CHAPTER 7

HAWAIIAN METHODOLOGIES OF INDIRECTION

Point-less vs. Pointless

K. Laiana Wong

INTRODUCTION: AGENTS, AGENCY, AND ADVOCACY

The indication of grammatical agents in Hawaiian is just one of many aspects of the language that serve to separate it from other languages, particularly with regard to worldview and the unique identity deriving from it. The current state of the Hawaiian language is in flux as it undergoes a rebuilding process whereby a new generation of speakers is being raised to preserve, perpetuate, and revitalize what would otherwise have been considered a moribund language (Warner, 2001). In facilitating this effort, Hawaiian language medium pre-schools called Pūnana Leo were established with the intent to "recreate an environment where Hawaiian language and culture were conveyed and developed in much the same way that they were in the home in earlier generations" (Wilson & Kamanā, 2001, p. 151). Subsequently, Hawaiian language medium schools were established within the Hawaiʻi State Department of Education to accommodate the matriculation

151

of the Pūnana Leo students beyond the pre-school level. At present, a child of this "new generation" can receive instruction in Hawaiian at all levels up to graduation. The vast majority of participants, however, are either second language learners or being raised or taught by second language learners (Wong, 1999). Although it is widely accepted among language professionals that language is not a static entity but one that is dynamic and subject to constant change,[1] the Hawaiian context must be differentiated from situations involving more natural language change for the very fact that non-native speakers of Hawaiian disproportionately influence the direction of that change (NeSmith, 2003). Since the default worldview of these new speakers is fundamentally English, the consequences of such influence include the emergence of a one to one correspondence between Hawaiian and English ways of speaking and the apparent convergence of worldviews (Wong, 1999). Frequent unwitting assumptions are made that for each language use pattern found in English there is a corresponding reflection in Hawaiian that operates in much the same way and is generated for the same reasons as its counterpart. This paper will focus on Hawaiian ways of pointing at agents (human agents, in particular), which differ from those that guide speakers of English.

I advocate here for the merits of maintaining a distinction between Hawaiian and English ways of speaking, particularly in terms of the ways in which agents are normally indicated, in order to preserve those characteristics that identify Hawaiian as unique. Such advocacy, although prescriptive in nature, is necessary in order to curb the wholesale shift in the character of Hawaiian away from its traditions and the resulting disconnect between the Hawaiian spoken today and its predecessor. The range of such characteristics must not be limited to those aspects of language such as grammar and lexicon, which are generally treated as autonomous in the field of linguistics and tend to be the primary criteria for the assignment of language labels such as English and Hawaiian. They must also include those ways of speaking that reflect the epistemology or "worldview" of the speech community. These ways of speaking are embodied in the structure of the language and are necessary components of a holistic communicative competence that marks an individual speaker as a member of the speech community (Hymes, 1972). Without mastering those ways of speaking, English speakers learning Hawaiian as a second language will be relegated to speaking (and socially performing) English in Hawaiian.[2] That is to say, mastery of grammar and lexicon alone without the concomitant mastery of more subtle ways of speaking, such as Hawaiian norms for pointing at agents, significantly limits the ability of the speaker to function appropriately in the target language[3] and ultimately contributes to an overall shift in the defining linguistic and related social characteristic of the language. In

this case, the shift moves away from Hawaiian and toward English and tests the link between language and identity.

Language is commonly recognized as a marker of identity, but what is the point of putting in the effort to learn Hawaiian if it merely results in the ability to speak English in Hawaiian? Simply attending to the acquisition of grammatical patterns and lexical items does little to alter the learner's ways of thinking and speaking. Such a person will continue to be identified as an outsider to the native speaking Hawaiian community. Moreover, the legitimacy of the Hawaiian that that person speaks is likely to be called into question. Grammar and lexicon can merely provide a thin veil to cover the deep-seated worldview that identifies a speaker's first language. They can be likened to cheap paint that fails to cover the old paint as it continues to bleed through. A certain amount of prescription must be accepted as inherent to the process of acquiring a target language. It is pointless to throw a spear without aiming and subsequently declare the point it comes to rest as the intended target. A target is, by definition, predetermined and therefore prescribed. Identity and authenticity, however, are not the only issues of concern. There are other, more socially related consequences of failing to attend to aspects of communicative competence. These will be discussed later in the chapter as part of this advocacy.

Finally, language research should never be conducted in a vacuum. It must always be connected to the reasons for using the language in the first place. Those reasons reside with the people who use the language to serve their communicative purposes. Research on indigenous languages must invariably attend to the fact that there will be ramifications for or a general social impact on the indigenous community. Thus, the researcher must be able to assess that impact to ensure that the research ultimately benefits the community and does not merely seek to extract knowledge from it (Smith, 1999). It is also critical that the researcher, as the agent of that research, be an advocate for the well being of the community. This paper deals with both content and process. As such, a significant part of the discussion will be devoted to examining those aspects of my methodology relating to my role as researcher, the kuleana (i.e., "right," "responsibility," "authority")[4] associated with that role, and the requisite decisions dictated by that kuleana.

POINTING WITH WORDS

It has been my contention (Wong, 2006) that, in Hawaiian, indirection is the norm when it comes to pointing at grammatical agents, especially those that denote humans. Although linguists view grammatical subjects as being able to perform several distinct roles such as agent, actor, experiencer, instrument, and patient/undergoer (Duranti, 1994; Keenan, 1984),[5] for the purposes of this study, I will consider a very broad definition of "agent" that includes all of these and more. That is, an agent can be the subject of either

transitive or intransitive verbs, an entity overtly marked as an agent in passive constructions, or an entity that can be deemed responsible for causing the occurrence of some state of affairs that results from implied action. Neither intentionality, free will, or resistance is a necessary component of agency as suggested by some linguists,[6] but they can be attributed to entities overtly indicated as responsible for actions or outcomes. I will also consider as an agent any such entity even if it is not overtly marked as such, but otherwise recoverable from context.

It is important to recognize that different languages have different norms with regard to the ways in which agents are indicated and that these often operate below the level of awareness. That is, norms of language use are generally part of the background of a language and are not realized at the conscious level unless they are violated and brought to the foreground. Benjamin Lee Whorf (1956) noted that:

> If a rule has absolutely no exceptions, it is not recognized as a rule or as anything else; it is then part of the background of experience of which we tend to remain unconscious. Never having experienced anything in contrast to it, we cannot isolate it and formulate it as a rule until we so enlarge our experience and expand our base of reference that we encounter an interruption of its regularity. (p. 209)[7]

Thus, the indirectness of pointing at agents in Hawaiian is not noticeable to the native speaker of Hawaiian. It is only when such indication is made too directly that it becomes noticeable. This phenomenon can also be realized at the conscious level when contrasted with English ways of pointing that are relatively more direct. Thus, a native speaker of English who is learning Hawaiian as a second language is likely to indicate an agent based on the norms of English, which operate as the default mode of that speaker, resulting in what I will call "overpointing." In much the same way that pointing a finger at someone can cause discomfort, the same result can be accomplished by pointing with words. Not having been raised in Hawaiian nor having acquired a sufficient level of communicative competence in the language, most second language learners are likely to overpoint with words while remaining oblivious to the power of such words and the effect they have on the indicated individual. This phenomenon can be exemplified by the common underestimation by L2 learners of the power of profanity in the target language. Being unaware of the power of words in another language, the second language learner is liable to produce such words unchecked. The social forces or consequences that would ordinarily curb the production of words of equivalent power in one's native language would simply not apply.

OVERPOINTING: FALSE ACCUSATION

There are numerous ways in which overpointing can occur, only a few of which will be discussed here. The first of these, which I will label "false accusation," deals with the grammatical indication of an agent who is not really responsible for any alleged or inferred action or outcome. For example, the question "How did you break your leg?" is quite acceptable in English. The use of the pronoun "you" in the subject position to indicate the agent responsible for committing the act of breaking the leg does not draw any attention to the idiomatic nature of this statement precisely because it has been regularized as normal language use in English. Intentionality is a non-issue in the indication of the agent and the resulting attribution of responsibility. It would therefore appear that, in the English way of viewing this situation, a person is responsible for his or her own leg and, by extension, whatever should happen to it.[8] If, in fact, intentionality is not applicable here, then the grammatical culpability suggested by the English construction is incorrectly assigned to an innocent party. On the other hand, in a Hawaiian way of viewing the same situation, the broken leg would be considered a simple matter of happenstance and require no attribution of agency, unless there were some compelling reason to do so.[9] A normal Hawaiian construction would employ the stative verb "haki" (broken) that signifies a state of being and not an action.[10]

> Ua haki kou wāwae?
> Is your leg broken?

The norm in Hawaiian calls for a focus on the result or outcome, implicit in the stative verb (haki), of some unidentified action, whereas English tends to highlight the subject/agent of an overt action (to break). In other words, Hawaiian views the scene as a condition that results from action while English views it more as an event that is constitutive of action. Because there is no ostensible importance, in the Hawaiian view, attached to the action leading up to the eventual state of being, there is also no reason to point at an agent responsible for such an action. The Hawaiian worldview recognizes that there is no agent responsible for breaking the leg and, therefore, provides constructions, such as the use of stative verbs, that allow a speaker to abstain from overpointing and falsely accusing an innocent party.

The idiomaticity of a question such as "How did you break your leg?" is not recognizable to the English speaker. It is only when compared to normal Hawaiian ways of speaking that it comes into question. Of course, the recognition of what is normal in Hawaiian requires the development of a certain degree of communicative competence in Hawaiian. As Whorf (1956) contends, it is necessary to expand our experience in order to recognize the subtle regularities that occur in a second language. Ways of

pointing in Hawaiian contrast with those of English in subtle ways and are not generally part of the second language pedagogy. This is indeed a short-coming, because failure to recognize these distinctions can result in the use of calques[11] or the incorrect use of Hawaiian lexicon and grammatical patterns to accommodate the expression of English idioms in Hawaiian. Moreover, failure to apply Hawaiian ways of pointing can result in an affront to the indicated party and precipitate interpersonal disharmony.

In a speech community comprised primarily of second language learners, lack of competence in this area is not likely to be noticed as unusual unless the interactants include native speakers. It is only then that the contrast in ways of speaking becomes salient. When interacting in the absence of native speakers, the fact that second language learners share a common default system (English) that guides their way of indicating agents obscures the idiomaticity of overpointing. This is an extremely subtle type of idiom to begin with. It is infinitely easier to recognize the awkwardness of literal translations of expressions more obviously idiomatic such as "The shit hit the fan" or "It's raining cats and dogs." Nevertheless, even the translation of expressions less than obviously idiomatic in English should, as part of the effort to revitalize Hawaiian, be avoided to prevent them from unduly influencing the character of the language. A pedagogy of conscientization should be developed in order to reveal the foreign origins of such direct ways of pointing. At the very least, it will assist the language learner to home in more accurately on the target language. Maintaining indirect ways of pointing that represent the norm in Hawaiian, as difficult as it might be for the English speaking second language learner, is well worth it because, in doing so, the unique characteristics that identify the Hawaiian speaking community are ultimately retained and the tendency to "speak English in Hawaiian" is significantly reduced.

<div align="center">

OVERPOINTING:
FABRICATION

</div>

Another type of overpointing, which I am calling "fabrication," deals with the fabrication of some nebulous entity that serves as agent and shoulders the responsibility for an action or outcome. In the English example "It's raining," there is no fixed referent for the ambient "it" that occupies the subject position and acts as the grammatical agent of the intransitive verb "raining."[12] It would seem that, in the absence of an actual agent, English manages to fabricate one to occupy an important position and play an important role. Much like the example of the broken leg, this example is subtly idiomatic and not recognizable as such unless contrasted with the Hawaiian way of expressing the same idea. See the example below:

Predicate	Subject
Ke ua nei	Ø
(It) is raining	

The first thing to notice here is that there is no subject in this particular Hawaiian sentence. This would seem odd to a speaker of English who is most likely to have been taught, as all of us have been, that a complete sentence in English must include a subject and a predicate. This grammatical tenet is injected into the shared repertoire of English speakers both by way of direct instruction and by the fact that it is pervasive of the ambient speech found in English speaking communities. It has been regularized as the norm vis-à-vis English ways of speaking and, as such, represents the default mode of the native speaker of English. That being said, it is easy to see why an English-speaking learner of Hawaiian might be prone to producing the following sentence:

Predicate	Subject
Ke ua nei	‘o ia
It is raining	

Such a construction, although grammatically possible in Hawaiian, does not represent the normal way of expressing this idea. A second language learner who, either guided or compelled by an English default system, produces this type of construction would be exposed as lacking in communicative competence. Given that the subject position is obligatory in the canonical constituent order of English, it is not surprising for a subject/agent to be fabricated in order to occupy that position, even though there is no referent in the real world that can be assigned literal responsibility for executing the act of raining. In terms of social impact, the indication of this particular type of fabricated agent, although it violates Hawaiian ways of pointing at agents and could influence a shift in the way this is handled in the community, does not necessarily contribute to social disharmony. That is, there is no affront created here because there is no human agent to take offense. In other types of overpointing, however, the possibility of causing an affront definitely exists.

COGNITIVELY SALIENT ENTITIES

Another example of overpointing involves the indication of what Cook (1993) calls the "cognitively salient entit[y]" instead of the "active zone" (pp. 1–2). In his example "David blinked," "David" is considered to be the cognitively salient entity while his eye would be the active zone. Cook reports that Samoan is an active zone language and that David's eye, as the active zone, would be the more appropriate agent. This is also true of Hawaiian. In my dissertation (Wong, 2006) I provide numerous examples,

gleaned from old Hawaiian language newspapers, that illustrate this way of pointing in Hawaiian. In Hawaiian, the indication of the active zone is a common occurrence, and it represents the norm with regard to ways of speaking. Although it is possible to say, "David blinked," in Hawaiian, it is more likely to be stated as follows:

Ua ʻimo ka maka o Kāwika
David's eye blinked

The broad variety of examples I collected in which the active zone was indicated as the grammatical agent instead of the cognitively salient entity supported my claim that the indication of agents in Hawaiian is must less direct than in English. As stated earlier, it would seem that the cognitively salient entity (David) is the more likely agent in the English worldview because David is ultimately responsible for the actions of his eye. That is, the actions of his eye are presumed to come under his control, even if it were to do something ostensibly involuntary such as to flinch. It would not be odd for an English speaker to say that it was David who flinched. It is, of course, possible to say, "David's eye blinked/flinched," in English, but that is not representative of the norm. One would expect to find this type of construction in more literary or poetic genres rather than everyday speech. For Hawaiian, on the other hand, it is not uncommon for the eye to see, the ear to listen, the hand to work, etc. This is reflected in the frequently quoted "(ʻŌlelo) noʻeau" (proverbial expressions) below:

Nānā ka maka; hoʻolohe ka pepeiao; paʻa ka waha.
Observe with the eyes; listen with the ears; shut the mouth. Thus one learns.
(Pukui, 1983, p. 248)
Paʻa ka waha, hana ka lima.
Shut the mouth; keep the hands busy.
Never mind the talking; start working. (ibid, p. 281)

Indication of the active zone instead of the cognitively salient entity allows the speaker of Hawaiian to avoid pointing too directly at human agents and the possible affront that such overpointing might cause.

In his discussion on the environments in which fully marked agents might be found in Samoan, Duranti (1994) puts forth the idea of a grammar of praising and blame in which he recognizes these as "important social acts through which speakers can in fact affect the way the world is" (p. 145). Such effect is particularly salient with regard to social relationships. Speech events involving the indication of a particular individual as the focus of blame or praise obviously affect the dynamics of social relationships and the overall harmony of the speech community. It is clear to see how blaming can negatively impact the relationship between accuser and accused while also impacting their relationships with other participants in

the speech event. It is less clear, however, to see how praising might be construed as negative in any way. I have suggested (Wong, 2006) that the overt indication of an individual, even for the purposes of praise, can often engender feelings of discomfort because it elevates that individual above his or her peers and, in doing so, isolates that individual from the rest of the group. The maintenance of group harmony, then, is facilitated by the avoidance of direct indication of human agents. By indicating the body part (active zone) instead of the individual to whom it belongs (cognitively salient entity) as the agent responsible for a particular act, a speaker can mitigate the negative effects of either blame or praise and preserve social harmony. The Hawaiian language is equipped with a number of features that allow for the indirect indication of agents and the avoidance of over-pointing. The appropriate use of such features reflects the ways of speaking that constitute the shared communicative competence of the speech community, marking it as distinct from other communities. I advocate for the use of such features as a way to avoid the wanton use of calques, capricious overpointing, and the general tendency to speak English in Hawaiian that pervades the language use patterns of second language learners of Hawaiian. I also advocate for their use as an effective strategy for facilitating the maintenance of social harmony.

SPEAKING HAWAIIAN IN HAWAIIAN

The goal that I advocate calls for speaking Hawaiian in Hawaiian. Some of the features Hawaiian offers for facilitating indirect indication of agents are found in the canonical constituent order Verb – Subject – Object, the pervasive use of the passive voice, the choice of stative or intransitive verbs in place of transitive verbs, the choice of non-verbal constructions instead of those that utilize verbs, the use of dual and plural pronouns to spread responsibility to other agents, and the indication of the "active zone" as the true agent responsible for an action, to mention a few. Each of these features allows for the mitigation of agency and was employed copiously in Hawaiian at a time when the language was still viable and, in fact, the lingua franca of the Hawaiian Islands.

In order to maintain the Hawaiian-ness of the Hawaiian language within the current revitalization context, it is necessary to prevent the convergence of Hawaiian and English worldviews. Avoiding the use of L1 strategies to point at agents in L2 contexts represents only half the battle. Hawaiian is not a language that is point-less (i.e., devoid of strategies for pointing at agents). As such, it is also important for the second language learner to recognize Hawaiian ways of pointing that are not part of his or her English default system and incorporate them into a new repertoire. As difficult as it is to break away from L1 habits, many of which operate below the level of awareness, it is just as difficult to acquire new norms in terms of ways of

speaking. The most difficult aspect here is imagining new ways of speaking that do not exist in the default repertoire. The default repertoire, although it does not limit the ideas we are able to conceive, does have a profound influence on them. An English speaker might never imagine the existence of certain Hawaiian ways of pointing unless prompted by exposure to them. Even upon recognizing such ways of speaking as important aspects of Hawaiian worldview, it is not easy to incorporate them into one's repertoire without a full understanding of the appropriate environment for their use. With regard to understanding unfamiliar ways of speaking, or any other aspect of linguistic performance, Duranti (1994) recognized the importance of asking the question "Why this form now?" (pp. 171–2). The examples presented below represent ways of pointing that are not part of my English repertoire. Duranti's question has been instrumental in leading me to my conclusions about Hawaiian ways of pointing and the nature of their use.

HAWAIIAN WAYS OF POINTING

In the story of Kawelo, a chief from the island of Kauaʻi, Kawelo's wife (Kanewahineikiaoha), travels across the island of Oʻahu to the home of her parents in order to ask her father if he would be willing to train Kawelo in the art of kaʻa lāʻau (a style of fighting that utilizes a war club). She has not been home for some time and her father, somewhat surprised to see her there and curious to know why she has arrived, addresses her as follows:

> Aia a pau kau paina ana, alaila, ninau aku au i ka makemake o nei huakai au, e ka maua lei aloha, i hoea mai nei ia nei, o ka au ana mai nei a kou mau wawae i keia loa (Hooulumahiehie, 2009, May 14).
> As soon as your eating is finished, then I will ask about the purpose of this journey, oh beloved child of ours, whereby you have arrived here, your feet having walked for such a great distance.

Before broaching his question, it is clearly important for the father to make sure that his daughter has been properly fed. The translation provided has been intentionally left in an unpolished state in order to illustrate that, instead of assigning agency to his daughter for terminating the eating process (e.g., As soon as you have finished eating…), he uses the stative verb "pau" (to be finished) which allows his statement to focus on the eating as the subject and to avoid setting up Kanewahineikiaoha as the agent. It is quite possible in Hawaiian to choose a transitive verb such as hoʻopau (to finish something) in order to place Kanewahineikiaoha in the subject position, marking her as the agent responsible for finishing the eating:

> Aia a hoʻopau ʻoe i ka pāʻina ʻana, e nīnau au iā ʻoe i kou kumu i hele mai ai i kēia loa a hōʻea mai ma ʻaneʻi.

As soon as you finish eating, I will ask you why you have traveled so far to get here.

So why, then, would the author chose to have Kanewahineikiaoha's father use the stative verb in this context? There are perhaps numerous reasons for doing so but I have focused on the fact that this is a common construction that represents the norm in Hawaiian. This type of encounter (i.e., that involves an inquiry into the purpose of someone's arrival) is commonly found in the old stories and is especially conducive to indirect pointing. Before even getting to the question, however, a minimum of hospitality would require that a visitor be fed. It would seem that the tendency toward indirectness in this type of event is reinforced by the fact that Kanewahineikiaoha must be properly received. The use of the stative verb shields her from the responsibility of expediting the eating process in order to move on to more pressing business. Instead, the eating, as an integral aspect of the welcoming process, becomes the subject of "pau" and the time frame within which it should be conducted is removed from her control.

After recognizing his responsibility to his guest, Kanewahineikiaoha's father foreshadows his question by announcing its contents. He again chooses an indirect path in his inquiry by further shielding his daughter from responsibility for her actions and for any intention related to their execution. He does this by pointing at the journey (huakai) as the subject of "makemake" (generally translated as "desire" or "want") thus passing the buck, so to speak, by attributing whatever intention there might be for making this journey to the journey itself. Even the execution of the journey, which required her to walk for some distance, is not placed directly under her control. That is, instead of pointing directly at her as the agent of "au" (to walk), her feet, as the active zone, are assigned that responsibility. In applying Duranti's question to this situation, it would not seem that the indirectness is motivated by some effort to avoid causing discomfort for Kanewahineikiaoha. It would seem, instead, that in the Hawaiian worldview, indirectness is the norm. With regard to her feet doing the walking, indication of the active zone reflects a worldview in which such entities as feet can shoulder the responsibility of agency and, in some cases, may even be considered to have their own mana'o (intention). The relative frequency, however, with which the overall indirect indication of agents occurs when compared to English, leads me to conclude that indirectness is the norm in Hawaiian.

I will offer one more example that illustrates this overall tendency to mitigate agency in Hawaiian. Many years ago, in a conversation with Josephine Kaleilehua Lindsay, one of a dwindling number of native speaking kūpuna "elders," she began to recount a story she had heard during her youth about a kupua (shape shifter) who lived amongst the people of Waipiʻo

Valley, Hawai'i, and who could take the form of a shark. According to the story, the people were vanishing one by one as they failed to return from their activities in the ocean. The existence of this shark-man was suspected to be the source of the problem and it had to be someone who lived in the valley. As she related the story to me, I found myself increasingly curious as to the nature of this kupua, and was unable to suppress my desire to ask a question of her. Knowing full well that asking a question would be inappropriate and would certainly interrupt the telling of her story, my curiosity got the better of me and I asked her anyway. I wanted to know whether this kupua was inclined to strike on land as well as in the water. Her response was interesting in a number of ways, the most salient of which is the fact that, left to my own devices, I would never have come up with a similar response. What she said was:

> 'A'ole, no ka mea, he ahuwale ko ka 'āina.
> No, because the land has clear visibility.

Although I was immediately able to understand what she meant, I would never have thought to put it that way myself. So why then did she choose to express her idea in that way? I realized then that her worldview differed significantly from my own in that her focus was not placed on the agency of the kupua but was placed instead on this particular quality that is possessed by land. I would have been inclined to say that the kupua would be seen and would not have been able to get away with it. This type of response, however, implies agency at a number of levels. The act of attacking innocent beach goers, the act of witnessing the deed, and the act of getting away all suggest agency in this situation. Thus my habitual compulsion to assign agency to action reflects a different worldview from that of Mrs. Lindsay who, at least ostensibly, has no such compulsion. Any agency denoted by her response lay imbedded in the context of the story and would have to be recovered from the available contextual information because there is no overt indication of agency. I realized that the acquisition of communicative competence in Hawaiian, as exhibited by Mrs. Lindsay, would require an adjustment in worldview. Attending to the norms of pointing at agents in Hawaiian would serve to facilitate the acquisition of communicative competence and to adjust my own worldview so that I might have a similar focus on the attributes of the land and not on the agency implied in the context. There would then be a much greater possibility that I might produce a similar response to that of Mrs. Lindsay when asked a similar question.

METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

A critical aspect of indigenous research methodology is that it must align with the values and purposes of the indigenous community in which the

research is conducted. The researcher, whether intentionally or not, acts as an agent of change. As such, he or she is ultimately accountable to the community and responsible for conducting research that ultimately enhances the community's well being (Smith, 1999). It is necessary for the researcher to position him- or herself in the research in order to ensure that accountability. In Hawaiian research, this is an issue of kuleana (right, responsibility, authority). Who has the kuleana to do research in Hawaiian communities? How is one's position as insider or outsider (in relation to the community) relevant to the issue of kuleana? Who should advocate to/for whom? What kind of impact will the research have on the community? Is there an indigenous way to engage in the production of knowledge?

In presenting my research on the indication of agents in Hawaiian, I decided to write my dissertation in Hawaiian. This was not a difficult decision to make given the fact that I was advocating for a concerted effort among second language learners of Hawaiian to aspire to speak Hawaiian in Hawaiian as we endeavor to revitalize the language and expand its domains of use. It would have been ironically hypocritical at worst or inherently counterintuitive at the least if I had chosen to advocate for the expansion of domains of Hawaiian through the medium of English. However, no other dissertation had yet been written in Hawaiian, even though it is clearly permitted under the policies and procedures of the institution, as listed in the University of Hawaiʻi style guide (Wong, 2004).[13] Transcending issues of hypocrisy, it would have been regrettable if I had chosen to bypass the opportunity to introduce Hawaiian to this new domain. The decision to write in Hawaiian, however, raises the question of kuleana in a number of different ways. As a Hawaiian who is a non-native speaker of Hawaiian, my status as insider or outsider for the Hawaiian speech community is somewhat unclear. One could easily make the case that my path in seeking competence in Hawaiian was markedly different from that of the native speaker and, as such, I should be considered an outsider. This would immediately bring into question my kuleana to engage in this research. Was it appropriate for an outsider to produce the first dissertation in Hawaiian? Was my Hawaiian up to the task? In advocating for Hawaiian language use that privileges Hawaiian worldview particularly in terms of ways of assigning agency, would I be prone to essentializing the Hawaiian-ness of Hawaiian language? What would be the social impact of this research? These and other questions constantly attended my work. Perhaps one of the most haunting questions, though, and one that was inextricably linked to the others, was whether this would be a Hawaiian dissertation or an English dissertation written in Hawaiian.

Again, while advocating for a revitalization effort that recognizes the merits of speaking Hawaiian in Hawaiian, it would be incumbent on me to write a Hawaiian dissertation in Hawaiian. But what does this mean?

There is no precedent, no model to pattern after. Furthermore, it would be pi'ikoi[14] to deviate too drastically from the norms and expectations that mark the genre. In other words, it was necessary to present my research in a format that would be recognizable as a dissertation while, at the same time, attempting to do so in a Hawaiian way. Making room for Hawaiian language and Hawaiian ways of speaking in a well established (and somewhat conservative) Western writing form would certainly require striking a delicate balance between advocacy for change and respect for existing conventions. In recognizing my role as agent of change, it was critical that I make decisions that would be acceptable to both the Native Hawaiian and Western scholarly communities. After all, I still wanted it to be considered a legitimate dissertation and did not want to be accused of hiding behind the Hawaiian (i.e., using the differences between Hawaiian and English to escape the rigor normally associated with an English dissertation). In order to accomplish this, I decided to maintain the canonical structure of an English dissertation while incorporating aspects of Hawaiian language and worldview that could be easily recognizable as such.

A HAWAIIAN DISSERTATION?

My strategy involved incorporating in my writing some ways of speaking normally associated with Hawaiian but not necessarily common to academic writing in English. The most prominent of these, of course, was the use of Hawaiian norms of pointing that would reflect the claims I was making in the main thesis of the dissertation. This strategy yielded a highly mitigated use of agency when compared with English. Pervasive use of the passive voice, which would normally be flagged as insufficiently definitive in English, aligned well with the Hawaiian texts from which my data were drawn. This was also the case for the use of stative and intransitive verbs that allow for a shift in focus away from human agents. Indication of the active zone instead of the cognitively salient entity, indication of dual and plural pronouns, indication of other non-human entities, and the overall avoidance of overpointing all facilitated the mitigation of human agency thereby adding a Hawaiian flavor to the text. This strategy, combined with a copious use of hedging words such as "paha" (perhaps or maybe) and phrases such as "me he mea lā" (it would seem that), allowed for softer claims to be made leaving room for the possibility that mine might not be the last word on the topic. From an English perspective hedging aligns with postmodern epistemology that recognizes the situated, ever evolving, and shifting nature of reality. But, from the Hawaiian perspective, claims are made with an appropriate degree of indirectness that avoids confrontation with opposing views.

Another feature along the same lines was the incorporation of "'ōlelo no'eau" (proverbial expressions) that lend a cryptic sense to some of the arguments and explanations. 'Ōlelo no'eau are ubiquitous in Hawaiian texts.

They serve to make points in an indirect fashion because they are much more figurative than literal. They are, however, widely accepted in that they reflect the intertextuality and intersubjectivity inherent in the schema shared by the members of a speech community. That is to say, they are part of the discourse of a community that can be accepted as given. "Taken together, the sayings offer a basis for an understanding of the essence and origins of traditional Hawaiian values" (Pukui, 1983, p. VII). These ʻōlelo noʻeau are formulaic expression that might be considered cliché in English and inappropriate for scholarly writing. In Hawaiian, however, they play an important role in maintaining Hawaiian values that guide the ways in which we interact with our environment and our fellow/sister human beings. The use of ʻōlelo noʻeau facilitates an overall sense of indirectness that represents the norm in Hawaiian. The cryptic nature of that indirectness, however, challenges the sensibilities of many English academics who tend to place a high value on clarity. According to Grice (1975), the maximization of clarity in communicative interaction is a universal human tendency. From a Western positivistic perspective that aspires to achieve objectivity, lack of clarity is viewed as problematic. From a Hawaiian perspective, though, lack of clarity is a resource that, when skillfully employed by competent Hawaiian speakers, allows for mitigation of behavior that would otherwise be considered mahaʻoi or "presumptuous."[15]

A couple other stylistic points are worth mentioning here although they are not intimately related to the issue of pointing at agents. One is the use of the second person perspective that is common in old Hawaiian writings, particularly in the genre of epic stories that served as the primary source of my data. Addressing the reader directly might be viewed as a rapport-building device that invites the reader to become more intimately involved with the story. In taking on the kuleana of creating a precedent for dissertation writing in Hawaiian, I chose to exploit this as well as some of the other features mentioned above in order to privilege Hawaiian ways of writing while maintaining the more canonical aspects associated with writing an English dissertation. In keeping with the narrative style of my Hawaiian sources, I employed a number of anecdotes to explicate my ideas and retold parts of the original epic stories in order to provide a contextual foundation for analyzing the data. This allowed me to employ a number of literary devices and language use patterns common to Hawaiian narratives, further contributing to the Hawaiian flavor of the dissertation.

One final decision worthy of mention that concerns the write up of my research has to do with the use of newly coined terms. In order to optimize my abilities in Hawaiian and avoid the natural tendency to think in English, I endeavored to write my thoughts directly in Hawaiian without translating from English. The obvious problem here is that, as a native speaker of English, I am more inclined to think first in English. Moreover, my studies

in the area of anthropological linguistics and Hymes' (1974) ethnography of speaking instilled certain habitual ways of understanding and expressing the main concepts of these fields. As a result, I often found myself in need of terminology commonly used to articulate those concepts. Such terminology did not exist in a more traditional version of Hawaiian. Therefore, in order to avoid creating a one to one correspondence between English jargon and the Hawaiian I was using, I made a conscious effort to circumlocute rather than transliterate or fabricate corresponding terms in Hawaiian.

METHODOLOGIES OF INQUIRY

What defines a Hawaiian way of doing research? There is no widely accepted template available to Hawaiian researchers, and it would be unreasonable to assume the existence of such a template as it would only serve to confine the limits of inquiry. It would be even more unreasonable to expect that traditional ways of knowledge production in Hawaiian would mirror those of English. It was for this reason that I found myself drifting away from those methods of inquiry that marked my experience with Western positivistic research traditions. Instead of formulating a research question based on some preexisting hypothesis and examining all the available relevant information that might either support or reject that hypothesis, I was inclined to engage in what I half jokingly refer to as the serendipity approach to the conduct of research; because the discovery of new knowledge via this approach would at first glance appear to involve a bit of luck. Of course, the serendipity approach is not merely dependent on luck. It requires, instead, that the researcher engage with the phenomenological world and recognize, in that experience, answers to questions previously unformulated in any formal way. Implicit in the empirical approach is the existence of a correct answer, either yes or no, to some preformed question. In comparing the two methodologies, it is clear to see the dramatic difference in the level of agency of the researcher. The search for a particular answer places the responsibility on the researcher to engage in actions that will lead to that answer whereas the recognition of answers among the body of one's experience, with or without being guided there by previously formulated questions, represents a more passive endeavor thereby removing the responsibility from the researcher for engaging in active efforts to make a "discovery." Furthermore, the absence of such responsibility removes the possibility of failure in this endeavor. In the serendipity approach, the agency must be assigned to the knowledge itself. It is the knowledge that is responsible for revealing itself to the researcher. This is not luck nor is it a less rigorous approach. The researcher must work to be in a position to receive the knowledge at the point of revelation.

The serendipity approach is, by comparison, less direct than the positivistic empirical approach in that it reflects a more passive stance. It applies to the ambient phenomena experienced by the researcher and not those phenomena he or she actively seeks. This approach seemed to align much more closely with the worldview I was describing as indirect, particularly in terms of the indication of agency. Moreover, the available information on Hawaiian ways of learning suggests that Hawaiians relied on observation and imitation. One learned what one was exposed to of the existing body of knowledge while new knowledge was also receives as opposed to actively sought with specific expectations. The ʻōlelo noʻeau "Nānā ka maka; hoʻolohe ka pepeiao; paʻa ka waha" (Pukui, 1983, p. 248) mentioned earlier in this paper suggests that questions were considered to constitute inappropriate behavior in the Hawaiian learning context. It was not, as in English learning contexts, considered a learning tool intrinsically available to the student. The Hawaiian worldview suggests that the learner is not the master of his or her own fate. By extension, this suggests that Hawaiian research, as we find in the language, also reflects a paucity of agency. I advocate for a new direction in Hawaiian language revitalization that reflects this worldview.

CONCLUSION

Any agent responsible for producing/receiving new knowledge through research must necessarily consider the social implications of that research. There is a responsibility that attends such work and it applies at multiple levels. That is, it transcends the level of content and applies at the methodological level as well. In this case, I am that agent and, as such, I am responsible for both the content and methodology of my research. Serendipitously, the content of my research itself deals with the responsibilities that accrue unto grammatical agents who are indicated as such in Hawaiian. Furthermore, within the content of this research, I have claimed that there is also responsibility attached to the assignation of agency and it is not the same for Hawaiian as it is for English. Pointing at grammatical agents generally involves placing an individual in the proverbial spotlight. This is quite capable of causing an affront to that individual and a level of discomfort similar to that caused by an accusatory finger. I have claimed that norms of language use in Hawaiian call for more indirect indication of agents than found in English and that, by comparison, there is a tendency to overpoint in English. Violation of language use norms in Hawaiian by making overly direct indication of agents can lead to a disturbance of social harmony. It does not make sense to work so hard to revitalize Hawaiian if we confine our attention to grammar and lexicon. I am claiming, and thereby advocating, that proponents of Hawaiian language revitalization also attend to Hawaiian ways of speaking. Furthermore, research on Hawaiian language

should be conducted in ways that are aligned with Hawaiian worldview. I was once asked whether there is room in academia for a dissertation that is for all intents and purposes a position paper. If there was no room then, there is now—and so it should be.

NOTES

1. Bynon (1977) claimed that language change has been systematically studied for a period of one hundred years.
2. The idea of speaking one language in another comes from a rumor about the famous Russian linguist Roman Jakobson who is alleged to have said, "I speak Russian, in seven languages." (Oller, 2000, p. 36) Apparently Jakobson had a heavy Russian accent. I have taken this idea and expanded it beyond the realm of phonology in order to include ways of speaking as, at least in part, implicitly constitutive of one's ability to speak a language.
3. Agar (1994) claims: "You can't *use* a new language unless you change the consciousness that is tied to the old one, unless you stretch beyond the circle of grammar and dictionary, out of the old world and into the new one."
4. See Pukui and Elbert (1986). See also Warner (1999) for a more complete discussion of kuleana.
5. See also Radford (1988) for an extended explanation of noun phrase roles.
6. See Ahearn (2001).
7. See Lucy (1992).
8. It should also be noted that this also applies to any act the leg might happen to commit.
9. For example, an improperly set broken bone in the leg might require resetting and an intentional re-breaking of the bone.
10. See Elbert and Pukui (1979) for extended discussion on stative verbs in Hawaiian.
11. See Odlin (1990) for a discussion of calquing.
12. The verb "to rain" can be either transitive or intransitive. In this example it is intransitive.
13. See University of Hawai'i (2002). It should also be noted here that under the Hawai'i State Constitution, both Hawaiian and English are considered official languages of the State. See State of Hawai'i (1978).
14. This word is defined by Pukui and Elbert (1986) as follows: "To claim honors not rightfully due, to seek preferment, to aspire to the best or to more than is one's due; to claim to be of higher rank than one is" (p. 327).

15. The word "maha'oi" can be translated literally as "protruding forehead" and gives the sense of butting into someone else's business.

REFERENCES

Agar, M. 1994. *Language shock: Understanding the culture of conversation.* New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Ahearn, L. M. (2001). Language and agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 30,* 109–137.

Bynon, T. (1977). *Historical linguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, K. W. (1993). Samoan as an active zone language. Paper presented at the Seminar on Indigenous Languages at the Autonomous National University of Mexico, Mexico City, Mexico.

Duranti, A. (1994). *From grammar to politics: Linguistic anthropology in a Western Samoan village.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Elbert, S. H., & Pukui M. K. (1979). *Hawaiian grammar.* Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics, vol. 3: Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press.

Hawai'i State Constitution, Official Languages, Article XV, Section 4.

Hooulumahiehie-i-ka-oni-malie-a-pua-lilia-lana-i-ka-wai. (1909–1910). Ka moolelo hiwahiwa o Kawelo. *Kuokoa Home Rula.* [Cited in text as Hooulumahiehie].

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride, & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–285). Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Keenan, E. L. (1984). Semantic correlates of the ergative/absoutive distinction. *Linguistics, 22,* 197–223.

Lucy, J. A. (1992). *Language diversity and thought: A reformulation of the linguistic relativity hypothesis.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

NeSmith, R. K. (2003). Tūtū's Hawaiian and the emergence of a neo-Hawaiian language. *'Ōiwi: A Native Hawaiian Journal, 3,* 68–76.

Odlin, T. (1990). Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oller, D. K. (2000). *The emergence of the speech capacity.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pukui, M. K. & Elbert, S. (1986). *Hawaiian dictionary.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Pukui, M. K. (1983). *'Ōlelo No'eau: Hawaiian proverbs and poetical sayings.* Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.

Radford, A. (1988). *Transformational grammar: A first course.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples.* London: Zed Books Ltd.

University of Hawai`i. (2002). *University of Hawai'i style gude.* Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i.

Warner, S. L. N. (1999). Kuleana: The right, responsibility, and authority of indigenous people to speak and make decisions for themselves in language and cultural revitalization. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 30*(1), 68–93.

Warner, S. L. N. (2001). The movement to revitalize Hawaiian language and culture. In L. Hinton, & K. Hale (Eds.), *The green book of language revitalization in practice* (pp. 133–144). San Diego: Academic Press.

Whorf, B. L. (1956). *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf* (J. B. Carroll, Ed.). Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Wilson, W. H., & Kamanā, K. (2001). Mai loko mai o ka ʻiʻini: Procceding from a dream. In L. Hinton & K. Hale (Eds.), *The green book of language revitalization in practice* (pp. 147–176). San Diego: Academic Press.

Wong, K. L. (1999). Authenticity and the revitalization of Hawaiian. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 30*(1), 94–115.

Wong, K. L. (2004). He hāwaʻe kai nui a kau ma kula. *Educational perspectives, 37*(1), 31–39.

Wong, K. L. (2006). *Kuhi aku, kuhi mai, kuhi hewa ē: He mau loina kuhikuhi ākena no ka ōlelo Hawaiʻi.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation in Linguistics. University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa.