

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/. graphic sense. This work is a necessary adjunct to any closer midden analysis, and is in itself an independent field activity falling naturally into the field recording scheme. Whether the aim to "devise a method for carrying out midden sampling" (Smart 1962:160) has been successful or not, will of course depend on whether the method outlined here can be adopted and used to some purpose.

REFERENCE:

Smart, C.D. Midden recording and sampling in the Waikanae region. N.Z.A.A. Newsletter 5:160-169 (Sept '62) Riddick [Reference not supplied. Ed.]

> COMMENTS ON "EXCAVATIONS AT SOUTH BAY, KAIKOURA" S49/43

> > R.J. Scarlett

I had a happy fortnight at South Bay excavating with Tony Fomison, and thought, from field discussions, that we had reached ageneral agreement in our interpretation of the site. I was away when Tony prepared his paper (<u>Newsletter</u> 6:100-102 June 1963), and it was a considerable surprise to find that his interpretation is now so widely different from my own.

Tony Fomison was officially in charge of the dig, and is of course, entitled to his views, but his interpretation, particularly of the "moahunter" phase, is based on such slender evidence, at the present state of our excavations, that I must set forth my own views on the site.

The Oven on the Old Raised Beach:

This is the only evidence we have for any association with the moahunter period at South Bay. For all evidence to the contrary, in the limited area excavated (the square on either side of that containing the oven, only contained remains of the old limestone rubble beach at the oven level) it could well have been used by a coasting party camping for the night. There is certainly nothing to suggest a settlement phase of occupation. The bone in the oven is almost certainly Euryapteryx gravis.

The Deeper Deposit at Point Two:

The artifacts (and there were many) from this part of the site are all "Classic" Maori in type, although the depth of the deposit, over 2ft 6ins, probably indicates some considerable period of occupation. There is nothing that can be considered "moa-hunter". Even the few broken pieces of onepiece fish hooks, which were scattered at various levels, are of "Classic" type. At the very bottom, resting on the limestone rubble "natural", I found bone points for two-piece fish hooks which are indistinguishable from those from many other late "Classic" Maori sites. Not one piece of moa bone, worked or unworked, was recovered from this part of the site.

Although there is probably a considerable period of time represented by the "build-up" of the deposit at Point Two, there is little or no typological difference between the artifacts from the various layers.

In my opinion, it is not yet possible to correlate the layers from the beach site (Point Four) and the central portion (Point B) with any exactitude. A line of squares connecting the two points is imperative if this correlation is to be proved or otherwise.

The occurrence of European pottery and other debris at the beach site is easily accounted for, Last century, and again about the twenties of this century, whaling stations operated there.

"Fish awls" in the list of artifacts from Layer 4 is a slip of the pen for "awls made from bird wing and leg bones". There is a lamentable failure on Tony's part to distinguish, in his report, between the artifacts from Points A and B.

Finally, I do not understand his reference to "the occurrence of bones in articulation" - it should be, "position of articulation" - I know of no such finds although it is possible to associate a very few bones to an individual skeleton.

Omitted from June 1963 issue: A. Fomison, Excavations at South Bay, Kaikoura.



160