

UPPER SEPIK-CENTRAL NEW GUINEA PROJECT

PROGRESS REPORT January 2006

Andrew Fyfe

The trip to document Upper Sepik-Central New Guinea collections in Europe was undertaken from the 29th October to 23rd December 2005. The planning stages of the European leg took place for several months prior to my departure. The museums had been aware of the imminent visits for some time however considerable adjustment of the schedule was needed to ensure maximum availability of museum stores and that each museum could be visited in turn without a lapse in my travel schedule. By the time of my departure three of the five participant museums had agreed to accommodate me during the November and December months and I was extremely fortunate that the visits were able to run sequentially without interruption. The two remaining museums, the Museum für Völkerkunde, Berlin and the Museum für Völkerkunde, Basel, were not able to accommodate me during January or February and this meant that I have had to return to Australia pending a return to Europe to complete the remaining collections.

The three museums I did visit, the British Museum, London, Museum für Völkerkunde, Vienna and the Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde (RMV), Leiden, held collections as they are listed in the ARC Project Description, however, as discussed below, I discovered during my stay that two additional museums held part of the Barry Craig 1968 Upper Sepik Collection intended for the RMV and I also ended up recording a considerable amount of additional material, a large part of this within the British Museum collections. The total of the number of pieces recorded was 2469.

London

The British Museum's Bryan Cranstone's Mountain Ok collection was the first recorded, commencing on the 31st of October and running through the first two weeks of November. We had known that there were approximately 450-500 objects in the Cranstone collection, as gleaned from original museum records, and the final total recorded was 461 – no Cranstone objects were damaged or unavailable during my visit.

The museum store was organised according to a three-tier system where objects were housed sequentially according to region, collector and object class. This system made the recording process fairly straight-forward and, along with some significant preliminary work by Jill Hasell, Acting Assistant Curator (Pacific and Australian collections), ensured that this material was able to be finished well within the allotted timeframe. I therefore had sufficient time to work at the anthropology archive of the British Museum and to visit colleagues at the University College London. I also was able to document additional material, which totaled almost two hundred objects. These additional objects were brought to my attention by Jill Hasell prior to any investigation on my part thus enabling me to prioritise my time appropriately.

The additional objects at the BM were of great value due to their diverse range, their significance and the existence of collection point data. They included a collection from Maria Wronska-Friend – there are a number of pieces collected by her and her husband, Tony Friend, in the PNG National Museum – and a range of shields and house-boards that were collected by Barry Craig in the late 1960s. There were also four Falamin sideboards obtained by the Museum in 1970 and these also appear to have been collected by Barry Craig. As with the Cranstone collection, all of these additional objects were from the Central New Guinea region of our study area.

*

On the 8th of November I gave an hour talk at the Institute of Archaeology, University College London. This was a productive sideline to the trip as it is at this institution where many of the present advances are being made concerning the spatial analysis of diversity in archaeological and anthropological assemblages. It is this kind of analysis that can inform scholars about the nature of cultural evolution and processes that give rise to linguistic and ethnic diversity. Importantly for us, these approaches have sought to demonstrate which classes and characteristics of material culture are able to be interpreted in such a manner that they can inform us about social structures and inter/intra-social interaction in a time-neutral context such as with some ethnographic collections.

There were a number of elements in my talk that were of particular interest to the UCL participants. One concerned the lack of interaction, and indeed enmity, between some groups in the Mountain Ok area where considerable cultural and linguistic homogeneity is found. This situation contrasts markedly with some assumptions in archaeological studies where material culture similarity has often been equated with intense interaction resulting in high levels of diffusion – what has sometimes been termed as the ethnogenetic process in material culture distribution. I also pointed out the marked differences in material culture and language between Upper Sepik Basin groups where field workers have noted strong interaction. These examples suggest that there may be strong phylogenetic signals in our dataset. It is the phylogenetic process in the evolution of cultural assemblages, the process where a diversity of types have descended from a common antecedent, that is of particular interest to many academics at UCL.

One of the participants at my talk was Professor Stephen Shennan, Director of the Institute of Archaeology and of the AHRB Centre for the Evolutionary Analysis of Cultural Behaviour and I was able to visit him on the 10th of November. Stephen Shennan has had ongoing communications with Barry Craig and myself and has offered considerable advice and support including the generous gift of a recent co-authored publication concerning the processes responsible for cultural change and diversity.¹ Stephen Shennan was particularly interested in the fact that we were using collection point data both within and between language/ethnic areas. Intra-group diversity is of particular interest to him because of his significant work concerning the identification of phylogenetic signals. He subsequently warned me of the dangers of using collection area data where point data was unavailable and how this could obscure the identification of branching or blending processes in cultural change. This is especially important for our ability to identify valid phylogenetic traits when attempting to gauge relationships between groups in the comparative melting pot of the Upper Sepik Basin. The paucity of point

¹ Mace, R., Holden, C. J. and Shennan, S. 2005. *The Evolution of Cultural Diversity: a Phylogenetic Approach*. UCL Press, London.

data have been of particular concern to us due to significant loss of field notes since the collection of objects, and the fact that we have been unaware of how many collections were poorly documented in the field – I will elaborate with examples discussed below.

An important issue that Stephen Shennan raised during my visit was the factor of variation that may be attributable to cultural drift, that is, variation over time between isolated groups with shared ancestry, regardless of the level of interaction with unrelated groups or other selective processes. Obviously the example of the Mountain Ok groups' strong cultural and linguistic homogeneity suggests that the limited interaction and indeed the relative isolation between the groups is a rather recent situation in which the restrictive geographical constraints had not yet had a marked influence on the rate of cultural drift. It must also be recognized that the rate of language change in proportion to cultural change may differ.

*

While I was in London I was also able to meet David Lee who was the photographer for the Cranstone expedition. David was able to explain some of the pieces and inform me about the expedition's movements during the collection process. While I was documenting Cranstone material at the PNG National Museum, I observed that some of the objects were given village attributions while others lacked collection point data and had instead been merely attributed to Tifalmin sub-groups. I had thought that my trip to the British Museum would resolve this issue. However, I found that a similar pattern of attributions had been recorded there. According to the field-notes and David Lee's recollections, he and Bryan Cranstone had camped in Bufalmin villages south of the Ilam River; they had made a significant trip north of the river but David confirmed that no objects had been collected on this trip. I had suspected that many of the objects from the sub-groups north of the Ilam, the Dubalmin and Ifilkimin, had been brought to Cranstone's camps in the south. It seems that this was the case and that Cranstone had usually enquired only about the vendor's sub-group membership, and was rarely informed of the vendor's village.

Vienna

I arrived in Vienna on the 13th of November and completed work on the 25th. I had discovered just prior to my departure from Australia that the Hanns Peter collection of Yuri material held by the Museum für Völkerkunde in Vienna was considerably larger than had been estimated the previous year. This underestimation was due to the fact that since the initial donations that took place in the 1970s, Hanns Peter had progressively donated his remaining personal collection and this had increased the number of objects considerably from around 150 to 900 objects. A comprehensive list of this material was constructed from information provided on registration cards by Dr Gabriele Weiss, Curator of the Oceanic Collections. This proved to be essential in ensuring that the collection could be documented successfully within the allotted 10 working days. I had prioritized objects with village collection point data; these totaled approximately 730 objects. This was by far the largest quantity of material attempted in a two week timeframe. Remaining time was spent revisiting the documentation within the museum and recording unprovenanced Peter material.

Importantly, Dr Weiss informed me that another Hanns Peter collection consisting of 226 objects was held at the Ethnology Museum at Göttingen University. I obtained the collection catalogue for this material and it became apparent that the Göttingen collection contained material from villages not represented in the Vienna collection. The University has since been contacted by Barry Craig and I have been given permission to record the objects when I return to Europe, although it will be necessary to pay for an assistant to be brought in to help.

Leiden

The work at the Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde (RMV) in Leiden started on the 28th of November and lasted four weeks until my departure on the 23rd December. This project was facilitated by Dr Dirk Smidt, curator of Oceanic collections. Two major collections were recorded: a quarter of Barry Craig's 1968 and 1969 Upper Sepik collections and a collection made by the Dutch Star Mountains Expedition of 1959 in the Sibil Valley, West Papua.

Prior to the trip I had made a request to the participating European museums for database worksheets containing any information on the collections so that I could import table data into my spreadsheet before I departed and therefore minimize my time at each institution. I was also particularly interested whether the field numbers had been allied with the museum accession numbers in the database for this would enable better identification; The RMV was the only museum able to fulfill this request as they had assimilated the collections into an electronic database. Unfortunately, the RMV's database entries included no field numbers. However, Sijbrand de Rooij, Registrar of RMV, was later able to find a document that reconciled accession numbers with the relevant field numbers. While this document included all of Craig's 1969 objects, many of the pieces from the 1968 collection were missing from the list, which led me to believe that the document was incomplete. On my arrival in Leiden I initially found no trace of the missing 1968 objects. Then in the collector files I discovered the complete list of the 1968 collection, typed by Barry Craig, with the missing objects being listed as having been sent to Leiden. Each of the entries for the missing objects, however, had either the letter "A" or "R" written next to them. I pointed these out to Mr de Rooij who soon realized that they stood for "Amsterdam" or "Rotterdam" – it seems as though there had been a practice at that time of sharing some of the larger ethnographic collections with related national institutions in other major cities in the Netherlands. These two other institutions were subsequently identified as the Tropen Museum (Museum of the Tropics) in Amsterdam and the Wereld Museum (World Museum) in Rotterdam. I immediately made requests to the relevant curators and collection managers and was able to get a commitment of at least two days for each of the museums just prior to the Christmas break. After some further investigation two more documents listing the object titles and original field numbers for each group of objects given to these museums were discovered. However, again the question arose whether the field numbers and new museum accession numbers had been reconciled in their documentation.

The documentation process at the RMV proceeded well because all objects had been stored according to region and the relevant compactus sections had been identified prior to my arrival. All material, aside from the arrows, was held in a series of shelves in a single store. I had extremely good light for images and very good access to the shelves. In the first week the store was inaccessible for one day so I used this time to visit the museum proper to check the documentation for the Star Mountains material. All of the descriptive notes concerning the

collection were written on catalogue cards which I then copied and assessed. These cards had been completed from the expedition's field notes by Dr Simon Koojiman, former curator of the Oceanic collections at the RMV. I found that almost no collection points had been recorded even though vernacular terms and explanations of the objects' function were often recorded. This was quite unexpected and caused considerable concern due to the fact that the catalogue cards were considered to be the best source of information for the collection. I asked where the original expedition field notes were kept and was informed that they were held at the Royal Dutch Geographical Society, in Utrecht. As time was limited I decided to contact the society and Mr de Rooij was able to give me the relevant email addresses and phone numbers. I was then able to establish a dialogue with Dr Paul van den Brink, Geographical Sciences, University of Utrecht, and Arnold Wentholt who are archivists at the Society. Fortunately the Society held all of the material from that expedition and was undertaking research into the 1959 Expedition at the time. Arnold Wentholt reviewed the field notes including those of Jan Pouwer, who was the ethnographer for the expedition, and was unable to find references to any specific or series of objects within the notes. Wentholt concluded thus:

This expedition had some minor points in the academic sense, i.e. the ethnographical field notes that were poorly dealt with. The man in charge was Jan Pouwer but somehow he made a poor job of it. In his reminiscences he never mentioned the Star Mountain expedition as if he never [sic] took part in it. I have to check up with him what actually the reason was..... In fact as I found out he rarely went to see the local tribes in their original habitat, but stayed in base camp for most of the time he spent there. People came to him with all kind of goods. The collection was then enhanced by what the other members of the expedition took with them from their field trips.²

I have written to Jan Pouwer but have yet to receive a reply. It seems that the objects had been brought to the bivouacs from the nearest villages and that not only had Pouwer neglected to ask the vendor/informant about the origin of any of the objects, he had also neglected to note which objects had been collected at which bivouacs.³ It also appears as though the few objects that have village attributions were collected while members of the team were undertaking surveys in the immediate area of the main bivouacs. Although there are detailed maps and information concerning the location of the Dutch bivouacs, there is little hope of being able to associate any of the objects with these bivouacs.

*

During my last week at Leiden, while I was recording the arrows of the Craig and the Dutch Star Mountains Expedition, I came across a number of arrows with physical attributes analogous to some from the north-western region of the Upper Sepik Basin. Their accession numbers indicated that they were not from the Craig collection and that they were indeed from a much earlier acquisition. After checking the register it became apparent that these arrows were collected prior to World War One, possibly by a Dutch survey expedition. The only recorded name associated with the collection was 'Gjellerup'. I alerted Barry Craig who quickly informed me that a likely candidate was the Dutch-German border expedition that had taken place during that period; Barry was also able to provide me with the reference for a Dutch report of the expedition.

² Email communication with Arnold Wentholt, December, 2005

³ The location of the bivouacs are given in published material, e.g. Brongersman, L. D. and Venema, G. F. 1962. *To the mountains of the stars*, Hodder and Stoughton, London

While I continued working at the museum store, Mr de Rooij was able to locate the published report for this expedition in the Leiden University Library.⁴ As it turned out, the objects were collected by K. Gjellerup, chief medical officer, during the 1910 expedition undertaken by the Dutch in coordination with a German team, to establish a natural border between the colonies of the two countries. The expedition in fact traveled up the Sepik as far as the foothills of the Star Mountains. These objects are likely to be the first to be collected from the study area and would provide an intriguing sample for the study— they predate Thurnwald's expedition by four years.

Prior to the Sepik sector of the expedition, they had made an attempt at identifying a natural and reliable north-south river course via the Humbolt Bay area. After a frustrating attempt to follow several river courses from the shore of the Bay, the expedition traveled due south attempting to find river courses further inland that would run closely parallel to the 141° meridian of east longitude. The southerly course of the expedition terminated on the 11 July 1910 along a westerly stretch of the Keerom River; the expedition then returned to Humbolt Bay via the Bewani and Tami Rivers and approached the objective from the Sepik River. Importantly for us, when the expedition was traveling along the Keerom just prior to the river's westerly course, they would have been traveling through the north western extreme of our study area.

Soon after the report had been uncovered, we obtained copies of the 1911-1914 minutes of the Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences.⁵ The Society had the responsibility of obtaining scientific and cultural material from such expeditions that were then to be housed in the colonial museum in Batavia. The minutes revealed that Gjellerup sent a catalogue with 3 appendices to the Batavian Society that related to a collection of 628 ethnographic pieces he had already sent. Some of these pieces then entered the RMV in 1914 while the rest appear to have remained in Batavia until Indonesian Independence when the material was brought to Jakarta. At present I am unsure as to where the catalogues were sent. Enquiries are being made to the National Museum in Jakarta where a significant part of the collection is likely to be held.

In the middle of that week I had a meeting with Dr Pieter ter Keurs, Curator of Southeast Asia, RMV. He had recently curated the show: *Indonesia: the discovery of the past*, at the Nieuwe Kerk in Amsterdam, an exhibition where many of the objects had been brought from the Indonesian National Museum, Jakarta. Dr ter Keurs claimed that there were many pieces from the PNG side of the border and the Sepik region in the Jakarta museum and that the staff at the Museum were unaware of their origin - indeed two Middle Sepik pieces from the 1910 expedition, identified by Dr ter Keurs, had been brought from Jakarta for the show. Importantly this implies that the expedition had been collecting consistently and that there may be a significant sample from between the May and the confluence of the Sepik and October Rivers, as this area was nearer their objective.

⁴ Commissie ter Voorbereiding van de Aanwijzing Eener Natuurlijke Grens Tusschen Het Nederlandsche en het Duitse Gebied op Nieuw-Guinea. 1911. *Verslag der Commissie ter Voorbereiding van de Aanwijzing Eener Natuurlijke Grens Tusschen Het Nederlandsche en het Duitse Gebied op Nieuw-Guinea, Ingesteld bij Besluit van den Gouverneur-Generaal DD. 11 Maart 1910 N. 8*, Batavia Landsdrukkerij.

⁵ Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen. 1911-1914. *Notulen van de Algemeene en Directievergaderingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, deel XLIX*, Batavia.

The total number of pieces from the 1910 expedition held by the RVM has been established as being 50 but it is yet to be established which of these pieces are from the Humbolt Bay or the Sepik venture. Obviously, some of the pieces I recorded were clearly from our area but documentation must be found that enables us to give the pieces collection points. I am sure that if the catalogues and related pieces are found there is a very good chance collection points can be established. While the 1910 report details the location points of bivouacs for the Humbolt Bay sector of the expedition, and along the course of the Sepik upstream from the confluence of the Sepik and October Rivers, it is likely that Gjellerup would have recorded the location of the bivouacs where objects were collected downstream from the confluence of the Sepik and October Rivers. That there is a catalogue solely for the objects suggests that the material is well documented and throughout the report itself the various bivouacs and activities are meticulously recorded.

I would like to add at this point that while such collections are of great interest and may potentially be significant sources of data, the amount of effort spent in retrieving these data must be rationalized. Already the effort and time on retrieving useful collection point information for collections such as the Campbell, Williams and Austen Mountain Ok collections have been significant and the sources almost exhausted without great success. While it was impossible to discern the true level of documentation existent in museums and private collections prior to visitation, we had assumed that there were rigorous methods used in the field and that the attrition rate for existing field notes and museum documentation would be less. The benchmark has been the rigorous notes compiled by Bryan Cranstone and Barry Craig and as yet no other collection of significance has proven to have the same level of geographical contextualization.

Rotterdam

On the 9th of December I made my first visit to Rotterdam at the kind invitation of Dr Kees van den Meiracker, Curator of Oceania and Head of Collections. This first visit was in a sense a reconnaissance trip where I set out to gauge the level of documentation and physically search the store to identify the Craig material and to see whether there was additional material from other collectors. That day I did find a number of pieces from other collectors that belonged to our area including three Mountain Ok shields, one Mountain Ok houseboard and a number of smaller artifacts from the western fringe of the Upper Sepik Basin. One Mountain Ok shield and one Mountain Ok houseboard were obtained from a London dealer in 1970 which led me to believe that yet more Craig material had been uncovered; the two other Mountain Ok shields were collected by C. Groenvelt around 1959. I learnt from Dr van den Meiracker that Groenvelt had been commissioned by the Wereld Museum to collect material from the Sepik region and was directed to potential collection areas via correspondence with the director of the museum. Groenvelt collected in the Waris and Jafé regions on the Dutch side near the international border. He made his way into the Australian side and within our study area he collected in the Yellow River area and then traveled south making his way up the May River and then presumably to the Telefomin area. There is a considerable amount of correspondence between Groenvelt and the museum, and Dr van den Meiracker spent some time going through a sample with me to gauge the level of detail within. We did not uncover any reference to the objects themselves, or any village that he may have visited. Dr van den Meiracker subsequently explained that it was Groenvelt's practice to retrospectively give attributions to the objects after he had made a representative sample from an area. Dr van den Meiracker stated that, for material that he had

researched, Groenvelt had given only the names of the culture/language groups and no village locations. At best Groenvelt had given a government/trading post or church to which the people would come from the surrounding villages. It seems as though his practice was to stay at these locations and purchase objects from villagers who would come into the center, as did Pouwer on the Star Mountains Expedition. It also appears that if Groenvelt collected while on the move he only documented objects once he had arrived at a regional centre. For example, many objects are listed simply as being from the May River or Yellow River. Curiously, the Mountain Ok shields were attributed to May River suggesting that Groenvelt only documented this collection once he had returned from the journey. It became apparent that the shields had been attributed to Telefomin subsequently by someone else.

Also on this day I spotted a series of smoking tubes that were very similar to our Yuri examples. Written on the tags attached to some of the objects was the name Lind along with the attribution of Dera tribe. The Dera area is within our study area and has been of special interest to us due to the lack of material from there and the ambiguity of its language affiliation. This relatively small area is wedged between the Yuri language area to the south, the Anggor language area to the east and Amanab to the north and the PNG/Indonesian border to the west. It is also significant because it was into this region that Douglas Miles proceeded on his expedition from Green River and upstream along the Faringi River, passing several kilometers directly west of Amanab Patrol Post.⁶ While I was identifying this collection and looking for tags, Dr van den Meiracker went to check some early registration material and found the name 'Jamar Nainda' among the entries. I suspected that this was a village name and after I had returned to Leiden I checked the Territory of Papua New Guinea Village Directories of 1960 and 1968 and found the name Yamamainda in the Dera census division of the Amanab sub-district.

On the 21st and 22nd of December I returned to Rotterdam to record the Craig and Lind material, which amounted to thirteen pieces. As it turned out J. J. Lind was a district officer whose area of administration was a district around the Keerom River on the Dutch side of the border - the languages within this area include Waris and Jafé. At this time the Dera region was a Dutch enclave which seems to have incorporated a rectangular area approximately ten by twenty kilometres inside Australian territory.⁷ Twelve of the Lind pieces were collected within this enclave from the villages of Kamberatoro, Tamarbek, and Yamamainda; the other object was collected at the village of Waris on the Dutch side. Since the visit to the Wereld Museum I have learnt that a report on Lind's patrol, written by Lind, is held in the Algemeen Rijksarchief (General State Archives) in Den Haag with a copy held by the Arsip National in Jakarta.⁸ It is now apparent that Lind also made patrols into the Waina and Waris areas and as yet I have not determined the extent of the collections made by Lind and other members of the Dutch administration in the area. However, I did make enquiries at all of the museums I visited in the Netherlands and I failed to locate any additional pieces. One important feature of these developments is that it is apparent that the Yuri language may not be an isolate, as stated in the linguistic report from Martin Steer at ANU, but possibly a member of a language family that is predominantly on the Indonesian side of the border. The Dera and Groenvelt's Jafé material

⁶ See Australian Museum report

⁷ Discussion with Douglas Miles, January 2006

⁸ Lind, J. J., 1962, *Verslag van de tournee door het stamgebied van de Dera van 19-24 maart*.

exhibit a marked similarity to that of the Yuri and investigations of the SIL linguistic studies of the region may confirm a linguistic relationship.

Amsterdam

On the 16th of December I made my first visit to the Tropen Museum to assess and negotiate the recording of the 59 objects of the Craig collection transferred from Leiden. Dr David van Duuren, Curator of Oceania, had kindly created a space and brought out the collection of Craig arrows which otherwise would have required considerable time to access. By the end of the day I was able to record all of the arrows except eight which had not yet been located after a recent consolidation of the store. The completion of the process occurred on the 23rd of December, my final day in Europe. After a thorough search of the store Dr van Duuren and I located all of the objects except for ten. Unfortunately the field numbers and accession numbers had not been reconciled in the Tropen Museum records. However, with the Leiden document and notes on village locations written in an early register by Dr van Duuren, I have recently been able to complete this process – these village locations must have been gleaned from the copy of Craig’s field list at Leiden. I did, however, manage to include two additional pieces: a hand drum I have not as yet been able to identify but with attributes diagnostic of the Upper Sepik Basin, and an initiation 'pigtail' which was the only 1959 Star Mountains Expedition object housed by the museum.

Summary of collections recorded in Europe

Central New Guinea

Collector	Nr of objects recorded	Year	Museum repository
Bryan Cranstone (BM Exped.)	461	1964-65	British Museum, London
Barry Craig	11	c.1968	British Museum, London
Maria Wronska-Friend	163	1980s	British Museum, London
Star Mountains Expedition	483	1959	R.v.Volkenkunde, Leiden
Barry Craig	3	c.1968	R.v.Volkenkunde, Leiden
Barry Craig	2	c.1968	Wereld Mus., Rotterdam
C. Groenvelt	2	c.1960	Wereld Mus., Rotterdam
Star Mountains Expedition	1	1959	Tropen Mus., Amsterdam
David Lee (BM Exped.)	1 (more forthcoming)	1965	Personal collection
TOTAL	1127		

Upper Sepik Basin

Collector	Nr of objects recorded	Year	Museum repository
Barry Craig	463	1968, 1969	R.v.Volkenkunde, Leiden
K. Gjellerup	9	1910	R.v.Volkenkunde, Leiden
Hanns Peter	748	1969, 1973, 1987	M.f.Volkerkunde, Vienna
Barry Craig	60	1968	Wereld Mus., Rotterdam
J. J. Lind	13	1962	Wereld Mus., Rotterdam
Barry Craig	48	1968	Tropen Mus., Amsterdam
?	1	?	Tropen Mus., Amsterdam
TOTAL	1342		

In the first week of January, Barry Craig and I sent instructions and guidelines for the documentation of two collections of Mountain Ok material identified during the second half of 2005. These two collections represent an assemblage from the Kwermin, an eastern Mountain Ok group that speaks a dialect of Faiwol, which was collected by Sveinn Eggertsson of Iceland; and one held at the University of Ontario representing the Dulanmin (Asabano) a Sepik-Ramu language group within the Mountain Ok cultural milieu, which was collected by Roger Lohmann. I would very much like to thank Sveinn Eggertsson, Roger Lohmann and Heather Miller for this assistance.

I would like to thank staff of all of the museums I visited, who provided willing and cheerful help through this difficult but rewarding process. The assistance received was skillful, diverse in nature and comprehensive. Not only was I never stuck for help I also learnt a considerable amount from everyone with whom I came into contact.