



NEW ZEALAND
ARCHAEOLOGICAL
ASSOCIATION

ARCHAEOLOGY IN NEW ZEALAND



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/>.

REVIEWS

Peter G. Stone & Robert MacKenzie (eds), *The Excluded Past: Archaeology in Education*. Routledge, London 1994. 316 pp. A\$50.95.

Archaeologists should seek to take on a role in education alongside other interpreters and mediators of the past, and educators should accept and understand the important role that archaeology alone can and should have in education. Additionally, if the children of the world are not taught about their own cultural pasts then the evidence of these pasts and the cultures that exist in the present will be destroyed and lost at an ever increasing rate, until we are faced with a present and future without any past at all.

These are two "inescapable conclusions" that the contributors to this book leave us with based on the aim of reappraising the concept of objectivity in archaeology to increase the value to society of the excluded past.

The Excluded Past: Archaeology in Education (number 17 of the One World Archaeology Series) is one of a major series of more than 20 volumes resulting from the World Archaeological Congress held in Southampton, England 1986. The congress was attended by 850 people, both academic and non academic, from more than 70 countries, with the main theme being "Archaeological objectivity in interpretation". The aim of the congress was to focus attention on the way that evidence of the past, including archaeological evidence, has been used and viewed by particular groups at different times and why particular interpretation has been chosen or favoured by individual societies and traditions at certain points in their development, or at certain stages of their activities.

P.J. Ucko sets the tone of this volume in the foreword by stating that archaeological interpretation is a subjective matter, and further to this, the notion that archaeology is the only legitimate scientific approach to the past is in need of re-examination, if not possible rejection. This narrow parochial approach based on linear chronologies and verifiable sets of meaningful absolute dates completely ignores the complexity of many literate and non-literate "civilisations" and cultures.

In stating that modern archaeology must recognise and confront its new role, which is to address the wider community with an awareness of the strengths and weaknesses of archaeological methodology and practise, Ucko begins to pose a number of questions which can be seen as themes present in the 25

REVIEWS

papers in this volume: questions such as:

- how can static material objects be equated with dynamic human cultures?
- could evidence of cultural continuity as opposed to discontinuity make all the difference in terms of a land claim, the right to access to a site/region, or disposal of a human skeleton?
- who makes decisions about how a site should be used?
- who is responsible, and why, for what is taught about the past in schools or in adult education?
- is such education based on a narrow local, regional, or national framework of archaeology and history, or is it oriented towards multiculturalism and the variety of human cultural experiences in a world wide context?

This brings me to the title of this volume, *The Excluded Past : Archaeology in Education*. This volume states that there has been an absence of attempts to confront the relationship between archaeology and education which is precisely what Stone and MacKenzie describe as part of the excluded past. When they mention the "excluded past" they are referring to the past in a dual sense which comprises the prehistoric past, which is virtually excluded from curricula around the world, and the suppressed or denied past of many indigenous, minority or oppressed groups.

Stone and MacKenzie allude to four major reasons why there is an excluded past in education.

Firstly, school curricula are overcrowded and time cannot be allotted to a new subject when many long established subjects are threatened by the domination of job related education. Further to this the prehistoric past may be excluded from school curricula because it is only perceived to be of any relevance at the tertiary level of education (see chapters 21,22,23).

Secondly, teachers may allow important parts of the past to be excluded through their own ignorance, or through lack of suitable teaching materials. One scenario that emerges from this is that material that is made available may be produced using insupportable evidence which may benefit a dominant group (see chapters 3,17,22).

Thirdly, the study of the excluded past is often seen as an indulgent luxury that has no direct bearing on today's society. This premise relates directly to the notion that the only real value of teaching about the past is to set the modern world into a narrow chronological framework relating solely to recent history (see chapters 2,23).

Finally, aspects of the past may be excluded for overtly political reasons as in South Africa and Namibia. Further to this, forms of political exclusion that

REVIEWS

are less overt may also be damaging to those concerned (see chapters 6,9,10,15,19)

Of the 31 contributors to this volume from all over the world (New Zealand does not feature) nine look directly at archaeology and education. In India (Chakrabarti, ch. 2), Nigeria (Nzewunwa, ch. 3), Kenya (Wandibba, ch. 4), Argentina (Podgorny, ch. 15), Alberta, Canada (Devine, ch. 16), Japan (Habu, ch. 18), Russia (Platonova, ch. 20), Poland (Mikolajczyk, ch. 21), England (Planel, ch. 23), and Toronto, Canada (Smardz, ch. 25). These chapters discuss topics such as the historical development of archaeology in universities, curriculum development, indigenous education and archaeology, the future of archaeology in schools, education nationalism and archaeology, the place of the past in primary school curriculum, public education and archaeology, and how do history and archaeology meet in school curriculum.

Other chapters focus more on the general responsibility to present an all inclusive past that acknowledges an awareness and realisation of bias in source material. For example: Hinz (ch. 6) 'The right to a past: Namibian history and the struggle for liberation'; Watson (ch. 8) 'The affirmation of indigenous values in a colonial education system'; Gawe & Meli (ch. 9) 'The missing past in South African history'; Holland (ch. 11) 'Whispers from the forest: the excluded past of the Ache' Indian's of Paraguay'.

The important aspect of these chapters, and the main thrust of this entire volume, is that education is inextricably linked to archaeology because archaeology provides the raw data for the teaching of those subjects concerned with the social world. The acceptance of responsibility for international education about the past is only one aspect of a more general acceptance of responsibility by archaeologists, and others concerned with the academic and scientific study of the past, towards that past in all its manifestations and in its relations with the present.

This volume in the One World Archaeology series contains a great deal of information and perspectives from around the world which discuss the way in which archaeology and education can mutually provide a better understanding in relation to cultural heritage, cultural policies, and general awareness of the past in an all inclusive fashion.

Simon Hodge
University of Auckland

Jon G. Hather (ed.), *Tropical Archeobotany : Applications and New Developments*. Routledge, London, One World Archaeology Series, Volume 22, 1994. 270pp. A\$134.95.

Thirteen authors, many of whom are well known in New Zealand and Australia, have contributed to this volume which is built around papers delivered at the second World Archaeological Congress (WAC 2) held in Venezuela in 1990. At WAC 1 in 1986, plant exploitation was reviewed at a world-wide level, and David Harris and Gordon Hillman's massive edited collection *Foraging and Farming: the evolution of plant exploitation* (1989) resulted. That volume was 'strongest', geographically speaking, on regions where cereal crops had evolved and where preservation of archaeobotanical remains was reasonably good. But a gap existed in our knowledge of plant use and management patterns of the humid and monsoonal tropics, areas where more perishable tree and root crops have been grown for many millennia, in climates unfavourable to preservation. It has been partially filled by *Tropical Archeobotany*, which contains several chapters rewritten since the 1990 conference, as well as three newly commissioned ones.

Not surprisingly, the contributors to *Tropical Archeobotany* are specialist archaeological scientists, most of them also trained as botanists, chemists, or palynologists. Finding evidence for starchy root and tree crops in corrosive climates is an operation which occurs in laboratories rather than in the field. It involves the isolation and subsequent identification of three categories of remains : macroscopic residues such as wood charcoal fragments, seeds, tuber and rhizome fragments, including those found in gut and faecal samples (Chapters 1-4); microscopic evidence in the form of starch cells and calcium oxalate crystals, inorganic phytoliths, and organic pollen grains (Chapters 5-9); and chemical and biochemical traces (Chapters 10-12). Geographically the papers cover case studies from India, Thailand, New Guinea, Australia, the Pacific Islands (including New Zealand), Ecuador, Chile and Peru. This regional focus should make the book of particular interest to readers of *Archaeology in New Zealand*.

The volume commences with a foreword by Jack Golson and Peter Ucko, who have played major roles in the spotlighting of problems of plant domestication at the three World Archaeology Conferences held so far. As well as contributing a chapter, Jon Hather then introduces the work with a brief review of the progress of archaeobotany, and some pertinent comments about the dangers of attempting to identify archaeological plant material to species. He reminds us that

"If we name an archaeological plant, we are giving a name to a plant of the past, not of the present. If the name is at the species level, and it is the same as the name of an extant plant, we are making a very

REVIEWS

important statement about the plant's evolution. When we are dealing with the remains of cultivated plants, many of which have a complicated history of recent evolutionary change, to do so is fraught with danger." (p.4)

Hather recommends that we restrict the naming of archaeological samples from cultivated plant groups to genus level, followed by a descriptive type rather than a loaded species name. But only a few of the book's contributors have followed this sound advice.

Jill Thompson's contribution on methods of analysing and interpreting wood charcoals from tropical sites (Chapter 1) is very cautious in its identifications. Her case study of firewood burned in hearths at the Thai site of Khok Phanom Di involved 24 samples, comprising 775 charcoal fragments, which were primarily of mangrove (*Rhizophoraceae*-type) genera. The declining frequency of these estuarine, river-bank and coastal plants correlated well with Lee Aitken's evidence from sediment studies that the site had been established initially on a tidally influenced river floodbank, which had been subjected to fluvial aggradation, leading to a replacement of forest by open swamp grasslands (p.25). Thompson's paper incorporates useful literature reviews, and close scrutiny of the methods and assumptions behind interpretations. It is an excellent guide to what a specialist may learn from this ubiquitous material.

In contrast, Mukund Kajale's chapter (2) on plant remains (mostly seeds) from the Adam site in Maharashtra, India provides too little detail to support its claims convincingly. For example, the site is said to date from 4000 - 1700 b.p., yet only a single radiocarbon date is available (p.34). The discussion refers to the site receiving influences from west Asian agriculture in the second millennium BC yet Table 2.1 lists only one identification of a wheat grain and one of barley in a period dated to 2300 - 2150 b.p. Nevertheless this paper provides evidence of the progress made in Indian palaeobotanical studies in the past two decades.

Jon Hather (in Chapter 3) addresses a problem that has plagued Pacific archaeology, that of identifying charred fragments of root and tuber crops, once they have been recognized. Hather sets aside the difficulties of distinguishing such fragments from other carbonized materials and concentrates instead on the question, do roots and tubers of the Pacific crop plants show diagnostic anatomical criteria when burnt and fragmented? A reference collection of the chief Pacific root crops was assembled, and thin sections were made of fresh and experimentally charred samples. These were compared to the remains of soft tissues from archaeological contexts, using scanning electron microscopy. Because morphological features are lost during fragmentation, anatomical characters such as the organisation of vascular

REVIEWS

tissues, become very important. Hather was able to identify the aerial yam, *Dioscorea bulbifera*, from Samoa, *Cordyline terminalis* from Hawaii, and *Ipomea batatas* from a historical Nissan Island site in the Solomons, and from prehistoric Mangaia. Essentially this was a pilot study, for Hather would be the first to say that his reference collection was not wide enough. He writes

"For any geographical area there will be a number of plant staples, each with a number of different varieties. In addition to this, there will be numerous other plant foods, either cultivated or gathered, that could possibly add parenchymatous tissues to the archeobotanical record." (p.59)

He also warns us about the danger of interpreting subsistence systems from the fragmentary remains of one or two tubers.

The desiccated human gut remains and coprolites from northern Chile which form the topic of Timothy Holden's chapter (4) are from exceptionally dry contexts, unlikely to be matched in Oceania. The samples, from three sites dating to 4000, 3000 and 2250 b.p. testified to diets of sea food, rhizomes of rushes, cactus seeds, quinoa seeds and possible potato tubers. The chapter contains a useful literature review and valuable comments on the key factors in food taphonomy. It also describes the calculations employed to relate weight of faecal debris to weight of food eaten.

In Chapter 5, Tom Loy discusses in some detail the methods he used to analyse the starch residues on prehistoric stone tools from the Kulu Cave assemblage in the northern Solomons. Loy is well known for his residue studies, especially those leading to the identification of blood from butchered animals. Readers of *Antiquity* (Vol.66, 1992) will also be aware of his claims that taros, specified as *Colocaia esculenta* and *Alocasia macrorrhiza*, were used in the Solomons some 27,000 years ago. Loy used both microscopy and chemical tests to detect the presence of starch grains on the tools, and then evaluated the shape and size variations of the starch cells and raphides (calcium oxalate crystals) in comparison with a modern reference collection, in order to achieve species identifications.

This paper provides considerable detail on methodology, including microscopy techniques and chemical treatments. It also stresses the critical importance of "a large and well-documented reference collection" and of recognizing the "potential for contamination of both prehistoric residues and reference materials during analysis" (p.95). Was his reference collection adequate for this study? He had reference samples from six species representing five aroid genera (including wild and cultivated taro), and seven *Dioscorea* yam species. He had taken care to get a range of cultivars from different localities. As well, three species of *Ipomoea* (including the sweet potato) were studied, as

well as the sago palm and one cycad. Were enough wild, tuber-bearing species sampled? As a family, aroids are well represented in the Island Southeast Asia, New Guinea, and Near Oceania region (Matthews 1995 : 106-7), and there is no reason to suspect that in the late Pleistocene, hunter-gatherers would have restricted themselves solely to the ancestors of species that would later be domesticated. What are the chances of wild species not in the reference collection having starch cells and raphides similar to those of *Colocasia* and *Alocasia*? The question occurred to Loy (p.110) but was set aside. However, Matthews (1995: 119) argues strongly for the examination of a wider range of species.

If we rule out modern, post-excavation contamination of the 17 flakes and fragments from the lower unit at Kulu Cave with aroid starch residues derived from peeling of tubers, and accept that the starch cells and raphides are indeed pre-20,100 b.p., then we must address the statistical basis for separating the species on mean grain size and standard deviation and on the presence or absence of raphides. Loy's Figure 5.10 shows overlap in the standard deviations of aroid starch grain sizes and those of the yam *D. esculenta*. It therefore proved essential to add grain shape to the other variables, in a multi-dimensional analysis.

Loy concludes that none of the analytical results contradict his initial hypothesis that the starch grains on the tools were from *Colocasia* taro (P-110). However in saying this, he is forgetting that he identified *Alocasia* starch cells on three of the 17 flakes from the lower unit. His identifications to species level ignore Hather's warnings and amount to an interpretation of a complex set of data with reference material that is in many cases derived from several millennia of selection under domestication. If this type of evidence was produced by the prosecution in a court case, I would hate to be convicted on the strength of it!

Deborah Pearsall (Chapter 6) reviews phytolith analysis as applied in the tropical lowlands of America, covering the nature and production of phytoliths, how they are recovered, identified and quantified. Unlike organic pollen and starch grains, phytoliths consist of opaline silica and as inorganic residues, they have the potential to survive in hot, wet climates. However, not all plant taxa possess diagnostic phytoliths, and if they do, they may permit identification only down to the level of family or at best genus. The phytolith success story has been the separation of tropical maizes from other wild grasses, including even the progenitor teosinte. But not all maize races share the large, cross-shaped phytoliths of the tropical forms; so the crucial criteria do not apply in all maize-growing regions. This is why Pearsall has repeatedly stressed that good phytolith analysis "must be grounded in detailed study of regional variation" (P-117). For the method to be useful in New Zealand archaeology we would need information on which native and

REVIEWS

introduced taxa have distinctive phytoliths, and at what level identification would be reliable. From Pearsall's list of tropical phytolith producers, the only families contributing food plants here that would be worth following up are the Cucurbitaceae (including the gourd), Palmae (nikau), Cyperaceae (raupo), and Gramineae (historically introduced maize). Unfortunately the sweet potato does not produce diagnostic phytoliths (p.117). However phytolith analysis can be directed towards palaeo-environmental reconstruction, and is a useful compliment to pollen analysis. This is likely to be the most fruitful application of the method for New Zealand conditions, being able to demonstrate, for example, broad patterns of forest replacement by grasslands.

Bernard Maloney has contributed a chapter (7) on "the prospects and problems" of using pollen analysis to document the beginnings of tropical agriculture in Southeast Asia. At this stage the emphasis is on the problems rather than the successes, and the chapter hints that archaeologists have themselves created some of the obstacles (p.152). However, palynologists will need to alter pre-treatment techniques which currently damage the pollen grains of the Cucurbitaceae and some other significant genera. Maloney believes that the millet species offer the best prospects for identification (p. 163), and casts serious doubts on Japanese and Chinese claims for the recognition of rice pollen in prehistoric contexts (p.146).

In contrast to Southeast Asia, New Guinea is one of the most intensively studied tropical regions, for which over 50 pollen records exist. Simon Haberle's chapter (8) is an excellent review of the evidence for human interference in the period from 33,000 b.p. Although the early indicators of burning and forest clearance are sporadic and difficult to interpret, there is widespread evidence from at least 7000 b.p. to the present, strongly supporting New Guinea's claims for very early horticulture. New palaeoenvironmental techniques, such as mineral magnetic analysis and carbonized particle counts, are used in conjunction with pollen analysis. However, distinguishing plant manipulation, which seems to have been important in Pleistocene subsistence patterns, from Holocene cultivation practices is extremely problematical and the cause of much current debate. It is heartening that Golson's argument for the Highland adoption c.2000 b.p. of soil tillage within stabilised grasslands is now supported by pollen records, as is the tree-fallowing of planted *Casuarina* by 750 b.p., or earlier. A dramatic increase in *Casuarina* pollen at 400-300 years ago may be correlated with the adoption of the sweet potato (itself unlikely to be identified in the pollen record until pre-treatment by acetolysis ceases).

The pollen record for human activity in Polynesia is more briefly surveyed by John Flenley in Chapter 9, who begins with this memorable statement

"There are few better careers than Quaternary palynology for the

REVIEWS

determined overinterpreter, the chronic circular arguer or the athletic bandwagon-jumper. This is because pollen diagrams have proved exceedingly difficult to interpret." (p.202)

His chapter is weighted to work in progress, emphasizing the problems of finding independent indicators of climate change, of finding the pollen of crop plants, and the dangers of dating swamp and lake deposits. These may contain transported materials, roots penetrating from above, soluble humic acids which can move up and down the profile, or 'old carbonate' derived from adjacent coral limestone. His warnings may be applicable to the controversial Manganian pollen records and their associated early dates (Kirch and Ellison 1994; c.f. Anderson 1995). The outstanding palynological results obtained on Easter Island have yet to be matched elsewhere in tropical Polynesia.

The next two chapters (10 & 11), by Donald Ugent and Barry Fankhauser respectively, deal with applications of chromatography and spectrophotometry to ancient food residues. Ugent's relatively modest aims were to discriminate between samples of prehistoric potato, sweet potato, jicama and manioc. These aims were achieved quite simply, but the study assumes (not unreasonably for arid Peruvian sites), that root crops will be recognizable amongst other organic remains in the first place. Fankhauser addresses the complexities of identifying food residues from the proteins and lipids that remain in the pores of potsherds. Since stability in amino acids and lipids varies, the archaeological chemist is working with the equivalent of smudged 'fingerprints'. This detailed and clearly written paper covers methods, sources of contamination (e.g. archaeologists' real fingerprints), preparation of standards, and statistical matching; it provides a 'meaty' introduction to an important area of analysis.

The final chapter, by Peter Matthews and Ryohei Terauchi examines ribosomal DNA variation in wild taro, and chloroplast DNA in both wild and cultivated aerial yam. Both may have been significant species of preagricultural Sahul, as endemics or early introductions, or both. In this important pilot study, wild taro in Australia was found to be regionally homogeneous in the three northern zones in which it occurs, suggesting little human dispersal. These wild forms are stoloniferous and have central corms with very little starch. (So what sort of taro was peeled at Kilu Cave 27,000 years ago, we may ask.) Interestingly, distinct rDNA patterns from wild taro near Lae (PNG) are absent in the cultivated taro studies so far. This may be indicative of an external source for the cultivars. In the aerial yam, cultivated forms from as far afield as Taiwan, Papua New Guinea and Hawaii have been linked in a single lineage, one of several isolated in the Asia-Pacific varieties.

It is hard to sum up edited volumes because of the variety in their contents.

REVIEWS

However the quality of *Tropical Archaeobotany* is consistently high, there are very few errors, and the contributions are well integrated and organized. Though I noted earlier that a few authors have not followed the editor's advice concerning levels of identification, readers are given helpful guidelines for deciding whether they will accept some of the bolder claims. *Tropical Archaeobotany* has all the excitement associated with forensic discoveries, and will undoubtedly provoke healthy disputes between the 'expert witnesses' involved.

Helen M. Leach
Department of Anthropology
University of Otago

References:

- Anderson, A. J. 1995. Current approaches in East Polynesian colonisation research. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 104(1) : 110-132.
Kirch, P.V. and J. Ellison. 1994. Palaeoenvironmental evidence for human colonization of remote Oceanic islands. *Antiquity* 68 : 310-21.
Matthews, P.J. 1995 Aroids and the Austronesians. *Tropics* 4(2) : 105-126.

David R. Harris (ed.), *The Archaeology of V. Gordon Childe: contemporary perspectives*. Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1994.

In the early seventies it was reported to our group of University of Otago graduate students that someone had met an archaeology student from the Auckland department who had not heard of Gordon Childe. This just confirmed our awfully superior view of the other place.

How many of us had actually read Childe except for a flick through 'Man Makes Himself' or 'What Happened in History' was another matter entirely. But I do remember discussions on Childe's political life in Australia and on the Marxist view of human progress which lay behind his popular publications. And I remember a fascination with his manner of death; which I could never believe was to do only with a fear of waning intellectual powers.

'The Archaeology of V. Gordon Childe' brings together papers given at the Childe Centennial Conference held in London in May 1992. All deal in one way or another with his quite extraordinary capacity to shape our thinking on the past, based on an embracing political philosophy and an immense and unique breadth of learning. There were holes of course, and Kent Flannery and John Mulvaney show that he had little interest in New World or Australian archaeology.

REVIEWS

I greatly enjoyed Mulvaney's contribution on Childe's Australian years, marvellously titled 'Another university man gone wrong' after the comment of a censor responsible for opening the mail of anti-war radicals. The courage needed to stick to his political guns in conformist First World War Australia is well told. But I must protest at Mulvaney's selective use of statistics in describing Australia's war losses. New Zealand enlistments and dead were both higher as proportions of total population.

It is interesting to read Childe's 1956 letter to archaeologists in the Soviet Union in which he criticises their techniques and results. In the end Childe was not swayed by his political views to overlook bad work. Leo Klejn's 'Childe and Soviet archaeology: a romance' amusingly tells the story of Childe's long but ultimately disillusioning affair with his 'lady-love', Soviet archaeology. Klejn's chapter like the others is followed by a transcript of the resulting discussion.

A photograph shows Childe reclining on a grassy bank in Cumbria while his companions walk on into the distance. In another can be seen his astonishing 'drainers' - three-quarter length trousers - which fit an eccentric English mould, and take him a long way from his Australian roots. As the gnomish face peers out at us one can't help but wonder all that intelligence wrapped up in such an unattractive body. I would like to know about the person. Was there something more that tipped him over the edge in the Blue Mountains of his native land in October 1957?

This remarkable scholar it seems was everywhere before us. Michael Rowlands' stand-out paper shows how powerfully Childe's politics of inclusion directed his archaeological thinking. Colin Renfrew argues that Childe anticipated the processualists. Forty years after his death he still has much to say. The contributions to this book tell of different parts of Childe's intellectual legacy. Meanwhile, to find out about the man I'm going to get hold of Bruce Trigger's 1980 'Gordon Childe: revolutions in archaeology' and Sally Green's 'Prehistorian: a biography of V. Gordon Childe' which was published the following year.

Nigel Prickett

F.L. Phillips. *Nga Tohu a Tainui: Landmarks of Tainui, Volume 2.* Tohu Publishers, Otorohonga. 1995. \$120.

This is the second volume of a massive work which attempts to link the history of the Tainui people with the landscape they lived in and with remains of the settlements and fortifications they left behind them, mainly

REVIEWS

through the medium of oblique aerial photos. The first volume, published in 1989, was reviewed by Neil Laurie in *Archaeology in New Zealand*, March 1990. Fin Phillips says he still has enough material to fill a third volume.

The scope of the subject matter is enormous. Tainui people claim a history of some 500 years in this land; they occupied a substantial portion of the North Island, and they made incursions as far as the East Coast, Northland and Taranaki. Their history is complex and convoluted.

The two volumes so far published contain an impressive quantity of material. They total 514 A4-size pages. The text is highly readable. There are 506 colour photographs of some 379 archaeological sites. Having all the stories linked to their geographic and topographic milieu makes traditional history, for this reviewer at least, much more digestible than it usually is. Both volumes are excellently indexed.

A big failing is the lack of location maps. The text, because it describes events in roughly chronological sequence, has a tendency to zigzag over the landscape. Without any maps, a reader needs a fairly intimate knowledge of North Island topography and placenames to be able to follow the text or comprehend the photos.

Decades of spare-time work must have gone into these volumes. Besides recapitulating all the standard Tainui history contained in the works of Leslie Kelly, Pei te Hurinui Jones and others, Phillips has done a lot of original research in the Native Land Court records, and has talked to a lot of Tainui elders. He has flown hundreds of hours and done a lot of tramping to get the thousands of photos from which those in these volumes have been selected. His career as an Otorohanga lawyer specializing in Maori land issues must have been very valuable for this work.

This review will not comment in detail on the quality of the history in this volume. Laurie noted in his mostly complimentary review of the first volume that Phillips seldom quoted specific sources for specific items of information, nor, when his account of an event differed from other accounts, did he comment on the reason for the difference. There appears to be less cause for such criticism of the second volume. There are still large chunks of narrative whose source is not stated however. There is also, sadly, at least one passage (p.31) in which five paragraphs are quoted verbatim from another source (the *Journal of the Wesley Historical Society*) without any indication - such as quotation marks or indentation - that they are copied.

This reviewer feels more competent to comment on the archaeological information of these two volumes which is mostly conveyed by the photographs. Some photos are a bit fuzzy, and some are taken in less than

ideal lighting conditions or from less than ideal vantage points, but overall the photos are very good, and give an excellent impression of the wide variety of topographic situations and defensive layouts utilized by the Tainui.

However Phillips usually does not indicate how he was able to link particular events, anecdotes or placenames with particular sites in the landscape, so the reader has no idea how reliable the identifications or locations are. Cross checking within the two volumes and against NZAA site records indicates that some locations and identifications are definitely wrong. A photo of S14/96, for example, is labelled as showing Tukupoto pa on I p.61, while another photo of the same site is called Kaitotehe on II p.116. A photo on I p.82 purports to show Otumatua pa. In fact the photo is of an unfortified site, R16/208, while the pa, R16/406, is out of view on the top of the hill behind. What is called Ohuka pa in one photo on II p.23 is readily identifiable by even a casual reader as the same pa (R18/15) pictured on p.289 but called Hukunui. The two pa Kororomaiwaho and Manuaitu, R15/3 and R15/82, 1.5 km apart, are transposed, despite both being named on the ordinary topographic maps and being well described in the literature (II pp. 27, 45, 106). II p.115 purports to show Te Uapata pa, although no earthworks are evident. Reference to site record S14/20 shows that the earthworks of this pa are still visible about 100 m outside the left frame of Phillips' photo.

The traditionally important pa Maungaroa, where the dispute occurred which led to the enormous slaughter of Hingakaka in 1810, is identified as R16/200, which is a tiny fortification enclosing a mere 570 sq m. Elders of the nearby Marokopa marae ridicule this identification and say that Maungaroa is the prominent hill behind their marae, which has an appropriately elongated fortification, R16/391, enclosing at least 2525 sq m.

Grid references are another problem. Phillips gives imperial and/or metric grid references for most sites. Sometimes the imperial and metric reference do not correspond. Sometimes a grid reference plots outside the topographic sheet number quoted by Phillips. Sometimes the same site has a different grid reference in different volumes. Sometimes two sites described separately will share the same grid reference. Sometimes a grid reference and the topography shown in a photo quite obviously do not match.

In volume II p.18, for example, five sites are mentioned. Rangiohua pa, R18/51, is stated to be in R17 but its grid reference plots in R18. The second site, R18/62, an unfortified site, is stated to be in Q18, but is really in R18, while the name given to it, Rerewaka, is actually the name of pa R18/2. It had a different grid reference in volume I (p.123), where the story told is about a pa and hence must refer to R18/2. The third site, R18/10 is given grid reference 501737 while its real location is 505741. The fourth site

REVIEWS

has what turns out to be a nonsense grid reference. The fifth site appears to be described without locational errors.

Of the 379 sites described by Phillips, 200 are in the Waikato site record file. At least 33 of these have incorrect grid references in "Landmarks". Of 44 sites checked against the Coromandel site files 14 have wrong grid references.

There are 4-digit, 5-digit (eg II pp. 132, 135), 8-digit (II p.259), and 12-digit (II p.80) grid references. What are we to make of "R11: 79, 83-84" (II p.144) or "T17: 39.01 177.03" (II p.35)?

Many of the problems with this otherwise impressive work could have been avoided if its author had made use of the NZAA site recording scheme. (Conversely the scheme could have benefited enormously if this work had been fed into the site files!) Site record numbers are not used anywhere in "Landmarks". Many of the sites misidentified or mislocated in "Landmarks" are easily identified from the site files. The site files could have provided a useful cross-check on grid references. Much of the information presented is already in the files and Mr Phillips has needlessly duplicated a lot of the effort that has already gone into the files.

Outwardly the two "Landmarks" volumes are quite handsome, and it is obvious that enormous effort has gone into them, so that the information in them appears more authoritative and reliable than it really is. A lot of wrong information has been put into the public arena, and will be hard to get out again. Bruce Bigg's footnotes to Pei te Hurinui Jones' "Nga Iwi o Tainui" (1995), illustrate this. They rely quite heavily on Phillips' volume I and repeat many of its errors. A particularly ironic example is footnote 12 on p.72 where Biggs follows Phillips (I p.21) in locating Rangiatea, the first inland Tainui settlement, at S16/27. Jones himself, however, called this site Marino, and located Rangiatea at S16/86, way back in 1930-31 when he provided names of pa for maps in the NZ Geological Survey's Bulletin 41 on the Te Kuiti district.

In conclusion, these volumes represent a brilliantly conceived and mostly well executed project which has been marred by suspect identification and sloppy location. The errors are already being replicated elsewhere. Cross-checking with NZAA site files could have corrected many of the faults.

Owen Wilkes

Both volumes are available from Tohu Publishers, 2 Ormsby Crescent, Otorohanga. Including postage and GST, Volume I costs \$90, while Volume II costs \$120.

REVIEWS

A partial list of NZAA site numbers and corrected grid references for sites covered by Phillips is available gratis from the author of the above review, at 210 River Rd, Hamilton.