
Lālau aku 'oe i ka 'ulu i ka wèkiu; I ke alo nō ka 'ulu a hala 'You reach for the 'ulu fruit at the distant top, but the 'ulu is right before you and you miss it.'

Albert J Schütz promises a history of Hawaiian language studies. What he delivers is primarily impressions of Hawaiian by those not fluent in the language. The book’s strength is its treatment of the initial seventy-five-year or so period when little was known about Hawaiian. However, Schütz misses what is right under his nose—the subsequent period of work by speakers of the language and linguists right here in Hawai'i.

Schütz spends 152 of 382 pages of prose essentially describing the steps that led up to the decision on how to spell Hawaiian, with background information on European attitudes and analysis of word lists collected between 1778 and 1820. Another 110 pages consist of an annotated bibliography. By contrast, Schütz spends 10 pages describing the nearly seventy-five years in which the University of Hawai'i has taught Hawaiian, with no mention at all of materials used in upper division classes, including specialized courses on the phonetics and phonology, morphology and syntax, prehistory, poetry, and literature of Hawaiian.

Schütz spends only five pages describing the teaching of Hawaiian in Pūnana Leo and Kaiapuni Hawai'i immersion schools, the core feature of the modern Hawaiian language movement. No space at all is given to the Kūpuna Program, the education of the totally Hawaiian-speaking Ni'ihau community, community programs, or contemporary laws relating to Hawaiian language use and study.

Schütz clearly concentrated primarily on older written material, in European languages. He gives no attention—other than mention in the annotated bibliography—to use of Hawaiian by the very large non-English-speaking immigrant population and has little familiarity with the huge volume of material written in Hawaiian. This may be one reason that Schütz had difficulty finding evidence for the pidginized Hawaiian reported by several linguists. Schütz’s primary contributions, other than his work on early European writings, are his suggestions on how to improve the Hawaiian Dictionary and his rewriting of his earlier article on English loan words in Hawaiian.

In the area of phonology Schütz places great weight on the proper recognition of the glottal stop and vowel length. The Voices of Eden, however, contains numerous words with incorrect marking of these features as well as other spelling mistakes and compromises of Hawaiian spelling conventions, such as use of a circumflex to indicate a macron in italicized words and sporadic use of an apostrophe to symbolize the glottal stop rather than the correct single open quote mark.

Schütz criticized Chamisso, an early grammarian of Hawaiian (260), for identifying the missionary convention
of using the apostrophe in first-person possessives (eg, na‘u for na‘u ‘for me’) as indicating a compound. Schütz sees this apostrophe as the missionaries’ sole marking of the glottal stop. Yet the missionaries had a convention of using an apostrophe to indicate the “dropping” of a vowel as in ke ‘Kua e ola‘i for ke Akua e ola ai ‘God who brings salvation’. It is likely that the missionaries analyzed and wrote first-person possessives such as na‘u as derived from underlying /na au/ ‘for me’ with the initial “a” of au ‘me’ dropped. Hawaiians also interpreted this apostrophe as something other than a glottal stop. Spellings such as wa‘u for wau ‘I/me’ show that some saw it as an indication of first person.

Schütz’s “touchstones” for grammatical studies of Hawaiian are descriptions of the verb marker ua and the noun marker he. He invariably criticizes other writers for calling ua a tense marker, which it can sometimes be, and for calling he an indefinite article. Schütz states categorically that each he phrase is a sentence (321). he phrases are not complete sentences in Aia he puhi ma ka ‘ale ‘There is an eel in the swell’ and Ua ‘ike mâkou he i’a ‘ula ‘We saw a red fish’. He can even be analyzed as an article in idiomatic equational noun sentences such as He ‘ai kāpulu kēia manu ‘This bird eats in a messy manner/This bird is a messy eater’. There are parallel idiomatic equational constructions using the “definite article” ka such as ‘O ke ku‘u kēia o ka manu ma ke ‘āhua ‘The bird is now landing on the mound’. Many Hawaiian specialists are more interested in describing and teaching the actual use of he and ua by native speakers than in quibbling over what to call them in English.

Schütz takes pride in being a professional linguist and judges all others on how well their work stands up to linguistic methodology and knowledge. Ironically, some of the greatest weaknesses of The Voices of Eden reflect a lack of attention to basic values of linguists, such as fluent learning of the language of study, collecting information from both oral and written sources, and reviewing the writings of all other linguists on a subject. Especially noticeable are flaws in the treatment of the Polynesian language family, as Dr Schütz is the Polynesian specialist of the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. He identifies the Tahitian cognate of Māori wheke ‘octopus’ as pe‘e rather than the correct fe‘e, refers to the well-known phenomenon of ergativity in certain Polynesian languages as a “possibility,” and states incorrectly that the A/O possessive contrast is found in all Polynesian languages. His chapter dealing with the relationship between Hawaiian and other Polynesian languages is glaringly deficient in failing to discuss the relationship between Hawaiian and Marquesan proposed by Roger Green and Samuel Elbert.

The Voices of Eden is weak in the area of linguistics and fails to capture much of the Hawaiian and non-haole history of the Hawaiian language. The book’s major contributions are in data relating to early visitors and missionaries, but Schütz’s analysis of these data suffers because of the lack of other than superficial knowledge of the Hawaiian language. In his introduc-
tion to *The Voices of Eden*, Schütz provides a definition of the topic of his book that, in its downplaying of the role of Hawaiians in the history of their own language, gives a hint of the deficiencies to come: “...Hawai‘i’s postcontact linguistic history: how outsiders first became aware of the Hawaiian language, how they and the Hawaiians were able to understand each other, and later how they tried to record and analyze Hawaiian vocabulary and grammar.” Schütz adequately covered only the first part of his ambiguous definition. Even there, it would have been helpful if he had clarified that he was not interested in contact between Hawaiians and the largest group of outsiders who came in contact with the Hawaiian people—the plantation labor ancestors of the majority of Hawai‘i’s local-born population. It is unfortunate that now, when there is such strong interest in the Hawaiian language among Hawaiians and the local population as a whole, Dr Schütz, the University of Hawai‘i, and its press have reminded us with this book of how far we still have to go. Even in an area as strongly associated with Hawaiians as the Hawaiian language, the part of history that defines history for those who control our university is the haole part, no matter how small a fraction it is of the total story.
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Detailed analyses of education provision and participation in the Pacific nations are few and far between, and those that do exist tend to be country specific and conducted for purposes such as United Nations or World Bank projects. These two books make a very important contribution to the literature of Pacific Islands education. Given the population of most of the countries in the Pacific, education, particularly at higher levels, cannot be seen solely as an individual country responsibility. Much can be learned from the experiences of one country by others. Both books raise a range of crucial issues for those responsible for providing education in the Pacific. However, they only begin to address the issue of the nature and appropriateness of the current education systems—primary, secondary, and tertiary—that have