NEW ZEALAND ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION NEWSLETTER

dealt with the principal features of the sites and the artefactual material recovered from them and consequently it should not be considered a full report. However, it is hoped that a more comprehensive survey will be carried out in the near future.

References

(1) Auckland's Volcanic Cones. Historic Auckland Society, 1957.

(2) Geology of New Zealand (von Hochstetter). Government Printer, 1959, p. 204.

(3) Loc.cit.

(4) Auckland's Volcanic Cones, p.28.

(5) von Hochstetter. pp.202-203

Notes on Artefacts from the Manukau Pa

by J. Golson

Mr. Taylor has been good enough to let me look at artefactual material he has personally collected on the sites he has described, or has sought out in the possession of local residents.

None of this material has been excavated, except by bulldozers, yet it forms a valuable little collection because the pieces submitted are precisely localised: not that is, merely to a general area, but to the very find spot. This is obviously a matter of considerable importance where the aim is to discover the artefactual fashions of the pa builders, and Mr. Taylor's care in this regard is to be commended to other fieldworkers.

I propose here to deal only with adzes as being culturally the most diagnostic of the material submitted (sinkers, hammerstones, etc.). They total 8, of which 2 are from Mt. Gabriel, 2 from Otauataua, and the remainder, 3 unfortunately broken and the fourth unfinished, from Pukeiti.

The Mt. Gabriel adzes are in terms of present adze typology both 2B : that is they are quadrangular in crosssection and lack a grip. Though they are markedly different in stone and size (5½in.and13½in. long), they possess in common the features of thinness in respect of width (thickness

as a percentage of width 40 and 44½), rather sharp angles between sides, back and front, and no great curvature of surfaces. As Fisher pointed out in his study of the adzes from Oruanangi (1), these are characteristics more of North Auckland than of South Auckland adzes. In addition, the smaller adze has the short steep bevel and pronounced chin common in North Auckland adzes.

The adzes from Pukeiti are difficult to classify and the unfinished adze will not be discussed at all beyond to note that like the others it is quadrangular in cross section.

Two of the broken specimens lack the butt, the most important part of the adze for the existing classification. Even so their differences from the Mt. Gabriel adzes are obvious: in particular they are much thicker for their width (thickness indices 69 and 76). They also differ from each other. The smaller adze is parallel sided and must have been narrow for its length. The other is even now a large specimen 8ins. long though only about half the original can be present, and in those 8ins. the sides converge from the cutting edge by 1 in.

The third of the broken specimens is the butt end of an adze whose thickness index is 55½. The interesting feature is the presence of butt modification to facilitate lashing. This consists not of the typical devices of Archaic butt modification, affecting the whole face of the butt, but of hammerdressing the margins between the face and sides of the butt into rounded form. It would seem logical to suppose this a development of Archaic practice but this has yet to be demonstrated, though the device is very common on museum specimens. Similarly the relationship of adzes of this type to 2B adzes of Classic Maori type is unknown.

The Otauataua adzes are the most significant of all. One is a small example of the Archaic type 1A with well developed grip but lacking the hollow back of some specimens. The thickness index is typically large: 67.

The other specimen is a large (10½ins. long) triangular sectioned adze of type 4 with fairly narrow (1½") cutting edge. In this respect it would be classed as Variety A — i.e. the well-known hogback form — though it lacks the concave back of the best examples and its grip is merely the butt left hammerdressed and very slightly reduced. Both these tendencies are, however, well-authenticated on adzes recovered on Archaic sites in the Hauraki/Coromandel area.

Mr. Taylor vouches for the localisation of both these adzes to the pa site of Otauataua: the triangular sectioned example indeed he found himself. Confirmation comes independently from an Auckland collector, Mr. Errol Willis, who some years ago showed the writer the butt ends of two adzes found by him on the top of Otauataua after quarrying. Both butts show modification for lashing: the angles between the butt face and the two sides are rounded by hammerdressing and reduced below the level of

the corresponding angles between blade face and sides and while the blade is polished, the butt face and sides are left hammerdressed. Only a short step separates this butt treatment which is demonstrably of Archaic type from that described for the adze butt from Pukeiti for there is no reduction of the face of the butt on the Otauataua specimens. Had this been polished in continuation of the polish of the blade face, the Pukeiti type would have resulted. The thickness indices of the two Otauataua adzes are typically large: 59 and 67.

These adzes from Otauataua may be slight grounds for suggesting the Archaic inspiration of at least some of the well-known Auckland pa. But they add their quota of evidence to the case for this argued more fully at the conclusion of the Kauri Point report in this issue.

THE DESPOLIATION OF AUCKLAND'S ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

by H.J.R. Brown

The Auckland Metropolitan area is the largest and one of the most rapidly growing urban centres in New Zealand. In the 24 years between 1916 and 1940 its population doubled, and by 1959 doubled again to reach a total of more than 400,000. Over £200 million, it is expected, will be spent on construction work in the next five years. This together with rapid urban sprawl has resulted in an increasing number of archaeological sites being built on, damaged, or removed to provide the room for development and the metal needed for the new highways and buildings.

To date there are few archaeological sites which have not been despoiled in some form or other. The majority of the larger sites are volcanic cones which are scattered in profusion around the city and together form one of the most densely populated areas of neolithic settlement in the world. Of the thirty eight which existed all were prominent pa, but five have been completely denuded of earthworks and only three are today completely intact.[1] To deny a modern, rapidly expanding city some of these sites would be impossible, but to exploit them in the haphazard and often piecemeal fashion that is the rule at present is an inexcusable destruction of our national heritage.