

# The Languages of the Pacific<sup>1</sup>

By J. MACMILLAN BROWN

---

ONE of the fallacies that dog the science of language is that there are three types of language, isolating, agglutinative and inflectional, separated strictly from one another. It was one of the too early generalisations of Max Müller who, coming from Germany with a knowledge of Sanskrit, ruled with absolute authority the science of philology in the English speaking world during the latter part of the nineteenth century. This theory together with the idea that all classical myths have a philological origin, is now discounted. It is found that almost all languages have some trace or relic of each type.

The Chinese is taken as the typical instance of the isolating language; each word may be used in various grammatical relations without any formal element to indicate these relations. But modern English has become practically an isolating language with only particles to indicate these relationships and a few relics in the pronouns of the old inflectional system. Polynesian is on the same footing; a word may be a noun, a verb or an adjective without any distinctive formal mark; and particles indicate the relationship, whilst in the pronouns, as in English, there remains a few relics of inflection. The Japanese is the Pacific Ocean language that best illustrates the agglutinating type. The formal elements retain so much of their original independence that adverbs and honorific words may be thrust in between them and the words they pilot grammatically. But the language has much that may be said to be inflectional and has some trace of the isolating. English, likewise, shows a tendency to the agglutinative in, for example, the frequent separation of the formal *to* of the infinitive by an adverb, or even a phrase, from the verb. So in Polynesian the *ia*, *a*, that added to the verb makes the passive, shows in some groups a tendency to assert

---

<sup>1</sup> Lecture delivered before The Hawaiian Historical Society September 5, 1918.



its independence and be separated from its verb. Of the inflectional type the best instances are found in the Indo-European tongues. Latin is highly inflectional, Greek still more so, and Sanskrit most of all. In Polynesian the inflections of the dual and plural personal pronouns still reveal their origin; the dual of the first person is *maua* or *kaua*, of the third *laua*; here the addition of *ua* is evidently for the numeral *lua*; the plural of the first is *makou* or *kakou* and of the third *lakou*; this again shows its origin in *kolu*, three. These inflections for the plural were manifestly formed at a most primitive linguistic stage when the ancestral speakers of Polynesian did not count beyond three; one and two were definite, three was all beyond, the indefinite. This must have been before they launched out into the Pacific, for there for the first time they counted up to five; *lima* for five is practically universal in the so-called Malayo-Polynesian languages; but they had been able to count up to four before they left the sphere of influence of the Indo-European languages. "One" varies most of all the numerals. Polynesian *rua* for two is the Latin *duo*, English *two*; for the sound-law that makes *l* or *r* and *d* interchangeable existed as strongly in early Indo-European as it does in Polynesian and Malay. Latin *lacryma*, Old Latin *dakruma*, is Greek *dakru*, Gothic *tagra*, Anglo-Saxon *teagor*, *tear*. Polynesian *toru* or *tolu* is the uncontracted form of Latin *tres*, German *drei*, English *three*; whilst Polynesian *wha*, four, is Latin *quatuor*, Sanskrit *catvar*, Anglo-Saxon *feover*. There is no trace of "five" in Polynesian or of *lima* as a numeral in any Indo-European tongue. Yet the Polynesian must have retained some consciousness of the old European for *one*, (Latin *unus*, Old Latin *oinos*), for in counting on the second hand, *six* is *ono*, i. e., number one of the second hand. *Whitu* for "seven" retains a trace of "septem" (from *sa-pita*). It is probably a modification of "*whiti*," to cross over, Hawaiian *hiki*, to come, to rise, just as "*tres*" is from "*tara*" to cross over. The Polynesian forms for *eight* (*waru*) and *nine* (*iwa*) belong to that by no means uncommon method of counting from the highest number counted downwards by subtraction; thus e. g. the numbers between *five* and *ten* in Yap are *ten* minus one, two, etc., which may be compared with the Roman numeration IV, IX, XL, XC. Malay also expresses 99, 98, 97, etc., by "hundred minus 1, 2, 3, etc." *Wa* is a common Poly-



nesian word for interval or "space between"; 8 (*waru*)=10—(space between or minus)2, 9 (*iwa*)=one—from 10. *Lima*, the word for five, is not without trace in European, though not as a numeral. There is a European root form, "*rima*," meaning "*row, numbers, verse.*" In Old Norse *rim*=calendar, verse. In old Irish *rim*=number. In Old High German *Rim*=row, number, German *Reim*=English rhyme. Compare the Greek *arithmos*, a number, *neritos*, countless. It is from the same root as *ra*, to arrange, to fit, Latin *rerī*, to think, *ratio*, *read*, *reckon*, *hundred*. The original form is *ra*, Maori *rarangi*, line, rank, row. The *ri* form is seen in *whakarite*, to arrange, put in order, Hawaiian *like*, to be like. Many of the languages use *lima* not only for "five" but for "hand," evidently meaning "the counter," but in Maori and Fijian the word for hand is "*ringa*," implying that "*ma*," was felt to be an affix, just as *nga* is. We may say then that the Polynesian ancestors were only feeling their way up first beyond three and then beyond five. They were feeling their way towards "*tekau*" which first meant "*the company*," "*the lot*," and, when they counted beyond, came to be "ten" or in some "eleven." (Compare *kau*, company, lot,=*ngahu-ru*, Gilbertese *tengaun*=10, Tongan *u*=bundle, *kehui*, flock.) The Hawaiian "*umi*" easily meant at first "the measure." The usual Polynesian *ngahuru*, for "ten," becomes in Malay "*sapuloh*" by prefixing "*sa*"=one, to *puloh*, equivalent to *huru*, the hair. *Sapuloh* means the bunch of hairs, *nga*, the plural article in Maori, being replaced by *sa*, and *huru*, brushwood, coarse hair, in English "wool."

The true classification of linguistic affinities is not by their grammar, but by their phonology, i. e. the range of sounds and sound laws that belong to them. The organs of speech do not change unless the climatic environment is changed, or the mothers. To shift from the temperate zone to the tropics relaxes all the tissues, including the tissues of the speech organs; to shift in the opposite direction gives them greater tensity and vigor. And if at the age of the moulding of a man, i. e. from infancy to seven years old, he is set in a different speech-environment from that of his ancestry his speech organs will be different. It is the mother or nurse that creates the phonological capacity of a man or woman. The speech organs are set practically for life during the first seven years, the period when it is the mother that is the dominant influence.



If therefore there is a difference between the Polynesian phonology and that of those to the west of it we may assume that it was a change of mothers that caused it; for right through the seven thousand miles from Tonga to the coast of India the climatic environment is practically the same, moist heat governed by regularly blowing winds.

Now the phonology of the Polynesian dialects differs by a whole world from that of all the languages to the west of it. The former have only twelve to fifteen sounds, the five vowels and seven to ten consonants, the most primitive outfit that any language in the world has. As soon as you step out of Polynesia westward, say from Tonga to the neighboring Fiji, the language has from twenty to thirty sounds, and this holds right to the coast of India and all through India. Further, there are sounds to these languages to the west that no Polynesian could by any training be made capable of pronouncing, nay that no European could, i.e. the speech organs are absolutely different in the two regions. One instance is the  $q=kpw$  of Melanesia. But the fundamental principle that divides Polynesian phonologically from all to the west is that it must close a syllable or a word with a vowel, and it cannot pronounce two consonants together. All the languages to the west can not only close a word with a consonant, but many of them (including Malay) prefer to do so. The only two languages in the Pacific Ocean that have the same phonological laws are Japanese, away to the northwest, and Quichua, away to the southeast; but the former is grammatically of a different type, the agglutinative, and the latter, though almost grammarless, like Polynesian, has inflections only in the pronouns, including the strange Polynesian characteristic of a different form in the first person for the plural that includes those spoken to and the plural that excludes those spoken to. I have found but a small percentage of Quichua words or roots the same as in Polynesian, while the range of sounds in Japanese is nearly the same as in Polynesian.

There is one other characteristic of Polynesian phonology that almost puts out of court the accepted theory that the Polynesian languages came from India or the Malay archipelago. They are divided into *l* languages and *r* languages. In Polynesia *l* has a little of the trill of the *r* and the *r* has somewhat of the liquidity of



of the *l* so that it is easy for one to pass into the other. But the southern groups have a preference for the *r* sound, so that the missionaries have always written this consonant in their language as *r*, whilst the northern have a preference for the *l* sound; these are Tonga, Samoa, Futuna, Tokelau and Hawaii; all the rest except Marquesas use *r*; that group has a rule neither *r* nor *l*. If we step out of Polynesia and go west, every language uses both *r* and *l*. I should like to have explained to me how, if the Polynesian languages came east into the central and eastern Pacific, they were able to divide off the *l* speakers and the *r* speakers after coming through seven thousand miles of languages that used both *r* and *l*. Undoubtedly in the now submerged fatherland, Hawaiki, probably lying well to the south of the equator and to the east of Samoa and Tonga and the Tokelau group, the peoples in the north and northwest of it preferred the *l*, those in the south and southeast preferred the *r*; though the preference had not grown as pronounced as it is now, it had been made perhaps through that contradictoriness which dictates the fashions of neighbors, probably more pronounced because the northern tribes were nearer the equator and preferred the sound that needed less tensivity and energy in the organs of speech. That Hawaiki was to the east of Samoa and Tonga is evident in the fact that the spirit land of the two groups is not *Hawaiki*, but *Bulotu*, which is probably from the Fijian *bulubulu*, the grave, and *bulu*, the abode of departed spirits, modified by the Polynesian *purotu*, pure, pleasant, agreeable, soft, delicate, beautiful. *Burotu* is in Fiji the residence of the gods and the place of spirits; so it is in Samoa and Tonga. Next to the northern tribes of Hawaiki must have lived the Tahitians, for they, like the Samoans and Hawaiians, eliminated the guttural *k* that had come with the primeval Polynesians from the colder north and continued in all the languages that, like those of Tonga, the Maoris, the Paumotus and the Austral Islands, Mangareva and Easter Island, drifted further south into a colder zone. But, to show the influence of climate on the organs of speech, the Hawaiians, when they got up to the borders of the temperate zone, though they did not restore the primeval *k*, began to substitute for it the *t* of all the other Polynesian dialects. The Marquesans had already begun on Hawaiki to avoid the rolling *r* and the liquid *l* and when they reached the steep-to islands in which



they afterwards settled, they almost though not quite completed the process; there are only a few words in their language that retain the *r*. They also showed the same tendency as the Hawaiian to substitute *k* for *t*, though the tendency did not proceed to the full length of the northern language. *Kaoha* is the Marquesan salutation equivalent to the Hawaiian aloha. Yet the *k* sometimes disappears in Marquesan; for it is only from eight to ten degrees south of the equator and has sufficient moist heat to create languor in the organs of speech.

Thus we have in the different branches of this, the most primitive of languages, fully developed a phonological law as strict as Grimm's Law amongst the Indo-European and far wider in its application; it dominates not merely the explosive consonants, (*t*, *p*, *k*) as in the Indo-European language, but the liquids and sibilants, *r*, *l*, *s*, *sh* and *h*, and even the nasal consonants, *n*, *ng*. If we know the form that a word common to most takes in any one of the Polynesian languages, we know the form it takes in every other, provided we know this strict sound law. There is one exceptional sound, *ch* or *tz*, which appears in Tongan and Moriori, whilst Tongan has a *b* instead of the usual *p*. This must be due to the long intercourse of Tonga with Fiji which had a phonology more Melanesian than Polynesian. Strangely enough this *ts* sound also belongs to Japanese, whilst the *ch* form of it belongs to Ainu. But *b* is purely Fijian and is in fact in that language *mb*.

This regularity of consonantal change in the various dialects of Polynesian is a characteristic that completely differentiates it from all those to the west, the Micronesian and especially Papuan and Melanesian. In these there is phonological chaos in their relationships. As a rule neighboring villages in Melanesia and Papua cannot understand each other's language though only a few miles apart, whilst the Maori can understand the Rarotongan or Tahitian or Hawaiian after a brief acquaintance with the consonantal changes. And in Hawaiki this tendency to consonantal decay must have been widespread, the change that is complete in one or more of these groups occurs sporadically in all the rest. Take as an example the loss of *k* which is universal in Tahitian, Samoan and Hawaiian. In Maori it is quite common to find two words meaning the same, one with the *k*, the other without it; two or three will



suffice, *kapo*, to snatch, and *apo*, to grasp; *kita*, tight, fast, and *ita*, tight, fast; and *koti*, to cut, and *oti*, finish.

Fornander points out how some, if not all of these, are paralleled in the Indo-European languages. The substitution of *s* in Samoan for the *h* of the other dialects occurs also in Sanskrit, Latin, Gothic, Iranian, Greek and Cymric. The change of *ng* of Samoan, Maori and other southern dialects into *n* in Tahitian and Hawaiian has its parallel in the substitution of *n* in Slavonic for the *ng* of Sanskrit, Zend, Latin and other European tongues. The *r* was interchangeable with *l* in Indo-European as in Polynesian, and both were often changed into *d* in both linguistic spheres. It is not infrequent to find roots in both spheres that have forms with and without the *r* or *l*, with and without the *k*, and with *t* for *k*. Further I have found in my analysis of Polynesian roots and words that *m* and *t* are moveable prefixes like *h*, e. g. *moti*, finished, and *oti*, finished; *manumanu*, rotten, and *anuanu*, disgusting; *tua*, the back, and *ua*, the backbone; *toretore*, to split into strips, and *hore*, to split off; *tu*, to be strong, to stand, and *u*, to be firm; *tuhi*, to tattoo, and *uhi*, the puncturing instrument. This occurs also in Indo-European roots. In fact, as Fornander points out, the primitive Aryan language must have had exactly the same range of consonants as Polynesian and though the process was not carried so widely among the vowels, the decadence and interchange of consonants had begun. The homeland of the primeval Aryan is now accepted as in Europe between the Baltic and the Black Sea, and that was a cold region in which the organs of speech were capable of different consonantal sounds; whilst the environment of Polynesian after it reached the Pacific was tropical and exactly suited to the decay of the consonants.

But the vowels in Polynesian, though not so unstable as the consonants still tend to interchange mutually, especially in the unaccented syllable. A few instances will suffice; *keo*, or *kea*, white; *imu*, *umu* and *oma*, oven (here *i* = *o* = *u* and *u* = *a*); *tohunga* in Maori, *kahuna* in Hawaiian and *tufunga* in Tongan and Samoan; Hawaiian *anoni* and *anune*, to mix up; Hawaiian *api*, the beating of the pulse, and Maori *kakapa*, to throb; Hawaiian *weo* and *wea*, red; Hawaiian *eulu*, a branch cut off to be planted again, Maori *huri*, a sprout, and Hawaiian *huli*, kalo tops for planting; Hawaiian *io*, to flee from fear, and Maori *ihi*, to shudder. So the double vowel



*au* passes into *o* and *ae* passes into *e*. As I have proceeded in my analysis of the Polynesian languages, I become more and more astonished at the traditional statement that the Polynesian vowels are stable. What I should say is that they are only a little less unstable than the consonants, without any method or law in their instability; they are capriciously unstable whilst the Polynesian consonants change according to a fixed law. The most stable of the vowels and the most predominant is *a*. Likewise in Indo-European, there are ten roots in *a* for one in each of the other vowels. It is almost as strong in Polynesian. In other words *a* was the primeval vowel in both Indo-European and Polynesian; the others are but variations from it, the commonest series being *a*, *e*, *i* and *a*, *o*, *u*. But the Indo-European tongues, as they have shifted away from their birth-land, have become more and more consonantal, which means that they have changed their climatic environment or the mothers of the generations. This increase of consonantalism has arisen largely from the elision of vowels. Thus it has come about that double consonants are fairly frequent, especially *s* with the other consonants. I fancy that this has come about through using an emphatic prefix *sa* and then dropping its vowel. Take, for example, the root *skar*, to cut, and *kar*, English shear, in Latin *curtus*, mutilated, Anglo-Saxon *here*, an army, *hargian*, to harry. German *Herzog*, a duke, English *harbour*; thence *heru*, a sword, Gothic *hacrus*. Root *skal*, to split, Anglo-Saxon *scolu*, a division, and *hal*, to scale, to strike, Anglo-Saxon *healt*, *halt*, *hilt* and *hild*, war, Latin *percellere*, to thrust, to strike, *clades*, slaughter, *gladius*, a sword; root *skal*, to be liable for fine for having killed, Anglo-Saxon *seyld*, a debt, *should*, *shall*; root *ala*, an *æwl*, Anglo-Saxon *al*; root *ar*, to cut, to loosen, Latin *aratrum*, a plough, *arvum*, a field plowed but not sown, *earth*, *ear*, to plow, to till; Polynesian *kari*, to dig; Hawaiian *ali*, a scar. Take one or two instances of other letters, root *stut*, to push, Latin *tundere*, to beat with repeated strokes; German *stossen*, to push, to strike; root *slit*, to tear, German *schleissen*, to slit, to split; English *slice*, and Latin *laedere*, to strike or dash with force against any thing; root *slu*, to shut, German *schliessen*, English *slot*, and root *luk*, to shut, English *lock*; root *svar*, to speak, to *swear*, to answer; and *var*, to speak, Latin *verbum*, word.

We can see then that the Indo-European languages have as



greatly changed from the primeval, or archetype language, as English has changed from Anglo-Saxon, or Italian from Latin. It is generally by contact with other peoples, most effectually by change of mothers or household environment that these changes occur, where there is no change in latitude. But it is the vowels that show the least change, for they are the product of the larynx and internal organs of the throat. The consonants are manipulated by the external parts of the organs of speech which are more affected by changes of temperature and moisture. In assigning a place to a language we must never forget this distinction between the vowels, the products of the protected organs of speech, and the consonants, the products of the unprotected and manipulative organs of speech, the palate, tongue, teeth and lips. In Indo-European and in Polynesian the vowels are naturally therefore the least subject to change, the least unstable. In both it is the consonants that have been most subject to change. But it is the Indo-European that has shown the most change. It has split up each of its explosive consonants, those of the lips, teeth and palate into three, (*p, b, f; t, d, th; k, g, gh*), and has thus added six sounds to its original range. That this was the case is shown by the discovery of a new Aryan language by Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan, some seven or eight years ago. He found a manuscript in the ruins of a Buddhist city written in an unknown tongue that was spoken by a people, the Tochari, included during Roman times in the Bactrian empire. It was found to be a pure Aryan tongue of the European type before the consonants had changed; it had only one dental, one labial and one palatal. If Polynesian is not merely a language that has an Aryan element in it, as Fornander very thoughtfully proved, but is an Aryan language itself, as he declared, then it parted from the primeval European type before the consonantal changes had gone far. It has *t, k*, and in most of its dialects *p*, but Tongan shows the change of *p* to *b* as it shows the change from *t* to *ch* or *tz*. Primeval Aryan as it is seen in Tocharish has the same range of sounds as Polynesian and practically the same sounds and number of sounds. It showed the same tendencies to drop *k*, to make *t* and *k* interchangeable, to elide *r* or make it interchangeable with *l* or *d*, to substitute *s* for *h*, *f* for *wh*, and *n* for *ng*. Its fundamental vowel was *a*; and so it is in Polynesian. Look in the Hawaiian dictionary and you will find ten



times as many words with *a* as the vowel as those with any one of the other four vowels, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*. From *a* in both languages there are two series of mutations *e* and *i* on the one hand and *o* and *u* on the other. If you look into Fick's Indo-European dictionary, you will find ten times more roots with *a* as the vowel than those that have *e* or *i*, *o* or *u*. And as far as I can judge by analysis of the roots of more than one syllable or two letters, they are all reducible to roots of one or two sounds, a pure vowel or a consonant and a vowel. In other words primeval Indo-European had the same sound law as Polynesian, i. e. it preferred to close a syllable or word with a vowel.

There is one other point that the discovery of Tocharish settles, it is that the western European type of language came east into Asia. Aryan languages are divided into two sections by a line drawn from the Baltic to the Black Sea. West of that all the languages retain the original *k* sound. East of it all reduce it to a sibilant, at least all till Tocharish was discovered. The former are called by philologists the *centum* languages from the Latin word for one hundred; the latter the *Sato* languages from the Sanskrit word for one hundred. Tocharish retains the *k* unchanged to *s*, and must therefore have come east long before Sanskrit hived off and traveled into Asia. Polynesian also retains the *k* unchanged into *s*, and it too with the same sound-range as Tocharish and the primeval Aryan languages must have traveled from Europe west of the line between the Baltic and the Black Sea through Asia, long before Sanskrit began its long migration into India or even began its elaborate inflectional system. That inflectional system had begun before it completely separated from its cousins; for many of its inflections have close kinship with those of Greek, Latin and the Teutonic languages. Even Polynesian, which shows an extremely primitive beginning of inflections in the personal pronouns (the dual in *ua* and the plural in *ou*), must have hived off and gone east before the inflectionalism had developed to any great extent. There could have been little or no formal grammar, as we can see in Tocharish; the same word could be used as noun, adjective, adverb or verb; and particles supplied the cement or binding element of the sentence.

Of course every dialect of Polynesia has a large percentage of its words and roots peculiar to itself; Hawaiian has, I should



think, at least thirty per cent of such, but this is no proof of any alien infiltration, but only of migrations from the sinking fatherland Hawaiki, to the group, separated by so long intervals of time as to allow of the disuse of one set of words in the mother tongue and the loss of another set in the new land. For they have all the same phonology, figurative application and transparency of composition that distinguish all the Polynesian dialects.

The languages of Melanesia and coastal Papua, away to the west of Polynesia, have only a small percentage of their vocabularies in any way to be identified with Polynesian words, and as a rule these are greatly mutilated and often difficult to recognize. I gave some few words in my previous lecture, which going right through to the Malay archipelago yet found their derivation only in Polynesian; as e. g. *bia* or *pia* the sago tree, but in Polynesian "exudation" from *pi* which is used in that language in the sense of "to exude." I will add one more; the Polynesian *wahine*, a woman, comes from *wa* = "set apart" and *hine*, "a girl," but it goes away west into Indonesia in many different forms as e. g. *fafen*, *vaine*, *aine*, *babineh*. I could easily give scores of others. I doubt greatly if the implication in the term "Malayo-Polynesian" that these languages are all akin is correct. For though they are to some extent grammarless like Polynesian, they have much more formal grammar than Polynesian. In the Melanesian and coastal Papuan and to a small extent in the Micronesian and Indonesian languages there is a shorter form of the personal pronoun used as an affix to the noun. These are so much more primitive in their linguistic and intellectual development that they cannot think of a thing but as belonging to some personality; it is always mine or yours or his. The Polynesians have no mental primitiveness of this kind, they can think of a thing in itself and apart from its possession by a person. So in the Polynesian dialects (chiefly in Hawaiian) there is only a trace of a grammatical habit that is found largely in the Indonesian languages and is almost universal in the languages between Polynesia and the Malay archipelago. They cannot use the numerals except with classifying particles; flat things have one special particle to themselves when being counted, and round things another and so on. A third characteristic of those languages to the west is the use of an infix, i. e. the insertion of a significant syllable right into the heart of a



word. Polynesian and Aryan show no sign of this. These characteristics reveal a different linguistic attitude of mind from Polynesian and Indo-European.

The linguistic attitude of Polynesia faces north towards Japanese and Ainu which have got no such restriction on their use of nouns and numerals. That the Polynesian vocabulary looks also to some extent in that direction will be apparent from a few examples. (1) Hawaiian *huli*, kalo tops for planting, Samoan *uli*, sprouts of taro, Ainu *chi urip*, the Japanese taro-yam, Japanese *uri*, a melon. (2) Maori *takutaku*, to recite incantations, Samoan *ta'u*, to tell. Ainu *itak*, to speak, word, speech. (3) Maori *tango*, to handle, Samoan *tango*, to touch, (Latin *tango*), Malay *tangan*, the hand, Ainu *tek*, the hand. (4) Maori *toko*, to spring up in the mind, Ainu *tok* or *tuk*, to grow, project. (5) Maori *toko*, a pole, (English *stock*), Japanese *oko*, a pole for carrying burdens. (6) Maori *po*, the under world, Ainu *pok*, beneath, under. (7) Maori *tohi*, to cut, Ainu *tui*, to cut. (8) Maori *tuhi*, to tattoo, Japanese *toji*, to prick, to sew. (9) Maori *toma*, a burial place; Ainu *toma*, a mat for rolling the dead in. (10) Maori *Tu*, the god who propped up the heaven, then god of war; Ainu *tuntu*, a pillow, chief support of a building, hence God as the upbuilder of the universe. (11) Maori *tupo*, a tomb, a cave or hiding place for the bones of the dead, *tupapaku*, a dead body; Ainu *tumbu*, a room, house. (12) Maori *tuki*, (Tongan *tsuki*), to thrust or strike with anything endwise; Japanese *tsuki*, to thrust, or strike with anything pointed. (13) Maori *ana*, a cave; Japanese *ana*, a cave. (14) Maori *whau*, (Hawaiian *hau*), the hibiscus from whose bark *kapa* and cords were made: Polynesian *aute*, (Hawaiian *wauke*), the paper mulberry, from Hawaiian *ahu*, to clothe; or the soaked bark of the mulberry, equal to Maori *kahu*, a garment, *kakahu*, to clothe; Japanese *kazu*, the paper mulberry. (15) Polynesian *ahi*, fire; Ainu *abc*, fire; Japanese *hi*, fire. (16) Polynesian *ai*, to beget; Japanese *ai*, love. (17) Tongan *amo*, to use friction on the body; Futuna *amoamo*, to rub a sick person lightly; Ainu *amusa*, to stroke the head as salutation. These have been taken at random out of scores of examples I have marked down in my Maori dictionary.

I must not weary you by too many examples of the affinity of the Polynesian words to European; Fornander has done it to some



extent in his third volume, and though a percentage of his examples are inaccurate because he has failed to get at the root of either the Polynesian word or the European and so compared a root element with a merely formative element, seventy-five per cent of his comparisons are on the whole correct and even scientific. I have hundreds of others; a few will suffice. (1) We all know the Hawaiian word *kahuna* for a sorcerer or priest; it is in other Polynesian dialects *tahunga* or *tohunga* or *taunga*, and Paumotan has *tahutahu*, a sorcerer; it is, like so many European words, and still more Polynesian, influenced by two roots; one is *tahu*, to kindle, to make a burnt offering, from the root *hu*, to shine, burn, *tapu*, sacred; the other is *tohu*, to draw out, teach, prophesy, (Ainu *tusu*, to prophesy, Latin *ducere*, to draw out, *educare*, to teach). There is a corresponding word in the European tongue; it is in German *Zauber*, a sorcerer, in Old Norse *taufr*, in Old Saxon *toufere*; this is probably at first from a root *hu* to offer a sacrifice, to perform a sacred service; this appears in Anglo-Saxon *husl*, an offering, the origin of Hamlet's "unhouselled, unaneled," but the prefix *ta* or *to* being added, the other function of a priest, that of educating drew in the influence of the root *tuk*, to guide, teach, which we see in our word *education*. (2) Polynesian *whatu*, a stone, has another form *patu*, to strike, the source of the Maori *patupatu*, a club, a stone striker; this is evidently from *pa*, to strike, and *tu*, to be strong or stiff. In the European languages there is the word represented by English *bat* and *batlet*; the English *battle* and *combat* are from the same, but through French from Low Latin i. e. Latinised Teutonic *batuere*, from *batu*, to strike, and that is from the same two roots, *ba*, to strike, and *tu*, strong. (3) The Hawaiian *awiki*, to hasten (equal to *wiki*); this is from two roots, *vi*, to be quick, as in *awiwī*, to hasten, and *ki*, to go. The French *vite* = quick and *vif*, lively or alive. The English *quick* which also means to be alive, is from a root *vi*, to be alive, which appears in Latin *vivere* and *ki* or *kvi*, to hasten, to have energy. (Compare root *i*, to go, Latin *ire*.) This *vi* or *kvi* or *ki*, to be strong, is practically the same as *vi* or *i*, to live; it appears as *i* in Tahitian and Paumotan *vai*, to be, to exist, and in Maori *toi*, life; (compare Latin *aevum* = English *ever*); this *vai* appears in the Polynesian word for spirit, soul, ghost, *vairua*, which properly means "the



double or second existence." In Maori we have the duplication of *wai* in *waikwai* meaning "energy," "intellectual force." The root *i* appears also in the Polynesian *io*, "the soul," and in the Hawaiian *io*, reality, truth. (4) The last example I shall take is the word *ruma*, a house, which has been almost driven out of Polynesian by the word *whare*, (Hawaiian *hale*, Samoan *fale*), probably because it was the name or part of the name of some king or chief and had become *tapu*; we find it in Maori *turuma*, an outhouse, in Tahitian *fareturuma*, an out-house, and in Samoan *luma*, a preposition meaning "in front of"; this last shows the original sense of the word "space"; it was the space in front of a temple or a chief's house, (whence a chief's breakfast was called *lumaava*, i. e. the drinking of *ava* before his house); from this it came to be used for "in front of." It goes away west, varying in form in both senses of "space" or "cultivated plot" or "house." In Java *uma* is an unirrigated rice field in the mountains, whilst *ruma* means "a house." In Malekula in the New Hebrides when they make a new garden in the forest it is called *uma*; and right up the Malay peninsula into Assam "*uma*" is the name applied to cutting a space in the forest by felling the trees and burning the bush in order to sow seeds or plant tubers. Now in English we have the word "room" meaning "space," (the older sense), and "apartment," originally "house"; this in Gothic was *rumas*, free space, German *Raum*, Old Norse and Anglo-Saxon *rum*; this meant originally "a space cut in the forest for cultivation" as is seen in the Latin *rus*, "the open country". The first form was *rao*, as is seen in German "*Raum*." The derivation is from the root *ru*, to fell, cut down, seen in such words as Latin *ruina*, downfall, and *diruere*, to pull down, and the affix *ma*. In Polynesian it is also derived from the root *ru*, to strike, to shake, to scatter, and the most common of all substantival affixes—*ma*. Whilst there exists also in Polynesian the word *raorao*, meaning "an open space free from trees," (Samoan) a part of the bush cleared for a plantation, *ruma* does not exist in Sanskrit.

These are specimens taken at random out of many hundreds, if not thousands. With such wealth of affinity in the words and roots, such similarity in the original range of sounds and in the sound-laws between Polynesian and primeval Aryan, it is difficult



to resist the conclusion that Polynesian came from Europe many thousands of years ago.

It looks as if this simple, primeval language came in with the first-comers in the old stone age, the potteryless migration that alone brought women into the central and eastern Pacific. For it has remained the most primitive language in the world as far as phonology is concerned. It is the women that mould the sound range, accent and pronunciation of a language. The mothers have the senses of their children completely in their power during the plastic age of the organs of speech, from one to seven; they dominate the phonology as they dominate the household arts like pottery; whilst the men have the vocabulary in their hands, its scope and extensions. It seems almost inevitable then that the main features of the Polynesian tongue, especially the sound-range and the sound-laws, go back to the old stone age in Europe. In that case we must conclude that the Aryan language started on its career from twenty to twenty-five thousand years ago, and that philological students of Latin and Greek and the modern European languages must study Polynesian in order to see the type from which these sprung and the final analysis of their words and roots. This long period of time is necessary to explain the vast extent of the earth over which first Indo-European had spread even before our era, and the still greater extent over which Polynesian elements have spread. Both have more than half circled the world. And if the two are one, we have the most extraordinary language that the world has seen. And out of the divisions of it, English is drawing towards becoming as nearly the universal language as one language can ever be. It is a great thing to have for one's language one of a type that has, as Polynesian has, traveled across half the world by land and then doubled back as far by sea.





Brown, John Macmillan. 1920. "Languages of the Pacific." *Occasional Papers of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum of Polynesian Ethnology and Natural History* 7(2), 15–29.

**View This Item Online:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/32785>

**Permalink:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/352066>

**Holding Institution**

Harvard University, Museum of Comparative Zoology, Ernst Mayr Library

**Sponsored by**

Harvard University, Museum of Comparative Zoology, Ernst Mayr Library

**Copyright & Reuse**

Copyright Status: NOT\_IN\_COPYRIGHT

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.