

Lapita for winners

Getting off the lapita merry-go-round and living without compulsive habits

Edward Terrel
Archaeologist

It should not be overly provocative to say that there is room for further consideration of the thinking that underlies larger-scale models of Lapita history. This conference and its predecessors are an acknowledgment that careful study of the fine details of Lapita phenomena has been thinner than both serious and whimsical debate about wider reconstructions. Good science, however, is neither solely inductive and reductionist nor purely deductive or Post-Modernist. We need to work both “bottom-up” and “top-down.” By now most of us who work in the Pacific are also tired of saying there are two ways of looking at Lapita the Fast Train (Made in Taiwan) and the Melanesian Homeland models (or some halfway compromise). We want better things to do with Lapita. Especially now that Jared Diamond who claimed this year in the Walt Disney magazine *Discover* that when the Polynesians finally got to Hawai’i and New Zealand, “ancient China’s occupation of the Pacific was complete” (1996: train out into the Pacific as far as it will go. It might even be argued that our bickering over whether Lapita in the Bismarck Archipelago was local or imported (or a bit of both) is undermining our credibility in the increasingly sophisticated arena of world archaeological thought. I must confess, however, that while I think there are still fine reasons to look at how we are thinking about Lapita history and even better reasons to ask what is the future of Lapita studies, these sentiments may only be a way to rationalize telling you about a most remarkable New Age experience I had not long ago.

After a low fat but pleasing lunch during the summer solstice in our northern hemisphere, I fell asleep at the foot of an ancient oak tree on my farm in Wisconsin. I awoke with a start about 2:15 that afternoon to discover that one of our cows had invaded my personal space and looked for all the world like she was about to give my face a full bovine lick. You can imagine how even more startled I was when this Holstein (no. 79) instead spoke to me in English with a heavy German accent! It soon developed that this

bold young heifer was channeling for none other than Prince Otto von Bismarck. Evidently Otto (as he asked me to call him) sensed there was a strong psychic convergence growing over the Bismarck Archipelago. A number of well-educated, mostly middle-aged people were repeating the mantra “Lapita cultural complex” with astonishing rapture. Otto found this state of affairs on earth so peculiar and alarming that when a friend, whom he identified only as “B.B.” (but whom I now suspect must be Beatrice Blackwood), told him I was the only person alive who actually knows what Lapita was and wasn’t and therefore I could probably tell him why psychically-gifted people were focusing their energies so intensely on the archipelago named after him well, to make a long story short, Otto told me he simply had to have a talk.

He reported his initial thought had been to contact a local service provider and establish an e-mail account. But he doesn’t have Visa or Mastercard and he has no active university affiliation. So he chose the first available alternative, which happened to be a psychically pliable cow, no. 79. What follows is my remembrance of the conversation Dear Otto and I had that afternoon. I see now I did most of the talking while he asked most of the questions. But after all he came to me, not the other way round. Next time (he assured me there will be a next time) perhaps I should listen more and talk less. I’m impressed, however, that Otto clearly listened to what I had to say, something not everyone is prepared to do. Here I omit the usual pleasantries about the weather and so forth that began our remarkable conversation. Let us turn directly to his first searching question.

Otto von Bismarck: I have come to you seeking honest answers to honest questions. Let me say right off that I’ve heard some pretty upsetting things about you, John. Some people say you have wacky ideas. In fact, I’ve heard some scholars only refer to your ideas when they want to prove some people say the most pathetic and extreme things about Pacific prehistory.

John Terrell: Gosh, I can’t imagine who you are talking about. You don’t have to name names, but could you be more specific? What am I supposed to have said that is so extreme?

Otto: Please don’t be upset, John. What I’ve heard is that you believe the Austronesian languages originated in Melanesia; that Lapita was only a trade ware; and that the ancestors of the Polynesians were people who had been living in Melanesia for 30,000 years or more. Is all this true?

John: No, but some people say the darnest things about other people, don’t they?

Otto: But why would anyone say you think things so deviant if you haven’t made these claims?

John: Don’t you think prior plausibility suggests the answer may simply be that some scholars don’t pay enough attention when they read what other scholars write? Or do you think maybe some people don’t bother to reread the references they cite before they

cite them? Or could it be that some individuals need extreme ideas to be against so their own ideas look good? They have to attribute such foundational but silly ideas to somebody. And for some reason, some people think I'm fair game. I certainly hope the answer isn't that some scholars, like some politicians, know the best way to get around criticism-if you can't just ignore what your critics are saying-is to trivialize the opposition by misquoting them and marginalize the significance of what they say.

Otto: Dear John, don't lecture me, of all people, about what politicians do! I may be famous for having said that politics is the art of the possible (or was it that politics is the art of the plausible?), but I assure you, I know every trick in the book! By Jove, I wrote the book!

John: Sorry, Sir! I know you are justly famous for your political wisdom (and cunning) and your tremendous diplomatic skills. Shall we turn to something less contentious?

Otto: We can certainly try, young man, but from what I've heard, everything about Lapita is contentious.

John: Not as much as it used to be, Sir. In fact, I think there is growing consensus that the agenda Pacific scholars have been following since World War II has outlived its usefulness. We are moving on. In the course of so doing, we are finding that we aren't nearly as divided about what Lapita was and what Lapita wasn't as we used to be.

Otto: Please don't mentioned that horrible war! Or that nasty little man with his preposterous moustache. Thank God I don't see him around here! Let's talk about the post-war era. What scholarly agenda are you talking about?

John: After that war, the Pacific came to be widely thought of as a place where scholars could study isolated societies and cultural traditions (simply put, one for each island or archipelago) related to one another by descent from the same ancestral society. Studying change largely meant investigating phenomena within particular societies, not among them. Studying culture contact in the Pacific as a social (and social evolutionary) process was assumed to be a matter more for historians than other students of humankind. And cultural evolution was routinely conceptualized as a process of radiating differentiation from a common source or (borrowing thought from zoology and paleontology) a process of adaptive radiation. Furthermore, the evident isolation and marginality of island societies led some scholars to assume that language, biology, and culture have co-evolved in this part of the world in such an orderly fashion that language can be used to circumscribe, label, locate, and index tribes, peoples, or populations and then reconstruct their ancient migrations and culture history. For all these reasons, for the last fifty years or so (Terrell *et al.*) the Pacific Islands have been seen as special places for the anthropological sciences, convenient laboratories where scholars could study "controlled examples" of human nature and cultural behavior under the near-experimental conditions made possible by isolation.

Otto: I've always thought it amazing that some people would believe the world is a mosaic of separate societies, ethnic traditions, or petty principalities. Let me tell you, such provincial thinking was a big headache for me when I was chancellor! But I suppose it makes more sense that some people would accept the commonsense notion that early or primitive human life was a world of closed social aggregates, each out of touch with other humans, and that contacts among primitive societies were haphazard and largely accidental. But Dear John, you say scholars working in the Pacific no longer think such things. What has changed?

John: Well, for one thing we now know that people have been living in the Pacific for a very long time perhaps 50,000-60,000 years and evidently there were no major physical barriers to inter-island travel in prehistoric times throughout the series of archipelagoes from southeast Asia at least as far as the Solomons. It's anyone's guess how interconnected people living on different islands in the southwestern Pacific were in prehistoric times, but there is no longer any particular reason to think, for example, that "Melanesia" and "Island Southeast Asia" existed back then as separate, somehow distinct culture areas. Instead, the inhabited edge of this ancient island world until about 3,000-3,500 years ago ran somewhere between the Solomons and the Fiji Islands, not at Wallace's Line or Weber's Line between southeast Asia and Oceania. And there is growing consensus that voyaging even in the central and eastern Pacific over long distances was not only feasible in prehistoric times but was common enough to be unremarkable.

Otto: But how has all this changed the way scholars look at Pacific prehistory?

John: Much of the research work done in the past 50 years was guided by the quest for origins. Such a goal for archaeology in the Pacific is hardly surprising. After all, the kind of reductionist thinking that has been labeled "the Garden of Eden syndrome" is a basic part of Western common sense. Consider these examples which not only hint at the pervasiveness of this way of thinking but also a few of its ramifications. (1) You can still sell newspapers with headlines announcing the discovery of, say, the oldest rock art in the Americas or a gene that "explains" the origins of breast cancer or homosexuality (here the search for origins means looking for the "root cause"). (2) Sometimes it seems the only kind of anthropology that gets published these days in a journal like *Science* is "human origins research."

Otto: Yes, yes, but I still don't understand what has changed.

John: The origins quest was not the only item on the research agenda after World War II but it was a leitmotif, nonetheless. But since we now know people got to island southeast Asia, Australia, and nearby parts of Oceania so very, very long ago, simply looking for where they came from presumably from somewhere in Africa or Asia, depending on where one stands on the "Eve out of Africa" debate makes little sense. The flip-side of the same coin has been to tell the story of Pacific prehistory as a tale

about “who got where when,” that is, as a outwardly expanding sequence of colonization events. But looking for the trail of early migrants through the islands and ignoring what happened afterwards in the Pacific would be like cutting a cake and not eating it. It is easier these days for prehistorians to see why professional historians say history is about “what happened in the past.” It is easier to see that what happened in the past is not necessarily going to be a story about the origins of things, the “oldest this and that,” or even a story about human progress, ethnic movements, or culture change. Said somewhat differently, we are discovering the rewards of thinking about Pacific prehistory as history in its own right; not just as history that happens to be of interest if it shows us, for instance, where the Polynesians came from. We are discovering that prehistory in its richness has unexpected things to tell us. In short, we are finding that “prehistory matters.” And that prehistory cannot be reduced to a few great moments of ethnic genesis and cultural migration.

Otto: Pardon my English but all this sounds rather grandiose, or do I mean philosophical?

John: I suppose both labels apply. It’s actually hard to know what to call such a fundamental change in scientific perspective. Are we talking here about a “paradigm shift”? A fundamental change in our working assumptions? Or a new approach to “higher level theory”? I do know something is changing, although I am equally sure some of my colleagues don’t think so.

Otto: Let me see if I have this straight, if that’s the right word. The predominant sense of Pacific prehistory used to be grounded on the notions that (1) people who live on islands live isolated lives; (2) prehistory in the Pacific is mostly a story about where the islanders came from; and (3) somehow living in isolation on islands causes people to change and radiate in isolation in a fashion comparable to the adaptive radiation of Hawaiian honeycreepers or Galapagos finches. You say that now, however, scholars are more interested in documenting the richness of that huge block of time called “Pacific prehistory.” But are you also saying they want to document how ties and interactions pulled people in the Pacific together into common spheres of human activity and history? Or do they still think people living on islands live isolated lives?

John: I’m sure some individuals still do, but frankly it is hard to read the ethnographic literature for Melanesia, Micronesia, and even Polynesia and not be impressed by how richly involved people have been with one another in the Pacific. It takes little stretch of the imagination, I think, to view the Pacific as a kind of giant playing field where people have taken up different positions at different times, traveling different distances, perhaps from different directions to play often similar, yet somewhat different, games. Everywhere they have taken up residence, people have created rules to live by suited both to that place and in keeping with the ideas and skills they arrived with. But I think there is little reason to believe that isolation among communities, between islands, and even between archipelagoes was so absolute in the past that new rules, discoveries, fashions, inventions, or genetic traits were not shared, passed along, and traded back

and forth. Also important is the perspective that settlers in new places in the Pacific would have come most often from just down the road, across the bay, or from the next island over; they are unlikely to have come from all the way back in southeast Asia.

Otto: But as I'm told you Americans like to say it, what's the bottom-line here?

John: These days, old notions of geography, time, and causality in Pacific prehistory are changing. The Pacific is not just an aggregate of isolated islands. Instead, Oceania is an interlocking, expanding, sometimes contracting, and ever changing geographic set of social, political, and economic subfields. And the length and complexity (and interdependence) of their history and prehistory are better understood if they are viewed as a geographic set of local and larger populations who are more or less in touch with each other and who have followed separate but often interconnected historical pathways of local adaptation and culture change. Put succinctly, it is becoming increasingly obvious that the history and prehistory of the Pacific Islands can no longer be so easily reduced to the categories and assumptions of Western common sense.

Otto: What does all this have to do with this sacred mantra I keep hearing? How does it go? "Lapita cultural complex," or something like that?

John: Yes, back to Lapita! It's no secret that I have been saying for some time now that we have been repeating the mantra "Lapita cultural complex" in the Pacific long enough. It's time to come up with new ways of looking at Lapita pottery and the other traits that were associated with it in one place or another and at one time or another. But I've also long suspected that many Lapita archaeologists accept two crucial assumptions that, frankly dear Otto, may be unwarranted. People need to take a close, hard look at these two assumptions, too.

Otto: Now John, don't be shy all of a sudden. What are these two possibly unwarranted assumptions?

John: The first is the assumption that something that looks big is big. And so, since Lapita pottery has an unusually wide geographic distribution in the southwest Pacific, it must be the hallmark of some kind of big prehistoric phenomenon or social entity. The second is the assumption that something that's big needs a big (or unusual) explanation. Some of my colleagues these days refer to this second assumption in terms of micro- and macro-analysis. They say looking at "the big picture" of Pacific prehistory takes big ideas that are in some way fundamentally different from looking at things close up. In other words, the assumption is made that things having different geographical scales must have different causal explanations.

Otto: You've lost me here, John. How does all this apply to Lapita?

John: Let's take the first assumption, the notion that things that look big to us must have been "big real things" in the past. An example may help. For years Pacific archaeologists have talked about something in the southwestern Pacific called "Lapita long-dis-

tance exchange” (Kirch 1990: 128). It has been said that Lapita exchange operated within two major distribution networks, one the Western Lapita network (incorporating all of the Melanesian archipelagoes from the Bismarcks to New Caledonia, excepting Fiji); the other the Eastern Lapita network (Fiji, Tonga, Samoa, and several of the smaller isolated islands in that part of the Pacific; see Kirch 1988: 105-6). These two big, supposedly real things have been invoked to explain, for instance, how obsidian from sources in the Bismarck Archipelago got as far east in the Pacific as the Fiji Islands. However, people like Jim Specht and I have long been skeptical that anything uniquely organized as a Lapita exchange ever existed. I can’t speak for Jim, but my own skepticism has been akin to Morgan’s Law in psychology (which I imagine is just a variant of Ockham’s *entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem*). Don’t posit an extremely widespread exchange system to account for how obsidian got as far away as Fiji if all that was needed was people being in touch with one another “on down the line.” (If it is true, as I said earlier, that people living on islands don’t live isolated lives, then chances are good that people back then would have been in touch with one another in any case.) It’s worth adding that the claim obsidian got around the Pacific through a distinctively “Lapita” exchange system or network, as evidence currently stands, is a fine example of tautology.

Otto: So you are saying there may not have been anything uniquely “Lapita” about “Lapita exchange” or the so-called “Lapita exchange system”?

John: For a man channeling through a cow you don’t miss a thing, do you! Maybe some of my colleagues should communicate by cow rather than by the Internet! Here’s another way of looking at what I’m suggesting. The geographical scale over which things got exchanged during Lapita times in the Pacific their spatial geometry does not necessarily mean there was anything strikingly long-distance about the process of inter-community exchange back then. Nor is there any particular reason to assume that “long-distance exchange was an essential component of the Lapita dispersal and colonization strategy” (Kirch 1988: 104). In fact, it could be argued that if eastern Lapita communities were isolated from western Lapita communities by the 850-1000 km. water gap between Vanuatu and Fiji, as some have suggested (Green 1994: 20; Kirch 1988: 112; Spriggs 1994: 74), then this observation in itself is an argument against the idea that there was something strikingly long-distance about Lapita exchange (White, in press). As Roger Green said not so long ago, “we do not have a single integrated exchange system operating throughout Remote Oceania at the time of the Lapita horizon. Instead, we have a series of such systems, only loosely linked to one another by different imports or exports” (Green 1994: 19-20; also Green 1995). In a word, while people in some of the newly settled parts of the Pacific beyond the Solomons evidently did not lose contact with people to the north and west of them, nobody thinks Lapita was an integrated society, kingdom, confederation, colonial empire, or plantation system. Contrary to opinions voiced by some (Kirch 1991: 158-60; Spriggs 1993: 187), Lapita was not even a “unity,” not an “extremely widespread system” (Green 1994: 21).

Otto: But isn't Lapita pottery something special?

John: Yes and no. Pamela Swadling (Swadling and Hope 1992: 36) and Paul Gorecki (Gorecki et al. 1991) have been saying for some time that pottery-making on the north coast of New Guinea predates the first appearance of Lapita pottery in the Bismarck Archipelago by 2,000 years. Matthew Spriggs (1996) doesn't believe them, and in the case of Swadling's C-14 dates, there are some problems. But the real difficulty at the moment is this: nobody knows for sure where or when people first began to make pots in the ornate Lapita style. That village where people first started making and exporting Lapita pots hasn't been found.

Otto: Aren't you forgetting your own work on the Sepik coast?

John: I didn't want to mention that because Rob Welsch, several other colleagues, and I are about to go off to Aitape to dig. So far we've only done survey work there. We aren't entirely sure how our archaeological findings fit into the picture of evolving human life on the north coast of New Guinea that Swadling and Gorecki have been putting together. I can tell you one thing. We only found a tiny sherd of Lapita pottery in 1993-94. Gorecki and Swadling didn't find any. Instead, we found lots and lots of other pottery. Welsch and I currently see the Lapita style of pottery-making as just one of several related, but not identical, early ceramic industries in what Geoff Irwin (1992) calls the "voyaging corridor" between Asia and Bismarcks. We suspect that pottery-making traditions on the coast of New Guinea and in the Bismarck Archipelago may be members of a widely distributed technical style of ceramic industries in the western Pacific marked roughly speaking by the presence of plain and red-slipped globular pots (Bellwood 1992: 50-51; Butler 1994). Societies in New Guinea are famous in the ethnographic literature for engaging "in an import and export of ritual and artistic culture that reaches intensities almost unparalleled in the nonindustrial world" (Roscoe 1989: 219). It is our suspicion that not only pots but the art of pottery-making was imported and exported with great enthusiasm among societies in the voyaging corridor back in the 2nd millennium B.C. when red-slip pots made their appearance on the list of things that people on the coast had available to exchange with others near or far.

Otto: But where is the Mother of all Lapita?

John: We have found potsherds on the hills around the town of Aitape on the coast that are from small, round-bottomed, low-fired vessels having thin (ca. 0.3-0.6 cm.) body walls and fine, white temper inclusions (quartz and feldspar). While the samples are often highly eroded, at least some of the vessels were red-slipped. Vessel rims are simple, usually unnotched, gently incurving or somewhat everted. Surface decoration is rare and limited to small-tool impressions and surface stamping and scoring done with pronged or dentate implements. We call this Sumalo ware, after a collecting locality on the Sumalo Hills near the mouth of the Rainu River east of Aitape.

Otto: What does Sumalo pottery have to do with Lapita pottery?

John: Nowadays most experts agree that the ornate Lapita style of pottery-making grew up in the Bismarcks. However, there are technical and some limited stylistic affinities between Sumalo pottery and Lapita pottery. To put it crudely, Sumalo pottery is Lapita pottery without the faces (see Spriggs 1990). Rob and I have difficulty seeing Lapita style pottery with its complex vessel forms and ornate decorative motifs as the precursor of the plain and impressed Sumalo pottery. The reverse seems more likely. So dig we must.

Otto: If so little Lapita got to the north coast of New Guinea, how did it get all the way out to Samoa and Tonga? Did people in the Bismarcks have a special “Lapita dispersal and colonization strategy”?

John: This claim is a nice example of the second (probably) unwarranted assumption sometimes made about Lapita, namely the thought that something big like Lapita demands something out of the ordinary (say, a special strategy of some kind) to account for it. These days anthropologists are acutely aware of the importance of being clear about “agency.” Let’s accept that people more than 3,000 years ago did colonize a number of previously uninhabited islands in remote Oceania as rapidly as some Lapita archaeologists have asserted they did, say within a period of 100-200 years. Why assume even then that there was something uniquely “Lapita” about these colonists keeping in touch with people “back home”? It can be argued on a number of grounds (Hunt and Graves 1990: 110-13; Terrell in press;) that patterned social relations “at a distance” are a universal constant of human life. If so, then why not begin your research instead with the assumption that island peoples, like everyone else, have deliberately maintained structured ties or valences (e.g., marriage, adoption, feasting, exchange, friendship, etc.) with others near and far for social and survival reasons; and that island peoples have tried to avoid situations that would lead to their isolation. In short, there undoubtedly were strategies behind the successful colonization of islands in remote Oceania. But it hardly seems necessary to think of the strategies involved as abnormal and unique to people having Lapita pottery.

Otto: But isn’t this obvious? Why would anyone think otherwise? And more to the point, what do you think scholars need to do to get off the Lapita merry-go-round and start looking at Lapita in new ways?

John: I have a few thoughts but scholars don’t like people telling them what to do. If I tried, they might start calling me the Iron Curator!

Otto: But surely something can be done?

John: Here are a few basic suggestions. First, I think we need to accept that Lapita isn’t a single or a simple story. Lapita pottery instead has lots of stories to tell depending on the time and place. We need to explore the likelihood that Lapita wasn’t a monolithic complex; more accurately, Lapita was probably a mosaic of Oceanic cultural traits (only

some of which, I'll bet, have so far been identified; only some of which got expressed at all or most Lapita pottery sites). Importantly, each of the traits in the mosaic probably had its own history, its own geographic distribution, its own temporal distribution. The histories of some of these traits probably did first come together in the Bismarcks, and how they did so is unquestionably part of the whole story of Pacific prehistory. Another part of the story is how some of the traits in this Oceanic cultural mosaic, as it was expressed in the Bismarcks, traveled from there to new places in the Pacific; this part of the tale also needs to be told. It may well be that people from a particular part of the Bismarcks were largely responsible for expanding the range of some of the culture traits in the mosaic (but surely not all of them). It seems likely, however, that after these traits got to new places in remote Oceania, by whatever means, each of them once more had its own historical trajectory, again depending on time and place. In short, dear Otto, I'll bet you the story of Lapita will prove to be every bit as complex (and every bit as much a part of the whole prehistory of the Pacific) as we know things usually are.

You can imagine how shocked I was at what happened at this point in our conversation on that sleepy afternoon. The cow standing so patiently in front of me suddenly gave out a deep sigh and lunged forward, giving my face a mighty slap with its huge tongue!

And Otto was heard from no more.

Bibliographie

- BELLWOOD (P.), 1992 — "New discoveries in southeast Asia relevant for Melanesian (especially Lapita) prehistory". In Galipaud (J.-C.) ed.: *Poterie Lapita et Peuplement. Actes du Colloque Lapita, Nouméa, Nouvelle-Calédonie, Janvier 1992*. Nouméa, Orstom : 49-66.
- BUTLER (B. M.), 1994 — Early prehistoric settlement in the Mariana Islands: New evidence from Saipan. *Man and Culture in Oceania* 10: 15-38.
- DIAMOND (J. M.), 199 — The great Chinese puzzle. *Discover* 17, 3 (March): 78-85.
- GORECKI (P.), MABIN (M.), CAMPBELL (J.), 1991 — Archaeology and geomorphology of the Vanimo coast, Papua New Guinea: Preliminary results. *Archaeology in Oceania* 26: 119-122.
- GREEN (R. C.), 1994 — *Prehistoric transfers of portable items during the Lapita horizon in Remote Oceania: A review*. MS (photocopy), Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association 15th Congress, Chiang Mai, January 5-12, 31 pp.
- GREEN (R. C.), 1995 — Comment on "Predicting similarity in material culture among New Guinea villages from propinquity and language", by Roberts (J. M. Jr.), Moore (C. C.), Romney (A. K.). *Current Anthropology* 36: 778-779.
- HUNT (T. L.), GRAVES (M. W.), 1990 — Some methodological issues of exchange in Oceanic prehistory. *Asia Perspectives* 29: 107-115.
- IRWIN (G. J.), 1992 — *The prehistoric exploration and colonisation of the Pacific*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- KIRCH (P. V.), 1988 — Long distance exchange and island colonization: The Lapita case, *Norwegianian*

Archaeological Review 21: 103-117.

KIRCH (P. V.), 1990 — Specialization and exchange in the Lapita complex of Oceania (1600-500 B.C.). *Asian Perspectives* 29: 117-33.

KIRCH (P. V.), 1991 — Prehistoric exchange in western Melanesia. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 20: 141-65.

ROSCOE (P.), 1989 — The pig and the long yam: The expansion of a Sepik cultural complex. *Ethnology* 28: 219-31.

SPRIGGS (M.) ed., 1990 — *Lapita design, form, and composition. Proceedings of the Lapita design workshop, Canberra, December 1988.* Canberra: ANU, Occasional Papers in Prehistory, N° 19.

SPRIGGS (M.), 1993 — "Island Melanesia: The last

10,000 years". In Spriggs (M.), Yen (D. E.), Ambrose (W.), Jones (R.), Thorne (A.), Andrews (A.) eds: *A community of culture: The people and prehistory of the Pacific*, Canberra, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University, 187-205.

SPRIGGS (M.), 1994 — Ancestral Oceanic society and the origins of the Hawaiians. *Hawaiian Archaeology* 3: 71-76.

SPRIGGS (M.), 1996 — "What is southeast Asian about Lapita"? In Akazawa (T.), Szathmary (E. J. E.) eds: *Prehistoric Mongoloid dispersals* Oxford, Oxford University Press: 324-48.

SWADLING (P.), HOPE (G.), 1992 — "Environmental change in New Guinea since human settlement". In Dodson (J. R.) ed.: *The naive lands: Prehistory and environmental change in Australia and the*

southwest Pacific, Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 13-42.

TERRELL (J. E.), *in press* — "30,000 Years of Culture Contact in the Southwest Pacific". In Cusick (J.) ed.: *Studies in Culture Contact: Interaction, Culture Change, and Archaeology*, Carbondale, Southern Illinois University Press.

TERRELL (J. E.), HUNT (T. L.), GOSDEN (C.), *in press* — The dimensions of social life in the Pacific. *Current Anthropology*.

WHITE (J. P.), 1996 — "Rocks in the head: Thinking about the distribution of obsidian in Near Oceania". In Davidson (J. M.), Irwin (G. J.), Pawley (A. K.), Brown (D.) eds: *Pacific culture history*, essays in honor of Roger Green, Auckland, New Zealand Journal of Archaeology special publication.