

# Hukay

*Journal of the University of the Philippines Archaeological Studies Program*

---

*Volume 10*

2006



Archaeological Studies Program  
University of the Philippines  
2006

**Theme Editor**  
Jack G. L. Medrana

**Editor**  
Victor J. Paz

**Consultants**  
Wilhelm G. Solheim II  
Eusebio Dizon  
Wilfredo Ronquillo  
Ceclio Salcedo

**Staff**  
A.C.L. Pineda  
Andrea Malaya Ragraio  
Emil Robles  
Taj Vitales

**Layout**  
Taj Vitales

**Cover Design**  
A.C.L. Pineda

*Hukay* is a refereed journal of the graduate community of the University of the Philippines Archaeological Studies Program. It welcomes articles from local and foreign authors who wish to present new data relevant to Philippine archaeology. It is published bi-annually. The journal accepts articles of varied length (from 2,000 - 10,000 words), provided that these are independent and have not been previously published. Book reviews are also accepted. Manuscripts may be mailed or personally submitted with a soft copy to **The Editor, Hukay, Archaeological Studies Program, University of the Philippine, Diliman, Quezon City 1101**, or sent to this email address: [mdbarretto@up.edu.ph](mailto:mdbarretto@up.edu.ph). The Editors and the Board of Consultants are not responsible and should not be held liable for any personal views or opinions expressed here by the contributing authors. All questions and/or reactions to such should be addressed to the individual author concerned.

Archaeological Studies Program, Palma Hall  
University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City

© The Archaeological Studies Program  
All Rights Reserved

No copies can be made in part or in whole without prior  
written permission from the author and the publisher

ISSN 0119 173X

**On the front cover:** From inside the Tabon Cave in Palawan Island (photograph by Victor J. Paz). **Back cover:** Stone artifacts (photographs by Alfred Pawlik, Leece M. Neri, and Armand Salvador B. Mijares).

# Contents

1 ..... Foreword

## Articles

3 ..... Tracking the Early Human Migration into Island Southeast Asia  
*Armand Salvador B. Mijares*

25 ..... A Possible Palaeolithic Site in Northern Mindanao  
*Lee M. Neri*

38 ..... Analysis of Two Polished Stone Adzes from Ille Cave  
at El Nido, Palawan Island, Philippines  
*Alfred Pawlik*

## Book Review

60 ..... Ukkil: Visual Arts of the Sulu Archipelago  
*Reviewed by Ma. Jasmina Liza R. Ceron*

## ERRATA

The Editorial staff would like to apologize for a few errors in the publication of volume 9. These are the following:

1) Paragraphs 2 and 3 of Lara's article (*The Reliability of an Externally-Derived Method...*) on pp. 65-66 should read as:

*Sex determination of a skeleton based on the skull is only considered secondary to that based on the pelvis in terms of accuracy and reliability. For example, Meindl et al. (1985), using a set of modern skeletons of known sex, found that 96.0 % of the material could be correctly sexed if the pelvis is used alone but only 92.0 % of this if the skull is instead used. Yet most of the time using the skull is the only option available when the pelvis is fragmented or absent and/or only the skull is retrieved and intact. The most widely applied methods in sexing the skull rely on morphological features, although metric methods have also been developed (e.g. Martin 1936; Hanihara 1959; Giles & Elliot 1963; Giles 1964; Kajanoja 1966). A number of morphological methods for sexing the skull have been developed by numerous workers by considering only a few landmarks (e.g. Keen 1950; Hoshi 1962; Holland 1986; Steyn & Iscan 1998; Graw et al. 1999) but which are then collated by textbook writers (e.g., Krogman 1962; Brothwell 1965; Stewart 1979; Bass 1995; Novotny et al. 1993; White & Folkens 2000). One such method is the one collated and largely presented by Acsadi & Nemeskeri (1970) which takes into consideration five morphological regions in the skull: the nuchal crest, mastoid process, supraorbital margin, glabella and mental eminence. (Hereafter, reference to Acsadi & Nemeskeri will be shortened to A&N).*

*There is, however, concern that any method, including the one presented in A&N, may not be readily applicable to populational groups other than the one the method had been derived from (e.g. Stewart 1979; St Hoyme & Iscan 1989; Bass 1995). This premise is based on variation, usually unknown, existing among populational groups separated in time and space. Whether to apply a certain method or not to a populational group under study then becomes a predicament at both ends: Applying a method to a populational group to which it is not actually applicable would have serious implications in the interpretation of results, but failing to apply a method that essentially is applicable is to lose potentially important information.*

2) The acknowledgements of Hernandez and Faylona's article (*Evaluating the Heritage Value...*) on p. 101 should read as:

*We would like to thank the local government unit of Cagayan de Oro City for the support they extended to make this project possible.*

# Foreword

Recent developments in Philippine archaeology since the last decade have brought significant improvements on our understanding of the country's stone ages. These are borne out of initiatives to direct serious attention on the Palaeolithic and Neolithic periods, which have been made possible through several mechanisms. One is the presence of faculty members and researchers capable of providing training and conducting research on the topic. There is now a good representation of lithics specialists in the roster of local archaeologists that could guarantee the advancement of knowledge in the stone ages. Another is the availability of facilities especially devoted to this kind of study. In the University of the Philippines, the establishment of the Lithics Laboratory has been of great help to those who are doing analysis of materials from the Philippine lithic ages. Another move that should be mentioned is the untiring efforts of the Archaeological Studies Program and the Archaeology Division of the National Museum of the Philippines to create linkages between them and several academic institutions here and abroad to facilitate sharing of information, technology, and experience.

Comprising this issue are articles that give fresh updates on works and ideas concerning the Philippine lithic ages.

Culture formation and peopling of the Philippines and the rest of Island Southeast Asia in the Palaeolithic period have occupied scholarly concerns since the beginning of the last century. The changing tides of archaeological thought throughout the years, however, have necessitated incessant reconstructions of this Genesis chapter in Southeast Asian archaeology. Armand Mijares gives us a plausible story of migration to the insular Southeast Asian world by way of comparing lithic artifacts throughout the region. Instead of a perpetual stream of people arriving in the islands since the beginning as most wanted to believe then, he proposes that the transfer of people during the Paleolithic period may have been punctuated and only began to show networks and an acceleration during the Neolithic period.

The occurrence of the Palaeolithic in the Philippines may have been a pan-archipelagic event, as islands relatively far from each other like Luzon and Palawan have been shown to have their own versions of the Palaeolithic. It is thus interesting to investigate what manifestations the era may have shown on other islands. Lee Neri, who has been doing

investigations on the southern island of Mindanao, attempts to place this island on the Paleolithic map by presenting the Huluga Open Site in northern Mindanao as a potential site of old-stone-age culture. The continuous work being done on this site and its materials could lead to amazingly new insights on what similarities or peculiarities the era might have had in the southeastern Philippines.

There are also positive trends in our study of Neolithic materials. Analysis on stone artifacts found from recent excavations are building up a clearer picture of technologies that might have been employed during the Neolithic period in the Philippines. Two adzes from the Palawan site of Ille Cave were studied by Alfred Pawlik. He suggests that these adzes might have been reworked and reshaped and were used for wood work. This is among the first studies done on lithic adzes in this country.

Together with a book review by Jasmina Ceron, these articles are a testament to what archaeology in this country can, and has, achieved through visions readily translated into reality.

## **The Editors**