WILLIAM ANDERSON'S HAWAIIAN WORD LIST

ALBERT J. SCHÜTZ

1. INTRODUCTION[1]

As the exploration of the South Pacific revealed an exotic world to the artists and scientists on Captain Cook's three expeditions, there was often no choice for them but to perceive the new in terms of the old. In his thought-provoking study *European Vision and the South Pacific*, Bernard Smith (1984) noted that the expeditions' artists had to interpret visual images according to the "pictorial conventions of the time". Not only was their perception filtered through their own culture, but often it was further altered – sometimes subtly, sometimes blatently – by the imagination of the engraver or painter who prepared the final version for the public.

In Smith's work, the depiction of tropical flora provides dramatic evidence of the differences between the original drawing and the final product. For example, in a view of Omai's return to Tahiti,[2] the engraver's version of the background vegetation looks rather more like spiders on stalks, or a presage of Wyndham's triffids, than the palm trees that were intended.

But it was not only the pictorial records that suffered in the transfiguration of primary records. In a similar but less obvious way, the linguistic data from Cook's third voyage also changed as they passed from manuscript to print. I should like to discuss one example: William Anderson's Hawaiian word list, which provided the western world with its first extended glimpse of the Hawaiian language.

Published in 1784, sold out in three days, and in its third edition by the next year (Beaglehole 1974:692), the account of Cook's third voyage gave an eager and impatient English-reading public the final instalment of one of the world's greatest adventure stories. The readership became even greater within the next few years with the appearance of French and German translations.

---

[1]I should like to express my appreciation to the staff of the Hawaiian and Pacific Collections, Hamilton Library, University of Hawai'i for the competent assistance which has long been their trademark. For help with stylistic matters, I am grateful to Ann M. Peters and Kenneth L. Rehg.

Keeping George W. Grace unaware of the work on this paper has been rather a hardship. Normally – that is, as I have done for the nearly thirty years that we have been colleagues – I would have asked for his help and advice, which he has always been so generous in giving. Just this once, however, without hearing any outlines or reading any rough drafts, perhaps he can read straight through to the denouement without the usual sense of familiarity with the material.

[2]Smith (1984:115), reproduced from Rickman's (unofficial) edition of Cook's journal from his third voyage (1781).

Robert Blust, ed. *Currents in Pacific linguistics: papers on Austronesian languages and ethnolinguistics in honour of George W. Grace*, 453-464.
Pacific Linguistics, C-117, 1991.

Aside from Cook's own transcription of a few Hawaiian words in an English context, most of the language sample was collected by Anderson, surgeon aboard the *Resolution* and unofficial naturalist for the expedition. The list appears in the Appendix to the three-volume work: 229 words and phrases, plus another implicit 10, the numerals "as at Otaheite".

At the time of the first European contact with Hawaiian, there was no established method for writing a previously unwritten language. Thus, the most common way to create an orthography for a new language was to use one's own, illustrating unfamiliar sounds with the closest (in this case) English equivalents. Naturally this practice distanced readers from the foreign language, to a degree depending on the accidental fit between it and the compiler's own. In addition, the compiler's intelligence and linguistic sophistication also had a marked effect on the success of the resultant alphabet.

Cook himself did not always receive high marks for his rendering of Hawaiian words. Perhaps the most negative assessment of his Polynesian spelling was that it was a "rough, inconsistent, quasi-phonetic spelling in Latin characters" (Wise and Hervey 1952:311).[3] As for Anderson's spelling of Hawaiian, it has been – at best – superficially treated, or – at worst – ignored.

One of the possible reasons that Anderson's word list has not been taken seriously is that through an unfortunate transition from the original to the final version, it apparently suffered a fate similar to that of the artist's rendering of the Tahitian palm trees.

2. ANDERSON'S ANONYMITY

One might propose that the role of a historian can be compared to that of a director or a stage manager. Even if the plot and cast of characters can seldom be altered, the focus can. Compared with the rest of Cook's officers and scientists, Anderson was seldom in the centre of the narration, outshone by the brilliant if harsh light of such characters as the difficult Johann Reinhold Forster.[4] Perhaps it was because of the implicit competition from the natural scientists, for although they all collected samples for the European specimen case, zoology and botany were more showy. Indeed, it is mostly through botany that Anderson's name is known at all, for the genus *Andersonia* serves as a memorial to the man and his work.

At any rate, Anderson's linguistic work has been largely neglected for the past two centuries. For example, the writers of a study of the development of the Hawaiian spelling system (Wise and Hervey 1952) discussed Cook's own spelling of the Hawaiian words that were scattered through his description, and that of several of his officers, but failed to mention Anderson or his word list.[5] A later and mainly derivative article (Walch 1967) made the same omission. When his orthography was finally treated at length (Hervey 1968), it was almost totally misinterpreted.

Even the particulars of William Anderson's life are difficult to find. The *Dictionary of national biography* is cursory in its treatment, giving only the date and cause of his death, his official positions on Cook's second and third voyages, and a summary of his contribution as a naturalist.

---

[3]One wonders, of course, how it could have been otherwise. Besides, the authors' examples (p. 311) show a greater degree of consistency than they either noticed or were willing to admit.

[4]For example, a recent three-part television movie on Cook's voyages, which was shown in Honolulu in October and December 1989, obliterated Anderson's role entirely.

[5]Perhaps the reason is revealed in the references, in which we find only secondary sources, with no mention of the official publication of Cook's journals.

Mostly through the extensive research of J. C. Beaglehole, we can add some detail to the rough sketches of the official biographies. William Anderson was born in Scotland in 1750 and was educated at Edinburgh University. In December 1771 he joined Cook's crew for the second voyage, and the two ships – the *Resolution* and the *Adventure* – set sail from Plymouth on 13 July 1772. Anderson's position aboard the *Resolution* was that of surgeon's mate. For the third voyage, he was surgeon on the same vessel. Beaglehole (1974:500), summarising Anderson's abilities and contributions to the expedition, wrote that he "was clearly one of the best minds of all the three voyages – professionally competent, but with an interest in all the departments of natural history as they were known at that time, acute as well as wide-ranging, and with a linguistic talent both eager and careful."

Circumstances almost prevented Anderson from seeing Hawai'i at all.[6] When the expedition was ready to sail north from Tahiti toward the American north-west coast, Anderson and Charles Clerke (Captain of the *Discovery*) had serious reservations about leaving the tropics. Because they were both ill with tuberculosis (or consumption, to give the disease its contemporary name), they did not wish to "encounter the severities of a frozen climate", but instead preferred to stay in the Society Islands. However, as the ship progressed from one island to another, it was always the next one that would be the place to remain. Why the two men continued the journey north is still a minor mystery; Beaglehole suggested that it was Clerke's sense of duty that lay behind his procrastination with the paper work that would have allowed him to resign his command. Perhaps we can hint further that Anderson might have dared the adventure with a companion, but hesitated to risk it alone.

3. ANCHORAGE AT WAIMEA, THE VISIT TO A *HEIAU*, AND THE COLLECTION OF THE WORD LIST

On 18 January 1778, as Cook and his crew were bound north-west from Christmas Island, they sighted land again – the Hawaiian Islands. They advanced toward the three northern islands and arrived at the eastern end of Kaua'i on the afternoon of the 19th. They then proceeded to the west, eventually anchoring in Waimea Bay, off the village and mouth of the river by the same name.

Just before landing at Kaua'i, Anderson had been very ill. But on 21 January 1778, he was sufficiently recovered to walk with Cook and Webber to a *heiau*[7] about a mile up the river (Beaglehole 1974:574). As we can surmise from his journal, Cook was carefully noting nearly all that went on around him on the way to and at the *heiau* (Beaglehole 1974:576). Webber spent the time sketching, resulting in a series of drawings;[8] Cook noted this as well. But he did not report on Anderson's activities. It is obvious from his word list, however, that he was recording, in his own way, the same scene that Cook observed and Webber drew, for part of his word list is an inventory of many of the ceremonial items in the *heiau*.

---

[6]This discussion is summarised from Beaglehole (1974:568-569).

[7]It is not certain which of several *heiau* sites up the Waimea River the men visited, but from Samwell's journal (Beaglehole 1967:1083), we learn that it was about a mile upstream and "on the Banks of the River". Several sources specify that it was Ke'a'ali'i *heiau*; Bennett (1931:104 wrote that "so little remains that the rumor can not be substantiated".

[8]Copies of the sketches can be found in Joppien and Smith's descriptive catalogue (1987:418-421).

3.1 TAHITIAN AS A LINGUA FRANCA

In contrast to many of the expedition's linguistic encounters, communication in Hawai'i seems to have posed few difficulties. It was a familiarity with Tahitian that eased the way towards a rapid understanding between Cook's crew and the Hawaiians – at least at a superficial level. As a matter of fact, the similarity of Hawaiian and Tahitian was one of the first things that several journal writers mentioned, with a touch of surprise because of the great distance from Tahiti. James King wrote: :

> ... what more than all surprisd us, was, our catching the Sound of Otaheite words in their speech, & on asking them for hogs, breadfruit, yams, in that Dialect, we found we were understood ...
>
> (Beaglehole 1967:264n.)

David Samwell was even stronger in his opinion, writing that the language was "the same as that of Otaheite".

Thus, since Anderson was already familiar with 'the idiom', there was little need to use gestures or ad hoc sign language to gather information. For example, it was undoubtedly Tahitian (and perhaps Māori) that helped him elicit the Hawaiian equivalents of three rather difficult grammatical concepts that begin the list: the Hawaiian forms for 'where (specifically)?', 'where (generally)?', and 'no'. From there on, the list continues with mostly content words: names for body parts, plants and food, and the artefacts mentioned earlier.

Unless Anderson had further contact with Hawaiians on board the *Resolution*, the time spent at the *heiau* was the extent of his work with native speakers. Storms and heavy seas curtailed repeated trips ashore, and the expedition left the islands on 2 February and headed north, Cook himself having gone ashore only three times. Anderson was able to write in his journal until 3 June 1778 (Beaglehole 1967:cxc), but died exactly two months later at the age of twenty-eight.[9] King wrote: "If we except our Commander, he is the greatest publick loss the Voyage could have sustained" (Beaglehole 1974:614n.). No memorial marks his resting place, for he was buried at sea. The next day, Cook named an island for him (in the Bering Sea), but unfortunately, "Anderson Island" was already St. Lawrence Island, sighted and named by Bering fifty years earlier.

4. THE PARADOX

Although Anderson was described as "an extremely intelligent person" (Beaglehole 1974:299), "with a linguistic talent both eager and careful" (1974:500), in the first few decades after Cook, visitors to Hawai'i complained that early word lists were of little help in trying to communicate with the Hawaiians.[10] For example, de Freycinet reported in 1819 (1978:152) that "... the vocabularies of the Sandwich tongue we had on board were so defective, and the spelling so little adjusted to our way of pronouncing, that it was almost impossible to make ourselves understood except by signs."

To those of us familiar with modern written Hawaiian, one of the first things that strikes us about Anderson's list is that *t* and *r* are written regularly, to the exclusion of *k* and *l*. However, although information on even the current distribution of [t] is surprisingly scanty,[11] it is clear from the

---

[9]Clerke died on 22 August 1779. He was only thirty-eight: just ten years older than Anderson.

[10]Although de Freycinet did not refer to Anderson's list specifically, one might assume that familiarity with the Cook volumes was de rigueur for any explorer bound for the South Pacific.

[11]Newbrand (1951) collected data from two informants from the Hanalei side of Kaua'i, both with [k] exclusively. However, an 83-year-old (in 1950 or so) man from Waimea, Kaua'i, produced [t] not in his narrative, but under special

missionary records of the 1820s that [t] was common, if not universal, on both Ni'ihau and Kaua'i, and some other parts of the Hawaiian Group as well. As for what Anderson wrote as *r*, the same records also contain sophisticated phonetic descriptions of the sound, showing that what was heard at that time was most likely an alveolar flap [ɾ], similar to /ɾ/ in Tahitian and Māori today.

Other differences from modern spelling, however, are not so easy to explain. When we examine Anderson's orthography carefully, it does seem to leave much to be desired. For example, the common word *hele* 'go' was written as *haire* (and *pele* as *paire*); *he i'a* 'fish' as *haieea*, *he niu* 'coconut' as *eeneeoo*, *au* 'I' as *ou*, and *he ihu* 'nose' as *eeeheu*, with the unusual sequence of three *e*s. *Oo* seems indiscriminately used for both /o/ and /u/, and there are many instances of *y* used as a vowel.

If one took the list at face value – that is, on its own and out of context – an analysis like the following might result. Hervey (1968:24) wrote that although Anderson gave no guide to the orthography he used, it was possible to reconstruct one. He went on to list such a system, one that bears little resemblance to Hawaiian. For example, his list of consonant phonemes includes /b/, /d/ and /f/, none of which is part of the system. As for the vowels, Hervey seemed to assume that all the vowel letters had their current values, except *oo*, which he correctly interpreted as /u/. Even fairly consistent relationships, such as Anderson's use of *ai* for /e/,[12] were explained as sound changes.[13]

Tables, included to show a variety of Anderson's spelling conventions, reflect little basic knowledge of Hawaiian grammar and linguistic history. For example, *heraee* [he lae] 'forehead' was annotated as follows: "Nothing resembling '*heraee*' was listed in Pukui & Elbert [1957]. '*He*' was most likely the demonstrative used at the beginning of the phrase." The explanation of *matta* [maka] 'eye' reveals that Hervey was ignorant of the extent of the [t] pronunciation on Ni'ihau and Kaua'i. He continued: "It is just possible that a shift from [t] to [k] did not constitute a phonemic change."[14] A fairly obvious form, *Heoo* 'nipple' ([he ū] 'breast'), was interpreted as *hiu*, *hi'u*, *heo*, or *heu* – but not *he ū*.

5. THE TAHITIAN PRONUNCIATION KEY

Even with an understanding of Hawaiian phonology and a rudimentary knowledge of Hawaiian grammar, one still finds problems with Anderson's transcription. However, most of this confusion vanishes when the Hawaiian list is examined not in isolation, but as a part of Anderson's total work, and with the knowledge that he was unable to advise the editor or printer about the conventions he used.

Although Hervey was correct in saying that there is no guide to Anderson's orthographic conventions for the Hawaiian list specifically, there is certainly such a guide to his Tahitian list (Cook

---

circumstances: "The recollection of old days brought forth the exclamation 'maita'i! maita'i!' (good! good!) – showing the use of the [t] allophone of /k/" (p. 79). Elbert and Pukui (1979) discussed the use of [t] on Ni'ihau, and mentioned William H. Wilson's report that it was also used on East Maui and on Moloka'i, but did not discuss the matter from a historical perspective.

[12]Consistent in one direction at least. However, many instances of /e/ are written with *e* as well.

[13]This is Hervey's explanation of *ai* (1968:26): "In Kauai orthography, <ai> is pronounced [*a-i*], while in the manner of Pukui and Elbert, *mahea* is pronounced [m*a*h*ea*]. Pukui and Elbert indicate that there is a tendency for [*a-i*] to change to [e-i] in 'fast pronunciations'."

[14]The phrase "just possible" is inexplicable, for the main part of Hervey's dissertation concerns the missionaries' decisions about such consonant alternations.

1777, II:319-322). The published version omitted Cook's introduction, which follows (Admiralty MS 55/108, pp. 243-244, quoted in Lanyon-Orgill 1979:47):

> This Vocabulary I had chiefly from M^{r}. Anderson Surgeons first Mate, who was indefatigable, in inriching it with all the Words he could collect ... In order to help the reader to a proper pronunciation of the different Words, I desired M^{r}. Anderson to draw up such Rules as he thought would answer this end, which he accordingly did ...

In these rules, Anderson took the contemporary approach to orthography: he proceeded from spelling to sound.[15] And he concentrated on the vowels, considering them to be the "regulation of all sounds". Although it is impossible to be sure what Anderson's own pronunciation of English was like (the situation is complicated by the two variables of geographical dialect and time), Table 1 is an attempt to convert his conventions into English phonetics, and from there, into Tahitian phonology.

TABLE 1: A PHONETIC AND PHONEMIC INTERPRETATION OF ANDERSON'S CONVENTIONS

Anderson's transcription	English phonetics	Current TAH orthography
a	[ʌ], [a]	*a*
ai	[e^{y}]	*e*
e	[e], [ɛ]	*e*
i	[ɪ]	*-i-* (?)
ee	[i^{y}]	*i*
y	[a^{y}]	*ai*
o	[o^{w}]	*o*
oo	[u^{w}]	*u*
eu	[yu^{w}]	*iu*
u	[ʌ]	*a*
ou	[a^{w}]	*au*

Notes: In the chart, an underline represents what was a long stroke or a ligature over the two vowel letters. Anderson's *o* doesn't seem to represent /o/ in today's Received Pronunciation [ɛ^{w}]. Perhaps it was closer to RP 'ought'.

Anderson discussed the diacritical convention illustrated in the table: a ligature joining two vowels indicated that they were to be pronounced as "one simple sound". Dots over two vowels in succession meant that the sounds they represented were to be "expressed singly" – that is, they constituted two syllables. In his examples, Anderson gave "Rôâ" ('great, long, distant'), with a dot over each vowel, probably to distinguish from the English spelling convention of *oa* representing a single sound, as in *boat*. Accent was marked before the syllable in question. Finally, a comma between parts of a word, especially reduplicated portions, represented a "rest or small space of time" ... but not a "full stop".

Table 2 shows Anderson's Tahitian examples (p. 322) respelled according to his conventions.

---

[15]With the advantage of hindsight, we now look on this approach as quite the opposite of the correct one. But so far as I know, it was not until Peter Duponceau's *English Phonology* (1817) that an attempt was made to reverse this direction and work from sound to symbol.

TABLE 2: TAHITIAN WORDS RESPELLED

Anderson's spelling	Gloss	Respelling	Modern spelling[16]
Ròà	Great, long, distant	*roa*	*roa*
E'reema	Five	*e'rima*	*e rima*
Ry'poeea	Fog or mist	*rai'poia*	*raipoia*
E'hoora	To invert, or turn upside down	*e'hura*	*e huri*
Paroo, roo	A partition, division or screen	*paruru*	*paruru*

In the Tahitian list, the diacritics were preserved through the printing.[17] However, in the Hawaiian list, which is without any such modifications, one of two things must have happened: either the diacritics were discarded by Anderson himself, or they were used in the manuscript but were lost in the printing process.

Having noticed other instances in which information was lost or confused in the transition from manuscript to printed page, I tend to favour the second solution. The following examples may serve as possible evidence that this is indeed what happened.

Note "Eeeheu" (*ihu*) 'The nose'. Would Anderson have written "eee" as such? It is unlikely. In his directions for pronouncing Tahitian, "e" represented /e/, whereas "ee" represented /i/. Thus, "Eeeheu" would have been fairly close to *he ihu.*

Another example is "Ooma ooma" (*umauma*) 'The breast' versus "Too" (*kō*) for 'Sugar cane'. For Anderson, the single "o" represented /o/, but "oo" represented /u/. In the Tahitian list, one of the transcriptions for 'sugarcane' is "Too", written without italics, perhaps reflecting Anderson's perception of the long vowel.

Still another example is underlined *ai*, which does not represent /ai/, but /e/, as (according to his example) in the second vowel of 'Arabia'. For instance, Anderson wrote "Haire" 'To go'. As it is printed, it looks nearly like Māori *haere.*[18] However, "Haire" would represent *here*, an accurate writing of what is now written as *hele.*[19]

Since the third volume of Anderson's journal of the third voyage is lost (Beaglehole 1967:cxc), it is impossible to **prove** that Anderson continued the orthographic conventions described for Tahitian. But the earlier volumes, which cover the period up to 2 September 1777, add weight to the argument, for in them, the conventions are used regularly. For example, Anderson's MS word list from New Zealand, collected in February 1777, shows ligatures over certain vowel combinations, dots over others, and accent marks before the appropriate syllables.

---

[16]All the Tahitian words were found in Davies 1851.

[17]Although the printer of the account of the second voyage did not do violence to Anderson's system (that is, no information was lost), the original is perhaps more elegant. Any two vowel letters used to represent one sound, such as *aī* for [e], were written with a ligature over them, or – in Anderson's own words – "joined together". This convention was translated by the printer into italics, and the text of the description altered accordingly. Another printer's convention was the substitution of a diaeresis over the first member of a pair of vowels, rather than a dot over each, to indicate that they belonged to separate syllables.

[18]Although Lanyon-Orgill (1979:47-48) quoted Anderson's guide to the pronunciation of Tahitian verbatim, he apparently did not realise that the conventions applied to Hawaiian as well. Thus, he interpreted *Haire* as *haele*, a dual or plural form for 'come'.

[19]Hervey (1968:26) went into an elaborate (and, incidentally, backwards) explanation to relate another *ai* spelling and an /e/ pronunciation.

Understanding Anderson's conventions turns a good many confused-looking forms into words that resemble those in the current spelling. This is not to say that his list is entirely accurate, but it is not a bad showing, considering the circumstances under which it was collected.

Table 3 shows the first twenty-five words from Anderson's Hawaiian list, with a possible respelling according to the Tahitian conventions compared with the modern equivalents.[20]

TABLE 3: SAMPLE FROM ANDERSON'S HAWAIIAN WORD LIST, RESPELLED

	Hawaiian	Gloss	Respelling	Modern spelling
1.	Tehaia	Where	*kehea*	*i hea* (specifically)?
2.	Mahaia	ditto	*mahea*	*ma hea* (generally)?
3.	Aorre, or Aoe	No	*aole*	*'a'ole, 'a'oe, 'a'ohe*
4.	He oho[21]	The hair	*he oho*	*he oho*
5.	E poo	The head	*e poo*[22]	*he po'o*
6.	Pepaiee aoo	The ear	*pepei au*	*pepeiao*
7.	Heraee	The forehead	*herae*	*he lae*
8.	Matta	The eye	*maka*	*maka*
9.	Pappareenga	The cheek	*papalinga*	*papālina*
10.	Haieea	Fish	*heia*	*he i'a*
11.	Eeeheu	The nose	*eihyu*	*he ihu*
12.	Oome oome	The beard	*umi umi*	*'umi'umi*
13.	Haire	To go	*hele*	*hele*
14.	Erawha	Tears of joy	*elawa*	*? le'a*
15.	Aee	The neck	*ai*	*'ā'ī*
16.	Poheeve	The arm	*pohivi*	*po'ohiwi* 'shoulder'
17.	Ooma ooma	The breast	*uma uma*	*umauma*
18.	Heoo	The nipple	*heu*	*he ū*
19.	Peeto	The navel	*piko*	*piko*
20.	Hoohaa	The thigh	*huha*	*'ūhā*
21.	He, wawy	The leg	*he wawai*	*he wāwae*
22.	Eroui	Wait a little	*elaui*	_
24.	Myao	Finger and toenails	*maiao*	*mai'ao*
25.	Eeno	Bad	*ino*	*'ino*

[20] *T* and *r* are changed to *k* and *l*, respectively.

[21] Note that the majority of nouns occur with *he*. In a sense, each phrase is a discourse, and new information is introduced as such (Hawkins 1979).

[22] This is an example in which we assume that Anderson made a distinction between "oo" and "o̲o̲".

6. RE-EXAMINING THE LIST

Rewriting Anderson's word list according to the conventions that were almost certainly lost in the editing and printing gives his work on Hawaiian a credibility that was missing before. Now perhaps the list should be re-examined for what it can tell us about the Hawaiian spoken on Kaua'i in 1778.

6.1 PHONOLOGY

It was noted above that Anderson's consistent transcription of *t* shows that that sound was used regularly in at least some parts of Kaua'i, and was not interchangeable with [k], as more recent records show (Newbrand 1951). But this is not particularly new information, since the missionary records contain many references to the predominance of [t] over [k] on Kaua'i. As for the shift to [k], Judd, Pukui and Stokes (1945:13) noted that [t] was more common "between 1778 and 1809 according to the dozen vocabularies made in those years. By the time the present Hawaiian orthography was established in 1825,[23] the "k" sound had become so general that the character "k" was adopted."[24]

Anderson also consistently wrote *r*, as opposed to the *l* that is written today. As for the phonetic nature of the sound, a careful reading of the missionary correspondence in the 1820s and later reveals that it was a tap – rather like the *r* in Spanish, Tahitian or Māori – and not an *r* like that in American English.

Another feature of pronunciation reflected in the list, however, is much less well known: there are five examples of *ng* spellings, apparently representing Anderson's hearing of [ŋ]: *Pappareenga* (*pāpālina*) 'cheek', *Tangaroa* (*Kanaloa*) name of god, *mango* (*manō*), 'shark' – and two examples showing alternation: *tanata ~ tangata* (*kanaka*) 'person' and *moena ~ moenga* (*moena*) 'mat'.

Treating Anderson's list as a serious document, Geraghty (1983:557) interpreted these data as showing that Proto Polynesian **ŋ*, was usually reflected as [n], but occasionally as [ŋ]. Such information would have added depth to those few treatments of Hawaiian phonology that exist.

Hervey (1968:28) apparently dismissed the idea that Anderson's transcription of *ng* was correct: the only example he treated is *pappareenga* 'the cheek', with the comment "The spelling symbols <ng> could indicate that Anderson thought he had heard [-iŋa] or possibly [-iŋga]." *Ng* does not appear on Hervey's list of "consonant graphemes" (p. 25).

Three unusual transcriptions of *h* – *eeeheu* 'the nose', *eahoi* for *he ahi*, 'the fire', and *erahoi* for *he lahi* 'thin' – suggest that the Hawaiian pronunciation of /h/ at the time may have included a palatal constriction common in certain dialects of Māori spoken around the turn of the nineteenth century and in the Marquesas at least as late as the 1930s.[25]

6.2 VOCABULARY

Out of the nearly 240 words on Anderson's list, there are still over two dozen not yet identified. Either they are forms that have since dropped out of general Hawaiian, or they are Kaua'i words not

[23]This is a mistake; the correct date is 1826.

[24]This observation, however, dealt only with the variable of chronology, and not with geographical distribution.

recorded elsewhere. Although we have little information about vocabulary differences in Hawai'i at that time,[26] Bennett (1930:59-61) listed a number of artefacts, described but unfortunately unnamed, "distinctively or predominantly found on Kauai".

One botanical term poses an interesting problem. Anderson collected the word *Tearre* (representing either *kiale* or *kiele*), which he identified rather loosely as 'Gardenia, or Cape Jasmine'. Now, however, *kiele* has come to refer to the gardenia that was introduced after European contact. Note the pertinent part of the dictionary entry for *kiele* (Pukui and Elbert 1986, apparently based on Neal 1965):

1. n. Gardenia (*Gardenia augusta*), introduced. (Neal 799-800.) (PPN *tiale*.)
2. vi. To emit fragrance; to perfume with *kiele*, as garments.

The fact that a native gardenia, *kiele* (or *kiale*), existed at the time of European contact seems to have been missed by lexicographers and botanists alike. In Andrews's (1865) dictionary entry for *kiele*, we find a suggestion that the plant was not recently introduced:

> The name of an odoriferous shrub or tree; he laau aala. Some say it was brought from a foreign country, but the word is found in two ancient meles at least. [The two *meles* are quoted.]

This information was included in the 1922 edition, but in no later dictionaries.

It is suggested (Derral Herbst, pers. comm.) that perhaps *kiele* was an alternate term for *nānū*, a native species of gardenia, but unrecorded since Anderson. Still, closer attention to Anderson would have cleared up the confusion in the current dictionary: an introduced plant whose name has a Proto Polynesian pedigree.

7. CONCLUSION

Ironically, Anderson's word lists from the third voyage seem to have suffered at every touch of an editor and printer. First, Dr John Douglas,[27] who edited the official publication of Cook journals (1784) and used much from Anderson's journals as a supplement (Beaglehole 1967:vi), printed the Hawaiian word list with no diacritics whatsoever, thus changing a fairly accurate rendering to the "defective" vocabulary referred to in section 4.

Next, in his editing of the Cook journals, Beaglehole (1967:817) reproduced (from the original manuscript, one presumes) Anderson's Māori list of 21 words, including dots over vowels and accent marks, but excluding the all-important ligatures over *ai*, *ou*, *ee*, and *oo* to show that each was to be pronounced as a single sound. Beaglehole, although he partially understood Anderson's system,[28] dispensed with this convention for what I consider an inadequate reason: because it would "often have meant a most unsightly page" (1967:ccxviii). In certain forms that would otherwise have

---

[25]Kendall's Māori grammar (1815), reflecting the Bay of Islands dialect, contains many instances of /h/ written as *sh*. Elbert (1941:58) mentioned a similar sound still used in the Marquesas in the 1930s. Note that in the only examples from Anderson, /h/ is followed by a high vowel.

[26]Kotzebue (1821:305) mentioned some vocabulary differences between O'ahu and Hawai'i that caused communication problems.

[27]"Canon of St Paul's since 1776 and fellow of the Royal Society since 1778 ..." (Joppien and Smith 1987:162).

[28]He wrote that the stroke over two vowels represented *quantity*; actually, Anderson did not generally recognise quantity, but used this convention to indicate *quality*.

been ambiguous (such as a succession of three *e*s), he added the diacritics. But his altered system does not allow for a possible distinction between "oo" (for *ō* or *o'o*) and "o͟o" (for *u*).

Finally, Lanyon-Orgill (1979:139-140) mentioned three versions of Anderson's short Māori list from the third voyage – the MS, the first printed version (1784), and Beaglehole's transcription of the manuscript – but seems to have chosen the last to reproduce, deleting one more diacritic in the process. Thus, we have a progression from (for example) "Makka'r͟e͟ede" to "Makka'reede" and finally to "Makkareede".

Lamenting the loss of Anderson's final volume, Beaglehole wrote (1967:cxci): "... and we should like our Anderson entire." So should we, especially with respect to the diacritics that change a "defective vocabulary" to a valuable document that gives us new insight into the nature of the Hawaiian language at the time of the first European contact.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANDREWS, Lorrin, 1865, *A dictionary of the Hawaiian language, to which is appended an English-Hawaiian vocabulary and a chronological table of remarkable events.* Honolulu: Henry M. Whitney. (Revised (1922) by Henry H. Parker. Honolulu: Board of Commissioners of Public Archives of the Territory of Hawaii.)

BEAGLEHOLE, J[ohn] C[awte], ed., 1967,*The journals of Captain James Cook on his voyages of discovery*, vol. 3: *The voyage of the Resolution...* Cambridge: Hakluyt Society.

1974, *The life of Captain James Cook.* [*Journals...* series, vol. 4.] Stanford: University Press.

BENNETT, Wendell C., 1930, Kauai archaeology. *Papers of the Hawaiian Historical Society* 17:53-62.

1931, *Archaeology of Kauai. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Bulletin* 80. Honolulu: The Museum.

COOK, James, 1777, *A voyage towards the South Pole and round the world, performed in His Majesty's ships, the Resolution and Adventure, in the years 1772, 1773, 1774, and 1775...* 2 vols. London: W. Strahan and T. Cadell.

COOK, James and J. KING, 1784, *A voyage to the Pacific Ocean, undertaken by the command of His Majesty, for making discoveries in the Northern Hemisphere...*, volume 3, Appendix V: Vocabulary of the language of Atooi, one of the Sandwich Islands. London: W. and A. Strahan, for G. Nicol & T. Cadell.

DAVIES, John, 1851, *A Tahitian and English dictionary, with introductory remarks on the Polynesian language, and a short grammar of the Tahitian dialect...* Tahiti: London Missionary Society Press.

ELBERT, Samuel H., 1941, Chants and love songs of the Marquesas islands, French Oceania. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 50:53-91.

FREYCINET, Louis Claude de Saulses de, 1978, *Hawai'i in 1819: a narrative account by Louis Claude de Saulses de Freycinet.* Translated by Ella L. Wiswell, notes and comments by Marion Kelly. Pacific Anthropological Records No. 26. Honolulu: Department of Anthropology, Bernice P. Bishop Museum.

GERAGHTY, Paul, 1983, Review of Peter A. Lanyon-Orgill *Captain Cook's South Sea Island vocabularies. Journal of the Polynesian Society* 92/4:554-559.

HAWKINS, Emily A., 1979, A new look at the determiner system in Hawaiian. Paper presented at the 5th Annual Linguistic Society of Hawaii Oceanic Festival, 3 May 1979, Honolulu, University of Hawaii.

HERVEY, Wesley David, 1968, A history of the adaptations of an orthography for the Hawaiian language. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon.

JOPPIEN, Rüdiger and Bernard SMITH, 1987, *The art of Captain Cook's voyages*, volume 3: *Catalog: The voyage of the* Resolution *and* Discovery *1776-1780.* Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

JUDD, Henry Pratt, Mary Kawena PUKUI and John F.G. STOKES, 1945, *Introduction to the Hawaiian language (an English-Hawaiian vocabulary, comprising five thousand of the commonest and most useful English words and their equivalents, in modern Hawaiian speech, correctly pronounced, with a complementary Hawaiian-English vocabulary).* Honolulu: Tongg. (New edn, 1955.)

KENDALL, Thomas, 1815, *A korao no New Zealand; or, the New Zealander's first book; being an attempt to compose some lessons for the instruction of the natives.* Sydney: G. Howe.

KOTZEBUE, Otto von, 1821, *Voyage of discovery in the South Sea and to Behring's Straits, in search of a north-east passage, undertaken in the years 1815, 1816, 1817 and 1818...* Translated by H.E. Lloyd. 2 vols. London: printed for Sir Richard Phillips. (Da Capo Press edition 1967.)

LANYON-ORGILL, Peter A., 1979, *Captain Cook's South Sea Island vocabularies*. London: the author.

NEAL, Marie C., 1965, *In gardens of Hawaii*. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 50. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press. (New and revised edition first published in 1928.)

NEWBRAND, Helene L., 1951, A phonemic analysis in Hawaiian. M.A. thesis, University of Hawai'i.

PUKUI, Mary Kawena and Samuel H. **ELBERT**, 1957, *Hawaiian-English dictionary*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

1986, *Hawaiian dictionary: Hawaiian-English, English-Hawaiian*. Revised and enlarged edition. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

SMITH, Bernard, 1984, *European vision and the South Pacific*, 1768-1850. (2nd edn; 1st edn 1960, OUP.) Sydney: Harper & Row.

WALCH, David B., 1967, The historical development of the Hawaiian alphabet. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 76:353-366.

WISE, Claude Merton and Wesley **HERVEY**, 1952, The evolution of the Hawaiian orthography. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 38/3:311-325.