

Tony Ballantyne

National University of Ireland, Galway
tony.Ballantyne@nuigalway.ie

THE “ORIENTAL RENAISSANCE” IN THE PACIFIC: ORIENTALISM, LANGUAGE AND ETHNOGENESIS IN THE BRITISH PACIFIC

SUMMARY

This paper suggests that the “Oriental Renaissance” was a crucial, often overlooked, thread in the intellectual life of the Australasian colonies. British imperial networks, together with the circulation of learned periodicals and monographs, ensured that British Orientalism profoundly shaped the intellectual culture of nineteenth century New Zealand and that it was particularly prominent in debates over the origins and identity of Maori. Linguistic comparison provided the most important evidence for establishing the relationships between and the ultimate origins of the peoples of the Pacific. Many scholars attempted to establish that Maori belonged to the Indo-European family and that their origins could be traced back to north India while the others suggested that Maori culture was too primitive to be “Aryan” and that it exhibited greater affinities with the Dravidian cultures of South India. Ultimately these conflicting positions were synthesised in a more generalised form of Indocentric anthropology that emerged in the 1890s and focused particularly on the supposed debts of Maori religion to Hinduism.

KEY WORDS: Orientalism, Indo-European/Aryan, Polynesian, Maori, New Zealand

Questions of language lay at the heart of the cultural politics of modern empires. While encounters with Native Americans posed important linguistic difficulties for the various European groups active in fashioning early modern Atlantic empires, the rapid expansion of the British empire into Asia and the Pacific after the loss of the thirteen North American colonies raised new questions about the nature and development of language. As British aspirations in the Asia-Pacific region shifted from the pursuit of trade to the pursuit of imperial dominion, the problematic of language in cross-cultural contexts assumed even greater significance.

Translation, a complex but endlessly repeated act in a world of empires, was essential to commerce, politics and inter-personal relations in distant lands. It was particularly significant in the delicate and precise registers of diplomacy and treaty-making which were integral to the processes of subordination and conquest that enabled British expansion. In light of these concerns East India Company experts produced manuals to guide their colleagues through the complexities of the courtly Persian of Indo-Muslim political discourse which dominated the political life of north

India well into the nineteenth century. The dangers of ambiguous translations or variant readings of translations were serious: the hasty and ambiguous translation of the Treaty of Waitangi, which formally absorbed New Zealand in the British empire in 1840, continues to vex New Zealand lawyers and historians alike.

Colonial policies towards indigenous languages were hotly debated, most famously in the Anglicist/Orientalist debate over education policy in India in the 1830s, while colonial authorities closely monitored the product of indigenous presses. Conservative metropolitan and colonial opinion-makers alike decried the debasing of imperial mother-tongues, attacking the development of new creolised languages and new accents and modes of speech amongst settlers. In colonial societies languages were in flux, taking on new, often hybridised forms, with remarkable speed.

While decrying the linguistic change that was an inevitable adjunct of colonial contact was an easy and popular pastime for some, many missionaries, colonial administrators and metropolitan linguists began work on the analysis of the deeper structures and grammatical logic of the 'new' languages they encountered. In India this enterprise was spearheaded by East India Company officials who devoted their spare time to the study of India's multitudinous languages, slowly building their knowledge under the tutelage of Indian learned experts. As Bernard Cohn (1985) has argued, the resulting grammars, phrasebooks and translations were fundamental to the construction of colonial authority, as the 'command of language' allowed the British to construct 'languages of command', but this project took on a broader, unexpected significance. The discovery of deep-seated grammatical affinities between Sanskrit, Greek and Latin, revolutionised understandings of both history and language, not only in Europe, but also throughout European colonial holdings and amongst the colonised elites.

This essay traces perhaps the most curious ethnological quest triggered by this discovery of the underlying unity of what came to be known as the 'Indo-European' language family. While the cultural impact of this idea in Europe has been explored in some depth, most notably in Leon Poliakov's *The Aryan Myth* (1973), and Martin Maw (1990), Romila Thapar (1996) and Thomas Trautmann (1997) have recently sketched the history of the 'Aryan' idea in British India, its importance as an ethnological framework in the Pacific is less well known. The Aryan idea was, as this essay will demonstrate, of central importance in the interpretation of Polynesian culture in the long nineteenth century and also profoundly shaped emergent settler nationalisms, especially in colonial New Zealand. The 'Oriental Renaissance' identified by Raymond Schwab (Schwab, 1984) was not confined to the British Isles and continental Europe alone: it was a crucial cultural reservoir which nourished the development of ethnological and historical writing in the distant settler societies in the Pacific, particularly amongst the Pakeha (settlers) of New Zealand. Just as in Europe, the new philological and ethnological models proved controversial, as their influence reached beyond the confines of learned journals, feeding into broader debates over race, nation and identity. This essay explores the complex intellectual and ideological threads that composed these debates in the Pacific.

Sir William Jones, Sanskrit and Human Origins

The genesis of the Pacific "Oriental Renaissance", like its European counterpart, can be located in British orientalist tradition that developed in Bengal and it can be particularly traced to the influence of Sir William Jones's Third Anniversary Discourse which he delivered to the Asiatic Society of Bengal in February 1786. Jones, a true Enlightenment polymath, was a leading figure in the British administration of Bengal as well as being a well-known lawyer, poet, translator, linguist and naturalist. Jones came to the study of Sanskrit, which is central to his modern reputation, late in his career. With the imminent departure of Charles Wilkins, the leading British Sanskritist in Bengal, and Jones's fears of perjury and misrepresentation in the colonial legal system mounting, Jones began a formal study of Sanskrit in 1785 in the hope that he would be able to master the language of Hindu oaths and legal tradition (Mukherjee, 1968: 94–95). Jones, whose prodigious linguistic gifts were such that he had not only mastered the classical languages and many of the modern languages of Europe, but was also acknowledged as a leading European expert on 'oriental' languages from Persia east, made rapid headway in his studies and soon described himself as 'tolerably strong' in Sanskrit (Teignmouth, 1804: 352).

Jones's Sanskrit studies had a broader utility than he initially anticipated, as the study of Sanskrit not only aided his legal work but also reshaped his vision of language, history and ethnology. In February 1786, less than six months into his serious study of Sanskrit, Jones delivered the Third Anniversary Discourse, "On the Hindu's [sic]" to the Asiatic Society (Jones, 1788). This paper was the first in a series of essays that explored the evidence for, and nature of, Asian ethnography and history. Because he aimed to establish a new framework of Asian history in the series, Jones was very concerned with the question of cultural origins; indeed the final essay in the series was entitled "On the Origin and Families of Nations" (Jones, 1792a).

"On the Hindu's" distilled the early fruits of Jones's dedication as he drew European attention to the sophistication and significance of Sanskrit and confidently identified a fundamental affinity between Sanskrit, Latin and Greek, in his famous statement that Sanskrit: "... is of a wonderful structure; more perfect than the *Greek*, more copious than the *Latin*, and more exquisitely refined than either, yet bearing to both of them a stronger affinity, both in the roots of the verbs and in the forms of the grammar, than could possibly have been produced by accident; so strong indeed, that no philologer could examine them all three, without believing them to have sprung from some common source, which, perhaps, no longer exists...." (Jones, 1788: 348–349). Here it is important to note that since the sixteenth century other European scholars and missionaries had suspected the affinities that Jones identified so confidently. The Jesuit Fillippo Sassetti, for example, in 1586 identified lexical similarities between Sanskrit and European languages by comparing Sanskrit numerals and words for 'God' and 'snake' with their Italian equivalents. The impact of such early observations, however, was limited. Sassetti's letters were not published until 1855 and similar observations on linguistic affinities by the English Jesuit Thomas Stevens were only published in 1957 (Rocher, 1994).

Until grammatical and etymological issues preoccupied philosophers in the eighteenth century, these early speculations on linguistic affinities could have only had a limited impact on European thought. Although Europeans did exhibit some interest in the Chinese and Indian languages, sixteenth and seventeenth century linguistic studies were largely preoccupied with European languages and any traces they might contain of the *ur-Adamic* language (Bonfante, 1953–1954; Eco, 1995). From the 1770s, however, European *philosophes* became increasingly interested in language itself. Schwab has argued that Europeans in the age of Goethe and Herder were gripped by a linguistic and etymological “fever”. “An entire age that tended to make all other problems dependent on verbal ones had dawned”: the study of language could determine the accuracy of Genesis, could test the veracity of the mechanistic hypothesis, and reveal the common bond between such apparently diverse peoples as Indians and Europeans (Schwab, 1984: 171–176).

Jones’s thought was moulded by this shift before he even arrived in India. As early as 1779 he wondered about the significance of European derivatives in Persian, and how these related to the existence of “a very old and almost primeval language” which was perhaps the source of “Latin and Greek” (Teignmouth, 1804: 168). But this increased interest in languages in Europe itself was not enough to resolve such questions. The relationship of Asian languages to the languages of Europe and to Genesis could only be established by research conducted in the Asia itself. Until the mid-eighteenth century European scholars in India had gained only a limited grasp of Indian languages as they were working largely independently, without a definitive system of transliteration (a problem partially solved by Jones), with a heavy dependence on local experts and with limited access to other published works. It was only after 1772, only under Warren Hastings’s administration, that this situation began to change and the foundation of the Asiatic Society provided an ideal framework for the discussion and publication of research on Indian languages.

The success of the Society gained Jones further fame and ensured that his observations on India were widely disseminated both in India and Europe. Jones, who was a skilled orator, used the forum of the Asiatic Society and the society’s journal to popularise his ideas. The first edition of *Asiatick Researches* was not printed until January 1789, but by that time Jones had already published a version of his First Discourse and had established a network of correspondents throughout Europe which he used to publicise the Society’s activities (Mukherjee, 1968: 85–89). Jones’s work received glowing praise from the leading British periodical *The Monthly Review* and *Asiatick Researches* proved so popular that unauthorised editions were soon published in London and the Continent (Schwab, 1984: 52).

Language and cultural comparison

So while Jones’s renown was, at least in part, the product of a conducive intellectual climate, his observations on Sanskrit were tremendously influential. He has remained a key figure in European and Indian intellectual history because his work marks a substantial shift in the history of linguistics. Jones’s work was based on what

we might term an empirical approach, which sought to divorce the study of language from broader philosophical speculations on the nature of the mind and language, characteristic, for example, of the universal grammar tradition established by Claude Lancelot and Antoine Arnauld in the 1660s (Aarsleff, 1967: 14–17). Instead Jones argued that the study of language, like the study of nature, should be carefully inductive, adhering closely to observable facts. He attacked the speculative use of etymology as “a medium of proof so very fallacious, that, where it elucidates one fact, it obscures a thousand, and more frequently borders on the ridiculous, than leads to any solid conclusion” (Jones, 1788: 343; also see Jones, 1792b: 199–200). Etymological connections, if securely established *a posteriori*, were strong evidence of connections between peoples, but they were not enough alone to establish a link with certainty. Grammatical structure provided the key test; it could establish the relationship between languages or, just as easily, disprove it. In his “Discourse on the Arabs”, Jones argued that Sanskrit “delights in compounds”, unlike the languages related to Arabic which “abhor the composition of words”, a morphological contrast that discounted any genetic connection between the two languages (Jones, 1792b: 53). This rigorous methodology not only marked Jones’s work from his more speculatively minded contemporaries but it also allowed Jones to identify deeply embedded grammatical and etymological affinities between Sanskrit and European languages.

These linguistic affinities moulded Jones’s views of ethnology and human history. Jones reconciled his belief in the connection between Indian and European languages with the Genesis account that underpinned western understandings of language and human development: methodological innovation was not incompatible with an ethnological model derived from the Bible (Harris and Taylor, 1989: 44). In his linguistic work Jones reaffirmed the essential unity of humanity, believing that even Chinese contained links to the languages of Tibet and India, further confirming the “common origin” of language. Jones fortified both Christianity and the value attached to Indian culture by orientalising the biblical account of Creation (Jones, 1792a: 487; David, 1996). He confirmed the broad outlines of the Genesis account; all of humanity was descended from an original couple and he was ‘absolutely certain’ that Iran was the post-diluvian centre from which the ‘whole race of man proceeded’ (Jones 1792a: 487). He argued that after the Flood three distinct races emerged: “Persians and Indians” (including the Greeks, Romans, Goths, Egyptians and their descendants, and probably the Chinese and Japanese), “the Jews and Arabs”, and “the Tartars”. Not only did these three broadly defined races approximate the sons of Noah, but they were also defined primarily on a linguistic basis (Jones, 1792a: 479–480, 490–491).

It is clear that Jones’s division was quite different from later nineteenth century theories that would equate Aryans (Indians, Europeans and even Polynesians) as the sons of Japhet. In Jones’s scheme the Tartars approximated the sons of Japhet, but they were uncivilised nomads who lagged well behind the other branches of the human family. The more advanced “Jews and Arabs” were the sons of Shem. The languages of the Semites were fundamentally different from the languages of the final group, the “Persians and Indians”. This group, the descendants of Ham, peopled

Africa, India, Italy, Greece and perhaps East Asia and Central America. Jones's insistence on the Hamite origins of what later scholars would call the Indo-European or Aryan family reflected both European and Indian sources. Thomas Trautmann has shown that Jones's theory was a reworking of Jacob Bryant's *Analysis of antient* [sic.] *mythology* (1774–1776) which argued that the Egyptians, Greeks, Romans and Indians were all the descendants of Ham (Trautmann, 1997: 42–47). Indo-Islamic sources also confirmed that Hindus were the sons of Ham. Alexander Dow's translation of Muhammad Qasim Firishtah's Persian history identified the Indians as Hamites and the *Akbar Nama* suggested that Hindus were the offspring of Ham, while the Mughals were the sons of the just Japhet (Dow, 1768: I, 7–8). Trautmann notes that the classical Islamic tradition reinforced the accuracy of the Mosaic framework and that Jones's interpretation was probably reinforced by the currency of these ideas among the learned Muslim elite (Trautmann, 1997: 53–54).

The emphasis on the shared Oriental origin of these different branches of humanity was in keeping with Jones's interpretation of Genesis. Like many other eighteenth-century scholars, Jones saw the Bible as an *Oriental* text, suggesting that European readers should make "all due allowances" for the "figurative Eastern style" of Genesis (Teignmouth ed., 1803: III, 325). His work was within the long established English tradition of defending the Genesis account through the study of other cultures. Indeed, as we have seen, his account of post-diluvian ethnic differences echoed the table of nations in Genesis 10. Like Lord Kames and Samuel Shuckford before him, Jones reconciled the ethnic differences confronting eighteenth-century Europeans with Biblical authority (Harrison, 1990: 139–146).

Jones's reassertion of the accuracy of Genesis and the shared origins of Indians and Europeans contributed to another significant result of his Oriental researches: the establishment of a comparative basis for the study of cultures. Unlike some European scholars, Jones did not suggest that Sanskrit was the parent of all the related Indian and European languages, or the source of all civilisation (cf. Ludwig Tieck in Schwab, 1984: 71). Rather Jones's emphasis on linguistic affinities created a comparative framework which combined a sensitivity to the complexity of a local (in this case Indian) culture with a desire to explain the pattern of human history at a global level. Javed Majeed has rightly argued that "Jones's thesis of the Indo-European family of languages...enabled comparisons to be made between cultures on a much firmer foundation than before" (Majeed, 1992: 15). Indeed, over the next century, India would be frequently identified as the ultimate source of European culture in particular and civilization more generally: even the cultural development of the distant southern margins of the Pacific were seen as a footnote to the great migrations that shaped the cultural development of South Asia.

The question of Polynesian origins

Although there had been considerable European interest in the Pacific from the sixteenth century, it was only from the 1760s, in the age of scientific exploration, that

the first serious European discussions about the origins and cultural development of the peoples of the Pacific developed. As both the British and French Royal Societies sponsored expeditions to the Pacific in the hope of discovering the great southern continent, *Terra Australis Incognita*, the Pacific became a great laboratory for the study of human, animal and vegetational variation (Bitterli, 1989; MacLeod and Rehbock, 1994). The journals of James Cook, captain of the *Endeavour* which charted much of the central and southern Pacific between 1768 and 1771, and Joseph Banks, the renowned naturalist who accompanied Cook, contained frequent and lengthy discussions of the natural and social world of the Pacific as exploration became increasingly systematised and scientific. This reflected the interest of British intellectual establishment as the President of the Royal Society, the Earl of Morton, provided a list of "Hints" to guide Cook in relations with Pacific Islanders and direct the science of the *Endeavour* expedition. The "hints" stressed that the description of human societies should receive the same attention as the collection and classification of plants and animals (see Beaglehole ed., 1955: II, 514–517). Thus Pacific exploration figured prominently in the intellectual agenda of the late Enlightenment, as it filled in the final gaps of what Edmund Burke termed the "great map of mankind" and finally allowed the construction of truly global frameworks for the interpretation of both man and nature (Marshall and Williams, 1982).

Given the heightened European interest in linguistics in the mid to late eighteenth century it is hardly surprising that language was central in this ethnographic project. The *Endeavour* set sail at a moment in European intellectual history where the study of language and cultural difference was taking on new significance. From the 1760s, however, European *philosophes* became increasingly interested in language itself. Raymond Schwab has argued that a new era was being ushered in where Europeans were gripped by a linguistic and etymological "fever". "An entire age that tended to make all other problems dependent on verbal ones had dawned": the study of language could determine the accuracy of Genesis, could test the veracity of the mechanistic hypothesis, and reveal the common bond which formed people into "nations" or "races" (Schwab, 1984: 171–176). European imperial expansion invested the study of language with new meaning and urgency, as understanding non-European languages was essential to trade, colonial administration and cross-cultural analysis.

In keeping with this project both Cook and Banks constructed basic Polynesian word-lists (see Beaglehole ed., 1955: I, 286–287 and Beaglehole, 1962: I, 35). The linguistic evidence collected by both men alerted them to the profound similarities uniting the cultures of the Pacific and encouraged them to speculate on the origin of this cultural group. Banks and Cook agreed that Maori origins lay to the west of New Zealand, discounting a migration from either America or the great Southern Continent, the existence of which they increasingly doubted (Beaglehole ed., 1955: I, 286–288). Their journals, edited in a rather loose and "creative" manner by John Hawkesworth, were hugely popular and as a result established a basic framework for Pacific ethnography and linguistics (Hawkesworth, 1773). The notion of linguistic unity was subsequently fortified by the work of Johann Reinhold Forster on Cook's

second voyage, as Forster extended and consolidated the comparative analysis of Pacific languages and customs (Forster, 1778). In the mid-nineteenth century the unity of the central and eastern Pacific perceived by Cook, Banks and Forster was further elaborated into a new taxonomy, as the islanders who exhibited the strongest degrees of affinity (Maori, Tahitians, Hawaiians, Samoans and Tongans) were designated Polynesian, in contradistinction to the darker peoples of the western Pacific who were called Melanesian (D'Urville, 1832).

But while these eighteenth century explorers were quick to note the substantial cultural ties uniting the Pacific, one crucial question remained. How did Maori (or later "Polynesians") relate to other peoples and languages and where did they originate? Hawkesworth noted that Maori had a firm answer, as their traditions recounted the migrations of their ancestors from the island of Hawaiki, but Hawkesworth believed that it was linguistic comparison, rather than Maori tradition, that was most likely to allow the ancient source of Maori culture to be identified (Hawkesworth, 1773: III, 474). Following Hawkesworth's lead, until the late nineteenth century European scholars generally discounted Maori traditions of their migration to New Zealand. In part, this reflected the inaccessibility of these traditions: they were clothed in the difficult language of myth and were considered *tapu* (godly, forbidden) knowledge that should be hidden from the prying eyes of the *tauiwi* (strange tribe – Europeans). More importantly, Europeans felt that the Maori language itself provided more reliable evidence for the discussion of Maori origins. Just as Sir William Jones believed that language provided the evidence to undercut Hindu mythic history, Pakeha scholars believed that language was a more reliable guide to the ancient Maori past than Maori traditions (see Jones, 1788: 343).

Maori language and the question of Maori origins

Little progress was made in the study of Maori culture between Cook's last voyage and the arrival of missionaries in New Zealand in 1814. Although Maori had frequent contact with European traders, sealers, and whalers, these individuals left little evidence of their understandings of Maori culture. Between the mid-1810s and the 1850s a substantial body of ethnographic material on Maori was published, in various travel-accounts, geographic works and in missionary journals such as the *Missionary Register* (1813–1854). Much of this material is extremely valuable for its anecdotal quality, as it was grounded in detailed personal observation and reflection, but unfortunately it contains limited sustained analysis of the Maori language.

When the early missionary ethnographers did consider the question of Maori language and cultural origins, they were unable to offer any confident answers. Occasionally they speculated that there were linguistic and cultural affinities which suggested that Maori were either descendants of the Jews or even a lost tribe of Israel. In a well-known passage Samuel Marsden, the Australian-based patriarch of the mission, noted that he was "inclined to that they [Maori] have sprung from some dispersed Jews" and he pointed, rather vaguely, to some affinities in "religious supersti-

tions and customs" (Marsden in Elder ed., 1932: 219). But less well-known is the opening of this discussion where Marsden admitted the limited nature of European understandings of Maori and revealed his ignorance of the Maori homeland of 'Hawaiki' earlier revealed to Cook and Banks: "With respect to the origin of the natives of these islands we are still in the dark. I could not learn that they had any traditions amongst them from whence they came" (Marsden in Elder ed., 1932: 219).

Thomas Kendall, one of the missionaries under Marsden's supervision, also tentatively noted some linguistic parallels between Hebrew and Maori after he was presented Parkhurst's *Hebrew Lexicon* as a gift: "The prefixes and affixes are placed nearly in the same way.... Many words are set down in Hebrew in the same manner as I shall spell those of the same meaning in the New Zealand language." Kendall did emphatically state, however, that "I do not pretend to say that the New Zealanders are descendants of the Jews, nor do I really think they really are so." This linguistic debt, Kendall suggested, probably arose from the Maori having 'been formerly acquainted with that people' (Kendall in Elder ed., 1934: 162). But by 1820 Kendall had retreated from any notion of substantial Semitic connections, as he now believed that religious comparison demonstrated that Maori were related to the ancient Egyptians, and were thus Hamitic, not Semitic (Elsmore, 1985: 64).

The question of any possible link with the ancient Israelites was settled clearly by Robert Maunsell, who joined the Church Missionary Society's New Zealand mission in 1835. Maunsell's linguistic work on Maori, like his own training in Classical languages at Trinity College, Dublin, was sophisticated and it culminated in his translation of the entire Old Testament in 1858. His work was a long way removed from the earlier piece-meal observations of his poorly educated predecessors. In 1842 he completed a new Maori grammar which recognised dialectical variation and the rapid change of Maori as a result of contact with European settlers. Maunsell was not convinced of an etymological or structural affinity between Hebrew and Maori, although he noted similarities could "occasionally" be observed. He did, however, model his grammar on Hebrew grammars, as European languages did not provide a useful model for Maori. Hebrew was, he observed, "altogether different from those [European] languages in structure", and Maori shared with Hebrew a poetic and expressive nature (Maunsell, 1842: XII–XIII). Although the Semitic theory did occasionally re-emerge Maunsell had effectively undercut its credibility. Manuscript notes dating from 1847, which contain comparative Sanskrit-Maori vocabularies, also suggest that he might well have been aware of the recent work of German and British linguists on the links between the languages of the Pacific and the Indo-European language family (Grey Mss. 39).

Leading German scholars had already attempted to classify Polynesian languages, and by extension Polynesian peoples, within their new linguistic taxonomies. Wilhelm von Humboldt, for example, argued in his study of Javanese languages that the Polynesian languages seemed to contain traces of an early form of Sanskrit (see Howe, 1988: 70). Franz Bopp, the leading German philologist of his generation, argued that Maori exhibited a deep affinity with Sanskrit (Bopp, 1841: 7). Scholars in the Pacific itself were also using comparative philology to reach similar conclusions.

J. R. Logan, the editor of *Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia* and the mid-century authority on the languages of Southeast Asia and the western Pacific, argued in 1851 that linguistic and cultural similarities established a firm link between Indians and Pacific Islanders (Logan, 1851). Further east, several Hawaii-based scholars discerned similar linguistic affinities. W. D. Alexander, a Greek linguist and Yale graduate, argued for an ancient Indian origin of Polynesian languages (Alexander, "Preface" [originally published 1864] to Fornander, 1878–1885). Abraham Fornander published an impressive three-volume survey of Polynesian culture, language and history in which he hoped to establish the Polynesian languages as a branch of the Indo-European family and demonstrate the distant but important cultural bond that united whites and Hawaiians (Fornander, 1878–1885).

The birth of "Indocentrism"

If it was Maunsell's manuscript notes that hinted at the direction of future work on Maori ethnology, it was his fellow missionary Richard Taylor who developed an Indocentric model for the interpretation of Maori culture. Taylor (1805–1873), a graduate of Queen's College Cambridge, spent three years in New South Wales before arriving in New Zealand in 1839, where he was an important figure in race relations in the lower North Island and fashioned a reputation as a fine naturalist and ethnographer. Although his early work in the late 1840s and early 1850s stressed that Maori were a "mixed race", as he was able to identify a host of features in Maori society that revealed a cocktail of Semitic, Indian, Malay, Chinese and Japanese influences, his most influential works produced from the early 1860s placed heavy emphasis on Indian connections and affinities.

In 1867 Taylor published *Our Race and its Origin*. This work was a closer examination of the peopling of the Pacific in light of contemporary debates about human origins. The race in Taylor's title referred to humanity as a whole rather than to Europeans alone: indeed Taylor here was defending the common origins of all humanity. *Our race and its origin* was stimulated by works such as Chamber's *The Vestiges of Creation* and Darwin's *Origins of Species*, research that challenged Taylor's interpretation of world history, which was grounded in a literal reading of Genesis. Taylor offered a scathing summation of their theories of "development"; that life originated in a protozoa, "a pure gelatinous substance" and "advancing to something else in the course of myriads of ages, passing from one form to another, until at last from the monkey emerged the man; and in the gorilla we...behold one of our grand progenitors" (Taylor, 1867: 4). Attacking this evolutionary narrative, Taylor confidently asserted that Creation was "comparatively recent" and humans were created in a "perfect form", denying the vast temporal scope required for evolution and rejecting the possibility that species improved or transmuted themselves over time. Moreover, in response to John Crawford's polygenism, he asserted that all humanity "originated with a single pair" and the post-diluvian world "began with four original pairs": Noah, his sons and their wives (Taylor, 1867: 7–9).

Although in *Our Race and its Origin* Taylor briefly discussed the contribution of the Jews to the peopling of the world, he identified Maori as primarily Asiatic (Taylor, 1867: 14). The Maori language revealed a heavy debt to Sanskrit both in vocabulary and "the character of the language", and he asserted the *tiki* pendant worn by some Maori was "remarkable for its Indian form", recalling the sculptures at "the rock temples of Salsette and Elephanta" (Taylor, 1867: 24). Elsewhere he noted that language provided "strong evidence in support of the original unity of our race", stressing that the "amount of Indian words and roots in European tongues is great" and that this debt was found in the languages of Polynesia as well. He then drew upon Max Müller to assert the unity of "Indo-European idioms" and suggested this reflected a period of cultural unity before the "first separation of the Northern and Southern Aryans" (Taylor, 1867: 28). Taylor had firmly moved away from the Semitic Maori thesis: he had reoriented debates about Maori origins towards India and the Sanskritocentric vision created by Jones and extended by Müller.

Taylor's use of Müller's work reflected his desire to place his defence of human unity on the New Zealand frontier on a solid scholarly footing through reference to the latest European scholarship. This unity was of particular importance as Taylor hoped that it would check "the strong feeling of aversion which the white entertains for the coloured races", a feeling that intensified in New Zealand in the 1860s as Pakeha, assisted by imperial troops and "loyal Maori" were locked into an ongoing war over land and sovereignty that raged through the North Island. Taylor encouraged his fellow settlers to continue to "equalise" and "fraternise" with Maori despite this conflict, believing that the affinities that he had identified might be an antidote to the centrifugal forces which threatened to tear the communities apart (Taylor, 1867: 38–39).

Taylor restated this argument in the second revised edition of his popular study of New Zealand, *Te Ika a Maui* (lit. "The Fish of Maui" – i.e. the North Island), published in 1870. Here Taylor delineated the full extent of the Asian influences that he thought had moulded Maori culture. He suggested that Japanese and Chinese influences in the Pacific could not be discounted, believing that this East Asian influence could be observed in the Maori physique and countenance (Taylor, 1870: 33). But most importantly, Taylor stressed the Indian connection as he suggested that "India presents many points of agreement with Polynesia, both in customs and language". He presented a full discussion of affinities between Maori and Hindus based upon recent British works on Indian ethnography and history (Taylor, 1870: 48–53). Maori were more directly connected with Asians, as Taylor argued, they "appear...to have entered the Pacific from the eastern shores of Asia". Once in the Pacific Maori intermarried with the other Pacific peoples and East Asians. Maori's long migration from their Asian homeland had ensured that they had become a mixed race (Taylor, 1870: 57).

These arguments reflected Taylor's increasing engagement with the wider world of Orientalism and comparative philology, which saw him increasingly rely on the works of leading European ethnographers and philologists such as Max Müller and James Cowles Prichard, as he moved towards an Indocentric hypothesis.

Both Müller and Prichard were profoundly influenced by the research of Sir William Jones on the linguistic and cultural ties between Indian and Europe. Prichard argued that linguistic proofs established that Celts and Indians were both related to Europeans, while Müller was the most influential populariser of the idea of a family of Aryan languages uniting Indians, Persians and Europeans (Prichard, 1831; Müller, 1859). Following Jones's lead they believed that the ultimate home of humanity was in South or Central Asia and that India was home to the most sophisticated ancient religious and cultural traditions. This stress on the sophistication of ancient Asian cultures and Indo-European affinities militated against the increasing racialism of European thought, at a time when advocates of Teutonic superiority and polygenist anthropologists alike questioned the sophistication of non-European and Celtic languages and cultures (see Young, 1995: 66–89).

There is no doubt that both the intellectual potential and cultural influence of these arguments appealed to Taylor, who blended these two concerns to create a socially-engaged ethnology which attempted to enhance European estimation of Maori by emphasising their connections to the "glorious culture" of ancient India. Taylor successfully achieved this aim because he was working in a very different social and intellectual environment than the early missionaries and traders who produced accounts of Maori culture. By the time he produced his major ethnological works there was a substantial body of ethnographic material, leading Pakeha settlements complete with libraries, reading-rooms and lecture halls were well established and a basic scholarly apparatus (grammars, dictionaries and translations) had been constructed for the fuller study of Maori. Most importantly, the study of Maori culture had become increasingly comparative, as both settler and metropolitan authorities attempted to locate Maori within their broader schemes of linguistic, cultural and historical development. Within this context Orientalist works, such as those by Jones, Prichard and Müller, were extremely popular, as colonial libraries, educational institutions and scientific societies amassed significant collections of Asian material (Ballantyne, 1999: especially 20–21). Some leading figures in Australasian intellectual life decried the influence of such works, as early as 1834 J. D. Lang was attacking the influence of Sir William Jones's work on the debates over Polynesian origins, a critique that was later developed by one colonial thinker who attacked the existing research on the Pacific for Eurasian orientation, complaining: "I believe we are too old-world in our ideas, and have got into the habit of looking to Asia for every migration" (Lang, 1834; Barstow, 1876: 242).

Contesting the Aryan theory

These critiques of the influence of Orientalism on Polynesian studies intensified and from the 1870s through to the 1890s there was a heated and ongoing debate over these issues generated by the Indian connections identified by Taylor. A few dissenting voices, such as the leading British spiritualist Gerald Massey, whose New Zealand lecture tours were extremely popular, rejected India as the home of the

Maori: Massey believed Maori were primitive Africans rather than Aryans (Massey, 1881 and 1883). One Pakeha scholar, R. C. Barstow, anticipated the later arguments of Thor Heyerdahl, suggesting that everyone was looking in the wrong direction: the Polynesians had entered the Pacific from their home on the coast of Peru, not from Asia (Barstow, 1876). And most notably many Maori themselves rejected the identification of India as their home – they instead saw Israel as their ancient homeland as they identified themselves as God’s chosen people who were to be soon liberated by the coming of a new messiah. From the 1840s numerous Maori prophets emerged, who identified their people as “Tiu” or “Hurai” (Jews) and Pakeha as “nga Paarihi” (the Pharisees) or “nga Haaruki” (the Sadducees) (see Ballantyne, 1999: 226–255; Elsmore, 1985 and 1989; Head, 1992). They promised that a millennial age was close at hand, where alienated Maori land would be restored and Pakeha would be driven into the sea: for many nineteenth-century Maori the authority of God overshadowed that of comparative philology!

But nevertheless most Pakeha intellectuals accepted that Maori had migrated from India into the Pacific. Despite the contributions of Massey and Barstow the main debate amongst Pakeha in the 1870s and 1880s was not so much whether Maori had migrated from India but rather where exactly in India? Taylor, of course, suggested that Maori were Aryan, but he did not identify any particular Indian region or homeland as the source. This was the new quest.

One who had a positive answer to this question was Edward Tregear, a prominent progressive politician, theosophist and ethnographer. Tregear’s well-known 1885 work on this topic, *The Aryan Maori*, was followed by a string of articles in New Zealand, Australian and British journals. While identified the Central Asian steppes as the most likely ultimate homeland of the Aryans, Tregear stressed the profound influence of north India on Aryan culture. Like north Indians (especially Punjabis) Maori were rugged Aryans and Maori culture was quite obviously Indian in its principal features. Tregear romanticised Maori culture, constructing a heroic history and exalting its roots in the “sublime truths of the Vedas” (Tregear, 1885 and 1891). Maori, Pakeha and Indians, were part of one large Aryan family and nothing should come between these brothers, an argument that not only reflected Tregear’s interest in Theosophy but was also moulded by family history, as his uncle was one of the first men killed during the Indian rebellion of 1857–1858 (Tregear, 1885: 103).

But the emphasis on Indo-European kinship, which at one level certainly raised difficult questions about colonialism, found in both Taylor and then in later in Tregear’s work was rejected by other colonial intellectuals convinced of a deep and permanent rift between Maori and the settler community. The earliest and most influential of these critics was John Turnbull Thomson, the former Chief Surveyor of Singapore who retired from service in the Orient to New Zealand where he became the first Surveyor-General. In the 1870s Thomson published a series of long densely-argued articles that marshalled a vast amount of linguistic evidence gleaned from orientalist texts on South and Southeast Asian linguistics and Thomson’s own knowledge of Bahasa Malay and Maori against the Aryan thesis. Thomson accepted an Indian origin but rejected the possibility that Maori were Aryan or Indo-European as he

posited an alternative theory. He argued that at the time of the Aryan invasion there was a diaspora of less-sophisticated tribal and Dravidian peoples from South India. A wave of migrants pushed east through Southeast Asia and ultimately into the Pacific (e.g. Thomson, 1872 and 1878). This long voyage, constant inter-marriage, and isolation from civilising influences meant that by the time this race arrived in New Zealand it was further weakened by social decay and cultural degeneration. Maori were in no way equal to the white colonists – in fact they were physically and culturally inferior. This inferiority was obvious in Maori depopulation: they were destined to die out and their extinction, in Thomson's eyes, was an inevitable adjunct of the civilising process. Thomson, an early apostle of large-scale pastoralism in the interior of the South Island, looked forward to the day when "the rough, shaggy Maori stealthily moving through the fern thicket in search for roots" would be replaced by a "fair haired lassie tending her goats on the braes" (Thomson, 1867: 70).

Although there were numerous other interpretations that linked Maori with different Indian communities and regions, the examples of Tregear and Thomson serve to reveal the important moral and political implications of the Indocentric paradigm established by Taylor. While all three men accepted the central importance of linguistic comparison as guide to cultural affinities and human history, they constructed very different visions of the past, present and future of Maori. Comparative philology was always a two-edged sword: linguistic evidence could be used to re-imagine and extend the boundaries of communities, countering racial hostility, but it could also just as easily be used to construct firmer boundaries and greater distances between communities.

An Indocentric consensus: Maori religion as transplanted Hinduism

By 1890 the debates over the precise location of Maori's Indian origins had died away as a new popular synthesis emerged. In classical Hegelian fashion the Aryan thesis of Tregear and the tribal antitheses of Thomson were synthesised into a broader argument that stressed the general debt of Maori culture to a generalised Indian "parent" culture. The attempts to locate Maori origins within Aryan, Dravidian or tribal communities were no longer of particular concern, as various aspects of Taylor's, Thomson's and Tregear's research could be drawn upon and reconciled if Maori origins were depicted as more generally Indian. This synthesising reflected the conscious effort of a new group of settler scholars to popularise and disseminate the findings of ethnology/anthropology. In 1893 the Polynesian Society was established as a new New Zealand-based institutional framework dedicated to the study of the "Oceanic races". For its first three decades this organization was dominated by two men: Percy S. Smith and Elsdon Best. Both men were dedicated to research in the Pacific, especially in New Zealand, and to distributing their findings to a general reading public through popular monographs, newspaper articles and lecture tours in addition to scholarly publication. This popularising agenda re-

quired a shift away from the intricate linguistic arguments and lengthy comparative vocabularies that particularly characterised the debates of the 1870s, especially J. T. Thomson's work, to a more generalised form of argument. Not surprisingly the detailed discussions of Asian linguistic and racial history that formed a necessary framework to the work of J. T. Thomson were, by necessity, truncated and simplified: the relative precision of terms such as "Dravidian", "Austro-Mongoloid" and "Indo-Aryan" were increasingly replaced by the catch-all "Indian".

Central to this shift was a declining interest in language as the primary evidence for comparative analysis and the rise of cultural comparison and an increased emphasis on religious comparison more specifically. This shift was signalled by the increased authority of comparative religion in metropolitan ethnology in the 1870s on. The two leading British-based comparativists Max Müller and E. B. Tylor both incorporated Polynesia into their theories of religious development and posited firm links between Hindu and Maori mythology.

Although Max Müller's modern reputation largely rests upon his achievements in Indology, he also explored the development of religion at a universal level. Max Müller believed that while religious sensibilities generally evolved, becoming more sophisticated and refined, isolation and environmental difficulties could easily retard this development. He suggested these factors had frozen Polynesian religion at an early stage of development. In his preface to William Wyatt Gill's important collection *Myths and Songs from the South Pacific* (1876) Max Müller argued that Polynesian mythology allowed unique access to the ancient Aryan past, because Polynesian society was actually frozen at the stage of Indian society at the time of *Rg Veda*. "We know that mythopoeic phase among the Aryan and Semitic races, but we know it from a distance only, and where are we to look now for the living myths and legends, except among those who still think and speak mythologically, who are, in fact, at the present moment what the Hindus were before the days of Homer?" (Müller, "Preface" to Gill, 1876: VI). He explained that mythology represented a "complete period in thought". Collections of mythology from the Pacific, which had only be opened to European influence comparatively recently, were valuable for the scholar exploring the development of human thought and society. It was as if 'the zoologist could spend a few days among the megatheria, or the botanist among the waving ferns of the forests, buried beneath our feet' (Müller, "Preface" to Gill, 1876: VI–VII). But among these fragments of the "childhood of the world" Max Müller found scattered evidence of divine enlightenment that would "comfort those who hold that God had not left Himself without a witness, even among the lowest outcasts of the human race" (Müller, "Preface" to Gill, 1876: XVIII). Some racial groups, blessed with a favourable environment, developed religious sensibilities more quickly than others, but these racial boundaries were not radical disjunctions, rather humanity was a continuum and our shared adoration of the Infinite, regardless of the sophistication of the expression of this adoration, united us all (see Mazusawa, 1993: 67).

Nine years later, in an 1885 article on solar mythology, Max Müller analysed the cycle of myths relating the feats of the Polynesian demi-god Maui. Maui, the *potiki* (last-born) son of primordial parents Ranginui (the Sky Father) and Papatua-

nuku (the Earth Mother), overcame his junior status through his ingenuity and daring. His tricks and conquests shaped the world we live in: he fished up the land (the North Island is still called *Te Ika Maui* – the fish of Maui), stole fire for humanity from the fiery fingers of his ancestress Mahuika, and used the magical jawbone of another ancestress Muriringa-whenua to beat the sun into submission and slow its movement across the sky. It was this last tale within the cycle that intrigued Max Müller. Maui, he argued, was an archetypal "solar hero". Like the Vedic god Yama (the son of the sun, the first man and later the god of the dead) Maui was born of a god but was a mortal who later became deified because of his daring exploits (Müller, 1885: 918).

Max Müller argued that the myths of Yama and Maui revealed the unity of humanity. He noted the dangers of philological comparison across linguistic families, but suggested that in mythology scholars could discern "one common human nature" that lay beneath "the diversity of human speech". All religions, from the "lowest" to the "highest", venerated the Infinite and initially people saw the sun as the Infinite's symbol and embodiment (Müller, 1885: 901). In the early stages of religion the sun assumed central importance, as riddles, myths, ritual and worship all focused on the sun's life-giving properties. This "heliolatriy" constituted the "most widely spread form of early faith" and in this respect the special attention scholars had devoted to solar myths in the Greco-Roman world was misplaced (Müller, 1885: 906–907). Thus, Polynesian mythology revealed the ancient history of human thought and belief, as the Maui myths epitomised the earliest stages of religion when humanity's veneration fixed on the sun and its animating power.

Maori mythology was also prominent in E. B. Tylor's studies of primitive culture and religious evolution. Tylor asserted that "all the world is one country" and synthesised a vast amount of material drawn from South Asia, the Pacific, Africa and North America (Tylor, 1871: I, 5). Tylor believed that a universalist world-view which treated "mankind as homogeneous in nature, though placed in different grades of civilisation" should be the foundation for the analysis of civilisation (Tylor, 1871: I, 6-7). His interpretation of religion was evolutionary, suggesting that the highest monotheistic and rational stages of religion had evolved out of the cruder religious beliefs that underpinned animism and primitive mythologies (c.f. Howitt, 1884). He argued that mythology had its roots in the reverence for nature in primitive societies. Thus nature worship was a consistent feature of all mythology and Maori mythology again proved a useful vehicle for establishing human kinship. Tylor identified Maui (who he described as "the New Zealand Sun-god") as the Maori parallel of Vishnu, just as his fishing up of *Te Ika a Maui* echoed Vishnu's boar avatar who dredged up the earth on his great tusks (Tylor, 1871: I, 248). Thus Tylor and Müller, the leading luminaries of comparative mythology, emphasised the importance of Polynesian sun myths and the strong parallels between Maori and Hindu mythology.

Tylor and Müller had theorised the belief of many settlers who had hinted at links between Maori religion and Christianity from the 1850s (e.g. A. S. Thomson 1859: I, 108–120). But these parallels were explored with greater energy and persistence by colonial intellectuals in the wake of Tylor's and Müller's work on Maori.

Although Elsdon Best made valuable contributions to this project (see Best, 1914 and Best, 1924: I, 294–297) it was the Indian-born settler Alfred Kingcombe Newman who dedicated the greatest effort to this project. Newman used the extensive Oriental collection of the Polynesian Society library in addition to a research trip to India to collect evidence for his popular text on Maori racial history, *Who are the Maoris?* After combing a vast range of literature on both Polynesia and India, Newman found evidence for 70 of these Hindu gods and 38 Hindu goddesses in Polynesia. Newman noted that just as Hindu gods often had several names, Maori worshipped “a few gods under many *aliases*.” Newman argued that a few names were perfectly preserved in the Pacific, such as Ira, Kali and Uma, but other parallels could be discerned in the similarity between the names of Indian and Maori gods, including “Tangara” and “Tangaroa”, “Devaki” and “Tawhaki”, “Manu” and “Oo-Manu”, “Rudra” and “Ru and Rua”, “Sina” and “Hina”, and “Dyo, Dyu, Io” and “Io” (Newman, n.d.: 198–200, 207–208). Underlying the apparent multiplicity of Hindu gods was “a trinity of gods” and traces of this trinity could be found among the Hawaiian branch of the Maori family, if not in New Zealand (Newman, n.d.: 198). Newman also discerned striking parallels between the “first men” Manu and Maui; they were both closely associated with fire, survived a great flood alone and both failed to cheat death by re-entering the womb (Newman, n.d.: 172–184).

Newman took the comparative method to its most extreme length, reading almost all available evidence as a proof of profound links between Maori and their north Indian homes. He saw Maori as part of a larger racial and religious community, spanning India, Southeast Asia and the Pacific and Newman was able to draw on a huge range of ethnographic material produced within the region to bolster his argument. Comparative religion and philology always contained the implicit methodological danger that evidence that challenged a theory, or was simply neutral, could be disregarded at the expense of evidence which apparently establish a particular theory. Newman, convinced of Maori’s fundamentally religious nature and their Indian origins, asserted a much stronger and direct connection between Maori religion and Hinduism than any other single scholar.

Although Newman’s ability to find parallels in disparate evidence was so extreme that it caused some scepticism, the outlines of his argument – that Maori had migrated to India and transplanted a form of Hinduism into the Pacific – were widely accepted. Most notably, Elsdon Best affirmed Maori’s Indian origins and spread the notion to a mass audience through a series of lectures delivered to various branches of the Workers’ Education Association. Percy Smith emphasised the Indian connection in a series of articles and books that spanned over twenty years (e.g. Smith, 1898). Peter Buck (Te Rangi Hiroa), a leading anthropologist of mixed parentage, affirmed that his Maori ancestors “probably did live in some part of India” in his immensely popular synthesis on Maori anthropology: *Vikings of the Sunrise* (Buck, 1938: 35). By this time there was such a huge literature discussing the manifold debts of Maori culture to India that Maori’s Indian origins were really beyond doubt: the ultimate source of the Maori population was India and their culture retained a clear imprint of this heritage.

From diffusionism to localism: the death of Indocentrism

By the 1930s intellectual and political forces were coalescing that would ultimately destroy the diffusionist paradigm. At an intellectual level, the middle decades of the twentieth century was a period of significant advancement in Polynesian studies and gradually the evidence that would ultimately undercut the Indocentric hypothesis was assembled. The professionalisation of both linguistics and archaeology undoubtedly led to a rapid improvement in the standard of Pacific studies between 1930 and the 1950s and the speculative tendencies of earlier ethnological writers such as Tregear and Newman were undercut and marginalised by increasingly rigorous and sophisticated empirical studies that benefited from advances in both technology and scholarly methodology. Most importantly, the aims and themes of Polynesian anthropology shifted markedly in the 1930s. In the New Zealand context this shift was particularly signalled by Raymond Firth's *Primitive Economics of the Maori* (1929), a work which redirected the analytical thrust of Maori studies from the location of the Maori homeland and the timing and routes of migration, to the fundamental socio-economic structures which governed Maori life. This work not only transformed approaches to the study of Maori culture, but at a profound level Firth's materialism militated against the romantic and theosophist currents that frequently emerged in late nineteenth century accounts of Maori culture, most notably in the work of Tregear.

Firth's recasting of Maori anthropology dovetailed with broader shifts in New Zealand intellectual life. Where the generation of Tregear, Smith and Best were central in moulding a romantic cultural nationalism, the 1930s and 1940s was marked by the emergence of a leftist, secular literary tradition that was intent on dissecting the development of the nation. While this led to a greater cultural confidence it also increasingly dislocated New Zealand from the broader world in which it had developed. The emphasis on New Zealand's unique position as a progressive and classless society, "God's Own Country", which re-emerged after the depression of the 1930s led to an age introspection and complacency.

This inwardness has increasingly characterised New Zealand intellectual life in the post-World War Two period. In both history and anthropology the overwhelming focus of New Zealand research is on developments within the geographic and political framework of the nation. New Zealand history has increasingly focused on the relationships between Maori and Pakeha, while anthropology has focused on the development of Maori material culture, social structure and political organization from settlement (around 800 C. E.) through to the modern age. Certainly the development of Maori culture is often seen against the broader backdrop of the Polynesian cultural group (including Hawai'i, Samoa, Tonga and the Cook Islands), but there has been a reluctance to embark on broader comparative work which might cast light on Maori linguistic, social or cultural development of the kind we find in Valerio Valeri's studies of Hawaiian kingship or A.M. Hocart's earlier work on sacrifice and social structure (Valeri, 1985; Hocart, 1936).

This has been most marked in the reluctance of New Zealand-based scholars to deploy the broader interpretative framework of Austronesian linguistics or cultural reconstruction in studies of Maori culture. Substantial linguistic and archaeological evidence collected over the past six decades clearly establishes that Maori, and Polynesians more generally, as Austronesians. Linguistic reconstruction has established that Proto-Austronesian was spoken in Taiwan around 5,500 years ago and that early Austronesians were practicing agriculture in southern China and Taiwan at this time (Jolly and Mosko, 1994: 7). From this homeland the Austronesians spread quickly, through Southeast Asia, reaching Melanesia within 1,000 years.

All of this forms an unacknowledged prelude to contemporary discussions of Maori origins in New Zealand. While New Zealand anthropologists and historians accept that Polynesians migrated into the Pacific from Melanesia, and were influenced by Melanesian culture, they feel uncomfortable about accepting the Asian connections implicit within the Austronesian concept. The leading New Zealand historian James Belich, for example, summarises the interaction, and distinction, between Melanesians and Polynesians as: "Melanesians were genetically and culturally diverse Pacific Islanders more influenced by nearby Asia; Polynesians were homogeneous Pacific Islanders more influenced by the wide and isolating ocean. Melanesian diversity and interaction with Asia, together with Polynesian isolation, rapid adaptation and descent from a small original group subsequently accentuated the differences" (Belich, 1996: 17). Ranginui Walker, an influential Maori historian and media commentator, also elides the Asian origins of the Austronesian ancestors of the Polynesians in his summation: "Samoans and Tongans were the first Polynesians to enter the Pacific, via Melanesia perhaps as early as 1300 B. C." (Walker, 1987: 141).

While there has been an understandable reluctance to return to the often simplistic diffusionism of the days of Indocentrism, this elision of the Austronesian concept reflects the ideological frameworks which shape contemporary scholarship in New Zealand. Powerful political agendas (or at least arguments that might be used to serve political agendas) are implicit such arguments which efface Asian influences and stress the uniquely Pacific nature of Polynesian/Maori society. Many Maori have voiced their strong opposition to recent Asian migration, which has, ironically, primarily come from East Asia, especially Hong Kong. Ranginui Walker himself has expressed resentment of the increased links to Asia that this migration has forged. He believes that increased Asian migration constitutes an "invasion" of New Zealand which will result in the economic and cultural marginalisation of the existing New Zealand population in general, but Maori in particular. He rejects any move that extends official recognition to the culture and productivity of the migrant communities, young or old, through the acceptance of multiculturalism. For Walker multiculturalism is a 'corrosive ideology' that allows for the 'expropriation' of indigenous wealth and power (see Walker in Greif ed., 1995: 289, 295–297).

Such arguments have retarded and fragmented the development of Pacific anthropology and history. Recent research (largely conducted outside New Zealand) has revealed significant linguistic and structural affinities that unite the Austronesian

world. While, as we have seen, European explorers had commented on the affinities between the languages of Southeast Asia and the Pacific, recent linguistic research has established a clearer image of the genetic relationships between Austronesian languages and firmer genealogies of linguistic development (Pawley, 1982; Tyron ed., 1994). This research has begun to establish historical connections and continuities which are expressed in cultural features which unite the Austronesian family, notions of rank and the role of hereditary ruler (whether chief, big-man or raja), the operation of *tapu* (or *kapu*, *tabu* or *abu* in its various forms), and the centrality of "purity" and "pollution" in religious observance. Viewing Maori society against the backdrop of these broader cultural forms could offer many analytical riches, particularly in the study of Maori religion, an area which still requires much work. Indeed the value of such comparative work can be seen in the sophistication of recent research on ancient Hawaii that has extended and adapted arguments regarding ritual status and social hierarchies from Indian anthropologists (especially Louis Dumont) to the Austronesian world (see Mosko, 1994 and Valeri, 1985). Maori culture grew out of a broader cultural family and comparative research can only serve to sharpen our understandings of the characteristics and development of that culture.

Conclusion

Thus the long search for Maori origins has largely been abandoned, it is now an academic trail fit only for the curiosity-seeker. Where questions of racial identity prompted this search in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, they now inhibit it. Where nineteenth century scholars emphasised the status of both Maori and Pakeha as migrants, as settlers in a new land, modern political discourse stresses the 'indigenous' status of Maori, and Maori culture as a unique manifestation of a distant Polynesian heritage. This inward turn is as analytically inhibiting as the late nineteenth century fixation on the cultural bonds between Maori and Indians. Where the diffusionist paradigm reduced Maori culture to being merely derivative, recent scholarship is in danger of depicting Maori culture as being so unique that is not amenable to comparative analysis at all. Hopefully the recent resurgence in Austronesian studies might locate the study of Maori culture in a broader interpretative framework and that scholars in the next millennium will develop new interpretations that strike a balance between a sensitivity to local forces and the broader heritages that shape cultural development.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to acknowledge the assistance of a National University of Ireland, Galway Millennium Fund Research Grant which helped to facilitate the research this paper is based on. Tēnā koe, Hēmi, mo too mahi manāki i ahau.

REFERENCES

- AARSLEFF, Hans (1967). *The Study of Language in England, 1780–1860*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- BALLANTYNE, Anthony J. (1999). *Imperial networks, ethnography and identity in colonial India and New Zealand*. University of Cambridge Ph.D. thesis.
- BARSTOW, R. C. (1876). "Stray thoughts on Mahori or Maori Migrations", *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute*, 9, 230–243.
- BEAGLEHOLE, J. C. (ed.) (1955–1974). *The Journals of Captain James Cook on His Voyages of Discovery*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BEAGLEHOLE, J. C. (ed.) (1962). *The Endeavour Journal of Joseph Banks, 1768–1771*. Auckland: Allen Lane.
- BELICH, James (1996). *Making peoples: a history of the New Zealanders: from Polynesian settlement to the end of the nineteenth century*. Auckland: Allen Lane.
- BEST, Elsdon (1914). "Maori Beliefs concerning the Human Organs of Generation", *Man*, 14, 132–134.
- BEST, Elsdon (1924). *The Maori*. 2 vols. Wellington: The Board of Ethnological Research.
- BITTERLI, Urs (1989). *Cultures in Contact: encounters between European and non-European cultures, 1492–1800* (ed. Ritchie Robertson). Cambridge: Polity.
- BONFANTE, G. (1953–1954). "Ideas on the kinship of European languages from 1200 to 1800", *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale/Journal of World History*, 1, 679–699.
- BOPP, Franz (1841). *Über die Verwandtschaft der malayisch-polynesischen Sprachen: mit den indisch-europäischen*. Berlin.
- BUCK, Peter (1938). *Vikings of the Sunrise*. New York: Frederick A. Stokes.
- COHN, Bernard S. (1985). "The Command of Language and the Language of Command", in: Ranajit Guha (ed.). *Subaltern Studies. IV. Writings on South Asian History and Society*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 276–329.
- DAVID, Alun (1996). "Sir William Jones, Biblical Orientalism and Indian Scholarship", *Modern Asian Studies*, 30: 1, 173–184.
- DOW, Alexander (trans. and ed.) (1768). *The history of Hindostan ... to the death of Akbar, translated from the Persian: together with a dissertation concerning the religion and philosophy of the Brahmins; with an appendix, containing the history of the Mogul empire ... to the present times*. 2 vols. London.
- D'URVILLE, J. S. C. Dumont (1832). "Sur les îles du Grand Océan", *Société de Géographie Bulletin*, 17, 1–21.
- ECO, Umberto (1995). *The search for the perfect language*. Oxford: Blackwells.
- ELDER, J. R. (ed.) (1932). *The Letters and Journals of Samuel Marsden 1765–1838*. Dunedin: Coulls Somerville Wilkie and A. H. Reed.
- ELDER, J. R. (ed.) (1934). *Marsden's Lieutenants*. Dunedin: Coulls Somerville Wilkie and A. H. Reed.
- ELSMORE, Bronwyn (1985). *Like them that dream: the Maori and the Old Testament*. Tauranga: Tauranga Moana Press.

- ELSMORE, Bronwyn (1989). *Mana from heaven: a century of Maori prophets in New Zealand*. Tauranga: Tauranga Moana Press.
- FIRTH, Raymond (1929). *The Primitive Economics of the Maori*. London: Routledge.
- FORNANDER, Abraham (1878–1885). *An Account of the Polynesian Race*. Vol. 3. *Comparative Vocabulary of the Polynesian and Indo-European languages; with a preface by W. D. Alexander*. 3 vols. London.
- FORSTER, Johann Reinhold (1778). *Observations made during a voyage around the world: on physical geography, natural history, and ethic philosophy*. London.
- GILL, William Wyatt (1876). *Myths and Songs from the South Pacific*. London.
- GREIF, Stuart (ed.) (1995). *Immigration and National Identity in New Zealand: One People: Two Peoples, Many Peoples?* Palmerston North: Dunmore.
- GREY, Sir George (n.d.). Manuscript collection. Auckland Public Library.
- HARRIS, Roy and Talbot J. TAYLOR (1989). *Landmarks in Linguistic Thought. The Western Tradition from Socrates to Saussure*. London: Routledge.
- HARRISON, Peter (1990). *"Religion" and the Religions in the English Enlightenment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HAWKESWORTH, John (ed.) (1773). *An account of the voyages undertaken by the order of His Present Majesty for making discoveries in the Southern Hemisphere: and successively performed by Commodore Byron, Captain Carteret, Captain Wallis, and Captain Cook, in the Dolphin, the Swallow, and the Endeavour. Drawn up from the journals which were kept by the several commanders, and from the papers of Joseph Banks*. 3 vols. London.
- HEAD, Lyndsay (1992). "The Gospel of Te Ua Haumene", *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 101: 1, 7–44.
- HOCART, A. M. (1936). *Kings and councillors: an essay in the comparative anatomy of human society*. Cairo: Printing Office.
- HOWE, K. R. (1988). "Some Origins and Migrations of Ideas Leading to the Aryan Polynesian Theories of Abraham Fornander and Edward Tregear", *Pacific Studies*, 11: 2, 67–81.
- HOWITT, A. W. (1884). "On Some Australian Beliefs", *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 13, 185–198.
- JOLLY, Margaret and Mark S. MOSKO (1994). "Prologue", *History and Anthropology*, 7, 1–18.
- JONES, Sir William (1788). "On the Hindu's [sic]", *Asiatick Researches*, 1, 343–355.
- JONES, Sir William (1792a). "On the Origin and Families of Nations", *Asiatick Researches*, 3, 479–492.
- JONES, Sir William (1792b). "On the Arabs", *Asiatick Researches*, 3.
- LANG, J. D. (1834). *A View of the Origin and Migrations of the Polynesian Nation; demonstrating their ancient discovery and progressive settlement of the Continent of America*. London.
- LOGAN, J. R. (1851). "Ethnology of the Indo-Pacific Islands", *Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia*, 5, 211–243, 249–585.
- MACLEOD, Roy and Philip H. REHBOCK (eds). (1994). *Darwin's laboratory: evolutionary theory and natural history in the Pacific*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

- MAJEED, Javed (1992). *Ungoverned Imaginings. James Mill's The History of British India and Orientalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MARSHALL, P. J. and Glyndwr WILLIAMS (1982). *The Great Map of Mankind. British Perceptions of the World in the Age of Enlightenment*. London: Dent.
- MASSEY, Gerald (1881). *A book of the beginnings, containing an attempt to recover and reconstitute the lost origins [sic.] of the myths and mysteries, types and symbols, religion and language, with Egypt for the mouthpiece and Africa as the birthplace*. 2 vols. London.
- MASSEY, Gerald (1883). *The natural genesis, or, Second part of a book of the beginnings*. 2 vols. London.
- MASUZAWA, Tomoko (1993). *In search of Dreamtime. The quest for the Origin of Religion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- MAUNSELL, Robert (1842). *Grammar of the New Zealand Language*. Auckland.
- MAW, Martin (1990). *Visions of India. Fulfilment Theology, the Aryan Race Theory, & the Work of British Protestant Missionaries in Victorian India*. New York: Lang.
- MÜLLER, F. Max (1859). *A History of Sanskrit Literature*. London.
- MÜLLER, F. Max (1885). "Solar Myths", *Nineteenth Century*, 18, 901–923.
- MOSKO, Mark S. (1994). "Transformations of Dumont: the hierarchical, the sacred, and the profane in India and ancient Hawaii", *History and Anthropology*, 7, 19–86.
- MUKHERJEE, S. N. (1968). *Sir William Jones. A Study in Eighteenth Century British Attitudes to India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- NEWMAN, Alfred (n.d. [c.1912]). *Who are the Maoris?* Christchurch: Whitcombe and Tombs.
- PAWLEY, A. (1982). "Rubbish-man Commoner, Big man Chief? Linguistic Evidence for Hereditary Chieftainship in Proto-Oceanic Society", in: J. Siikala (ed.). *Oceanic Studies: Essays in Honor of Aarne A. Koskinen*. Helsinki: Finnish Anthropological Society, pp. 33–52
- POLIAKOV, Leon (1973). *The Aryan myth: a history of racist and nationalist ideas in Europe* (trans.) Edmund Howard. London: Chatto and Windus.
- PRICHARD, James Cowles (1831). *The Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations Proved by a Comparison of their Dialects with the Sanskrit, Greek, Latin and Teutonic Languages. Forming a Supplement to the Researches into the Physical History of Mankind*. London.
- ROCHER, R. J. (1994). "Sanskrit: Discovery by Europeans", in: R. E. Asher (ed.). *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Vol. 7. Oxford: Pergamon.
- SCHWAB, Raymond (1984). *Oriental renaissance: Europe's rediscovery of India and the East, 1680–1880* (trans.) Gene Patterson-Black and Victor Reinking. New York: Columbia University Press.
- SMITH, S. Percy (1898). *Hawaiki, the Original home of the Maori*. Wellington.
- TAYLOR, Richard (1867). *Our Race and its origin*. Auckland.
- TAYLOR, Richard (1870). *Te Ika a Maui, or New Zealand and its inhabitants*. 2nd ed. London.
- TEIGNMOUTH, Lord (1804). *Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Correspondence of Sir William Jones*. London.
- TEIGNMOUTH, Lord (1807). *The Works of Sir William Jones, with a Life of the Author by Lord Teignmouth*. 13 vols. London.

- THAPAR, Romila (1996). "The theory of the Aryan Race and Indian History and Politics", *Social Scientist*, 24: 1–3, 3–29.
- THOMSON, A. S. (1869). *The story of New Zealand: past and present – savage and civilized*. 2 vols. London.
- THOMSON, John Turnbull (1867). *Rambles with a Philosopher or, Views at the Antipodes by an Otagoian*. Dunedin.
- THOMSON, John Turnbull (1872). "On Barata Numerals", *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute*, 5, 131–138.
- THOMSON, John Turnbull (1878). "Barat or Barata Fossil Words", *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute*, 11, 157–185.
- TRAUTMANN, Thomas R. (1997). *Aryans and British India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- TREGEAR, Edward (1885). *The Aryan Maori*. Wellington.
- TREGEAR, Edward (1891). *The Maori-Polynesian comparative dictionary*. Christchurch.
- TYLOR, E. B. (1871). *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art and Custom*. 2 vols. London.
- TYRON, D. T. (ed.) (1994). *Comparative Austronesian Dictionary, Trends in Linguistics*. 5 vols. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- VALERI, Valerio (1985). *Kingship and Sacrifice: Ritual and Society in Ancient Hawaii* (trans.) P. Wissing. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- WALKER, Ranginui (1987). *Nga Tau Tohetohe*. Auckland.
- YOUNG, Robert (1995). *Colonial desire: hybridity in theory, culture, and race*. London: Routledge.

Tony Ballantyne

»ORIJENTALNA RENESANSA« NA PACIFIKU: ORIJENTALIZAM, JEZIK I ETNOGENEZA NA BRITANSKOM PACIFIKU

SAŽETAK

U članku autor sugerira da »orijentalna renesansa« koju je utemeljio Raymond Schwab nije ograničena na kontinentalnu Europu i Veliku Britaniju, nego je zapravo bila ključna, često zanemari-vana nit u intelektualnom životu australoazijskih kolonija. Britanske imperijalne mreže, zajedno s cirkulacijom stručne periodike i monografija, osigurale su da je Britansko Carstvo temeljito oblikovalo intelektualnu kulturu Novog Zelanda u 19. stoljeću i da je ona bila istaknuta u debatama o podrijetlu i identitetu Maora. Pitanje maorskog podrijetla prevladavalo je u proučavanju Maora od otkrića Pacifika Jamesa Cooka i Josepha Banksa u kasnim šezdesetim godinama 18. stoljeća sve do tridesetih godina 20. stoljeća. Od početka je lingvistička komparacija pružala najvažniji dokaz za ustanovljavanje odnosa između naroda Pacifika i njihova krajnjeg podrijetla. Cook i Banks su skupljali riječi koje su ukazivale na duboko ukorijenjeno jedinstvo koje je povezivalo ljude istočnog i središnjeg Pacifika (kasnije poznate kao »polinezijski« jezici/narodi). Važnost lingvistike u istraživanjima Pacifika kasnije je pojačana utjecajem glasovitog diskursa Sir Williama Jonesa iz 1786., »O Hindusima«, koji je ustanovio sličnosti između grčkog jezika, latinskoga i sanskrta i tvrdio da je gramatička a ne etimološka usporedba osnova rekonstrukcije lingvističkih srodnosti. Ti su argumenti oblikovali buduću putanju polinezijskih studija. Mnogi pridošli (naseljeni), učenjaci kao i oni iz matične zemlje pokušavali su utvrditi da Maori pripadaju indoeuropskoj porodici i da se njihovo podrijetlo može pratiti unatrag sve do sjeverne Indije. Ti su argumenti bili uvijek sporni, posebice u zastrašujućoj atmosferi kolonijalnog života gdje je natjecanje za zemlju i vlast dalo rasnom identitetu povećano značenje. Mnogi su uzimali s rezervom pojam »arijevski Maor« i ukazivali da je maorska kultura preprimitivna da bi bila »arijevska« te da pokazuje veće sličnosti s dravidskom kulturom južne Indije. Konačno su ta sukobljena mišljenja sintetizirana u općenitijem obliku indocentrične antropologije koja se pojavila u devedesetim godinama 19. stoljeća i usredotočila poglavito na ono što maorska religija duguje hinduizmu. U ovom prilogu autor istražuje intelektualne i ideološke tokove koji su oblikovali debate o maorskom podrijetlu i kulturi. Na kraju sugerira da bi žustrije bavljenje australonezijskim studijama moglo obo-gatiti maorsku antropologiju i etničku povijest.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: orijentalizam, indoeuropski/arijski, polinezijski, Maori, Novi Zeland

Tony Ballantyne

**« RENAISSANCE ORIENTALE » DANS LE PACIFIQUE:
ORIENTALISME, LANGUE ET ETHNOGENESE DANS LE PACIFIQUE
BRITANNIQUE**

RÉSUMÉ

L'auteur suggère que la « renaissance orientale » initiée par Raymond Schwab ne s'est pas limitée à l'Europe continentale et à la Grande Bretagne, mais constitue en fait une voie cruciale, souvent méconnue, de la vie intellectuelle des colonies australiennes et asiatiques. Les réseaux de la Grande Bretagne impériale ainsi que la circulation de publications périodiques spécialisées et de monographies, ont permis à l'Empire britannique de modeler fondamentalement la culture intellectuelle de la Nouvelle Zélande au 19^{ème} siècle, qui s'est particulièrement distinguée dans les débats sur l'origine et l'identité des Maoris. La question de l'origine des Maoris a dominé l'étude de ce peuple depuis la découverte du Pacifique par James Cook et Joseph Banks à la fin des années 1760 jusqu'aux années 30. Dès le début, la comparaison linguistique fournit l'argument principal pour remonter jusqu'aux toutes premières origines des peuples du Pacifique, dans le sillage de Cook et Banks, qui réunissaient des vocabulaires montrant une profonde unité entre les habitants du Pacifique oriental et du Pacifique central (plus tard désignés sous le nom de peuples/langues « polynésiens »). L'importance de la linguistique dans les recherches sur le Pacifique s'est encore accrue par la suite à la faveur du discours de Sir William Jones (1786), « Des Hindous », qui établissait une similarité entre le grec, le latin et le sanskrit, et affirmait que la comparaison grammaticale fournit, plus que la comparaison étymologique, la base de la reconstruction des parentés linguistiques. Ces arguments ont décidé de la voie qu'allaient suivre les études polynésiennes, à savoir que nombre de savants étrangers (venus s'installer dans ces régions) et locaux, essayèrent de montrer que les Maoris appartenaient à la famille indo-européenne et qu'on pouvait suivre le tracé de leurs origines jusqu'au nord de l'Inde. Ces arguments ont toujours été sujets à caution, en particulier dans l'atmosphère effrayante de la vie coloniale où la course aux terres et au pouvoir décuplait l'importance de l'identité raciale. Nombreux sont ceux qui ont exprimé des réserves quant à la notion de « Maori aryen », et montré que la culture maorie était trop primitive pour être « aryenne », mais présentait de plus grandes similarités avec la culture dravidienne du sud de l'Inde. Finalement ces pensées antagonistes se sont synthétisées dans la nettement plus générale anthropologie indocentrique, apparue dans les années 1890 et qui se concentra essentiellement sur ce que la religion maori devait à l'hindouisme. L'auteur scrute les courants intellectuels et idéologiques qui ont modelé ces débats sur l'origine et la culture des Maoris. Pour finir, il suggère qu'un regain d'intérêt pour les études australonésiennes pourrait enrichir l'anthropologie et l'histoire ethnique des Maoris.

MOTS CLES: orientalisme, indo-européen/aryen, polynésien, Maori, Nouvelle Zélande

Tony Ballantyne

**TE "WHAKAHOHONGA O TE RĀWHITI" I ROTO TE MOANA NUI Ā
KIWA: WHAKĀRO RĀWHITITANGA O INGARANGI, REO ME NGĀ
PŪTAKE O NGĀ IWI I ROTO TE INGARANGI A TE MOANA NUI Ā KIWA**

KAUPAPA

Ko te tino pātai e pā ana ki te whakamātauranga Māoritanga mai i nga tau 1770 tae atu ki 1930, ko ngā pūtake o ngā iwi Māori. I tautohetia e tokomaha o ngā kaituhituhi, mai i Kāpene Kuki ki Te Rangi Hiroa, te nohoanga o te wāhi tūturu o ngā iwi Māori ko Hawaiki. I tiroiro te tautohetanga ki runga i te reo Māori ano nā te whakapono a ngā tohunga o ngā reo o Uuropi me te Rāwhiti ki te oritenga o te reo Māori ki ētahi atu reo (Ko te reo Hebrew rātau ko Sanskrit ko Hindustani ko Malay ko etahi atu reo hoki). Ko tētahi taha nui o ēnei tautohe ko ngā ariā i puta mai i te taiwhenua nō Ingarangi a Inia no te whakamātauranga a tokomaha o ngā tohunga ki te whakapapa te reo Māori ki ngā reo o Uuropi me Inia, ā, ko te iwi Māori i raro i te whakapapa o Uuropi me Inia. Engari kaore i tautokona e ētahi kaitō rangapū Pākehā me ētahi kaituhituhi Pākehā tēnei kaupapa, ko ō rātau whakāro kē no te ao tawhito te reo Māori me ngā tikanga Māori, ā, i ai ki a rātau nō te whakapapa o Inia-ki-te-tonga ngā iwi Māori. Ko te kaupapa o teenei tuhinga kia whakāro ki ēnei tautohenga me ngā whakanui tōrangapuu o ēnei tautohenga, kia whakātu ai te whakāro rāwhititanga o Ingarangi he miro mātua o te taiwhenua nō Ingarangi a Aotearoa.

NGĀ KUPU MATUA: whakāro rāwhititanga o Ingarangi, Uuropi me Inia, Te Moana nui ā Kiwa, Māori, Aotearoa.