ARCHAEOLOGY IN NEW ZEALAND

ROGER GREEN THE LINGUIST

ANDREW PAWLEY

Although best known for his archaeological work Roger Green also made important contributions to Oceanic historical linguistics Among his 300 or so publications about 15 focus on linguistic issues, while many others treat these to a greater or lesser degree. Roger's linguistic contributions were of two main kinds. First, he planned and directed multidisciplinary projects in which historical linguistic research was one major strand. Second, he wrote a number of substantial papers and a major book dealing with Oceanic (chiefly Polynesian) historical linguistics and what this tells us about Oceanic culture history. A brief account of this part of the Green oeuvre is given in the following pages.

Roger was schooled in the Boasian tradition of anthropology which was regarded as consisting of four subfields: cultural (or social) anthropology, archaeology, linguistics and physical anthropology. From an early time he aimed to do what he called 'holistic archaeology' or 'culture history' (later he preferred the term 'historical anthropology'), integrating the testimony of all relevant historical disciplines. Roger took enough courses in descriptive linguistics to give him a basic knowledge of its methods and taught himself the fundamentals of historical linguistics. When he came to do archaeological fieldwork on Mangareva and Mo'orea between 1959 and 1961, as a PhD student, it was second nature to him to take notes on and try to learn the local languages, Mangarevan and Tahitian. Around this time or soon after he began to examine and add to the evidence advanced by others, chiefly Kenneth Emory and Samuel Elbert, concerning historical relationships among the Eastern Polynesian languages.

The first major multi-disciplinary enterprise initiated by Roger was the Polynesian Culture History Project (PCH), begun in 1965. This was designed to meet Roger's wish for an investigation of the history of the Polynesians in which linguistics would play a central role alongside archaeology. Roger persuaded Roland Force and Kenneth Emory of the Bishop Museum, and Bruce Biggs of the University of Auckland, to join forces with him and they obtained grants from the National Science Foundation and the New Zealand Golden Kiwi

fund. Among other things the project supported the first few years work on a Proto Polynesian Lexicon database (POLLEX), initially compiled by a small team led by Bruce Biggs and David Walsh. Over the next few decades, under Biggs's direction, this grew into a massive etymological dictionary containing more than 3000 cognate sets, circulating in electronic form. POLLEX is still being expanded and refined, under the wing of Ross Clark. The PCH project also funded fieldwork by Biggs and several University of Auckland graduate students recording grammatical and lexical data in the late 1960s on several Polynesian languages: East Futunan, Sikaiana, Luangiua, the Nanumea dialect of Tuvaluan and the Ma'uke dialect of Cook Islands Maori. One of the fruits of the project was a very successful interdisciplinary symposium held at Sigatoka, Fiji, in 1969, which produced the three volume publication Studies in Oceanic culture history (Green and Kelly 1970-72).

The PCH project did not happen out of the blue. It built on foundations laid at the 10th Pacific Science Congress in Honolulu in 1961, where Roger helped to plan an ambitious Polynesian Prehistory project, funded by the National Science Foundation through the Bishop Museum. This supported archaeological research by scholars from various institutions, in several parts of Polynesia and Fiji. Roger was keen to expand the scope of research to include historical linguistics and when he took up a senior lectureship at the University of Auckland in 1961 he saw his chance.

On his first visit to New Zealand in 1958-59 as a young Fulbright Scholar Roger had found kindred spirits in Ralph Piddington's Department of Anthropology in Auckland, a small department whose core staff then consisted of two social anthropologists (Piddington and Ralph Bulmer), one archaeologist (Jack Golson) and a linguist, Bruce Biggs, who was head of the Maori Studies programme. Historical linguistics was not yet part of the mix there. Soon after his return to Auckland in 1961 Roger set about trying to persuade Biggs to put Polynesian historical linguistics on his research agenda. Biggs at first resisted. He was primarily a descriptive linguist and already had plenty of other projects on his plate. Roger had more immediate success persuading me, then a graduate student in anthropology who had decided to become a linguist. In 1962 Janet Davidson and I were the only students in a Master's course taught by Roger, in which she and I reviewed, respectively, the archaeological and linguistic literature to do with the origins of Pacific Island peoples.

As it turned out, Roger's cause was aided by linguists of the University of Hawai'i at Manoa, in Honolulu, who arranged for Biggs to spend 1964 as a visiting professor at the East-West Center. There Biggs talked at length with, and learned much from the leading Oceanic historical linguist George Grace. He became entranced by the challenge of unravelling the complex phonologi-

cal history of Rotuman, and this in turn led him to write an important paper comparing Rotuman with Polynesian and other Oceanic languages and arriving at a body of Proto Eastern Oceanic lexical reconstructions (Biggs 1965). I tagged along on the Hawai'i trip, as Biggs's PhD student. I was then writing my dissertation, a grammar of a Papuan language of New Guinea, but also dabbled in Oceanic historical linguistics.

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

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

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

Green's paper also explored the implications of the new subgrouping for Polynesian prehistory, formulating hypotheses about settlement sequence

and patterns of contact capable of being tested by data from archaeology and other domains. One implication was that Samoa rather than Tonga was the most likely source of the first settlement of eastern Polynesia. Others were that both the Marquesas and Easter Island were settled very early in the eastern Polynesian sequence and that Hawai'i was probably first settled from the Marquesas with later influence from the Society Is. Green noted that the major cultural differences between western and eastern Polynesia do not reflect the sequence of linguistic differentiation and pointed to continuing contact among western Polynesian societies as the explanation for the western Polynesian culture area.

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

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

During the mid 1960s Roger's major archaeological field project was in Samoa, where he and Janet Davidson filled a large gap in the Polynesian record. His eyes were already looking westwards, however, to the sources of the Lapita culture which looked like being the foundation culture in western Polynesia. This orientation is evident in a paper honouring the ethnologist Kenneth Emory (Green 1967), in which he assessed competing theories of the immediate origins of the Polynesians, chiefly in the light of current linguistic, archaeological and ethnographic evidence. Following Emory, Green argued that these point clearly to a movement through eastern Melanesia, and do not support the once-favoured hypothesis of a Micronesian source. He was aware,

however, that the archaeological record for both Melanesia and Micronesia was patchy and fragmentary and that various unresolved issues remained in Oceanic historical linguistics.

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

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

One of Roger's most compelling arguments for a holistic archaeology was the fact that even the richest archaeological assemblages contain no more than a small fraction of the named types of artefacts of a society – in Polynesia never more than about 20 percent. He wrote a number of works that drew on lexical reconstructions to complement the testimony of archaeology. Correlating archaeological and linguistic events proved to be more difficult in Island Melanesia than in Polynesia. Pawley and Green (1973) was an early attempt to formulate a set of principles for making such correlations in Oceania and to draw attention to the importance of the biogeographical boundary between Near and Remote Oceania in the history of human settlement of the southwest Pacific.

As the archaeological record for Melanesia improved during the 1970s and 80s it became clear that the initial spread of the Lapita cultural complex

across the southwest Pacific around 3200-3000 BP, and the initial dispersal of the Oceanic languages across Remote Oceania, were facets of one and the same large event. This made it possible for scholars to use lexical reconstructions to reconstruct features of Lapita technology and society not attested in the archaeological record. Studies by Roger in this domain include treatments of terms for rank and status and social stratification (Green 1994, 2002), house terms (Green 1998), terms for architectural forms and settlement patterns (Green and Pawley 1999) and overviews of early Oceanic technology and society (Green 1997, 1999, 2002, 2003, Pawley and Green 1984).

Roger's most important synthesis of this kind is undoubtedly Hawaiki; Ancestral Polynesia: an Essay in Historical Anthropology, a 370 page book co-authored with the archaeologist Pat Kirch (Kirch and Green 2001). This work draws on the cognate sets in the POLLEX database and other sources to reconstruct the way of life of the Proto Polynesian speech community, which the authors equate with an archaeological tradition they call Ancestral Polynesian. It deals with almost every major cultural subsystem, including chapters on 'subsistence', 'food preparation and cuisine', 'material culture', 'social and political organization', and 'gods, ancestors, seasons and rituals', as well as on 'Polynesia as a phylogenetic unit'.

The great achievement of the Hawaiki book is not so much in proposing a novel view of ancestral Polynesian culture and society – the general outlines have been clear for a long time – as in giving a remarkably full and detailed set of proposals supported by reconstructions for various terminologies. The more solid sets of lexical reconstructions treated by Kirch and Green provide a very rich and robust base for the study of adaptive and regional change in Polynesian cultures.

Acknowledgements

Roger C. Green: Publications on Oceanic historical linguistics

The following list contains Green's major publications on issues in Oceanic historical linguistics and a small selection of others that touch on such issues:

1966. Linguistic subgrouping within Polynesia: the implications for prehistoric settlement. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 75:6-38.
1967. The immediate origins of the Polynesians. In Genevieve Highland, R.W. Force, A. Howard, M. Kelly and Y. Sinoto, eds. *Polynesian Culture History. Essays*

in Honor of Kenneth P. Emory. Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu. Pp. 215-240.

1971. Anuta's position in the subgrouping of Polynesian languages. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 80:355-370.

1973. (Andrew Pawley and R.C. Green) Dating the dispersal of the Oceanic languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 12:1-67.

1976. Languages of the southeast Solomons and their historical relationships. In R.C. Green and M.M. Cresswell, eds., *Southeast Solomon Islands Culture History: A Preliminary Survey*. Bulletin of the Royal Society of New Zealand, Wellington. Pp. 47-60.

1981. Location of the Polynesian homeland: a continuing problem. In Jim Hollyman and Andrew Pawley, eds., *Studies in Pacific Languages and Culture History in Honour of Bruce Biggs*. Linguistic Society of New Zealand, Auckland. Pp. 133-158.

1984. (Andrew Pawley and R.C. Green) The Proto-Oceanic language community. *Journal of Pacific History* 19:123-146. [Reprinted in R. Kirk and E. Szathmary, eds., 1985. *Out of Asia: Peopling the Americas and the Pacific*. Journal of Pacific History, Canberra. Pp. 161-184.]

1987. (Patrick V. Kirch and R.C. Green) History, phylogeny and evolution in Polynesia. *Current Anthropology* 28:31-56.

1987. The initial identification of a people as Polynesian in race, language and culture. In R. Auger, M.E. Glass, S. MacEachern and P.H. McCartney, eds. *Ethnicity and Culture*. Archaeological Association, University of Calgary, Calgary. Pp. 175-180.

1988. Subgrouping of the Rapanui language of Easter Island and its implications for East Polynesian prehistory. In C. Cristino F., P. Vargas , R. Izaurieta S., and R. Budd P., eds., *First International Congress, Easter Island and East Polynesia. Volume 1: Archaeology*. Faculdad de Arquitectura y Urbanismo, Instituto de Estudios, Universidad de Chile, Santiago. Pp. 37-57.

1994. Archaeological problems with the use of linguistic evidence in reconstruction of rank, status and social organisation in Ancestral Polynesian Society. In A. Pawley and M. Ross, eds., *Austronesian Terminologies: Continuity and Change*. Pacific Linguistics, Canberra. Pp. 171-184.

1997. Linguistic, biological and cultural origins of the initial inhabitants of Remote Oceania. *New Zealand Journal of Archaeology* 17 [1995]:5-27.

1998. From Proto-Oceanic *Rumaq to Proto-Polynesian *fale: a significant reorganization in Austronesian housing. *Archaeology in New Zealand* 42:253-272.

1999. (R.C. Green and Andrew Pawley) Early Oceanic architectural forms and settlement patterns: linguistic, archaeological and ethnological perspectives. In Roger Blench and Matthew Spriggs, eds., *Archaeology and Language*. Routledge, London. Pp.31-89. [Abridged and slightly revised version in M. Ross, A. Pawley and M. Osmond, eds., 1998. *The Lexicon of Proto Oceanic. The Culture and Environment of Ancestral Oceanic Society. Volume 1: Material Culture*. Pp. 37-65.]

1999. Integrating historical linguistics with archaeology: insights from research in Remote Oceania. In P. Bellwood, D. Bowdery and 5 others, eds. *Indo-Pacific Prehistory: the Melaka papers*, vol. 2. Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association 18, Canberra. Pp. 3-24.

2001. (Patrick V. Kirch and R.C. Green) *Hawaiki: Ancestral Polynesia: An Essay in Historical Anthropology.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

2002. Rediscovering the social aspects of Ancestral Oceanic societies through archaeology, linguistics and ethnology. In S. Bedford and D. Burley, eds. *Fifty Years in the Field. Essays in Honour and Celebration of Richard Shutler Jr's Archaeological Career.* NZ Archaeological Society monograph 24, Auckland. Pp. 21-35.

2003. The Lapita horizon and traditions – signature for one set of oceanic migrations. In C. Sand, ed., *Pacific Archaeology: Assessments and Prospects (Proceedings of the Conference for the 50th Anniversary of the First Lapita Excavation, Koné Nouméa 2002).* Les Cahiers de l'archéologie en Nouvelle-Caledonie 15, Nouméa. Pp. 95-120.

2009. (R.C.G. and Douglas E. Yen). The Southeast Solomon Islands culture history project: Principal investigators' overview of the 1970s project including recent and current research. In Peter J. Sheppard, Tim Thomas and Glenn R. Summerhayes, eds., *Lapita: Ancestors and Descendants.* New Zealand Archaeological Association, Auckland. Pp. 147-172 (esp. pp. 160-166).

in press. The Outer Eastern Islands of the Solomons: a puzzle for the holistic approach to the anthropology of history. In John Bowden, Nikolaus Himmelmann and Malcolm Ross, eds., *A Journey through Austronesian and Papuan Linguistic and Cultural Space: Papers in Honour of Andrew K. Pawley.* Pacific Linguistics. Canberra.

References to other works cited in the text

Bayard, Donn, 1966. The cultural relationships of the Polynesian Outliers. MA thesis. University of Hawai'i. [Published 1976 in Otago University Studies in Prehistoric Anthropology.]

Biggs, Bruce, 1965. Direct and indirect inheritance in Rotuman. *Lingua* 14:383-415.

Green, R.C. and M. Kelly, eds. 1970-72. *Studies in Oceanic Culture History* (3 vols). Pacific Anthropological Records 11-13. Department of Anthropology, Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu.

Langdon, Robert and Darrell, Tryon, 1983. *The Language of Easter Island: its Development and Eastern Polynesian Relationships.* Institute for Polynesian Studies monograph series. Brigham Young University of Hawai'i Campus, Laie.

Lincoln, Peter, 1978. Reefs-Santa Cruz as Austronesian. In S.A. Wurm and Lois Carrington, eds. *Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics.* Pacific Linguistics, Canberra. Pp. 929-967.

Pawley, Andrew, 1966. Polynesian languages: a subgrouping based on shared innovations in morphology. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 66:37-64.

Ross, Malcolm and Åshild Næss, 2007. An Oceanic origin for Äiwoo, the language of the Reef Islands? *Oceanic Linguistics* 46(2): 456-498.