

REVIEWS.

LORRIN ANDREWS, "A Dictionary of the Hawaiian Language."  
Revised by Henry H. Parker.

When Andrews's Hawaiian Dictionary was published in 1865, it was the most important work of its kind. No other Polynesian dialect had received such thorough treatment. The difficulties he had to encounter were many of them peculiar to the Hawaiian language. To begin with, the Hawaiian alphabet is the most attenuated of the Polynesian group, wanting *f*, *k*, and *ng*, which are current elsewhere, and replacing *t* by *k*. This reduces the number of letters to twelve, five vowels and seven consonants. Words had been adopted by the natives from English and other sources, or had been introduced in lavish abundance by the missionaries from Greek and Hebrew to supply their needs in the translation of the Bible and books on anatomy, surveying, natural history, and moral philosophy. In introducing these words of foreign origin the missionaries used any of the letters of the English alphabet, except *c*, *q*, and *x*<sup>i</sup> the only accommodation to the genius of the language being that every syllable should end with a vowel, and that no two consonants should come together.<sup>ii</sup> These early authorities also displayed a prolific ingenuity in the creation of compound words, frequently merely joining an adjective to its noun without any change of meaning in the components. The majority of such exotic and compound words might well have been neglected, but were faithfully recorded by Andrews, even when one element of the word, or both, happened to be of foreign origin; and in not a few cases variant forms of the foreign interloper were included. While the inclusion of words of this nature made a noble contribution to the bulk of the dictionary, it added nothing to the knowledge of the Hawaiian tongue. Under these headings we find the names of the various books of the Bible, also such words as *iagua*, *jaguar*; *kamelopadi*, camelopard; *kerubima*, cherubim; *kerokodile*, crocodile; *penetekota* (two entries), pentecost; *ineka* and *inika*, ink; *agata* and *agati*, agate; and so on. There are 53 compounds of *hale*, house, recorded, of which no less than 35, including *halekula*, school-house, are unnecessary. While *ipu*, vessel, bowl, etc., gives us 26 derivatives, of which we could certainly have spared *ipuholoi*, washbasin; *ipuinika*, inkwell; *ipunui*, the bronze laver in Solomon's Temple; *iputi*, teapot; and more than a dozen others. So too, *keiki*, child, young of animals, gives us *keikihipa*, lamb; *keikihoki*, young ass; *keikikao* and *kaokeiki*, kid; *keikibipi*, calf; and *keikibipikane*, young bullock. Surveying produced "*paailiumikumamalua*, a twelve-sided solid, the sides being equal, i.e.,

five-sided polygons" (a dodecahedron, in fact), "*paailikaulikehio*, an oblique parallelepiped," and many other helpful words. This list need not be extended further, but other instances will be referred to later incidentally. Still, even when all these exuberances have been allowed for, Andrews's Dictionary remains a noble production.

On January 1st, 1915, fifty years after the publication of Andrews's Dictionary, a definite move was made for the production of the second edition under the direction of the Rev. Henry Hodges Parker. During the half-century which had elapsed there had been made available a large amount of material dealing with Hawaiian and other cognate Polynesian dialects; while the science of lexicography had made great advances, and a high standard had been set in such works as Funk's Standard Dictionary in America, and the Oxford English Dictionary in England.

The objects of the new dictionary, as set forth in the preface and in a short introduction by the editor, include the recording of the correct spelling, the separation into syllables, the addition of diacritical marks, the accurate definition of the Hawaiian words, and the incorporation of new words from various sources which are enumerated. In carrying out this project the following procedure was observed: the words were arranged according to the order of the English alphabet; all words and definitions given by Andrews were incorporated, except such as were inaccurate; most of the Scriptural references were omitted, owing to changes having been made in successive revisions of the translation; the English-Hawaiian vocabulary was omitted; there was appended a valuable list of between two and three thousand Hawaiian place-names.

The book is well and attractively printed, only a few misprints having been noticed, two or three involving misplaced lines. But a careful perusal leaves a sense of disappointment.

Andrews had arranged the words in the order of the Hawaiian alphabet as taught in the schools — that is, vowels first, then the Hawaiian consonants, and, lastly, the other consonants from the English alphabet, as mentioned above. The change in the order is certainly a great improvement, but more might have been done for the convenience of the users of the dictionary. In all the Polynesian dialects there are many groups of homophones, but the paucity of consonants in Hawaiian assimilates other words which are distinct in the cognate dialects, and adds largely to the number of words which are indistinguishable in form. As a result we have under a five entries, *aa* eleven, *ae* six, *au* eight, *i* six, *ia* nine, *ii* seven, *ka* eight, and so on; while a glance at the meanings given makes it evident that in many cases more than one root has been included in the treatment under a

single entry. It is true that distinctions are introduced by the addition of the diacritical marks, but cross-references are made to the simple form *aa* or *au*, as the case may be. It would have been better to have numbered each set of homophones, and have used the distinguishing numbers in the references. Under the new arrangement all the words of one form are placed in the order adjectives, adverbs, conjunctions, interjections, prepositions, etc., alphabetically; this means that an adjective is often separated by several entries from its cognate verb. A further simplification would have been effected if due consideration had been given to the fact which was long ago recognized by Alexander, that the same word may be a noun, adjective, or other part of speech, according to its use in the sentence. This would have meant that *hou*, for instance, with the sense of *new*, would be treated under one main heading, the senses being indicated as given, instead of appearing under separate head — as adj., adv., and v., the latter, as generally in such cases, separated from its cognates. Additional advantage would result from placing reduplicated derivatives in juxtaposition with their root words — or at least providing a cross-reference from one to the other in each case. It may be remarked here that the removal of the causative verbal forms with *ho'o* from their position under the main words, where Andrews had them, is a retrograde step.

The introduction of the diacritical marks, including the accent, is an interesting and valuable addition; but the division into syllables, on which stress is laid as a feature of the new edition, had been done by Andrews, whose usage is rigidly adhered to in nearly every case. But was the division into syllables worth while, seeing that it means simply placing a hyphen after each vowel in the word? As executed the only exceptions made are in the case of vowels divided by the glottal closure (‘), and the so-called diphthongs, of which some are divided and some not, even in the same word. Strictly speaking every vowel indicates a syllable, as the editor points out on page xx. The use of the hyphen would have served a better purpose if it had been confined to dividing the word into its disyllabic and monosyllabic elements. This expedient would in most cases have eliminated the necessity of marking the accent. For example, *olu-eko-loa-ho'o-ka'amoe-na* would be a safer guide to the pronunciation than *o'lu'-e-ke-lō'-a-ho'o-ka'a-mo-e'-na* and *o-lule-lule-a* than *o'-lu-le'-lu-lē'-a*; and at the same time this arrangement would generally suggest the etymology of the word.<sup>iii</sup>

The application of the macron (¯), and breve (˘), raises some interesting problems, and not a few serious difficulties. It is explained (p. xix) that "the macron is used to mark the long or normal vowels,"

and "the breve to indicate the short sounds"; from which it might be inferred that an unmarked vowel should be understood to be normal, or long. But with very few exceptions the final vowel of a word is unmarked, and from the structure of the word it is, in almost every case, difficult to avoid the conclusion that the final vowel is meant to be short. A curious mistake occurs on p. xix, where ě is exemplified by the name *Ewa*, which is marked (ē) both there and on p. 628, though in the latter passage it is said to be the same as *ěwa*, crooked. By some oversight the majority of the words under O and U are given without the macron and breve signs. In a large number of instances a derivative word shows a change from the vowel quantity given in the root word, as *māōki* from *ōki*, *mālōwai* from *mālo*, *kāhūāi*, baker, and *kāhūāi*, to bake, from *kāhu*, bake, and *āi*, food. There are other examples of change in vowel quantity with change in the part of speech, as *ēu*, v., rise; *ěu*, n., act of rising; *hānai*, v., feed; *hānai*, adj.; *māhūāhūa*, adj. and v.; *māhūāhūa* n.; *pūmāhāna*, n., warmth; *pūmāhāna*, adj. and v. These changes do not appear to conform to any rule. With reduplicated forms also we find *ēlī* with *ělīeli*, *māli* with *mālimāli*, *mālūhi* with *mālūhīlūhi* and *mālūhīlūhi*, *mālāma* with *mālāmālāma*, and *mālīno* with *mālīnōlīno*. The last example is perhaps the most usual form given in the dictionary, though the first syllable is not always lengthened as in this case, and again no rule is apparent. These examples show marked divergence from the idiom in Maori under which a form *mārīnō* invariably produces *mārīnōrīnō*. The suspicion arises as to whether these vagaries of quantity are accurately recorded, and the suspicion is strengthened when we find *Hālēākālā* (p. 98) given also as *Hāleākālā* (p. 629), and other similar contradictions.

The mark for the glottal closure (‘), is sometimes wrongly inserted, and sometimes omitted where necessary. Thus the equivalent of the Maori *whēwhē*, a boil, is given by Andrews in the forms *hehe*, *hehee*, and *heehee*, and wrongly referred by him to the root *hee*; it accordingly appears here only in the form *hehe‘e*, and is defined as the discharge from a sore. On the other hand *aahu* (M. *kakahu*), *maona* (M. *makona*), *mau* and *mauu* (M. *maku*, *makuku*), should have been given with the glottal closure.

The treatment of the hybrid words of foreign origin, many of which involve the use of consonants not in the Hawaiian alphabet, raised a real difficulty. The simplest solution would have been to omit them all, and to restrict the dictionary to words of purely native origin. But many of these words are in constant popular use, such as *baka*, tobacco; *bake*, *bipi*, *dala* (also *kala*), *gula*, gold; (also *gola*, *kula*), *rose*; (2 syl., also *loke*), *rope*; (2 syl., also *ropi*, *lope*, *lopi*); *rama*, *mare* (also *male*), *minute*, *hora*, *hanere*, *tausani*, and so on.

These could hardly be omitted, and it is stated in the editor's introduction that "Hawaiianized words derived from foreign speech have their place in the main body of the work." This statement is hardly accurate. Any word which occurred in the main body of the work is there retained, but all those beginning with a foreign consonant, which are placed by Andrews at the end of his dictionary, disappear — from *Baibala* to *zizinia* — unless like dollar, rose, beef, rope, and rum, they have had the good fortune to acquire an alternative form in accordance with the strict requirements of the language, and even then we are told that the word ought to be written in the hybrid form — that *male*, for instance, "is an incorrect spelling of *mare*, marry." This arbitrary rule cuts out many words in daily use, but leaves in useless items like *agoza*, Hebrew for nut, and *ouranatana*, orangoutang.

The introduction enumerates an imposing list of sources from which new material has been drawn, but the total increase under this head does not appear to amount to ten per cent.

The changes made in the matter collected by Andrews are confined to more accurate elucidation of the meaning of words, and to the omission of such definitions as appeared to be inaccurate. Under further elucidation may be classed the inclusion of the scientific names of the native fauna and flora. This is useful, but the twenty-six varieties of seaweed listed under *limu* seem, unfortunately, to have escaped notice. In the case of other words the additional information supplied is sometimes superfluous. Thus *agata* has been expanded from "an agate, a precious stone," to "a variegated wavy quartz, in which the colours are in bands, in clouds, or in distinct groupings; also a precious stone made from this mineral; agate"; and *eheu* from "the wing of a fowl," to "(1.) The fore limb of a bird, bat or pterodactyl, adapted for flight; (2.) A wing; (3.) That which is conceived as conferring power of swift motion or performing some function of wings; a metaphorical use."

The treatment of the numerals is inconsistent and unsatisfactory. *Eiwa* is defined as "consisting of one more than eight; or thrice three; nine, a cardinal number"; while *iwakalua* is given as "the sum of ten and ten; twice ten; twenty. Any symbol representing this number; as XX"; but no explanation is offered of the altered meaning of *iwa* involved. It is only from the fearsome term for dodecahedron, quoted above, that we gather that *umikumamalu* represents twelve, and may deduce the form of other numbers up to twenty; but *umikumamalu* is

itself a compound involving the element *kumama*, or more probably *kuma*, which is not given a place in the dictionary.

In some cases the amendment of the definition is of doubtful value. Under *palaoa* Andrews gave "a species of large fish; a whale," and "the sea-elephant." In spite of the fact that the Hawaiians apply the term to the sperm whale, and that the word is translated "whale" in the Fornander collection, this meaning has been dropped; "sea-elephant" has given way to "walrus," although the latter has an arctic habitat, while the elephant-seal was probably quite familiar to the Hawaiians. Under *puaa* is still retained the amazing entry, "(2.) An unclean bird, *puaa ilioi*, rendered in English, bittern. Mentioned in the Bible." *Ilio* is not given in the dictionary, but is a compound of *ili*, skin, and *oi*, full of sharp points. The Biblical reference in Andrews gives the clue to the explanation, that the entry does not mean that the pig is an unclean bird, but *puaa* i.e., porcupine, is used in one passage to translate an obscure Hebrew word, which is in two other places transliterated *kipoda*; the word was translated in English, bittern, and in the Revised Version, porcupine; *puaa ilioi* was in 1868 replaced by *kipoda* in this passage also of the Hawaiian Bible. A more serious matter is the retention, under *kaikaina*, of Andrews's careless mis-statement that "if a brother speaks of a sister, or a sister of a brother, it is *kaikunane*"; though *kaikunane* and *kaikuahine* are correctly defined under their respective entries.

Andrews indulged in a loose system of etymology, which has in most cases been faithfully reproduced in the new edition. We are still given "*hee*, the squid, so-called from his slippery qualities"; though a glance at the Samoan dictionary would have shown that *hee* (*S. fee*) squid, and *hee* (*S. see*) slip, are two words entirely distinct. In not a few cases the suggested derivation involves the use of a word which is either not recorded in the dictionary, or has an entirely different meaning. Thus *oluekeloahookaamoena* refers to "*ekeloa*, the quiet cool of the forests," *wahinemanuahi* to "*manuahi*, extra," and *wahauhauha* to "*wahauha*, gaping," in no case is any such word recorded. Under *manuheu*, *heu* is stated to mean wing, the actual word being *eheu*. In some instances the reference is to a form or meaning which had occurred in Andrews, but had been discarded in the present edition.

A constant source of confusion is the failure to realize that Andrews sometimes wrote a double vowel to represent a long

one, and sometimes erred by writing a single vowel in place of a doubled one. An interesting instance of this is the verb *keehi* with its verbal noun *keehana* or *keehina*, which Andrews wrote also as *kehina*. The acceptance of the latter form has obscured the fact that the verb is clearly *ke'ehi*, with *keehana*, equivalent to the Maori *takahi*, *takahanga*; the form *ke'ehina* arising when the fact that *-hi* was a transitive verbal suffix had been forgotten. The occurrence of this word leads naturally to the particle *ana*, which is here inadequately defined as "a word used as a participle modifying the action of verbs, as *hele*, go; *hele ana*, going." Now this definition, while otherwise unsatisfactory, entirely ignores the fact, noted by Alexander, that *ana* (a) "denotes continuance, and may be present, past or future"; and also (b) "often forms a participial noun." In point of fact these are not two different uses of the same particle, but instances of the use of two distinct particles. The usage under (a) *e hele ana oia*, he is, was, or will be going, is that of the particle, and is identical with the Maori verbal particle *ana*, which is used in precisely the same way. The *ana* under (b) represents the suffix which appears in Samoan as *-ga*, *-aga*, *-maga*, *-saga*, *-taga* (the *g* being equivalent to *ng*), and in Maori in several other forms as well, the function of which is to form verbal nouns. If this *ana* had been recognized by Hawaiian grammarians as a suffix it would have obviated the necessity of describing the nouns *moena*, *huina*, *hakina*, etc., as contractions of *moe ana*, and so on. A large number of these verbal nouns is recorded, and there is at least one other in *-hana*, viz., *komohana*, the west.

The niceties of Hawaiian grammar are in many cases overlooked. The group of nouns characteristic of all Polynesian dialects, which have been styled in New Zealand "local nouns," i.e., *lalo*, *luna*, *loko*, *waho*, etc., are variously described: "*lalo*, adv. usually with the preposition *i*, etc."; "*luna*, prep. found only in the compounds *a*, *i*, etc."; "*loko*, prep. compounded with any of the simple prepositions, as *o*, *ko*, etc."; "*waho*, prep. prefixed by *o*, *no*, etc." This information is neither explicit nor accurate. The use of *pehea* as a verb is noted, but in the case of *aha* the sentence, "*E aha ana oia?*" (What is he doing?) is given as an example under "*aha*, interrog. adv." *Kaina* is explained, with the same meaning, under two separate headings; one as a "variant of *kaiia*, passive of *kai*," the other as "intransitive of *kai*, to move." It is in fact the equivalent of the Maori *takina*, and a genuine passive of *kai*. A third *kaina*,

placed between these two is described as "an imperative form of the verb *kai*, to lead." It is of course the imperative passive used in the way so general in Maori; and probably identical with a fourth "*kaina*, n., an expression used at the end of a, sorcerer's incantation." In connexion with passives may be mentioned the ludicrous explanation now given of *Haleluia*," Very unusual passive form of *halelu*." It is of course simply Hallelujah, Praise ye the Lord; and not as further explained "synonymous with *halelu*, to sing praises to God"; *halelu* meaning simply "praise."

In view of these considerations the conclusion is inevitable that the new edition adds little to the vocabulary of Andrews, and nothing to the elucidation of the genius of the Hawaiian language.

**H.W.W.**

[Herbert William Williams]

---

i A native contributor to the Fornander collection boldly introduced "queen" into a Hawaiian narrative.

ii They wrote, however, *Kristo* for Christ.

iii Surely the division of *Ha•wai-la•kea*, given on p. 114, is very misleading. Should it not be *Ha•wa•i'l•a-kea*? See p. 631.