

SOME ORIGINS AND MIGRATIONS OF IDEAS
LEADING TO THE ARYAN POLYNESIAN
THEORIES OF ABRAHAM FORNANDER
AND EDWARD TREGEAR

K. R. Howe
Massey University
New Zealand

At the two extremes of the Polynesian triangle, Abraham Fornander in Hawaii and Edward Tregear in New Zealand independently and simultaneously concluded that Polynesians shared an Aryan ancestry with Europeans. Fornander outlined this proposition in volume one of his *Account of the Polynesian Race*, which appeared in 1878, but it was volume three, subtitled a "Comparative Vocabulary of the Polynesian and Indo-European languages," published in 1885 that contained his most substantive evidence. Tregear's *Aryan Maori* was also published in 1885.¹ Their general thesis was that about four thousand years ago an Aryan people whose homeland was on the high plains east of the Caspian and north of the Himalayas moved off in two great migrations. One went westward into Europe and provided the populations that eventually spoke the Greek, Latin, Celtic, Slavonic, Teutonic, and Romance languages. The other swept southward over Persia and India, dividing into two with one eventually speaking Zend, the other Sanskrit. It was the Sanskrit-speaking Aryans who became the ruling peoples of India. Meanwhile some Aryans continued moving through India, into the Southeast Asian archipelago, and onward to the most

Pacific Studies, Vol. 11, No. 2-March 1988

far-flung islands of the Pacific. For Fornander the Polynesians were “a chip of the same block from which the Hindu, the Iranian, and the Indo-European families were fashioned.”² Tregear expressed it: “The ordinary European who counts in his ranks the Bengalee, the Savoyard, and the Portuguese as Aryans, need not blush to own his brotherhood with the beauties of Hawaii or the heroes of Orakau.”³ Both authors found in Maori and Hawaiian language, mythology, and customs so many remnants or survivals of an ancient Aryan heritage that they believed that an investigation of them could provide clues as to the very formation of Aryan culture itself. Fornander explained:

There must have been a time when the Celt, the Slav, the Goth, the Latin, the Greek, the Persian and the Hindu—neither of whom can now understand the other—must have spoken a common language. . . . Modern philological science, by taking Sanskrit as a standard, has discovered their kindred to each other, but has as yet only partially reproduced that ancient form of speech, of which the Sanskrit and its contemporary sister dialects were the comparatively modern developments. In my humble opinion a critical examination of the Polynesian language will throw a very considerable amount of light on a vast number of those roots.⁴

Tregear was of the opinion that “these uncivilized brothers of ours [the Polynesians] have kept embalmed in their simple speech a knowledge of the habits and history of our ancestors, that, in the Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, and Teutonic tongues, have been hidden under the dense aftergrowth of literary opulence.”⁵ A number of reviewers greeted such propositions with scorn and ridicule, claiming that Fornander and Tregear had misused the findings of comparative linguistic scholarship or misunderstood Polynesian language and culture.⁶ Yet Fornander and Tregear helped to establish both a popular and scholarly orthodoxy about the Caucasian or Aryan origins of Polynesians that survived largely intact until the 1930s and beyond.

It is not my intention here to examine their particular works, nor to discuss the psychological or other reasons why, of all Pacific writers, Tregear and Fornander most enthusiastically embraced Aryan theory. Rather I will outline some of the intellectual forerunners of their general conclusions to illustrate that while much of their information on Polynesian history and culture was novel, not to say highly imaginative, their basic premise as to the Aryan origins of Polynesian people was any-

thing but original. Such an idea in fact had a lengthy tradition, especially in the field of comparative linguistics.

It is now well accepted that, to quote Professor M. P. K. Sorrenson, "European theorists read into Maori [and Polynesian] origins and culture what they wanted and expected to find, on the basis of theories derived from their own cultural and philosophical traditions." In very general terms scholars searching for the original Polynesian "homeland" in pre-Darwinian days tended to find a Semitic one. The next generation of scholars, influenced by evolutionary doctrines and the new comparative "sciences," created an intellectual context in which the supposedly more advanced "natives" could be attributed Aryan origins. But seeing such a clear-cut ideological turning point at about mid-century obscures a hundred years of linguistic research that led, perhaps almost inevitably, to Fornander's and Tregear's conclusions.

Alongside the many early nineteenth-century references to the Polynesians' Semitic origins can be found discrete observations by visitors to the Pacific islands as to possible Hindu influences. But the more substantive argument for such influences originated with linguistic research that initially had nothing to do with the Pacific but instead with investigations into the origins of modern European languages.

British rule in India brought Sanskrit to the attention of European philologists. The discovery of links between Sanskrit and European languages, at first specifically Greek and Latin, and more tenuously "Gothic," "Celtic," and "Persian," was announced by Sir William Jones (the founder of the Asiatic Society) in 1786. Jones's belief that Sanskrit was "more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more exquisitely refined than either"⁸ stimulated an Orientalist tradition that regarded Indian thought and literature as perhaps the finest in the world. Jones's linguistic discovery was quickly elaborated upon by a succession of scholars over the first half of the nineteenth century, many of them Germans such as the von Schlegel brothers, Franz Bopp, Rasmus Rask, Jacob Grimm, A. F. Pott, and A. Schleicher. Most of them spent some time in Britain studying Sanskrit and other Indian documents at East India House and interviewing members of the Indian civil service. Their work gradually unraveled the complex relationships that existed among languages belonging to what became known as the Indo-European family, which included Sanskrit, Persian, Greek, Latin, as well as Celtic, Slavonic, Teutonic, Baltic, and Romance languages. Piece by piece they illustrated the history of these relationships through the reconstruction of earlier forms of these languages and drew up precise "laws" to trace and account for phonetic changes over time—Grass-

man's Law, Grimm's Law, Verner's Law. The German linguistic tradition remained very strong throughout the century. Other scholars trained in Germany pursued the science of language elsewhere, such as Max Müller in England and William Dwight Whitney in America. The techniques of comparative linguistic science that were developed during the study of the Indo-European language family amounted to one of the more impressive intellectual achievements of the nineteenth century and became the basis for the modern comparative study of language. Yet certain interpretations of many of these nineteenth-century linguists reflected various beliefs and values that have long since lost their currency, in particular the assumed centrality of Sanskrit and things Indian, the assumption (first enunciated by Friedrich von Schlegel) that language could be equated with race, and the concept of an Aryan brotherhood.⁹

The classification of languages into families was pursued vigorously for other parts of the world, including the Pacific islands. European explorers in the latter half of the eighteenth century immediately noted similarities in languages between such distant places as New Zealand, Hawaii, and parts of the Southeast Asian archipelago and concluded that most Pacific Islanders probably once shared a common homeland. By the early nineteenth century the languages of the Pacific islands, parts of Southeast Asia, and Madagascar had been categorized into single family—the Malayo-Polynesian language group. Linguists subsequently argued for decades about the precise relationship between Malay and the Oceanic languages: did the latter emerge from the former or was the Malay a later, or earlier, arrival?¹⁰ This debate will not be discussed in detail since it is only partially relevant to the theme of this article. Of more direct relevance was the attention given to the possibilities of a link between the Indo-European and the Malayo-Polynesian language families.

Wilhelm von Humboldt, in his pioneering study of a Javanese language, found numerous Sanskrit words in Malay, Javanese, and Bughis languages but not in any other languages of the Malayo-Polynesian group. This suggested that such words were introduced relatively recently, after the Polynesian and Madagascan peoples had moved on from the Malay region. Humboldt, however, believed that Polynesian and Madagascan languages contained traces of a much older form of Sanskrit or "pre-Sanskrit," though he did not elaborate on this notion." Franz Bopp, in his *Über die verwandtschaft der Malayisch-Polynesischen sprache mit den Indo-Europäischen*, published in Berlin in 1841, argued that Malayo-Polynesian had emerged from a Sanskrit so de-

cayed that grammatical affinities between Sanskrit and Malayo-Polynesian could never be found. But comparison of isolated words was possible, Bopp claimed, and he gave numerous examples. He concluded:

It might be coincidental that e.g. the New Zealand word *ra* the sun sounds like Sanskrit *ravi*, or *wetu* the star like Sanskrit *ketu* comet, or *wai* water like [Sanskrit] *vari*, or *awa* river like [Sanskrit] *apa* water . . . or *rere* to fly like [Sanskrit] *di*, or *pakau* the wing like [Sanskrit] *paksa*, or *reo* speak like [Sanskrit] *rava* voice. . . . But it is unbelievable that just coincidences trifled with all these words and with all the others from the same area of usage which we can compare with Sanskrit, especially as there is nearly complete unison in some classes or words, namely the pronouns and numerals which are predominantly important for the demarcation of the families of languages.¹²

Bopp, though an acclaimed authority on the comparative philology of Aryan languages, met with almost universal condemnation from his colleagues for what, in their view, were such arbitrary and fanciful verbal comparisons between Sanskrit and Malayo-Polynesian. Subsequent studies of Polynesian languages, such as by Horatio Hale of the U.S. Exploring Expedition, suggested that Polynesian languages had a simple or “primitive” structure rather than being remnants of such a highly complex language as Sanskrit, even if it were in a state of “decay.” But the appealing notion of links between Polynesian and Indo-European languages persisted. J. F. Logan, editor of the *Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia*, conducted extensive studies of Malay and Indian languages and claimed analogies between customs and languages of the “Bhotiya” of India and the peoples of southeast Malaya and Polynesia.¹³

None of the scholars mentioned so far had extensive experience of life and language in Polynesian itself. What they knew of Polynesian languages came from brief visits or, more commonly, from word lists or dictionaries and biblical translations from mission presses in various parts of Polynesia. Among the first island-based European scholars who considered the possibility of Polynesian and Aryan/Indo-European connections (as opposed to earlier views on Semitic origins) was John Rae from Maui, Hawaii. Rae was one of the more original intellects in the nineteenth-century Pacific. A Scotsman with medical training, Rae first pursued schoolteaching in Canada. There he wrote a treatise on politi-

cal economy that, though a commercial failure, influenced the likes of John Stuart Mill. In retrospect this work has been hailed as a major contribution to economic thought and has been republished twice this century. Rae moved to the Californian goldfields, where he failed to make his fortune, and in 1851 ended up living a rather sad and lonely existence in the isolated Hana district of Maui. He tried farming and was variously employed by the Hawaiian government as a doctor, teacher, and magistrate.¹⁴ Rae had a strong philosophical bent and was passionately interested in the classics, geology, and science generally. Some of his speculations on aeronautics, mechanics, and geology were generations ahead of his time. Among his surviving papers¹⁵ are accounts, too, of his interest in the Hawaiian people and of how, through studying their language and customs, he believed that he gained insights into human antiquity and cultural development.

I was I think first led to think of this from their language as my ear became accustomed to it seeming to babble so strangely of the Greek-like a child with its imitative propensities playing with the sounds. . . . I one day put this to a sort of test. The Hawaiian being eminently a vowel language they speak one rotundo and having scarcely concealed contempt for our tongue with its sibilants and sounds forced out between the lips. I have often caught them ridiculing our talk by giving a sort of caricature imitation of it. On the day to which I refer about half a dozen of them were in a room with me when one of them took up an English book and pretending to read gave utterance to sounds such as might be expressed thus psha psi chi cho sharo turn etc. I made them understand that that was not the way to read and taking up the volume and fixing my eyes on the page as if I was reading I gave them some of Homer's rolling hexameters and fearing to get aground there turned to an ode of Anacreon. They pricked up their ears in profound attention and uttered expressions of surprise and delight such as "Maikae maoli" "a thing truly and naturally good" etc and made me understand that they had never heard English read so before.¹⁶

Rae quickly concluded that the Hawaiians were "remnants of a race once extensively dominating in Asia" that then colonized the Pacific islands in "very very remote antiquity . . . antecedent to the formation of the Sanscrit & consequently all other known languages." He then set about to prove his case by trying to collect suitable research materials:

I am somewhat lame on the subject of conjectural attempts to trace real primitives the only book I have studied with reference to the subject being Damn's Lexicon of Homer. I believe a good deal has been done by the Germans but I am no German scholar. You might help me considerably by giving Mr Willson the name of any English, French or Latin work of character on the subject. I have also written Mr W. to send me copies of the Bible in the New Zealand and Tahitian tongues and any grammars & dictionaries of them that may be to be had. Also such works on the Sanscrit as may enable me to trace the derivatives in that Language. ¹⁷

In 1862 he published an article in a Honolulu newspaper (edited by Abraham Fornander) about "two discoveries" that he considered of "very great and decided importance":

One of these implies that the original seat of the Polynesian race was in Central or Western Asia. I believe that it will be found that all those tongues which we designate as the Indo-European languages have their true root and origin in the Polynesian language. I am certain that this is the case as regards Greek and Sanscrit; I find reason to believe it to be so as to the Latin and more modern tongues, in short, as to all European languages, old and young. The precise relation which these bear to it is not so easily traced, but it is that of filiation; they are not cognate.

Rae's second discovery was that the study of Polynesian language "gives us the key to the original formation of language itself, and to its whole mechanism."¹⁸ Language, Rae believed, originated from gesture and facial expression—a notion that was considered seriously in the 1930s. ¹⁹ Rae's "two discoveries" were of sufficient interest to be mentioned favorably by Max Müller in his second volume of *Lectures on the Science of Language*, 1864:

Strange as it may sound to hear the language of Homer and Ennius spoken as an offshoot of the Sandwich Islands, mere ridicule would be a very inappropriate and very inefficient answer to such a theory, It is not very long ago that all the Greek and Latin scholars of Europe shook their heads at the idea of tracing the roots of the classical languages back to Sanskrit, and even at the present moment there are still many persons who cannot

realize the fact that, at a very remote, but very real period in the history of the world, the ancestors of the Homeric poets and of the poets of the Veda must have lived together as members of one and the same race, as speakers of one and the same idiom. ²⁰

Bopp's notion that Polynesian languages were a remnant of a decayed Sanskrit never again gained currency. Rae's idea that Polynesian predated Sanskrit became the accepted opinion of those who saw links between Polynesian and Indo-European languages.

W. D. Alexander, a Yale graduate and son of a missionary in Hawaii, taught Greek at Honolulu's Punahou School. He followed up Rae's Honolulu article in 1864 with a brief overview of the history of linguistic research into Polynesian languages, supported the idea of an ancient Asiatic and Indian origin, and made an impassioned plea for further linguistic research: "By the student of language in a future age the beautiful thought of Max Muller may yet be realised, so that to him the thousand languages of the earth will be 'like a chorus of innumerable voices to which the more intensely he listens, the more all discords will melt into one majestic trichord or unison is heard as at the end of a sacred symphony.'" ²¹ The search for the Polynesian-Sanskrit connection was then pursued vigorously in New Zealand in the 1870s by armchair theorists in the pages of the *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute*. Edwin Fairburn argued for a relationship between Maori and "the Sanskrit, English, German, Greek, Latin, and Moorish languages" and that Maori was "a mixture of the Indo-European and Semitic." ²² J. T. Thomson wrote a series of articles claiming, on linguistic and other grounds, that the Maori had at least part Aryan ancestry and originated in Barata, or south India. ²³ Echoing Müller's statement that language was "fossil poetry," ²⁴ he went in search of Barat "fossil" words in Malay and Polynesian languages. He concluded that "Sanskrit and Hindu are the connecting links between European and Polynesian languages, but not as regards their roots, only abstract or secondary terms having been imprinted in the latter." ²⁵ W. Vaux of the British Museum later argued in the same journal that the application of Grimm's Law on phonetic change to Malay and Polynesian languages suggested that "Malay and Polynesian, alike, ultimately came from some part of Central Asia." ²⁶

By the late 1870s and early 1880s it was commonly assumed in scholarly circles that there was some connection between Polynesian languages and those of the Indo-European family, though there was considerable debate over the actual route into the Malay region--was it

direct from south India or did it come from north India via the south Asian mainland?²⁷ A number of writers at the time investigated Polynesian legends and claimed to find in them similarities with European tales.²⁸ Just as Rae reversed the assumed relationship between Sanskrit and Polynesian languages, the same was done for mythology. Edward Shortland in New Zealand, for example, argued:

When we consider the great remoteness of time at which it is possible that a connection between Aryans and Polynesians could have existed, we are carried back to the contemplation of a very primitive condition of the human race. In the Polynesian family we can still discover traces of this primitive condition of the human race. We can also observe a similarity between the more antient form of religious belief and mythological tradition of the Aryans and that still existing among Polynesians; for which reason we think it allowable to apply to the interpretation of old Aryan myths the principle we discover to guide us as to the significance of Polynesian Mythology.²⁹

But in many respects all these arguments had not added substantively to Bopp's assertion a generation earlier that there *was* a connection between Polynesian and Indo-European. What was needed to "prove" the notion was an extensive comparison of Polynesian and Indo-European language and culture. That could only be accomplished by someone very well versed in both a Polynesian language and culture and the Sanskrit and linguistic scholarship of Europe. Such a combination of skills was unlikely, but was met in modified form by Fornander and Tregear. These two men had remarkably similar backgrounds.³⁰ Tregear grew up in Southampton, England; Fornander in Oland, Sweden. From their earliest years they developed an acute sense of their respective European histories and folklores, and were very keen students of Greek and Latin language and literature. Both lost their fathers in their mid-teenage years. Both left their comfortable family homes and scholarly studies and traveled to the other side of the world where they experienced considerable physical hardship. Tregear spent many years surveying in the wilds of New Zealand's central North Island; Fornander went whaling in the Pacific. Both eventually settled down to domestic life, in New Zealand and Hawaii respectively, and became influential government administrators. Both became passionately interested in the language, history, and culture of Maori and Hawaiian people respectively. Both immersed themselves in the works of a number of Euro-

pean-based scholars, particularly the German-born Oxford professor of comparative linguistics, Max Müller.

Müller was the leading British Orientalist with a particular expertise in Sanskrit and the history and cultures of India.³¹ He translated many volumes of sacred Hindu texts including the *Rig-Veda* (in Müller's words "the first book of the Aryan nations")³² and was something of an academic cult figure in England with his astonishingly popular lectures and books on the "science" of language, religion, and mythology. Müller not only extolled ancient Indian literature and culture, which he believed had played a fundamental role in the development of Western intellectual and cultural tradition, but also was obsessed with the notion of a single, glorious Aryan ancestry that he believed most modern Europeans and Indians shared. Müller was rather extreme in his insistence on the centrality of Sanskrit and the concept of an Aryan brotherhood. Other British scholars like John Crawfurd (known as "the Objector-General") wrote considered and hard-hitting critiques of "Aryan theory" and the identification of language with race.³³ Müller remained a devout adherent to the notion of an Aryan brotherhood, though he admitted in an 1872 lecture in Germany the fallacy of "arguing from language to blood-relationship."³⁴ But most of his followers elsewhere in the world who already had his major books on their shelves were unaware of this apparent change of heart.

Müller considered the science of language to be one of the natural or physical sciences. His philological studies did not have mere linguistic purposes but, along with studies of plants and animals, human societies, the earth and the heavens, were a means of investigating broad historical and philosophic issues concerning the biological and cultural origins and development of mankind. Müller was a popularizer and generalizer. His works were sufficiently eclectic and historiographic to expose the likes of Fornander and Tregear not only to the development and findings of comparative philology and mythology but also of other related sciences. "The study of mankind," Müller wrote, "is making rapid progress in our days. The early history of the human race . . . has now been taken up in good earnest by men who care for facts only." Thus the comparative study of religion, legends, laws, customs, and manners could also reveal, as could language, fossils, or survivals of ancient lifestyles that, claimed Müller, provided "a real and living idea of the early ancestors of our race."³⁵ Steeped in such ideology, Fornander and Tregear respectively examined Hawaiian and Maori language, myth, and culture and claimed to detect in them remnants or survivals

from those ancient times when Aryan civilization first emerged on the high tablelands of Tartary and when some of its members voyaged through India and on to the islands of the Pacific.

Both Tregear and Fornander acknowledged their indebtedness to Müller, in particular to his two-volumed *Lectures on the Science of Language* (1861, 1864) and his four-volumed *Chips from a German Workshop* (1868-1875) from which they drew a good deal of their non-Polynesian information as well as their understanding of comparative philology and mythology. Tregear idolized Müller and expressed the most extreme confidence in the techniques of "Comparative Philology and Comparative Mythology . . . the two youngest and fairest daughters of Knowledge."³⁶ While Müller was perhaps the major European-based influence on Fornander and Tregear, both men were familiar with much of the literature on Aryan origins for Polynesians mentioned above. Fornander offered his indebtedness to Bopp "for the first idea of comparing the Polynesian and Aryan language with a view to establishing their common origin," though he rejected Bopp's contention that Malay was "a corrupted daughter of the Sanskrit" and that Polynesian was "a still worse corrupted grand daughter."³⁷ But Fornander supported Bopp's technique of word comparison and spent considerable time in the introduction to his third volume countering the criticism that scholars like W. D. Whitney and A. H. Sayce had leveled at Bopp for his methods of Polynesian and Indo-European linguistic comparison.³⁸ Fornander also thanked John Rae, who "first called attention to the extreme antiquity of the Polynesian language."³⁹ Tregear noted that his interest was first stimulated by Thomson's articles in the *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute*.⁴⁰

While both Tregear and Fornander acknowledged their indebtedness to a long tradition of linguistic and related scholarship, they nevertheless made considerable claims for the originality of their views. Having demonstrated to their own satisfaction that Polynesians had Aryan origins, they tended to assume that this *was their* discovery. Fornander explained that he had seen "so many varying theories about the origin of the Polynesians, and all of them extra-forensic" that he "determined to set forth the data which the Polynesians themselves possessed about their Origin and Migration."⁴¹ He felt that the Hawaiian people would not hesitate to accept his views but claimed that he was somewhat diffident about offering his conclusions to the "literati of foreign lands" since he considered himself a "pioneer in an untrodden field."⁴² Tregear had no such real or feigned modesty. He positively boasted about his

pioneering role and rather misleadingly proclaimed himself to be "the first to apply the scientific method to the Maori language, and to prove the fellowship of the Polynesian with the races of Europe."⁴³

Once both men became aware of each other's work, they indulged in mutual congratulations. Tregear sent Fornander a copy of his *Aryan Maori*. Fornander praised Tregear for having "on independent grounds arrived at the same conclusion" as himself.

It is a great pleasure to me, and a matter of unalloyed satisfaction to notice that the Polynesian question is coming to the front more and more, and that gentlemen of education and literary attainments are turning their attention toward it. . . . The Asiatic, Caucasian, Aryan origin is the one that will receive the attention of the ethnologists and linguists in the future. . . . We have doubtless made many mistakes in our linguistic comparisons: bones for the critics to gnaw and to worry us with; but after all such mistakes and errors have been sifted out, I think the principle we contend for will remain intact and be established as an ethnological fact.⁴⁴

This self-assessment proved remarkably accurate. For the next fifty years virtually every ethnographer/anthropologist of note examining Polynesian cultures believed them to have had some Aryan ancestry.⁴⁵ However, it should be noted that many European linguistic scholars were, by the end of the nineteenth century, very skeptical of claims for Aryan/Polynesian linguistic links. Furthermore, nonspecialist readers of this article should be aware that modern scholarship rejects the theory of Aryan origins for the peoples of Polynesia. So-called Polynesian linguistic and cultural characteristics are now thought to have evolved largely within the region of Polynesia. The ancestors of these people can be traced back to the region of the South China Sea some four to six thousand years ago.

NOTES

Some of the research for this paper was conducted while I was the Andrews Distinguished Scholar at the Center for Pacific Islands Studies, University of Hawaii. I am very grateful to staff there for their assistance, as well as to staff at the Pacific Collection in the University of Hawaii's Hamilton Library, and at the Bishop Museum.

1. Abraham Fornander, *An Account of the Polynesian Race, Its Origin and Migrations*, and *the Ancient History of the Hawaiian People to the Times of Kamehameha 1*, 3 vols. (London, 1878-1885); Edward Tregear, *The Aryan Maori* (Wellington, 1885).

2. Fornander, *An Account of the Polynesian Race*, vol. 1, p. iv.
3. Tregear, *The Aryan Maori*, p. 103. Orakau is the place where some Maori warriors put up a particularly spirited fight during the New Zealand wars of the 1860s. For one interpretation of Tregear's *Aryan Maori* see Michael Belgrave, "Archipelago of Exiles: A Study in the Imperialism of Ideas: Edward Tregear and John Macmillan Brown" (unpublished M.Phil. thesis, University of Auckland, 1979).
4. Fornander to Erik Ljungstedt, 24 May 1879, *Abraham Fornander: Thirteen Letters to Erik Ljungstedt*, ed. Christian Callmer (Lund, 1973), p. 25. See also Fornander's *An Account of the Polynesian Race*, vol. 3, p. 13.
5. Tregear, *The Aryan Maori*, p. 38.
6. For example, on Tregear see A. S. Atkinson, "The Ayro-Semitic Maori," *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute* 19 (1886), pp. 552-576; on Fornander see *The Saturday Review*, 9 Feb. 1878, pp. 180-181; *The Evening Post* (New York), 28 Aug. 1884; *The Nation*, 26 Aug. 1886, p. 181. These and other reviews can be found in various Fornander papers, Bishop Museum, Honolulu, e.g., Fornander Memorabilia Box 4, and MS Group 262.
7. M. P. K. Sorrenson, *Maori Origins and Migrations* (Auckland, 1979), p. 7. See also A. Howard, "Polynesian Origins and Migrations: A Review of Two Centuries of Speculation and Theory," in *Polynesian Culture History*, ed. G. A. Highland (Honolulu, 1967), pp. 45-101.
8. Quoted in Leon Poliakov, *The Aryan Myth: A History of Racist and Nationalist Ideas in Europe* (New York, 1974), p. 190.
9. There are numerous histories of nineteenth-century linguistics. Useful is Holger Pedersen, *The Discovery of Language: Linguistic Science in the Nineteenth Century* (Bloomington, 1962). See also Poliakov, *The Aryan Myth*, chap. 9.
10. For example, A. H. Keane, "On the Relations of the Indo-Chinese and Inter-Oceanic Races and Languages," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 9 (1880), pp. 254-301; J. Fraser, "The Malayo-Polynesian Theory," *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 4 (1895), pp. 241-255; 5 (1896), pp. 92-100.
11. W. D. Alexander, "The Polynesian Language: Its Origin and Connections," *The Friend* (Honolulu), 1 Jan. 1864, pp. 2-3.
12. Franz Bopp, *über die verwandtschaft der Malayisch-Polynesischen sprache mit den Indo-Europaischen* (Berlin, 1841), pp. 6-7. I am grateful to Jutta Brünger for this translation.
13. For example, J. R. Logan, "Ethnology of the Indo-Pacific Islands," *Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia* 5 (1851), pp. 211-243, 249-585; n.s. 3 (1859), pp. 65-98.
14. R. Warren James, *John Rae, Political Economist: An Account of His Life and a Compilation of His Main Writings*, 2 vols. (Toronto, 1965). Rae's treatise was entitled *Statement of Some New Principles on the Subject of Political Economy, Exposing the Fallacies of the System of Free Trade, and Some Other Doctrines Maintained in the "Wealth of Nations"* (Boston, 1834).

15. John Rae Papers, Pacific Collection, Hamilton Library, University of Hawaii, Honolulu.
16. Rae to [probably R. C. Wyllie?], [1854], Rae Papers. R. C. Wyllie was a fellow Scotsman who was minister for foreign relations in Kamehameha III's government.
17. Rae to [Wyllie?], [late 1850s], Rae Papers. Willson was a correspondent of Rae's in Canada.
18. Rae, "Polynesian Languages," *The Polynesian* (Honolulu), 27 Sept., 4 Oct., 11 Oct. 1862. This article is reprinted in James, *John Rae*, vol. 1, pp. 368-399.
19. See Richard Paget, *Human Speech* (New York, 1930), p. 157. Paget was so impressed with Rae's *Polynesian* article that he included it as an appendix to his book, pp. 318-353.
20. Max Müller, *Lectures on the Science of Language* (London, 1864), vol. 2, pp. 10-11. It is worth noting that what Rae and others claimed for Polynesian languages was also being claimed for certain language families of Africa. W. H. I. Bleek argued in his *Comparative Grammar of the South African Languages* (London, 1862) that the "origin of the grammatical forms, of gender and number, the etymology of pronouns, and many other questions of the highest interest to the philologist, find their true solution in Southern Africa"; see Müller, *Science of Language*, vol. 2, p. 12.
21. W. D. Alexander, "The Polynesian Language: Its Origin and Connections," *The Friend* (Honolulu), 5 Feb. 1864, p. 12. The first part of the article appeared in the issue for 1 Jan. 1864. A modified version of this article prefaces volume three of Fornander's *An Account of the Polynesian Race*.
22. Edwin Fairburn, "On the Analogy Between the Maori and Indo-European Language," *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute* 3 (1870), pp. 314-315.
23. J. T. Thomson, "Ethnographic Considerations on the Whence of the Maori," *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute* 4 (1871), pp. 23-51; "On Barata Numerals," *ibid.*, 5 (1872), pp. 131-138; "Philological Considerations on the Whence of the Maori," *ibid.*, 6 (1873), pp. xxv-lxv; "Barat or Barata Fossil Words," *ibid.*, 11 (1878), pp. 157-185; "Pronouns and Other Barat Fossil Words Compared with Primeval and Non-Aryan Languages of Hindostan and Borders," *ibid.*, 12 (1879), pp. 223-237.
24. Max Müller *Chips from a German Workshop* (London, 1868), vol. 2, p. 54.
25. Thomson, "Ethnographic Considerations," p. 48.
26. W. Vaux, "On the Probable Origins of the Maori Races," *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute* 8 (1875), p. 53.
27. Keane, "Indo-Chinese and Inter-Oceanic Races," pp. 254-301.
28. For example, Adolf Bastian, *Die heilige sage der Polynesier. Kosmogonie und theogonie* (Leipzig, 1881).
29. Edward Shortland, *Maori Religion and Mythology* (London, 1882), p. 3.
30. E. H. Davis, *Abraham Fornander: A Biography* (Honolulu, 1979). I am currently writing a biography of Edward Tregear.

31. On Müller see Nirad C. Chaudhuri, *Scholar Extraordinary: The Life of Professor the fit. Hon. Friedrich Max Müller* (London, 1974).
32. Müller, *Chips*, vol. 1, p. 60.
33. John Crawfurd, "On the Aryan or Indo-Germanic Theory," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London* 1 (1861), pp. 268-286; "On Language as a Test for the Races of Man," *ibid.*, 3 (1865), pp. 1-9. There was also some opposition in Australia and New Zealand to such assumptions; see Sorrenson, *Origins and Migrations*, p. 19.
34. Poliakov, *The Aryan Myth*, pp. 213-214.
35. Müller, *Chips*, vol. 2, chap. 15.
36. Tregear, *Aryan Maori*, p. 1. Tregear dedicated his *Maori-Polynesian Comparative Dictionary* (Wellington, 1891) to Müller in the following words: "in admiration of the genius and learning which he has devoted to the science of language and in gratitude for words of kind encouragement and sympathy sent over the sea to the author,"
37. Fornander, *An Account of the Polynesian Race*, vol. 3, p. 2.
38. W. D. Whitney, *Language and the Study of Language* (New York, 1870), p. 245; A. H. Sayce, *Introduction to the Science of Language* (London, 1880), vol. 1, p. 49.
39. Fornander, *An Account of the Polynesian Race*, vol. 1, p. vi.
40. Tregear, *The Aryan Maori*, p. 106.
41. Fornander to Ljungstedt, 24 April 1878, *Thirteen Letters*, p. 14.
42. Fornander, *An Account of the Polynesian Race*, vol. 1, p. ix.
43. Tregear, *The Aryan Maori*, p. 104.
44. Fornander to Tregear, 7 October 1886, private collection of H. Robinson, Auckland.
45. Sorrenson, *Origins and Migrations*.