AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

It was the intention of the Author of this volume to make some extended remarks concerning the character, peculiarities and extent of the Hawaiian Language, by way of Preface or Introduction; but the want of physical strength, and especially of mental energy, has induced him to forego such an attempt and be contented with a mere History of the manner in which this Dictionary has come into existence. The History of Hawaiian Lexicography is short. For the first effort the Author will quote from the preface of "A Vocabulary of Words in the Hawaiian Language" as follows:

"At a General Meeting of the Mission in June, 1834, it was voted, 'That Mr. Andrews prepare *a Vocabulary of the Hawaiian Language.*' At the same time a wish was earnestly expressed and often repeated, that the work should not be delayed, but should be printed as soon as possible; and it was fully understood and expected that the work would necessarily be an imperfect one.

"On receiving the above appointment from the Mission, the Compiler set about a review of his materials for the compilation of a Vocabulary. The materials at hand and from which the following work has been compiled were the following:

"1. A vocabulary of words collected mostly, it is believed, by Mr. Loomis, formerly a member of this Mission. This was transcribed by the Compiler on his voyage from the United States, and put to use in 1828. In using it, his object was to insert every new word which he saw in print or understood in conversation or could obtain in any other way, besides correcting such mistakes as had been made in transcribing from the copy of Mr. Loomis. It was also a point with him to insert, if possible, the authority. Owing, however, to his ignorance of the Language at the time, many mistakes were made both in the orthography of the words and in the definitions.

"2. A vocabulary of words arranged, it is believed, in part by Mr. Ely, at the request of the Mission, and finished by Mr. Bishop. A copy of this was received and transcribed by the Compiler in the summer of 1829. Every other page was left blank for the insertion of new words, and for any such other corrections or additions as should be important. In using this manuscript, the same method was taken as with the Vocabulary of Mr. Loomis. New words and new definitions of words before collected, increased the size of the book to a considerable extent.

"On the slightest review of these irregular masses of materials, it was manifest that the labor of a thorough examination of every word, either by consulting intelligent Natives or by examining the *usus loquendi* from such manuscripts as could be obtained, or from the books that had been printed, must necessarily be a very protracted labor—the labor of some years at least. In consideration, therefore, of the urgent desire that something should be commenced in the form of a Vocabulary, and that a work having any pretensions to perfection must be slow in its progress, and protracted in its completion—and as the Compiler was burdened with labors of another kind—he judged it best to reduce the materials

he had on hand to order in the best manner his time would permit. He has done so, without looking for any new words or extending the definitions of such as were collected, or consulting any native with regard to the propriety or impropriety of any definition. He feels it his duty, therefore, to forewarn those who may consult the following Vocabulary that they will often be disappointed. *It is by no means a perfect Vocabulary of the Hawaiian Language.*"

Such is the History of the Vocabulary. The printing was commenced at Honolulu in 1835, but finished at the press of the then High School at Lahainaluna and published early in 1836. It consisted of 132 pages octavo, and contained a little over 6,000 words, and has been the principal Vocabulary in use until the present time.

OF THE PRESENT DICTIONARY.

As soon as the aforementioned Vocabulary was published, the Author had several copies bound with blank leaves for making corrections and inserting new words, and continued his reading of Hawaiian documents both printed and written—giving the preference in all cases to such as were written by Chiefs to other Chiefs, and such as were written by one intelligent Hawaiian to another. As many of these written documents were never printed and were ephemeral in their nature, no reference could be made to them except by quoting a short sentence containing the word in question. No works of Foreign Authors—i. e., Foreigners writing Hawaiian—have been referred to except a very few school books, such as the *Anahonua* (Surveying), the *Anatomia*, a short treatise on Anatomy by Dr. Judd; *Hoikehonua* (Geography), and a few others. The translation of the Bible, however, from the great care exercised in translating—the frequent and thorough reviews by parties distinct from the original translators—and in all cases with Hawaiians sitting by and assisting, who were distinguished for intelligence and skill in their own language—is the principal exception. That has been considered and treated as a *classic*, and numerous references have been made to it accordingly. It may be remarked, however, that as the Hawaiian Bible has been under a revision for two or three years past, and is now being printed in the United States, *some* of the references in the Dictionary may not apply to this new edition of the Bible. With these exceptions, the authorities for the definition of words, so far as the Author is concerned have been drawn from Manuscripts written by Hawaiians or from printed pages originally written by such. The Author has ever sought after the best and purest Hawaiian he could obtain. As he has had no use for the low, filthy, vulgar language of ignorant and sensual depravity that must ever exist where there is no purifying principle to counteract it, his book may appear deficient in low terms, too common even now. A

good many, it is to be feared, have crept in unawares along with better company, but they have never been sought after.

Besides two interleaved volumes filled up by the Author himself, he has been permitted to draw from the following sources:

1st. From a Manuscript of Dr. Baldwin, of Lahaina. This manuscript was especially useful, not so much for definitions fully written out, as for its suggestions of what might be and what should be further investigated. In noting down the ideas that appeared to belong to the word under review, he appears to have had a shrewd Hawaiian at his elbow. Some of his definitions have been copied in entire, but the most are mixed up with those of the Author, making the article more full. Hence this general acknowledgment is all that can appear in the work.

2d. Mr. Richards' book. This was a printed volume of the Vocabulary bound up like the Author's with blank leaves. In his Missionary work, and especially after he became a Teacher for the Chiefs, Mr. Richards obtained quite a stock of new words; but it is to be regretted that his engagements did not allow him time to define them well. He frequently obtained a new word, but instead of giving a radical definition, merely mentioned that the *Princess* or *Hoapili* or some other Chief used the word, *apparently* meaning so and so, leaving the Author to find out as best he could the *real* meaning of the word. It was, however, of considerable help to the Author.

3d. The volume of Rev. A. Bishop has also rendered assistance to the Author. Having a blank interleaved book, he corrected or improved many definitions of the printed Vocabulary, and also added upwards of two hundred new words.

4th. The Author is also indebted to Dr. Judd in the same way: i. e., by allowing the Author the use of his interleaved Vocabulary. Besides his work on *Anatomy* into which he introduced the Hawaiian names of the bones, muscles and ligaments of the human system, he has collected in his Vocabulary a good number of words belonging to the colloquial department.

5th. The Vocabulary of S. M. Kamakau. This was designed to be a vocabulary of Hawaiian words with Hawaiian definitions. This work was commenced and carried on by Mr. Kamakau through the instigation, if not the expense of the Rev. J. S. Emerson while Professor at the Seminary of Lahainaluna. Its value as a vocabulary is diminished, not for want of information in the writer, but for want of skill in making definitions. Instead of giving a definition in other words, he merely added the *synonyms* of the word in question. The work, however, was of value to the Author, for these synonyms increased the number of words which finally found their way into the Dictionary. For all these helps, the Author desires to make due acknowledgment.

Still there has been ample room for the exercise of the Author's own judgment. The different departments in which he has been called to act, as that of a Missionary, a Teacher in the Seminary at Lahainaluna, a Magistrate in the different Courts of the Kingdom and Secretary of the Privy Council, in all which the Hawaiian Language was used, have brought before him a great variety of forms of speech, and perhaps also, a greater variety of the senses in which many words are used than could have been obtained had he been confined to any one department. But after all, as he reviews his Dictionary, he feels that he has nothing to boast of. The deficiencies are still great. Much will remain for the Author's successors to do before the genius, extent and peculiarities of the Hawaiian Language will be fully developed.

There are several departments of the language the words of which are but feebly represented in this Dictionary. That which relates to the imaginative in the Kaaos or Legends of different classes,—that which relates to what may be termed their philosophical views, i. e., their mode of accounting for natural phenomena, as the creation of their own islands,—the Origin of their Religious rites,—and especially the power of imagination displayed in their Meles and the consequent richness of their language for expressing the nicest shades of love, of hatred, of jealousy and revenge, and the language employed by the priests when drawing on their gods for assistance, are but partially presented in the definitions of this Dictionary. The Kaao of Laieikawai is almost the only specimen of that species of language which has been laid before the public. Many fine specimens have been printed in the Hawaiian periodicals, but are neither seen nor regarded by the foreign community. Volumes more of the same quality as Laieikawai might be collected and printed and whose moral influence would be no worse on Hawaiian minds than the famous Scott's Novels are on English readers. The study of these Kaaos would demonstrate that the Hawaiians possessed a language not only adapted to their former necessities, but capable of being used in introducing the arts of civilized society, and especially of pure morals, of law and the religion of the Bible.

The number of words in this Dictionary is about 15,500. The Author would here state that four-fifths of the work were completed before he had any intimation that it would ever be printed. It was written solely for his own amusement and information, and preparatory to a more full investigation of those departments of the language above mentioned. He has been desirous for many years of going more fully into the study of Hawaiian poetry, and as a preparation to it he was induced to collect specimens of the language of common life; hence the origin of this Dictionary. An appropriation of money for a Dictionary passed by the Legislature of 1860 without his knowledge, was the first intimation the Author had that such a work was desired by the Foreign community on the Islands.

Much praise is due to the Managers of the Office of the *Advertiser* for the correctness of the printing. Seldom is a book of this size printed with so few typographical errors. The public will also feel indebted to Professor Alexander for assiduous attention not only in one reading of each proof sheet, but in suggesting improvements in the language of definitions. The work is now submitted to a candid public. The Author hopes and prays that as God has spared his life to bring it to a close, he will in some way make it useful to the increase of intelligence in this Hawaiian Kingdom.

LORRIN ANDREWS.

HONOLULU, April, 1865.

NOTICES TO THE READER.

The Reader will notice that the *Order* of words in the Dictionary does not follow the order of letters in the English Alphabet, but they follow the order in which they stand in the Hawaiian *first books* for children, viz.: 1st, the vowels; 2d, the Hawaiian consonants, and 3d, such foreign consonants as have been introduced in connection with foreign words. (See the Alphabet below.)

In arranging the definitions, where there are several attached to a word, the Author has endeavored first to ascertain, if possible, the radical idea of the word in its simplest form, and from that he has used his best judgment in arranging in the order of their sequence the various derived significations. How far he has succeeded must be left to the judgment of the Reader.

The Reader of Hawaiian will notice that many words begin with the letters *hoo*. In looking in the Dictionary for such words, he may not find them; thus, *hoonaauao* will not be found under the letter *H*. Throw off then the *hoo* and look for *naauao*, *v.*, and there it will appear, and so of many others.

The sounds of the vowels will appear in the Alphabet below, and in the same order as they stand in the Dictionary.

Hawaiian Vowels.
- A as heard in *arch*, *ask*, &c.
- E as in *hate*, *late*, &c.
- I as in *ee* in English, or as *i* in *pique*.
- O as long in *note*.
- U as *oo* in *coo*.

Hawaiian Consonants: H, K, L, M, N, P, W — as in English.

Foreign Consonants pronounced as in English: B. D. F. G. R. S. T. V. Z.

L. A.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

The Hawaiian is but a dialect of the great Polynesian language, which is spoken with extraordinary uniformity over all the numerous islands of the Pacific Ocean between New Zealand and Hawaii. Again, the Polynesian language is but one member of that wide-spread family of languages, known as the Malayo-Polynesian or Oceanic family, which extends from Madagascar to the Hawaiian Islands, and from New Zealand to Formosa.

The Hawaiian dialect is peculiarly interesting to the philologist from its isolated position, being the most remote of the family from its primeval seat in South-Eastern Asia, and leading as it were the van while the Malagasy brings up the rear. We will first give a brief account of what has been done for these languages, chiefly by European scholars.

The similarity of the Polynesian dialects to one another is so striking that it did not escape the notice of the first discoverers in this Ocean. Dr. Reinhold Forster, the celebrated naturalist of Captain Cook's second voyage, drew up a table containing 47 words taken from 11 Oceanic dialects, and the corresponding terms in Malay, Mexican, Peruvian and Chilian. From this table he inferred that the Polynesian languages afford many analogies with the Malay, while they present no point of contact with the American languages. After him Mr. Anderson, in a comparative table, which was published at the end of Cook's third voyage, drew attention to the striking resemblance of the Polynesian numerals to those of the Malay archipelago and Madagascar.

According to Max Muller, it was the Abbe Lorenzo Hervas who first made what he calls "one of the most brilliant discoveries in the history of the science of language, the establishment of the Malay and Polynesian family of speech, extending from the Island of Madagascar over 208 degrees of longitude to Easter Island," &c. From what has been said, however, it is evident that the credit of this discovery is really due to Forster and Anderson. Hervas was a Spanish Jesuit, who spent several years as a missionary in South America, where his attention was drawn to the comparative study of languages. After his return to Europe, he lived chiefly at Rome, where his correspondence with Jesuit missionaries in all parts of the world gave him great assistance in his philological researches. In his "Catalogue of Languages," published in the year 1800, he clearly stated this relationship, which it was reserved for a Humboldt to demonstrate.

A few years later William Marsden, who was the first to investigate with

accuracy the history of the East Indian Archipelago, arrived independently at the same conclusions. He considered all the insular nations as colonies from the Malays, whose original home was the Island of Sumatra, and their common speech he termed the Great Polynesian.

John Crawford, in his great work on the East Indian Archipelago, published in 1820, in which he gave a valuable comparative vocabulary, advanced a very different theory, which has occasioned a great deal of discussion, and is not without its advocates even at the present day. He supposed that the basis of each barbarous language was originally distinct, each tribe being a distinct race, and properly indigenous. The common words in each dialect he supposed to have been derived from a foreign language, which he calls the Great Polynesian, and which was spread, as he imagined, by a more civilized people, through conquest and commercial intercourse, over the whole Archipelago. On this subject we briefly remark that his theory affords no explanation of the dispersion of the Polynesian race over the islands of the Pacific Ocean. Besides we have good reason to believe that whatever superiority in civilization is enjoyed by the East Indian islanders, was derived by them from Continental India, long after the dispersion of the insular races from their common center, and not from his imaginary Great Polynesian. Again, the words which are common to all these languages are such as are least likely to have been borrowed by one race from another, as the pronouns, the numerals, the names of family relations, of parts of the body, of the great objects of nature, and all the simplest ideas of every-day life. The Saxons, for example, learned to use many Norman-French words, but most of their household words remained Saxon. So did their numerals, so did their pronouns, and so in the highest degree did their grammar.

Dumont d'Urville's report on the Philology of the French Exploring Expedition, during the years 1825–1829, published in 1833, reflects great credit on its author. Besides other valuable materials, it contains a comparative vocabulary of seven Oceanic languages, comprising over eight hundred words in the Madagascar, New Zealand, Tongan, Tahitian, Hawaiian and Malay languages.

In the able essay which accompanied it, he drew attention to the fact that a class of words common to the Malagasy and the Polynesian are wanting in the Malay; which confirmed, as he justly thought, Forster's opinion that "all these languages were derived from one very ancient tongue, now lost," which held towards them all the relation of a common parent, the Polynesian having remained nearest to the original type, while the Malay has been greatly modified by the influence of the Sanscrit, and the Malagasy by the African and Arabic languages. M. d'Urville then goes on to advance an ingenious hypothesis, which, however, will not stand the test of examination, that a continent like Australia, or at least an archipelago, once occupied part of Polynesia, inhabited

by a people of whom the Polynesian tribes are but the remnant that have survived some great convulsion of the globe. In that case the Malays would have been but colonists from the supposed Polynesian continent, who had followed the general course of the trade winds.

The earliest really scientific analysis of the structure of a Polynesian language, with which we are acquainted, is the work on the Hawaiian language published at Berlin in 1837, by Adelbert von Chamisso, the poet, who had been the naturalist of the Russian Exploring Expedition, under Kotzebue, in the years 1815 to 1818. It is a work of rare ability, considering the meagre materials which the author had at his command. In the year 1838 appeared a work by Baron William von Humboldt, the distinguished statesman and scholar, which marked a new era in the history of the science of language, and which first fixed on an impregnable basis the relationship of the Malayo-Polynesian languages. This great work "On the Kawi Language in the Island of Java," which was edited after the author's death by his friend and assistant, M. Buschmann, has ever since been regarded as a model and masterpiece of philological research. In the words of Professor De Vere, "the Kawi served him as a canvas on which to weave those truths and that wisdom, which have placed his name in universal comparative philology by the side of that of Leibnitz."

In this work, which occupies three quarto volumes, he first lays down the fundamental principles which govern the development of language, and shows the influence of the structure of language on the intellectual development of races. He then institutes a most minute and searching examination of the nine principal languages of the Malay stock, viz.: the Malagasy, Malay, Javanese, Bughis, Tagala, New Zealand, Tongan, Tahitian and Hawaiian, analyzing the structure of their roots, and investigating the laws of derivation and euphony, in accordance with which the common stock of words is modified in each dialect. He next proceeds to make a most careful and elaborate analysis of the grammatical structure, the particles and formatives of each language, after which he makes a comparison of the numerals, and of 131 primitive words in all the nine languages mentioned above. The result of this extensive and laborious analysis is to prove that there is not only a fundamental and close affinity between these languages in respect to their vocabulary, but that their construction is so similar that they may be considered as belonging to one and the same grammatical system, and pervaded by the same modes of thought. Humboldt also showed that the Tagala, the leading language of the Philippine Islands, is by far the richest and most perfect of these languages, and that it may even be considered as the type of the family. "It possesses," he said, "all the forms collectively of which particular ones are found singly in other dialects; and it has preserved them all with very trifling exceptions unbroken, and in entire harmony and symmetry. * * * It was necessary, in order to display the high-

est perfection of which the organism of this stock of languages is capable, to exhibit the system of verbs in the Tagala."

The languages of the Oceanic region have been divided into six great groups: 1st, the Polynesian; 2d, the Micronesian; 3d, the Melanesian or Papuan; 4th, the Australian; 5th, the Malaysian, and 6th, the Malagasy, as the language of Madagascar is called. In regard to these different groups our limits will not allow us to go into any details. Suffice it to say of the Australians that their languages appear to be radically distinct from the Malayo-Polynesian family, though they have left some traces of former contact on the dialects of the small islands west of New Guinea. The Melanesian or Papuan languages present but very slight points of resemblance to the Malay or Polynesian, and differ greatly among themselves. If, as is generally supposed, the black race were the first settlers in the Pacific, the wave of immigration which peopled Polynesia must have swept around them to the north, and at a later period the Micronesians may have moved in and closed up the rear.

Of the languages of Malaysia, those of the Moluccas approach the nearest to Polynesian. Those islands then may be considered as the probable starting point of the ancient Polynesian emigrants. The languages of Micronesia unmistakably belong to the great Malay family, and in their grammatical structure resemble the East Indian languages more than the Polynesian.

The remarkable fact that the language of Madagascar belongs to this great family was first established by William Humboldt in his great work on the Kawi language. The Malagasy has no resemblance to the South African languages. In its grammatical structure it approaches nearest to the Tagala, but it contains several Polynesian words which are wanting in the intervening Malay languages. The first ten numerals in Malagasy are "Rec or isa, rua, telu, efat, dimi, enim, fitu, valu, sivi, fulu." In Malay they are "Satu, dua, tiga, ampat, lima, anam, tujuh, delapan or walu, sambilan, sa-puluh." The original Polynesian forms are "Tasi, lua, tolu, fa, lima, ono, fitu, valu, siwa, fulu." Compare the Malagasy word for "heaven," *langits*, with the Malay *langit*, the Polynesian *langi* or *lani;* the Malagasy word *nifi*, a "tooth," with the Polynesian *nifo* or *niho;* the Malagasy *uvi*, a "yam," with the Polynesian *ufi* or *uhi*. Indeed some words, such as *mate*, "dead," &c., are found in the same identical forms throughout this whole circle of languages. Many other examples might be given if they were needed to illustrate the connection of these languages.

The Polynesian language is, as has been before remarked, an extremely ancient and primitive member of the great Malay family.

It was observed by Humboldt that the introduction of Sanscrit words into the Javanese and Malay must have been centuries before the Christian era, and that the separation between the different branches of the Malay family must have

taken place at a still earlier period. It has also been seen that the internal structure of the Polynesian language indicates its high antiquity. It was the belief of William Humboldt that the Polynesians exhibit the original state of civilization of the Malay race, when they first settled in the Indian Archipelago, and before they had been changed by foreign influence. The *unity* of the Polynesian dialects is still an astonishing fact. Tribes like the Hawaiians and New Zealanders, separated from each other by one-fourth of the circumference of the globe in space, and thousands of years in time, speak dialects of one language, and have the same customs and mythology. The laws of euphony in the several dialects which regulate the changes of consonants are so fixed and uniform, that a New Zealand or Samoan word being given, we can generally tell with certainty what its form will be in each of the other dialects. The conclusion that the course of migration in the Pacific was from west to east might be deduced from an examination of the comparative grammar and vocabularies of the different dialects. We find in those of the western groups many forms which are entirely wanting in the eastern dialects, while others which are complete in the former are found in the latter defective or perverted from what was evidently their original meaning.

The New Zealand dialect, on the whole, is the most primitive and entire in its forms. The Hawaiians, Marquesans and Tahitians form a closely related group by themselves. For example, the Marquesan converts are using Hawaiian books, and the people of the Austral Islands read the Tahitian Bible.

Although, in a scientific point of view, the Hawaiian may seem to be one of the most attenuated and degenerate dialects of this family, we believe it to be practically one of the most copious and expressive, as well as the richest in native traditional history and poetry.

The Samoan and Tongan languages have probably been modified, by a later importation from the East Indies. They contain several Malay words which are wanting in the eastern dialects. The Tongan in particular has several Feejee traits not found elsewhere in Polynesia.

The Feejee or Viti seems to form the transition between Polynesian and Papuan, where the two streams of colonization met and mingled. The principles of its grammar and one-fifth of its words are Polynesian. Among the remaining four-fifths are several pure Malay words, such as *vula*, the moon, *lako*, to go, *masima*, salt, &c., while many of its peculiar words are also found in the Kingsmill Group, and some, e. g. *dra*, blood, *kana*, to eat, *tina*, mother, can even be traced into Micronesia. The Kingsmill Group, as far as its language is concerned, has a closer connection with Polynesia than Micronesia, though considerably modified by mixture with the latter as well as with the black race. To-

gether with the Feejee and Rotuman it retains some characteristics of Eastern Malaysia, particularly of Aru-Sambawa, and even some traces of Australian. The native traditions show that they are a mixed race sprung from Samoan and Micronesian colonists.

At the south-east extremity of Polynesia the Pa'umotu or Dangerous Archipelago, presents a curious problem for the philologist. While the grammar and most of the vocabulary is Tahitian, the numerals and a large number of the most common words are utterly unlike every other Oceanic language with which we are acquainted, although Logan finds many of them "recognizable as Indonesian or Indian words." Their canoes and some of their manufactures are of the Micronesian pattern, though there is nothing in their language that points in that direction.

A few words should be added on the peculiar genius and structure of the Polynesian Language in general, and of the Hawaiian dialect in particular.

It is a law of all Polynesian languages that every word and syllable must end in a vowel, so that no two consonants are ever heard without a vowel sound between them. Most of the radical words are dissyllables, and the accent is generally on the penult. The Polynesian ear is as nice in marking the slightest variations of vowel sound as it is dull in distinguishing consonants. No Polynesian dialect, for instance, makes any distinction between *b* and *p*, *d* and *t*, *g* and *k*, *l* and *r*, or *v* and *w*. Besides *l* is often sounded like *d* and *t* like *k*, which latter was unfortunately adopted in the written language of the Hawaiian Islands to represent the same element which is represented by *t* throughout the rest of Polynesia.

As was said before, the laws which regulate the changes of consonants in the different dialects are remarkably uniform. In Hawaiian both *f* and *s* are changed into *h*, *ng* is softened into *n*, *k* at the beginning of a word is dropped, but in the middle of a word is represented by a peculiar guttural catch or break, and *w* is used for *v*, though the sound is properly intermediate between the two.

The following table from Hale shows the number of consonants in each dialect, and the changes which they undergo in passing from one dialect to another. The guttural break, which takes the place of *k*, is represented by an apostrophe.

Fakaafo.	Samoan.	Tongan.	New Zealand.	Rarotongan.	Tahitian.	Hawaiian.	Marquesan.
F.	F.	F.	W or H.	Wanting.	F or H.	H.	F or H.
K.	'	K.	K.	K.	'	'	K.
L.	L.	L.	R.	R.	R.	L.	Wanting.
M.	M.	M.	M.	M.	M.	M.	M.
N.	N.	N.	N.	N.	N.	N.	N.
NG.	NG.	NG.	NG.	NG.	Dropped.	N.	NG, N or K.
P.	P.	P or B.	P.	P.	P.	P.	P.
S.	S.	H.	H.	Wanting.	H.	H.	H.
T.	T.	T.	T.	T.	T.	T or K.	T.
V.	V.	V.	W.	V.	V.	W.	V.

The vowels undergo but few changes, and these chiefly in consequence of consonant changes. E. g. *fetú*, a star, and *fenua*, land, in Hawaiian become *hokú*, and *honua*, and the omission of *k* produces similar changes, so that *meika*, a banana, becomes *mai'a*, and *meitaki*, good, becomes *maika'i*. It will be observed that in consonant sounds the Hawaiian is one of the softest and most attenuated of the dialects, being surpassed in that respect only by the effeminate Marquesan. The following examples show the changes which words undergo in passing from one dialect to another.

Fakaafo.	Samoan.	Tongan.	New Zealand.	Rarotongan.	Tahitian.	Hawaiian.	Nukuhivan.
Foe.	Foe.	Foe.	Hoe.	Oe.	Hoe.	Hoe.	Hoe.
Tonga.	Tonga.	Tonga.	Tonga.	Tonga.	Toa.	Kona.	Tonga, tona.
Sina.	Sina.	Hina.	Hina.	Iua.	Hina.	Hina.	Hina.
Ika.	I'a.	Ika.	Ika.	Ika.	I'a.	I'a.	Ika.
Vaka.	Va'a.	Vaka.	Waka.	Vaka.	Va'a.	Wa'a.	Vaka.
Songi.	Songi.	Hongi.	Hongi.	Ongi.	Hoi.	Honi.	Hongi.
Tufunga.	Tufunga.	Tufunga.	Tohunga.	Taunga.	Tahua.	Kahuna.	Tuhuna.
Kupenga.	'Upenga.	Kupenga.	Kupenga.	Kupenga.	'Upo'a.	Upena.	Kupeka, &c.

The vocabulary of the Hawaiian is probably richer than that of most other Oceanic tongues. Its child-like and primitive character is shown by the absence of abstract words and general terms. As has been well observed by M. Gaussin, there are three classes of words, corresponding to as many different stages of language: 1st, those that express sensations, 2d, images, and 3d, abstract ideas. The Polynesian vocabulary was originally composed chiefly of words of the first two classes. As languages grow older, words acquire a figurative sense, and the original meaning is gradually forgotten. In English, for instance, how many are aware that *tribulation* originally meant threshing, respect, looking back, *reveal* to draw back a vail, *affront* to strike in the face, and *insult* to leap upon the body of a prostrate foe? Now there were comparatively few Hawaiian words that had gone through this process.

Not only are names wanting for the more general abstractions, such as space, nature, fate, &c., but there are very few generic terms. For example there is no generic term for *animal*, expressing the whole class of living creatures, or for insects or for colors. At the same time it abounds in specific names and in nice distinctions.

The first step in the formation of language was no doubt the employment of particular names to denote individual objects. It was only afterwards by a process of abstraction that these individual objects were classified by those qualities which are common to a number of them. It is from the specific that we ascend to the general. The same principle applies to verbs or names of actions as well as to nouns. The savage has in his mind a picture of the whole action, and does not always abstract or separate the principal circumstance from the accessory details. This is true of uncultivated languages in general, and is not peculiar to Hawaiian. Thus the Javanese has ten words to express as many different

modes of standing, and twenty of sitting. The Feejee has sixteen words meaning to strike, and eight to wash, "according as it affects the head, face, hands, feet or body of an individual, or his clothes, dishes or floor." So in Hawaiian everything that relates to their every-day life or to the natural objects with which they were conversant is expressed with a vivacity, a minuteness and nicety of coloring which cannot be reproduced in a foreign tongue. Thus the Hawaiian was very rich in terms for every variety of clouds. It has names for every species of plant on the mountains or fish in the sea, and is peculiarly copious in terms relating to the ocean, the surf and waves. The ancient Hawaiians were evidently close observers of nature. For whatever belonged to their religion, their wars, their domestic life, their handicrafts or their amusements, their vocabulary was most copious and minute. Almost every stick in a native house had its appropriate name. Hence it abounds in synonyms, which, however, are such only in appearance, and on which a volume might be written. E. g. To be broken as a string is *moku*, to be broken as a dish *naha*, as a stick *haki*, to fall from an upright to a horizontal position as a wall is *hina*, to fall from a height through the air *haule; auamo* means to carry on the shoulder with a stick, *ka'ika'i* in the hands, *hii* as a child in the arms, *koi* on a stick between two men, *haawe* on the back, *hali* to carry in general, &c.

Besides the language of every day life, there was a style appropriate to oratory, and another to religion and poetry. This latter is known to but few natives of the present generation, and is fast disappearing. The same thing is taking place in New Zealand and Tahiti.

The above mentioned characteristics make it a pictorial and expressive language. It still has the freshness of childhood. Its words are pictures rather than colorless and abstract symbols of ideas, and are redolent of the mountain, the forest and the surf. It was completely adapted to the country and the circle of ideas in which the people lived, and bore no trace of a higher civilization or of foreign influence. Far be it from us however to deny its capability for higher development. Its characteristics are such as belong to all languages in a certain stage of growth. It has been and is successfully used to express the abstractions of mathematics, of English law, and of theology.

We regret that our limits forbid our adding any remarks on the grammatical structure of the Polynesian languages.

W. D. ALEXANDER.

Honolulu, April, 1865.