



General Borgono 1135
Miraflores, Lima, Peru
August 20, 1972

Dear Don:

I hope you and Evelyn are having a good summer amidst the usual Snake River plain heat---Lima is certainly a contrast to those scalding days down in the cottonwood grove. In fact, the living conditions are about as different between Dierkes Lake and Miraflores as I can imagine (campsite without facilities to huge house complete with servants), but I couldn't say either was more enjoyable than the other.

I've been down here ten weeks now, and am getting a good introduction at least to Peruvian lithics. The first month or so I spent getting oriented to the sites and work already done on the Ayacucho project, while Carl worked on more debitage to bring up his sample size over last year. We then spent nearly three weeks putting together an attribute analysis form for some functional analysis Scotty wants done, and have been applying it since. Neither of us is too sure what we'll get out of the work, but we have a fairly detailed morphological description of edges that may give us some good clusters of kinds of tool edges associated with particular kinds of faunal remains and vegetable resources. We're trying, anyway, even if neither of us is terribly enthusiastic about functional analysis to begin with. We'll have to get the material only IBM cards and run through the machine this winter before we know much about what we have, but the preliminary indications (from some simple eyeballing) are provocative.

I received your letter about the Plainview-MacHaffie paper just as I was catching the plane in June, and consequently haven't had much time to worry about my own research. I'm sorry your response was so negative, but I sincerely appreciate the time and effort you put into your reply and have thought about it a good deal. I was a bit surprised you didn't remember receiving my first paper on Plainview, which I sent you in late January or early February; perhaps it got stuck in the back of your files. You did read that paper, though, because you sent me a letter making some general comments about it and apparently liked the manner in which I was handling the material. It should be published soon, and I'll of course send you a reprint when I have some.

The comments you sent in June which interested me the most had to do with style---what it is, how I used the term. I know you have mentioned that before, but I didn't get the message before (a bit slow at times) and I also wasn't communicating what I was talking about at times. Reading over the paper, and thinking about it considerably more, I agree with you---it needs some work. Would you agree that papallel-collateral flaking is a technique of lithic manufacture, but is culturally-preferred by a population of flint-knappers over time and space (in contrast, say, to parallel-oblique flaking or fluting) and hence is a selected style as well? I don't have any library here, of course, but when I get home want to go through my anthropological library, particularly Kroeber's stuff, and read up on the concept of cultural styles. Whatever, I shall be much more careful with the concept and term in the future, and do appreciate your insistence on talking about until I finally saw the problem more clearly.

I suspect that many of your objections to the paper were due to it's lack of detail, but this I deliberately left out. There are different philosophies as to what is appropriate for a public lecture; for a professional meeting, with a twenty-minute time limit, things have to be fairly cryptic. The paper was delivered to a specific lithics session, so that it could be fairly directed on the assumption that most of the people knew enough about rocks to follow. I prefer to emphasize the problem and conclusions in a short professional lecture, with enough data presented to give general support to the argument but not so much as to take all the time up---I assume that people who are really interested in the presentation will ask for more supportive data elsewhere, in a journal article for instance. I also used a lot of slides (45 total, I think), about half of which were illustrations of artifacts illustrating the particular point I was making in that half-minute allotted to the slide. The paper was written up more as a record of that presentation than anything else, a preliminary statement of my work on the problem, and wasn't intended to be immediately transferrable to a journal because of the lack of detail. That's all a pretty defensive reply to your comments, but I didn't intend it to be comparable to a journal article and would like to be sure you understand that.

Yes, my terminology is a bit sloppy at times, and I need the reminder to go over it again and again to check it out. That's what I would do more conscientiously for the thesis, of course. Many of the terms are ones Guy and I have been using everyday around the lab, and I must keep reminding myself that they are foreign to many others in archeology or even lithics.

I do appreciate your comments, and think I have benefitted from them. I'm sorry you seem to think that "snap and pat judgments" are involved after as much time and effort has been spent with the collections over the past $1\frac{1}{2}$ years, and would like to see more experimenting myself. Both Plainview and MacHaffie are important collections, particularly the latter with all its debitage, and they merit considerable attention.

Back to the attic lab to measure and describe more edges--- I really am enjoying the chance to work with a collection as far removed from the Plains. The almost complete production of unifacial implements is new to me, and has given me lots of questions about some of the traditional tool categories on the Plains. The pressure-flaked projectile points are a contrast with the percussion-flaked uniface here, and there is so little manufacturing debris from the points. But lots of rejuvenation spalls off the edges of heavy-edged (80° angle before use, probably) uniface, for Scotty to think about. I'm really glad I came down.

Carl's back in the States for a couple of weeks, but said to say hello if I got the time to write to you. We've had a good exchange of knowledge this summer, and hopefully will get something worthwhile out of this functional stuff. Again, I hope you and Evelyn have had a good summer, and that the field school went well.

Chou,

Zutmann