



NEW ZEALAND
ARCHAEOLOGICAL
ASSOCIATION

NEW ZEALAND ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION NEWSLETTER



This document is made available by The New Zealand Archaeological Association under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

To view a copy of this license, visit
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>.

Nodules are often irregular in shape. Cores (unless many flakes have been removed) have marked striking platforms, sometimes at both ends, and are conical or cylindrical in shape. If a core is used as a tool it may have evidence of secondary working.

TYPOLOGY

Knapped stone artifacts are often classified as 'scrapers', 'blades', 'knives', 'points' etc., or are said to have 'use-marks' on their margins. It is beyond the scope of this guide to suggest any typological classifications, although these will no doubt be developed from an extensive study of the descriptive characteristics of a large number of artifacts made from different raw materials.

DRAWING

In this guide, the convention has been adopted of describing artifacts with the striking platform at the top, although the use of 'top', 'bottom', 'back', 'front' as descriptive terms is not recommended. It is suggested that artifacts be drawn in this conventional way.

The drawing should be kept as simple as possible. The outline can be done by laying the artifact on the paper and drawing round the margins, the number of views shown depending on its characteristics. If the bulbar face lacks secondary working, it, or all except for the area of the positive bulb of percussion, can be omitted. The outer face, the surface of the striking platform and one of more lateral views may have to be shown, especially if there is any secondary working. The number of cross-sections figured depends on the shape of the outer face and the position and extent of secondary working.

CONVENTIONS EMPLOYED IN DRAWING

Such features as the positive bulb of percussion, flake scars and ripple marks can be represented diagrammatically by concentric arcs which follow the curves visible on the surface of the artifact. It is not necessary to attempt to reproduce each ripple mark etc. exactly. When fractures are not clearly visible, it is better to state this by the side of the drawing rather than insert them by guesswork. Intelligent accentuation in the representation of surface features on one side of the longitudinal axis can often give body to the drawing.

Stippling is useful to represent the cortex, and is sometimes used to denote flake scars etc. on coarse-grained rocks. 'Artistic' shading should be avoided.

A NOTE ON THE DESCRIPTION OF ORNAMENTS

P. GATHERCOLE

INTRODUCTION

Ornaments are so varied in their shape and other features that they cannot be discussed in the same homogeneous way as the remainder of the artifacts considered in this symposium. Strictly speaking, they are non-utilitarian, although an every-day object can be used as an ornament where appropriate. This means that their definition is sometimes tentative. For all these reasons, no attempt has been made here to suggest a comprehensive set of terms for use in describing the features of the various

groups. To do so would involve an extensive reconsideration of the characteristics of each group, and, I feel, a redefinition of these groups, which is beyond the scope of the Artifact Record Scheme as such. This note is confined to a number of simple points to assist in the completion of the form.

RAW MATERIAL

Stone, bone, teeth of numerous animals and shell are used, and similar forms often rendered in quite different raw material. An attempt should be made to identify it as far as individual competence allows.

METHOD OF WORKING

Some ornaments (e.g. teeth) are not always greatly modified from their natural shape. Others (e.g. fish hooks) are adapted from utilitarian artifacts, or, like the pekapeka, have forms peculiar to themselves, whatever their stylistic analogies to other forms of Maori art. In each case, the method of working should be stated as fully as possible. This helps to distinguish not only genuine and fake specimens, but also examples of authentic Maori workmanship made with European tools. This point is particularly important when recording private collections.

DESCRIPTION

This should be kept as simple as possible and carefully related to the illustration(s). The fact that certain ornaments have Maori names, which, whatever their validity, have passed into general usage, might seem to be an advantage when describing them. Even if these names are used, it is important to give an actual description.

With the exception of such forms as combs, ornaments are broadly divided into necklaces and pendants. The position of the perforation usually determines the location of the top of a pendant, and the lateral edges in the case of such necklace units as reels. The front and the back of breast pendants are generally equally clear.

This common-sense approach is adequate for many simple ornaments. Difficulties arise when dealing with a complicated form like the 'chevroned amulet' - some of which, as Skinner pointed out when coining the term, have no chevrons.

ILLUSTRATIONS

In these circumstances, the best way to avoid ambiguity is to provide as many illustrations as convenient, with photographs if possible for unusual or complex forms or features. Certain ornaments require reverse, lateral or superior views, depending on the extent and character of working, especially decoration. Reproduction should be at least 1/1.

SOME LITERATURE

As so many varieties of ornaments are known, it would be out of place to list and illustrate them here, especially as this would duplicate much information obtainable from literature already generally available. In order to become familiar with the range of forms as a help in description and drawing, it is useful to refer to the following:-

Buck 1950,¹ for general survey;

Duff 1956,² for detailed discussion of Archaic forms;

Golson 1959,³ for lists of the most important ornaments;

Skinner 1932 - 1936, 1943, 1947,⁴ for extensive discussion, especially of many unusual examples.

References

1. BUCK, Sir Peter 1950 *The Coming of the Maori*, (Second Ed.), 284 - 296.
2. DUEF, R.S. 1956 *The Moa-hunter Period of Maori Culture*, (Second Ed.), 83 - 138.
3. GOLSON, J. 1959 'Culture Change in Prehistoric New Zealand,' in FREEMAN, J.D. and GEDDES, W.R. (eds) *Anthropology in the South Seas*, esp. 39 and figs 2 - 3 (Archaic), 51 - 53 and fig. 9b (Classic Maori).
4. SKINNER, H.D. 1932 - 1936, 1943, 1947 'Maori Amulets in Stone, Bone and Shell,' *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 41, 202 - 211, 302 - 309; 42, 1 - 9, 107 - 113, 191 - 203, 310 - 320; 43, 25 - 29, 106 - 117, 198 - 215, 271 - 279; 44, 17 - 25; 45, 127 - 141; 52, 132 - 152; 56, 357 - 363.

The Otago Anthropological Society

S. WILLIAMS

After nearly two years existence, the Society can now feel that it has consolidated itself. Of 100-odd members there is a stable core of 60, some of whom are active in archaeological field work, some whose interests lie more towards Social Anthropology. Membership comes from both the City and the University, although the student proportion is relatively small - as it will remain until the Anthropology Department expands. For the rest, some members come from the Medical, Dental or Science faculties and give us specialist advice in certain fields (human osteology and faecal analysis are two cases in point). It has been felt for some time; however, that our greatest need at present is for certain specialist members, especially geologists and zoologists, who can work in conjunction with the archaeologists on the field-work programme.

Meetings have covered a wide range of topics. The Chairman, Mr H. Knight, began the year with an address entitled 'Spanish Studies'. Seven other meetings have been held. Mr V.F. Fisher, of Auckland Museum, spoke on 'Maori Plant Lore'; Mr P. Gathercole on 'Anthropology and Industrial Society', and Professor G.R. Manton, of the Department of Classics, Otago University, on 'Anthropological Attitudes in the Classical World'. A meeting held in conjunction with the Historical Section of the Royal Society was addressed by Mr G.S. Parsonson (Department of History, Otago University) who, in a paper entitled 'New Light on Quiros and on Eastern Melanesian Settlement' put forward a theory on the influence of malarial mosquitoes on the pattern of Pacific settlement. A joint meeting was held in August with the main branch of the Royal Society (of which this Society is a section), consisting of a symposium reviewing current archaeological work in Otago. The speakers were Mr L. Phelan, Mr P. Gathercole, Mr L. Lockerbie and Mr H. Knight. A meeting was held in conjunction with the Otago University Maori Club on 'Maori Urbanisation' which, because of the interest shown, led to the organisation of two discussion sessions on the Hunn Report. Finally, we were privileged to have a most stimulating talk by Mr K.E. Larsson of the Etnografiska Museet, Göteborg, on 'Post-European Contact in the Pacific'.