

groups. However, the inference was drawn on grounds of a distribution peripheral to the Society group and has since been confirmed, all Moa-hunter types except 5A now being recorded from the Tahiti area. From the implications of the later submergence of the Tahiti adze kit after the Early Polynesian period when New Zealand was settled, the proliferation of the type range in New Zealand was regarded as an *archaic* survival of Tahitian prototypes. From the viewpoint of Moa-hunter New Zealand the Moa-hunter adzes were archaic East Polynesian. Interesting problems were posed by the Moa-hunter ornament types, notably the "whale-tooth" and the "reel" necklace units, and by the peculiarity of the lashing provision through the shank limb of the unbarbed points of the Moa-hunter equivalent of the Polynesian bonito lure. The latter were seen to exhibit a moderate proximal projection ideally with two perforations, only matched for East Polynesia in Fanning Island. By contrast the final hardening of style in Western Polynesia had produced an even greater proximal projection, permitting a third perforation while Eastern Polynesia generally favoured a distal projection. For the Moa-hunter ornaments the "reel" necklace bead could be precisely matched in the recent period only from West Polynesia, notably Tikopia, while the "whale-tooth" unit could be best matched in recent Fiji. The problem was to reconcile an apparent West Polynesian ornament and fish-hook affiliation with an East Polynesian adze affiliation. The explanation offered was that during the Early Polynesian period, East Polynesia had retained certain proto-type forms ante-dating the later hardening into Eastern and Western fashions. From this point of view the Moa-hunter ornament and lure hook forms represented the *archaic* survival of East Polynesian fashions which were also proto Polynesian.

Both aspects of this thesis have just received dramatic confirmation from the Bishop Museum's current excavations in the Society Islands. In June, Yoshiko Sinoto noticed in the possession of a man from Maupiti Island two "whale-tooth" necklace units in whale ivory identical with the Moa-hunter and Moriori examples, together with a 4A adze. These had been removed from a burial on the reef islet of Motu Paeau. Dr Sinoto returned to uncover the remains, finding associated with a prone burial as at Wairau Bar, a third whale-tooth unit, two 3G adzes, three pearl shell lure shanks, of which the point base was exactly as at Wairau, intermediate to the later East-West differentiation.

This cross confirmation of the Early East Polynesian status of the first occupation of New Zealand might help us to treat with respect the foundation on which it was based, notably primary association with remains of the *moa*, a criterion so effective that the age and origin of the Moa-hunter phase could be proposed before stratigraphy and Carbon 14 analysis.

The earliest Polynesian migrations to New Zealand in the light of the illumination thrown by the demonstration of a Moa-hunter phase and Dr H. D. Skinner's distributional studies, are now seen to be not only East Polynesian, but specifically from the earliest settlement period which Buck (1944) designated as Early Polynesian in a thesis which has received insufficient attention since. The significance of Buck's Early Polynesian period is that it represented the first period of Polynesian movement into the groups lying in the southern tropic zone, during which the prototype culture as between the western and eastern groups still preserved many elements in common. The New Zealand evidence supports this hypothesis for ornament and lure fish-hook points and the composite dart head (Ulutoa) although by the same token the distinctive eastern adze assemblage arose in the Society Islands before the migration to New Zealand. On the basis of Percy Smith's genealogies and "in spite of their unreliability" Buck, *ibid.* (p. 504) it was "passively accepted . . . that the Polynesians began to move