IN MEMORIAM

Yosihiko H. Sinoto

(3 September 1924 – 4 October 2017)

Kenneth P. Emory (left) and Yosihiko H. Sinoto (right) at the Pu'u Ali'i sand dune site, South Point, Hawai'i Island, in 1954, examining a remaining block of the thick midden layer that Emory had been excavating in arbitrary 6-inch levels. (Photograph courtesy of Y. H. Sinoto)

YOSIHIKO H. SINOTO (1924–2017) AND HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLYNESIAN ARCHAEOLOGY

Yosihiko H. Sinoto, known to his friends and colleagues as Yosi, passed away on 4 October 2017, at the age of 93, having spent a remarkable 62 years of his life in pursuit of the Polynesian past. His long career spanned virtually the entire history of modern

Asian Perspectives, Vol. 57, No. 2 © 2018 by the University of Hawai'i Press.

archaeology in the Pacific, beginning with the inception of stratigraphic excavation after World War II. Although he also carried out brief field projects in Micronesia and Western Polynesia, most of his research was focused on Eastern Polynesia, especially in Hawai'i, the Society Islands, and the Marquesas. In these key archipelagoes, Sinoto discovered and excavated some of the most iconic of Polynesian sites, including Pu'u Ali'i and Wai'ahukini at South Point, Hawai'i, Hane on Ua Huka in the Marquesas, and Vaito'otia-Fa'ahia on Huahine in the Society Islands. Guided by his material culture-centered approach to archaeology and drawing upon erudition gained from decades of meticulous study of the hundreds of fishhooks, adzes, ornaments, and other artifacts he excavated, Sinoto substantially revised our understanding of the course of human migrations into and across the Pacific. That not all of his theories have withstood the test of more recent research is not surprising, for science is always self-correcting, but our current interpretations would not be what they are if Sinoto had not led the way with his pioneering efforts.

Sinoto was born on 3 September 1924 in Kyoto, Japan, where his father was a professor of genetics and later the president of International Christian University. Young Sinoto was educated at the exclusive Jiyu Gakuen school in Tokyo; while there, he read a book by anthropologist Kinji Imanishi that convinced him he wanted to become an archaeologist (Sinoto and Aramata 2016:1–3). Sinoto spent most of the war years in Japanese-occupied Beijing working at the North China Agricultural Experiment Station, but returned to Japan in December 1944, when his family fled Tokyo to avoid the massive Allied firebombings. For several years after the war, Sinoto cultivated sweet potatoes on his uncle's farm in Nirasaki Village.

That Sinoto should have worked in Polynesia at all was a matter of sheer happenstance. In the early 1950s, Sinoto had the good fortune to meet the Dutch Catholic priest and archaeologist Gerard Groot, who had established The Archaeological Institute of Japan in abandoned Japanese military quarters in Ichikawa City. Groot hired Sinoto, who assisted in the excavation of the Jomon-period Ubayama shell mound, 15 km east of Tokyo (Groot and Sinoto 1952). Advised by Peter Throckmorton—an American acquaintance and archaeological enthusiast—that he should pursue further study in the United States, Sinoto applied to and was accepted at the University of California, Berkeley. When the SS *President Wilson* docked at Honolulu en route to San Francisco on 4 July 1954, however, Sinoto was handed a telegram from Throckmorton that read: "DR. EMORY OF THE BISHOP MUSEUM IS CONDUCTING AN EXCAVATION AT KA LAE ON THE SOUTHERN END OF HAWAII ISLAND. GO THERE AND MAKE OBSERVATIONS" (Sinoto and Aramata 2016:11).

Kenneth Pike Emory had joined the staff of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum in 1920 and over the course of more than three decades had become one of the leading ethnologists of Polynesia (Kirch 1992). Most of Emory's prior archaeological field research had consisted of mapping the stone foundations of ancient temple ruins in Hawai'i, the Society Islands, and the Tuamotus. Beginning around 1949, however, Emory began to excavate sites on O'ahu and Moloka'i using the method of "artificial stratigraphy," or digging by arbitrary 6-inch levels.[1] He had been amazed to find that careful screening of the earth in the Hawaiian rockshelters and sand dunes yielded large numbers of bone and shell fishhooks, stone adzes, and other artifacts. The

serendipitous discovery of radiocarbon dating by Willard Libby at the same time allowed Emory to put these finds into an absolute chronological framework.

In the summer of 1954, Emory's team of University of Hawai'i students and volunteers was at work in a sand dune situated at Ka Lae, the southernmost point of Hawai'i Island, called Pu'u Ali'i (Hill of the Chiefs). After removing an upper dune layer containing numerous Hawaiian burials, the team was stripping away a thick midden of concentrated fishbones and shellfish containing the densest array of bone fishhooks that Emory had yet encountered. The site had evidently been a fishermen's encampment situated so as to take advantage of the rich pelagic fishing grounds in the lee of South Point.

Arriving at South Point, where the group was quartered in an abandoned Coast Guard lighthouse station, Sinoto found Emory slavishly stripping away the deposit in 6-inch levels, without regard for natural stratigraphy. At Emory's request, Sinoto mapped the sand dune, but was too polite to object to the latter's use of arbitrary levels. Emory insisted that Sinoto abandon his plan to matriculate at Berkeley and enroll instead at the University of Hawai'i. When his new patron asked Sinoto to continue the work at South Point, Sinoto finally insisted that the digging had to be done using proper stratigraphic methods (Sinoto and Aramata 2016:20).

Having cut his teeth on Jomon archaeology, for Sinoto the essence of archaeological research consisted of the meticulous analysis of variation in pottery and its classification into types that could then be used to construct chronological frameworks. He was initially mystified to find that the ancient Polynesians had not possessed pottery, pondering how one could do archaeology in the absence of this essential material trait. Before long, however, Sinoto realized that the hundreds of bone and shell fishhooks coming out of the Pu'u Ali'i excavations exhibited substantial variation in size, shape, details of the line attachment device, presence or absence of barbs, and so forth. In Polynesia, Sinoto reasoned, fishhooks would replace pottery as the archaeologists' window on chronology, setting him on a course of research that he would continue to pursue until the end of his career.

Now employed by the Bishop Museum while simultaneously continuing his studies at the University of Hawai'i, Sinoto worked away on the analysis and classification of the more than 4000 whole and fragmentary fishhooks that Emory and his team had unearthed from dozens of sites throughout the Hawaiian Islands. In this pre-computer age, all of the attributes and measurements that Sinoto observed had to be recorded on manual punch cards that were clipped with a special punch tool around the edges to correspond with the specific attributes for each fishhook or hook fragment. To query the deck of punch cards, one used a long metal spindle in a series of operations to literally shake out the cards that had been edge-punched with the attributes one was seeking. The fruit of Sinoto's painstaking research on fishhooks was a slim volume in the Bishop Museum's Hawaiian Archaeology series entitled *Fishhooks* (Emory et al. 1959; see also Sinoto 1962). Although Sinoto is listed as the last author, there is little doubt that his work was the most important contribution, including not only the statistical results, but all of the pen-and-ink illustrations. A second volume in the Hawaiian Archaeology series, *Oahu Excavations* (Emory and Sinoto 1961), followed two years later, detailing the results of work in four rockshelters on the southeast end of O'ahu.

In the *Fishhooks* volume, the chronological sequence of changing fishhook styles revealed in the South Point excavations was presented as the essential framework for

Hawaiian prehistory. Radiocarbon dating was still relatively new, expensive, and—at least to some archaeologists—not completely trustworthy, so the emphasis was still placed on changes in material culture to provide the basis for regional chronologies. At South Point, the oldest deposits—in the Pu'u Ali'i sand dune—contained exclusively two-piece fishhook points with notched bases. In the H8 rockshelter site at nearby Wai'ahukini, this earliest phase was followed by one with both notched and knobbed point bases, while in the uppermost layers at both H8 and in the H2 rockshelter, only knobbed bases were present (Emory et al. 1959:41, fig. 23). Based on the radiocarbon dates obtained from these sites at the time, the initial Polynesian settlers of Hawai'i were thought to have arrived by A.D. 125 (Emory et al. 1959:ix).[2]

Emory was eager to extend his excavation program into the archipelagoes of central and western Polynesia, where he reasoned (mostly on linguistic grounds) that the deeper origins of the Polynesians would be uncovered (Emory 1959). The U.S. National Science Foundation, which had begun to fund archaeological research programs, awarded the Bishop Museum its first grant for a three-year coordinated "Archaeological Investigation of Polynesia," to be carried out jointly with Otago University, the Canterbury Museum, and the University of Auckland in New Zealand from 1962 to 1964.

In October 1962, Sinoto arrived in Pago Pago, American Samoa, accompanied by William K. ("Pila") Kikuchi, a graduate student at the University of Hawai'i. Together they reconnoitered Tutuila and the smaller Manu'a islands, collecting several hundred stone adzes and recording stone house mounds and other sites, but in the end were disappointed with their results, especially the lack of fishhooks in any of their test excavations (Emory and Sinoto 1965:47). Emory and Sinoto reluctantly decided to leave the Samoan field to the University of Auckland team headed by Roger C. Green, which was concentrating on the large islands of 'Upolu and Savai'i. Instead, they resolved to redirect the Bishop Museum's efforts to the Marquesas Islands of Eastern Polynesia.

In 1956–1957, Robert Carl Suggs had opened up the field of Marquesan archaeology with fieldwork on the large island of Nuku Hiva, sponsored by the American Museum of Natural History (Suggs 1961). While writing up the results for his doctoral dissertation at Columbia, Suggs had been in communication with Emory and Sinoto; consequently they were aware that his sites—like those in Hawai'i—had been rich in fishhooks, adzes, ornaments, and other artifacts. Suggs had applied the classic method of seriation to both fishhooks and coral abraders, aided by a few radiocarbon dates, to establish a chronological sequence for the Marquesas. Based on his earliest radiocarbon dates, Suggs put the initial Polynesian colonization of Nuku Hiva at 150 B.C. Given that linguistic evidence suggested a close link between Hawai'i and the Marquesas, this date fit well with Emory and Sinoto's postulated first settlement of Hawai'i around A.D. 125.

As Suggs had worked only on Nuku Hiva, Emory and Sinoto correctly reasoned that extending fieldwork to other islands within the Marquesas group would likely result in further discovery of sites containing abundant artifact assemblages. During his first field season in 1963, Sinoto had the good fortune to be dropped off by the copra schooner he was traveling on at Ua Huka, east of Nuku Hiva. Looking down into Hane Valley, Sinoto "saw a large sand dune on the beach. There is usually a good chance of finding archaeological remains in sand dunes, so I went down to check. To my surprise, I discovered an amazing number of fishhooks and bone fragments

scattered all around. I immediately realized I had found something very unusual" (Sinoto and Aramata 2016:78).

In May 1964, with continued funding from the National Science Foundation, Sinoto returned to Hane with so many crates of supplies and equipment that, as he later wrote, "people told me when they first saw me with heaps of supplies, they thought I intended to open a store" (Sinoto and Aramata 2016:81). Accompanying Sinoto was Marimari Kellum, the daughter of a prominent American couple residing on Mo'orea Island since the 1920s, now studying archaeology at the University of Hawai'i. Sinoto and Kellum dug into the stratified sands of the Hane dune throughout the summer of 1964, uncovering one of the richest assemblages of artifacts as well as faunal materials ever encountered in Eastern Polynesia (Sinoto 1966; Sinoto and Kellum 1965).

The Hane site had four main phases of deposition, as is evident in a photograph that Sinoto took to record the main stratigraphic section in the highest part of the sand dune (Kirch 2016:28, fig. 1.14). The uppermost deposits consisted of dark gray midden that included considerable quantities of human bone (Sinoto's Phase IV). Beneath this was a relatively thick layer of dune sand containing multiple human burials (Phase III), representing a period when the dune had served as a cemetery for the valley's residents. At the base of the sequence were two layers (Phases II and I), the upper containing a stone house pavement, together representing what Sinoto interpreted as the initial phase of Polynesian settlement. As at the Ha'atuatua site on Nuku Hiva excavated by Suggs, Sinoto found a few sherds of low-fired, earthenware pottery, along with abundant pearl shell fishhooks, stone adzes, and other artifacts in the deepest layers at Hane. Sinoto's radiocarbon dates from Hane suggested to him that Suggs' estimated date for the settlement of the Marquesas had been too early; Sinoto revised the date for Polynesian arrival in the northern Marquesas to A.D. 300.

I first met Sinoto when I was a student intern in the Bishop Museum's Malacology Department (Kirch 2015:14–34), not long after his return from the enormously successful Hane excavations in 1963 and 1964. The work benches in the archaeology laboratory on the ground floor of Konia Hall were covered with trays filled with pearl shell fishhooks, coconut graters, and pendants, along with basalt adzes, and seemingly countless coral files. Although Sinoto's primary interest was always material culture, he nonetheless was a careful excavator who meticulously screened all the sand and earth dug up by his Marquesan workers, bagging and saving as well the ubiquitous and prosaic fragments of bone and shell midden. In 1970, by now a student at the University of Pennsylvania but taking spring semester classes at the University of Hawai'i, I was privileged to participate in the only graduate seminar ever jointly taught by Sinoto and Doug Yen, the Bishop Museum's ethnobotanist. For my seminar research project, Sinoto graciously allowed me to analyze the Hane faunal assemblage. The stratified sequence of fish, bird, pig, sea mammal and other bones and of shellfish exhibited remarkable changes in subsistence practices over the course of Marquesan prehistory, beginning with an early phase dominated by marine resources, followed by a gradual shift to pig husbandry and reliance on agricultural production (Kirch 1973).

Between trips to Samoa and the Marquesas, Sinoto also carried out reconnaissance surveys on Tahiti, Mo'orea, and other islands in the Society Islands, mostly working together with Emory. Their test excavations in rockshelters and coastal sites proved disappointing, however, as they only found occasional small fragments of pearl shell fishhooks and the rare stone adze. Word of their search for ancient artifacts had spread among the local population, however; when Emory and Sinoto arrived in Tahiti in

May of 1962, they were shown an adze and two whale-tooth pendants that had been brought from Maupiti Island by Bruno Schmidt, a local nurse-practitioner.[3] Emory and Sinoto traveled to Maupiti where they were taken to the location on the coral *motu* or islet of Paeao where the artifacts had turned up in a watermelon garden. Further excavations by Sinoto in 1963 uncovered several extended burials with grave goods including adzes, whale-tooth pendants, and pearl shell trolling lure shanks (Emory and Sinoto 1964). What especially impressed Emory and Sinoto was the close similarity between the adzes and whale-tooth pendants from Maupiti and artifacts that had been excavated by Roger Duff at the Wairau Bar site in New Zealand (Duff 1956). These similarities seemed to point to the Society Islands as the homeland of the Polynesian settlers of New Zealand, as both linguistic evidence and oral traditions suggested.

The emerging archaeological sequence in the Marquesas—which built upon and amplified Suggs's earlier work—combined with the new finds in Maupiti and the results of previous excavations in New Zealand, Hawai'i, and Easter Island (primarily the work of the 1956 Norwegian Archaeological Expedition) prompted Emory and Sinoto to outline a new model for the primary settlement of Eastern Polynesia. The model was first explicitly discussed and expressed graphically as a map in their report to the National Science Foundation (Emory and Sinoto 1965:103, fig. 13). The key feature of this model was the importance accorded to the Marquesas as a primary dispersal center for Eastern Polynesia, a theme that Sinoto expanded on in several subsequent articles (Sinoto 1967, 1970, 1979*a*, 1983). In this respect, their model differed significantly from the theories of previous scholars such as Te Rangi Hiroa (1938), who had argued that Tahiti had been the hub from which other Eastern Polynesian islands had been settled.

In their initial presentation of the new settlement model, Emory and Sinoto did not attempt to put dates on their proposed sequence of settlement events, but simply numbered their sequence order, with the first stage being the movement of settlers from the Samoa-Tonga area to the Marquesas, and the seventh and final stage being a secondary settlement of Hawai'i from Tahiti (the primary settlement of Hawai'i being from the Marquesas). Dates were attached to these stages in later versions of this model (Jennings 1979:3, fig. 1.1). After further decades of research, we now know that these dates for the arrival of Polynesians were consistently too early, the result of a number of issues with radiocarbon dating, such as the dating of old wood leading to significant in-built age (Kirch 2016:198–203).

In 1970, Emory (now 73 years old) stepped down as Chairman of the Bishop Museum's Anthropology Department; Sinoto was appointed by Director Roland Force to succeed Emory.[4] The 1970s and 1980s were a period of rapid economic growth in Hawai'i; the increasing demand for contract archaeology (later known as "cultural resource management") resulting from the development of new highways, resorts, golf courses, and subdivisions led to an expansion of archaeological work in the islands. Among the young archaeologists hired by Sinoto to handle this growing demand for applied archaeology were Steve Athens, William Barrera, Paul Cleghorn, Robert Hommon, Patrick C. McCoy, Thomas Riley, Paul Rosendahl, and myself.[5] Under Sinoto's leadership, the Bishop Museum's Anthropology Department was a vibrant center of Polynesian research, although there was a kind of unstated geographic division of responsibilities. Sinoto reserved French Polynesia for himself, usually aided in his fieldwork by a loyal trio of technical assistants: Eric Komori, Elaine Rogers-

Jourdane, and Toni Han. Doug Yen and I worked in the eastern Solomon Islands and Western Polynesia, while most of the others concentrated on the continual flow of contract projects in Hawai‘i. The volume of research conducted by Bishop Museum in this period is reflected in the dozens of reports issued during those years in the Anthropology Department's two publication series, *Pacific Anthropological Records* and *Departmental Reports*.

Sinoto's management style as Anthropology Chairman was a combination of reserved paternalism, reflecting the Japanese cultural traits of respect and deference for elders and persons of authority, combined with a considerable freedom he allowed his staff in pursuing their allotted tasks. Calling you into his office, Sinoto would assign a project, pointing out the stated objectives and the budgetary constraints; the rest was up to you—he never in my experience attempted to micromanage. He was always interested, however, to hear of one's results. Sinoto also enjoyed field trips to visit sites where Bishop Museum research was being carried out, as when he visited my team at the extensive Kawela settlement complex on Moloka‘i Island in 1981 (Kirch 2015:157, fig. 10.1) He greatly enjoyed these outings, getting away from the office and from the stress of keeping the department's budget in the black, not an easy task given that the Bishop Museum seemed to be perpetually in financial straits.

In 1972, Sinoto was restoring a large *fare pote‘e* or traditional meeting house at Maeva on Huahine Island when he was told that construction for a new resort at the Bali Hai Hotel had turned up whalebones (Sinoto and Aramata 2016:121–122). One of these whalebones turned out to be a *patu* or hand club of a distinctive shape known from early ethnographic collections (illustrated in Sinoto and Aramata 2016:126). With support from the National Geographic Society, Sinoto began a multi-year investigation of this site, known as Vaito‘otia-Fa‘ahia after the names of two adjacent land divisions (Sinoto 1979*b*; Sinoto and Han 1981; Sinoto and McCoy 1975).

Vaito‘otia-Fa‘ahia is a waterlogged site, situated in the low-lying, often swampy coastal plain created by in-filling of the old lagoon, occasioned by gradual subsidence. Consequently, the site's perpetually wet calcareous sand deposits preserved a variety of artifacts of wood and fiber rarely encountered in other Polynesian archaeological contexts.[6] I was astounded when Sinoto returned to Bishop Museum from Huahine with a complete hafted adze, the sennit lashing and wooden handle still intact after nearly 800 years. Even more remarkable was the discovery of two planks, some 23 feet long, from a large voyaging canoe, along with a mast and steering paddle. Given that these discoveries occurred at the same time that the replicated voyaging canoe *Hōkūle‘a* was preparing for her path-breaking voyage from Hawai‘i to Tahiti, a great deal of public attention was directed to Sinoto's findings. The excavations at Vaito‘otia-Fa‘ahia were featured in a full-length 1983 PBS documentary film, *The Navigators: Pathfinders of the Pacific*, directed by Sam Low and Boyd Estus, which also traced the first *Hōkūle‘a* voyage to Tahiti.

In addition to his major excavations at South Point, Hane, and Vaito‘otia-Fa‘ahia, Sinoto contributed to Pacific prehistory in other ways. On Huahine Island, he mapped and restored a major temple (*marae*) complex at Maeva that extended up onto the hill of Mata‘ire‘a (Sinoto 1996*a*). Sinoto also restored *marae* in the ‘Opunohu Valley on Mo‘orea Island and elsewhere in the Society Islands. In the early 1980s, Sinoto collaborated with Richard Shutler, Jr. and Jun Takayama in the study of an important artifact assemblage excavated by the latter two archaeologists at Fefan, Chuuk (Truk), in Micronesia (Sinoto 1984). The Fefan site, which yielded the first pottery known

from Chuuk, dates to around 2000 B.P., providing important evidence for the human settlement of the Caroline Islands.

From November 1970 to March 1971, Sinoto along with his son Aki participated in the Bishop Museum's Archaeological and Marine Biological Expedition to Southeast Oceania on the research vessel *Westward*. The *Westward* visited a number of remote and difficult to access islands, including the upraised limestone (*makatea*) island of Henderson, near Pitcairn. Test excavations in a rockshelter on Henderson showed that the island had been permanently inhabited by Polynesians as early as A.D. 1350, although the island had been abandoned by the time of European discovery. At the rocky pinnacle of Marotiri, Aki swam ashore and climbed up to a rockshelter where he found a wooden, barbed fishhook point (Sinoto and Aramata 2016:176–177).

Sinoto's approach to archaeology and prehistory was explicitly that of material culture, which is to say that he believed in tracing the history of human cultures through their artifacts (Sinoto 1996*b*). He had a connoisseur's eye for the fine details of a fishhook or an adze. Some of my fondest recollections of him are of the times (all too rare) when we would sit down with a tray of artifacts and discuss the fine points of how the tang of an adze was developed, or the way in which a fishhook barb was carved, or a pearl shell pendant shaped. Sinoto was never particularly interested in other approaches to archaeology, and since he was never trained in the Americanist school of holistic anthropology (having given up his chance to attend Berkeley), certainly did not think of the past in terms of social, economic, or political change. For him, past cultures were best reflected in the artifacts they left behind. He was interested to hear what others were doing with faunal analysis, or lithic sourcing, or settlement pattern studies, but had no interest himself in pursuing those avenues of research.

Sinoto was unreservedly a materialist, but I don't believe he ever carried the implications of this through to a more fully formed theoretical conception of cultural process. He certainly was not a Marxist archaeologist in the sense of the famous Gordon Childe, another artifact-centered scholar. Indeed, he was largely atheoretical. I recall being quite taken aback when, one day at a staff meeting in the late 1970s, Sinoto laid a copy of *Research and Theory in Current Archaeology* (Redman 1973) down on the long conference table in his Konia Hall office and suggested that we all should read the book. I, in fact, already possessed a copy and *had* read it. He never mentioned the book again, and reflecting back on this episode, I think Sinoto just wanted the younger archaeologists on his staff to know that he was, to some extent, endeavoring to follow the intellectual trends of the discipline.

No account of Sinoto's career would be honest without noting his great reticence to publish in full the results of his excavations. The publication of final reports of archaeological excavations has long been regarded as a professional obligation in our field, because without the details of stratigraphy and spatial associations, the artifacts and other materials recovered from an excavation lack the context needed for other scholars to properly interpret them. It is for this reason that Kent Flannery famously wrote: "Archeology is the only branch of anthropology where we kill our informants in the process of studying them" (Flannery 1982:275). Tragically, Sinoto never wrote up final accounts of any of his major excavations; the lack of final reports for the South Point sites, for Hane, and for Vaito'otia-Fa'ahia has left the archaeological community bereft of the insights that only Sinoto himself could have provided. Fortunately, Sinoto took meticulous notes, frequently drawing detailed plans and stratigraphic sections,

augmented with numerous photographs. Researchers will need to draw upon these records when Sinoto's finds are reassessed, as they inevitably will be by future generations of scholars, because archaeological knowledge is dynamic and always subject to reinterpretation.

In 1985, Donald Duckworth became the new Director of Bishop Museum, ushering in a period of radical transformation that would last sixteen years. Duckworth felt that Bishop Museum had been too focused on research. Within a year of taking charge, he fired a significant component of the museum's research staff, including archaeologist Patrick McCoy, anthropologist Roger Rose, and, even more poignantly for Sinoto, Marion Kelly, who had been Emory's and later Sinoto's loyal research assistant for decades. Sinoto was not consulted on these decisions. Soon the extensive Hawaiian archaeological program was taken away from Sinoto's purview and placed in a separate Applied Research Group. The revolving funds that supported the Anthropology Department's publications (of which Sinoto was justly proud) were seized. The Museum's library staff was allowed to remove from the departmental archives any and all notes, maps, photos, and other documents and accession them into the central archives.[7] Although Sinoto himself was too highly regarded in the Honolulu community to become a direct target of Duckworth's budget-and-research-slashing axe, the once flourishing Anthropology Department was systematically hollowed out. Sinoto retained his office and worked at Bishop Museum (albeit less frequently as he became older) until the day he died, but he became increasingly bitter about the direction the museum was taking, even as he was held up by the museum's public affairs office as an icon.[8] On several occasions when I visited him in his Konia Hall office in recent years, Sinoto voiced his deep disappointment with the museum's leadership. In his memoir, Sinoto comments that the museum's greatest era was in the 1950s, under the directorship of Alexander Spoehr (and mentorship of Kenneth Emory):

> The museum [at that time] became a mecca of learning in the Pacific, attracting some prominent researchers in anthropology, archaeology, and ethnobotany. Many became internationally renowned. I should say that, in contrast, the museum these days seems designed more to entertain visitors than to carry on professional research. The anthropology section, in particular, has lost the academic status it once had. If Dr. Emory were still around and could see what has happened, he would be disappointed. (Sinoto and Aramata 2016:23)

Sinoto's accomplishments in Polynesian research earned him a number of honors and awards. Two of which he was especially proud were the Order of the Rising Sun, Gold and Silver Rays, presented by Japanese Emperor Akihito in 1995, and the Order of Tahiti Nui, Chevalier, awarded by the French Polynesian government in 2000. In 2002, the Honpa Hongwanji Mission of Hawai'i named Sinoto a Living Treasure. In 2005, the Historic Hawai'i Foundation presented Sinoto with a lifetime achievement award.

Yosihiko Sinoto's long life and remarkable career spanned virtually the entire period of modern archaeological research in Polynesia. Mentored by Bishop Museum's Kenneth Emory, Sinoto later succeeded Emory as the head of the museum's Anthropology Department, remaining loyal to this institution despite changes that he did not agree with. His excavations at South Point, Hane, and Vaito'otia-Fa'ahia yielded some of the most significant collections of ancient artifacts from Eastern

Polynesia, while his meticulous study of fishhooks, adzes, and other specimens provided the basis for the first major revision of our understanding of the history of Polynesian settlement of this vast region. Although one laments the lack of final publications on these sites, Sinoto's legacy will endure in the rich collections and archival records he bequeathed to future generations. His contributions to Polynesian and Pacific archaeology and prehistory were legion. He will be missed. *Auwe! Auwe! Auwe!*

—Patrick V. Kirch

REFERENCES CITED

Carroll, Rick
2005 *Huahine: Island of the Lost Canoe*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.

Duff, Roger
1956 [1950] *The Moa Hunter Period of Maori Culture* (2nd ed.). Wellington: Government Printer.

Emory, Kenneth P.
1959 Origin of the Hawaiians. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 68:29–35.

Emory, Kenneth P., W. J. Bonk, and Yosihiko H. Sinoto
1959 *Hawaiian Archaeology: Fishhooks*. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 47. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.

Emory, Kenneth P., and Yosihiko H. Sinoto
1961 *Hawaiian Archaeology: Oahu Excavations*. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 49. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
1964 Eastern Polynesian burials at Maupiti. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 73(2):143–160.
1965 Preliminary Report on the Archaeological Investigations in Polynesia. Mimeographed report submitted to the National Science Foundation, Grant G-21572. Honolulu: Bishop Museum.

Flannery, Kent
1982 The Golden Marshalltown: A parable for the archaeology of the 1980s. *American Anthropologist* 84:265–278.

Groot, Gerard, and Yosihiko H. Sinoto
1952 *The Shell Mound of Ubayama*. Ichikawa: Archaeological Institute of Japan.

Hiroa, Te Rangi (Peter H. Buck)
1938 *Vikings of the Sunrise*. New York: Frederick Stokes Co.

Jennings, Jesse ed.
1979 *The Prehistory of Polynesia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kirch, Patrick Vinton
1973 Prehistoric subsistence patterns in the northern Marquesas Islands, French Polynesia. *Archaeological and Physical Anthropology in Oceania* 8: 24–40.
1992 Kenneth Pike Emory, 1897–1992. *Asian Perspectives* 31: 1–8.
2015 *Unearthing the Polynesian Past: Explorations and Adventures of an Island Archaeologist*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
2016 *On the Road of the Winds: An Archaeological History of the Pacific Islands before European Contact*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Redman, Charles ed.
1973 *Research and Theory in Current Archaeology*. New York: Wiley InterScience.

Sinoto, Yosihiko H.
1962 Chronology of Hawaiian fishhooks. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 71: 162–166.
1966 A tentative prehistoric cultural sequence in the Northern Marquesas Islands, French Polynesia. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 75: 287–303.

1967 Artifacts from excavated sites in the Hawaiian, Marquesas, and Society Islands, in *Polynesian Culture History*: 341–361, ed. G. A. Highland, R. W. Force, A. Howard, M. Kelly, and Y. H. Sinoto. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 56. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.

1970 An archaeologically based assessment of the Marquesas Islands as a dispersal center in East Polynesia, in *Studies in Oceanic Culture History*: 105–132, ed. R. C. Green and M. Kelly. Pacific Anthropological Records 11. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum.

1979*a* The Marquesas, in *The Prehistory of Polynesia*: 110–134, ed. J. Jennings. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

1979*b* Excavations on Huahine, French Polynesia. *Pacific Studies* 3: 1–40.

1983 An analysis of Polynesian migrations based on the archaeological assessments. *Journal de la Société des Océanistes* 76: 57–67.

1984 *Caroline Islands Archaeology: Investigations on Fefan, Faraulep, Woleai, and Lamotrek*, ed. Y. H. Sinoto. Pacific Anthropological Records 35. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum.

1996*a* Mata'ire'a Hill, Huahine: A unique prehistoric settlement, and a hypothetical sequence of *marae* development in the Society Islands, in *Oceanic Culture History: Essays in Honour of Roger Green*: 541–553, ed. J. Davidson, G. Irwin, F. Leach, A. Pawley, and D. Brown. New Zealand Journal of Archaeology Special Publication. Dunedin: New Zealand Journal of Archaeology.

1996*b* Tracing human movement in East Polynesia: A discussion of selected artifact types, in *Mémoire de Pierre, Mémoire d'Homme: Tradition et Archéologie en Océanie*: 131–152, ed. M. Julien, M. Orliac, and C. Orliac. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne.

Sinoto, Yosihiko H., and Hiroshi Aramata
2016 *Curve of the Hook*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Sinoto, Yosihiko H., and T.L. Han
1981 Report on the Fa'ahia Site Excavations, Zone "A"–Section 5; Fare, Huahine, Society Islands, French Polynesia. Unpublished report on file. Honolulu: Department of Anthropology, Bernice P. Bishop Museum.

Sinoto, Yosihiko H., and M. Kellum
1965 Preliminary Report on Excavations in the Marquesas Islands, French Polynesia. Mimeographed report submitted to the National Science Foundation, Grant G-21572. Honolulu: Bishop Museum.

Sinoto, Yosihiko H., and Patrick C. McCoy
1975 Report on the preliminary excavation of an early habitation site on Huahine, Society Islands. *Journal de la Société des Océanistes* 47: 143–186.

Suggs, Robert Carl
1961 *Archaeology of Nuku Hiva, Marquesas Islands, French Polynesia*. Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History 49, Part 1. New York: American Museum of Natural History.

NOTES

1. In this, Emory was following the methods of Edward Gifford of the University of California, Berkeley, who himself was introduced to this technique by Robert Heizer. Gifford conducted the first modern excavations in Fiji in 1947, followed by more work in New Caledonia in 1952.
2. Later research and extensive re-dating of the South Point sites would demonstrate that this date was inaccurate. Current estimates for the initial settlement of Hawai'i center around A.D. 1000.
3. In 2005 Bruno Schmidt, then retired in Mangareva, recounted to me how he had been given these artifacts by a Maupiti farmer who had dug them up while planting watermelons on the islet of Paeao.
4. The original plan was for Emory to be succeeded by Roger C. Green, who had been recruited to Bishop Museum by Director Force in 1967. When Green took a leave of absence from the museum in 1970 to hold the first Captain James Cook Fellowship of the Royal Society in New Zealand, however, Force decided to replace Emory with Sinoto as Anthropology Chairman. Green did not return to Bishop Museum, instead taking up a professorship at the University of Auckland.
5. Not all of these individuals were employed at the same time at Bishop Museum, but all worked there under Sinoto's direction in the 1970s and early 1980s. I was employed on the museum staff as a research anthropologist from 1974 to 1984.

6. Sinoto believed that a tsunami had been responsible for the burial of many of these wooden objects, an idea further promoted by Carroll (2005). This seems improbable, given what is known of the site's stratigraphy, although storm surges during tropical cyclones may have had some effect on the site.
7. A lasting consequence of this Duckworth-inspired act is that the archaeological archives at Bishop Museum to this day are divided—in no logical order—between the Anthropology Department and the central Library and Archives.
8. In November 2000, Eric Conte and I hosted a conference of Polynesian archaeologists, including Sinoto, at the Richard Gump Research Station on Mo'orea Island. During the conference word arrived that Duckworth had finally been dismissed by the Bishop Museum Trustees. That evening, as we sat under the limbs of a spreading *kamani* tree, Sinoto led a toast to the future of the museum, now finally rid of his nemesis.