Henderson (Secretary), Suzannah England and Jeremy Meredith (Circulation), Sarah Tarlow (Treasurer), Margriet Haagsma, Nathan Schlanger, Dee De Roche, Ruth Charles, Claire Whielden

Special thanks are due also to Sarah Taylor and Simon Kaner for their helpful advice on past practice, as well as all those others who contributed to -- and put up with -- interminable and sometimes noisy debates in the Coffee Room. We are also grateful to Anthony Sinclair for the cover design, to Colin Shell for technical advice and Jessica Hale for selling us all the production hardware. We thank our readers for their patience in awaiting this belated issue.

The opinions expressed in contributions do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the editors, singly or collectively.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION:

ARC is published biannually: in spring and autumn. Subscription rates for volume 9 are as follows:

	Individuals	Institutions
UK subscribers:	8.00	10.00
Overseas subscribers:	10.00	12.00

Single issues of some previously published volumes are available at 4.00 (UK) and 5.00 (Overseas). These prices are inclusive of postage. Payment is preferred by cheque or money order in Pounds Sterling, payable to either: Archaeological Review from Cambridge or Oxbow Books, Park End Place, Oxford OX1 1HN. Please note that ARC is no longer able to accept payment in dollars.

ADDRESS ALL EDITORIAL COMMUNICATIONS TO: The Editors,
Archaeological Review from Cambridge, c/o The Department of Archaeology, Downing Street, Cambridge
CB2 3DZ, England.

Archaeological Review From Cambridge 8:2 (1989)

WRITING ARC-HAEOLOGY

Anthony Sinclair

One of the more pleasant aspects of working for *ARC* is the feeling that the journal is attempting to bring out for discussion issues that are topical and developing. *ARC* likes to think of itself as being on the 'cutting-edge' of archaeology, or at least with sharpening stone in hand, 'thinking aloud' and being actively involved in the creation of a more critically aware discipline. This is a view that naturally lends some degree of support to those striving to produce the published journal with deadlines pressing. In this sense, *ARC* is a material expression of a 'structure of feeling'; a structure that is hopefully on the rise and not on the wane.

In the past the journal has tackled themes such as politics, time, education, space, the heritage industry and gender. All of these issues have arisen out of immediate and contemporary concerns amongst members or associates of the Department of Archaeology in Cambridge. Often they have been preceded by a series of seminars (as is the case with *Archaeology and Time 6:1*) or sessions arranged (sometimes concurrently) at the annual conference of the Theoretical Archaeology Group (*Archaeology and the Heritage Industry 7:2*) and that on *The History of Archaeology 3:1*) or simply reflected matters that were immediately topical. *ARC* has, in this way, always been 'of-the-moment'.

Writing is now a major area of interest in anthropology, with the production of 'experimental' fieldwork accounts as well as a number of articles and books consciously concerned with the way in which anthropology is written. Recent works suggest a similar vein of conscious consideration to be developing in archaeology, although (as yet?) there have been no whole texts specifically devoted to the subject in itself. Perhaps, therefore, this edition of *ARC* might be seen as just a reflection of a current structure of feeling.

There is some truth in this. Writing, or to be particular, 'writing-up' (a thesis of some form), is a common topic of discussion, formally and informally¹. At another level, it is also of profound current interest. Those who have made the decision to do, or even complete, a piece of research have in many cases decided to seek employment in archaeology, and in certain cases as it exists within the framework of the university system. In the current economic and political circumstances, writing, by which I mean both the ability and also the product (to have written and to have been published), is essential. I, for instance, might be quite knowledgeable about some aspect of stone tools, but unless I can prove it, in terms of written works, then my career potential is frankly limited. As a post-structuralist (?), I might even be theoretically convinced of the 'death of the author', but as a hopeful archaeologist-to-be, no authorship is 'suicide'. We should perhaps, imagine Flannery's "Skeptical Graduate Student" (1976) spending less of his time at the keyboard of a calculator and more behind that of a word-fo

Archaeological Review From Cambridge 8:2 (1989)