



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/>.

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 3.0 Unported License.

To view a copy of this license, visit
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>.



REVIEWS

David Simmons. *The Carved Pare A Maori Mirror of the Universe.* Huia Publishers. 2001. ISBN 1-877241-95-4. \$34.95.

Visit any marae and above the door into the whareniui will be found an enlarged lintel, in some cases carved, while on others simply carrying the name of the building and the date of its erection. These lintels are known as pare and they have a long tradition.

David Simmons, former ethnologist at the Auckland Museum, has brought together examples of some 86 carved pare and with an introductory essay discusses their significance within the context of the meeting house. Symbolically the meeting house is the body of an ancestor, so to enter it you are going into the body. The act of passing under the pare is to “change one’s state.”

The introductory essay covers pare design, composition, symbolism, and themes. Doorways are made up of whakawae (doorjambs) across the top of which are placed pare. Simmons notes (citing an example found at Thornton’s Beach, Whakatane) that on older examples the pare was a critical part of the doorway construction but in more recent times it has taken on a more symbolic role. The older pare appear to have only carried minimal adornment, such as notching.

An extra upright piece was added to the front of the lintel to form what is now known as the pare. Originally these pare would have been found on chief’s houses and were smaller than the later pare which are seen today on marae.

Simmons quite correctly discusses that the majority of the lintels from the Taranaki region which have been referred to as pare in the past are in fact

paepae pataka (on the basis of attachment) although they share similar composition details.

Depending on the number of figures depicted Simmons has arranged and illustrated pare on the basis of whether they contain one-figure, two-figures and three-figures. Drawing on the work of previous scholars, such as Michael Jackson, Simmons reminds us that pare “composition is invariably symmetrical and this symmetry is founded upon a key central figure ...”.

As stated previously the act of passing under the pare as the meeting house is entered is one of great significance. Using information Church Missionary Society member Thomas Kendall wrote in 1823-24 Simmons suggests that “three states, realms or modes of existence” form the background theme to all lintels. These are Te Kore or Te Korekore, the first state, Te Po, the second state and finally Te Ao Marama. Using these Simmons describes how pare can be ‘read’. I am sure that this area will continue to be debated for sometime to come.

Simmons concludes his essay by saying that “While the war canoe, pataka, and other forms of Maori art portray broad mythological themes, it is the pare which is the most immediate mirror of the universe, relating as it does to the three realms of existence, creation, life, death, and the genealogies of gods and humanity”.

I noticed a couple of errors. Plate 62 is not Kawatapuarangi house and therefore the person in the porch is not Te Pokiha Taranui. It is another house, Te Awhe-o-te-Rangi, at Maketu which was built by Mita Te Ranguakoha in 1872. The maihi and one amo are now in Te Papa Tongarewa. Kawatapuarangi was the personal house of Te Pokiha at Maketu and some of it is now in the Rotorua Museum. Plate 69 – the accepted date for the completion of Hotunui is September 1878, not 1874.

For a student of Maori art the bringing together in one book of a selection of carved pare is extremely useful. Pare are among some of the most beautifully carved objects and this is reinforced by those chosen to be included in this book.

Kelvin Day
Taranaki Museum

Roger C. Green and Marshall I. Weisler. *Mangarevan Archaeology: Interpretations using new data and 40 year old excavations to establish a sequence from 1200 to 1900 AD.* University of Otago Studies in Prehistoric Anthropology No. 19. Dunedin. 2000. 39 pp.

In 1959 a youthful Roger Green conducted a six-month archaeological study of the Mangarevan (or Gambier) group under the sponsorship of the American Museum of Natural History. His survey and excavations were an important contribution to the region's cultural history but for many years the information was available only as an unpublished manuscript. While Green generously shared this document with colleagues and interested students over the years, the present publication makes his pioneering work accessible to a far wider audience. Moreover, enhancing Green's original study are the more recent field observations of Marshall Weisler and insights from Weisler's in-depth research on Pitcairn and Henderson (e.g., Weisler 1998). This volume thus reviews the 1959 field study, outlines Mangareva's cultural historical sequence from ca. 1200 to 1900 AD, and places the group in its larger regional context. The publication is timely as another expedition to Mangareva is now underway, this one being carried out by an international team under the direction of Eric Conte, Patrick Kirch and Marshall Weisler with funding from the French Polynesian government.

The 1959 work involved both survey and subsequent excavations at six sites spread across three islands: Kamaka, Aukena, and Mangareva. Interpretations of traditional Mangareva settlement patterns were derived from both physical recording of remnant surface structures and a consideration of settlement components as known from ethnohistoric sources. The evidence indicates that settlements were concentrated within the main bays of high islands, varying in size, function, and complexity. The excavations were centred in rockshelters where there were relatively undisturbed and stratified deposits. The report focuses on these excavations, including reasons the six sites were selected for study, details of the excavations, stratigraphic descriptions and interpretations, and the associated radiocarbon determinations. The sequences obtained from the six sites are correlated, leading to the recognition of several "intervals" or temporal units, based in the main on radiocarbon dates and stylistic changes in artefacts, primarily fishhooks. As fishhook styles were important in refining chronological correlations between the six sites, a few more details would have been welcomed. The authors do not attempt to define cultural historical phases for the group, perhaps in recognition of the specialised nature of rockshelter use, or possibly because change was largely gradual and continuous.

The publication makes several useful contributions. Foremost, the basis for the Mangarevan occupation sequence, documented from the 13th century AD, is detailed. The site specifics, excavation details, and radiocarbon determinations also provide important contextual information for the varied artefact and faunal analyses that are presented elsewhere (see below). As the authors themselves note, it is increasingly difficult to find publication outlets for this kind of basic archaeological data but these details are nonetheless critical for evaluating the accuracy and precision of related analyses. Second, the authors refine their arguments that the first 200 to 400 years of the Mangareva sequence is as yet unidentified, and offer some ideas about where earlier deposits may be found, most notably Rikitea Village on Mangareva Island. Finally, the essay ties the Mangarevan sequence to the larger regional context, drawing on recent work elsewhere. One important development has been Weisler's (1998) modelling of the Mangareva-Pitcairn-Henderson interaction sphere and recognition of the important role that Mangareva played in supporting settlement of the remote and resource-poor island of Henderson. On another front, Green's (1998) recent comprehensive review of the evidence for the origins of Easter Island (Rapa Nui) peoples points to the Mangareva-Pitcairn area as a likely source region.

The work is well illustrated, with photos from both Green's original 1959 field study and more recent ones from Weisler's 1990 visit, as well as several line drawings of plan views and profiles. The quaint soil colour terminology (giving us *sepia* and *umber* sands) is based on Otswald Standard watercolours. These might have been translated into Munsell equivalents; on the other hand they speak to an ingenious attempt to standardise terminology under difficult field conditions. Overall the material presented is clear and accessible.

The volume is foundational to a series of forthcoming works and reflects the authors' ethical commitment to providing the sometime less than glamorous details of excavation. Among the related papers that will soon appear is one that examines stylistic features of the Mangarevan adzes and related geochemical analyses; this is being published as part of the 2001 *Australasian Archaeometry Conference* proceedings (Weisler and Green, in press). A second paper in press with *Asian Perspectives* considers geographic expansion into southeast Polynesia from the perspective of the Mangareva sequence (Green and Weisler, in press). A third work, still in preparation, will detail the archaeofish remains. The present volume will be an important resource for future studies in the region.

Melinda S. Allen

number of explicit algorithms for modelling travel. Boaz and Uleberg consider the location of transitory hunter and gather sites in Norway. They use viewshed analysis to propose that people were more concerned with the cultural landscape than the distribution of environmental resources. As noted in Harris' discussant paper, Boaz and Uleberg are far more successful at raising interesting issues than providing conclusive answers. Bell and Lock identify prehistoric optimal pathways through Oxfordshire, England. They present a number of useful algorithms for refining the measurement of energy expenditure, and they use viewshed analysis to assess the influence that the location of hillforts had on how people travelled from one area to another. Again Harris provides an insightful critique of Bell and Lock's paper when he notes that it is very difficult to evaluate their conclusions.

Two papers in the third section of the volume focus on predictive modelling and the third paper investigates the use of fuzzy logic. Kamermans contrasts inductive and deductive predictive modelling, recommending the use of deductive land evaluation as a technique for comparing the requirements of prehistoric land use with the potential resources of an area. His analysis of archaeological sites in Agro Pontino, Italy, incorporates economic and social variables, and he shows significant correlations between different types of agricultural sites and land use zones. Stancic and Veljanovski demonstrate the potential of regression procedures for predictive modelling of Roman settlements on the island of Brac. With reference to Stancic and Veljanovski's paper the discussant Kuna reminds the reader of the old adage that correlation does not necessarily correspond with cause, and that cultural concerns as opposed to environmental variables, might explain the location of archaeological sites. Indeed in both predictive modelling papers it is difficult to assess the relative influence of cultural and natural variables. Crescioli et al. provide a primer on the basics of fuzzy logic and its application in archaeology. They demonstrate the utility of the method to incorporate uncertainty due to imperfect knowledge with burial data from the Etruscan-Campanian centre of Potecagnano, Italy. While the incorporation of fuzzy logic into archaeological analysis is an exciting prospect, their results are preliminary, and for a paper in a volume about GIS there is a noticeable lack of graphic presentation.

The final section of the book includes three papers that highlight some fairly standard techniques for incorporating data into a GIS. Giannini et al. describe a GIS for Pompeii based on photogrammetric plans, digital elevation models, and vector data. Forte demonstrates the usefulness of fine-grained digital elevation models and 3D-modelling and virtual reality software for monitoring

site preservation and identifying features in northern Italy. Lang explores the interaction between CRM and research with the implementation of the Heritage Spatial Information Service by English Heritage. In the role of discussant, Verhagen reviews issues of data standards, scale and future developments in integrating GIS use in CRM.

The introduction to the volume stresses the need to analyse qualitative experiences of phenomenological landscapes with the quantitative techniques of GIS analysis. This is a difficult task due to the data structures of GIS (raster, vector, and object oriented), and it is often easier to incorporate physical environmental data than recreated societal or cultural information. Many of the papers in the volume explore the complexities of achieving this aim. While it provides few definitive answers, the volume is essential reading for those interested in the topic.

Thegn Ladefoged
Department of Anthropology
The University of Auckland