REFERENCES

Review: VALERIO VALERI
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

> Demetrius [the Besieger] was greeted as the son of Poseidon and Aphrodite; his wife Phila, as an avatar of Demeter. Then followed the claim that the other gods were deaf, or indifferent, or absent, whereas "*You* are here, and visible to us / Not carved in wood or stone, but real, / So to you we pray."[1]

Ever since the publication of *The Apotheosis of Captain Cook,* I have been besieged by requests to review the book. I have declined them all. The reason should be obvious. Obeyesekere's claims stand or fall by the interpretation of a great number of sources, which in turn depends on a variety of voiced and unvoiced presuppositions. The limited space usually available to a reviewer does not permit one to go in sufficient detail into either interpretations or presuppositions. A review of the book, then, can be little more than a public declaration of the side of the fence on which one stands. For such declarations--the life blood of certain academics--I have no taste. And, I must confess, even if I were offered all the necessary space, I would not gladly go into all the details either. My life is getting shorter and otherwise occupied. So I had every inten-

tion of saying no to [Book Review Forum editor] Rob Borofsky as well. I had not reckoned with his persistence and persuasive talents. So in the end here is the result of my weakness. It is at least a bit more detailed than a review would have been--and I don't have to summarize the book!

Obeyesekere's basic point is that Cook was named after the god Lono, not identified with him. That he was so identified, he says, is a Western myth perpetuated by a majority of scholars and brought to extremes by Sahlins. He himself sides with the minority opinion, articulated by Peter Buck, that Cook was installed as a high-ranking chief in Hikiau temple. And he claims to have found the motivation for such installation: Kalani'opu'u, the king of the island of Hawai'i, wanted to enlist Cook's help in his wars against Maui. Thus Cooks enthronement was a piece of political strategy rather than Sahlins's stereotypic enactment of a mythical-ritual structure (Lono's return during the New Year festival). In addition, it was an attempt to preserve indigenous hierarchies threatened by the arrival of an outsider to whom the populace paid honors that by right went only to the Hawaiian nobility.

In asserting that "Lono," as applied to Captain Cook, was just a name, Obeyesekere assumes a priori that the Hawaiian theory of names was very much like his own. This is not my reading of the evidence--which Obeyesekere does not even examine. Hawaiians believed in an ontological connection between names, and especially proper names, and their referents and associations. One participated in what one's name stood for and evoked. Name, rather than character, was destiny in this society. [2] Being called Lono thus entailed, at the very least, membership in the class of beings that was grouped under this god. [3] It prompted people to act towards the named one in ways consonant with his category affiliation and to expect similarly consonant actions from him--in the appropriate contexts. Whatever the reasons Hawaiians may have had in naming Cook Lono, then, we can be sure that the extreme disjunction of name and god postulated by Obeyesekere is not in agreement with Hawaiian ideas. Precisely because Hawaiians did not have the Judeo-Christian view of God as radically different and separate from the world, the relationship between a category-god like Lono and all things and persons he subsumed was hierarchical and not dichotomous. The either/or approach taken by Obeyesekere is conceptually dubious, because the question whether Cook was a god or was simply named after a god is based on ontological premises that were not, I believe, those of eighteenth-century Hawaiians. The very contrast of the appellations *akua* (god) and *kanaka* (human) was a relative one in

their "language game." [4] Being named Lono meant participating in the properties of Lono and thus being, in some capacities and respects, Lono. The upshot of this is that I see no necessary contradiction between the view that Cook was Lono the chief and the view that he was Lono the god. [5] A contradiction only arises when a non-Hawaiian view of "divinity"--and thus also of the relationship of gods and humans--is introduced in the situation. It also arises when each identification is used to the exclusion of the other in the interpretation of the events. Thus Obeyesekere wants to see everything in terms of chiefly politics and strategic improvisation, Sahlins in terms of ritual enactment of the god Lono's epiphany. Perhaps they are both too reductive for the complexity of the events and for the multiplicity of possible readings inherent in the situation-- as seen in Hawaiian (and thus non-exclusionary) terms.

Once divine and human identities cease to be treated as mutually exclusive, a number of Obeyesekere's arguments against the thesis that Cook was seen as an "avatar" [6] of Lono lose much of their apparent force. Such is the case for the argument that Cook was called "Tuute" (Cook) as much as "Lono" by the Hawaiians, and that his country was referred to as "Brittanee" and not just as "Kahiki" (pp. 88 and 61-62). [7] Moreover, it is wrong of Obeyesekere to assume that the signs of hunger, voracity, and mortality that were noticeable in Cook as in the other British necessarily undermined his divine status (pp. 63-64). Hawaiian gods were often represented with enormous gaping mouths [8] and described as always hungry. [9] It was even said that if not fed with sacrifices, they might die. [10] Indeed, I have doubts about the accuracy of the term "immortal" in connection with them. "Long lasting" may be more appropriate--at least for many. Ironically for somebody who attributes the thesis of Cook's apotheosis to Western and particularly missionary mythmaking, Obeyesekere consistently attributes Christian ideas of divinity to Hawaiians in order to argue that with such ideas they could never have viewed Cook as a god. [11] He does not seem to have felt the necessity of delving into the religious notions of the Hawaiians themselves, as they appear in rituals, prayers, and stories. Some familiarity with such materials would have taught him that the Hawaiian's relationship to his gods was highly complex and ambivalent--oscillating between seriousness and playfulness, fear and derision, in ways that must seem puzzling and even scandalous to the modern (less so to the medieval) Christian mind. [12] It is therefore rash to assume as a matter of course that the derision with which some Hawaiians confronted Cook towards the end necessarily indicates that he had no divine status in

their eyes (pp. 104-105). To the contrary, disrespectful behavior vis-à-vis the gods, and the disparaging of their powers, was common in Polynesia[13] and in Hawai'i it was even *de rigueur* during the Makahiki period.[14] And if we recall our own pagan classics--for instance Ajax's threat to cut the ears of Apollo and Poseidon (Hom. *Il.* 21.455)--we may not find it strange that Hawaiians could act violently toward Cook and yet believe in his divinity. [15] If anything, there are positive indications that some Hawaiians, at least, took Cook to be alive even after his death--as if they thought that only one of his "avatars" (or, to use a Hawaiian word, *kino,* "body") had been killed. Indeed, they asked Captain King: When would "Lono" (Cook) return? [16]

Obeyesekere's attempt to explain this question as motivated by the fear of Cook's avenging ghost or by the expectation that the ghost would possess a medium is not very convincing (pp. 138-139). Moreover, this explanation entails a contradiction with Obeyesekere's own basic thesis on the ontological status of the British officers. Why would the Hawaiians ask them for news of the return of Cook's spirit if they believed that they were merely human? How could they presume that Captain King and others on board knew better than themselves, who had just performed the appropriate rituals for Cook's "post-mortem deification," in Obeyesekere's words? And if it was a matter of mediums being possessed, why not consult the mediums instead or, better still, call Cook's spirit to find out how to placate it? In any case, Obeyesekere's interpretation seems to me squarely at odds, whatever he says, with the questions asked of Colnett in 1791, namely: When had he last seen Cook, would Cook come back again, and what could they do to enlist Cook's support against the Spanish?[17] The idea that Cook was a mere spirit seems incompatible with such questions. They seem to presuppose that Cook was alive where Colnett came from--unless of course Colnett was himself taken for a spirit!

Obeyesekere may still be right that Cook was seen just as a chief by Hawaiians, but my point is that neither hunger, nor mortality, nor lack of respect, nor even the evidence of clearly human traits, [18] necessarily proves this from the point of view of Hawaiian religious ideas. My own view is, and has always been, [19] that Cook was considered a divine chief of the Lono category and thus participating in the attributes of this god --although not in all of them and perhaps not even in all those that were activated in the Makahiki festival. Nor did these Lono attributes exclude relationships with other gods, for reasons that I have discussed elsewhere and to which I shall return shortly.

Since Cook was not taken for the god Lono, argues Obeyesekere, the

"honors" paid him in Hikiau temple must have been his installation ceremony as a Hawaiian "chief" (p. 77). The expression "chief" is vague: does "chief' translate *ali'i* as "member of the aristocracy" or *ali'i* as "ruler"? In the latter case, we would have to ask: ruler of what? Of a particular district? Of the island of Hawai'i? If the latter, then Cook took the place of the king of the island, Kalani'opu'u--a conclusion in obvious contradiction with Obeyesekere's claim that the priests of Hikiau were acting on Kalani'opu'u's orders as he hoped to enlist Cook's help (pp. 79-88). If, on the other hand, Cook was made the chief only of a district, we do not understand why he was treated as a superior or at least as an equal by **Kalani'ōpu'u.** Either, then, Obeyesekere's thesis that the priests of Hikiau were acting on Kalani'opu'u's orders is wrong, or Cook was only installed as a person of rank, not as a ruling chief. But then, have the rites performed for Cook any connection with what we know of rites for "installing" an *ali'i* in whatever capacity? This is the crucial question. The answer is not easy. There is no mention by the canonical Hawaiian antiquarians (Malo and so on) of a ceremony for installing somebody as a person of rank, except perhaps the chanting of the ancestral genealogy at birth. [20] The only mention of any such rite for an adult that I found is in the legend of 'Umi, who was born a commoner but was made into an *ali'i.* The transformation was effected by making him go again through birth and circumcision rituals *('oki ka piko),* which were symbolically performed for him in chiefly fashion. [21] As for ruling chiefs, they were installed (or installed themselves) simply by dedicating the main sacrifice in the main temple of a district or an island. The highest ruler (whom I call "king") had to dedicate human sacrifices. Such sacrifices had to be constantly repeated to maintain "ruling" status. In other words, no installation was once and for all. [22]

Now is there any connection between these rites and those performed for Captain Cook in Hikiau temple? There is a tradition that the *Kumulipo* (the birth chant of Hawaiian royalty) was chanted at the ceremony, probably because the last name in the genealogy it consists of is that of Lonoikamakahiki (Lono-of-the-Makahiki), and Cook was supposed to have been called Lono due to his arrival during the Makahiki festival. But the tradition is a very late one. [23] Furthermore, none of the chanting that occurred during the rite in Hikiau was long enough to warrant the possibility that the *Kumulipo* was performed (although it could have been in abbreviated form). In any case, I cannot find any trace of symbolic navel cutting (or circumcision, for that matter) in the ritual undergone by Cook. Even the tapa cloth he received was not the loincloth we would expect in such a case but a kind of mantle in which he was wrapped. [24]

And what about the dedication of sacrifices by rulers? As I indicated long ago (but Obeyesekere seems to be unaware of my work on this as on several other points touched by him), there is similarity or even identity between this rite and the one performed for Cook in the upper part of Hikiau, in front of the main image, that of the god Kū in his form as Kūnuiākea.[25] If we focus exclusively on this rite, which seems to connect Cook with Kūnuiākea, we would have to say that Obeyesekere is right, that Cook was treated as a chief legitimized by his connection with Kū and not as the god Lono. But this first stage of the ritual cannot be separated from the next, which took place in the lower part of Hikiau. Obeyesekere's imaginative suppositions notwithstanding (p. 85), the rite that Cook underwent there resembles only one Hawaiian rite known to us: the *hanaipu,* in "which the image of Lono as god of the Makahiki festival was consecrated by the feeding of his bearer."[26] In this case, then, it is Sahlins who is right.[27]

But if each component of the ritual performed for Cook in Hikiau corresponds to a known rite, the ritual as a whole corresponds to nothing that is otherwise documented. It is most probably an *ad hoc* creation that combines the crucial rite in the cult of Kū with the crucial rite in the cult of Lono. The issues, then, are: For what purpose was this ritual put together and performed? What does it tell us about the view that Hawaiians had of Cook? I tried to answer these questions in my 1982 essay. I suggested that the ritual was probably an attempt to give a priest-controlled form to the Lono identity that had already been spontaneously bestowed upon Cook because of the time of the year at which he arrived. At the same time I emphasized that Cook "was considered divine, just as a king was considered divine: he was a human manifestation of the god; he was both king and god."[28] This required removing an anomaly. A king reached the Lono pole of his identity only after a transformation of his Kū pole. The ritual year saw his oscillation from the Kū pole (war, human sacrifice) to the Lono pole (peace, first-fruits offerings). But Cook had appeared directly in the Lono period. To fully make him part of a Hawaiian-controlled order, it was necessary to make up in ritual for what was missing in empirical reality. Hence the invention and performance of a ritual that telescoped, in essence, the whole ritual process in order to reconstitute Cook's Lono identity in an orderly fashion. Although made up for the occasion, the ritual respected the basic structure of the Hawaiian ritual cycle--a fact that demonstrates the Hawaiian priests' considerable powers of analysis and abstraction. Hawaiian ritual, as I emphasized in *Kingship and Sacrifice,* was not just a fixed, unreflected-upon text (although it could be, and ordinarily was, that too), but a generative system of possibilities.

Today, I still feel that the thrust of this argument is correct, but I would develop it further. The emphasis that was put on Cook's Lono identity (to the point of treating him, at least in the temple, as an image of the god himself) at the expense of his Kū identity (which existed only through the mediation of a sacrifice reconsecrated to the god), and especially the insistence that the former identity resulted from an irreversible transformation of the latter one, seems to betray a fear that Cook might turn out to be a destroyer and a violent conqueror after all. Probably, there was nothing preordained about Cook's identity: The performance of rituals was an attempt to orient and fix this identity in a direction favorable to the Hawaiians. But the Hawaiians themselves were apparently divided in different interests groups, with different views, hopes, and fears vis-à-vis Cook. This brings me to Obeyesekere's claim that Cook's "installation" in Hikiau was part of an attempt by Kalaniʻōpuʻu to enlist the British forces in his war against Maui. By this hypothesis, Hikiau's priests were the agents of the king pure and simple.

There are several difficulties with such a view. One should be evident. The first part of the ritual performed for Cook in Hikiau granted him a prerogative of the king himself: sacrificing to the god Kūnuiākea in the main *luakini* temple. Although Cook was immediately transformed into an exalted, but--hopefully--less threatening persona, that is, a quasi-image of Lono, the priests' implicit challenge to Kalaniʻopuʻu's status must have been clear. That there were some tensions between the Hikiau priests and the king is rather evident from the journals--*pace* Obeyesekere. Further evidence of the tensions, and of the reasons for them, was adduced in my 1982 essay. There I showed that (again contrary to what Obeyesekere assumes without looking any further into the matter) the temple connected with the Maui war was not Hikiau, but Keikipuʻipuʻi-- as it should have been, since Kū in his warlike aspect (Kukaʻilimoku) was housed there. [29]

Moreover, for reasons that I have again explained in my 1982 essay, it is unlikely that Kaʻoʻo, the high priest based in Hikiau, was the same person as Holoaʻe, the man who according to Hawaiian tradition was the priest of Kukaʻilimoku, based in Keikipuʻipuʻi temple. [30] Obeyesekere inherits this assumption (p. 79) from Fornander and uses it as an argument for his claim that the Hikiau priests closely identified with Kalaniʻopuʻu's interests. On the contrary, there may well have been a rivalry between Holoaʻe, as priest of the warlike Kukaʻilimoku in Keikipuʻipuʻi, and Kaʻōʻō and his group, as priests of the more peaceful Kūnuiākea/Lono pole enshrined in Hikiau. [31] The conflict was probably sharpened because (and here again I side with Sahlins against Obeyes-

ekere) Kalani'opu'u was still at war on Maui notwithstanding the fact that it was already Makahiki time and thus tabu to fight. Indeed, it is quite possible that the populace's identification of the unexpected visitor, Cook, with a Lono type of divine chief was also a veiled form of protest against Kalani'ōpu'u's (and Kahekili's--the king of Maui) disastrous insistence on war (and thus on the Kūkā'ilimoku pole of kingship). The priests of Hikiau may have wanted to ride, at least for a while, this popular protest in the absence of Kalani'opu'u. [32] In sum, the situation can be interpreted in more than one or two ways--but I do think that in identifying a Cook/Kalani'opu'u contrast, corresponding to a Lono/Kū one, Sahlins is closer to the truth.

In any event, Obeyesekere's hypothesis that Kalani'opu'u must have asked Cook to help him in his war against King Kahekili of Maui is based on no evidence whatsoever. His suggestion (p. 78) that this evidence must have been contained in the "lost" part of Cook's journal strikes me as extremely implausible. If such a request had been made, the other officers would have recorded it in their own journals, as they did on other occasions. In fact, there is good reason to surmise that Kalani'opu'u-- whatever his views of how Cook related to Lono--increasingly saw him as a threat and was probably anxious to see him leave.

There would be much more to say about all this, and about other points made in *The Apotheosis of Captain Cook,* but I am coming to the end of the maximum space allotted to me. Before I close, however, I must say that the more valuable part of Obeyesekere's book is, to my mind, the one where he discusses the Western myth of Cook and its legitimating functions for British imperialists, New Zealand and Australian colonizers, and American missionaries. No doubt some part of this mythology, especially the missionary one, influenced Hawaiian thinking about Cook. But I disagree with Obeyesekere's characterization of Hawaiian antiquarians as totally passive tools of the missionaries in these matters. Precisely because, as Obeyesekere notes (and as I have myself insisted before him), [33] Hawaiian culture was contentious and full of debates, which continued well after conversion to Christianity, it makes no sense to characterize their views of Cook as purely derivative. Obeyesekere also underestimates the ambiguities of Hawaiian attitudes toward the American missionaries (Samuel Kamakau, for one, eventually became a Catholic and finally a nativist), [34] and the political context of their attempts at indoctrination. As Sahlins has noted against other critics with views very similar to Obeyesekere's, it made little sense for the missionaries to elaborate a Cook myth that would favor British

rights against American ones. [35] The Lahainaluna students may have presented a poisoned gift to the missionaries, at least qua Americans. The psychology of colonial subordination is more complex--and less supine-- than Obeyesekere makes it to be.

Finally, I do find that the different strands of the Western myth of Cook are not distinguished well enough in the book. The Christological version of Cooks deification by the Hawaiians was very different, in my opinion, from the more paganizing version followed by most educated people in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and, in a sense, by Cook himself. Unfortunately Obeyesekere cannot do full justice to this version and to its cultural and psychological underpinnings, because he does not fully or even correctly reconstruct its genealogy. The version owes less to Cortez and his "Indians" than to Alexander and his Indians. [36] It is also incomprehensible without a realization of the strange status that Pagan gods-- viewed euhemeristically as apotheosized heroes--had retained in aristocratic culture at least until the end of the eighteenth century.[37] Obeyesekere makes Westerners--even Englishmen-- far more Christian than they ever were. [38] And he forgets that the divinization of authority figures came almost as naturally to Europeans as to Hawaiians. Perhaps, then, the culture that had proclaimed "Papa est Deus" and that "kings are not only God's lieutenants upon earth, and sit upon Gods throne, but even by God himself they are called gods" was closer to Hawaiian political-theological sensibilities than one may suspect. [39] But by the same token, we may have to be prepared to admit that neither Hawaiians nor Europeans were as deadly literal about Cooks divinization than later, Reformed versions, have led us to suppose. One thing is certain: Belief is too complicated a matter to be settled by the incidence of empirical indexes on propositions[40] or by reference to official ideologies. Cooks self-mythologization through his projection onto Hawaiians of the pagan residues of his own culture and the Hawaiians' own mythologization of him as Lono may have converged for a fleeting moment. The fuller philosophical history of this encounter of beliefs remains to be written.

NOTES

1. P. Green, *From Alexander to Actium* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 398.

2. See M. K. Pukui, E. W. Haertig, and C. A. Lee, *Nana i ke Kumu* (Look to the Source) (Honolulu: Hui Hanai, 1972), 94-106; V. Valeri, "Constitutive History: Genealogy and Narrative in the Legitimation of Hawaiian Kingship," in *Culture through Time,* ed. E. Ohnuki-Tierney (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990), 175-188.

3. V. Valeri, *Kingship and Sacrifice* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 9-18,144.

4. Valeri, *Kingship and Sacrifice,* 144.

5. Indeed, as Beckwith observes, "Gods are represented in Hawaiian story as chiefs dwelling in far lands or in the heavens and coming as visitors or immigrants to some special locality in the group sacred to their worship" (M. W. Beckwith, *Hawaiian Mythology* [Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1970], 3).

6. Sahlins's expression. M. Sahlins, "Captain Cook at Hawaii," *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 98 (December 1989): 385.

7. Obeyesekere disregards the fact that for the Hawaiians Brittanee was axiomatically in Kahiki, since Kahiki refers to the zone of space where all distant lands are.

8. Valeri, *Kingship and Sacrifice,* 244.

9. Hence the expression *no'u ke akua mu-ki,* "the god that smacks the lips is mine," in G. W. Kahiolo, *He Moolelo no Kamapuaa: The Story of Kamapuaa* (Honolulu: Hawaiian Studies Program, University of Hawai'i, Miinoa, 1978), 37; A. Fornander, *Fornander Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folk-lore,* Memoirs of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum [Honolulu, 1916-1920], 4:606-607. Cf. also the following dialogue: " 'You have a large god indeed,' 'Yes, you could all be devoured without satisfying his hunger' " (Fornander, *Collection,* 4:520). There are dozens of such examples.

10. "The term *'Akua pukuole'* used by the Hawaiians, and found in one of their old prayers, represents the deserted gods as hungering and starving for lack of worship and physical sustenance to be derived from the offerings which their neglectful worshippers failed longer to provide" (J. S. Emerson, "The Lesser Hawaiian Gods," *Hawaiian Historical Society Papers* 2 [1892]: 24). Cf. the following text: "The starving god can only whisper softly, / Hunger! Famine! / Dead for lack of food, but there is indeed food" (Kahiolo, *He Moolelo,* 82).

11. In this he appears to follow Charlot's opinion. But the unconscious Christian projections that are perhaps understandable in an exseminarian are much less so in a South Asian. On the other hand, there is little serendipity in Obeyesekere's recourse to notions and attitudes from his own Serendip to make inferences about Hawaiian views.

12. Cf. V. Valeri, "Pouvoir des dieux, rire des hommes: Divertissement théorique sur un fait hawaiien," *Anthropologie et Sociétés* 5, no. 3 (1981): 11-34.

13. An example among many: When the great Tu'i Tonga Kau'ulufonua attacked Futuna, the men of the island "marvelling at his prowess, said, 'Thou art not brave of thyself, but by favour of the gods.' And he mocked them, and cried, 'Then I will leave my back to the gods to defend, and myself defend my face.' And as he was attacking the gate of the wall which his father's murderers had built, one of them wounded him in the back as he was passing through the gate. Thereat he cried, 'The gods *are* fools: they cannot *even* shield my back' " (B. Thomson, *The Diversions of a Prime Minister* [London: Blackwood, 1894], 303). Kau'ulufonua implies that he is stronger and abler than the gods themselves. Yet he does not deny their status as gods. The gods were also derided in Tahiti, when their images, captured in battle, were stripped of plumes. This was "a predicament described as ludicrous to the gods and mirth-provoking to humans" (D. L. Oliver, *Ancient Tahitian*

Society [Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1974], 116). Also, during the rite in which the images were refurbished with plumes, the officiating priest provoked a general hilarity by remarking: *"Ua pohe tena atua, e ua pohe paha fatu e! Inaha 'a'ita roa e 'ura,"* "This god is defeated [literally: "dead"], perhaps his owner is defeated [dead] too. Look, it has no plumes!" (A. Babadzan, *Les dépouilles des dieux: Essai sur la religion tahitienne à l'époque de la découverte* [Paris: Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, 1993], 137). In none of these cases is the divinity of the gods denied, although they are derided for their weakness.

14. Valeri, *Kingship and Sacrifice,* 223-224.

15. Obeyesekere himself mentions Kamehameha's destruction of the gods who failed to help him in his expedition against Kaumuali'i in Kaua'i (p. 149).

16. J. Cook, *A Voyage to the Pacific Ocean* (London: Nicol and Cadell, 1784), 3:69.

17. J. Colnett, *Colnett's Journal aboard the* Argonaut (New York: Greenwood Press, 1968), 220.

18. Nor even the fact that Cook did not look like a Hawaiian and only had a smattering of Tahitian, another of Obeyesekere's arguments (see p. 61). There is no reason to assume that gods had always to look Hawaiian to the Hawaiians. Indeed, many of their forms of manifestation did not (images with distorted mouths and eyes and, in one case, with a nose in the shape of a pig [Valeri, *Kingship and Sacrifice,* plate 9]; animals, plants, natural phenomena). A certain degree of otherness sustained divine status. The gods came from Kahiki, which also means, let us not forget, "far lands" (Beckwith, *Hawaiian Mythology,* 3).

19. V. Valeri, "The Transformation of a Transformation: A Structural Essay on an Aspect of Hawaiian History (1809-1819)," *Social Analysis* 10 (1982): 3-41. I shall quote this essay from its reprinting in *Clio in Oceania,* ed. A. Biersack (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991), although I should warn the reader that, due to the fact that I was not given the proofs to correct, it contains some misprints. The most serious is on p. 148, where lines 21-22 should read: "Thus it is not a matter, here, of viewing ritual as a 'reflection' of a praxis, but as a praxis in its own right, which enabled . . ." An erratum sheet can be obtained from the Press.

20. Valeri, "Constitutive History," 180-181.

21. V. Valeri, "The Conqueror Becomes King: A Political Analysis of the Hawaiian Legend of 'Umi," in *Transformations of Polynesian Cultures,* eds. A. Hooper and J. Huntsman (Wellington: The Polynesian Society, 1985), 81.

22. Valeri, "The Transformation," 152, n. 16.

23. Queen Lili'uokalani, trans., Introduction to *An Account of the Creation of the World According to Hawaiian Tradition* (Kentfield, Calif.: Pueo Press, 1978; photographic reprint of 1897 ed.). Cf. Valeri, "Constitutive History," 182.

24. J. King in J. Beaglehole, *The Journals of Captain Cook on His Voyages of Discovery. Vol. 3, The Voyage of the* Resolution *and* Discovery, *1776-1780.* Parts 1 and 2. (Cambridge: Cam bridge University Press, 1967), 505.

25. Valeri, "The Transformation," 134. Incidentally, Obeyesekere's reading of King's account is questionable on one point of this sequence. King writes that the officiating priest ("Koah") "prostrated himself [to Kunuiakea's image], and afterwards kiss'd, and desired the Captain to do the same" (King in Beaglehole, *Journals,* 505-596). Obeyesekere assumes as a matter of course that "to do the same" refers to both prostrating and kissing, but I think, along with Beaglehole (*The Life of Captain James Cook* [Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974], 659), that it only refers to kissing. I cannot see Cook, even at his most passive, prostrate himself with his men watching.

26. Valeri, "The Transformation," 134.

27. M. Sahlins, *Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities.* ASAO Special Publications, no. 1 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1981), 21.

28. Valeri, "The Transformation," 134-135.

29. Valeri, "The Transformation," 135. Of course, this did not exclude that enemies from Maui could be offered in Hikiau, as was indeed mentioned to the British (Beaglehole, *Journals,* 505). But, if one has to judge from surgeon Ellis's sketch of the temple, the heads of human victims stuck on the palings were not fresh. The same sketch makes evident that the temple was in a state of disrepair.

30. Valeri, "The Transformation," 154, n. 27.

31. A possible indication of this rivalry is that while the Hikiau group of priests sponsored Cook, Holoa'e never seems to have visited the ships. His name is never mentioned in the journals and not, I think, because he was the same person as **Ka'ō'ō.**

32. Sahlins has rightly insisted on the popular and spontaneous character of the veneration of Cook in 1778-1779, well before the chiefs and priests could decide what to do about him (and thus about it) ("Captain Cook," 412-414).

33. Valeri, "Constitutive History."

34. T. G. Thrum, "Brief Sketch of the Life and Labors of S. M. Kamakau, Hawaiian Historian," *Hawaiian Historical Society Annual Reports* 26 (1917): 46.

35. Sahlins, "Captain Cook," 372.

36. And also, of course, to the memory of the spontaneous emergence of a cult of the Emperors--to whom they ambivalently submitted, to the point of unwillingly performing, like Vespasian in Egypt, "miracles" (Suetonius, *Vespasiani Vita,* 7)--in the Eastern part of the Roman dominions (cf. S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 19841).

37. See the fundamental study by J. Seznec, *The Survival of the Pagan Gods* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953).

38. Let us not forget that the cult of rulers was long a competitor of Christianity (cf. L. Cerfaux and J. Tondriau, *Un concurrent du christianisme: Le culte des souverains dans la civilisation gréco-romaine* [Bibliothèque de Théologie, series 3, vol. 5. Tournai: Desclée 19571). And that in countries like France the cult of the monarch and the belief that he could perform miracles (such as curing the scrofula) survived even longer than in England, namely until the nineteenth century (M. Block, *Les rois thaumaturges,* new edition with a preface by J. Le Goff [Paris: Gallimard 1983]).

39. W. Ullmann, *The Medieval Papacy, St Thomas and Beyond* (London: Aquinas Press, 1960), 5. James VI and I, "A Speech to the Lords and Commons of the Parliament at White-Hall (1610)," in *Divine Right and Democracy,* ed. D. Wootton (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986), 107.

40. I am surprised and disappointed that Obeyesekere, for all the influence of psychoanalysis on his thought, should take such a simpleminded empiricist view of belief as he does when he repeatedly asserts that Hawaiians could not have believed in Cooks divinity in the face of various experiential evidence to the contrary (pp. 56, 147, 168). This is not just the misunderstanding of Hawaiian notions of divinity I have already denounced: it is also a misunderstanding of the nature of belief. See the classic paper by O. Mannoni, "Je sais bien, mais quand même . . . ," in *Clefs pour l'imaginaire ou l'autre scène* (Paris: Seuil, 1969), 9-33.