The Institute’s primary research groups

The coordinators of each of the Institute’s five primary research groups report on their group’s activities during the 2002/2003 academic year.

The Environment and Culture Research Group
Co-ordinator: Andrew Garrard

The Environment and Culture Research Group brings together the many staff and research students who are concerned with past interactions between people and the environments they occupied. Many of its members also participate in the activities of the Centre for the Evolutionary Analysis of Cultural Behaviour, which is a joint initiative between UCL and the University of Southampton, directed by Stephen Shennan and funded by the UK Arts and Humanities Research Board. During this academic year, the group has been joined by three new post-doctoral fellows: Daniel Antoine, Eleni Asouti and Marcello Mannino.

Research projects
Research in human osteoarchaeology has continued with Simon Hillson’s and Charles Fitzgerald’s investigation of dental reduction in the evolution of Neandertals and anatomically modern humans, and Simon has also been preparing for publication his analyses of Upper Palaeolithic populations from the sites of Dolni Vestonice and Pavlov in the Czech Republic. He continues his projects in southern Peru and on the Aegean island of Astypalaia (see AI 2001/2002) and, with Daniel Antoine, has started a project to determine the impact of the Great Famine of AD 1315–1320 on the growth of people who experienced it in childhood in London.

Several projects are concerned with the origins and spread of agriculture. Stephen Shennan, James Conolly and Sue Colledge are investigating the spread of the earliest plant domesticates from Southwest Asia into and across Europe, by compiling a comprehensive database of the archaeobotanical evidence from all relevant sites in this vast region (see AI 2001/2002 for an initial account of this project). In a separate project, Stephen Shennan, Mark Lake and Alex Bentley are developing an agent-based computer simulation of the spread of agriculture in Neolithic Europe and the extent to which it resulted from the spread of farmers or the adoption of agriculture by foragers. Dorian Fuller and Eleni Asouti have begun an investigation of wood charcoal from Neolithic sites across southern India, to examine the environmental settings of early agricultural economies and their impact on the regional landscape. Arlene Rosen has continued her analyses of phytoliths from early sites in western Asia and China to investigate plant exploitation in pre-agrarian societies, the types of micro-environments in which early farming occurred, and subsequent changes in agricultural practice; and Ken Thomas and Marcello Mannino have begun an ecological study of prehistoric shellfish exploitation in the coastal zone of northwest Sicily.

Several members are involved in geoarchaeological research and in the reconstruction of environmental and cultural landscapes. In Britain, Mark Roberts is mapping the Middle Pleistocene coastal plain of Sussex and Hampshire, in particular the geological units relevant to the Middle Palaeolithic site at Boxgrove (on which he reported in AI 1997/98); Jane Sidell is studying the tidal sections of the Thames valley, in relation to sea-level changes, the ecology of the floodplain, and prehistoric land use along the river margins (see her article in AI 2001/2002); and Tim Schadla-Hall has completed two field seasons at Lihou, the first late Mesolithic site to be found in Guernsey. Beyond Britain, James McClade has continued his study of the evolution of the cultural landscape and the emergence of urban settlements in northeast Spain (see his article in AI 1998/99); Fekri Hassan has four current field projects in Egypt (see p. 9 of this issue of AI), including his geoarchaeological studies at Farafra oasis, where he is examining short-term climatic changes between 7600 and 5900 years ago, and their implications for cultural changes in the Sahara and the Nile valley; also in Egypt, David Jeffreys has continued his work at ancient Memphis (see his article in AI 1999/2000); Dorian Fuller is involved in four field projects in India and has also participated in salvage survey and excavation in northern Sudan (see p. 9). In northern Lebanon, I have undertaken reconnaissance for a Palaeolithic landscape project; and Arlene Rosen continues her geoarchaeological research in the Yiluo valley of central China (see her article in AI 2001/2002).

Seminars
During the autumn term, the Centre for the Evolutionary Analysis of Cultural Behaviour held a very well attended series of seminars on the theme “Evolution of culture”. Topics discussed ranged from early hominid culture (Robert Foley, Cambridge) and culture among chimpanzees (Andrew Whiten, St Andrews), to evolution and history in present-day Fiji (Christina Toren, Brunel) and major transitions in technology, including self-reproducing robots (Robert Auinger, Cambridge). The centre also runs the Culture Club, which holds informal seminars throughout the academic year. Their format varies from discussions of recently published academic papers to presentations of research in progress by members of the Centre, and occasional contributions by visiting speakers. As well as contributing to the knowledge and ideas of its members, the aim of the club is to develop the sense of identity that is essential to the continuing success of a research group.

During the spring term the research group ran two series of seminars. The first was concerned with environmental trauma and human responses in antiquity. It included two presentations relating to the eastern Mediterranean region: one on responses to ecological and social disasters in Egypt at 2100 BC (Fekri Hassan, UCL), and the other on vegetational changes relating to major seismic events in northern Turkey (Suzanne Leroy, Brunel) and Byzantine settlement (Suzanne Leroy, Brunel). Two seminars were concerned with the impact of natural and humanly induced environmental changes on island communities: one on the human colonization of the Pacific Islands (Paul Rainbird, Lampeter), and the other on settlement patterns in Iceland (Gudrun Sveinbjarnardottir, UCL). The final seminar was on the management of agricultural risk in relation to environmental changes in the Peruvian Andes (Ann Kendall, UCL, Nick Branch and Barbara Silvaboth, both of Royal Holloway). The second seminar series in the spring term consisted of informal talks given by members of the research group, including the three new postdoctoral fellows: Daniel Antoine spoke about teeth as a source of data on human growth and disease, Eleni Asouti described her recent fieldwork in southern India, and Marcello Mannino reported on the initial phase of his and Ken Thomas’s project in Sicily. Also, Jane Sidell summarized her work on sea-level change in the Thames estuary, and Arlene Rosen spoke about aridization, landscape change and the rise of social complexity in the late Neolithic of central China.

This year, too, members of the group, and many other colleagues from the Institute and farther afield, came together on 13 March 2003 to hear Simon Hillson deliver his inaugural lecture as Professor of Bioarchaeology. His title was “Teeth and recent human evolution”, and in the allotted hour he gave a masterly account of what the study of teeth is beginning to reveal about the evolution of Homo sapiens during the past 100,000 years, including some of the results of his own research on human teeth from Upper Palaeolithic sites in western Asia and Europe and from medieval and later burials in London.
The Material Culture and Data Science Research Group

Coordinator: Thilo Rehren

The Material Culture and Data Science Research Group is a new addition to the primary research groups of the Institute. Established in May 2002, it takes the place of the former Material Culture and Technology secondary research group, and by making this change the Institute has recognized its longstanding contribution, and increased commitment, to this field of study. The new group brings together individuals with research interests in the analysis of archaeological materials, particularly by instrumental and quantitative methods, within broader archaeological frameworks. One of its primary aims is to promote the critical application of these methods to archaeological questions by generating data that are independent of, and complementary to, traditional archaeological methods of enquiry. A major aim of the group is to study analogies and analogies by analyzing the form and composition of artifacts, raw materials and waste products, and by means of experimental studies. We aim to optimize the productivity of the Institute's substantial human and technical resources in this field of research, and to promote the understanding of science-based archaeological information as an essential component in the study of material culture. One way to achieve this is for the group as a whole to facilitate the early integration of quantitative methods and data in projects being developed by the Institute’s other research groups, and for its individual members to contribute to group research, in addition to their own projects.

Most of the research currently undertaken by members of the group is done collaboratively, both with colleagues in the Institute and also with a wide range of external partners. Many of the group's activities are concerned with the development of innovative methods, the promotion of best analytical practice, and the establishment of working standards. In addition, members of the group frequently offer advice on procedural and other aspects of science-based archaeological enquiry, particularly in relation to the use of advanced computing facilities and of the equipment in the Institute’s Wolfson Archaeological Science Laboratories.

Research on instrumental and statistical methods

A key issue in the use of scientific instrumental and numerical analysis in archaeology is the development and promotion of coherent procedures, aimed at generating reproducible, reliable and compatible data, and interpreting existing datasets in the most effective and relevant way. Exam-

In November 2002 the group initiated a one-day conference to discuss the Jordan valley in the Bronze and Iron Ages. It was held jointly with the British Museum and included lectures by several European colleagues and by local scholars. The one-day conference on the theme “Past societies and materials: archaeological information and written sources”, which took place in May 2002 and was briefly reported on page 6 of AI 2001/2002, is currently being prepared for publication by members of the research group.

On 6 March 2003 members of the group joined many other staff and students of the Institute, as well as numerous friends and colleagues from elsewhere, to hear Clive Orton give his inaugural lecture as Professor of Quantitative Archaeology. It was entitled “The fourth umpire: risk in archaeology”, and in it he explained why he gave up a promising career as a mathematician in the civil service to follow his avocation in archaeology, first at the Museum of London and later at the Institute. Unravelling, with clarity and wit, the meanings hidden in the lecture’s tantalizing title, he persuaded even the non-mathematically minded in the audience of the merits of Bayesian statistics, and he concluded by offering some challenging thoughts on the future of archaeology.

Within the Institute, the group has organized several informal seminars on practical issues related to laboratory work and the processing of numerical data. They are intended to provide a practical guide to the use of the existing analytical facilities and offer hands-on experience. In addition, two members of the group have contributed to this year’s Institute Research Seminar: Alex Bentley presented his research on the use of strontium-isotope analysis of skeletal remains to investigate forager–farmer interaction in Neolithic Europe, and I discussed the significance of specialized types of slag in medieval urban contexts in Central Asia. The Wolfson Archaeological Science Laboratories contain a wide range of analytical instruments, including two standard SEMs (scanning electron microscopes) with EDX (energy dispersive spectrometry) systems, a Phillips ESEM (environmental SEM) with EDX and WDX (wavelength DX) system, a FEI microscope, a Spectro Xlab 2000 (P) ED-XRF (energy-dispersive X-ray fluorescence spectrometer), dedicated wet chemistry and sedimentology facilities, full sample preparation and several furnaces for metal and glass melting (see pp. 4–5 in AI 1997/98 for a brief account of the creation of the Wolfson Laboratories in the early 1990s).

Note

1. The Wolfson Archaeological Science Laboratories contain a wide range of analytical instruments, including two standard SEMs (scanning electron microscopes) with EDX (energy-dispersive spectrometry) systems, a Phillips ESEM (environmental SEM) with EDX and WDX (wavelength DX) system, a FEI microscope, a Spectro Xlab 2000 (P) ED-XRF (energy-dispersive X-ray fluorescence spectrometer), dedicated wet chemistry and sedimentology facilities, full sample preparation and several furnaces for metal and glass melting (see pp. 4–5 in AI 1997/98 for a brief account of the creation of the Wolfson Laboratories in the early 1990s).
The Social and Cultural Dynamics Research Group

Coordinator: Ruth Whitehouse

The Social and Cultural Dynamics Research Group brings together staff and postgraduate students of the Institute whose primary interest is in anthropological and sociological approaches to the study of material culture, cutting across the regional and chronological boundaries that have traditionally divided archaeology. Its members share the common aim of studying the dynamics of material-culture systems in a comparative perspective.

Research projects

Several existing field projects undertaken by members of the group continued, one of the main themes of which is island archaeology: Cyprian Broodbank’s Kythera Island project, now in a post-survey stage, Peter Drewett’s research in the Caribbean (part of which, on the island of Tortola, he describes in this issue of AJ), José Oliver’s project in Lanzarote, his student Liz Graham’s in Cuba, and Lis Bacu’s on Bali. The global scale of Institute research on this theme – extending from the Caribbean to Indonesia and taking in the Mediterranean en route – and the staff and research students involved (see e.g. Reuben Grima’s research on the Maltese islands described in this issue of AJ) provide the opportunity for comparative research directed at broad theoretical and methodological issues. Indeed, the research group hopes to organize a workshop on island archaeology in 2003/2004.

Other continuing field projects (almost all of which have been described in AJ) include Liz Graham’s project at Lamanai, Belize (see AJ 2000/2001), Kevin Macdonald’s Cane River African diaspora project in Louisiana (described in this issue), Andrew Reid’s project in Buganda (see AJ 2000/2001), Bill Sillar’s research at Raqchî in Syria (see AJ 1999/2000), and Todd Whitelaw’s project at Knossos in Crete (see this issue for an account of one of his other island projects in the Aegean). Sue Hamilton’s joint project with Barbara Bender and Chris Tilley at Leskernick on Bodmin Moor (described in AJ 1999/2000) is close to final publication.

Two new field projects are under way. Peter Jordan, whose work forms part of the research programme of the Centre for the Evolutionary Analysis of Cultural Behaviour (see p. 4 in this issue of AJ), has been awarded a Leverhulme Special Research Fellowship to investigate processes of cultural and linguistic transmission in western Siberia (see his article in this issue on fieldwork that he has already carried out in this region). The other new field project – the Tavoliere–Gargano prehistory project in southeastern Italy – was initiated in a short exploratory season in the summer of 2002. It is jointly directed by Sue Hamilton and myself and its aim is to explore the interrelationships in prehistory of two adjacent areas of contrasting physical character in northern Puglia (the flat Tavoliere plain and the rocky mountain promontory of the Gargano on its northern flank). We anticipate a five-year project involving GIS-based landscape analysis and phenomenological field survey, as well as re-examination of previous excavation and survey data and the collection of new samples for dating and environmental analyses.

In addition to the existing and new field projects, another investigation has been started. Entitled “Developmental literacy and the establishment of regional and state identity in early Italy: research beyond Etruria, Greece and Rome”, it is funded by the UK Arts and Humanities Research Board and is directed by myself, together with John Wilkins (University of London Archaeological Research Institute) and Kathryn Lomas, who has been appointed at the Institute of Archaeology as a research fellow for the project. Our aim is to study the role of incipient literacy in the formation of urban societies, and in the emergence of cultural identities, in three areas of ancient Italy where local communities developed in contact with the Etruscans, the western Greeks and the Romans. In all three areas, writing was adopted from elsewhere in Italy and seems to have been used in ways that differed from usage in other regions. The methodology we are following involves a combination of contextual archaeological study (writing appears in a wide variety of objects and contexts in these areas) and linguistic analysis, which usually constitute quite separate fields of research. We hope that the comparative framework of the project will allow us to identify shared cultural processes of wide applicability and also specific factors that operated locally.

Publications

The three volumes mentioned in my report last year as then being in preparation – Women in archaeology, women in antiquity (edited by Sue Hamilton, Ruth Whitehouse and Karen Wright); Agency uncovered: archaeological perspectives on social agency, power and being human (edited by Andrew Gardner), and The archaeology of water: social and ritual dimensions (edited by Fay Stevens) have all made good progress and we expect them to go to press before the end of 2003.

Note

1. “Phenomenonological” refers here to the type of survey that includes, in addition to visual observation, other aspects of sensory experience of the landscape; see C. Tilley, A phenomenology of landscape: places, paths and monuments (Oxford: Berg, 1994).
The Complex and Literate Societies Research Group
Coordinator: John Tait

Since last year’s report of the Complex Societies Research Group was published in *AI 2001/2002*, the group agreed, after considerable discussion, to add “and Literate” to its former title. However, the range of research of its members remains essentially unchanged, and literate and pre-literate societies continue to be studied. Although the research of many members involves work on texts, all are engaged with archaeological data and some have particular interests in coinage, ceramics or art. The geographical range of work is vast, extending from Central and Southwestern Asia to Egypt, the Balkans, Greece, France and southern England. Research also covers an immense chronological span, from the Neolithic period to Roman and medieval times, including work on the present-day management of sites and collections. Some members of the group are concerned with the research of a single site over a long timespan, whereas others focus on trade and other interconnections between areas usually studied in isolation. Following the formation of the Institute’s Material Culture and Data Science primary research group (see p. 5 in this issue), several members of the former Complex Societies group have transferred to it, but our group has also seen an influx of new members of staff and research students.

Research projects
Several members of the group have continued their existing field projects. In England, David Rudling completed a third season of research excavations at the site of Barcombe Roman villa in Sussex, and Neil Faulkner has conducted the seventh consecutive summer season at the village of Sedgeford in northwest Norfolk where a middle–late Saxon cemetery and settlement in a well defined medieval landscape is being investigated (see his article in *AI 2001/2002*). Field projects continuing overseas include Kris Lockyear’s at Roman Noviodunum on the lower Danube (see his article in this issue); Harriet Crawford’s and Rob Carter’s in Kuwait at the Neolithic site known as H3, where evidence of very early seafaring has been discovered (see Rob’s article in this issue); and Tim Williams’ at ancient Merv in Turkmestan (see his article in this issue). Tim has become Co-director of the Merv project (with Kakamurad Kur-bansakhatov in Ashkhabat), and Gabriele Puschmigg has been appointed Assistant Director. In addition to limited excavation, the project has two chief objectives: first, to develop appropriate conservation procedures for a site with colossal buildings, newly threatened by dramatic rises in the water table caused by modern irrigation schemes nearby; and, secondly, to develop the collaboration to ensure that the Turkmen have the skills and resources to carry forward in the longer term the maintenance and interpretation of the site. Roger Matthews has completed the fieldwork in northern Turkey for his Project Paphlagonia (see his article in *AI 1999/2000*), has carried out related museum study, and is now preparing the results of the project for publication. He has also published two books this year: the first presents fully for the first time the results of early twentieth-century excavations at the important Late Chalcolithic site of Jemdet Nasr in southern Iraq, and the second is an account of methodological approaches to the archaeology of Mesopotamia.¹

Several other research projects deserve mention. Martin Welch, with two Institute research students, Sue Harrington and Stuart Brookes, has compiled an electronic database for Early Anglo-Saxon Kent. It is a collaboratively-built record of over 3500 burials, 10,000 artefacts and 650 findspots, and is a first step towards establishing a national database – the Early Anglo-Saxon Census project – which will provide a comprehensive electronic register of the archaeological remains and material culture of the Early Anglo-Saxon populations of England (c. AD 400–750). Alan Johnston has continued his studies of Greek pottery (see, for example, his article in *AI 2001/2002*), and has started work on a corpus of minor Greek inscriptions. Rachael Sparks is investigating interaction between Egyptians and Canaanites in Palestine during the Middle and Late Bronze Age, using items of material culture from the Institute’s Petrie Palestinian Collection and the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology (see her article in this issue). The year saw the publication by Stephen Quirke (with Mark Collier, University of Liverpool) of a volume of letters from the Petrie Museum’s collection of Middle Kingdom papyri from Kahun,² and it is also the final year of the successful project Digital Egypt for Universities (described by Stephen and his colleagues in *AI 2001/2002*).

Conferences and seminars
In December 2002, Stephen Quirke, together with Amelie Kuhrt of the UCL History Department, organized a one-day workshop on Achemenid Egypt, and in January 2003 the fourth conference on current research in Egyptology, organized by several of our research students, was held in the Institute. It attracted nearly 100 participants, and some 25 papers were given over two days. It showed that many present-day students are developing theoretical approaches to Egyptian data.

In the autumn term, Rachael Sparks (together with Karen Wright) launched a series of meetings to give research students opportunities to discuss their work with each other. The group also continued to support, and its members participate in, the Joint Seminars in Early Medieval Studies (organized with the British Museum’s Department of Medieval and Modern Europe), the Mycenaean and Classical Archaeology Seminar (organized jointly with the University of London Institute of Classical Studies), and seminars and lectures given under the auspices of both the London Centre for the Ancient Near East and the Egypt Exploration Society.

Notes
The Heritage Studies Research Group
Coordinator: Nick Merriman

The Heritage Studies Research Group brings together those members of the Institute who are involved in research on the interpretation, presentation and conservation of the cultural heritage. At the beginning of the academic year an open meeting was held to discuss the group’s future role. One of our first tasks was to inform ourselves more fully about the activities of the group as a whole, which comprises 22 staff, 11 honorary members of the Institute, and 25 postgraduate research students. A document detailing the research interests of each member was compiled, circulated and placed on the group’s notice board. It reveals the great strength and diversity of current research at the Institute on the cultural heritage, not all of which can be described in this short report.

Research projects
Projects currently undertaken by members of the group fall into a series of themes. One of these is public interpretation and understanding of the cultural heritage. Beverley Butler’s ethnographic research in Alexandria, Egypt, focusing on the Bibliotheca Alexandrina (a joint project between UNESCO and the Egyptian government) and the Egyptian government to revive the ancient Mouseion/Library and underwater archaeological excavations on the waterfront, is groundbreaking in its approach to the themes of heritage revitalism, urban regeneration, and the role of myth and memory in linking Alexandria’s ancient and modern pasts (see AI 1998/99 for an article by Beverley on some aspects of this research).

Paulette McManus’s research is concerned with museum visitors. She is currently working on a model to describe how the behaviour and functions of exhibition teams affect museum communication, and she is also developing methods of evaluation for the museum and heritage sector. Related work is being undertaken by a research student, Olga Fakatseli, who is exploring the conceptions and misconceptions of social history and folk art held by Greek academics and members of the public in Greece, in order to develop a new model of museum presentation.

The popular representation of the past is another theme in heritage research at the Institute, on which the projects of several research students focus. Examples of such research include Fiona Handley’s investigation of how trans-Atlantic slavery is represented at historic sites in the USA (see her article, with Kevin MacDonald and David Morgan, in this issue of AI), Isabel Medina’s examination of nineteenth-century three-dimensional archaeological representations of Mesoamerica, and Michael Seymour’s study of the representation of ancient Mesopotamia, particularly Babylon, in modern Europe.

Conservation has been a major strength of the Institute since its foundation, and a wide range of research is currently being undertaken by staff and students. John Merkel is investigating corrosion inhibitors and protective coatings for metallic artefacts, soil conditions and corrosion of metals at Kaman–Kalehüyük (Turkey), Chalcolithic copper smelting in Israel, Byzantine metal artefacts, and Sican-period gold alloys and copper alloys from Peru. Clifford Price’s work on historic buildings and monuments continues to attract research students to this field of study. For example, Fadi Bala’awi is examining salt damage to stone monuments at Petra, Jordan, and Louise Cooke is studying the conservation and management of earthen architecture in archaeological contexts. Research in conservation at the Institute also extends beyond traditional archaeology to topics such as Anna Karatzani’s work on the characterization of metal threads from Orthodox ecclesiastical textiles of the late and post-Byzantine periods, Jocelyn Kimmel’s characterization and conservation of Cairean coloured glass windows set in a gypsum frame (qamarriyas), and Pip Laurenon’s on the conservation and management of time-based works of art such as videos. The Institute’s commitment to public archaeology is also stimulating research in what can be called public conservation. Thus, Glenn Wharton’s work on heritage conservation as social intervention focuses on public involvement in the conservation of a statue of Kamehameha, the last Hawaiian king; and Konstantina Liwieratos is examining the involvement of the public in conservation projects on the Mani peninsula in southern Greece.

Public archaeology is also well represented, for example in the research by Sarah McCarthy, who is assessing local knowledge and perceptions of archaeology in Ireland and Scotland, and their implications for archaeological resource management, and in Ioannis Poulios’s study of how archaeological and economic approaches might be reconciled to benefit the management of Byzantine archaeological sites in Greece.

To encourage discussion among the group’s research students, I invited them all to an informal meeting to hear about one another’s work and to debate what makes good research in heritage studies. They are now being encouraged to form their own reading and discussion groups and hold their own study days.

Seminars and lectures
The main theme for this academic year has been the future of heritage collections, which was taken forward by Suzanne Keene, first through a seminar of five short papers and then through a five-week series of lectures and discussions focusing in particular on the large traditional research collections that do not fit comfortably into current government initiatives concerned with public access and social inclusion. Topics included discussions of the ways in which greater use could be made, by scholars and the public, of archaeological archives, natural history and history of science collections, and of whether museums contain too much material.

Members of the group also contributed to the Institute Research Seminar this year: Suzanne Keene and Pip Laurenon spoke about the preservation of digital cultural materials, including works of art, and Sally MacDonald and Stephen Quirke of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology discussed new ways of representing ancient Egypt, based on research among African–Caribbean, Egyptian and Sudanese communities in London.

The group was also pleased to be able to host several external speakers this year. They included Brigitte Wallborn of the Association des Centres culturels de Recouvrement, Paris, whose topic was “Re-using historic architecture: experience and perspective of a European network”, and Klas Nordberg of the Department of Electrical Engineering, Linköping University, Sweden, who discussed “The use of mobile information technology in the presentation of museums and heritage sites”.

UCL Heritage Studies Teaching and Research Forum
In 1999, a study revealed that a hundred staff and research students at UCL, scattered across a wide range of academic departments, were undertaking research in the heritage field. It is clear that there is a need to share information and I have therefore established the Heritage Studies Teaching and Research Forum, which held its first meeting on 11 November 2002. The aim of the forum is for representatives of each of the main departments in which heritage-related activities take place to meet and exchange information on current research and teaching programmes, and to discuss ways of cooperating more closely.
All the overseas projects depend on collaboration with local archaeologists and with the relevant antiquities services, museums or universities, and several of them also involve collaboration with other UK universities, museums and other organizations, e.g. 9 (English Heritage, Natural History Museum), 20 (British Museum), 22 (Cambridge, Durham), 25 (UMIST), 27 (Cambridge, Oxford, Sheffield), 30 (Cambridge, Southampton), 31 (Bournemouth), 33 (Natural History Museum, Oxford Brookes), 40 (Egypt Exploration Society), 45 (British Museum), 46 (Lampeter), 47 (Cambridge), 53 (British Museum).

The list includes only the projects involving survey or excavation (or both) run by members of the Institute or to which they make a major contribution (individual research students’ field projects are excluded, as are study visits to museums and other collections), and only the main members of the Institute involved in each project are named; staff from other UCL departments and other UK and overseas universities and organizations also participate in many projects and in some cases co-direct them.

World distribution of current field projects

**The Americas**

1. **Cane River, Louisiana, USA**  
   MacDonald: historical (creole)

2. **Lamanai, Belize**  
   Graham: multiperiod

3. **Los Buchillones, Cuba**  
   Graham: 12th to 17th century AD

4. **Ilo, Peru**  
   Hillson: multiperiod

5. **Tortola, Virgin Islands**  
   Drewett: Prehispanic

6. **Barbados**  
   Drewett: Prehispanic

7. **Raqchi, Peru**  
   Hillson: multiperiod

**England**

9. **Boxgrove, Sussex**  
   Roberts: Lower Palaeolithic

10. **Shoreham, Sussex**  
    Stevens: medieval

11. **Winchelsea, Sussex**  
    D. Martin: medieval

12. **Mount Caburn, Sussex**  
    Drewett, Hamilton: multiperiod

13. **Lydd, Kent**  
    Barber: medieval

14. **Cinque Ports coastal survey Kent, Sussex**  
    Clarke, Milne: medieval

15. **Ashford, Kent**  
    Stevenson: Iron Age

16. **Crawley, Sussex**  
    Stevens: medieval

17. **Ewell, Surrey**  
    Orton: Roman

18. **Thames foreshore, London**  
    Milne, Sidell: prehistoric–present

19. **Hoxne, Suffolk**  
    Parfitt: Lower Palaeolithic

20. **Sedgeford, Norfolk**  
    Faulkner: multiperiod

21. **Pickering, Yorkshire**  
    Schadla-Hall: Mesolithic

22. **Lihou, Guernsey**  
    Schadla-Hall: Mesolithic

**Continental Europe**

24. **Empordà, Spain**  
    McGlade: multiperiod

25. **Northern Puglia, Italy**  
    Whitehouse, Hamilton: Neolithic–Iron Age

26. **Northwest Sicily, Italy**  
    Thomas, Mannino: Neolithic–Iron Age

27. **Kythera, Greece**  
    Broodbank, Johnston: multiperiod

28. **Knossos, Greece**  
    Whitelaw: multiperiod

29. **Astypalaia, Greece**  
    Hillson: Late Archaic–Classical

30. **Noviodunum, Romania**  
    Lockyear, Popescu: Roman–Byzantine

31. **Novgorod, Russia**  
    Orton: medieval

32. **Reykjolt, Iceland**  
    Sveinbjarnardottir: medieval–present

33. **Oued Laou, Morocco**  
    Parfitt: Upper Palaeolithic

34. **Volubilis, Morocco**  
    Fentress, Palumbo: early Islamic

35. **Nile 4th Cataract, Sudan**  
    Fuller: multiperiod

36. **Buganda, Uganda**  
    Reid: Iron Age–historic

37. **Farafa Oasis, Egypt**  
    Hassan: Late Palaeolithic

38. **Wadi Gimal, Egypt**  
    Hassan: multiperiod

39. **Thebes, Egypt**  
    Janssen: Dynastic

40. **Memphis, Egypt**  
    Jeffreys: multiperiod

41. **Kafir Hassan Dawood, Egypt**  
    Hassan: multiperiod

42. **Qantir-Piramesses, Egypt**  
    Rehren: Late Bronze Age

43. **St Catherine Protectorate, Egypt**  
    Hassan: Neolithic–Early Bronze Age

44. **as-Sabiyah, Kuwait**  
    Carter, Crawford: Neolithic

45. **Sidon, Lebanon**  
    Doumet, Griffiths: multiperiod

46. **Qadisha Valley, Lebanon**  
    Garrard: Palaeolithic

47. **Çatalköy, Turkey**  
    L. Martin, Rosen: Neolithic

48. **Paphlagonia, Turkey**  
    Matthews: multiperiod

49. **Azokh Cave, Nagorno Karabagh**  
    Moloney: Palaeolithic

50. **Ob Valley, western Siberia, Russia**  
    Jordan: ethnographic

51. **Merv, Turkmenistan**  
    Williams, Puschnig: multiperiod

52. **Akhsiket, Uzbekistan**  
    Rehren: early Islamic

53. **Bannu, Pakistan**  
    Thomas: multiperiod

54. **Garhwal, India**  
    Fuller: Early Historic

55. **Belan River, India**  
    Fuller: Neolithic

56. **Karnataka, India**  
    Fuller: Neolithic

57. **Tamil Nadu, India**  
    Fuller: multiperiod

58. **Yiluo River, China**  
    Rosen: Neolithic–Bronze Age

59. **Bali, Indonesia**  
    Bacus: multiperiod