were thought to be somehow related if the names for these objects were even partially homophonic. They were very careful in their songs since a mistaken syllable might change a word, altering not only the literal meaning but also the kaona or hidden meaning. Earliest chants were sacred to the gods, including family gods; hence the family guarding these heirlooms was loath to share them with outsiders. This attitude also shielded the songs; although the latter are no longer held to be sacred, there is still a limit beyond which Westernization, it is felt, should not go.

In examining the Hawaiian and English which are printed side by side, one wonders about the problems involved in translation. The editors' stated goal was "to produce an echo that will enable the singer who does not know Hawaiian very well to deduce the meanings of every content word in the song." The English mirrors Hawaiian devices of assonance, does not employ rhyme, and assumes a studied vagueness in an attempt to imitate Hawaiian syntax. However, several criticisms of this plan spring to mind: the mainlander cannot sing the songs without the music; furthermore, while the vagueness of the songs themselves may be termed art, the vagueness of the introductory paragraph which heads each song is simply annoying. The editors' intent may have been to make the reader wrestle with kana, but he cannot help but be defeated since he, in grappling with a cultural context not his own, is always afraid of going too far or of not going far enough. Perhaps it was only the educated twentieth century Hawaiian that the editors had in mind.

The taste is tantalizing, appetizing, but not satisfying. Because the songs are arranged in alphabetical order by title and the book lacks a thorough index of songs by subject and theme, the reader finds it difficult to study likenesses. One would like to know, for example, how often and where native plants and animals, water and forest images appear. Still, these are the complaints of the literary scholar, the folklorist, and the linguistic scientist. For the intelligent tourist or immigrant the book opens up a new Hawaii. To the extent that the book does tantalize, it calls the reader back to it and grants with every reading a deeper understanding of the original people of this land.


Reviewed by Warren E. Roberts.

Publications for the ever-expanding antiques world of dealers, collectors, and museums are many and varied. They range from the glossy picture book intended for the gift-giver with many pictures but little text to more serious works of scholarship. A common type of scholarly work is the finding list of the names of craftsmen, their marks, working dates, and the likes. Because of the history of antiques collecting, such finding lists have usually been made for the eastern coastal regions, the original thirteen colonies. The last decade, however, has seen an unprecedented expansion of antiques collecting. More people are collecting types of things; newer things are being labelled as antiques and collected and, as a result, items which were made far from the original thirteen colonies are being collected. Thus there has been a need for finding lists in other states and many have been published. A recent example is the book under review.

Furniture Makers of Indiana 1793 to 1850 is a good example of a carefully done
finding list. It exemplifies the virtues and the limitations of the historical approach to folk crafts. By investigating every available written source - old newspaper advertisements, census records, local histories, city directories, manuscript shop records - Mrs. Walters has been able to compile a list of 2,176 names of craftsmen who probably made furniture in Indiana, cabinetmakers, chairmakers, and turners. Biographical data, location, working dates and the like are given whenever possible. In the process, a considerable amount of general information comes to light, such as the kinds of wood used, the types of furniture made, the number of men working in a shop, and "sidelines" of furniture makers such as undertaking. Mrs. Walters' research seems to have been thorough, detailed, and accurate and we must be grateful for her industry. The main use to which her book can be put, I suppose, is in identifying the maker of an old piece of Indiana furniture in case a name or initials are found on it or in case of a tradition that the piece in question was made in a certain locality at a certain time.

The main criticism that the student of folklife raises when he encounters a typical book for the antiques world is that the books restrict themselves to historical sources, and Mrs. Walters' book is no exception. The folklife researcher writing a book on furniture makers of Indiana would consult the written sources (and probably would not do as thorough a job as Mrs. Walters has done), but he also would try to locate and interview living craftsmen, assuming first that the contemporary craftsman is important in his own right but also that many living craftsmen have information inherited in traditional ways about crafts in earlier times. The historian, I suppose, would deny the validity of these traditions or perhaps consider them unimportant. The folklife researcher, realizing that the traditions may be unreliable, is nonetheless attracted to them because they can supply dimensions that the written records cannot. The traditions can, for instance tell us about the sources of designs and how they are modified, and about the role of the craftsman in the community. The folklife researcher, then, can make real contributions to our information about the total context of traditional crafts, but he had better be about his task before the old traditions are lost completely.

One puzzling note remains to be made about Mrs. Walters' book. In July 1970 Arthur Whallon published in Antiques (pp. 118-25) an article entitled "Indiana Cabinetmakers and Allied Craftsmen, 1815-1860." This is exactly the same kind of finding list as Mrs. Walters', though hers is far more complete. Yet Mrs. Walters makes no mention of Whallon's article beyond inserting it in her bibliography as item number 50a. Since Mrs. Walters' preface is dated 1969, I suppose we must assume that she had completed her manuscript before Whallon's article appeared but that publication was delayed until two years after it appeared. At any rate, it would have been a little less mystifying had Mrs. Walters explained these circumstances.