Marquesan Art and the Krusenstern expedition

Created across the six islands of a remote archipelago in eastern Polynesia, the art of the Marquesas is one of the world’s most distinctive and remarkable art traditions. Though exhibited in major museums around the world, Marquesan art is nevertheless poorly understood, and the formation of collections still largely unresearched.

This book documents and explores the most extensive early collection from the archipelago. In May, 1804, participants in the first Russian voyage round the world, usually known as the Krusenstern expedition after the principal commander, spent twelve days at the island of Nuku Hива. Inspired by the science and collecting associated with the voyages of Captain James Cook, the mariners interacted with Islanders, and made extensive collections of artefacts. While the lives of the collectors and exchanges among scientists led to these artefacts being widely dispersed, the research reported here has identified some 200 objects collected during the voyage which are now in museums in Russia, Estonia, Germany, Switzerland and the Netherlands.

The outcome of years of work in museum stores and archives, Tiki reassembles a collection of exceptional importance. A set of essays contextualise these precisely-provenanced artefacts historically, and in the life and environment of the Marquesas Islands. For the first time, this heritage is made accessible to Islanders themselves, and to interested scholars and curators.
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Handle of fan (tahi’i) (St Petersburg, MAE: 736-181)
'Tiki' refers in many Polynesian languages to images of ancestors and deities, carved or woven from wood, fibre, stone or bone.

In Marquesan, the word is also a verb, meaning 'to sculpt, draw, paint, fashion or create'.

Tiki (nom du premier homme dont ils font un dieu). Idole, statue sculpté, sculpture, sculpté, sculpter, dessiner, peindre, dessin, peinture, tatouage, façonner. Créer en parlant des hommes et des êtres organisés...

- Rene Idelphone Dordillon,
  Grammaire et dictionnaire de la langue des îles Marquises (Paris, 1931)
ABBREVIATIONS

EHM  Estonian History Museum, Tallinn
EMZU  Ethnographic Museum of Zurich University
ENM  Estonian National Museum, Tartu
LES  The Learned Estonian Society
MAMSU  Museum of Anthropology of Moscow State University
MAE  Peter the Great Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Kunstkamera), St Petersburg
MFK  Five Continents Museum, Munich
MV  Museum Volkenkunde (National Museum of Ethnology), Leiden
NME  National Museum of Ethnology (Museum Volkenkunde), Leiden
NMWC  National Museum of World Cultures, The Netherlands
RAC  Russian-American Company
RAN  Russian Academy of Sciences
TM  Tropenmuseum, Amsterdam
Between 2013 to 2018 the European Research Council funded *Pacific Presences: Oceanic art and European museums*, an ambitious project that explored the extensive collections of art and artefacts from the Pacific region that are cared for in ethnography and world cultures museums across Europe, from Spain to Russia. The team reconsidered famous works of Oceanic art, but put more energy into research of little-known, sometimes vast collections in storage, and in particular made connections across collections, reconstructing the histories of particular art forms and their contexts, and investigating collections made by particular travellers and fieldworkers which have in many cases been dispersed across many institutions.

The project was empowered, above all, by dialogue with Pacific Islanders. We have had extraordinarily rewarding engagements with many scholars, curators, artists, elders and community members from Pacific nations and diasporas. Many have joined the project for periods as affiliated scholars and visitors. They have undertaken study visits with us, they have contributed joint presentations to conferences, they have produced works of art, some acquired by the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology in Cambridge where the project was based, and they have written or co-written for various project publications. *Pacific Presences* not only enlarges understanding of Oceanic art history and Oceanic collections in important ways, but it also enables new reflections upon museums and ways of undertaking work in and around them. It exemplifies a growing commitment on the part of curators and researchers not merely to consult, but to initiate and undertake research, conservation, acquisition, exhibition, outreach and publication projects collaboratively and responsively.

This book series publishes work arising from, or associated with, the project. It includes studies dedicated to particular genres such as the famous coconut-fibre armour of Kiribati, critical reflections on concepts and methodologies in the anthropology of art, and a summative two-volume set of overviews of collections in specific countries, and case studies from a range of perspectives. This volume, *Tiki*, exemplifies one of our core methodologies, that of re-assemblage. For reasons outlined in this book, Russian and German visitors to the Marquesas Islands in 1804 acquired, through barter and gift exchange, exceptionally rich collections which are now distributed across institutions in a number of countries. The book draws together what we have been able to reconstruct, concerning not only extant artefacts, but those once in museums, now missing, and those we know through illustration and publication.

The *Pacific Presences* team was enormously fortunate that Dr Elena Govor was excited by the idea of building on her previous work on the Krusenstern voyage, published as *Twelve Days at Nuku Hiva* (2010). Together with other members of the team and myself, she has led an extraordinary hunt for artefacts, images and documents
that uncovered far more than we had initially thought possible. The findings decisively extend understandings of Marquesan art, they have already excited Marquesan practitioners, and they open up broader questions for future reflection and research. But the book is also, simply, a celebration of the extraordinary creativity and skill of Marquesan artists. It is about the many meanings of tiki.

Nicholas Thomas
July 2018
INTRODUCTION

NICHOLAS THOMAS

Created across six islands forming a remote archipelago in eastern Polynesia, the art of the Marquesas can only be described as an extraordinary world art tradition. Known to us primarily through works of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, as well as earlier archaeological pieces and sites, ‘Marquesan art’ is a powerfully distinctive body of work, a singular movement, specific to place and time, and a set of largely unresolved interpretive and historical problems.

Immediately recognizable, yet difficult to describe, Marquesan forms exhibit a proliferation of faces and human or humanoid images, which generally represent – and incarnate – ancestors and deities. Typically squat figures bear disproportionately large heads, their surfaces adorned with strong but fine, quadrilateral but curved design, potent in their symmetry but always disrupted, subtly destabilized. While Marquesan wood and ivory sculpture has, predictably, been of greater interest to western curators, collectors and scholars than other genres, the arts of the Marquesas were as varied as those across Oceania: in addition to ritual performance, they include a spectacular tattoo tradition – closely related in its iconography to Marquesan design on other media – as well as delicate fabrics, intricate personal ornaments, complex feather assemblages, woven valuables, rock engravings, musical instruments, decorated bamboos, basalt tiki, and other sculpted stone architectural elements.

Marquesan art is globally famous, in the sense that Oceania galleries in institutions ranging from the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York to the Musée du Quai Branly – Jacques Chirac in Paris, as well as larger and smaller museums in many other countries, represent and celebrate the tradition. Marquesan style has also been prominent discursively, in that it loomed large in Alfred Gell’s *Art and Agency* (1998), among the most provocative and influential interventions in the anthropology of art in recent decades, as well as in many surveys of the arts of the Pacific. Yet Marquesan art also remains paradoxically understudied. The landmark early account, Karl von den Steinen’s *Die Marquesaner und ihre Kunst* (1925-1928), based on a period of fieldwork and wide-ranging investigations of collections, incorporated an ambitious formal analysis, but was often neglected by anglophone and francophone scholars. Among more recent researchers of Oceanic art, Carol Ivory produced an important doctoral thesis and a number of articles, and in particular drew attention to the emergence of the neotraditional style, an early tourist art, of the later nineteenth century. And several exhibition catalogues have enlarged on the corpus of works reproduced by Karl
von den Steinen, publishing higher quality photos, and including contextual essays and commentaries, most recently and notably including Marquesan voices.4 But Marquesan art has remained weakly historicized, in part because the collections themselves tend to be of unspecific provenance. Whereas, to varying degrees, many major individual objects from Fiji, the Society Islands and New Zealand, among other places, can be linked with specific collectors, visits, places and events, this is true of only a very small proportion of the Marquesan works known to exist in collections today. The bulk lack any link with a field collector or indeed useful documentation of any kind. Consider what is probably the largest single holding of the iconic war clubs known as ‘u‘u, which is in Te Papa, in Wellington. The museum holds some 27 examples, but nearly all of them derive from the collection of the London dealer Oldman; although he is thought to have bought much material in northern France, and the pieces are thus likely to have come through French mariners or colonial officials, we have no idea from which islands within the group they were collected, when, or under what circumstances.

This paucity of documentation and understanding underscores the importance of the research published here. The first Russian voyage of circumnavigation of 1803-1806, generally referred to as the Krusenstern expedition after its principal commander, visited the island of Nuku Hiva over 12 days in May 1804. Although the visit was comparatively brief, the collections that were made were extensive, not least because, as we explain below, the acquisition of what were then commonly called curiosities or artificial curiosities became an enthusiasm of many voyage participants. Over 200 artefacts are documented; some 130 can be identified in collections today. In addition, a large number of individual barkcloth specimens are extant which were obtained during the voyage. Ethnographic specimens, unlike charts, records of navigational or hydrographic observations, had at this time an ambiguous status, but were considered the personal acquisitions of expedition participants rather than elements of the voyages’ official findings. Hence collections remained typically in the hands of individual collectors; in some cases, following the ships’ return, they were promptly if partially gifted to state museums, in others they were sooner or later presented to learned societies, to scientific patrons or remained for generations in private hands. Krusenstern voyage collections, like many others, were therefore dispersed, their travels and transactions the consequence of varied biographic, institutional and political histories: artefacts were distributed among museums in Russia, Ukraine, Estonia, Germany, Switzerland and the Netherlands.

This book re-assembles the collections made in May 1804. For a period these artefacts had shared the space and time of two ships, the Nadezha and the Neva; before that, they were owned, valued and used by people of Nuku Hiva, primarily those of the great bay of Taiohae, and particularly the leader Kiatonui and his relatives and associates. The collection is thus a remarkable resource, a lens on the Marquesan art present in a particular place and time, though it should not be assumed that all or even a majority of the objects collected were made on Nuku Hiva, and represent a style particular to Nuku Hiva, within the Marquesan archipelago. To the contrary, sources from this period make it clear that regular canoe voyaging and gift exchange linked the people of Taiohae with Islanders in the southern part of the archipelago, and it is
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specifically stated that carved objects were routinely obtained by people from Nuku Hiva during these trading visits to Hiva Oa and Tahuata.⁵

The collection appears to be the largest from the Marquesas associated with any exploratory voyage; indeed, it appears to be the single largest, coherent collection made from the islands until very late in the nineteenth century. While artefacts are known to have been collected at the time of Cook’s 1774 visit (primarily in the Pitt Rivers Museum, the Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Cambridge, and the British Museum), by various New England traders over the first decades of the nineteenth century (notably in the Peabody Essex Museum, Salem, and in a number of other museums in the northeast of the United States), and by Dupetit-Thouars, the French vice-admiral who took possession of the archipelago, and his officers and seamen (in the Musée du Quai Branly – Jacques Chirac, Paris, as well as in regional French museums), these collections generally number at most a dozen or so objects.⁶ Various of the Catholic missionaries active in the group from the 1840s onwards collected, as did some of the French administrators (the provenanced pieces in Paris were obtained by missionaries, mariners and administrators), but it was not until von den Steinen’s fieldwork over 1897-1898 that an extensive and genuinely systematic collection (of some 550 artefacts, in the Ethnologisches Museum, Berlin) was again made. Not only is the Krusenstern voyage collection thus large, in the Marquesan context, it was also made at a time when Marquesan art forms were still being created, circulated and used, in societies that remained vital and dynamic. And it is broadly representative: it includes a wide range of ceremonial objects, personal ornaments, implements, vessels and types of weapons. These are not exactly samples of ‘traditional’ art in the sense that they certainly predated European contact. We do not know how old they may have been at the time they were collected. Some may have been made before iron tools reached Islanders during the visit of James Cook in 1774, and in increasing numbers from 1791 onwards, with the visits of the New England trader Joseph Ingraham and the French navigator Etienne Marchand. (‘First contact’ in the southern Marquesas occurred two centuries earlier, with the short and violent intrusion of Quiros and his companions in 1595.) Other artefacts were no doubt relatively newer. Like all rich collections, these raise as many questions as they answer, and even advanced dating and analytic techniques are unlikely ever to help us determine when, exactly, certain of these works were made, nor whether they were from Nuku Hiva or the islands to the south. Yet irrespective of the ambiguities of the material evidence, as we understand it now, the Krusenstern voyage collections are a revelation of great art practices at a fertile moment in their turbulent histories, and of larger importance for the understanding of art, culture and history in the Pacific.
Figure 1.1. Georg Langsdorff, ['A view of an inhabited valley on Nukuhiwa'], drawing on paper: ink and wash, in Robert B. Honeyman, Jr. Collection of Early Californian and Western American Pictorial Material. Kruzenshtern/Rezanov/Langsdorff expeditions, 1803-1810. Bancroft Library, University of California (Berkeley, USA), 1963.002: 1009.
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COLLECTIONS
CHAPTER 1

Making collections: the Krusenstern expedition at Nuku Hiva

ELENA GOVOR

The first Russian voyage around the world, of 1803-1806, was launched in the wake of Bougainville's, Cook's and La Perouse's expeditions to the Pacific. The Russians came to the Pacific at a time when the practical advance of American and European whalers, traders and missionaries had already started, so it is not surprising that the expedition was partly financed by the Russian-American Company (RAC) and that commercial objectives – supplying Russian settlements on Kamchatka and the American northwest coast and delivering furs from these territories to China – ranked highly on its agenda. At the same time, the expedition's architect and initial commander, Adam Krusenstern (Ivan Fedorovich Kruzenshtern), saw it as his golden opportunity to contribute to discoveries in geography and natural history, the zeal for which had developed in the Age of Enlightenment.

Krusenstern came from a cultured Baltic German family living near Reval in the Russian Empire (now Tallinn in Estonia) and, although he received his main education in the Russian Naval Cadet Corps (School) in Kronstadt, which focused mostly on naval and navigational training, he had broad horizons enriched by European experiences and contacts. After graduating from the Cadet Corps he served for several years in the British Navy, travelling as far as China, while his family had cosmopolitan Russian Baltic and German cultural and scholarly connections. For instance, the German writer August von Kotzebue was married to Krusenstern's cousin, and August's teenage sons from his first marriage, Otto and Moritz Kotzebue, were included in the expedition as cadets, while Krusenstern's neighbour, the doctor Karl Espenberg, who had studied medicine in Halle and Erlangen, joined the expedition as a surgeon. Among the participants were also German-speaking savants – Johann Kaspar Horner, an astronomer from Zurich who had been a pupil of the famous Austrian-Hungarian astronomer Franz Xavier Zach; naturalists Wilhelm Tilesius from Mühlhausen in Thuringia, trained in Leipzig, and Georg Langsdorff, who had studied under Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, one of the most eminent comparative anatomists and naturalists of the period, at the University of Göttingen. Baltic Germans were also among the expedition's officers, and German was the most common language in the mess room.1
Krusenstern was the commander of the expedition's flagship, the *Nadezhda (Hope)*. The commander of the second ship, the *Neva*, was Urey Lisiansky. He was of Russian and Ukrainian stock and like Krusenstern had been trained at the Naval Cadet Corps and served in the British Navy. The surgeon aboard his ship was Moses Laband from Silesia, educated at Halle University. While both ships certainly had ethnic Russian officers, the strongest Russian bent in the expedition came from Nikolai Rezanov's 'Embassy to Japan.' This mission was added to the expedition at the eleventh hour, as by that time the expedition had received support and partial financing from the Russian Emperor Alexander I and was entrusted with additional tasks. Rezanov was a high ranking public servant and the Emperor's officials considered that it would be beneficial and respectful to assign Rezanov the powers of commander over the whole expedition; he boarded the ship with an instruction to that effect signed off by the Emperor. Ironically, neither Krusenstern, nor the crew nor the savants aboard the ships were informed of this decision, all being convinced that Krusenstern was their commander. All of this was to have a direct impact on the collection of artefacts by the expedition's participants.

The expedition left Kronshtadt on 7 August (26 July in the Russian, or Julian calendar, which was 12 days behind the Gregorian, or Western calendar) 1803 and, after calling at Tenerife on the Canary Islands and Santa Catarina Island in Brazil, in March 1804 they rounded Cape Horn and entered the South Pacific. Here, during a storm, the ships separated and hurried to Nuku Hiva, proposed as a rendezvous by Krusenstern, which the *Nadezhda* reached on 7 May and the *Neva* two days later. The reason for this visit was to take on provisions and fresh water, but the encounter with the world of the Nuku Hivans soon added an extra dimension to this visit.

**Collecting: instructions and expectations**

At the time of the departure of the first Russian circumnavigation, Russian academia had no established routines or methodologies for collecting artefacts. Krusenstern's expedition was dispatched to the Pacific without any explicit instructions regarding the observation of peoples and their manners and customs, or the collection of artefacts, though those who had read the published accounts of the voyages of Cook and his successors would have been well aware that 'artificial curiosities' had been collected extensively; they were well-represented in many of the printed engravings included in these books. Of course, the expedition's organizers presumed a broad exploratory and investigatory orientation. This dimension of the venture was championed particularly by Krusenstern and Count Nikolai Rumiantsev, the Minister of Commerce and a supporter of science and scholarship. The instruction that Krusenstern received from the RAC dealt with these tasks in the most general terms:

> we hope that you and Mr Lisiansky will not fail to deliver to the RAC all that you discover and acquire which is new for Natural History, Geography, Navigation and other sciences, as well as maps and descriptions, and therefore, knowing your zealoussness in these matters, we feel it unnecessary to explain to you all the specifics of your brief.²
Count Rumiantsev’s letter to Krusenstern was concerned only with recommendations for geographical discoveries in the Pacific. The instruction from the Russian Academy of Sciences for the official naturalist of the expedition, Wilhelm Tilesius, discussed primarily geological and geographical issues. The only instruction which dealt with ethnographical issues was composed by Count Rumiantsev for Rezanov and signed by the Emperor:

While in America, do not fail to note the habits of the inhabitants, their physical characteristics, arts, worship, customs, tales, laws and very manner of their behaviour. You will collect precise information regarding their clothing, weapons, habitations, navigation, domestic life, food, hunting, trapping, warfare and domestic animals. Aim to bring back what is possible in specie, make drawings of all the rest, including views of all the most important Company establishments, volcanoes, and other noteworthy places, for which purpose you are provided with two draughtsmen, academician counsellor Prichetnikov to draft views and academician Kurliandtsev to draw clothes.³

This instruction spelled out the budding Russian interest towards the study of the native inhabitants of Russian America, an area of special Russian interests. It was likewise applied by Rezanov at Nuku Hiva, although, alas, he kept it secret from Krusenstern and his team.

The RAC was also aware that the expedition might visit some places in ‘India or Asia […] where it will not be possible to acquire the required provisions and other necessary items except through the barter of our goods’ and provided a tentative list which included ‘bugles [small beads], fire beads, cloth, tobacco, or […] various other things and clothing’.⁴ These Krusenstern was to obtain from the RAC cargo which was aboard the ships and intended for the native inhabitants of Russian America. The RAC recommendations did not mention iron hoops as a potential commodity to be offered in trade, but Krusenstern was well aware from his reading of his predecessors’ encounters of the interest Islanders showed in iron and, while still in Kronshtadt, he ‘had supplied both ships’ with ‘pieces of old iron hoops, four or five inches long’ in large quantity.⁵ He anticipated that these iron hoops would be the major remuneration for food and water in such places as the Marquesas.

Although barter for artefacts was not specified in the instructions, Krusenstern, his officers and naturalists obviously had this in mind. The supercargo of the Nadezhda, Fedor Shemelin, wrote in his private journal: ‘While in England, our Messers managed to stock up not only on iron wares, but also on a number of other trinkets, such as shiny buttons, multi-coloured glass bugles, necklaces, and beads’.⁶ This stocking up on items for barter suggests that plans to build personal collections were entertained by the expedition’s savants from the very beginning. Other items for barter and gifts included ‘knives, scissors, little mirrors, printed linen kerchiefs, and chain lockets made of Russian coins’, according to supercargo of the Neva Nikolai Korobitsyn,⁷ and ‘small chisels, hammers of differing size with an axe blade on one side, and pocket knives […] and large English [elsewhere said to be German] clasp knives’, according to
Shemelin. Shemelin also mentioned red pestriad – a roughly woven patterned cloth usually home-produced by Russian peasants.

Krusenstern, considering himself the commander of the expedition, had his own plans for its exploratory work. Geographical and astronomical observations were his highest priority, and he attributed importance too to a range of studies across the natural sciences. While he left botanical and zoological inquiry to the expedition’s naturalists, he was personally interested in the Indigenous population of the places visited by the expedition, compiling, for instance, a detailed account of the Nuku Hivans and their artefacts. Nevertheless, he saw the collection of artefacts primarily as a gentleman’s pursuit rather than as a fulfilment of duty to the state. This is clear from his correspondence with Pavel Chichagov, the Naval Minister and an Anglophile. Arriving at Kamchatka after visiting Nuku Hiva, Krusenstern received Chichagov’s letter informing him about the establishment of the Admiralty (Maritime) Museum in St Petersburg. Chichagov wrote:

Your acclaimed scholarship and knowledge, which can greatly benefit the naval arts, gives me reason to request you to deliver to us various natural and artificial products which you may collect in the places where you will happen to visit, and which could serve to enrich our Museum’s collection…

Krusenstern responded:

The Maritime Museum has inspired in all of us an enthusiasm for the collection of rarities… All that has already been collected by us and, of course, will be collected with great zeal, each of us will donate to the Museum with special pleasure on our return to Russia.

His assumptions were consistent with those made some 30 years earlier, when Cook and his companions on the Endeavour returned to England with the first major collection of Indigenous artefacts obtained by any European expedition: the ‘artificial curiosities’ were seen as personal acquisitions made by individual collectors, though Cook, Banks and others also presumed that they should be gifted to museums and institutes of learning, hence the various donations to the British Museum, Oxford, Cambridge and elsewhere.

The above correspondence might create the impression that, before Kamchatka, the collection of artefacts was not considered a priority by Krusenstern, but in fact encounter and exchange, and passions aroused over these issues, became the focal point of the Russian visit to Nuku Hiva. Approaching the Marquesas, Krusenstern issued an order concerning the treatment of the native people humanely and in the spirit of fairness. Already at this stage he anticipated that interests in exchange could generate tensions and conflict, and aimed to take precautions to prevent disorderly trade. He was primarily concerned that a mismatch of wants and desires might prevent the ships obtaining vital provisions. The order applied his reading of his predecessors’ experience and anticipated what might happen:
It will be very natural if, on our arrival, unfamiliar objects provoke in many [natives] the desire to have them. You, for your parts, would gladly barter European goods for the various curios of these people. But lack of caution might have undesirable results: the natives, anxious [‘greedy’ in Russian original] to acquire objects of ours and getting them in plenty in exchange for things of little value for them, would no doubt end by wanting objects that we could not surrender before they would satisfy our genuine needs.  

Ironically, it was the Russian visitors’ ‘greediness’ for Marquesan ‘curios’ which nearly brought their expedition to its downfall.

The language of artefacts

Before turning to exploring the dynamic of Russian-Marquesan exchange, we consider the categories and terms used by the voyagers in their journals and later writings in relation to artefacts and collecting.

In the early eighteenth century, when Peter the Great established the Kunstkamera, the first public museum in Russia, its holdings were often described with the linguistic calque kuriositet; this is not surprising as the museum was established under the influence of European natur-cabinets. By the late eighteenth century, the word kuriositet was replaced with Russian terms, such as the Russian word redkosti, which corresponds to ‘rarities’ in English and ‘rareté’ in French. A more descriptive Russian variant of this word was redkie veshchi – rare things. The Russian language also had a synonym, dikovina or dikovinka, which can loosely be translated as ‘curiosity’, but in Russian it had archaic, folk origins. A Russian-French-German-Latin dictionary of 1785 translated curiosité, chose rare, curieuse and eine Seltenheit as ‘Dikovina;… a thing worthy of curiosity and inspection’, but these terms were not used consistently or systematically to describe ethnographic artefacts. Characteristically, Osip Beliaev, in his 1800 account chronicling the development of the Kunstkamera’s collections, was indecisive in respect of terminology to describe the ethnographic items of Siberian Indigenous peoples. In one case he referred to them as ‘diverse rarities’ in another as ‘different things’; finally, in the section describing ethnographic collections, he settled on ‘various things’.  

In his account of the Nuku Hiva visit, Krusenstern used Seltenheiten in the German version and redkosti in the Russian version; both can be translated as ‘rarities’. In the English edition of his book this word was translated as ‘curiosities’; this was the English word commonly used in voyage narratives by Cook, the Forsters and others. Urey Lisiansky used redkosti in his Russian text, translating it into English as ‘articles’ or ‘articles of curiosity’ and in one case ‘trifles’. Hermann Löwenstern and Georg Langsdorff – both German speakers – wrote pragmatically about ‘articles’, ‘trade articles’ (Handels Artikel), and ‘wares’ (Waare).

The variety of terms used by the ethnic Russian members of the expedition is especially revealing, suggesting an emerging perception of artefacts as both ‘curiosities’ for European eyes and as samples of folk craft. Thus the supercargo Korobitsyn, who did not know any Western European languages, settled upon the quite precise expressions ‘national and art objects’ and ‘rarities or national objects’, implying that the artefacts
were significant in the sense that they were ‘nationally’ specific, that is, associated with particular peoples or cultures. Rezanov, in his order issued to Shemelin concerning the acquisition of artefacts, used the descriptive formula ‘different things related to their clothing and customs’, again implying an association with the distinctiveness of particular peoples. Shemelin himself employed a number of expressions, most interestingly in his unpublished journal. Initially he used the Russian expression rukodelia (handicrafts) with the explanation ‘crafted of wood or woven skilfully from tree roots’, this is distinctive for signalling Indigenous virtuosity. He also referred to ‘rare and curious things’, ‘things worthy of curiosity’ and simply ‘things’. In the following days he wrote of ‘rarities’ and ‘island rarities’. The evolution of Shemelin’s terminology shows a gradual shift in attention from the quality of crafting to the objects’ rarity and curiosity – however exactly that might be defined. In fact, this shift in understandings was experienced by many members of the expedition.

**First encounters**

Encounters involve exchange: of gifts, artefacts, services, sexual intimacies and expressions of civility. They have both material and nonmaterial, ceremonial and of more ordinary dimensions, which are not always readily distinguished. Accounts of the Russian expedition provide data about two initial cases of encounter which took place in quite different circumstances and involved exchanges of different artefacts.

The *Neva*’s visit to the eastern shore of Nuku Hiva provides detailed data of contact with the Nuku Hivans, in the absence of any go-between. These materials are especially important as the inhabitants of the eastern coast of Nuku Hiva, unlike those of the Taiohae and Taipi valleys, appear to have had no experience of contact with foreign visitors before the Russian arrival. Nor did the inhabitants of the eastern coast attract the attention of visitors in subsequent decades. This encounter is moreover illuminating for the range and variety of artefacts – in the narrow and in the broad meaning of the word – being exchanged.

The Islanders came from ‘the north-eastern bay of the island’ and, approaching the *Neva*, ‘one of the company sounded a large conch, while another waved a piece of white cloth.’ ‘Thinking these to be tokens of friendship’, Lisiansky relates, ‘I ordered, in return, a white handkerchief to be waved, and a white flag hoisted’. Other participants mention that the Islanders brought bunches of bananas and other fruits. Obviously seeing European visitors for the first time, the Islanders did not anticipate that there could be demand for their artefacts and did not bring any besides the things conventionally presented at the time of a meeting, that is plain cloth, green branches and kava. The Russian visitors reciprocated this ceremonial message with corresponding actions and objects. The Islanders stepped onto the deck of the ship smiling, singing and dancing. The common sailors, who usually do are not much mentioned in voyagers’ accounts, in this case contributed to the festive atmosphere by staging their own performance on the volynka (bagpipes). Listening to them, the Nuku Hivans ‘marveled and grew shy, jumped around and shouted’, remembered the ship’s priest Gideon. This spontaneous exchange of music and songs can be considered not only a form of communication, but also a nonmaterial artefact of encounter (which has been discussed in other Pacific
Figure 1.2. Kozma Chesky after Wilhelm Tilesius, ‘View of Morai or Cemetery on Nuka Hiva Island’, engraving, in Ivan F. Kruzenshtern, Atlas k puteshestviu vokrug sveta kapitana Kruzenshterna [Atlas to Captain Krusenstern’s Voyage Round the World] (St Petersburg: Morskaia tipografiia, 1813), pl. XVI.
voyage contexts by Vanessa Agnew). In the second group of visitors approaching the ship Lisiansky spotted

a chief, who held a long stick, to which was fastened a bunch of bananas ['a bunch of dry banana-tree leaves' in the Russian original], a piece of white cloth manufactured on the island, and a square fan. [...] As soon as he was on the quarter-deck, he sat himself down, and presented me with the bunch of bananas, and the cloth that had been fastened to the stick. I was going to put on his head a cap of striped stuff; but he refused the honor, and begged a knife, which was given him, as well as a copper coin to use as an earring.32

Although the exchange was of a ceremonial nature and Lisiansky, stepping into the role, wanted to reciprocate with a similar symbolic item, which in his understanding corresponded, perhaps, to a royal crown, it is notable that the chief did not ascribe it the same value, and asked instead for the highly prized practical gift of a knife, the knowledge of which had obviously already reached this remote coast of Nuku Hiva.

Among the goods brought aboard by the Nuku Hivans were, Gideon recorded, 'a small quantity of cloth, bananas, sugar cane, and coconuts'. But it seems that for both sides mutual discovery was of greater interest than regular barter. The Russians did their best to impress the Islanders with the commodities of their own world. 'We offered them some white Tenerife wine, but they did not drink it; neither did they snuff the tobacco.'33The visitors were more attracted by the ship's animals:

I showed them fowls and pigs; the fowls they called moa, and the pigs boaga, intimating by signs that there were plenty of both on shore; but, from their surprise at the sight of our sheep and goats, I inferred that they had never till then seen such animals.34

At the end of their visit the Russians 'loaded our guests with gifts of iron articles and other things, which they accepted with great delight'. The Islanders, whom the Russian visit caught unprepared in respect of return gifts, nevertheless reciprocated in their own way: 'In return, they entertained us with their songs, accompanied by various contortions, and by beating in time the right palm upon left shoulder.'35 'As a token of gratitude they did not fail to display their proficiency in exercising their bodies to the accompaniment of handclapping and singing in their native tongue.'36

Brief though it was, this visit reveals much about Russian attitudes and their preconceptions about the Islanders, and demonstrates their ability to establish friendly contact without language or intermediaries. It also testifies to a good-natured openness towards white-skinned visitors on the part of the Islanders, who had not experienced European atrocities. Exchange of nonmaterial for material artefacts (e.g. songs for iron items) suggests that in special circumstances, such 'artefacts' could become comparable.

The well-documented arrival of the Nadezhda in Taiohae Bay followed a different course. Fortunately for the Russians, initial contact with Nuku Hivans here was facilitated by the beachcomber Edward Robarts, who had been living in Taiohae for several years, was fluent in Marquesan and knew the local customs.37 He immediately
took up an intermediary role. The encounter started with a ceremonial visit by the Taiohae haka'iki Kiatonui, who brought onboard a kava plant, a symbol of peace and friendship. The message was received by the Russians and the solemnity of the moment was noted in Loewenstern's drawing of this event. From this first moment, the Nuku Hivans seem to have absorbed the Russian visitors into their own system of ceremonial relations with outsiders, and the Russians responded accordingly. For the gift-giving ceremony Kiatonui and his brother were invited into the Captain's cabin, where he received a piece of red pestriad cloth. A similar piece was given to Kiatonui's brother, while his 'retinue' received pieces of new sail-cloth and knives made by the ship's blacksmith from barrel hoops. Krusenstern also gave Kiatonui a hatchet and a mirror. The Russians noticed that Kiatonui accepted the gifts with all due ceremony, for instance 'he immediately bound round his loins' the cloth. According to midshipman Friedrich Romberg, when Kiatonui returned to the shore he demonstrated the gifts to his people.

The Islanders' reaction to the European world being revealed aboard the ship is noteworthy. Rather than immediately exploring the variety of novel objects, they choose to engage with what was familiar from their perspective – the reflection of their own bodies in the mirror, and the birds aboard the ship. Krusenstern recounts that Kiatonui was struck with the appearance of some small Brazil parrots, at which he expressed his pleasure and astonishment in no very moderate terms, sitting himself down, and considering them for some minutes. I conceived that I should ensure his friendship by making him a present of one; and Roberts [Robarts], who blamed my liberality, appeared to have conveyed my offer to him in improper terms, for the next day a hog was brought to me in exchange for it.

Robarts may not have been to 'blame' for misinterpretation, as the gift of the parrot was of high value from the Marquesan point of view. Krusenstern's parrot had red feathers, and although the Russians knew about the special attitude of the Pacific Islanders to the colour red, they did not suspect, as Thomas points out, 'that feathers were intimately associated with gods and demi-gods, who were supposed to be born as bloody miscarriages, covered in feathers'. This is confirmed by Langsdorff's observation that 'Red or any naturally bright feathers (they learned very soon to recognize artificially coloured ones) seemed to be valued very highly'. Kiatonui's reciprocation with a hog was quite appropriate, as hogs had a similar, symbolic position in the Nuku Hivan scale of values.

The Russians did not exactly single out and favour local aristocrats, since the latter put themselves forward and naturally led meeting parties. The dynamics of these meetings were co-created, but in so far as the Russians followed the pattern set by other voyagers, they behaved in a manner broadly intelligible to Nuku Hivans. Unlike direct barter, the exchange of gifts is a sophisticated process involving valuables of unequal nature and significance, return gifts are often delayed rather than immediate, various ritual protocols are appropriate, even if, in cross-cultural gifting, there will be a lack of
fit and, on both sides, an incomplete understanding of the other party’s expectations. The success of the American trader Captain Edmund Fanning’s sojourn at Taiohae Bay in 1798 was largely due to the fact that, although he kept hostages on board during his visit to Kiatonui’s abode, he made gifts, on Crook’s advice, with extravagant ceremony. For instance, a metal plate on a crimson ribbon – ‘a medal’ – was wrapped in paper, delivered by a special steward and solemnly handed to the young ‘king’. His description of the ceremony surrounding his shore visit occupies 17 pages in his book.\textsuperscript{44} Ceremonial objects or gifts are not expected to be reciprocated immediately, but both manifest and aim to elicit goodwill.

On board the \textit{Nadezhda}, Kiatonui initiated a formal exchange of ceremonial gifts and courtesies; at the same time, the exchange in the water around the ship, involving common Islanders and seamen, developed in its own fashion. The Islanders anticipated that after the long voyage the visitors’ first demand would be for fresh food. Shemelin gives the most detailed account of this exchange:

They brought us coconuts, bananas, bread fruits and sugar-cane; they crowded on both sides of the ship and each aimed to sell their goods before the others, and each wanted us to understand him especially, and in order to attract our attention they made all sorts of grimaces and gestures, employing their heads, eyes, mouths, tongues, hands and indeed their whole bodies, and added emphasis to these by shouting at the tops of their voices words consisting of vowels such as o! a! e! ou! and so on.\textsuperscript{45}

Later the voyagers would pick up a number of actual Nuku Hivan words from the Islanders, making communication easier without any intermediaries. In the meantime Robarts stepped in and helped to organize a surprisingly orderly barter. Shemelin, as supercargo, chronicled it:

\begin{quote}
In place of coins we used pieces of iron broken from old barrel hoops 2 vershok [about 9 cm] or less in length. For 5 or 6 coconuts we gave one piece, two or three bunches of bananas had the same price; but as coconuts and banana bunches differed in size, we paid with bigger or smaller pieces.\textsuperscript{46}
\end{quote}

At the first glance this trade was conducted in a purely business-like manner where one commodity was immediately reciprocated with another commodity, notionally of equivalent value. However, Krusenstern observed the same scenes and noticed the Islanders’ special respect for iron hoops:

\begin{quote}
They shewed a childish joy on receiving even a small piece of iron hoop, and usually evinced their satisfaction by a loud laugh, displaying their newly acquired riches with an air of triumph to their less fortunate companions, who swam round the ship. This expression of pleasure was perhaps a proof of the little opportunity which they have hitherto had of procuring this valuable metal.\textsuperscript{47}
\end{quote}
The Russians were yet to discover that these iron hoops, their principal item of barter, which, by drawing on the experience of earlier voyagers they had stocked beforehand, were not simply a commodity to the Islanders.

Noticeably, Nuku Hivan artefacts, if present at all, do not figure in accounts written about this first encounter.

**Regulating exchange**

As the commander of the expedition he believed himself to be, Krusenstern had to think about the provision of his ships with the most essential materials – meat, fruits and water. His consequent attempt to control all aspects of the exchange between Russian visitors and Nuku Hivans encroached upon the availability of local artefacts on the market. He wrote in his account:

In order to facilitate the purchase of provisions, I forbade the crew, immediately upon my arrival, to barter for any thing, but more particularly for curiosities, with the natives; [...] I appointed Lieutenant Romberg and Dr. Espenberg to manage the barter, and they alone were permitted to purchase provisions, conceiving this to be the only means of preserving order.  

Realizing soon after their arrival that the most necessary commodity, meat, was not easily obtainable, Krusenstern made further amendments to his instructions: ‘As I understood that very few hogs were to be had, I gave out that these alone should be considered as payment for axes and hatchets.’

This seemingly reasonable care for the vital needs of the expedition clashed with the lure of the exotic world around it. Dissatisfaction began to brew from the moment Krusenstern’s order was announced. Rezanov would write later in his complaint:

The captain, out of politeness, should have informed me of his order from the outset, but as he had a lasting disrespect for the authorities, which were used to his insults, and as the order had real benefit, I did not utter a word against it.  

Shemelin in his published account mentioned the benefits of the order:

The order is highly reasonable and beneficial; and the Captain foresaw that a premature freedom of trade with the local inhabitants would firstly lower the price of our iron currency … and secondly that an unreasonable ambition in obtaining curios will surely result in jealousy and competition against each other. The imparting of good objects for islander trinkets will cause, contrary to the communal benefit, the price for all things sold by the islanders, and especially foodstuffs, to rise.

Shemelin was clearly opposed to free barter and in favour of centralized, ‘state’ control. The only problem was that he did not believe that Krusenstern represented the interests of the ‘state’. In his unpublished journal he wrote indignantly that the proper course would
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have been to let him supervise the trade, since he was the supercargo of the RAC, in charge of goods used for barter. His second point of criticism was of a less personal nature:

Moreover, Mr. Krusenstern should not have restrained or limited his instruction to foodstuffs especially; his embargo ought to have also encompassed those objects which in their rarity or fine craftsmanship are worthy of constituting a collection in the Imperial Kunstkamera. Thus no-one would dare to acquire anything for himself from the islanders before an appropriate quantity is procured both for the Kunstkamera and the board of the Russian-American Company.\(^{51}\)

Shemelin clearly considered that stocking up on artefacts was no less important than on provisions, being furthermore of the opinion that he and his superior, Rezanov, should have received the exclusive right to acquire curios ahead of naturalists, officers and crew. Intriguingly, he also implied that certain artefacts were of higher value, due to their particular fineness or rarity, but does not go into the issue of which pieces might qualify or how such judgements might be made.

Krusenstern's restrictions on the acquisition of curios in preference to foodstuffs, and especially pigs, did not have the desired effect: pigs were not delivered in large numbers. On the fourth day of their stay he had to lift his ban on barter for curios. The only formal restriction that remained was a ban on payment with axes or hatchets. These continued to be reserved as payment for pigs only. Now the officers, scientists, and all others aboard could use their own resources to barter for artefacts and naturalia.

As mentioned earlier, Krusenstern and his officers had no explicit instructions about obtaining artefacts and were guided by general notions of gentleman-naturalist collecting. By contrast, Rezanov seemed to have a clear-cut plan about collecting from the onset. At Nuku Hiva he gave Shemelin instructions to acquire two to three examples of each sort of artefact, intending to present collections, each evidently representative, to the Imperial Kunstkamera and the Central Board of the RAC, which was financing the expedition. By that time relations between Rezanov and Krusenstern had deteriorated into antagonism over the issue of the leadership of the expedition; they hardly communicated concerning any matter, let alone the collection of artefacts.

Shemelin, an experienced merchant, feared that competition for Islanders' 'trinkets' would raise the prices for foodstuff, but what happened was even worse. Here he describes the atmosphere on deck:

The manropes on both sides of the ship were occupied by doctor Espenberg and Lieutenant Romberg, who had been instructed to purchase provisions. Pacing from one side of the ship to the other, they zealously guarded their positions and blocked the gangways with their bodies, thus preventing others from bartering with the islanders. If they did make an exception, it was only for their officers; everyone else called from the quarterdeck, waist-deck,
bow and stern to passing islanders, holding out sellable trinkets of all kinds. Sometimes one item took the fancy of two or three people, and no one wanted to give it up to the others.52

While competing for Marquesan artefacts, the visitors experienced for themselves the passion aroused by the acquisition of ‘prestige’ goods, which had particular value for different expedition members: Krusenstern and Lisiansky dreamt, perhaps, of Cook’s laurels; the naturalists similarly aspired to emulate the scientific appropriation of the Indigenous world accomplished by Banks and the Forsters (notwithstanding all the difficulties they had experienced); Rezanov and Shemelin were concerned to please their patrons (the Emperor and the RAC); and the officers and ‘passengers’ sought souvenirs of their exotic voyage. On that first day of ‘free trade’ the Russian buyers got so carried away that, from the thrifty Shemelin’s point of view, they began to pay grossly inflated prices:

Our buyers, regrettably, had no cheap items (apart from beads and buttons) to barter for the Islanders’ trinkets, such as – among handcrafted items – slings, cloth, headdresses decorated with red seeds, necklaces made from pigs’ teeth and other base materials, and – among natural products – simple and conical shells, coral, etc. But as the islanders did not respect either beads or shiny buttons, and refused to take them for any of their items, we were forced to pay for everything with pieces of iron, English clasp knives of differing size, razors, chisels and other woodworking instruments.53

In his manuscript he gives examples of barter:

For five or six small shells, a sling, or two carved seashells like the ones the savages wear in their ears, we readily bartered iron and well-made iron items such as small chisels, hammers of differing size with an axe blade on one side, and pocket knives. When the shells were larger, or for anything else of better quality, we did not spare even the large English clasp knives.54

That day all attempts by Shemelin to acquire artefacts for the Kunstkamera and the RAC were literally blocked by his more powerful competitors. He believed that those competitors were conspiring against Rezanov, and did not hide his irritation in his diary:

Today with the assistance of the Englishman Roberts … the best things filled the cabinets of Krusenstern and his favourite, Doctor Essenberg [sic]. The captain’s cabin had items including weaponry of different kinds, and of such good quality, finely carved and made from the choicest wood; weaponry so fine that finer could not be found anywhere on the island; while Essenberg’s collection included curios of an anatomical nature such as human skulls, decorated in places with pearl shell, and other items worthy of interest.55
Krusenstern was not the first commander to visit the Marquesas who had attempted to regulate exchange and particularly barter for artefacts. In 1798 Captain Fanning, approaching the islands, announced that all ‘dealings and trade with the natives’ will be conducted via a ‘daily appointed’ officer only, making a special reservation that ‘any person wishing to possess an article of curiosity, without having the means so to do, had them charged to their account on the ship’s books’. A severe punishment was imposed for any breach of these rules. Krusenstern, unlike the trader Fanning, had an array of savants and ‘gentlemen’ on board, which, coupled with his generally liberal and enlightened attitudes, made it difficult for him to impose strict rules and prohibit members from the acquisition of ‘curios’. But the first day of ‘free trade’ made it obvious that the passions it provoked were not in line with the rational demeanour expected of gentlemen’s pursuits.

By the end of the fourth day, Krusenstern added iron barrel hoops to the list of items excluded from barter for artefacts, a ruling which specifically targeted Shemelin and Rezanov, the only two other members with access to the hoops. That hoops were excluded while more valuable items such as clasp knives continued to be traded is especially noteworthy. As mentioned earlier, Krusenstern had obtained the hoops in quantity at Kronshtadt as part of the RAC’s cargo and believed that he, as head of the expedition, had the exclusive right to use these and other company property for the expedition’s needs. Rezanov, though believing that he was the head of the expedition, had kept silent for the time being. It is interesting that both Shemelin and Krusenstern sensed something special about the iron hoops. Shemelin wrote:

In the early morning, when the islanders did not yet know the extent of our greed to obtain their wares, some pieces of broken iron hoops serving in this place as coinage would have much helped me in the purchase of a few items for the Imperial Kunstkamera and the Board [of the RAC], but the Captain forbade me to use them.

Rezanov’s complaint to Pavel Koshelev, the Governor of Kamchatka, also refers to Krusenstern’s ban on the use of iron hoops:

When I myself was trading pieces of iron for seashells, the Captain came up to me and said that iron was necessary for the ship’s needs, and told me to barter knives instead. I started bartering knives but could not obtain anything in exchange for them, and however much I pleaded that it was not for me but for the Imperial cabinet [Kunstkamera], my pleas not only went unheard, but [the curios] were snatched from the hands of those who had my orders concerning bartering.

The controversy over the iron hoops continued into the next day, when Shemelin decided to go ashore, away from the competition on the ship. A thrifty supercargo, he intended to use ‘knives, scissors and drills’ to barter for more valuable artefacts. Iron hoops, he believed, would do for shells and other ‘trifles’. He asked Krusenstern’s permission to take ten pieces of iron hoops with him and was met with refusal. It is
interesting to listen to arguments of both sides in the following discussion. According to Shemelin, Krusenstern argued that,

He would not allow anyone to use iron in bartering for useless trinkets, insisting that it was needed in trading for provisions for the ship’s crew, whose health and well-being he held above everything else. ‘You,’ he said to me, ‘have knives, axes, and other items, which you can use for anything you desire.’ I replied that of the things he had listed axes cost 70 kopeks, while knives cost more than a ruble, and that a piece of iron was worth no more than a single coin [kopek], so would it not be wiser to use the iron for the purchase of island handicraft, and keep the knives and other items to obtain livestock and various provisions?

Krusenstern’s belief in the special value of iron hoops in spite of the sound commercial appraisal by Shemelin is noteworthy. Krusenstern was obviously influenced by the experience of his famous predecessors.

The Islanders, for their part, also took an active position in the question of exchange. The visit of two Russian ships whose crews were eager to take all their valuables – foodstuffs, artefacts, natural curiosities, female charms, male labour, tattoos, etc. – represented their greatest opportunity, until this time, to engage in commerce with Europeans. Shemelin wrote:

The stay of our ships in Taio-goe Bay became a general and merry celebration for the islanders. They abandoned their usual occupations and turned to trade. Iron or European ironware they praised most of all. Each of them tried to sell their crafts, which take up much time and effort in production, in order to receive some iron for them; those who had nothing for barter were engaged in work for us on the shore, helping the sailors in filling barrels with water and delivering firewood, which the sailors chopped in their woods, to the longboat.

By the eighth day of the Russian visit the special place that iron hoops occupied in the newly-established system of Nuku Hivan values had become obvious. That day, the ‘royal ladies’ – Kiatonui’s wife, her daughter and daughter-in-law – were invited to visit Lisiansky’s ship Neva. While Lisiansky simply mentioned in his published account that they received ‘presents of knives, scissors, and looking-glasses’ his supercargo Korobitsyn, who looked after the gifts, closely observed the royal reactions:

For propriety’s sake we loaded the ladies with gifts such as scissors, small mirrors, and beads. They accepted all these things without much ado and without any expression of thanks. Their whole interest was centered on receiving four-inch pieces of hoop-iron and knives. We were not remiss in gratifying their desires and gave them each an additional piece of iron and a
small knife. These last gifts of ours so excited our guest’s admiration that they
were even ready to execute a dance on our quarter-deck and volunteered,
through an interpreter, to grant us audiences.65

This is supported by Löwenstern’s remark in his private journal about Kiatonui’s
daughter-in-law who, the Russians believed, was respected as ‘The Goddess of the Bay’:
‘This saint Dulcinea has, nevertheless, for a piece of iron brought her allurements to
market on the Neva.’64

Krusenstern remarked that ‘the smallest piece of iron that they received from us,
they instantly fastened to a handle, after sharpening the edge of it’, and stressed that
the Nuku Hivans’ ‘eagerness after iron [was] so very great’.65 Rezanov learnt that a war
with the people of Comptrollers Bay was expected in a month, and ‘to this end the
islanders eagerly bartered for iron, to sharpen it into spearheads to kill their enemies’.66

Moreover, since the iron hoops were adaptable as blades for the Islanders’ traditional
tools, they were likely to provoke more demand than completely novel implements
such as clasp knives.

Thomas, however, argues that in general the demand for iron on the Marquesas
was rather limited:

Marquesans were not ‘crazy to get’ axes or knives. They did not engage in
much swidden agriculture, and their demand was perhaps limited to relatively
few tools which would have been used in canoe building, house construction,
and wood carving.67

Indeed, Joseph Ingraham, an American trader, visiting the nearby island of Tahuata
in 1791, noted that ‘Bits of iron hoops, so much valued at the Sandwich Islands, they
would not take in exchange for anything’.68 Remarking to Krusenstern about the day of
free trade with the Nuku Hivans, Shemelin noted,

yesterday the savages did not want to take those very same pieces of iron even
for coconuts. Instead they scraped or patted their chins and heads, repeating
the word togi and showing by this that they needed not iron but knives and
razors.69

It is likely, however, that iron hoops held a far more stable position in Nuku Hivan
society, though one which was at odds with Shemelin’s notions of money and value.
The first to offer iron wares to Nuku Hivans was Josiah Roberts, an American sealer,
who touched down briefly on the island in 1792; he bartered with both nails and
iron hoops.70 Iron hoops were offered along with nails and other European wares by
Fanning in 1798, who did not notice any exceptional significance attributed to them by
the Nuku Hivans.71 In the following years there was a steady flow of iron implements
as a result of several more visits by sealers and whalers, and Krusenstern noticed that
by the time of his visit in 1804 iron tools were already quite common: ‘The latter [stone
axe] they never use but in the total absence of all European tools’.72 It is nevertheless
likely that iron hoops, which broke and wore out, might have been much needed in the
households of low-ranking Islanders. The royal family, however, had little need for iron hoops as tools, since by that time they had received numerous axes, chisels and knives from the Russians and from previous visitors. For the royal women, then, iron hoops were less a practical necessity than an expression of their association with Europeans, and perhaps things that they used to trade on with other Islanders, who as yet lacked iron, as those in settlements more distant from the sites of contact with Europeans inevitably would, for a time.

The day before, Löwenstern, after staying on shore and observing the barter, recorded:

The concept of trade is just beginning to form here. … They demand a toki (piece of old iron) for a red bean just as for a club and often prefer this piece of iron instead of a well-scoured knife.\textsuperscript{73}

This was not strictly correct: barter and reciprocal gifting had long proceeded, between the Islanders of the north and south of the archipelago, but the writer was no doubt correct in seeing an evolution in local approaches to commerce with Europeans. Korobitsyn noted, in connection with the Islanders’ assistance in delivering barrels of fresh water, ‘They would not take anything for all their great efforts, except some 4-inch bars of hoop-iron. Everything else, even the finest objects, did not seem to them to be any recompense for their toil at all.’\textsuperscript{74} While we may be witnessing the birth of the notion of iron hoops as money, the apparent lack of systematic equivalence between them and local wares in the minds of the Islanders suggests a more complex association.

Above and beyond their trade value, iron hoops may have acquired some features of prestige goods or even sacred goods. If others had already obtained an iron hoop, it is better to demand one whether you need it or not. Thirteen years earlier, when Ingraham visited Tahuata, he noted that ‘Rope, yarn, bits of wood, bread, meat, or anything whatever procured from the vessel was preserved [by the Islanders] with great care.’\textsuperscript{75} It is probable that a similar attitude was forming towards iron hoops. We may recall Krusenstern’s evidence that, on acquiring an iron hoop, the Islanders ‘evinced their satisfaction by a loud laugh, displaying their newly acquired riches with an air of triumph,’\textsuperscript{76} which is confirmed by Espenberg:

When any of them had obtained, as the price of their wares, a small piece of iron, or an old nail, they burst out into an immoderate fit of laughter; the reason of which, as [it] appeared, was, that they thought we had been most egregiously cheated.\textsuperscript{77}

Iron barrel hoops were brought by the visiting ships that came from another world, and were used for barter only with the authority of the captains – the Nuku Hivans might have noticed that Krusenstern prohibited their use in barter for artefacts on the day of free trade.
Krusenstern’s attempts to regulate the dispensing of iron hoops might have further contributed to their increasing value, in a Marquesan rather than a European sense. Marquesans, encountering an array of novel objects, tried to make a commercial appraisal of their relative value and were sensitive to the visitors’ attitudes to their wares. For instance Johann Forster noted of the visit to Vaitahu bay, Tahuata, in 1774 that ‘In the beginning they valued small nails much, but seeing we had enough of that commodity, they gradually wanted larger ones, till at last the largest Spikes were no temptation for them.’ Charles Fleurieu wrote about the similar experiences of fluctuating preferences experienced by the French, also at Tahuata in 1791:

Nails at first excited their wishes; they would have nothing but nails in exchange: and it was not because they were acquainted with their utility and employment, for the only use that they made of them, was to wear them as ear-pendants...; to nails succeeded looking-glasses; to these whistles; to the last, small knives.

Krusenstern’s attempt to regulate barter might have had an unexpected impact on both the value of iron hoops and the supply of native hogs, and the reason for the voyagers’ failure to obtain hogs in quantity went beyond rational commercial ones such as scarcity of livestock. In Nuku Hiva, as in many South Pacific islands, pigs were also prestige goods, not to be traded simply as pork. When a pig changed hands or was killed by its owner this was part of a special social or spiritual event such as the rituals of birth, marriage or death, or payment to a tahuna for tattooing or to a tau’a for a cure. When the Russians refused to accept anything but pigs for hatchets, this may have triggered unexpected associations in the minds of the Nuku Hivans, who might have wondered if it was safe to exchange this special object, even for a much-coveted hatchet. It is no accident that the Russians observed a number of cases when the owner of a pig brought one to the ship, and, after some hesitation, decided not to sell it. In the few cases when the Russians did succeed in obtaining a pig it was in exchange for similarly prestigious goods – red feathers:

During our whole stay there we were able to obtain five pigs, in exchange for two large Brazilian ducks, which seemed an attractive transaction to them since they entertained the hope that the ducks would hatch ducklings with red feathers. They were led to this belief by their having seen a parrot on our ship.

Tahuata’s ‘chief’ similarly offered his large hog for the ship’s cat during Marchand’s visit in 1791, and a large quantity of red feathers offered by one of the gentlemen in Cook’s expedition in Tahuata had ruined the barter established there.

The Russians, like other Europeans of the time, were ill-prepared to grasp the full complexity of exchange in traditional Polynesian society. Unluckily for them, their Eurocentrism came close to wrecking an expedition which had had such promising beginnings.
While the role of Krusenstern was important in orchestrating the exchange (though not always with the desired effect), the role of his Nuku Hivan counterpart haka’iki Kiatonui was equally significant. He established especially cordial relations with Lisiansky and often visited his ship. Lisiansky praised Kiatonui’s scrupulous honesty, telling how, while he refused to accept Kiatonui’s pigs in exchange for two sheep the Russians had aboard, he offered him

as a present … some axes, knives, and other articles; … he would only take a striped cap, observing, as he refused the rest, that such precious things could not be accepted, till he had something to give me in return. He immediately sent on shore his canoe, which soon returned with fifty cocoa-nuts, for which, in addition to what I had before given, I made a present to the uncle of an axe and three knives.

The Russians obviously enjoyed this spirit of mutual generosity. On another occasion that day, Lisiansky, being unable to part with his green parrot, for which Kiatonui offered him ‘two large pigs’, ‘to keep his majesty in good humor, … gave him a quantity of sugar, of which I knew he was extremely fond.’

The voyagers’ wish to please Kiatonui by offering him gifts, while expecting him and his ‘subjects’ to supply pigs in quantity, put him in a difficult situation. We may remember how on the day of the Nadezhda’s arrival Krusenstern gave his red parrot to Kiatonui as a gift and asked Robarts to make clear to Kiatonui that it was indeed a gift. Kiatonui nevertheless reciprocated with a hog. The Russians, not fully appreciating the difference between gift-giving and trade in Polynesian society, began to confuse these practices. Kiatonui, wise politician though he was, could not be expected to realize that the Russians’ gifts implied a certain pressure. Thomas, in his study of South Pacific exchange, remarked that ‘Keatonui was no doubt bothered by the pressure to supply pigs and did not want to become indebted.’

Similarly Kiatonui was reluctant to ‘receive anything in return’ when he brought abundant gifts from his family during Fanning’s visit in 1798. This reluctance to enter into relations which he could not maintain was probably the reason why, to the visitors’ surprise, ‘Ketenue gave his name to Captain Krusenstern, but assumed none in return.’ Espenberg in his account of this event suggests that Cook was wrong to assume that name exchanges were always reciprocal and served to taboo both parties against mutual threats.

Contact with the visitors sometimes led to such situations that only Kiatonui’s cunning could avert a crisis. Lisiansky wrote about one of Kiatonui’s visits to the Neva:

During this visit, a circumstance took place of a seriocomic nature. One of my midshipmen [Berkh], in examining the oar of a canoe that I had purchased, happened to let it fall, and it struck against the head of the king, who was sitting on the deck. His majesty immediately fell down, and began to make the most extraordinary wry faces, as if in great pain. The accident mortified me so much, that I reprimanded the young man a little severely for his carelessness. He was himself considerably alarmed; and, in apologizing, presented the king with a small piece of iron. This changed the scene; his majesty burst into a
loud laugh, and expressed by signs, how cleverly he had deceived us, and that he was not in the least hurt. This scene over, the king went on shore in high spirits, and I was myself not a little pleased that the accident terminated as it did.88

Lisiansky, though alarmed, probably did not fully realize how grave the incident might have been. The head, let alone the head of such an important man as Kiatonui, was tapu which no one could touch.89 In this light Kiatonui’s reaction shows a wise and resourceful man. By turning the incident into a practical joke of his own he avoided conflict without compromising his authority in the eyes of his people.

Nuku Hivan perspectives
Nuku Hivans had long engaged in periodic barter with communities in the southern part of the archipelago. The latter made and traded carved wooden artefacts – some of which collectors went on to acquire – though it is unclear whether comparatively few, possibly higher-status objects in the north were obtained from the south, or whether the bulk of wooden artefacts were produced in the southern islands and distributed around the archipelago.90 The first of these two potential scenarios is the most likely: although the relative stylistic homogeneity of north and south suggests interaction and a coherent context of creation, the same timbers were available throughout the archipelago and there is no obvious reason why Nuku Hivans should not have among them expert carvers who created work for their own communities.

Such dealings are likely to have embedded in long-term relationships, like Tahitian taio entailing name-exchange. So, the idea of treating artefacts as commodities that could be sold to strangers was novel. Traditionally, and like many other Islanders, Marquesans typically met sea voyagers with fruit and other fresh produce. They also offered emblems of peace, such as kava plants and white cloth. This practice continued at the time of Russian visit. When artefacts were exchanged during the earliest European visits, it was through apparently spontaneous transactions rather than more systematic trade. For instance, when the Tahuata ‘chief’ (see Figure 1.9) visited Cook in 1774 he took off and gave to Cook ‘some of his ornaments’ as thanks for his ‘present of Nails and Several other Articles’, while William Wales, astronomer on the same expedition, offered a sheet of paper to an Islander (likely to have been perceived as a special form of fine tapa), and in return received his club.91 A Nuku Hivan spotting a fish hook in the possession of a young sailor aboard Fanning’s ship in 1798 offered him to swap it for his ‘curiously fashioned fish hook’; they struck a deal in spite of Fanning’s prohibition upon individual barter, and when the ‘breach of regulations’ was discovered the sailor was punished by Fanning.92 Cook’s expedition was the first, however, to experience artefact frenzy in the Marquesas. It might have started in Cook’s absence by the gentlemen of the expedition who were offering ‘china-cups, saucers, glasses and other things’ as well as red feathers from Tongatapu for barter. Georg Forster wrote about this incident that ‘The red feathers of Tonga-Tabboo or Amsterdam Island, were likewise in great repute here, and the natives gave many head-dresses, and other ornaments, in exchange for them’.93 It is noteworthy that although some curiosities had previously been obtained in exchange for nails,94 the market for
exquisite Marquesan artefacts such as headdresses was opened by the gentlemen’s offer of exquisite items, of both European and South Pacific origin. Although Marquesan artefacts were obtained during the visits of Marchand and Fanning, their accounts fail to detail the circumstances of these transactions.\footnote{95}

When the Russian expedition arrived in 1804, Nuku Hivans were obviously aware of the potential market for their artefacts. Loewenstern’s drawing of Kiatonui’s approach to the Nadezhda with a kava plant includes numerous men swimming in the water around the ship, some of them holding long sticks with bundles attached to their ends.
Langsdorff later noted that, delivering ‘various articles for trade’ to the Russian ships, the Islanders tied them ‘to a long pole which they carried above the water to keep them from getting wet’. While there is no reference to the artefacts offered by the Islanders on the first day in the Russian accounts, Shemelin’s private journal chronicles their abundant influx on the second, when Krusenstern’s ban on artefact barter was still in force:

Today the natives, besides their usual foodstuffs, sold a variety of their handicrafts, crafted of wood or woven skilfully from tree roots; rare seashells of various types; human skulls with jawbones, whole and undamaged, the eye sockets adorned with carved pearl shell; various headdresses; necklaces; weapons used by them in war, such as: pikes, spears, clubs, all artfully crafted from hard red-brown or black wood; cloths, which comprise the majority of the women’s clothing here, beaten from tree bark, of yellow or white colour, of different thickness, length, width and quality.

Figure 1.8. Wilhelm Tilesius von Tilenau, ‘Skizzenbuch des Hofrath Dr Tilesius v. Tilenau Naturforschers der Krusensternischen Reise um die Welt in den Jahren 1803-1806’. Russian State Library, Manuscript Department (Moscow, Russia), fond 178, M 10693b, f. 85.
It is quite possible that Robarts kept the Nuku Hivans informed about visitors’ demands in respect of trading goods and on the day free trade was permitted, the Islanders delivered artefacts in abundance. Nevertheless, the demand was so high that the Europeans remained unsatisfied throughout the entire visit. Years later, Tilesius, for instance, would complain in his writings that items he aspired to acquire for science were intercepted by his competitors aboard the ship. The visitors’ enthusiasm, reinforced by the demands of the savants and gentlemen aboard the ships, Shemelin’s attempts to buy a full set of artefacts in triple numbers for different Russian institutions
and sponsors, and Krusenstern's reluctance to support the quite reasonable commercial ideas of Shemelin, who was a supporter of Rezanov, but Krusenstern's bitter enemy — all these had not remained unnoticed by the Nuku Hivans. They responded with a rapid reassessment of the assortment of goods they accepted as remuneration on the one hand, and with practical jokes on the other.

Shemelin's private diary describes a notable Nuku Hivan response to the Russian eagerness to acquire artefacts:

One joker played a magnificent trick on us, and one especially rude to boot. He had nothing in his hands, but having swum up to the ship and grabbed a dangling rope with one hand, he bulged out his belly and, holding his penis, proceeded to offer it for sale to Krusenstern, who happened to be standing there. There was no escape. Krusenstern laughed and walked away.98

But this joke was only the beginning; the events of the following days annoyed Shemelin more and more. He wrote in his account:

The islanders noticed that for mere trinkets — of no value or use to any of them — we would trade objects very helpful for them and by their reasoning quite expensive, so they all left their coconuts and rushed off to find for us rarities of nature. Not bothering to inquire about our taste in the matter, they boldly concluded that any old rubbish would be fitting for us, and without any discrimination dragged up for barter whatever they could find, whether in the water, on the shore or in the forest. It is laughable what rarities the islanders would grace us with in those days. One, having tied a few live mice to a stick, tried to sell them for a good price; another ripped up a bag of worthless grass and tried to haggle for something made of iron; a third brought us some broken and ruined seashells or a rock lying on the shore. For all these products of their island they demanded exclusively razors and knives, not even bothering to look at small pieces of iron, which they previously favoured.99

Shemelin referred to the similar experience of Cook at 'Amsterdam Island', i.e. Tonga. Thomas comments that there 'The indiscriminate enthusiasm appeared ridiculous to the Tongans who parodied the mariners'.100 At Nuku Hiva the Russians experienced full interaction with a constantly fluctuating 'market' which responded to their enthusiasm in unexpected ways.

**Crisis**

On the eighth day of the Russian visit, while Lisiansky was remunerating his royal female visitors on the Neva with iron hoops, events aboard the Nadezhda were taking a dramatic turn. The last straw was Shemelin's success in securing first-rate artefacts, breaking Krusenstern's ban on using iron hoops and axes for such barter. For one trading operation he ventured on shore where he managed to acquire 'several pieces of weaponry, a couple of paddles, and a human skull decorated in places with pearl
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shell’, several pieces of cloth and ‘decorations which were worn on the head or neck’.101 The next day, when all his ‘competitors’ went on a shore excursion, visiting Kiatonui’s abode and marae, he wrote that he was

left free to barter with the savages; first I bought a large conch, which is used by the islanders as a war trumpet and produces a loud and strange sound resembling the roar of wild animals. It is decorated with human hair, as is all their weaponry; and second, a human skull and a few weapons; for these I bartered three small hatchets and a few clasp-knives. I was very pleased with my acquisition and hoped that my superior [Rezanov] would also be happy with it.

His joy was short-lived. Soon after Krusenstern and the others returned from the shore excursion ‘deeply exhausted from the heat and a long walk’, Shemelin was informed of Krusenstern’s demand to submit all axes which remained in his hands. Shemelin, perfectly aware that ‘these arrows were aimed straight into his [Rezanov’s] heart’, complained to the latter.102 The conflict was about to erupt.

The problem was not the barter for curios itself, as Krusenstern had lifted his ban on this several days previously, but the use of axes and iron hoops for barter. Löwenstern states this clearly in his diary:

Mr. von Krusenstern had ordered and repeated several times that only foodstuffs should be bought for old iron and axes. Schemelin, ignoring this, bought (even though we have few axes) several things for axes, as he says, for Resanoff. Everyone has permission to buy whatever he wants for knives, scissors, mirrors, buttons, etc.103

Thus Löwenstern ranks iron hoops along with axes as prime commodities, while knives and scissors are classed as second-rate goods. Rezanov in his complaint to Koshelev mentioned that Krusenstern had ordered him to use knives rather than iron hoops for barter, but Rezanov and Shemelin considered that they had the right to use property belonging to the RAC, especially as they did so in the name of science. They were acquiring artefacts for the Imperial Kunstkamera, and Rezanov had full authority over RAC property, besides being in overall charge of the expedition itself. While this latter authority plainly conflicted with Krusenstern’s, Rezanov’s authority in the area of trade was beyond dispute, as Krusenstern knew from the onset of the expedition. Yet Rezanov and Shemelin refrained from using axes for barter until that last day. The arguments of the opposite side are expressed by Ratmanov, who claimed that Shemelin ‘began to sell axes to the savages for trinkets, thereby completely stopping the acquisition of pigs’.104 This was not really correct: Shemelin bartered not for trinkets but for artefacts, which he considered of the highest quality, intended to become the pride of the Kunstkamera’s collection. And the unwillingness of the Nuku Hivans to barter their sacred commodity – pigs – was not Shemelin’s fault, as discussed above. Rather it was the perhaps inevitable consequence of the partial understandings, confusions and outright misunderstandings typical of cross-cultural encounters.
Krusenstern’s Eurocentrism, paradoxically, led him to breach the RAC instruction without his realizing it. The supplement to clause 16 of that instruction, issued to Krusenstern after Rezanov was included in the expedition, stated incontrovertibly that ‘all trading operations’ were to be in the charge of Rezanov.105 It is unlikely that Krusenstern would have questioned Rezanov’s powers in this field at Kamchatka or Japan, but in his view, clearly, barter with Nuku Hivans was not a ‘trading operation’. He had approached the island in the belief that he could take on water and fresh provisions ‘even without the natives’ goodwill’, but for humanitarian reasons he preferred not to do so.106 He firmly believed that the victualling of the expedition was his prerogative and his alone. But what followed was unquestionably trade, and very enthusiastic trade on both sides, while all attempts by Rezanov to discharge his obligations – to buy artefacts for the RAC and the Kunstkamera – were hampered by Krusenstern. It was Krusenstern’s failure to make reasonable adjustments to his ban on exchanging axes and iron hoops for anything but pigs that aggravated the situation to the limit.

As he approached Nuku Hiva, Krusenstern expected that the Islanders would be greedy ‘to acquire objects of ours’, but in fact the principal difficulty for the visitors was not the Islanders’ greed but their own. Shemelin had remarked a few days earlier: ‘Many items were acquired today, and just as many good iron items were given to the inhabitants. With the assistance of the Englishman Roberts the best things filled Krusenstern’s cabinet.’ If Krusenstern wanted to bring a collection to the Emperor and the Kunstkamera he would obviously prefer to do so in person, rather than as Rezanov’s assistant. The situation on the Neva was similar. Korobitsyn, the RAC supercargo, recorded in his notes that Lisiansky had given orders that only he had the right to barter for artefacts. For this purpose he used iron hoops, knives and axes belonging to the RAC, but, according to Korobitsyn, ‘almost all of the best items were appropriated by Captain Lisyansky himself’ ‘in his greediness’.107 Rezanov in his letter to the Emperor also spoke of greed: ‘I began to collect rarities for the Academy, but they gave me no opportunity and greedily filled their own cabinets’.108 We can only agree with Rezanov’s later conclusion that the cause of their discord was ‘the ambition for fame and fame alone’.109 He himself was no exception.

On that eighth day, Rezanov, as a result of a direct confrontation with Krusenstern, finally revealed his instruction signed by the Emperor, but the animosity towards him by that time was so great that Lisiansky literally mocked it: ‘We want to know who wrote it, and as for the signature, we ourselves know well that he [the Emperor] will sign anything.’ Finally all the officers but one publicly declared that they would not have sailed with Rezanov as commander of the expedition and that Krusenstern was their real leader.110 A conflict which had begun as a simple dispute over the Nuku Hivan warriors’ clubs and skull-trophies got out of control and turned into an open rejection of the authority of the Emperor’s representative on board and of the Emperor himself.

On the day of departure, as the Russian ships were warping towards the entrance of the bay, and Kiatonui ‘with his retinue’ came to the Neva for a farewell visit, one of the cables gave way.
Immediately the king sent his canoe on shore for a diver, to assist us in recovering it. This was by no means necessary, as we could easily have found it with our grappers; but the king’s intentions were so friendly, that I did not oppose them; and, in recompence, I gave both him and the diver some pieces of iron, which pleased his majesty so much that he left the ship in high glee.\(^{111}\)

The piece of iron, on top of numerous axes, hatchets and knives that Kiatonui had already received, and which so delighted him concludes the story of the mysterious power of the iron barrel hoops.
Figure 1.11. Aleksandr Orlowski after Wilhelm Tilesius, ['A View of the Island of Nukahiva'], ink and wash, in Robert B. Honeyman, Jr. Collection of Early Californian and Western American Pictorial Material. Kruzenshtern/Rezanov/Langsdorff expeditions, 1803-1810. Bancroft Library, University of California (Berkeley, USA), 1963.002:1004.
CHAPTER 2

From Nuku Hiva to Europe: the collections’ histories

ELENA GOVOR

The Russian ships laden with Marquesan artefacts left Nuku Hiva on 18 May 1804 and, after visiting Hawai‘i, Kamchatka, Japan and China (the Neva also spent time in Alaska, then Russian America), returned to Kronshtadt in July – August 1806. The expedition was financed by the Russian government and the Russian-American Company (RAC), and its members were expected to produce collective results for these sponsors. Rezanov, in the expedition’s onset, declared that all journals of its participants were to be submitted to him at the end of the voyage; he expected naturalists to give him a duplicate of every specimen they discovered, similarly he kept under lock and key all stuffed birds and animals prepared by the expedition’s hunter-taxidermist, Petr Filippov. As we saw in Chapter 1, the ambiguity of the issue of the expedition’s leadership intensified because of the rivalry over artefact acquisition on Nuku Hiva and resulted in the downfall of Rezanov as the formal leader of the expedition. After the visit to Japan, he left the ship and went to the Russian colonies in the American far north. While returning overland across Siberia two years later, he fell ill and died. Ironically, all the zeal he put into collecting Marquesan artefacts for the Kunstkamera and the RAC seems to have been in vain, as his collections, at least as a whole, appear not to have reached Russian museums.

As state oversight of the expedition was eased with Rezanov’s departure, Krusenstern’s venture, in comparison with subsequent Russian expeditions in the Pacific, became one of the most liberal in respect of intellectual property and collecting; each participant of the expedition preserved his own collection and disposed with it according to his circumstances. Thus, Nuku Hivan artefacts were kept or disposed of by individual voyage participants, and in due course ended up dispersed across in many Russian and Western European museums, institutions and private collections. As mentioned above, only around 150 of the estimated hundreds have survived to the present day. Moreover, not all artefacts collected by the expedition members in the South Pacific even reached Europe, a case noted by Lisiansky during his visit to Hawai‘i:
In the mean time the general trade had been carried on so briskly, that by noon, not only officers, but the men, were possessed of a variety of articles, many of which, though pleased with them for the moment, they afterwards threw away as useless and cumbersome.

We can only guess about the ‘cumbersome’ treasures that were thrown away, both on the island and later in the voyage...

**Russia**

*The Admiralty Museum, St Petersburg*

Although, at the time of Krusenstern’s return, St Petersburg’s ethnographic museum, known generally as the Kunstkamera, had been established for just over a century – and this institution was the intended destination of Rezanov’s Nuku Hivan collection – most of what had been collected went initially to a different St Petersburg...
The State Admiralty Department Museum was for some years a rival of the Kunstkamera in respect of artefacts brought by voyagers. It traces its history back to the time of Peter the Great when, in 1709, the Russian Admiralty Department established a Model-kamera, which evolved into a cultural centre for the Russian fleet, housing an archive of technical documentation, nautical and physical equipment, models of different vessels and a library. In 1805 the Russian Emperor Alexander I approved the expansion of its remit: it would henceforth include a ‘curiosity cabinet’, and it was renamed the State Admiralty Department Museum, but more commonly known as the Maritime Museum. As mentioned above, Krusenstern learned about this new institution while in Kamchatka from the Naval Minister Chichagov and enthusiastically promised to donate artefacts to its collections. His expedition was the first to establish a new tradition of donating artefacts and natural curiosities brought from the Pacific voyages to the Admiralty Museum in particular; three participants of Krusenstern’s expedition – Krusenstern himself, Lisiansky, and Povalishin – presented collections to this museum soon after their return.

The first of these donations was made in November 1806, by Captain-Lieutenant Povalishin who travelled with Lisiansky on the Neva. Its inventory included 13 entries and 48 objects. The inventories, made at the time these collections were gifted, are now the main source for the reconstruction of the Nuku Hiva artefact collections. They usually included brief descriptions of the items or at least their type, sometimes identifying them according to their place of origin, material, use, native name, but often, less informatively, grouping notionally similar items without separate or more specific identification. Povalishin's inventory is unfortunately notable for such grouped entries, and for an absence of references to the items' places of origin:

- Fans of different type of savage peoples, three altogether
- Different handicrafts woven from straw and bark: bags, baskets etc. six altogether
- Tools [or weapon] of savage peoples of different sorts, ten altogether

Nevertheless, it is quite possible that these groups included Nuku Hivan artefacts. At the same time, a set of items described as ‘Different bark cloth of mostly dun and white colour – ten pieces’ leaves no doubt that at least some of these pieces of tapa were from Nuku Hiva Island, because the only other place visited by Povalishin where tapa was produced was Hawai‘i, but Hawaiian tapa is distinguished by patterned designs. On the other hand, a few entries in Povalishin's inventory listed items of Far Eastern and North American origin, as seen from their brief descriptions (e.g. ‘Dress sewed from [fish] swim bladder, named kamleika’).

Lisiansky, upon his arrival, divided his collection into three parts – one went to the Kunstkamera, another to Count Rumiantsev, and the third to the Admiralty Museum. His donation to the latter was made just a few days after Povalishin's. It had 15 entries and 44 objects. In comparison with Povalishin's collection, his was more varied. It included similarly ambiguous entries ('Different handicrafts of savage peoples woven from straw and bark' (four items)) and eight pieces of tapa as well as several items...
described quite thoroughly, the Nuku Hivan or Hawaiian origin of which is quite probable. They were:

- Thin rope made from bark, one
- Elongated stone, one side of which is filed, sort of chisel, one
- Two fish hooks made of pearl shell

Only one entry in his list had a direct reference to Nuku Hivan origin: 'Earrings, which are worn by men from Nukagiva, two.'

Krusenstern donated his collection to the Admiralty Museum in 1809. It included 15 entries, 23 objects and represented only a fraction of the collections he had brought back to Russia. It consisted mostly of items from Kamchatka and Asia, though in at least in one case the Nuku Hivan origin of the item was noted in the inventory. The entry read as 'Teeth, decoration of inhabitants of Nukagiva Island.' This was undoubtedly a boar tusk necklace. His collection also included a fan and a stone axe, which most likely were from Nuku Hiva, because, unlike Lisiansky, Krusenstern did not acquire artefacts while cruising near Hawai‘i and did not visit North America.

The curiosity cabinet of the Admiralty Museum grew rapidly during the first decades of the nineteenth century as further Russian voyages brought new collections. Fabian Bellingshausen's expedition, which visited the Pacific in 1820, brought home a collection numbering over 500 items. The museum also housed several other Pacific collections from donors associated with the Russian navy who had not personally participate in voyages to the Pacific. The largest among them was the collection of Captain Stepan Scott, which was donated to the Admiralty Museum in 1808. It included a number of Polynesian artefacts, particularly from New Zealand. It is possible that Scott obtained these artefacts at an auction in London.

During Napoleon's invasion of Russia in 1812, the collections were packed up and evacuated to Ladoga, east of St Petersburg. This was the first transfer that the Nuku Hivan artefacts had to endure. Although the collections were returned to St Petersburg, many items remained stored in trunks; in ensuing years the museum made little use of its remarkable accumulation of 'artificial curiosities.' An attempt to reinvigorate the museum was made in 1825, following the death of its first head and curator Alexander Glotov. The position was offered to Nikolai Bestuzhev, a naval officer and maritime writer. Once appointed, he had an inventory of artefacts prepared, now a key source for untangling the origins and movements of the ethnographical collections of the museum. Upon taking the position, Bestuzhev drafted a plan for the museum's restructuring; he proposed drawing on both ethnographic and natural history collections to prepare ambitious exhibitions dedicated to the various geographic regions explored by the Russian voyagers. This, Russian museum specialists have argued, was a significant innovation in Russian museum practices which took displays beyond the unsystematic 'cabinet of curiosities' stage and justified their accumulation in the Admiralty Museum.

Unfortunately, political events interfered. Bestuzhev was a member of a secret society aiming to replace Russian autocracy with a constitutional monarchy. After the death of the Emperor Alexander I in December 1825, the revolutionaries declared
themselves. From now on they were known as Decembrists. The uprising was severely repressed by the new Emperor Nicholas I: five of the rebels were executed and many others were sentenced to hard labour in Siberia. Bestuzhev, one of the active members of the movement, was sentenced to hard labour in Siberia for the term of his natural life. In his place, Dmitry Zavalishin, another educated naval officer and a participant of the Russian expedition that visited the South Pacific in 1823, was briefly appointed. In his memoirs he wrote that he ‘made foundations for establishing an ethnographical museum,’ which was opened to the public and became one of St Petersburg’s early tourist attractions.10 Alas, Zavalishin remained on this post for only three months, as the enquiry into the Decembrist uprising also uncovered his connection with the rebels, and he was likewise sentenced to hard labour in Siberia.

These political events had a direct impact on the Nuku Hivan collections. The museum, two directors of which were accused of high treason, fell under the suspicion of the new Emperor. In 1827 Nicholas I wrote to the head of the Naval Department that the Museum ‘stored things which have nothing to do with naval arts’ and ordered that, among other items, ‘weapons, dress and crafts of the inhabitants of the Eastern [i.e. Pacific] Ocean’ were to be transferred to the Department of Education and to the Naval Cadet Corps.11 This marked the beginning of the dispersal of the Admiralty Museum’s collections. Some of the artefacts and natural history collections were transferred to the Academy of Sciences (over 6,000 exhibits), of which 1855 artefacts were deposited in the Kunstkamera in 1828. Other objects were sent to the Naval Cadet Corps in St Petersburg and some to the Map Depot in Nikolaev on the Black Sea. These transfers were accompanied by inventories in which artefacts were grouped according to their place of origin rather than the collector. The inventories of these transfers are now located in the Russian Naval Archives in St Petersburg. According to these records, Povalishin’s and Lisiansky’s collections were split between the Academy, Cadet Corps and Nikolaev, while Krusenstern’s collection went to the Academy and from there to the Kunstkamera.12

The Kunstkamera, St Petersburg

The Kunstkamera had been established by Peter the Great in St Petersburg in 1714. The first public museum in Russia, it was inaugurated, like its counterparts in Europe, with naturalia, having a special interest in lusus naturae, monstra and curiosities and included important collections purchased from Leiden. Throughout the eighteenth century it was stocked with Chinese, Tatar and Siberian ‘rarities.’13 The first South Pacific artefacts to reach the Kunstkamera originated from Cook’s third expedition, the participants of which presented a selection of Indigenous artefacts to Russian officials in Kamchatka where the expedition anchored after Cook’s death in Hawai‘i in 1779. Over the course of the eighteenth century the museum’s collection of artificialia became increasingly important. Artefacts from the disbanded Admiralty Museum arrived at a time of change within the Kunstkamera itself: in the 1830s its collections were divided between newly established museums, including the Ethnographical and Anatomical Museums. In 1878, the original Kunstkamera became the basis for the newly established Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography. Currently this institution has the official name of Peter the Great Museum of Anthropology and
Ethnography (abbreviated as MAE), but being the heir of the original Kunstkamera it is also referred to as the Kunstkamera; it has long been the major centre of Oceanic anthropology studies in Russia.

The ethnographic collections brought by Russian expeditions in the Pacific are the crowning jewel of this museum, but their identification raises a number of complexities. The artefacts transferred to the Kunstkamera from the Admiralty Museum in 1828 were accompanied by a 'List of rarities' organized by territorial subdivisions, and some early labels, but, by the 1870s, when custodians of the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography turned to these collections, the connections between surviving documentation and objects had become tenuous. Most of the South Pacific artefacts from the Admiralty Museum were grouped together as fond (collection) 736. Unlike later MAE collections, this fond does not list individual donors, referring to the origin of the artefacts as 'From the old collections'. Although most of the artefacts in this fond were collected during one or other of the Russian voyages to the Pacific, some of the items, as mentioned above, are from individual collectors, e.g. Captain Scott or Lev Waxell. Fond 736 has over 330 artefacts, most of which are attributed to particular localities in the Pacific; they include 44 items from New Zealand, 27 from Hawai‘i, 23 from Fiji, 17 from the Marquesas, 16 from Australia, 15 from Hervey Islands, etc. Currently MAE scholars are in the process of correlating the original Admiralty Museum inventories with Pacific and American artefacts brought by the Russian expeditions.

Uniting the original inventories and artefact labels created by the curators of the Admiralty Museum with the present-day research of the MAE scholars allows a tentative correlation between the artefacts donated by Povalishin, Lisiansky and Krusenstern to the Admiralty Museum with the present collection; most form part of fond 736 but a number have been allocated to North American fonds, perhaps because some voyages visited both the Pacific Islands and Russian north America. All items identified as Marquesan in the 1825 inventory are presented in Table 2.2 in the same sequence as they were recorded in the 1825 inventory. Some items in the 1825 inventory are easily linked with the initial 1806-1809 listings and with artefacts in MAE's fond 736; for instance entry no. 19 'Ordinary fan from the Marquesas Islands from Captain Krusenstern' corresponds to entry 'A fan' (without specified location) from Krusenstern's 1809 inventory discussed above. Entry 15 'Ordinary fan from the Washington Islands' without reference to the donor might refer to one of three 'Fans of different type of savage peoples' in Povalishin's collection. The fact that in the 1825 inventory its type was specified as 'ordinary' (i.e. a square diamond-shaped fan, as opposed to the finer semi-circular genre) suggests that originally artefacts might have been accompanied by labels with such additional information. It is known, for instance, that Golovnin, donating his artefacts to the Admiralty Museum, wrote the artefacts' 'names and [their] application on labels accompanying them'. MAE's inventory of fond 736, compiled in the early twentieth century, has several old textual labels (e.g. 'Hunting net for carrying birds from the Marquesas Islands') as well as 'No. XX' labels glued to the inventory pages; they were made in the Admiralty Museum not long before the transfer of the collection. Juxtaposing the 1825 inventory with the original inventories of the donations by Povalishin, Lisiansky and Krusenstern in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item description in 1825 inventory</th>
<th>No of items</th>
<th>Notes re origin in 1825 inventory</th>
<th>Correlation with artefacts in MAE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clubs serving as swords during a battle from the Marquesas Islands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>736-175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Weapons of the Marquesas Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>736-174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Club, used in battle by the inhabitants of the Marquesas Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NB from Captain Krusenstern</td>
<td>736-177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Weapon of the savage people of the Marquesas de Mendoza Islands, Nakueva Island</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>736-176 (Tonga)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Weapon of the savage people of the Marquesas de Mendoza Islands, Nukagiva Island</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stone axe from the Marquesas Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NB from Captain Krusenstern</td>
<td>2925-4 (North America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stone axe from the Marquesas de Mendoza Islands, Nukagiva Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NB from Captain Krusenstern</td>
<td>736-178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Oar from Nukagiva Island, one of the Marquesas Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NB from Captain Krusenstern</td>
<td>736-182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Oar from Nukagiva Island, one of the Marquesas Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NB from Captain Krusenstern</td>
<td>4319-1 (North America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Oars from the Marquesas Islands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NB from Captain Krusenstern</td>
<td>736-170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>736-171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mask from the Marquesas de Mendoza Islands, Nukagiva Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NB from Captain Povalishin</td>
<td>633-9 (North America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wooden oblong basin, type of trough (basket – another reading), from the Marquesas Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2539-16 (North America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pearl shell fishing hook from the Washington Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NB from Captain Krusenstern</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fishing hook from the Marquesas Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ordinary fan from the Washington Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Probably 736-179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Earrings made of bone which are worn by men</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>From Captain Krusenstern</td>
<td>736-183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Earring made of bone from the Marquesas de Mendoza Islands, Nukagiva Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>736-184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teeth, decoration of inhabitants of Nukagiva Island which are worn by men on the neck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>In the list of Krusenstern's donation to the Admiralty Museum 1809</td>
<td>736-191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ordinary fan from the Marquesas Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>From Captain Krusenstern</td>
<td>736-180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Decorated cap (hattock) of the inhabitants of the Marquesas Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>From Captain Krusenstern</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Wooden cup from the Washington Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>From Captain Povalishin</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Pau, cloth from bark, a yellow piece from the Marquesas Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pau, a speckled piece of cloth from bark, from the Marquesas Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Wooden armour, bound, from Nukagiva Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2454-7 (North America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Pau, coloured cloth from bark, from the Marquesas Islands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pau, yellow cloth from the Marquesas Islands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pau, white cloth from bark, from the Marquesas Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Pau, white cloth from bark, from the Marquesas Islands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Handicrafts from the Marquesas Islands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2. Correlation of Nuku Hivan items in the Admiralty Museum inventories and MAE holdings.
1806-1809, we see that by 1825 there were more Nuku Hivan artefacts than mentioned in the obscure entries of the original 1806-1809 inventories; most importantly, another collection by Krusenstern had clearly been added to his original donation. Thus while the 1825 inventory lists two stone axes from Krusenstern (nos 6 & 7), Krusenstern’s original inventory of 1809 listed only one.

At the same time it is quite possible that some artefacts were mislabelled at the early stages of their handling in the Admiralty Museums and listed as Marquesan when in fact they did not originate from Nuku Hiva. For instance, item no. 23, ‘Pau, a speckled
piece of the cloth from bark from the Marquesas Islands', was more likely of Hawaiian origin, as Marquesan cloth was notably unpatterned. A mysterious 'Wooden armour, bound, from Nukagiva Island' (no. 24) could not originate from the Marquesas as there are no records of any such battle-dress (which could well have been Tlingit, or from elsewhere in northwest America). Similarly uncharacteristic for the Marquesas is a 'Mask from the Marquesas de Mendoza Islands, Nukagiva Island. From Captain (sic) Povalishin' in the 1825 inventory (no. 11). Studies of Belkov and Korsun correlated these and several other items listed above with North American artefacts stored currently in other collections at the MAE.

Lisiansky's collections, although distributed between several institutions, are easier to detect, as he presented his Marquesan artefacts on plate I of his Atlas. This collection, which he donated directly to the Kunstkamera upon his return from the expedition in December 1806, was accompanied by a list compiled by Lisiansky or with his participation, which identified artefacts better than the Admiralty Museum inventories mentioned above. Marquesan artefacts in this list number 15 entries and at least 20 items (some of the artefacts are listed in plural without reference to quantity). A juxtaposition of the Atlas drawings, of the original Kunstkamera inventory, and the earliest available documentation of the Rumiantsev collection holdings, which will be discussed further on, allow us to trace a number of artefacts in the museums back to the original Lisiansky collection (Table 2.3).

Out of the 15 Marquesan entries in Lisiansky's original inventory of artefacts donated to the Kunstkamera, at least seven (oar, stilts, axe, collar, fan, fishing hooks and reel) can be found in Lisiansky fond 750. It would be tempting to suppose that some of the others are located in fond 736 (spear, parahua club and tokotoko pio'o staff), but, if current reconstructions are correct, this means that they had to be donated to the Admiralty Museum first. A skull from Lisiansky's inventory was transferred to the Academy of Arts, while several other objects (particularly lidded bowl kotue belonging to Kiatonui and shell trumpet putoka) do not appear to be in the Russian museums. On the other hand, Lisiansky's fond 750 has a boar tusk necklace which is not listed in his original inventory. We will continue a reconstruction of Lisiansky's collection in the following section, concerning Rumiantsev's collections.

Besides the two major collections, 736 and 750, which have Marquesan artefacts, the MAE holds further artefacts in other collections which could originate from Krusenstern's expedition. Most of them were identified in Lubov Rozina's pioneering study of Marquesan artefacts in MAE collections and further studied by Irina Fedorova, but some, particularly collections of tapa, need further study. These artefacts were transferred to the MAE in the 1930s, when further restructuring of museums was undertaken by the Soviet authorities. The pieces in question were deposited in the MAE without original documentation, but it is likely that they originate from the previously dispersed collections of the Admiralty Museum, a significant proportion of which had been transferred, as mentioned above, to the Naval Cadet Corps in St Peters burg. Thus in 1930 the Frunze Naval School, the heir of the Cadet Corps, deposited to the MAE a collection of 32 items (fond 4100) which had, for instance, several pieces of white and yellowish unpatterned tapa, which could be the Nuku Hivan tapa brought back by members of Krusenstern's expedition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lisiansky’s Atlas, plate I, unless otherwise indicated</th>
<th>Lisiansky’s Kunstkamera inventory 1806</th>
<th>Rumiantsev (Dashkov) museum labels</th>
<th>Current museum collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Headband with fretworked turtle shell disc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAMSU 370-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Wooden earrings</td>
<td>145. Wooden earrings, Washington Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAMSU 370-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Bone earrings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corresponds to ENM Tartu C1-44b (E24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Earrings made of shell with cork in the middle</td>
<td>144. Earrings from shell with cork in the middle from Washington Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAMSU 370-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E [1], Pearl shell fishing hook [with obtuse barb]</td>
<td>40. Marquesan fishing hooks</td>
<td>150. Pearl shell hooks from Washington Islands</td>
<td>MAMSU 370-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E [2], Pearl shell fishing hook [without barb]</td>
<td>40. Marquesan fishing hooks</td>
<td>150. Pearl shell hooks from Washington Islands</td>
<td>MAMSU 370-4 and MAE, Lisiansky’s collection 750-14 and 750-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Collar studded with red peas with black spots [tahi poniu]</td>
<td>33. Marquesan collar</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAE, Lisiansky’s collection 750-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Tool for tattooing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not identified in the collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Necklace of teeth</td>
<td>149. Neck decoration made of teeth, Washington Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAMSU 370-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Stone axe</td>
<td>27. Marquesan axe</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAE, Lisiansky’s collection 750-10; image in the Atlas corresponds to MAE 736-178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Club [‘u’u club]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not identified in the collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Club serving as a sword in battle [tokotoko pio'o staff]</td>
<td>7. Marquesan backsword [tokotoko pio'o staff or parahua club?]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Might correspond to MAE 736-174 or 736-175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Stilts</td>
<td>8. Marquesan stilts</td>
<td>152. Stilt footstep, Washington Islands</td>
<td>MAE 750-9/1 and MAE 750-9/2 or MAMSU 370-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Fighting spear</td>
<td>6. Marquesan spear</td>
<td></td>
<td>Might be one of the spears MAE 736-141 and the following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Calabash, in which pudding is kept</td>
<td>111. Vessel from the Sandwich Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td>Probably MAMSU 372-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Shell used as a horn</td>
<td>83. Marquesan horn used in ceremony</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not identified in the collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Wooden bowl [kotue]</td>
<td>26. Wooden bowl of Marquesan king</td>
<td></td>
<td>Might correspond to Tartu, ENM: C1-37 (U4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Reel with fishing hook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAE, Lisiansky’s collection 750-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Ball decorated with red peas, which is used for entertainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not identified in the collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Ordinary fan</td>
<td>35. Marquesan fan</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAE, Lisiansky’s collection 750-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Sling</td>
<td>141. Sling made of coconut fibre from Washington Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAMSU 370-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Ceremonial fan</td>
<td>140. Fan made of grass, Marquesas Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAMSU 370-17, 370-18 or MAE, Lisiansky’s collection 750-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X [2]. Neck decoration with two boar tusks</td>
<td>147. Neck decoration made of boar tusks, of inhabitants of Washington Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAMSU 370-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAE’s fond 5754 had a different story. This collection was transferred to the MAE in 1937 from the State Ethnographical Museum – another institution in St Petersburg which specialized in the peoples of Russia, then the Soviet Union, and accordingly disposed of collections unrelated to its scope. The origin of this collection was traced by Sergei Dmitriev. The State Ethnographical Museum had inherited it from the ethnographical department of the Russian Museum, while the Russian Museum received it in 1907 from the Arsenal (Armoury) in Tsarskoe Selo, which housed collections nominally belonging to the Russian Emperor. This collection had dozens of South Pacific artefacts and their origins indicate that these were donations from the participants of various Russian expeditions to the Pacific. Two items in this collection were Marquesan: a parahua (paddle-shaped war club), described in the Arsenal Inventory as ‘Lance or standard from the Marquesas Islands’, and a tapuvae or stilt step. The collection also had another ‘lance from the Marquesas Islands’ and ‘A piece of stale [in the inventory lit. ‘petrified’] bread’ which might be similar to the unidentified item in the collection of the Estonian History Museum (U7).

And finally there are a few Nuku Hivan artefacts in the MAE which were privately donated in later years but could also originate from the Krusenstern expedition. The participants of the expedition brought back numerous artefacts which remained in their private possession, while other artefacts went missing from museum collections during

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lisiansky’s Atlas, plate I, unless otherwise indicated</th>
<th>Lisiansky’s Kunstkamera inventory 1806</th>
<th>Rumiantsev (Dashkov) museum labels</th>
<th>Current museum collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X [3]. Neck decoration with two sharpened shells</td>
<td>146. Neck decorations made of shells, of inhabitants of Washington Islands</td>
<td>MAMSU 370-15 (includes extra pendant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. Fishing net</td>
<td>58. Marquesan net for fish</td>
<td>Not identified in the collections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL2:A. Headdress [on the plate with Sandwich Islands artefacts]</td>
<td>Has some similarity with Zurich heiku’a headdress (H2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL2:H. Pearl shell fishing hooks with bone barb [on the plate with Sandwich Islands artefacts]</td>
<td>MAMSU 370-2, 3, 5 or MAE 750-6, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Marquesan paddles</td>
<td>MAE, Lisiansky’s collection 750-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Marquesan head [i.e. skull] crushed with a stone in battle</td>
<td>Later insertion in 1806 inventory: Sent to the Academy of Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Marquesan scoop [?] used in ceremony</td>
<td>Not identified in the collections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Marquesan cloth (6 pieces)</td>
<td>Not identified in MAE, but might correspond to tapa in MAMSU’s collections of tapa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153. Belt from Washington Islands</td>
<td>MAMSU 370-7 [Ball of rope braided from coconut fibre (no reference to old catalogues and no labels)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143. Pearl shell earrings, Washington Islands</td>
<td>MAMSU 370-8 (attributed as Marshal Islands)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAMSU 370-13 (attributed as North American)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3. Nuku Hivan items in Lisiansky collections.
the repeated restructuring and reshuffling of the collections during the nineteenth and especially the twentieth century; such items could have been returned privately at a later date. An example of such an undocumented donation is a Marquesan battle club (‘u’u), which was donated to the MAE by V.V. Kravtsova in 1936 (W2). There is no data concerning its origin.

Museum of Anthropology of Moscow State University
As mentioned above, Lisiansky donated the third part of his collection to Count Rumiantsev, and it was initially stored and exhibited in St Petersburg, first as Rumiantsev’s private collection and then as the Rumiantsev Museum. In 1861 these collections were transferred to Moscow, becoming part of the Moscow Public and Rumiantsev Museum, the ethnographic collections of which were known as the Dashkov Ethnographical Museum. After the revolution these collections became part of the Moscow Museum of Ethnology [narodovedenie], which was transformed into the Museum of the Peoples of the USSR in 1930. After the Second World War this museum was disbanded and its Australian and South Pacific collections, which were stored in the Moscow Industrial Art College, were finally transferred into the Museum of Anthropology of Moscow State University (hereafter MAMSU), the full name of which at present is Anuchin Research Institute and Museum of Anthropology of Lomonosov Moscow State University.26 Presently the Museum holds 1,500 South Pacific and Australian artefacts and is the second-largest Russian collection in this area, after the Kunstkamera.27 Unfortunately, the Museum has not displayed its collections for decades, but at present the project of opening museum exhibitions is nearing completion.

The Marquesan artefacts in the Museum of Anthropology form fond 370, numbering 19 entries and 22 items. The nearby fonds are 372 (Hawai’i Islands) and 373 (Easter Island). Whereas a list of artefacts accompanied Lisiansky’s donation to the Kunstkamera, no ‘original’ inventory for Lisiansky’s MAMSU collection is known to be extant today. However, some documentation indicates that the collection came from Lisiansky. The main sources are several printed catalogues of the Rumiantsev Museum (the earliest is from 1882), which state as fact that the Pacific artefacts originated from Krusenstern and Lisiansky’s expedition; they also used the term Washington Islands in reference to the Marquesas, which was current in Russia in the wake of Krusenstern’s expedition and rapidly became obsolete. The entries and numbers in the printed catalogues can be correlated with oblong paper labels, which accompanied the artefacts. The ink and handwriting, as well as the invariable usage of ‘Washington Islands’, suggests that these predated the printed catalogues and probably accompanied the collection at the time of its transfer from St Petersburg to Moscow in 1861. Furthermore, most of the artefacts in fond 370 appear to be illustrated in the engravings in Lisiansky’s Atlas (above, Table 2.3). In several cases there can be no doubt that the pieces engraved in the Atlas are the very same as those at MAMSU and, in some cases, in the MAE collections; those that can be positively identified include the large fishing hook (Fh4 & Fh-20), three pendants (see N5 and Figure 2.1, X[2], N7 and Figure 2.1, X[1], N9 and Figure 2.1, X[3]), wooden earrings (E16-E17 and E-29, left) and an uhikana (head ornament) (see H3 & H-9).
A few items from the Atlas, to be discussed below, can be found neither in the MAMSU nor the MAE collections; conversely the Moscow Lisiansky collection, ostensibly from the Marquesas includes a couple of artefacts that do not appear in his Atlas, among them stunning pearl shell earrings and an elaborate woven belt with patterned triangular ends, to which are attached loose plant fibres, forming an ankle-long skirt. Neither are similar to any early nineteenth century Marquesan artefact types. The uniform old museum labels attached to them, most likely from the Rumiantsev Museum, identify their origin as 'Washington Islands', and in the published catalogue of the Rumiantsev collection they appeared in the Washington Islands section, but the belt can be identified as a male belt or grass skirt from the Marshall Islands. Otto Kotzebue was the only early Russian voyager who had both visited the Marshall Islands and donated his collections to Count Rumiantsev, so it is quite likely that this belt originates from his collection and was mislabelled at the early stages of its handling.

A similar situation occurs with the pearl shell earrings from the Moscow Museum of Anthropology. According to the inventory book of its predecessor, the Museum of Ethnology, which dates to the 1920s and 1930s, besides the two rectangular plates, there existed a third plate in the shape of 'an isosceles triangle with a rounded tip' (E22, now missing). The two remaining plates (E20, E21) are a fine example of jewellery made from abalone in the form of rectangular tablets, slightly curved, with one drilled hole in the middle of the longer side. Although functionally they might look like pendants rather than earrings, they resemble Northwest Coast pearl shell earrings, shown for example in an Edward S. Curtis photograph of a woman from Vancouver Island. Langsdorff, who visited the area in 1806, collected a necklace with similar (but not identical) abalone shell plates (now in the Munich Museum Fünf Kontinente) and depicted similar necklaces in his book. There are thus grounds for believing that the Moscow earrings too were miscataloged in the early stages of the collection transfers and that they most likely originate from some part of the American coast; if Lisiansky, who only visited what is now Alaska, did not collect them personally, he may have obtained them from someone who did.

There is also ambiguity regarding composite fish hooks in the Marquesan collection (discussed further below), but the Moscow fond 370 importantly appears to preserve an early selection – Lisiansky’s original gift to Rumiantsev. Some of the items are of superb quality and size, for instance the large fishing hook with an obtuse barb, and the whale tooth and heavy shell pendants, which could have originated from Kiatonui himself. He, as mentioned above, developed especially cordial relationships with Lisiansky.

Along with fond 370, the Museum of Anthropology has a large collection of tapa, which very likely originates from the early Russian Pacific expeditions, especially that of Lisiansky. The documentation of the Museum of Anthropology and its predecessors allows us to identify around 80 pieces of tapa, most of which are currently located and stored in the Museum. Old inventories, cardboard labels and notes in printed catalogues suggest that most can be traced back to the Rumiantsev Museum. A couple of the items were collected – as evidenced by the information which accompanies them – in the South Pacific by Russian travellers of the second half of the nineteenth century; for the bulk of the items, collectors are unidentified.
Many tapa pieces in this group are accompanied by information which describes them as ‘cloth for dress called tapa or pau’, and gives their provenance as the ‘Sandwich Islands’. Pau is the Hawaiian word for women’s skirts, opposed to maro – a male loincloth. While this information may lead one to assume that the items originate in Hawai’i, there is evidence to strongly suggest this is not the case. In Russia, the term pau was used only very briefly before becoming obsolete – it appears in the inventories of the Krusenstern expedition’s donations to the Admiralty Museum in St Petersburg, where it referred to various barkcloth of South Pacific provenance. The appearance of pau in Russian can be traced to Lisiansky’s visit to Hawai’i. While his supercargo Korobitsyn accurately noted the narrow usage of pau for women’s skirts in his manuscript, Lisiansky mentions the term in a context from which it is evident that he understood pau to mean cloth in general: ‘[…] for a piece of [European] cloth, 4 and a half arshins in length, which is called pau here, we could obtain 20 arshins of their best cloth.’ In this formulation the term was brought to Russia. From the late 1830s, however, tapa was becoming the generic term for barkcloth, while pau had fallen entirely out of use. Therefore, the descriptions which accompany the Museum of Anthropology items, naming them as ‘tapa or pau’, were clearly written when the term tapa was becoming more widespread, but were almost certainly based on earlier labels. This dates the barkcloth collection to the first quarter of the nineteenth century at the latest, and most probably to the time of Lisiansky and Krusenstern’s donations.

As mentioned above, in the inventories of the Admiralty Museum, barkcloth from the Hawaiian Islands was often described as Marquesan: for instance, ‘Pau, a speckled piece of cloth from bark, from the Marquesas Islands’ is obviously of Hawaiian provenance, as Marquesan barkcloth of the time was never patterned. In the case of the Moscow collection there appears to be a reversed situation, where almost all barkcloth was recorded as coming from the ‘Sandwich Islands’, when some of it was most likely Marquesan. While the collection includes pieces of patterned or speckled barkcloth which must be from Hawai’i, the bulk of the items (46 of 68) are plain yellow or white pieces of barkcloth, some of which are extremely thin – a particular characteristic of Marquesan tapa manufacture. Although white or dyed yellow barkcloth was produced in Hawai’i, such a large concentration of plain, unpatterned barkcloth strongly suggests a predominantly Marquesan origin, as on Hawai’i it would have been the patterned barkcloth which caught Lisiansky’s eye. Visiting Hawai’i, he wrote: ‘I could not believe that savages could be possessed of such elegant taste. The colour combination and artistry of design, taken in conjunction with the strictest observance of proportion, would bring fame to a maker even in Europe.’ In the English version of the book he added:

Their cloth greatly surpasses that made by the inhabitants of Noocahiva; who, I am persuaded, would part with their most costly things in exchange for this, as it would be deemed by them, excellent article.31

Although all this evidence is circumstantial, it is very likely that the present Moscow Anthropology Museum has in fact inherited the rich collection of Lisiansky’s mixed Hawaiian and Marquesan tapa. In that case the Marquesan collection there might be one of the largest and oldest in the world.
Other museums in Russia and Ukraine

Nuku Hivan artefacts brought by the Krusenstern expedition might be located in other museums in St Petersburg and Moscow. A carved wooden figure of a tiki, now at the Museum of the History of Religion in St Petersburg, was probably collected by the Russian expedition. In 1932 it was part of the holdings of the State Antireligious Museum (the former St. Isaac Cathedral), established in the wake of the Russian revolution of 1917 in accordance with its crusade against religious tenets. In 1932 the tiki was transferred to the Museum of Religion and Atheism which became the Museum of the History of Religion after perestroika (Tk1).

In Moscow, some fragments of Lisiansky's collection donated to Rumiantsev may have ended up in the State Historical Museum. It has a large piece of fine tapa cloth, which was catalogued in its collection in 1954 with the only reference to its origin as ‘From the earlier acquisitions’ of the Museum, but the descriptive labels attached to it leave no doubt of its Nuku Hivan origin (T20). The museum has another item, an embroidered bag from Kodiak Island (Alaska), which has an identical label, suggestive since Lisiansky visited both places.\textsuperscript{34} The numbers indicate that they were part of a large collection, on display at one time.

The Museum of Medical History of Moscow University has a Marquesan skull with inscription ‘Sent by Admiral Krusenstern’ (Sk1); it was at one time in the collection of the anatomist Justus Loder, whose collection was later acquired by the Moscow University and stored in the anatomical department.

In Ukraine, Kharkov University Museum once held a collection donated by the surgeon on the Neva, Moritz Laband, following his return to Russia in 1806. It had included ‘different rarities (household items, tools, dress) which he collected from the inhabitants of the Marquesas Islands, the Hawai‘i and Kodiak,’\textsuperscript{35} but the material was destroyed by German bombing during the Second World War.

Also in the Ukraine were the donations from the dispersed collections of the Admiralty Museum which were transferred to the Nikolaev Map Department in around 1828. At least some South Pacific artefacts associated with the Russian expeditions are known to survive in the Nikolaev Regional Museum; some may have been transferred to institutions in Odessa or Kherson.

Estonia

The amount and quality of surviving Nuku Hivan artefacts in Estonia is comparable with those in Russia, although their journey to the two major museum collections – the Estonian History Museum (EHM) in Tallinn and the Estonian National Museum (ENM) in Tartu – was long and precarious.

Estonian History Museum, Tallinn

At the time of the early Russian Pacific expeditions led by Baltic Germans in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, Estonia was divided into two provinces of the Russian Empire – Estland with a capital in Tallinn, formerly known as Revel, and Lifland with a capital in Tartu, formerly known as Derpt and Jurev. Neither province had any public museum that might have solicited donations of overseas artefacts. There was, however, an important private collector, Johann Burchard (1776-1838), a Tallinn pharmacist
and physician, who started collecting curios in 1802. He called his collection ‘Mon Faible’ and had extensive correspondence and contacts with voyagers, scholars and collectors in various parts of Europe, though his main sources were Baltic Germans in Estonia, including several participants of the Russian expeditions in the Pacific.

Burchard’s first catalogue of his collection, published in 1822 on the occasion of the first exhibition of his treasures, had seven entries of artefacts from Nuku Hiva (Nos 120-126) which, all together, comprised ten items. The listed artefacts were the following: two fans (they might be two different types of fan – semi-circular, tah’i, and square-shaped), a large club (which must be an ‘u’u club), two ‘large darts’ (these could be mataku spears), a large fishhook made of bone, a sling, two men’s earrings and a men’s necklace. It is possible to state with certainty that this collection originated from the Krusenstern expedition and was donated to Burchard by Karl Espenberg, the surgeon of the expedition, as Burchard mentioned that Espenberg gave him his rarities and Kotzebue provided him with a selection of all his ‘treasures’ in his account of the collection for the 1822 exhibition. Although Otto von Kotzebue visited Nuku Hiva with Krusenstern, he was a young boy at the time and it is most likely that the collection he donated to Burchard was the result of his own expedition of 1813-1816, but he did not visit the Marquesas during this expedition.

A manuscript catalogue of the collection which was kept and updated by Burchard in the following years has only two items in the Nuku Hiva section: ‘A richly carved oar’ from Dr Hunnius and ‘Ein Ordenszeichen’ (a religious symbol) from Rosillion. The catalogue also records ‘A pair of stirrups, Nukahiva’ from Heindorff in the ‘Arms’ section. The oar can be with certainty identified in the EHM collection (K-1850), but it comes from Tubuai rather than Marquesas Islands. The ‘stirrups’ are also documented and identified (K-2138) and originate from Asia. These might be acquisitions made via middlemen, which explains the corruption in their places of origin. It is interesting to note that the ‘stirrups’ are described in Hansen’s catalogue of 1875 as ‘allegedly from the Marquesas Islands’.

The Nuku Hivan ‘religious symbol’ might be identical to the item described in Burchard’s 1822 catalogue as ‘Small wooden heathen god’ without reference to locality. It has not been identified in the EHM collections and was probably not transferred there.

As a result of subsequent transfers and the confusions of successive inventories, only some of Espenberg’s artefacts can be identified, and those tentatively, in the EHM collection. Most of the artefacts from Burchard’s collection were donated by his heirs to the Estonian Literary Society Museum in 1870, although some followed later. There are two fans, semi-circular and square-shaped, which are attributed to Espenberg (F14 and F4) in this group. They were acquired by the Estonian Literary Society Museum from Helene Maydellift in 1914 and eventually deposited in the EHM. It might be mentioned that an unrevealed object wrapped in palm leaves and bound with fibre string (U7) has an identical documentation of acquisition (Espenberg, Maydellift) and may be Nuku Hivan as well.

Burchard’s handwritten catalogue included several other objects attributed to Espenberg. One of them was ‘Ein Jagdhorn aus einem Kinkhorn mit den ausgerauften Haaren des Feindes als Siegeszeichen’ (A hunting horn or horn [musical instrument] with the plucked hair of an enemy as a trophy) without place of origin in the ‘Arms’
This is almost certainly a conch shell trumpet (M2), which was later catalogued in the Estonian Literary Society Museum inventory next to a similar trumpet from Friederici's collection (M1). Finally, a paddle from China attributed in Burchard's handwritten catalogue to Espenberg could be identical to Espenberg's Marquesan paddle in EHM (P5, identified as such by us) which was not attributed to a particular location in the EHM inventory but had China as a possible place of origin.

Another Nuku Hivan collection, which can be identified within the EHM's holdings, belongs to Hermann Karl von Friederici, a member of Krusenstern's expedition. He donated his collection to the Museum of the Estonian Literary Society in Tallinn on 26 July 1853 to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the departure of Krusenstern's expedition. The society was established in 1842 with the objective of studying Estonian culture, but one of its aims was the establishment of a local history museum. While Burchard’s private museum was conserved after his death in 1838, the museum of the society was accepting artefacts beyond the scope of local history. Friederici donated his collection in his lifetime and it was well documented. In a few cases, the artefacts still have their original storage containers with Friederici's name on them. Besides Nuku Hivan artefacts, Friederici's collection included objects from Russian America, Siberia, China, Japan and Tenerife. Most of these objects are now part of the EHM.

Friederici's Nuku Hivan collection included a large conch shell trumpet, a bracelet made from human hair, a boar tusk necklace, a bracelet made from 'the finger bones of a slain enemy', slings, and a number of tapa samples. The EHM collection also has a number of pieces of tapa, whose origin can be traced back to Nuku Hiva and Hawai'i and probably to Krusenstern's expedition. A further group of Tahitian, Hawaiian and possibly Marquesan tapa samples seems to belong to one collection – the pieces share the same Hansen number (E V II D3) in the EHM inventory cards. These cards also attribute the collection to 'F.G. Forster', meaning presumably Georg Forster, son of Johann Reinhold Forster, both naturalists on Cook's second voyage – but there are similar samples, indeed some which appear to have been cut from the same larger pieces, in Johann Horner's collection in Zürich which raises the question of their origin. These can be traced to an entry in the Chinese section of Burchard's handwritten catalogue referring to 'Diverse Stücke buntgefärbter Pflanzenbaste mitgebracht von Georg Forster' (Several pieces of brightly coloured inner bark brought by George Forster). The donor is recorded as Milius. In the Hansen catalogue of 1875 the same group of artefacts appears in the Society Islands section with a reference to Johann Georg Forster as the collector and Milius as donor; perhaps Pierre Bernard Milius (1773-1829), a French voyager who had travelled with Baudin. Some of the Hawaiian tapa might have been collected by Lisiansky who had a longer sojourn at Hawai'i than Krusenstern, and shared his artefacts with Krusenstern's co-voyagers (who included Horner and Friederici) when the ships reunited in China. It is also possible that Horner's collection in Zürich might at one time have been supplemented with artefacts from other voyagers, including Forster.
The Estonian National Museum, Tartu

The ENM in Tartu has another fine collection of Nuku Hivan artefacts numbering 22 items. They are part of the collection C1, which, according to its inventory, was deposited to the ENM as a transfer from the Opetaatud Eesti Selts (the Learned Estonian Society, LES) in 1923. The current ENM inventory book of the C1 collection has references to the earlier inventory numbers of the LES. These numbers run consequently (from 776 to 794) interrupted by a few Chinese and Aleutian objects, which might indicate that the Nuku Hivan artefacts might have belonged to one collection while in the LES. A few Nuku Hivan artefacts also have older numbers and inscriptions (St6 – St8, T75), which suggests that they belonged to a collection predating the LES’s holding at the time of transfer in 1923. This allows us to suggest the following reconstruction of this collection’s history.

Krusenstern had special ties with Tartu. After the expedition he would often stay in his manor Kiitsi, situated north of Tartu; in those years he established long lasting connections with Derpt (Tartu) University, being elected an Honorary Doctor of Philosophy there. According to a study of the university’s history, Krusenstern donated to the university’s Arts Museum, established in 1803, ‘artificial curiosities collected during his journey around the world in China, Nukahiwa, on the Aleutian Islands, in the north-west coast of America, and Otaheite’.44 A German traveller, Ulrich Schlippenbach, visiting the university in 1814, noted that it was worth seeing curiosities brought by Krusenstern in the Arts Museum, especially those of the South Sea Islanders.45 This makes the collection the earliest South Pacific museum collection in Estonia. Later on, when the LES was established in 1838 in Tartu, the ethnographic collections from the Arts Museum might have been transferred there, and, finally in 1923, to the ENM.

The collection in ENM is well composed, representing most of the major groups of Nuku Hivan artefacts (neck, chest and ear ornaments, fans, stilt steps). The gem of the collection is a lidded bowl (kotue) (U4), the only example of this type of artefact to survive in the expedition collection holdings across various museums.

Germany

Collections of the University of Göttingen

The University of Göttingen was the first institution in Europe to receive some of the treasures brought by the members of the expedition from the voyage. This was as a result of the ties between the members of the expedition and German naturalist and anthropologist Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752-1840), a professor of this university. While travelling, they sent him information about Nuku Hiva and Tilesius sent him a full-length portrait of a Nuku Hivan ‘in decoration’ (see Figure 1.3). Upon return of the expedition Langsdorff sent him a decorated Nuku Hivan skull (Sk6), the description and engraving of which Blumenbach published.46 Although Blumenbach’s skull catalogue was burnt in the Second World War, due to the assistance of the curator of the collection, anthropologist Michael Schultz, it was possible to locate another skull from Krusenstern expedition in Blumenbach’s collection, donated to him by Espenberg (Sk7); from another Nuku Hivan skull, which was in Espenberg’s possession, Blumenbach had a cast taken (Sk8).
As the early inventory books of Blumenbach’s ethnographical collections did not survive, it is impossible to attest with certainty if any Nuku Hivan artefacts were donated to him by the participants of the Krusenstern voyage. However, considering the intensity of his contacts with German members of the voyage and the fact that Göttingen collections have three Japanese objects donated by Tilesius, it is quite likely that some of Nuku Hivan artefacts were donated to him as well. For instance, Tilesius wrote in 1829 that examples of the shell trumpet, *putoka*, could be found in the museums in St Petersburg, Berlin and Göttingen. A similar suggestion was expressed by Manfred Urban, a former curator of the collection.

**Five Continents Museum, Munich**

The earliest collection in Western European museums housing Krusenstern expedition artefacts is the so-called ‘Krusenstern collection’ in the Five Continents Museum (Museum Fünf Kontinente, MFK), formerly the Museum für Völkerkunde in Munich. It was donated to the museum by Langsdorff in 1821 during his visit from Brazil, where he was serving as the Russian Consul General. The objects of his collection appear in the two earliest inventories of the museum: the ‘Blauer catalogue’ compiled by the director of the gallery, Robert von Langer, in 1843; and the inventory compiled by museum taxidermist Dr Kühn in 1857-1858. The latter inventory attached letters to inventory numbers which corresponded to the early collectors: Martius (M), Cook (C) and Krusenstern (K). The painstaking research of the former South Pacific curator Michaela Appel revealed that, in a number of cases, this attribution

---

*Figure 2.2. Georg Langsdorff, [Weapons and household utensils of the inhabitants of Nukahiva], drawing on paper, ink and wash, in Robert B. Honeyman, Jr. Collection of Early Californian and Western American Pictorial Material. Kruzenshtern/Rezanov/Langsdorff expeditions, 1803-1810. Bancroft Library, University of California (Berkeley, USA), 1963.002: 1011.*
was misleading and the objects from the early collections were already mixed by the time the Blauer catalogue was compiled. Appel made the reasonable assumption that, among these earliest, pre-1857 collections, the Marquesan artefacts are most likely to originate from Langsdorff’s 1821 donation.\(^5\)

According to the Blauer inventory, the Krusenstern-Langsdorff collection had 181 entries with around 200 artefacts. Nuku Hivan artefacts comprised around 5% of it, while the majority of the collection consisted of Unalashka, New (Nuevo) California and the Kuril Islands items with a few artefacts from the South Pacific.\(^5\) Although some artefacts might have been mixed with items from earlier collections, this distribution does reflect Langsdorff’s collecting pursuits in North America. The Nuku Hivan artefacts in this collection number 12 items, including a rare type of stilt footstep with a figure of a tiki looking backwards (St11). The earliest MFK collection includes 15 pieces of tapa, the provenance of which has been attributed in the Blauer catalogue as ‘Otahiti’ (no. 525); in Kühn’s catalogue they received the symbol K, which identifies them as originating from Krusenstern-Langsdorff’s collection. The Krusenstern expedition never went to Tahiti, so if the collection is indeed Tahitian, it cannot be Langsdorff’s, but acquaintance with the catalogue of this collection suggests that several samples of tapa in it have striking similarities with tapa in the Moscow, Tallinn and Zürich collections associated with Krusenstern’s expedition.

**Grassi Ethnographical Museum in Leipzig**

A number of Marquesan artefacts in the collection of this museum were collected by Tilesius. He, after some years in Russia, returned to his native land in 1814, settling in Mühlhausen, Thuringia. Tilesius maintained a broad network of contacts with European savants, one of whom was the German anthropologist Gustav Klemm (1802-1867), who developed the concept of cultural evolution. Klemm’s passion was ethnographical collecting and, as he wrote in his account,

> Not without substantial influence on the further development of this [collection] was daily contact, during a summer-long stay in Leipzig in 1830, with the well-known naturalist and circumnavigator Court Councillor Tilesius, who happily opened his richly-filled coffers and explained them by means of lively accounts.\(^5\)

One of the results of these visits might be the numerous references to Nuku Hivan data in Klemm’s classical study *General History of the Civilisation of Mankind*.\(^5\) He obviously received a number of artefacts from Tilesius, some of which are mentioned in his works.\(^5\) His catalogue also included ‘very beautifully carved clubs of Nukahiwa and other islands of the South Seas’ and ‘stone hatchets from New Zealand, Nukahiwa and Nutkasound’.\(^5\) A ‘carved step for stilts from the Friendly islands’ in the form of a ‘grotesque human figure surrounded by several ornaments’ was most likely Marquesan as well.\(^5\)

Klemm also had contacts with the Moscow historian and collector Mikhail Pogodin (1800-1875); it is documented, for instance, that Klemm received from him a Hawaiian tapa.\(^5\) Pogodin belonged to the circle of young Russian historians and naturalists under the patronage of Count Rumiantsev. A collection of artefacts which Lisiansky gave to
Rumiantsev and which ended up in Moscow might be the source used by Pogodin for exchange with Klemm; the latter could potentially have ended up with some Nuku Hivan artefacts from this source.

Klemm’s huge collections were stored in his private museum in Dresden and after his death in 1867 they formed the basis for the Museum of Ethnology in Leipzig, which is now included in the complex of the Grassi Museum.

**Switzerland**

*Ethnographic Museum of Zürich University*

Karl von den Steinen, exploring museum collections in the early twentieth century for his study of Marquesan artefacts, mentioned that ‘Zürich had some pieces’ brought by Horner.\(^5^8\) Von den Steinen published nine of them in his study, but Horner’s collection until recently remained little-known to scholars of the Marquesas. Currently Horner’s collection is part of the Ethnographic Museum of Zürich University. The original inventories of the predecessors of the Ethnographic Museum indicate that around 150 items were attributed to Horner. It should be noted that in some cases the collector was recorded as ‘Kruse’ or ‘Krusenstern’ which coincides with the practice implemented in Munich, where Langsdorff’s artefacts were inventoried as ‘Krusenstern collection’. Similarly to Munich, the collection consisted of artefacts from the territories of the Pacific rim. Their distribution was approximately as follows: Nuka Hivan artefacts comprised a quarter of the collection; Hawaiian and unidentified Polynesian about 9%; North American up to 42%, North-East Asian 9%; and Chinese and Mongolian 14%. The collection also included a few items from Brazil and Sumatra.

During the voyage Horner looked critically on the competition for artefacts that had consumed the expedition members. In a letter he wrote that they snatched everything from the natives, not discriminating between genuine and fake objects, ‘so that one is ashamed to be lumped together with these [journalistic] paper heroes and all-devouring, but little-digesting human beings’.\(^5^9\) His own collection was quite well assembled and covered many aspects of Nuku Hivan life. He obviously continued his collecting during the Asian leg of the expedition. As for the significant proportion of North American objects in his collection, they were most likely collected for him by Langsdorff, as these artefacts originated both from Kodiak and North-East California, and Langsdorff, accompanying Rezanov, was the only collector in the latter area. Correspondence between the German speaking expedition members suggests that they maintained scholarly contacts with many European naturalists and we can reasonably suppose that after Horner settled in Zürich in 1809, his collection continued growing as a result of exchange with the milieu of European naturalists, voyagers and collectors. This might explain the presence in Horner’s collection of some artefacts from locations which were not visited by the expedition. Particularly this concerns Polynesian tapa, some pieces of which, as discussed above, might even originate from Cook’s voyages.

Horner, being first the vice-president and then president of the Zürich Society of Natural Sciences (Naturforschenden Gesellschaft), was also connected with the Swiss Society of National Antiquities (later the Antiquarian Society of Zürich), founded by his colleague Ferdinand Keller, where Horner’s collection must have been deposited.
after his death in 1834.\textsuperscript{40} In 1888-1889 this society deposited 158 artefacts from its collection with the newly established Ethnographic Society. The list of transfer opens with 18 objects from ‘Washington Islands (Nukahiwa)’; which are followed by groups of artefacts from ’New California and Norfolk Sound’ and ‘Alaska and Unalashka’; the list also includes Central and South American, Chinese and Indian sections.\textsuperscript{41} Although this transfer list did not refer to the collectors, they were obviously known to the curators, as the Ethnographic Society catalogue\textsuperscript{42} compiled by Dr Otto Stoll (1849-1922) listed the above 18 Nuka Hivan objects with attribution to ‘Hofrath Horner’ (nos starting from 400). The catalogue similarly identified artefacts from his Asian and North American collections. Some more artefacts, including a tapa collection, were transferred from the Antiquarian Society to the Ethnographic Society in the following years. In 1899 it merged with the Geographical Society and formed the Geographic-Ethnographic Society, which offered its ethnographic collections to the University of Zürich. In 1916 these collections were opened to the public and in 1971 they formed the Ethnographic Museum of the University of Zürich.\textsuperscript{43} Sometime before this final transfer, most of the artefacts in Horner’s collection were re-inventoried and received new numbers (nos starting from 2300). Comparison of the transfer list of 1888 with the subsequent inventory entries explains the origins of the misattribution of some artefacts and reveals some Nuka Hivan artefacts which were initially part of Horner’s collection but are currently missing.

Presently the collection numbers nearly 30 Nuku Hivan items, including such rare ornaments as a heiku’a (H2), a tete poniu (H4) and a well preserved tahi poniu (Tp5).’

The Netherlands

National Museum of World Cultures, Leiden

Some artefacts originating from Krusenstern expedition ended up in the Siebold collection in the National Museum of Ethnology in Leiden (or Museum of Volkenkunde, now part of the National Museum of World Cultures). Philipp Siebold (1796-1866), a German physician and botanist, is famous for his travels to Japan, where, along with botanical specimens, he collected artefacts. Returning to Europe in 1830 and settling in Leiden, he continued to build up his collection; from members of Krusenstern’s expedition he acquired artefacts from Japan, Korea, Siberia and the South Pacific, which included Nuku Hivan items.\textsuperscript{44} The entry of these artefacts in the ‘Catalogus der… Siebold’ stored in the museum archives unambiguously indicate their connection with Krusenstern, with the list heading reading ‘Some objects from Nukahiwa collected in 1805 by the Russian expedition under von Krusenstern’.

The original collectors of these artefacts have not been identified, although it is known that Siebold corresponded with Tilesius, probably enquiring about artefacts. In his 1850 letter to Siebold, Tilesius wrote, ‘I am the last surviving member of the Krusenstern[ern] circumnavigation, everything I had collected there is in Petersburg and I have nothing but pictures and descriptions’.\textsuperscript{45} Matthi Forrer, a researcher of the history of Siebold’s collections in the National Museum of World Cultures, shared with us his findings about Siebold’s Russian connections. According to records in Siebold’s private archives, in 1836 he received a trunk with artefacts sent from St Petersburg by Baron
Heekeren; it was accompanied by a list which is now missing. It is most likely that the sender was a Dutch diplomat, Jacob van Heeckeren tot Enghuizen (1792-1884), at that time the Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the court in St Petersburg. He is ill-famed in Russia because his adopted son d’Anthès killed the Russian poet Alexander Pushkin in a duel in 1837. As no direct connections between Baron Heeckeren and members of Krusenstern’s expedition were found, it is reasonable to suppose that he was just a go-between, using his diplomatic privileges to ship the

Figure 2.3. ‘Ornaments of Marquesas Islands’, in James Cook, A Voyage toward the South Pole and round the World (London, 1777), plate XVII.
artefacts out of Russia for Siebold. Another contact of Siebold's in Russia was, according to Matthi Forrer, Baron Paul Ludwig Schilling von Cannstatt (1786-1837), but he was mostly interested in Tibetan collections and does not seem to have connections with the expedition members.

Whoever was the source of the Nuku Hivan artefacts in Siebold's collection, the collection was well assembled, having samples of various types of Nuku Hiva tapa and cloth. It includes a fishing reel (Fh19), which is similar to the one in Lisiansky's collection in the Kunstkamera (Fh18).
PART TWO
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CONTEXTS
The population of the Marquesas Islands archipelago fell to just 2000 people in 1920. Ruins and remains on the islands, including on those islands that are now uninhabited, suggest that this archipelago used to sustain a large population with an in-depth knowledge of the local environment. People settled everywhere it was possible to live and they used their resources sustainably. Their world included the spirit and underwater realms of ancestors as well as the ecospheres inhabited by the plants and animals they lived amongst and made use of, but which also commanded their respect. This universe extended to the horizon and beyond; the people were skilled sailors.
The history of settlement of the archipelago, local stories and the wide distribution of artefacts made from Eiao rock, for example, are testament to the extent of ancient Marquesan networks: such connections were often facilitated by stop-over islands such as Eiao, Fatu’uku or Motane.

The Marquesas are young volcanic islands with a central ridge (over 1000m) that has been shaped and moulded by erosion – on Ua Pou, mountain ridges reach out in all directions from the centre of the island. Steep-walled valleys create boundaries within the island and are dominated by peaks that are considered protective. The weather patterns on the islands are localized, vary greatly and feature irregular rainfall levels (between one and three metres a year on average), but clouds that cling to the mountains ensure that these valleys are wetter than the coast. Moreover, the proximity of the equator causes cycles of both droughts and heavy rainfall that can result in serious famine. The El Niño weather system further adds to the climactic vagaries.

Social and religious organization on the islands was influenced by the climate; the breadfruit tree (tumu mei, Artocarpus altulis) played a particularly important role along with a well-developed and strict system of taboos, tapu. Further to the geographical and climactic constraints on life, these taboos governed social life by regulating ways of being: some taboos related to food, such as the kalui, while other taboos controlled land use.

Whether in the light, airy settlements by the sea or the dark, cool, humid areas further inland, the ‘enata, people of the Marquesas, followed the ancient traditions that had been passed down through generations as they voyaged through the Pacific Islands.

Figure 3.2. A’akapa valley, on Nuku Hiva’s north coast, seen from the To’ovi’i plateau. The houses visible offer a limited sense of the historic population, five to ten times larger than today’s.
While life on the islands was shaped by the natural constraints of the environment, it was also organized according to a person’s role and their family’s position in the community. Social life and indeed the whole universe was hierarchically divided into different social orders – *papa* – with *papa haka’iki*, the chief’s order, and *papa tau’a*, the priest’s order, at the top. Like rock strata, also called *papa*, social life and its organizational principles were also formed of many layers. The world was arranged according to genealogies and geographical orientations. The West was where they had come from and where they would return to, to Havaiki, as in the rest of Polynesia. The West, proximity to the sea, the sound of it, or access routes to the coast helped determine the location of scared sites or the orientation of religious spaces in community buildings.

Settlements were based in the valleys, from the shoreline and the sacred spaces of the sea, to the *va’o*, the far end of valleys where rivers ran and nature created and regenerated itself. The less fertile slopes and the dry ridges housed fewer constructions; these were more discrete and had specific purposes, connected to funerals, defence or shelter, or for the storage of wood, birds, honey, salt, drying fish or the mining and processing of rocks.

There were many similarities in the way of life throughout the archipelago. Notably, there was a holistic vision of the human as grounded in a universe inherited from ancestors, to be passed on to descendants. This fundamental view of the world was expressed in a variety of ways but was to be found most often in decorations, where anthropomorphic figures are often pictured under other images representing the elevated position of chiefs and ancestors. This was also a system that should not be interrupted, hence perhaps the importance of circular forms – with neither beginning nor end – formed of an infinite number of minute self-similar elements. The idea of perenniality, of an infinite number, is found even in local surnames such as those ending with *tini*; people are called *a lot*, *many*, *countless*.

The populations that came to make up this culture approached these mountainous islands by those bays that were relatively sheltered from the prevailing swell and the Easterly trade winds. The rugged landscape would have looked promising: it would have been covered with forests and dotted with cascades in the humid season. But there were few sheltered bays. The islands are fringed by cliffs of variable heights; these are bordered with caves and large boulders, that is if the cliffs do not plunge straight into the sea.

The absence of barrier and coral reefs mean that the island’s coastline is in direct contact with the ocean. Marine resources are therefore more difficult to access. In fair weather and in sheltered spots, edible shells and sea urchins could be collected, or people could use a fishing line from the shore to catch coastal fish. Larger scale fishing trips would, however, have to be led by master fisherman who had the technical and spiritual knowledge.

The coastal regions of many valleys are not always suitable for human settlement: especially in the east, the sun is too strong, the habitable space too small and the winds bring sea spray that batter both people and their houses. Coastal plants, such as *temanu* (*Calophyllum inophyllum*), *tou* (*Cordia subcordata*), *mi’o* (*Thespesia populnea*) or *hau* and *fau* (*Hibiscus tiliaceus*), are essential to reduce erosion, protect from the damage caused by salt and strong winds, and they also provide shade for daily activities. These bays are however particularly vulnerable to ground swell and tsunamis (*taitoko*), that
Figure 3.3. The archaeological complex of Kamuihei, Tahakia and Te l’ipoka, at Hatiheu, Nuku Hiva.
can travel several kilometres up low valleys. In 1946 for example, a tsunami caused damage to much of the coast: destroying fishermen's shrines, community structures and the shore itself.

Coastal regions were commonly also the sites for tribal warfare and kidnapping. It would therefore ideally be fishermen and the people in charge of overseeing relationships beyond the community – both friendly and hostile – who lived in these areas. Chiefs’ houses would occasionally be built near the coast, and these would often be paired with another house that was more suitable to the variable climate and unpredictable harvests. As much as they could, the haka'i'iki would control the bay and the sea beyond it; a fort or observation post would often be built on a hill or headland for this purpose.

While there are many springs near the coast, fresh water, essential to any settlement, was often in short supply on the leeward side of hills where rain rarely falls and streams flow irregularly. The harshest environments could therefore only ever serve as temporary destinations, or for specific activities, such as fishing. However, where there was overpopulation in inland areas, some people were forced to resettle in the more difficult environments. Moreover, on all these small islands, the first settlers were quickly forced to leave to go in search of more suitable lands that could provide shade, protection and enough water.

Where they were able to, people established their settlements along the fertile valleys to make the most of the varied geographical and ecological zones. They set up their bases away from the sea to protect themselves from its spiritual and physical power. Hamlets were carefully situated between cultivatable land and wet areas, to be neither too close to the sacred (va'o) nor too exposed (the coast). Land was therefore subdivided into plots that allowed families to balance out the risks coming from the sea with the risks coming from the mountains: enemies, taitoko, landslides, etc. Around the centre of villages were gardens and orchards, that were themselves surrounded by the people and things that protected or defended: lookout points and sacred ground taboo for the majority of the community. Further afield, on the hillsides and the edges of the fenua were priests who cared for and looked out for the dead and their spirits.

If families and the lands they had rights to could be found at the bottom of valleys, or, less frequently at their edge, most settlements were in the middle of the valley on either side of the central river and its tributaries that irrigated the gardens and served for daily bathing. In the middle of the valleys, where it is relatively flat and bathed by sunlight, rich soil and a wet climate created dense vegetation. Cultivated and wild plants grew side by side: food crops, medicinal plants, plants used for natural dyes and for their fibres and plants serving for symbolic uses like the banyan tree (ao'a, Ficus marquesensis).

Gardens for fruit trees and cultivation terraces were selected according to the quality of the soil and the amount of sunshine, water and temperature the plot would get. In the more isolated areas of valleys, where even now remains of old gardens can be found, plants that needed little maintenance were grown: for example, Araceae, bananas (huetu, Musa troglodytarum) and yams (pua'uhi peahi, Dioscorea alata and D. nummularia). These gardens were backups in case of food shortages but also provided refuge during inter-tribal raids. Crops that needed care, like the paper mulberry (ute,
Broussonetia papyrifera) or kava (Piper methysticum) were planted where they would get the best growing conditions: from settlements to the bottom of valleys and from the top of valleys to the sun-baked hillsides. Finally, irrigated terraces were built up along rivers and streams using water channels made from pandanus (ha'a or fa'a) or bamboo (kohe, Schizostachyum glaucifolium), lined ditches, dykes or holding ponds. Rather than tubers, people relied on banana plantations (meika and huetu) and fruiting trees more generally: breadfruit, Polynesian chestnuts (ihi, Inocarpus edulis) and coconuts, for example. Taro (ta'o, Colocasia esculenta) nevertheless formed a major part of the diet. Interest in sweet potatoes (kuma'a, Ipomoea batatas) developed in response to exchanges with passing trade ships that needed to replenish their food stocks. Sugar cane (to, Saccharum officinarum), arrowroot (pi'a, Tacca leontopetaloides) and rose apples (kehika, Syzygium malaccense) were also a part of the local diet.

As the population increased, more land was put aside for agriculture and so the landscape had to be managed to prevent erosion and flooding rivers: people built small walls and terraces. Clearing stones in gardens optimized the available land and provided the materials needed for the construction of footpaths, land boundary demarcations and garden walls that protected crops from grazing pigs as well as burst river banks. The land therefore had to be carefully managed and maintained and so people often built houses nearby.

Agricultural and food technologies also helped ensure that there was always food to eat: for example, food fermentation pits, ‘ua ma (ma pits), for breadfruit (mei) that produced four harvests a year, meant that the breadfruit ma (the fermented paste of
breadfruit, preserved in the air-tight pits) could be stored for several decades in case of food shortages. The pits were dug into the ground, sometimes within the house (through the paepae platform, see below) and were often lined. These assured a year-round stock of food, especially useful between chestnut (ihi) harvest seasons. Each family had one or several pits measuring from 1 to 6m$^3$, which were supplemented by much larger community-managed pits where tens or even hundreds of cubic metres worth of ma could be stored in out of the way protected areas.

Although edible plants (kaikai) and in particular breadfruit, formed the basis of the local diet, meat (ina’i) was greatly appreciated. While pork was only eaten during important ceremonies – or outside of this usually only by men – birds, especially sea birds and their eggs were highly sought after; traps were arranged on islands seasonally frequented by birds. Fish was another source of protein and fishermen would rest in rock shelters along uninhabited coastlines during large expeditions. These shelters were levelled out or paved with stones and depending on their size, the fishermen’s pirogues could also be housed when needed. These shelters may have been very comfortable paepae and some would have included fishermen’s shrines.

Ancient Marquesan buildings were constructed on a quadrangular stone platform, the paepae or upe, depending on both the island and the time period. The main sleeping house, the paepae hiamoe, became rectangular very early on. The use of paving stones to cover the ground came later and the quadrangular stone platform is even more recent. From the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the paepae, stone platform, was
Figure 3.6. This large paepae, 20 x 12 metres was undoubtedly that of the ha’e toa, a meeting place reserved for chiefs and warriors. The paepae was restored for the Mataoa’a / Festival des arts des Marquises which took place over the end of December 1999 and the beginning of 2000.

Figure 3.7. At the upper end of Kamuihei/Te i’ipoka complex, that is in the most tapu area, this great rock, naturally in the form of a turtle, is covered in petroglyphs.
introduced to make more impressive and taller buildings; on Ua Pou and Nuku Hiva especially, these could sometimes be megaliths.

The different architectural styles between the islands have many key similarities. The paved buildings set on two levels were constructed from a layer of loose stones and thus connect to the local symbolism of dichotomies and elevation that leads to sacred or taboo spaces. The elevated level supported the covered part of the building: the fa‘e or ha‘e. The characteristic quadrangular form of buildings is significant: the four sides of a paepae appear of equal length and their harmonious form connects them to the sacred domain. Indeed, smaller paepae in particular were not constructed for dwelling purposes. Throughout the whole archipelago, paepae were built on sacred land and on funerary terraces, an added indication that these buildings relate to the sacred domain and not the profane. As a general rule, the upe is formed of paving stones that slope upwards, either with the slope of the hillside or by successive man-made layers of stones. The smooth shape of the stones, washed by water in riverbeds or in the sea, seemed also to be important: for comfort, but also as a symbol of fertility. In addition, paepae are the result of the accumulation of goods and all its related connotations. Furthermore, stone is the very material through which people come to live and grow. Traditionally, the ‘enata came from papa, rock; Handy and Linton were shown the ‘birth rock’ of different valleys, their pito, or navel, when they visited the Marquesas Islands.
The importance of a site was indicated by the raised ground on which it was built and the types of plants grown around it, such as: banyan trees; a type of pandan; auti (Cordyline fructicosa); the Australian pine tree toa (Casuarina equisetifolia); temanu; pua or kaupe (Fagraea berteroana).\textsuperscript{13} The most sacred sites, where access was often restricted or banned outright, could be found away from human activity and noise. Here, ideally on a hillock, would live a high priest or the beings he cared for, in a graveyard, for example. Shade was a significant aspect of the sites, emphasizing the sacred presence and the peaceful atmosphere of abundance created by the plants, themselves often sacred. Taboos would have served to protected this. Furthermore, the perfumes and colours of plants were important: a piece of Alyxia stellate (akatea, mei'e, ...) could only be picked after an offering of a pig; red hibiscus flowers (koute, Hibiscus rosa-sinensis) could attract the living to the grave of women who died in childbirth\textsuperscript{14}; the flowering season of the red-orange Erythrina (kena'e, Erythrina variegata) would coincide with the period of the year when priests became 'uncontrollable'.

\textit{Paepae} can now be found decorating the landscape of the Marquesas Islands: from me'a'e to tohua and the smaller sized versions at Ua Huka, Tahuata and Fatuiva, which are smaller islands and therefore probably had smaller populations. Like many of the trees that were essential to life on the islands – bread fruit, banyans and the Australian pine – paepae are everywhere and connect the sea to the land. The effort and organization that went into constructing these was remarkable. Sourcing and transporting the materials needed for the most important sites over great distances was compared to the work of ants.\textsuperscript{15} Like ants, 'enata made human chains to carry blocks of sea-polished basalt. These \textit{kiva}\textsuperscript{16} were to pave paepae that were sometimes kilometres inland and at several hundred metres altitude up steep mountain sides. Paepae are physical representations of this universe where people, spirits and gods meet. The Marquesans maintained harmony through their spiritual beliefs and their role as caretakers of the land and its inhabitants.
CHAPTER 4

Nuku Hiva in 1825: Artefacts collected during the voyage of the Maria Reigersberg and the Pollux

CAROLINE VAN SANTEN

On Monday 23 August 1824 two Dutch navy ships, the frigate Maria Reigersberg and the corvette Pollux, left the roadstead of Texel in the north of the Netherlands. They embarked on a journey to establish political and trade contacts with the emerging states in South America. Two experienced navy officers were selected for this expedition: Captain Frederik Coertzen (1771-1832), commander of the Maria Reigersberg, and Commander Christiaan Eeg (1774-1832), who commanded the Pollux. Both ships had extra crew on board to supplement the navy in the Dutch East Indies, their destination after South America.1

Besides the political and trade tasks the expedition members were ordered to make scientific observations, such as measuring latitude and longitude, declinations and hydrographic measurements.2 Also, because the route around Cape Horn and across the Pacific Ocean was less-known territory for the Dutch than the one around Cape of Good Hope to East Asia, the ships were not only equipped with charts and atlases, but also with several travel journals, mostly translated into Dutch, such as the 13 volumes of James Cook’s voyages between 1768 and 1780 and books by Krusenstern and Langsdorff.3 Several officers had also brought their own private books, such as David Porter’s journal. This publication was available on both ships.4

Many of the crew members, especially the naval officers, will have kept journals of some kind during the voyage. However, relatively few of these written accounts, which are the basis for the narrative below, seem to have survived. Most of the preserved texts deal with the whole trip, but some focus on particular topics, such as sea currents and distances or describe the stay on Nuku Hiva. Texts in some form or other have been made by the Commanders Coertzen and Eeg (official ship’s logs), Lieutenant-Commander of the marines Pieter Troost (1790/1-1846; published travelogue), Lieutenant Willem Carel Singendonck (1801-1874; private travelogue), midshipman Johan Christiaan van Haersolte (1809-1881; private travelogue and letters), Lieutenant-Commander Hendrik Franco Tengbergen (1795-1876; published article) and Lieutenant-Commander Gerhard Willinck (1795-1849; private ship’s
What these writers have in common is their military background. They often joined the navy, army or marines early on in their lives. They did not receive any higher education or academic training. However, in their narratives the individual authors show awareness of their knowledge of previous visits to the Marquesas and mention those narrators by name. Especially Krusenstern and Porter are referred to and, to a lesser extent, Langsdorff.

**Sojourn at Taiohae Bay**

After having visited St. George d’Elmina on Africa’s West coast and the South American countries Uruguay, Argentina, Chile and Peru, Commanders Coertzen and Eeg decided that it would be advisable to plan a stopover on their final route to the Dutch East Indies due to the high number of crew on board. Port Anna Maria, present-day Taiohae, on Nuku Hiva was chosen as a rendezvous point. Not only would this be a convenient location to replenish the water supply, it was also deemed to be a good place to stay for a while, should the two ships lose sight of one another.\(^5\)
On 13 May 1825 the first Marquesan island to be spotted on the horizon was Saint Dominica, now called Hiva Oa, and later that day Hood Island (present-day Fatu Huku) was detected. The next day first Riou, or Ua Huka, and later Nukuhiva (modern Nuku Hiva) came into view. It was not until 15 May, just after 2 o’clock, that they entered the bay of Taiohae. On entering the bay only two of the authors mentioned they saw a couple of men: ‘two natives who seemed to be completely naked’ according to Singendonck; Troost spoke of ‘three completely naked men, one of whom had a piece of matting around his body’. These men made a loud signalling sound by pressing their left arm to their side with the hand on the chest and slapping with their right hand on the inside of the elbow.

The Pollux anchored in the middle of the bay with the Maria Reigersberg on its starboard side. A few people were seen on the shore, some may have been armed with pikes, and also a white flag was waving from one of the dwellings near the beach. Commander Eeg decided to raise a white flag into the mizzenmast, which gesture was followed by the Maria Reigersberg. As soon as this was done, several Nuka Hivans came in canoes and a few others, mostly women, came swimming to both ships and climbed, hesitantly at first, on board. They were soon followed by others.

During their stay in Taiohae both ships received Nuku Hivan visitors on a regular basis. Each day the white flag was raised in the morning and lowered at sunset after the music succeeding the parade. At that moment, according to Van Haersolte, the officer of the watch declared the ship taboo and all Nuku Hivans left the ship. That is to say, all apart from the girls and women who were allowed to spend the night on board to amuse the sailors and marines, and most likely also some of the officers, but this was not mentioned in their writings. These girls were brought ashore each morning in jolly boats and returned in the evening. Troost mentioned that they came swimming to the ships. Eeg, however, stated that the girls and women had not stayed on board the first night and also that they seldom came swimming to the ships around sunset. But if jolly boats were sent ashore near the watering places, these returned with 30 to 40 women and girls.

Of the day-to-day events during the stay of the Dutch on Nuku Hiva not much has been recorded. Only one of the writers, Willinck, made a record in his journal of what occurred from day to day, but his résumé is incomplete, only stating the point of view from the Pollux and not showing Willinck’s own actions. In other ship’s journals, including the official ones, the arrival was mentioned, followed by a narrative about Nuku Hiva, and the diary was only picked up again once they left Taiohae. However,
with the help of Willinck's log a few occurrences can be dated. Firstly, the Dutch felt they had to introduce themselves properly to the person who was in charge of the bay. To this end on Tuesday 17 May Commander Eeg and a number of officers went ashore in two armed boats taking with them a large detachment of seamen and marines and all the musicians from both the Pollux and the Maria Reigersberg. They marched to a meeting place where Eeg communicated with two chiefs, regents for a descendant of Kiatonui, a boy who was still too young to reign himself.\(^\text{12}\) A second notable dated occurrence took place on Monday 23 May when two officers, Lieutenant-Commander Coops from the Maria Reigersberg and Lieutenant-Commander Tengbergen from the Pollux, were sent around the south coast of Nuku Hiva in a longboat to make observations. This party were the only crew to have visited another bay, most likely Hakatea Bay.\(^\text{13}\) However, the main concerns of the Dutch were the supply of freshwater and food and the repairing of the ships, which took up most of their time. On the morning of Thursday 26 May, both ships left Taiohae and set sail west towards their next destination, the Dutch East Indies.\(^\text{14}\)

**Gifts and barter**

Being familiar with Krusenstern's and Langsdorff's accounts, after they had left the Peruvian coast and set sail for Nuku Hiva, both Coertzen and Eeg had ordered the blacksmiths on board of their ships to make iron tools, such as axes, saws, knives and

---

Figure 4.3. Sketch of Marquesan stiltwalkers by J.C. van Haersolte [1825], pencil. In the collection of Historisch Centrum Overijssel (Arch.inv. 0237.1, inv.nr. 129).
scissors to use in the trade for supplies. However, having arrived on Nuku Hiva the Dutch were startled that iron and iron tools were no longer seen as being as valuable as they had been before. Eeg, for example, gave the two chiefs at the meeting place an axe and a knife each, with which he noted they were not too impressed. The diminished interest in iron was attributed to the fact that whaling vessels had visited the island for provisions on a regular basis. As Singendonck related, the Dutch were also surprised that the Nuku Hivans asked for gunpowder as a means of exchange, since they did not seem to have guns when Porter stayed on the island 12 years earlier. They were obviously not aware of the changes in the preferred items for bartering, guns and gunpowder, as a result of Porter’s stay on Nuku Hiva. The Dutch did not trade guns with the Nuku Hivans, but they used unusable gunpowder in the bartering process. Singendonck mentioned another possible object of exchange that would have been useful to bring, namely whale teeth. He said it was a pity the Dutch did not know beforehand the value Nuku Hivans attributed to this material, because it would have been easy to get those in the harbours on the South American coast with all the whaling vessels that anchored there.

Despite the diminished interest in iron tools and the fact that the Dutch only wanted to barter with gunpowder and not with guns, they were still able to acquire a considerable quantity of provisions. The bartering for supplies really took off after the delegation went ashore and the two chiefs had accompanied Commander Eeg to the Pollux. Two or three days later the chiefs returned to the Pollux and gave a number of coconuts and a head ornament. For this, Eeg presented them with a couple of yards of white cotton, which the chiefs used straight away as waist cloths.

In contrast to what happened on other voyages such as Krusenstern’s, everyone on board the Dutch ships was allowed to barter, so not just a few designated officers. Troost wrote how the sailors and marines, having heard stories about interesting things to acquire, had saved up trinkets such as coarse beads and buttons, for which they mostly acquired coconuts. Officers had also collected a stock of small things to give as presents or to barter with, such as nails, staples, iron and copper rings, and, for more important persons, objects such as small scissors, clasp knives, tokens and coins. Although iron in general was less liked, Singendonck described that when he traded something with a Nuku Hivan man in exchange for an old shaving knife:

[he] was so pleased with this valuable piece he had acquired that he showed his joy by hopping and dancing and straightaway he had to use his knife by shaving the head of one of his countrymen bald.

The Dutch also sometimes gave Nuku Hivans objects, merely to see what they would do with them. Troost mentioned for example giving one of the chiefs a number of coins and tokens just with that thought in mind. Van Haersolte described how the victualler, Mister Beekel, gave one of the chiefs two pipes and a pound of tobacco, which prompted the chief to cut a pipe in the hole in each of his earlobes and showed them off. Apart from the provisions, crew members were also interested in acquiring objects of a more curious nature. In addition to the head ornament mentioned above, Eeg indicated that only on the last day the Nuku Hivans offered some pikes and war
Figure 4.4. ‘Inhabitant of Nuku Hiva’, in P. Troost, Aantekeningen gehouden op eene reis… (Rotterdam, 1829), plate V.
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Figure 4.5. 'Images of objects collected on the Dutch navy voyage', in P. Troost, Aantekeningen gehouden op eene reis… (Rotterdam, 1829), plate III.
Van Haersolte mentioned in his travelogue that they had obtained some of their head, ear and neck ornaments, signal horn-shells, stilts, slings, pikes and clubs. In one of his letters to his parents, Van Haersolte wrote which pieces he had amassed himself: ‘… 2 neck rings, 2 head ornaments, 2 pair of ear ornaments, 2 trumpet shells which they use for trumpets and several other things, including 2 slings, very neatly plaited’.

Two days before the Dutch left Nuku Hiva, Troost received a club from a Marquesan man he had befriended, called ‘Poopie’. Troost had drawn an image in the sand of a club he had seen in Porter’s journal, to show Poopie what he was interested in. Only a few days later a number of islanders in canoes came to the Maria Reigersberg and brought the club aboard. Several crew members tried in vain to buy it from them. However, they only wanted to give it to Troost. He received the club from the hands of Poopie himself, who said ‘Typhies! Typhies!’ , from which Troost concluded that the club must have been booty from the Taipi. Troost gave Poopie an old uniform jacket and white linen trousers in return.

The objects mentioned above, of which some have found their way into museum collections, were not the only things the Dutch ‘collected’; some of the crew also produced a few images. Willinck only made a map of Taiohae Bay and a sketch of the Sentinels, two islands at the bay’s entrance. Van Haersolte too made a map and a drawing of the bay. More interesting, however, are the drawing he made of a tattooed Marquesan man and his sketch of three Marquesan stilt walkers. The latter, although small in size, is proof of the fact that Marquesans still used stilts in 1825, whereas it was previously thought that they had already abandoned this practice at an earlier stage. Van Haersolte also made a detailed drawing of a stilt step. This drawing is linked to a pair of stilt steps in a Dutch museum collection.

Another person who made drawings related to the Dutch voyage is Quirijn Maurits Rudolph Ver Huell (1787-1860). This naval officer did not take part in the expedition, but nevertheless played a role in the images from the voyage. He drew the plates for Troost’s publication, four of which are related to Nuku Hiva. One plate shows two different types of Marquesan huts and another an overview of Taiohae Bay, but this image is a rather generic tropical landscape. A third plate shows a group of objects, six Marquesan objects and two from Nui, which were presumably collected by Troost (see Figure 4.5). None of these have been traced, although there are some similarities with pieces collected by both Van Haersolte and Cosijn. The last plate shows a tattooed Marquesan man (see Figure 4.4). This image has been reproduced in several publications, among others in books by Von den Steinen and Ottino-Garanger. It is unknown on whose drawings the plates by Ver Huell are based and so far the originals, if still in existence, have not been located.
Collected Marquesan objects

As already follows from the previous section, the Dutch collected several Marquesan objects. In the overview below the objects and images that I have been able to trace to the voyage are discussed.

_Chest ornaments_

A type of chest ornament often referred to as a gorget is to be found in the object plate in Troost’s book (see Figure 4.5). Both the Museum Volkenkunde (MV) in Leiden (see Figure 4.6) and the Tropenmuseum (TM) in Amsterdam (see Figure 4.7) (now part of the National Museum of World Cultures (NMWC)), have a gorget in their collections that can be traced to the Dutch navy voyage. They consist of a wooden U-shaped base, most likely of breadfruit wood, which at one time had been covered with red and black coloured seeds, rosary pea (Abrus precatorius), set in resin. Two varieties of this type of chest ornament exist: those where the U-shaped wood is made of smaller pieces of wood strung together or those in which the U-shape consists of one piece of wood. The two mentioned above are of the latter variety and also the one depicted in Troost seems to be of this variety.

Besides the type of chest ornament mentioned above two other types of chest ornaments have also been collected. The first one has only been captured on paper (see Figure 4.1). Van Haersolte’s Marquesan man wears a necklace of pandanus fruit. The Marquesan in Troost’s publication (see Figure 4.4) seems to wear a similar type of necklace, although it is not very clearly drawn. The second type of chest ornament is a mother-of-pearl shell to which a small piece of plaited coconut cord though a man-made hole in the shell is attached (see Figure 4.8). The complete chest ornament must have been very similar to the one worn by the tattooed man drawn by Max Radiguet in 1842.

![Figure 4.6. Chest ornament collected by A. Cosijn. Held in the collection of the Museum Volkenkunde (RV-1474-16).](image-url)
Figure 4.7. Chest ornament collected by J.C. van Haersolte. Held in the collection of the Tropenmuseum, Amsterdam (TM-1322-210).

Figure 4.8. Shell chest ornament collected by J.C. van Haersolte. Held in the collection of the Tropenmuseum, Amsterdam (TM-4847-8).

Figure 4.9. Head ornament tete poniu collected by A. Cosijn. Held in the collection of the Museum Volkenkunde, Leiden (RV-1474-17).

Figure 4.10. Head ornament tete poniu collected by J.C. van Haersolte. Held in the collection of the Tropenmuseum, Amsterdam (TM-1322-212).
**Head ornaments**

At least two head ornaments of the type referred to in literature as tete poniu were collected by the Dutch. They are made of a piece of calabash adorned with rosary peas set in resin and bordered with natural coloured and dark brown plaited hibiscus fibres, which on both sides run into a cord. Both the MV and the TM have a head ornament like this in their collections (see Figures 4.9 and 10). Unfortunately, only the one in the MV has a few rosary peas left. In Troost's book an image of a tete poniu is also included in the object plate (see Figure 4.5).

**Ear ornaments**

In one of his letters home, Van Haersolte gave a detailed description of an ear ornament:

> The ear decoration consists of a flat ground shell, in which they put a kind of cork in which they have a wild boar's tusk the length of a little finger, in the earlobe they have a small hole through which they put the tooth. They stick a small pin through the tooth to prevent it from falling.

The Marquesan man who was drawn by him (see Figure 4.1) seems to wear this type of ear ornament, which is generally referred to as pu taiana. The shell used is usually a white species of cone shell, the rim of which has been carved with two shallow grooves and which has been filled with a wood-like material, possibly hibiscus. In addition to those ornaments made of a boar's tusk, there are also pu taiana whose spurs are made from a piece of whale tooth. Van Haersolte collected a pair of these which are now in the TM (see Figure 4.11). Only one of these ear ornaments is still complete and has a sitting tiki at the end of the spur and a stylized humanoid figure in bas-relief halfway. In the collections of the MV two pairs of pu taiana can be traced to the Dutch voyage. Of one pair both spurs have a larger tiki figure on the end and a slightly smaller one halfway on its side (see Figure 4.12). The other pair (Figure 4.13) is slightly smaller and the spurs only have one tiki figure on its side towards the end of the spur. The tiki on the left ear ornament is missing his head.

Van Haersolte also collected a pair of hakakai: ear ornaments completely made out of a piece of whale tooth (Figure 4.14). They are rather plain; only the right ear ornament is decorated with a stylized humanoid bas-relief figure on its side.

**Leg or arm ornament**

In his extensive study into the Marquesan material culture, Karl von den Steinen included an image from the object plate in Troost's book. He described it as a leg ornament made from shells, boar's tusks and coconut fibres. In the collection of the TM there is an ornament that is very similar to this drawing, although it only has shells and no boar's tusks (see Figure 4.15). It is a leg or arm ornament assembled in a similar way as the ones with locks of dark brown hair or, less common, black seeds. This type of ornament with shells seems to be one of a kind.
Trumpet shell
Less well-known than its larger counterpart is the small trumpet horn made of a red helmet shell (Cypraecassis rufa). One collected by Van Haersolte came into the collection of the TM (see Figure 4.16). It is a simple shell of which the top has been taken off, so it can function as a trumpet. It does not have any decorations or items attached to it.

Slings
Several Dutch crew members refer to the dexterity of Marquesans with the sling. Troost mentioned how well they could sling a selected fruit in the breadfruit tree into pieces and compared this with target practice for Dutch soldiers.45 A sling is included in the object plate of Troost’s book (see Figure 4.5). Van Haersolte mentioned in one

Figure 4.11. Ear ornaments pu taiana collected by J.C. van Haersolte. Held in the collection of the Tropenmuseum, Amsterdam (TM-1322-248).

Figure 4.12. Ear ornaments pu taiana collected by A. Cosijn. Held in the collection of the Museum Volkenkunde, Leiden (RV-1474-12).

Figure 4.13. Ear ornaments pu taiana collected by J.F. Kist. Held in the collection of the Museum Volkenkunde, Leiden (RV-360-7180).

Figure 4.14. Ear ornaments hakakai collected by J.C. Van Haersolte. Held in the collection of the Tropenmuseum, Amsterdam (TM-4847-14).
Figure 4.15 (left). Leg or arm ornament collected by J.C. van Haersolte. Held in the collection of the Tropenmuseum, Amsterdam (TM-4847-24).

Figure 4.16 (above). Trumpet shell collected by J.C. van Haersolte. Held in the collection of the Tropenmuseum, Amsterdam (TM-1322-254).

Figure 4.17. Sling collected by J.C. van Haersolte. Held in the collection of the Tropenmuseum, Amsterdam (TM-4847-21).
of his letters that he had acquired two slings which were ‘very neatly plaited’. One of his slings found its way into the collection of the TM (see Figure 4.17). The MV also has one sling in its collection which can be traced to the Dutch voyage (see Figure 4.18). Both slings are plain and do not have any decorations.

Clubs
The object plate in Troost’s publication (see Figure 4.5) shows an ‘u’u club and a chief’s staff, neither of which have so far been traced to a Dutch museum collection. The only club that has a direct link to the Dutch navy voyage is a paddle club or parahua (see Figure 4.19) which was donated to the MV by the Ministry of the Navy in 1883. In a catalogue of the Models Room it was described as coming from the inhabitants of Nukahiwa and having been brought back by the Maria Reigersberg in 1825.46 As for this type of club in drawings: Van Haersolte’s drawing is inconclusive, since his Marquesan man holds only part of a club, although it will most likely have been an paddle club. However, the man in Troost’s publication clearly holds a paddle shaped club.47

Figure 4.18. Sling collected by A. Cosijn. Held in the collection of the Museum Volkenkunde, Leiden (RV-1474-15).

Figure 4.19. Paddle club, parahua, donated to the Museum Volkenkunde, Leiden, by the Ministry of the Navy in 1883. (RV-351-24).
**Stilt steps**

Stilt walking is observed by several crew members. They differed in opinion about the function of stilt walking. On the backside of his stilt walker sketch, Van Haersolte noted that the stilts were being used to cross small streams. Troost thought it was a clever way to avoid dangerous animals such as scorpions and snakes in the lush undergrowth when walking from one dwelling to another. Such animals, however, are non-existent on the Marquesas Islands. And Singendonck saw it as a kind of amusement, dancing and chasing after each other. He described the stilts as having been made of black wood on which a human figure had been accentuated. This footrest was about one and a half feet long and tied to a bamboo pole.

Van Haersolte donated two stilt steps to a scientific society in Zwolle before 1852. Through another museum in Zwolle they ended up in the TM in 1939. These stilt steps were exchanged with a dealer for another object by the TM in 1991 and they are now in a private collection in the Netherlands (see Figure 4.20). The most interesting aspect of these stilt steps is that they are of the type described by Von den Steinen as ‘Ehepaar’ [Married Couple]. The first stilt step has two standing tiki figures with the back to one another, each holding their hands on their bellies. The platform on which the figures stand has one small lying tiki figure below on the left. On the other stilt step one figure is facing the front and the other one is turned sideways. Both tiki figures have the left hand high up towards the crown of the stilt step and the right hand on their bellies. In this case, the platform on which the tiki stand has a broad tiki head underneath. Interestingly both stilt steps have been made from non-tropical wood, perhaps carved from wood left behind by one of the many visiting ships.

As related before, Van Haersolte also made a drawing of a similar type of stilt step (see Figure 4.21). This one has two standing tiki figures with their backs to one another and their hands on their bellies. As with the previous one the figures stand on a platform with a broad tiki head underneath. The collection of the MV contains a pair of stilt steps which had been bought in an auction in Amsterdam in 1885 (see Figure 4.22). One of them looks almost identical to the

*Figure 4.20. Two stilt steps, tapucaes, collected by J.C. van Haersolte. Held in a private collection in the Netherlands. Photo: Fotolemaire.*
Figure 4.21. Van Haersolte’s drawings of a Marquesan stilt [1825], pencil/watercolour. In the collection of Historisch Centrum Overijssel (Arch.inv. 0237.1, inv.nr. 129).
one in Van Haersolte’s drawing, the only difference being that the design of the body carving of one stilt figure seems to have been switched with the one on the other stilt step. This stilt step also has two tiki figures with the backs against each other, but in this case the one on the left has his head turned towards the front. The MV collection also comprises a stilt step with the more common single standing tiki figure (see Figure 4.23) which can be traced to the Dutch voyage.

**Conclusion**

In the 21-year period between the Krusenstern expedition and the Dutch navy visit, a lot had happened in the Marquesas Islands. The increasing number of ships that stopped there for provisions, repairs and pleasure brought with them new materials, tools and diseases. Especially after Porter’s visit in 1813 the influx of muskets and
gunpowder had brought great changes to island society, not in the least in the process of bartering in which it started to play a major role as the Dutch also experienced. However, despite all the foreigners who visited the islands since 1774 and all the new materials they brought with them, many objects, like chest ornaments or gorgets and head ornaments, collected in 1825 are still very similar to the ones collected 20 to 50 years beforehand. Or at least this is what can be concluded from the objects collected by foreign visitors, such as the Dutch, and/or the objects the Marquesans wanted to use for bartering and which can be traced to the present day.

Comparing the relative small group of objects collected by the Dutch with the ones from the Krusenstern expedition a few distinctions can be observed. The most notable difference is the increasing use of whale teeth, especially in ear ornaments. From a design point of view the stilt steps with the two figures back to back are a new feature. However, it does not seem to have taken hold in the artisans’ repertoire, since there are only a limited number of these ‘Ehepaar’ stilts known. A rarity to conclude with is the leg or arm ornament solely adorned with small shells, which seems to be one of a kind.
CHAPTER 5

Tiki, mana, history: reflections on Marquesan art and the Krusenstern expedition

NICHOLAS THOMAS

Anyone who has had the privilege to encounter a wide range of tiki, of the ‘images’ that constitute what can be called ‘Marquesan art’, can only be overwhelmed by the mana, the extraordinary power, of this Polynesian art. If, in particular, you have had the opportunity to handle, unwrap, and examine the intricate woven constructions of feather headdresses, if you have held and felt the weight of clubs, of ‘u’u and parahua, if your eyes have sought to unravel the mind-boggling variety of subtle variations across a genre such as that of the stilt step, the tapuvae, you can only be profoundly impressed by the skill and dexterity of the artists who created these remarkable works. Equally, you can only be moved by the sheer intelligence materialized in these forms: the logic of their motifs, and of the transformations of those motifs, speak a formidable capacity to conceptualize, project, and innovate upon form.

Following Karl von den Steinen’s great compendium and analysis of the 1920s, the most insightful exploration of the tradition is without doubt that of Alfred Gell. Forming the eighth chapter of his celebrated, if controversial, Art and Agency (1998), Gell’s discussion attempted to create a new basis and framework for the study of artistic style, grounded not in superficial affinities between motifs or sets of motifs, but in the relations among motifs, and in the principles generative of those relations. Gell’s analysis bore something of the character of the art itself: intricate, complex, difficult, at times bewildering. While repudiating any reductive sociological correlation between ‘art’ and ‘society’, the exegesis suggested that a ‘principle of least difference’, that is, a model of motif-transformation was ‘akin’ to the distinctive dynamic of the Marquesan social formation. ‘The forms taken by motifs and figures are the ones involving the least modification of neighbouring motifs consistent with the establishment of a difference between them’; hence a face and a seated god resemble each other. And Marquesan society, Gell noted, drawing on my own early study (1990), ‘was characterized by an acute preoccupation with ‘social difference’ in a political context of ‘devolved’ or fractured hierarchy in which ‘difference’ was exceptionally difficult to sustain, practically.’

Peter Brunt has recently distilled the question that the art, and Gell’s reading, foreground:
Paul Gauguin said it best when he described the character of Marquesan style as ‘always the same thing and yet never the same thing’. He was referring to the repetition of conventionalized tiki (godling) figures and schematic patterns across the entire range of Marquesan material culture and body art (tattooing, adornments, statues, clubs, bowls, food pounders, fan handles, etcetera), and at the same time, the fecundity of artistic play: of small formal variations, witty inventions, visual puns and ironic allusions that kept the endless iteration of the same alive with the constant slip and surprise of minor differences.

He concluded:

The question is: how is Marquesan style, not just in the prevalence of war clubs, tattooing and body adornment but in the very logic of its formal language – ‘always the same thing and yet never the same thing’ – to be related to the temper of warfare and social instability that characterized Marquesan society until the mid-nineteenth century?

What these fascinating discussions have not done is situate the art historically, or offer a historicized analysis. Was Marquesan art always like this, or ‘classically’ like this? Was Marquesan society, similarly, a constant counterpart to the material culture? Carol Ivory has identified and documented a colonial Marquesan style of the second half of the nineteenth century, distinguished by an elaboration of decoration on clubs, bowls and other forms, typically and predominantly made for sale: contemporary Marquesan wooden sculpture can be seen as a continuation of this style. The catalogues associated with the 2005 New York and 2016 Paris exhibitions accordingly offered works associated on the one hand with a tradition, and on the other a period of revival. ‘Classical’ Marquesan art was not itself historicized, though many of the works listed were attributed to the ‘19th century’.

Though this attribution was probably correct for most if not all of the artefacts shown, its implications are confusing. Were these works therefore not representative of Marquesan art, before the nineteenth century, or before European contact? What chronology of contact would be relevant, and would enable understanding of Marquesan art’s development over time? Did reference to the ‘19th century’ imply that older, eighteenth century works would have been different?

While histories of Indigenous peoples, and histories of the Pacific in particular, have turned upon the idea of ‘first contact’, and treated the moment of initial encounter between Europeans and native people as a foundational event for subsequent interaction, scholars such as Chris Ballard have criticized an ethnocentric temporal understanding that underlies this preoccupation with an event, or what may have been a ‘non-event’, in local imagining. This point is relevant; but there is also a more specific issue in Marquesan history.

The first Europeans to visit the archipelago were Quiros and his companions, who interacted violently with people at Fatuiva and Tahuata, killing perhaps 200 Islanders over a week in July and August 1595. The islands were not called at again for nearly
180 years, until the arrival of the Resolution in April 1774, not quite two years into Cook’s second voyage. The encounter, again primarily at Vaitahu bay on the island of Tahuata, took place over just four days. As Cook had difficulties obtaining pigs in exchange he decided quickly to move on elsewhere.

In neither 1595 nor 1774 were the northern Marquesas – the inhabited islands of Nukuhiva, ‘Ua Pou, and ‘Ua Huka – visited. The Boston merchant Ingraham and the French trader Marchand were, in 1792, the first to engage with their inhabitants; from this time contacts became more frequent; and from 1797 European beachcombers such as Edward Robarts and Joseph Kabris, and the missionary-turned-beachcomber William Pascoe Crook, were resident and acted as go-betweens when ships visited. When, over this period, should we say that ‘first contact’ took place? Was ‘first contact’ consequential, in what ways? From the perspective of the creation of tiki, of art forms, when did contact make a difference, prompting adaptation, innovation and transformation of works? How, anyway, did encounter change art?

Not all these questions can be answered, or even considered here. But the identification of Krusenstern voyage artefacts that we have engaged in, the re-assembly of the collections made in May 1804, provides a new basis for the exploration of early Marquesan art. It is possible, for the first time, to go beyond a corpus of ‘classic’ works attributed to ‘the 19th century’. This chapter considers, in a limited and provisional way, the distinctions between eighteenth century collections; collections from the very beginning of the nineteenth century; and those made later. These distinctions are suggestive and they point to certain conclusions, but they also raise a host of issues that require further work.

A truly historical investigation of early Marquesan art could provisionally be said to have five reference points, which are:

1. the Cook collection of 1774;
2. the Krusenstern voyage collections, documented here;
3. some 35 more or less contemporaneous artefacts, collected between about 1800 and 1803, brought back by a number of New England traders, now in the collections of the Peabody Essex Museum in Salem (which holds a further 30 pieces attributable to specific voyages up to the mid-1820s);
4. the Dutch collection of 1825, documented in Caroline van Santen’s chapter (Chapter 4); and
5. later collections, together with the wider body of less well-provenanced artefacts.

The collection made during the visit of the Resolution in April 1774 is not made up of ‘pre-contact’ artefacts – the event or non-event had taken place much earlier, in 1595. No objects that were collected during that late sixteenth century encounter have survived or can be identified, nor do the voyage sources incorporate references to material culture that are useful from the perspective of this inquiry. We cannot know whether the weapons, ornaments, vessels and other material forms of the people who encountered the Spanish resembled those in use later. We cannot know whether iron obtained by Islanders during that visit was used, or adapted for use in wood carving, work with shell, or other materials, leading to modified practices and artefacts as early as the end of the sixteenth century.
Kaeppler’s *Artificial Curiosities* attributed, in 1978, 35 artefacts from the Marquesas to the *Resolution* visit. The bulk were associated with Johann Reinhold Forster and are divided between Oxford and Göttingen; a number of other pieces were collected by the Forsters’ assistant, Anders Sparrman, and are now in the Stockholm Ethnographic Museum. Five of the artefacts appeared in an engraved plate published with the official narrative, *Cook’s Voyage toward the South Pole* (1774; Figure 2.3); the club in the centre of the print is in the British Museum; the other four are all in the Forster collection in the Pitt Rivers Museum. The remaining objects include headdresses, chest and other ornaments, fans and a shell trumpet.

Of all the early collections, those associated with the Krusenstern expedition are in total by far the most numerous, consisting of approximately 225 objects. Some of the 1804 artefacts are similar to those collected by Cook 30 years earlier; some are similar to objects collected by the Dutch 20 years later, and by French mariners in the 1840s; hence there are notable continuities, which may be attributed either to continuity in artistic creation, or to the fact that artefacts made, say, around 1800 still existed and were still being collected as late as the 1840s. But the Krusenstern voyage artefacts also have attributes not found in the Forster-Sparrman collections from Cook’s second voyage. The Dutch collection similarly includes artefacts which are distinctive relative to those collected in both 1774 and 1804.

The points suggested by these comparisons are as follows:

1. The ‘u’u club represented in the 1777 engraving, now in the British Museum, does not bear the complex decoration which is fully realized in both the one example which was definitely collected during the Krusenstern voyage (W1), and the second St Petersburg club which may also have been collected in 1804 (W2). Given that two ‘u’u in the Peabody Essex Museum in Salem collected slightly earlier, around 1800, also bear the famous, multiple eyes, faces and related motifs, it is clear that the elements of this genre were fully established by the end of the eighteenth century.

   While absence of evidence is not evidence of absence, there are strong grounds for considering the ‘plain’ ‘u’u in the engraving to be representative of clubs of its period, the 1770s, and presumably earlier. It is notable also that the long clubs (parahua) which are sometimes mistaken for paddles are well represented in the earliest collections and may have been as or more common, as a type of weapon.

   Research across many collections, reported upon in detail elsewhere in this set of volumes, has found that all ‘u’u bearing complex decoration (that I have had the opportunity to examine) also feature fine, sharp and straight cuts that could only have been made with introduced tools. Cook’s men gave away in exchange a good deal of iron in 1774, probably stimulating this elaboration and refinement of the genre. The renewal of contact from the early 1790s increased the availability of iron (and glass) providing artists with continuing capacity to create sharper tools and engage in the more precise work characteristic of the ‘classic’ ‘u’u.

2. Similarly, the fans bearing elaborately sculpted handles of wood and bone – sometimes in combination on a single fan – are similarly unrepresented in the 1774 collection, and it is unlikely that such intricate work on either material could have been
executed without iron tools. The Krusenstern collections suggest that at the start of the nineteenth century most fans, including those exhibiting exceptionally fine weaving, bore simple wooden handles. However, one featuring stacked, back-to-back ivory tiki is extant, and there is also a fan with a handle sculpted primarily in bone, but with a wooden section at its base, in Salem, which reached the museum in 1802 (E.5,099).

3. The ear ornaments deriving from the 1804 visit are of several types, made of soft wood, in some cases within a shell ring, and in some cases with a pin formed from a boar’s tusk or bone. There are no examples of the complex ear ornaments known as pu taiana or pu taiata, which as Kjellgren and Ivory state, ‘consist of a caplike cylinder of shell into which is inserted an elaborately carved spur’ of human bone. The spur features a rank or arrangement of minute figures, relating in some cases to a narrative of two girls on a swing, who trick the young man, Akaui, and in others to death in childbirth, among other themes. The 1825 collection does include pu taiana, but they are notably less elaborate than the examples in the 2005 and 2016 catalogues, which generally lack specific provenances. This implies that the genre underwent continuing elaboration and refinement from the start of the nineteenth century onwards. The Krusenstern collections do, on the other hand, include several examples of the soft wooden type of ear ornament in which an extension (made of the same wood) features highly abstracted tiki. In other words, the compositional concept associated with the pu taiana appears already present; innovation adopted a harder, more valuable material, susceptible to being polished and rendered almost iridescent. At the same time, the tiny figures were treated more sculpturally and their arrangement diversified to represent, perhaps more explicitly than earlier, several different stories and themes.

4. Some of the cylindrical bone pieces known as ivi poʻo in the Krusenstern voyage collections are decoratively ridged but just one, in Munich, is sculpted into the tiki form. This implies that the tiki ivi poʻo which have been published and exhibited extensively, e.g. in the 2005 and 2016 catalogues, were like the sculpted fans initially rare. They were however present in the earliest collection: an elaborate sling in the British Museum (Oc1977,Q.9) features an extension of human hair, an ornamental seed, and a clearly sculpted and defined tiki ivi poʻo. As there is graphic evidence in the form of a Sarah Stone drawing for this artefact being in the Leverian Museum, this piece is certainly among the artefacts of the 1774 encounter.

These observations point towards a trajectory, one of dramatic elaboration. But the last point underscores a need for caution. It would be wrong to suggest that intricately decorated Marquesan artefacts were absent from the 1770s collections, and a development only of the post-contact, or post-1800 period. To the contrary, there is evidence that the design system which became canonical was present among some of the earliest artefacts. The first documented stilt steps (tapuvae) – known through an engraving in the publication of Marchand’s voyage, which called at Tahuata in 1791 – exhibit the same kinds of engraved surface as those collected later. Neither does the evidence indicate a straightforward ‘before’ iron tools and an ‘after’. Instead, genres appear to have been foci for elaboration over different periods. Highly elaborate ‘u’u
were created during the 1780s and 1790s on the basis of the ‘plain’ and slightly smaller type exemplified by the 1774 object, and perhaps supplanted parahua. Fans with elaborately sculpted handles in bone as well as wood appear to have been present but very scarce around 1802-1804, and to be better represented in later collections.

There is no evidence that the famous sculpted bone ear ornaments were yet being made, at the beginning of the nineteenth century. In so far as the Dutch collection may be representative, they were only partially elaborated in the 1820s. The finer examples, featuring more numerous figures, in virtually all cases lack specific acquisition dates. Pu tai ana may have been the last of the notionally canonical genres to have undergone – perhaps in the 1830s and 1840s – the refinement associated with what is supposedly the ‘type’. This ‘type’, is evidently in fact a specific historical expression of the development of a more diverse group of ornaments.

These comments are tentative. They relate only to certain of the artefacts and artefact genres represented in the Krusenstern voyage collections, and others. A great deal of further work could be done, on headdresses, fishhooks and barkcloth among other forms not discussed here.

In an overview of Sepik art published in another volume in this series, Anthony Forge suggested that the astonishing range of material from the region raised the questions, ‘Why is there so much and why is it so important?’ The conundrums are equally apt in the case of the Marquesas, and there is intriguingly a resonance between the provisional answer that Forge gave, and the lines of inquiry that were salient to Gell’s investigation, cited earlier, of Marquesan style.

Forge turned to hierarchy, or rather the relative presence and absence of hierarchy, to address the issue.

One of the most important aspects of ritual art is the expression of the relationship between the individual or group and the supernatural. In hierarchical societies, and most of island Melanesia is hierarchical in some sense, these relationships are managed by a chief or a small group at the top of some merit system… often the possession of ritual paraphernalia is in itself a sign of rank, so in general there is less need for art in quantity. Without hierarchy, every tiny group must handle its own supernatural relations and compete with every other; every individual has to assert his own prestige with the group and outside it, and all use art for these purposes so there is a very large amount of art.

Referring to Shirley Lindenbaum, he went on to refer to groups such as Iatmul and Abelam as ‘cultural factories’, producers of forms for export,

expanding their symbolic and conceptual systems as quickly as they expand their territory, taking great pleasure in their dominance over their neighbours but also in the intensification and perfection of their own ritual systems.

It is important not to conflate these arguments. Gell’s was based on stylistic principles rather than volume, quality or ‘importance’, and suggested that the distinctiveness of the Marquesan context arose not from an absence of hierarchy but from what I had
referred to as devolution, that is, a relatively unstructured, dynamic, competitive system, in which hierarchical distinctions were available, yet not definitely prescribed: rank and status were not given, but there to be secured or seized through compelling and effective action, violence and performance. In the Marquesas, we might also ask why there was ‘so much’ art. If what counts as ‘a lot’ is somewhat arbitrary, given especially the vagaries of preservation and our uncertainty as to the exact population in the early period, we can be in no doubt that art was ‘important’. On their own scale, Marquesan communities were certainly ‘cultural factories’ like those of the Sepik. They exhibit much the same ‘explosion of cultural energy’ or ‘burst of creativity’ as Forge highlighted in the Sepik.12

If, in social-systemic terms, unstable hierarchy helps explain a proliferation of aesthetically challenging and compelling art forms, the historic context in eastern Polynesia helps explain the broad trend referred to above, towards greater intricacy and elaboration in such forms. In 1774, Marquesan societies were already distinguished by localized competition, as it were by the improvisation of hierarchy. The circumstances of contact at once supercharged and imbalanced competition. Marquesans swiftly attached considerable mana – prestige, sanctity, power – to associations with Europeans, that is, both with the social relationships that were initiated with visiting mariners, and with artefacts such as fabrics and weapons which were obtained from them. Foreign contact, needless to say, was not something all Islanders could access. Ships happened to call at particular harbours. The places that became known as safe anchorages, which were visited and revisited, swiftly gained advantages that they had not previously possessed. Within localized communities, certain individuals moreover obtained privileged access. The dynamism of an already competitive order was thus disrupted and intensified. Under these circumstances, it is not at all surprising that an art system which had long been expressive of individuals’ mana, long a technology to enhance or sustain prestige and status, should be a focus for the investment of further creative energy, indeed of an explosion of artistic creativity.

This implies that the object of curatorial, anthropological, art historical and indeed Indigenous knowledge should not be ‘Marquesan art’, a corpus and style loosely associated with an epoch, but a proliferation of tiki, that is, a historical development. This perspective has two broader implications. First, it makes the ‘history’ of Oceanic art more like the history of any other art. Rather than framing work by place, ethnic group, culture or tradition, and situating it in time only in relation to authentic tradition or revival, it situates art in relation to social changes both internal to local societies and responsive to their engagement with wider networks and relations. The latter precede, and are not limited to, the expansion of European commerce and empire, even though such contacts generate the collections through which we know these art histories, and shape them in powerful ways. Secondly, it highlights the extraordinary creativity of the artists of the early contact period. These practitioners were not only making remarkable works in a variety of genres. They were inventing and reinventing those genres, making not ‘examples’ of established forms, but in effect new forms. The period of early encounter was exciting, fertile, dangerous and difficult for both Europeans and Islanders. As the archive of artefacts is more fully investigated, it becomes apparent that this extraordinary time stimulated the making of extraordinary things.
Figure 5.1. Mark Adams, Krusenstern’s Memorial at St Mary’s Cathedral, Tallinn. 25 September 2016.
PART THREE
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CATALOGUE
This section provides a full listing of all the artefacts across the collections we have studied that were collected from Nuku Hiva by participants in the Krusenstern expedition. The catalogue includes artefacts that are documented through inventories, but currently missing; we also include objects depicted in drawings, engravings and other visual images.

For the purposes of this volume and for future reference, we have grouped artefacts in broad categories such as headdresses, weapons, neck ornaments, and so on. Most of these groups embrace a number of more specific Marquesan artefact categories; in a few cases anomalous artefacts have been somewhat arbitrarily included under what seemed the most relevant heading.

Each object is identified by a letter, such as H for headdress, and a number: H1, H2, etc. We refer to relevant images in the same way, but with a hyphen: H-8 is an engraving depicting a headdress.

It should be emphasized that the findings presented here are provisional. The majority of the artefacts discussed are of known Marquesan genres and are stylistically consistent with a range of examples in collections; we are confident that the evidence referred to concerning their voyage provenance is clear, if not invariably absolutely unambiguous. However, some genres, such as barkcloth specimens and fishhooks, are more similar across islands and archipelagos and their identification as Marquesan examples may be more tentative. Our research continually addressed issues of misattribution, and it is a common feature of old ethnographic collections that artefacts over time are regularly misattributed to both neighbouring and more distant populations and regions. In various cases of uncertainty we have exercised judgement and included or excluded pieces about which there was some doubt.
While this catalogue includes the full range of artefacts we have identified, up to the time of its completion (May 2018, see Table 2.1), it is likely that further objects will come to light in due course and that the Krusenstern voyage collection, and related collections, will be re-assessed and further interpreted as investigation advances, particularly in collaboration with Islanders. Our hope is that this initial study will draw attention to the importance, range and dispersal of Krusenstern voyage collections, and enable further research.

**Ornaments**

At the time of the Russian visit, according to Shemelin, ‘Among their decorations one does not notice any European items, such as glass beads, trade beads, shiny buttons and so on, but both sexes decorate themselves with island produce’.

**Headdresses**

A small number of headdresses preserved in museums, which can be attributed to Krusenstern’s expedition, are supplemented by pictorial and textual accounts of the participants. Tilesius noted that ‘in the dress as well as in the taste of the different islands small differences prevail, and can be noted on the artful head decorations made of feathers with incised pearl shell plates, which Forster has illustrated and which we did not notice on Nukahiwa’. The illustration, actually first published in Cook (1777) (see figure 1.9) but reprinted in German editions of Forster, is in fact of a composite headdress consisting of two parts – a feather headdress and a fibre band decorated with pearl shell and turtle shell discs. Krusenstern described head ornaments of different types as follows:

> The head-dress consists either of a large helmet of black cocks’ feathers, or of a kind of diadem or band of woven cocoa fibres, ornamented with mother of pearl; or else of a ring made of a soft wood, from which a row of strings is suspended. Several wore broad leaves stuck in their hair.

E.S. Craighill Handy considered that the first type of headdress described by Krusenstern was probably *tuette*, ‘a feather headdress made by binding the neck and breast feathers of a black chicken on sennit’, but considering that a *tuette* was not brought back by the expedition and does not appear in other accounts, Krusenstern is more likely describing the *tavaha* type of headdress, distinguished by long black cock tail feathers. The Krusenstern expedition brought at least one headdress of this type to Russia; it is stored at the MAE, being transferred there from the Admiralty Museum in 1828 (H1). The MAE also has a similar headdress donated in 1928 (no. 3757-9), but its original collector is unknown. The other feather headdress brought by the expedition is from Horner’s collection in the Ethnographic Museum of Zurich University (H2). While in the earliest inventory of Horner’s collection it was described as ‘A feather ornament, which is used as decoration on hands and feet’, the latter words in the Zurich inventory were amended to ‘for head (Heikua)’. And indeed this is a fine example of a *heiku* type headdress made of orange-brown rooster feathers attached to a woven cord decorated with zigzag embroidery. The peculiarities in the weaving of the band in
comparison with the heiku’a at the Musée du Quai Branly in Paris (no. 71.1909.19.23 Oc D) suggests that there was no total uniformity in the production of this ornament.

Expedition members also provided several pictorial representations of feather headdresses. Lisiansky’s engraving is similar to the Zurich heiku’a headdress (H2) although in his Atlas it was placed on the plate of Hawaiian artefacts (H-8). Tilesius’ sketch of a feather headdress (see figure 1.8) presents two types of feathers; he obviously aimed to provide a precise image of Nuku Hivan ornaments which was never included in any of his engravings as a whole. It is possible that the engraving of a Nuku Hivan with a feather headband in Krusenstern’s Atlas was partly based on the above sketch by Tilesius, but with an application of artistic license (see figure 1.10, above, 1st on the left).

Tilesius recorded two words for headdresses: Pae and Pehue, noting that the latter means a feather headdress.⁷ The usage of these terms is confirmed by Dordillon’s dictionary: pa’e indeed is the general term for head ornaments and hats/caps,⁸ while pehue (peue) was the general term for feather headdresses.⁹ Langsdorff in his ‘Vocabulary from the Island of Nuku Hiva’ recorded words for two types of feather headdresses as bete (i.e. peue) and heigüa.¹⁰ The latter obviously refers to the above mentioned heiku’a style headdress.

The second type of headdress mentioned by Krusenstern – ‘a kind of diadem or band of woven cocoa fibres, ornamented with mother of pearl’ – might be uhikana, a woven headband ornamented with pearl shell and openwork carved turtle shell disks. Steinen noted that there is no documentary record in the early literature of the presence of uhikana in the north-western group of the Marquesas, including Nuku Hiva.¹¹ Although neither Krusenstern nor Langsdorff in their descriptions of a similar ornament ‘made from feathers mixed with mother-of-pearl and other trimmings’¹² specified that it included turtle shell, it can be stated with certainty that uhikana was used by Nuku Hivans at the time of the Russian visit: one was acquired by Lisiansky and is now in his collection in the Museum of Anthropology of Moscow University (H3). This item was also depicted in Lisiansky’s Atlas (H-9). The Moscow uhikana belongs to the old tracery style described by Karl von den Steinen, with an ipu, or container, motif.¹³

The third type of headdress described by Krusenstern – ‘a ring made of a soft wood, from which a row of strings is suspended’ – might correspond to George Forster’s description of ‘a circle, from whence several ranges of twisted strings of coco-nut core, about two inches long, either of the natural colour, or dyed black, diverged round the head’, which he saw at Tahuata.¹⁴ This description corresponds with the tapiuma in the Forster collection at the Pitt Rivers Museum (1886.1.1266).

Shemelin noted that ‘headdresses decorated with red peas’ were among the ornaments the Nuku Hivans brought to the Russian ships for barter. Rezanov’s kokoshnik [frontlet] with glued red beans¹⁵ clearly refers to the same type of ornament. This frontlet can be identified as tete poniu, which was often a part of composite headdresses. Only one item of this type survived in the expedition collections: it can be found in Horner’s Zurich collection (H4). Steinen considered it to be one of the oldest preserved tete poniu.¹⁶ It should be noted that the Zurich Antiquarian Society’s transfer inventory listed it as ‘Neck ornament made of a gourd vessel pasted with red beans’, but its similarity with tete poniu in other museums helps its identification. Time has taken its toll on this artefact: the
beans have partly fallen off and the trimming has disintegrated from the centrepiece, but using better preserved *tete poniu* in other collections as a guide, it can be reassembled. According to Linton, the trimming with a repeated zigzag motif was plaited from 'strings of white tapa and blackened fau bark'.\footnote{17} The trimming in Horner’s artefact is made of tapa. Such trimming was consistently used for the ornamentation of *tete poniu*, a uniformity Steinen noted in his study: ‘All [*tete poniu*] I have met differ in width, but are perfectly comparable in the trimmings and fields of red beans.’\footnote{18}

The Russian visitors also described a head ornament with boar tusks, which was not noted by other visitors. Löwenstern drew a portrait of a Nuku Hivan wearing such a headband (see Figure 1.7), while Tilesius mentioned boar tusk ornaments as a part of composite headdresses:

> This necklace of boar tusks is also worn on the head, especially by priests; but over it they put another [noun missing – probably ‘head ornament’], which is curly and beautifully woven from mulberry tree bark or from string.\footnote{19}

He made a painstakingly accurate drawing of this ornament (H-10), which was later incorporated into the iconic image of the Nuku Hivan with an ‘*u‘u* club and gourd (see Figure 1.4). His further comments about this headdress can be found in the obscure publication of the coloured engraving by Bertuch: ‘the bottom of his hat is trimmed with tusks and the top is made of small sticks of the breadfruit tree glued together. The tip is adorned with a tuft of hair of a defeated enemy.’\footnote{20} This headdress might correspond to the object which was once in the collection of the Admiralty Museum in St Petersburg; it was described in the inventory of 1825 as ‘Decorated cap of the inhabitants of the Marquesas Islands’ with note ‘From Captain Krusenstern’ (H7). The identity of this type of headdress remains unclear.

The Russian visitors did not mention the spectacular *pa‘e kaha* headdress consisting of a woven band with engraved turtle shell panels, which might suggest that at the time of the Russian visit this ornament, typical for the southern Marquesas, was not common on Nuku Hiva.
H1 Headdress (ta’avaha)
Rooster tail feathers, wood, coconut fibre
W 105 cm, h 35 cm
Ta’avaha headdress made from black rooster tail feathers, consisting of two connected fan-like parts.
St Petersburg, MAE: 736-227
1828 Transferred from Admiralty Museum to Kunstkamera (MAE)

H2 Headdress (heikua)
Rooster feathers, coconut fibre
L from front to knot 30 cm; W 30.5 cm
Headdress made of sennit, plant fibre and feathers. The binding on the base has a complex structure, formed of bundles of sennit strands, which lead through two supporting cords, and terminate in several bunches, each of approximately ten feathers.
Zürich, EMZU: 02325
Horner collection
**H3 Headdress (uhikana)**
Coconut fibre, turtle shell, pearl shell
Band length 115 cm, width 4 cm; diameter of large turtle shell disc 13 cm, pearl shell disc 5 cm, small turtle shell disc 4 cm
Headband braided of coconut fibre to which, most likely, four disks were originally attached, of which three are extant. A plaque of turtle shell and pearl shell, which, according to the above engraving would be attached to the end of the band, is also missing, although the thread at the spot where it was attached is still visible.
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/16
Lisiansky collection

**H4 Headdress (tete poniu)**
Gourd, tapa, Abrus precatorius seeds, resin
W 23.4 cm, depth 19.4 cm, H 6.7 cm
Part of a calabash gourd with Abrus precatorius seeds. Some 80% of the seeds are detached; the trimming is made of dark dyed pandanus leaves and light coloured tapa strands. Two smaller ribbons adorn the top end of the calabash, one broader one its base end. All three ribbons are worked differently and therefore show different patterns.
Zürich, EMZU: 02365
Horner collection
**H5 Resin to affix seeds**

Resin  
Zürich, EMZU: 00464  
Horner collection  
Missing

**H6 Box with detached seeds**

Abras precatorius seeds  
Zürich, EMZU: 00465 (o.Nr.1821)  
Horner collection

**H7 Headdress**

‘Decorated cap of the inhabitants of the Marquesas Islands”

Donated by Krusenstern to Admiralty Museum  
Not identified in collections at present

**H-8 Iury Lisiansky,**  
‘Headdress’, engraving,  
in Iurii Lisianskii,  
*Sobranie kart i risunkov, prinadlezhashchikh k puteshestviu flota kapitana… Lisianskogo na korabli ‘Neva’*  
(St Petersburg: Morskaia tipografiia, 1812), pl. II, A.

**H-9 Iury Lisiansky,**  
‘Headband with fretworked turtle shell disk’, engraving depicting headdress (uhikana), in Lisianskii, *Sobranie kart…*, pl. I, A.
Chest ornament (tahi poniu)

Krusenstern considered that Nuku Hivans paid ‘chief attention… to the ornament for their necks’ and most of the varieties of this type of artefact are well represented in the collections of the Russian expedition. The most elegant among them was the tahi poniu, which Krusenstern described as a ‘gorget, in the shape of a crescent, made of… soft wood, to which several rows of red seeds are affixed; and this ornament is the particular mark of a priest.’ The seeds (red with black tips) adorning this gorget are Abrus precatorius, known to Marquesans as poniu, while one of the meanings of tahi is ‘united, joined’. Four tahi poniu brought by the Russian expedition survive in museum collections; there are also seven sketches, drawings, and engravings of this spectacular artefact. Tahi poniu were made of segments, usually carved from the wood of the breadfruit tree. Each segment had a raised collar and was drilled with holes, through which twine was threaded to connect them together. The ends of these twines were used to secure the gorget around the neck. The wood was whitened with lime or clay, and the seeds were glued on with breadfruit resin. The distribution of seeds on the tahi poniu collected by the expedition is of two types: radial rows, two seeds in width and separated by spaces, and radial rows of single seeds with no separation between them. The former are in Lisiansky’s MAE collection (Tp1) and in both Estonian collections (Tp2, Tp3), the latter is represented by Horner’s artefact in Zürich (Tp5). Drawings of the tahi poniu can similarly be divided into two types: Lisiansky and Tilesius had distinctly separated rows of seeds (see Figures 2.1, F; 1.3; 1.4), while Langsdorff and Loewenstern presented them as contiguous rows (see Tp-6; Figures 2.2; 1.7). The variations in seed distribution were noted by von den Steinen and artefacts of the Russian expedition testify that these variations occurred in the same location and at the same time.

The iconic image of a tattooed Nuku Hivan in Krusenstern’s Atlas is presented wearing a tahi poniu with rows of double seeds (see Figure 1.4). Tilesius, in his handwritten captions for the Atlas plates, named him as ‘The chief priest.’ The original version of this portrait in Blumenbach’s collection, drawn by Tilesius, had the title ‘A so-called priest or distinguished savage of the Marquesan Island of Nuku Hiva in decoration’ (see Figure 1.3), which corresponds to Krusenstern’s impression that this ornament was characteristic for priests. Tilesius also made a field sketch of a tattooed man wearing a tahi poniu and other ornaments (see Figure 1.8). Unusually, the tahi poniu was reversed from the way in which it was depicted in other early images. The meticulous accuracy with which Tilesius made this study leaves no doubt that he portrayed what he observed; this way of wearing a tahi poniu suggests a functional explanation for the raised collar and curved shape of the artefact: when worn inside out this construction would protect the fragile glued seeds from direct contact with the skin.
Tp1 Chest ornament (*tahi poniu*)
Wood, coconut fibre, *Abras precatorius* seeds, resin
H 26 cm, w 26.5 cm
17 segments; some of the seeds are missing
St Petersburg, MAE: 750-18
Lisiansky collection

Tp2 Chest ornament (*tahi poniu*)
Wood, coconut fibre, *Abras precatorius* seeds, resin
H 28 cm, w 26 cm
18 segments, one segment of collar section is missing; most of the seeds are in a separate container (Tp3)
Tallinn, EHM: K-1905
Friederici collection

Tp3 Seeds from a *tahi poniu* in wicker container
*Abras precatorius* seeds
Presumably seeds from Tp2
Tallinn, EHM: K-1311
Friederici collection
Tp4 Chest ornament (*tahi poniu*)
Wood, coconut fibre, Abrus precatorius seeds, resin
W 26,5 cm
19 segments, one segment of collar section is missing; most of the seeds are missing.
Tartu, ENM: C1-34
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM

Tp5 Chest ornament (*tahi poniu*)
Wood, coconut fibre, Abrus precatorius seeds, resin
H 26,5 cm, w 23,5 cm
16 segments; about half the seeds detached.
Zürich, EMZU: 02366
Horner collection

**Neck ornaments (hei/ei)**

While there are no explicit references to necklaces made of boar tusks in earlier visitors’ accounts of the Marquesas, the participants of the Russian expedition noted them as one of the major male ornaments; they brought back at least four of these impressive artefacts and made three pictorial representations. The massive curved tusks, fastened to a coconut fibre band via bored holes in their upper ends, number from 24 to 43 on these necklaces (N1 – N4). Löwenstern drew them worn around the neck with the curved ends turned down (N-16), while Tilesius’ engraving in Krusenstern’s Atlas (see Figure 1.10; below, 2nd from the left) on the contrary depicted them with the curved ends turned up.

Krusenstern also wrote that Islanders ‘wear single boars’ teeth, either suspended round their neck, or to their beards’. The expedition brought back two sets of double tusks suspended on a string (N5, N6), accompanied by two images (see Figure 2.1, X[2]; N-17). It is interesting to note that Zürich’s double tusk necklace (N6) in the first transfer lists of 1888 was described as ‘Bast cord with two boar’s teeth’, but in the subsequent Museum of Ethnography inventory this was changed to ‘Bast cord with boar’s teeth used as decoration of enemy skulls’ (Inventory entry 484). This description was used by von den Steinen, who published a reproduction of the Zürich necklace on the plate featuring skulls decorated with boar tusks, while other Russian drawings and descriptions testify that this was an ornament in its own right. The quality and 60 cm length of the tightly woven string which was used to suspend the tusks from Lisiansky’s collection in Moscow further testifies that this was a neck ornament per se.

The curve of the tusks in Lisiansky’s collection is tighter than in Horner’s collection, which reinforces the suggestion that Lisiansky was privileged to obtain the highest quality artefacts from the family of the haka’iki.

One of the most prized ornaments of the Marquesans were pendants made from whale teeth. Before whalers frequented the South Pacific islands in the early nineteenth century, such teeth would be obtained from a beached whale and were greatly valued for their rarity. In many cases imitations of whale tooth pendants were made of filed bone or shell. Porter, visiting Nuku Hiva in 1813, was the first to discover the enormous value of whale tooth for the Islanders; Crook, who lived on Nuku Hiva earlier, mentioned in passing the use of whale tooth as an ornament. As there were no illustrations of whale tooth pendants in the accounts of Cook’s expedition, the Russian visitors did not identify them among the ornaments they saw. Nevertheless they seemed to have unwittingly described them or their imitations. For instance, Krusenstern wrote that the ‘king’s son-in-law’ (Moate’i) wore ‘a boar’s tusk or something similar to it in his beard’ (in the Russian version: ‘or a bone similar to it’). Langsdorff wrote about ‘pieces of bone or thick, rounded, longish mussel shells fastened to a string neatly woven from coconut fiber’. The Nuku Hivans, presumably assuming that whale tooth was as valuable a commodity for the Russians as it was for them, employed an imitation of one for a practical joke. Löwenstern wrote:

> A savage came swimming up with a decorative white object on his neck. Moritz [Kotzebue] thought it was a tooth and gave him a sacking needle for it. The exchange had barely been completed when the savage broke out in loud laughter, since what he had sold was a peeled banana which he had
A fine sample of a pendant made of whale bone has survived in Lisiansky’s Moscow collection (N7); its engraving appears in his Atlas as ‘Neck decoration with hanging bone’ (see Figure 2.1, X[1]). Horner’s Zürich collection also includes a ‘Cachalot tooth’ with the location attributed as ‘South Seas’, which most likely originated from Nuku Hiva (N8).

Lisiansky’s collection at the Museum of Anthropology in Moscow has two rare pendants catalogued as one item. One is a pair of heavy ornaments suspended on a thick plaited string similar to that of N5 (N9). The ornaments are made out of an unknown, off-white, calciferous material, and are shaped as an imitation of sperm whale teeth. An engraving of this item appears in Lisiansky’s Atlas as ‘Neck decoration with two sharpened shells’ (Fig. 2.1, X[3]). There is also a separate pendant made of similar heavy matter, which is longer and thicker than the above pair. It is curved like a boar tusk (N10). Although it is catalogued as one item with N9, this pendant could not be suspended on the same string with it, as the hole drilled in it is much narrower than the string used for N9. These objects are very similar to a set of three pendants in the Cook-Forster collection of Göttingen University (Oz 167-169), described as being made of ‘shell, bone, or tooth material’, while Kaeppler describes the same objects as ‘Shells carved to resemble whale tooth ornaments’.

Lisiansky mentioned the use of porpoise teeth for necklaces and collected such a necklace (N11). This object corresponds to the engraving in his Atlas described as a ‘Necklace of teeth’ (N-18). Horner’s Zürich collection includes a necklace made of shell cylinders (N9 and N10) which has no analogues in other Marquesan collections, although inventories, including the earliest transfer list of 1888, identify it as Nuku Hivan (N12). Another shell necklace was originally acquired by Siebold from a Krusenstern expedition member and stored in his Leiden collection, but by the time of its transfer to the Museum of Ethnology (now National Museum of World Cultures) the object was missing (N13). Horner’s collection also included a necklace ‘made of red and black seeds’ (N14, currently missing); Langsdorff recorded the name for necklaces of red seeds as ‘teha tefa’. There are no references to such necklaces in other collections, but Nuku Hivans still produce such ornaments using Abrus precatorius seeds. Another missing item from Horner’s collection is ‘Neck decoration made of fibres’ (N15), which might correspond to Shemelin’s ‘fringe woven from thin strings decorating neck and chest of men’.

Tilesius referred to women’s necklaces made of ‘yellow fruit’, the name of which he recorded as tehaau ‘ua or tehăă cua. He seems to make a precise pictorial representation of this ornament in the portrait of ‘Titkia Wobusi’ (N-19) which was later incorporated into two engravings in Krusenstern’s *Atlas*, with both necklaces differing considerably from his original (see N-20, Figure 1.10, below, right).
**N1 Boar tusk neck ornament (hei)**
24 boar tusks, coconut fibre  
L 52 cm, w 9-15 cm  
St Petersburg, MAE: 750-11  
Lisiansky collection  
Published: Liubov G. Rozina, ’Kollektsiia MAE po Markizkim ostrovam’ [MAE’s Marquesan collection], *Sbornik Muzeia antropologii i etnografii*, 21 (1963), pp. 114, 116.

**N2 Boar tusk neck ornament (hei)**
34 boar tusks, coconut fibre  
L 52 cm, w 6-11 cm  
St Petersburg, MAE: 736-191  
From Krusenstern collection in Admiralty Museum  
1828 Transferred to Kunstkamera (MAE)  
Published: Rozina, ’Kollektsiia…’, pp. 114-115.

**N3 Boar tusk neck ornament (hei)**
32 boar tusks, coconut fibre  
L 55 cm, w 10 cm  
Tallinn, EHM: K-1308  
Friederici collection
N4 Boar tusk neck ornament (*hei*)
43 boar tusks, coconut fibre
L 55 cm, w 10 cm
Necklace of 43 boar tusks on a coconut fibre cord; several tusks split.
Tartu, ENM: C1-33
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM

N5 Boar tusk pendant
2 boar tusks, coconut fibre
Tusks l 11 cm; string l 60 cm
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/11
Lisiansky collection

N6 Boar tusk pendant
2 boar tusks, plant fibre
Tusks l 6.8 cm; cord l 8.5 cm
Zürich, EMZU: 02321
Horner collection
N7 Whale bone pendant
Whale bone, plant fibre
L 15.7 cm, w 6.8 cm; string l 53 cm,
thickness of cord 0.5 cm
A neck ornament in the shape of
a concave oval plate, the outward,
bulbous side polished.
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/14
Lisiansky collection

N8 Cachalot tooth
Cachalot tooth
H 13 cm, W 4.5 cm
Zürich, EMZU: 02367
Horner collection

N9 Shell pendant
Shell Cypraecassis rufa, coconut fibre
Pendants l 9.7 cm, w 1.8; string l
66 cm, thickness 1 cm
Neck decoration consisting of two
pendants suspended on thick, finely
plaited coconut fibre string.
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/15
Lisiansky collection

N10 Shell pendant
Shell Cypraecassis rufa
Pendants l 12 cm, w 2.2 cm
Heavy pendant with curved and
slightly sharpened end.
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/15
Lisiansky collection
N11 Necklet of porpoise teeth
Porpoise teeth, plant fibre
String l 40 cm; section of string with beaded teeth l 21 cm; teeth l between 1.5 and 2 cm
Necklace of small porpoise teeth beaded onto a braided string made from plant fibre. The teeth are mostly uniform in size and shape. There are 71 teeth on the string and 30 more teeth have come loose.
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/9
Lisiansky collection

N12 Necklet of shell cylinders
24 shell cylinders, plant fibre
L 31 cm, w 0.9-1.7 cm
Ground shell, some square in section, some round, some with perforations. 26 pieces on a plant fibre, probably European, cord.
Zürich, EMZU: 02318
Horner collection

N13 Shell necklace
Leiden, NMWC: RV-XII-I-109
Krusenstern expedition members collection
Object missing

N14 Necklet of red and black seeds
Seeds, plant fibre
Zürich, EMZU: 00491
Horner collection
Missing

N15 Fibre neck decoration
Plant fibre
Zürich, EMZU: 02364
Horner collection (?)
Missing


N-18 Iury Lisiansky, ‘Necklace of teeth’, engraving depicting necklace of porpoise teeth, in Lisianskii, Sobranie kart…, pl. I, H.
Hand and ankle ornaments

Ornaments worn on the limbs are not represented widely in Russian collections. Langsdorff wrote that

The adornments made from the tail feathers of a tropical bird are particularly important. They are rings decorated with six feathers and worn on the dancer’s middle fingers. They help improve the swinging movements infinitely. Along with these finger decorations, they have others ingeniously woven from hair and feathers on their hands, feet, around their hips, on their heads, around their necks and in their ears.39

He made a drawing of a feather ornament on a woven band used for hand or ankle decoration (see Figure 2.2) and recorded the name for ‘very long hair for adornment while dancing’ as hobemōa/hopemoa.40 A perfect sample of an ouoho, an ankle ornament made of hair, survived in Friederici’s collection in the Estonian History Museum in Tallinn (B1, cf. Loewenstern’s drawing Figure 1.7). The EHM has another artefact originating from Friederici’s collection, which consists of four bones in a box with Friederici’s inscription: ‘Parts of arm bracelet. Nuka Hiva. K[arl] v[on] Fr[iederici]’ (B2). These bone cylinders with transverse ridges are a sample of plain ivi po’o, used for the adornment of objects and hair locks, and might belong to the oldest samples of ivi po’o ornament, where cylindrical bones were embellished with elegant
ridging rather than tiki carvings. While there are no explicit early records that they were used for arm bands,\textsuperscript{41} Friederici’s testimony could point to a hitherto undescribed use for these items.

**B1 Ankle ornament (ouoho)**  
Human hair, coconut fibre  
L (circumference) c. 13 cm, w 10 cm  
Tallinn, EHM: K-1393  
Friederici collection

**B2 Ivi po’o pieces for bracelet**  
Human bone  
H 1.7-2.5 cm  
Tallinn, EHM: K-1307  
Friederici collection

**B3 Toggle?**  
Bone (human?)  
L 5.3 cm, circumference 2.5 cm  
Toggle made from a half section of bone decorated on outer surface with criss-cross/hatching design.  
Tartu, ENM: C1-46  
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM
**Ear ornaments**

Ear ornaments are prominent in the Russian expedition collections; they acquired three major types, which were worn by the Nuku Hivans and available for exchange at the time of their visit.

Composite ear ornaments made of shell with an intricate system of fastening are the most numerous in their collections. Krusenstern described them as follows:

> they adorn their ears with large white muscles \([i.e. mussels; cf. \textit{shells}/\textit{Muscheln} in Russian/German originals, respectively]\) of a circular form, filled with a hard substance like sand, to which a perforated boar's tooth is affixed for the purpose of fastening it to the ear; a small wooden peg that passes through the tooth \([serves] as a clasp to prevent its falling out.\footnote{42}

There are 15 ornaments of this type in the collections of the Russian expedition, some incomplete \((E1 - E15)\), supplemented by six drawings and engravings \(\text{see E-28, and Figures 1.4, 1.5, 1.6 and 2.2})\). While the front cuplike cylinder shells, which Tilesius identified as \textit{Conus marmoreus} \footnote{43} (more precisely these are \textit{Conus marmoreus suffusus}), are uniform throughout all collections, the pins, inserted through the earlobe, are made of different materials. For two items in the MAE's collection the upper half of bird beaks served as the pins \(E1, E2)\). Other materials used were bone, boar tusk and, in Langsdorff's collection in Munich, a sperm whale tooth \(E10\). MAE's ear ornaments of this type \(E1\) have a pre-1826 Admiralty Museum label 'Bone ear ornaments worn by the men.' All other Russian drawings similarly show them as male decoration.

These ear ornaments have some similarity with the hakakai and pu taiata ear ornaments. Both types have pins carved with intricate tiki figures and were collected later in the nineteenth century. Kjellgren and Ivory consider that the spectacular pu taiata ear ornaments may have been 'a postcontact development, carved with metal tools introduced by Westerners.'\footnote{44} Indeed, none of the items in the Russian expedition collection have carved pins. Nevertheless, it should be noted that Tilesius twice recorded, in his sketchbook and journal, the name associated with shell ear ornaments as \textit{Putaÿata},\footnote{45} which suggests that while the objects might have been evolving with the times, their names did not change. Furthermore, the pins of the ear ornaments in the Moscow, Munich, and Zürich collections have small ridges located where the pu taiata/pu taiata figurine carvings would have been made \(E4, E5, E10, E15)\); there is also a similar notch on the pin in the engraving of such an ornament in Lisiansky's Atlas \(E-28)\). It seems reasonable to suppose that some sort of ridge on the pin was part of an ancient tradition which existed in the precontact period, and evolved into the intricate carvings of later decades.

It should be mentioned that the pair of ear ornaments in Lisiansky's Moscow collection \(E4, E5\) are distinguished by their unusual size, having a diameter of 6.3 cm, while the diameter of all other similar ornaments in the expedition collections is between 2 and 4.3 cm, mostly 3.5 cm. This might indicate that this was a special gift to Lisiansky from a member of the haka'iki family.
The second type of ear ornament was described by Langsdorff as 'a light, oval piece of breadfruit wood', being 'the largest decoration put in their ears'. These ornaments are known as kouhau. Four items survived in Lisiansky's and Krusenstern's collections, in Moscow (E16, E17) and Tartu respectively (E18, E19). They were accurately sketched for Lisiansky's Atlas (E-29) and by Tilesius in his sketchbook (see Figure 1.8) and, later, appeared in Krusenstern's Atlas in a somewhat distorted form (E-30).

Finally, one last type of ear ornament was preserved in Krusenstern's Tartu collection. These are made of creamy whale ivory (E23, E24). Similar ornaments, described as 'bone ear ornaments', are engraved in Lisiansky's Atlas (E-31). McKinney, in describing an extremely similar object in the British Museum collection, albeit without a drilled hole, writes that while it was 'described in Hewett's listing as an ear ornament, [it] is in fact a ta'a puaika/ ta'a puaina, an ear piercer'. However, Russian artefacts of this type seem to testify that this is an ear ornament rather than a piercer. Besides the accompanying explanation in Lisiansky's Atlas, the fact that they were usually collected as a pair supports this view. Moreover, one of the Tartu items has a blunt point and both of them have drilled holes where a peg holding them in the earlobe would be inserted. This type of object has some similarity with hakakai ear ornaments, although their front plate is smaller and their bone pins have none of the carvings characteristic for hakakai. The museum in Tartu also has an object which can be identified as a bone earring pin (E25).

Besides these classical types of earrings, Lisiansky's Moscow collection has abalone pearl shell ear ornaments which were discussed above in Chapter 2 (E20 – E22). Although these almost certainly originate from the northwest coast of America, we include them here to illustrate the complexities of documentation and provenance. It might be noted that a square ear ornament of similar shape appears on the portrait of Kabris, published in Langsdorff's book, this ornament did not appear in other records concerning Nuku Hiva.

Finally, Tilesius' portrayal of Ma'uhau, a toa ('head warrior'), seems to reflect a new fashion emerging under the influence of European visits, with large nails being used as ear ornaments. The ear ornament which appears in his field drawing of Ma'uhau is not very clearly drawn and could be either a large nail or a bone ear ornament. On the engraving of this portrait in the Atlas, which was likely made under Tilesius' supervision, the nail is more visible (see Figure 1.10, above, 2nd from the right), and on the engraving which is even further evolved from the original drawing, the nail is clearly depicted (E-32). Löwenstern also sketched a Nuku Hivan with a clearly visible nail in his ear (N-16).

**E1 Cylindrical shell ear ornament**

Shell, soft wood, bird's beak

Cylinder: h 2 cm, d 3.7 cm; pin l 3.7 cm
St Petersburg, MAE: 736-183a
Ex. Krusenstern collection in Admiralty Museum
1828 Transferred to Kunstkamera (MAE)
E2 Pin from cylindrical shell ear ornament, probable pair of E1
Bird’s beak
Pin l 5.5 cm
St Petersburg, MAE: 736-183b
Ex. Krusenstern collection in Admiralty Museum
1828 Transferred to Kunstkamera (MAE)

E3 Cylindrical shell ear ornament
Shell, soft wood, bone
Cylinder h 2.5 cm, d 3.5 cm; pin l 5.8 cm
St Petersburg, MAE: 736-184
Ex. Krusenstern collection in Admiralty Museum
1828 Transferred to Kunstkamera (MAE)

E4 Cylindrical shell ear ornament
Shell, soft wood, bread fruit tree resin, bone
Cylinder d 6.3 cm, pin l 6.5 cm, stick l 7.5 cm (one end broken off)
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/10[a]
Lisiansky collection

E5 Cylindrical shell ear ornament
Shell, soft wood, bread fruit tree resin, bone
Cylinder d 6.3 cm, pin l 8 cm
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/10[b]
Lisiansky collection
E6 Cylindrical shell ear ornament
Shell, soft wood, wood, bone / whale ivory
Cylinder d 2 cm; pin l 5 cm; stick l 8 cm (one end broken off)
Tartu, ENM: C1-47
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM

E7 Cylindrical shell ear ornament
Shell, soft wood, wood, bone / whale ivory
Cylinder d 3.4 cm; pin l 5 cm; stick l 8 cm
Tartu, ENM: C1-48
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM

E8 Cylindrical shell ear ornament
Shell, soft wood, wood, bone / whale ivory
Cylinder d 2.8 cm; pin l 4 cm; fragment of stick l 1.8 cm
Tartu, ENM: C1-49
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM

E9 Cylindrical shell ear ornament
Shell, soft wood, bird bone (?)
Cylinder d 3.5 cm; pin l 4 cm; stick l 5.5 cm
Tartu, ENM: C1-265
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM
E10 Cylindrical shell ear ornament
Shell, soft wood, whale ivory
Cylinder h 2 cm, d 3.8 cm; pin l 5.5 cm
Munich, MFK: I.11
Langsdorff collection

E11 Cylindrical shell ear ornament
Shell, soft wood
Cylinder h 1.8 cm, d 3.6 cm
Munich, MFK: I.12
Langsdorff collection
Published: Appel, 'Die frühesten Südsee-Bestände…;', pp. 310-311.

E12 Cylindrical shell ear ornament
Shell, soft wood
Cylinder h 1.6 cm, d 3.5 cm
Munich, MFK: I.13
Langsdorff collection
Published: Appel, 'Die frühesten Südsee-Bestände…;', pp. 310-311.

E13 Cylindrical shell ear ornament
Shell, soft wood
Cylinder h 1.4 cm, d 3.3 cm
Munich, MFK: I.147
Langsdorff collection
Published: Appel, 'Die frühesten Südsee-Bestände…;', pp. 310-311.
E14 Cylindrical shell ear ornament
Shell, soft wood, whale (?) ivory
Cylinder d 4.3 cm; overall l 7.5 cm
Zürich, EMZU: 02319a
Horner collection

E15 Cylindrical shell ear ornament
Shell, soft wood, boar tusk / whale (?) ivory
Cylinder d 4 cm; overall l 7.9 cm
The end of the bone pin may have been carved, but the motifs are indistinct.
Zürich, EMZU: 02319b
Horner collection

E16 Wooden ear ornament (kouhau)
Wood, chalk/paint
L 12.5, w 8 cm; pin l 15 cm
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/12a
Lisiansky collection

E17 Wooden ear ornament (kouhau)
Wood, chalk/paint
L 12.5, w 8 cm; pin l 15 cm
One pin is missing
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/12b
Lisiansky collection

E18 Wooden ear ornament (kouhau)
Wood, chalk/paint
L 8.5 cm; w 5.8 cm; pin l 7.2 cm;
fretwork protrusion: l 6.6 cm
Tartu, ENM: C1-42
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM

E19 Wooden ear ornament (kouhau)
Wood, chalk/paint
L (up to broken off point) 4.7 cm, w 6 cm; pin l 7 cm; fretwork protrusion l 6.5 cm.
Tartu, ENM: C1-43
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM
**E20 Pearl shell ear ornament**
Abalone pearl shell, plant fibre
L 5.5 cm, w 3.6 cm
Rectangular shell plate with plant fibre string attached to drilled hole near top edge
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/13
Lisiansky collection

**E21 Pearl shell ear ornament**
Abalone pearl shell, plant fibre
L 5.5 cm, w 4 cm
Rectangular shell plate with plant fibre string attached to drilled hole near top edge
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/13
Lisiansky collection

**E22 Pearl shell ear ornament**
Abalone pearl shell
The third pearl shell plate ornament recorded in one entry with E20 and E21. Had the shape of an isosceles triangle with a rounded tip.
Moscow, MAMSU, Inventory book E no.74
Lisiansky collection
Object is missing

**E23 Bone ear ornaments**
Whale ivory
L 3.9 cm
Tartu, ENM: C1-44a
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM

**E24 Bone ear ornaments**
Whale ivory
L 3.6 cm
Tartu, ENM: C1-44b
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM
E25 Bone earring pin (?)
Bone
L 11.2 cm
Tartu, ENM: C1-45
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM

E26 Ear ornament
Munich, MFK: Blauer catalogue: entry 609.
Presumably Langsdorff collection
Object is missing

E27 Ear ornament
Leiden, NMWC: RV-XII-I-110
Krusenstern expedition members collection
Object is missing

E-28 Iury Lisiansky, ‘Earrings made of shell with cork in the middle’, engraving, in Lisianskii, Sobranie kart..., pl. I, D.

E-29 Iury Lisiansky, ‘Wooden earrings’, engraving depicting wooden ear ornament (kouhau), in Lisianskii, Sobranie kart..., pl. I, B.


Ornaments made from a beard

The pavahina, essentially the beard of an older man (in any case, one of grey or white hair), woven together with a structured sennit binding, similar to that employed in headdresses and other assemblages, is referred to in a number of sources. While Kjellgren and Ivory imply that the pavahina was a component of a more complex head ornament, the artefact is also found in a number of collections as a separate form. Examples, all lacking specific provenance, include those in the collections of the British Museum (Oc1923,1006.1), Te Papa (FE005326) and the Brooklyn Museum 42.211.108.

Pa1 Ornament with hair from the beard of an older man (pavahina)

Hair, sennit
19 x 10 cm
Tilesius collection; presented by him to Klemm; no. 1001 in Klemm’s catalogue.
Fans

Fans can be found in most of the collections of Krusenstern’s expedition members. They were of two distinct shapes: square with the handle coming down from one of the corners (sometimes described as diamond or rhombus-shaped); and semi-circular, with the handle coming down from the rounded side. Interestingly, none of the earlier voyagers to the Marquesas made reference to square fans, but Krusenstern clearly distinguished between the two types of fans as ornaments carried by women:

I have never seen any of them [women] with ornaments round their necks; but they all carry fans, shaped either like a lozenge, or a half circle, platted very neatly with grass, and coloured white with muscle-shells burnt to chalk.52

Tilesius mentioned that ‘Islanders of authority held wooden, woven or bast fans with which they cooled themselves when it was hot’;53 he also found out the native word for a fan, rendered in German as Tahier, which quite closely corresponds to Marquesan tahi‘i.54 Shemelin remarked that ‘Slings [and] fans woven from coconut fiber, handmade by women, indicate ingenuity in their [i.e. Nuku Hivan] production’.55 They were obviously a popular item for barter: Langsdorff’s drawing ‘A view of an inhabited valley on Nukuhiva’ shows two Islanders bringing fans of two types to trade with the visitors (F-18).

Square fans

Six square fans are presently located in the expedition collections (F1, F2, F4 – F7). These fans, plaited of palm leaf strips, had bamboo handles, into the split ends of which the blades were wedged and held in place with thin woven strings of coconut fibre. The handles of several have smoke-darkened marks which might suggest some ritual associated with their production or usage. Early Russian inventories of Marquesan artefacts indicate that Russians considered square shaped fans to be ‘ordinary’ or ‘common’, while semi-circular ones were ‘ceremonial’,56 and the exceptionally fine weave characteristic of the latter implies higher value. However, during the Neva’s visit to the eastern coast of Nuku Hiva, ‘the chief’, according to Lisiansky, brought a square fan along with other ceremonial gifts. Such a fan was engraved in Lisiansky’s Atlas (see Figure 2.1, U) and is preserved in his collection in the MAE (F1); it is quite possible that this particular artefact originates from Haatuatua Bay on the east coast of Nuku Hiva.
**F1 Square fan**
Palm leaf, bamboo, coconut fibre  
H 39 cm, w 29.5 cm  
St Petersburg, MAE: 750-13  
Lisiansky collection  

**F2 Square fan**
Palm leaf, bamboo, coconut fibre  
H 42 cm, w 32 cm  
Smoke-darkened marks on the handle  
St Petersburg, MAE: 736-180  
Ex. Krusenstern collection in Admiralty Museum  
1828 Transferred to Kunstkamera (MAE)  
Published: Rozina, ‘Kollektsiia…’, pp. 114, 117, 119.

**F3 Square fan**
‘Common fan from the Marquesas Islands’.
1806 Donated by Povalishin to Admiralty Museum  
1827 Transferred to Black Sea Map Depot in Nikolaev  
Not identified in collections at present

**F4 Square fan**
Palm leaf, bamboo, coconut fibre  
H 37, w 28 [EHM inventory]  
Tallinn, EHM: K-1403  
Ex. Espenberg collection  
1914 Estonian Literary Society Museum acquired from Helene Maydellift  
1952 Transferred from ENM to EHM

**F5 Square fan**
Palm leaf, bamboo, coconut fibre  
H 43.2 cm; w 34 cm  
Smoke-darkened marks on the handle  
Tartu, ENM: C1-41  
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM
F6 Square fan
Palm leaf, bamboo, coconut fibre
H 41 cm, w 33 cm.
Munich, MFK: 168
Langsdorff collection

F7 Square fan
Palm leaf, bamboo, coconut fibre
H 40 cm, w 30 cm
The bamboo handle shows burn stains, probably from flattening the bamboo through heat. The weaving on top is lost.
Zürich, EMZU: 02304
Horner collection

Semi-circular fans (tahi‘i)
Semi-circular fans were tightly woven around a wooden shaft, ending with a handle of dark polished wood. In many cases, the shaft to which the blade was attached was additionally bound near the handle with thin coconut fibre string, forming a rhombic pattern. Kjellgren and Ivory note that 'The earliest fans described and collected in the late eighteenth century had smooth wood handles […] Shortly after 1800, however, the handles became more ornate and were carved in the form of human figures.'\(^58\) Indeed Porter, describing fans during his 1813 visit, speaks of handles ornamented with tiki figures as a common occurrence.\(^59\) Artefacts of Krusenstern's expedition seem to fit well to this trend: out of eight fans of this type all but one have plain wooden handles (F8, F9, F12 – F16). The only exception is the fan from the MAE collection (F10), the handle of which is ornamented with bone carvings of tiki figures. This fan was probably donated to the Kunstkamera by Tilesius in 1814. It was mentioned in Fedor Russow's account of the Kunstkamera collections, most likely erroneously, as 'bamboo fan'.\(^60\) Tilesius had numerous contacts with Kiatonui and his family and such a richly decorated fan could have originated from this source. The fact that fans with carved handles existed at the time of the Russian visit is confirmed by Langsdorff, who in his 'Vocabulary from the Island of Nuku Hiva' recorded a special word for such fans as tahikatu.\(^61\) Their scarcity in the Russian expedition's collections may reflect both their rarity and the Nuku Hivans' reluctance to part with especially treasured possessions. The members of the expedition left several visual representations of semi-circular fans (see F-17, E-18, Figure 1.5)
F8 Fan (*tahi‘i*)
Coconut leaf, coconut fibre, wood
H 41 cm, w 35 cm
St Petersburg, MAE: 750-12
Lisiansky collection
Published: Rozina, ‘Kollektsiia...’, pp. 114, 117.

F9 Fan (*tahi‘i*)
Coconut leaf, coconut fibre, wood
H 42.5 cm, w 37
St Petersburg, MAE: 736-179
Ex. Povalishin collection in Admiralty Museum
1828 Transferred to Kunstkamera (MAE)

F10 Fan (*tahi‘i*)
Coconut leaf, coconut fibre, wood, bone
H 45 cm, w 45 cm
Handle length 12 cm, diameter 2.9 cm.
Bone handle is attached to wooden rod with bone pins, and carved with two rows of Janus-like tiki figures and three ornamental bands.
St Petersburg, MAE: 736-181
Presumably Tilesius’ gift to the Kunstkamera in 1814.62
F11 Fan (tahi‘i)
'Semicircular fan woven from root’.63
1806 Donated by Povalishin to Admiralty Museum
1827 Transferred to Black Sea Map Depot in Nikolaev
Not identified in collections at present

F12 Fan (tahi‘i)
Coconut leaf, coconut fibre, wood
H 43.2 cm, w 41.5 cm
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/17
Lisiansky collection

F13 Fan (tahi‘i)
Coconut leaf, coconut fibre, wood
H 37.5 cm, w 34 cm
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/18
Lisiansky collection

F14 Fan (tahi‘i)
Coconut leaf, coconut fibre, wood
H 41 cm, w 42 cm
Evidence of an Indigenous repair prior on
one top corner.
Tallinn, EHM: K-1391
Ex. Espenberg collection
1914 Estonian Literary Society Museum
acquired from Helene Maydellift
1952 Transferred from ENM to EHM

F15 Fan (tahi‘i)
Coconut leaf, coconut fibre, wood
H 43 cm, w 39 cm
Tartu, ENM: C1-35
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM

F16 Fan (tahi‘i)
Coconut leaf, coconut fibre, wood
H 41.5 cm, w 39.5 cm
Munich, MFK: 169
Published: Appel, ‘Die frühesten Südsee-
Bestände…’, pp. 295-296.
F-17 Iury Lisiansky, ‘Ceremonial fan’, engraving depicting fan (tahi’i), in Lisianskii, *Sobranie kart…*, pl. I, W.


**Utensils**

The Russian list of Marquesan utensils and domestic implements is not large, probably because they had little opportunity to visit Nuku Hivan houses and to see different means of production, while the Islanders themselves did not expect these items to be of interest to the visitors and did not bring them for barter. Thus, for instance, the visitors do not mention pounders for popoi (a breadfruit paste), nor do they have any in their collections. One of the reasons for this might be, however, the association of these pounders with sacred activities. These considerations aside, many Marquesan utensils were nevertheless noted by the visitors. For instance, Shemelin provided the following detailed description:

House utensils, from which Islanders eat, consist of small wooden troughs and cups of different size. The latter are so accurately, smoothly and roundly made as if they were turned on a turntable. They also make goodly utensils from the plants known as calebasa [calabash], taking the soft meat out of them. These vessels can keep liquids such as water, oil etc. For easier carrying they put them into fine-meshed nets, woven out of coconut threads, similar to drawstring bags. For drinking, in place of glasses they use coconut shells.64

**Calabashes and other vessels**

Calabashes (hue) attracted the Russians’ attention; moreover, Tilesius’ engraving of a distinguished Nuku Hivan holding a calabash in a net turned it into an icon of Marquesan culture (see Figure 1.4). In his journal he noted that the Nuku Hivan name for calabash was Hue, while ‘hölzerner Topf’, which can be translated as wooden bowl, was *Ticha*.65 By *Ticha* he undoubtedly meant the calabash cover, or tiha, which was frequently ornamented. Two other drawings of a calabash were made by Langsdorff (see...
Figure 2.2) and Lisiansky, the latter with the explanation ‘Calabash, in which pudding is kept’ (U-9). The Russian visitors mentioned that Kiatonui brought Krusenstern ‘a pudding made from breadfruit and coconut’ and most likely Lisiansky referred to this type of pudding. It should be noted that the pattern of netting holding the hue on these three images differs and Lisiansky’s representation is probably the most authentic. Only two hue were found among the Russian expedition collections: one in Krusenstern’s collection in Tartu (U1) and another complete with netting in Horner’s Zürich collection (U2). The cover from the latter was catalogued separately as ‘Carved wooden bowl’ (U3), but thanks to the heuristic expertise of the conservator, Robert Tobler, and scientific staff member, Katharina Haslwanter, the two parts of the artefact were reunited. The pattern of fine ridges carved on the cover coincides with the one engraved in Krusenstern’s Atlas and it can be assumed that this hue, travelling with the Russian expedition, served as the basis for Tilesius’ iconic drawing.

U1 Calabash (hue)
Gourd
H 13.5 cm, circumference 53 cm, d of opening 17 cm
Tartu, ENM: C1-267
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM

U2 Calabash (hue) in carrying net
Gourd, coconut fibre
H 22 cm, D 20 cm
Calabash in sennit fibre net. Organic residue inside.
Zürich, EMZU: 02317
Horner collection
Published: von den Steinen, Die Marquesaner..., Vol. 3, p. aN no. 5.

U3 Lid (tiha) for calabash (hue)
Wood
D 20 cm, H 10.5 cm
Zürich, EMZU: 00469
Horner collection
The lid of the U2 (02317).
The Russian expedition brought back at least two kotue – bird-shaped bowls with lids. One fine item is in Krusenstern’s collection in the ENM (U4), while the other was donated by Lisiansky to the Kunstkamera, described, most likely, as ‘Wooden bowl of Marquesan king’ (U5). Unfortunately, this item is missing, but it was engraved in Lisiansky’s Atlas (U-10). Krusenstern described them as ‘large covered dishes of a thin brown wood in the shape of muscles [i.e. mussels; cf. ’shells’ in Russian and German versions]’, while Langsdorff notes their artistic aspect, describing ‘smaller and larger eating vessels resembling troughs with poorly carved human faces and fish and birds for decoration’; his description probably encompasses smaller containers decorated with carvings. The Admiralty Museum in St Petersburg also had three artefacts described in the original inventories as ‘Wooden oblong basin, type of basket, from the Marquesas Islands’, ‘Water carrier’, and ‘Wooden cup from the Washington Islands’ (U6), all of which are missing. The basin, as mentioned earlier, was identified as being of North American provenance; the water carrier, deposited in the Admiralty Museum in 1822, was most likely from Bellingshausen’s collection.

**U4 Lidded bowl (kotue)**

Wood  
L 47 cm, w 25.5 cm

Large bowl in bird form with lid; the base is not flat, so the bowl does not sit evenly; features a tiki or human face. A large crack extends almost the entire length of the bowl section and towards the front there are four sets of holes which have been drilled into it to form a repair. The two holes in the middle still have coconut fibre cordage which hold it together. At the opposite end to the tiki figure, there is a tail which extends out over the end of the bowl section and comes to a point with a ridge running down. The interior bears some scratching, most likely tool marks associated with its manufacture, but no staining or organic residue: this appears never to have been used to hold food.  
Tartu, ENM: C1-37  
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM

**U5 Lidded bowl (kotue)**

‘26. Wooden bowl of Marquesan king’  
1806 Donated by Lisiansky to Kunstkamera  
Not identified in the collections

**U6 ‘Wooden cup from the Washington Islands’**

1806 Donated by Povalishin to Admiralty Museum  
Not identified in collections
U7 Block wrapped in palm leaves
Palm leaf, bamboo, coconut fibre, block of some kind of plant substance
L 14 cm, w 7 cm, h 7 cm

A block of hard substance – possibly some kind of vegetable or food material which has solidified over time. The block is wrapped in leaves which have dried out and are very fragile. The leaves are secured in place by a length of coconut fibre cord which has been wrapped around several times and knotted.

Tallinn, EHM: K-1855
Ex. Espenberg collection
1914 Estonian Literary Society Museum acquired from Helene Maydellift
1952 Transferred from ENM to EHM

U8 Scoop (?)
‘39. Marquesan scoop (?) used in ceremony’
1806 Donated by Lisiansky to Kunstkamera
Not identified in the collections

U-9 Iury Lisiansky, ‘Calabash, in which pudding is kept’, engraving depicting calabash (hue) in carrying net, in Lisianskii, Sobranie kart..., pl. I, P.

U-10 Iury Lisiansky, ‘Wooden bowl’, engraving depicting lidded bowl (kotue), in Lisianskii, Sobranie kart..., pl. I, R.
Cordage

Although fibre and cordage were not priorities for the Russians in their collecting pursuits, they did collect a number of items in this category. Various types of cordage used for utilitarian or ornamental purposes are also incorporated in various artefacts. All together they number about 80 pieces (some artefacts incorporate more than one type of cordage) and provide quite a representative picture of cordage employed by Nuku Hivans before regular European contact was established.

The expedition collected rope, twine, and nets of different types. In his vocabulary, Langsdorff distinguished between 'rope, hawser', for which he recorded the Nuku Hivan word vhau, and thin twine, iti-iti vhau.75 While iti in Marquesan means small, Langsdorff’s vhau must be the Marquesan word fau, the name for trees of the Hibiscus genus, the bark layers of which were used as material for various cordage.76 Krusenstern likewise noted two types of rope produced by the Nuku Hivans:

The fishing line as well as all the string they use, either in the fitting out of their canoes or for other purposes, is made of the bark [bast – in Russian version] of the fau tree; but they make another kind of string very smooth and strong of the fibres of the cocoa-nut.77

Lisiansky described this tree as

Fou. Tree of middling size, from the bark of which threads are woven for use for fishing nets and ropes. They say that branches of this tree have up to eight layers, which can be very convenient to strip off one after another.78

One of the rare items in this group is a net with a string attached at the top, acting as a pull-tie, in the MAE collection (C1). It was identified by Rozina as ‘Net for carrying calabashes etc.’, though the original label and inventories attest it as ‘Hunting net for carrying birds from the Marquesas Islands’. The size of this net (57 cm long) and pattern of its weaving suggest that it might have been neither of the above, but a special net used for carrying breadfruit with its rigid upper ring removed.79 Horner’s collection in Zürich has a calabash net complete with calabash, discussed above (U2). The ENM in Tartu also has another type of net, a small one with a fine mesh (C2).

Horner’s collection in Zürich has two types of cordage: one is thick and braided of bast (no. 02361) and the other of coconut fibre (C3). Although the Museum inventory identifies them as part of Horner’s collection from the Marquesas, they were not on the original transfer list from the Antiquarian Society and the thick rope is most likely not Marquesan. Finally, the Admiralty Museum had three skeins of twine from Krusenstern and Povalishin, which are now missing (C4).

The collections of the expedition include two almost identical balls of tightly balled twine of two-ply twisted fau (hibiscus) fibre: one in Lisiansky’s collection in Moscow (C5) and another one in Friederici’s collection in Tallinn (C6). They might have had a utilitarian application, but it is also possible that these balls were part of an entertainment set, which Langsdorff named as a ‘Jou-Jou, or toy of the Nukahivans’ (C-7) describing its use:
Under the title of playthings may be mentioned one which consists of a stick about a foot long and an inch thick. A hole is bored in it at one end, through which is run a peg five or six inches in length, and at the point of the peg is stuck a little ball of cocoa-thread. The stick is then struck with another, so that the ball is thrown up into the air, and the dexterity of the thing is to catch it again upon the point of the peg.⁸⁰

These items did not appear in the accounts of other visitors.⁸¹ Lisiansky acquired a ball of another type, which he described as a ‘Ball decorated with red peas, which is used for entertainment’ and had it engraved in his Atlas (C-8); unfortunately, this item is now missing. Krusenstern probably wrote about the same artefact: ‘they also wear [sic] [...] balls about the size of an apple, entirely studded over with red beans’.⁸²

C1 Net with pull-tie
Coconut fibre
L 57 cm
Made of strong coconut strings, which are joined by a string at the top, acting as a pull-tie.
St Petersburg, MAE: 736-182
1828 Transferred from Admiralty Museum to Kunstkamera (MAE)
Published: Rozina, ‘Kollektsiia…’, pp. 112-113.

C2 Net with a fine mesh
Coconut fibre
L 26.5 cm; w16.7 cm; side of sinnet square: 1.4 cm x 1.3 cm
Net constructed from length of coconut fibre knotted at intervals. Open at wider end; small opening at opposite end.
Tartu, ENM: C1-36
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM
C3 String
Coconut fibre [?]
L 292 cm
Zürich, EMZU: 02470
Horner collection

C4 String
‘Three skeins of string’
1806 Donated by Krusenstern and Povalishin to Admiralty Museum
1827 Transferred from Admiralty Museum to Naval Cadet Corps
Not identified in collections at present

C5 Ball of twine
Coconut fibre
D 8.5 cm, twine d 0.3 cm
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/7
Lisiansky collection

C6 Ball of twine
Coconut fibre
D 9 cm, twine d 0.2 cm
Tallinn, EHM: K-1310
Friederici collection

C-7 Georg Langsdorff, ‘Yo-yo, or toy of the Nukahivans’, drawing on paper, ink and wash, in Honeyman, Jr. Collection…, 1963.002: 1030.

C-8 Iury Lisiansky, ‘Ball decorated with red peas, which is used for entertainment’, engraving, in Lisianskii, Sobranie kart…, pl. I, T.
**Stone axes (toki kou)**
The tool that attracted most of the Russians’ attention during their time on Nuku Hiva was the stone axe. As mentioned above, by the time of the Russian visit, stone axes were being replaced with iron tools, and Krusenstern made a special note that he had seen ‘a stone axe made use of in the construction of a canoe’.\(^{84}\) Nevertheless, axes and adzes were still valued by the Nuku Hivans. For instance, Kiatonui, exchanging gifts with Lisiansky, brought him ‘a pig, and a stone axe, in exchange for two of my iron axes’.\(^{85}\) This axe must be the item in Lisiansky’s MAE collection (A2). According to the Admiralty Museum inventories, Krusenstern donated two stone axes from the Marquesas Islands to the Museum. One of them is missing, but the other is in the MAE collection (A1). This axe seems to be depicted in Lisiansky’s Atlas (A-5). Langsdorff, too, had a drawing of an axe on his plate of Nuku Hivan artefacts (see Figure 2.2). Finally, a rare item, a set of ‘shark teeth from which the inhabitants of Nuku Hiva made drills’ was in Langsdorff’s collection in Munich, but is now missing (A4).

**A1 Axe (toki kou)**
Stone, wood, coconut fibre, tapa (plant fibre)
L shaft 54 cm; l head 26 cm
St Petersburg, MAE: 736-178
1828 Transferred from Admiralty Museum to Kunstkamera (MAE)
Published: Tokarev and Tolstov, *Narody…*, p. 582; Rozina, ‘Kollektsiia…’, pp. 112-113.

**A2 Axe (toki kou)**
Stone, wood, coconut fibre
L shaft 44 cm; l head 20 cm
St Petersburg, MAE: 750-10
Lisiansky collection

**A3 Axe (toki kou)**
‘Stone axe from Marquesas islands’\(^{86}\)
1809 Donated by Krusenstern to Admiralty Museum
Not identified in collections at present

**A4 Shark teeth**
‘Shark teeth from which the inhabitants of Nuku Hiva made drills’
Munich, MFK: Blauer catalogue: entry 610.
Presumably Langsdorff collection
Object is missing

**Fishing tackle**

**Paddles**

Tilesius recorded the Nuku Hivan name for ‘an oar shovel’ as Tehou/Tehöu, which corresponds to hoe or tohua, while Lisiansky recorded the name for oars as hoi-hoi. Five of the paddles brought by the Russian expedition survived in museum collections. One was donated to the Kunstkamera by Lisiansky (P1). This might be the paddle which, as Lisiansky wrote, had been accidentally dropped on Kiatonui’s head (this incident was discussed in Chapter 1). Two paddles from Krusenstern’s collection, accompanied by an Admiralty Museum label, were transferred to the Kunstkamera after the disbandment of the Admiralty Museum’s ethnographic collections (P2 and P3). One more paddle from Krusenstern’s collection was probably transferred to the Naval Cadet Corps in 1827 and deposited at the MAE in 1931 (P4). The fifth paddle was identified as Marquesan in Espenberg’s collection in Tallinn (P5). Two paddles from Krusenstern’s collection have their knobs decorated with carvings: the trapezoid knob of P2 has a relief carving of Janus-like tiki heads, while P3 has a forked knob with roughly carved tiki figures, positioned back to back. None of the paddles have carved ornaments on the blades, and textual accounts by the Russian visitors do not mention any. The existence of blade carvings in the precontact period remains an open question, although richly ornamented paddles were produced by Marquesans as curiosities for sale from the nineteenth century onwards.

**P1 Paddle (hoe)**

Wood

Paddle l 145 cm; blade l 60 cm, w 15.5 cm; shaft diameter 3 cm; butt h 5, w 6 cm

St Petersburg, MAE: 750-19

Lisiansky collection

Published: Rozina, ’Kollektsiia...’; pp. 112-113.
**P2 Paddle (hoe)**

Wood

Paddle l 153 cm; blade l 71 cm, w 22.3 cm; shaft diameter 3.5 cm; handle h 5.2, w 7 cm

The butt has carved designs on it, including a tiki face on either side facing out. There is white paint on carved section. Brown string tied around shaft near butt.

St Petersburg, MAE: 736-170

1828 Transferred from Admiralty Museum to Kunstkamera (MAE)


**P3 Paddle (hoe)**

Wood

Paddle l 146 cm; blade l 62 cm, w 17.5 cm; handle h 6.5, w 2.2 cm

The handle is forked; the forks depict two roughly carved tiki figures, facing away from each other.

St Petersburg, MAE: 736-171

1828 Transferred from Admiralty Museum to Kunstkamera (MAE)

Published: Rozina, ‘Kollektsiia…’, pp. 112-113.

**P4 Paddle (hoe)**

Wood

Paddle l 120.5 cm; blade l 59 cm, w 16 cm

St Petersburg, MAE: 4319-1

1827 Transferred from Admiralty Museum to Naval Cadet Corps

1931 Transferred from Naval Museum to Kunstkamera (MAE)
**P5 Paddle (hoe)**

Wood

H 37, w 28 [EHM inventory]

Paddle 144.5 cm, blade 60 cm, w 17 cm

Tallinn, EHM: K-1879

Ex. Espenberg collection within Burchard collection

1952 Transferred from ENM to EHM

**Simple pearl shell fish hooks**

Langsdorff and Tilesius provided the name for fish hooks as medau and metāu correspondingly. Thirteen fishing hooks have been located in the museum collections, four more can be tentatively attributed to the expedition, and three are missing, based on early documentation. Of these, nine are simple pearl shell hooks and come from the collections of Lisiansky, Langsdorff, and Horner. It is interesting to note that in the collections of Langsdorff (Fh5 and Fh6) and Horner (Fh8 and Fh9) the hooks were originally tied in pairs, each consisting of a larger and a smaller hook. Horner’s hooks were published as a tied pair in von den Steinen’s study. This might suggest mass collecting and a subsequent redistribution of artefacts, rather than spontaneous individual bartering.

Langsdorff noted that the hooks were ‘simple and made from mother-of-pearl shells without any barb’ and indeed all but one hook in the expedition’s collections have sharp, barbless points, which correlates with Linton: ‘Such hooks were barbless with only slightly recurved points.’ The only exception is the quite massive fish hook in Lisiansky’s collection in the Museum of Anthropology in Moscow (Fh4), the point of which has an inner, not very prominent barb, which seems not to play any functional role, especially given its smoothness and the thickness of the hook. Its pictorial representation appears as an engraving in Lisiansky’s Atlas with the ‘barb’ evolved into an obtuse angle (Fh-20). Its shape is similar to Marquesan ceremonial fish hooks discussed by Michel Panoff and von den Steinen, but such ceremonial hooks were larger and made of bone or turtle shell. The scarcity of Marquesan hooks in museum collections might explain this type of hook does not appear in Beasley’s and Blau and Maaz’s studies of Pacific fish hooks. Lisiansky’s friendship with Kiatoniu allows the speculation that this unusual hook, modelled on ancient ceremonial forms, was preserved in the haka’iki’s family and given to Lisiansky as a special gift.

**Fh1 Simple fish hook**

Pearl shell; coconut fibre

L 5.5 cm, w 2.7 cm, thickness 0.7 cm

St Petersburg, MAE: 750-15

Lisiansky collection

Published: Rozina, ’Kollektsiia…’, pp. 113-114.
Fh2 Simple fish hook
Pearl shell; coconut fibre
L 6 cm; w 1.2 cm, thickness 0.3 cm
Similar to Fh1, but point broken off.
St Petersburg, MAE: 750-14
Lisiansky collection
Published: Rozina, ‘Kollektsiia…’, pp. 113-114.

Fh3 Simple fish hook
Pearl shell; hibiscus fibre
L 4 cm; w 2.5 cm, thickness 0.5 cm
Similar to Fh1, but point broken off
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/4
Lisiansky collection

Fh4 Simple fish hook
Pearl shell; hibiscus fibre
L 7.4 cm; w 4.2 cm, thickness 1.4 cm
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/1
Lisiansky collection

Fh5 Simple fish hook
Pearl shell; coconut fibre
L 4 cm, w 2.3 cm
Munich, MFK: 89
Langsdorff collection

Fh6 Simple fish hook
Pearl shell; coconut fibre
L 3.5 cm, w 2.2 cm
Attached to same cord at Fh5.
Munich, MFK: 89
Langsdorff collection
Fh7 Simple fish hook
Pearl shell; coconut fibre
W 1.9 cm
Sennit bundle 20 cm, l of line probably 5m; hook H 2.6 cm
Zürich, EMZU: 02322
Horner collection
Published: von den Steinen, *Die Marquesaner*..., Vol. 3, p. aP no.9.

Fh8 Simple fish hook
Pearl shell; mixture of fau fibre and coconut fibre
W 2.6 cm
Sennit L 45 cm; hook H 4.5 cm
Elastic sennit cord attached.
Zürich, EMZU: 02323
Horner collection
Published: von den Steinen, *Die Marquesaner*..., Vol. 3, p. aP no.9.

Fh9 Simple fish hook
Pearl shell; coconut fibre
W 3.5 cm
Sennit L 47 cm; hook H 6.8 cm
Elastic sennit cord attached.
Zürich, EMZU: 02324
Horner collection
Published: von den Steinen, *Die Marquesaner*..., Vol. 3, p. aP no.9.

Fh10 Simple fish hook
Shell, fibre
L c. 3 cm
Leipzig, Grassi Museum: Po 1695. Object missing
Tilesius collection; presented by him to Klemm; no. 3296 in Klemm’s catalogue.

Fh11 Simple fish hook
‘Pearl shell fishing hook from the Washington Islands’
1806 Donated by Krusenstern to Admiralty Museum
1827 Transferred to Black Sea Map Depot in Nikolaev
Not identified in collections at present
**Composite fish hooks**

Lisiansky’s collection in the Moscow Museum of Anthropology also includes three composite fish hooks for bonito fishing (Fh13, Fh14, Fh15). They consist of a pearl shell shank with a bone barb attached to the shank with a twisted string. While Lisiansky’s engravings of such composite fish hooks appear on the Hawaiian artefacts plate of his Atlas (Fh-21), in the old MAMSU inventories they were recorded as Marquesan and grouped under inventory number 150 with the simple Marquesan pearl shell hooks discussed above. Langsdorff has an engraving of a similar composite fish hook on his plate of Marquesan artefacts (see Figure 2.2). There is similar confusion with the attribution of composite fish hooks in the MAE collections. Its early voyagers collection 736 has a composite fish hook with the inscription on the back of the shank ‘Markez[as] Is[lands] (Kruzen[shern])’ (Fh12), although according to old inventories this is Hawaiian fishing tackle. The early voyagers collections of this museum have three other almost identical hooks with bundles of string still attached, all attributed as Hawaiian (723-220, 750-6, 750-7). Although there are a lot of similarities between Marquesan and Hawaiian composite bonito hooks, according to Beasley’s typology, ‘The Marquesan type differs in having two holes in the barb instead of one with the notch below.’ All the composite fishhooks in the museums in Moscow and St Petersburg, as well as the ‘Marquesan’ fish hook on the Langsdorff’s engraving, have one hole in the barb. This increases the probability that they were all acquired by Lisiansky on Hawai‘i and misattributed as Marquesan in the process of museum transfers. One more bonito fish hook with attached line is located in Siebold’s collection in Leiden, where it was attributed as Nuku Hivan according to the early inventories (Fh16). This fish hook also has only one hole for fastening of the barb and a separate fixture for the end tip of the barb which makes it similar to Society Islands fish hooks. Nevertheless, considering that the early Marquesan fish hook collections in the museums are scarce, and may not reflect the variety of types used by Marquesans, we give the benefit of the doubt to the fish hooks attributed in the museums as Marquesan and provide information about them.

**Fh12 Composite fish hook**

Pearl shell; bone; pig hair; plant fibre  
Shank l 8 cm, w 1.4 cm; barb l 4.6 cm, w 2.6 cm.  
Inscription on the back side of the shank ‘Markez[as] Is[lands] (Kruzen[shern])’, but according to old labels it originates from the ‘Sandwich Islands’. 

St Petersburg, MAE: 736-221  
1828 Transferred from Admiralty Museum to Kunstkamera (MAE)  
Fh13 Composite fish hook
Pearl shell; bone; pig hair; plant fibre
Shank l 7.4 cm, w 1.5 cm; barb l 5.5 cm, w 2.5 cm
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/2
Lisiansky collection

Fh14 Composite fish hook
Pearl shell; bone; pig hair; plant fibre
Shank l 8 cm, w 1.5 cm
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/3
Lisiansky collection

Fh15 Composite fish hook
Pearl shell; bone; pig hair; plant fibre
Shank l 7 cm, w 1.3 cm
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/5
Lisiansky collection

Fh16 Composite fish hook
Pearl shell; bone; plant fibre
Shank l 12 cm, w 2 cm.
Leiden, NMWC: RV-1-113
Siebold collection
Harpoons, fishing lines, fishing nets

The collections of Krusenstern’s expedition have several other items associated with fishing. Horner’s collection in Zürich includes an artefact which can be identified as a wooden harpoon (Fh17); its size and shape are similar to bone harpoons published by Panoff and von den Steinen. Bone and wooden harpoons were mentioned by Porter in his account of his stay at Nuku Hiva in 1813. Siebold’s collection in Leiden also has a fishing line on a bamboo reel (Fh19). A similar artefact is in Lisiansky’s MAE collection (Fh18) and appears in Lisiansky’s Atlas (Fh-22). The Marquesan plate in Lisiansky’s Atlas also includes a fishing net (Fh-23), which, if one is to believe his scale (1:2) should be just 37 cm long, which seems unlikely – perhaps the intended scale was 1:20, which would make its actual length 370 cm. The only net associated with the expeditions of Lisiansky or other early Russian voyagers in European collections is a large fishing net in the Museum of Anthropology in Moscow (373-1), which was catalogued as part of the Easter Island collection, but has an old label ‘South Sea Islands’.

Fh17 Harpoon

Hard wood, plant fibre
Hook: L 18.6 cm, W 2.7 cm; rope L 125 cm
Zürich, EMZU: 03875
Horner collection

Fh18 Fishing line on reel

Light wood, plant fibre
L 30 cm, w 8.5 cm
St Petersburg, MAE: 750-16
Lisiansky collection
Published: Rozina, ‘Kollektsiia…’, pp. 112-113.

Fh19 Fishing line on reel

Bamboo, plant fibre
L 23 cm, w 6 cm
Leiden, NMWC: RV-1-111
Siebold collection


Weapons and ceremonial objects

According to Shemelin, Krusenstern had acquired the best collection of Nuku Hivan weaponry among the expedition members; he described the main types of weapon as follows:

Their arms consist of clubs, spears, and slings. The clubs are about five feet long, of casuarina wood, beautifully polished, and very massy, not weighing less than ten pounds; and at their extremity is a carved human head. The spears are of the same wood, ten or twelve feet long, about an inch thick in the middle and sharp at each end. Their slings are simply a woven band, broad and flat in the middle to admit the stone.  

Tilesius distinguished four types of clubs and ceremonial insignia: ‘Pole with a head of hair is totoko pioh; a lance is pakeu; a battle club is eu; a wide saber-shaped weapon is akāau,’ the Marquesan names of which are reconstructed below.

War clubs (‘U’u)
The most prized of these weapons among collectors are the carved war clubs, ‘u’u; Tilesius and Lisiansky attested them as ‘war clubs’ and recorded their name as Eu. Only one club that can be connected with certainty to Krusenstern’s expedition has been identified in the museum collections at present; it is held in the MAE (W1). It was first studied and published by von den Steinen. The MAE do have another ‘u’u club (W2), but it was acquired in 1936 and the original collector is unknown; it is possible that it was collected by Krusenstern’s expedition members and was kept privately. Carol Ivory noted that the club W2 ‘stylistically is a twin to the Krusenstern one’ and they could have been made by the same artist. Another club was in Lisiansky’s possession, as its engraving appears in his Atlas (see Figure 2.1, L). The base of the club is decorated with a sleeve of fibre and tufts of what could be hair or feathers. This is the only club with such ornamentation among the artefacts brought by the Krusenstern expedition and might reflect, as discussed above, Lisiansky’s close relationship with Kiatonui and his family. A ‘small club’ from the Marquesas was transferred from the Admiralty Museum to the Black Sea Map Depot in 1827, but, considering the date of its deposition into the former (1822), it was most likely from the collection of Bellingshausen, who did not visit the Marquesas during this expedition of 1819-1821. Espenberg noted that he collected a club, but it did not reach the Estonian History Museum with the rest of his collection. Yet another club was in Horner’s Zürich collection. In 1888 it was described as ‘A club from ironwood with carving’ (W4) and was transferred from the Antiquarian to the Ethnographic Society along with his other Nuku Hivan artefacts, but it probably never reached the Zürich University Museum collections as there is no reference to it in von den Steinen’s study, who published a number of Horner’s Zürich artefacts. Tilesius’ incorporation of ‘u’u clubs into his classical portraits of Nuku Hivans (see Figures 1.4 and 1.3, and further evolution of these images in Max Radiguet) turned this object into an icon of Marquesan culture.
**W1 War club (‘u’u)**
Wood
L 160.3 cm, head w 20 cm, butt w 5.5 cm
One of the largest ‘u’u documented, made from toa (Casuarina equistefolia). The face on one side has three raised tiki facial head carvings – one on each eye and one immediately beneath. There is another facial feature emerging at crest of club. Straight lines radiate out around eyes. Immediately beneath the face there is a band of complex carved designs. The reverse side has the same template but has significant cracks.
St Petersburg, MAE: 736-177
1828 Transferred from Admiralty Museum to Kunstkamera (MAE)

**W2 War club (‘u’u)**
Wood
L 150 cm, head w 20 cm
St Petersburg, MAE: 5449-1
1936 obtained from V. V. Kravtsova
This club exhibits broad stylistic affinities with W1, but there is no specific evidence pointing to its provenance.

**W3 War club (‘u’u)**
Wood
Espenberg collection, Estonia
Not identified in the collections

**W4 War club (‘u’u)**
‘A carved club made of ironwood’
Horner collection
1888 Transfer list from Antiquarian Society in Zürich to Ethnographic Society in Zürich
Item is missing; was not deposited in the Zürich, EMZU collection.
Chiefs’ staffs (tokotoko pio'o) and war clubs (parahua)
The ceremonial staff used by chiefs, tokotoko pio'o, (cf. Tilesius’ Totoko pioho), surmounted, according to Langsdorff, ‘with a slain enemy’s braided hair’, was another praised curio for the voyagers. One such staff (W5) was deposited in the Kunstkamera soon after the disbandment of the Admiralty Museum, while another was in the Emperor’s Arsenal collection and reached the MAE in 1938 (W6). It is highly likely that it was donated to the Emperor by Krusenstern. One more tokotoko pio'o was in Lisiansky’s possession, as it appeared in his Atlas (see Figure 1.2, M) and in the list of his donations to the Kunstkamera (W7), but it is now missing. There is also a parahua, an oar-shaped club, in the MAE collection, the grip of which is ornamented with a woven sleeve of plant fibre decorated with black geometric designs made of human hair (W8). It is interesting to note that the club W8 and staff W5 were accompanied by the Admiralty Museum label ‘Clubs serving instead of swords during a battle from the Marquesas Islands’. Lisiansky similarly attested his staff as ‘Club serving as a sword in battle’ or ‘Marquesan palash [backsword]’ (Figure 1.2, M and W7). A tokotoko pio'o also appears in Langsdorff’s iconic image of a Nuku Hivan (see Figure 1.5). Tilesius’ akäau, ‘a wide saber-shaped weapon’ mentioned above, might in fact be a parahua club. Langsdorff recorded a similar term for war clubs as kääu-tóa. According to Dordillon the meaning of the word kääu or akau is wood and as such it is included in the names of various wooden implements.

W5 Chief’s staff (tokotoko pio'o)
Wood, plant fibre, hair
L 181 cm, weaving l 9 cm, shaft d 2.7 cm, lower end w 4.7 cm
St Petersburg, MAE: 736-175
1828 Transferred from Admiralty Museum to Kunstkamera (MAE)

W6 Chief’s staff (tokotoko pio'o)
Wood, plant fibre, hair
L 196 cm, weaving l 7 cm, shaft d 2.7 cm, lower end w 5.5 cm
St Petersburg, MAE: 5754-35
Originally was in Arsenal of Tsarskoe Selo collection.
1938 Transferred from State Museum of Ethnography to Kunstkamera (MAE)
Published: Rozina, ‘Kollektsiia…’, pp. 111-112.
**W7 Chief’s staff (tokotoko pio’o) (?)**
‘7. Marquesan palash [backsword]’
1806 Donated by Lisiansky to Kunstkamera
Not identified in the collections

**W8 War club (parahua)**
Wood, coconut fibre, hair
L 235.2 cm, sleeve 1 8.8 cm, butt w 5.5 cm, lower end w 11.6 cm
Club with paddle end. The shaft naturally curves up slightly, towards the centre. The whole surface has been highly polished which has brought out the natural grooves and striations in the wood. The butt flares at end of shaft into lozenge shape which flattens off and is covered in a very finely woven sleeve of coir bound into diamond shape patterns which have cross-shaped black human hair designs woven into them.
St Petersburg, MAE: 736-174
1828 Transferred from Admiralty Museum to Kunstkamera (MAE)
Published: von den Steinen, *Die Marquesaner...,* Vol. 3, p. aQ1b; Rozina, ‘Kollektiia...’, pp. 111-112.

**W9 War club (parahua)**
Wood, coconut fibre, hair
L 229 cm
Long club with paddle end, with woven grip and tassels of human hair, similar to W8.
Leipzig, Grassi Museum: Po 1487 (in storage; inaccessible as of May 2018; not sighted)
Tilesius collection; presented by him to Klemm.

**W10 War club (parahua)**
Wood, coconut fibre, hair
L 255 cm
Long club with paddle end, with woven grip and tassels of human hair, similar to W8.
Leipzig, Grassi Museum: Po 1488 (in storage; inaccessible as of May 2018; not sighted)
Tilesius collection; presented by him to Klemm.
Spears (mataku)
The MAE early voyagers’ collection 736 has a number of spears brought by Russian expeditions from the South Pacific, but none of the spears in this collection have original documentation which would specify their provenance. Only one (W11) has been positively identified by Rozina as Marquesan and is included here as an example of a potential Krusenstern voyage acquisition. It is part of a set of seven; the others similarly may derive from the voyage. These spears, along with the spear represented in Lisiansky’s Atlas and Krusenstern’s Atlas (see Figures 2.1, O & 1.2), are not serrated, while Langsdorff’s engraving represents spears with serrated tips (see Figures 1.6, 2.2).

W11 Spear (mataku)
Wood
L 330.5 cm
Spear of red/brown wood
St Petersburg, MAE: 736-141
1828 Transferred from Admiralty Museum to Kunstkamera (MAE)
Published: Rozina, ‘Kollektsiia…’ , pp. 111-112

W12 ‘Lance from the Marquesas Islands’ Arsenal of Tsarskoe Selo collection.
Not identified in the collections

Slings (maka)
Slings were an important element of the Marquesan arsenal. Rezanov formed the impression that ‘their weaponry mostly consists of slings for throwing stones,’ while Langsdorff, like earlier voyagers, observed that ‘around their heads they wear slings woven from coconut fibers, which to a foreigner look more like an adornment than armament.’ Langsdorff also noted that ‘Beautiful, sturdy slings are woven from coconut fibers and those of another plant, which I did not get to see (probably a kind of nettle or Phornium tenax Forst.)’. Shemelin believed that slings were woven by women and Tilesius recorded the Nuku Hivan term for them as makê, which corresponds to maka or maa in Dordillon’s dictionary. The best collection of Nuku Hivan slings is in the Estonian History Museum in Tallinn: the five slings there originate from Friederici’s collection (S2 – S6). One sling from Horner’s collection is in Zürich (S7), another one is in Lisiansky’s collection in the Moscow Museum of Anthropology (S1); the latter was also engraved in his Atlas (see Figure 1.1, V). The slings in Moscow, Zürich, and three slings from the Tallinn collection (S2 – S4) have similar designs, featuring a diamond-shaped, uniformly woven coconut fibre cradle with braided coconut fibre trimming around the edge. The cord which was held in the hand during stone-throwing was made of quite tightly braided coconut fibre, ending with a loop for a finger; the cord which was released was made of looser, twisted fau fibre. This type of sling also appears in Langsdorff’s drawing (see Figure 2.2). This was likely the most common type of sling in Nuku Hiva at that time. Two other slings in the Tallinn collection have a different weaving technique. Sling S5, although uniform with the former slings in shape, is distinguished by extremely fine weaving and a braided ridge which runs across the cradle, pulling it into a more
bowl-like shape. Sling S6 is made entirely of coconut fibre, has a very different pattern of perpendicular plaits, a rectangular cradle with no trimming, is smaller in size and might originate from elsewhere in the Pacific. A similar sling to S6 was located at Quai Branly Museum, where it was attributed as from 'Polynesia' (no. 71.1963.50.4).

S1 Sling (*maka*)
Coconut fibre; fau fibre
L 296 cm; cradle l 15 cm, w 5 cm
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/6
Lisiansky collection

S2 Sling (*maka*)
Coconut fibre; plant fibre
L 294 cm, cradle l 13.5 cm, w 4.3 cm
Tallinn, EHM: K-1309/1
Friederici collection

S3 Sling (*maka*)
Coconut fibre; plant fibre
L 271 cm, cradle l 15.4 cm, w 4.9 cm
Tallinn, EHM: K-1309/2
Friederici collection

S4 Sling (*maka*)
Coconut fibre; plant fibre
L 267 cm, cradle l 15.5 cm, w 4.5 cm
Tallinn, EHM: K-1309/3
Friederici collection

S5 Sling (*maka*)
Coconut fibre; plant fibre
L 261 cm, cradle l 17.8 cm, w 4.8 cm
Tallinn, EHM: K-1309/4
Friederici collection

S6 Sling (*maka*)
Coconut fibre
L 241 cm, cradle l 10.7 cm, w 4.9 cm
Tallinn, EHM: K-1309/5
Friederici collection
Musical instruments

Shell trumpet (putoka)

The expedition participants noted the existence of two remarkable musical instruments, the functions of which were not limited to entertainment. The shell trumpet (putoka) was highly prized by the Russian visitors. Shemelin described how he acquired one in the absence of other competitors from the ship:

first I bought a large conch, which is used by the Islanders as a war trumpet and produces a loud and strange sound resembling the roar of wild animals. It is decorated with human hair, as is all their weaponry.\(^{123}\)

Tilesius noted its construction: ‘They would bring us […] warlike horned shells (Buccinum bellicosum) from which they make trumpets, grinding down the end of the spiral whorl and inserting there, instead of a mouthpiece, half of an oil nut (Aleuritis)’.\(^{124}\) Langsdorff likewise noted that the mouthpiece was made of ‘a little coconut shell or the hull of an oil nut’. According to other studies, the mouthpiece could also be made of gourd or bamboo.\(^{125}\) Two putoka have been preserved, both in Friederici’s collection in Tallinn. Another was in Lisiansky’s collection donated to the Kunstkamera in 1806; it was described as ‘Marquesan horn used in ceremony’ (M3). It is now missing, but its engraving is in Lisiansky’s Atlas (M-4). Lisiansky’s engraving of a putoka features a sophisticated mouthpiece, an element which is missing in the surviving artefacts from Friederici. The two putoka differ in quality: one has a broken shell and basic hair and string decorations (M2), while the other is a perfect sample with elaborately plaited fibre cordage knotted with tassels of human hair (M1). While the artefacts share core design elements, it is clear that there were major differences in quality, craftsmanship and luxury between individual putoka from the same area.
M1 Shell trumpet (*putoka*)
Shell; coconut fibre; human hair, human bone
L 37 cm
Tallinn, EHM: K-1305
Friederici collection

M2 Shell trumpet (*putoka*)
Shell; coconut fibre; human hair
L 36 cm
Tallinn, EHM: K-1306
Friederici collection

M3 Shell trumpet (*putoka*)
‘83. Marquesan horn used in ceremony’
1806 Donated by Lisiansky to Kunstkamera
Not identified in the collections

M-4 Iury Lisiansky, ‘Shell used as a horn’, engraving depicting shell trumpet (*putoka*), in Lisianskii, *Sobranie kart…*, pl. I, Q.
**Drum (pahu)**

The Russian visitors were the first to describe the Nuku Hivan drum, but probably did not collect any during their visit. Tilesius recorded the name for them as Pahu and made sketches of big and small drums that he saw in the hut at the me'ae (M-5), accompanied by marginalia:

> The big drums from the Morai house [are decorated] with woven braiding. The small drums (of which there are four) are covered with squid skin. The big ones are covered with cloth covers. Their tones are pure and pleasant, they are beaten with a flat hand.\(^{127}\)

These sketches were later incorporated into his engraving in Krusenstern’s *Atlas* (see Figure 1.2).

---

**M-5 Wilhelm Tilesius, pencil, detail depicting drums, in Tilesius, ‘Skizzenbuch…’; f. 79.**

**Stilts (vaeake) and stilt steps (tapuvae)**

Although known to be used during public feasts and for entertainment, stilts had sacred associations which were not immediately recognized by the voyagers. The expedition members knew about stilts from the account and engraving of Marchand, whose book was aboard the ship. Tilesius noted that ‘Marchand, in his description of the journey around the world, has portrayed these stilts as extremely beautiful’.\(^{128}\) Langsdorff, expressed the opinion that ‘Pleasure seems to be the main reason’ for races on stilts during public festivals, when the participants tried to throw their opponents off balance.\(^{129}\) He recorded a few facts, learned probably from Robarts or Kabris, which did not fit well with the ‘amusement’ theory, and tried to provide a rational explanation for them:
The best runners on stilts, who perform at public dances, are taboo for three days preceding a dance. They do not go out, take care of themselves well and do not associate with their wives, probably in order to gather more strength.¹³⁰

Tilesius gained insight into the hidden sacred dimension of the stilts while observing their ornamentation. During the visit itself he already noted that stilt steps were decorated with 'almost the same figures as you see on their Morais'.¹³¹ Upon his return to Europe he noted the similarity of figures tattooed on bodies and those the Nuku Hivans carved on their 'boats, stilts, clubs and mortuary monuments'.¹³² He added to these observations in his theoretical paper of 1828, where he discussed designs on stilts steps and other artefacts in the context of the social functions of early Marquesan pictograms. He noted that those who take part in peace agreement customs and feasts had the figures tapubai kake (stilt-performing ground) or weha kake (dancing place) tattooed as a sign of their commitment to participating in the construction of these places and, he added, 'these figures are made not only on the skin but on the stilts as well'.¹³³ Writing that 'the image of etua on stilts, on the prows of war canoes, and on battle clubs is the same as that made on the thighs of priests and chiefs and similar to carved monuments on morai,' he concluded that these were 'symbolic documents of some actions, benefits, feasts or celebrations, marks of belonging to a feasting society, and an evidence of mutual obligations'.¹³⁴ However speculative his conclusions might be, it should be noted that he was the only one in the Russian expedition to record the Marquesan name for stilts as Tapubai¹³⁵ and draw the above-mentioned sign for stilt-performing ground tapubai kake, which correlates well with the term tapuvai, attributed by Kjellgren and Ivory to stilt steps.¹³⁶

Fourteen stilts brought back by the Russian expedition survived in museum collections; there are also engravings by Lisiansky (St-15) and Langsdorff (see Figure 2.2). Lisiansky's collection in the MAE has a pair of stilts complete with steps tied to the poles (St1 – St2), while all the other collections (in Moscow, Tartu, Munich and Zürich) have only footsteps. Although structurally uniform, it seems that stilt steps, more than any other artefact, provided an avenue for a variety of artistic implementations. It should be noted that the available artefacts do not necessarily represent the whole variety of designs that existed at the time of the visit. For instance, Tilesius noted in his journal the existence of footsteps decorated with a carving of two or three Tetua [i.e. etua] arranged together,¹³⁷ while most of the footsteps collected by the Russian visitors have only one tiki. The exception is two items in the MAE collection (St3 and St4) with the face of the second tiki carved under the pedestal of the upper one. Another stilt step that breaks away from the overall pattern of tiki carved en face is an item in the Langsdorff collection in Munich (St11). It is positioned with its back to the viewer, as if looking over the shoulder. Appel noted that von den Steinen called such figures 'climbing tiki looking backwards' and etua potiki, i.e. 'god's baby'.¹³⁸ Unlike in the other items, the pointed base below the tiki is also carved, both on the outside and inside. However, even less sophisticated stilt step carvings (ex. St1, St2, St5, St9, St10) have variations in the designs of their headdresses and body lines representing tattoo. Moreover, many tiki are often individualized by a particular 'feature' like a half closed eye lid (St9), a winking eye (St3), or a 'tattoo' mark on the cheek (St6, St9). It
also appears that different types of wood were used for carving these stilt steps; in some cases the items are very heavy, in others very light. In comparison with footsteps ornamented with intricate tiki, the collections of the Russian expedition seem to be less sophisticated and ornamental, which might confirm the theory suggesting that the introduction of metal tools into Marquesan society generated a change in artistic style. Nevertheless, the variability and expressiveness found among the figures of this very early collection suggests that the groundwork for the forthcoming development of artistic exuberance had already been laid among the Nuku Hivan tahuna.

**St1 Stilt with step (vaeake)**

Wood; coconut fibre

Stilt pole l 202.5 cm; h of step 33 cm

Marquesan stilt consisting of a long sturdy wooden shaft of mid-brown wood, to which is lashed a darker brown wooden figure/step. The butt of the stilt pole shows considerable signs of usage is damaged and softened on base and around. The top end is very slightly tapered in – where the user’s hands would sit. The figure is finely carved with raised ridges running along the contours of the body. There is the suggestion of a penis. Hands resting on stomach with five fingers delineated. Classic tiki head, flat ears, flattened nose/brow feature, raised ridge for mouth suggesting two lips. Eyes are flat. At the bottom of the headdress section is a raised collar. The headdress itself has horizontal lines radiating out from central raised ridge – all one section not divided into fields. From the buttocks down to the platform upon which the figure sits is one solid block.

St Petersburg, MAE: 750-91

Lisiansky collection

Published: Rozina, ’Kollektsiia…’, pp. 118-119.
St2 Stilt with step (*vaake*)
Wood; coconut fibre
Stilt pole l 201.5 cm, h of step 29 cm
Marquesan stilt, the pair to St1. The figure is very similar to 750-9/1 except that the figure is supported by a small carved pedestal which extends to the back of the leg.
St Petersburg, MAE: 750-92
Lisiansky collection
Published: Rozina, 'Kollektsiia...', pp. 118-119.

St3 Stilt step (*tapuvae*)
Wood
L 38.5 cm
St Petersburg, MAE: 736-169
Stilt step made of sandalwood, covered in brown paint (woodstain?), with a tiki figure standing on a small base in the form of a human head. In the ornamental tattoo of the figure are evident concentric circles on the thighs and semicircles on the chest and shoulders.
1828 probably transferred from Admiralty Museum to Kunstkamera (MAE) but according to von den Steinen, this object comes from Langsdorff’s collection in St Petersburg, although it could also be a gift from Tilesius, mentioned by Russow.141
**St4 Stilt step** *(tapuvae)*
Wood  
L 31 cm  
Stilt step, covered in brown paint (woodstain?), on which is carved a tiki figure standing on a small conical base in the shape of an anthropomorphic head. The right side of the head is unfinished. The tiki figure is painted black (woodstained?). In the ornamental tattoo decorating the figure are evident a double-arch ‘necklace’ and under it a rhombic motif on the chest.  
St Petersburg, MAE: 5754-36  
Originally was in Arsenal of Tsarskoe Selo collection.  
1938 Transferred from State Museum of Ethnography to Kunstkamera (MAE)  
Published: Rozina, ‘Kollektsiia…’, pp. 118-119.

**St5 Stilt step** *(tapuvae)*
Wood  
L 30 cm  
Moscow, MAMSU: 370/19  
Lisiansky collection

**St6 Stilt step** *(tapuvae)*
Wood  
L 35.5 cm, figure l 25.5 cm  
Carved wooden stilt figure, probably Casuarina, exhibiting light wear or use. The reverse is roughly carved out and there is some knotting in the wood. The actual carved instep is decorated with a complex set of interlocking fields of diagonals. The front ‘headdress’ section is carved with fields of diagonal grooves. A set of vertical lines run down front of chest towards navel with diagonal grooves which tend upwards to the shoulders. The hands are flat on the stomach and the fingers are suggested by ‘u’ shaped motif. Two nested ‘u’s make up five fingers. The lower stomach grooved lines and a penis is distinguished. Legs have grooves. The feet merge into a pedestal.  
Tartu, ENM: C1-38  
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM
St7 Stilt step (tapuvae)
Wood
L 36.5 cm, figure l 25.5 cm
The wood is very worn and there is lots of surface wear and damage, suggesting heavy use. There is also some insect damage which looks to have been present in the wood prior to carving. The carving is quite rough and it is possible to see individual tool marks. The figure itself has smooth feet and face, its arms are flat and placed upon the edges of the stomach. The hands are almost worn away.
Tartu, ENM: C1-39
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM

St8 Stilt step (tapuvae)
Wood
L 19 cm, figure l 11 cm
Small carved wooden stilt figure made of atypically light wood.
Tartu, ENM: C1-40
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM

St9 Stilt step (tapuvae)
Wood
L 30.5 cm, figure l 23 cm
Munich, MFK: 186
Langsdorff collection
Published: Appel, 'Die frühesten Südsee-Bestände…', pp. 298-300.
St10 Stilt step (tapuvae)
Wood
L 30 cm, figure l 22 cm
Small step with gouge running down it and a piece of bone running through which has broken off. Very light wood.
Munich, MFK: 187
Langsdorff collection
Published: Appel, 'Die frühesten Südsee-Bestände...', pp. 298-300.

St11 Stilt step (tapuvae)
Wood
L 33.5 cm, figure l 20 cm
Munich, MFK: 188
Langsdorff collection
Published: von den Steinen, Die Marquesaner..., Vol. 2, p. 113; Appel, 'Die frühesten Südsee-Bestände...', pp. 298-300.

St12 Stilt step (tapuvae)
Wood
L 36.5 cm, figure l 28.5 cm
Zürich, EMZU: 00471
Horner collection

St13 Stilt step (tapuvae)
Wood
L 33.5 cm, figure l 27 cm
Zürich, EMZU: 00472
Horner collection
St14 Stilt step (*tapuvae*)
Wood
L 31.3 cm
Leipzig, Grassi Museum: Po 1487; on display (in May 2018)
Tilesius collection; presented by him to Klemm. no. 4386 in Klemm’s catalogue.

**Tiki figures**

The Krusenstern expedition was one of the first to bring back to Europe information about the variety of tiki figures in Marquesan culture, constructed using various media including wood, stone and bone. Besides tiki images on wooden stilt footsteps, only two tiki figures from the expedition have survived in museum holdings; these figures are, however, supplemented by rich pictorial and textual material. The first object, a carved wooden tiki, has had a complex transfer history and lacks early inventory information, which makes it difficult to date; it is now housed at the Museum of the History of Religion in St Petersburg (Tk1). Its height is 33.5 cm, which fits into the classification of von den Steinen, who documented a group of ‘middle sized wooden tiki’ with an average height of 50 cm. The distinctive features of the St Petersburg tiki are holes drilled into the earlobes and carved ‘horns’, corresponding to the characteristic hair style of Nuku Hivans at the time of the Russian visit. Another pair of holes is drilled through the ankles. The figure’s nose, hands and knees are polished, which seems to be the result of long-term handling, suggesting that it could be a precontact carving rather than part of later ‘touristic’ production. Its early provenance can be further supported with observations by Linton, who considered that under European influence the proportions of the later carved tiki became more ‘naturalistic’; the St Petersburg tiki adheres to an earlier, more stylized design. Apart from the wooden figure itself, the Russian expedition was the first to bring to Europe images of wooden and stone carved tiki placed on posts in the me’ae. These sketches, accompanied by some notes, were made by Tilesius (Tk-3 – Tk-7) and later reworked for the iconic engraving ‘View of Morai or Cemetery on Nuka Hiva Island’ in Krusenstern’s *Atlas* (see Figure 1.2).

Tiki figurines carved of bone, used for the decoration of household utensils, have now become an emblem of Marquesan culture. Such artefacts at present are numerous in museum collections and are noted for variation in their designs. The Russian visitors did note the use of bones for the decoration of household utensils, though they do not specify if these bones were ornamented with carved tiki images. For instance, Krusenstern wrote that ‘The calabashes and cocoa shells are mostly ornamented with the finger and arm bones of their enemies, whom they have devoured’. Crook mentioned ‘carved human bones’ used for the ornamentation of calabash nets. The only item of this type, disregarding Friederici’s bone bracelet discussed above (B2), is the tiki ivi po’o figurine carved from a cylindrical human bone in Langsdorff’s collection in Munich (Tk2). Langsdorff’s tiki ivi po’o is distinguished by tiny holes in its earlobes, which is a rare feature. It is the only bone figurine to have survived in the expedition’s collections and the lack of any other references to tiki ivi po’o in the inventories might suggest that the expedition participants did not collect any, or, conversely, were reluctant to part with these amusing figurines.
Tk1 Figure (tiki)
Wood
H 33,5 cm
1932 Transfer from the State Antireligious Museum (the former Isaac Cathedral) to the Museum of Religion and Atheism (now Museum of History of Religion)
St Petersburg, Museum of History of Religion: 116-3-1

Tk2 Bone ornament (tiki ivi po’o)
Bone
H 3,5 cm, d 2,5 cm
Munich, MFK: 195
Langsdorff collection
Published: Appel, ‘Die frühesten Südsee-Bestände…’, pp. 300-301.

Tk-3 Wilhelm Tilesius, pencil, detail depicting wooden tiki figure, in Tilesius, ‘Skizzenbuch…’, f. 78 v.
Tk-4 Wilhelm Tilesius, two wooden tiki figures, pencil, ink, in Tilesius, 'Skizzenbuch...', f. 80 v.

Tk-5 Wilhelm Tilesius, stone tiki figure, pencil, ink, gouache, in Tilesius, 'Skizzenbuch...', f. 83 v.

Tk-6 Wilhelm Tilesius, four wooden tiki figures, pencil, ink, in Tilesius, 'Skizzenbuch...', f. 80.

Tk-7 Wilhelm Tilesius, 'Morai of the Priest's Family in Nuka Hiva', grey ink, brush, washed over pencil sketch, in Universität Leipzig, Art collection, TIL069.

Tattooing tools

Many members of the Russian expedition described the Nuku Hivan tattooing procedure; there are a number of discrepancies in their observations. While Langsdorff wrote that the tattooing instrument was made out of 'the wing bones of the tropic bird (Phaëton aethereus)’ ‘stuck at an acute angle into a finger-thick piece of bamboo',147 Ratmanov believed that it was made from a reed or bamboo with 5 or 10 sharp prongs ‘similar to what we use to rule note lines',148 and Gideon wrote of ‘an instrument with a tiny toothed edge made out of a shell'.149 Rezanov and Tilesius also referred to bones. Tilesius described them as ‘cylindrical half-split bird’s bones with five sharpened teeth as a comb’, and added: ‘I wanted to buy such a tool, but the excessive curiosity
with which some of my companions rushed to obtain true and fictitious memorabilia prevented me from this.\textsuperscript{130} He noted that Nuku Hivans used the word t\u0101\u0161\u0101 for both ‘wooden harpoon for piercing fish’ and tattooing instruments.\textsuperscript{151}

The only tattooing instrument that has survived in the Russian expedition collections is an implement in Horner’s collection in Zürich (Tt1). According to the original inventory, it was made of a shark tooth fixed to a handle, which adds a new material to the list of tattooing implements. Lisiansky most likely acquired a set for tattooing as well, since it appears on the engraving in his Atlas (see Figure 2.1, G), but it did not reach his collections in Moscow or St Petersburg. Two more drawings of tattooing instruments were made by Tilesius and Langsdorff. Tilesius’ sketch was published during the voyage (Tt-2) and must be the first image of the Marquesan tattooing tool to reach Europe. Langsdorff’s engraving of a tattooing instrument with five interchangeable heads was published in his paper about Nuku Hivan tattoo (Tt-4); his original drawing of the instruments had an inscription: ‘Bird bones (serrated like a comb) necessary for the different figures of tattooing’ (Tt-3). The tool is shown in action in his ‘Interior of a Nukuhivan hut where a tattoo artist is sitting and practicing his art’.\textsuperscript{152}

\textbf{Tt1 Instrument for tattooing (attributed)}\\
Shark tooth, wood, plant fibre\\
L 13.7 cm\\
A shark’s tooth attached with plant fibre to the top of a wooden stick, but which bears no residues of dye, hence unused, or possibly not for tattooing at all.\\
Zürich, EMZU: 00483\\
Horner collection\\


Skulls as artefacts (ipu o’o)

One of the most striking features of Nuku Hivan attire, noted almost immediately by members of the expedition, were ornamented skulls carried by men. Langsdorff shared his first discovery with Blumenbach upon reaching Kamchatka:

The ornamental locks of hair thought by earlier travellers to be mementoes of beloved friends and relatives are in fact trophies from slain enemies. In just the same way they carry the complete skulls as trophies tied at the waist – a custom which, casually said, has put me in the position to obtain some nice skulls for your collection.\(^{153}\)

By the beginning of the nineteenth century skulls were collected not only by naturalists, but were becoming a fashionable souvenir. For instance, Krusenstern’s cousin, Christiane, the second wife of the famous playwright August von Kotzebue, wrote playfully to Krusenstern on his departure:

Of course you have to bring me something, but what? Perhaps skulls of the various wild tribes you will come across? In earnest, dear Adam, you will oblige me greatly if you can do it without inconvenience or danger to yourself. […] bring me some lovely skulls [‘schöne Todtenköpfe’].

She accompanied this extraordinary request with the explanation that they would be for her friend, who was collecting ‘skulls and bones’;\(^{154}\) Nuku Hivan warrior-trophy skulls, distinguished by sophisticated ornamentation, fitted the image of ‘schöne Todtenköpfe’ quite well and also became highly prized in the eyes of non-naturalist members of the expedition, such as Rezanov and Shemelin.

Löwenstern remarked on the tensions arising when Krusenstern allowed members of the expedition to barter for ‘curiosities’: ‘Espenberg had a hefty dispute with Langsdorff because of a skull that they both wanted;\(^{155}\) From Shemelin’s account we see that the skull, ‘decorated in places with pearl shell’, fell into the hands of the former.\(^{156}\) Tilesius lamented in his journal, ‘I would have had the opportunity to bring home for my scientist friends some very good skulls of Marquesan savages, if only everybody else on board had not wanted to collect them, and if some who had no use for them whatever had not forestalled me’;\(^{157}\) Shemelin was lucky enough to get a skull ‘with jawbones, whole and undamaged, the eye sockets adorned with carved pearl shell’;\(^{158}\)

Upon the return of the expedition to Europe, the skulls of Nuku Hivans, as well as those of the peoples of East Asia and North America, were in high demand within the circle of German-speaking naturalists in Europe and Russia. Tilesius, in a letter to anatomist August Mayer (1787-1865), indicates the scope of the expedition’s skull collecting: ‘Krusenstern acquired skulls for Loder, Espenberg for Isenflamm, Dr. Langsdorff for Bojanus and Langenbeck, and naval officers for the Imperial Russian Admiralty and other collections’.\(^{159}\) Although currently only a few skulls originating from the expedition have been located in the museum collections, their original
number was much higher, over a score. Several of them were carefully depicted and published, while others are mentioned in textual references.

Blumenbach was the first to describe and publish a Nuku Hivan skull delivered to him by Langsdorff, which he attested as 'most rare and striking'. Although he described its decorations and its use as a trophy, for him it was primarily an anatomical specimen which he described in Latin; his engraving of the skull lacks any ornaments. This skull is preserved in the Museum of the University of Göttingen, intact with nose plug and plaited band around the lower jaw (Sk6).

Another surviving Nuku Hivan skull was initially in the possession of a Baltic German anatomist in the Russian service, Justus Christian Loder (1753-1832), for whom Krusenstern acquired five skulls. Loder’s anatomical collection was bought by the Russian Emperor in 1818 and donated to Moscow University. Currently this skull is displayed in the Museum of Medical History of Moscow State University, adorned with decorations and believed to be ‘a skull of Polynesian chief’. An inscription in Russian, 'Sent by Admiral Krusenstern', was written on the left lateral side of the skull. The skull is likewise ornamented with a woven band and nose plug. The plaiting technique of the band is identical with the Göttingen object, but the nose plug differs in shape. A notable feature of the Moscow skull is a round hole under the left lateral eye socket, of unclear origin (Sk1).

Tilesius, despite lamenting about the competition he faced from his co-travellers, acquired a number of skulls, three of which he intended to dispatch to Prof. Franz Heinrich Martens (1780-1805) in Jena upon his arrival in Europe (see Sk11). Tilesius was obviously interested in skulls both as anatomical material and as artefacts. He recorded in his field journal some data which he received from Robarts and Cabri regarding the latter case:

A similar trophy is the skull of a slain enemy, which they bleach, [then] attach, by means of a rope, the lower jaw to the upper and stick [the skull] on a pole in such a manner as to be able to carry it ahead of them in war campaigns, in order to bolster the courage of their own warriors, and horrify their enemies.

He recorded the Marquesan name for this kind of skull-trophy as opokho, while Langsdorff recorded the name as oopocho obogo, which corresponds to the actual name of ipu o'o.

The iconic engraving ‘Shape of the skull of a Nukuhivan’ in Krusenstern’s Atlas was based on Tilesius’ drawings, the originals of which, ‘Menschenschädel aus Nukahiwah’, are in the Leipzig University Kustodie (Sk-13 – Sk-15). These drawings were based on a skull which Tilesius had received from Espenberg in the early spring of 1808. The images seem to form a classical anatomical representation (views in profile, from below and from the front), but Tilesius, unlike Blumenbach, clearly goes beyond the drawing of an anatomical specimen, depicting in detail the ornaments decorating the skull. There is one more detailed drawing by Tilesius of a Nuku Hivan skull in Leipzig University Kustodie, which was not included in the Atlas (Sk-12); it seems to have been drawn separately from the above set of three projections as the paper size
differs. This decorated skull with a broken side is depicted sitting on a bound volume, which conveys the aura of a gentleman’s study, therefore diverging even further than the *Atlas* engraving from a primarily anatomical tradition. It may seem that by framing the skull in a European context, Tilesius is appropriating it as an object for Western science. However, indigenous agency does not let it go, and reveals its hold in the marginalia with which Tilesius accompanies his drawing. This narrative makes the skull an artefact of encounter:

The beautiful original of this skull of a savage Nukuhivan is in the collection of Adelung in St. Petersburg. The plates of both ossis parietalis have been smashed with a club and driven into the brain cavity; it was a trophy with which the miserly King Keettenua [Kiatonui] Tapega only reluctantly separated.¹⁶⁸

This conflation of the curio skull from the gentleman’s study with the skull of encounter was not what was needed for Krusenstern’s *Atlas* and Tilesius made a set of three new, seemingly depersonalized projections of ‘Schädelform’ for the *Atlas* mentioned above. The owner of this skull, Friedrich von Adelung (1768-1843), a German in the Russian service, was a prominent linguist and historian, but there is no information regarding the destiny of his craniological holdings.

One of the skulls belonging to Tilesius surfaced in the 1820s. Tilesius gave some of his materials to the German anatomist Johann Christian Rosenmüller (1771-1820). After his death, his collections were auctioned in Leipzig and August Mayer (1787-1865), an anatomist from Bonn, bought an unidentified skull. Only later did he notice a pencilled inscription on it, ‘Nukahiwa,’ and made a thorough investigation, which led him to the conclusion that it was the skull of a 12-year-old girl.¹⁶⁹ Discovering that the original owner of the skull was Tilesius, Mayer received abundant information from him regarding the circumstances of its acquisition, which he published in his paper. While Mayer described the skull from an anatomical and raciological point of view, for Tilesius this was an occasion to return to his personal memories of his Nuku Hivan experiences, wherein the skull appeared again as an artefact of encounter rather than an anatomical specimen. He wrote that he had acquired the skulls of two children, a girl of around 12-14 (Sk9) and a boy of 5-6 (Sk10), from the priest of Taiohae valley at Nuku Hiva. He learned that these skulls were the remains of human sacrifices which had been made after the death of the high priest. A member of another tribe was usually kidnapped, strangled and hung up on a tree near the high priest’s house, where the body would gradually dry up and disintegrate. This was the reason Tilesius gave for the missing lower jaw of the girl’s skull. Tilesius learned that such skulls were a rarity on Nuku Hiva, as such sacrifices were conducted only after the death of the high priest; the skulls were taboo for all but priests and Tilesius could find them only in the possession of one priest.¹⁷⁰

The characteristic feature of such sacrificial skulls was an undamaged foramine magno occipital, i.e. the opening in the occipital bone at the base of the skull. Tilesius noticed that all trophy skulls, on the contrary, had the bones at the opening smashed as, according to Robarts and Cabri, when the enemy was slaughtered in battle ‘the winner
immediately cuts his head with an obsidian [knife] and breaks the foramen magnum with a stone, to suck the blood and eat the warm brain." Later on this opening was used to affix the plaited decoration which held the lower jaw in place. In the case of sacrificial slaughter, however, the victim was taboo and their body was untouched after death. Although the Atlas had no commentary for the plate with the three views of the skull, Tilesius' letters to Mayer make it clear that the view from below was an illustration of the crushed magno occipital, which takes this engraving beyond a purely anatomical specimen.

Espenberg, who supplied Tilesius with this skull for the Atlas, acquired several more skull specimens. One of them he donated to Blumenbach (Sk7). According to the research of the curator of the Göttingen collection, Michael Schultz, this is likely to be the skull of a young female. The opening in the occipital bone at the base of the skull was not damaged, which suggests the interesting conclusion that trophy skulls were not necessarily of male warriors. Another skull from the Espenberg collection was studied and published by Heinrich F. Isenflamm (1771-1828), a German anatomist and physician in the Russian service. The skull was ornamented with a woven band, similar to the one sketched by Tilesius (Sk-16). Michael Schultz discovered a cast in Blumenbach collection in Göttingen made from the skull published in Isenflamm's article. Isenflamm also noted that while visiting Espenberg in 1809, he examined the second Nuku Hivan skull in his possession, presumably the one in the Atlas, which was in his opinion 'the most superior one' (see Sk5). The final destiny of the skulls collected by Espenberg is unknown, although there is a record that Isenflamm passed the skull that he had studied to Samuel Soemmering, a German anatomist and a friend of Blumenbach.

Skulls collected by Langsdorff likewise served the cause of science. Besides the skull that he gave to Blumenbach (Sk6), he, according to Tilesius, collected skulls for his German colleagues – the physician and naturalist Ludwig H. Bojanus (1776-1827) and the surgeon and anatomist Konrad J.M. Langenbeck (1776-1851), but their destiny is unknown. In his description of the trophy skulls he, similarly to Tilesius, noted that

The victor or hero who has killed the enemy receives the head. He immediately severs it from the body, widens the opening at the back of the skull and drinks the blood and eats the brain. The skull is cleaned of all flesh, and decorated with pig bristles.

The reference to bristles ('Schwein Shaaren' in the German original) must be a typo; Langsdorff obviously meant pig tusks. He depicted such a skull, decorated with tusks, on two plates in his book: 'Young Nukahivan not completely tattooed' (see Figure 1.6) and 'Nukahivan weapons and utensils' (see Figure 2.2). Both of the drawings are schematic, with the skull serving as an artefact rather than an anatomical specimen.

There are some records of skulls collected by other members of the expedition, but their destiny is now unknown. Lisiansky, according to his account, collected several skulls, 'paying a knife for each'. At least one of these he donated to the Kunstkamera; it appears on the list of his donations as 'Marquesan head [i.e. skull] crushed with a stone in battle', this entry was accompanied by a later addition: 'Sent to
the Academy of Arts’ (Sk2). As late as 1844, Friederici donated ‘a skull from Nukaiwa Island’ (Sk3) to the Anatomical Museum of the Russian Academy of Sciences in St Petersburg, the collection of which was supervised by the Baltic German biologist Karl Baer (1792-1876); later it became part of the MAE anthropological collection. In the publication of the museum’s cranial collection by Julius Fridolin this skull was allocated no. 370 and described as ‘Male skull from Nukahiva Island. From General Friederici’. Next to it in his catalogue was a female skull from Nukuiva Island from the collection of Prince Soltykov (Sk4). These two skulls were also registered in Ludewig’s inventory as Nuku Hivan from Soltykov’s collection. Currently they have not been located in MAE. It is quite likely that these two skulls has been published by Rozina in 1964 in her study of Marquesan artefacts (fond 1104), although she believed that they were collected in 1884. The skulls are classical ipu o’o, decorated with boar tusks.

Sk1 Decorated skull (ipu o’o)
Skull has inscription: ‘Sent by Admiral Krusenstern’
Moscow, Museum of Medical History of Moscow State University
Brought by Krusenstern to Loder
1818 Transferred/acquired from Loder to Moscow State University

Sk2 Decorated skull (ipu o’o)
‘20. Marquesan head [i.e. skull] crushed with a stone in battle’
1806 Donated by Lisiansky to Kunstkamera
Transferred to the Academy of Arts, St Petersburg
Not identified in the collections

Sk3 Decorated skull (ipu o’o)
1844 Donated by Friederici to the Anatomical Museum of the Russian Academy of Sciences in St Petersburg
St Petersburg, MAE: Anthropology section
Published as no. 370 in Fridolin’s catalogue; presumably published in Rozina, ‘Kollektsiia…’, pp. 118-119.
Has not been located at present
Sk4 Decorated skull (*ipu o’o*)
Nuku Hivan female skull donated by Prince Saltykov to the Anatomical Museum of the Russian Academy of Sciences in St Petersburg
St Petersburg, MAE: Anthropology section
Published as no. 369 in Fridolin’s catalogue; presumably published in Rozina, ‘Kollektsiiia…’, pp. 118-119.
Has not been located at present

Sk5 Decorated skull (*ipu o’o*)
Espenberg collection, Estonia
Not identified in the collections

Sk6 Decorated skull (*ipu o’o*)
Museen und Gärten der Universität Göttingen: Blumenbach No. 85c

Sk7 Decorated skull (*ipu o’o*)
Museen und Gärten der Universität Göttingen: Blumenbach No. 39
Collected by Karl Espenberg for Blumenbach

Sk8 Cast of decorated skull (*ipu o’o*)
Museen und Gärten der Universität Göttingen: Blumenbach collection
Published Sk-16
Collected by Karl Espenberg

Sk9 Skull
Skull without lower jaw of a girl aged about 12 from a ritual sacrifice.
Bonn, Institute of Anatomy, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, No. I 223.24
Collected by Tilesius from priest at Taiohae
Was in Johann Christian Rosenmüller’s collection in Leipzig
Was in August Mayer’s collection in Bonn
Published: Mayer, ‘Beschreibung…’, pl. XII.
Sk10 Skull
Skull of a boy aged 5-6 from a ritual sacrifice.
Collected by Tilesius from priest at Taiohae
Not identified in the collections

Sk11 Decorated skulls (*ipu o'o*)
Three skulls collected by Tilesius for Franz Heinrich Martens, but not delivered as Martens died before their meeting
Not identified in the collections

Sk-12 Wilhelm Tilesius, 'Skull (*ipu o'o*) of a savage Nuku Hivan, a trophy in the possession of King Keetenua [Kiatonui] Tapega', sepia, feather, brown ink, in Universität Leipzig, Art collection, TIL068.
Was in Friedrich von Adelung's collection in St Petersburg
Not identified in the collections

Sk-13 Wilhelm Tilesius, 'Profile view of a human skull from Nuku Hiva', washed ink drawing, pen, brush, in Universität Leipzig, Art collection, TIL007.

Sk-14 Wilhelm Tilesius, 'Bottom view of a human skull from Nuku Hiva', washed ink drawing, pen, brush, in Universität Leipzig, Art collection, TIL008.

Sk-15 Wilhelm Tilesius, 'Front view of a human skull from Nuku Hiva', washed ink drawing, pen, brush, in Universität Leipzig, Art collection, TIL009.

Sk-16 Georg Vogel after [F.?] de Lutgendorf, 'Marquesaner', engraving depicting decorated skull (*ipu o'o*), in Isenflamm, 'Beschreibung...', pl. 2.
Engraving of Sk8
Not identified in the collections
Cloth and tapa

Cloth was an element of Nuku Hivan culture with which Russian visitors could easily engage, since it was a manifestation of the ‘national costume’ that they were expecting to describe, draw and collect. Although they spoke with one voice of the predominating ‘nakedness’ of Nuku Hivans, cloth played an important role in their representations. Shemelin, with his sharp merchant’s eye, noted variations in this product:

Cloth, from which the dress of local women is mostly comprised, is beaten from tree bark of white or yellow colour and comes in different thinness, length, width and quality.\(^{116}\)

Krusenstern's description of two types of cloth was strongly connected with the representation of social stratification:

their chief employment is making cloth, of which there are two kinds:
one coarse and of a greyish colour, made of the fibres of a tree, is used for tschiabus or girdles, and the poorer class dye it of a yellow colour, and wear it for clothing. The second sort, of which the women make their headdress and clokes is very fine, and of a brilliant white, and is made of the cloth-mulberry shrub. The fine stuffs are considerably smaller than the coarse, and not so strong and close; at any rate I never saw a single piece that was not weak and full of holes.\(^{117}\)

The latter section in the Russian version of his text has further social connotations:

The second sort of cloth is very thin and extremely white, it is so thin that the pieces I saw seemed to have holes [i.e. lace-like]. This cloth is prepared from the mulberry tree and it is used for dresses and headdresses of women of the highest standing.\(^{118}\)

Lisiansky was the only one to note that cloth of the first, thick type was made from the bark of ‘Toomoomey or Bread-fruit-tree’; in the Russian version he added that it was ‘sometimes dyed yellow with a type of root and coconut oil’.\(^{119}\) Lisiansky’s toomoomey corresponds to tumumei, the Marquesan name for the breadfruit tree.\(^{120}\)

A second type, noted by Lisiansky as ‘the best cloth’, was made from the bark of the tree he named ‘Eooty’.\(^{121}\) Langsdorff identified this tree as the ‘mulberry tree (Morus papyrifera Linn.)’ and wrote that ‘from a great distance most of the women could be distinguished by their mainly yellow garments made from the paper mulberry tree’.\(^{122}\)

Rezanov added some olfactory impressions: ‘They were dressed in yellow cloth made from tree bark, which had this colour from coconut oil, which they also smear on themselves, and [this cloth] produced an unbearably strong smell.’\(^{123}\) Tilesius specified that ‘bast [fibre] of the paper mulberry tree treated with hollyhock juice’ was used in the production of the cloth.\(^{124}\)

Lisiansky detailed its production in the Russian version of his account:
The manner of manufacturing is very simple. Collecting some amount of bark, it is soaked until wooden particles separate from the fibres, which afterwards are beaten with a mallet; because of this the fibres are squashed and join with one another, forming something similar to a sheet of paper. Finally this cloth is spread on the ground and, when dry, it becomes ready for use.\textsuperscript{191}

Lisiansky’s account, which he most likely recorded from Robarts, disagrees with the conclusions reached by Simon Kooijman for his study *Tapa in Polynesia*. Kooijman considered Dordillon’s report – that bark was put in water with the outer layers unseparated – ‘highly unlikely’,\textsuperscript{192} but Lisiansky’s account supports that of Dordillon.

Langsdorff recorded the word kahu/kachu for cloth;\textsuperscript{193} Tilesius recorded the same word, to mean cloth in general, as Cahu,\textsuperscript{194} while Lisiansky probably misheard the same word as ekagoo.\textsuperscript{195} They all correspond to Crook’s generic name kahou for different kinds of cloth.\textsuperscript{196} Kooijman restricts kahu to the name for a rectangular cloak.\textsuperscript{197}

In respect of loincloths, Tilesius noted that a ‘binding cloth around the waist’ is Hami,\textsuperscript{198} which corresponds to Crook’s account and later records.\textsuperscript{199} Langsdorff also recorded the name for women’s loincloths as ‘teweu or teuweu’.\textsuperscript{200} Krusenstern noted two names for loincloth, ‘according as it is made of coarse or fine stuff. The first kind they call tschiabu, and the latter eatu [euta in the Russian version]’.\textsuperscript{201} Langsdorff had a similar entry in his vocabulary.\textsuperscript{202} Lisiansky noted that loincloth was made from the bark of ‘a large tree’ named hiaba (giaba in the Russian version).\textsuperscript{203} Shemelin also wrote about chiabu, with which men ‘wrap themselves around the waist in two rows, leaving one end hanging in front to cover their nakedness’.\textsuperscript{204} Chiabu/hiaba might be the visitors’ version of the Marquesan word hiapo, a reddish cloth made from young banyan trees (*Ficus* sp.).\textsuperscript{205} The Marquesan name for the tree was aoa. It usually grew at me’a’e, ‘was considered sacred and was used to make the loincloths for the haka’iki’; the tapa made from it had a natural reddish-brown colour.\textsuperscript{206}

It is quite likely that the Russian visitors caught a rare glimpse of the red hiapo. Loewenstern’s drawing ‘Landing place’ depicts a formal shore visit by the Russians, who are met by a group of Nuku Hivans, led, according to textual accounts, by Kiatonui’s uncle Puakahu;\textsuperscript{207} four of the Nuku Hivans on the drawing wear red loincloths (T-107). These cloths might have been pieces of the Russian ‘red pestriad’ which was presented on the previous day to Kiatonui and his brother, but pestriad, although called ‘red’, was more accurately a finely chequered tartan incorporating a variety of colours along with the predominant red thread, and it is more likely that Loewenstern depicted the red hiapo.

Horner’s collection in Zürich has two pieces of long narrow bands of red tapa (T91 and T92); the size of the latter (225 x 32 cm) is the right size for a loincloth. Similar red tapa cloths have been located in Munich (T79) and in the Moscow collections (T66, T67, T69). Their texture is similar and similarities in size between several of these pieces suggest that they might have been cut from the same larger tapa. In Zürich this tapa band was catalogued as Nuku Hivan from Horner’s collection; in Moscow, according to early inventories, it was Hawaiian from Lisiansky’s collection; and in Munich it is part of the earliest collections attributed to Cook or Krusenstern, *i.e.* Langsdorff, from ‘Tahiti or Hawaii (?)’. Most likely this is a Hawaiian rather than Nuku Hivan tapa and
laboratory analysis in the future might reveal if it was made from Ficus sp., which was the only tree reserved for the manufacture of red hiapo in the Marquesas.

The Russian visitors produced several pictorial representations of cloth, sketched in the field. Two watercolours by Tilesius portray women in pale yellow cloth worn over the shoulders; a woman in the third watercolour, ‘Nukuhivan aristocrat’, is wrapped in pale coloured cloth with greyish shading (T-103 – T-105). In all cases the cloth is covered with parallel streaks which might be an attempt to depict its ribbed texture, which was however never mentioned in Russian textual accounts. Amateur watercolours by Loewenstern and Horner depict men and women wearing dark yellow cloth over the shoulders and men in white and yellow loincloths (see Figure 1.7 and T-106, T-108).

There is evidence that the Russians actively acquired tapa, despite the supercargo Korobitsyn’s utilitarian remark that Nuku Hivan barkcloth ‘cannot be used for anything and has no importance except as an object of curiosity.’ The Islanders, according to Tilesius, brought ‘numerous pieces of paper mulberry tree cloth’, and Kiatonui, visiting the ships ‘every day, sold a lot of… cloth’. The Nuka Hivans’ willingness to supply tapa was due to the fact that this commodity was used for gifts in Polynesian societies, and may have been stored in abundance in some households. Langsdorff, nevertheless, recorded a more spontaneous attempt at transaction:

The women usually cover themselves with large pieces of cloth made from the bark of the paper mulberry tree (Morus papyrifera Linn.). They do this less from a sense of modesty than to prevent sunburn. When we bartered with them, some of them would have gladly traded their coverings for a piece of iron or a knife, if their houses had not been so far away and they had not been afraid of losing their white skin in the burning rays of the sun.

Still, it can be safely stated that according to numerous accounts, the Russian expedition acquired tapa consistently and in bulk, resisting Kooijman’s supposition that since ‘most of the Marquesan tapa was undecorated [it] had little attraction for the Western visitors’. This is particular interesting in the light of his observation that ‘there is little tapa from the Marquesas Islands in the museum collections’, as it suggests that a large amount of unidentified, rare, and therefore valuable Marquesan tapa was brought by the Krusenstern expedition to Europe.

Although identification of the provenance of unpatterned South Pacific tapa is not a straightforward process and might be better accomplished in the future with new technologies, even now, on the basis of the comparative study of museum collections, it is possible to say that the amount and the varieties of Marquesan tapa acquired by the members of the Krusenstern expedition might be the largest and the most representative among the earliest collections of this Marquesan commodity. According to a conservative estimate, they number over 100 items, about 80 of which can be identified in museum collections. Certainly, the correlation of the earliest inventories with current museum holdings is quite a complex process, as made apparent by the example of St Petersburg museum holdings. Soon after the return of the expedition, the Admiralty Museum in St Petersburg received numerous pieces of tapa cloth: Povalishin donated ten pieces of ‘material of a pale-yellow and white colour made of bark’ and Lisiansky eight. In the
following inventories it might be these items which appear as ‘Pau, bark cloth from the Marquesas’ of ‘yellow’, ‘white’, ‘coloured’, and ‘grey’ colour.\textsuperscript{212} After the disbandment of the ethnographic collections of this museum, the tapa was sent to various institutions; some pieces were later transferred to the Kunstkamera, where Lisiansky initially donated six pieces of ‘Marquesan cloth’. Nevertheless, when in 1963 Rozina published her inventory of the MAE’s Marquesan artefacts, it did not include any tapa. Neither did Marquesan tapa appear in her special study of South Pacific tapa.\textsuperscript{213} This is unsurprising, as without analysis, it is not always possible to attribute the origin of unpatterned Polynesian tapa with absolute certainty. For instance, a piece of unidentified ‘tapa from Polynesia’ of cream colour with ribbed texture (T5) might be Nuku Hivan as its ribbing corresponds to Tilesius’ drawings of tapa, although there is some possibility that it was Hawaiian, as the Hawaiians used a similar technique for the production of plain tapa. Unpatterned, lacy white tapa, which is characteristic for the Marquesas and Hawai‘i and was attributed by Rozina as Hawaiian,\textsuperscript{214} is present in MAE fond 737 (T1 – T4). This collection vaunts tapa originating from the third expedition of James Cook, which visited Kamchatka in 1789, but it might also be the location of tapa deposited originally into the Admiralty Museum, particularly from the Krusenstern-Lisiansky expedition.

The unpatterned tapa of possible Marquesan origin in Lisiansky’s collection in Moscow numbers at least 49 pieces: 28 among them are yellow; 14 are white; some of them are semi-transparent; some of a denser texture with ribs; four of the lacy type with artificially added holes. (T21 – T65, T68). While this tapa looks typically Marquesan, in the museum documentation its provenance was recorded as ‘Sandwich Islands’ and we cannot exclude the possibility that some of it might be Hawaiian; but, as supposed earlier, it remains unlikely that Lisiansky, upon seeing the rich variety of patterned Hawaiian tapa, would choose to collect plain tapa on that island in abundance. Similarities between three items of red tapa in Lisiansky’s collection in this museum were discussed above. It must be added that the original collection of tapa in Moscow was larger but during inter-museum transfers during the last century several items were lost.\textsuperscript{215}

Horner-Krusenstern’s collection in Zürich has 14 pieces of tapa, which can be identified with certainty as Marquesan (two of them are missing, T80 – T93) and nine other samples which could be Hawaiian. It should be noted that the original list of the major transfer of Horner’s artefacts from the Antiquarian to the Ethnographic Society in Zürich in 1888 listed only ‘Two pieces of cloth made of the bast of the paper mulberry tree’. There could certainly have been a few following transfers with missing documentation. At the same time, considering the similarity of the pattern of the Hawaiian tapa in Zürich and ‘Forster’s’ tapa in the Tallinn collections, it is quite possible that some of the Zürich samples were the result of an exchange of ‘curios’ by the voyagers after the expedition. Patterned Hawaiian tapa in the Moscow Lisiansky collection also has similarities with items attributed to the Krusenstern expedition in the Tallinn and Zürich collections.

The complexity of the rich tapa collection in the Estonian History Museum is discussed in the corresponding section above. This museum has a number of samples donated by Friederici as well as samples from Georg Forster with Friederici’s notes. Some of these pieces of tapa might be Marquesan, while others are likely to be Hawaiian or Tahitian. It is interesting to note here that one group of Friederici’s Marquesan tapa
samples in the EHM has detailed original inscriptions, identifying them as ‘Cloth of Marquis-Isles from the plant eute. Sort 1. Pai. Sort 2. Ami. Sort 3. Cao’ (T72). Friederici’s eute is undoubtedly cognate with the Marquesan word ute (mulberry tree). Unfortunately, there are no documentary indications to help correlate the names recorded by Friederici with the objects in question. It can at least be assumed that the sample with a ribbed texture is cao, as it is identical with the large sheets of tapa described by early visitors as cahu.

A fine collection of Nuka Hivan tapa and cloth is stored in the National Museum of World Cultures in Leiden, being part of Philip Siebold’s collection which he acquired from Krusenstern expedition members. Besides four pieces of white and yellowish cloth it includes a very thin piece of tapa (T99), which is similar to items in the Zürich collection (T89 and T90), and corresponds to the aforementioned description by Krusenstern of small fine pieces of tapa ‘full of holes’. It also matches one of Friederici’s tapa samples in the Estonian History Museum (T72), which features a number of irregular holes despite being in excellent condition. Similar lacy tapa in excellent condition is identified in the Museum of Anthropology in Moscow (T26, T27, T29, T33). This suggests that the holes on this type of tapa were the result of the original manufacturing process rather than subsequent dilapidation. Most likely this is the tapa which Porter described as pahhee, consisting of ‘a remarkably white and fine piece of paper cloth, of open texture, and much resembling a species of fine gauze’; it was worn by women on their heads. Thus we can assume that Friederici’s pai from the collection T72 corresponds to Porter’s pahhee, with the result that the third the former’s mystery tapa specimens is of the type ami.

Siebold’s Leiden collection has three more rare cloth items. One of them (T97) is a multi-layered tapa which might have been produced using the ‘felting technique’ noted by Kooijman, a type which is hardly preserved in museum collections; another is cloth made of coir (T100); the third is a rectangular mat woven of pandanus leaf strips (T101). This must be the clothing which the visitors attested with the Russian word rogozhka, which can be translated as ‘bast matting’. It usually served as men’s casual dress: ‘Men do not use any cloth but go naked’, wrote Shemelin, ‘we saw just a few among them who would cover themselves with mats, but only when it rained’. Similarly Tilesius wrote about ‘the king’s nephew’ Moate’iti, who ‘wore over his shoulders a bast mat instead of cloth’.

Finally, there are some mystery objects. The Estonian National Museum in Tartu has a piece of tapa accompanied by an old label in German identifying its origin as ‘Mendosinischen Inseln’, i.e. the Marquesan islands (T74). This large, quite coarse sheet of tapa is ornamented with parallel rows of prints which differ from all known Marquesan samples. Linton was, indeed, certain that ‘Designs were never painted on Marquesan tapa’. While Krusenstern’s expedition was the major, if not the only, source of early Marquesan artefacts in this museum, the prints on the piece have some similarities in technique with samples in Friederici’s collection of Tahitian tapa, ascribed to Foster (EHM K-1445). Tapa pieces which have some similarity with this ‘printed’ marble-style Tartu item have also been identified in the Moscow Lisiansky collection (MAMSU: 319/5) and in the Munich Cook-Krusenstern collection (T78).
T1 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 123 cm, w at the ends 64 cm and 71 cm
Thin, lacy, soft tapa
St Petersburg, MAE: 737-28
1828 Transferred from Admiralty Museum to Kunstkamera (MAE)
Published: Rozina, ‘Tapa Okeanii…’, p. 69 (identified as Hawaiian)

T2 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 114 cm, 90 cm
Thin, soft with a closely ribbed texture tapa
St Petersburg, MAE: 737-29
1828 Transferred from Admiralty Museum to Kunstkamera (MAE)
Published: Rozina, ‘Tapa Okeanii…’, p. 69 (identified as Hawaiian)

T3 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 152 cm, w at the ends 63 cm and 24 cm
Thin, lacy tapa
St Petersburg, MAE: 737-29a
1828 Transferred from Admiralty Museum to Kunstkamera (MAE)
Published: Rozina, ‘Tapa Okeanii…’, p. 69 (identified as Hawaiian)

T4 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 137 cm, w at the ends 64 cm and 47 cm
Thin, lacy, soft tapa
St Petersburg, MAE: 737-30
1828 Transferred from Admiralty Museum to Kunstkamera (MAE)
Published: Rozina, ‘Tapa Okeanii…’, p. 69 (identified as Hawaiian)

T5 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 266 cm, w 193 cm
Thick, one-layered, cream colour, ribbed texture tapa
St Petersburg, MAE: 4100-1
1930 Transferred from the Naval School named after Frunze to MAE
Published: Rozina, ‘Tapa Okeanii…’, p. 64 (Identified as Polynesian)
T6 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 430 cm, w 240 cm
Thick, one-layered, cream colour, ribbed texture tapa
St Petersburg, MAE: 4100-2
1930 Transferred from the Naval School named after Frunze to MAE

T7 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 275 cm, w 234 cm
Thick, one-layered, cream colour, ribbed texture tapa
St Petersburg, MAE: 4100-3
1930 Transferred from the Naval School named after Frunze to MAE

T8 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 311 cm, w 217 cm
Soft, one-layered, yellow colour, ribbed texture tapa
St Petersburg, MAE: 4100-4
1930 Transferred from the Naval School named after Frunze to MAE
Published: Rozina, ‘Tapa Okeanii…’, p. 69 (Identified as Hawaiian, with matching pattern of tapa beater)

T9 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 300 cm, w 224 cm
Soft, one-layered, yellow colour, ribbed texture tapa
St Petersburg, MAE: 4100-5
1930 Transferred from the Naval School named after Frunze to MAE
Published: Rozina, ‘Tapa Okeanii…’, p. 69 (Identified as Hawaiian, with matching pattern of tapa beater)

T10 Tapa
‘77. Marquesan cloth (6 pieces)’221
1806 Donated by Lisiansky to Kunstkamera
Not identified in the collections

T11 Tapa
‘Different types of material from bark, eight pieces’222
1806 Lisiansky donation to Admiralty Museum
May correspond to T13 – T19
Not identified in the collections
T12 Tapa
‘Material of a pale-yellow and white colour made of bark, ten pieces thereof’
1806 Povalishin donation to Admiralty Museum
May correspond to T13 – T19
Not identified in the collections

T13 Tapa
‘Pau, bark cloth, a yellow piece from the Marquesas Islands’
Not identified in collections at present

T14 Tapa
‘Pau, a speckled piece of bark cloth from the Marquesas Islands’
Probably of Hawaiian rather than Marquesan origin
Not identified in collections at present

T15 Tapa
‘Pau, coloured bark cloth, from the Marquesas Islands’
Not identified in collections at present

T16 Tapa
‘Pau, yellow cloth from the Marquesas Islands’
Not identified in collections at present

T17 Tapa
‘Pau, white bark cloth, from the Marquesas Islands’
Not identified in collections at present

T18 Tapa
‘Pau, white bark cloth, from the Marquesas Islands’
Not identified in collections at present

T19 Tapa
‘Cloth or Pau of grey colour’
1806 Donated by Krusenstern to Admiralty Museum
1827 Transferred from Admiralty Museum to Black Sea Map Depot in Nikolaev
Not identified in collections at present
T20 Tapa  
Plant fibre  
L 174 cm, w 167 cm  
Tapa cloth of almond colour with ribbed texture.  
Moscow, State Museum of History: GIM 85701  
Source: 'From the old collections'  
One of the attached early labels reads: 'Material made of grass by the native inhabitants of Nukagiva Island and used by wealthy women to cover their nakedness in imitation of Europeans, though most go about naked.'

T21 Tapa  
Plant fibre  
L 69 cm, w 63 cm  
White semi-transparent tapa  
Moscow, MAMSU: 314/1  
Lisiansky collection

T22 Tapa  
Plant fibre  
L 80 cm, w 66 cm  
White semi-transparent tapa  
Moscow, MAMSU: 314/2  
Lisiansky collection

T23 Tapa  
Plant fibre  
L 1010 cm, w 74 cm  
White semi-transparent tapa  
Moscow, MAMSU: 314/4  
Lisiansky collection

T24 Tapa  
Plant fibre  
L 284 cm, w 224 cm  
White ribbed tapa  
Moscow, MAMSU: 314/5  
Lisiansky collection
T25 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 186 cm, w 80 cm
White semi-transparent tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 314/6
Lisiansky collection

T26 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 90 cm, w 60 cm
White transparent tapa with holes
Moscow, MAMSU: 314/7
Lisiansky collection

T27 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 88 cm, w 81 cm
White transparent tapa with holes
Moscow, MAMSU: 314/8
Lisiansky collection

T29 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 57 cm, w 54 cm
White transparent tapa with holes
Moscow, MAMSU: 314/10
Lisiansky collection

T31 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 87 cm, w 176 cm
White ribbed tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 314/12
Lisiansky collection

T28 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 243 cm, w 187 cm
White ribbed tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 314/9
Lisiansky collection

T30 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 144 cm, w 86 cm
White ribbed tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 314/11
Lisiansky collection

T32 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 1010 cm, w 80 cm
White semi-transparent tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 314/13
Lisiansky collection
T33 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 125 cm, w 66 cm
White transparent tapa with holes
Moscow, MAMSU: 314/14
Lisiansky collection

T35 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 180 cm, w 120 cm
Yellow tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 315/2
Lisiansky collection

T37 Tapa
Plant fibre
Yellow tapa
L 284 cm, w 70 cm
Moscow, MAMSU: 315/4
Lisiansky collection

T39 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 460 cm, w 65 cm
Yellow tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 316/2
Lisiansky collection

T41 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 480 cm, w 65 cm
Yellow tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 316/4
Lisiansky collection

T43 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 480 cm, w 65 cm
Yellow tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 316/6
Lisiansky collection

T34 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 281 cm, w 80 cm
Yellow tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 315/1
Lisiansky collection

T36 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 284 cm, w 70 cm
Yellow tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 315/3
Lisiansky collection

T38 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 286 cm, w 218 cm
White ribbed tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 315/5
Lisiansky collection

T40 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 460 cm, w 70 cm
Yellow tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 316/3
Lisiansky collection

T42 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 480 cm, w 65 cm
Yellow tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 316/5
Lisiansky collection

T44 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 480 cm, w 65 cm
Yellow tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 316/7
Lisiansky collection
**T45 Tapa**
Plant fibre  
L 480 cm, w 65 cm  
Yellow tapa  
Moscow, MAMSU: 316/8  
Lisiansky collection

**T46 Tapa**
Plant fibre  
L 348 cm, w 70 cm  
Yellow tapa  
Moscow, MAMSU: 317/1  
Lisiansky collection

**T47 Tapa**
Plant fibre  
L 130 cm, w 67 cm  
Yellow tapa  
Moscow, MAMSU: 317/2  
Lisiansky collection

**T48 Tapa**
Plant fibre  
L 340 cm, w 65 cm  
Yellow tapa  
Moscow, MAMSU: 317/3  
Lisiansky collection

**T49 Tapa**
Plant fibre  
L 168 cm, w 126 cm  
Yellow tapa  
Moscow, MAMSU: 317/4  
Lisiansky collection

**T50 Tapa**
Plant fibre  
L 330 cm, w 65 cm  
Yellow tapa  
Moscow, MAMSU: 317/5  
Lisiansky collection

**T51 Tapa**
Plant fibre  
L 348 cm, w 66 cm  
Yellow tapa  
Moscow, MAMSU: 317/6  
Lisiansky collection

**T52 Tapa**
Plant fibre  
L 336 cm, w 65 cm  
Yellow tapa  
Moscow, MAMSU: 317/7  
Lisiansky collection

**T53 Tapa**
Plant fibre  
L 248 cm, w 64 cm  
Yellow tapa  
Moscow, MAMSU: 317/8  
Lisiansky collection

**T54 Tapa**
Plant fibre  
L 333 cm, w 69 cm  
White semi-transparent tapa  
Moscow, MAMSU: 317/11  
Lisiansky collection

**T55 Tapa**
Plant fibre  
L 285 cm, w 60 cm  
Yellow tapa  
Moscow, MAMSU: 318/2  
Lisiansky collection

**T56 Tapa**
Plant fibre  
L 285 cm, w 60 cm  
Yellow tapa  
Moscow, MAMSU: 318/3  
Lisiansky collection
T57 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 285 cm, w 60 cm
Yellow tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 318/5
Lisiansky collection

T58 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 285 cm, w 60 cm
Yellow tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 318/6
Lisiansky collection

T59 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 285 cm, w 60 cm
Light-grey semi-transparent tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 318/7
Lisiansky collection

T60 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 400 cm, w 69,5 cm
Yellow tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 318/10
Lisiansky collection

T61 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 401 cm, w 68 cm
Yellow tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 318/11
Lisiansky collection

T62 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 416 cm, w 70 cm
Yellow tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 318/12
Lisiansky collection

T63 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 430 cm, w 70 cm
Cream tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 318/13
Lisiansky collection

T64 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 352 cm, w 61 cm
Yellow tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 318/17
Lisiansky collection

T65 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 350 cm, w 61 cm
Yellow tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 318/18
Lisiansky collection

T66 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 70 cm, w 20 cm
Red tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 319/2
Lisiansky collection
T67 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 125 cm, w 77 cm
Red tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 319/3
Lisiansky collection

T68 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 117 cm, w 76 cm
White, semi-transparent tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 319/6
Lisiansky collection

T69 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 172 cm, w 76 cm
Red tapa
Moscow, MAMSU: 372/15
Lisiansky collection

T70 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 240 cm, w 187 cm
Semi-transparent tapa of yellowish-reddish colour
Tallinn, EHM: K-1417
Friederici collection

T71 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 230 cm, w 200 cm
White-yellow almost transparent tapa with ribbed texture
Tallinn, EHM: K-1418
Helliseuilt collection

T72 Tapa
Plant fibre
Three samples of Marquesan tapa with attached labels: ‘Sort 1 Pai; Sort 2. Ami; Sort 3. Cao’.
Tallinn, EHM: K-1446
Friederici collection
T73 Tapa
Plant fibre
White-yellow tapa
Tallinn, EHM: K-2214
1952 Transferred from ENM to EHM

T74 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 90 cm, w 58 cm
White-yellow in colour and has three distinctive bands of decoration; most likely not of Marquesan origin, although the attached old label attributes it as Marquesan.
Tartu, ENM: C1-69
1923 Transferred from LES to ENM

T75 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 65 cm, w 60 cm
White tapa
Munich, MFK: 117
Langsdorff collection (?)

T76
Tapa
Plant fibre
L 105 cm, w 88 cm
White tapa
Munich, MFK: 118
Langsdorff collection (?)

T77 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 400 cm, w 78 cm
White tapa
Munich, MFK: 120
Langsdorff collection (?)

T78 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 144 cm, w 63 cm
Light-tan tapa with ‘marble’ prints
Munich, MFK: 123
Langsdorff collection (?)

T79 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 139 cm, w 23.5 cm
Red tapa
Munich, MFK: 124
Langsdorff collection (?)

T80 Tapa
Plant fibre
Zürich, EMZU: 02301
Horner collection
Object is missing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T81 Tapa</th>
<th>Plant fibre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L 188 cm, W 172 cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-orange tapa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine tapa with parallel lines showing the structure of the beater. Colour is rather orange than yellow, with some nearly brown rims (most likely where it was most exposed to light). Probably dyed with turmeric. Zürich, EMZU: 02303 Horner collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T82 Tapa</th>
<th>Plant fibre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L 200 cm, w 134 cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White tapa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zürich, EMZU: 02354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horner collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T83 Tapa</th>
<th>Plant fibre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L 112 cm, w 96 cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White tapa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zürich, EMZU: 02351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horner collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T84 Tapa</th>
<th>Plant fibre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L 151 cm, w 115 cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White tapa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zürich, EMZU: 02424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horner collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T85 Tapa</th>
<th>Plant fibre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L 234 cm, w 214 cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown tapa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zürich, EMZU: 02350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horner collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T86 Tapa</th>
<th>Plant fibre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L 130 cm, w 63 cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow tapa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zürich, EMZU: 02348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horner collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T87 Tapa</th>
<th>Plant fibre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L 86 cm, w 74 cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark yellow tapa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zürich, EMZU: 02336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horner collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T88 Tapa</th>
<th>Plant fibre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L 170 cm, w 135 cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White tapa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zürich, EMZU: 02353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horner collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T89 Tapa
Plant fibre
Square piece: L 58 cm, W 56 cm; the other piece: L 68 cm, W 24 cm on the narrow end; total L 126 cm
Very fine white tapa, nearly transparent. Made of two pieces of tapa, beaten together on one edge. One piece is nearly square, the other one is narrowing down along one side to nearly half of its width, and shows two big holes.
Zürich, EMZU: 02301
Horner collection

T90 Tapa
Plant fibre
Three narrow lengths of tapa, knotted together with a strip of tapa on top.
Zürich, EMZU: 02300
Horner collection

T91 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 74 cm, w 19 cm
Red tapa
Zürich, EMZU: 02342
Horner collection

T92 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 255 cm, w 32 cm
Red tapa
Zürich, EMZU: 02352
Horner collection

T93 Tapa
Plant fibre
L 296 cm, w 210 cm
Brown tapa
Zürich, EMZU: 02356
Horner collection
**T94**

Three barkcloth samples, mounted in glass, c. 23 x 17 cm
Accompanied by a short manuscript extract from Langsdorff’s published travel narrative referring to the making of barkcloth. On the reverse is written ‘donum Tilesius 1830’. While the catalogue record indicates that all three samples are from ‘Nukuhiwa’, two are patterned and are certainly from Hawaii. The third is plain, and has been glazed with a viscous substance to give it water resistance.
Leipzig, Grassi Museum: Po 1734
Tilesius collection; presented by him to Klemm; no. 955 in Klemm’s catalogue.

**T95 Tapa**
Plant fibre
L 84 cm, w 44 cm
White tapa
Leiden, NMWC: RV-1-100
Siebold collection

**T96 Tapa**
Plant fibre
L 52 cm, w 50 cm
Leiden, NMWC: RV-1-101
Siebold collection

**T97 Tapa**
Plant fibre
L 56.5 cm, w 41.5 cm
White tapa
Leiden, NMWC: RV-1-102
Siebold collection

**T98 Tapa**
Plant fibre
L 139 cm, w 54 cm
Yellowish tapa
Leiden, NMWC: RV-1-104
Siebold collection
**T99 Tapa**  
Plant fibre  
L 30 cm, w 30 cm  
Yellowish tapa with holes  
Leiden, NMWC: RV-1-105  
Siebold collection

**T100 Coconut husk sheet**  
Coconut husk  
L 97 cm, w 35 cm  
Coconut husk sheet  
Leiden, NMWC: RV-1-106  
Siebold collection

**T101 Mat**  
Pandanus  
L 78 cm, w 65.6 cm  
Pandanus mat  
Leiden, NMWC: RV-1-108  
Siebold collection

**T102 Fine mat**  
Plant fibre  
Leiden, NMWC: RV-1-107  
Siebold collection  
Item is missing

**T-103** Wilhelm Tilesius, 'Woman in yellow cloth', gouache, ink, pencil and watercolour on paper, in Tilesius, 'Skizzenbuch…', f. cover verso.

**T-104** Wilhelm Tilesius, 'Nuka Hivan with palm branch', gouache, ink, pencil and watercolour on paper, in Tilesius, 'Skizzenbuch…', f. 86.

T-106 Hermann Löwenstern, 'Watering place', watercolour, in Löwenstern, 'Anmerkungen...'; f. 81.
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Chapter 3

1. While the population was estimated to be 20,200 in 1842, population numbers had already severely suffered as a consequence of over 50 years of frequent contact with European trading ships. J.L. Rallu estimated that the pre-contact population was around 43,000 (‘Évolution de la population des archipels du Pacifique au 19ème et au 20ème siècle’, thèse de Doctorat d’Etat, Université de Paris, 1989, p. 12).

2. An inner arm tattoo seen in 1804 seems to have represented this view of the universe. Russians were fascinated by this design, but unlike other researchers, were unable to obtain a name for it. See also ipu, the concentric three-quarter circles that closely resemble Chief Paiore’s representations of the universe in the Tuamotu archipelago. The open side of these ipu, which were used in representations of birth in petroglyphs and links to pu henua, placenta, were often face to face with another, like a reflection of the internal organization of society. Karl von den Steinen was told by enata that this image described the world: on one
side, ao, light, the world of mortals and on the other side, po, darkness, the world of spirits, with whom contact was nevertheless possible.

3. Circular forms are important first as a symbol of the gaze, or as metaphors of the face through which the power of the figure is channelled and around which are beings which owe it their life like eyelashes around an eye (for example represented in mata of maces). Similarly, the concentric circular forms can be understood as a metaphor for birds on the branches of the banyan tree that nourishes them; birds represent protectors of a group, like a haka’iki or his first warrior.

4. R.C. Suggs dates the oldest levels of Ha’atuatua, on the east coast of Nuku Hiva, as being from 120+-150BC (‘The archaeology of Nuku Hiva, Marquesas Islands, French Polynesia,’ Anthropological Papers of American Museum of Natural History (49 [1], 1961). For Y.H. Sinoto, the deepest level of Hane on Ua Huka cannot be dated. By estimating the rate of sedimentation, studying the material composition and comparing radiocarbon dating results already obtained at higher levels, Sinoto estimated that at the earliest, the island was settled at around 700AD. He considered that the first settlements on the Marquesas Islands must have been around 300-400AD (Sinoto, An Archaeologically Based Assessment of the Marquesas as a Dispersal Center in East Polynesia, Honolulu: Bishop Museum, 1970; ‘The Marquesas’, in J.D. Jennings (ed.), The prehistory of Polynesia, Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1979). In 1985, the radiocarbon date of 150+-95BC confirmed Suggs’ analysis after charcoal from Anapua, an Ua Pou fishing site was dated (Ottino, ‘Un site ancien aux îles Marquises: l’abri-sous-roche d’Anapua, à Ua Pou’, Journal de la Société des Océanistes 80/XLI, 33-37). This seems to have been contradicted by more recent datings from shell material that have produced a much later date even though the shell came from the same layer as the charcoal. The dates continue to change, but while the majority of results go back to 1200AD, the settlement of the Marquesas Islands is estimated at about 800AD.

5. For example, the island of Ua Pou, of average size, measures 15km by 10km and has a surface area of 105km².

6. For example, access to the coast was restricted for women because of this area’s power. In architecture too, stones polished by the sea (kiva) were often held in place, or ‘anchored’ like a pirogue, by large rocks surrounded by a quantity of stones.

7. See Sinoto, ‘The Marquesas’, p. 112; for R.C. Suggs, however, buildings in the initial period of settlement, from 150BC to 100AD (approximately, this does not match current dating) had an oval base and were sometimes constructed on paving stones (Suggs, ‘The archaeology of Nuku Hiva,’ p. 159). It should be noted that oval buildings have only been found at Nuku Hiva. The average area of a paepae in the eighteenth or nineteenth century was 85m² at Haka’ohoka (Ua Pou; Ottino, ‘Contribution à la connaissance de l’île de Ua Pou’ thèse de 3ème cycle, Université de Paris I, 1985); and 32m² at Hanateku’ua (Hiva Oa; P. Bellwood, A settlement pattern survey, Hanatekua valley, Hiva Oa, Marquesas Islands, Honolulu: Bishop Museum, 1972).

8. The paepae Menaha, that became the funerary me’ae for Chief Heato, the only chief who governed the whole island without assistance from Westerners (from
about 1838-1849), is 40m by 20m and 3m high on average, with two rows of ke’etu. Some of the ke’etu are almost 3m long and most are decorated in bas-relief. At Haka’ohoka, many of the paepae walls reach 3 to 4m in height – a difference due to the slope.

9. Houses, their arrangement and the use of household space illustrate dichotomies in the same way as do many other Marquesan artefacts. The profane and the tapu; outside and inside; sunny and shady; in front and behind; above and below, etc. Amongst others, the ao and po dichotomy is frequently seen in the contrast between black and white or light and dark in many Marquesan creations: tattoos, head ornaments (such as uhi kana and pâ’e kaha, which feature dark turtle shell with decorated anthropomorphic shapes set side by side with white shells), the plaited tapa of certain pahu drums, in the use of ivi po’o (the brightness and shape of bone alternating with two black round seeds from the Sapindus saponaria, koku’u), etc.

10. The inside of buildings was divided into two of unequal size. The back of the house, the area with the highest roof, is where one rested one’s head, the most sacred part of the body. The term fa’e is used on Ua Huka, Hiva Oa, Tahuata and Fatuiva, while ha’e is only used at Nuku Hiva, Ua Pou and on some of Ua Huka.

11. While the term paepae is currently used widely, it seems that it used to be reserved for important buildings: ‘tapu paving stones’. Upe, in contrast, has more profane connotations and is commonly used at Ua Pou and some other areas, such as at Hiva Oa.

12. See for example the multiple wrappings and protective layers of plaited textiles or tapa that cover both sacred people and sacred objects during some ceremonies.

13. Other important plant species include Erythrina, the sea-almond mai’i or koai’i (Terminalia glabrata), puatea (Pisonia grandis), hutu (Barringtonia asiatica), ‘eva (Cerbera manghas), tou, mi’o, etc. Not all of the local names for these plants are listed here; the scientific names of plants are sometimes revised.

14. The ornaments in small baskets would serve the same purpose.

15. Some stones in the archipelago, for example at Taiohae (Nuku Hiva), Vaitahu (Tahuata), Ua Pou or Omoa (Fatuiva), are still reported to have been carried by ants, either red or black. There used to be a kind of large black ant that walked in single file, but these have disappeared since the 1980s.

16. The length of these paepae was divided in two ways. There were two levels on the upper side: a front platform like a terrace, and at the back a covered, elevated section. The back section was itself divided in two with a carefully arranged front paving area, the pa’ehava oto, and a back, communal section for sleeping that had no paving stones, called oki. The pa’ehava oto was usually made with large stones (kiva of 40 to 50cm in diameter) from the sea or river beds. Any activities that could dirty the pa’ehava oto were strictly banned in this space and were usually carried out on the outside terrace, pa’ehava vaho, or outside: for instance, it was strictly forbidden to spill food or drink in the pa’ehava oto and meals were eaten on the terrace.
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Created across the six islands of a remote archipelago in eastern Polynesia, the art of the Marquesas is one of the world’s most distinctive and remarkable art traditions. Though exhibited in major museums around the world, Marquesan art is nevertheless poorly understood, and the formation of collections still largely unresearched.

This book documents and explores the most extensive early collection from the archipelago. In May, 1804, participants in the first Russian voyage round the world, usually known as the Krusenstern expedition after the principal commander, spent twelve days at the island of Nuku Hiva. Inspired by the science and collecting associated with the voyages of Captain James Cook, the mariners interacted with Islanders, and made extensive collections of artefacts. While the lives of the collectors and exchanges among scientists led to these artefacts being widely dispersed, the research reported here has identified some 200 objects collected during the voyage which are now in museums in Russia, Estonia, Germany, Switzerland and the Netherlands.

The outcome of years of work in museum stores and archives, Tiki reassembles a collection of exceptional importance. A set of essays contextualise these precisely-provenanced artefacts historically, and in the life and environment of the Marquesas Islands. For the first time, this heritage is made accessible to Islanders themselves, and to interested scholars and curators.