
Malcolm Naea Chun has been accomplishing important work in the most difficult and exacting areas of Hawaiian studies: the discovery of materials and the publication and translation of Hawaiian-language texts. For instance, besides the books under review, *I ka Wa o Kamehameha* (Kamakau 1988) makes available five essays by the important nineteenth-century writer Samuel M. Kamakau in both the original Hawaiian and English translation, along with a biographical sketch and a list of Kamakau’s newspaper articles not already published in a bibliography. Such work provides a valuable basis for further research.

No single Hawaiian-language work has been more influential than David Malo’s *Ka Moolelo Hawaii*, written in the 1840s, circulated widely in manuscript copies, and translated with notes by Nathaniel B. Emerson (Malo 1951), but never before published in the original Hawaiian. Born in 1795 and attached to a high chiefly court, Malo received a classical Hawaiian education from at least one of the encyclopedically learned men of the time. In his book, Malo preserved not only a vast amount of detailed information about Hawaiian culture, but formulated it in the classical educational genres, such as vocabulary groups and lists. His work was highly appreciated by other Hawaiians. Writing probably in the 1880s, Bicknell (n.d.:3) repeats what was perhaps only a rumor about Kalākaua:

The King, it is reported, is striving to bring the system of fetish worship into a concise form of which he shall be the acknowledged head. In the palace is a small room the only furniture in which is a table with a book lying upon it. The book is David Malo’s history of Hawaiian traditions and legends, which after his death came into his daughter’s possession; the King obtained it through her husband, John Kapena.

Usually, before reading, a circuit of the table is made seven times, after which the book is opened with a show of reverence, and then the credulous owner of the sanctum holds converse, in imagination, with the gods and demi-gods. This book is the basis of the present Hale Naua.

Malo’s book was used extensively by other nineteenth-century Hawaiian writers. Dorothy Barrère goes so far as to call it the “skeleton upon which Kamakau and I’i put clothes” (Finney et al. 1978:312). Malo’s book continues to be a prime source for scholars and students today,
with the important difference that most are able to read it only in translation.

Emerson’s translation is a valuable document in itself, based on his extensive knowledge of Hawaiian language and culture and his wide acquaintance with knowledgeable Hawaiians of his day. Moreover, he was able to add considerable material from other sources in his notes. No translation, however, is a substitute for the original, and the use of Emerson without reference to Malo’s Hawaiian text is improper. For instance, the claimed basis in Malo of some widespread opinions—that commoners did not keep genealogies and that women were less religious than men, among others—can be challenged from the original text. Moreover, passages that bear on current discussions can be overlooked because of mistranslation, as I have shown for the subject of women as the creators of feather ornaments (Charlot 1991:146, n. 11).

Malo’s form is even more vulnerable to problems of translation than his content. For instance, he often uses the classical educational form of lists composed very strictly and regularly for ease of memorization. This use of form is sometimes perceptible in Emerson’s translation (for example, Malo 1951:45ff.; Malo n.d.: ch. XV, sects. 5–20); in other cases, it is completely concealed (such as Malo 1951:44; Malo n.d.: ch. XIV, sects. 15–17). The loss is major: content is distorted, the original memorized forms are hidden, and Malo’s own style and use of traditional materials is obscured. The basic impression made on the reader by the original text is lost.

The Hawaiian text of Malo’s book, in view of its intrinsic importance and extensive influence both earlier and today, clearly requires a scholarly edition based on all available manuscripts and provided with a critical apparatus. A close translation should be done along with a detailed commentary using all of Malo’s writings, other nineteenth-century sources, and the work of Emerson and others. Only such a full treatment can adequately define Malo’s thinking and style, separate the materials he received from his own additions and views, and evaluate his writings as sources. Such a treatment would also make possible an evaluation of Malo’s writings as influences on the history of Hawaiian thought and, usually through Emerson’s translation, on modern scholarly and popular descriptions of Hawaiian culture.

Chun’s edition, *Ka Moʻolelo Hawaiʻi (Hawaiian Antiquities)*, is an important first step towards such a goal: a transcription of the manuscript that he considers the best available (pp. xxi–xxv). The handwriting of the manuscript is difficult, and Chun’s transcription provides a useful reading copy. For exact scholarly work, however, the original
manuscript must still be consulted because the transcription contains a number of errors including misreadings, many of which affect the sense,¹ and omissions.²

There are also unmarked editorial changes and inconsistencies. Connections between words are irregular in the manuscript and are changed irregularly in the transcription. The punctuation of the manuscript is followed more regularly but sometimes omitted. Capitals are irregularly changed. Arabic instead of roman numerals are used for the chapter numbers, and added for the first. Chun follows Emerson’s correction of the numbering of the manuscript: from XXXVIII 56, 56 [bis], 57, 58, 59, 61 to 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61. Chun has moved Malo’s table of contents from the back to the front of the book but has not adjusted his translation of the title: “Contents of the Foregoing.” Editorial brackets are used for several purposes—e.g., for Malo’s own superscript additions to the texts (XVIII 51, XXII 2) and for Chun’s additions to or corrections of the text (II 11, XVII 8, XVIII 50, XXI 3, XXII 1)—so the reader is not always sure who is writing what. Furthermore, brackets are used regularly to change lii to [a]lii and kua to [a]kua, but both are recognized, respectively, as a short form and a variant (Pukui and Elbert 1986: li‘i 2, kua 6).

That errors have escaped such a careful worker as Chun demonstrates the imperative need for teamwork on Hawaiian language texts, especially in view of the increasing activity in publishing educational materials. A single person cannot adequately proofread a text in Hawaiian or any other language, which—in view of the shortage of people with the requisite knowledge, training, and experience—largely explains the problems with most publications of Polynesian texts, including my own.

Chun provides a useful introduction and biographical sketch of Malo along with a checklist of articles by and about him (this difference is not indicated). Further articles by Malo can be added to this list, such as Malo 1843a, 1843b, and 1844. The location of the manuscript “He buke no ka oihana kula” is not provided (p. xviii).

Chun’s Hawaiian Medicine Book, He Buke Laau Lapaau is an example of the wide current interest in Hawaiian medicine, a subject of intrinsic interest and an area in which Hawaiian expertise was arguably superior to its contemporary Western counterpart. Hawaiian medicine was closely connected to Hawaiian culture, worldviews, and religious and other practices, and was transmitted in a variety of literary forms, such as chants, stories, genealogies, descriptions, instructions, and case reports. Hawaiian Medicine Book is therefore a valuable source for a number of fields.
Chun has done extensive research in Hawaiian medicine and related areas, such as plants. This background is obviously useful in his translation of the often extraordinarily difficult and concise Hawaiian text. Among my very few disagreements, I mention Chun’s translation of kiaki kuki iuka as “guards the kuki in the uplands” (p. 45, n. 15); I would choose the alternative possibility, “the kuki in the uplands guards,” based on the pattern in the Kumulipo (Beckwith 1972:188, l. 36 and parallels). Some of Chun’s translations are summarizing or explanatory rather than close (e.g., p. 32, par. 7). The translation on pages 45–46 does not follow the format of the original on page 11. Page 3, paragraph 1 (Hele ia, aole . . . mamuli o ke ola) has not been translated. The Hawaiian text for the English translation on page 59 (“Ka. This is . . .”) through page 60 is missing from page 19. Chapter headings seem to be added (as well as the explanation in parentheses on p. 63, par. 2), but I have not checked Chun’s transcription against the original newspaper articles, and he does not provide full bibliographical information on them.

Finally, the design of the book—with its distribution of materials and use of the same typeface and size—does not enable the reader to tell at a glance whether he is reading the translation or introductory or explanatory material.

Again, many of the above problems could be solved by trained publishing teams. Chun deserves every credit for being a pioneer in work that he amply demonstrates is important.

NOTES

1. Examples of misreadings: I 3, Chun hookuka instead of manuscript hookuke; II 9, naau instead of naauao; V 16, papamu instead of papanui; VI 4, hookokoli instead of hookokoli; VI 7, hanu instead of mau; XIII 8, iwa instead of inoa; XIII 17, inoa instead of moa (the pen slipped, but the sense is clear from the context); XIV 2, ono instead of ano; XV 18, i ano instead of ia ono; XVII 6, hoi instead of koi; XVIII 3, huna instead of hewa (difficult to read but clear in the context); XVIII 18, ila uku instead of ila muku (for ilamuku); XVIII 30, kialoa instead of kialoa; XIX 32, kalo instead of lako; XXXII 1, hana instead of kane; XXXVI 18, apu instead of pa u; and XXXVII 89, kcili instead of kuili (for the name of a ceremony).

2. Omissions: II 11, missing after a he pele: no ma na moku a pau ma keia moana, o na pohaku a pau, he pohaku; IV 5, missing after Kuaihelani: na aina ma na pale, o Ului; XVIII 74, missing after akamai: loa, ua kapaia laikou he mai au, he poe akamai; and XXXI, sect. 14 is missing.
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