Atholl Anderson, ed., *Traditional Fishing in the Pacific: Ethnographical and Archaeological Papers from the 15th Pacific Science Congress.* Pacific Anthropological Records No. 37. Honolulu: Department of Anthropology, Bernice P. Bishop Museum, 1986. Pp. xi, 213. $21.00.

Reviewed by Patrick V. Kirch, The Burke Museum, University of Washington

Despite being an old theme in Oceanic anthropology, the study of traditional fishing has never been more active or innovative than in the past decade, witnessed by this significant collection of thirteen essays authored both by archaeologists and ethnographers. Approaches to traditional fishing have come a long way from the days of Sir Peter Buck, when anthropologists rarely looked beyond the point of a fishhook. Indeed, typological analyses dominated archaeological studies of Oceanic fishing until quite recently. Thus, it is all the more revealing that only one paper in this volume (by Bell, Specht, and Hain) specifically addresses fishhook form and classification, focusing on a polymorphic

assemblage of composite hooks from the Solomon Islands. But even these authors conclude their essay with the admonition that "it is now time to look beyond the reef" (p. 57). Most of their colleagues have already taken that advice to heart.

Most of the papers in this volume were originally presented at a symposium, organized by the editor, in the 15th Pacific Science Congress held in February 1983 in Dunedin, New Zealand. In organizing them for publication, Anderson divided the papers into two groups, dealing with the tropical and temperate parts of the Pacific respectively. While there are some important differences between tropical and temperate fisheries, this division superficially masks some interesting similarities, at least in research orientation. For example, both Swadling and Nichol, in their studies of prehistoric shellfish exploitation in the tropical Reef Islands and temperate New Zealand, are concerned with the archaeological manifestation of overexploitation. One wishes that Anderson had taken the time to pull together such common themes and interrelationships in a more extended introductory essay to the volume. Nonetheless, he is to be commended for a fine job of editing, and seeing to it that this worthwhile symposium reached the stage of publication.

Given the somewhat acrimonious debate surrounding the subsistence economy 'of the early Lapita Cultural Complex, stemming largely from Les Groube's 1971 hypothesis that the Lapita adaptation was one of "Oceanic strandloopers," the contributions by Green and Swadling on Lapita fishing and shellfishing are especially welcome. These papers present some of the first detailed archaeological data on Lapita marine exploitation, on which Groube's hypothesis and other propositions may be empirically tested. Green deals with the fishbone assemblage from his important RF-2 site in the Reef Islands, finding the evidence overwhelming for concentration on inshore reef species. Minor benthic and pelagic components are, however, present. Given the dearth of angling gear, Green concludes that the dominant fishing strategies were netting, trapping, and spearing. Swadling deals not only with RF-2, but also sites SZ-8 and RF-6, providing quantitative data on levels of molluscan resource exploitation. To those who have followed the Lapita "strandlooper" debate, her conclusion is significant: that the RF-2 situation "reflects moderate, sustained exploitation such as might occur in a horticultural society exploiting maritime resources to provide a relish for their otherwise bland and starchy food' (p. 146).

The papers by Allen, Chikamori, and Masse all present long archaeological sequences with fishbone faunal suites from south coastal Papua, the Polynesian outlier of Rennell Island, and the Palau archipelago. In

the Motupore site excavated by Allen, fishbone was plentiful while fishhooks were wholly absent (although *Anadara* net sinkers were common), and he argues that fishing strategies concentrated on netting and perhaps spearing. Chikamori summarizes a two thousand year sequence, with most of the evidence coming from the deeply stratified RE-LC2 rockshelter. The faunal assemblages show a distinct pattern of early emphasis on marine exploitation, including a strong pelagic fishing component. Also noteworthy is the early emphasis on the taking of birds, turtles, and sea mammals, a pattern noted for other Pacific Islands sequences, such as that of Tikopia and the Marquesas. Chikamori argues that after about A.D. 1000 the local fishing pattern changed dramatically, with an emphasis on inshore species exploitation. He sees this as, in part, a reflection of a developing agricultural system. This sequence of substantial change in the history of Rennell Island fishing strategies contrasts markedly with that for Palau. Masse's very extensive Palauan data (2,303 MNI from five site complexes) reveal a remarkable stability in fishing practices from A.D. 700 to 1900. While Chikamori links the Rennell fishing changes to agricultural developments, Masse points out that Palauan fishing remained stable despite dramatic shifts in the nature of Palauan terrestrial economic activities. Together, studies such as these underscore the complexities of Oceanic economic systems, and how much we have yet to learn of the linkages between marine and terrestrial systems.

A further comment on the archaeological papers of Green, Allen, Chikamori, and Masse: there is a growing problem in the standardization of archaeological faunal data, such that direct comparison between cases is frequently impossible. Several authors present their data in the form of MNI (minimum numbers of individuals), although they differ in how MNI are calculated. Chikamori presents his data in gross weights, and thus his data cannot be compared with the MNI suites, nor can inter-taxon comparisons in the Rennell sequence be readily made. Largely due to the efforts of Donald Grayson and his colleagues, North American faunal analysts have moved away from the use of MNI (or weight), and prefer to present primary faunal data in terms of NISP (number of identified specimens). This practice has much to recommend itself to studies of Oceanic faunal assemblages.

Another group of archaeological papers deals with New Zealand situations. Anderson looks at the evidence for selection of fish species in a number of South Island sites, arriving at the conclusion that technology per se was not the constraining factor, but rather insufficient labor to produce or operate the kind of technology that would be necessary to

adequately exploit these temperate fisheries. His contribution should stimulate others to pay greater attention to the role of labor in Oceanic fisheries generally. Till and Blattner explore the potential of using oxygen isotope ratios in shellfish to determine the time of collection (through correlation with seawater temperature), and thus the seasonality of exploitation. They suggest that their preliminary result "demands a reassessment of current views about seasonality in prehistoric Otago." Nichols uses a midden sample from Site N44/215 in the Coromandel to address a persistent theme in the New Zealand literature on fishing: that of "stress" and the exploitation of what might normally be considered marginal resources (that is, small fish, less desirable molluscan species). The very small size of his sample makes his conclusions highly tentative, but the article offers some provocative suggestions that deserve to be followed up.

The contributions by Hall, Akimichi, and Severance deal with ethnohistoric and ethnographic evidence for the diversity of fishing strategies and, to some extent, offer "cautionary tales" to archaeologists who would reconstruct fishing strategies on the basis of faunal assemblages. Hall's paper documents a remarkable case of aboriginal-dolphin commensalism, with parallels drawn from a worldwide ethnohistoric search. Akimichi focuses on the concept of "conservation" as this pertains to use of marine resources on the Micronesian atoll of Satawal. His paper is especially useful in documenting some of the complex cognitive, ritual, and political factors that impinge on daily fishing activities. Severance looks at the problem of using contemporary ethnographic data to project fishing strategies into the past, noting several instances of historic innovation and adaptation in the "traditional" fishery of Losap Atoll, Truk. Severance also cautions archaeologists to "consider more than one probable capture strategy and gear" (p. 41) for any particular species when interpreting archaeological assemblages.

The final paper by Akazawa, while presenting an innovative approach to prehistoric regional and "ethnic" diversity in Japan, is somewhat out of place in this volume. Akazawa deals with fishing only peripherally, in that fishing gear is included in his discriminant function analyses of Jomon assemblages.

Traditional Fishing in the Pacific is printed and softcover bound in the characteristic style of the Pacific Anthropological Records series, which anthropologists worldwide have come to respect as one of the most important monograph series disseminating primary results of anthropological, and especially archaeological, research in this region. I must conclude this review on a sad note, for almost simultaneously

with Pacific Anthropological Records No. 37, I received word that the series is shortly to be discontinued, a victim of "administrative reorganization" at the Bishop Museum Press. What a pity that this series, which Roger Green and Doug Yen started on a mere shoestring and which has grown to be an internationally respected monographic outlet for Pacific anthropology--as witnessed by volumes such as *Traditional Fishing in the Pacific*--will be terminated. Finding publication outlets for important symposia such as Anderson's from the 15th Pacific Science Congress will be all the more difficult in the future.