



Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand). This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.
<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the Library [Thesis Consent Form](#)

**READING LAPITA IN NEAR OCEANIA:
INTERTIDAL AND SHALLOW-WATER POTTERY
SCATTERS, ROVIANA LAGOON, NEW GEORGIA,
SOLOMON ISLANDS**

MATTHEW WALTER FELGATE

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Anthropology, University of Auckland, 2003**

ABSTRACT

Lapita is the name given by archaeologists to a material culture complex distributed from Papua New Guinea to Samoa about 3000 years ago, which marks major economic changes in Near Oceania and the first settlement by humans of Remote Oceania. Those parts of Solomon Islands that lie in Near Oceania, together with Bougainville, comprise a large gap in the recorded distribution of Lapita, which the current research seeks to explain. At Roviana Lagoon, centrally located in this gap, scatters of pottery, stone artefacts, and other stone items are found in shallow water in this sheltered, landlocked lagoon, initially thought to be late derivatives of Lapita. This research seeks method and theory to aid in the interpretation of this type of archaeological record.

Intensive littoral survey discovered a wider chronological range of pottery styles than had previously been recorded, including materials attributable directly to the Lapita material culture complex. A study of vessel brokenness and completeness enabled sample evaluation, estimation of a parent population from which the sample derived, assessment of the state of preservation of the sample, and systematic choice of unit of quantification. Studies of wave exposure of collection sites and taphonomic evidence from sherds concluded that the cultural formation process of these sites was stilt house settlement (as found elsewhere in Near Oceania for Lapita) over deeper water than today. Falling relative sea levels and consequent increasing effects of swash-zone processes have resulted in high archaeological visibility and poor state of preservation at Roviana Lagoon.

Analysis of ceramic and lithic variability and spatial analysis allowed the construction of a provisional chronology in need of further testing. Indications are that there is good potential to construct a robust, high-resolution ceramic chronology by focussing on carefully controlled surface collection from this sort of location, ceramic seriation and testing/calibration using direct dating by AMS radiocarbon and Thermoluminescence.

Data on preservation and archaeological visibility of stilt house settlements along a sheltered emerging coastline allows preservation and visibility for this type of settlement to be modeled elsewhere. When such a model is applied to other areas of the Lapita gap, which are predominantly either less favourable for preservation or less favourable for archaeological visibility, the gap in the distribution of Lapita can be seen to be an area of low probability of detection by archaeologists, meaning there is currently no evidence for absence of settlement in the past, and good reason to think that Lapita was continuously distributed across Near Oceania as a network of stilt village settlement. This finding highlights the need for explicit models of probability of detection to discover or read the Lapita archaeological record.

Keywords: pottery; Lapita; formation processes; surface archaeology; tidal archaeology; Oceania

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Primary supervisor, Dr. Peter Sheppard, got the New Georgia Archaeological Survey off the ground (and into the sea), an achievement that made this research possible. As a supervisor he gave me a lot of rope, as well as the occasional well-timed tug back to the topic, and has always been available when needed. Peter was instrumental in obtaining institutional financial support in the form of a University of Auckland Doctoral Scholarship, and a research stipend from the Marsden Fund. Field expenses and substantial analytical expenses were funded primarily from grants to the NGAS by the University of Auckland, National Geographic Research and the Marsden Fund. Peter has also been a steady companion and mentor in the field and at all stages of the research, and he and Debbie have made my family and I welcome in their home on numerous occasions.

This research in effect continues an academic program begun in the 1970s by Professor Roger C. Green, as the Southeast Solomons Culture History Project, which eventually brought Peter Sheppard to this part of the world to work on Lapita lithics from Solomon Islands. It was Roger Green who first focused my attention on Oceanic prehistory, initially with an ample shirt emblazoned with pacific canoes, and later through an intense series of lectures on Oceanic Prehistory, capped by his last 3-week fieldschool before retirement from active fieldwork in the mid 1980s. Roger predicted in 1978 that Lapita would be found at New Georgia, and like Peter Sheppard, has been a mentor throughout. He also organized and personally funded petrographic analysis of ceramic tempers, and made his extensive personal library available.

Dr. Simon Holdaway generously accepted the task of secondary supervision in mid-research when the rules changed, and has, through suggestions in the lab, comments on drafts, and by convening an archaeology theory reading group, contributed substantially to the outcome.

Material and moral support from family were essential to successful completion of the research, especially from my parents, who largely financed the final years, and elder brother, who was always ready to help pack up the house and store incredible accumulations of household effects every time we decamped to the Solomons, and is still doing so.

In Solomon Islands, support and encouragement from Mr Lawrence Foanoata, Director of the National Museum has been constant and essential. Permissions from the Research committee of the Ministry of Education, and from the Western Province Administration were key to the success of the research. Mr John Keopo of the National Museum was instrumental in the smooth running of the first field season. Rhys and Margaret Richards provided hospitality in Honiara on more than one occasion, and Rhys was instrumental as the New Zealand High Commissioner in obtaining a residence permit during extended fieldwork.

Mr Kenneth Roga, Western Province Field Archaeologist, has been a primary architect of fieldwork throughout. Unflagging energy in the field, his encyclopaedic network of *wantok* which has ensured a warm welcome on so many occasions, commitment to archaeology despite difficult political circumstances, and a range of talents too numerous to mention have been invaluable. A rock-steady figure at the helm of a canoe over many long journeys through sometimes dangerous seas, his and Janet Roga's hospitality in Gizo on so many occasions is deeply appreciated.

At Roviana Lagoon, permission for research was received from the late Chief Johnathan Roni. Chief Joseph Kama of Kaliquongu and Chief Nathan Kera of Saikile each consented to research in areas under their jurisdiction. Thanks are also due to Mr. Solomon Roni and his family, especially all at Miho in Sasavele: Sam Roni and Waring, Martha Roni, Aggie Roni and Abel Kae, my father-in-law Sale Maebule and late mother-in-law Mabelo Roni, Sitiveni, my wife Noseduri, and many of the next generation too numerous to mention. Thanks also are due to members of the Elelo community who helped out in so many ways during our extended stay, especially Hetti Lanni, Barrie and Selina Ford and George and Visa Sapolo. The late Mr Phillip Lanni generously assisted with his time during a visit to Gharanga, despite ill health. In Munda, thanks are due to David Kera and family, Dave and Mariana Cook, and Trevor and Zahi Cumberland, for assistance with communications and travel on many occasions. In Saikile, John Kororo and family abetted us on our search for pottery at Mbaraulu, and Sae Oka was a prime mover in the survey for pottery on Ndora Island.

During analysis and writeup at Auckland many individuals contributed their skills: Dilys Johns and Dr Rod Wallace supplied technical and conservation advice, Hamish McDonald and Tim Mackrell took all the artefact photographs (or at least all the good ones), Joan Lawrence illustrated the pottery and lithic artefacts, Dr Simon Bickler collaborated on the problem of sample interpretation, and wrote a simulation program to estimate parent population of vessels. Dr Robin Parker of the Geology Department provided thin section descriptions of lithics. Barry Curnham, also in Geology, showed me how to make epoxy-impregnated ceramic thin sections. Peter Sheppard examined chert thin sections. Bill Dickinson of the University of Arizona analysed and reported on ceramic thin sections, and collaborated on a paper writing up the results. Jim Feathers of the Anthropology Department, University of Washington, did the thermoluminescence analysis and was generous with his time in discussing progress and results. Dr Christine Prior of the Rafter Radiocarbon Lab organized AMS dating of samples from Honiavasa and Hoghoi, including some careful experimentation with the Honiavasa sample. Professor Jim Allen gave permission to cite the 1984 and 1985 Lapita Homeland Project Field Reports. Discussions with Dr Stuart Bedford, Moira Doherty, Dr Simon Best and Dr Simon Bickler, contributed to the research and identified several errors. Stuart, Simon Best and Moira provided useful comments on parts of the manuscript. Stuart and Carolyn made me welcome in their home during the final stages of writing.

Contents:

CHAPTER 1:

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY	1
Introduction:	1
The Research Region:	6
The Roviana Early Ceramic Archaeological Record:	14
Research Questions:	15
Approaches to Ceramic Classification and Analysis:	21
Quantification:	34
Seriation Theory : a Review:	43
Form and Function: a Review :	57
Chapter summary and conclusions:	70

CHAPTER 2:

A REVIEW OF CONSTRUCTIONS OF LAPITA TEMPORAL VARIABILITY	77
Introduction:	77
Green's 1978 Lapita Ceramic Series:	79
Anson's Early Far Western Lapita:	85
Mussau:	88
The "Changing" Face of Lapita:	89
Summerhayes, West New Britain, Anir, and a Three-stage Lapita Ceramic Series:	93
The Watom Lapita Series:	103
Wahome's Seriation of Admiralties Pottery Assemblages:	107
Specht on Buka:	109
Wickler on Buka:	111
Vanuatu:	116
New Caledonia:	119
The View from the East: Fiji and Tonga:	123

Lapita Temporal Variability -Conclusions:	125
--	-----

CHAPTER 3:

SCALE AND METHOD OF FIELD SURVEY REQUIRED TO GENERATE A SAMPLE OF LAPITA SITES FOR SERIATION IN THE NEW GEORGIA REGION	133
Introduction:	133
Review of Near-oceanic Survey Methods and Results:	139
Sampling Theory and the Roviana/Kaliquongu Survey Regions:	158
Survey Methods:	163
Results:	188
Discussion and Conclusions: the Two Surveys.	190

CHAPTER 4:

CERAMICS: UNITS OF DESCRIPTION	193
Introduction:	193
Database Structure:	195
Thickness, Form and Decoration of Various Vessel Parts Represented on Sherds:	202
Vessel Form:	205
Decoration:	219
Transforming Relational Data into a Flat Table:	242
Chapter Summary and Conclusions:	244

CHAPTER 5:

SAMPLE EVALUATION AND QUANTIFYING SAMPLE SIZE. . . .	247
Introduction	247
Methods for Establishing Vessel Brokenness and Completeness:	248
Simulation Approach:	253
Statistical Approaches:	257
Simulation Results:	259
Statistical Results:	262

Discussion:	263
Summary and Conclusions:	263

CHAPTER 6:

WAVE EXPOSURE	269
Introduction:	269
Review:	270
Roviana Intertidal Ceramics and Waves:	272
Solomon Islands Tides:	277
Winds:	280
Measuring Fetch:	282
Results:	283
Discussion:	283

Chapter Summary and Conclusions:	286
---	-----

CHAPTER 7:

SITE/ASSEMBLAGE FORMATION PROCESSES (SHERD TAPHONOMY).	289
Introduction:	289
Review: Middle Range Theory for the Identification of Formation Processes:	291
Models of Cultural Formation Process:	298
Models of Post-depositional Formation Process:	299
Summary of Models:	301
Qualitative Evidence From Samples:	302
Quantitative Evidence: Size/Density Effects and the Structure and Context of the Deposit:	305
Sea Level History:	312
Chapter Summary and Conclusions:	313

CHAPTER 8:

VESSEL FORM VARIABILITY AND VESSEL FUNCTION	319
Introduction:	319
Form: Initial Nominal Classification:	322
Metric Variability Within Form 6:	331
Inferring Vessel Form from Body Sherds:	339
Vessel Function from Evidence for Use-Alteration:	346
Secondary Smoothing of Vessel Interiors, and Interior Neck Form: ..	347
Shoulder Form Classes of Form 6 Vessels:	351
Sherd Restriction Factor:	353
Chapter Summary:	355

CHAPTER 9:

CERAMIC DECORATIVE CLASSIFICATION AND DECORATION/FORM VARIABILITY:	359
Introduction:	359
Classification of Linear Motifs:	360
Part Representation in the Potsherd Sample:	361
Covariation Between Vessel Part and Decoration:	364
Summary of Decorative Structure Across the Vessel:	371
Interpretation of Decorative Co-variation by Vessel Part:	373
Attribute Frequencies:	374
Variability of Impressed Lips:	375
Decorative Attributes and Vessel Form:	383
Chapter Summary:	391

CHAPTER 10:

LITHICS	395
Introduction:	395
Review:	398
Roviana Lithic Artefacts:	401
Chert Flakes/Fragments:	411
Analysis of Hoghoi Water-rounded and Fractured Volcanic Manuports:	

.....	412
Chapter Summary:	417

CHAPTER 11:

INTRASITE SPATIAL STRUCTURE OF CERAMIC AND LITHIC VARIABILITY:	421
Introduction:	421
Selection of Sites for Intrasite Spatial Analysis:	423
Objectives:	423
Method	425
Zangana:	428
Hoghoi:	438
Honiavasa:	443
Chapter Summary and Conclusions.	447

CHAPTER 12:

CHRONOLOGY	451
Introduction:	451
AMS Radiocarbon Dates on Potsherds:	453
Thermoluminescence (TL) Dates from Quartz-Calcite Sherds:	458
Roviana TL Data:	463
Seriation:	465
Discussion of Correspondence Analyses: the Alternatives:	478
Conclusions: Integrating ¹⁴C, TL and Seriation:	480

CHAPTER 13:

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	483
Introduction:	483
Summary:	484
External Comparisons:	498
The Lapita Gap as an Area of Low Probability of Detection :	503
Intertidal-Zone and Shallow-Water Archaeology:	504

REFERENCES	509
-------------------------	-----

List of Tables:

Table 1: Sampling, assemblage richness, and the Jaccard coefficient (p=present, a=absent).	52
Table 2: Reef/ Santa Cruz motif counts as given in Anson 1983.	80
Table 3: Sherd counts and MNI assembled from various tables in Parker (1981). . .	81
Table 4: Relative proportions of dentate and incised, recalculated from data presented by Donovan (1973).	82
Table 5: Summary of a review of survey methods and Lapita results.	155
Table 6: Site densities by period for Roviana and Kaliquongu surveys.	188
Table 7: Structure of master record for each sherd.	196
Table 8: Classes of mineral identified at 10x magnification in reflected light.	199
Table 9: Examples of descriptive syntax for tempers.	200
Table 10: Temper groupings after Dickinson 2000.	201
Table 11: Data structure of table of thicknesses for each part of the sherd.	204
Table 12: Data structure for the table of records of sherd form attributes by vessel part.	206
Table 13: Data structure for decoration records.	220
Table 14: Decorative techniques.	221
Table 15: Decoration pattern definitions	229
Table 16: Decorative elements.	240
Table 17: Data structure for flat table of summary data of sherd properties.	245
Table 18: Variation in lip brokenness between sites.	250
Table 19: Selection of sample for estimating vessel completeness.	252
Table 20: Breakage population estimate for the combined Roviana highly decorated lip sample using the statistic of Chao 1984.	262
Table 21: Fetch measurements for collection sites as an indicator of wave exposure.	283
Table 22: Total sherd count and average sherd area by collection site, resulting from combined effects of collection intensity and wave exposure.	286
Table 23: Ratio of lip-rim sherds to body sherds as a measure of collector effect.	

.....	309
Table 24: Ratios of plain to decorated sherds, controlled by vessel part (lips, rims, necks and shoulders.	310
Table 25: Body sherd to neck sherd ratio as an index of sherd skipping.	311
Table 26: Counts of vessel form classes.	336
Table 27: The attribute “even/not even” by site.	348
Table 28: Relative abundance of “hard neck” interior profiles to “not hard”.	350
Table 29: Relative abundance of even interiors with hard neck interior profiles to even interiors without hard profile.	350
Table 30: Sherd restriction factor comparison of site samples.	353
Table 31: Preservational bias of vessel parts as an explanation for differences in sherd restriction factor (data has the form <i>average thickness (count) standard deviation</i>).	354
Table 32: Part representation, all sherds including necked sherds but excluding carinated and/or inverted-rim sherds.	362
Table 33: Part representation for inverted-rim sherds (no neck corner point expected from morphology of sherd).	362
Table 34: Carinated sherds (excluding carinated sherds with inverted rims).	363
Table 35: Form strength variation for different pottery styles and the effect on part representation.	363
Table 36: Lip decoration and rim decoration.	365
Table 37: Lip decoration and neck decoration.	366
Table 38: Cross-tabulation of lip decoration with shoulder decoration.	367
Table 39: Cross-tabulation of rim decoration and neck decoration.	368
Table 40: Cross-tabulation of rim decoration and shoulder decoration.	369
Table 41: Cross-tabulation of neck decoration and shoulder decoration.	370
Table 42: Counts of occurrences of decorative attributes.	375
Table 43: Petrographic descriptions of lithic artefacts.	407
Table 44: Petrographic classification of manuports collected at Hoghoi.	414
Table 45: Size comparisons between petrographic classes of lithic manuports. . .	415
Table 46: Radiocarbon determinations from pottery (calibrated using OxCal 3.5, Stuiver <i>et al.</i> 1998 atmospheric data).	454

Table 47: Thermoluminescence dating results. Precision shown is at confidence limits of one standard deviation.	464
Table 48: Definitions of attribute codes used in seriation tables and plots.	465
Table 49: Relative contribution of first and second components of CA using all attributes and forms.	468
Table 50: CA diagnostics by attribute, all attributes included.	468
Table 51: CA diagnostics by site, all attributes included (*=inertia outlier).	470
Table 52: Eigenvalues and contributions to inertia of CA components, for data excluding form-correlated attributes.	473
Table 53: CA diagnostic table for attributes, form-correlated attributes omitted (*=inertia outlier).	473
Table 54: CA diagnostics by site, form-correlated attributes omitted (*=inertia outlier).	475
Table 55: CA diagnostics for attributes, omitting Honiavasa data and form-correlated attributes.	477
Table 56: CA diagnostics by site, omitting Honiavasa data and form-correlated attributes.	477
Table 57: CA eigenvalues and component contributions to inertia omitting Honiavasa data and form-correlated attributes	477
Table 58: Summary of variability	479

List of Figures:

- Figure 1:** Near Oceania, Remote Oceania and Solomon Islands, showing the location of the New Georgia Group. 3
- Figure 2:** Map of New Georgia Group showing principal geological formations (after Coulson, Dunkerly, Hughes and Ridgeway 1987). 9
- Figure 3:** The author providing scale for solution notches in Plio-Pleistocene limestone cliff near Saikile passage, Roviana Lagoon (photograph courtesy of Peter Sheppard) 14
- Figure 4:** Paniavile at low tide, looking north, with several inhabited islets and the New Georgia mainland in the distance. 16
- Figure 5:** Processes of formation of the Archaeological record (After Felgate and Bickler n.d., adapted from De Boer 1983): inferring a breakage population from an archaeological sample. 44
- Figure 6:** Roviana and Kaliquongu surveys as samples of the New Georgia lagoon and barrier island system. 158
- Figure 7:** Slab-built carinated vessels from Honiavasa initially assigned to the Lapita period (this assignment is examined in more detail in Chapters 8 and 9): the solid vertical line in HV.2.464 represents an estimated location of the central vertical axis (CVA) of the pot. 167
- Figure 8:** Carinated vessels from Honiavasa, showing double-line marks on some design zones, bands of nubbins at the neck in two cases, and a band of fingernail impression in one case (top). 168
- Figure 9:** HV.4.202 has an incised motif laid out in double lines; HV.1.314 is dentate-stamped, with similar design structure and a double carination; HV.2.341 is carinated, with the design laid out in applied fillets, bounded horizontally by decorated lap joints between slabs; HV.2.297 and HV.4.379 have bands of single fingernail impressions and nubbins at the neck respectively. 169
- Figure 10:** Incised rims with opposed-pinch fingernail impressed band at the neck, diagnostic of the Miho subgroup of Post-Lapita styles. 171
- Figure 11:** Miho-style post-Lapita sherds. 172
- Figure 12:** Miho-style post-Lapita sherds with incised shoulders. 172

Figure 13: Miho-style post-Lapita sherds with CVA measurements shown (MH290 was measured at two locations on the profile; at the interior of the neck orifice and the exterior shoulder).	173
Figure 14: Miho-style post-Lapita sherds; dashed CVA lines are measurements based on non-circular (uneven) curvature at the profile locations indicated by arrows.	174
Figure 15: Gharanga-style post-Lapita sherds. (Gharanga is a short-rim subgroup of Gharanga-Kopo which may have multiple bands of opposed-pinch fingernail impression on the shoulder.	175
Figure 16: Gharanga-style post-Lapita sherds.	175
Figure 17: Gharanga/Kopo style post-Lapita sherds (top) and a large Gharanga-style sherd (bottom) (four measurement points used as arrowed to estimate CVA.	176
Figure 18: Intermediate between Gharanga and Kopo styles: all post-Lapita.	177
Figure 19: Kopo-style post-Lapita rim sherds.	177
Figure 20: Another large Gharanga-style post-Lapita sherd from an unrestricted vessel form.	178
Figure 21: Gharanga-style small-orifice post-Lapita sherd showing rolled rim and thin wall common to this style.	178
Figure 22: Kopo-Style post-Lapita sherd (taller, less everted rim than Gharanga style) from a large-orifice vessel, with bands of impressions along both inner and outer edges of the lip.	178
Figure 23: Less decorated variant of Gharanga-Kopo post-Lapita style, without a strong corner point in vertical section at the neck.	179
Figure 24: Large-orifice Gharanga/Kopo-style sherd with deformation of the lip into a wave pattern.	179
Figure 25: Large Gharanga-style post-Lapita sherd with typical decoration, including a band of impressions along the inner edge of the lip.	179
Figure 26: Gharanga/Kopo-style post-Lapita vessels: most are weakly restricted at the neck, with short, heavily everted rims. Punctate band at the neck is the most common decoration in this group, while multiple bands of fingernail pinch are common on the short-rim examples. One sherd (MH.33) had exotic quartz-calcite	

hybrid temper (see Chapter 4).	180
Figure 27: Locations mentioned in the text in relation to Roviana and Kaliquongu surveys.	183
Figure 28: Kaliquongu survey transects: the unfilled symbols represent sites discovered by informant-prospection during the Roviana survey.	189
Figure 29: Data structure for each sherd record; each sherd can have many records in the detail tables pertaining to the various parts of the vessel represented.	195
Figure 30: Major vessel form variants showing part terminology; L=lip, R=rim, N=neck, S=shoulder, C=carination, B=body; inverted or unrestricted vessels have no neck, while for restricted vessels with everted rims (the first seven) the only distinction in neck types is between the double neck (top centre) and the single neck (including all unlabelled).	203
Figure 31: Lip form variants showing database codes	207
Figure 33: Measurement of rim depth, rim Vcurve, neck angle and neck Vcurve at different levels of brokenness.	212
Figure 34: Shoulder form measurement.	213
Figure 35: Derivation of conical/cannister (C) and spheroidal (G) sherds from various body forms.	216
Figure 36: Form codes for vessel interiors.	217
Figure 37: Possible conical base sherds from robust vessels.	218
Figure 38: Examples of applied decoration.	223
Figure 39: Examples of applied decoration.	223
Figure 40: Applied decoration on compound rims.	224
Figure 41: Examples of deformation of the lip into a discontinuous band.	224
Figure 42: Horizontal deformation of the lip into a continuous band in a wave pattern.	225
Figure 43: Examples of discontinuous deformation.	225
Figure 44: Excision of outer lip to form a band of notches.	226
Figure 45: Compound rims from Nusa Roviana. NR.34 has excised lines forming the triangle pattern on the upper rim.	226
Figure 46: Impressions on the top of the lip; and spatula impressions on the neck, thought to indicate forming of the neck using a tool.	227

Figure 47: Excision by rotation: one end of a small twig or rod has been poked into the clay and the other end moved in a circle, leaving a conical hole.	227
Figure 48: Perforation (upper hole).	227
Figure 49: Examples of wavy stamping and an example of dentate-stamping. . . .	228
Figure 50: Applied decoration (in combination with incised decoration) with detachment scars indicating a v-pattern, and also possible attached disc.	228
Figure 51: A band of fingernail impressions (opposed pinch), each of which is oriented diagonal to the CVA rather than vertically, or parallel to the CVA.	230
Figure 52: Deformation, perforation, and the “bnd” incomplete pattern example.	230
Figure 53: “cf” (Crow’s foot) pattern on the vessel rim above a band of pinching.	230
Figure 54: Examples of lip impression in pattern “bpi” (band parallel inner-edge of lip).	231
Figure 55: Examples of lip impressions laid out in pattern “bpo” (band parallel outer-edge).	231
Figure 56: Fragmented examples with lip impressions assigned to “band parallel outer” pattern.	232
Figure 57: Examples of lip impressions/incision laid out in patterns “bot” (band opposing top), “bdt” (band diagonal top) and “bpt” (band parallel top), which were regarded as equivalent in analysis due to non-exclusive nature of these descriptions.	232
Figure 58: Pattern expressed using linear arrangements of fingernail pinching. . . .	233
Figure 59: Miscellaneous incised patterns: MH360 is middle row, left-hand column. GW258 is bottom-right.	233
Figure 60: Examples of applied nubbins and some bounded incised patterns (MH259 is an unbounded pattern).	234
Figure 61: Decorated sherds with quartz-calcite hybrid granitic temper.	234
Figure 62: Unbounded incised patterns.	235
Figure 63: Thin incised rims from Hoghoi.	235
Figure 64: Unbounded incised pattern on the shoulder from Paniavile.	235
Figure 65: An example of “chv” pattern, a band of unbounded linear triangles filled by	

alternating fields of parallel lines.	236
Figure 66: Example of “chv” pattern on tall rim (pinching at neck).	236
Figure 67 Curvilinear incised patterns.	237
Figure 68: Crow’s foot mark, probably post-deposition scratching.	237
Figure 69: Example of cross-hatch pattern “ct3”.	237
Figure 70: Cross hatch pattern “cvh”.	238
Figure 71: Example of pattern “gm5”.	238
Figure 72: Sole example of pattern “rl1”, a double-line arrangement of single repeated fingernail impressions.	238
Figure 73 Roviana vessel completeness against sampling fraction, sampling fraction against vessel representation fraction; random assignment of shreds to vessels; mean EVE of 5.78%.	260
Figure 74: Roviana vessel completeness against vessel representation fraction; random assignment of sherds to vessels; mean EVE of 5.78%.	261
Figure 76: Effect of sherd thickness on sherd strength (controlled for temper variation by using placered volcanic tempered sherds only).	306
Figure 77: Body sherd size for the various temper classes.	306
Figure 78: Histogram of body sherd size classes by site.	308
Figure 79: Initial classification of vessel forms.	321
Figure 80: Examples of unrestricted Form 2 variants: Form 2a (top); Form 2b (upper middle); Form 2c (lower middle); and Form 2d (bottom).	325
Figure 81: Additional Form 2a Sherds (top 6); the two decorated gambrelled vessels from Nusa Roviana are a short-rim variant of Form 2a; the lower sherd is transitional between Form 2a and Form 2d, being unrestricted.	326
Figure 82: Form 3 inverted restricted vessels.	329
Figure 83: Form 3 or Form 4 (top left) and another example of a short-rim variant of Form 2a (top right); the sole example of Form 3 with loop handle(s) (2 nd to top); the only confirmed Form 4 carinated bowl, in exotic temper (2 nd to bottom) and a large base sherd or frying pan, Form 5 (bottom).	330
Figure 84: External neck radius, all sites, size intervals 10mm.	331
Figure 85: All sites, sherds >25cm ² , neck Hcurve intervals 10mm.	332
Figure 86: Form 6 “Neck Hcurve” variation; the two top sherds are too small to get a	

hand into (Form 6a), while the two lower sherds have head-sized or larger orifices (Form 6b).	334
Figure 87: Relationship between rim angle and rim height for two sites, all measurements shown.	337
Figure 88: Rim angle and rim depth, all sites, filtered so that EVE is greater than 9%, to reduce the effects of measurement error.	338
Figure 89: Body sherd curvature measurements, showing spheroidal sherds (diagonal alignment) and other canister/conical forms (e.g. s-shaped pattern of Honiavasa sherd measurements).	340
Figure 90: Comparison of body sherd curvature measurements by site.	342
Figure 91: Robust base sherds and cannister-shaped large body sherd (the latter having exotic quartz-calcite temper).	344
Figure 92: Curvature of robust body sherds (thicker than 14mm).	345
Figure 93: Hard interior neck profile and even interior body/shoulder profile (top); a softer neck interior profile (middle) and uneven interior profile (bottom).	349
Figure 94: Hard shoulder variants of Form 6 (top and middle) as distinct from the more common soft shoulder form (bottom).	352
Figure 95: Tall, fragile everted excurvate rims.	356
Figure 96: Lip impression, single band on outer edge of lip, labeled by mark section: u=u-shaped, v=v-shaped, o=oblique v, w=w-shaped, s=flat-bottomed groove.	379
Figure 97: Lip impression, single band on inner edge of lip, labeled by mark section: u=u-shaped section, etc..	379
Figure 98: Lip impression, single band on top face of lip, labeled by mark section: u=u-shaped, etc..	380
Figure 99: Lip impression, bands on both edges of the lip. Labeled by mark section: u=u-shaped, etc..	380
Figure 100: Calculation of lip orientation angle.	382
Figure 101: Lip orientation and location of impressions.	383
Figure 102: Rim depth by decorative class.	384
Figure 103: Rim depth and rim angle of undecorated lip-rim-neck sherds.	387
Figure 104: Location of bands of lip impression in relation to rim form variability.	388

Figure 105: Neck thickness comparison of Gharanga/Kopo and Miho styles/types.	389
Figure 106: Neck Vcurve for Gharanga/Kopo decoration, Miho Decoration, and plain rim-plain neck-plain shoulder sherds.	390
Figure 107: Planilateral sectioned adze from Hoghoi initial surface collection (top), plano- convex-sectioned type V adze from Zangana (middle), and planilateral adze fragment from Zangana (bottom).	402
Figure 108: Images of the adzes shown in the preceding illustration.	403
Figure 109: Green “type VI” or “type VIII” triangular-section adze fragment from Miho (top); butt-end of a plano-lateral-sectioned adze from Zangana South (middle) and a fragment of a trapezoidal-sectioned Green “type IV” adze from Zangana.	404
Figure 110: Images of adzes illustrated on previous page.	405
Figure 111: Canarium hammerstone from H5 ceramic findspot (top) (a similar artefact was found at Hoghoi); waisted sandstone slab from Zangana (middle); and chert flakes from Hoghoi (bottom).	406
Figure 112: Artefacts photographed from Oka collection and reported to be from the Paniavile site: shell and stone adzes (top); stone adzes (middle) and waisted tools/weapons and a pineapple club (bottom).	409
Figure 113: Waisted axes photographed from the Lanni collection, courtesy of the late Mr. Phillip Lanni, found in the vicinity of Gharanga Stream.	410
Figure 114: Un-ground adze preform photographed from Lanni collection courtesy of the late Mr. Phillip Lanni, reportedly found at the Gharanga site.	411
Figure 115: Water-rounded lithic manuports, cortex complete.	416
Figure 116: Size distribution of fractured lithic manuports, either with some cortex or without.	416
Figure 117: Intertidal collection units at Zangana: numbers are values in “unit” column in table “Flat.db” appended on CD. Units without numbers are those which yielded no sherds.	427
Figure 118: Spatial distribution of the sherd sample at Zangana.	428
Figure 119: Across-shore size sorting at Zangana.	429
Figure 120: Possible linear settlement patterning in the distribution of large sherds at	

Zangana south.	431
Figure 121: Initial point-provenanced collection of decorated sherds at Zangana (subsequent collection transects shown for spatial reference).	432
Figure 122: Lip deformation into a wave present in both Zangana-North and Zangana-South.	433
Figure 123: Bands of punctation were restricted to Zangana-North.	434
Figure 124: Unbounded linear incision or necks banded with pinching at Zangana.	435
Figure 125: Distribution of temper classes at Zangana.	436
Figure 126: Detail of distribution of temper classes at Zangana-North.	437
Figure 127: Distribution of the sherd sample at Hoghoi.	438
Figure 128: Lack of sherd size variation at Hoghoi, except at 35-40m (n=4).	439
Figure 129: Larger average manuport mass from 25m to 60m at Hoghoi.	440
Figure 130: Large unfractured stones and small fractured stones concentrated between 25m and 75m at Hoghoi, with small rounded stones more widely distributed.	440
Figure 131: Size-sorting of manuport petrographic classes at Hoghoi, suggestive of different size-procurement patterns by source.	441
Figure 132: Distribution of potsherd temper classes at Hoghoi.	442
Figure 133: Distribution of the sherd sample at Honiavasa.	444
Figure 134: Effects of wave refraction (and collection intensity?) on sherd size at Honiavasa: the western margin is exposed to waves from Honiavasa channel, which expend their energy in a swash zone at about the centre of the site at low tide.	445
Figure 135: Distribution of pottery tempers at Honiavasa.	445
Figure 136: Co-joining sherds from deeper western margin of Honiavasa..	446
Figure 137: Distribution of pottery decorative attributes at Honiavasa.	447
Figure 138: A method of identifying sub-fossil organic inclusions? (Image supplied by Rafter Radiocarbon Lab)	455
Figure 139: Calibration of radiocarbon determination from a charcoal inclusion in a sherd from Paniavile.	455
Figure 140: Calibration of a radiocarbon determination from smoke-derived carbon on a	

sherd from Hoghoi.	456
Figure 141: AMS sample taken from blackened sherd at far left, found on the surface of unit 12 at Hoghoi. The sherd to the right, found in a subsurface test of unit 15 at Hoghoi, may be from the same vessel, and also has a sooted surface.	457
Figure 142: Vessel with surface sooting from Hoghoi dated by AMS radiocarbon.	458
Figure 143: Attributes used in seriations, groupings explained in chapter conclusions.	467
Figure 144: Correspondence plot (attributes) using all attributes and forms.	469
Figure 145: Correspondence plot (sites) using all attributes and forms.	471
Figure 146: Correspondence plot (attributes) excluding form-correlated attributes	474
Figure 147: Correspondence plot (sites) excluding form-correlated attributes.	475
Figure 148: Correspondence plot (sites), Honiavasa sample and form-correlated attributes omitted from data-set.	478

