

# JEAN CHARLOT'S HAWAIIAN-LANGUAGE PLAYS<sup>1</sup>

John Charlot

*University of Hawai'i at Mānoa*

The artist and writer Jean Charlot (8 February 1898—20 March 1979) was born in Paris and worked in France, Mexico, the continental United States, and the Pacific. In each place, he studied the local and indigenous cultures as a scholar and expressed his insights in the visual arts and literature. Charlot arrived in Hawai'i in 1949 and made it his home until his death, producing a large and multi-genred body of work on Hawaiian history and culture.

The publication of Charlot's *Two Hawaiian Plays, Hawaiian English*<sup>2</sup> was an event in the history of Hawaiian literature, as it made available the first piece of extensive modern Hawaiian prose and, to my knowledge, the first formal, published plays in the Hawaiian language.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the bilingual technique and format of the plays were designed as models for future works. In this article, I will discuss briefly only some aspects of the plays.

## INTEREST IN LANGUAGE

Although Charlot is best known as a visual artist, he produced in fact more literary works than many writers.<sup>4</sup> He authored not only scholarly books and articles, but creative literature as well, including a large body of poetry.<sup>5</sup> As an adolescent, he seriously considered poetry as his life vocation and had to make a conscious decision to devote himself primarily to the visual arts.

He did not, however, lose the poet's special interest in and sensitivity to language. He learnt German, Spanish, English, Náhuatl, and Hawaiian, and produced works in all but German. He was particularly attentive to the unique qualities and expressive potentialities of a given language and attempted to exploit these in his writings.

Significantly, he early became interested in languages or stages of languages that had not yet been fixed, stabilised, and strictly regulated by reduction to writing or by a process of classical purification. As an

adolescent, he read widely in French Mediaeval writers and the Pleiad, whose style he found richer and more flexible than that of Malherbian classicism. He recalls the expressive phrase *nu à nu*, used of a couple in bed, a phrase that is impossible in modern, corrected French. Although this interest was without conscious influences, it can be considered part of a wide trend in the French poetry of the time to enrich and re-invigorate the attenuated classical tradition, a trend observable, for example, in Paul Claudel.

In Charlot's view, and that of others, Hawaiian language and literature in the 1950s and 1960s were in a state of tension between the language of native speakers and the older texts—which is characterised by freedom and variability of construction and usage—and attempts to fix the living language by imposing a system and standard of correctness. Charlot compared this academic Hawaiian to *Hochdeutsch* and considered it an almost inevitable result of the modern Western academic approach to language. Charlot's sympathies lay solidly with the unregulated language. In his plays, he included and carefully preserved through the editing process examples of variability and non-'standard' construction and usage.<sup>6</sup> An indication of the tension mentioned above was that readers made more corrections in the sections Charlot had quoted verbatim from nineteenth-century Hawaiian writers than in those sections that he had freely composed himself.

Basic to Charlot's opting for non-academic Hawaiian was his appreciation of what he regarded as its special qualities. The vehicle of the spoken word is the breath of life. The word emerges *mai nei loko*, from the insides, the seat of emotion and truthfulness. The breath, in Hawaiian thinking, is related to the winds, which also have personalities and speak. Once voiced, the word lives on only in the memory. The experience of oral communication is the basis for a 'magical' view of language, in which words have some real connection to their referents and thus an efficacy for good or ill. A call receives an answer. A name reveals a person and a destiny. The power of an achieved prayer flies to its goal. This view of language is still a living element of the thinking of many Hawaiians.

The creative freedom of the living Hawaiian language is one with that of Hawaiian thought. Charlot contrasted the familiar fixed linearity of modern European languages with 'Pacific languages ... closer to post-Euclidean lines, contrasting, expanding, with distortions

as complex and boneless as are the motions of a cephalopod.<sup>7</sup> Detouring allusions and suggestions, plays on words, evocations of related forms and occurrences, are means of thought as well as of communication. Comprehension demands the listener's engagement in a proffered complex network touching numerous sensibilities.

Important among these is the visual, for which Charlot was peculiarly apt. His interest in the conjunction of word and image can be traced back to his childhood, when he learnt drawing and writing simultaneously and combined them in his compositions. He early studied the art of Mediaeval churches—the Bible of the illiterate—and Náhuatl picture-writing from the codices of his uncle Eugène Goupil's famous collection at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris.<sup>8</sup> In his own painting, he sought to define expressive symbols, such as 'Work and Rest': as the kneeling mother moves backward and forward the stone roller before her to spread the tortilla dough, the baby on her back is rocked gently to sleep. Chinese and Japanese calligraphy naturally interested Charlot<sup>9</sup> (he at one time planned to learn Chinese), and he considered the scroll a form of great potential for the notation of living speech. Hawaiian petroglyphs, which Charlot interpreted in the context of Hawaiian thought,<sup>10</sup> were, he believed, the first steps in the development of a system of writing that would have been truly appropriate to the language, a development stopped by the awkward imposition of the Latin alphabet.

## INTEREST IN ORAL TRADITIONS

Charlot was early interested in oral historical traditions. He remembered an old lady, an early model, whose father had been present at the violent night arrest of Robespierre in 1794. From her account, Charlot remembered a detail that would have no place in academic histories, but that deeply appealed to him: when Robespierre, with his ghastly jaw wound, was laid on a table, the lamp above it was set swinging.

On a visit to Brittany early in World War I, Charlot copied down at least one song of a Breton folk singer. In Mexico, Charlot became a close friend of Luz Jiménez, an important Aztec informant.<sup>11</sup> Charlot was therefore ready to appreciate oral Hawaiian historical traditions, such as those found in Sheldon Dibble's *Ka Mooolo Hawai'i*.<sup>12</sup> A detail from that work that struck Charlot as typical of oral traditions

and interests, as opposed to those of academic history, is the story of the boy who ate Captain James Cook's entrails thinking them those of a dog.<sup>13</sup> A primary interest of oral tradition for Charlot was clearly its appeal to the visual and dramatic.

Moreover, oral history was the means by which both native Mexicans and Hawaiians transmitted their side of the story of their first contacts with Europeans. Charlot said that his experience in Mexico prepared him to look for Hawaiian native accounts, which would differ considerably from histories based only on European sources.<sup>14</sup> In Hawai'i as in Mexico, the interpretation of that contact and James Cook's death is of actual significance for ethnic consciousness, since a Western-oriented understanding of those events has been used to undermine Hawaiian cultural confidence.

## INTEREST AND TASTE IN THEATRE

French classical theatre is, of course, a central study of every French schoolboy.<sup>15</sup> Charlot quickly expanded his reading to the playwrights who preceded Corneille: Jodelle, Théopile de Viaud, and, most important for him, Cyrano de Bergerac. Paul Claudel soon became a continuing influence.

Parallel to Charlot's own creative play-writing from the middle 1950s through the early 1960s, he read a wide variety of plays and books on theatre. The authors I remember being of greatest interest were Aristophanes, Shakespeare, Jonson, and the Beckett of *Waiting for Godot*. He was also intrigued by Japanese Kabuki, Noh, and puppet theatre, as well as by early Samurai movies. Shakespeare was, however, by far his greatest interest.

His reading indicates his taste. He felt little sympathy for naturalism. 'Not exactly slice of life,' was what he would say of something momentous. On the other hand, he was not attracted to high, purified tragedy. He once remarked that he could easily believe Molière a great classic, but had difficulties according Corneille and Racine the same rank. For the purposes of this article, I will use the label 'classical comedy' for that group of plays that interested Charlot and that can be placed between naturalism and tragedy.

Among the aspects that attracted him was certainly the humour that comes from the perspective of genius on the everyday world. Another attraction of classical comedy was its inclusion of different



levels of society. Charlot read Victor Ehrenberg's *The People of Aristophanes*<sup>16</sup> and particularly enjoyed Jonson's low-life scenes. In his Hawaiian plays, Charlot carefully differentiated the social levels of his characters by their modes of speech and thought. In *Laukiamanuikahiki*, the two low-born guards contrast with the chiefs Maki'i'oe'oe and Kahiki'ula. *Na Lono Elua* is constructed in three acts, each devoted to a different social level. As often in classical comedy, the lower social levels are frequently treated with humour: in Charlot's case, always affectionate.

An originality of Charlot's is that the few characters who are hard to place socially—because of ambiguous birth or uncategorisable manners and conduct—are either markedly religious, like Laukiamanuikahiki, or artistic, like Kawelo in the English *Na'auao*. The social indefinability of these characters within a highly structured society—a quality perceptible in the Hawaiian traditions about them—may have been a reason Charlot was attracted to them as subjects. That he then interpreted them as religious or artistic enables us to apprehend the limits he placed on strictly social values and classifications.

Another important aspect of classical comedy is its strong artistic form. As a visual artist, Charlot paid great attention to craft and to the exigencies of a given medium. When working on a project such as ceramics or copper repoussé with a technical assistant, he regarded the creative—at times even transformative—contribution of the other person as integral to the work, not as a mere realisation of his idea. A parallel can be found in Charlot's incorporation into *Laukiamanuikahiki* of the changes made by the actors during its production. While editing the plays, I had to be prevented by him several times from returning to a more literal, less dramatic, use of his sources. Charlot anticipated, in fact would have welcomed, the changes a production of *Na Lono Elua* would occasion.

In his writings on art, Charlot continually emphasised that art is not a mirror. A Freudian interpretation of *Hamlet* is as naive as a botanical discussion of a painted apple. He was delighted by the way Tom Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* revealed the non-naturalness, the artifice, or the craft of *Hamlet*. He pointed out to me how unnaturalistic it is for Hickey to fall asleep on the stairs at the end of the first act of Eugene O'Neil's *The Iceman Cometh*.<sup>17</sup>

In Charlot's aesthetics, a medium has its own beauty, which should

not be obscured by a produced illusion. Even more, a medium generates a seemingly spontaneous power of its own, if handled properly. In this context can be understood Charlot's adoption of extremely non-naturalistic dramatic conventions.<sup>18</sup>

Similarities can easily be found between Charlot's Hawaiian plays, especially *Na Lono Elua*, and Greek theatre, such as the limited number of speakers in any one scene, the chorus-like use of the crowd in *Na Lono Elua*, the exclusion of violent action from the stage, the tragic flaw of Captain James Cook, and the ritual interpretation of the latter's death. The spareness, the majestic pace, the unhurried but undistracted setting of the scene for the final furious solution also strike me as Greek.

Monologue is used extensively in the plays that particularly interested Charlot, and an increasing use of monologue can be observed in his own work. *Moa A Mo'i* has the fewest. More were employed in *U'i A U'i* in anticipation of its possible use as a libretto. Monologues became a key and expert device in *Na'auao* and in the unpublished English-language *Laukiamanuikahiki*. A difference can be noted between the monologues of *Na'auao* and *Na Lono Elua*: the latter, but not the former, are story-telling. Western and Japanese parallels can, of course, be found for these, especially stage-side narrators in Japanese theatre or the party historian in the film *Samurai Assassin*. But a more conscious and proximate influence is the Hawaiian story-telling form itself. Charlot once remarked that, in both Hawaiian plays, he attempted to depart as little as possible from the traditional art of the Hawaiian story-tellers and that he considered that medium peculiarly appropriate for conveying Hawaiian thought.

An important purpose of the plays was the presentation of Hawaiian art forms within their traditional settings: individual story-telling, dance, chant, and puppet hula, as well as the visual arts in the staging. Moreover, an attempt to revitalise and display the usefulness of Hawaiian art forms can be observed in the use of the puppet for the Owl in *Laukiamanuikahiki*, based on the *hula ki'i*, puppet hula, a theme of several of Charlot's oil paintings.<sup>19</sup>

The above art forms are not, however, presented as stylistically foreign artefacts against a general Western naturalistic background. The whole atmosphere of the plays is informed by the Hawaiian story-telling genre, as claimed above. A visual parallel can be found in Charlot's Leeward Community College mural, in which all the natural

forms—human, plant, rock, and water—are informed by the Hawaiian arts included in the picture: bowls, poi pounders, tapa beaters, gourds, surfboards, and petroglyphs. A genuine stylistic unity is thus achieved in both the plays and the mural.

A further and most important advantage of a very conventionalised theatre is that its very removal from naturalism enables one to express more convincingly a religious view of life. The *deus ex machina* and the Noh ghost do not rend the æsthetic fabric. In *U'i A U'i*, we can laugh with the goddess Pele at how she teaches men to believe in her.<sup>20</sup> The providence that devises Laukiamanui kahiki's happy ending and Maki'i'oe'oe's final wisdom, the priests' theologoumena *re* Captain James Cook, all have their contextual reasonableness, the result of an achieved stylistic unity.

#### SCHOLARSHIP, VERBAL AND VISUAL ARTS, AND THE HAWAIIAN PLAYS

Charlot concluded soon after coming to Hawai'i that he could not understand Hawaiian culture or express his understanding of it through visual means alone.<sup>21</sup> Even in Mexico, where more abundant visual evidence of the native culture has survived, he learnt and used Náhuatl. An important subject of his art was the *Volador*, the native Meso-American dancer pausing atop a high pole to chant before jumping to twirl by his tethered feet to the ground. This was the moment when the deep, silently meditative culture of the Náhua burst into verbal expression. Similarly, in Hawai'i, Charlot chose subjects in which the culture peaks into speech: the chanter at the drum or gourd and the puppet hula. The conjunction of art and speech can be considered characteristic of Charlot's work, part of his general preoccupation with particular cultural forms of universal human activities and experiences, a preoccupation that is the context, I believe, for his scholarly work.

Charlot's scholarly works on Hawai'i did not completely satisfy his need for verbal expression. He turned first to creative writing in English on Hawaiian subjects. The choice of drama as the form employed was, of course, important for the later decision to write Hawaiian-language plays. Charlot's intensive work on the English plays satisfied his habitual need to do creative work in a field that had

long interested him as a student. Characteristically, he involved himself in every aspect of the production of *Na'auao*: he designed, and at times made, sets, costumes, and props. The plays were, in fact, composed with the mental eye as well as the ear, and his drawings and illustrations are essential for understanding them.<sup>22</sup> Drama is clearly a form in which his various talents can be employed simultaneously.

Charlot's long experience as a classroom student of Hawaiian language at the University of Hawai'i and as a collaborator on and illustrator of a number of publications forms an important part of the background of his creative Hawaiian-language works. He wrote prose,<sup>23</sup> translated poetry,<sup>24</sup> and included Hawaiian chants in his English plays. His original comic hula *Hula 'Ulala* became well known.<sup>25</sup> The model conversations used as classroom teaching aids could be considered mini-dramas. Contemporary English-language plays were translated into Hawaiian by the students.<sup>26</sup> The story of Laukiamanui kahiki was used in class in a simplified form similar to Charlot's play.<sup>27</sup> He naturally chose dramatic moments to illustrate, such as the battle of Pele and Kamapua'a, and Kamalālāwalu's meeting with Halemano.<sup>28</sup>

Also important is Charlot's own wide reading and research in published and unpublished writings. He had a flair for ferreting out important and neglected materials. He saw the dramatic possibilities, not only in narrative hulas and puppet hulas, but in the, to my knowledge, previously unrecognised 'dramatic' dialogues in prose writings. To illustrate this point, I could mention that a University of Hawai'i Hawaiian-language student was advised in 1974 (by someone who had been a negative reader for a press of Charlot's plays) to compose a play using Hawaiian sources for the Captain Cook Bicentennial play contest. The student reported that he could not find any dramatic potential in the texts! Charlot's plays enable us to read Dibble, Samuel K. Kamakau, and Kepelino with new eyes.<sup>29</sup>

Drama has specific advantages for Hawaiian-language materials, besides its connection to older Hawaiian genres. Most important, the actor-audience relationship of live theatre is similar to that of the speaker and listener in oral story-telling. Also, a dramatic presentation escapes from the usual restricted setting of Hawaiian studies; it becomes a public event. Charlot was committed to perpetuating and spreading Hawaiian culture, not as an artefact or relic, but as a living reality. A young Hawaiian once told me that many scholars were

interested in Hawaiians as they once were, but my father appreciated the feeling of Hawaiians today that they still embody their cultural values.

An expression of Charlot's desire to make Hawaiian culture available to those who do not speak the language is his use of stage-side English readers to provide 'subtitles' after the Hawaiian speeches. In the production of *Laukiamanuikahiki*, the readers were helpful and undisturbing, acceptable as part of the non-illusionistic craft of the play.<sup>30</sup> The English readers do not provide literal renderings of the Hawaiian (one woman complained of the bad translations). Specifically Hawaiian literary techniques, such as repetition and allusions to sayings, are omitted. Often a point is expressed that is only suggested in the Hawaiian. A noticeable advance in technique is observable in *Na Lono Elua*, in which some stage business is often provided to link the Hawaiian with the English or to carry through the English into the next Hawaiian speech.

#### THE COMPOSITION OF *LAUKIAMANUIKAHIKI*

*Laukiamanuikahiki* is based on a story in Fornander,<sup>31</sup> which contains considerable complication, interpreted by Charlot as the result of accretions.<sup>32</sup> The Fornander original consists of two stories that have been joined by processes typical of oral tradition. The two stories are quite different; in the former, *Laukiamanuikahiki* is a charming innocent girl and, in the latter, a vengeful wife and sorceress. Charlot suppressed the second story entirely, but retained a theme made explicit in its chants: *Laukiamanuikahiki*'s religiosity.<sup>33</sup> In the play, however, religion takes the form of a providence visible only in its results, and *Laukiamanuikahiki*'s actions are the fruits, not of calculation or advice as in the story,<sup>34</sup> but of a spontaneity that, on a deeper level, is really a responsiveness to the promptings of the gods. To strengthen this theme, several stereotyped 'naturalistic' motivations of the original are suppressed, such as the heroine's desire to escape her foster-father's beatings.

Charlot considerably reduced the large cast and wide family relationships of the original. For dramatic simplicity, the several companions of *Laukiamanuikahiki* were gradually reduced to the Owl, and minor relatives were suppressed altogether. The wife of

Maki'i'oe'oe was omitted, thus intensifying the theme of his loneliness. Kahiki'ula was made a stranger, rather than Maki'i'oe'oe's son and the heroine's half-brother.

Charlot completely reworked the character of Maki'i'oe'oe, as can be seen from the fact that in the original it is he who brings Laukiamanuikahiki and Kahiki'ula together. In the play, Maki'i'oe'oe begins as cavalier to Hina and not wholly respectful toward or believing in the power of the gods. As he grows older and lonelier, he yearns for his abandoned daughter. At the end, he sees both that providence has fulfilled his every unconsidered requirement and that he has lost the daughter he longed for. The process by which human beings are convinced of the power of the gods was a theme in *U'i A U'i*. The father's loss of his daughter can be found in *Na'auao* and is greatly expanded in the English *Laukiamanuikahiki*.<sup>35</sup>

Charlot added to the story the theme of the significance of names in Hawaiian thought, an aspect that particularly interested him. A key emotional experience for him was reading in Queen Emma's autograph letters that she signed herself Kaleleokalani, 'The Flight of the Chief,' after the death of her son, and later, after the death of her husband, Kaleleonālani, 'The Flight of the Chiefs.' He was amazed at how expressive such a small change could be. Charlot followed Hawaiian practice in creating original Hawaiian names for some of his grandchildren. The idea that a name expresses and prophesies character and destiny, and is even an active factor in a person's life, can be clearly linked to the theme of providence, as it is in certain stories of the Bible. Charlot's interest in names can also be considered part of his general interest in the role of language in life.

In writing *Laukiamanuikahiki*, Charlot developed a technique that he used later in *Na Lono Elua*.<sup>36</sup> He began by copying and typing all the dialogue and potential dialogue in the Hawaiian original. Below the typed Hawaiian line, he wrote his own English translation in pencil. He then blocked out all his scenes, giving the story a structure somewhat different from the original and displacing the extracted dialogue to fit his new form. A working copy was then composed, in which a Hawaiian line was typed and underlined in pencil. A corresponding English line was placed underneath. The English lines are fairly complete. The Hawaiian lines are either: a) quotations from the Fornander text, taken from the extracts mentioned above; b) some short original sections, which are typed; c) some apparently more

tentative original sections written in light pencil; or d) a large number of blank spaces, more numerous at the beginning of the play than toward the end. Significantly, Maki'i'oe'oe's last line, which expresses a central theme of the play, is an original formulation by Charlot.

This working copy was given to Samuel H. Elbert, who amended all the included Hawaiian—both Charlot's original formulations and the quotations from Fornander—and filled in the blanks. Charlot then made some small changes in the Hawaiian and added material. This version was then typed, some further simplifications were effected, the stage directions were expanded, especially to clarify the technique of the English readers, and the English lines were improved. The play was then printed privately.

The next large revision of the play resulted from the invaluable experience of staging it. Charlot wrote continuously in his stage copy, which was then used as a basis for the final edition. Stage directions were amplified, and the co-ordination of the English readers perfected. The introductory English lines were considerably expanded, and the English dialogue lines received many changes.

Most important was the contribution of the Hawaiian-speaking actors. When Charlot asked one woman how she was learning her lines, she replied that she had changed them all around and memorised them very easily. Most of these changes were small, but important moves toward a more idiomatic style, as in the use of such words as *Tza*, *nō*, *paha*, and the directionals, which have always interested Charlot as a peculiarity of Polynesian languages. The chanter Ka'upena Wong, who played Maki'i'oe'oe, was provided with the chants with which he opens and closes the play. The duet chant of Laukiamanuikahiki and Owl, played by singer and song-scholar Noelani Māhoe, was added to Scene 5 and expanded in the final edition. The good stage business of the finger counting was added to Scene 2.

The last scene was reworked to emphasise further the themes of Maki'i'oe'oe's recognition of providence and realisation of his loss. In the earlier version of the play, he entered as Laukiamanuikahiki and Kahiki'ula were exiting. In the stage version, he enters earlier and sees them embrace. Whereas before, he had simply mentioned the recognition tokens he had demanded his daughter obtain from the gods, he now refers to them in detail. He chants and then speaks his

last line. This very effective sequence of chant and speech was used later to conclude *Na Lono Elua*.

The above is merely a summarising sketch of some of the main lines of the process of composition. Charlot continually reworked his material, even into the final galleys. A complete study would require a variorum edition. The final folk-like simplicity of the play was achieved only by the great effort of Charlot and those who helped him.

### THE COMPOSITION OF *NA LONO ELUA*

The process of composition was even longer and more complicated for the three-act *Na Lono Elua*, which is based on more than one source.<sup>37</sup> Charlot began as he did with *Laukiamanuikahiki*: dialogue and potential dialogue were extracted from Dibble and Kamakau. The Hawaiian was typed on one page and his own translations were typed (with some pencil additions) on another page, which was set to face the page of Hawaiian.<sup>38</sup> In the left margin of the Hawaiian were written in pencil the topics mentioned in the Hawaiian text. Charlot has marked some passages and topics for inclusion or omission.

The play was then cast into shape as an English one-act play, originally entitled *Ka Moolelo o Lono*, of twenty typescript pages.<sup>39</sup> A one-page typed outline for this gives the three scenes, as the acts in the final version, and, below, a list of the topics to be included in each, with manuscript revisions. The topics are derived largely from those marked in the margins of Charlot's extracts from his Hawaiian sources.<sup>40</sup>

The English one-act play was then used as a basis for the Hawaiian text.<sup>41</sup> A folder contains the English sheets on the right and facing them, on the left, the sheets with the Hawaiian text of the speeches. This Hawaiian text is composed of both quotations from the Hawaiian sources and original sections; that is, Charlot is responsible for this entire first Hawaiian text, rather than only sections as in *Laukiamanuikahiki*. There are pencil additions to both the Hawaiian and the English.

The Hawaiian and English were for the first time put on the same sheets in the next typing of the play, sometimes marked Text A. A wide left-hand margin is provided for the English, and a wide right-hand margin is provided for the Hawaiian. This preserves the spatial



orientation of the notes and the version mentioned in the last paragraph and is the germ of the final lay-out.

One photocopy of Text A was given to Samuel Elbert and Koana Wilcox and another to Dorothy Kahananui. Their comments and extensive changes occasioned the most thoroughgoing refashioning of the text. Charlot always spoke and wrote with particular appreciation of Dorothy Kahananui's aid, and he accepted the great majority of her suggestions. She was able to correct the text and make it more idiomatic by the smallest possible changes, that is, by disturbing least the original text. She suggested several very beautiful phrases as well.<sup>42</sup> Charlot remembered how she reflected over the text, understood his point, and then translated it into the often very different Polynesian thought pattern.

Elbert largely restricted himself on Text A to changing words and phrases. His suggestions show a very intimate understanding of Charlot's purposes. He advises against *wa'apā* and *mō'ī* as most likely later words. He replaces *kanaaho* and *paiho* respectively with the better known *pu'u honua* and *pe'ahi*. He provides traditional or proverbial turns of phrase,<sup>43</sup> as he had for *Laukiamanuikahiki*. At the description of the divine honours accepted by James Cook, he writes: 'Will this shock your missionary audience?'

Koana Wilcox used the blank facing page of the typescript to rewrite extensively almost every speech. Her tendency was to modernise and elucidate the original by expansion. Charlot accepted from her many alternative words and turns of phrase—a number of which have great force<sup>44</sup>—and on occasion even refashioned a speech.

Charlot then used the original typescript of Text A to fashion a revised text. He accepted and rejected changes. He combined suggestions by different readers.<sup>45</sup> He arranged and reordered the speeches and the breaks in translation in order to move more rapidly between the Hawaiian and the English, thus making the action more comprehensible and dramatic and co-ordinating the speeches better with the stage business and gestures. Charlot therefore controlled very personally the revision of the text, no matter how many suggestions were accepted. He of course made original changes as well and revised the text considerably in later stages.

This amended text was retyped completely and worked over again by Charlot. This new text was then typed and called Text B. A photocopy was given to Koana Wilcox and Samuel Elbert, and a

second photocopy to Dorothy Kahananui. Wilcox seems to have made few, if any changes in this text. Kahananui made a number of changes in detail and expanded a phrase to a sentence.

Elbert made a number of corrections of accents, letters, and punctuation. He dropped a word, commenting: 'better rhythm & parallel without "ua".' He added another traditional saying. He also added the colourful 'Ai, 'ai, 'ai.<sup>46</sup> He suggested dropping a reference to twenty years in Kalani'ōpu'u's speech about the length of the war—'I don't think they talked much about years'—and suggested the very flavourful speech contrasting the chief's physical condition at the beginning of the war to his present state.<sup>47</sup> At the voyage narrative, he commented: 'very smooth here.'<sup>48</sup>

The entire text was again retyped and called Text C. Elbert and Kahananui made a number of small changes in this. Charlot himself used this text to make a number of changes in the Hawaiian and very large changes in the English. However, when I began the final editing of the text, I was given a copy of Text C on which the above changes were not recorded, but on which Charlot had made a small number of new, minor changes. The larger changes made earlier by Charlot on Text C were thus not used. My own editing was confined largely to the regularisation of spelling and accents and seeing these as well as I could through the printing.<sup>49</sup> I did persuade my father to reinstate a non-standard phrase that had been deleted earlier.

In the above discussion, I have given only the general outline of the very long and complex process of composition.<sup>50</sup>

## THE LANGUAGE OF THE PLAYS

An understanding of the complex process of composing the plays enables us to appreciate the achievement of their stylistic unity. This unity was the result of Charlot's constant control and conscious goals. First and foremost, he wanted a language that was based on older texts and free of post-contact influences, such as loan words. Such a preoccupation is unusual in Hawaiian literature<sup>51</sup> and is most likely due to a typically French sensitivity to purity of language. Perhaps Charlot's striving for clarity of expression can also be considered French. Purity and clarity do not, however, mean for Charlot the imposition of a system of correctness, but the authentic variability and expressive creativity of the oral tradition.

The greatest influence on those aspects of Charlot's Hawaiian style was undoubtedly Kepelino, in whom Charlot early became interested.<sup>52</sup> Charlot felt that Kepelino's education by French Roman Catholic missionaries in English, French, Latin, and Greek, made him conscious of the peculiar stylistic potentialities of his own language, which he then deliberately exploited in his writings. Charlot calls Kepelino—with some hyperbole—the only conscious stylist of the nineteenth-century Hawaiian writers.

Charlot also wanted a language that would be *usable*, that could become an aid in actual conversation. Such a purpose is comprehensible in light of the relative dearth of fluent native speakers of Hawaiian and their often weak influence on academic studies of Hawaiian.

Closely related to the above-mentioned preoccupations is Charlot's sparing use of the proverbial sayings, epithets, and allusions that are constantly used in Hawaiian literature and conversation. One Hawaiian told me: 'A Hawaiian of the old times would say, "He is a duck." Your father explains this by writing, "He walks like a duck."' "<sup>53</sup>

On the other hand, Charlot made an effort to conform to the Hawaiian practice of using what he calls 'sanctioned phrases.' The use of the conventional prose expressions or clichés is an element of politeness in Hawaiian and carries with it the forceful resonance of tradition. Charlot's native speaker consultants often reformulated his lines to include such traditional phrases, which were much appreciated by native listeners. The production of *Laukiamanukahiki* occasioned the introduction of a number of very idiomatic and conversational expressions, the full meaning of which is not immediately obvious. Charlot says that, in spoken Hawaiian, there is always an element that the listener must complete for himself.

*Laukiamanukahiki* depends very much on such traditional and conversational expressions. One Hawaiian termed the play 'classical,' and another, 'authentic.' *Na Lono Elua* is, however, much more freely composed and thus departs, in all likelihood, from what a tape-recorder would have picked up on the scene. The language of *Na Lono Elua* is therefore very much an artistic creation, an attempt to convey the thought and spirit of a time without always reproducing naturalistically its exact modes of expression.

## RELIGION IN THE PLAYS

Charlot was a committed Roman Catholic, but his particular type of Christianity was confidently inclusive, rather than exclusive of other religions. He emphasised the holy pagans of the Bible<sup>54</sup> and the undeniable greatness and truth of much non-Christian religion, which he interpreted as a product of God's providential dispensation.

His own religiosity was so central to his life and thought that he naturally looked to the religion of a culture he studied for clues to its character. Much of his understanding and interpretation of pre-Columbian art was based on its religious dimension. Charlot himself was able to create original works of art, that expressed that non-Christian religion.<sup>55</sup>

Characteristically, Charlot felt the need to connect the forms of a particular religion to their sources in thought and experience. He felt strongly that studies of Hawaiian religion were too concentrated on surface phenomena and urged me some years ago to attempt a deeper interpretation of Hawaiian religion with the methods of modern religious studies. He himself proposed in *Na 'auao* an interpretation of certain so-called animistic aspects of Hawaiian religion in terms of æsthetic response to form.<sup>56</sup>

Charlot's two Hawaiian plays depict Hawaiian religion from many angles: the fabulous, the use of religious thought models and explanations, the tension between the chiefs and the priests, and so on. The religious dimension is shown as powerful and all-pervasive in Hawaiian life.

More controversial is Charlot's attribution to the Hawaiian religious dimension of an organised, directing, even providential role. In both plays, all is finally resolved by unseen, godly forces. Although individual elements of this view are taken from classical Hawaiian religion, the largeness and completeness of the providential plan and the ascription to it alone, or at least primarily, of the effective action seem to be influenced by Christian doctrine. In fact, Charlot found a Biblically influenced providential view of James Cook's death in his nineteenth-century Hawaiian sources,<sup>57</sup> a product of an earlier encounter between Hawaiian religion and Christianity.

Charlot's two Hawaiian plays can therefore be related to a particular chapter of post-contact Hawaiian religion. In my opinion,

later writings of his<sup>58</sup> can be similarly related to the current phase, in which Hawaiian religion is challenging Christianity as an adequate expression of Hawaiian consciousness.

## NOTES

1. The first version of this article was published in French: John Charlot, Les pièces dramatiques en langue hawaïenne de Jean Charlot, *Journal de la Société des Océanistes* 33 (March-June 1977): 65-75. Jean Charlot was still alive and contributed much to the article. I have now made revisions and additions. Charlot's 'Preface' to his *Two Hawaiian Plays*, his notes, documents, and typescripts, as well as numerous interviews with Charlot, and several with people connected to his work, form the basis of this article. This material is now in the Jean Charlot Collection, Hamilton Library, University of Hawai'i. I thank the *Journal de la Société des Océanistes* for permission to publish this English version of the article. Short references to Jean Charlot's writings will be by last name only; those to mine will include my first name.
2. Jean Charlot, *Two Hawaiian Plays, Hawaiian English*, Honolulu: published by the author, 1976 (distributed by The University Press of Hawai'i); containing a Preface by the author; *Laukiamanuikahiki, Snare-That-Lures-a-Farflung-Bird*; and *Na Lono Elua, Two Lonos*. An earlier version of the former play was published: *Laukiamanuikahiki, Snare That Lures a Farflung Bird, A bilingual playlet, Hawaiian-English*, Honolulu: private printing, 1964. A three-act English-language version of the story was composed later under the title *Laukiamanuikahiki, Snare that Lures a Farflung Bird*, but has not been published. From this English version, *Spirit Island, One Act Play*, was taken with emendations and produced at the John F. Kennedy Laboratory Theater, May, 1964. Jean Charlot, *Two Lonos, Paradise of the Pacific* 77 (6) (November-December 1965): 68-76, constitutes a stage in the composition of *Na Lono Elua*, as explained later in this article. Jean Charlot, *The Old Warrior Briefs Two Young Chiefs, Mele 2* (March 1966), unpaginated, is based on *Na Lono Elua*, Act II. Jean Charlot, *Three Plays of Ancient Hawai'i*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1963, contains *Na'auao, The Light Within; U'i A U'i, Beauty Meets Beauty; Moa A Mo'i, Chicken into King*; English-language plays placed in the reverse order of their composition. See also his *Na'auao (The Light Within)*, Honolulu: private printing, 1962. During his stay in Mexico from 1945 to 1947, Charlot wrote a puppet play in Náhuatl to be produced in Mexican villages: *Mowentihke Chalman, Los Peregrinos de Chalma, Pieza Para Muñecos, Mele* (1969). The research of Frances Karttunen, forthcoming, has shown that this play, like *Laukiamanuikahiki*, was based on Charlot's work in the Náhuatl language class of R. H. Barlow.
3. I have been told of a pageant in Hawaiian on Lā'ieikawai performed early in this century—one of a number of Hawaiian-language pageants—and of later, short student plays, one of which was rewritten, but not yet published, by the poet Larry Kimura.

4. Jean Charlot, *A Catalog of Murals and Monumental Sculpture, Books, Books Illustrated, Portfolios*, compiled by Zohmah Charlot, Honolulu: private printing, 1986: section 'Books, Plays and Portfolios by Jean Charlot.' I am preparing a complete bibliography.
5. Most of this is still unpublished, but see, for example, Poemas de Jean Charlot, *Contemporâneos, Revista Mexicana de Cultura* (37) (June 1931): 267-71; and Jean Charlot, *Picture Book, Images and Verses*, Los Angeles: Dawson's Book Shop, 1974. A number of Charlot's poems were published in *Mele, Carta Internacional de Poesía, International Poetry Letter*, Honolulu.
6. For example, numerals both with and without glottals. 'Ulipō ke kino ... Ulipō ka 'ili ma waho,' Charlot, *Two Hawaiian Plays* (see note 2), p. 52. 'E maopopo pololei no ka 'oukou po'e wahine i ke 'ano maoli o na malihini!' (ibid., p. 57). 'O kāua i 'elua, he mau 'elemākule' (ibid., p. 90).
7. Ibid., p. 8.
8. John Charlot, Jean Charlot as Paul Claudel's Ixtlilxóchitl, *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 17-18 (1990-1991): 64-74.
9. He had read Paul Claudel's *Cent Phrases Pour Éventails*, now in Paul Claudel, *Oeuvre Poétique*, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, Paris: Gallimard, 1967, pp. 697-744, especially pp. 699-701. Charlot criticised the editors of Claudel's journals for ignoring the aesthetics of his original layouts.
10. Jean Charlot, Petroglyphs of Hawai'i, in Jean Charlot, *An Artist on Art, Collected Essays*, Honolulu: University Press of Hawai'i, 1972, vol. 1, pp. 235-40. Significantly, this article originated as a narration for a film on petroglyphs by George Tahara.
11. See Fernando Horcasitas, *De Porfirio Díaz a Zapata, memoria náhuatl de Milpa Alta*, Serie de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea 8, Mexico City: unam, Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, 1968 (English: *Life and Death in Milpa Alta: A Náhuatl Chronicle of Díaz and Zapata*, translated and edited by Fernando Horcasitas from the Náhuatl recollections of Doña Luz Jiménez, Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1972). See also Frances Karttunen, *Between Worlds: Interpreters, Guides, and Survivors*, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, pp. 192-214.
12. Sheldon Dibble, *Ka Mooolo Hawai'i, Histoire de l'Archipel Havaiien (Iles Sandwich)*, text and translation by Jules Rémy, Paris and Leipzig: A. Franck, 1862. This was certainly the edition used by Charlot; he stated often his admiration for Rémy's translation.
13. Ibid., p. 34.
14. John Charlot, Ixtlilxóchitl (see note 8 above), pp. 66 ff..
15. As a small child, Charlot constructed a miniature theatre for which he made the sets and wrote the plays. In Hawai'i, he acted in several plays to good reviews.
16. Victor Ehrenberg, *The People of Aristophanes: A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy*, New York: Schocken Books, 1962.
17. Charlot played Hugo Kalmar in the March 1957 University of Hawai'i production of the play. Charlot also admired Pirandello. See also Charlot, On Illustrating 'Henry VI', Part III, in *For the Subscribers to the Limited Editions Club's Shakespeare: A Shakespeare Commentary* (June 1940), p. 4: 'the play spoke for itself; and eloquently so. The very defects from the point of view of the modern theatre-goer seemed good qualities to me, who had seen in Mexico medieval

- mysteries and historical pageants performed by Indian actors on open air stages: the scenery a mere sheet hanging on a rope, the facial expressions reduced to naught by the use of masks, the action as formal and symmetrical as that of the Chinese theatre. The scene wherein the son brings in the dead body of his father and where a father brings in the son he has slain, proves the acting of the original play to have been, not realistic, but of such a symbolic kind.'
18. Charlot felt a certain kinship with Epic Theatre, although he was not very attracted to works done by members of that school. He showed *Moa A Mo'i* to the important set-designer and director Mordecai Gorelik in 1955 or 1956, while staying in New York, and was complimented on his use of the stage.
  19. Katharine Luomala, *Hula Ki'i: Hawaiian Puppetry*, Lā'ie: The Institute for Polynesian Studies, 1984.
  20. Charlot, *Three Plays of Ancient Hawai'i* (see note 2), pp. 93 and 166.
  21. Charlot, *Two Hawaiian Plays* (see note 2), Preface. Charlot repeatedly emphasised this point in interviews.
  22. Charlot designed sets for his own theatre as a child and for student productions in Colorado in 1947-1949. He designed sets and properties for the production of *Na'auao* by the Honolulu Community Theatre under Don Tescher in April-May 1962. In the early 1970s, he designed a set for *U'i A U'i* to be produced by the Drama Department of the University of Hawai'i. The Department, however, cancelled the production without explanation and lost the model of the set. An important discussion of the English-language plays is Samuel H. Elbert's Preface in Charlot, *Three Plays of Ancient Hawaii* (see note 2), pp. v-ix; he emphasises Charlot's knowledgeable and innovative use of Hawaiian-language sources and his original insights into Hawaiian culture.
  23. See He mo'olelo no 'ekolu pea a Kawena Johnson a me Palani Charlot, in Samuel H. Elbert and Samuel A. Keala, *Conversational Hawaiian*, fifth edition, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1965. Earlier editions do not mention Charlot as author. Now in Samuel H. Elbert, *Spoken Hawaiian*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1970, p. 70.
  24. Samuel H. Elbert (ed.), *Selections from Fornander's Hawaiian Antiquities and Folk-Lore*, Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii, 1959, p. 3. See also He Kahamana'o, *Mele* (March 1972), p. 15.
  25. Leonard Lueras (ed.), *Manna-Mana*, Honolulu: private printing, copyright 1973, pp. 21 and 167. Also *Mele* (June 1969), p. 14 (unpaginated).
  26. Examples of television plays translated in Hawaiian class can be found in Gore Vidal (ed.), *Best Television Plays*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1956: Paddy Chayefsky's *The Mother* (pp. 1-31) and Gore Vidal's *Visit to a Small Planet* (pp. 221-48). Charlot told me how interesting he had found translating the latter play. At an unknown date, Charlot wrote in the margins a partial translation into Hawaiian of Earle C. Anthony's (with Carey Wilson) *Aloha oe, A Legend of Hawaii*, The Fifty-Third Grove Play of the Bohemian Club, San Francisco: The Bohemian Club, Grabhorn Press, 1958.
  27. 'Ka mo'olelo no Lau-kia-manu-i-Kahiki' appears already in Samuel H. Elbert, *Conversational Hawaiian*, first edition, Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1951, pp. 48, 52, 56, 58 f., and 60, and remains through the following editions.
  28. Elbert, *Selections* (see note 24), frontispiece, facing p. 226.

29. For instance, Charlot pointed out to me the dialogues in Kepelino; see Martha Warren Beckwith (ed.), *Kepelino's Traditions of Hawai'i*, Bernice P. Bishop Museum Bulletin 95, Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1932, pp. 145 and 147. The recognition of such forms is important for the Form Criticism of Hawaiian literature, including the use of the narrative devices of single stories in longer complexes: see John Charlot, The Application of Form and Redaction Criticism to Hawaiian Literature, *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 86 (4) (December 1977): 479-501.
  30. I remember as a child wondering how silent film titles managed not to destroy the effect of a movie. My father compared them to turning pages in a book.
  31. Abraham Fornander, *Fornander Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folk-Lore, Volume 4*, Memoirs of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum, Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1917, pp. 596-609.
  32. Some modern elements can, in fact, be found in the story. See Fornander (note 31 above), p. 598, note 2.
  33. Charlot copied one of these chants and apparently considered using it in his play.
  34. As in the original, Fornander (note 31 above), p. 599.
  35. In the Fornander text, the abandonment theme concerns only Kahiki'ula's desertion of Laukiamanui kahiki.
  36. I have reconstructed this technique from documents among Charlot's papers. His own recollection at the time I wrote this article was that the process was much simpler. His wife, Zohmah Charlot, remembered him writing quantities very quickly and giving her much to type. Charlot's many discussions of the texts with various people are, of course, inaccessible now. The production was tape-recorded but unfortunately not filmed.
- Charlot once compared his technique in general to that of S. N. Hale'ole's *Laieikawai*. See Martha Warren Beckwith (ed.), *The Hawaiian Romance of Laieikawai, Thirty-Third Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution 1911-1912*, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, pp. 284-666. In Charlot's opinion, both he and Hale'ole combine classical elements in order to produce new literary forms.
37. Primarily Dibble, *Ka Mooolelo Hawai'i* (see note 12), and Samuel M. Kamakau. Charlot went to the original Hawaiian-language newspaper articles of Kamakau, references to which can be found in the footnotes of Samuel M. Kamakau, *Ruling Chiefs of Hawaii*, Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools Press, 1961, especially pp. 66-116. Charlot's attitude was very much influenced by the short but powerful reference to James Cook by Kepelino: see Beckwith (note 29), p. 75; and by Kepelino's thought in general; compare *ibid.*, p. 139, 'e like me ka nui o ka hewa, pela ka nui o ka uku,' with Charlot, *Two Hawaiian Plays* (note 2), p. 88, 'O Pakakū ke kino haina paha i kūlike ka nui me ka nui o ka hewa?' I will not discuss the historical accuracy of Charlot's view of that of his sources. For opposing views known to Charlot, see, for example, John F. G. Stokes, *Origin of the Condemnation of Captain Cook in Hawaii, A Study in Cause and Effect, Thirty-Ninth Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society for the Year 1930*, Honolulu: Hawaiian Historical Society, 1931, pp. 68-104; and Terence Barrow, *Why Has Captain Cook Been So Maligned in the Land Where He Left His Bones? An Anthropologist Comes to the Defense of Hawaii's Most Kicked-Around Hero*, *Honolulu* 9 (5) (November 1974): 109-13 and 120 f. For Barrow's criticism of



- Charlot's *Two Lonos*, see p. 110. Captain Cook's death has lately become a major topic of debate among anthropologists.
38. Some sections of the published translation of Kamakau's *Ruling Chiefs* (see note 37) were typed separately and apparently later.
  39. The final version of this is Charlot's *Two Lonos* (see note 2).
  40. A set of topics, later abandoned, for the third scene is: 'Seer: future. Race defiled. Gods defiled and taboos. Alcool [*sic*, French spelling] and syphilis.' Charlot appended in pencil '(W. Ellis),' referring to that missionary's encounter with, and besting by, a priestess of Pele. See William Ellis, *Narrative of a tour of Hawai'i, or Owhyhee*, reprint Honolulu: Advertiser Publisher Co., 1963, pp. 215-18. This projected portion of the play may have been a parallel to the ending of *Moa A Mo'i*, Charlot, *Three Plays of Ancient Hawai'i* (see note 2), pp. 277-82, which had been criticised strongly by readers as undramatic.
  41. Of course, Charlot went back to the Hawaiian sources for the language of the play. As the composition of the final play progressed, Charlot revised the English considerably so that the English in the published version stands in the same free relationship to the Hawaiian as in *Laukiamanuikahiki*.
  42. She changed the original 'Elua 'elemākule kāua ...' to the dignified and old-fashioned 'O kāua i 'elua, he mau 'elemākule....' Charlot, *Two Hawaiian Plays* (see note 2), p. 90; the original 'e lilo ke 'ano kanaka o Lono i ke 'ano akua o ka Lono lua, Lono i ka Lani,' to the priestly subtlety and religious awesomeness of 'ua lilo kekahi lihi o ka Lono 'i'o iā Lono ka haole' (in the final text, 'ke kanaka,' [ibid., p. 87]).
  43. For example, 'noho nihinihi' for the original 'olu'olu' (ibid., p. 76).
  44. She supplied 'Mele mamua, a ke kaua mahope,' which became 'Mele mamua, a kaua mahope' (ibid.).
  45. A simple example can be found (ibid., p. 51): the original read 'he wahi kanaaho.' Wilcox added 'ko laila.' Elbert suggested replacing *kanaaho* with the more familiar *pu'uhonua*. Charlot amended the text to read, in Text B, 'he wahi pu'uhonua ko laila.'
- On p. 63, the original read 'Waliwali ke kanaka. E kokua kana ikaika ke akua i ka lani.' Kahananui cut this to the powerful antithesis, 'Waliwali ke kanaka. Ikaika ke akua o ka lani.' Wilcox rewrote: 'Nāwaliwali ke kanaka. Na ke akua o ka lani e hooikaika a'e.' Text B then became: 'Nāwaliwali ke kanaka. Ikaika ke akua i ka lani.'
- On p. 88, the wonderfully whining response of the priests was originally: 'E nonoi 'ole k(m)akou ia 'oe, e ka Lani. E 'ole 'oe kāu ninau o 'oe.' Kahananui emended: 'A'ohe i nonoi 'ia aku nei[.] No ke aha ho'i keia hō'ole?' Wilcox wrote: 'E Kalani! 'A'ole mākou i nonoi iā 'oe i kekahi mea. Nolaila, heaha kāu mea āu e hō'ole ai?' Charlot initially followed Kahananui, but then developed the final: 'E Kalani! 'A'ohe mākou i nonoi iā 'oe i kekahi mea. He aha kāu mea e hō'ole ai?'
46. Ibid., p. 55.
  47. Ibid., p. 70.
  48. Ibid., p. 62.
  49. Hawaiian orthography has gone through many changes, and the one my father and I worked out both differed from and anticipated the current form. For instance, Charlot was adamantly against the use of the macron in the plural article, but wanted a macron on the first *a* of *na'au* 'gut.' I believe we were among the first to

- separate regularly the passive marker 'ia from the preceding noun; thus *pēpē'ia*, p. 66 (ibid.), is a typographical error, the only one I have found in the text.
50. Among others consulted should be mentioned Fred Meinecke and Rubellite K. Johnson.
  51. The novelist Moses Nākuina is exceptional in making purity of language an explicit goal of his writing. In Sāmoa, purity of language was at least into the 1970s a definite stylistic principle of oratory.
  52. On Kepelino, see Beckwith, *Kepelino's Traditions* (see note 29), pp. 3 ff. This text was used by Elbert in his Hawaiian language class. The inscription for Charlot's now destroyed 1952 mural, 'Early Contacts of Hawai'i with Outer World,' at the Waikiki branch of the Bishop Bank, was taken from Kepelino (ibid., p. 167).
  53. Compare Martha Warren Beckwith's remarks on the modern difficulties of allusiveness in her preface to Laura S. Green, *Hawaiian Stories and Wise Sayings*, Poughkeepsie, New York: Vassar College, 1923, second to the last page (unpaginated).
  54. He enjoyed Jean Daniélou, *Holy Pagans of the Old Testament*, Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1958.
  55. See, for example, J. Eric S. Thompson, *Maya Hieroglyphic Writing: An Introduction*, Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1960, frontispiece, pp. ix and 61: 'It has been necessary to interlard this poetical imagery with dull discussions of Maya etymology. It is as though one discussed the geology of Mount Helicon in an introduction to a brief essay on Clío. Nonetheless, deviations along arid paths are necessary in assessing such an unknown quantity as the mental outlook of the Maya. We are, accordingly, fortunate in having the aid of Jean Charlot in bringing to life this vivid concept. He has captured its qualities of mysticism and striking beauty in the frontispiece of this volume.'
  56. The speeches of Kawelo form curious, unconscious parallels to sonnets of Michelangelo.
  57. For example, Dibble, *Ka Mooolelo Hawai'i* (see note 12), pp. 28 and 30.
  58. Especially his introductions to the journals of Bishop Louis Maigret: Le 'Journal' du Picpucien Louis Maigret, 1804—1882, Évêque d'Arathie et Vicaire Apostolique des Îles Sandwich, Notes et Analyses, *Journal de la Société des Océanistes: Les Missions dans le Pacifique* 25 (December 1969): 320-35; and Introduction au 'Journal' de Mgr. Maigret, cinq ans missionnaire aux Îles Gambiers, 1835—40, *Bulletin de la Société des Études Océaniques* 17 (2) (December 1977): 43-56.

*Author's address:* Prof John Charlot, Department of Religion,  
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, 2530 Dole Street, Honolulu, HI  
96822, U.S.A. (e-mail: charlot@hawaii.edu).

