



Project
MUSE[®]

Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.

Roger Green, 1932–2009: Linguistic Archaeologist

Andrew Pawley

Oceanic Linguistics, Volume 49, Number 1, June 2010, pp. 288-297 (Article)

Published by University of Hawai'i Press

DOI: [10.1353/ol.0.0069](https://doi.org/10.1353/ol.0.0069)



Oceanic
Linguistics
VOLUME 49 NUMBER 1 JUNE 2010

 For additional information about this article

<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ol/summary/v049/49.1.pawley.html>

Roger Green, 1932–2009: Linguistic Archaeologist

Roger Green, probably the most influential figure in the field of Oceanic prehistory over the past 50 years, died in Auckland on October 4, 2009, aged 77.¹ Although best known for his archaeological work on human settlement of the Pacific, Green also made important contributions to Oceanic historical linguistics, especially to the synthesis of linguistic evidence with that of other historical disciplines.

Green's scholarly career grew into a kind of giant banyan tree, spreading in many directions while providing open spaces and shelter for others. In the Pacific his archaeological field projects spanned Polynesia, from Mangareva, Tahiti, and Samoa to New Zealand and Hawai'i, and Melanesia, from Fiji and the Southeast Solomons to Watom, in the Bismarck Archipelago. Along the way, he nurtured scores of up-and-coming scholars, as advisor, teacher, project leader, backer in matters of grant-getting, job application referee, coauthor, critical reader of drafts, and so on.

Green's linguistic contributions were of two main kinds. First, he wrote a number of substantial papers and coauthored a major book dealing with Oceanic (chiefly Polynesian) historical linguistics and what this tells us about Oceanic culture history. Of his 300 or so publications, about 15 focus on linguistic evidence, while many others treat linguistic issues to a lesser or greater degree. Second, he planned and directed multidisciplinary projects in which historical linguistic research was one major strand. In this entrepreneurial role, he played a large part in sparking off a golden age of Polynesian linguistics—the burst of descriptive and comparative research that took place in the 1960s and '70s.

Roger Curtis Green was born in Ridgewood, New Jersey, on March 15, 1932, but spent most of his childhood in Watertown, in upstate New York. His father, Robert, and his mother, Eleanor, had degrees in engineering and English, respectively, but in the Great Depression neither could find work in their chosen fields, and the family moved to Watertown when Robert found work there. By the age of 11, Roger had decided he wanted to become an archaeologist and work on Native American prehistory. The family took his wishes seriously. After the sudden death of Roger's father in 1947, Eleanor moved with her children to Albuquerque, New Mexico, so that Roger could finish high school there and qualify for in-state tuition at the University of New Mexico, which offered a program in archaeology. After gaining a BA in Anthropology and a BSc in Geology from UNM, Roger began graduate studies at Harvard in 1955.

1. I am indebted to Janet Davidson, Valerie Green, and Piet Lincoln for comments on a draft of this memoir. Melinda Allen, Janet Davidson, and Pat Kirch kindly provided me with copies of pieces they have written about Roger Green. A lengthy account of Roger's life and career up to 1996 can be found in Davidson (1999).

Both at UNM and Harvard, Roger was schooled in the Boasian tradition of anthropology in which this field was regarded as consisting of four subfields: cultural (or social) anthropology, archaeology, linguistics, and physical anthropology. From an early time, he aimed to do what he called “holistic archaeology” or “culture history,” integrating the testimonies of all relevant historical disciplines. (Later, he preferred to call it “historical anthropology.”) He took enough courses in descriptive linguistics to gain a basic knowledge of its methods, and taught himself the fundamentals of historical linguistics.

In his first couple of years at Harvard, Roger had no thought of working in the Pacific. He was learning from the famed Americanist, Gordon Willey, about the new “settlement pattern” archaeology, which focused on settlement and artifact scatters across a landscape, and he had in mind to continue working in the American Southwest, where since his undergraduate days at UNM he had accumulated a considerable amount of data and fieldwork experience.

BECOMING A POLYNESIANIST. It was a social anthropologist at Harvard, Douglas Oliver, who caused Roger to become a Polynesianist. Oliver was then beginning a long-term anthropological study of the Society Islands. Roger took some courses from him, including a seminar on Polynesia, and Oliver invited him to join his project and do settlement pattern archaeology on Mo‘orea. At first Roger declined, but in the end was persuaded that in Polynesia he would have the freedom to help shape a field in a way not possible in the archaeology of the Americas.

As preparation for Roger’s research in French Polynesia, Oliver arranged a Fulbright Scholarship to enable him to do fieldwork in New Zealand. New Zealand was the one part of Polynesia where there was an established tradition of systematic subsurface archaeology, under the leadership of the young Cambridge-trained scholar, Jack Golson, at the University of Auckland. Golson was part of Ralph Piddington’s small Department of Anthropology, whose core staff then consisted of one archaeologist, two social anthropologists (Piddington and Ralph Bulmer), and a linguist, Bruce Biggs, who was head of the Māori Studies program. Roger enjoyed the intellectual atmosphere in the Anthropology Department at Auckland and soon made his presence felt there and in the New Zealand archaeology scene generally. Jack Golson recalls, “Roger was involved in almost everything. He did so much. It was like having another staff member.”

Roger’s star rose over my horizon briefly a few months after he first landed in Auckland. In 1959 he took a bunch of us second-year anthropology students up Mt. Eden to teach us about triangulation surveying by taking sightings on various of Auckland’s volcanic cones. I recall being impressed with Roger’s energy, enthusiasm, and warmth of personality. This little event was prophetic in its symbolism, because Roger was to become the great triangulator of the various disciplines that are witness to Pacific prehistory.

After getting his Pacific feet wet in New Zealand, Roger went to French Polynesia, where he made waves. First he spent six months digging on Mangareva, southeast of the Tuamotus, and then moved to Mo‘orea in the Societies, where in the spacious ‘Opunohu Valley in Mo‘orea, densely populated in prehistoric times, he was able to carry out exemplary settlement pattern archaeology and combine it with the rich historical record pieced

together by Oliver. His Mo'orea excavations, and his prompt and detailed excavation reports, set high standards that he was to maintain throughout his career.

While in New Zealand, Roger married his fiancée, Kaye Chandler Smith, who accompanied him during his time in French Polynesia (and later, with their two children, on spells of fieldwork in Samoa and the Solomons).

While excavating on Mangareva and Mo'orea, it was second nature to Roger to take notes on and try to learn the local languages, Mangarevan and Tahitian. Around this time, he began to examine and add to the evidence advanced by other scholars, chiefly Kenneth Emory and Samuel Elbert, concerning historical relationships among the Eastern Polynesian languages.

RETURN TO AUCKLAND. In 1961 Roger returned to Auckland to take up a lectureship, replacing Golson, who was about to move to the Australian National University to found a Department of Prehistory there. In 1967 Roger moved to the Bishop Museum before returning to New Zealand in 1970 as a James Cook Research Fellow attached to the Auckland Museum. He was given a personal chair by the University of Auckland in 1973 and Auckland remained his main base thereafter.

THE POLYNESIAN CULTURE HISTORY PROJECT. The first major multidisciplinary enterprise initiated by Roger was the Polynesian Culture History (PCH) Project, begun in 1965. This was designed to meet his wish for an investigation of the history of the Polynesians in which linguistics would play a central role alongside archaeology. Roger persuaded Roland Force and Kenneth Emory of the Bishop Museum, as well as Bruce Biggs, to join forces with him, and they obtained grants from NSF and the New Zealand Golden Kiwi fund. Among other things, the project supported the first few years work on a Proto-Polynesian Lexicon database (POLLEX), initially compiled by a small team led by Biggs and David Walsh. Over the next few decades, under Biggs's direction, this grew into a massive etymological dictionary containing more than 3,000 cognate sets, circulating in electronic form. POLLEX is still being expanded and refined, under the wing of Ross Clark. The PCH project also funded fieldwork by Biggs and several University of Auckland graduate students recording grammatical and lexical data in the late 1960s on several Polynesian languages: East Futunan, Sikaiana, Luangiua, the Nanumea dialect of Tuvaluan, and the Ma'uke dialect of Cook Islands Māori. One of the fruits of the project was a very successful interdisciplinary symposium held at Sigatoka, Fiji, in 1969, and funded by the Wenner-Gren Foundation. This symposium, organized by Roger, reviewed the findings of the 1960s, particularly in archaeology but also in biological anthropology, historical linguistics, and comparative ethnography. It produced the three-volume *Studies in Oceanic culture history* (Green and Kelly 1970–72), and helped to set the agenda for research in the 1970s, a decade when Melanesia and Micronesia began to come into their own.

The PCH project didn't happen out of the blue. It built on foundations laid at the Tenth Pacific Science Congress in Honolulu in 1961, where Roger helped to plan an ambitious Polynesian Prehistory project, funded by NSF through the Bishop Museum. This supported archaeological research in several parts of Polynesia and Fiji by scholars from various institutions. However, Roger was from the first keen to expand the scope of research to include

historical linguistics, and soon after his return to Auckland in 1961 he set about trying to persuade Bruce Biggs to put Polynesian historical linguistics on his research agenda.

Biggs at first resisted. He was primarily a descriptive linguist and already had plenty of other projects on his plate. Roger had more immediate success persuading me, then a graduate student in anthropology who had decided to become a linguist. In 1962, Janet Davidson and I were the only students in a Master's course taught by Roger, in which she and I reviewed, respectively, the archaeological and linguistic literature to do with the origins of Pacific Island peoples.

As it turned out, Roger's cause was aided by linguists of the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, in Honolulu, who arranged for Biggs to spend 1964 as a visiting research scholar at the East-West Center. There Biggs talked at length with, and learned much from, the leading Oceanic historical linguist George Grace. He became entranced by the challenge of unraveling the complex phonological history of Rotuman, and this in turn led him to write an important paper comparing Rotuman with Polynesian, and other Oceanic languages, in which he reconstructed a substantial body of Proto-Eastern Oceanic lexical items (Biggs 1965). Biggs was hooked on historical linguistics and Roger was able to reel him in. The POLLEX project followed.

I tagged along on the Hawai'i trip, as Biggs's PhD student. I was then writing my dissertation, a grammar of a Papuan language of New Guinea, but had also begun to dabble in Oceanic historical linguistics.

POLYNESIAN SUBGROUPING. My dabbings helped to spark off Roger's first major publication on Polynesian historical linguistics (Green 1966). One of the long-standing challenges of Polynesian prehistory was to determine the settlement sequence of the island groups within the Polynesian Triangle. The subgrouping of the Polynesian languages was an obvious source of clues, but this field was then in an embryonic state, with classifications by scholars such as Elbert, Emory, and Dyen largely based on highly problematic lexicostatistical methods. At that time, most linguists thought Polynesian divided into a Western group, with Tongan and Samoan as the best-known members, an Eastern group, comprising New Zealand Māori and all languages spoken east of Pukapuka, plus an uncertain number of Outlier groups, spoken in Melanesia and Micronesia.

I argued for a revision of the standard family tree, such that the first split in Polynesian was between a Tongic branch, which gave rise to Tongan and Niuean, and a Nuclear Polynesian branch, from which stem all other Polynesian languages for which there was reasonable information (Pawley 1966). This proposal, based on innovations in morphology and phonology, placed the Eastern Polynesian group and all the Outliers together with Samoan. When I showed a draft of the paper to Roger in late 1964, it prompted him to pull together findings from the work he had been doing on the internal relationships of the Eastern Polynesian languages. Green (1966) puts forward evidence, in the form of shared innovations in phonology, morphology, and lexicon, for a Marquesic group, comprising Southwest and Southeast Marquesan, Hawaiian, and Mangarevan, and for a coordinate Tahitic group, including Tahitian, Rarotongan, New Zealand Māori, and the Tuamotuan dialects. It proved difficult to determine the sequence of splits within Marquesic, but Roger found some evidence indicating that the first split was between Mangarevan and

Marquesan, and that Hawaiian derived from a Southeast Marquesan dialect area. Both Hawaiian and Mangarevan show signs of later borrowing from Tahitian.

At a higher level, the Easter Island language stood alone as a first-order branch of Eastern Polynesian, opposed to a Central-Eastern group made up of Marquesic and Tahitic, which share a number of innovations apart from Easter Island.

Roger's paper also explored the implications of the new subgrouping for Polynesian prehistory, formulating hypotheses about settlement sequence and patterns of contact capable of being tested by data from archaeology and other domains. One implication was that Samoa rather than Tonga was the most likely source of the first settlement of eastern Polynesia. Others were that Hawai'i was probably first settled from the Marquesas, and that both the Marquesas and Easter Island were settled very early in the eastern Polynesian sequence. He noted that the major cultural differences between western and eastern Polynesia do not reflect the sequence of linguistic differentiation, and pointed to continuing contact among western Polynesian societies as the explanation for the western Polynesian culture area.

Roger was to make two further contributions to Polynesian subgrouping. One was a paper on the position of Anutan, an Outlier spoken north of Vanuatu. In 1970, Anutan was the least known of the Outliers, almost the only published linguistic and cultural information being some notes by Raymond Firth. Donn Bayard (1966) concluded from Firth's notes that Anutan had been settled from Tonga some 300–400 years ago and had later been influenced by contact with Tikopia. In June 1970, while on archaeological fieldwork in the Solomons, Roger made a one-day visit to Anuta, with the aim of collecting further data that might determine whether Anutan was indeed a Tongic language. If so, it would have been only the third member of the Tongic subgroup and a valuable witness for reconstructing Proto-Polynesian. Roger concluded (Green 1971) that Anutan is not Tongic; on the contrary, it exhibits the major phonological and morphological innovations defining Nuclear Polynesian. It does, however, show some evidence of borrowing from Tongan or East Uvean.

In another paper (Green 1988), he gave a detailed rebuttal of a radical proposal (Langdon and Tryon 1983) that the Easter Island language is not Eastern Polynesian but should be placed in a subgroup with East Futunan and Rennellese. In this he adumbrated an idea he later came to favor: that the staging area for the settlement of Easter Island was the Mangareva-Southern Australs region.

THE SOUTHEAST SOLOMONS PROJECT. During the mid-1960s, Roger's major archaeological field project was in Samoa, where he and Janet Davidson filled a large gap in the Polynesian record. However, his eyes were already looking westward, to the sources of the Lapita culture, which was shaping up as the foundation culture in western Polynesia. This orientation is evident in a paper honoring the ethnologist Kenneth Emory (Green 1967), in which he assessed competing theories of the immediate origins of the Polynesians, chiefly in the light of current linguistic, archaeological, and ethnographic evidence. Following Emory, Green argued that these point clearly to a movement through eastern Melanesia, and do not support the once-favored hypothesis of a Micronesian source. However, he was aware that the archaeological record for both Melanesia and

Micronesia was patchy and fragmentary, and that various unresolved issues remained in Oceanic historical linguistics.

Accordingly, his next major project, with the ethnobotanist Douglas Yen as codirector, was a decade-long multidisciplinary study of culture history in the Southeast Solomons, an area that was archaeologically almost a blank slate. This region also posed some real headaches for linguists. The affiliations of the three poorly documented non-Polynesian languages of the Santa Cruz and Reef Islands, and to a lesser extent the six non-Polynesian languages of Vanikoro and Utupua, had long perplexed Oceanic linguists. Most commentators had concluded that the Santa Cruz and Reefs languages are Papuan, that is, non-Austronesian. If true, this would make them the only non-Austronesian languages to the east of the ocean gap separating Near Oceania from Remote Oceania.

Roger's large team of researchers included an Auckland graduate student in linguistics, Christine Cashmore, who gathered data on the Utupua and Vanikoro languages. Roger wrote a lengthy essay that reviewed the history of ideas about the relationships of the various groups of Southeast Solomons languages and gave a reassessment in the light of his own examination of the data (Green 1976). A few years later, another linguist, Peter Lincoln, joined the Southeast Solomons project, and concluded (Lincoln 1978) that the Reefs/Santa Cruz languages are members of the Oceanic subgroup, albeit highly aberrant ones, a conclusion subsequently confirmed by Ross and Næss (2007). Roger never stopped thinking about the history of the Southeast Solomons, and in one of his last publications (Green forthcoming) he reviewed the linguistic and archaeological evidence and its implications for untangling the sequence of initial settlements and subsequent interactions between island communities in the region.

RECONSTRUCTING ANCESTRAL POLYNESIAN CULTURE FROM LEXICON. One of Roger's most compelling arguments for a holistic archaeology was the fact that even the richest archaeological assemblages contain no more than a small fraction of the named types of artifacts of a society—in Polynesia never more than about 20 percent. He wrote a number of works that drew on lexical reconstructions to complement the testimony of archaeology.

However, such use of lexical reconstructions can only be justified when a distinctive archaeological tradition can be correlated with a high degree of confidence with a particular language. Correlating archaeological and linguistic events proved to be more difficult in Island Melanesia than in Polynesia. Pawley and Green (1973) was an early attempt to formulate a set of principles for making such correlations in Oceania and to draw attention to the importance of the biogeographical boundary between Near and Remote Oceania in the history of human settlement of the southwest Pacific.

As the archaeological record for Melanesia improved during the 1970s and 1980s, it became clear that the initial spread of the Lapita cultural complex across the Southwest Pacific around 3,200–3,000 BP, and the initial dispersal of the Oceanic languages across Remote Oceania, were facets of one and the same large event. This opened the way for scholars to use lexical reconstructions of Proto-Oceanic and its immediate descendants to reconstruct features of Lapita technology and society not attested in the archaeological record. Studies by Roger in this domain include overviews of early Oceanic technology

and society (Green 1997, 1999, 2002, 2003; Pawley and Green 1984), treatments of terms for rank and status and social stratification (Green 1994, 2002), house terms (Green 1998), and terms for architectural forms and settlement patterns (Green and Pawley 1999).

Roger's most important synthesis of this kind is undoubtedly *Hawaiki: Ancestral Polynesia: An essay in historical anthropology*, a 370-page book that he and the archaeologist Pat Kirch wrote during the 1990s (Kirch and Green 2001). This work draws on the cognate sets in the POLLEX database and other sources to reconstruct the way of life of the Proto-Polynesian speech community, which the authors equate with a post-Lapita archaeological tradition they call Ancestral Polynesian, which developed in the Tonga-Samoa region during the first millennium BC. It deals with almost every major cultural subsystem, including chapters on "subsistence," "food preparation and cuisine," "material culture," "social and political organization," and "gods, ancestors, seasons and rituals," as well as on "Polynesia as a phylogenetic unit."

So far, it seems that the only archaeologists who have paid much attention to this formidable book are those who have some knowledge of linguistics, chiefly those trained in American universities. Some archaeologists remain skeptical of attempts to reconstruct a unified ancestral Polynesian culture. I suspect that others are daunted by the sheer volume of evidence concerning domains of culture and society that they are not used to dealing with and that they are afraid to delve into. This is a pity, because the array of solid Proto-Polynesian lexical reconstructions presented by Kirch and Green greatly extends the baselines for the study of adaptive and regional change in Polynesian cultures that one can obtain from archaeology alone.

RETIREMENT. By the mid-1980s, health problems brought an end to Roger's participation in major fieldwork projects. However, there was no perceptible slowdown in his writing output, and as a distinguished senior scholar he was called on to serve the academic community in various ways, at the national and international as well as the local level.

Roger formally retired in 1992 at the age of 60, so that a younger scholar could take his professorial post, and so that he could give more time to research. He continued to lecture part-time for the next decade, and kept in touch by phone, email, and travel, with virtually every scholar working in Pacific prehistory. A former colleague, Melinda Allen, observed (Allen 2009) that "Roger's generosity of spirit resulted in a remarkable network of colleagues and contacts. On retirement, far from withdrawing from academic life, he became an intellectual hub. He knew where everyone was working and what they were finding. People regularly sent him manuscripts for comment. He often had long phone conversations with many of us, as he continued to explore new ideas." She recalls the profound impact on her career of Roger's advice given when she was a graduate student at the University of Hawai'i, worried about whether her work was worth publishing: "Melinda, publication is just a conversation. But, if you want to be a scholar, then you have to join that conversation."

Roger's first marriage ended in the late 1970s and in 1984 he married Valerie Sallen, a social anthropologist. That same year, he and Valerie set up the Green Foundation for Polynesian Research, which provides small grants to scholars working in Oceanic historical anthropology. As Roger's health deteriorated in his final decade, Valerie's medical exper-

tise and moral and intellectual support enabled him to keep researching and entertaining. Almost until the end, there was a constant stream of academic visitors to their beautiful house among the majestic podocarps on the ridge of the Titirangi Range, overlooking the Manukau Harbour.

Roger received many honors, among them election to the Royal Society of New Zealand (1975) and the US National Academy of Sciences (1984), award of the Hector Memorial Medal (1992) for contributions to human sciences in New Zealand and the Marsden Medal for his work in Pacific prehistory (2003), and being made an Officer of the New Zealand Order of Merit (2007) for services to New Zealand history. The festschrift he received after his retirement (Davidson et al. 1996), with contributions from more than 50 scholars from diverse disciplines, was an appropriate tribute to the range and impact of his scholarship and mentoring.

Roger will be greatly missed by colleagues and students who benefited from his generosity of spirit, as well as from his stimulating intellect.

ANDREW PAWLEY
Australian National University

ROGER C. GREEN: PUBLICATIONS ON OCEANIC HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS

The following list contains Roger Green's publications that focus on issues in Oceanic historical linguistics, and a selection of others that touch on such issues.

1966. Linguistic subgrouping within Polynesia: The implications for prehistoric settlement. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 75:6–38.
1967. The immediate origins of the Polynesians. In *Polynesian culture history. Essays in honor of Kenneth P. Emory*, ed. by Genevieve A. Highland, Roland W. Force, Alan Howard, Marion Kelly, and Yosihiko H. Sinoto 215–40. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
1971. Anuta's position in the subgrouping of Polynesian languages. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 80:355–70.
1973. (Andrew Pawley and Roger Green.) Dating the dispersal of the Oceanic languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 12:1–67.
1976. Languages of the Southeast Solomons and their historical relationships. In *Southeast Solomon Islands culture history: A preliminary survey*, ed. by R. C. Green and M. M. Cresswell, 47–60. Wellington: Bulletin of the Royal Society of New Zealand.
1981. Location of the Polynesian homeland: A continuing problem. In *Studies in Pacific languages and culture history in honour of Bruce Biggs*, ed. by Jim Hollyman and Andrew Pawley, 133–58. Auckland: Linguistic Society of New Zealand.
1984. (Andrew Pawley and Roger Green.) The Proto-Oceanic language community. *Journal of Pacific History* 19:123–46. [Reprinted in Robert Kirk and Emöke Szathmáry, eds. 1985. *Out of Asia: Peopling the Americas and the Pacific*, 161–84. Canberra: Journal of Pacific History]
1987. (Patrick V. Kirch and Roger Green.) History, phylogeny and evolution in Polynesia. *Current Anthropology* 28:31–56.

1987. The initial identification of a people as Polynesian in race, language and culture. In *Ethnicity and culture*, ed. by R. Auger, M. E. Glass, S. MacEachern, and P. H. McCartney, 175–80. Calgary: Archaeological Association, University of Calgary.
1988. Subgrouping of the Rapanui language of Easter Island and its implications for East Polynesian prehistory. In *First international congress, Easter Island and East Polynesia*, vol. 1: *Archaeology*, ed. by C. Cristino F., P. Vargas C., R. Izaurieta S., and R. Budd P., 37–57. Santiago: Facultad de Arquitectura y Urbanismo, Instituto de Estudios, Universidad de Chile.
1994. Archaeological problems with the use of linguistic evidence in reconstruction of rank, status and social organisation in Ancestral Polynesian Society. In *Austronesian terminologies: Continuity and change*, ed. by A. K. Pawley and M. D. Ross, 171–84. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- 1997 [1995]. Linguistic, biological and cultural origins of the initial inhabitants of Remote Oceania. *New Zealand Journal of Archaeology* 17:5–27.
1998. From Proto-Oceanic *Rumaq to Proto-Polynesian *fale: A significant reorganization in Austronesian housing. *Archaeology in New Zealand* 42:253–72.
1999. (Roger Green and Andrew Pawley.) Early Oceanic architectural forms and settlement patterns: Linguistic, archaeological and ethnological perspectives. In *Archaeology and language*, ed. by Roger Blench and Matthew Spriggs, vol. 3:31–89. London: Routledge. [Abridged version appears in Malcolm Ross, Andrew Pawley, and Meredith Osmond, eds. 1998. *The lexicon of Proto Oceanic. The culture and environment of ancestral Oceanic society*: vol. 1: *Material culture*, 37–65.]
1999. Integrating historical linguistics with archaeology: Insights from research in Remote Oceania. In *Indo-Pacific prehistory: the Melaka papers*, ed. by P. Bellwood, D. Bowdery, F. Beardsley, D. Bulbeck, S. Keats, and S. Phear, vol. 2:3–24. Canberra: Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association 18.
2001. (Patrick V. Kirch and Roger Green.) *Hawaiki: Ancestral Polynesia: An essay in historical anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2002. Rediscovering the social aspects of Ancestral Oceanic societies through archaeology, linguistics and ethnology. In *Fifty years in the field. Essays in honour and celebration of Richard Shutler Jr's archaeological career*, ed. by Stuart Bedford, Christophe Sand, and David Burley, 21–35. Auckland: New Zealand Archaeological Society Monograph 24.
2003. The Lapita horizon and traditions—Signature for one set of oceanic migrations. In *Pacific archaeology: Assessments and prospects (Proceedings of the conference for the 50th anniversary of the first Lapita excavation, Koné Nouméa 2002)*, ed. by Christophe Sand, 95–120. Nouméa: Les cahiers de l'archéologie en Nouvelle-Calédonie 15.
2009. (Roger Green and Douglas E. Yen.) The Southeast Solomon Islands culture history project: Principal investigators' overview of the 1970s project including recent and current research. In *Lapita: Ancestors and descendants*, ed. by Peter J. Sheppard, Tim Thomas, and Glenn R. Summerhayes, 147–72. Auckland: New Zealand Archaeological Association.
- Forthcoming. The Outer Eastern Islands of the Solomons: A puzzle for the holistic approach to the anthropology of history. In *A journey through Austronesian and Papuan linguistic and cultural space: Papers in honour of Andrew K. Pawley*, ed. by John Bowden, Nikolaus Himmelman, and Malcolm Ross. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

REFERENCES TO OTHER WORKS CITED

- Allen, Melinda. 2009. Tribute and celebration: Roger C. Green. Presented at a gathering to remember Roger Green, University of Auckland, October 30.
- Bayard, Donn. 1966. The cultural relationships of the Polynesian Outliers. MA thesis, University of Hawai'i. [Published 1976 in Otago University Studies in Prehistoric Anthropology. Dunedin: Department of Anthropology, University of Otago.]
- Biggs, Bruce. 1965. Direct and indirect inheritance in Rotuman. *Lingua* 14:383–415.
- Davidson, Janet. 1999. Roger Green. In *Encyclopedia of archaeology. The great archaeologists*, ed. by Tim Murray, vol. 2: 835–53. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.
- Davidson, Janet, Foss Leach, Geoffrey Irwin, Andrew Pawley, and Dorothy Brown, eds. 1996. *Oceanic culture history: Essays in honour of Roger Green*, 387–410. Wellington: New Zealand Archaeological Association.
- Green, R. C., and M. Kelly, eds. 1970–72. *Studies in Oceanic culture history*. 3 vols. Pacific Anthropological Records 11–13. Honolulu: Department of Anthropology, Bernice P. Bishop Museum.
- Langdon, Robert, and Darrell Tryon. 1983. *The language of Easter Island: Its development and Eastern Polynesian relationships*. Institute for Polynesian Studies monograph series. Laie: Brigham Young University – Hawai'i Campus.
- Lincoln, Peter. 1978. Reefs-Santa Cruz as Austronesian. In *Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics: Proceedings*, ed. by S. A. Wurm and Lois Carrington, 929–67. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Pawley, Andrew. 1966. Polynesian languages: A subgrouping based on shared innovations in morphology. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 66:37–62.
- Ross, Malcolm, and Åshild Næss. 2007. An Oceanic origin for Āiwoo, the language of the Reef Islands? *Oceanic Linguistics* 46:456–98.