from: ***The Voices of Eden: A History of Hawaiian Language Studies***, Albert J. Schütz. University of Hawai‘i Press. 1994. pp 225-228.

Andrews-Parker 1922

In the decades after 1865, Lyons was not the only scholar to try to improve on the existing dictionary Marguerite K. Ashford (1987:7–12) discussed at length a number of missionary successors to Andrews who annotated their copies: Arthur Alexander, Anderson Oliver Forbes, Charles McEwen Hyde, and Elias Bond. She went on to sketch the beginnings of the next published revision of Andrews's dictionary (1987:12):

> By the turn of the century Andrews' dictionary had been long out of print, and an increasing interest in other Polynesian languages, as well as the need for an authoritative source for the spelling, pronunciation, and definition of Hawaiian words, led to arrangements for the preparation of a new Hawaiian dictionary under the direction of the Board of Commissioners of Public Archives. A 1913 act of the Territorial Legislature provided for the compiling, binding, and publishing of the dictionary, and substantial grants in subsequent years by the legislature and by Bishop Museum provided the necessary funding.

The compiler chosen to revise the dictionary was the Reverend Henry Hodges Parker, a second-generation missionary already in his eighty-second year when the work began in 1915.

As Parker himself described it, Andrews's 1865 work served as a basis for his revision, to which he added "a mass of unclassified material," including Lyons's annotated copy, manuscripts from the Catholic Mission, and contributions from W. P. Alexander, Hiram Bingham, and W. D. Westervelt (p. vi). Ashford (p. 13) added more detail by noting that some 500 new words were added, and by describing the editorial contributions of the Bishop Museum staff, which helped to verify geographical and other scientific terms.

Although Parker probably was not aware of the historical coincidence, he wrote in his introduction that he had received a copy of Herbert W. Williams's Māori dictionary (5th edition, 1917), which revealed "a remarkable similarity in the structure of many Hawaiian and Maori words." As we saw in chapter 7, almost exactly 100 years earlier the First Company of missionaries in Hawai'i received a copy of the first Māori grammar and dictionary, using it to confirm their decision to use the continental values of the vowels. And, as we will see below, just as a careful study of that first dictionary would have cleared up some problems with the interim orthography, so might a better understanding of Williams's orthography have saved Parker from wasting such a great amount of time and space rewriting each entry to give a nearly uniformly false notion of its pronunciation.

Although Parker had the advantage of speaking Hawaiian, formal training seems to have been missing: unlike many other mission children, he received his entire education in Hawai'i. Unfortunately, the narrow confines of this education show only too clearly in his treatment of Hawaiian pronunciation.

Aside from the addition of new words and a change in the alphabetical order, Parker's most noticeable (and most unfortunate) addition to Andrews's dictionary stemmed from official sources. The legislative act referred to above included the following phrase: "In such a dictionary there shall be given the correct pronunciation of the ancient and modern Hawaiian words and phrases..."

Parker followed these instructions to the letter, but according to his own peculiar understanding of Hawaiian pronunciation. It is no surprise to find that vowel length and the glottal stop were the source of his greatest misunderstandings. In terms of printing, at last the essential type was available, but there is no evidence that Parker understood the contrastive function of the sounds the symbols represented. For example, he wrote that a macron should be used "to mark long or normal vowels," and thus his entries abound with short vowels marked with a macron (as, for example, with the common words *hale* (hā'-le), *hula* (hū '-la), and *aloha* (ā-lō'-ha). "The glottal closure (ʻ)." he wrote (p. xix), "indicates an interruption of a sound that prevents two vowels from coalescing . . ." As for accent, Parker omitted a general statement, except to propose that there were two types of diphthongs, depending on whether the first or second element was accented. As a result, the pronunciation symbols that appear after each headword give no reliable information except, in some cases, to show a glottal stop in noninitial position.

There are two ways in which a careful examination of Williams's Māori dictionary could have improved the Hawaiian dictionary. First, although Williams apparently did not fully understand the phonemic nature of vowel length, he came close: even though he could perceive several degrees of length in speech, he marked vowels in headwords either short (with no mark) or long (with a macron).

Next, in the comparative table of consonants in Alexander's introduction to Polynesian languages, referred to above, the reader can see that a Hawaiian glottal stop corresponds to, for instance, a Māori *k.* Thus, had he been so inclined, Parker might have noticed that the Māori word *kai* 'eat' should correspond to Hawaiian *ʻai* (as it does). As it was, however, Parker treated the difference between that word and *ai* (which he defined as 'coition') as a difference in vowel length.

Pukui and Elbert (1957:ix) criticized Parker's concept of an entry, suggesting that it was "based on translation into English." This is not quite accurately stated. True, in the example given, *maikaʻi,* the division into three entries is based on English, but on English parts of speech: one each for a noun, a verb, and an adjective. But in another example (also cited by Pukui and Elbert), the words spelled *pua* are separated into five entries, each with a different pronunciation (that is, different according to Parker).

All in all, Parker's revision was a failure, as Williams concluded in his review (1926). But it did have the effect of making available a slightly enlarged version of the Andrews dictionary—at least until the extremely short run (400 copies; Ashford 1987:13) was exhausted.