CLASSICAL HAWAIIAN EDUCATION
CLASSICAL HAWAIIAN EDUCATION

Generations of Hawaiian Culture

John Charlot

THE PACIFIC INSTITUTE
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY–HAWAI‘I
Lā‘ie, Hawai‘i
For Samuel H. Elbert, our pathfinder through the richness of the Hawaiian lexicon.
Chapter IV. The Practice of Education 175
  Observation 177
  Listening 182
  Imitation 185
  Play, Games, Training, and Sports 190
  Sites of Learning, Huts 191
  Non-Verbal Memory and Demonstration Aids 192
  Memorization 196
  Verbal Memory Aids 206
  The Verbal Organization of Knowledge 210
    Vocabulary and Names 211
    Lists 223
    Organization through Paired Opposites 247
      Place Knowledge 263
      Gender: Male/Female 270
      Time: Pō/Ao 273
  Education and Other Literary Forms 273
  Subject Areas and Bodies of Knowledge 278
  Recall, Retrieval 285
  Manipulation of Knowledge: Riddling 287
    Contests of Wits 296
    The Literature of the Contest of Wits 307
    The Formal Hoʻopāpā 309
    The Basis of Riddling in Education and Training 319
    The Organization of Knowledge 320
    The Use of Paired Opposites 332
    Verbal Opposites 334
  Experience 335
  The Creative Use of Knowledge 338
  Notes 344

Chapter V. Educational Institutions 387
  The Extended Family 387
  Peers 404
  Experts 407
    Farming 412
    Fishing 412
    Canoe Making 413
    Star Lore, Navigation, Watercrafts 418
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorcery and Countersorcery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dream Lore and Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genealogists and Historians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests and Temples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter VI. The Encounter with Western Education | 607 |
Notes | 664 |

Appendix I: Recent Studies Relating to Hawaiian and Polynesian Education | 673 |
Notes | 675 |

Appendix II: The Use of the Hawaiian Language in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries | 677 |
Notes | 715 |

Appendix III: Family and Rank | 725 |
Notes | 737 |

Appendix IV: Foreign Influence on Hawaiian Educational Forms and Views | 741 |
Notes | 753 |

Appendix V: Onomatopoeia | 755 |
Notes | 760 |

Appendix VI: Lists | 763 |
Informal Lists | 763 |
Informal Lists of Animals, Food, and Offerings | 767 |
Informal Lists of Weapons | 769 |
Formal Lists | 770 |
Formal Lists with *Eia* | 773 |
Numbered Lists | 781 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended Compositions Based on Lists</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger Compositions of Numbered Lists</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger Compositions Based on Previous Numbered Lists</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malo’s Use of Lists</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lists in Literature</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lists in Chants</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lists in Prayers</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God Lists in Prayers and Chants</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lists in Ritual Statements or Responses</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix VII: Contests of Wits</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms and Expressions</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kalapana/Kaipalaoa Tradition: Persons and Places</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix VIII: Some Nineteenth-Century Newspaper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports on Hawaiian Medicine</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acknowledgments

I ACKNOWLEDGE WITH THANKS the many people who have helped me with this book through their discussions and comments and provision of materials, including Colette Akana, Roy Alameida, Bellarmino Lōkahi Antonio, Jerry Bentley, Lydia Delacerna, Renate von Gизыcki, Leonard Goodman, Vilsoni Hereniko, Cathie Jordan, John Kaimikaua, Nahekeaopono Ka‘iuwailani, Kristina Kikuchi, Brij Lal, Edith McKinzie, Esther K. Mookini, James and Jane Ritchie, David Shideler, Gisela Speidel, Chieko Tachihata, Konai Thamann, Roland Tharp, and James Treat. I am grateful to the students in courses and seminars in which much of this material was discussed. Samuel H. Elbert, Margaret Orbell, Albert J. Schütz, and Noenoe Silva read the whole typescript and made invaluable comments and criticisms. I thank Olga Kalama for a written statement and permission to publish it, and Grant Tolentino for the information credited to him in the text.

For much help over many years, I thank the staffs of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum, the Hawaiian Mission Children’s Society Library, and the Hawaiian Historical Society. I thank all three institutions, along with the State Archives of Hawai‘i, for permission to quote unpublished materials. More generally, I have used with profit the Hawaiian Ethnological Notes (HEN) at the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum, both to discover relevant materials and to help with translations of certain passages. I thank also the Oratory of St. Philip Neri in Birmingham, England, for permission to use a quotation from John Henry Newman, and James and Jane Ritchie for permission to quote their writings.
Many of the subjects discussed in this book are treated by Albert J. Schütz in his *The Voices of Eden: A History of Hawaiian Language Studies* (1994), which I read in typescript. While Schütz and I agree in our general interpretation, he brings to his work an expertise in linguistics that I lack and a wealth of materials that I have not employed. I have not referred to that work in detail, but the reader of this book is urged to study it.

I have not cited several works that either came to my attention after I had finished the relevant section or were published after I had completed the book: Linda K. Menton on the Hawaiian Chiefs’ Children’s School, Kristina Kikuchi on lāua, Manu Meyer on Hawaiian education, and the later publications of Malcolm Naea Chun.

I am grateful to Deborah A. Forbis and Cynthia Lowe for the editing that concentrated on the English and to Noenoe Silva for the special editing of the Hawaiian. I thank Michael E. Macmillan for designing and formatting the text for electronic publishing and for his continual friendship.

I offer my sincere thanks to the publisher, The Pacific Institute, Brigham Young University–Hawai‘i, its Director Dale Robertson, and its Managing Editor of Publications Sharlene Rohter, for their continual support and collegial encouragement over the years. They have enabled me to continue my work through many difficult years.

A most special thanks to George Williams, who championed this publication for many years. His enthusiasm for new forms of publication convinced me of the virtues of the CD-ROM: my entire text could be produced at minimal cost to the publisher and the buyer and, being fully searchable, partially replaced an index. I hope that this publication will persuade scholars that the dissemination of unusually large-scale projects is feasible with new technology.
Preface

Education permeates the whole of Hawaiian culture. All learning and experience are part of the great search, ka ‘imi loa: probing backward in time to the origins, entering intensely into the current experience, and looking forward in time both to estimate the consequences of past and present and also to innovate and create. Ideally Hawaiians study the past thoroughly, live the present to its fullest, and observe and mold the new. Hawaiian education must therefore be studied globally in its many forms and connections to life, action, and thought.¹

Hawaiian education can be compared to the Greek paideia: it is no less than ‘the formation of the Greek human being’ and thus, as an object of study, a means of rethinking Greek culture as a whole.² The classical German idea of Bildung—the formation or cultivation of human talents towards a cultural ideal—was influenced by that of paideia and is similarly broad. The esthetic sense is given the role of joining all human capacities in this quest, which includes the study of world cultures, historical and living, and should result in a harmony of the human being with the cosmos.³ This German educational ideal, just like the Hawaiian, inspired works of literature such as the Bildungsroman ‘novel of cultivation’.

The importance of studying education in order to understand a particular culture is recognized. Jane and James Ritchie discuss the new emphasis on ethnopsychology and indigenous theories of knowledge (1989:115):
To know what is worth knowing is to understand matters that lie at the very core of a culture, and this can be studied by examining what the young are taught and how they are taught it. Thus the content of learning, as well as learning styles, has become an important focus.

Indeed education in general and pedagogy in particular are recognized as prerequisites of human culture itself. Education is used to enculturate or socialize people in their own culture; it can be used also to acculturate or adapt them to a foreign one, a process that can end in assimilation. Complicated cultures cannot be transmitted merely by language learning, observation, nonverbal instruction, or informal teaching, though these have attracted more theoretical and ethnographic attention than formal education itself. In Hawai‘i in particular, the emphasis on words, even in technical or skill training, imbues to an extraordinary degree all fields of knowledge with cultural perceptions and values (compare Premack 1984: 16, 29–34). Finally the esthetic dimension of education, explicit in Hawaiian culture, is now seen as central to all pedagogical efforts, whether recognized or unconscious. In his study of classical Greece, Werner Jaeger writes (1959: 2), ‘all education is the immediate outflow of a human community’s living consciousness of a norm.’

The broad range of Hawaiian education can be seen in its concerns. As have apparently all human beings, Hawaiians felt the need for a general view of the world and the meaning of life. Their very survival depended on their knowledge of their environment and their ability to use it for their own purposes. Their relations with others demanded a view of society, character, and proper conduct or morality. The intellectuality of Hawaiian culture has been neglected in the secondary literature, although apparent in such varied phenomena as the abstraction in the design of petroglyphs and feathered cloaks, the geometric designs in tattooing and on household objects, the stylization of statues, and
the ease with which abstract ideas are expressed in the Hawaiian language.

The Hawaiian emphasis on learning is a characteristic of Polynesian cultures (Luomala 1955: 43–60). Indeed the great similarities among the traditions of the different Polynesian groups demonstrate that a major effort was made to preserve their intellectual heritage in their migrations. Nevertheless, all of the above areas of study were developed with unusual fullness and complexity by Hawaiians, a result, I will argue, of their cultural and educational ideals. The ideal of completeness motivated them to accumulate an enormous amount of material; the ideal of perfection, to develop an extraordinarily large number of specializations. Knowledge and expertise were themselves ideals and conferred prestige. The methods and ideals of education influenced strongly both literature and behavior.

Because of the importance of education in Hawaiian culture, intellect, cultivation, education, expertise, and training are explicitly and frequently emphasized in various forms of Hawaiian literature. As a result, a broad basis of documentary evidence exists on which to study the subject today.

For the classical period, a vocabulary was canonized to express the ideals and the process of education. Proverbial sayings and expressions transmitted the Hawaiian view on the subject from generation to generation. Tales exalted the intelligent and poured scorn on the foolish. Short and very extended narratives were composed about experts in riddling and the contest of wits. The traditions of Pāka’a and his son Kūapāka’a are lengthy and popular descriptions of education and its uses (Charlot recently completed). Pāka’a is the learned counselor of the major Hawai‘i chief Keawenuia‘umi but loses his position through the intrigue of his enemies. He moves to Moloka‘i and educates his son, Kūapāka’a, in order to revenge himself and regain his place at court. By tricks and displays of knowledge and service, they succeed. In the traditions of Kalapana or Kapalaoa/Kaipalaoa, a Kaua‘i chief becomes
famous at the hoʻopāpā ‘contest of wits’, during which the contestants bet their lives. Kalapana’s father is killed after losing to the chief, and the son is educated in order to revenge his father, which he succeeds in doing after a long and brilliant contest.

Historical traditions of chiefs like Kawelo and Lonoikamakahiki devote much attention to their early upbringing and education. As the chiefs learn one profession after another, information is provided about the particular forms of education in each field. Reports of the achievements and famous deeds of experts in various fields were transmitted. Families and organized schools passed on their histories and the stories of their famous experts. The literary works associated with the different professions were memorized, transmitted, and finally recorded in writing.

Indeed, once the Hawaiian language had been officially reduced to writing in the mid-1820s, Hawaiians were quick to transcribe their oral traditions and memorized materials. Great numbers of manuscripts were produced, and the Hawaiian-language newspapers regularly published articles and series dealing with historical and ethnographic subjects. The major nineteenth-century Hawaiian-language authors will be used extensively in this study.

The first and in many ways foremost among these authors was David Malo (February 18, 1795–October 21, 1853). From an early age, Malo was employed at court because of his intellectual capacities (A. November 5, 1853):

He was a great favorite when young, with the chiefs, on account of his smartness, his acquaintance with their songs, dances and other amusements, and hence able to administer largely to their love of pleasure.

He received a classical education from the chief ‘Auwae of Wailuku, Maui. As a court intellectual, he was one of the first to hear of Christianity and to be charged with the task of obtaining a
Western education. At thirty-six years of age, he was a member of the first class of the high school established at Lahainaluna, Maui. He later served as a teacher and educational administrator, including Superintendent of Schools for the Kingdom from 1841 to 1845. He was an avid reader and lifelong supporter of education: “As soon as books were to be had in his own language, he seized each successive volume with the avidity of one actuated by a passion to learn” (A. November 5, 1853). He collected Hawaiian books, read them constantly, and bound his newspapers for further use. He was converted to Christianity, served as a preacher, and in 1852 became the third Hawaiian to be ordained. He had for some time been an essential aid to the missionaries in the translation and composition of Christian works in Hawaiian. He was an effective preacher and wrote works in support of Christianity. He served in the first House of Representatives, protested against the growing influence of foreigners in the Hawaiian government, and worked in many different ways for the good of his people. To give just one example, as “a man of business, and of industry and enterprise,” he supported a brief and unsuccessful movement to render Hawai‘i independent in the production of cloth by planting cotton and processing it until he had produced a complete suit for himself: “When asked where he got that strange-looking cloth (it was rather coarse) he would point to the dirt under his feet, saying ‘it came thence’” (A. November 5, 1853).

Malo’s greatest achievement was his manuscript *Ka Moolelo Hawaii*, the earliest book-length account of Hawaiian culture (Malo n.d.; 1951; 1987). That manuscript was often used as the foundation of the effort of nineteenth-century Hawaiian writers to preserve their past. Malo’s work was at the time not only the most complete written record of traditional knowledge, but presented that knowledge according to the traditional organization. The book was therefore the product of centuries of Hawaiian educational theory and practice and was treated with extraordi-
nary reverence. James Bicknell repeats what was perhaps only a rumor about Kalākaua (n.d.: 3):

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

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

One of those who profited from Malo’s work was the younger writer Samuel Mānaiakalani Kamakau (October 29, 1815–September 5, 1876). From a family of priestly intellectuals who converted to Christianity—*he poe mikiala i ke akamai* ‘a people prompt at intelligence’ (Kamakau August 25, 1866)—Kamakau entered Lahainaluna in 1833. He worked as a teacher and translator and became the most prolific nineteenth-century writer and controversialist on Hawaiian history and culture, often using his own family members as informants. He was also involved in various speculations placing Hawai‘i in relation to world and biblical history. He was active in politics and became a Roman Catholic in 1860.

Like Malo and Kamakau, S. N. Hale‘ole (ca. 1819–October 22, 1866) received both a Hawaiian and a Western education. He did extensive research in Hawaiian history and culture, little of which was published in his lifetime but was used by Kamakau after Hale‘ole’s untimely death. He is best known as the author of the world-class novel *Laieikawai* (Beckwith 1919).

Writing independently of Malo, John Papa ʻĪʻī (August 3,
1800–May 1870) was one of the most important Hawaiian government officials of the nineteenth century, serving in education, administration, the judiciary, and the legislature.\textsuperscript{13} He was educated by his mother to be a court functionary, an occupation he assumed at the age of ten. Like Malo, he was sent early to receive a Western education and performed valuable services for the missionaries. His writings contain much information on both classical and early Western education in Hawai‘i.

Kepelino Kahoali‘i Keauokalani (ca. 1830–1878) was born into a priestly family, and his father was known and recorded as a cultural expert (Kepelino 1932: 3 ff. [Beckwith]). He and his family were converted to Roman Catholicism in 1840, and Kepelino was educated by Catholic priests to be a teacher, learning English, French, Latin, and Greek. He worked briefly in his youth as an assistant missionary in Tahiti and wrote for the Catholic side in religious controversies. His writings on Hawaiian culture seem independent of those of Malo and his followers, and he is considered one of the greatest stylists of Hawaiian prose.

Moses Kuaea Nākuina (July 12, 1867–August 3, 1911) was also from a family with important priestly traditions (Charlot recently completed). His uncle Moses Kuaea was a famous pastor, and his father was a teacher in an English-language school. Nākuina began work as a government bureaucrat but left in a dispute with his boss, Thomas George Thrum, the editor of the Hawaiian Almanac and Annual, in which Nākuina published several translations. In 1902, he published two of the finest Hawaiian-language novels, Moolelo Hawaii o Pakaa a me Ku-a-Pakaa (1902a) and Moolelo Hawaii no Kalapana (1902b), which emphasized the educational and intellectual traditions of Hawaii‘i. The latter novel was left unfinished when Nākuina began the church work on which he concentrated until his early death.

The tradition of receiving both a Hawaiian and a Western education was a prominent feature of the life of Mary Kawena Pukui (1895–1986).\textsuperscript{14} Raised in the district of Ka‘ū on the island of
Hawai‘i, Pukui was the chosen member of her generation to carry on her family’s traditions. She became an invaluable resource for a number of scholars with whom she collaborated on books that are essential reading for all students of Hawaiian culture. To her contribution is largely due the fact that so much more information exists on Hawaiian family life than on that of other Polynesian groups.

I will cite many more authors about whom little biographical information is available. For instance, J. H. Kāne‘pu‘u’s charming memoir about growing up on Moloka‘i in the 1820s and 1830s (February 20–April 2, 1868) is an important source of information that would be otherwise unavailable. Kāne‘pu‘u wrote for the newspapers and was a sufficiently public personality to be recognized behind his disguises. Molokainuiahina (April 2, 1868) identified him under his pseudonym and gave the real names of family members and places behind those that Kāne‘pu‘u had invented. Yet Kāne‘pu‘u, like so many nineteenth-century Hawaiian authors, remains a subject for future research.

The great deposit of Hawaiian documents, published and unpublished, provides the basis on which detailed study can be done, especially on subjects that no longer admit of field research. Certain Hawaiian educational practices can in fact still be observed or have been described in the writings of near contemporaries, like Pukui. Many families, hula academies, and individual experts perpetuate into the present day practices that can be documented from the earlier literature. But many other practices must be identified or reconstructed from texts. In doing this, certain problems arise.

Since any study such as this must depend on postcontact written sources, questions of accuracy and continuity arise. This is especially true because change and creativity are as much a part of Polynesian culture as conservatism, resulting in a “persistence of pattern in a changing world” (Ritchie and Ritchie 1979: 8 f.; also 26). To ignore the historical process of Hawaiian culture is to fall
into the error of anthropologists who have “amputated our sense of time in human life” (Carrithers 1990:190; also 191 ff., 199–203). Rather than generalizing broadly on cultural change in Hawai‘i, I prefer to investigate individual cases and subjects. For instance, in literature, less difference is now seen by scholars between oral and written. Hawaiians perpetuated many classical genres, techniques, and even composition and performance practices, as well as transmitting a good deal of literature that shows no trace of foreign or postcontact influence. On the other hand, Hawaiians adopted foreign genres, such as songs and serial novels, and exploited many of the possibilities of print, such as editorial notes, references to previous publications, and the omission of previously published materials to which they could refer. In religion, some fields and practitioners adopted new practices and views, others remained free of them, and mixed forms were created.

In educational practices, the continuity seems remarkable. For instance, the literary forms used in education, such as lists, are found very widely and over a long time period. Moreover, the education and training of young children can be followed through postcontact literature: the reminiscences of John Papa ʻĪʻī of his childhood at the beginning of the nineteenth century (especially February 6, 1869–May 14, 1870); the accounts of J. H. Kānepuʻu of his early life in the 1820s and 1830s, disguised by the pseudonym of Kānewailani (February 20–April 2, 1868); and the writings of Mary Kawena Pukui, based on her own upbringing in the early twentieth century and also on her reading of Hawaiian literature. Interestingly as a kind of tease, Kānepuʻu regularly (and anachronistically) antedates his narrative by one hundred years; the point seems to be that growing up in the country had not changed much.\(^5\) These childhood reminiscences are among the liveliest and most interesting in any literature. More recent Hawaiian accounts can therefore be checked against earlier records.

Moreover, parallels and variants in other Polynesian cultures provide a means of control. For instance, the Tahitian \textit{tataorero}
can be compared to the Hawaiian *kākāʻolelo*, and both Tahitians and Hawaiians emphasize place knowledge. The same use of genealogies with stories to preserve and formulate historical accounts is found in Sāmoa as well as Hawaiʻi.

Most important sources for the subject of Hawaiian education are the writings of the missionary teachers who established a Western school system in the islands, starting in the 1820s. In 1831, the high school at Lahainaluna was founded and attracted some of the best Hawaiian minds of the time, such as Malo, Kamakau, and Haleʻole. Their principal teacher, Lorrin Andrews, was one of the most culturally sensitive and perceptive of the missionaries, and his reports convey a vivid picture of the intense cultural encounter experienced at the school. They also provide details that might more easily be expected of a contemporary cross-cultural psychologist. Indeed many of the intellectual differences between the cultures were openly discussed; Andrews writes (December 2, 1835: 2), “The scholars have frequently said to me, ‘we can’t think as you do’[.]” Significantly many of the observations made by missionary teachers in the early nineteenth century have been repeated by contemporary researchers and educational specialists.16

The influence of this Western schooling can be identified, for instance, by examining the schoolbooks used up through the 1840s and comparing them with Hawaiian writings (Appendix IV). Missionary reports are also important for identifying educational activities and processes prior to Western schooling. For instance, training in memorization was a standard part of the Western schooling of the time, but missionaries found that Hawaiians were already so adept at it that it created problems, such as identifying which students could read a text and which had simply memorized it. The missionaries’ surprise that Hawaiians were most interested in the genealogical passages in the Bible confirms the premissionary character of that interest.

In sum, a remarkable unity can be found in Hawaiian and
foreign sources on education, from the earliest to those of today. On the other hand, systematizing must be avoided, and the variations in the sources respected. Those variations provide indeed much of the richness of Hawaiian and Polynesian materials. Variations can be purely personal. ‘Ī‘ī was a good boy, so his parents did not instruct him with physical punishment: *O ka laua ao ana iaia, aole me ka hoopai* ‘Their teaching him was not done with slaps’ (‘Ī‘ī July 31, 1869). Kānepu‘u was a bad boy, so he was scolded more often. ‘Ī‘ī lived at political and cultural centers; Kānepu‘u was a backcountry boy. Lydia Delacerna stated that her famous hula master Pua Ha‘aheo was *olu‘olu* ‘pleasant, polite’ rather than *huhu* ‘angry, irritable’ like some other teachers (personal communication, November 8, 1990).

An individual took pride in his or her own traditions and personal knowledge; *‘o ka‘u hula no keia* ‘this is my hula’ (Pukui 1983: number 2571). Inventors and innovators would keep their advantages to themselves, their families, and perhaps their students. The chants composed by Pāka‘a and his brother should have been known only by them and their students, not by this strange boy who is in fact Pāka‘a’s son (Nākuina 1902a:63). The teacher would generally hold something back from his students until death, retaining the prestige of knowing something others did not.

The extended Hawaiian family perpetuated its own distinctive culture, its own special traditions and practices. This was true also of places, which could vary even in vocabulary, pronunciation, the calendar, the ranking and social position of nobility, and the division of labor by gender. Places were famous for certain products, such as tapa and *‘awa*, and activities, such as forms of the martial arts; places also competed with each other in various events. Some proverbial sayings had a purely local reference and currency (Luomala 1985: 289). Considerable local literatures were developed (Charlot 1983a:55–78). In Nākuina’s novel of a riddling contest, the hero Kalapana learns a crucial bit of place
knowledge only because he has traveled to study under his aunt in Hilo (1902b: 7, 9 f., 17). Even with his intensive preparation, Kalapana finds that he must learn special Kaua‘i rules for riddling and needs the help of a local person or *kama‘āina* ‘child of the land’, as well as good judgement (1902b: 27–30).

Throughout Hawaiian—and indeed Polynesian culture—individual differences are emphasized and prized. Most often, however, these can be seen as variations within a pattern. Accordingly each teacher has his or her own methods, but these can be placed within a similar educational context. ‘Ī‘ī (October 16, 1869) describes three schools of martial arts, each with its own master, rules, and style. But each school has those three elements, and each operates inside a stone enclosure (characteristically, Kamehameha I seems to amalgamate different schools within his own in order to be comprehensive). Pukui describes the differing teaching methods of two hula masters, but both operate within a specially built enclosure, use terms and rules, and have the same teacher-student relationship. Hoakalei Kamau’u stated at a dance concert (May 18, 1991) that her famous hula master ‘Iolani Luahine did not teach chants from written sheets, as other teachers did, but told the students “to watch her mouth” as she chanted. Similarly Western education is organized into levels and courses, but content and method vary.

Such a continuity during a time of intense change argues for the firm foundation of Hawaiian education in culture and society. That education is in fact rooted in fundamental ideas—such as the power of words and names—many of which continue to be influential today. Indeed Hawaiian culture offers a particularly clear example of the unexpected capacity of small native cultures to survive intensive contact with world cultures and modernization. Moreover, the first and most basic educational institution was the extended family, which proved one of the most stable elements of Hawaiian society. Through the nineteenth century and into the present day, the Hawaiian family has continued to
offer a traditional education of varying degrees of formality as an alternative to the official system introduced from the West (e.g., Hale’ole in Fornander 1919–1920: 67 ff.). The educational experience of most Hawaiians has therefore been bicultural as have their lives in general.

In view of the complexity of Hawaiian continuity and change, the separation of Hawaiian history and culture into precontact and postcontact is too simple for the purposes of this book. This is true also of the nineteenth-century division into two periods separated by the Christianization of the 1820s. I will use the following three categories for culture:

1. *Classical*—cultural elements that originated in the precontact period and were perpetuated with changes or developments, including genealogies, hula, and certain Hawaiian religious practices and values. The word *classical* is used as in the phrase “classical music,” implying a developing but continuous history. I use *classic* in the sense of a famous or recognized exemplar of a type.

2. *Traditional*—both classical cultural elements and those that originated in the postcontact period and were transmitted. For instance, it is classical practice to use sayings and historical references; it has become traditional to use the Bible and other foreign texts in the same way (e.g., Luomala 1985: 285 ff., 291). *Traditional* can be used as the umbrella term for both types of transmitted practices and materials.

3. *Foreign*—cultural elements that originated outside of the Hawaiian community, many of which were adopted, usually with modifications, by Hawaiians.

Other than pre- and postcontact, there is no commonly accepted periodization of Hawaiian history, although several have been proposed for prehistory.\(^{22}\)
Hawaiian education is clearly an important subject of academic research, both in itself and as a basis for understanding Hawaiian and Polynesian history and culture. A study of Hawaiian education is also important for the self-awareness and self-image of contemporary Hawaiians. Due mainly, I would argue, to the nearly total loss of Hawaiian language facility in the course of the twentieth century, Hawaiians have been severed from much of their intellectual heritage, which is enshrined largely in literary sources that have not been translated or that lose much in the process. As a result, many Hawaiians have come to believe the hostile stereotype that they are unintellectual, and some have even adopted it as a mark of cultural identity. Among the only too numerous expressions of this view is the often-heard statement that Hawaiians are all heart and haoles—‘foreigners’ and particularly whites—are all head. I have in fact heard Hawaiians deny that there was any extended intellectual life in precontact Hawai‘i. One student was told by his family that his ancestors had been simple people so completely occupied by their farming and fishing that they had no time for intellectual inquiry. He could not therefore understand how the great chant of the origin of the universe, the Kumulipo, had been produced. Such attitudes can be found in secondary literature. For example, Kelly writes (1982: 4), “before 1778, the skills people needed were basically those which brought about successful harvests of crops from the land and fish from the sea, and good health for the people.” Similarly Hawaiian cultural achievements tend to be classified as “folk arts” even when clearly products of a higher cultural level. Hawaiian teachers in the University of Hawai‘i system have confirmed to me that they have had to address this anti-intellectual stereotype. The response to the stereotype of the “big, dumb Hawaiian” is sometimes to play the role, a defense found also among Samoans in Hawai‘i, who have found that their culture and intellectual heritage are not recognized, much less respected.

Such attitudes contribute to the very real problems faced by
Hawaiians in the Western educational system. Indeed, intellectual and academic success can be considered a betrayal of one’s origins and a cause of alienation from the community. The college experience can be distorted from one of personal growth and intellectual expansion to one of political maneuver to obtain a degree valuable only for its usefulness in a society that the student considers hostile. A recognition of Hawaiian intellectual and educational achievements would help reduce the inner conflict felt by some Hawaiians today. Moreover, certain aspects of classical Hawaiian education might prove attractive and useful, just as education by kūpuna ‘elders’ and hālau hula ‘hula academies’ has succeeded with students who were uncomfortable with the Western school system.

The study of classical Hawaiian education is important also for the subject of a specifically Hawaiian way of thinking, which is currently much discussed. All human beings have the same intellectual capacities or fixed capabilities, but different cultures encourage different mental dispositions or learned tendencies in thinking; this pattern can be expressed in and supported by such activities as child-rearing and social expectations, recognition, and acclaim. The wide spectrum of human possibilities cannot be covered by one method of learning and teaching or by one psychological theory. Missionary teachers of Hawaiians emphasized strongly the intellectual capacity of their pupils: “the native children are not inferior to those of other lands in point of intellect.” This attitude accorded with the explicit antiracism of the mission. The educational task, as the teachers saw it, was both to introduce their students to new information and to train them in new ways of thinking. In modern terms, the meeting between the two cultures was that of two different sets of means of thought and communication. A culture provides devices such as vocabulary, concepts, images, and modes of reasoning, by means of which individual members can perceive and understand themselves in their world, can respond emotionally, seek intel-
lectually, and articulate creatively their individual views. To fail to recognize these activities in another culture is to rob its members of their full humanity and to deny ourselves a source of knowledge and insight as well as valuable companions and collaborators in our common human intellectual quest.

Means of thought and communication are also used on the most practical level of problem solving, and a study of such use in other cultures is valuable for understanding their complexity and creativity. Such a study is valuable also for appreciating the practicality of other cultures, the ways their members could use the means of thought and communication provided to achieve their particular and general goals. At a conference, after a non-Hawaiian gave a highly poetic and mystical description of Hawaiian religion, a Hawaiian responded, “But they still had to catch the fish.” The Hawaiian medical practitioner had to heal the patient. The chanter had to deliver the chant. How did and do Hawaiian ideas of power, balance, beauty, and the cosmos help them to accomplish those tasks? I argue that Hawaiian ideas are unreal to us unless we can answer that question, unless we can see the connection between the ideational and the practical. In the same way, we cannot understand the Hawaiian intellectual quest unless we see its connection to the Hawaiian experience of reality.

To acknowledge the success of the Hawaiian means of thought and communication at the practical level and their value at the philosophical is to accept their challenge; a challenge among others to our impractical notions of religion, the arts, and speculation. Hawaiian education is therefore of general interest. Hawaiian education should not be understood in the sense of mere enculturation, of encapsulation within a society or culture. Hawaiian education directs the student towards observation and creativity, towards a greater appreciation of living in the universe, understanding oneself in that context, and acting accordingly—the Great Search. An overemphasis on historical and cultural limitations, however important and worthy of respect, distorts
the basic human experience of confronting life as a reality to be explored through involvement, study, individual insight, debate, and creativity—a process that enables historical and cultural achievements to challenge us today. The goal of creating sensitive, well-rounded, moral, and searching human beings has inspired many cultures, each of which can help us in our own efforts.

This book is a general mapping of the large subject of classical Hawaiian education, each particular area of which merits an exhaustive study. I have tried to provide sufficient references to begin such particular investigations. Certain points—such as the application of knowledge to particular situations and the uses of experience—may seem not to require references, as they appear to be normal human behavior. However, the specific ways Hawaiians acted are important, and I want to avoid making assumptions and imposing foreign concepts or behavior. Moreover an object of this essay is to demonstrate—as best I am able through my own, admittedly limited reading—the wealth of materials available in the largely unused Hawaiian texts and the amount of information they can provide for a study of this type. Indeed, although indigenous texts cannot be understood without a basis in ethnography, that ethnography itself must be refined on the evidence of the texts. As Kenneth Emory stated in the case of the Tuamotus, “The ethnology is inextricably tied in with the chants and prayers, and largely depends on them for its authenticity” (Krauss 1988:241).

I have usually chosen to quote at length sources that are either unpublished or untranslated. I have used the original Hawaiian texts wherever possible. Besides the usual problems of translation, modern publications of Hawaiian works often suffer from the absence of the original language text and editorial omissions and displacements, often as particular as parts of sentences. These editorial practices have destroyed the original organization and forms of presentation, which are essential for this study.

Texts will be reproduced as published unless otherwise
noted. The texts vary considerably in spelling, word separation, and punctuation. I will use *sic* only in cases of possible confusion. The occasional apostrophes used for the glottal stop in some Hawaiian texts have been silently changed to the modern inverted apostrophe. My translations and simple glosses will be placed in single quotation marks; those of others in double (glosses in double quotation marks are from Pukui and Elbert [1986]). I have alphabetized the Hawaiian entries in the bibliography by the first word, whether it is an article or not, in order to facilitate use by those who do not know the language.

In the text, I have added macrons and glottal stops to often-used names, the pronunciation of which is reasonably certain. In the bibliography, I have retained the name as originally published. Long titles will be shortened for citation. When the title of a series varies, I will use a composite title for reference. If a Hawaiian article is unsigned but can be attributed with sufficient security, the author’s name is given in brackets in the bibliography, but not in the text references. Unless otherwise noted, all references to Andrews are to Lorrin Andrews; Kānepuʻu, to J. H. Kānepuʻu; Johnson, to Rubellite K. Johnson; Judd, to Henry P. Judd; and Stewart, to C. S. Stewart. Since the date of the reference will be provided as well, there should be no confusion. For clarity in the references, I have included the month and day in the dates of newspaper articles and letters. To save space, I have not repeated the name of the month in references: I write “September 10, 12, 1898” instead of “September 10, 1898; September 12, 1898.” I have numbered unnumbered pages except when they precede the first page; I then use the section title. I have regularized the citations from Malo n.d. to chapter numbers in roman numerals and section numbers in arabic. I have also followed the correct sequence of chapter numbers as corrected by another hand on the manuscript; the original numbers are of course important for a study of the composition of the work, but that is not the subject of this book. I use the original manuscript numbering xxxviii 56, 56 [bis], 57, 58, 59, 61, rather than the correction of Malo 1951 and Chun in Malo 1987: 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61 (Charlot 1992b:176).
No translation can convey the richness of the original texts. The reader should be particularly attentive to the repetition of key Hawaiian words, the result of the canonization of the vocabulary on education. I have not attempted a Hawaiian-to-English correspondence of individual words in my translations; the differences in my glosses reflect the range of possibilities of each term when placed in different contexts.

The nature of my subject has forced me to enter fields in which I am untrained, such as general psychology, educational psychology, cross-cultural cognition studies, and behavior modification. I can only hope again that I have indicated the amount of material available in Hawaiian sources to experts in those fields and sketched a historically accurate framework in which particular studies can be made. Indeed, I have not included many interesting sources, both primary and secondary; although I regret several, my book is already sufficiently charged. Finally I have largely, but not completely, avoided the more abstract theoretical issues that can be raised in connection with this subject. A close description of the evidence provided by the sources is necessary in almost all areas of Polynesian studies before larger theoretical concerns can be adequately addressed.

NOTES


2. Jaeger 1959: Vorwort; 1, ‘Education is the principle that is used by the human community to preserve and propagate its bodily and spiritual type’. Compare Premack 1984:15–18; Carrithers 1990:191ff. Later work on Greek *paideia*, such as that of Kevin Robb, offers many more parallels to the material presented in this book.
4. Premack 1984: 16, 18 (“By pedagogy, I mean that social process in which one individual observes another, judges him or her according to some standard, and intervenes to bring the novice’s behavior into conformity with the standard”), 29. Carrithers 1990: 197. D’Amato and Tharp, n.d.: 8, in social reproduction theory, society uses schooling to reproduce itself; 15, “the two constant challenges” of education are “language development and contextualization of instruction”; four variables are: “sociolinguistics, motivation, cognitive styles, and social organization.”
6. A. November 5, 1853. Malo 1897: vii–xxv (Chun). Chun 1993: 1–10, is the most complete treatment. Malo is often mentioned in the literature. Stewart 1831: 163, “Maaro” is working as the secretary of the chief “Hoapiri” (Hoapili). Andrews 1835: 139, “David Malo, one of the wisest of them.” Further references for the biographies of Malo and the writers mentioned below will be given throughout this book.
9. Richards, Andrews, Spaulding, and Chapin 1833: 262 f., Malo and Kauwa are superintendents of meetings “and may be considered as a kind of licensed preachers. They are unquestionably useful, and are esteemed so by the people.” Kuykendall 1947: 339. Chun 1993: 8.
10. For example, Malo 1837. “He Mau Hana Pono Ole Maanei” November 12, 1845: 91, urges Malo to write against hula, chant, and so on. A. November 5, 1853, Malo’s preaching was “more original, comprehensive, and instructive” than that of other native preachers.
14. For example, Handy and Pukui 1972: xvii. Kaeppler 1993: 147. Pukui preferred that her name be written without the modern macron and glottal stop: Pūkū’i.
15. Kānepu’u February 20 (1724, 1728); February 27 (1731); March 5 (1731, 1733); March 19, 1868 (1737). Molokainuiahina April 2, 1868, recognized this ploy. This bit of humor can be explained from two of the author’s themes. He
regularly contrasts his modern, realistic, and true narrative to the fabulous stories of the past that usually appear in the newspapers, and he emphasizes that his experiences were in all likelihood common to Hawaiian children. The antedating spoofs the fables and stresses the continuity with the past.

16. Appendix I. See also the reports of the Kamehameha Early Education Project (KEEP), Tharp and Gallimore 1988:115–129 and throughout; Tharp 1989:350; Vogt, Jordan, and Tharp 1987; Educational Perspectives, Volume 20, Number 1, Spring, 1981.

17. The Hawaiian extended family has been described at length in such works as Handy and Pukui 1972; and Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 and 1979. I will give my views on the family throughout this work and in Appendix III.


22. I would argue very generally for the following major periods: (a) the early contact period through the major conquests of Kamehameha I, (b) his reign, (c) from his death to missionization, (d) from the accession of Kamehameha III until that of Kalākaua, subdivided by reigns, (e) the reign of Kalākaua, and (f) from the accession of Liliʻuokalani until Annexation. Statehood and the beginning of the Hawaiian Renaissance of the 1970s could serve as divisions after Annexation.

23. Similarly the stereotype of lazy Hawaiians (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:306 f.) can be adopted as a group characteristic. I experienced a curious variant in my first class in Hawaiian religion at the University of Hawai‘i in 1974. A number of the younger students continually arrived late. When I asked about this, I was told that they felt it was un-Hawaiian to be punctual. I have never experienced such problems with older Hawaiians, who tend to be punctilious in religious, intellectual, and educational matters.

24. These problems have been studied in some detail in precollege education, e.g., Gallimore and Howard 1968; Gallimore, Boggs, and Jordan 1974: 58 ff. See also Appendix I. On Polynesians in general, see Keesing 1947; Ritchie and Ritchie 1979:129 ff.

25. Several Hawaiian students at the University of Hawai‘i told me during the 1970s and early 1980s that they were making a tremendous effort to complete their education so that they could serve their community. They
were finding, however, that their very presence at the university was estranging them from other Hawaiians. Similarly in the planning sessions for a mid-1980s conference on college-level Hawaiian studies, the majority of Hawaiians did not want their academic degrees listed so as not to alienate the nonacademics being invited. Recently, however, I have noticed some change in these attitudes.

26. The terminology is from Baron 1988: 118 f., 120 ff., 466 f.; also 114–117 (culture and education shape emotions), 135 (cultures provide certain ways of human development among the many possible in nature), 134, 138. See also Cole and Scribner 1974: 95 f. (the activities of a culture influence perception and problem solving), 49 f., 55–58, 193. Cultural differences in thinking can also be described in terms of focus, range, and emphasis.

27. Wilkes 1845: 73, the opinion of Alexander; also 77. Bingham 1981: 115, “evidence of the capacity of the natives”; 524, “minds had been unaccustomed to reason correctly”; 526, “The human mind, the human heart, the human soul, may safely be regarded as essentially the same in all ages and countries.” In a very critical report on missionary education in Hawai‘i, Andrews 1834a: 160 refuses to blame the problems on a supposed intellectual inferiority of Hawaiians. McLoughlin 1986: 360, missionaries made the same positive assessment of young Cherokee students. Blackburn 1808: 85, “In the course of the first week we had twenty-one children who all gave flattering evidences of promising geniuses.”

28. For example, Andrews 1829: 5. Whitney and Richards 1832: 8. Martin, Lyman, Bond, and Damon 1979: 148. Hutchison 1987: 47, all human beings have the same original parents, so a universal religion is justified. This Enlightenment view accorded with the Hawaiian tradition of human beings being descended from the original parents Papa and Wākea.


30. Cole and Scribner 1974: 173, 193–196. This aspect of culture is currently emphasized by anthropological practice theory.
Classical Hawaiian culture was highly complicated, artistic, and literary, and education shares these characteristics. My analysis will require the examination of much detail, and a brief sketch of my conclusions will provide a context for the individual points to be discussed.

Hawai‘i was widely settled by A.D. 700. The land was divided into *ahupua‘a*, sections that usually extended from the mountains out to sea and comprised a large valley or several smaller ones. These basic sections could be grouped into *moku*, or regions, and then into islands, *moku* or *mokupuni*. People usually lived in one place over many generations but could have a wide net of relations and travel frequently.

Society was based on extended families that were cultural units with their own traditions, gods, histories, and arts. Society was also divided into levels, starting from the *kauā* “Outcast, pariah, slave, untouchable, menial,” through the people without claims to land use, to the great majority of the population, the *maka‘āinana* ‘the people of the land, commoners’, who enjoyed land-use rights that were maintained over many generations. The *maka‘āinana* also formed the basis of the culture, developing the
practices, occupations, and forms that could be elaborated at the higher level of the ali‘i ‘chiefs’, themselves ranked by complex systems. Kāhuna ‘experts, priests’ were found at all levels—from the people of the land through the nobles. Although relations between levels of society naturally varied with time, place, and personality, the bulk of the evidence indicates that they were usually close, marked by respect and aloha ‘affection’ (Appendix III). The expressed ideal was certainly one of solidarity and hospitality.

The two foci of classical Hawaiian culture were family and place, around which clustered a variety of practices and expressions. These foci were not narrow. Family included past generations reaching to the original parents of all human beings—the female Papa ‘The Foundation Layer’ and the male Wākea ‘The Vast Spaces of the Sky’—forward to posterity, and outward through the large network of relatives. Place extended from one’s own land, to one’s ahupua’a, region, island, the chain of the Hawaiian islands, then outward to the legendary distant islands of Kahiki, and finally to the ultimate context: the universe bounded by sky and earth. The themes of land and family joined at the beginning of the universe, the mating of earth and sky, which started the long series of generations that filled out the universe as a family tree.

As members of their cosmic generation, Hawaiians studied the universe in its myriad relations in order to understand themselves as a part of their world. The Hawaiians’ study filled them with awe before the immensity of the universe and with grateful appreciation of its beauty. Learning is therefore at the center of the Hawaiians’ way of thinking and living. Education transmits the accumulated knowledge of past generations, and response and creativity add to the store. Life is ka ‘imi loa ‘the great search’ that involves all aspects of sensitivity, perception, intelligence, and action.

As in other fields, the Hawaiian vocabulary of education is large, as can be seen from a study of relevant English words in the
English-Hawaiian section of the dictionary by Pukui and Elbert (1986). Moreover, just as for other subjects, Hawaiians canonized a vocabulary with which to discuss learning, a set of words used regularly, which articulates a cultural attitude.¹ These words are not technical terms and can be glossed differently according to their context, as seen in the often long entries in the Hawaiian-English section of the dictionary, but they do tend to emphasize certain aspects or characteristics of more general definitions. A good example is the word for expert: *kahuna* (plural: *kāhuna*). It covers the broad spectrum of Hawaiian culture from the most practical to the most literary, intellectual, and ritualistic. But some measure of each extreme of the spectrum can be felt at each intermediate point: the fisherman uses ritual and the priest performs his ceremony for a practical effect. I will gloss *kahuna* as seems most appropriate for its use along the spectrum: *expert* towards the more practical end and *priest* towards the other. Occasionally I will need to use two English glosses, separated by a slash, for a single Hawaiian word.

Some words of the educational vocabulary are used regularly with broad, inclusive senses (*akamai, ka'a, no'eau*), but even these can express an emphasis. For instance, *no'ono'o* is often used with the sense of active thinking or considering.² Intellectual activity can be distinguished also as cleverness or even cunning (*ma'alea, 'āpiki*), knowledge and skill (*'ike, ka'a*), or wisdom (*na'auao, maha'o*).

Knowledge is connected to light and clarity (*na'auao* ‘entrails of light’); ignorance to darkness and confusion (*na'aupō* ‘entrails of darkness’).³ Correct knowledge, like morality, is straight (*pololei*); inaccuracy and dishonesty are crooked (*'apake'e*). Knowledge is careful and neat (*maiau*); the lack of it leads to entanglement and confusion.⁴ Knowledge is faultlessly effective and moves straight to its results; the opposite is to blunder and wander without result, often with a connotation of immorality.⁵ Knowledge is calm and settled; agitation is a sign of mental overexcitement or even instability.⁶
Ignorance and lack of skill are connected to physical awkwardness and then to carelessness, rudeness, and lack of consideration for others. The relation of intellect and skill to the body and ultimately to morality is an important theme of Hawaiian thinking on education, as discussed below.

Knowledge must be desired (akeakamai) and actively sought (‘imi ‘ike, ‘imi loa, ‘imi na‘auao). Ultimately one can achieve expertise, which brings appreciation (mahalo), fame (kaulana), and reward (waiwai). This vocabulary of education is used widely and fulsomely in Hawaiian literature.

Similarly conventional phrases recur:

ʻĪʻī February 5, 1870: boatmen who can handle the craft in bad weather are akamai no a maale[a]. (ʻĪʻī February 5, 1870).

Kamakau December 29, 1870, on Kūapāka'a, Ua naauao keia keiki, a ua makaukau i ka hoopaapa[a] olelo, a ua akamai loa ma ka hookele moana, a ua paanaau loa ia ia na makani o ka aina a me na makani o ka moana, a ua akamai loa i ke kilokilo-lani, a ua akamai loa i ke ano o na ao a me na hoku, a ua naauao loa i ke ano o ka pīi ana o ke au iluna a ilalo. . . . ‘This child was wise and was ready/prepared in verbal contests, and was very knowledgeable in navigation and had memorized the winds of the land and the winds of the sea, and was very knowledgeable in star lore, and was very knowledgeable in the types of clouds and stars, and he was very wise in the ways the currents arose above and below. . . .’

Trickster stories have conventional introductions referring to the cleverness of the protagonist:

Fornander 1918–1919: 419, He kanaka akamai loa o Kapunohu i ka pu a me ka nanenane ‘Kapunohu was a very knowledgeable person in pū (a guessing game) and in riddling’.

423, He kanaka akamai o Lepe i ka hoopunipuni i ke ‘kua ‘Lepe was a knowledgeable person in deceiving gods’.
The process of education is often described: learning or teaching (aʻo) to knowledge (ʻike, akamai) to readiness (mākaukau) or ease of action (maʻa, walea, walewaha):

Kauʻi November 13, 1865, e ao i ka hoopapa a makaukau ‘to learn the contest of wits until ready’.

Nākuina 1902b: 9, aʻo iho la a ʻike, a makaukau ‘learned until he knew, until ready’.

Kamakau December 22, 1870, He kanaka naauao o Pakaa, a ua aoia oia ma na oihana naauao me ka makaukau loa ‘Pākaʻa was a person who was naʻauao, and he was taught in all the naʻauao occupations with great readiness’.

i ao ai a makaukau ka holo moana ‘learned until ready for sea-faring’.

Nākuina 1902a: 34, Ao iho la laua, a aole i loihi ke ao ana, ua pau loa ae la ia mau mea i ka loaa i ua keiki nei, a ua lilo ia i mea walewaha iaia ‘The two [Pākaʻa and Kūapākaʻa] followed a course of instruction, and the instruction was not long before all these many things were exhaustively learned by the child and became things he could recite with perfection and ease’.

Knowledge is connected to prestige and fame:

Fornander 1918–1919: 419, Ua kaulana loa ia no kona maalea i ka hoopunipuni ‘He was very famous for his cleverness in deceiving’.

“He Moolelo no Pakaa” November 7, 1867, he keiki akamai a kaulana hoi o Pikoiakaalala i ka pana ana i ka ʻiole ‘Pikoiakaʻalalā was a child who was knowledgeable and famous in shooting rats with a bow and arrow’.

Many of the above expressions will be found in texts cited below. Proverbial sayings clearly encourage learning and pour scorn on ignorance (texts regularized):

Judd 1930: proverb 431: Mai haʻalele i ke aʻo ‘Never abandon learning’.

Pukui 1983: number 1957: Lawe i ka maʻalea a kūʻonoʻono ‘Hold to cleverness until it becomes deep’.

Pukui 1983: number 844: He noio ʻaʻe ʻale no ke kai loa “A noio [tern] that treads over the billows of the distant sea.”

Pukui 1983: number 1430: Ka lama kū o ka noʻeau “The standing torch of wisdom.”

Pukui 1983: number 1650: Ka waihona o ka naʻauao “The repository of wisdom.”

Pukui 1983: number 2318: Noʻeau ka hana a ka ua; akamai ka ʻimina o ka noʻonoʻo ‘Wise is the work of this person; intelligent is the search for thought’.

Pukui 1983: number 2814: Ua lehulehu a manomano ka ʻikena a ka Hawaiʻi ‘Numerous and multitudinous is the knowledge of the Hawaiian’.13

In contrast: number 621: He ʻike nāwele “A scanty vision.”14

In accordance with the ideal of completeness, knowledge and ignorance are contrasted respectively as fullness and emptiness, using the image of knowledge as objects or pieces of information:

Pukui 1983: number 643: He ipu kāʻeo “A full calabash.”


Pukui 1983: number 1247: I ʻolāʻolā nō ka huewai i ka piha ʻole ‘The partly filled water gourd gurgles indeed’.15

Wisdom is deep; ignorance is shallow.16 The young, the new, and the premature can be foolish:
Pukui 1983: number 715: *He lā'au maka no ka nāhelehele* “A green wood of the forest.”

Pukui 1983: number 2337: *No ke ʻēhu kakahiaka* ‘Only from the morning sea spray’.

Pukui 1983: number 2343: *No nehinei aʻe nei no; heaha ka ʻike?* “[He] just arrived yesterday; what does he know?”

Wisdom is solidly based: *E hana mua a paʻa ke kahua mamua o ke ʻaʻo ʻana aku iā haʻi* ‘Work first until the foundation is firm before teaching others’ (Pukui 1983: number 276); *he mea kahua ʻole* ‘A person without foundation’. Knowledge is clear and precise; ignorance hides behind vagueness (Pukui 1983: number 2527).

Cautionary and humorous tales make fun of ignorance and foolishness. The most famous are the stories of the brothers Waʻawaʻaikinaʻaupō and Waʻawaʻaikinaʻauao ‘Little Benighted Waʻawaʻa’ and ‘Little Enlightened Waʻawaʻa’, who have become proverbial. He mamo na Waʻawaʻa ma ‘A descendant of Waʻawaʻa and his ilk’ is “A fool” (Pukui 1983: number 796). People of different locations can be teased as foolish. Numerous trickster stories express an appreciation of cleverness. Extended narratives of experts and intellectuals, such as Pākaʻa and Kalapana, exalt them to heroic stature.

In accordance with the above views, life for Hawaiians is *ka ʻimi loa* ‘the great search’, on which they embark with confidence, as seen in the cry of the children’s game of hide-and-go-seek: *O ʻimiʻimi, o nānā wale, o loaʻa, a loaʻa hoʻi e* ‘Seek continuously, look around, catch, until it is indeed caught’ (Judd 1930: proverb 536). But the universe has infinite depth, so the search of life is endless: *ʻAʻole i pau kuʻu loa* ‘My length is not yet reached’; and not everything can be known (Pukui 1983: number 2405). As a result, no one person or school has an exclusive claim to all knowledge: *ʻAʻohe i pau ka ʻike i kāu hālau* ‘Knowledge is not exhausted in your
academy’; ‘Aohe pau ka ‘ike i ka hālau ho‘okahi ‘Knowledge is not exhausted in a single academy’. Nonetheless achievements in the unending search for knowledge are undeniable: Ka hohonu i hiki ‘ole ke ana ‘ia, akā, ua ‘ike ‘ia nō kahi mau papa ‘The depth is unfathomable, but several strata have indeed been seen’ (Charlot 1983a:119).

This intellectual emphasis and the ideal of education are applied throughout Hawaiian culture. As a result, fields that are usually considered nonintellectual in Western culture are treated as ‘oihana ‘ike ‘occupations of knowledge’. Kamakau can therefore write (December 14, 1867): He lahui mahiai, a he lahui naauao ka lahuikanaka kahiko o Hawaii nei ‘A farming people and a people that was na‘auao “wise, enlightened”, the olden people of Hawai‘i here.’ For the nineteenth-century writer Kepelino, farming is very much part of the great search, the intellectual quest of Hawaiian life (Charlot 1983a:116 ff.). Similarly intellectual expressions are applied to sports. John Papa ‘Ī‘ī (August 7, 1869) writes: ua mahalo ia ka mea akamai i ka lele kawa ‘The person was appreciated who was akamai in the sport of jumping from a cliff into the sea’. The same word can be used for horse riding (Kānepu‘u March 5, April 2, 1868).

Despite all the differences, a widely shared, general form of education can be found. Hawaiian culture and society promoted the life of learning: Mai ha‘alele i ke a‘o ‘Never abandon learning’. The subjects of proverbs demonstrate that even the smallest, apparently insignificant aspects of life and practice could be used as sources of knowledge and subjects of meditation. Hawaiians, like other Pacific Islanders, possessed a good, general competence to meet the needs of their daily living and ordinary emergencies. The appreciation and creation of literature was considered a normal part of such a competence, among children and backcountry people as well as among the elite.

The primary institution of education was the family, which formed its own cultural unit, its members servicing each other’s
basic needs. If an individual was particularly skilled at a certain function, nonfamily members could seek his or her services in special cases. Certain families were recognized over generations for their particular talents, such as medicine, dance, chant, canoe making, religion, or advising. Nākuina (1902b: 4) is reflecting on this characteristic when he designates an inherited family aptitude for the formal contest of wits as *ka ‘ike maoli* ‘the genuine knowledge’ as opposed to a merely acquired competence, *he a‘o maoli* ‘learning in the literal sense’, of an amateur of the contest of wits, *Puni Hoopapa*. A member of the new generation would be carefully and religiously chosen to be the future leader in the family specialty. Kūapāka‘a carries on his family traditions, skills, and specialized knowledge, which he has been taught by his father Pāka‘a. Kalapana perpetuates in his generation the family aptitude for the contest of wits inherited from his mother. Hawaiian society is in fact remarkable for the intense development of specializations and professionalism—that is, people depending on their occupation as their primary means of support.

A specialist or expert, *kahuna*, could become so famous that nonfamily members would come from great distances to study under him or her. Schools were therefore developed, such as the famous *hālau hula* ‘hula academies’, usually under one master teacher working with advanced students as assistants. These schools were structured according to the model of the family. The ‘*aumākua* ‘ancestral gods’ of the school were the great founders and innovators of the occupation. The school kept its genealogy of teachers (related or not) and its history, practiced its own rituals, and developed its own style. Students were selected as carefully as within a family, and the teacher-student relationship lasted for life. The word *māna* is used both for a family trait and for the special quality that a teacher transmits to a pupil.

A number of different experts were gathered by chiefs to make their courts centers of learning, both for young nobles and for talented commoners. The major temples were quasi
universities with experts of a wide variety of professions teaching under the overall direction of the high priest, who was supposed to have a professional competency in all.

A characteristic of Hawaiian culture is the active spreading, *laha*, of knowledge. New chants composed at court would quickly spread through the area, the island, and then to other islands. The sayings, stories, and new cults of the people would make their way to the attention of the chiefs and priests, as seen in the development of the Kamapua‘a literature (Charlot 1987: 8–12). Hawaiians would go sightseeing, *māka‘ika‘i*, to the places they had heard about in literature. They would visit distant specialists to increase their knowledge and watch the public rituals, deliberations, and conversations. In the professionalization of such encounters—the formal contests of wits, *ho‘opāpā*—the winners would achieve great prestige and fame, and the losers would be scorned or even killed.

The views and ideals of education reflect its importance in Hawaiian life. Knowledge was supposed to be practical and useful rather than useless and ineffective. But Hawaiians had a broad idea of practicality, from the basic skills needed for survival to the highest speculation on the origin and structure of the universe that provided them with a mental context for their lives. Accordingly activities were considered *‘oihana ‘ike* ‘occupations of knowledge’. For instance, farming was considered an intellectual and cultural activity, not a merely mechanical one; it was a means of deepening one’s view of the environment and therefore of life as a whole. Farming was therefore encompassed by religious teachings and practices. In many senses, Hawaiians considered knowledge a matter of life and death and therefore emphasized the need for industry and energy.

Because knowledge was effective, it was considered powerful. Human beings, powerful in themselves, use their knowledge to turn the elements to their advantage, as their sails use the winds. The word spoken by human beings was also powerful, effecting
changes not only in human society, but in the world around them as well. This power of the knowledgeable person could seem magical to the ignorant, and stories like that of Pāka‘a could include fabulous elements. Knowledge of the gods could also enable one to call on them successfully. The relation of knowledge to power and of human power to godly was the subject of widely differing speculations among Hawaiian thinkers. In opposition to earlier sources, Nākuina, with his theological interests, states that the knowledge of Pāka‘a and his opponents was equal, and his advantage derived from the godly power of the wind gourd (1902a: 30).

In any case, like all sources of power, knowledge was surrounded with prayers and rituals. For instance, a student needed to be accepted by the gods—most often the ‘aumākua ‘ancestral gods’ of the profession—in order to graduate.

Because knowledge was powerful, morality was an essential component of education. The students needed moral solidity to be able to handle the powers with which they came in contact. The teachers had to be sure that their students would not misuse the power they imparted to them. The teachers of martial arts usually withheld some of their knowledge in case a student should turn against them.

As with the holism of the ancient Greeks, morality included demeanor, the whole presentation of the person: both etiquette and a positive attitude. Cultivated persons were in fact effective in that they won friends and allies who helped them succeed. The learning of Kūapāka‘a impressed his interlocutors, and his good manners disposed them towards him. Kalapana’s youth, skill, and correctness endeared him to the crowd watching the contest of wits. Kamehameha’s success with foreigners was attributed to his courtesy and fairness, which gained him their respect, trust, and even affection.

Classical Hawaiian culture demanded perfection of presentation. The first poi made and served by a child had to be perfectly smooth. To be effective, a prayer had to be chanted without
fault. According to a story from Kahana Valley, O‘ahu, taro that is planted crooked will grow misshapen. Criticism was therefore important. Hula masters invited other teachers to criticize their students. A new chant was picked over word by word before it was considered finished. Competition, disagreements, and controversies sharpened work and promoted excellence.

Important in an oral tradition is that knowledge be complete down to the last and smallest details. Anything unlearned or forgotten will be lost. Kūapāka‘a needed to learn the names of all the winds and of all the men in the chief’s canoe. Specialists moved beyond the general competence by learning all the details of their profession. Certain gifted individuals could attain a professional knowledge of several occupations. The greatest scholars, the high priests, were supposed to be competent in most or even all fields and were accorded immense prestige.

Knowledge was constantly tested. Children played riming games to show who had learned the most vocabulary and sang chants with blanks to be filled in with the material they had learned. Testing took place at public displays, necessary in an oral culture to establish one’s position and status. At graduation, the student had to demonstrate to other experts and the community his knowledge and that of his teacher along with the power of their god. Experts would debate genealogical points in public. Learned people would challenge each other in contests of wits, ho‘opāpā, on the outcome of which they could wager their lives.

Such public displays of knowledge generated much excitement in the community and provided with their wordplay and chants much esthetic delight. Education could therefore be entertaining and vice versa (mikomiko). Losers earned shame, scorn, and even death. Winners would be recognized and praised, and their names and stories would be passed down in history. Classical Hawaiian culture emphasized the legitimacy of being proud of one’s knowledge, skill, and accomplishments.
Reports of such activities as well as other sources demonstrate the vast amount of information that was transmitted orally in Hawaiian culture, and a study of educational practices reveals how this was done. A well-recognized method is training in observation. Young children and beginning students were not supposed to ask questions, but to learn first to watch attentively the activities of their elders. The wide range of such activities made normal Hawaiian life a rich opportunity for learning. This close observation inspired imitation, an important part of childhood games and adult humor. On a higher level, hula students were trained to imitate plant movements and chanter sounds in the environment. Play and sports were conscious preparation for adult occupations.

Observation and imitation are, however, limited means for the transmission of knowledge. The verbal dimension of Hawaiian education has not been sufficiently studied, but was clearly a major part of Hawaiian culture as a whole and necessary for higher education. Children and students were trained to listen carefully, hoʻolohe, an obvious necessity in an oral culture. The wide range of verbal and literary activities mentioned above provided an ideal learning environment. Moreover, just like observation, attentive listening was a lifelong virtue. The chief who disregarded his counselors was called an aliʻi hoʻokuli ‘unhearing chief’, and many cautionary tales warned of the disastrous consequences of his deficiency.

Listening was often the first step in memorizing, again a necessity in an oral culture and therefore emphasized in education and often mentioned in literature. Modern psychological studies of memory distinguish immediate memory of about one second, short-term memory of between fifteen and thirty seconds, and long-term memory, which must be actively maintained. Hawaiians were trained to grasp what they had heard, ʻapo or ʻaʻapo, and then to place it in long-term memory by silent
rehearsal, so as not to be heard by unauthorized ears. They were then trained to maintain that long-term memory and to retrieve memorized information and use it in different ways.

Various devices, such as physical memory aids, were used in this process. The most important device was the verbal organization of knowledge for easier memorization and recall. Psychological studies have demonstrated that organized materials are easier to process than random ones. Items should be organized into groups, categories, or classes. The members of well-organized groups have some clear relation to each other, which can be expressed by a title or attribute. The better and clearer the organization, the easier the information will be to remember and retrieve.

The most basic device is the word or name, which identifies a referent for use in thinking and communication (epithets are also used). The intensive use of vocabulary in Hawaiian culture is demonstrated by its size and precision, a result of close observation: colors of the water, states of the ocean, parts of plants, emotions, and so on, are minutely differentiated by the words applied to them. Words and names are important throughout Hawaiian culture and were considered to possess a real connection to their referents. Knowledge of vocabulary was clearly practical, but it was also considered a participation in the wisdom of the past and the accomplishments of the ancestors. Vocabulary was a treasure to be valued and transmitted to future generations.

Words themselves were then organized into groups or lists, a major genre in Hawaiian literature. A body of knowledge would be māhele ‘divided’ into divisions—āpana or papa—by ʻano ‘type’, which corresponds to an attribute. Items appropriate to the division would then be picked, ʻōhi, and inserted, hoʻokomo, into it. Hawaiians can pray, Hō mai ka ʻike nui, ka ʻike iki ‘Give the big knowledge, the little knowledge’.

Hawaiians used many types of lists, both spontaneous and memorized. Memorized lists could be informal, that is, inserted
into the syntax of a larger sentence. That they were memorized can be recognized by the fact that the same list of items, such as weapons or offerings, was used by different people.

A formal list had a definite, conventional structure, of which there were many types. A common one had an introduction: *Eia ka inoa o ...* or *Eia nā inoa o ...* ‘Here are the name/s of. . . .’ This was followed by a description, usually short, of the subject or attribute of the list, such as red fish, shore fish, or deep-sea fish. The list was then provided and was often followed by a termination, such as *he nui nō ka/nā inoa o ...* ‘Many indeed are the name/s of. . . .’ A list could consist of stereotyped lines with blanks to be filled in; the word *mea* ‘thing, something’ or ‘person, someone’ is used for the blank in Hawaiian discussions of this form. There were several sorts of counting lists—prominently ones of ten items. These could be used as incantations: the effect was produced when the count of ten was reached.

In order to conform to the ideal of completeness, a given field should be completely covered by the lists used to describe it. For instance, every single known fish should be listed when discussing the subject, even if some fish were considered so singular as to form their own category, that is, a list of which they were the sole item. Moreover, the completeness of each individual list was emphasized. That every item should be named that fits the attribute was the principle both of childhood games and of the professional contest of wits. Finally information could be reorganized according to need. An individual item could appear on several lists if it fit their attributes. For instance, a pig could appear on a list of animals and on a list of appropriate offerings. The rapid retrieval and reclassification of memorized information was also tested by games and contests.

A great deal of information could be organized clearly by means of such word lists. Their use in education was also influential on other literary forms. Lists appear often in chants, such as lists of gods in prayers. Chants can themselves be lists,
like the famous chant of Kana, which lists all the items in a canoe. The wind chants of Pāka‘a and Kūapāka‘a are prime examples of list chants. In prose, stereotyped lists of weapons are found often in accounts of battles, and the frequent itineraries are expressed as lists of place names. Genealogies are lists of family members.

The next higher level of organization was the hierarchical structuring of lists themselves. For instance, a discussion of fish would divide that subject into fresh-water and salt-water fish; lower levels of organization could be reef fish, deep-sea fish, and so on. The year was divided into two seasons, hot and rainy; they were in turn divided into months, the months into days, and the days into periods. The hierarchical society itself could be articulated in a hierarchical list of offices. This structuring influenced Hawaiian speaking and writing, which moved almost invariably from general to particular, big to small, high to low, and from category to detailed contents. Hawaiian verbal expression is in fact easier to interpret once this pattern has been recognized.

The highest level of organization was the division under a pair of opposites, pairs found in Polynesia and indeed worldwide. These pairs were used to organize large amounts of information and even the universe as a whole. They could be used also in short formulas that expressed completeness. The choice of a pair depended on its utility for the subject under discussion.

The two pairs most often used for organizing physical items were luna/lalo ‘up/down’ and uka/kai ‘land/sea’. Both pairs were used in formulas to designate totality. They provided a clear cosmic picture to which an individual item could be quickly and easily connected either directly or by rising through increasingly general categories. Other pairs used with similar extension were male/female and pō/ao ‘night/day’. The latter has the advantage of expressing chronological sequence and thus was used in the Kumulipo to describe the development of the universe. Other pairs, such as loko/waho ‘inside/outside’ could designate totality
but were used only on special occasions for limited purposes. These pairs of opposites could be repeated in subordinate classes and could be combined with great creative freedom. All had literal and symbolic uses.

An item was thus understood by being placed correctly in a universal frame of reference. This method can be found worldwide and, along with further parallels to education in other cultures, suggests that Hawaiian pedagogy is an especially well-preserved example of similar systems that were developed to serve the needs of oral, family-based societies.

The use of these paired opposites has had an important influence on Hawaiian thinking. Rather than strictly delineating a subject or problem, Hawaiians seek its outermost parameters, connecting everything to its cosmic context. Balance is an inculcated virtue in Hawaiian thinking and presentation. Pāka'a scolds Kūapāka'a for not chanting the winds of the extreme western island after he has chanted those of the extreme eastern one (Nakuina 1902a:60).

The verbal organization of knowledge described above was used along with other methods in the teaching of Hawaiian subjects or bodies of knowledge and occupations. The amount of material learned and even memorized in such education is impressive. Knowing the material was, however, not enough; it had to be put to practical use. Hawaiians devised therefore methods for training the mind in the quick retrieval, reclassification, and application of information to new situations.

Prominent among these methods was riddling and its extension and professionalization, the *hoʻopāpā* ‘contest of wits’. Such contests can be adequately understood only in the context of classical Hawaiian education, that is, they tested knowledge according to the rules by which it had been organized. For instance, many contest rounds depended on completeness of knowledge. One side proposed a category, listed all the items that belonged to
it, and challenged the other side to add an item. Kalapana, faced with his opponents’ list of islands, won by adding to it the tiny Mokuola in Hilo bay (Judd 1930: proverb 45).

A virtuoso variation on the usual method of testing for completeness was to create an attribute so odd and particular that only one item could be found to fit it, frustrating the opponent. Such categories of one item were in fact used in special cases in the Hawaiian organization of knowledge. An example from a contest is the *pinao* ‘dragonfly’, proposed as the single item that fits the attribute *manu lohelohelohelohelohe* ‘drooping bird’. The opponent counters with the ‘ūhini ‘long-horned grasshopper’, an answer based on close observation. Both sides may be playing on *lohelohelohelohe* as ‘drooping’ or ‘dragonfly larvae’. Such word play was an extremely complicated part of contests, as were allusions, similarities of form, and so on.

The use of pairs was central to contests of wits; “the natural philosophy of opposites which he [the contestant] must master” (Beckwith 1932:333). The boy hero is contrasted to the adult experts. Told by his opponents that he cannot come inside the house, Kalapana answers that they cannot come outside, and they are trapped. Challenged by the ‘o’opu fish as the single item that fits the attribute ‘the fish that has no home except rock’, the boy answers simply the ‘o’opu kai ‘the sea-’o’opu’. One round will be based on plants *i lalo* ‘below’; the next round, plants *i luna* ‘above’.

The contest of wits displayed one’s education, both by following the educational structure and by playing with it. The mind had first to learn a vast amount of material and then to be quick in retrieving it completely and flexible in reclassifying individual items, inventing new classifications, and applying one’s knowledge to new questions, problems, and situations.

Learning needed in fact to be joined to personal experience. Place songs combined the traditional perceptions of a place with one’s own personal response. In facing a political problem,
one needed to know the many models provided by history and to apply the proper one. The highest prestige was accorded to persons versed in tradition who attained such personal expertise that they could innovate and add their creations to the common heritage. Oral cultures can be described as conservative in that more effort is needed and made to preserve traditions; indeed the wide distribution of certain elements argues for their great antiquity. Moreover, traditions are more interiorized when memorized rather than recorded. Nevertheless Hawaiians clearly considered their traditions materials to be used: treasures discovered by their ancestors for the well-being of posterity.

Classical Hawaiian education was a major factor in the formation of Hawaiian character, and many of the personal qualities described by early visitors to Hawai‘i can be ascribed to it: the Hawaiians’ alertness, intellectual curiosity, quickness to learn, and tenacious memory.

In postcontact times, Hawaiians perpetuated their classical views on education and adapted them to their new historical situation. For instance, the classical vocabulary was applied to new occupations, such as painting, and to success in Western schooling. Hawaiians composed sayings that applied to the new knowledge introduced by foreigners. Kamehameha III in his accession speech stated that his was a government of palapala, of documents or literate education, a statement that was then used as a saying. Lahainaluna School, the first institution of higher Western education in Hawai‘i, was the subject of praise sayings (Pukui 1983: numbers 1414, 1428). A riddle—Ka wai ‘ele‘ele a ka po‘e ‘ike ‘The black liquid of the people who know’—is answered by “ink” (Pukui 1983: number 1646). Most basically, Hawaiians were anxious to learn the introduced Western knowledge. In Lorrin Andrews’ words, “there has existed, and does now exist among the people, a great desire for instruction.” In a moving passage, the farmer Maoloha says with hope to his son Kānewailani/Kānepu‘u (April 2, 1868):
E kuu keiki, aole o‘u makemake i ka paani a me ke kaloe, hoo-kahi a‘u mea makemake nui ia oe, o ka mea au e hele la, oia hoi ka imi ana i ka ike mailoko mai o ka wailanahu a ka haole, oia hoi ka imi ana i ka ike i ka palapala.

‘My child, I take no pleasure in your play and mischief. I have only one great wish for you: the reason you go [to school], that is, the search for knowledge from inside the ink of the foreigner, that is, the search for the knowledge in the writing/document.’

Kekūanao‘a (1864: 11) writes of poor Hawaiians, “hardly one can be found, so well do the people understand the value of knowledge, who does not give his children the best education he can afford.” Hawaiians were also proud and supportive of the educational policy and efforts of their government (Kaulainamoku June 2, 1858). The nineteenth-century historian, S. M. Kamakau writes that the waiwai ‘treasure’ of the nation of Hawai‘i is its success in education, so that ua heluia kakou me na aupuni naauao no ka hiki wawe ma na mea naauao ‘We are counted among the enlightened nations because of our promptness/speediness in intellectual matters’ (Kamakau March 5, 1844: 15); he expresses the hope that e lilo keia aupuni i poe akamai me ka naauao ‘this nation will become a knowledgeable and enlightened people’ (16).

Despite—or more correctly, along with—this appreciation of the new learning, important nineteenth-century Hawaiian writers remained convinced of the value of the classical native education. ‘Ī‘i (April 16, 1870) writes on fixed stars, ua ike nui ia ia ano, no ka mea, ua aoia ia ano ‘this type was well known because this type was taught/learned’.

A common theme of such writers is the value of Hawaiian knowledge.²⁸ Kepelino (1932: 99) states emphatically that knowledge of the lunar calendar was not just superstition, but was a part of ko Hawaii nei naauao kahiko ‘the ancient wisdom of our Hawai‘i’; it was brought to these islands over a thousand years
before Bingham and the other Calvinist teachers arrived. Hale‘ole relates how he had both Western and Hawaiian teachers, and his experience demonstrated to him that the Hawaiians were sometimes right.\(^{29}\) Although he learned many branches of Hawaiian knowledge at home, *aole wau i manao maopopo i ka waiwai o keia mau mea* ‘I did not realize clearly the value of these things’; but he believes now that they are *he waiwai nui ia no‘u, a no ko‘u hooilina, a me ko‘u lahui* ‘a great treasure for me and for my heirs and my people’. Joseph L. Kukahi (February 1, 1902: 12) goes so far as to state that depth and breadth of the account of the origin of the universe in the *Kumulipo* evokes greater feelings of religious reverence and awe than the biblical account.

Much of the great knowledge of the past, they argued, was now lost; the people of their day were not as knowledgeable as those of old. A few quotations from Kamakau illustrate this theme:

\[
O ka nui o na hana akamai a ka poe kahiko o Hawaii nei, ua pau loa i ka nalowale ‘The majority of the knowledgeable occupations of the people of old of our Hawai‘i have all disappeared’ (January 4, 1868).
\[
ua kupanaha loa ke akamai a me ka hohonu o ko lakou ike . . . He mea kupanaha loa no ko lakou akamai. Aole no e hiki ia kakou i keia wa ka lakou mau hana ‘Most astonishing was the skill and the depth of their knowledge. A most astonishing thing indeed their knowledge and skill. Indeed we are not able to do in this day what they did in theirs’ (December 21, 1867).
\[
No ka Mooolelo Hawaii keia Mooolelo, e pili ana i ke akamai a me ka naauao o ko kakou poe kupuna i ka holo moana, i ka nana hoku . . . ua oi ko oukou [sic: lākou] ike ko ka poe hou ‘This Report is part of Hawaiian History relating to the knowledge/skill and wisdom of our ancestors in navigation and astronomy . . . Your [sic: their] knowledge was greater than that of the new people’ (August 12, 1865).
Chapter I

In the old days, they worked with skill/knowledge and great wisdom to catch fish. But the skillful, knowledgeable people have all died, and the great occupations of fishing have disappeared (December 14, 1867).

What about the knowledge and the people called wise in these days? Does their wisdom stand equal to that of Kūapāka’a, and what wealth of Moloka‘i, of the government, was paid to Pāka‘a for teaching his son?

Later writers expressed the same opinion. The author of “Ka Oihana Lua a Mawaii Lahuui [sic]” (July 19, 1923) wants the fame of Hawaiian achievements to be preserved for posterity. Foreigners come to Hawai‘i to research Hawaiian culture and leave their work in the hale hoikeike o Kamehameha ‘the museum of Kamehameha’ [the Bishop Museum], but the old knowledge is often not available today. What is a stone adz compared to a steel axe? But great work was done with stone adzes, as the author has seen with his own eyes; indeed, he could not write of the martial art of lua ‘bone-breaking wrestling’ unless he had seen it himself and learned it from his grandfather.

In view of this situation, such writers felt impelled to perpetuate Hawaiian traditions through writing. Typical of these was Hale‘ole, quoted above, who along with his colleagues worked me ko makou hilina nui e malama no ka hanauna mahope mai ‘with our great faith and confidence to preserve [information] for the generations after us’ (April 20, 1865); the work they did e like me ka hana ana a ka poe kakau moolelo o na aupuni naauao o ka honua nei ‘is like the work of the history writers of the enlightened nations of this earth’ (June 15, 1865).
“No ka hiki ana mai o ka malamalama i Hawaii nei” May 9, 1834, o ka olelo kahiko o keia mau aina aole i pai ia. Auhea oukou e na lii malama aupuni, e ae ana i ka naauao, e ae mai oukou, e pai ae na moo kuauhau kupuna ma ka olelo honua, no ka mea o ka olelo kahiko no ia o keia mau aina, malia paha o pau oukou i ka hala e aku, nalo wale loa ka olelo kumu o Hawaii nei mai ka mole mai. A i ole e pai ia la ea! he hoailona ia no ka na’ili malama i ka mea mea kahiko ‘the old language of these lands [of Hawai‘i] is not printed. O you chiefs who care for the government, agreeing to wisdom, consent that the ancestral genealogies be printed in the language of this earth, because this is the old language of these lands; perhaps when you have all passed away, the source language of our Hawai‘i will simply disappear completely from its very root. That is, if it is not printed! It is a sign of the chiefs’ care for the things of old’.

Bush and Paaluhi January 5, 1893: Hawaiians should cherish their literature as other peoples do theirs. Loss of literature leads to the loss of language and ultimately to that of the people itself. O keia hauleule ana o na moolelo, oia kekahi ouli a ke kilo e nana ai me ka naau i piha i na mana hoopohopo no ka mau ana o kona lahui maluna o ka aina o kona mau kupuna, no ka mea, e hoike mau ana ka moolelo io maoli o na aina i kakau ia na moolelo ‘This loss/forgetting/falling away of the stories is a sign for the observer to study with entrails filled with thoughts of fear for the perpetuation of his people on the land of his ancestors; because [the stories] show enduringly the true, authentic history of the lands in which the stories are written’.

Bush and Paaluhi January 6, 1893: a people will not endure for long, but will disappear if it does not revere and cherish with enthusiasm its stories and songs of all sorts; these should be discussed with the young people in a way that inspires them to the same feelings, inspires them with ke aloha ‘āina ‘the love of the land’ by means of the stories and songs related to their one hānau ‘the sands of their birth’, its wahi pana ‘famous places’, and the famous deeds of their ancestors. The authors hope that
their writings will be received with *ka pu‘uwai aloha ʻāina* ‘the heart that loves the land’ and understood with maturity, *aole ma ke ano he mea e hoala mai ai i na li‘a a me na kuku hewa, aka, me ka wae ana ae a hoopaa a hoomau aku i ka io o ka olelo a me ka nani o na puana a me na hooku‘iku‘i huaolelo o ke kaao a me kona mau mele*. . . *not as something to awaken wrongful cravings and desires, but with selection and reflection to fix and perpetuate the authenticity of the language and the beauty of the utterance and the joinings of the words of the tale and its songs . . .’

“He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna, Hawaii” 1902: the author offers his story for the readers happiness *e hoomau ia ai ka hoomanao ana iloko o ka houpo o na opio hou o Hawaii ma kela hope akp [sic: aku], i ike, a i hoomaopopo ai lakou i na mea e pili ana i ko lakou one oiw i me na hana kaulana i lawelawe ia e ko lakou mau kupuna o ke au kahiko, kela au i okikilo loa i hala wale aku la, a i hoomauia aku ai hoi na hoomanao ana a me ka paanaau o ia mau hana kaulana mawaena o na pulapula hou o keia lahui, a o ka manaolana hoi o Hawaii ma keia hope aku ‘in order that the remembrance be perpetuated into the future inside the breast of the new youth of Hawai‘i so that they see and understand the things relating to their native sands [homeland] and the famous works undertaken by their many ancestors of the ancient period—that period examined thoroughly, passed forever—and so that the memories be perpetuated along with the memorization of these many famous doings among the new descendants of this race, the future hope indeed of Hawai‘i’.*

Societies were founded for research into Hawaiian culture and history and for the dissemination of the information discovered (chapter V). By the early twentieth century, an enormous body of Hawaiian-language material had been produced on many aspects of traditional Hawaiian culture.

This productivity in recording Hawaiian traditions and the emotion behind it are surprising in view of the then conventional division of Hawaiian history into the benighted, premissionary
times, the *wā naʻauropō*, and the enlightened, postconversion epoch, the *wā naʻauao*. Expressions of ambivalence are indeed frequent; a friction that reaches a tragic intensity in the work of Kepelino. In fact, few Hawaiians rejected completely either past or present. The majority could be arranged along a spectrum of appreciation of old and new. But all could recognize the traditional culture as the benchmark from which the rapid changes in their history, lifestyle, and self-image could be measured as well as the age in which their major literary, artistic, and social forms were created. That past could be reinterpreted, idealized, or condemned, but it remained a major subject of discussion.

The educational tradition of Hawai‘i provided the intellectual and emotional context within which Hawaiians faced the challenge of foreign penetration. Hawaiians were not passive victims or uncritical recipients of Western culture; rather they understood the introduced materials in their own way and connected the elements of their original culture to those they recognized as similar in the new. This context has not been been adequately recognized, for instance, by Ralph Kuykendall (1931:159):

> The Hawaiians had rather an elaborate educational system before the white men came; it was designed to fit them into the world in which they lived, and it worked rather well; but it was of little use after the haole culture overwhelmed the land.

The missionaries themselves slighted or ignored classical Hawaiian education except where it impinged on their own efforts: for instance, in the Hawaiian capacity for memorization, in the role of *kahu* ‘guardians’, and in the rivalry presented by the hula schools. Sheldon Dibble wrote, “Formerly they had no schools, except to teach their vile amusements and the art of breaking a man’s bones for the purpose of robbery.” They made no effort to study the Hawaiians’ own schools or their methods, although they recognized some elements piecemeal, such as the use of chant in learning.
The continuity was, however, much more than fragmentary; classical cosmic and religious ideas and practices persisted along with formal education in the family and in schools for the crafts, arts, and professions, as will be seen in detail throughout this book. Most if not all Hawaiians received a dual education that enabled them both to learn the necessary Western skills and also to perpetuate Hawaiian culture at a high level. Hawaiians were perfectly aware of this duality, inventing from school the loanword kula, which could be used as a noun and a verb (e.g., “No ka pono o ka imi ana” March 28, 1834); with rare exceptions, this word is used only for Western education. The complex situation is expressed by the writer of the story “Moluhi, He Kaao no Hawaii Nei” (July 18, 1863): the fourteen-year-old son ua hele i ke kula a ua naauao ma ke ano Hawaii ‘went to the school and was educated in the Hawaiian way’; the father loves the ten-year-old son so much that he keeps him at home and teaches him himself; nana no i ao aku ia ia ma ka palapala ame ka helu ‘he it was who taught him reading, writing, and arithmetic’. The work of the writers of the nineteenth century cannot in fact be understood without a knowledge of this background. The history of Hawai’i since contact can be understood only if it is recognized as bicultural and later multicultural (e.g., Alexander 1902: 23).

This continuity of Hawaiian culture must be appreciated in the context of the massive historical discontinuity Hawaiians were experiencing in every aspect of their lives, a discontinuity that began with the arrival of the ships of Captain James Cook in 1778. I will examine only a few aspects of that subject on the basis of a selection of sources treated from the perspective of this study.

The contact with Westerners was a learning experience from the beginning. Hawaiians questioned foreigners intensely about their homelands and about many aspects of their lives. They used their trained powers of observation and imitation to learn
a number of new crafts and trades, even though some foreigners resisted training them for fear of losing their position. ʻĪʻī (January 22, 1870) refers to this early period of contact and learning, especially crafts, as the wā pokeʻo ‘period of childhood’. However, although Kamehameha I enlisted the services of foreigners and encouraged learning, little formal or academic education is recorded and that fragmentary. Liholiho was taught English by a sailor, who taught him whist as well. The young Frenchman Jean Rives began giving English lessons at court in 1810 but abandoned the project after three or four weeks (ʻĪʻī August 14, 1869). Extensive Western education was hampered by the lack of suitable teachers—most of the foreigners in Hawaiʻi were uneducated—and by the lack of adequate interest and receptivity on the part of the Hawaiians.

Both those problems were solved in a curious confluence of events that many later considered providential. In response to the arrival of foreigners, Kamehameha I had united the islands and restructured Hawaiian culture—religion, government, economy, and many aspects of the society. His reorganization had enabled Hawaiians to thrive as a sovereign nation through the crucial first decades of contact. On his deathbed in 1819, he urged his successor, Liholiho, later Kamehameha II, to continue in the lines he had laid down. However, for political reasons, Liholiho and his party—especially powerful women of the court—destroyed the national temple cult and then attempted to replace it with a royalist religion (Charlot 1991b:123–129). Hawaiians had thus been deprived of their strongest political leader and the highest level of their traditional religion. Adding these factors to the ever-increasing foreign pressure, the result was confusion and even demoralization.

At this point, in 1820, the first group of Christian missionaries arrived from New England, sent by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM). They offered
both Christianity to replace the abolished national temple religion of the Hawaiians and also the formal education in the foreign knowledge that Hawaiians realized they needed and were now anxious to receive. Education for Hawaiians had always been a combination of knowledge, religion, and culture. For the very first time, they were being offered—in a major, systematic effort—such a totality from the foreign side.

The Christian missionary enterprise had behind it many centuries of experience, conflicting theoretical positions, and alternative methods, and the Hawai‘i mission needs to be studied in comparison with other efforts, especially the ABCFM experience with the Cherokee and Choctaw. Central to the subject of this book is the long and fundamental debate about the connection of religion to culture, a debate that had been decided for the ABCFM missionaries to Hawai‘i: religion and culture—or in their terms, preaching and education—were for most practical purposes inseparable. The remaining debate would be over two points. The first was whether education should precede evangelization or vice versa. The Hawai‘i mission tended to place education first; “Without schools, as a general remark, there cannot be intelligent hearers of the gospel.” The second point debated was how much effort should be devoted to each, with the corollary: how much ideological content should be included in education.

Lorrin Andrews, one of the strongest proponents of the educational role of the mission, later identified two basic problems of the effort being made: the lack of emphasis put on education in general by the mission and the overemphasis on religion in education. For instance, most of the books available to the students were religious in content (Andrews 1834a:157). A “just proportion” was needed between teaching religion and teaching literature, in the broad sense of the time, and “mental improvement,” that is, proper ways of thinking.
have we complied in the best manner we were able with the real wants of the nation, by preaching to them so much, and teaching them so little?

though the people need a great deal of preaching, and a great deal of religious knowledge; do they not also need mental discipline in order to make a right use of this knowledge? Would not our church members stand stronger, and become more efficient co-workers with us, if they had more mental discipline? In short, are not enlightened Christians the best Christians?

literature must go hand in hand with religion or religion will stand on a very feeble foundation. No people can be expected to exhibit stability of character until they are taught to think. The human mind needs to be expanded & exercised before it knows what use to make of moral or religious truths . . . therefore science & literature must expand the mind and religion must sanctify it. (Andrews November 3, 1829: 2)

knowledge is essential to civilization & the religion of the gospel (Andrews October 1, 1834: 62)

If the missionaries really wish

to lay a broad and deep foundation upon which the future welfare of the islands may rest, we wish to give stability to this kingdom, and the churches we are now planting; to build up and perpetuate those institutions, which are the glory of all hands [sic; mss.: lands]; if to do this, we are persuaded that literature and religion, as means, should go hand in hand; that knowledge should expand the mind and religion purify the heart

then they should devote more time to education (Andrews 1834a: 163). For this reason, the importance of educational institutions needs to be recognized (Andrews November 24, 1835: 57):
institutions of learning are just as valuable, as a means [of Christianizing], and just as necessary here as in the U.S. or or [sic] other christian countries.

Without “a literary institution,” “heathenism & ignorance will remain, and remain an effectual barrier to the blessings of the gospel” (58).

Andrews was led to this view partly because of his own interests and inclinations. Despite a poor educational background, he wrote, “I had been to school just enough to form a taste for literature” (December 21, 1836: 3): “I never read much in my life. I had studied a few books & knew the value of books of reference” (7). As a result, he always felt unprepared for the great tasks of missionizing and education. More important, Andrews applied to knowledge the Pauline teaching that the Kingdom of God would come only after the Gospel had been preached to all nations (June 13, 1832: 1 f.):

The general diffusion of knowledge, is among the great events spoken of by the Prophets as tending to introduce the latter day glory.

the kingdom of Christ is a kingdom of light & of knowledge . . .

The increase of knowledge, therefore, especially of religious knowledge, is one of the most direct means of hastening the kingdom of our Saviour.

The ideological connection of religion and culture was the reason that the instructions given to the first group of missionaries included not only converting Hawaiians to Christianity, but a broad program of Westernization that included education and the reformation of the Hawaiians’ way of life. The missionaries were instructed
to aim at nothing short of covering those islands with fruitful fields and pleasant dwellings, and schools and churches; of raising up the whole people to an elevated state of Christian civilization.\textsuperscript{45}

That is, just like the Hawaiians, the missionaries connected education, religion, and a way of life. The civilization they had in mind was naturally their own, that of New England or more precisely, in Hutchison's wicked formulation, that found “somewhere between Cape Cod and the east end of Boston Common.”\textsuperscript{46}

A number of decisions and practices were consequences of this cultural emphasis. For instance, although missionaries recognized the distinction between religion and culture and their relative importance—and could even acknowledge the need for flexibility in cross-cultural relations—their efforts included many items such as sewing and tea parties that seem inessential today.\textsuperscript{47}

More seriously, cultural missionizing entailed an attitude of general depreciation of and opposition to Hawaiian culture. That is, instead of seeking compatible elements within the traditional culture on which Christianity and a modern way of life could be constructed, missionaries tended to demand a complete break with the past and suspect and distrust any continuities. This attitude influenced strongly the continuing debate about the compatibility with Christianity of individual elements of the traditional culture, such as dance, native medicine, and wailing at funerals. Decisions on such questions were made by the foreign leadership that dominated the Hawaiian church into the twentieth century, and those decisions were often embodied in law. Even more important, the negative attitude towards the traditional culture was internalized by many Hawaiians and continues to affect them and Hawaiian Christianity today.

The depreciation and distrust of native culture manifested itself in two complementary areas. The first was the reluctance of
missionaries to admit Hawaiians to church membership and then to leadership, despite the urgings of the secretary of the ABCFM. For the missionaries on the scene, the persistence of Hawaiian cultural traits in their candidates raised doubts about their internal disposition; they still seemed too Hawaiian to be Christian as the missionaries understood that religion. In education as in religion, Hawaiians seemed quick to adopt the outer forms, but not the internal processes, the way of thinking. The missionary teachers realized correctly that forms of thinking were essentially related to culture (e.g., R. Armstrong 1854: 6). Evidence in support of this view could be found in the greater success of half-caste students both among the Hawaiians and the Native Americans; their Western parent provided the necessary home atmosphere and informal and even formal teaching. Similarly education was more effective in schools attached to mission stations than in ones with little or no foreign presence (e.g., Martin, Lyman, Bond, and Damon 1979: 197). Complete education or civilization therefore demanded assimilation.

Assimilation was most difficult to accomplish with the traditionally formed adults, who were the initial targets of schooling in Hawai‘i. The decision to refocus the effort on children and women was based on the expectation that the former would be easier to form and the latter would eventually provide the proper home atmosphere for the next generations. The proposed education of women and children was emphatically cultural. Missionaries felt that Hawaiian parents failed adequately to educate their children and to inculcate in them the proper docility. J. S. Green articulated the missionary view of women. Hawaiian culture, like other non-Christian ones, degrades women, and they must be raised up by Christianity and the example of the missionary wives (1838: 35 ff.). At court, women idle, “and anon a half day is consumed in making a useless vegetable wreath for the neck” (41 f.). Their education at home perpetuates their position: “What employment, suited to their sex, can a Hawaiian parent give to his
daughters? They have neither loom nor wheel—”; “of household employment for females there is almost none” (41); “Our compassion is awakened on beholding the female children, half clad, unwashed, ungoverned, and unemployed” (42). The solution was boarding school to prepare women to be wives and mothers or domestics. This ideal of women’s education lasted into the twentieth century at the Kamehameha Schools, established for the education of Hawaiians.

Until the Hawaiian or Native American family could be reformed, the ideal solution was to remove the child completely from native influence into a perfectly Western atmosphere. Home placement and boarding schools—the Carlisle and Cornwall schools for Native Americans and Lahainaluna (when refocused on children) and the Kamehameha Schools for Hawaiians—proved remarkably effective for this purpose, despite individual disappointments. Many of the best and the brightest were purged of their culture and alienated from their own people (Hutchison 1987: 82 f.).

The Chiefs’ Children’s School was founded in 1839 under Amos Starr Cooke and his more powerful wife, Juliette Montague Cooke, in order to form specifically the future rulers of Hawai‘i by “an English education” (A Häolé 1854: 65). The royal children were separated from their parents, their guardians, and as much as possible from their language and culture, especially their chiefly ideology. The boys were stubborn, but the Cookes were so successful at civilizing some of the girls that they felt they could be married happily only to Americans. The great conflict was over Princess Bernice Pauahi, intended by her parents to marry one of the two princes, Alexander Liholiho or Lot—later Kamehameha IV and Kamehameha V—to carry on the royal line. Mrs. Cooke found that “both are unworthy of her” and wrote: “we cannot bear to leave her till she is lodged in safer hands than those of her parents, who are kind enough, but who are ignorant of what civilization consists, and wish their daughter to be great in their
way” (M. A. Richards 1970: 325, 341). The “safer hands” were those of the American Charles Reed Bishop, whom Mrs. Cooke was making available to her young and impressionable charge. The princess’s father wrote Mrs. Cooke, “inquiring why we had let Mr. Bishop call & see Bernice & steal her heart.” She married Bishop, and Lot remained a bachelor, the last of the Kamehameha line. The subsequent competitions for the kingship seriously weakened the monarchy and the nation.

The relation of culture to religion or of teaching to preaching was clearly of prime importance for the missionaries and a major topic for discussion. On the Hawaiian side, that discussion was articulated as the relation between the *pule* ‘prayer’ and the *palapala* ‘document, writing’, a word used for Western education. Since the missionaries quickly realized that education was a prime inducement for the Hawaiians to accept Christianity, they were anxious to connect the two as closely as possible or even to identify the one with the other. Some Hawaiians tried to separate the two, saying: “It may be well for us to learn the *palapala*, but prayer and *tabu* days will not enrich us.” Such opponents could see the *waiwai* ‘value’ of education but not “what temporal advantages could be derived from listening to preaching” (Bingham 1981: 209). Their position was similar to the slogan under which the Japanese decades later modernized their country: “Western technology and Asian ethics.” The Hawaiian opponents of Christianity had another Asian parallel for their argument (Stewart 1970: 198):

> It is well to attend to the “*palapala*”, reading and writing; but there is no good in the “*pule*”, religion, in the prayers, and the preaching, and the Sabbaths. In India, we are told, they have the *palapala*; and are so rich, that all the people in England and America go there for property; but they keep their stone and wooden gods still. It will be well for us, then, to secure the palapala, for it will make us rich; but let us cast off the pule, it is of no use!
Other opponents of Western education used the traditional connection of religion to health and well-being, arguing that Christianity and education were responsible for the terrible health problems and depopulation of Hawaiians; a mother told her sick son, “The god is angry with you for learning that new thing,” the *palapala*.53

Hawaiians were therefore aware that the decision to accept Christianity and Western education would cause profound transformations. The main reason they made that decision—along with their characteristic interest in religion and knowledge—was that they realized their position as, in today’s terms, a developing nation. In the words of Edmund Burke (1993: 21), “A state without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation.” Indeed, as seen in the example of Japan, the greatness of a culture is not demonstrated by its success in remaining isolated, but in negotiating the inescapable contact with other cultures. Just as Kamehameha I had faced the foreign challenge by restructuring the religion, government, and society, so his successors would have to do the same to preserve their nation in its new circumstances. The problems of a traditional or even old-fashioned government in a rapidly changing, developing, or modernizing situation can be studied elsewhere (e.g., Knight 1986: 513 ff.): it is impossible to disconnect the necessary or inevitable developments from economic, social, and political changes, which are themselves difficult to foresee in all their consequences.54 Moreover, in the then beginning age of Imperialism, Hawai‘i was a threatened nation and required the recognition and respect of others for the preservation of sovereignty. As reported by a visitor in 1825, “The Sandwich Islanders regard Christianity and literacy as ties connecting them with the civilized nations” (Barrett 1988: 190). Hawaiians were aware of the disrespect foreigners felt for the traditional religion, and distinguished visitors had long urged them to accept Christianity. Conversion to that religion was therefore important “to be received into the family of
Christianized and civilized nations” (Bingham 1981: 586). The task of the missionaries was therefore, in Sheldon Dibble’s words, “to raise the people from a state of heathenism, to take a permanent stand as a christian nation.” The effects of this would be wide-reaching:

If the Sandwich Islanders are to exist as a Christian nation, there must be a thorough reformation, not only in religion, good habits, and intellectual capacity, but also in the form of government.

Western education was therefore necessary for the many tasks of internal development and external relations. The idea was familiar to Hawaiians; chiefs had traditionally attracted knowledgeable people to their courts in order to increase their power. The ABCFM missionaries were deeply committed to the sovereignty of the Hawaiian nation and used that concern throughout the nineteenth century as a major argument for the acceptance of their services. Lorrin Andrews was feeling every day more & more the importance of educating the people as a means of saving the nation from destruction, as well as the people from their sins.

Here in almost savage ignorance, without the least vestige of civilization, are the future Lawyers and Doctors & schoolmasters & Preachers of the Sandwich Islands. Here are the persons, who, under God, are to give tone & character to this nation & be the perpetuators of the infant churches just now planted.

Andrews’ views were shared by E. W. Clark, writing about the high school at Lahainaluna: The Seminary is greatly needed to provide men to aid in the civil affairs of the nation. The present policy of the government has come down from the thick darkness of heathenism. While the religion of the nation is changed, and letters and the arts of civilized life introduced, the government, although somewhat modified, remains, in all its essential features, unaltered. It is, of
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course, ill adapted to the present state of knowledge and civilization. This fact is becoming every year more apparent. It is the general impression, that some changes must be effected, or the present government cannot long exist. But important changes cannot be safely effected without wisdom on the part of the rulers and their advisers. It is of vast importance that the nation should exist as an independent people, that a fair experiment may be made of the effects of the Gospel in transforming a whole nation. Every philanthropist will desire that the people may continue the proprietors of their own islands—that the government may be reformed and not destroyed. The Mission Seminary was not founded for the purpose of producing political reform; but, it is to be hoped, that the young men trained up in the Seminary will become safe and efficient helpers in this work.

Moreover, this effort was important “not only to the islands, but to others of this wide Pacific Ocean.” The concern for the sovereignty of Hawai‘i is the reason that several missionaries left the mission, the preaching, to enter government service. For instance, William Richards and Lorrin Andrews taught political economy or science to the chiefs and acted as advisors and officials.

The project of providing a Western education for Hawaiians must therefore be studied in the context of Hawai‘i as a developing nation; Hawaiians had to be prepared and trained to meet the challenges of change. Indeed the Hawaiian case is one of the earliest and most successful examples of such an effort. Many of the problems and challenges faced in Hawai‘i would later arise in other nations around the world, providing instructive parallels. The main problems were genuine, difficult, and admitted of conflicting solutions, each with its advantages and disadvantages: the control of education, access to education, the development of native teachers and national institutions of education, curriculum, the amount of ideology taught, and language policy. These problems have received no universally acceptable solution up to the present day.
The native response in Hawai‘i followed a curve observed elsewhere. Hawaiians felt an initial enthusiasm for the foreign culture and tended to depreciate their own. Missionization and Western education became the historical dividing line between the *au kahiko* ‘the olden time’ and the *au hou* ‘the new age’. The former was characterized as the *au na‘aupō* ‘the time of benighted entrails’; the latter, as the *au na‘auao* ‘the time of enlightened entrails’. This scheme was the principal mental framework for the many nineteenth-century discussions of Hawaiian history and culture change. After longer acquaintance with the introduced materials, Hawaiians became more critical of them and began to reevaluate their traditional ways. They then arrived at more balanced views and lifestyles, incorporating elements from each, with emphases varying according to time, place, and individual.

Hawai‘i differed from many other nations in that this sequence of responses was experienced widely throughout the population, not merely among an intellectual elite of the most forward thinking intellectuals—the best and the brightest, especially among the young. This was due to the traditional emphasis on education and to the fact that Western education quickly became universal. Moreover, Western education did not provoke a nativistic countermovement in the nineteenth century, as it did in some other countries. Hawaiians remained just as convinced of the value of Western education as they were of their own.

A further important reason for the continuation of Hawaiian support for Western education was that—in contrast to their experience with organized Christianity—Hawaiians controlled in many ways the process of education in their own country and assumed many positions of leadership and responsibility as teachers and administrators. The missionaries needed the permission of the king to begin their work. It was granted under the condition that they begin by educating the chiefs and the intellectuals of the court, after which education could spread
throughout the kingdom. The government therefore controlled access to Western education for the earliest period of its spread, making it available first to the elite but ensuring its later spread to the whole population. In 1840, the schools were taken over by the government, and Hawaiians were appointed as general school agents. David Malo served as the superintendent of schools from 1841 to 1845 and was succeeded by the trusted and loyal ex-missionary William Richards, who served from 1846 until his death in 1847. Richard Armstrong’s long tenure from 1848 until his death in 1860 demonstrated the dangerous potential of the position, as he propagandized for the extended use of the English language in the long controversy over language policy (Appendix II). Kamehameha IV attempted, I believe, to regain control by appointing as head of the Board of Education the chief Kekūanāo‘a, whose report of 1864 was a strong argument for the use of Hawaiian in the schools. His successors had more balanced positions than those of Armstrong, but the problem of the control of education was a perpetual one. Hawaiian control operated at lower levels as well. For instance, the students at Lahainaluna ruled themselves by committees (Wilkes 1845: 247 f.).

One means of governmental control of education was through support, which soon became government policy. This support was given classic expression in the famous saying used in the accession speech of Kauikeaouli, Kamehameha III, that his government would be one of education. Other statements made the same point, such as his speech of dedication of a church (Kauikeaouli 1831: 2):

*He mea pono ia kakou e hooikaika ma ka palapala* ‘It is right for us to make a great effort in the *palapala*’; *E hooikaika oukou e na kumu i ke ao i na haumana* ‘You teachers, make a great effort to teach the students’. He wants all his people to know correctly *i ka heluhelu i ka ke Akua olelo* ‘the reading of God’s word’, and feels that God has shown his goodness in sending them *i keia mea*
nui a me na kumu i naauao ai kakou, a i pomaikai hoi ko kakou uhane ‘this great thing and the teachers that we may be wise and our souls may be blessed’.

Legislation organized and supported the school system throughout the Monarchy. For instance, in 1835, Governor Hoapili of Maui ordered that all children over four years old attend school and that no one receive a marriage license who was unable to read.

The curriculum of the Western schools was determinedly academic, up-to-date, and much more stringent and demanding than schooling today. As Hutchison (1987:28) writes of the Native American mission schools, “in pressing equally high standards for Englishman and Indian they were treating the latter with dignity and something like equality.” This decision to provide a predominantly academic education was controverted from different perspectives. Many foreign residents, as opposed to the missionaries, doubted the capacity of Hawaiians for education (e.g., King 1989:13). Others, both Hawaiians and foreigners, felt that Hawaiians had a natural aptitude for and interest in vocational training and that the skills learned were especially important for a developing nation. In fact, manual instruction and labor were always a part of the school program and were later emphasized by the Board of Education. H. K. (June 6, 1838:1) notes the criticism of newcomers: “Ua ao nui aku na misionari i na mea o ka uhane wale no, aole i na mea o ke kino” ‘The missionaries teach extensively only the things of the spirit, not those of the body’. However, vocational subjects are indeed being taught. Hawaiians are very good at crafts, as demonstrated by several examples from the time of Kamehameha I. A faulty education is not the reason why Hawaiians are not working.

The basic commitment of the missionary teachers to academic education can be seen in their establishment of the high school at Lahainaluna in 1831, of which both Hawaiians and
foreigners were proud. At that school, the curriculum was academic but well-rounded. Hawaiians worked with their foreign teachers on the curriculum and school books, which included an increasing amount both of Hawaiian material, such as history, and of topics of importance to the nation, such as political science (e.g., S. Bishop 1868a: 2). For a time, the curriculum included an experimental course in Greek, of which at least one distinguished foreigner disapproved, but which the students enjoyed. Andrews had introduced the course to help with Bible translation and, on a deeper level, to train the minds of his students. That is, he would teach them Western thought from its very roots rather than superficially. Similarly the modern Tongan educator Futa Helu includes Greek and Latin in the curriculum of his ‘Atenisi [Athens] Institute so that students can compare the Western classics with Tongan ones. In his view, true education must be based on the classics, and the classics of all cultures are mutually reinforcing.

That Hawaiians were active in the process of Western education can be seen clearly in the introduction of what was perhaps the most basic change in their culture: the introduction of writing. Hawaiians were already acquainted with writing, and Kamehameha I made limited use of it in combination with oral methods:

Whenever Tameamea issues an order to one of his “governors,” he always does so through a chief of lower rank who delivers the message orally; at the same time Elliot issues a written order, to which the King affixes his sign, which is always identical. The recipient of the order examines the sign and compares what the envoy said with what the Secretary tells him, and if it agrees he executes the order; but if it differs he sends for a repetition of the order.

No standard orthography had been established, however, which resulted in considerable variation. The author of “Kamehameha”
(September 12, 1838) lists ten different spellings for that name from *kekahi palapala haole* ‘some foreign writings’: *Ua maopopo keia inoa i na kanaka maoli, aka he mea e ka lauwili o ke kakau ana o na haole* ‘This name is clear to native Hawaiians, but the variability of the writing of the foreigners is something strange’. Ellis writes (1984:53):

> The more intelligent among the natives, particularly the chiefs, frequently smile at the manner of spelling the names of places and persons, in published accounts of the islands, which they occasionally see.

Between 1821 and 1826, the missionaries established an orthography that was regular and easy to use but that had several deficiencies. First and foremost, it lacked markers for the glottal stop and the long vowel and for some occasional sounds. The difference in sound of Hawaiian consonants from Western ones resulted in a choice of letters that was arbitrary; for instance, *l* was chosen instead of *r* or *d*. Moreover, Hawaiian was in a state of transition in which *t* was being replaced by *k*. As a result, Hawaiians could find points to criticize in the new system as well. Liholiho preferred his name to be written *Rihoriho*. Hawaiians spoke in such a way that “a sentence appeared . . . all one word” and tended to write words continuously in phrases; the separation of words in written Hawaiian is still controversial. The former Lahainaluna student Napela (April 10, 1835) used Greek spelling to criticize the developed Hawaiian alphabet. Barenaba (November 11, 1835) writes in order to correct a number of words that are being misspelled in the translation of the Bible and in school books.

Despite these problems and criticisms, literacy almost immediately became extremely popular among Hawaiians. Hawaiians quickly became one of the most literate peoples in the world, and publications became extremely popular, being a great incentive to education. The missionary teachers intended writing to be used mainly for educational and religious purposes, notably for
schoolbooks and the translation of the Bible as well other religious literature like hymns. But Hawaiians quickly appropriated it for their own purposes, producing a wide variety of literature: chants, stories, genealogies, letters, family histories, and so on. Ancient chants transmitted orally for generations were put on paper. The freshly composed chants of the court of Kamehameha and his successors were transcribed, endowing us with the poems of the great public figures of the time. Old men wrote or dictated their reminiscences of earlier times. Forms and devices were adapted from introduced literature; the mutual influence of the two types adds a special interest to Hawaiian literature. Many of these manuscript materials await study in public archives, museum libraries, and private collections.

Although most of the early publications were done by missionaries, Hawaiian materials were also used. For instance, the missionary teacher at Lahainaluna Seminary, Sheldon Dibble, sent his students out to collect historical and traditional materials, which he then edited into the first Hawaiian history book (Dibble 1838).

Similarly, although the first newspapers were published, starting in 1834, for missionary purposes, Hawaiians quickly contributed materials related to their own interests; later nonmissionary newspapers were established, which became extremely popular. Fourteen different Hawaiian-language newspapers were being published in 1896. Newspapers quickly became literary journals, publishing translations of foreign literature as well as traditional literature and modern Hawaiian-language compositions. Rubellite K. Johnson counted eighteen major Hawaiian chants published in one year of the weekly Ka Nupepa Kuokoa (personal communication). Sagas told in traditional fashion were published next to modern novels like Hale'ole's great Laieikawai (Beckwith 1919), a Hawaiian version of the nineteenth-century serial novel. Hawaiian readers had an apparently insatiable appetite for accounts of their traditional culture as well as their near past. The voluminous
accounts of such writers as Kamakau satisfied that need as did the writings of the older political leaders like John Papa ʻĪʻī. Robert Louis Stevenson wrote of the eagerness with which Hawaiians awaited and devoured their newspapers. J. W. Kaikaina (July 4, 1863) wrote to the newspaper, calling in very traditional fashion on all the islands to petition the editor to publish a newspaper serial as a book:

_Ua ilihiiaia mai au e ka makemake puni moolelo, e pili ana i ke ano naauao, me kuu manao o oukou ka oi o ka makemake i nei mea he naauao, oiai he poe maa ma ka ike mau ana i ka mea maikai, oia hoi na mooolelo_

‘I have been overcome by the desire for stories that are of a type related to wisdom and learning, and I am of the opinion that your desire for the same thing, wisdom, must be of the highest, since you are people accustomed constantly to see the good thing, that is indeed, stories’.

Such literary production continued in strength through the early twentieth century and then began diminishing due to the gradual loss of the language by the majority of Hawaiians (Appendix II).

Hawaiians not only used writing, they also conducted a discussion on its significance, many topics of which will be discussed in the following chapters. Significantly _palapala_ “Document of any kind . . . writing of any kind, literature . . . formerly the Scriptures or learning in general” (Pukui and Elbert 1986: at word) became the umbrella term for all that the missionaries were introducing. When a priestess of Pele urged the people to reject the _palapala_, her credal formula, _Mana roa ka Pele_ ‘Powerful indeed is Pele’, was turned around by her opponents to _Mana roa ka palapala_ (“Sandwich Islands” 1826: 242 f.). _Palapala_ has much the same range as the contemporary English word _literature_, a sense similar to the modern _humanities_ or _arts and humanities_. The word is defined in Webster’s dictionary of 1828:
Learning; acquaintance with letters or books. Literature comprehends a knowledge of the ancient languages, denominated classical, history, grammar, rhetoric, logic, geography, &c. as well as of the sciences. A knowledge of the world and good breeding give luster to literature.\textsuperscript{78}

That \textit{palapala}—rather than some other word, such as \textit{pule} ‘prayer’ or \textit{lā‘au} ‘medicine’, both emphasized by the missionaries—was used as a \textit{pars-pro-toto} term for the missionary effort argues for its being the most impressive offering of the missionaries in the Hawaiians’ view. The \textit{palapala} could easily be appreciated as an aid in memorizing, a recognized and prestigious activity in classical Hawaiian education.

For a people who based their culture on verbal traditions, the encounter with writing and a foreign set of written traditions necessitated a reevaluation of both contents and means. A variety of responses can be found. First and foremost, the value of writing was recognized. Levi Chamberlain reports that when Kapi‘olani made her famous defiance of Pele, a priestess of the volcano goddess met her:

She had a piece of tapa in her hand which she said was a palapala from Pele. Kapiolani requested her to read it but she seemed unwilling to comply and when compelled to obey she muttered an unintelligible medley of sounds, altogether without meaning. Kapiolani then took out her spelling book & hymns, & said, you have pretended to deliver a message from your god Pele, but we have not understood it—I will now read a message from the true God which you can understand for I too have a palapala—

The priestess was abashed and “said the god had left her, & she could make no reply.”\textsuperscript{79} The Christian missionaries realized that they had a polemical advantage with their written Bible and with the prestige of their schools, in which reading and writing were
emphasized to their eager students. Hawaiians began to speak of the uncertainty and disunity of their traditions, which could be considered to reflect unfavorably on their whole preliterate culture. Their response—often emotional and ambivalent, as will be seen in the following chapters—largely formed the intellectual life of the nineteenth century.

The broad influence of Western education indicates the considerable success of the schools. A Häolé writes that the system of education is “One of the leading influences”:

In no nation on earth is the cause of public instruction more widely diffused, or more sacredly honored and guarded. It is exceedingly difficult to find a child of ten years of age who can not read his Bible and other school-books fluently. Probably every native child at the age of twelve and fourteen can read and write well . . . The proficiency of many of the common-school pupils is truly astonishing . . .

The early process of education was rapidly successful in reading and basic arithmetic, and both missionaries and Hawaiians took justifiable pride in their achievement. Andrews wrote that the schools had accomplished in a very few years what had required centuries elsewhere, a point made later by Kekūanao‘a. Kamakau attributes this accomplishment to the classical Hawaiian interest in and aptitude for education (January 4, 1868):

_O ka lähui hoolii o a pau, he olulu, he aloha, a he hookipa. He poe hikiwawe i ke ao ana, he poe hoopili i na mea paahana a me na mea naauao i aoia . . . he poe la i ao maoli ia ma kela ano keia ano. O keia hikiwawe o ka hoopili ana, no ka naauao no mai na kupuna mai._

“The entire race/people was courteous, loving, and welcoming to strangers. A people quick in learning, applied to industrious things and the things of wisdom that were taught . . . a people genuinely learned in different ways. This speed in application was
indeed from/because of the wisdom that came from the ancestors’.

The early success of the schools created an impression that the missionaries felt was overly optimistic (e.g., “Sandwich Islands” 1825:139, 142) and that they were anxious to dispel. Andrews (1834a:161) admitted that the schools had done a great deal for the nation, reviving it at its lowest point, but felt that he had to present “the darkest side of the picture” in order to balance the exaggerated views of the home office: the statistics on the schools were better than the reality (158). His fellow teachers agreed with his appraisal, expressing the common complaints of low funding, lack of school facilities, texts, and supplies, inadequate teacher training, and a continuous questioning of the use of Hawaiian as a medium of instruction. Both teachers and students were prevented for many reasons from regular attendance. The missionary teachers did not have sufficient reference materials to do their job. Andrews was embarrassed when he could not answer the students’ questions: “I have scholars that can ask questions & they expect to be answered” (December 21, 1836:17; also 18 f.). Hawaiians in fact asked many interesting questions: “Their curiosities and their enquiries are awake and inquisitive” and must be satisfied or they will be discouraged. Training for the native teachers was poor and, unless improved, would cause the schools to diminish in importance. Books and teaching materials were in drastically short supply. A well equipped school was necessary in order that the instructors may do justice to the scholars. We need all that any set of Professors need in a similar institution in any community. The fact that we are on heathen ground does not make it less important that we be thoroughly furnished. (Andrews December 21, 1836:22)

It will at once be perceived that in commencing a school such as ours vz, among a barbarous unlettered people, that everything
is to be done. The whole *machinery* is to be constructed before the main work can be commenced. All the books and apparatus, as far as such are needed, are in some way to be brought into existence, before the educator can act... books, for the scholars improve faster than books can be made for them. (Andrews November 15, 1833: 2 f.)

Such criticisms would continue to be made of the school system and, for Hawaiian subjects at all school levels, are valid today.

**NOTES**


2. For example, Hale'ole October 17, 1861, to solve a problem. ‘Īi September 4, 1869. Kamakau December 22, 1870. Nākuina 1902b: 18, 26 f., 29 ff., 36, 83 f. Elbert 1959: 93 (to plan), 143 (to solve a problem). Note the distinction between knowledge and active thinking in Kawaiakumaiikamakaokaopua October 26, 1922, *O ke kalaiwaa, o keia kekahī o na oihana pookela loa; me ka nui o ka ike ame ka noonoo o ke poo e hiki ai keia hana* ‘Boat carving was one of the highest occupations; this work was possible only with greatness of the knowledge and thinking of the head’. Compare *kākepakepa*, *noelo*, and *nūnē*.


4. *Maiau*: Malo January 7, 1845: 90, *He keiki noonoo no o Kuakini mai kona wa uuku, he kanaka maiau no* ‘Kuakini was indeed a thinking child from the time that he was small, a painstaking person indeed’; Spencer 1895: 56. Compare words that connect neatness to beauty, such as *popohe*, *pa'ihi*. Kawaiakumaiikamakaokaopua November 16, 1922, *Me ke akamai, ame ke aka-hele o ka noonoo* ‘With knowledgeableness and carefulness of thinking’.

Anders 1838: 402, “*Maiau*, expert, ingenious, applied to men; when applied to women it is *loia*” (a variant spelling). This distinction is not found in other texts, and Anders 1974: at word, does not state that *loea* is used only for women. *Loea* is used for a male in Kamakau December 14, 1867, perhaps with a feminine connotation; Nākuina 1902b: 17, 22; “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” February 17, March 17, 1921. See also Malo n.d.: xvi 15, use of *loea*.
Entanglement and confusion: ‘ānoni, ‘ānoninoni, hihi, hīhe’e’a, hōkai, kāhihi, pōhihi, pohihihi. The images are taken from both the plant world and from crafts.


7. ‘Anu’u, hape, hāwāwā, kāpulu (often used as a term of opprobrium for bad work), lalau, neki, waha pala. Compare hāpuku, kīkoi, kiko’olā, palaka.


9. Hani, hiapa’i’ole, ihupani, lae’ula, lawa (adequate to the task), lehia, pau lehia, lewa 4., loea, loio, loloiāhili, lolohili, mālaioa 2., po’okela.


11. Aoa’o means to give particular instructions, e.g., Malo lxvii 31. Compare the use of i/ā mākaukau in Fornander 1918–1919: 699, 709, 719; also 705.

12. Followed by Nākuina 1902a: 37 f. The sentences are typical kaulana introductory formulas, Charlot 1977b: 481, 496.


17. Pukui and Elbert 1986: knowledge. See also Pukui 1983: number 2459.

Mea Kakau June 27, 1902, offers three stories. The first, with different protagonists, is traditional, praising cleverness and showing that dumbness leads to death and destruction: *no ka nui o ke akamai ame ka maalea i kumu e pakele ai i ka make* ‘the greatness of the intelligence and the cleverness was the reason for escaping death’; *ka noonoo i ka wahine e hana i kekahi hana maalea loa* ‘the thinking of the woman to do some very clever deed’; *e ike iho ai ka mea heluhelu i ka nui o ka maalea* ‘so that the reader can see for himself the greatness of the cleverness’; *ua make ke kanaka iloko o ka hupo e like me Waawaa ma* ‘the man died in his foolishness like Wa’awa’a and his ilk’.

The author has however Christianized the two connected Wa’awa’a stories, with the *na’auao* brother as the Christian and the *na’aupō*, the pagan. The author is adopting this use of these words from the conventional nineteenth-century rhetoric that contrasts the Christian era in Hawai‘i to its pagan past. The innocent, trusting *na’auao* brother is at first fooled by the *na’aupō*, thus reversing their places in the original story, though using the same trick. Then in the second story, the *na’auao* brother fools his brother in his turn, thereby emerging victorious in the end. In this Christian reinterpretation, the classical emphasis on cleverness gives way to one on selfless morality (as opposed to *lokoino ame ke aloha ole* ‘evil insides and lack of *aloha*’) and even martyrdom. See also A. May 15, 1861 for another such story provided with a Christian moral.

Stories that make fun of foolishness are related to those that laugh at physical disabilities, e.g., “Na Maka-Po o Moaula” (L. S. Green and Pukui 1936: 144 f.), another indication of the mental connection between intellectual and physical qualities.


20. Compare, e.g., the materials in Kirtley 1971: section K.

21. Judd 1930: proverb 508; also 560. Different interpretations and uses are recorded, e.g., “Na Wahi Pana o Ewa” July 8, 1899. Charlot 1983:118 f.

would be expected; kāu may imply either that the person addressed has chosen the academy or that he or she has established or leads it.

23. S. N. Hale‘ole in Fornander 1919–1920: 57, 89. Kirtley and Moo-kini 1977: 63, atamai and no‘eau are used for crafts. The classical Hale Nauā, translated “Temple of Science,” was reestablished by King Kalākaua in 1886 for “the revival of Ancient Science of Hawaii in combination with the promotion and advancement of Modern Sciences, Art, Literature and Philanthropy” (Kuykendall 1967: 345). The king and his fellow members therefore considered Hawaiian traditions more than folklore; they merited comparison to modern knowledge.


25. Painting: Lehua December 15, 1866, the artist must work with ikaika ‘strength’ and hoomanawanui ‘patience’ and can earn ka mahalo i ka nani o ke kii, me ke kaena ana i ka maikai o kana hana ‘the appreciation of the beauty of the image with the earned pride in the goodness of the work’. Schooling: Kepohoni February 5, 1881, Lla hoonaaau o ia oia ma ke kula haole o Mililani, aua ike ia kona holomua ma na mea i aoia, aua mahalo nui na kumu iaia[.] He kaikamahine hoolohe oia i na olelooa, aohe hookuli a pakike. He kaikama- hine olulu a hookipa, a he mikiala ma na hana ‘She was made wise in the foreign school of Mililani, and her progress in the things taught was seen, and the teachers greatly appreciated her. She was a young woman who heeded the words of teaching; she did not turn a deaf ear or answer rudely. She was a gracious and welcoming young woman and energetic in her tasks’. Even when encouraging Western education as opposed to Hawaiian, the traditional vocabulary was used. In a didactic song, good students—those who go to Western schools—are contrasted with bad ones who pursue Hawaiian subjects (Hawaii June 25, 1870):

2. Nui ka poe mumule,
   Ame ka poe hookuli,
   A ane i pupule.
   A lilo i lolo, &c.
   Ku a hele i ke kula, &c.

3. Aia ka poe i hula,
   A waiho i ke kula,
   A like me na miula.
   A lilo i lolo, &c.
   Ku a hele i ke kula, &c.
2. Many are the sullen people,
   And the people who won’t listen,
   And who are even a little crazy.
   And they become feeble-minded, etc.
   Stand up and go to school, etc.

3. There are the people who dance hula
   And leave school,
   Just like mules.
   And they become feeble-minded, etc.
   Stand up and go to school, etc.

Other words of opprobrium used are naʻaupō, pupuka, molowā, kuʻulala, and hune.

26. Pukui 1983: number 553; compare number 2773. Kamakau April 25, 1868. Kuykendall 1931:160, 165; 1947:106. Charlot 1991b:129. This saying may be the basis of Kaomi’s teasing Kamehameha III by saying to him, Aole oe he alii, he alii oe ma ka pepa wale no ‘You are not a chief; you are a chief only on paper’.

27. Andrews 1834a:160. Bingham 1981:114, 172 f., 242, 257, 339. “Na Olelo Hope a Limaikaika Wahine” October 23, 1880, Ua ikaika ka manao o na kanaka e imi i ka naauao ‘The intention of the people was strong to seek [Western] wisdom’. Hawaiian expressions of this eagerness were common from the nineteenth century into the twentieth. For example, Kamakau May 2, 1868, people were so enthusiastic about education that they forgot their other duties, which created problems; 1961:374. Akana 1992:13; Akana was deeply imbued with the classical Hawaiian ideals of education, e.g., 7–20, 28 ff. Missionaries had found the same eagerness among the Cherokee and Choctaw. Blackburn 1808:85. Mcloughlin 1986:14, 335.

28. For example, “Kaao Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” June 21, 1911: 13 ff., the astonishing knowledge of the people of old. “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” March 31, 1921, Kahekili’s knowledge of warfare is compared favorably to that of foreigners.

29. Fornander 1919–1920:67 ff. See also Haleʻole April 24, 1865.

30. Kamakau December 29, 1870; also September 9, 1865b; December 28, 1867. Haleʻole June 15, 1865.

31. See also ‘Ī‘ī August 14, 1869; September 4, 1869; September 18, 1869, na mamo a ka poe hoomanakii ‘the descendants of idolators’ should learn about the ceremonies of benighted days. Kamakau September 9, 1865b, is particularly insistent on not transmitting errors to the younger generation. “He Moolelo no Pakaa” October 24, 1867, implies that perpetuating Hawaiian literature is
particularly important in view of earlier government attempts to suppress it in favor of Christianity. "He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhauipio/Kekuhaupio" December 16, 23, 1920; February 10, 1921. "He Mau Olelo Ku i ka Noeau" June 20, 1919. Compare Kaluaakumuole November 24, 1866, an old prayer was published i mea e ike pu iho ai kakou a pau i ka lapuwale maoli o na pule a ko kakou mau makuau ‘in order that we all see the true foolishness of the prayers of our parents’.

32. Memorization will be discussed in chapter IV. Hula rivalry: e.g., Andrews July 1, 1833: 23 ff.


34. For example, Dibble 1839: 76, 139–142. Ta Moo-Atua a me na Taao o ta Honua nei 1858: 15–20, old beliefs and practices continue even among converts, who are judged insincere. N. April 28, 1858. Kamakau April 18, 1868, in the war on Kaua‘i, the chief Hoapili interprets weather signs and delivers a traditional speech of encouragement to the soldiers; he then asks for a Christian prayer. Similarly Hawaiian practices like games and dance were periodically revived, e.g., Honolulu July 6, 1865. New practices were adopted that were similar to traditional ones. For instance, wehewehe Baibala ‘opening the Bible’ and interpreting the first verse encountered could replace omen reading. It was in fact a Christian practice based on the pagan one of bibliomancy or rhapsodomancy, using Homer or Virgil.

The continuity between old and new was a basis for many practical and official activities. For instance, “Ka make ana o Ka Mea Hanohano Ioane Li,” May 7, 1870, writes that ‘Ī‘ī was the only Hawaiian to reach the high position of judge:

Aole oia i ike nui i na Kanawai haole, aka, me na Kanawai o kona Aupuni iho, ua paulehia wale no ia, a ua hooko no e like me ka pololei o na hihia ana i hooholo oi [sic: ai].

‘He did not know much about the foreign Law, but he was deeply immersed in the laws of his own Government, and he enforced it indeed according to the correctness of the cases he decided’.

The point is that ‘Ī‘ī was applying traditional Hawaiian rules to cases rather than new or introduced laws.

Many of the personnel of the temples overthrown in 1819 were still alive for decades afterwards, e.g., A Häolé 1854: 338 f.; Zwiep 1991: 59; possibly King 1989: 188. León-Portilla 1988: 83–88, 92, on the persistence of the native religion among the Mexican Indians. Mexico is a particularly interesting parallel to Hawai‘i because of the native development of a high culture.

35. Culture change is mentioned in many reports of Hawai‘i, e.g., Barratt
1988:220, 247 (Adelbert von Chamisso felt that the introduction of Christianity would destroy the “entire order of things”).


38. For example, Dibble 1839:57–60, 68–71. See also Hutchison 1987:8, 52–62. Chapter V.

39. Kuykendall 1947:100–104. On the ABCFM and nineteenth-century American missionaries, see Hutchison 1987. The literature on the missionaries is vast, and I will cite it only when necessary.


Artemus Bishop 1838 gives an important theoretical formulation of the prevailing view. Christianity has proved historically an even greater civilizing influence than Rome, especially over the Northern barbarians, who were “savage” (270 f.), “the once barbarous nations of Europe” (272). Christianity came for the salvation of human beings but also for their “temporal good” and thus their civilization (271). Christianity is in fact essential for civilization (274 f.). The uncivilized person can be Christianized, but the non-Christian cannot be civilized (272 ff.). Evangelization should therefore precede civilization. Since the advent of Christianity, no country has been civilized without it. Non-Christian countries that are civilized, such as China, were in fact never barbarous.

The same question had arisen in the missions to the Cherokee and Choc-taw. Blackburn 1808:39, “Is it possible they should be civilized, and become acquainted with the gospel of Christ?”; previous preaching had been too intellectual and dogmatic; 40, “I conceived it therefore indispensable to prepare the mind by the most simple ideas, and by a process, which would associate civilization with religious instruction, and thus gradually prepare the rising race for the more sublime truths of religion, as they should be able to view them”; “I had drawn up the outlines of a plan for the education of the Indian children, as the most likely mean [sic] of accomplishing a revolution in the habits of the nation”; the Committee of Missions approves his plan; 85, his students show good “order and discipline”; “my design was to introduce Christianity, as the young mind should be capable of receiving it”; 417, at a public school examination, the visiting governor says “I see civilization taking the ground of
barbarism, and the praises of Jesus succeeding to the war whoop of the savage.” On the missions to the Cherokee, see McLoughlin 1986: e.g., 72–76, 149, 171, 173 f., 356.

41. Dibble 1839: 176 f.; also 169 f., 175.
42. For the Cherokee, see McLoughlin 1986: e.g., 74 f. On the general debate, see Hutchison 1987, references given above.
43. Andrews 1834a: 161. I have compared this publication to the manuscript, Andrews June 13, 1832.
45. Kuykendall 1947: 100–113; 101 f., the instructions.
46. Hutchison 1987: 56; 28, on teaching and cultural presumptions. The same model was taken for the development of the southeastern native American nations, McLoughlin 1986: 95.
47. Distinction and flexibility: Dibble 1839: 117, 132 f.; but see 201 ff. Inessential: L. F. Judd 1928: 46. Bingham 1981: 497. Barratt 1988: 265 f. “Miscellaneous” 1838: 428, the students’ table manners are impressive; “they partook of their meal in perfect silence—rather a difficult requirement for a Hawaiian, one would suppose, but only the more necessary to be observed from their extremely loquacious habits.” Grimshaw 1989: 35, the chiefess Kapule writes, “I want to learn to sew and read and do like them” [the missionary wives]. The missions to the Native Americans also emphasized details of culture. Blackburn 1808: 322, education should change habits of diet, clothes, table manners, and recreations; 323, 417, children are taught to wear Western clothes and sleep in beds. A further example of the cultural influence of the schools is that a variety of functions were performed at them; for instance, a marriage is regularized, “Ka hope o ke koena” December 20, 1834.


children should be taken into boarding schools at an early age. Paleka October 11, 1879, argues for boarding schools as being similar to earlier Hawaiian practices and useful for health as well as education. Papaiku May 12, 1858, argues that Hawaiian children are foolish because their parents neglect their education; they should take as models na keiki a na haole misionari ‘the children of the foreigners who are missionaries’; if Hawaiian parents educate their children at home from an early age and support them in school, they might even in time advance to na Kula Nui, a kula haole paha ‘the high schools or even the foreign [English-language] schools’. See also the discussion in chapter VI. For Native American children, see Blackburn 1808: 85, 323.

Women: “Instructions given by the Prudential Committee to the Rev. Sheldon Dibble, About Returning to the Sandwich Islands Mission” 1839: 174, women should be taught as well as men; “Both sexes must rise together”; “The best teachers, indeed, for female seminaries, provided they are properly educated, are females.” Wilkes 1845: 241, the girls at the Wailuku Seminary are being trained to marry boys from Lahainaluna. R. Armstrong 1858: 25, school money should be used “in aiding parents to secure places for their girls, while quite young, in good foreign families, where they can be taught the English language, and at the same time the domestic duties”; 1860: 24, “If native girls are to be taken into family schools, it must be at a tender age, and they must be kept there for a number of years, until their characters are formed and they are able to support themselves, to settle in life.” For the home placement of children, see above.


51. Barratt 1988: 286, Hawaiians accept Christianity because they want education. Bingham 1981: 195, 212, 228, 243, 263 f., pule and palapala are connected but not identified; 208 (probably), 227 (versus 228), 233, they are identified. Whitney and Richards 1832: 27, 166, 169–171, 173, credit good behavior and other characteristics to the palapala. Chamberlain n.d.: 20; February 3, 1825, her visit “has been the means of exciting the people to an attendance upon the palapala & the observance of the Sabbath.” Kuykendall 1947: 100 (pule and palapala “were simply two aspects of the same thing”), 104, 106. Parsonson 1967: 54, note 103. Grimshaw 1989: 41, 158. The connection was made by non-missionaries as well, e.g., Wilkes 1845: 212. An indication of the prestige of the palapala is seen in the report of a debate between S. E. K. Papaai of Waikâne, O’ahu, and a Roman Catholic; Keone March 28, 1868. Papaai won by placing his Hawaiian Bible on the table and asking the Catholic to do the same. There was no published Roman Catholic translation.
53. Richards, Andrews, Spaulding, and Chapin, 1833: 263. Missionary Letters, Volume 2, n.d.: 710a–713a. Zwiep 1991: 219. In the Marquesas, C. C. Armstrong 1886: 13 had “a most reluctant class of women with whom she labored for a time, but they soon declared that ‘reading made them sick,’ and one by one absented themselves.” In contrast, “Ka hope o ke koena” December 20, 1834, reports that a rural official was happy to receive a teacher because he thought his health would be protected. Opposition by Hawaiians to the pala-pala based on its intrinsic lack of value, was seldom reported, e.g., Barratt 1988: 246. Compare Hezel 1983: 207 ff.
54. A tragic example of this was the change in the system of land tenure, which was an early concern of the missionaries, e.g., “Instructions given by the Prudential Committee to the Rev. Sheldon Dibble, About Returning to the Sandwich Islands Mission” 1839: 172. Compare for the Cherokee McLoughlin 1986: 142.
55. Dibble 1839: 170; for the following quotation, 189; also 170–175, 180–196.
56. Dibble 1839: 171, “The work of raising a people, within a short period, from a state of heathenism, to that of an intelligent, industrious, and christian nation, is a work not yet on record. Such an event, whenever it shall take place, will fill a page in history of inconceivable interest.” Bingham 1981: 446, 483. The usefulness of education for the nation was a constant theme of the reports of the head of the Department of Education. W. Richards 1847: 8, “No nation was ever wealthy, no nation was ever powerful, no nation was ever well supplied with the blessings of life, without education”; 10, “Why is it that the trade of our country and many other kinds of business are conducted by foreigners?”; the answer is “intelligent industry.” R. Armstrong 1851: 24 f., education is necessary to govern and develop the nation; 25, “To the native race, the education of the young is a matter of incalculable importance. Here is their last and best hope of prosperity and even of existence as a race”; 1852: 48; 1854: 6; 1855: 4; 1858: 9 ff. See also Hunt and Alexander 1848: 11 f. Q. November 3, 1853, the schools are the last hope “for the existence of the natives either as a nation or a race.” Kamakau January 21, 1869. M. A. Richards 1970: 226, 271. Martin, Lyman, Bond, and Damon 1979: 135. Hutchison 1987: 63. On the Native American missions, see McLoughlin 1986: 248, 288 f. Mission schools were also supportive of native peoples in Africa.
57. Andrews October 1, 1834: 7, 45; also, November 24, 1835: 34; 1835: 146.
58. Clark 1838: 349 f.; also 347 f.

59. Andrews 1834a: 164; also October 1, 1834: 59. Clark 1838: 350. Dibble 1839: 173, 194 f., 199–201; compare 209–253. This effort was stimulated certainly in part by a negative view of native cultures, e.g., Whitney and Richards 1832: 151–177; compare 8 f.; Dibble 1839: 164.


62. For example, Andrews 1834a: 156. Wilkes 1845: 81, a chief at Wai‘anae is a “ruler, preacher, and schoolmaster.” Kānepu‘u February 27, March 5, 1868. Kamakau March 21, 1868a, chiefs and intellectuals were educated first; April 18, 1868, the chiefs were taught first, and then teachers were sent out; He kula okoa ko kela alo alii keia alo alii ‘This court and that court had its separate school’; after the war on Kaua‘i, Western education spread, laulaha, among the commoners; April 25, 1868; May 2, 1868, court intellectuals were sent to Lahainaluna for higher Western education. Barratt 1988: 181, 186 f., 286. Kuykendall 1947: 104. Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 59. Grimshaw 1989: 34 f. The decision in favor of education was also made by the Cherokee chiefs, Blackburn 1808: 84 f.

63. Clarissa Armstrong had studied Pestalozzi (Grimshaw 1989: 15), but her writings are disappointingly lacking in information on her teaching experiences with Hawaiians. Wilkes 1845: 74, the school at Waialua, O‘ahu, uses the “Peztalozzian system” (sic). Richard Armstrong was an admirer of Horace Mann. The missionaries tried unsuccessfully to use the Lancastrian system of student teachers that was being introduced increasingly in New York and was used extensively in Latin America. The system was used in Tahiti, Parsonson 1967: 44, New Zealand, Schütz, personal communication, and in the Cherokee schools, McLoughlin 1986: 361.

64. Andrews remarked several times on the desire and aptitude of Hawaiians to learn Western crafts: the students “have always been exceedingly
anxious to learn different kinds of handicraft” (October 1, 1834: 36); a Hawaiian printer is good, and the students want to learn printing (46 f.); 1835: 146, the Lahainaluna students are interested in printing once a native printer sets up the press in January 1834; “our Hawaiian printer knew more of the business in detail than I did.” In response, he recommended engaging a teacher for vocational education, “one who will have a great share of patience and perseverance & who will feel a deep interest in the prosperity of the school and of the nation”; such training would tend to “wake up the energies of the people & of course to civilize them” (October 1, 1834: 58). Gibson 1884: 3, “The aptitude of the Hawaiian for technical training”; he wanted to establish “an Industrial or Technical Institute of the Kingdom.” M. A. Richards 1970: 302 f. Grimshaw 1989: 170 f., Hawaiian women were anxious to learn Western manual tasks. Some Hawaiians argued for more emphasis on vocational education; e.g., Kamakau 1961: 375; 1988: 19 (Chun); Chun 1993: 22. Nohoua April 11, 1838, urged the teaching of navigation to boys and sewing to girls; the navigators could then marry the seamstresses. Wilkes 1845: 247, 249, recommended manual education over higher studies. A Hāolé 1854: 306, felt that Lahainaluna was too academic and produced “judges, lawyers, and physicians, the last of which are villainous professions in the hands of Hawaiians generally.”

65. Richards, Andrews, Spaulding, and Chapin, 1833: 268. Andrews 1834b: 169; October 1, 1834: 57 f.; 1835: 143 f., the students do better if involved in both manual and intellectual work; 144, they “have always been exceedingly anxious to learn different kinds of handicraft.” “Instructions given by the Prudential Committee to the Rev. Sheldon Dibble, About returning to the Sandwich Islands Mission” 1839: 173 f., the students are learning copper engraving and printing, which may provide a profession for them. “Sandwich Islands. Letter from Mr. Clark, Dated at Lahainaluna, Oct. 25, 1838” 1839: 257, he is teaching navigation, which the students very much wanted; “They will soon have a far better knowledge of this art, than graduates generally in America. So far as capacity is concerned, we have every encouragement to go forward. The results of the school thus far have more than answered our expectations.” S. Bishop 1868a: 5, “teaching and superintending manual labor”; “Four hours daily are employed in manual labor, chiefly in cultivating taro and sugar cane.” Martin, Lyman, Bond, and Damon 1979: 216, 218. Kuykendall 1947: 356 and note 80. Board of Education: Gibson 1886: 13–18. W. R. Castle 1894: 3, vocational education has been spreading, and it has been suggested that Lahainaluna “should be made still more of a station for agricultural training.” Alexander 1896: 7.

66. “Sandwich Islands. Plan of a High School for Teachers” 1832, the
resolutions of meeting of June 1831; 188, “The work of educating the whole nation was to be performed”; the school was designed for the training of teachers; 189, the candidate for admission “must be able to read fluently and intelligibly in his own language; must be able to write a neat, plain, legible hand; and be acquainted with common arithmetic and the fundamental principles of geography”; the students will learn arithmetic and geography and “composition in their own language” along with religion; a public examination will be held after each semester. “Mission to the Sandwich Islands” 1833: 457, Lahainaluna will be “the grand nursery of education in the islands.” “No ka hiki ana mai o ka malamalama i Hawaii nei” May 9, 1834. Clark 1838. Dibble 1839: 197 f. “Sandwich Islands. Letter from Mr. Clark, Dated at Lahainaluna, Oct. 25, 1838” 1839: 257, “We shall not be satisfied until the school is made worthy [of] the name of Polynesian College. We believe it is destined to be a great blessing, not only to these islands, but to other parts of the Pacific”; 257 f. A Häolé 1854: 303–308. Kānepu'u December 31, 1856, states that Lahainaluna is the best Hawaiian-language school and Punahou is the best English-language one (on Punahou, see A Häolé 1854: 64). Bingham 1981: 423 ff. Wilkes 1845: 246 ff., gave a negative report on Lahainaluna, which he visited in 1841. Fornander 1919–1920: 524–534. Kuykendall 1947: 111 f., 364 f., 112 f., other high schools. The experience at Lahainaluna was very like that of the Colegio Imperial de Santa Cruz in Tlatelolco, León-Portilla 1988: 9–11.

Lorrin Andrews’ account of the early history of the school is particularly interesting; e.g., 1835: 135, the school was founded to diffuse knowledge, to train school teachers, but especially to prepare preachers; the name Lahainaluna came from the students; 138, during the rainy season, “One of my most interesting Bible-class meetings was in a shower, that compelled the scholars to hold their slates perpendicularly to prevent the rain from washing out their questions; nor could I get their consent to dismiss until we had gone through with the lesson”; 145, in October 1833, Andrews was so discouraged that he dismissed the school and thought it would never reassemble; “At this time, everything respecting the school seemed gloomy”; 145 f., but he called the school together again in January 1834 by the blowing of a conch shell.

67. Andrews November 15, 1833: 5 f.; October 1, 1834: 41; 1834b: 170; 1835: 145, 147. “No ka pono o ka imi ana” March 28, 1834, students learn languages including Greek. Clark 1838: 344. Wilkes 1845: 249, disapproved of the Greek course, but Rémy 1862: 1, reported that the students enjoyed it very much. A Häolé 1854: 305, “To test their capacity for the classics, they were permitted to study Greek, and they made considerable progress in that language.” See chapter VI.
68. Golovnin 1979: 205; see also 184, 187 f. In contrast, Kamehameha III had his orders printed, Barratt 1988: 286. On early views of writing, see, e.g., Dibble 1839: 81 ff.

69. Bingham 1981: 153. Kuykendall 1947: 104 f. For Náhuatl, see León-Portilla 1988: 44. No study has been done, to my knowledge, of the development of punctuation for Hawaiian. Commas seem often to mark pauses—e.g., , akā, . Sentences were divided irregularly, but were not combined with commas at such length as found in written Samoan texts.


71. According to the author, hoohuhualau should be hoohuahuanalau (versus Pukui and Elbert 1986; Andrews 1974, reports huahuanala as a synonym for huahualau); uluaoa should be uluoa (Andrews 1974, and Pukui and Elbert 1986, have this form but with another sense); uwalaau should be walaau (the former can be found in Andrews 1974 in a different sense); nuunuu should be anuunuu (neither dictionary has the former). Some of Barenaba’s examples might be due to dialect differences or typographical errors.

72. Ellis 1984: 62–65, 130, 139 f., 434, 465. Dibble 1839: 80 f. Barratt 1988: 173; compare 200. Kuykendall 1931: 165, a woman chief whose husband left her says, “she has now chosen the palapala . . . to be her husband.” ‘Ī‘ī refers to himself throughout his writing as ka mea nona keia pulima ‘the person whose “Wrist, cuff . . . Handwriting, signature” this is’, e.g., June 12, 1869, apparently a new formula perhaps derived from closing letters (definition from Pukui and Elbert 1986: pūlima). For Polynesia, see Ritchie and Ritchie 1979: 110, 122 f., 155. Parsonson 1967: 44; 55 f f., interest in literacy declined when it did not bring the expected material progress. In Hawai‘i, however, literacy maintained its attraction, although there was an occasional decline in interest in schooling and sometimes books; “Mission to the Sandwich Islands” 1833: 455; “Sandwich Islands. Extracts from a Letter of Messrs. Green and Dibble, dated at Hilo, Oct. 4th, 1831” 1832: 219, 223, the novelty of schooling and books has worn off, and education is suffering through the lack and incompetence of teachers; Wilkes 1845: 73, 220; Kuykendall 1947: 109.

73. The claim to a high literacy rate in the Hawaiian population has been challenged in discussion by Marshall Sahlins on the basis of the number of signs instead of signatures on nineteenth-century petitions. Some criticisms of the teaching of reading can indeed be found, C. B. Andrews September 1, 1866. However, the educators of the time distinguished between those able to read and those able to write, and until the late 1850s, the former outnumbered the latter; “Sandwich Islands” 1825: 139, “Probably not less that 1,600 of the natives have been instructed in reading and spelling, since the year commenced, most
of whom might have been instructed in writing, also, had they been provided with slates and pencils”; “Mission to the Sandwich Islands” 1833: 454, “many thousands of the natives have been taught to read, and not a few to write”; R. Armstrong 1852: 11; 1853: 1; 1855: 1; 1858: 9, “As a general thing too, those who can read, can also write their own language.” Kuykendall 1947: 107. The decree of Hoapili, governor of Maui, that literacy was required for marriage referred to reading and not to writing; Bingham 1981: 474 f.; Kānepu’u April 2, 1870; versus Alexander 1902: 23. Publications popular: Martin, Lyman, Bond, and Damon 1979: 32, 74 f. Publications helped education: e.g., Zwiep 1991: 181 ff.


75. Andrews 1836: 15, 17 ff. A letter written by the chief Kuakini in 1822 is considered at least one of the first examples of writing by a Hawaiian in Hawai‘i, Bingham 1981: 157; see also 172 ff.; Parsonson 1967: 52; Barratt 1988: 189; also 188. Johnson 1976: v, 14. Wilkes 1845: 241, male students wrote courting letters to female ones; “I was informed these were the first love-letters that had ever been written in this group . . . The correspondence appears to have been carried on under the eye of the missionaries, and the expressions they contained were very common-place.” Fornander 1919–1920: 443, an uwē helu, a traditional ‘wailing chant’, for the princess Nāhi‘ena‘ena is written down; line 170: ka uwe ana o ka palapala ‘the wailing of the palapala’; line 172: Palapala wau a paa ‘I palapala until it is fixed’. Schütz 1994, has studied the writing of Henry ʻŌpūkahaʻia and other Hawaiian students at the Cornwall school before the first missionaries were sent to Hawai‘i. Writing in Náhuatl was also quickly appropriated for native purposes, León-Portilla 1988: 16–24, 28, 40 ff., 60–67, 245 f. Compare the Cherokee, McLoughlin 1986: 353, 356, 361, 378.


77. “Makemake” 1860, calls on the elders to send literary materials for publication; they should write correctly, without errors (apparently little copy-editing was done other than that of the typesetters, who are thanked explicitly by several authors). “He Palapala he Nui” April 14, 1858, reports that so many writings have been received from all the islands that they cannot all be published in the newspaper. Johnson 1976: v, 14, a chant; 54, 233, letters to the
editors; 185, 187, 203, the editors are worried about the use of fictitious names or initials to sign letters; 145, 179, 233, contributors pay to have their writings published.

78. Webster 1828: LITERATURE. For this use, see also McLoughlin 1986: 143.


80. For example, Andrews 1829: 5. Whitney and Richards 1832: 8. Malo 1837: 14, uses the fact that the doctrine of the resurrection is written down in the Bible as a proof that God intends it.


82. For example, Ellis 1984: 53 f., 62–65, 130, 139 f., 434, 465.


Appendix II.


88. For example, Andrews 1834a: 158. “Miscellaneous” 1838: 430 f. “Instructions given by the Prudential Committee to the Rev. Sheldon Dibble, About Returning to the Sandwich Islands Mission” 1839: 174, there is a pressing need for manuals and textbooks; “Mind can no more be educated there, without appropriate means and instruments, than it can here. And why should a liberal and learned education be deemed more essential here than there?” Kuykendall 1947: 107.
The Intellectual and Educational Environment of Hawaiian Culture

Intellectual and educational activities permeate Hawaiian culture and take many forms. In chapter V, I will examine formal educational institutions and in chapter III will show that the extended family provides the basic model for the court and for the schools of individual experts. These formal institutions, however, must be understood within the context of the general intellectual and educational environment of Hawaiian culture. Daily living, in fact, provided continual educational opportunities and—with its manners, kapus, prayers, and occupations—was sufficiently complicated to require education. I will sketch only a few of those educational opportunities here, while others, such as sightseeing, will be discussed later. I will concentrate on the use of literature in Hawaiian living because of its importance and its comparative neglect in popular images of Hawaiian culture.

The land is a primary influence on Hawaiian culture (Charlot 1983a:55–78). Each island was divided into sections called ahupua’a that usually stretched from the mountains out to the sea, thus providing a complete example of the Hawaiian cosmos. Moreover, each ahupua’a and larger region had its own character,
dry or wet, rocky or lush. *Makaʻainana* ‘commoner’ families would normally inhabit an *ahupuaʻa* continuously and permanently, becoming over generations *kamaʻaina* ‘children of the land’ and being formed by the character of the place they lived in and from. The interest and pride they felt in their place were expressed in special practices, ways of doing things, and in a large body of literature: place names, stories, histories, reports, chants, and songs. A place would be praised for its smart people and scorned for its dumb.¹

Children were reared as *kamaʻaina*, taught to observe the place they lived in and appreciate its special qualities. Much of this instruction was communicated through the literature of the place, the names of places, rocks, and seaweeds, the sayings connected to them, the stories that took place in particular locations, the chants and songs that portrayed and celebrated the place as an environmental and cultural whole. Children in their turn would add to this always growing body of material. They would also learn about the neighboring *ahupuaʻa*, the next region, and the next island, until they had accumulated a great amount of place knowledge and literature. When they traveled—on business or just for sightseeing—they would have a mental guidebook to the famous places, the *wahi pana*, along their routes and at their destinations (chapter IV).

Much Hawaiian thinking concentrates on two subjects, land and family, considered the two major influences on an individual’s character. The two can be joined in various ways. Cosmogony can be depicted as a genealogy, and gods can have the character of their land, such as the explosive, unpredictable Pele, goddess of volcanoes.

The extended family provides also the foundation of Hawaiian education, not only because it is the earliest influence on the child, but because it was a nearly complete social and economic unit and also a center of culture with its own religion, history, literature, and practices. The child grew up in a rich learning
environment with opportunities to observe a large variety of social interactions, types of work, and religious and cultural activities. Children could imitate these or be allowed to participate in them. As children grew up, they could assume more responsibilities and receive informal and formal training and education. In the words of Elizabeth Reynan (personal communication, August 4, 1979), Hawaiian culture “was dwelled into the child.” Similarly an adult hula master told me that he regularly socialized with older Hawaiian people just to receive their nonverbal formative influences.

As in other Polynesian cultures, the life of the family was filled with literature, most commonly the conversation that is a developed art form. Conversation was a delight of all classes: *e kamailio ana ma kela mea keia mea e like me ke ano mau o na‘lii* ‘they were conversing about this thing and that thing as was the constant character/custom of the chiefs’ (*ʻĪʻī November 13, 1869*). More formal literature was practiced constantly. Boys and girls and their genitals were formally named. Birth, name, and genital chants were composed for them, which were performed publicly—for instance, at the *pālala* birth ceremony and at children’s beauty contests—and also sung to them in private and in family ceremonies. The saying, *He keiki mea makua* ‘A child with parents’ or *kupuna/kūpuna* ‘grandparents/forebear[s]’, refers to one who receives beautiful gifts such as chants from his or her older relatives. Other honorific chants could be composed on particular occasions by family, *kahu* or guardians (*ʻĪʻī January 29, 1870*), and friends. Family members could be famous poets and chanters, such as *ʻĪʻī’s uncle*, and could test a child and also provide an opportunity for study. The telling of stories was and continues to be a regular practice.

The traditional Hawaiian family environment was obviously an ideal educational atmosphere for the child, with its many social and cultural activities and its emphasis on verbal accomplishment, probably the area most sensitive to positive influence or deprivation. To this can be added the family’s own organization
with clear roles for each member, its emphasis on health and diet, its conscious training of children for excellence, and the high premium it placed on achievement.

The extended family was obviously a large social unit. It was in turn a part of the larger community, which itself exercised an educational and cultural influence. Such communities were full of socializing, gossip, and activity; and children could learn a great deal by listening and observing (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:49). Moreover backcountry communities were highly literate; Kānepu’u describes country people living very simple lives, but using sayings, songs, and stories. Ka’ū was another country district, and the writings of Mary Kawena Pukui reveal how much literary activity and creativity was found there. Such communities could have literary specialties, such as the Kamapua’a stories of Kaliuwa’a, O’ahu, and the Pele literature of Ka’ū. Nineteenth-century newspapers contain many beautifully written pieces by people living in country districts.

Opportunities were even greater at cultural centers, such as the residence of a chief. ‘Ī‘ī and his playmates could regularly watch and thus learn sports, martial training, entertainments, hula, chanting and poetry (‘Ī‘ī August 7, 1869). Academies and temples were the pride of their areas, and institutions like hula academies were used as cultural resources by the inhabitants.

Also educational and cultural was the Polynesian world of childhood, which was a prefigurement of and preparation for the world of adults. For instance, children developed their talents for cooperation, competition, and leadership among playmates and peers. When children traveled, they would play with the locals and learn about their place, families, and occupations (‘Ī‘ī July 24, 1869).

The world of children was also literary. Games and sports, both of children and adults, were accompanied by conventional expressions and poetry, including incantations. In a swinging game accompanied by a chant, *na ka mea lea nae i ke oli e lele*
mau ‘the person who was delightful in chanting got to swing all the time’ (‘Ī’ī December 25, 1869). ‘Ī’ī traveled to Nānākuli, O’ahu, and found that the children there sang together from the branches of the breadfruit trees, using a peculiar vibration or whistle, kani oeoe (July 24, 1869). ‘Ī’ī listened carefully and memorized the words. He then managed to meet the children so that he could learn the vibration. All the children memorized the words so that they could chant together. William Ellis describes the spontaneous reception of a chief on his unexpected return to his village (1984:282):

Multitudes of young people and children followed, chanting his name, the names of his parents, the place and circumstances of his birth, and the most remarkable events in the history of his family, in a lively song, which . . . was composed on the occasion of his birth.

Children were appreciated for their ability to memorize and perform chants and make clever statements; children even competed in chant contests. Children’s literature, especially chants with games, continued to be popular into the twentieth century and was collected by students and scholars of Hawaiian culture.

Although some chiefly children were raised in isolation, an effort was usually made to find suitable companions. The chief Lonoikamakahiki could use his peer companions to practice riddling (Fornander 1916–1917:167).

Childhood was not of course without its troubles. Children were often hungry, and older children could bully and tease and scare them with gods, ghosts, and sorcerers. Everyone could experience family and personal tragedies, and war could disturb terribly and sometimes fatally the community. Nonetheless, the life of the child seems in the main to have been filled with warm human relationships, intellectual stimulation, and fun. When ‘Ī’ī leaves home, he is sent off with feasts, chanting, and tears by his close family, his relatives, his guardians, and kona mau hoa hele.
his many companions of his childhood, who have gathered expressly for the occasion (ʻĪ‘ī January 29, 1870).

The world of childhood was considered an important cultural resource, as can be clearly seen in the work of Mary Kawena Pukui. Kalapana uses the wind chant of the children of Hilo to prove a point in a contest of wits, and the same chant helps him remember a point (Nākuina 1902b:16 f., 94). Nineteenth-century writers refer frequently to what they learned and witnessed themselves in their childhood and youth, material they use as a basis for their reports. Such eyewitness testimony is considered important in Hawaiian culture (e.g., “Mau Mea Kahiko” December 5, 1838).

Both children and adults could witness and participate in a large number of public and community celebrations, like the famous Makahiki. The people of the community would assemble outside the walls of the temple to witness important ceremonies, verify that they were being performed correctly and successfully, and voice their approval or disapproval when asked officially.

Crowds would assemble for historic events, such as the departure of the king’s fleet (ʻĪ‘ī January 22, 1870). They would react excitedly to a race, appreciating the knowledge and skill involved (Nākuina 1902a:14, 112, 116). The general public itself was sufficiently knowledgeable to watch hoʻopāpā ‘contests of wit’ and even to serve as informal referees, ensuring the fairness of the judging and final outcome:

na kanaka mawaho, oiai o ka lakou hana no hoi ia o ka makaikai me ka hoolohe, a e ake nui ana hoi lakou e ike i ka hopena o ka aoao e ko ana, a me he Aha Jure la ka piha mau i na poe makaikai, mai ka wa i hoomaka ai ka hoopapa, a hiki ma keia wahi a kakou e heluhelu nei.

‘the people outside, meanwhile, their work was indeed watching and listening, and they also greatly desired to see the ending of the side that would win; and like a jury was the constant fullness
of spectators from the time the contest of wits began until this point at which we are reading’.  

Local families, communities, and ranks were rarely isolated. News traveled fast, and special efforts had to be made to keep anything secret. Most events were ‘ike laulaha ‘common knowledge’; laulaha and laulā, ‘widely known’. When chief Keawe decides to seek his disgraced advisor Pāka’a, Ua laulaha ae la ka lohe ma o a maanei, ma ka loa a me ka laulā o keia Pae Aina ‘The hearsay spread widely here and there, the length and breadth of this archipelago’. News of odd deeds, whether good or bad, would soon be known (ʻĪʻi September 18, 1869).

This spread, laha, or circulation of news and information was culturally important as a constant enrichment of the resources of every element of society. An invention or innovation in sailing by Pāka’a spread throughout the islands (“He Moolelo no Pakaa” October 24, 1867). Speaking of a newborn child’s name chant, Kamakau of Ka’awaloa writes: laha aku la ia mau mea a pau loa i kela wahi keia wahi ‘these many things spread everywhere, to this place and that place’. Those who could not perform the chant were called waha pala “coated mouth.” Destructive elements such as diseases could also spread, in precontact as well as postcontact times. ʻĪʻi (October 23, 1869) tells the story of immigrant gods who brought disease: A ma na mokupuni nae a pau a lakou i haele mai ai, pela no ka laha ana o na mai ma na mokupuni a pau e pa make ana ‘On all the islands they traveled over, thus indeed was the spread of the diseases on all the islands which were being touched by death’.

As elsewhere in Polynesia, the knowledge of experts filtered down to the community at large, for instance, sorcery and dream lore: He mea ka moeuhanal i aoia i ka wa kahiko e ka poe moemoea, a laha ia olelo-ao mai o a anei ‘The dream was something taught in the olden time by the dream[-expert] people and this teaching spread here and there’. Aristocratic culture could influence the
people; for instance, chiefly etiquette was taught to both noble and commoner children.\textsuperscript{24} The word of the chief would be proclaimed, \textit{ho‘olaha}, to the people.\textsuperscript{25} Courtly chants would quickly spread to the common people (Fornander 1916–1917:277).

On the other hand, the culture of the people was the broad basis for that of the upper classes and could influence them on very specific points, from proverbial sayings, which were usually based on the lifestyles and occupations of the commoners, to the extended literature of Pele and the pig-god Kamapua‘a (Charlot 1987:2 ff.). Experts from the people would seek the attention of the chief, and the chief’s fame was largely dependent on the many outstanding people he could attract to his service. Communities would send delegations to express formally their \textit{manaʻo} ‘opinion,’ which was memorized and appears to have had a form; the word was used in postcontact times for essays.\textsuperscript{26} This practice may have influenced the widespread nineteenth-century practice of writing petitions to the government.

Travel and sightseeing were common, and news was eagerly exchanged. Chiefs would visit each other bringing the latest literature and practices from their courts and learning about those of their hosts.\textsuperscript{27} Experts and students would travel to increase their knowledge.\textsuperscript{28}

This circulation of knowledge continued into postcontact times. News of Captain Cook and his ships spread quickly throughout the islands.\textsuperscript{29} Hawaiians eagerly interrogated foreigners and Hawaiian travelers to other lands.\textsuperscript{30} Christianity and Western education started at court and then diffused to the commoners. American manners and learning spread, \textit{laha}, as chiefly etiquette had before (Kepelino 1932:141). Card games would be learned at court and then be picked up by the rest of the society: \textit{A ma ka laua alakai ana i ua Moi opio nei, ua laha ae ia ano pepa iwaena o keia lahui} ‘Because of these two men’s leadership of the young King [the heir], this type of cardgame spread out among the people’ (‘Ī‘ī March 19, 1870). Before the missionaries visited a
region, word of their activities had already arrived (Ellis 1984: 201, 204). The high school at Lahainaluna was founded as _he mea hoolaha ike_ ‘a thing to spread knowledge’ (“No ka hiki ana mai o ka malamalama i Hawaii nei” May 9, 1834).

Books were recognized early as a means of disseminating knowledge (e.g., Kamakau June 2, 1866). _Ho‘olaha_ was used in the sense of _to publish_ (“He mau Rula o ka Papa no ka Hoakoakoa ana i ka Moolelo Kahiko Hawaii a me ka Mookauahau o na Alii Hawaii” ca. 1882: 1 f.). Newspapers, in which books were serialized (e.g., G. W. December 16, 1869), had an even wider circulation and were often collected and bound as volumes:

The Kumu Hawaii (Hawaiian Newspaper) has quite an extensive circulation. The number of subscribers this year exceeds that of the past year by 150. How much good the paper is I cannot say. Some read it & are profited by it. Others do not read it. They are preserving it, till it is large enough to be bound into a volume. Indeed one reason why some subscribe for it, is that they may have a _book_.

Newspapers were founded expressly for the purpose of _ho‘olaha_ ‘spreading’ ideas (Johnson 1976: 12, 60). The first newspapers were started at Lahainaluna to teach the students how to publish them, to communicate materials to the students, and to give the students practice in communicating their own ideas (Andrews October 1, 1834: 47 f.; November 24, 1835: 5 f.). The students read the paper “with avidity” and quickly took to writing articles:

They even now furnish a great part of the matter for the “Kumu Hawaii,” and are in this way speaking to their more ignorant countrymen. (“Sandwich Islands. Letter from Mr. Clark, Dated at Lahainaluna, Oct. 25, 1838” 1839: 257)

... under judicious management, the time may perhaps be hastened, when the press shall become fully domesticated at the
islands, and exert its power and scatter its blessings without any other aid than it shall derive from the reading capacity and habits of the people. (“Instructions given by the Prudential Committee to the Rev. Sheldon Dibble, About Returning to the Sandwich Islands Mission” 1839:173).

The Kumu Hawaii is attended with as much success, I believe, as was expected. About 3,000 copies of the first volume were circulated . . . It is used to some extent in schools, and read more or less at their houses, as other books are read by such a people. Natives write more and more for it; and we hope it may prove more and more useful as their intelligence increases and also our skill in adapting it to their wants. (“Sandwich Islands. Extracts of Recent Letters of the Missionaries” 1837:73)

The educational use of newspapers was not an unusual purpose at the time. Samuel Johnson remarked (Boswell 1987:477):

The mass of every people must be barbarous where there is no printing, and consequently knowledge is not generally diffused. Knowledge is diffused among our people by the newspapers.

*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* provided *na nu hou a me na mea e ae e pili ana i ka hoonaaauao* ‘the news and the other things related to producing wisdom’ (“He Wahi Olelo Kahea” September 20, 1862). A letter to the editor was quoted praising *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* (No title September 6, 1862):

*He nui ka olioli a me ka hauoli o na kanaka maoli o ko’u Apana, i ke Kuokoa, no na olelo hoonaaauao a ka poe akamai, me na Kii o na aina e . . .* 

‘Great is the joy and happiness of the native people of my District in the Kuokoa for the wisdom-producing statements of the knowledgeable people and the Pictures of foreign lands . . .’

After a report of idolatrous activity by W. B. Kapu (April 21, 1858), an editorial comment argues: *ua hewa ka lakou hana a pau,*
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aole imi iki lakou i ka naauao, aole lawe lakou i ka Hae Hawaii . . . ‘all their activities are wrong; they do not seek wisdom even a little; they do not subscribe to Ka Hae Hawaii’, the newspaper of the Board of Education. To see what kind of people live in a place, ask how many people subscribe. If there are many, the place is naauao ‘wise’; if not, it is naaupo ‘benighted’. He kanawai mau keia, ma na aina a pau, aole he kanaka naauao hookahi i lawe ole i ka Nupepa ‘This is a constant law in all lands: there is not a single wise person who does not subscribe to the newspaper’.

The author of “He Makemake Anei ka Lahui Hawaii i ka Naauao” (September 30, 1899) argues that Americans are a lahui naauao loa ‘a very wise people’ because they read newspapers and books. Newspapers hoolaha ‘spread’ knowledge, even that of specialized professions. People can write in questions when they have problems. In this way, Americans have been able to develop new fields and inventions. All Hawaiians should receive newspapers so that they will be makaukau ‘ready, prepared’; they should read na olelo ao ‘the instructive statements’: o ke alahele ia e loaa ai ka naauao laula ia Hawaii nei ‘it is the path for our Hawai‘i to obtain broad wisdom’.

Newspapers were a major means of communicating information to the public and are often cited as sources. They were used extensively in cultural and historical research to solicit and to publish information. Newspapers provided also the forum in which were discussed the topics of the day.

Levels of human intelligence are the same across cultures, but the intellectual pattern of an individual culture, the emphasis given to certain types of intelligence and intellectual achievements, can vary widely. The emphasis of classical Hawaiian culture is on acquiring a full range of abilities from the most practical and mechanical to the most artistic and intellectual; at all levels there is a special emphasis on verbal devices and attainments. As a result of the intellectual environment and of common expectations of classical society, Hawaiians usually possessed a good, general,
well-rounded education and competence,\textsuperscript{34} which could serve as a solid basis for further specialization. This basic competence can still be observed among many Pacific Islanders, who possess the necessary knowledge of house building, fishing, and plant use to survive alone, if necessary. In Hawai‘i, for instance, everyone had some knowledge of stars, although not a professional expertise (Johnson and Mahelona 1975:158). Kamakau emphasizes the skill and knowledge needed for tasks, like house building, that were not the preserve of specialists.\textsuperscript{35} Many, perhaps most, religious functions could be performed by nonspecialists.\textsuperscript{36} Audiences for storytellers were numerous and critical (Rae 1900:245). Malo describes the backcountry people studying the chiefs carefully and distinguishing well between those who were *pono* ‘correct, righteous’ and those who were *hewa* ‘faulty or immoral’.\textsuperscript{37} Commoners acted effectively as their own advocates before the chief in legal matters (Ellis 1984:423). On approaching Hawai‘i in 1825, Byron hailed a fisherman out at sea, who, commoner though he was, “gave us some very interesting intelligence concerning both public and private matters” (Byron 1826:98). In an analogous situation off the island of Moloka‘i, Kūapāka‘a astonishes the fleet of Keawe with his knowledge. When asked how he knows all these chants, he replies that such things are common, picked-up knowledge, even games, for the children along this coast.\textsuperscript{38} The story of Pāka‘a and Kūapāka‘a is a good illustration of the quality of people who could be found in the country districts—and still can be according to my own experience—but his chiefly connection can be recognized in his son’s style of accomplishing his tasks.\textsuperscript{39} The high level of knowledge in the general community set high standards for expertise and performance. To be outstanding in any field demanded considerable achievement.

Kamehameha I seems to have had the policy of increasing this general competence. For instance, he ordered that chiefs and warriors maintain and improve their martial arts. He also set an example by farming and fishing and arranged special training
for the court in medicine and sorcery, possibly in reaction to the health problems of the time (chapter V). Finally following the traditional ideal of chiefs, he regularly rewarded competence and took experts into his employ.

This competence continued in many areas into the twentieth century. In the biography and memorial volume for the politician Joseph K. Nāwahī (J. G. M. Sheldon 1908), the letters and poems of condolence from even the most isolated country districts are written in an eloquent, classical style. The continuation of this knowledge enabled scholars and students in the nineteenth century to do research on earlier times and traditional practices: *Aua nui ka poe i haawiia i na hoa, a me ka poe naauao e noho ana ma na kuaaina* ‘Many were the people who contributed [information] to the colleagues, and also wise people living among the backcountry people’.40 Similarly at the beginning of the Hawaiian Renaissance in the 1970s, young Hawaiians sought and found knowledgeable elders in the country districts, especially Moloka‘i, where they were able to impart not only their knowledge, but living examples of its formative influence: *‘Oi'ai e nānā mai ana nō nā maka* ‘While the eyes are still looking’ (Pukui 1983: number 2381)—learn from the old people while they are still alive.

**NOTES**

3. Ellis 1984: 109 (making tapa “With lively chat and cheerful song”), 170, 343f. Kānepu‘u April 2, 1868, speaks of children amusing themselves just by *kamailio* ‘conversing’. ʻĪ‘i March 12, 1870. J. S. Green 1838: 42, “Social intercourse at these islands is corrupting to a high degree.”; “*nothing is too low and obscene to be the subject of conversation between the sexes!* Nor are they restrained by the presence of their children.” Andrews December 2, 1835: 2, “I have heard several persons converse together hours upon one simple thought,
too silly for even children to talk about for a minute.” Malo n.d.: xviii 72–73, chiefs and retainers could stay up all night talking. “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” June 30, July 7, 21, 1921; July 7, 1921, chiefs greatly ‘discuss and wonder about’ events; August 18, 1921, people discuss a sudden storm, which they see as a sign. Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:40. Grimshaw 1989:31. For Tonga, see Rutherford 1977:81, evening “confabulations” were “designed to refine the mental processes, improve language facility and instruct in acceptable behavior.” The Tongan writer ‘Epeli Hau’ofa told me that his prose was inspired by the gossip of Tongan women. The gossip I heard in Sāmoa was truly artistic.


6. ‘Ī‘ī July 17, 1869; also January 29, 1870.

7. For example, Nākoa 1979:6–9. Important information on family storytelling is supplied by Johnson 1957.


9. Prayers of different sorts are mentioned often; the children play at prayers (Kānepu‘u March 26, 1868). Sayings: February 27, March 5, April 2, 1868 (Judd 1930: proverb 253; Handy and Pukui 1972:183). Teasing, taunting: February 27, March 12, 26 (composed by the children), 1868. Wailing: March 5, 1868 (uwe kumakena, uwe helu), March 12 (along with beautiful speech of farewell), April 2, 1868.


11. For example, Ritchie and Ritchie 1979:58–71. Relationships with peers are discussed at length in the Hawaiian-language memoirs, e.g., Kānepu‘u February 27, March 12, 19, April 2, 1868. I will discuss particular points in the course of this book.


13. A. November 5, 1853, of David Malo: “He was a great favorite when young, with the chiefs, on account of his smartness, his acquaintance with their songs, dances and other amusements, and hence able to administer largely to their love of pleasure.” ʻĪʻī July 17, December 4, 1869. Kalaiwaa May 29, 1924, refers to children’s chant contests.

14. Honolulu, July 6, 1865, several activities of the old time are being revived, including lele koali ‘swinging’; young women swing, me ke kanikani o na leo ma na waha, me ka nana aku hoi o na lehulehu me ka maka hilihila ole ‘with the continual sounding of the voices in the mouths and also with looking on of the multitudes with shameless eyes’. “Kekahi mau Olelo Hawaii Naauao” May 18, 1922. Collected: H. H. P. September 22, 1866; J. S. Emerson 1919: 6 [Beckwith].


16. Hunger: Kamakau November 10, 1870, implies that the famous chief ‘Umi was always hungry as a child and stole food. This may be a motif of the ever-hungry chief, but does accord with the experience of commoners, Kānepu‘u March 26, April 2, 1868. Andrews 1834b: 169, mentions “the fear of hunger” among some of the Lahainaluna students. Even the nineteenth-century royal children went hungry at the Cookes’ school and were secretly supplied by their displaced guardians with food and sometimes alcoholic drink, M. A. Richards 1970: 89, 104, 106, 113, 240, 250. Compare Ritchie and Ritchie 1979: 46, on the underfeeding of children.

Bully and tease: Kaui November 13, 1865. ʻĪʻī July 24, 1869. Compare Nākuina 1902b: 10 ff. Kānepu‘u February 27, March 19, 26, April 2, 1868; March 26, 1868, in a time of hunger, older boys fool Kānewailani into giving him his food and then laugh at him for doing it; his father is angry when he keeps returning for more food for himself. Teasing a child about his missing father is a Polynesian motif.


Interesting examples of scaring children with religion are given by
Kānepuʻu; February 27, 1868 (during Christian prayers, the older children tell him that if he moves, he will die and so will his soul, a use of the classical Hawaiian idea of multiple souls: *He mea e ka weliweli loa o Kanewailani, mamuli o ke ao-ao ana mai a ka poe keiki numui ae* ’Kanewailani’s fear was extraordinary because of the teachings of the bigger children’; *penei mai ka lakou la olelo me ke ano hoomakaʻukaʻu nae, “E noho malie oe e-a, mai oni oe e-a, ina i walaau oe a onioni iki ae, make oe, make pu me kou uhane”* ‘thus was their statement intended to cause fear, “Sit quietly, don’t move; if you talk or move even a little, you will die, die along with your soul”’; he remains sitting quietly even after the prayer is over, and only when people call him over, *maopopo ae la ia ia nei ua noa, a ua pau paha ka make ana ke oni ae* ‘it was clear to him that the tabu was lifted, and he would no longer die if he moved’. Similarly Kanewailani is scared when the Christian missionary prays; when the foreigner looks up at the mat ceiling, the child thinks his god is there bodily, listening to them (March 19, 1868). When the children go to the mountains to pick wild fruit, Kānepuʻu is greedy and tries to carry too much home (April 2, 1868). When he falls behind, the bigger children scare him by saying: *“Aia aku ke akua huluhulu o ka mauna mahope ou la-e, a pau oe i ke akua ama-uma-u o uka!”* ‘There’s the bushy/hairy god of the mountain behind you there; you’re going to be caught/destroyed by the fern god of the uplands!’ When the child was scared, he would drop the fruit he was carrying. (Mea Kakau June 27, 1902, provides a curious parallel to this god: one bird-snaring brother scares the other by sticking feathers on himself; *a kahea aku la me ka leo hoomakaʻukaʻu e pau ana ia i ke akua ahuluhulu o ka mauna ke ole e haalele i ka manu* ‘and he called out with a frightening voice that he would be destroyed by the feathered god of the mountain unless he left the birds’). When children are dividing up roles to play—horse, boat, chief—an older boy frightens them by saying he will play Jehovah (Kānepuʻu April 2, 1868).

The guardians of the nineteenth-century royal children also scared them with religion, as did the older children the younger, M. A. Richards 1970: 58–61, 108; compare 63 f., 81. On the same in Sāmoa, see Ritchie and Ritchie 1979: 55.

Adults could be unpleasant to children, e.g., Kānepuʻu March 26, 1868.

17. “No na Mea Kahiko” August 1, 1834. Laanui January 4, 1837, *Eia koʻu lohe a me koʻu ike no hoi ke hai aku nei ia oukou . . .* ‘Here is what I heard and also what I saw; I am telling it to you . . . ’; March 14, 1838. ʻĪi May 22, 1839: 101, and throughout his work, is careful to distinguish between what he himself saw and what he simply learned or heard. Kailiehu June 12, 1865. Kamakau January 26, 1867, *ka paa naau ma na hana iloko o kuu wa kamaalii [sic]* ‘the memorization and activities in the time of my childhood’. “He Moolelo Kaa
no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” May 12, 1921, the author publishes a beautiful song he heard sung in his childhood by old women at dawn along with other literary materials from the place. “Kekahi Mau Olelo Hawaii Naauao” May 18, 1922, *Eia hou kekahi mau olelo i lohe mau ia e d’u i ko’u mau la kamalii* ‘Here again are some sayings heard continually by me in my childhood days’. “Ka Oihana Lua a Mawaii Lahuui [sic]” July 19, 1923.

18. Kamakau of Ka’awaloa in Fornander 1919–1920: 13, 17, 19, 31, 37, 39. ‘Ī‘ī August 14, 21, 28, 1869. Not all ceremonies or every part of some were visible to the community, Fornander 1969: 59.

19. Kauʻi December 4, 1865; also December 18, 1865. Kuahuur June 5, 12, 1861. For Nākuina 1902a and 1902b, see my article on this CD-ROM. Luomala 1938: 41, an audience would be “critical and appreciative” of verbal contests.

20. Pukui 1983: number 2114. Nākuina 1902b: 28. R. C. Stewart 1990: 161, describing the period from 1913 to 1920, writes that village people would invite strangers into their homes: “The reason for the invitation was to get the latest news of the people and places the stranger had just come from. We were his very interested listeners.”

21. “He moolelo no Pakaa” November 7, 1867; also Kuahuur April 24, 1861; Nākuina n.d.: 17, 38f. The people become worried when Keawe does not return at the announced time; Kuahuur May 29, 1861; Fornander 1918–1919: 117; compare Nākuina n.d.: 95. Compare “He moolelo no Pakaa” October 24, 1867, in which the community knows about the sightseeing trip of the chief and makes efforts to prepare for it.


24. Kepelino 1932: 141. Kamakau November 10, 1870, ‘Umī’s mother teaches him what to do when he gets to court, a regular section of this famous story. Much information on such training is contained in ‘Ī‘ī, e.g., June 12, July 31, August 7, 1869. Although people were certainly awkward and uneasy when unfamiliar with the details of chiefly etiquette (‘Ī‘ī July 31, 1869, pīoo), good manners were everywhere appreciated; in fact, incognito chiefs could pass for commoners, although they usually stood out enough to be recognized.

25. For example, ‘Ī‘ī October 30, 1869; February 12, 1870. “He Moolelo Kaa ao Ku haupio/Kekuhaupio” July 21, 1921; also June 30, 1921.

26. For the practice, see Dibble n.d.: 2090 people would go a great distance not for instruction “but for the purpose of *telling a thought*. Upon
the annunciation of this intention one of the company would furnish his more ignorant companions with a sentence or two, which they committed to memory & then marched off to relate it to the missionary . . .

2091. “If upon their arrival one of their number had forgotten a part of his thought his companion of more retentive memory would secretly prompt him”; when “a false prophetess arose” in Puna, “the people from all quarters flocked around her to tell their thoughts . . .”; “This rage for telling thoughts has not been confined to any one station, but has existed throughout the islands . . .”


The form has a terminating sentence: “Ka hope o ke koena” December 20, 1834, Ua pau keia hana manao ‘This mana’o work is finished’; Kalauau November 11, 1835, Pau keia manao ‘This mana’o is finished’; Namau August 30, 1837, Pau keia manao; Nohoua April 11, 1838, ko’u manao hoakaka ‘my clarifying mana’o’ (a possible introductory statement), Ua pau keia wahi manao hoakaka ‘This little clarifying mana’o is finished’.

27. For example, Kamakau October 25, 1842: 52, and the story of Lonoi-kamakahiki, discussed below. See also chapter IV.

28. For example, “He Mooolelo Kaa no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” May 26, 1921. For the New Zealand Māori, see Ballekom and Harlow 1987: 17 (English 40).


31. Lyons 1835: 2174. “Sandwich Islands. Extracts of Recent Letters of the Missionaries” 1837: 73, the Kumu Hawaii is a great success; “About 3000 copies of the first volume were circulated.” Masthead July 18, 1863, states that Volume 1 of Ka Nupepa Kuokoa can be purchased bound for $4.00; complete sets can be exchanged for bound ones for $2.00.

32. For example, Kānepū’u February 8, 1868. Kamakau February 15, 1868; June 24, 1869. Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua November 1, 1923. Foreign newspapers were used as well, e.g., Kamakau January 19, 1867.


34. For example, Townsend 1900: 35 f. Elbert 1951: 350.

35. Kamakau December 14, 1867. Also Handy and Pukui 1972: 112. House building is perhaps the most important specialization in Sāmoa.


38. Kuapuu May 8, 1861: loaa wale ‘just picked up’. “He Moolelo no Pakaa” November 14, 1867, column 1, on the name chants of Keawe recited by Kūapāka’a: He mea loaa wale no ke mele o na’līi i kamalii o keia kaha, eia ka he mea paakiki, a loaa ole i ko oukou kamalii, he mea loaa wale no ia ia makou ‘The chant of the chiefs are just a picked-up thing for the children of this coast. It’s something really difficult—something your children don’t get—but just something picked up by us’; column 2, on the wind chants of Hawai‘i: Ua olelo mua aku nei au ia oukou, he mea paani wale no na koonei kamalii ke mele o na’līi, a e hiki no ia’u ke hai aku i na mele o Hawai‘i, e pili ana i na makani, e loaa ai ka ino ia oukou ‘I told you before, the chant of the chiefs is just a plaything, a game, for the children of this place. And I can recite the songs of Hawai‘i relating to the winds so that the storm will fall upon you.’ Nākuina 1902a: 51 ff., 63, He mea loaa wale no keia i kamalii o keia aina, ina no oe e pae ae la o ka hana hookahi wale no keia i ka waha o kamalii o keia kaha “This is something just picked up by the children of this land. If you land, [you will see that] this will be the only activity in the mouth of the children of this coast.’ Also Fornander 1918–1919: 91. Compare Tatar 1993: 14.

39. Kuapuu May 22, 1861: a mahalo mai la ia i ke keiki i ka hana kanaka makua, me he mea la ua noho i kahi alii, no ka makaukau o keia keiki ‘And he [Keawe] appreciated the child because he worked like a child with [distinguished] parents, as if he had lived in a residence of a chief, because of the readiness of the child’. Nākuina 1902a: 83. Fornander 1918–1919: 113 ff. Krauss 1988: 79, 82, 85, the knowledge among commoners of Hawaiian traditions.

40. Kamakau September 9, 1865b. Good examples of this research can be found in the series Ka Hoomana Kahiko, published in Ka Nupepa Kuokoa. Poli January 5, 1865, states that he has received much information from older people. Waiamu January 19, 1865, went to an old man for information. [Ekaula] March 23, 1865, traveled to Kaua‘i to supplement the research done on his home island Maui. On the other hand, Kekoa September 30, 1865, was unable to find much information on burials. See the section on history in chapter V.
Classical Hawaiian views of education must be understood within the general thought world of Hawaiian culture. Since Hawaiians were individualistic, differences and variations were common, and the general ideas discussed here—largely in terms of Western thought and in relation to the subject of this study—must not be construed as a universally accepted philosophical system (Charlot 1983a:19–52, 121–131).

In the major precontact chant, the *Kumulipo*, the origin of the universe is described as the mating of sky and earth, followed by a series of generations—elements, plants, and animals, then the first anthropomorphic gods and human beings—that complete the cosmos as the Hawaiian knew it. The universe is thus a family tree, the different members of which bear a family resemblance to each other. Much Hawaiian thinking and literature explores this network of resemblances, resemblances which reveal genuine interrelations of the different parts of the universe. Those relations are in fact real connections, like those in a family. To understand fully things or people is to place them accurately within the network of their multiple relations inside the universe.
framed by earth and sky. That understanding is powerful because it enables one to treat or use properly and thus effectively the people or objects with which one has to deal.

This genealogical view of the universe is the basis for many recognized characteristics of Hawaiian thinking. No person or object is isolated or alienated; everything and everyone is a member of the universal family. The human being is completely an integral part of the universe in which he lives with family resemblances to its many parts. To study the universe is therefore simultaneously to study human beings, and poetry that seems to be about the nonhuman environment is in fact depicting the same forces that operate in persons. The primary force in this genealogical view is necessarily sexual; every part of the universe, including the elements, perpetuates itself as a family line. Emotion and beauty are therefore central categories and subjects of thought, and fertility and vigorous life, ola, are goals and ideals.

More generally, the universe is the ultimate reality and forms a whole. That whole is finite, with the sky above and the earth below. There is nothing beyond the universe—it is a container like a calabash (Judd 1930: riddles 227, 252)—and therefore no distinction can be made between natural and supernatural. Similarly the word nature should not be used in a less than all-encompassing sense.

Precontact Hawaiians did not develop theologies of a universal creator god. The gods live within the framework of sky and earth and are therefore components of the universe. Words such as godly are therefore more accurate than supernatural. As members of the universe, as parts of a larger whole, the gods are not all-powerful, but have their areas of competence and even weakness. It is therefore a Westernism to make such statements of Hawaiian thinking as “all power comes from the gods.”

In fact, the universe contains not only personal powers, the gods, but impersonal forces as well. In the Kumulipo, sky and
earth are not treated as personal gods. They are not identified respectively with the god Wākea and the earth goddess Papa or Haumea; that pair arises much later in the development of the universe. The fact that earth and sky can be considered to mate without being personal gods is an example of the Hawaiian view that the elements, such as rocks, are themselves sexual. Similarly just as in Japanese religion, a mountain or a rock can be a god without being a person. Nor need the mountain or rock possess a soul. Hawaiians were not “animists,” always ascribing personal souls to impersonal objects; animism is a theory that explains certain aspects of primary religions by supplying a Western justification for them. The impersonal object can itself be powerful and thus important in itself and through its own place in the universe, not through its connection to some personal god. Such a combination of personal gods and impersonal forces is familiar to students of other religions, such as Shintō and Taoism.

Impersonal forces have been less discussed in Hawaiian literature, in which stories and prayers focus most often on the personal. Interpreters can also be misled by the frequent practice of rhetorical personification (Charlot 1983a:106 f.) and by the fact that in Hawaiian thinking elements can act in ways that Westerners consider personal, like mating. Impersonal forces were however clearly listed among the things worshipped: He poe palaualelo; he poe hoomana kii; he poe hoomana i ka la a me na ia o ke kai ‘A useless, lying people, an idolatrous people, a people who worshipped the sun and the fishes of the sea’ (Kalauau November 11, 1835). In an important discussion of the gods, Hukilani (November 19, 1864) innovates by dividing them into three categories: gods, goddesses, and Na Akua okoa ‘The different or separate gods’, that is, gods that are neither male nor female. These last gods are impersonal, as will be seen from the examples below. This last category, he writes, will surprise his readers, but he cites a chant that alludes to the wondrous sands of
Māhinahina of Hālawa, Moloka‘i, sands that have god-like powers (Charlot 1983a:75 f.). He then divides these gods into two categories:

*He elua no mahele o na Akua okoa.*


‘There are indeed two divisions of the separate Gods.

1. The thing that is connected above. 2. The things that are connected below here . . . ’

Those in the “above” category include the sky, the sun, the moon, the stars, and the rain; those in the “below” category include the rock, the wood, and the river. The author’s view would not be shared by all Hawaiians—for instance, the sky could be treated as male in certain contexts—but he is certainly correct in stating that certain elements need not be always so considered.

The recognition of the existence of impersonal forces is important in understanding without distortion certain areas of Hawaiian thinking, practice, and education. For instance, a kapu or law once proclaimed can have power over the person who owns and uses it (Charlot 1985a:39 f.). A prayer or curse once said becomes an impersonal force on its own and can even be turned against the person who sent it. The prayer is not a person. In education, only moral students should be taught certain prayers because their intrinsic power can be directed to immoral ends.

More generally, the impersonal provides the framework of the personal. The gods cannot break through the sky; they act within the cosmos and its general laws, over which they have limited powers. They can bring rain, but the rain falls. Pele cannot make her fires impervious to the rain from Kamapua‘a’s cloud bodies; at most, she can stoke them to try to overcome the flood. Similarly a sorcerer can send a curse, but cannot recall it. The framework of the universe is therefore stable: *He lani i luna, he honua i lalo* ‘The sky above, the earth below’ (Pukui 1983: number 718). It is not entirely subject to godly intervention. The relation
of personal to impersonal power was important for Hawaiian thinkers in their discussions of certain subjects like medicine and law, and a good deal of disagreement can be found. Some thinkers and practitioners emphasize more the personal, others the impersonal, and describing accurately the relations between the two in any one field or thinker is difficult.

In education, the student learns to work with both the personal and the impersonal forces. The fisherman learns the prayers, religious rules, and rituals, but he also learns the names and habits of the fish, the weather signs, and currents, and discovers new fishing grounds through his own experience and observation. Godly help does not dispense the fisherman from the need for skill, knowledge, and wisdom. The fisherman who relies on godly help to act foolishly lacks respect for both the gods and the sea.

Moreover, just as there was no supernatural beyond the universe in classical Hawaiian thinking, so also, on the evidence, there was nothing purely immaterial. Like the ancient Greeks, Hawaiians conceived of ghosts or spirits as composed of matter finer than that of, say, rocks and leaves, but matter nonetheless; gods thus needed to be housed and fed. Similarly because souls were material, they could be trapped, manipulated, and even crushed to extinction.

This materialism of Hawaiian thinking preserved the unity of their universe; for instance, it avoided the conceptual split between an immaterial mind and a material body that has raised so many problems in Western thinking. Pukui has stated, “Hawaiian words often first described a physical act or feeling and then took on mental or emotional meanings” (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 9). For Hawaiians, their body was integral to their identity and was honored and expressive. The body was also powerful as were all things in the universe.

The Hawaiian view of the materiality of human activity—perceptions, emotions, and thought—avoided also the separation of the human mind from the world it contemplated and modified.
Thought could be expressed in the spoken word, which had the power to effect results through its real connection to the thing it named—a connection revealed to Hawaiians by onomatopoeia and a long tradition of appropriate naming and wordplay. To impose the material-immaterial distinction on Hawaiian culture is, I argue, another Westernism.

Powerful in body and mind, the Hawaiian lived within and was a part of a network of powerful relations, the exploration of which was also a process of self-discovery. Learning, thinking, education, and creativity were integral to Hawaiian life because they were demanded by the Hawaiian view of the universe and of the place of human beings within it.

This exploration could awaken a whole range of emotions from awe, to fear, to love, to amusement. As seen in the literature, however, the fundamental response was an immediate and ever growing realization of the beauty of the universe, a beauty that ranged from the small and dear to the tremendous manifestations of the power of the gods and elemental forces. Ultimately in a genealogical view of the universe, beauty is the power of attraction that is an essential component of the sexual dynamic through which the universe originated and perpetuates itself in all its parts. Sensitivity to and exploration of beauty—an exploration that involves all faculties and capacities—is the deepest and most complete response to the human situation. Ultimately Hawaiians learn to participate in that beauty; they learn that they are an integral and active part of the beautiful universe.

Finally the difference between the Hawaiian world view and Western ones results in differences in educational views. For instance, because Westerners do not believe in the real connection between words and referents, much Hawaiian use of words seems magical and fabulous. Westerners do not usually have family and craft gods who take an intimate interest in the education of the next generation. Because of the Hawaiians’ emphasis
on genealogy, they ascribe much to nature that Westerners categorize as nurture.

My purpose is to describe Hawaiian educational views and practices and understand them in the social and mental context of their time. As a modern Westerner, I find much in them to admire, such as the sense of the whole and the importance of the esthetic. I am also challenged by the privileged position accorded the intellectual, educational, and creative in Hawaiian culture. Finally I cannot forget that Hawaiian education proved its usefulness over perhaps two millennia of precontact Hawaiian life and has preserved and inspired invaluable cultural treasures from that time until today.

I will concentrate in this chapter on general points and those only in their relation to education. For instance, I do not discuss Hawaiian morality as a whole or all that was taught, but only the relation of morality to education.

THE IDEALS OF HAWAIIAN EDUCATION

The ideals of Hawaiian education are the same throughout its many fields, from what Westerners would consider the most utilitarian to the most intellectual or religious. Indeed, the utilitarian were considered ‘oihana ‘ike ‘professions of knowledge’, and the intellectual and religious always had a practical purpose. As in much Asian philosophy and religion, knowledge should lead to wisdom, competence, service for others, health, long life, and so on.

Similarly like the Greeks, Hawaiians treated skill training and intellectual education in the same way, not distinguishing them as is done by modern psychologists (Baron 1988: 79–82). That is, physical training was considered to influence thinking as well (e.g., Beamer 1976: 56, 58), and physical grace was a sign of
intelligence, as is clear from the discussion of vocabulary and sayings in chapter I. The reason for this is that skill and knowledge were always connected in an occupation or activity, as can be seen in the prominent use of language in instruction, which imbued the subject with culture. In fact, the same general pattern of activity can be found in each:

training: observation-practice-production-variation and innovation;

knowledge: attention-memorizing-recall-creativity.

This similarity of approach may have facilitated the positive transfer of benefits gained in one field to another. Hawaiian thinking emphasizes similarities between objects and fields as well as their relative position within a cosmic framework, so that different fields were perceived as containing similar elements and general principles, as will be seen below.

In education as in other fields, Hawaiians emphasized similarities over differences and saw their world and their activity as a whole. As a result, a profession could become a total religious, intellectual, and cultural unit—a whole way of life in itself, with an origin story, patron gods, rituals and ceremonies, a genealogy or an applied genealogical form, and so on. Goethe, whose society was still based on patriarchal families that practiced crafts within an aristocratic order, formulated an ideal of such occupations:

For the smallest head, it will always be handwork; for the better, an art; and the best, when he does one, he does all, or, to be less paradoxical, in the one that he does right, he sees the image of all that is done right.¹

Many Hawaiian educational ideals as well as techniques are influenced by the requirements of an oral culture. An emphasis on completeness and perfection was clearly useful when large amounts of information needed to be transmitted orally. Other
ideals, such as seriousness, morality, and a connection of education to religion and the gods supported and sanctioned the effort required to transmit those traditions. More examples and variations will be provided in later discussion.

Finally, that ideals were articulated does not mean that they were realized. In fact, the very emphasis of Hawaiian literature on certain ideals—and the repeated condemnation of their opposites—reveal that they needed to be prescribed. For instance, the repeated injunctions not to give way to anger when acting or making decisions reveal that this was a danger of chiefly rule. Energy, alacrity, and precision in work were Hawaiian ideals—and studying night and day is an expression of particular zeal—but foreigners differed widely on whether Hawaiians followed them. Pāka’a’s rivals become lazy once they have assumed his position; true alacrity and energetic service come from devotion to the chief and are a subject for praise. One student explained, “it was not customary for the common people to obey their chiefs when they had plenty of their own to eat” (Andrews October 1, 1834: 31). Robert Louis Stevenson provides a vivid picture of workers building a house under the supervision of a chief, albeit in Kiribati (1971: 291):

In all the affair servile obedience was no less remarkable than servile deliberation. The gang had here mustered by the note of a deadly weapon; the man who looked on was the unquestioned master of their lives; and except for civility, they bestirred themselves like so many American hotel clerks. The spectator was aware of an unobtrusive yet invincible inertia, at which the skipper of a trading dandy might have torn his hair.

Hawaiians were clearly like other people in holding ideals that they did not always achieve. Indeed, an ambivalent fascination with bad behavior is widespread in Hawaiian literature (e.g., Charlot 1987: 17–21). Ideals are prescriptive rather than descriptive. Nonetheless, expressed ideals are important as a picture of
a culture as its members think it ought to be and as standards by which behavioral failures and achievements can be measured.

Practical

Practicality or usefulness is a high ideal of Hawaiian education that is applied to all branches of learning. Knowledge and activity should have a *waiwai* ‘virtue, value, or benefit’. Learned people are *poe akamai a waiwai* (Johnson 1976: 62). As the young chief Lonoikamakahiki learns about the world, he asks about the *waiwai* of a thing or person (Fornander 1916–1917: 257–267). He asks, “*I aha ka‘u hana e hana ai i waiwai ai? A ina ua ike oe i ka hana waiwai no‘u, alaila, e ao no kaua*” “What work should I do to be wealthy? If you know the wealthy work for me, then let us two indeed study it/then teach me indeed” (267). His advisor suggests *kākā‘olelo* ‘word-fencing, oratory’ and *ho‘opāpā* ‘contests of wits’: *ina e akamai oe ma na hana hoopapa, alaila, waiwai oe* ‘if you become knowledgeable in the activities of *ho‘opāpā*, then you will be wealthy’. Kamehameha is scolded for spending his time at play—*he hana hope ole* ‘an activity without result’—and returns ashamed to his studies.5 ‘I‘ī wins general approval when he answers the question whether it is better to serve the rich old chief or the poor young one with the words, *O ka hoolohe no hoi paha ka pono o ke ali‘i waiwai ole, i waiwai ai no hoi, alaila, waiwai pu no hoi me ke kanaka* ‘The right thing is probably to heed indeed the poor chief; he will probably become rich, then he will be rich indeed with his servant’ (July 31, 1869). The chief uses his riches to reward and retain his followers, rewards that are a fit object for prayer.6

These ideas continued into postcontact times. The word *waiwai* was applied to the Bible and Christianity.7 One read newspapers to become *akamai* and *waiwai* (Johnson 1976: 62). A problem with the early higher education in Hawai‘i was that the
students saw no future positions in which they could put their education to use (Missionary Letters, Volume 7, n.d.: 2174 f.).

At his ʻhōʻike ‘display or graduation ceremony’, the student must show that his knowledge is effective, that is, that it actually works or produces results. The useless, profitless, and ineffective are always expressed in derogatory terms (hikauhi, pahuʻa, ʻuʻa). Great accomplishments are praised: He pohō na ka pohō, ‘o ke akamai nō ke hana a nui ‘Useless things are done by useless people; the knowledgeable person indeed is he who works until something big is achieved’. In my own experience, some Hawaiians have found it difficult to understand why I would study their traditional religion and not want to use my knowledge for such practices as exorcism.

Knowing the purpose of something is important for understanding it; “the term ‘understand’ is relative to some context, purpose, or goal” (Baron 1988: 97; also 98–101). Such knowledge can be important also in the crucial activity of an oral tradition, memory retrieval: “It is an interesting fact about problems in some areas of knowledge that the best retrieval cues are often purposes” (Baron 1988: 100).

Knowledge can have many uses and types of uses. Stars need to be studied for navigation, omen reading, and the ritual calendar.9 The member of the younger generation selected to be the family leader is given a broad and intense education—and listens to and observes his elders—in order to perform that important function (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972: 190). Pākaʻa imparts his knowledge to his son Kūapākaʻa in order to regain his place at court. Kalapana learns hoʻōpāpā ‘contests of wits’ in order to revenge his father; he will not rest until he achieves this purpose.10 A chief needs advice that is practical and must sometimes search for it (Kamakau August 17, 1867).

Knowledge is serious, indeed, a matter of life and death. Mai kāpae i ke aʻo a ka makua, aia he ola ma laila ‘Do not set aside the teaching of the parent; there is life in it’ (Handy and Pukui 1972: 276).
number 194; text regularized). John Papa ‘Ī‘ī, imbued with classical educational ideals, accepts his parents’ moral advice because, through their long and thorough study of human beings, they have learned *i kaawale ka pono, a i kaawale ka hewa, a me ia no ka make, a me ke ola* ‘to separate right and wrong, and with this is indeed death and life’.  

Education prepares people for life-threatening situations:

*Ia wa no e a’o pu ai i ka oihana ha’iha’i (lua,) [sic] a’o no a lehia, a o ia ike i a’o ai a makaukau he mea no ia e pale ae ai i ka make i kekahi manawa.*

‘At that time indeed, one learned the occupation of [bone-] breaking (*lua*), learned indeed until expert, and this knowledge, which was learned until one was ready, was something to ward off death on some occasion’ (“Ka Oihana Lua a Hawaii Lahui” August 2, 1923).

Those who do not learn how to swim may drown. Kamakea exclaims over a reported drowning (May 14, 1844):

*Eia paha kona mea e make ai, o kona ike ole i ke au. Ka inoa ua pau loa na kanaka Hawaii i ka ike au, aole ka!*

‘Here is probably the reason why he died: he didn’t know how to swim. One would have thought all the Hawaiian people would know how to swim, but it isn’t so!’

Those who do not learn how to surf well will die from a mistake. If a stone building is constructed badly, it will fall and kill someone. Only being *mākaukau* ‘at the ready’ saves one from ambush. Such advance preparation for action is emphasized in Hawaiian literature. Kamehameha I prepares for combat while his enemies spend their time grumbling (“He Moolelo Kaa no Kuhaupio/Kekuaupo” August 11, 18, 1921). Lack of preparation can be fatal. When ‘Ī‘ī as a child forgets the court rules his mother
taught him for carrying the chief’s spittoon, he almost drops it, which would have led to his death (October 9, 1869).

A writer connected with the Board of Education writes in 1856:

\[
\textit{ina aole lakou e hana, aole ai.---Ina uuku ka hana, nui ka wi, no ka nui o na kanaka, uuku ka aina no kekahi—hookahi paha kihapai, a elua paha kanaka no ke kihapai hookahi. Nolaila, ina ua hemahema ka mahiai ana, uuku ka ai a nui ka pilikia. Aole meia ka pilikia i keia wa; nui ka aina a uuku na kakaka [sic: kānaka], a nui na kihapai no ke kanaka hookahi.—A no ka pilikia ole, ua lilo ka nui o na kanaka i poe palaualelo.}
\]

‘if they didn’t work, they didn’t eat.—If the work was small, the famine was big. Because of the high number of people, there was little land for each one—maybe a single field, or maybe two people for each field. As a result, if the farming was faulty, the food would be little and the trouble great. The trouble of this time is different. The land is much and the people are few, so the fields are many for the single person.—Because of this lack of difficulty, most people have become lazy’.

Similarly the advice one offers can lead to the death or life of others as well as oneself. When the chief Keawe gives Kūapāka'a authority over his canoe, \textit{ia ia ko lakou make a me ke ola} ‘his was their death and life’ (Kuapuu June 5, 1861). A goddess will kill someone if he gave her bad advice (ʻĪʻī September 11, 1869).

A recognition of the ideal of practicality is a corrective for over-mystical interpretations of Hawaiian culture and religion. But the breadth of Hawaiian ideas of practicality prevents their being interpreted—any more than Confucianism or Taoism—in terms of Western utilitarianism. Much that is removed from Western ideas of utility is considered useful in Hawaiian culture. Religion, moral cultivation, music, the visual arts, and so on are considered efficacious and powerful, which means they can be used for practical purposes. Westerners recognize a “higher” or
other-worldly utility in such pursuits, such as the formation of character.

Similarly no occupation is purely practical in a Western sense, but is an ‘oihana ‘ike ‘a knowledgeable occupation’, and intellectual terms are used for such professions as farming: *He lahuī mahiai, a he lahuī naauao ka lahuikanaka kahiko o Hawai‘i nei* ‘A farming people and a wise people the old race of this Hawai‘i’ (Kamakau December 14, 1867). Such practical occupations involve religion, morality, esthetics, and literature: they have a beauty, *nani*, to be enjoyed, *nanea*. As such, they form positively the people who practice them. All these aspects become clearer as professionalization increases, for instance, in the *ho‘opāpā* ‘contest of wits’. A Western analogy can be found in Goethe’s saying, *Vom Nützlichen durchs Wahre zum Schönen* ‘From the practical through the true to the beautiful’ (Goethe 1961: 73; also 74 f.).

A clear analogy can be found in the Hawaiian way of creating, using, and cherishing objects that are considered utilitarian in other cultures. For instance, the digging stick is a throwaway item in Sāmoa. In Hawai‘i, it is a work of art to be passed down as an heirloom. In fact, it must be carved with the help of special gods, which implies knowledge of their names and the appropriate prayers, that is, education.16

An important reward of education is prestige. In wrestling, *o kekah poe no ke ake i ka waiwai, a o kekah poe no ka hookelakela ike* ‘some people indeed [pursued the profession] from the desire for wealth, but others for the display of knowledge [or for the attaining of excellence]’ (‘Ka Oihana Lua a Hawaii Lahui” August 2, 1923). But prestige is the recognition of something that is valuable for the community itself. Ultimately work must be understood in the context of an active universe: *‘Oiai nō e kau ana ka lā, hana ke kanaka i ola ka honua* ‘While the sun is up, the man works so that the earth may live’ (Judd 1930: proverb 542).
Powerful

Knowledge is useful or effective because it is powerful. A stereotyped line of a prayer is *Hō mai he mana, hō mai he ‘ike* ‘Give power, give knowledge’. A variation reads: *e haawi i ka ike a nui, ka ike mana, ka mana palena ole...* ‘give knowledge until it is great, the powerful knowledge, the boundless power...’ (Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua December 7, 1922a). An expert can be praised as *he kahuna mana, a he kahuna ike* ‘a powerful priest, a knowledgeable priest’ (Kamakau August 11, 1870). Indeed, the full and true possession of knowledge must be demonstrated by exercising it to effect, as in the *hō’ike* ‘display or graduation ceremony’.

Hawaiian views of this power depend on the classical world view and cannot be translated without distortion into such Western categories as “natural,” “magic,” or “superhuman.” Hawaiian views can be placed on a spectrum with, on one extreme, the capacities of ordinary human beings and, on the other, deeds possible only with extensive godly help. Along the spectrum would be the activities of increasingly knowledgable and talented people and increasing amounts of godly assistance. For instance, remarkable people can be innovators in crafts and professional techniques and can win contests of wits or genealogical controversies; but the aid given to Lonoikamakahiki by his advisors during a contest could be explained only by their special powers and relationship with gods. Beckwith (1922: 322), who believes that such contests “On the whole” depend more on intelligence than “miracle,” is “inclined to think” that some of the marvelous elements in that account “are substituted for misunderstood puns, so at variance are they with the realistic spirit of the other contests” (324).

Certain capacities however are ascribed to ordinary human beings in Hawaiian culture that would be considered magical elsewhere, such as the power of the word; and godly assistance is also
more normal than in many other cultures. Hawaiian views can differ considerably in the emphasis given to any of these factors, and their relative proportions are often difficult to define. Texts can range from those that would be unexceptionable in most cultures to the fabulous, but some sense of the power of knowledge is always present. The author of “Na Anoai” writes that the deeds of the people of old seem fabulous to those who do not understand the rules by which they were done (July 27, 1922):

Mamuli o ia maopopo ole ana i na loina hana e loaa mai ai ka mea i manaioia, pela i pahaohao ai ka mea i ike ole, a kapa aku ia ano hana he hoomanamana. O ka oiaio nae he hana ia i hanaia maloko o na rula a loina hooponopono o ia hana, i mea e loaa ai ka mea i makemakeia.

‘Because of this lack of understanding of the work rules by which the object of desire was obtained, this was why the unknowledgeable person was astonished and called this type of work idolatry. But the simple truth is that this work was done within the rules and directing laws of this work, in order to achieve the thing desired’.

The author’s example is an effective ceremony to change the rusty-colored hair of an infant to black.

A basic theme of Hawaiian thinking is the connection of the power of knowledge to that of words. Thoughts themselves do not seem to have effective power, but the right words, spoken correctly, produce by themselves, as an impersonal power, external results. This is particularly clear in the case of ritual prayers: the successful ceremony or prayer lele wale ‘flies unhindered’ to its goal; the unsuccessful one hā‘ule ‘falls’. Wordplay is used in a variety of rituals; for instance, the fish weke is used in religious ceremonies because the meaning of its name is ‘opening’ (Titcomb 1972:162). The wind chants of Kūapāka’a do not just name the winds, they call them up: A hooki o Kuapakaa i ke kahea ana i na makani, ua lohe ia ka halulu, me he nu makani la i na waa o Keawenuiaumi
‘When Kūapāka’a cut off the calling on the winds, the rumble and roar of the winds were heard in the boats of Keawenuia‘umi’ (Fornander 1918–1919:97). The chief is angry that Kūapāka’a has used this dangerous power: Maikai hoi ka olelo a ke keiki, a ko kahea ana i ka makani, hewa oe ‘The child’s speech is good, but in your calling on the wind, you were wrong’ (Fornander 1918–1919:97; also, 95). In another version, the chief says, o ko noi ae nei no ka ia, homai—homai, he makani, nolaila, aole au e pae i kou awa e ke keiki ‘This was indeed your appeal—raise me up, raise me up a wind; therefore, I will not land in your harbor, child’.22

The learning of words is basic to Hawaiian education, as will be seen below. Those words have a practical purpose in that they enable someone to manipulate more knowledgeably and therefore effectively the personal and impersonal powers of his environment. Moreover, the Hawaiian view of the connection of words to their referents allows for the use of words also as powerful ritual devices. Lists of wind names can be used to call the winds named. In such cases, knowledge appears as the basis of power, or at least its prerequisite.

Hawaiians speculated about the relation of knowledge and power. The two, or certain sorts of them, could even be distinguished, as in the saying ‘Ike nō i ka lā ‘ike; mana nō i ka lā mana ‘Knowledge indeed on the day of knowledge; mana indeed on the day of mana’ (Pukui 1983: number 1212).

In his book on Pāka’a and his son, Moses Nākuina elaborates a theory based on the fact that two sources of power over the wind are mentioned in the traditional story: the names of the winds, which are the subject of instruction (1902a:21, 34), and the wind gourd. In characteristic Hawaiian fashion, he ties these two sources to the family genealogy: Pāka’a is known for his knowledge, but from his grandmother, who was ‘e‘epa ‘extraordinary, uncanny’, comes a mana kūpaianaha ‘wonderful power’ that makes the winds her kauā ‘servants’.23 To raise the winds, two things are necessary. The first is the wind gourd itself, in
which the winds have been collected. The second is a memorized knowledge of the wind names so that they can be called: *a ua paanaau pu hoi iaia ka inoa pakahi o na makani mai Hawaii a Kaula* ‘and along with this [the wind gourd], she memorized the individual names of the winds from Hawai‘i to Ka‘ula’. Both gourd and name are used in raising a wind: *ina he la makani ole, he wehe wale ae no kana i ke po‘i a kahea aku i ka makani, o ka pa iho la no ia o ka makani* ‘if it was a windless day, she would just open up the cover and call the wind, and the wind would blow’ (21; also 20, 76). However, Nākuina tends to ascribe the power more to the wind gourd than to knowledge or the word. Accordingly, in opposition to the earlier publications, which emphasize the superiority of Pāka‘a’s knowledge, Nākuina states that his opponents’ knowledge is equally extensive and Pāka‘a’s advantage lies in his *mana* over the winds (30).

Nākuina’s view of the relation between knowledge and power differs from that of Kuapu‘u, who writes clearly of Pāka‘a’s mother La‘amaomao (April 17, 1861): *ua kaulana oia no ka hoolohe o na makani; a ia ia ke kahea aku i na inoa, a i kona make ana, ua hooili oia i ka mana kahea makani i kana keiki* ‘she was famous because the winds heeded her; and hers it was to call out the names, and at her death, she bequeathed her power to call the winds to her child’ (compare Fornander 1918–1919: 73). In Kuapu‘u, the wind gourd seems secondary for the power; it is the repository for the mother’s bones and named for her. However, Kuapu‘u and the authors of other versions seem also to describe the wind gourd being used without the calling out the names.²⁴ The problems of defining views on this question are clearly great.

Because of its power, knowledge can be dangerous (Pukui 1983: number 2721) and therefore needs to be handled with care. This is the reason for many of the practices discussed below, such as the institutional controls on knowledge, the moral conditions connected to its transmission and use, and the caution in selecting students.
Religious

Like the rest of Hawaiian life, education is connected in many ways to religious practices and the gods. Such connections do not, however, indicate an absolute dependance of human beings on nonhuman powers. Human beings are themselves powerful, as seen in the fact that they learn to manipulate personal gods and impersonal forces; an activity that involves knowledge, intelligence, courage, will, and even morality. As with other subjects, different activities and fields can be placed on a spectrum with human capacities at one end and godly help at the other, but both elements are usually present in Hawaiian thinking, even if in differing proportions. Moreover, human capacities include much like ‘ike pāpālua ‘second sight’ (Pukui 1983:622) that Westerners would consider marvelous and ascribe to supernatural intervention. Hawaiians themselves expressed a variety of views on the relations of human to nonhuman powers, and a corresponding variety can be found in educational thought and practice. I confine myself in this section to some general points, and more information will be provided in the discussion of individual specialties.

Gods can help human beings by imparting knowledge to them. They can do this in two ways. Firstly, they can be the sources of the original knowledge that was then transmitted by human beings. For instance, traditions of hula and medicine can trace their origins to a god (chapter V). Hawaiians asked the missionary William Ellis (1984:434) whether Westerners had been taught writing by God. Kamakau gives a Christian reinterpretation of the godly source of omen reading (July 13, 1865):

*Mai manao no oukou, ua ku ia ike ana i ka hoomanakii. Mai ke Akua mai no ia haawina, a e paulele aku no iaia ka mea ia ia na aouli a pau o ka lani*
‘Do not think that this knowledge is connected to idolatry. This gift comes indeed from God, and you can put your trust in him, the person to whom belong all the signs in the firmament’.

Such godly help does not exclude human effort:

_O ka poe loea kuku kapa, ua hoomanao lakou i ka lokomaikai o ke akua i ka haawi ana mai i ke akamai a me ka naauao i ka imi ana o kekahi wahine o Lauhuki a loaa ke kapa mailoko mai o ka ili o ka laau . . ._

‘The people who were expert in tapa beating, they commemorated the inner goodness of the god in granting knowledge and wisdom in the seeking by a certain woman, Lauhuki, until tapa was obtained from inside the bark of the tree . . .’ (Kamakau February 3, 1870).

Gods can also reveal information, _palo_, to individuals of all periods. Kaneiākama is _ke kanaka i ao uhane ia e Kaneikaulanaula_ ‘the person who was soul-taught by Kāneikaulana‘ula’, a poison god of Moloka‘i.26 An entire profession can be taught through possession (“No na Kahuna Hawaii” n.d.: 561). Dreams are a major medium of communication with the gods and continue to be an experience of contemporary Hawaiians.27 Ellis (1984: 366 f.) was told that the dreams and visions of priests were the source for the Hawaiians’ knowledge of the land of the dead. In accordance with this view, Hawaiians distinguished and studied different types of dreams, cultivated them, and developed interpretation codes for their symbols.28 Other modes of communication included a wide variety of visions, auditory and visual, signs and omens, and skin sensations (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972: 92 ff., 156 f.). Such revealed information is usually credited in some way to the gods;29 as such, it was and often still is considered extremely important, occupying a major place in the information to be considered in any judgement or decision. Simple “gut feelings” can also be considered important. The Hawaiian was thus trained to
be attentive to a wide variety of sensations and perceptions and to include them in thinking and the decision-making process.

The gods can also help in the process of learning. Haleʻole felt that one could not be a successful teacher without a god, *akua ole* (Fornander 1919–1920: 71). In specialized education, the appropriate prayers seem to have been learned first in order to be able to call on the appropriate godly assistance (chapter V). Eleanor Hiram Hoke stated that the gods helped the hula student to remember the chants and have a flexible body, which seems a minimal interpretation.30 A postcontact text on learning navigation uses the Christian god as an aid: *E lolo oe i kau mau oihana i ao ai i paanaau ia oe; i kokua mai ai ke Akua i kona mana Hemolele* ‘You will be an expert in your occupations learned and memorized by you, God having helped with his holy and perfect power’—but Kāne seems to have been the traditional patron.31

Learning was accompanied by prayers, kapus, rules, and regulations: *Ma na oihana hana a pau o Hawaii nei, ua aoia me ke kapu wale no* ‘In all the work occupations of Hawai‘i, they were taught only with the kapu’.32 The student had to follow the *kānāwai* ‘laws’ of learning to achieve effective knowledge, especially in such fields as sorcery, but also in spear throwing, boxing, and wrestling.33 Laws had to be followed also in the practice of professions such as fishing, tapa making, and house building.34 Joseph S. Emerson (1926: 503) states that canoe making “became a religious rite all through.” Hula and other kinds of training demanded sexual abstinence (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972: 201; 1979: 88). Kamakau (February 10, 1870) describes the strict kapus enjoined while educating children from chiefly, priestly, or professional families. Education was provided in temples for some occupations, as will be discussed below.

Graduation depended not only on the student’s own work, but on acceptance by the appropriate god or gods, as revealed in the omens at the *hōʻike* or *ʻailolo* ceremony (Fornander 1919–1920: 71,
Lonoikamakahiki is trained in several martial arts; at his graduation ceremony, the omens are good for all except boxing, which he must avoid (Fornander 1916–1917: 263). An omen can also indicate another direction for one’s career. At Mary Kawena Pukui’s hō‘ike, her asthma prevented her from graduating as a chanter (“As a chanter, you are impossible. You do not have the lungs for it”), but an omen indicated that she should be “not a performer, but a teacher” (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 57).

Godly help can also be received during the performance of an occupation or a special deed. Kawaikaumaiiakamakaokaopua writes (November 23, 1922), aole i nele kekahi kahuna kalaiwaa, i ke akua ‘no boat building expert lacked his god’. Nākuina emphasizes the godly assistance received by his hero in a contest of wits (1902b: 28):

\[
\text{ua aloha mai la no kou akua hoopapa a haawi mai la no hoi i ka ike ia oe, a ua palekana oe i ka make a lakou nei i manao ai nou.}
\]

‘your contest-of-wits god has indeed loved you and given to you also the knowledge, and you have been saved from death from these here who planned it for you’ (78 f.).

\[
\text{Aohe no hoi oe e kanaenae ae i ko akua hoopapa la, malia no hoi o lohe mai ia oe a aloha mai, loaa ka hoi ka kaua aina makani nui.}
\]

‘You are indeed not praying to your contest-of-wits god; perhaps indeed he will hear you and grant his love; then truly our “land of great winds” [a piece of information needed in the round] will be obtained’ (93).

Gods can offer the general help that was a normal part of the occupation and requested in the conventional prayers. Gods can also be resorted to at moments of special need, but as opposed to Christian teachings, one should not be calling on them continuously (L. S. Green 1926: 62). The gods are thanked conventionally for a normal catch of fish, but their particular intervention is...
recognized only in a catch that is extraordinary by its quantity or mode. As stated above, godly help does not negate the need for human effort. A chief’s priest helps him to victory both by prayer and by good advice (Naimu September 23, 1865).

Moral

Because knowledge is powerful and connected to religion and the gods, Hawaiians emphasize the need to use it morally (A Lamentation for Kahahana, Fornander 1919–1920: 298, lines 250 f.):

Ilaila no ka ike la, ike iho,
Ilaila no ka pono la, pono iho

‘There indeed is the knowledge, knowledge itself,
There indeed is the rightness, rightness itself’.

This emphasis is clear in the moralities of the different specialties (chapter V). War and the martial arts can be used both morally and immorally. Bad genealogists use their knowledge to degrade others, ‘ōhikihiki, “to pry into the past, especially an unsavory past”; the good ones are positive (Kamakau October 28, 1865):

Aka, o ka poe i ao i ka Mooolelo, a Mookuauhau me ka naauao a me ke akamai i kela mea i keia mea, ke kakaolelo me ke kalaiaina, oia ka poe i kapaia he poe akeakamai io. A ua naauao io lakou . . .

‘But the people who studied the Story and Genealogy, with wisdom and intelligence in this and that subject, oratory and administration, these were the people who were called truly desirous of intelligence. And they were truly wise . . .’

Moral intentions and qualities are important, therefore, in the selection and advancement of students, especially in fields like sorcery, in which the student might even try to kill his teacher.
Ethics are taught with the occupations, which themselves are considered ways of searching for wisdom. The modern Hawaiian cultural and religious teacher Fred W. Beckley connected traditional voice training to a philosophy and moral attitude of harmony with all (1932: 26); that training is now rare and as a result: “To his lack of proper knowledge of vibration and color reaction may be attributed a great deal of the listless and aimless existence of our Hawaiian youth.”

Moral education is also one of the primary obligations of the family, and children are urged to attend to and to remember all their lives the teachings of their elders. Kamehameha’s personal teaching of his son Liholiho was important for the whole government. The court itself was a site of moral instruction (Johnson 1981: 6).

Hawaiian moral education makes no essential distinction between morals and manners: I ‘ike ‘ia nō ke kanaka i ka noho mai o ke kanaka ‘The person is truly seen in the way he acts’. Proper conduct includes both manners and morals. Hawaiian thinking accords in this with that of the ancient Greeks: ‘Cultivation shows itself in the total form of the human being, in his external demeanor and deportment as in his internal attitude’, a view that has been perpetuated in the West. The individual is formed into the human ideal of his culture, a totality that usually includes a large number of characteristics and values. Etiquette is therefore regularly connected to morality in Hawaiian instruction and is essential for family and social standing and professional success. Hawaiians are indeed trained to be sensitive to more elements in a situation than Westerners, such as attitude, tone of voice, posture, and so on; as a result, Hawaiian reactions are sometimes difficult for outsiders to anticipate and understand.

This broad morality is in fact useful in achieving one’s goals, whether general ones like happiness or particular ones like successful cooperation in a project. In their moralizing view of history, Hawaiians claim that good chiefs are more effective and
successful than bad. Indeed, examples can be found of modern chiefs prevailing because of their steadiness and righteousness (ʻĪ‘ī May 22, 1839). On the highest level, Kamehameha I was generally taken as a positive model. ʻĪ‘ī credits much of Kamehameha’s economic success with foreigners to his lokomaika‘i ‘inner goodness’, important also along with aloha for the ku‘ikahi ‘agreement’ among nations, as taught by Christianity. Virtue can thus have its antique meaning of ‘strength’: ka waiwai nui o ke aloha a me ke ahonui ‘the great waiwai of aloha and patience’ (ʻĪ‘ī May 8, 1869).

Punishment and social approval are certainly important in the teaching and sanctioning of behavior. However, in Hawaiian thinking, both manners and morals—and indeed all activities and aspects of culture—are supposed to come mai nei loko ‘from the inside’, that is, to be interiorized or connected to genuine emotions. Feelings need to be educated as much as intellect; indeed, one does not really know something unless one has the appropriate feeling for it, whether respect, fear, awe, or love. Nona Beamer writes, “In the hula nothing happens visually that does not occur emotionally.” Thus education transforms character. In Nākuina (1902a:20), the child Pāka‘a’s mother instructs him:

_E hele no nae oe me ka haahaa, akahai, me ka noho malie, me ka hoolohe a me ka hooko pono ana hoi i na hana a pau e haawi ia mai ana ia oe, me ke ahonui a me ka hoomanawanui . ._.

‘Go with lowliness, meekness, with unobtrusiveness, with attentiveness and with correct accomplishment indeed of all the tasks alloted to you, with long-suffering and with patience . . .’

This instruction is interiorized to become his character: _he piha oia i ka hoomanawanui a me ke aloha e like no me kona ano mau . . . kona lokomaikai a me kona aloha_ ‘he was full of patience and aloha in accordance with his constant character . . . his inner goodness and aloha’ (27; also 29).

Moral instruction does influence children. When ʻĪ‘ī’s playmate is beaten, he plans to gang up on the bully with his friends,
but his mother dissuades him with moral arguments (‘Ī‘ī July 17, 1869). Kānepu‘u has the reputation of a mischievous boy, but morality is clearly a concern for him and his playmates. For instance, older boys have been fooling Kānewailani into giving them his food, which upsets his father. He finally turns on them and scolds them with a fine expression of Hawaiian-Polynesian morality: “He lepo awekaweka oukou e na kamalii, hoomalimali oukou i ka‘u, a awekaweka oukou i ka oukou” ‘You’re dirt that hides what you’ve got instead of sharing it. You sweet talk me out of my food and hide your own’. Friends show proper behavior by sharing when they are given a large sweet potato.

Some children steal, and Kānewailani’s gang apparently did at one time (March 12, 1868), but later they refuse to put stolen food in their imitation _imu_ ‘earth oven’ (March 26, 1868). When the older boys tease them for eating scraps, some of them cry, but one of them makes a good response:

_A olelo aku la kekahi keiki noonoo kupono o Kanewailani ma, “Heaha la auanei ka hewa o ka aihamu ana? Aia no paha ka hewa o ka aihue ana i ka hai.” A no keia mau olelo naauao a ke keiki aihamu i hoopuka aku ai, ua mumule ka waha o ka poe keiki nui aihamu ole._

‘But one child of Kānewailani’s gang who thought correctly spoke out, “What’s wrong with eating scraps? What’s wrong is stealing food from others.” And because of these wise words uttered by the scrap-eating child, the mouth was silenced of the big children who didn’t eat scraps’.

The connection between morals and deportment and between interior and exterior explains the Hawaiian emphasis on expressiveness, on showing one’s disposition openly, a quality essential to the character of Hawaiian interpersonal contact and to the effectiveness of Hawaiian art. I once observed a sixteen-year-old girl leading a beginners’ Hawaiian-language class. She
would ask the students in Hawaiian “How are you?,” and they would reply, *Maika‘i nō* ‘Very well’. When one student muttered her answer in a monotone, the girl was indignant: “If you say it like that, they’ll think you’re lying!”

Such an attitude—even if an ideal—obviously created problems in social and political relations. Deceit was clearly immoral: feigning emotions, deliberately lying, or explicitly misleading someone, *palai*. Stories were indeed told of famous deceivers.\(^5\) A person was allowed, however, to maintain a reserve, even if it could be misunderstood; to use such expressions as *pēlā paha* ‘perhaps so’ or *‘ae paha* ‘yes, maybe’; and to avoid eye contact that would put one in the position of being either deceitful or confrontational, *pāweo*; an element of rudeness is accepted here in order to avoid a greater one.\(^5\) All these devices should, however, alert the attentive person to an underlying friction that requires attention.

The Hawaiian attitude towards life was moralistic, and a basic set of precepts could be held to apply to all (Malo n.d.: e.g., xxI 3–9, 12, 23). But the rules could be particularized to classes, stations in life, and occupations; just as in Western culture, different professions can formulate distinctive rules of conduct. Moral instructions were often given in a temporal, social, and occupational context, not as universal rules. For instance, listening—which was universally practical in an oral culture—had a moral dimension that was applied to all. But different people would practice the virtue in the way that was appropriate to them: the child should listen to his parents and the chief to his counselors. To fail to do so was to invite disaster.\(^5\) Kamakau (August 26, 1869) generalizes this virtue: Hawaiians are *he lahui hoolohe* ‘a listening/obedient/attentive people’; that is, they obeyed their chiefs.

Different stages in life could also have some differences in rules. A child should *noho mālie* ‘keep quiet’ to avoid being
beaten by older boys, as should any adult when faced with superior power. Even Liholiho can be described according to the conventional ideal for boys (Kamakau September 28, 1867):

*he keiki noho malie loa oia, a he hoolohe no hoi i ka leo o kona mau kahu, a he keiki lealea loa no hoi i ka paani i kona wa kamalii*

‘he was a very quiet child and one who also listened to the voice of his guardians; a very happy child also in play in his childhood’.

In a different situation or in a later stage in life, one can be more assertive, competitive, and boasting. Indeed, ‘Ī‘ī’s (July 24, 31, 1869) account of Liholiho shows that Kamakau is idealizing.

Similarly the same rule could be interpreted differently according to the station of a person. Obedience was a virtue, but its character varied according to the context: child to parent, people to chief, or subordinate chiefs to the high chief—no unjustified rebellion was moral. Patience was a general virtue, but could assume a nuance in a given case: Liholiho was praised by Kamehameha I for his chiefly *ahonui* when he refused to join a plot to use him to replace his father. ‘Ī‘ī states that in acting thus he behaved like a true chief.

Certain virtues or moral teachings were peculiar to ranks. Commoners, for instance, could be enjoined not to overstrive. The author of “O ka Hoapono ana o ka Poe Kahiko i na Mea i Ikeia” presents a traditional opinion with which he disagrees strongly: *Eia kekahi olelo a ka poe kahiko a‘u i lohe ai ‘Here is a statement of the old people which I have heard’:

*Hoapono lakou i ka lani a me ka honua. I ka ai me ka ia; i ke kapa i ka malo a me ka pau, i ka hale a me ka moena. O ka olelo a ka poe kahiko, penei ka lakou olelo.*

*O luna o lalo o uka o kai, o nae o lalo; ua ai ua ia, ua hale ua kapa, ua lako iho nei no keia noho ana, o ke aha aku ua pono? O ka hana ae ko ka uluna a kiekie ka poo iluna, o ke kaka ae no kona wawae a kau i ka paia o ka hale me he pua kaaona la, nolaila, ea*
‘They approved of the sky and the earth; of vegetable food and flesh food; of tapa, loincloth and skirt; of the house and the mat. The statement of the people of old, thus was their statement:

Above, below; landward, seaward; windward, leeward; this vegetable food, this flesh food, this house, this tapa; this living is provided for indeed; what else is necessary? To continue working on a pillow until the head is lofty above; to kick out one’s legs until they are stuck like a dart in the thatch wall of the house, wherefore indeed?’

Surely, the author argues, we should be using our education for posterity and immaterial goals. The author of “No na Mea Kahiko” (August 1, 1834) writes more positively:

O ka olelo a ko’u makuakane ia’u, o ke kapa, o ka hale, oia na mea malumalu o ke ao nei i lohe oe e ke keiki. O ka ai a me ka ia oia kekahui mea pono ia makou nei, o ka noho malie o ke kolohoe ole aku ia hai, oia kekahui pono.

‘The statement of my father to me: tapa, house, these are the sheltering things of this world of which you have heard, O child. Vegetable food and flesh food, these are some things proper to us here. Living quietly and not mischievously to others, this is something right’.

The moral attitude enjoined on the lower ranks was one of obedience, loyalty, devotion, and service to higher ones. This virtue was reciprocated by the protection and care exercised by the higher for the lower in a relationship based on mutual aloha. The articulated morality of chiefs and leaders emphasizes constantly and in detail the obligations of protection and care for one’s subjects. Naturally, these precepts were not always practiced (Elbert 1956–1957:1105 f.), and a description of the ethos of chiefs must be completed by a consideration of all that was due them because of their exalted station and great deeds. A conventional boast of a great chief was that his rank permitted him to trample on the kapus of others (Charlot 1985a:10). Indeed, the precepts of the articulated noble morality seem to target potential
abuses of power: the chief’s pride should be tempered by politeness and humility, his anger by patience, his great power by his attention to advice, and his authority by his obligations to those under him. The chief’s graciousness is impressive in proportion to his rank. The chief’s reward will be the aloha of his subjects, the respect of his fellow chiefs, and the historic fame of his goodness.

For a people attuned to personal relationships, the tone adopted by a person was as important as his actions. The chief should be protective and beneficent towards his inferiors, but his tone in doing so should be modest rather than superior, lowly rather than lordly. He should feel aloha, but that aloha should be expressed by ‘olu’olu ‘graciousness’. Kepelino provides a lapidary formulation of this principle in a famous passage:

A o ka loina nui o na ‘īi Hawaii nei, o ka haahaa o ka oluolu, ke aloha a me ka lokomaikai

‘The great law of the chiefs of our Hawai‘i was lowliness, graciousness, welcoming affection, and inner goodness’.60

The general form of human relationships should therefore be that of inferior to superior, an expression of respect. That form is clearly based in the morals of the commoners, the vast majority of the population and the cultural basis of the society.

The morals of the commoners were thus generalized to include all human beings. Indeed, the chief’s position was not essentially different from that of any human being: all had superiors and inferiors; all should have a legitimate pride in their person and accomplishments, but exercise the virtues of graciousness, care, and proper placement of themselves in the social and cosmic whole. People of all ranks had to exercise care (Judd 1930: proverbs 202, 203), and it was a particular point of courtesy to be modest, unassuming, and even lowly with one’s inferiors. Conversely, a human being was always subordinate to someone; the highest chief had the obligation of piety towards
the gods. Ultimately this morality of proper humility could be
generalized into an attitude toward all greater powers, the gods,
and the cosmos (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:54). It could also
be applied to the gods themselves: Hi‘iaka accuses Pele of being
*kolohe* ‘mischievous’ in destroying Puna, Hi‘iaka’s favorite land:
*Ha‘aha‘a Puna, ki‘eki‘e Kīlauea* ‘Puna is low/humble, Kīlauea is
lofty/proud’.\(^6\) Since the volcano at Kīlauea is Pele’s home, she
herself is being criticized.

An important means of articulating this attitude in moral
education is the conventional pair *nui*/iki or *li‘ili‘i* ‘big/little’,
which can have both a practical and a moral sense (e.g., Pukui
1983: number 218). As the child Pāka‘a is leaving to accompany
the chief on a trip, he is advised to do all the little things in order
to avoid being mistreated.\(^6\) Making himself small and useful is
*nāauao a akahai* ‘wise and modest’, as are long-suffering and
patience, *ahonui* and *ho‘omanawanui* (Nākuina 1902a:18 f.).
The same attitude is correct when Pāka‘a assumes high govern-
ment office: *He ike no o Pakaa i ke kanaka* [lacuna: nui] *ka [sic]*
*kanaka iki* ‘Pāka‘a had a knowledge of big people and little people’
(Nākuina 1902a:45). He is patient with the great and considerate
of the small.\(^6\)

In these qualities, he is following the example of his father,
who, besides caring perfectly for his chief, was *He oluolu, he aloha
a he hoomaopopo i ke kanaka nui a me ke kanaka iki* ‘Courte-
os, loving, and heedful of the big person and the small person’
(Nākuina 1902a:29). Indeed, his last instructions to Pāka‘a are: *e
hoolohe i ka olelo iki a me ka olelo nui a ke alii* ‘Listen to the small
words and the big words of the chief’ and *E malama i ke kanaka
iki a me ke kanaka nui, ke kanaka kiekie a me ke kanaka haahaa
‘Care for the small person and the big person, the high person
and the low person’. These passages are based on proverbial advice to
a chief: *E mālama i ke kanaka nui, i ke kanaka iki* ‘Care for the big
person, for the small person’.\(^6\)

These moral injunctions are even more important in training
someone for regular service for the benefit and comfort of a chief. ‘Ī‘ī provides detailed information on such education (e.g., July 31, 1869). He emphasizes the morality of his parents and its central place in their instruction (June 12, 1869):

he mea mau no ka lunaikehala mai kahiko mai, ua no i ka pono a me ka hewa. Pela no paha ia i ao mau ai i kana keiki mai kona wa uuku mai i na kanawai o ka pono, oiai ua manao laua me kana wahine, e hoonoho ana ma ke alo alii i ka laua keiki

‘The conscience was a constant thing from olden times, in the right and the wrong. Thus it was perhaps that he constantly instructed his child from the time he was little in the laws of rightness, while he and his wife thought that they would install their child before the face of the chief.’

When he is chosen to serve at court, his mother tells him that this was the goal of his education and that now he must leave his family and have the chief take the place of his parents (July 31, 1869):

Mai manao mai oe ia maua, o ke ‘lii wale no kou makuakane a me kou makuhine, iaia kau ai a me kau i-a, ke kapa hoi a me ka malo

‘Do not think back on us. The chief alone is your father and your mother; his, your vegetables and fish, the kapa also and the loincloth’.

Just before leaving, ala mai la iloko ona ka noonoo ana i na rula a pau a kona mau makua i ao mai iaia mamua ‘there awoke inside him the reflection on all the rules his parents had taught him earlier’ (‘Ī‘ī July 31, 1869). Later his main contact at court, his relative and namesake, Papa, a famous medical priest, will advise him to stay at Liholiho’s court no ka mea, ua ike no oe i ke ano o ka noho ana a me ka hana ana, ka holohe ana a me ka malama ana i na kauoha e aoia mai ai oe ‘because you know indeed the way of
living and working, the heeding and observing of the commands that are taught to you’ (ʻĪʻī February 5, 1870).

ʻĪʻī had been apprehensive about entering the chief’s service. As a boy he had been beaten almost to death by Liholiho and was saved only when one of the heir’s companions asked him to spare ʻĪʻī as a potential servant (July 24, 1869). Also, as will be seen below, a young relative had been executed after making a mistake in Kamehameha’s court, and the false accusation of another relative had put the whole family in mortal danger; only an appeal based on the family’s prior service prompted an investigation that led the chief to regret his mistake (ʻĪʻī June 26, 1869; also, July 3, 1869). Even after accustoming himself to chiefly service, ʻĪʻī continued to miss his family and once even left without permission to visit them (January 15, 1870). Chiefly service demanded therefore courage and dedication.

Prominent in moral education was the use of positive and negative models. Parents and guardians were among the most important. Great athletes and historical figures, such as good and bad chiefs of olden times or the present day, could be used as models, which connected morality to the honoring of ancestors and the cultural emphasis on genealogy and history. Elements of the environment, such as fish, could also be used as moral examples.

Hawaiians developed ethics as a field, designated by the words pono and hewa. An extensive moral vocabulary was developed, and words were organized in lists for memorization (e.g., Malo n.d.: xxvi); this was a practice followed in other subjects and fields, as will be seen below. These lists were in turn organized under the two terms that provided the title for the field. Other literary forms were used in moral instruction, such as sayings, instructions, and many cautionary tales, especially about oppressive chiefs or those who disregarded advice and disrespected priests. Kamakau (August 24, 1867) describes Hawaiians:
He lahui ike i ka moolelo o ka honua nei i ka pono a me ka hewa. He lahui ike i na moolelo o kela a me keia aupuni, no ka maikai a me ke ino.

‘A people that knows the history of this earth, the right and wrong. A people that knows the histories of this and that government, for the good and the evil’.

‘Ī‘ī gives a large number of cautionary stories that seem particularly appropriate for a family such as his, although many of them are famous. A long series of stories illustrates good and bad conduct from the examples of earlier chiefs, with biblical comparisons.

Because the chief Kamalālāwalu is too lili ‘jealous’ of a chief who has bested him, he refuses to correct his invasion strategy when he learns he has been given an incorrect report. He then kills a good chief of the opposing side, who has refused to flee in order to stay with his people. Kamalālāwalu listens to the false advice of the local people, who mislead him in order to avenge their chief. ‘Ī‘ī moralizes about this story, using the Bible as a parallel. Good conduct, even pre-Christain, may be inspired from above.\(^7\)

A local warrior, Hinau, saves the life of an invading chief and asks that the fact not be revealed. The chief does so, however, and Hinau is killed. ‘Ī‘ī draws two conclusions from this event: a traditional one, that people sometimes do not act as they should; and a postcontact one, that Christianity has brought a better time (May 22, 1869).

Hākau was an evil chief: *kue pinepina ia i ka pono o na makaainana . . . kona imi ole i ka pomaikai no na makaainana, no ka mea, ua hana wale aku no oia mamuli o kona makemake . . . A o ka oleloao a na elemakule . . . aohe no i malamaia ‘he often opposed the right of the commoners . . . his not seeking the good of the commoners, because he acted only according to his own desire . . . And the instructive speech of the old people . . . he did not observe’. He was killed in an uprising by his half-brother ‘Umi (May 29, 1869).
Hua also was an evil chief, *ka mea o ka hoolohe ole i na olelo i ao ia mai ai* ‘the person who did not heed the words he was taught’. As a result, he had no one to bury him, and thus arose the proverbial saying: *Koʻele nā iwi o Hua i ka lā* ‘The bones of Hua rattle in the sun’.72

The emphasis on listening to advice and adhering to the principles one was taught is clear in these stories. ‘Ī‘ī’s next example begins with a *kahuna* priest: *ua ao aku ua kahuna la i ke alii, aka, aole nae keʻlīi i hoolohe ae i kana* ‘that priest taught the chief, but the chief did not attend to his words’. ‘Ī‘ī can also give positive examples of good chiefs who loved and helped the people. Similarly when Kamehameha I instructed his heir Liholiho, he used historical examples of good and bad chiefs (‘Ī‘ī March 26, 1870).

Models did not need to be historical. ‘Ī‘ī was urged by his mother to take children, commoners, and chiefs as models and to follow the proper ones, like his uncle (July 17, 1869). ‘Ī‘ī was himself impressed by the way his parents studied others, and thus he could accept their perceptions and advice (July 17, 1869):

> Ma ka ia la mau olelo, noonoo iho la ke keiki, pela ka paha ka pono e hana aku ai. No ka mea, ua nanenane mau ua mau makua la ona i kela me keia ano, mai ke poo a ka wawae o ke kanaka, a mai loko a waho o ke kanaka, pela hoi ka hele ana aku a me ka hoi ana mai, pela no ka noho ana o ka hale, a me ka malama i na kauoha kupono, a me na kauoha pono ole, e nana mawaena o nei mau mea elua, i kaawale ka pono, a i kaawale ka hewa, a me ia no ka make, a me ke ola, ua kaawale, a pela wale aku.

‘After listening to his words, the child reflected within himself that this was perhaps indeed the right way to act; because those parents of his were constantly puzzling out this or that character or type, from the head to the foot of the person, from inside to outside of the person; so also the way of walking off or coming back, so indeed the way of acting in the house, and the observation of right commands or wrong ones; in order to distinguish between the two, to separate the right and to separate
the wrong, and with this indeed death and life, they separated, and so forth’.

In accordance with his training, ʻĪʻī finds examples in his contemporaries, for instance, the followers of the older sons of Kamehameha who talked badly about the king and so lost for their leaders their inheritance:

_He hopena ia o ka hahai ana mahope o na olelo waha-a o kanaka, a nele i ka hahai ana i ka ka makua mau pono a me kona makemake, oia ka noho pono a me ka imi i mea e maluhia ai ka lehulehu . . . Ina no paha e hoolohe . . ._

‘This was a result of following after the rude talk of people and failing to follow parental right instructions and wishes, that is, correct conduct and seeking the peace for the multitudes . . . If they had only listened . . .’

A principle of service, emphasized in education, was good stewardship of all that was entrusted by the chief to his servants. This principle was expressed in various literary forms, such as the saying _aohe malama i pau i ka iole_ ‘anything uncared for will be lost to the rat’. ʻĪʻī’s mother admonishes him (July 10, 1869):

_o na koena mea ai a pau, e malama, a pela no i na mea e ae i waihoia mai ai e malama, a hiki i ka wa e ninauia mai ai, ua kupono no ia oe ke hai aku, ‘ei ae no’._

‘all the food remainders, keep them carefully; and so also the other things left with you to keep. And when the time comes when you will be asked, it will be right indeed for you to answer: “Here they are.”’

Models and examples were used in the teaching of good stewardship. Some of these could be taken from family history. Maoloha was a half-brother of ʻĪʻī, who had inherited his father’s position as keeper of the storehouse of Kamehameha. Apparently immature (his father had died young in an epidemic), lonely, and without means, he sold a _lei_ that was in his care, thus not only
stealing, but placing the royal family in danger from sorcery. The lei was recognized by Ka‘ahumanu, Maoloha was found out, and Kamehameha regretfully ordered his execution. The young ‘Ī‘ī was sent with his older sister to bury Maoloha and on that occasion saw Honolulu and a horse for the first time (compare Kamakau April 18, 1868). Maoloha was apparently used often as a negative example for ‘Ī‘ī; he did not hoolohe ‘heed’ instructions but his own desires, and he was not makaukau ‘ready’ (‘Ī‘ī June 26, July 3, December 4, 1869). The family experience with Maoloha may be the reason that ‘Ī‘ī himself was entrusted so carefully to a family member, ‘Ī‘ī’s namesake at court, the distinguished medical priest Papa: e hoolohe pono loa loa [sic] oe i na mea a pau o ko inoa e ao mai ai ia oe, a malaila wale no oe e hoolohe pono ai ‘listen very very precisely to all the things your namesake teaches you, and listen carefully only to him’ (December 4, 1869).

The family offered positive models as well. The relative Kuihelani was a high and successful servant of the king with ke akamai i ka puunaue a me ka malama waiwai o ka Moi ‘the skill in division/management and the keeping of the wealth of the King’. There are na aina no hoi o ka Moi i waihoa ma kona lima ‘the lands also of the King that have been placed in his hand’. He manages successfully because he places his relatives over the king’s lands and they listen to his orders, e hoolohe ana i ka ia nei mau kanawai (January 8, 1870). Papa, ‘Ī‘ī’s main contact and entrée at court, is another exemplary relative.

Again, history provides models, such as Lonoikamakahiki’s brother, who serves him so well that the chief they are visiting, Kamalālāwalu, praises his mākaukau ‘readiness’ as a servant.75 ‘Ī‘ī can also find good models in his own time. Some commoners refuse the request of a chief because his messenger has conveyed it improperly: ua malu na mea a pau e waiho ana ma keia aina ‘all the things entrusted to this land are secure’. The chief praises them for guarding his goods so carefully (December 11, 1869). Coconuts are marked to keep them for the absent chiefs who own
them (March 19, 1870). Kekūanāo’a guarded the things entrusted to him to the point of being pi‘i ‘stingy’; he once refused Liholiho some food until he got permission from his father, the king.76

**Industrious**

Because of their views of education, Hawaiians naturally emphasize industriousness and stigmatized laziness as immoral.77 Since knowledge can be a matter of life and death, being *molowā* ‘lazy’ can prove fatal. Pāka’a can escape the court because his pursuers do not give themselves enough trouble; he will return to take his revenge on them (Nākuina 1902a:33; also 85).

**Perfect**

As elsewhere in Polynesia where there is “the likelihood of ridicule for inept or incomplete performances,” the Hawaiian ideal is meticulous perfection of craftsmanship and presentation, *maiau*.78 The first thing a child makes—poi or a mat—must be finished faultlessly (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:52). Imperfection and sloppiness are considered rude and immoral: *He wa’a holo nō kā ho‘i, kālai kāpulu ‘ia iho* ‘It’s a boat that will float, but it has been carved sloppily’.79

According to a cautionary tale from Kahana valley, O‘ahu, told to me by Mrs. Lydia Delacerna, a man was planting his taro in crooked rows. A god called down to him from the top of the cliff, “Your rows aren’t straight.” The man went right on planting, but when he harvested his taro, he found that the corms were all bent (compare Sterling and Summers 1978:171). The all-inclusive esthetic sense of Hawaiians can be seen in the fact that the corms would be mashed into poi before they were seen publicly.
Only something without fault can be ultimately effective. To work, a prayer must be said perfectly, *kulukeoe*, that is, without mistakes or hesitations and usually on one breath or long ones. A chanter who makes a mistake can be deeply troubled and search his conscience. A ritual must be performed perfectly and cannot be disturbed even by outside noises.

Carefulness and faultlessness of work were praised in terms that reveal the ideals applied: peace and plenty reign in the land because of *ka hooponopono akahele* ‘the careful administration’ (Nākuina 1902a:30); *ua maikaia* [sic: *maika‘i a*] *mikiala laua i ka hana, a mikioi a maiau ka laua hana ana* ‘They were good and prompt in their work, and their work was well-crafted and meticulous’ (34); a proper worker is *maikai a makaukau* ‘good and prepared’ (35) and works *me ka eleu, maiau ame ka mikioi, a ua mahalo mai ke ali‘ia iaia no kona makaukau* ‘with energy, meticulousness and good workmanship, and the chief appreciated him for his readiness’ (82). Because of such good work, *aohe wahi i hemahema ai ka malihini* ‘there was no place the visitor was neglected or in want’. Bad work, in contrast, is *hana apakee* ‘slow and crooked [in all senses]’; bad workers are *hookiekie, aohe hooko koke ia mai o ka makemake o ke ali‘i* ‘arrogant; the desire of the chief was not quickly fulfilled’ (35).

This emphasis on perfection continued through the nineteenth century. Kamakau (September 9, 1865b) insists on completeness and accuracy of details and the need to correct mistakes. Perfection is still a vital ideal in Hawaiian education today, for instance, in chant and hula instruction.

Hawaiian education clearly supported the reflective rather than the impulsive cognitive style: “‘Reflective’ children are those who choose to be careful at the expense of speed. Impulsive children do things quickly but make many errors” (Baron 1988:120; also 121f.). Reflective thinking tends to be more open-minded and to consider many possibilities and factors before making a
decision, a desireable practice (464) that fits well the Hawaiian and Polynesian idea of naʻauao ‘rumination’. As one Samoan chief told me when I talked too much at a meeting, “Think twice, speak once.” The possibilities to be considered, for instance, in a political decision would include the many historical models, good and bad, the cautionary tales, and the personalities of all the people involved in the situation as well as any possible signs of godly communication. Councils of chiefs deliberated at length on such matters. When Kalapana encounters the kapu post of his opponents in the contest of wits, he withdraws from it, sits down, and thinks for a long time about the things he has been taught in order to figure out what to do.80

Reflective thinking is clearly relevant to the ideal of completeness (Baron 1988:465, 470), discussed below. For instance, reflection on a large or complete set of models or examples helps prevent the mistake of overemphasizing one (Baron 1988:372). The ideal of perfection was clearly important also in supporting the effort to transmit information without omissions or mistakes, which effort can be seen in the use of such devices as memory aids. On the other hand, Hawaiian education emphasized quickness in learning and in the more mechanical types of mental operations, as will be seen in chapter IV.

Complete

Hawaiians emphasized the importance of a complete education. Everyone needed a general competence simply in order to survive, to participate in society, and to maintain a proper relationship with the gods and to the impersonal forces of the cosmos. Experts needed to have a full knowledge of their fields or branches. The highest level, the ideal, was the person who had an expert knowledge of all fields and specialties. For instance, a kahuna kakaolelo
nui ‘great word-fencing priest’ is described as *he kahuna nui oia ma na oihana kahuna apau* ‘he was a great/high priest/expert in all the priestly occupations/branches’. Such a priest had knowledge that pertained to both life and death and could therefore be feared.

A knowledgeable person, like the famous historical chief, priest, and prophet Kalanikāula, was more usually the object of praise. Authors emphasize the breadth of Pāka’a’s learning. The knowledge of Hoapili or Ulumaheihei, companion of Kamehameha, was proverbial: ‘*O Ulumaheihei wale nō, iā ia ‘o loko, iā ia ‘o waho* ‘Ulumaheihei alone, the inside is his, the outside is his’. Kamakau (August 26, 1865: 2) describes *kekahi alii akamai i ke kaka olelo, kuauhau, kahunapule, kilo, kuhikuhipuuone, he koa, a he akamai no hoi i ka haku mele* ‘a chief knowledgeable in oratory, genealogy, priesthood, stargazing, geomancy, a warrior, and also knowledgeable in chant composition’. ‘Auwae, a chief of Wailuku, Maui, was a famous polymath and the teacher of Malo; his obituary states:

> Ua maopopo i na’lii a me kanaka a pau o keia pae aina, ua make ke kanaka noonoo, naauao, akamai, a me ka ikaika i kana hana ana. Mamua, i ka wa o Kamehameha, ua ao ia i ke kakaolelo, a he kuauhau oia mamua, a mahope mai a hiki i ka wa o kona make ana, nui kona ikaika ma ka imi ana i na mea e pono ai ke aupuni. Aka, ua make ia, ua kanu, a e lilo koke ia i lepo. Aole paha kakou e ike hou i ka mea like? Pela, ua mae wale ka nani o kanaka. E na’lii, a me kanaka a pau o Hawaii nei, “E hoomakaukau e halawai pu me ke Akua.”

‘It is clear to the chiefs and all the people of this archipelago that the man has died who was thoughtful, wise, knowledgeable, and strong in his work. Earlier, in the time of Kamehameha, he was taught oratory; he was a genealogist first. After this, up until the time of his death, his strength was great in seeking the things by
which the government would be right. But he has died, has been 
buried, and will soon turn to dust. Perhaps we shall not see his 
like again? Thus the beauty of the human being just fades away. O 
chiefs and all the people of our Hawai‘i, “Prepare to meet God”.

Completeness was a goal in particular activities. ‘Ī‘ī describes 
at length how thoroughly his parents studied people (July 17, 1869). 
Completeness was appreciated in an answer and in a story. 86 The 
completeness of Kūapāka‘a’s wind chants is emphasized by his 
stopping to ask whether the one he is chanting is complete and 
then adding more wind names. 87 People are impressed that he can 
name all the men in the other canoes: Aohe inoa i koe ‘No name 
was left’, a conventional expression from a ho‘ōpāpā contest. 88 
After a variety of contests, a competitor admits aohe ike hou aku 
i koe ‘there is no new knowledge left’ (“Kaao Hooniu Puuwai no 
Ka-Miki” February 7, 1912: 17).

Since completeness is crucial in a ho‘ōpāpā contest, as will be 
seen below, the literature emphasizes its place in education.

In the story of Kalapana or Kaipalaoa, a major point is that 
the father failed because of the incompleteness of his knowledge: 
ua ao ia no, aole nae i ailolo ‘he was taught, but in fact had not 
graduated’ (Fornander 1916–1917: 575). The son’s mother and aunt 
therefore wanted to train him thoroughly. The mother Wailea 
taught him all she knew: ao iho la laua a pau ko Wailea ike ‘the 
two followed a course of instruction until Wailea’s knowledge 
was exhausted’. She then sent him to his aunt, nana e ao ia oe a 
pau loa ‘hers it will be to teach you completely’. Once with his 
aunt, ao iho la me ka makua hine a pau na mea a pau loa, o ko 
luna o ko lalo; o ko uka o ko kai; o ko ke ao o ko ka po; o ka make 
o ke ola; o ka hewa o ka pono; lolo iho la a pau . . . ‘with the older 
woman relative he learned thoroughly every last thing, the things 
belonging to above, the things belonging to below, to the land, to 
the sea, to the day, to the night, death and life, wrong and right; 
he became expert in all . . . ’ 89
The same emphasis can be found in Nākuina’s version (1902b). Kalapana’s grandfather died before he could teach everything to his daughter Halepaki (4, the name of the mother in Nākuina’s version). She was therefore unable to train her husband completely: *Mamua nae o ka pau ana o ke aoia ana o Halepaki, ka muli loa, make e iho la na makua, nolaila, aole i pau loa na hana hoopapa i ka paa iaia, a ua hapa iki mai kona ike i kona mau mua, a oia ke kumu i make ai o Kanepoiki, ke kane ana, ana no i ao ai* ‘Before the completion of the education of Halepaki, the youngest [of the siblings], her parents died. Therefore, the works of the contest of wits were not completely mastered by her, and her knowledge was a partial one in comparison with her older siblings. This is the reason why her husband Kānepōiki, whom she had taught, died’ (also, 8 ff.). The husband had in fact refused to make the extra effort to learn more. In contrast, the chief who defeated Kānepōiki was well trained (6): *A hala kekahai wa loihi o ke ao ana, a pau hoi na ike, na hana, ame na mele hoopapa apau i ka paanaau ia Kalanialiiloa, alaila, i aku la na kumu i ke ali, “E ke alii, ua pau loa ae la no ko maua wahi ike, nolaila, ina he ike hou aku kekahi, e pono ke alii e hele ilaila, no ka mea, aia no ka pono o keia hana o ka pau mai o na ike apau, o pa auanei i ka hoa hoopapa* ‘After a long time had passed in learning, and all the different pieces of knowledge, the works, and all the chants of *hoʻopāpā* had been memorized by Kalaniali’iloa, then the teachers said to the chief, “O chief, our little knowledge has indeed been exhausted. Therefore, if you want some new knowledge, it is right for the chief to go there [where he can find it], because the correct procedure of this work lies in the exhausting of all the different pieces of knowledge, lest one be hit/defeated perhaps by one’s companion in the contest of wits’. Halepaki’s sister in Hilo had information that she learned there (7): *no kona hele ana hoi i Hilo a noho ilaila, ua loaa hou iaia he mau hana hoopapa hou, nolaila, ua oi ae kona ike i ko Halepaiwi ame Halepaniho . . . ‘because she went to Hilo and lived there, she obtained anew some new *hoʻopāpā* works. Her knowledge
was therefore superior to that of [her brothers] Halepāiwi and Halepānīho [the instructors of Kalaniali‘iloa]. Kalapana was therefore given a complete set of ho‘opāpā equipment—aohe mea i koe ‘nothing was left/missing’ (13)—and went to his sister to complete his education: huli i na ike apau ‘to seek all the pieces of knowledge’ (14, also 15); especially the things that remained to be learned, kahi i koe (16). His aunt conducted a real contest with him to test the limits of his knowledge and found that he lacked two categories: ka moku kele i ke kai ‘the island/district surrounded by the sea’ or ‘reached by boat/sailing’ and ka aina nui o ka makani ‘the great land of the winds’ (16 f.). Knowledge of each of these categories would be crucial to Kalapana’s victory: he would know the little island Mokuola in Hilo Bay and the winds of Hālawa (used by other authors). The aunt held back none of her knowledge; as a result, Kalapana had the complete family knowledge, with which Kalaniali‘iloa had been trained, and also new material unknown to his uncles (17). This completeness is mentioned specifically as the criterion for victory in the chants of the contest (20 f.).

Completeness of education can be expressed through the conventional pairing of big and little, discussed above in relation to morality. E kuhikuhi pono i nā au iki a me nā au nui o ka ‘ike ‘Show correctly the small currents and the big currents of knowledge’; ‘Ike i ke au nui me ke au iki ‘Know the big current and the small current’.90

This practice was supported by the view that much knowledge consists in the mastery of details, considered as pieces of information, which seems the basis of the image in a number of proverbs (Pukui 1983: numbers 643 f., 1650, 2814). Kānepu‘u (March 19, 1868) uses the image for memorizing: aia no iloko ona kahi i waiho ai me ka poina ole ‘there was indeed inside of him a place in which they [the letters he had learned] had been left without being forgotten.’ The prayer, Hō mai ka ‘ike nui, ka ‘ike
iki ‘Give the big knowledge, the small knowledge’, is interpreted correctly by Handy and Pukui (1972:103):

Ka ike nui referred to the knowledge of the work as a whole, while by “little things” (ka ‘ike ike [sic]) was meant all the exact little details affecting material and technique which the good craftsman must thoroughly comprehend.

The big/little pair can be used in fact as a conventional “completeness formula,” a poetic way of designating all members of a group, category, or class. 91 a e-e no ke kanaka, o kanaka nui, o kanaka iki, o na mea lau no a pau ‘the man embarked, the big man, the little man, all the many people’, 92 means that every appropriate person got on. Pāka’a attends to the big and little words of the chief (Nākuina 1902a:29), that is, to all of them. Kūapāka’a chants Make ka waa iki, pau pu me ka waa nui ‘The little boat is dead, finished together with the big boat’, meaning all will be destroyed without exception. 93 In another chant, he says they will die in the waves that are iki and nui, loa ‘long’ and poko ‘short’, and other little/big contrasts are used in the same chant. 94 In a letter of condolence, Edward Kekoa assures Mrs. Joseph Nāwahī, Owau ame ko’u ohana apau, mai ka mea nui a ka liilii, ke huipu aku nei makou me oe ‘I and all my family, from the big person to the small, we join with you [in sympathy]’ (J. G. M. Sheldon 1908: 180). Ho’opāpā chants and taunts regularly refer to completeness or the lack thereof. 95

The big/little contrast played a curious role in the 1911 controversy between Kamaka Stillman and a writer using the pseudonym Kohala-nui-Kohala-iki. Stillman (May 10, 1911) wrote that her relative had cared for the young Kamehameha: a ua lohe a paanaau keia moolelo i ke Kohala nui ame ke Kohala iki ‘and this story was heard and memorized in big Kohala and small Kohala’ (a section of Hawai‘i). In the next issue, Kohala-nui-Kohala-iki (May 17, 1911) denied the authenticity of the tradition and wrote
that Kohala-nui ame ke Kohala-iki ‘big Kohala and small Kohala’
know his version is correct. He then adds another pair of contrasts
to support his claim of superior knowledge of the local traditions:
He Kohala au-he Kohala iki, Kohala nui-he Kohala loko, Kohala waho
‘I am from Kohala—from small Kohala, big Kohala—inner
Kohala and outer Kohala’. Stillman retorted (May 24, 1911) to this
Makapo Inoa Ole ‘Nameless Blind Man’ that his ignorance proved
he could not be from Kohala, whereas she could claim to be from
ke Kohala loko, Kohala waho, ke Kohala ua apaapa ‘inner Kohala,
outer Kohala, Kohala of the ‘Āpa‘apa‘a rain’. Moreover, Ina oe he
Kohala io, alaila, ua maopopo ia oe ke ano o kela ‘Ke Kohala nui,
Ke Kohala iki,’ na ke Alii Aimoku ia olelo, ‘No‘u ke kanaka nui, no‘u
ke kanaka iki’ ‘If you were really from Kohala, then the meaning
of ‘Big Kohala, Small Kohala’ would be clear to you: this saying is
uttered by the District Chief, “Mine is the big man, mine is the
little man”’. So her pseudonymous opponent is foolish to add
“inner” and “outer.” Her opponent shot back that she was quite
wrong: O kahi i loaa mai ai o ko‘u inoa, oia no o Kohala Akau, o
Kohala-Nui ia; o Kohala Hema, Waimea, o Kohala-Iki ia. O ka
manao nui, he kupa a he kamaaina au no na Kohala elua, aole
wale no Kohala Loko ame Kohala Waho, aka, no na Kohala elua
‘The place from which my name is obtained is North Kohala, this
is Big Kohala; South Kohala, Waimea, this is Small Kohala. The
point is that I am a native and child of the land of the two Kohalas,
not just of Inner [east] Kohala and Outer [west] Kohala, but from
both Kohalas’.96

The big/little contrast used for completeness can also take
on moral overtones. Kānepu‘u argues that many people are writ-
ing about big subjects, but they should not forget the small, such
as childhood, child rearing, and education, to which he devotes
his series.

In his introduction to his series, Kānepu‘u states that his work
is not like the traditionary tales of important figures that are
usually published; he will write a true story of an ordinary man who came from poor backcountry folk and hopes his readers will accept it (February 20, 1868). In the second to the last number of the series (March 26, 1868), he expresses the hope that his readers will not be angry with him for writing about *keia mau mea ano liilii* ‘these many things of a little type’, but he has not found anything similar in any Hawaiian writings. He writes *i mea e nalowale ole ai kekahi mau moolelo a kakou a me kekahi mau hana o ka wa kamalii* ‘so that these many stories of things done by us and the many activities of the time of childhood will not disappear’. There is in fact the danger that all the full Hawaiians will disappear, *a koe aku ka hanauna Hawaii hapa-haole, a hapa-pake, a hapa-pukiki, a hapa-nika, a hapa lahui e ae paha* ‘and the only Hawaiian posterity remaining will be half-white or half-Chinese or half-Portuguese or half-negro or maybe half some other race’. Kānepu'u then composes a passage that is based on the multiple meanings of *ōlelo* and *hua'ōlelo*: they can mean words, reports, narratives, and by extension the subjects of narratives. Andrews’ dictionary has recorded many old words; *ua pau no nae na olelo ano nui, a he mau wahi huaolelo uuku paha i koe* ‘the words of a big type have been exhausted, and maybe only some little words remain’. In the stories and chants being published by Hawaiians, new words can be found for the dictionary; *a nolaila ko'u kakau ana i na olelo ano liilii a pau* ‘therefore, I write all the words of a little type’. Kānepu'u is developing an elaborate parallel: just as the big/major words have been recorded in the dictionary, so the big/major subjects have been treated in narratives; now the little/minor words need to be discovered for the dictionary, and the little/minor subjects need to be treated in narrative. Because of this parallel, Kānepu'u can move smoothly into discussing the fact that he is writing about childhood; he does not seem to be changing the subject for the Hawaiian reader. If he does not write about childhood, when the older generation and he himself disappear, the younger ones will not inherit this knowledge. Many have much to write about but scare the newspaper editors with their demands for high
pay. But if the people who care for the traditions do not write, *pehea la e laha ai iwaena o ka hanauna hou? Huna kele loa ia no* ‘how will they be disseminated among the new generation? They will be hidden away forever’. In his final number (April 2, 1868), Kānepu‘u returns to the unusual character of his series. He jests that he will carry the story into old age, which will make the series on Pāka‘a and Kana seem short. People concentrate on adulthood and old age and forget childhood. The newspapers have many reports on crafts, farming, and plants, but his story *ho‘olaha‘ia* ‘distributed’ by the newspapers is for enjoyment, *ho‘onanea: E hiki no ia‘u ke kakau i na moolelo liili o kela ano keia ano* ‘I am able to write the little stories of this type and that type’. He ends his series however by stating his opinion that it is *he mea nui* ‘something big’ to pay attention to such facts and to memorialize them.

Preparation was enjoined in Hawaiian literature, as seen above, and the big/little contrast can be used to express it. Pāka‘a’s taking care of the little sweet potatoes as well as the big ones is a sign of his planning and providence; insignificant though they may appear, he will use them in a trick to vanquish his enemies.97

The big/little contrast can be used also in different ways, for instance, as separating two categories (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:213).

The ideal of completeness was an important support for the effort needed to transmit large amounts of information intact. Again, devices to aid this effort will be discussed below.

Together, the ideals of perfection and completeness—combined with a reflective thinking style and the emphasis on memorization, to be discussed below—are important for understanding classical Hawaiian thinking. That is, Hawaiians had a vast amount of information present in their consciousness, and this information needed to be processed before making judgements or decisions. This information included cosmic connections, historical examples and models, literature, assessments of character that
included physical manifestations, moral issues, and godly communications. Their method in historical research was to gather and present all the relevant traditions before evaluating them and selecting the ones that seemed most accurate. Western thinking is generally trained to be Cartesian, defining a problem by excluding anything that does not seem essential to its solution. Hawaiians, in contrast, tended to include anything that might possibly be relevant to the issue at hand. Figuratively, Western thinking can be compared to a spotlight, and Hawaiian to a floodlight.

The same qualities of Hawaiian thinking contributed to the density of their experience and literature (Charlot 1983a:42–46). Chants can be complex and loaded with allusions because, through memorization, much information was present in the mind of the composer and his audience. The constant cosmic reference of Hawaiian thinking is due to these qualities along with the cosmic framework of the organization of knowledge, to be discussed below. Such thinking inspires and is expressed in literary genres that strive for a global description of their subjects: such as place chants that include the knowledge of the environment, the people, history, and religious practices and traditions; name chants that portray a person from his ancestors to his accomplishments; and dirges that recount the events of a person’s life. In the nineteenth century, Hawaiian authors developed an encyclopaedic style in prose fiction, in which quantities of information of all sorts were provided at appropriate places in the narrative.

CRITICISM, COMPETITION, DISAGREEMENTS, AND CONTROVERSIES

In a culture that prized perfection and completeness, criticism filled an important function, and the related vocabulary is large. Experts were called in to give constructive criticism of chant compositions and performances; approval was necessary for
Audiences were knowledgeable and articulate. In the nineteenth century, Hale'ole welcomed debate, *ho'opapa'apa'a*, with expert genealogists in order that the correct view would emerge.

There was, however, a strong sense of competition among schools and experts, which was extended to Western education. A word for expert is *hiapa'i'o*le ‘someone who does not want to end in a tie’; the word *pa'i* is used prominently in *ho'opapa* contests for an exchange in which neither opponent gains an advantage. Combined with the connection of knowledge to morality, competition could lead to a certain negativity in criticism, as can be seen in the Stillman controversy described above. This negativity has increased as the traditional material for controversy has diminished in quantity and intrinsic importance due to the increasing loss of cultural knowledge.

**DISPLAY**

Many Hawaiian display practices can be understood from the requirements of an oral culture. Since there were no newspapers, sealed treaties, certificates, diplomas, credentials, or licenses, other devices were needed; since one could not inscribe into the public record, one had to imprint on the community memory. Display and the resulting reports fulfilled that function. Display is used therefore in a number of ways in Hawaiian culture. For instance, a chiefess gives birth in public, and a new chief or important visitor is displayed to the people. Once home from O'ahu, the Kaua'i chiefs display, *hō'ike*, the honorable presents they have received there (ʻĪi November 13, 1869). A farmer shows his biggest bananas by the road (Kamakau 1976: 38). Kānepuʻu’s father is such a good farmer that people come to sightsee his fields (February 27, 1868). The public acknowledges the successful conduct of a ceremony and the advantage gained in a contest of wits.
Similarly one has to demonstrate one’s knowledge and expertise. Kalapana’s father wants to *hoike i ko’u ike ame ko’u akamai* ‘make seen my knowledge and skill’. ‘Ī’ī writes about a paddler who performed a public exploit that established his reputation for posterity and regrets that other paddlers, though perhaps equally skilled, did not have the opportunity to undergo a similar public test. Kamehameha’s display of strength in moving the Naha stone was the subject of much comment and was important for his career: his fame was established and spread, raising him in people’s consideration and trust. The deed was also connected to a prophecy of his eventual victory and added to his self-confidence (“He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” June 30, 1921). An expert could travel to display his skill.

The graduation ceremony is specifically a display, *ho’ike*—to the public, the teacher, and other assembled experts—of the fact that the student can achieve the results for which he has been trained: he shows what he has learned and that he can use his knowledge effectively. Only then can he be called an expert or past master. The student can even show his knowledge by challenging his teacher: ‘O ke kumu, ‘o ka māna, ho’opuka ‘ia “the teacher, the pupil, come forth [challenge from pupil to teacher].”

When experts competed or disagreed, they could meet in a public contest, of which the *ho’opapā* was a most formal example. ‘Ī’ī mentions an 1805 genealogical contest in Lahaina between a Hawaiian *kākāʻōlelo* ‘word fencer, orator’ and the Boraboran Apo, another intriguing indication of early exchanges between learned men of the two cultures. The Hale Nauā, discussed below, was a public forum for adjudicating genealogical claims.

After contact, Hawaiians developed new forms of display, such as the *ho’ike* ceremonies in Western schools, often conducted before government notables. Kamakau (April 25, 1868) explicitly links the school *ho’ike* to that of the hula academies: *O ke ano o na kula i ka wa kahiko, ua like ke ao ana me ke kula*
ana o na aha-hula ‘As to the character of the schools in those old days, the studying was like the *kūloa* of the hula troupes. *Kūloa* is glossed “name of the lengthy ceremonies on the night before graduation day in hula . . .” (Pukui and Elbert 1986, at word) and can refer to other long ceremonies as well. Kamakau seems to be referring to the long study before such a display:

> O ke kuloa ana o kela hale kula keia hale kula, no ka manao nui e oi aku ka ike mamua o kekahi hale kula i ka la hoike, a nui ka mahalo ia. Ua hookaulana ia na kula ike a akamai hoi, a o na kula hawawa, ua hoohilahilaia.

‘The *kūloa* of this or that school house [was conducted] because of the strong desire to have one’s knowledge be greater than that of another school house on the day of the *hō‘ike*, and it was greatly appreciated. The knowledgeable and intelligent schools were made famous, and the awkward schools were beshamed’.

Not all were pleased with such performances (Andrews 1834a:166):

> the common practice is to have school only two or three days in a week, and about an hour at a time. Thus they go on till a proclamation is made by a governor or a missionary, to prepare for examination, they then wake up and make a real push for several days, if so many are allowed. Their memories are literally crammed with this and that to make a show. After examination is over, or rather exhibition, all is forgotten [*sic*], they go on as before until again summoned to examination.

Andrews recommends, “Let them keep examinations and exhibitions perfectly distinct,” seeing in the current practice a distraction from what he feels are the real goals of education (163). Others felt, however, that the desire for display was a proper device for encouraging students.

Besides such ceremonies, newspapers became an important medium for displaying one’s knowledge, challenging other experts, and conducting controversies.
ESTHETICS OF KNOWLEDGE:
PRESENTATION, RECOGNITION, AND PRIDE

The display of knowledge was appreciated as beautiful by the Hawaiian audience, not only in the arts, such as chanting and dance, but in other areas as well. The author of “Ka Oihana Lua a Hawaii Lahui” (July 19, August 2, 1923) emphasizes the le'a‘a ‘beauty, delight, amusement’ of wrestling contests with all their chants.

Knowledge was connected to esthetics in several ways. The organization of knowledge itself, as will be seen below, was based on a dualism that produces a satisfying impression of balance. Knowledge was presented in literary forms either specifically designed for such display or derived from them. That is, Hawaiians—just like the Greeks and some early nineteenth-century Western scientists (Kellner 1963: 200–208)—had not divorced science from the arts. Ultimately the Hawaiians’ fundamental feeling for the beauty of the world they live in permeates their views of knowledge and education.

The public, which was knowledgeable itself, could be deeply impressed by a display of knowledge. Classic descriptions of such crowd reactions can be found in the traditions of Pāka'a and Kūapāka‘a.

Kūapāka‘a has performed wind chants. ua kunana hou lakou la . . . no ka mahalo wale no i ke akamai o ke keiki a me ka paanaau hoi o na mele a me na makani, mai Hawaii a Oahu, a no ko ia nei ike ana aku . . . ‘they stood and stared again . . . simply because of their appreciation of the child’s skill and also of his memorizing of the chants and the winds, from Hawai‘i to O‘ahu, and because of his knowledge’. A crowd appreciates Kūapāka‘a’s skill at canoe surfing: a uwa ae la na kanaka o uka, no ko lakou ike ana mai i ke keiki akamai i ka hookele ana . . . ke akamai nui i ka hookele ana ‘and the people in the uplands shouted because they were watching the child who was skillful in handling the canoe
. . . the great skill in canoe handling’.111 In Nākuina’s version (1902a: 58), Pāka’a’s brother Lapakahoe, who does not know Kūapāka’a’s identity, says to the boy, Akamai maoli oe e na wahi keiki, lea kau hana, a he keu aku ka paanaau o na mele ame na makani o Hawaii ame Oahu ia oe ‘You are really smart, little boy; your work is delightful, and your memorizing of the chants and the winds of Hawai’i and O’ahu is superlative’. Keawe himself says (61), Nani hoi ka lealea o kau hana e ke keiki ‘Beautiful indeed the delightfulfulness of your work, child’.

People clearly enjoy, nanea, le’ale’a, such displays of knowledge and skill, especially Kūapāka’a’s akamai, his hookahiko ‘classical style’, and his hookanaka makua ‘precocious maturity’.112 An important element in public recognition, as seen in the above quotations, is the beauty of knowledge and its presentation. In several versions, the audience is described enjoying, nanea, Kūapāka’a’s chanting and conversation.113 Moreover, the process of work as well as its products could be le’ale’a.114 A religious ceremony could be described with the same term (Ī’ī September 25, 1869).

That experts were generally recognized is clear in the ho’opāpā; for instance, Kalapana’s aunt recognizes the knowledge of her brothers and the chief they have taught (Nākuina 1902b: 8). The chief’s fame has indeed reached across the island chain so that experts from far away travel to Kaua’i in the hope of winning a greater fame by defeating him.115 But such recognition, mahalo ‘appreciation’, was also a part of normal social interaction. People are regularly recognized and appreciated for particular actions.

Ī’ī reports this practice (August 7, 1869): ua mahalo ia ka mea akamai i ka lele kawa ‘the person skilled at splashless cliff jumping was appreciated’. When Liholiho recites a prayer correctly after being instructed by Ke’eaumoku, ua nui loa ka hauoli o ke anaina a me ke’lii no hoi, aka, o Keeaumoku nae ka oi loa aku o ka mahalo, no ke kupono loa o na haina a pau ‘the happiness of the assembly was very great and of the chief as
well, but Ke‘eaumoku himself was by far the most appreciative/thankful because of the propriety of all the ritual responses’ (August 21, 1869). Others are also appreciated, mahalo, when they act well in a ceremony and can even brag about it (August 28, 1869). People are appreciated, mahalo, who prove themselves akamai in a rock fight, a sham battle staged to keep the people mākaukau ‘ready’ for battle (December 4, 1869). A man who was able to repair a serious leak at sea is praised because of his expertise—ma‘ama‘alea, na‘auao, akamai—as more skillful than the foreigners (January 22, 1870). When Kamehameha and Ka‘ahumanu surfed, He akamai aku, he akamai mai ka ka aha makaikai ‘The crowd of spectators kept saying to each other how skillful they were’ (May 14, 1870). When I‘i makes a good answer to a difficult question posed in front of Liholiho, lohe ka makuahine ia mau pane ana a ke keiki . . . alaila, olioli loa iho la kela, no ke ano naauao o ia pane ana ‘his [I‘i’s] mother heard of these answers of the child . . . then she was very happy because of the wise character of the answer’ (July 31, 1869).

Kānepu‘u (March 12, 1868) writes that that a child was mahaloia ‘appreciated’ for doing well in school, though young.

This continual recognition, appreciation, and thanks can be found in other Polynesian societies as well. In Sāmoa, it can be expressed in the conventional phrase Mālō le . . . in which the action designated is praised as well done; the conventional answer is Fa‘afetai tāpuai‘i ‘Thank you for your sympathetic support’. These conventional phrases can be heard often through the day. Such constant recognition or reinforcement of a person’s social standing is obviously important in Polynesian societies. Indeed, in such intensely social communities, one’s standing is a major part of one’s identity, as seen in classical Greece (Jaeger 1959: 32):

Praise and blame . . . constitute the fundamental social fact in which the existence of objective criteria of value in the community life of human beings becomes visible . . . Striving to
distinguish oneself and claiming honor and recognition seem sinful conceit to Christian sensibilities. For the Greek, they mean in fact the growth of the person into the ideal and transpersonal, with which the worth of the person really begins . . . [the hero’s *areté* ‘excellence/virtue’] survives him in his fame, that is, in the ideal image of his *areté* even after death.

In Hawai‘i also can be found this desire for posthumous fame. Teachers are remembered in their schools, and innovators in crafts can be deified as patron gods. In Hale‘ole’s *Laieikawai* can be found a prophet’s “desire to be remembered to posterity by the saying ‘the daughters of Hulumaniani’” (Beckwith 1919: 308). When Lonoikamakahiki meets Kamalālāwalu, they travel to Lāna‘i to eat petrel (*i mea ano imi akamai paha i ka ai ana i na io manu* ‘perhaps as a way of seeking knowledge in the eating of the flesh of the birds’) and do not scatter the bones when they are finished. Ī‘ī wonders why they acted so strangely: *A i mea e kaulana ai paha ia hana ana pela . . . A i mea hoi paha kekahi e ikeia ai ko laua launa pu ana, a me na hana kupanaha hou a laua* ‘Perhaps they acted thus in order to be famous . . . Perhaps again in order that their meeting would be known along with the new astonishing deeds of the both of them’ (May 8, 1869).

The question arises as to how the practice of recognition accords with the contemporary observation that praise is seldom used in Polynesian child-rearing. Verbal praise may be and may have been used sparingly; because of the importance of the uttered word, it might have been considered too definitive for a child as well as a temptation to lose perspective. But observant Polynesian children know when they have pleased their elders; for example, Ī‘ī’s parents laugh at a bright remark he makes. Praise itself could be used on suitable occasions: for instance, Ī‘ī’s mother praises him for being a good student before she sends him to serve Liholiho (Ī‘ī July 31, 1869). The process of Polynesian education was long and demanding, and some positive reinforce-
ment must have been present. No extended reports of Hawaiian childhood are consistent with a system that would depend solely on punishment; indeed, excessive childhood punishment is always presented as abnormal, as in the story of ‘Umi, whose putative father’s harshness is a sign that ‘Umi is really the son of another (compare Fornander 1916–1917: 549).

The opposite of positive recognition is discredit, scorn, and disgrace (Pukui 1983: number 1182).

When Keawe sees that Kūapāka’a was right, he becomes very angry with his own experts: I aku la ia ia lakou penei; “Ka! mea kau a hala ka olelo a ke keiki, ka olelo mai nei no o ke keiki ia kakou he la ino, he la malie wale no keia ia oukou. A laa ka make o kakou la. Nui kuu ninau ia oukou no kou oukou ike, aole ka o oukou ike!” “He spoke to them thus, “Really! you faulted what the child said, his statement to us that it would be a stormy day. This was just a serene day according to you. And now our death has come upon us. How often have I asked for your knowledge, but really you have none!” He then tells them he wanted to seek Pāka’a no ko oukou hawawa, aohe ike, aohe akamai. He mau papakole pulu ole keia la i ke kai ina o Pakaa, a ia oukou la pulu iho nei, a me ka make maoli auane i ‘because of your awkwardness—no knowledge, no intelligence. If Pāka’a were here, we’d be dry-assed this day at sea; but with you, we’re all wet, and maybe really dead’.119 Keawe, an intelligent chief, recognizes that Pāka’a is more expert than the people with whom he was replaced.

Similarly the Kaua‘i chief who is famous in contests of wits berates his teachers and advisors when they lose rounds, which shames and discourages them, hilahila, nuha, as does Kakuhihewa in his losses to Lonoikamakahiki.120 Scorn for lack of knowledge is used conventionally against opponents in the ho’opāpā and appears in the formal chants of the contest of wits.121 Such taunting is also emotionally powerful (Nākuina 1902b: 75), just as
it is in martial arts contests. The recognition of learning, knowledge, and expertise is obviously important for social standing and a stimulus to education.

As in other cultures (Jaeger 1959: 32–35), the Hawaiian expert can be proud of his accomplishments, jealous of his reputation, and demanding of his rights and prerogatives. Pāka’a contrasts his own skill to that of the people who replaced him in Keawe’s favor and refuses to return to the chief unless certain conditions are met (Nākuina 1902a: 125). A farmer can chant to the gods, *E ola ia’u, ka mahi’ai nui* ‘Give me life, the great farmer’ (Kamakau 1976: 31). Puna, the *kahu* ‘guardian’ and free-speaking favorite of Kalani’ōpu’u, was in charge of carving a canoe for his ward. While the chiefs were carrying the canoe log toward the sea to be finished, Puna climbed up and stood on top of it. When Kalani’ōpu’u saw this, he said:

“*Pehea oe e ku nei maluna o na’lli e auamo nei i ka waa? E lele oe ilalo!*” Pane mai hoi ua Puna nei, “*E ke’Lii, aole au iluna o na’lli e ku nei, aka, eia no au iluna o ka’u mea i kalai ai e ku nei.*”

“‘How dare you stand above the chiefs carrying the boat? Jump down!’ But Puna answered, “Oh Chief, I’m not standing above the chiefs, but here I am indeed standing on top of the object I will carve’”.

When the officers of a foreign ship question the ability of a Hawaiian pilot, he questions theirs (Golovnin 1979: 201 f.).

**PRESTIGE**

Learning is clearly prestigious and brings honor and fame along with rewards.123 When Lonoikamakahiki becomes *na’auao* ‘learned’ in important intellectual activities, he becomes *kaulana* ‘famous’ (Fornander 1916–1917: 267). Practical occupations are so honored: *he hookelewaa kaulana oia no ke akamai* ‘He was
a famous steersman because of his knowledge’ (Johnson and Mahelona 1975:161). Knowledge is attractive; more than fishing and farming, skill in chant and hula will help the hero win his beloved.\textsuperscript{124} Skill in sport is also prestigious and could be long remembered: \textit{ua kaulana mai kekahi kanaka akamai i ka pana pua} ‘a certain man, knowledgeable in archery, was famous’.\textsuperscript{125} The famous deeds of the Kamehamehas have elevated a monument for future generations (Kehukai December 15, 1866).

This prestige was accorded also to the Hawaiian teachers in the early nineteenth-century schools.\textsuperscript{126} Andrews worried that they were (1834b:171):

falling into fatal snares from the mere pride of distinction: for although solid attainments in science and learning tend to humility, by showing the possessor how little he knows compared with what may be known, a smattering of knowledge puffeth up; and a trifling distinction of a Sandwich islander, from his fellows, or his countrymen, if noticed kindly by the chiefs, exposes him to injury and ruin.

Hawaiians did in fact have the idea of \textit{ka ‘imi loa} ‘the great search’, but they also felt that they could be proud of their accomplishments to date. Pride and prestige were legitimate Hawaiian rewards of learning.

THE USE OF THE MODEL OF THE FAMILY FOR EDUCATION AND SCHOOLS

Classical Hawaiian schools, and perhaps other Polynesian ones as well, were developments from family education. A family or one or more of its members would be famous for expertise in a particular field. They would be the teachers of the younger family members and, if sufficiently famous, would attract non-members as students, forming a school. The family structure and
its attendant ideas were then transferred to the school. The use of the family model for schools is not surprising since it was the principal model for the genealogical development of the universe and was applied in many individual areas. Not all the aspects listed below need be determined solely by the family model.

Family and education share the same words and images, notably, floral (Handy and Pukui 1972: 3 f., 179 f., 197 f.). Kumu ‘stalk’ is used for teachers and for parents (Pukui 1983: number 981) and family origin in ancestors, the kūpuna, literally ‘sproutings, outgrowths’. Such images can be found in other cultures: French élève can refer to both students and seedlings (compare Pukui 1983: number 684, in which plants are considered children). The teacher is a kumu ‘source or origin’ because he or she is the unique repository of certain pieces of knowledge or information. The student must obtain these from the living voice of the teacher, which requires being selected or accepted. The teacher is also the expert in using or applying that knowledge. Although a‘o means both ‘learn’ and ‘teach’, no play on words is used to articulate a mutual influence in the process. The teacher is normally accepted as superior, and cases of the student besting the teacher are exceptional.

The word for student, haumāna, is probably based on māna, which can be used also as a short form for student (Pukui and Elbert 1986: haumana, māna). The basic sense of māna is probably a ball of chewed food used to feed a child (Elbert and Pukui 1986: māna 1.). An extended sense (māna 2.) is a “Trait believed acquired from those who raise a child.” Finally the word can be applied to the influence of the teacher.

In a family that specialized in a certain occupation, the ‘aumākua ‘deified ancestors’ or ‘ancestral gods’ were also those invoked in the performance of one’s work (chapter V). Mrs. Ulunui Garmon expressed a modern view of this practice at a workshop on Polynesian religions (January 7, 1992). Her deceased mother, the famous hula master Edith Kanakaʻole, continues to be
“praised” by the members of her academy, who practice what she has left them. In this way, they “uphold” and “breathe life” into her. As a result, she can continue to “guide” them.

Crafts could also have gods that were treated like 'aumākua and called such, rather than akua. The inventor of a technique could be deified and become the “ancestral” god of the people who used it, as seen above. Professions could have origin stories and histories. Schools could have lineages of teachers. In a family, these would be relatives or a regular genealogy. In some established schools, however, the lineage would consist of people from different families. This was the case also of the lineage of teachers of an individual student who had studied with many experts. In Polynesia, teachers and lineages could be named to establish one’s credentials, just as one recited one’s genealogy to establish one’s identity.

The relationship between teacher and student is crucial for education. The teacher’s own character and attitude towards education are powerful influences on the student, especially in a culture that is attuned to personalities. The teacher’s treatment of the students also influences their self-image and view of their role. In Hawai‘i, the student-teacher relationship was endowed with many of the characteristics of a family. Even when the teacher and the student were not members of the same family, they usually lived together, the teacher being in loco parentis, and established a lifelong relationship that ideally included strong affection and the performance of various duties. In the stories of chiefs, the names of their teachers are often transmitted (e.g., Elbert 1959: 37, 41). Similarly fellow students established lifelong bonds; for instance, students at a hālau hula still become “hula brothers” or “hula sisters.” Two chiefs remained close because they had spent their youth together and shared a single kahu ‘guardian’ (‘Ī‘ī September 11, 1869).

This positive personal relationship between teacher and student was the context in which the considerable strictness
and rigor of Hawaiian education was practiced; qualities that impressed the students with the seriousness, even sacredness of their work, and their responsibility to study accurately, transmit their knowledge, and in turn innovate and create. Indeed, the combination of strictness and personal relationship is vital for Hawaiian students today. Similarly the establishment of a life-long relationship between teacher and student continues today in the hula academies and even at the university. Indeed, when some Hawaiian teachers in Western schools consider themselves rivals, they introduce a party or partisan spirit among their students.

The long-term relationship of teacher to student is evident in the many reports of coaching during the actual performance of the occupation taught. In a cautionary tale of single combat, a teacher urges his student to finish off his opponent. In a rude reply that became proverbial, the student answers, “Kuli! I ka hale pau ke a’o ‘ana” ‘Quiet! Teaching stops at home’, and is soon killed. The chiefly ho‘opāpā opponent of Kalapana owes his success to the participation, to the point of unfairness, of his advisors (Nākuina 1902b:6f., 10). Pāka’a’s coaching of his son is emphasized in all versions. Nākuina has Pāka’a send his son off (1902a:99), “o hele, hele ana no noonoo i ka olelo a ka makua” ‘Go, and in going think on the words of the parent.’

Moreover, just as a child represented his family to the world, so a student raised or lowered his teacher’s reputation. The wrestler names his teacher during a contest: he mau huaolelo no hoi e hapai ana i ka inoa o ka mea nana i a’o iaia a ike ‘statements also that were exalting the name of the person who taught him until he knew’. The wrestler chants, Helu au i na ai a kuu kumu a lau ‘I count out the strokes of my teacher until they are many’; a chant that ends Na ka haumana Olohe lua a Kuioiomoa ‘By the Expert wrestling student of Kū‘io‘iomoa’, the name of the teacher. If he loses, o ia ka wa o kona hoa e paha iho ai i kana mau olelo kaena, a hoike i ka inoa o kana kumu a’o ‘this was the time of his opponent to chant out his boasting statements and to show forth
the name of his teacher’ (“Ka Oihana Lua a Hawaii Lahui” August 2, 1923). The accomplishments of a youngster who can best his elders, like Kūapāka’a and Kalapana/Kaipalaoa, reflect favorably on his teacher, especially if those elders are the teacher’s rivals. In 1783, a navigator placed one of his student sons in a potentially fatal situation in order to demonstrate in a striking way the knowledge he had acquired (Kamakau July 13, 1865). This attitude was transferred to Western schools. A school and its students were the representation of the teacher: “E like me ke Kumu, pela no ke Kula” ‘Like Teacher, like School; “e like me ke kumu, pela no ka haumana” ‘Like teacher, like student’.137

Food was extremely important in Hawaiian families and in the whole culture as a sign of love and hospitality (Pukui 1983: number 450). Polynesian mothers generally practice demand feeding, and a prime obligation of a kahu ‘guardian’, besides education, was to hānai ‘feed’ his charge.138 A characteristic of the leading peer among children and adolescents both in classical times and today is that he will feed his playmates or friends.139 A chief is generous with food in order to attract experts to his service (Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua October 26, 1922).

Food was important in education, for instance, to cement the relationship between teacher and student and to reward good performance.140 An invitation into a hula academy promises abundant food (Pukui 1983: number 277). Students should not be stingy with their food (Westervelt 1963a:204). Kamehameha organizes farming and fishing in order to feed his followers, who are being instructed in warfare (“He Moolelo Kaa no Kuhaupio/ Kekahaupio” August 11, 1921). Graduation is accompanied by a feast as are many occupational occasions, such as medical treatment.

The child Kānepu’u was therefore confused by the very different food customs of his foreign teachers, who expected to be paid in food for their services, not to feed the children (March 19, 26, 1868). Hawaiian parents would send their children to Western...
schools because of the food provided at the graduation feast, but in fact the students often went hungry. ٠١١ Kāne'pu'u, perhaps remembering his own hungry times at school, urged Hawaiian parents to feed their children before they began their schoolwork (December 31, 1856: 173 f.). The same advice is given today (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 68 f.).

A full search of Hawaiian sources would be necessary exhaustively to determine gender differences in subjects taught. The most regular gender differentiation in teaching is connected to the economy of the family: the older women taught the girls the traditional female occupations, such as reef fishing and tapa making, while the men taught the boys deep-sea fishing and so on. As will be seen below, however, women could teach a number of subjects and fields, such as martial arts (e.g., Haleʻole April 24, 1865) and the care of a chiefly feather loincloth, that might be thought by Westerners more appropriate to men. Transsexual male tapa dyers could teach a subject in a field usually occupied by women (Kamakau December 14, 1867). Many subjects or fields, such as hula and obstetrics, were taught regularly both by men and women, and others were open to both sexes although usually practiced by one, such as certain rituals at the Hale ʻo Papa, the women’s temple.

The selection of young family members to learn a profession or occupy a family position was an important and complicated process (chapter V). Experts also had to select students or permit applicants to enter their schools. One could become a priest by birth or by talent, but selection was necessary in either case (Malo n.d.: xxxviii 26). Along with the ideal of affection connected to the family model, this selectivity helps explain the close bond between teacher and student. Hawaiian experts and teachers today use a certain amount of testing and discouragement to see if a potential student is serious. I watched an art teacher tell a candidate how hard the course was and how much he would have to work. The adequacy of the candidate’s intelligence can
be doubted. Once a student is in a course of instruction, ridicule, scolding, and the assignment of humbling tasks can be used to test his resolve and to reinforce his subordination to the teacher (compare Kirtley 1971: H1557.7). I have found almost no trace of these procedures in the literature. Moke Manu has the originating goddess of the hula warn a potential student of the many things necessary to such a course of education (August 12, 1899):

*he nui na mea kapu no keia hana; aia wale no me ka hoolohe pono o [sic: e] hana'i a hiki i ka ike ana, a ina e nui ka makemake, alaila, aole no e 'emo [sic: 'emo] a o ka puka no ia.*

‘many are the kapus connected to this work; only with listening carefully will it be done until you arrive at knowledge; if the desire is great, then, it will not be long before you graduate’.

Just as in a family a young person is reared through different stages—for instance, the boy leaves the women and enters the *mua* ‘men’s house’—so a student is started at the lowest level and brought forward as far as he or she can go. The movement from level to level could be considered, I would argue, a minor graduation, and in sorcery education is a formal one. The teacher considers the student as a complete person—knowledge, skill, and qualities of character—and judges whether he or she is ready to advance. The next stage of learning demands a solid foundation in the earlier stages, the necessary knowledge and skill to perform the activities of the advanced stage, and most important, since all occupations include religion, the morality and solidity of character needed to undergo the experiences of the new stage.

The specialization of families in certain occupations accords with the classical view that certain talents are passed down in families as part of their genetic makeup, to use a modern term. That is, Hawaiians ascribed to nature much that Westerners ascribe to nurture, a manifestation of the Hawaiian materialist conception of reality. Part of the family model for education is therefore the materialist conception of learning and the physical
character of many related practices. For instance, just as a child can be made to follow a proscribed diet for the purpose of health, so the student is made to follow a diet that will aid his study (e.g., Luomala 1955:60); for instance, slippery foods are avoided so that information will not slip from the memory. Similarly, special talents or powers could be obtained by possessing portions of the body of someone who had them to a remarkable degree. Great fishermen have to be careful that their bones are not stolen to be made into fishhooks. That “blood will out” in rearing and education can be seen for instance in the fact that the child ‘Umi will heed his mother but not her husband, who, unbeknownst to all but the mother, is not ‘Umi’s real father (Kamakau November 10, 1870).

As in other languages, intellectual activity can be described in physical terms. Different types of knowledge are located physically in different parts of the human body: ‘ike in the sight; wisdom, na‘auao, in the entrails, na‘au. Memorizing is pa‘ana‘au “fixed in the entrails” or ho‘opa‘ana‘au ‘to firm up the entrails or to fix firmly in the entrails’. The physicality of the words can be felt in the construction ua paanaau loa ia ia na makani o ka aina a me na makani o ka moana ‘the winds of the land and the winds of the sea were very gut-fixed in him’ or ‘were fixed firmly in his entrails’. Similarly, writing is hana pa‘a ‘ia i ka palapala “made fast on the paper” (Ellis 1984:296, Hawaiian text regularized). One can catch or grasp a point, ‘apo, which accords with the image of knowledge as pieces of information. The student can moni ‘swallow’ information or good example: na kela ame keia haumana no i moni mai iloko o lakou iho i keia mau ano maikai ‘this and that student swallowed into themselves these good characteristics’ of Joseph Nāwahī.

Correspondingly, knowledge, ability, and personal qualities can be transmitted from teacher to student by the transfer of some physical substance. The best known example is hā, the ritual breathing into the mouth or onto the fontanel.
In a medical origin story, a chief follows a healing god with the request (ʻĪʻī October 23, 1869):

“e ao mai oe iaʻu i ka lapaau.” Pane mai la hoi kela, “Hamama mai ko waha.” Ia hamama ana aku o ia nei, e kuha mai ana kela. A o keia kuha ana, ua lilo ia i mea nona e akamai ai ma ka lapaau ana, a ua akamai io no hoi

“‘teach me medicine.” The other responded, “Open your mouth to me.” When he opened it up, the other was spitting into it. And this spitting became the thing for the other to be knowledgeable in medical treating, and he was really knowledgeable’.

Knowledge can also be transferred by the student’s sucking the teacher’s blood or eating someone’s eye to obtain his ‘ike ‘sight, knowledge’.

At least one aspect of the teacher-student relationship is not found in the family: the payment due the expert for services. Reward and even enrichment were important motivations for learning, and the expert felt entitled to them, asking for them explicitly (Kamakau of Kaʻawaloa in Fornander 1919–1920: 7, 15). Hiram Bingham reports the speech of the early convert Puaʻaiki or Bartimaeus in support of the community’s payment of the mission teachers, “Believing that education was of great value, especially to the young, both as it respects this life and that which is to come . . .”:

He said, “I have been twice educated. In the time of dark hearts I learned the hula, and the lua, and the kake. And did it cost me nothing? Had we not to pay those mischievous teachers? Ah, think of the hogs, and kapa, and fish, and awa, and other things we used to give them. And we did it cheerfully. We thought it all well spent.”

* The song and dance, the robber’s art, and the secret dialect.
“He Mea Hoolaha Ike” (December 26, 1834) suggests hiring out Lahainaluna students and maybe teachers to earn support:

> O ke dala, oia ka mea nui no ka hoolimalima ana; o ka uku a kakou e hana'i, o ke kapa, o ka ai, o ka ia, o ka ilio, o ka puua, o ka moa. Eia no na waiwai i uku ia'i na kahuna kalai waa o keia pae aina, a me kumu kuai i ka kakou mea e makemake ai.

‘The dollar is the important, difficult thing in hiring. The pay we will work for: tapa, vegetable food, flesh food, dogs, pigs, and chickens. These are indeed the riches that were paid to the canoe-making experts of this archipelago and the price of the things we want’.

Reports in the nineteenth-century Hawaiian newspapers complained of traditional experts being paid (“Kahuna Hawaii” May 3, 1862):

> e hai mai ana i ka hele o kekahiki mau Kahuna Hawaii ma ia wahi e ohi ai i na dala no ka hookahuna'ku i ka poe e makemake ana e lilo i Kahuna

[a letter from Kaua‘i] ‘reports that several Hawaiian Kāhuna came to this place to collect dollars for making kāhuna those people who wanted to become kāhuna’.

The accusation was made frequently against Hawaiian medical practitioners.

Another aspect, although present in the family, seems to have been emphasized more particularly outside of it: the teacher’s keeping at least one professional secret to himself until death or else revealing it only on his deathbed. Teachers of the martial arts would reserve for themselves certain knowledge, for example, of strokes, to protect themselves from students who might turn on them. The great Lanikāula was the most famous example of a teacher destroyed by the student in whom he had trusted. Knowledge could be retained also because it was prestigious to know
something others did not; this attitude has proved an obstacle in academic research (Beckwith 1972: 40). Finally because knowledge is power, the revelation of information can be dangerous to the parties involved (Rémy 1859: 15, note 1).

The need for secrecy demonstrates that classical Hawaiians did not have the strong sense of the ownership of knowledge that is found in some other cultures. Much knowledge was common, and one did not need to be a member of the Pele family to tell her stories. There was indeed a sense of authorship, and families had their own traditions and styles. Moreover, when a mele inoa ‘name song’ had been presented to someone, the honoree was considered to own it, not the composer. Nevertheless, there was no system of copyright, so that if one absolutely did not want certain information to be used, one had to keep it secret. An honor system prevailed, but Hawaiians feared and still fear that others will not adhere to it.

The retention of professional secrets by the teacher, even within the family, helps explain certain passages in Hawaiian literature. For instance, Nākuina (1902b: 17) emphasizes that Kalapana obtained all of his aunt’s knowledge, implying for the Hawaiian reader that exceptionally she held nothing back. Similarly, the chief Keawe orders Pāka’a’s father to teach him all his knowledge (Nākuina 1902a: 26): e aʻo ae oe iaia nei i na hana au a pau a hiki i kona wa e ike ai, mai huna oe i kekahi mea hookahi a hiki i kona makaukau loa ana ‘teach this person here all of your types of work until the time he knows them; do not hide a single thing, so that he arrives at complete readiness’. In the story of Ka-Miki, the parents who opposed him and lost convince their children not to continue the struggle with the argument that if their parent-teachers lost, the children-students would not be able to win (“Kaa Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” February 7, 1912: 16). More examples of completeness in teaching have been given above.

Similarly just as families had treasures and secrets that should
not be revealed—

_kaula‘i iwi_ “to expose the bones of the ancestors” (Pukui and Elbert 1986)—so did schools have a _disciplina arcana_, about which little unfortunately is known.

The practice of secrecy influenced education in several more general ways. It helped to surround knowledge and learning with the mystique they enjoyed in Hawaiian culture. It helped retain the students in a lifelong relationship to the teacher, who still had some final knowledge to give them. Finally it made clear to the student that he did not know everything and that the process of his education must be a continuing search. Even more generally, the Hawaiian view that the teacher was more knowledgeable than the student stimulated the general impression of a decline of expertise over time; despite all recognition of progress and useful innovation, nineteenth-century writers are always looking back to the people of old and regretting their passing.

The classical use of the family model for education influenced the early students in the Western system. Students of Lahainaluna, Na Haumana o Lahainaluna (May 29, 1865), refer to their school as _ko makou makuahine hookama_ ‘our adoptive mother’; _o Lahainaluna no ua makuahine hookama nei, a o na haumana a pau e noho nei, o lakou no na keiki e omo waiu nei i keia wa_ ‘Lahainaluna is indeed this adoptive mother, and all the students who live here are indeed the children who are now sucking [her] milk’. Joseph Nāwahī is praised as a teacher by one of his former students because _e lawelawe ana no hoi oia ma ke ano o ka makua i kana mau keiki aloha_ ‘he was ministering indeed like a parent to his beloved children’ (J. G. M. Sheldon 1908: 307; see also 284 ff., 298). Malo apparently felt for William Richards much that a traditional Hawaiian student would for his teacher.

However, the inevitable cultural differences required adjustment, for instance, in the role of the teacher. When Lorrin Andrews convinced the students of the need to build a schoolhouse (1835: 136 f.; October 1, 1834: 9):
They all assented that what I had said was proper, and that they would work if I would show them how; that I must be their teacher and their chief. I told them I would be their teacher, but not their chief—if they worked they must work willingly and cheerfully—it was for their own benefit, and not for mine.

Andrews’ actions did not fall completely into either one of the categories—teacher or chief—with which the students were familiar. He himself was unaware of the confusion that they felt and that most probably the students were hinting that he was being lordly.

Similarly, the classical Hawaiian practice was for the teacher to delegate responsibility to the advanced pupils, such as the po’opua’a and the alaka‘i ‘leader’ in the hula academies. This practice was quickly extended to Western schools: a ina o ka haumana hele loa, ua lilo ia i kumu kokua ‘and if the student was advanced, he became an assistant teacher’ (Kānepu‘u February 27, 1868). The missionaries were soon complaining that the native teachers they had spent so much time training were simply passing their work on to others: they “soon get above their work, and leave the drudgery of the business to others less competent than themselves.”

Both foreign and Hawaiian teachers were unprepared to assume the role of “mediator or interpreter between two cultures”; “Native school teachers cannot teach a culture they have never experienced.” A study of Hawaiian education recalls, however, many forgotten or neglected aspects of Western: the need for apprenticeship in such fields as law and medicine in which theory must be applied to real life; the quasi-adoPTION of the apprentice by the master; and the view of schools as in loco parentis. Western teachers, by their personalities, attitudes, and styles, still exercise a crucial influence on their students; and artists, such as pianists, can recite the lineages of their teachers, towards whom their attitude is one of pietaS. Churches honor their Fathers and Doctors, and universities their great presidents and teachers. We contact
the great thinkers of our past through reading rather than through memory, ritual, and dream, but they still form us into members of the tradition they have helped create. Even when we do not agree with them, even when we no longer think as they do, they impart to us the māna that makes us culturally what we are.

NOTES


2. For example, Judd 1930: proverb 495. An example of the problem will be discussed below. Elbert 1956–1957: 1105 f. states that the chiefly morality described by Malo is not reflected in the stories.

3. For example, Judd 1930: proverbs 92, 113, 125, 256, 278, 369, 525, 520. Kepelino 1932: 151. “Ka hope o ke koena” December 20, 1834. Nākuina 1902b: 16. Compare “He Moolelo Kaa no Kuhauipio/Kekuhaupio” December 23, 1920, the burden of learning. Kirtley and Mookini 1977: 55. The ideal could be applied to the new learning; Keaopolohiwa June 19, 1862, describes the person who is not lazy: he nui ka heluhelu buke a nupepa paha, me na buke akamai kona ake nui “his reading of books and maybe newspapers is great, and intelligent books are his great desire”.

4. Golovnin 1979 can praise Hawaiian workers, 106, 200, but also criticize them, 125 f., 135; see also 166 f. Barratt 1988: 135 f., 139, 149 f., 170, 174, also 184, Manuia, a younger brother of the important chief Boki, is described as a capable fourteen-year-old chief entrusted with an important mission. He later visited England with Kamehameha II, returning with a decoration from the British government, Kamakau April 18, 1868; Fornander 1919–1920: 436, line 70. Manuia later became an associate of Boki and died on the fatal mission of that chief to seek sandalwood; “Sandwich Islands. Extracts of a Letter from the Missionaries on the Island of Oahu, Dated March 20, 1830” 1831: 121 f.; “Sandwich Islands. Extracts from a General Letter of the Missionaries, Dated June 28th, 1831” 1832: 74; Kamakau May 2, 18, 1868. Broeze 1988: 71 f. describes a boy in 1828 who is “so quick and always cheerfully ready” [71]; he is accepted into the boat’s company, and his mother brings him a bundle of medicinal herbs and bids him a tearful goodbye. Wilkes 1845: 256, Hawaiian vices have been exaggerated by missionaries and foreigners. Buck 1932a: 348, Polynesians are hard workers; their reputation for laziness is due to the facts that foreign-
ers do not know the Polynesian work routine and that Polynesians do not like to do the foreigners’ work. Andrews October 1, 1834: 10, “it is not the custom of Hawaiian people to be quick at work”; 11 f., Hawaiians have to be supervised when at work, even when working for chiefs; 12, they have no sense of “the importance of doing their work well”; 20 f., an accident during building of Western-style building is “a good specimen of Hawaiian carelessness”; 30 f., when students had enough to eat, they neglected their work and became quarrelsome and difficult to handle; 54, “employing and overseeing native workmen” is necessary; also 1835: 137, 142. Grimshaw 1989: 33, 46, 45, 111 f.

5. “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” June 2, 1921; August 18, 1921, abandoning oneself to sports and sex is waiwai ole ‘worthless’—the only waiwai is to be a warrior and prominent; see also April 7, 1921, tardy regrets are he kaumaha waiwai ole ‘a worthless burden’; June 9, 1921, a spear passes its target me ka waiwai ole ‘without result’.

6. Malo n.d.: xxxviii 64, 65. Kamakau August 17, 1867. Prayer: loa’a ‘getting’ and waiwai are found in prayer, e.g., Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua February 8, 1923: Ula paa ka waa, a e hoolanaia aku ana i ke kai, o konaaina ia e huli ai i ka loaa ame ka waiwai ‘The boat is fixed and will be floated out to sea; this is its land to seek getting and riches’; N. B. Emerson 1909: 34, E laka [sic] i ka loaa; E Laka i ka waiwai ‘O Laka in the getting/O Laka in the riches’.


8. Pukui 1983: number 904; also, Handy-Pukui 1972:119. Judd 1930: proverbs 140, 143, 394, 515, 519, 530, 542 (praise of big or difficult accomplishments); 79, 80, 87, 103, 134, 367 (?) (easy deeds deserve no praise); 97, 100, 306, 307, 505, 513, 517, 534, 534, 610 (ridicule of unsuccessful or useless work).


that they will be shamed if the house they are constructing falls down. Ambush: ʻĪʻī March 13, 1869; “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” June 2, 1921; Pukui 1983: numbers 131, 859.

14. For example, Judd 1930: proverbs 1, 34, 118, 122, 124, 232, 263. The chief ʻUmi prepares a trick to impress visitors, Elbert 1959: 131 ff. Preparation of equipment and tricks is crucial in the contest of wits, e.g., Nākuina 1902b: 13; Kalapana will not even lower his sail when storing his canoe, because he wants it to be instantly ready (25). “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” May 5, 1921. See below for Pākaʻa’s preparations.

15. J. P. September 10, 1856. This may have been Fuller, who wrote occasionally under the name Pula.

16. Fornander 1918–1919: 681. Other artifacts were treated as precious, such as maika stones, Ellis 1984: 199, used in a bowling game, which were developed into beautiful works of art from their conjectural beginnings as round sections of breadfruit. Other objects could be destroyed for ceremonial or religious reasons, Titcomb 1948: 157 f.; this does not imply however that they were badly made.

17. Text regularized. Iliwai June 1, 1867, an effective prayer. Kirtley and Mookini 1977: 55. J. S. Emerson 1918: 37, Hewahewa’s prayer, O ka ike, o ka mana, o ke ola. Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua December 7, 1922b, a prayer before felling a tree:

   E haawi mai i ka ike a nui,
   ka ikaika, ka noonoo,
   Haawi mai iaʻu i ke aholoa
   ‘Give knowledge until it is great,
   Strength, active thinking,
   Give me perseverance’.


18. Hawaiian views also cannot be systematized under the umbrella concept of mana. That concept is derived too often from anthropological speculation rather than from a close examination of texts according to acceptable methods, such as not compounding senses and not assuming that several or even all senses are present in any one use. The speculative approach is exemplified by Shore 1989.

19. Kohala Nui Kohala Iki May 31, 1911, states in classical language that
he has power over his disputant in a newspaper controversy because he knows her genealogy but she does not know his: e ao oe o pa i ka pohaku, a hoka oe, no ka mea o kou poopo'au kau i ike, aole oe i ike i ko'u ‘Beware lest you be hit by the stone and be baffled, because you know your nooks and crannies, but you don’t know mine’. The first clause is based on a chant line, e.g., Charlot 1987: 19, and the reference to “nooks and crannies” is based on sayings that use ‘ike and po'opo'o to make the same point, Pukui 1983: number 1204; Pukui and Elbert 1986: po'opo'o.

20. Fornander 1916–1917: 293–301; on the other hand, on 291 ff., the guardian sees an approaching problem through his own knowledge, not by his prophetic gift, so he can give reasons for his conclusion.

21. For example, Kamakau of Ka‘awaloa, Fornander 1919–1920: 17, 19 (note also the cloud that disappears through prayer), 31. N. B. Emerson 1915: 139 f., 142. Incantations are powerful, Judd 1930: proverbs 95, 96, 139, 491, 555; as are curses, proverbs 128, 129. I will discuss counting-out chants in chapter IV. Beckwith 1919: 313–320, emphasizes the power of words over the objects they name; lists therefore have an effective power; 1972: 35 f., reciting a genealogy is “in the nature of a charm”; also 40. Compare Judd 1930: riddles 88, 90, 94, 95, 100, 102–105. Pukui n.d.: 1602 [1], stories of ghosts or spirits were not told “as the things talked about were often attracted to the place.” Charlot 1983a: 41 f.

22. “He Moolelo no Pakaa” November 21, 1867. See also Kuapuu May 8, 1861; Nākuina 1902a: 56, 60 f. Compare Westervelt 1963b: 80–84. “Prayer. Calling the Winds in a Calm” n.d., joins the prayer with a ceremony: “After singing the above, take a handful of sea water and throw it at the stern.”

23. Nākuina 1902a: 20 f. For other uses of the word, see 9 f. (Pāka’a’s mother feels he gets his ‘e‘epa character from his father), 33, 37.


26. Kamakau May 19, 1870; also, hookahi kanaka wale no i ao ia e ke akua ma Molokai, a oia wale no, aole i laulaha, aole gekahi mea e ae i ao ia ‘only a single person was taught by the god on Moloka‘i; he alone; it was not spread; no other person was taught’. L. S. Green 1926: 60–63.

27. For example, Westervelt 1963a: 205 f. Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 172 f., 191–205. Pukui 1943: 218, “New steps and gestures were revealed to the po‘opua‘a at night through the medium of a dream or through the sound of the drum in the dance hall” Compare Andrews April 30, 1875. Beckwith 1919: 317 writes that the purpose of a certain chant is “to exhibit inspired craftsman-
ship, the process of enumeration serving as the intellectual test of an inherited gift from the gods.”

28. For example, see “dreams” in the indices of Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972, 1979. See chapter V.

29. I cannot recall such information ever being credited to an unconscious mind. I would argue that some signs—such as rainbows appearing where chiefs are present or certain elements of birth divination—are impersonal effects, but this problem is not on the point under discussion.

30. Mrs. Hoke spoke to my class in Hawaiian religion. A tape-recording was made and given to the Hamilton Library, University of Hawai‘i, but cannot currently be located. Compare J. Emerson 1892:20. For Sāmoa, see Buck 1931:56.


32. Kaawa December 9, 1865. McLean and Orbell 1990:18, a New Zealand Maori spell to fix knowledge.


37. Kamakau August 26, 1865:2; September 21, 1867. Kirtley and Mooki ki 1977:55.


Moral considerations are also of primary importance in disputes and differences of opinion and practice, which tend quickly to be ascribed to personalities. In stories of contests of wits, the hero is better morally as well as more knowledgeable than his opponents. *Ad hominem* arguments are the rule rather than the exception, and opponents are most often treated as fools or preferably knaves, an attitude contrary to certain Hawaiian precepts, e.g., Judd 1930: proverb 156. Knavery produces fabricated, falsified, and plagiarized traditions and is revealed by obstinate refusal to admit mistake or fault. A contemporary
scholar has satirized Hawaiian criticism: “Everything they say is wrong, and they stole it all from me.”

39. Pukui 1983: numbers 2065, 2083; also 883. ‘Īi June 12, July 17, 31, December 4, 1869. Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972: 128; 1979: 53 ff., 224–227, 294. Johnson 1981: 6, 8, 9 (“The moral center around the hearth and the home as source of ethical philosophy and moral support . . .”). For today, see Gallimore, Boggs, and Jordan 1974: 96. For Tonga, see Rutherford 1977: 80 ff. The father of the author of “No na mea Kahiko” August 1, 1834, gave his son decidedly unconventional advice when he was scolded for eating with the women: o ke koloha pono no ia, o ka ike no i ka mea ai lalau no ka lima ai no ‘this is indeed mischievousness itself: at the very sight of food, the hand just grabs, and one eats indeed’.


42. Jaeger 1959: 24. Mauvaise éducation and mala educacion refer to bad manners. The connection between demeanor in morals was a commonplace of German Bildung, as seen in the writings of Herder and Schiller; e.g., Schiller 1962: 277, ‘his moral acquirements must be revealed through gracefulness’; also 281 f., 288 f., 300 f.


44. ‘Īi July 31, August 7, October 9, 1869, he is trained in courtly rules and etiquette. Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 54 f., 224–227, 294. The many stories of chiefs living incognito in the backcountry, Appendix III, show that despite courtly peculiarities, there was a commonality of good manners.

45. For example, H. K. June 6, 1838. Kalimahauna March 27, 1862: hooponopono iho la i mea e pono ai na alii a me na makaainana [he] ‘regulated so that the chiefs and commoners were well’; he listened to his council, promulgated the Law of the Broken Paddle, was generous with food, and drew experts to himself; he fished, farmed, and distributed food; a maluhia na aina mai Oahu a Hawaii, no ka pono o kana hana ana ‘and the lands from O’ahu to Hawai‘i were made peaceful because of the rightness of his activity’. Kamakau March 23 [sic: 16], 1867 b; August 26, 1869. ‘Īi December 18, 1869. Dibble 1839: 59, 61. On Kamehameha as a historical model, see chapter V.


48. Kānepu‘u March 26, 1868. Kānepu‘u’s account of his childhood can be compared with that of the anonymous author of “No ko‘u Wa i Hanau mai
ai, a Hiki mai nei i nei Manawa” December 17, 1834, and “Ka hope o ke koena” December 20, 1834. In the former article, he states that he au loa i na ino o ke ao nei ‘swam far in the evils of this world’; he nui ka‘u mea i ao ai i ko‘u wa kamalii o ka hula ka mua, o ka mahiai, o ka laawaia, a me ka epe ‘I learned many things in my childhood; hula was the first, farming, fishing and mischief’. He was reformed by the arrival of the missionaries and Western education.

52. General: Hale‘ole October 17, 1861. Child: Kalehuaopuna April 21, 1858. ‘Ī‘ī July 17, 1869. Chief: Sahlins and Barrère 1973: 29; Kamakau January 21, 1869; “Ke Alii Aloha ole i kona Kaula/O Hua ke Alii” April 21, 1894; “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” February 24, March 24, 31, April 21, June 2, August 25, September 1, 1921; December 23, 1920, Kamehameha is urged to obey his chief even against his better judgement and personal moral views; Elbert 1959: 129, 133.

53. Kānepu‘u March 26, 1868, the father’s statement to Kānewailani is multi-leveled: “Ua ike no nei keiki e pepehiia ana no e kamalii nui, alualu aku ana no ia lakou la, he hewa ka oe i ka noho malie, a e uwe no oe a e pono” “This child knows indeed that he is being beaten up by the bigger boys, and he still goes chasing after them there. You’re making a mistake in sitting quietly here [second layer of meaning: You have been faulty in not keeping quiet], and now you’re crying, and it’s quite right’. Kānewailani’s father complains of his conduct several times in the series, so the sarcasm of his remark can be perceived. Compare “No na Mea Kahiko” August 1, 1834; Kalehuaopuna April 21, 1858.

56. Judd 1930: proverbs, e.g., 179, 180.
57. August 8, 1834. See also K*. October 5, 1871.
58. For example, ‘Ī‘ī May 8, 1869: pono, maikai akahele maoli,akahai, e like me ka makemake o ke‘ili; see also June 12, July 17, 31, December 4, 1869. Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 295.
59. For example, Malo n.d.: XVIII, XXXVIII, LXI 2, 4–9. Koko June 26, 1865: uses terms such as ‘olu‘olu, mana‘o aloha, ha‘aha‘a. Kamakau September 2, 23, 1865: 1; September 7, 1867, when chiefs complain to Kamehameha that Kekuaokalani has taken some of their goods, the king replies, Ua nani iho la ua ai i ka waiwai a oukou a na alii, aia ka hewa o ke kii i ka na makaainana
'It is good that he has enjoyed the goods of you, the chiefs; the wrong would be taking the goods of the commoners'; 1988: 59. 'Ī'ī May 29, June 5, 1869; March 26, 1870. Elbert 1959:129–137, 143–149. Charlot 1985a:1–4, 12 ff., 20–25. Ka'aie June 12, 1862, is a good example of an articulation of chiefly morals.

60. Kepelino 1932:141. Kepelino based the passage on Whitney and Richards 1832:159 f. See chapter VI.


67. Chiefs: examples are numerous, e.g., “No ke kauoha a Kaahumanu ma kona make ana” March 28, 1834; Malo November 22, 1837; Ka'aie June 12, 1862; ‘Ī’ī May 29, June 5, 1869; Kamakau December 22, 1870. “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” May 26, 1921, the commoners follow Kamehameha’s bad example. “‘Ka wa ia Kaomi’” September 11, 1861, uses classical thinking with postconversion arguments: signs of a bad chief are that Ua hoopauia na kula, ua wawahiia na hale kula, ua puhia ka okolehao, ua hulaia na hula a puni ka aina . . . ‘The schools were ended, the school houses were torn down, liquor was brewed, and hulas were danced all over the land’; people were unfaithful to their spouses and neglected work, so that hunger resulted. Further examples will be given elsewhere. Runner: Judd 1930: proverb 518. On the use of historical situations as models, see Charlot 1985a: 7 and note 44. Malo’s wearing a suit made from cotton he had grown, spun, and woven into cloth seems to have been a deliberate attempt to provide a model that, if adopted, would have rendered Hawai‘i independent of foreign cloth imports. This was
a policy objective of missionary advisors at one time; Richards, Andrews, Spaulding, and Chapin 1833:268. A. November 5, 1853, Malo was “a man of business, and of industry and enterprise”; he planted cotton, obtained a loom and wheels and had cloth made; this provided an example of developing local resources; “When asked where he got that strange-looking cloth (it was rather coarse) he would point to the dirt under his feet, saying ‘it came thence.’”

68. Kepelino July 2, 1867: i sections 5 (a certain fish is haahaa ‘lowly’, not haaheo ‘proud’; it were well that people were so), 6 (God made the âholehole clean as an example to human beings to be maemae maloko a mavaho ‘clean on the inside and the outside’); ii sections 11 (the mother leleiona feeds her children with blood of the enemies she kills; there is a deep lesson in that), 77 (the kio-noho-one has demeanor that is hoohiki ‘able[?]’ and haahaa, but is akamai ‘intelligent’). Titcomb 1972:75.

69. For example, ‘Ī’ī June 12, 1869, discussed above. Fornander 1916–1917:575. Kamakau March 23 [sic: 16], 1867a, Kahahana asks his counselor, Ka‘ōpulupulu: e nana mai oe i ka pono a me ka hewa ‘Look at the pono and the hewa. Pono and hewa can be coupled with ola ‘life’ and make ‘death’; a traditional pair that is used also as a broad subject heading, e.g., Fornander 1916–1917:575, quoted below.

70. Malo n.d.: xxxviii 4, 24. Kamakau August 26, 1865: 2, people revolt against bad chief; September 9, 1865a, a bad chief is deposed because he is unheeding, disobedient, and arrogant; a good chief is good to big and small and follows the advice of his priests: Hana iho la ke Alii e like me ka ke Kahuna ‘The Chief acted according to the words of the Priest’; October 7, 1865c; March 23 [sic: 16], 1867a, the people of O‘ahu depose a chief: O ke kumu o ka uluhua ana, he ali‘i hiamoe loih i o Kumahana, he ali‘i pi, he aua, he hookuli, he hele i ke kula i ka pana iole ‘The reason for the revolt was that Kumahana was a chief who slept late, a stingy chief, refusing requests, deaf to counsel, a chief who went to the plain to shoot rats’; 1961:188, an epidemic follows Kamehameha’s disregard of a prophecy. Kauʻi December 18, 1865, people want a bad chief to be killed and a good one to be spared. ‘Ī’ī May 29, 1869. “Ke Alii Aloha ole i kona Kaula” 1894. Fornander 1916–1917: 459; 1969:11 69 (chiefs versus priests), 132 (Ka‘u people depose or slay bad chiefs). Nākuina 1902b: 28, a burdensome chief is not helped by his people. “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio,” e.g., March 24, 31, April 7, 21, 28, May 19, 1921, disregarding advice. L. S. Green 1926:86–91, oppressive chiefs. Handy and Pukui 1972:191f., versus inhospitality. Chiefs versus priests: Kamakau September 23, 1865b; Fornander 1918–1919: 515–519; Elbert 1959: 129, 135ff., 143; Summers 1971:13, 209. Bruner 1986:65–69. On the moralistic use of stories, see Johnson 1957:31.

Similarly Kalaniʻōpuʻu and other chiefs refuse to listen to their advisors and make bad judgements because of their emotions, “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” April 21, August 11, 1921; April 28, 1921, because of his negative feelings, Kalaniʻōpuʻu does not keep the peace. Other examples used in Hawaiian history are Hākau, whose hatred of his brother ‘Umi works against him; Lonoikamakahiki, who nearly kills his wife out of jealousy; Kamehameha, who repents of his mistreatment of some fishermen and proclaims a protective law; and Liliʻuokalani, who repulsed a U.S. envoy by angrily claiming her right to execute those who had worked for her overthrow.


73. ‘Īʻī August 21, 1869. Other examples can be found. The visiting son of a former kahu ‘guardian’ brings Kamehameha a malo ‘loincloth’, an example of good service, February 27, 1869. ‘Īʻī regularly praises knowledgeable people, for example, a man who fixed a leak on a boat out at sea, January 22, 1870: maamaalea, naauao, akamai.

74. ‘Īʻī January 29, 1870. See the articulation of the ideal in “No kekahi hewa a me ka pono” February 24, 1834.

75. ‘Īʻī May 8, 1869. The story is famous, e.g., Elbert 1959: 179 ff.

76. ‘Īʻī December 5, 1868. Also ‘Īʻī May 22, 1839: 101.


80. Nākuina 1902b: 27. See also Kau November 13, 1865; “He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902: 4; Fornander 1916–1917: 577.

81. Fornander 1916–1917: 265. Also Haleʻole in Fornander 1919–1920: 69 ff., the kahuna nui has all ten branches of priestly learning (the kahuna nui is mentioned also, 139). Luomala 1989: 289.

82. Pukui 1983: number 2721. On the term pūhi oka or pūhi okaoka, see also Haleʻole in Fornander 1919–1920: 59 and 58, note 3; Pukui and Elbert 1986: pūhi okaoka. Compare the polymath and priest of the poison gods of Moloka‘i, Kāiākea; “He Moolelo Hawaii: O Kāiākea” 1902; Charlot 2005. For Polynesia, see Buck 1931: 58.

83. Kamakau December 22, 1870. Nākuina 1902a: 6, Pākaʻa learns from
Ma'ilou, an expert in *kāpili manu*, *ho'opāpā* (added by Nākuina to his sources), and *'ōlelo le'ale'a* ‘amusing talk or wordplay’; 30, he is given several positions by the chief; 34, he is good at farming and fishing, which is useful later (84 ff.); 121, he is good at distinguishing objects at sea. Hale'ole's guardian had mastered a number of branches, but not all, Fornander 1919–1920: 67. Also Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 145.

84. Pukui 1983 number 2541. Other polymaths are mentioned in Hawaiian literature, e.g., Westervelt 1976: 121, and below.

85. “Make” December 17, 1834. Compare L. F. Judd 1928: 23, “Auwae was in the train of the great conqueror, one of his savants, and keeps in memory genealogies, traditions, and ancient lore. He is an astronomer and botanist . . . He seems to be a genuine encyclopedia of Hawaiian science.” Stewart 1831: 161.

86. Nākuina 1902a: 121, *keia pane maikai* ‘this good answer’; 122, a story is *piha* ‘full’. Johnson 1957: 28 f., stories were to be transmitted completely and accurately or the storyteller would become ill.


89. The same points are made in Kauʻi November 13, 1865. Compare “He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902: 4. “No ke Keiki Hoopapa, Oia o Kalapana” n.d.: 32 [1]. “Kao Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” February 15, 1911. The fact that a teacher imparts his or her complete knowledge is worthy of mention: e.g., Kamakau August 26, 1865: 2; December 30, 1920; “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” December 23, 1920; “Ka Oihana Lua a Hawaii Lahui” August 2, 1923. The same point is emphasized in a Māori text, Ballekom and Harlow 1987: 18, 40.

90. Pukui 1983: numbers 325, 1209; also 197, 774.
92. Kauʻi November 27, 1865; also November 20, December 4, 1865. Nākuina 1902b: 60. “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” August 18, 1921. Compare Fornander 1916–1917: 309, 321. The use of the singular for the plural is common in older texts; the word used probably refers to a category or class. The significance of this practice will be discussed in chapter IV.
95. For example, Kauʻi November 20, 27, December 4, 1865. Compare “Kao Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” June 14, 1911: 13. More will be said on this
in the discussion of the contest of wits in chapter IV.

96. Kohala-Nui Kohala-Iki [sic] May 31, 1911. Mrs. Stillman was supported in the controversy by Imaikalani June 9, 1911, and Kaapuiki June 23, 1911. For similar rhetoric, see Kamakau October 7, 1865b. The obituary, “Ua Hala o Mrs. Kamaka Stillman” August 7, 1924, provides biographical information.

97. Kuapuu 29, 1861. “He Moolelo no Pakaa” November 28, 1867. Fornander 1918–1919:117. The moral connotation is emphasized by Nākuina 1902a:31–86, 101, who structures his novel on Pāka’a’s powers of foresight and planning. Pāka’a teaches the chants to his young son, prepares for the chief’s visit far in advance (starting at 38), makes all preparations for people to come ashore (84–88) so that he is perfectly mākaukau ‘ready’ for them, and formalizes an arrangement with Keawe before returning to his service (122 f., 126 f.). Compare Kirtley 1971:1678, 1711.


100. For example, Pukui 1980:74, dancers of one place “vied with those of another.” Western education: Kamakau April 25, 1868, quoted below; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:59.


102. Nākuina 1902b: 9. The chief of Kaua’i desires to do the same, Kaui November 13, 1865.


105. Pukui 1983: number 2772: Ua a’o a ua ‘ailolo “He trained until he ate brains” or “He became an expert”; also number 2771. Eating the brain of the sacrificed pig was part of the graduation ceremony. Similarly, a child is given opportunities to show he can perform a function for which he might be selected, Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:56 f. See also “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhapio/Kekuhapio” February 10, 1921.

Buck 1931:58 mentions a stone being given at graduation to protect the student. For a similar practice in Hawai‘i, I have found only Kekahuna n.d.:1, “Certain objects were chosen by each person to represent him . . .”; 2, at graduation, a preferred object is left in a protected place at a temple.


107. See chapter V. Such contests are found elsewhere, e.g., Parks 1990.
Compare also Kirtley 1971: H509.6–H551.2; on tests and contests in general, section H.

108. ‘Ī‘ī October 30, 1869. Kamakau October 7, 1865a, mentions Apo’s stay in Hawai‘i at the time of Kamehameha I and attributes the Nanaulu genealogy to him. Apo discussed genealogy with learned Hawaiians, the best of whom was Kalaikuahulu, whom Kamehameha then appointed to teach Hoapiliwahine and Kekāuluohi, the mother of the later King Lunalilo. Kamakau studied with both, but they had already forgotten some of the information they had learned. Compare Kamakau October 28, 1865; Whitney and Richards 1832: 169.


110. “He Moolelo no Pakaa” November 14, 1867. See also Nākuina 1902a: 58; compare 1902b: 18. Compare “Kao Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” February 8, 1911: 15.


112. Nākuina 1902a: 54; also 58, 61. The word hookahiko may have the sense ‘old-time style’ and may be a modernism.

113. For example, Kuapuu May 8, 1861. “He Moolelo no Pakaa” November 14, 21, 1867.

114. Kawaiakumaiikamakaokaopua November 23, 1922; December 7, 1922b, the boat makers wore maile leis in the mountains; January 11, 1923.

115. Nākuina 1902b: 6–9, 25; 73, 75, the boy’s opponents and the referee recognize his knowledge. Kaui November 19, 1865.

116. For example, J. S. Emerson 1892: 17, Kūpā‘aike’e invented the bevel adz and is now a god of canoe makers; “He presided over the work of the interior of the canoe” Handy and Pukui 1972: 102 f. On the fame of professionals, craftspersons, and innovators, see Malo xxxiv 30; Fornander 1919–1920: 171, 191; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 269 f.; Jenkins 1989: 107 ff. Kamakau February
3, 1870; 1976:116 (translation); the Hawaiian text is sufficiently important to be published:

O ka poe loea kuku kapa, ua hoomanao lakou i ka lokomaikai o ke akua i ka haawi ana mai i ke akamai a me ka naaauao i ka imi ana o kekahih wahine o Lauhuki a loaa ke kapa mailoko mai o ka ili o ka laau, a ua lilo kela wahine kahiko i aumakua kuku kapa no ka poe loea kuku kappa . . . O na wahine loea i ke kapala, a ina [sic: i nâ] oihana kapalapala a hoionio kakau a pau, ua hoomanao ka poe loea i ka wahine kahiko nana i hoomaka i ke kapala, oia o Laahana, a pela ka poe hooluu kuaula, a hamoula, a waiilii, a uaua a me na mea like, ua lilo o Ehu ka mea nana i hookumu mu a hana i ke kuaula i aumakua kane no ka poe hooluu. A pela ka poe kahiko ma Hawaii nei i ka poe nana i hookumu na hana kahiko, ua hoomanao lakou ia. Pela lakou i hoolilo ai ia Maikoha i aumakua no ka wauke, oia ke kumu mai o ka wauke, a pela ko lakou hoomanao ana ia Lonowahine, oia ke kumu o ka ipu, a hoomanao ia o Kuula, oia ka lawaia mu a, pela ka poe ka upena e hoomanao ai ia Maiai ke kanaka nana i hoolilo i ke olona i upena.

For Sāmoa, see Ella 1897:154.


118. ‘Ī‘ī December 4, 1869. See also Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:51, 65.


121. For example, Kauai November 20, 1865. Nākuina 1902b:37 (Aohe paha i ao a makauakau ‘Perhaps not trained until ready’), 38.

122. ‘Ī‘ī March 6, 1869. The expert’s pride and need for recognition could explain a curious episode reported by ‘Ī‘ī February 19, 1870. When dying, his uncle Papa, the famous medical expert to the chiefs, requested a privilege that was exceptional and difficult to grant. When the privilege was accorded him, he seemed to lose interest in exercising it. I would guess that he made the request to elicit a demonstration from the rulers of the special regard in which he was held.

123. Beckwith 1919:311, 312, “Ability in learning and language is, there-
fore, a highly prized chiefly art, respected for its social value and employed to aggrandize rank”; 1972: 40. Elbert 1951: 350, “intellectual virtuosity was much esteemed in the culture.” Titcomb 1972: 49, “knowledge was held in high esteem, and experts trained pupils in all their knowledge, which included names.” Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 295 f.

Fame of learning and accomplishments is often mentioned in Hawaiian literature: e.g., Kamakau September 2, 1865: 1; September 23, 1865a; “Ka Oihana Lua a Hawaii Lahui” August 2, 1923, a person is famous for being able to run away from the battle to recuperate and return rested; Elbert 1959: 169 ff. Compare Bingham 1981: 481 f., blind Bartimaeus was famous for his memory.


The missionaries worried that the Hawaiian teachers they trained used their prestige to obtain sexual favors: “adultery has been the crying sin of native teachers from the commencement of the school system; & it is not impossible, yea it is highly probable, that it was viewed in prospect by the scholars of the High School as a part of the perquisites of the office,” Missionary Letters, Volume 4, n.d.: 1295. On sex and adultery in the schools, see Missionary Letters, Volume 4, n.d.: 1293, 1299, 1301 f.; Missionary Letters, Volume 7, n.d.: 2174, the strong sexual atmosphere in society corrupts the students; “Sandwich Islands. Extracts from a Letter of Messrs. Green and Dibble, dated at Hilo, Oct. 4th, 1831” 1832: 221 f., in general; 223, teachers assume a superiority over their pupils and “trespass upon their credulity and virtue”; Andrews October 1, 1834: 37; 1835: 144; Hunt and Alexander 1848: 5 f., a case of adultery at Lahainaluna; Grimshaw 1989: 163 f., 175. There is no evidence of this practice for classical Hawaiian education. I have found two cases in which medical practitioners tried to extort sex: Kaliwaaboy October 6, 1866, a man; Aholo 1861: 6, a woman. Alapai July 24, 1862, is probably a third case. See also Kamakau August 4, 1870.


127. For Polynesia, see Bargatzky 1987: 113 f.


132. Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 64, 68. Sloat 1981: 11, the teacher should be warm, encouraging, and positive; 10 ff., control and discipline. Au 1981: 14, discipline. Tharp 1989: 354, the teacher must have “a personal, affective link with students,” which is warm, nurturing and socially reinforcing, and also be “firm, clear, and consistent in insisting that the children comply with their directions and requests”; both rewards and punishments should be used. Hawaiians felt that Vancouver was such a teacher: he taught graciously, ao oluolu, like a real friend, Dibble 1838: 30. Compare Buck 1932: 406, the foreign teacher of Polynesian students should have a knowledge of anthropology and “a sympathetic attitude towards native races.”


135. Kuapuu May 8, 15, 22 (pela ke aooa ana a Pakaa i ke keiki ‘thus was Pāka’a’s instructing of the child’). “He Moolelo no Pakaa” November 7, 14, 21, 1867. Fornander 1918–1919: 81, 93–99, 105 ff. Nākuina 1902a: 41–61; 1902b: 64, 66 f., 72 f., 75–78, 83 f., 124, 126; Pāka’a’s coaching is revealed to Keawe, 120. In ‘Īi March 20, 1869, a person who provided instructions on what to say is called a kumu olelo, although not actually the person’s teacher.

See also the above account of ‘Ī‘ī’s education. For Polynesia, see Buck 1931: 56; Counts 1990: 231. See also chapter V.

137. J. P. September 10, 1856; October 1, 1856. As noted above, J. P. may be a foreigner.


141. Parents: Wilkes 1845: 53. Hungry: Andrews October 1, 1834: 30 f.; 1835: 138 f., 142, students are disobedient when they have enough to eat; October 1, 1834: 16 f.; November 24, 1835: 31; Bingham 1981: 425; Martin, Lyman, Bond, and Damon 1979: 93 f., 104. Compare the giving of presents at examination ceremonies for Native Americans in Blackburn 1808: 85.

142. For Polynesia, compare Luomala 1955: 49, 60.


144. Kamakau December 29, 1870. A curious use of pa‘ana‘au can be found in ‘Ī‘ī March 12, 1870, in which the physical reference can be felt. Speaking of the impression made by poison gods, he writes ua piha mau nā‘lli a me na kanaka i ka maka‘u ma keia mau mea, no ka mea, ua paanaau ka make i na kanaka ma o a maanei ‘the chiefs and commoners were constantly filled with fear of these things because death was fixed in the entrails of people here and there’.


the consumed sacrifices of the graduating ceremony, e.g., “Ka Oihana Lua a Mawai Lahuui [sic]” July 19, 1923.


150. Bingham n.d.: 43 f. “Sandwich Islands. Journal of Mr. Armstrong on the Island of Maui” 1836: 256. The support of Western and Hawaiian teachers and their schools was a frequently expressed concern of the mission, e.g., “Instructions given by the Prudential Committee to the Rev. Sheldon Dibble, About Returning to the Sandwich Islands Mission” 1839: 173. Some foreign residents like Stephen Reynolds were opposed to paying the missionary teachers, King 1989: 144. Edward August 24, 1867, the rebel J. W. Kaona made a point of the fact that he did not demand payment like the foreign missionary teachers, but was he kumu uku ole ‘an unpaid teacher’.

151. Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972: 45; 1979: 296. Luomala 1989: 307. For modern times, Ritchie and Ritchie 1989: 117. This final revelation may at times have been more a ritual than the imparting of a real secret. For instance, the canoe maker’s secret that the woodpecker reveals the hollowness of a tree is given as an example of such a secret, but was widely known.


153. Albert J. Schütz (personal communication) finds this point supported by the use of the two different possessives: na/a- (of in the sense of by) and no/o (of in the sense of belonging to). The chant is na/a the composer and no/o the honoree.


155. Buck 1932b: 406; 1932a: 361, speaking in general of foreign teachers of Polynesian students. See also the discussion in chapter VI.
A number of conditions and practices were common to the educational institutions to be discussed in the next chapter. First and foremost, there was a vast amount of information to be transmitted, and the principal means was oral. Many of the practices of Hawaiian education, like many of the ideals discussed above, must be understood as components of this process of oral transmission, that is, as the most appropriate methods and devices for that particular task.

Oral traditions were closely connected to other cultural elements, such as views of the power of the word and the teacher as kumu ‘source’. The existence of a multitude of differing traditions was recognized, but this had the positive effect of permitting families, experts, and schools to have their individual traditions, just as they could have their own artistic styles. An important task of advanced education was learning a variety of traditions; for instance, students of the hula would travel to study under different experts, learning both traditions and new forms of dance. A proper discussion of a particular topic included therefore the mention of differing traditions (e.g., Fornander 1918–
Traditions were, however, considered to differ in quality, and judgement was therefore necessary in assessing them, which stimulated competition, criticism, and controversy.

For such a culture, the encounter with writing was a major event, as will be discussed below. Nevertheless, many of the classical educational methods have been perpetuated into the present day. The spoken word continues to be considered powerful. The kumu ‘teacher’ continues to be the source of knowledge because the information he or she possesses is unavailable in books. As a result, classical pedagogical methods along with the devices and exercises of oral transmission were used—and can be studied—throughout the nineteenth century, through the childhood of Mary Kawena Pukui, and in contemporary hula academies.

Several reasons can be inferred for the tenacity of classical practices. For instance, the constant emphasis on listening is clearly necessary for the success of oral transmission; if people do not listen, they cannot memorize and thus cannot transmit the items they have been told. Teaching depends on knowing, which depends on memorizing, which depends on listening. That is, the very process of oral transmission demands certain techniques, practices, and emphases, all of which are mutually interdependent. As a result, although Hawaiians recognize stages of personal and intellectual development, the learning methods used in childhood continue with appropriate modifications throughout life. Children can start learning chants just by listening to them being performed. As they get older, they can apply themselves consciously to memorizing them, using a number of techniques and devices. As long as they continue learning literature, they continue to use and develop their listening and memory techniques and to expand the contents of their memory deposits. Similarly games and sports continue to be used for learning, literary opportunity, and display. Childhood education lays the foundation of both methods and content for the subsequent levels of learning.
Listening is also connected to certain cultural ideals, such as respect for elders, subordination to authority, and humility before greater wisdom. In this connection, listening becomes a moral virtue as well as a practical one and as such is applicable to all. Using a wordplay on *kuli* ‘knee’ and *kuli* ‘deaf’, a parent hits a child on his *kuli* ‘knee’ because he is *hoʻokuli* ‘unheeding’. The great priest and prophet Kaʻōpulupulu tattoos his knees “as a sign that the king had turned a deaf ear to his admonitions.”\(^1\) Such a leader is called an *aliʻi hoʻokuli* ‘a chief who acts deaf’ or *aliʻi kuli* ‘unhearing chief’ in Hawaiian chants.\(^2\)

Finally educational practices influence literature and behavior. Children who are taught to observe will tend to lead an observant life, and their literary compositions will be filled with what they have learned and perceived.

**OBSERVATION**

The fundamental importance of observation and listening rather than questioning—especially for children—has long been recognized in Hawaiian education.\(^3\)

Pukui 1983: number 1186: *I ka nānā nō ā ʻike* ‘In looking indeed until one sees/knows’.

Pukui 1983: number 2268: *Nānā ka maka; hoʻolohe ka pepeiao; paʻa ka waha* ‘The eye sees; the ear listens; the mouth is shut’.


Pukui 1983: number 2605: *Pau ka ʻike, pau ka lohe* ‘Seeing is finished, hearing is finished’ means “To be in a coma or in a state of unconsciousness.”\(^4\)

Questioning can be discouraged for several reasons. Pākaʻa’s mother calls him *niele* ‘overinquisitive’ when he keeps asking
who his father is, a story motif (Nākuina 1902a:7; see also 9 f.). A child can be considered unready for certain information. When the fisherman Peter Kelekolio was taken as a child to plant sweet potatoes and asked why he had to remove his clothes, he was called niele and told kulikuli ‘Quiet!’ Only as an adult did he learn that the plants were supposed to grow “as big as our balls.” Finally questioning seems to be considered a distraction from observation, which requires more effort, engages more of the senses, imprints the information more firmly in the memory, and exercises the individual’s own thinking capacity. I have heard many Hawaiians emphasize the superiority of living and looking over book learning. Observing and listening are therefore the basic and lifelong learning skills and the means of acquiring the first knowledge necessary for all human activity.

Observation itself can be in fact the object of instruction, and the lack of it, the object of scorn (Judd 1930: proverb 590). Children were not supposed to move while observing (Pukui 1942:376). Nona Beamer (1976:58 f.) and her siblings were taught a game by their grandmother in which they caught small black crabs on the black lava rocks of the shore in the twilight. Regular games tested observation (Poepoe January 8, 15, 1909). Chad Baybayan described in class how his fisherman grandfather taught him to spot fish on the open sea by observing the slight color changes on the surface. The student of hula is taught to observe the motions of plants in the wind. The child’s adeptness and application in observation is one way to prove himself worthy of selection for more formal education. Pāka’a and other prodigies with their interest, aptitude, and assiduity constitute extreme examples.

Children were expected to pick up information and skills from the normal activities in the family and the community, which offered a wide variety of opportunities (Handy 1965:54 f.). For instance, all children would have the learning experience of observing taro planting (Fornander 1918–1919:685): aole paha
kela keiki keia keiki i nele i ka ike ole i ka hana ana mai, a ko lakou mau makua ma ka mahiai ana i ka ainamaloo, a i ka aina wai ‘there was probably not that child or this child who suffered from the lack of opportunity of seeing the work of their parents and elders in farming dry land and wet land’. Hawaiians used their training to master foreign crafts; Wilkes (1845:97) reports they learned carpentry “entirely by looking on and practicing.”

Children had ample opportunity to observe the arts, such as conversation, literature (prayers, genealogies, stories, family history, legends, chants), music, and dance, as elsewhere in Polynesia.6 Finally children had the beautiful world around them. For instance, a wind pushes birds to a particular group of trees, which is mea lealea na ko laila kamalii ‘a delightful thing for the children of that place’ (ʻĪʻī March 5, 1870).

A bright and observant child like John Papa ʻĪʻī could take full advantage of such opportunities. His mother sends him to watch soldiers drilling (July 24, 1869). He watches men distilling liquor and building a stone house.7 In his vivid and detailed descriptions of novelties—for instance, seeing someone smoke for the first time (February 19, 1870)—the precision of his observations can be gauged. ʻĪʻī was also careful to clarify the information he obtained by questioning the people involved before storing it in his memory. As a result, in his very old age, he was able to provide detailed descriptions of such activities as canoe making (March 26, 1870).

Observation is mentioned prominently in literature about children. Pākaʻa observes activities, asks to do things, shows his talents, and chooses a specialization (Nākuina 1902a:8 ff., 19). His energy and aptitude mark him for future training.

More generally, the very training in observation influences literature and vice versa. When ʻĪʻī traveled, he observed his surroundings carefully enough to be able to describe them with precision many years later. In these observations, he was guided by the extensive Hawaiian place literature, which made him aware of
the local elements, characteristics, landmarks, and famous happenings. He could then check his personal impressions against the traditions he had learned. For instance, *ua oleloia no nae, he aina anu no i ke kehau, aka, aole no nae paha i like me kela makani ma Hilo ke anu, i kapaia he Alahonua* ‘it is said indeed to be a cold land because of the dew, but the cold is probably not like that of the wind in Hilo called the ‘Alahonua’ (‘Ī‘ī March 5, 1870). This mutual interaction of received tradition and personal observation is characteristic of Hawaiian place literature (Charlot 1983a:62–73).

Some questioning is of course permitted, especially after a demonstration in a more formal process of learning (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972:170; 1979:48). The child and high chief Lonoikamakahiki is presented as quite exceptional in that he asks questions regularly about what he sees (Fornander 1916–1917:257–263). However no one is upset when Kānepu‘u *ninau pinepine* ‘asks questions constantly’ about his father’s projected trip, probably because he is so clearly excited (March 5, 1868).

In general, children are taught to observe and explore on their own, are allowed an increasing amount of questioning depending on the stage of their development and the situation, and finally are selected for more formal education (compare Pukui 1942:376). Kalapana *kia‘i* ‘observes’ some fishermen, *ike* ‘sees’ how they prepare their boat, and does it himself. He then goes out with the fisherman, gets a *ha‘awina* ‘lesson’, practices, and becomes *mākaukau* (Nāku‘ina 1902b:13). This pattern was followed in sex education, which started with observation, imitation, and talk, and became more formal on puberty. In formal education, observation remains prominent. Through a long apprenticeship, the students watch their teacher work.

Given its prominence in education, observation is naturally employed in other aspects of Hawaiian life. Observation provides the basis for judging what one hears; it is used to confirm a claim, an accusation, or a prophecy. Parents observe their children’s
potential spouses to see if they are industrious (Handy and Pukui 1972:110). Observation demands individual response and makes possible creative innovation. In the contest of wits, opponents use observation to formulate and answer difficult challenges. During the Christian missionization of the early 1820s, the poet Nī’au details the phenomena of the separated soul as an argument for the validity of Hawaiian religious experience. In the early twentieth century, Harriet Desha Beamer renovates the place song by focusing on her personal perceptions rather than on received expressions. Observation could be used even to argue for a new world view: the chief Hoapili is open to the idea that the earth is round because when he goes out to sea, he loses sight first of the beach (Wilkes 1845:44).

The emphasis on observing was important for nineteenth-century Hawaiian studies, as is obvious in the case of ‘Ī‘ī. Kekoa emphasizes that he was an eyewitness to burial customs: A o kahi mooolelo i haiia‘e la maluna ua ike au, a ua ike maka hoʻo, o i ai koʻu wa uuku, me ka umi paha o na makahiki. ‘Some of the history reported above, I have seen, and seen indeed with my own eyes, while in my childhood, around ten years old’. Ultimately the Hawaiians’ personal experience of the efficacy of their classical culture convinced them that it was not wholly to be rejected in favor of the new, foreign one.

Young people of today have found much value in the observations reported by elders who lived in a world that was more Hawaiian. Indeed, the lack of traditional experiences available to contemporary young Hawaiians is creating cultural problems. In the mid-1970s, the poet and teacher Larry Kimura told me with some shock that he had just met his first Hawaiian who had never picked ‘opihi ‘limpets’ on the seashore. The significance of this loss of common, traditional experiences, once a strong characteristic Hawaiian culture, has yet to be assessed.

Observation should not be equated simply with informal education. As seen above, it could be the subject of formal
instruction, and demonstrations also could be formal, requiring a designated setting, sustained attention from the student over a period of time, testing, and so on. Moreover, despite the importance of observation, it should not be separated from other aspects of Hawaiian education or idealized in opposition to verbal factors. Education is limited without verbal instruction, and classical Hawaiian education emphasized verbal ability perhaps more even than Western schooling does. To looking must be added listening.

**LISTENING**

Along with observation, listening is the most basic skill in which children are trained. Listening was of obvious practical importance in an oral system, especially when, as will be seen below, verbal instructions were given little more than once.

Listening is also connected to Hawaiian views. Most important, the power of the word makes both speaking and listening matters of life and death: *Aia ke ola i ka waha; aia ka make i ka waha* ‘There is life in the mouth; there is death in the mouth’; *He lohe ke ola, he kuli ka make* ‘Life is listening, death is being deaf’.

The seriousness of listening carefully is therefore emphasized. A mother scolds when a listener talks: “Daughter, storytelling is not a game. If you want to learn, listen. I don’t have to tell what I know” (Pukui n.d.:1605 [4]). When ‘Īi (July 3, 1869) wonders why his parents want to send him to court after his half-brother Maoloha had been executed there, his mother replies, *ua make no kou kaikuaana, no ka malama ole i na mea a pau a maua i ao aku ai iaia, e like me oe e ao ia aku nei* ‘your older brother died in fact because he did not keep all the things that we two [she and her husband] taught him, as you are being taught’. On the other hand, she says of ‘Īi, *ua makaukau oe i ka malama*
ia oe iho, ma ko hoolohe ana mai i ka maua mau kauoha ‘you are ready to take care of yourself because you heed our instructions’. The word hoʻolohe is repeated several times in the following passages. Later at court (July 31, 1869), ‘Ī‘i is able to extricate himself from a potentially dangerous verbal test because, in his mother’s words, ua hoolohe mai oe i ka maua ao ana ia oe ‘you have heeded our teachings’. Similarly he will now be successful at court if his conduct at court is me ka hoolohe a me ka malama ‘heedful and careful’. ‘Ī‘i had indeed heeded, hoʻolohe, the moral teachings of his parents because he respected the religious example they gave (July 17, 1869), and his successful answer during the test contained the words, O ka hoolohe no hoi paha ka pono . . . ‘Heeding indeed is probably the right thing to do’ (compare ‘Ī‘i December 4, 1869).

Chiefs themselves must listen to experts, advisors, and the council of chiefs.13 The legendary Milu dies because he will not heed, hoʻolohe, his medical expert (ʻĪ‘i March 5, 1870). When Kūapāka’a complains that the alii hookuli ‘unheeding chief’ is not doing what he requests, Pāka’a tells him (Nākuina 1902a:75):

_E hoomanawanui . . . he lohe ke ola, he kuli ka make, eia aku ua haku nei ou la a hoi mai, no ka mea, he make mai koe, ua hookuli ia oe._

‘Be patient . . . Life is listening; death, being deaf. This chief of yours will come back because death is all that’s left if he is deaf to you’.

Numerous historical examples caution the chief to listen to his advisors. The great chief ‘Umi overthrew his brother Hākau with the help of two advisors who had joined him after being mistreated by that ruler. ‘Umi consulted regularly with kana kahuna akamai, kaulana . . . kona kahuna mana ‘his knowledgeable experts, famous . . . his powerful experts’ (Fornander 1916–1917: 247). Chief Kealiʻiokaloa went from good to bad (Kamakau December 22, 1870):
He heeded the teachings of the priestly experts and the prophets. But when Keali‘iakaloa turned a deaf ear to the teachings of the priests and the Prophets and did not observe the teachings of his father ‘Umialīloa to care for the chiefs and to care for the old men and women, for the orphans and the poor people; but when he abandoned the teachings of the knowledgeable people, he turned himself over instead to the teachings of worthless people and abandoned the teachings of his father and the knowledgeable people of his government, and he abandoned the god and devised burdensome tasks to lay upon the people of the land’.

Kamakau summarizes: pono ole o ka Keali‘iokaloa mau hana, a me ka malama ole i na oleloao a ko laua makuakane a Umialīloa ‘Keali‘iokaloa’s many deeds were unjust as well as the failure to observe the teachings of their father ‘Umialīloa’.

The famous story of the unsuccessful invasion of Hawai‘i by Kamalālāwalu has been already discussed as a cautionary tale transmitted through ‘Ī‘ī. The best thing for a chief is to listen to the expert even if he seems improbable. For instance, Ua ae ke ali‘i i ka mana‘o o ke keiki ‘The chief approved the opinion of the child [Kūapāka‘a]’ (Kamakau January 5, 1871).

Experts must listen as well: O ka hoolohe ka mea nui i oleloia ma keia oihana ‘Listening is the great/important thing, it is said, in this occupation’ of genealogy (Kamakau June 2, 1866). In nineteenth-century Hawaiian, the word lohe was used for ‘to conduct
research’. Not listening is as dangerous for specialists as for chiefs. The opponents of Pāka’a become an example: *ina lakou i hoolohe i ka ke keiki ina la ua koe na pono o lakou, aka, paakiki lakou* ‘if they had listened to what the child said, then their goods would not have been lost, but they were stubborn’ (Nākuina 1902a:81). As he calls on the winds, Kūapāka’a tells the group he is confronting (“He Moolelo no Pakaa” November 14, 1867):

\[
papapau oukou e Keawenuiaumi ma i ka make, ma ke Alii, ma ke kahuna, ke kilo, ka puulena, ka hailawa, ka lawa-uli, ka lawa-ea, a lone [sic: lohe] mai oukou e na’lili hookuli o Hawai’i i ka’a [sic: ka’u] olelo, ola; o ke ola no ia a ike ka maka o ka wahine, ke keiki, na makua a me ka lehulehu no a pau.
\]

‘you are all finished in death, oh traveling party of Keawenuia‘umi, with the Chief, with the priest, the star expert, the old person, the expert talker, the expert steersman, the expert fisherman. If you listen to what I say, oh deaf-acting chiefs of Hawai‘i, you will live; live for your eyes to see your wife, your child, your parents, and all your people’ (the translation of some of the terms is speculative).

Similarly the use of *ho’olohe* in the literary forms of the *ho’opāpā* must be taken seriously; he who does not listen will lose the contest and be killed.

**IMITATION**

Mimetic ability is highly prized in Polynesia, is used from childhood into adulthood and in informal and formal education, and is significant for Hawaiian views. Imitation is also the source of much amusement and delight.

In informal education, especially for children, imitation is a way of practicing those roles and activities they have observed and heard about: *Nānā ka maka, hana ka lima* ‘The eye sees,
the hand works’ (Handy and Pukui 1972:183; text regularized). Descriptions of the use of imitation in childhood and learning are basically the same in Hawaiian reports from the early nineteenth century through the mid-twentieth century and agree with traditions of the earlier period.

Within the family, children could observe activities, play at them, and then imitate them; finally they could be assigned the actual task to accomplish, such as pounding poi.\textsuperscript{15} As in other cultures, the activities of grown-ups fascinated children: \textit{Ka ‘ike a ka makua he hei na ke keiki} ‘The knowledge of the parent is a snare for the child’ (Pukui 1983: number 1397). As a result, \textit{Ka hana a ka makua, ‘o ka hana no ia a keiki} ‘The work of the parent, this is the work of the children’.\textsuperscript{16} This was especially true in a culture that passed down specialties within the family.

Such imitation was a part of early childhood play in Polynesia, though inadequately noticed by foreigners (Harms 1969:180 ff.). The little ‘Ī‘ī (July 24, 1869) follows the girls who go to pick grass for thatching and lolls in the makaloa sedge, building a little house of midribs.

Young and sometimes even older boys and girls would play together, but in imitating or playing at work, they divided according to the gender separation of labor. Kānepu‘u (April 2, 1868) would only watch when the girls played at their own tasks, just as he would watch women at their real work. This division expanded increasingly into other activities as the children aged.

Boys would dig in the sweet potato fields already harvested by their elders and do some childish farming themselves, with poor results.\textsuperscript{17} Such childish work is mentioned in a proverb and provides the background for a joke in a story of the pig-god Kamapua‘a: when the little pig was taken to the taro farm, instead of playing ineffectually, it accomplished a gigantic amount of real work.\textsuperscript{18}

Taught by the older boys, Kānepu‘u and his friends played at making \textit{imu} ‘earth ovens’ (Kānepu‘u March 12, 26, 1868).
Sometimes they would make one without any food at all (the older children teased them for doing this), or they could find wild foods in the bush or use scraps they had stolen, begged, or even raised. Kānepu'u emphasized that they were not really hungry but just playing. The imitation did, however, prepare them for the real work when they were older.

The girls would imitate the process of making tapa, which they had been observing and were beginning to learn (Kānepu'u April 2, 1868); Kānepu'u's mother was ikaika . . . i ke kuku kapa 'strong/skilled in tapa beating' (February 27, 1868). Because of their play materials, the girls' tapa did not hold together, and Kānepu'u compares it to the results of his childish farming. The girls would also shred ti leaves into thin strips to make wigs that they would wear and practice dressing. Kānepu'u writes that in his youth, girls used to have many other activities peculiar to themselves, but at the time of writing, girls spend their time sewing. Needlework was in fact one of the first things the missionary women taught Hawaiian girls (“Sandwich Islands” 1825: 142).

Children imitated also activities observed in the community. Boys could learn spear fighting by watching the men train (ʻĪ‘ī August 7, 1869). Children could use role playing to reproduce the society and even the cosmos: Kānepu'u and his friends took up the roles of horse, boat, and chief, and then an older boy scared them by saying he would play Jehovah (Kānepu'u April 2, 1868).

Such childish play was not just practical or technical, but encompassed the characteristic cultural range of Hawaiian activity. The boys did not just make an imu, they also composed a prayer to say over it (Kānepu'u March 26, 1868). Serious matters such as rituals and prayers could thus be learned by imitation (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 50 f.). ʻĪ‘ī and his companions made imitations of the makahiki gods, set them up, and conducted four evenings of boxing matches in front of them; on the fifth, they held a rock fight like the sham battles of the ceremony (ʻĪ‘ī
December 4, 1869). Other fights could be more earnest, if still childish (Pukui 1983: numbers 675, 676).

Imitation was important in learning language and literature, as seen in the use of prayer and ritual above. ʻĪʻī (July 17, 1869) learned the chant technique of the Nānākuli children apparently by imitating it by himself. Imitation of bird calls and other natural sounds is discussed in Appendix V.

Children and even adults were interested especially in imitating new or foreign things. Hawaiian children seem first to have been awed and frightened by horses and then fascinated by them. ʻĪʻī (December 4, 1869) could not have a real horse of his own so he built himself a play one he could “ride” around on. He pranced before his parents and friends, and the latter soon hoʻohālike ‘imitated’ him. Kānepuʻu and his friends loved to play horse, either on all fours (April 2, 1868) or running around tirelessly with the “rider” holding the rope the “horse” held in his mouth, neighing and stamping. ʻĪʻī (February 19, 1870) tried smoking no kona nana ʻana just because he saw people doing it.

Imitation was most often humorous, a Polynesian characteristic. Tongan nobles would imitate commoners for fun (Rutherford 1977:81), and the inhabitants of one place have long traditions of belittling wittily the ways of others and exalting their own. Humor is thus used to mark differences, to characterize or understand them in a way that removes their threat, and to enhance one’s own sense of doing things the right way. When applied to foreigners, such humor inserted them into the familiar context of a traditional practice. With the arrival of Captain Cook, Hawaiians began to imitate foreigners’ speech and attempts at speaking Hawaiian. The practice was continued by children, from ʻĪʻī to Kānepuʻu and his friends, using a stick in their mouth as a pipe. Amusing examples and anecdotes can be found throughout nineteenth-century Hawaiian literature.
Imitation was a regular method used in formal education. The hula student imitated the motions made by plants in the wind or water, and depicted with gestures the objects mentioned in the chant: “the action always echoed to the sense” (Sahlins and Barrère 1973:34). As instructed by his parents, ‘Ī‘ī ho‘ohālike ‘imitated’ the walk of the courtiers (July 31, 1869). I have found no description of such a walk, but many postures were regulated according to rank, and those considered chiefly were not to be used by commoners or before someone of higher rank; such as kūāki‘i “To stand with hands on hips or crossed in front,”22 to tilt one’s head back rather than forward, and to sit cross-legged with wrists on knees.

Hawaiians continued to use imitation in Western education. Richard Armstrong writes of penmanship (1858:9), “Hawaiians being expert at imitation of any kind; are generally good writers: many of them even elegant . . .” When Kānepu‘u was finally caught and made to go to school, he watched the older children who had already been studying according to the Western way (March 19, 1868). Earlier, through memorization and imitation, he had managed to pick up a smattering of reading and writing, but no real understanding of them (February 27, 1868). Imitation by a younger child of the model activities of an older one is a recommended strategy in contemporary education (Jordan, D’Amato, and Joesting 1981:34).

The practice of imitating was connected to fundamental Hawaiian views. The imitation of bird calls and other sounds supported the view of the real connection between words and their referents. The meditative imitation of the hula dancer reinforces even today the experience of the connection between human beings and the environment. In a culture that considers the universe an extended family, imitation is a way of exploring and realizing the interrelatedness of all things.
Play, games, training, and sports were major activities throughout a Hawaiian’s life, had important social and educational functions, and influenced behavior and mood. Physical games were means of keeping fit (Johnson 1981:7), but they were also ‘oihana ‘ike ‘occupations of knowledge’, examples of an overarching Hawaiian ideal of intellectuality. Accordingly games of both adults and children were almost always connected with literature, most prominently, ritual expressions and chants.

For children, games, like imitation, could be a preparation for adult activities. Moreover, in characteristic Hawaiian fashion, later or more adult activities could be elaborated from earlier ones. The children’s chant to call up the winds for kite-flying could be developed into a sea-goer’s prayer, a sorcery prayer, and into the whole wind-calling chants of the Pāka’a tradition.

A number of games were devised specifically to develop, train, and test intellectual skills, such as “riddling and guessing games.” This is the background for a joke in the story of Pāka’a: when the Hawai‘i chiefs ask the child Kūapāka’a how he knows so many chants, he replies he mea paani wale no na ko onei kamalii na mele ‘the chants are just a plaything for the children of this place’ (Nākuina 1902a:53).

Such activities were obviously attractive and effective means of education, as has been found in other cultures, and have been recommended for use in modern schools (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:55, 69 f.). The missionaries, however, condemned Hawaiian games both for children and adults as a distraction and invitation to license, a policy that even created health problems at schools. The nineteenth-century revival of games was thus an expression of cultural resistance, and the revival of sports such as paddling is a part of the contemporary Hawaiian renaissance.
The Practice of Education

SITES OF LEARNING, HUTS

Hawaiians dedicated certain areas and built special structures for particular activities; for instance, *Ma ke ano o na hale o ke akua e maopopo ai ke ano o ka oihana e hoomana ai i ke akua* ‘In the type of the houses of the god was clear the type of the occupation to worship the god’ (Kamakau August 17, 1867). This practice added a certain formality to the procedure and facilitated concentration, secrecy, and the keeping of the associated kapus. For instance, special areas or houses were set aside for mat making and tapa beating and dyeing. Pukui connects the practice to the skill of the craftswoman. Kamakau states (February 3, 1870), *ua kapu na hale kuku kapa* ‘the tapa-beating houses were kapu’ because of the godly origin of the knowledge of the craft. Such houses could be used for instruction. Girls would observe and then be taught the activities at the tapa beating houses. Only helpers could enter the hall of the canoe maker (Handy and Pukui 1972:11).

Houses could also be built specifically for instruction, as elsewhere in Polynesia (Luomala 1955:47, 49). These houses were often named, a practice extended to Western schoolhouses (‘No ko’u Wa i Hanau mai ai, a Hiki mai nei i nei Manawa” December 17, 1834). The temporary house called *pu‘upu‘uone* was erected to teach that form of land knowledge. A ruler could build a special house for education (Sterling and Summers 1978:229). A young chief could be taken to be educated in an isolated place in the country called a *paliuli* ‘dark cliff’ (Beckwith 1972:63). Kamehameha constructed sites for the teaching of the martial arts and medicine. Traditions describe certain places as former centers of education (Sterling and Summers 1978:107, 122, 135). Such formality prevailed in the *ho‘opāpā* and the preparation for it.
Polynesians and other Pacific Islanders used non-verbal memory and demonstration aids, but information about them is scanty. Samoans could use stones to keep count of victories in battle (Moyle 1984:164, 221). Pohnpeians used tattooing as a device for recording history (Hanlon 1988:41, 81 []). In Hawai‘i, tattooing was used to memorialize the death of a chief (Charlot 1991b:125). Tahitians “preserved some events by instituting new ceremonies,” and Hawaiians developed a new ceremony to commemorate the death of Kamehameha I.32

Various physical devices were used in Polynesia to aid in the recall of chants: sticks or bundles of sticks, plaited pandanus leaves or coconut fronds, and possibly knots.33 Two physical devices are reported to have been used for genealogies: knotted ropes and notched bones, the former of which has been claimed for Hawai‘i.34 Kaeppler (1982:86 ff.) suggests on the basis of Māori notched devices that the joints on Hawaiian image staffs and the nobs on the backbones of statues represent the genealogy. Handy and Pukui (1972:196) deny that mnemonic devices were used for genealogies, but practices could have differed. “He Naaupo Atei ka Lahui Hawaii?” (January 31, 1898) claims:

*aole no hoi he mau Buke moolelo i kakau ia e ka poe kahiko, aka ua hoopaanaau no lakou a o ia paanaau, ua a-o aku lakou i ka lakou mau keiki a i na moopuna ua hiki no nae ke hoomaopopo pono ia, he lahui ike maoli no ka lahui Hawaii i ke kakau a me ka heluhelu i ka wa kahiko*

‘there were also no history Books written by the people of old, but they did memorize. And this memorization/memorized material they taught to their children and grandchildren. So it can be correctly clarified that the Hawaiian people was indeed a people that really knew writing and reading in the olden time’.
Their reading and writing

\[
oia \text{ no na hipuu La-i a i makemake kekahi e kamailio pu ma kahi kaawale, e hipupuu no ia i ka la-i, oia mau hipuupuu ana he mau olelo ana ia, a malaila e heluhelu ia ai ka manao
\]

‘they were indeed the Ti-leaf knots, and if someone wanted to converse in another place, he would in fact tie knots in a ti-leaf. These knots of his were his statements, and from them would be read his opinion’.

The Samoan scholar Dixie Crichton Samasoni speculated that the petroglyphs of circles formed by small pecked pits were records of official trips or different generations (personal communication). In Hawai‘i, petroglyphs could be used to record visits and reportedly success in fishing and planting (Ellis 1984: 459). Petroglyphs of birth or a series of births or people in a vertical line may be representations of generations (Cox and Stasack 1970: 8 f., 12, 17, 20, 30, 35, 42–49, 69, 72, 76). Memorial stones were used to commemorate births, deaths, and other events.\(^{35}\) Calabashes could be named as memorials, and the teeth inserted into spittoons would remind a chief of his conquered enemies.\(^{36}\) However Andrews and Richards denied that Hawaiians used any physical memory aids.\(^{37}\)

Polynesians continued to use physical mnemonic devices or memory aids in new situations. Georg Forster (1968: 304 f.) reported that a Tahitian traveling with them set aside one twig for each island they visited in order to remember them. Hawaiians could tattoo words and dates rather than precontact designs.

Hawaiians also used demonstration aids. Craft experts probably used the materials with which they were working on real tasks. The \textit{kuhikuhipu‘uone}, the priestly expert in selecting sites and devising plans for temples, would build models of historical and projected temples for his teaching and advising (Malo n.d.:
A gourd and net were used for teaching stars and navigation (Johnson and Mahelona 1975:72 f., 155 ff., 145, 147). Laura Fish Judd (1928:23) reports that the polymath ‘Auwae “placed two long rows of stones to show how they classified plants in sexes, and gave us the native names for each.” Pebbles were used in teaching anatomy for medicine and for a number of other purposes.38

A range can be found in the elaborateness and formality of the use of demonstration devices. Most children began to learn boating with miniatures and then with logs or small boats that they made themselves or were made for them by their parents.39 ‘Īi’s mother however gave him formal instruction in paddling, for which a small practice canoe was used (July 31, 1869). At the apex of the society, Kamehameha had a miniature Western boat built for his heir, Liholiho, and two teachers were assigned to teach him how to work the foreign sails (‘Īi December 11, 1869).

Foreigners found early that Hawaiians enjoyed drawings and prints, and the missionary educators soon used illustrations in their books and newspapers, which the students very much enjoyed.40 Lorrin Andrews (1834a:164; 1834b:171) found that visual aids were effective in nineteenth-century Western schools and recommended an expanded use of them. Dibble made visual aids a major means of teaching reading comprehension.41 After describing the problems of Hawaiian children in learning to read, C. B. Andrews (September 1, 1866) recommends that each child have his or her own paper and pen. Letters should not be taught individually, which is boring, but in short words. For each word, the children should draw a picture of the object referred to and then write the word under it. The individual letters should then be recited in chorus for the children to memorize them:

*He lealea lakou ia hana kakau kii, a e hoihoi auanei lakou. E loaa pu no ma ia hana ana ke kakau lima a o ke akamai i ke kakau kii, he lala nui ia o ka naauao loa ma na aupuni naauao.*
‘They will delight in this work of drawing and will soon enjoy themselves. In this work, they will acquire at the same time penmanship and skill in drawing pictures—this is an important branch of great wisdom in the enlightened nations’.

Visual methods of teaching are recommended for contemporary Hawaiian students (Speidel, Farran, and Jordan 1989: 62, 67 f.).

Kāneʻuʻu (March 12, 1868) resisted going to school but was intrigued by his sister’s illustrated school materials:

a ike iho la o Kanewailani he wahi palapala me ke kii maloko, alaila, hoonanea iho la oia ma ka nana ana, ina he pepa kii ole, aole no oia e nana ana, oiaí, aole oia i ike i ka heluhelu ana, e hiki ai ia ia ke nana malaila. Ua lealea loa o Kanewailani i ka nana ana i ka haole iloko o ka palapala, ka lio, ka bipi, ka waa, ka leho, ka ia, a me na kii e ae no i paiia maloko o ka palapala. A ma ia ano paha i hoihoi ai ka manao o ka kakou kamalei, me ka manao e loaa ia ia he wahi pepa kii . . .

‘when Kānewailani saw that it was a document with a picture inside of it, then he enjoyed himself looking at it. If it was a sheet of paper without a picture, he did not look at it because he did not know how to read so that he could look at it [with understanding]. Kānewailani was delighted to look at the foreigner inside the document, the horse, the cattle, the boat, the shell, the fish, and the other pictures indeed printed inside the document. In this way, this dear little boy of ours occupied his mind with delight, with the thought of obtaining for himself some small illustrated sheet of paper . . .’

Adults did not lose their appreciation for pictures. D. W. Epelaima (July 4, 1863) wrote to the newspaper from Molokaʻi:

he makemake loa au i na kii, aole no owau wale, o makou no a pau. I na i hooipiha okoa ia kekahi aoao ou me na kii, he nani maoli no ia.

‘I very much like pictures, not just me, but all of us. If one of your
sheets were filled completely with pictures, it would be really beautiful’.

MEMORIZATION

Memorization plays a fundamental role in classical Hawaiian education and life in general. Memory is in fact basically important for human thinking and living (Baron 1988: 69):

When possibilities, evidence, or goals are generated internally, they are based on information in our memories. In general, the more information that our memories contain, the more effective our thinking will be in helping us to achieve our goals.

A sketch of generally accepted views in modern studies of memory is necessary before discussing the subject in Hawaiian culture, keeping in mind that there are many individual differences in learning and remembering.

Modern psychologists distinguish between types of memory characterized by duration. Immediate memory lasts about a second. Short-term memory extends to fifteen or thirty seconds. If an effort is made to retain a short-term memory, it can be stored in long-term memory. A distinction can be made also between “primary memory, or working memory” and “secondary memory or long-term memory” (Baron 1988: 70). In Jonathan Baron’s view (1988: 71; also, 111):

behavior in thinking, including problem solving, judgment, and decision making, is largely determined by the contents of primary memory. Specifically, before it can be used, anything you know must first be recalled from secondary memory and placed in primary memory.

The process of transferring short-term memories to long-term memory is closely connected to the process of retrieving or
recalling them. That is, the means used to transfer them are often connected to those used to retrieve them. A basic method of storing something in long-term memory is rehearsing or repeating it, sometimes called “overlearning,” to be recalled by rote.

More often, various memory aids are used. The memory is “encoded” or connected to something. That “attribute” helps to distinguish it from other memories and can be used as a “memory cue” to retrieve it when needed. The effectiveness of such attributes depends on their number and how clearly distinguishable they are.

A basic device is simply to give a name to the item to be remembered, as is done notably for historical events. For instance, a certain voyage is given the name ka “Peleleu nui;” ‘the big Peleleu boat’ (‘Īi March 12, 1870). Visual images and emotions or feelings associated with the memory can also be used.

When more than one or a few items are to be remembered or the matter is complex, memory is aided by organizing the material: “organized material is easier to learn than unorganized material.” A basic method is to cluster items or place them in categories, using some common element found in them. Memory is in fact aided if the material is already presented in such clusters and if it is accompanied by “explicit verbal instruction and training” in memory and recall, including the use of memory aids (Cole and Scribner 1974:127, 131f., 139). Memory aids or mnemonic devices can in fact be highly developed in different cultures, resulting in veritable systems (compare e.g., Cole and Scribner 1974:125f.). Such systems aid memory retention and slow forgetting as well as facilitating retrieval.

Once memories and their attributes have been stored in long-term memory, they interrelate with the other materials encountered there. If memories and attributes are not clearly distinguishable from others already in storage, confusion can result, causing interference with retrieval. For this reason, an overall, well-organized, coherent system is necessary for efficiency. Since
such a system is used to organize a person’s memories as a collection, it can be connected to his view of the world. This possibility is supported by the fact that the organization used is more effective if it is meaningful (this is true also of the individual items of memory): “In the course of normal events, things are remembered because their natural contexts are organized in ways that matter to the individual and make sense in terms of his social experiences” (Cole and Scribner 1974: 139; also, 123 ff., 138). Thus, “It is an interesting fact about problems in some areas of knowledge that the best retrieval cues are often purposes” (Baron 1988: 100; also, 96 ff.). Knowledge of purpose however presumes knowledge of the life or cultural context of an item. Cultural familiarity is therefore an aid to understanding and thus to remembering. Conversely, lack of familiarity and ease—or anxiety, stress, and conflict—can inhibit retrieval, which is important for other aspects of thinking (Baron 1988: 119).

Non-literate peoples depend on memory even more than literate ones. The assumption cannot, however, be made that all non-literate peoples have highly developed memories or memory systems (Cole and Scribner 1974: 123 ff., 129 ff., 138). When memory training and systems are found, they are the achievements of a conscious intellectual and educational effort.

Such an effort and its results can be documented for classical Hawaiian culture. Beckwith argues for the accuracy of the memorization of chants from the fact that they can be collected in different places with few variations in the text. The need for memorization was clearly realized by Hawaiians, as is evident in their comparisons between oral and written transmission, discussed in chapter V. Kepelino writes:

‘The people of the mooolelo ‘history, report, story’, these were the people whose it was to keep correctly the histories of all the governments, and to memorize them till they were rightly fixed so that the history of this or that period, this or that chief, would not disappear’.
Memorization is often mentioned in Hawaiian writings. Kepelino reports that dream interpretation was similar throughout the islands and *paanaau maoli no ke ano me he Katekimo la i hele a hani i ka wa kamalii* ‘was really memorized like a Catechism so that people arrived at a thorough knowledge in the time of their childhood’.\(^4\)\(^5\) The author of “He moolelo Kaa no Kuhauapio/Kekuhaupio” describes the way he learned a chant in his childhood (May 12, 1921):

> no keia wahi no hoi o Wailua-iki i kahea ia ai ke mele kaulana a Hiiaka-i-ka-poli-o-Pele, a he mele kaulana no hoi i paa i ka poe kahiko o Hawaii nei, ai “ olioli” ia no hoi e ka poe elemakule o ka wa kahiko o ka aina ae na luahina [sic: luahine] kahiko hoi, ae olioli ia ai i na hora o ka wanaao, a ua lohe no ka mea kakau moolelo i ke olioli ia o keia mele i kona mau la kamalii, a penei ua mele kaulana nei a Hiiaka.

‘from this place indeed, Wailuaiki, was called out the famous chant of Hi‘iaikaikapoliopele, and it was also a famous chant that was memorized firmly by the people of old of our Hawai‘i. It was also chanted in *oli* style by the elderly men in the old days of that land and also by the very old women; it was chanted in the hours of dawn. And the person writing this story listened to the chanting of this song in his childhood days, and thus runs this famous chant of Hi‘iaka’. [chant follows].

Kupahu writes that songs for hula were memorized (December 16, 1865) and feels the need to state that he failed to memorize the names of certain gods (May 11, 1865). ‘Ī‘i often mentions memorizing in different contexts. Like Kupahu, he can regret that he did not memorize certain chants when he had the opportunity to do so.\(^4\)\(^6\) The anonymous author of the newspaper serial “He Moolelo nona Wahi Pana o Ewa” ‘The Story of the Storied Places of ‘Ewa’ arrives at the famous hill of Pu‘uokapolei and writes that it was the subject of a well-known classical chant, which he will now present:
imua o ka poe aole i loaa a paa naau i neia mele. E like me na mele kahiko i loaa ole i kekahi poe, a loaa hoi kahi i kekahi poe

‘before the people who have not obtained and memorized this chant. Just like the old chants-some were not obtained by some people, and some were indeed by others’.\(^{47}\)

More detailed descriptions can be given of memorizing. When certain chiefs learned of the sickness of Kala‘imamahu, the estranged half brother of Kamehameha, they sent a delegation to visit him in the country. When the sick chief saw his nephew arriving among them, his emotion welled up within him, and he performed a spontaneous chant. The chant reminded the friends of an important past event that had affected all their lives:

\[
nolaila, ua paanaau ka ia la heluhelu ana ma ua piina pali la o Kaipuolono i Nuuanu i ka poe e lohe ana i kana kepakepa ana, a ua lilo iho la ia i mea na lakou e hoomanao mau ai.\]

‘therefore, his recounting during the climb up the slope of Kaipuolono in Nu‘uanu was memorized by the people who were listening to his chanting, and it became something for them to think about constantly’.\(^{48}\)

Memorization can play a major role in Hawaiian historical narratives and stories. Engaged in a contest of wits with his fellow chief Kakuhihewa of O‘ahu, the Hawai‘i chief Lonoikamakahiki spends a whole night memorizing a chant taught to him by a Kaua‘i chiefess. Later his opponents memorize the chant by the group method: individual lines are apportioned to different people for memorization, and they are all rejoined later to reconstruct the whole chant (Fornander 1916–1917:277).

In discussing the education of Kūapāka‘a, Kamakau writes,\(\text{ua paanaau loa ia ia na makani o ka aina a me na makani o ka moana ‘the winds of the land and the winds of the ocean were}\)
thoroughly memorized by him’. Memorization was basic to the ho'opāpā ‘contest of wits’. The Kaua‘i chief in the story of Kalapana is thoroughly instructed: a pau hoi na ike, na hana, ame na mele hoopapa apau i ka paanaau ia Kalaniali’iloa ‘the pieces of knowledge, the actions, and all the ho‘opāpā chants were exhaustively memorized by Kalaniali‘iloa’ (Nākuina 1902b: 6; also 16). Kalapana himself is similarly trained: A lohe ke keiki i keia mau hana hoopapa hou, hoopanaau loa iho la oia a paa . . . ‘When the child heard of these new ho‘opāpā actions, he memorized them very well until they were fixed . . . ’ (17); he learns his material until he is walewaha ‘able to perform it without thinking’ (e.g., 4, 8, 13).

Talent at memorizing was much praised and participated in the prestige of education. Lapakahoe praises Kūapāka‘a (Nākuina 1902a: 58):

Akamai maoli oe e na wahi keiki, lea kau hana, a he keu aku ka paanaau o na mele ame na makani o Hawaii ame Oahu ia oe.

‘You are genuinely smart, little boy. Your deeds are entertaining, and the memorizing by you of the songs and winds of Hawai‘i and O‘ahu is outstanding’.

‘Ī‘ī’s obituary praises him for his memory:

Ua piha kona waihona hoomanao i ka paanaau i na mele olio o na wa kahiko a me na mele a na‘līi i haku ai, a ua lawe pu aku la oia me ia mau buke mele. Ke hoomanao nei makou i ka make ana o Kamehameha IV., ua olio mele ia e ia kekahi po holookoa mai ke ahiahi a wehewehe kai ao.

‘His treasury of memory was full with the memorizing of the chants of the olden times and the chants composed by the chiefs, and he took away with him these song books as it were. We remember the death of Kamehameha IV: the entire night was chanted away by him from the evening till the first light of dawn’. 
The full extent of the use of memorization in Hawaiian life has yet to be described. Grandparents chose children with good memories for instruction (Pukui n.d.: 1602 [1]). Prayers were memorized for the different professions.\textsuperscript{51} Reports could be memorized for communication elsewhere.\textsuperscript{52} Delegations could memorize a community *mana‘o* ‘opinion’ and deliver it.\textsuperscript{53} The person in charge of keeping order during a series of public matches would memorize the names of the competitors (“Kaao Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki” June 14, 1911). Preliteracy historical traditions depended on memory for preservation, and what was not memorized was lost.\textsuperscript{54} The motif of there being no single survivor of an event means in an oral culture that all memory of it will be lost. The urgency of preserving historical materials informs many of the nineteenth-century Hawaiian writers. The importance of memorization continues today. Larry Kimura writes (1983: 221): “It is still bad form in Hawaiian culture to hold a script before you when chanting.”

The use and prestige of memorizing was remarked by foreign residents. John Rae wrote around 1855 (1900: 243; also 244 f.):

It is also to be remembered that before the introduction of writing, the brains of living men were the only records that nations had . . . A diligently cultivated and retentive memory, therefore, gave a man position and abundance; the memory was diligently cultivated, and became capable of performing feats which to us who lean on writing and books seem very surprising.

Lorrin Andrews reports:

we have seen that a Hawaiian *kaao* or legend was composed ages ago, recited and kept in memory merely by repetition, until a short time since it was reduced to writing by a Hawaiian and printed, making a duodecimo volume of 220 pages . . . and that too with the poetical parts mostly left out. It is said that this legend took six hours in the recital. Hawaiians have many other *kaaos* of a similar class, some longer and some shorter. Hawaiians
composed *meles* or songs which, in the same way, have been kept in memory for ages and handed down to the present time.\(^{55}\)

Such extensive use of memory demanded training even when one had a recognized talent for the task. Different cultures can develop differing methods of remembering. For instance, no reports exist to my knowledge of Hawaiians repeating materials out loud (memory retrieval games will be discussed below). On the contrary, to do so was discouraged (Pukui n.d.:1605 [4]):

She had a habit of memorizing aloud and was often heard to recite portions outside of the school which were picked up by some of her hearers. When the teacher (kumu) heard of it, he watched to see if it was so. He saw her busily memorizing her lesson of the day audibly and so she was never permitted to finish her course.

Ellis (1984:376) provides an early description of Hawaiian memorizing, in which the selection of a special person and his standing are made clear:

The chief then sent for a youth, about sixteen years of age, of whom he seemed very fond, and, after he and his wife had requested him to attend very particularly to what he should hear, they requested us to repeat to him what we had told them. We did so; the youth evidently tried to treasure up the words in his memory; and, when he could repeat correctly what had been told him, the parents appeared highly pleased.

The account is not clear in detail, but Ellis does not seem to have repeated the material many times, and the boy’s repetition seems to have the purpose of checking whether he has grasped the matter correctly. This conforms to the ideal described earlier of correctness or perfection.

Hawaiian accounts emphasize the quickness of learning and especially of memorization:
he keiki noeau no o Ku, a he oi loa aku nae paha o Kuapakaa, i ka hikiwawe i ka hoopanaanau ana i na mele.

‘Kū was an intelligent child, and Kūapāka‘a was perhaps far superior indeed in the quickness of memorizing chants’ (‘He Moolelo no Pakaa” November 7, 1867).

Ao iho la laua, a aole i loihi ke ao ana, ua pau loa ae la ia mau mea i ka loaa i ua keiki nei, a ua lilo ia i mea walewaha iaia. A pau ia, ao pu aku la o Pakaa i ke keiki i ka inoa o na makani a pau o kela a me keia mokupuni, a e like no me kela mau hana mua, aole i emo, ua pau loa i ka paa i ke keiki.

‘The two went through the learning process, and the learning did not take long. These things were exhaustively acquired by this child and became things he could recite without thinking. When this was done, Pāka‘a taught to the child also the names of all the winds of this and that island, and just like that first work, in hardly any time, they were exhaustively fixed in the child’.

This quickness of grasping verbal instruction and materials is in fact a Polynesian ideal. Luomala describes a student who was legendary because “After hearing the priests’ chants but once, he knew them letter-perfect.”56 I have been told by several older Hawaiians that in their childhood verbal instruction was not repeated; the student or youngster was expected to grasp it the first time it was said, with perhaps one more repetition: ‘apo, ‘a‘apo (“To learn quickly, to catch the meaning quickly”). Into the 1970s, I heard Hawaiian composers worry about certain members of an audience memorizing their uncopyrighted songs on a single hearing (with the decline of memorizing, tape recordings and losing music sheets have become the problem). This quickness was an ideal also in the manipulation of memorized material, as will be seen below. This ideal should however be balanced against the ideal of perfection, discussed in chapter III. Moreover, Hawaiians were also taught to ruminate slowly over important decisions, bringing to bear as many parallels as possible.
The ideal of quickness was transferred to Western learning. Kāneʻpūʻu (December 31, 1856) writes that Hawaiian teachers and parents appreciated speed in learning. Kamakau praises the quickness with which Hawaiians picked up Western education: *He poe hikiwawe i ke ao ana . . . O keia hikiwawe . . . no ka naaauao no mai na kupuna mai* ‘A people quick in learning . . . This quickness . . . was indeed from the wisdom that came from the ancestors’ (January 4, 1868). The missionary teachers however urged the Hawaiians to proceed more slowly with the new material. Andrews writes in his English language textbook: *Aole pono ke hana wikiwiki ma keia hana, e akahele no, a e hoi hope pinepine no i akaka . . . ‘Working quickly with this work is not right; proceed carefully indeed, and go back frequently over the material so that it will be clear’* (Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 147 [1837]:2). Hawaiians also used their training in memorization in Western schools, which created problems that will be discussed below.

In sum, Hawaiians were trained to listen attentively to what was said, *ho‘olohe*, to grasp and hold it fast in the short-term or primary memory, *ʻapo/aʻapo*, and then to rehearse it silently in order to transfer it to long-term memory. For instance, members of an audience could not rehearse out loud the uncopyrighted song they wanted to steal. The full significance and importance of attentive listening is now clear. Memorizing was not however simply hearing. One had to go through the next steps in order to commit what had been heard to memory; that is, one could forget a chant one had heard if one did not make a special effort.

Memorization is also an important factor in any description of classical Hawaiian thinking. Memorizing clearly trained the mind in the ways described above, and the constant practice of memorizing and recalling would have hindered intellectual deterioration in old age, perhaps a factor in the use of older people as leaders and advisors; older people were certainly lively participants in community activities. Moreover, primary or working
memory is used to solve problems, make judgements and decisions, and confront new cases (Baron 1988:70 f.). Through memorization, educated Hawaiians had an unusually large amount of information in their working memory. Their long ruminations when faced with important problems or decisions demonstrate that they used it, and their ideal of completeness supported this practice. Indeed, literate cultures have continued to use memorization to train the mind and to provide it with a store of important information. Boswell describes Johnson (1987:1400 f.):

he had accumulated a vast and various collection of learning and knowledge, which was so arranged in his mind as to be ever in readiness to be brought forth. But his superiority over other learned men consisted chiefly in what may be called the art of thinking, the art of using his mind; a certain continual power of seizing the useful substance of all that he knew, and exhibiting it in a clear and forcible manner; so that knowledge, which we often see to be no better than lumber in men of dull understanding, was, in him, true, evident, and actual wisdom.

Memorization influenced the practice and composition of literature as well. A story was recited as a whole, so that many Hawaiians and Polynesians find it difficult not to start at the beginning. The memorizing of previous examples of a genre would promote the canonization of the pertinent vocabulary, discussed below. The amount of memorized material possessed by the audience encouraged the use of references and allusions that contributes to the richness of the literature. More points will emerge in the course of this book.

VERBAL MEMORY AIDS

Hawaiians developed a number of verbal memory aids along with other aids and exercises for recall or retrieval. These aids
influenced literary style and forms as well as behavior. A well-known example is linked assonance, the identity of the last vowel of the previous line with the first vowel of the next: “Linked assonance may have served originally as a mnemonic device to prompt the memory on chants which were hundreds of lines long, but poets took pride in using it as a mark of superior craftsmanship” (E. C. Smith 1955a:19). Similarly, repetition is an obvious aid to memory that becomes an element of style.

Both memory and retrieval would have been aided by the canonization of vocabulary. Just as with symbols (Charlot 1983a: 44), special lexicons were developed for genres, such as chants of love and mourning, and for subjects, such as Pele and Kamapua’a. The proper use of this canonical vocabulary was a mark of classical cultivation, and as a result, certain words could be expected on a given occasion.

Similarly, memory needs encouraged the regularity of literary forms: a defined structure helped a person to place the information to be memorized and to notice whether something had been omitted in performance. Literary structures are particularly defined in such technical fields as medicine and dream-lore. For instance, ‘Īi provides two examples of a literary form that was used to help memorize the characteristics, history, and treatment (ritual and physical), of a disease by placing that information within a fixed fill-in-the-blanks structure: o ne ia [sic: neia] mau mea a pau i hanaia a i hakuia hoa paanaau ‘all these things were worked and also composed until memorized’.

Moreover, a close parallelism can be found between a method of composition and a method of memorization: a chant could be composed by a group, each individual contributing a line; a chant could also be memorized by each member of a group committing a line to memory and later reassembling the lines to reconstruct the whole chant. This method seems to have been developed from or at least adapted to techniques of memorization. In any case, the proximity of compositional method and memory
technique would have supported the influence of memory needs on the form of chants. Such a development from memory and other technical aids to appreciated elements of style is known for other literatures, such as Latin: “What may have begun as a licence to help out metre ended as an ornament of style.”

Memory aids can become literary genres in their own right, such as the redactional outline of an extended complex, which was composed and memorized as an aid both to organizing the whole material for memorization and to ensuring completeness of recall (Charlot 1987:65–68). Various types of lists and chants are used as memory aids, as described below.

All such aids would have been valuable in an oral society. There is indeed evidence that the first utility Hawaiians saw in writing was its possibilities as a mnemonic device. In this they resembled Samoans (Moyle 1984:237):

They have sense enough to reason on the value of the art of writing. A shrewd Chief one day expressed his opinion on that art by saying it was very valuable to a captain to know how to write, for he bought yams & pigs in such a number that if they were not written down it would be impossible to remember how many he had obtained, but by writing them down none would be forgotten & when he got to his own land the greater Chief would pay for them . . . However he said he thought that the Samoans were even more clever in this respect than the English for they retained such things in their heads without the use of writing.

The author of “No ka Olelo Hawaii,” probably a missionary, explains in catechism style the advantages of writing (September 12, 1834):

21. I ko oukou ike ana ea, heaha ka maikai nui o ka palapala? O ka hiki ana o ka manao ke hoounaia aku i kahi loihī, a me ka ike pono ia o ka manao o ka poe kahiko mai kinohi mai, a i keia wa, a ia wa aku. Ua oi loa ka poe ike i ka palapala mamua o
The possibility of the thought to be sent to a far place and the correct knowledge of the thought of the people of old, from the beginning, up to this time, and into the future. The people who know the palapala are superior to those who do not, because the thought is fixed in being written, so that one can indeed look at it again and understand it again, and disseminate it widely, and care greatly for it, so that the good thought does not disappear.

‘22. True. Therefore let us think a great deal about this work. Let us seek the meaning/character of the language of our Hawai‘i, so that our thought will be completely correct in speaking and also without awkwardness in being written’.

Ka‘ahumanu “requested Mr. Ellis to write her a form of prayer for grace at meals” lest she “make crooked work of it.” In Hawaiian religion, using the exact words of a prayer, always spoken aloud, is essential to its efficacy; the queen does not want to use words that are “crooked” in the Hawaiian sense of “incorrect.” Moreover, writing would clearly be used as a memory aid for the recitation aloud of the prayer, that is, as a form of prompt for the living voice. This practice is described by Byron (1826:74):

Boki, who had kept a journal during his residence in England, made very full notes of what passed at this audience. Since his return to his native land, he writes, that he has read these notes so often to the different chiefs that he has become very hoarse. We regret much that a copy of this journal was not procured while Boki was on board of the Blonde.
This point is important for defining the early Hawaiian view of reading. In discussing the problems he is encountering in reading comprehension, Andrews complains (1834a:166):

I have spent hours at a time in the High School trying to make the scholars believe that a word written on paper or printed in a book, meant just the same thing as when spoken with the mouth.

For Hawaiians, the written word needed to be actualized by the living voice, just as a musical score needs to be actualized by performance. The written word could not be the equivalent of the spoken because it lacked performance: tone, gesture, emphasis, and so on. The text needed to be read aloud just as the memorized prayer needed to be spoken. This view is connected to the Hawaiians’ greater facility in learning Western subjects through oral means and to their delight in the performance of reading as decoding, discussed below. Accordingly writing and memorizing were used in various combinations through the nineteenth century, and manuscripts and publications became important in all fields. The idea of writing as a superior memory aid—seen in my discussion of the perceived advantages of writing over the oral tradition (chapter V)—explains also its great attraction for Hawaiians: it was a foreign introduction that they could easily understand within the context of their own educational and intellectual system. As a result, before the palapala and the pule became inseparably linked, some Hawaiians wanted to accept the former without the latter.

THE VERBAL ORGANIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE

As shown above, the organization of knowledge is important for memory and retrieval. The organization used in Hawaiian culture and education started with words, which were then collected into lists, each with a distinctive attribute, principle, or criterion
by which the subsumed items were selected. These lists could then be placed in one of several, but similar overall structures. Finally there could be subjects, fields, and bodies of knowledge. Similarly in Sāmoa, words are used to articulate social order, and lists of names and epithets are formulated to express the order of a district (Bargatzky 1987:217). Individual passages in discourse can also be organized by such words as *eia* ‘here is’, *inā* ‘if’ (e.g., the lists in Kaaie April 24, 1862), and *no* ‘for’. This organization of knowledge influenced literature and was in a mutually influential relation with education.

Vocabulary and Names

Modern psychologists have found that words are important in fixing, transmitting, and acquiring knowledge (Cole and Scribner 1974:45–50, 137). A name or word for a thing guides our perception of it by focusing our attention on it. The same word makes the referent easier to communicate or teach and, once grasped, to remember. Moreover, since language is connected to culture, the entire process from perception to vocabulary to the transmission of knowledge through language and the formulation of world views—indeed, the very way we think—is culturally conditioned. One learns a culture by learning a language (Ritchie and Ritchie 1989:118). Cultural conditioning is, however, different from determining. That is, the world is too big, experience is too varied, and life is too surprising to be fully covered by any culture or tradition, however developed and extensive. Indeed, culture is itself a historical and continual interaction between tradition and experience, between our learning of the old and our experience of the new. From that interaction arise innovations and new creations, which can in turn become part of the tradition.

For instance, the Hawaiians’ close observation of a place was fixed in the extensive naming of phenomena found in it: areas,
rocks, winds, rains, mists, special plants, and so on. These names were then used in literary genres—such as place sayings, stories, and place chants and songs—which circulated widely. When therefore a Hawaiian visited a place, he possessed a memorized guide to his perceptions: just as a Western tourist visits the cathedral listed in his guide book, so the Hawaiian would want to see the famous seaweed of Manu‘akepa at Hanalei, Kaua‘i, and feel the Kipu‘upu‘u wind at Waimea, Hawai‘i. Hawaiian perception was therefore guided by training, but it was not limited by it. In his own song of appreciation for a place, he could add his original perceptions and personal feelings, and the resulting creation was added to the ever growing tradition, which is in fact the record of a long history of similar creations (Charlot 1983a: 55–78). The accumulation of such traditions constitutes the transmitted portion of Hawaiian culture.

The subject of vocabulary and names in Hawaiian culture is basic and large. I will concentrate on those points important for education. Hawaiians articulated their close observation of their varied environment, their social relationships, their activities, and traditions in a vast vocabulary that was practical, esthetic, and religious. All oral cultures need to rely on words, and consequently most attribute a high value to language and much prestige to its proper use. But the extension and specialization of Hawaiian vocabulary as well as its general use was extraordinary even in that context. This phenomenon was connected, I would argue, to the intensive specialization in Hawaiian society and the consequent need for thorough training. Each profession developed its own technical terms, which were practical in articulating and transmitting their teachings and were also considered a power and a treasure of the profession. The prestige of learning and employing a large vocabulary also supported its further development beyond utilitarian requirements. Once started, the process of extending vocabulary was limited only by the capacity of memory. The very size of the vocabulary made the need for
organization imperative. Moreover, the practice of giving proper names to particular objects added a new level of particularity.

The extensive Hawaiian vocabulary could obviously be used as a guide to the environment, material culture, and society. Historical events also were named and could be mentioned by name. For instance, Kalaniʻōpuʻu’s execution of an unsuccessful water-finding priest received a name that referred in summary fashion to the event (“He Moolelo Kaa no Kekuhaupio” August 4, 1921). In connection with the use of models, personal names could become proverbial for qualities, such as that of the evil chief Hua. Kamakau writes (August 24, 1867), *O ka poe aua a pi hoi, ua hoohilahila loa ia ko lakou mau inoa* ‘The people who withheld requested things and were stingy too, their names were much beshamed’.

Hawaiian words and names were very much part of a cultural complex. Names were almost always—and words were often—transparently meaningful rather than opaque, and their meanings gave them a place in the cultural whole. This is clear with such plant names as *kūkaepuaʻa* ‘pig excrement’, which connects its referent to observations of pigs and to the pig god Kamapuaʻa, and *paʻū-o-Hiʻiaka*, which connects that plant to the sister of Pele. Words were also interconnected by extensive and significant wordplay (Elbert 1951:351 f.; 1963:66 f.), which was considered to reveal genuine connections among their referents. Modern psychologists have found that words with similar sounds and meanings tend to be recalled together, so Hawaiian wordplay had an important function in the memory process. Abraham Piʻianaiʻa, the first director of the Hawaiian Studies Program at the University of Hawai‘i, stated correctly of his culture, “It’s all in the language.” In this perspective, the struggle of Hawaiians to perpetuate their language can be recognized as one to preserve their cultural identity, as seen for instance in their efforts to preserve and explain the traditional vocabulary. For instance, Kepelino (January 1860: 30) explains the word *Tahoa* as “preface”, pointing
out that this is the first time the word is being used in a newspaper. The word is old:

he huaolelo tamaaina teia mai na tupuna mai: he huaolelo maitai, he huaolelo mole i tanuia ma ta vaha o Havaii-Nui te te [sic] tupuna o to Havaii nei pae aina; a he huaolelo hoi i tatauia maluna o to tatou vaha, mai a tatou a hiti i ta tatou mau hapa haole.

‘this is a kamaʻāina word from the ancestors; a good word, a root word planted in the mouth of Hawaiʻi-Nui, the ancestor of this chain of lands of Hawaiʻi; and a word also that was tattooed/ written/marked on our mouths, up to us today and unto the part-Hawaiians engendered by us’.

Kepelino is therefore embarrassed to explain it:

ata, no na teiti malihini mai o na aina e mai i matemate e ite i te ano o ta olelo Havaii nei, nolaila, ua pono au te vehevehe iti i te ano o ia huaolelo.

‘but for the newcomer children from foreign lands who want to know the character of the language of our Hawaiʻi, for this reason it is right that I provide a little explanation of the meaning of this word’.

In fact, Kepelino is the only one I know to use the word in this sense.

The real connection of names and words to their referents is basic to understanding the Hawaiian view of language and many aspects of its use (compare Hallpike 1979:409 f., 413). Because a person’s name says something real about him, whether of his past or his future or both, its use is protected by rules. For instance, the naming of a child is a formal event, done by the appropriate person following a traditional procedure, and calling on the help of the ancestors or gods. For Hawaiians, onomatopoeia supported their view of language and became a major interest and literary device. 71
Because of this connection of word to referent, to study vocabulary and to establish the interconnections among words is a means of studying reality itself. Andrews (1834a:166) reports that a Hawaiian wanted to know the name of a person used in a sermon illustration. He also recounts (1834a:167f.) “a pleasing specimen of memory, reflection, etc.” Some time earlier, Hoapili and several chiefs had “inquired the name of the wood, of which the sheeves in the pully blocks of ships were made.” They were told it was *lignum vitae*, which was translated “*laau o ke ola*, i.e. *wood or tree of life*.” Three or four years later, the first translation of the beginning of Genesis was made and given to the chiefs. Several days later, Hoapili and other chiefs insisted on seeing Andrews even though he was very ill; “it was evident that they had business which in their estimation was of importance.” They had in fact made a verbal connection on reading Genesis II 9: they “inquired if the *laau o ke ola* (tree of life) there mentioned, was the same as that of which the little wheels in the pullies of ships were made?” Andrews was surprised that Hawaiians would even remember the name learned so many years before, but its meaning would have marked it as important for them: *ola* ‘life, health’ expresses a major ideal of Hawaiian culture, and *lā′au* can refer to herbal medicine. Finding the expression in the Bible would have added to its importance, and the possibility that the wood mentioned there was obtainable would need to be explored.

Most important, knowing the word for or the name of a thing gives one some degree of power over it.72 Words, such as those in prayers and curses, are powerful independently of the person who says them; once uttered they move to their target (e.g., Pukui 1943:210). Thus, language should be used properly and correctly, potentially destructive words should be avoided, and mistakes should be especially avoided on formal occasions, for instance, while chanting.73 Wordplay can also be used for power; in one ceremony, the name of the person had to be that of the day (Kamakau of Ka‘awaloa in Fornander 1919–1920:43). The
full extent and variety of Hawaiian practices related to language has not yet been defined; for instance, one text mentions he keiki leo kapu ‘a child with a tabu voice’ around whom one should not olelo ino ‘speak badly’ (Fornander 1916–1917:99).

Words were clearly important in Hawaiian education. Language is indeed essential in any pedagogy that goes beyond the imparting of technology to, for example, social relationships. Hawaiians in fact imbued even simple technology with social values and ideology, which were communicated in words and names: “knowledge was held in high esteem, and experts trained pupils in all their knowledge, which included names” (Titcomb 1972:49). Therefore, as will be seen in many examples, words and names were at the basis of Hawaiian education and among the first things a student learned.

When Kamapua’a’s grandmother teaches his older brother to care for him, the first thing she has him memorize, pa’a, is that pig god’s name or names (Kahiolo 1978:13). She uses some of Kamapua’a’s names to call him to come and eat, and the same names can be used to call upon him for mercy: he will spare those who know his name chants (e.g., Kahiolo 1978:147 ff., 177 ff.). One needs to know the god’s name in order to handle him.

The Hawaiian student acquired the practice of learning the words associated with a new subject. For instance, Kānepu’u/Kānewailani and his friends learn the terms for sweet potatoes while playing at making earth ovens (March 26, 1868). ‘Īi has a relative working at one of the new rum distilleries and uses the connection to observe, kilohi, the work. He carefully records the technical terms he learns: Pela ia i kapaia ai he lolo, (kulu mua) kawai, (kulu hope) kawai hemo, (kulu ekolu) ‘Thus, this thing was named: lolo (first brew), kāwai (next brew), kāwai hemo (third brew)’. Three brews were also distinguished in ‘awa making, the second of which was also called hope (Titcomb 1948:116).

The same emphasis on recording the proper words, terms, and names—in fact, the organization of knowledge by means of
word lists—is basic to the work of Malo, Kamakau, Kepelino, and other writers and informants,\textsuperscript{76} and differentiates them from the Western writers of the same period. This tradition continued in the encyclopaedic style in later fiction, which used narrative as a means of preserving information.

Lorrin Andrews, who was intensely interested in language and literature, made a number of suggestive remarks on Hawaiian vocabulary from the point of view of a (sometimes exasperated) teacher of Western culture to a non-Western people. He was indeed a pioneer in the study of “the influence of the structure of language on the intellectual development of races,” as W. D. Alexander describes the work of Wilhelm von Humboldt in Andrews’ dictionary.\textsuperscript{77} Andrews’ main complaint was that Western concepts and ways of thinking were difficult to express in Hawaiian words:

\begin{quote}
the difficulty of communicating instruction to a people that only just begin to think, and through the medium of a language deficient in terms for conveying ideas & very imperfectly understood by us. (Andrews October 1, 1834: 53 f.)

[Arithmetic has been little taught unless some missionary has emphasized it.] And even then it has been confined to the first rules, for want of terms in the language to convey the ideas. Probably no native, by himself, has been able to get the least information from the tract on arithmetic, except perhaps the names and numerical value of the figures. The same is true with regard to a portion of the Ho-pe no ka Pia-pa, or supplement to the spelling book. (Andrews 1834a: 157)
\end{quote}

Similarly Clark writes (1838: 341): “no books, or even scientific terms were ready at hand, as a means of conveying knowledge to the minds of the pupils”; and Dibble, “Everything was to be formed anew—the very terms were to be manufactured.”\textsuperscript{78}

Andrews sees deficiencies in the Hawaiian language that demonstrate that they do not think (again, in the Western way).
Primary among these is “the great want of abstract & general terms” (Andrews December 2, 1835:3; also 1835:141). There is no “general term” for “to break” but different ones depending on the type of breaking done; “Everything is specific & of particular application.” In translating the Ten Commandments,

it was found they had about twenty ways of committing adultery, & of course as many specific names; and to select any one of them would be to forbid the crime in that one form & tacitly permit it in all the other cases. It was necessary therefore to express the idea in another way, by “Thou shalt not sleep mischievously.” They have no word answering to our word color.

Characteristically, Andrews places this observation within the context of Hawaiian culture:

The whole language shows that they never have been a thinking people. Their habits & manners show that everything is considered individually. The property of a husband & wife are perfectly distinct. *Hoapili* & his wife have two perfectly distinct establishments, they rarely eat together. No man ever uses his wife’s book & vice versa & so of a slate & other property, each must have one of his own.

Explanations made to one student are not understood by others to apply to them:

Ask him if he had not heard what I just said; “Yes, but you did not tell me, what you said belonged to him.” And frequently at the close of a school, I have made some appointment or mentioned something that applied to them all, & state it in the most explicit terms, & sometimes half the school would follow me home, to have me say it to them personally. (December 2, 1835:4)

The Hawaiian vocabulary is vast and contains a large number of finely distinguished words, the knowledge of which is a mark of learning and the proper, even virtuoso use of which is a criterion
of good style. Listing a large number of related words is a rhetorical device. For instance, Kānepuʻu (December 31, 1856) writes *eia na olelo ino* ‘here are the evil sayings’ and lists thirty-four words and expressions. Kamakau relies heavily on accumulations of words to lend weight to his pronouncements, for instance, seven different terms for “to steal.” That is, where Westerners would use a generic term, Hawaiians would use a vocabulary cluster or list, which serves to extend the speech being made and display the knowledge of the speaker. This can be illustrated by conventional descriptions, for instance of beauty: *Aohe puʻu, aohe keʻe, pali ke kua, mahina ke alo* ‘No bumps, no crooks, back like a cliff, face like the moon’ (e.g., Fornander 1916–1917:501). A similarly effusive description is conventional for old age. These vocabulary groups can be organized into formal lists with introduction and conclusion, a form—to be described below—that functions similarly to a generic term. Malo can even use a more general term along with his list.

The above points do not however entail that Hawaiians did not use general terms. Contrary to widespread belief, Hawaiians and other traditional peoples did not and do not suffer from a disability for abstract thought or from particular difficulties in using abstract terms. Abstractions can be formed in Hawaiian simply by placing the article in front of a word and are used commonly: *ka nani* ‘beauty’, *ka nui* ‘bigness, size’, *ka laʻi* ‘calm’, and so on. Categories or classes can be formed through abstraction, such as *ka ʻai* ‘plant foods’ and *ka iʻa* ‘flesh foods’. ʻĪʻī (May 29, 1869) provides the elegant phrase *inoa hui* ‘joining name’ for generic term, but I do not know whether it was widely used. Similarly the lack of a particular word cannot be used as evidence that the referent is unknown or impossible of expression in other words (vs. Andrews 1834a:165).

Andrews’ problem was that he often could not find Hawaiian equivalents for English-language general terms. The missionary solution was to invent equivalents, adapt existing words, or use loan
words. Finding “no general term” for color (Andrews December 2, 1835:3), the word for “dye,” waihoʻoluʻu, was at some time given that function. A curious word is kanikapila ‘the fiddle sounds’ for ‘music’. The process is described in “No ka Olelo Hawaii” (September 12, 1834):

19. Heaha ke ano o ka palapala ia oukou mamua?
   He mea wai e hoopiliia e ka wahine ma ka hana i nani ai, ua kapaiaʻku ka inoa he kapala.

20. Nohea mai hoi ia inoa i keia manawa?
   No ka like iki o ka pepa i paiia me ke kapa i kapalaia, ua hoopiliia kela inoa a lilo ia i palapala. He mea hou no ka palapala, ka mea i maopopo ai ka manao ma ke kahakaha ana; na na misionari i lawe mai mai a ua loaa ia makou.

‘19. What was the meaning/character of palapala for you before?
‘It was a liquid applied by women for decoration; the name was called kāpala [“to paint or print a design, as on tapa,” Pukui and Elbert 1986: at word].

‘20. From where comes this name in this time?
‘From the slight resemblance of the paper that is printed to the tapa that is decorated, that name was applied, and it became palapala. The palapala [‘writing, document’] is a new thing indeed, the means of making the opinion clear by marking; the missionaries brought it from afar, and it was obtained by us’.

Linguistic novelties were popular (e.g., Andrews 1836:18), and a determined effort had to be made to preserve the old vocabulary. The literature of the period needs to be studied in detail to discover the changes introduced, which have since become unremarkable components of the language. Such changes certainly influenced Hawaiian thinking, and similar changes can be observed in Polynesia today. For instance, N***** (November 29, 1873) complained that people were using the loan word kaea ‘tired’ instead of one of a number of more particularized
Hawaiian words. Similarly, Konai Thamann explained to me that classical Tongan contains three words, each with its own shade of meaning, to decline an invitation because one is otherwise occupied. Tongans however are now beginning to use the loan word *pisi* ‘busy’ in their place. The use of the general *pisi*, as of *kaea*, requires much less knowledge, effort, and dedication to linguistic excellence. Curiously, the Hawaiian N***** (November 29, 1873) used the same example for his mother tongue.

The remarks by Andrews quoted above were made early in his career in Hawai‘i and reflect the initial stage of his learning the language and literature; he had arrived only in 1828. By 1865, although still convinced of the problem of abstract terms, he could wax eloquent on the “richness of their language for expressing the nicest shades of love, of hatred, of jealousy and revenge.” In his “Introductory Remarks” to Andrews’ dictionary, W. D. Alexander made the connection to culture (Andrews 1974:14):

So in Hawaiian everything that relates to their every-day life or to the natural objects with which they were conversant is expressed with a vivacity, a minuteness and nicety of coloring which cannot be reproduced in a foreign tongue . . . The ancient Hawaiians were evidently close observers of nature. For whatever belonged to their religion, their wars, their domestic life, their handicrafts or their amusements, their vocabulary was most copious and minute. Almost every stick in a native house had its appropriate name.

As a result, “Its words are pictures rather than colorless and abstract symbols of ideas, and are redolent of the mountain, the forest and the surf.” Moreover, Hawaiian could be developed; “the Hawaiian possessed a language not only adapted to their former necessities, but capable of being used in introducing the arts of civilized society, and especially of pure morals, of law and the religion of the Bible.” Similarly when the early Andrews complained of needing to teach about “attaching different ideas to the
same words according as they were used” (October 1, 1834: 22), he could not know that he would spend years of his later life patiently interpreting the double meanings, wordplay, and linguistic virtuosity of Hawaiian poetry.

Andrews and Alexander were not the only foreigners to learn to appreciate the Hawaiian language through its vocabulary. In fact, the missionary preoccupation with translation and publication forced them to devote a great deal of time to learning the language, which converted them into admirers. For instance, William Richards writes of David Malo (October 7, 1828):

The author [of a translated letter] is among the most intelligent [sic] of the people and is a most valuable assistant in translating. His knowledge of his own language is thorough, is able to give authorities for his use of words by reference to the ancient meles and konikans [sic: kanikau]—is a valuable member of the church, is often consulted by the chiefs on important business and is esteemed by them as a good counsellor.

As to Malo’s letter, it is “difficult doing it justice in a translation, as it is compositions in the refined oriental languages.”

There are several sentences in this letter which lose much of their beauty in translation, for want of that distinction which exists between the kakon [sic: kākou] and maken [sic: mākou]. Kakon, we, including both those who speak and those addressed—Makon, we, including only those who speak.

Richards compares the expressiveness of aloha as salutation to Latin and Greek:

It would seem from the variety of senses in which the word is used that it must be indefinite, but it is far from being so to a native ear. And after becoming familiar with it, we often feel the need of such a word in English.

Richards asks whether a grammar or vocabulary of the language
should be prepared in English “for the gratification of the learned or the curious.”

Indeed, Hawaiian and Polynesian culture are particularly interesting and delightful for those interested in philology and literature. The large Hawaiian vocabulary most often provides the *mot juste* that enables writers to attain a particularly clear and precise style with great sharpness of focus. Learned linguistic discussions can be found even in tales, such as that on the different uses of *kauā* in the story of Pākaʻa.8 Hawaiian sophistication about language enables them to analyze thinking as well, such as the description of three models of creation used by traditional thinkers (Charlot 1991a:132).

Lists

The Hawaiian vocabulary is large even within individual fields and needs to be remembered (Beckwith 1919:313):

The Hawaiian (or Polynesian) composer, who would become a successful competitor in the fields of poetry, oratory, or disputation must store up in his memory the rather long series of names for persons, places, objects, or phases of nature which constitute the learning of the aspirant for mastery in the art of expression.

Organization is therefore useful and probably imperative. The most basic means of such organization is the formation of lists, which are used frequently in Hawaiian literature and are given many forms. Such lists were used to assist memory, but were also intellectual tools and elements of literary esthetics; they shared in the power of the word, being used in or even as prayers and charms.89

Lists can themselves be unorganized or made up of unrelated materials and memorized simply by rote. Lists are however more
useful when they group items that share some common characteristic; that is, when the list has a principle by which the list is formed, a criterion of selection of the items to be included, or an attribute shared by all the items. The clarity of the attribute—the ease with which it and thus its list is distinguished from others—is important in the effectiveness of the list as an aid to memory and recall. Moreover, the principles or attributes used are significant in understanding the intellectual devices and frameworks of the authors, for instance, the ratio of concrete to abstract “criterial attributes.”

Once lists have been created, they can be modified according to need. For instance, more items can be added, as Malo (n.d.: XL 24, 28) clearly implies, and shorter or longer forms can be used according to need and occasion. Because items are complex, they can be used in more than one list, depending on how many criteria they fit. A given amount of information or number of items can therefore be “reshuffled” in several ways according to the attributes used. These two processes of classifying and reclassifying are complex intellectual achievements and are aided by and even require training (compare Cole and Scribner 1974:106 ff., 120 ff.).

Finally, since lists are often cast in a certain form, that form can influence the composition of the list itself. For instance, a numbered list can tend to stop at an easily remembered or ritually significant number like ten, discouraging the addition of further items. For instance, in the Kumulipo (lines 1995–2034), ten exploits of Māui are given in a numbered list, and the tenth is called the one that hoʻolawa (line 2032) ‘causes completeness, sufficiency’. However the composer must then append the famous story of Māui and the snaring of the sun, which he leaves unnumbered. Similarly as will be described below, Kamakau of Kaʻawaloa and others feel obliged to use a second list introduction when the first has been expanded to the point of possible confusion. Moreover, just as storytellers find it uncomfortable not
to tell their tale complete, so ‘Ī‘ī (May 14, 1870) is impelled to go beyond his report of the surfing of Kamehameha at a particular place to provide a long, regular list of waves—their names, characters, and locations from Hawai‘i to Kaua‘i—a list he terminates with A anei la, pau na mokupuni, a pau no hoi na nalu a‘u i hoomaopopo ai, a ia oukou aku hoi ke koena ‘And here perhaps all the islands are covered, and the waves I remember are exhausted, and the remainder is up to you’ (this is a good example of Hawaiian as opposed to Western forms of composition). Finally the uses to which lists are put, their various settings-in-life, can influence their composition.

The above points are illustrated by the obvious example of a genealogy: a list of names selected according to the criterion of family connection. The practical application of that criterion reveals much about Hawaiian ideas of family extent and structure. The genealogical list can be expanded forwards with newly born members, backwards towards more ancient ancestors, and sideways to include more distant relatives. The total family membership can be reshuffled by tracing different lines, as Kamakau (November 10, 1870) does when he traces ‘Umi’s ancestry from his mother’s side. In such cases, family members will occupy different positions; for instance, a woman can be a mother in one genealogy and an aunt in another. A genealogy usually forms an amount of material large enough to require teaching, and the complex manipulations of a genealogy require training. A genealogy is also used in certain ways on social and ritual occasions, for instance, to make claims or support ambitions. These uses—as well as such factors as prestige, social pretentions, and so on—may occasion the modification of a genealogy. Most obviously, a usurper may discover family connections to justify his new position. In the same way, adoptees, patrons, and allies may, because of the influence of the form, be listed as relatives. The use of the genealogy can be extended as a thought model to non-human beings, such as gods, stars, and diseases, and ultimately to the whole universe
as in the *Kumulipo*. This practice is important also for understanding Hawaiian thinking, that is, the intellectual means and frameworks they used.

The subject of lists in Hawaiian thinking and literature is vast. The prevalence of lists in Hawaiian literature is ample evidence of the extensiveness and variety of the practice of classifying and categorizing. I will only suggest the range of the subject of lists in my discussion of a few aspects and examples.

Lists and especially list chants (and the games based on them) were of obvious importance in Hawaiian education as devices for learning and memorization (e.g., Titcomb 1972: 49–52). Counting was one of the first things a child learned, and a list chant of the days of the month, an important and practical subject, was in fact one of the first things a child was formally taught:

> In order to teach the days of the month to a child, the following chant was recited in Kau:
> Kamalii ike ole i ka helu po
> Muku nei, muku ka malama
> Hilo nei, kau ka Hoaka
> Eha Ku, eha Ole
> Huna, Mohalu, Hua, Akua,
> Hoku, Mahealani, Kulu,
> Eha Laau, Ekolu Ole,
> E kolu Kaloa, Kane, Lono, Mauli.
> ‘Children who do not know how to count the nights,
> Muku is here, Muku the moon,
> Hilo is here, then comes Hoaka
> Four Ku’s, four Ole’s,
> Huna, Mohalu, Hua, Akua
> Hoku, Mahealani, Kulu,
> Four Laau, three Ole,
> Three Kaloa’s, Kane, Lono, Mauli’.

A proverb based on this practice is used for people who “don’t know the first thing”: *Kamali‘i ‘ike ‘ole i ka helu pō* ‘Children
who don’t know how to count the nights’. Characteristically of Hawaiian culture, such a children’s educational list chant could be developed into a symbolic list saying, into riddles, and into a chant at a major ceremony at which the months were called out. Counting chants are an important type, as will be seen below. Malo seems to provide a picture of a seashore fishing lesson in which lists were used. He emphasizes that one can see the fish in shallow water and organizes four lists by location from the shore to deep water, as if he were standing on the beach and looking out to sea.

Hawaiians transferred their educational use of lists to Western schooling. Kānepu‘u (February 27, 1868) describes his father’s methods of teaching the few Western materials he had memorized. He organized straight lists of names under the attributes *Na kanaka* ‘The people’, *Na Aina* ‘The lands’, and *Na Malama* ‘the months’. Kānepu‘u’s father would call out the names singly, *kahea pakahi*, and the class would answer, imitating him in chorus. Western teachers remarked with some puzzlement on the interest Hawaiian students showed in memorizing lists, including genealogies and even lists of answers to mathematical problems.

Classifying and categorizing are also mentioned in Hawaiian literature: objects can be divided, *māhele*, into sections, groups, or divisions, *‘āpana* or *papa*, by their type or character, *‘ano*. Individual items are selected, *‘ohi*, for a category and inserted, *ho‘okomo*, into it as are subordinate levels under higher ones. An item is counted, *helu ‘ia*, as belonging to a category. Malo writes, *Ua mahele ia na wa, me na malama, ma loko o ka makahiki hoookahi* ‘Within the single year, the seasons with the months were divided’ (Malo n.d.: xii 1; compare xxxvi on the year). Kepelino writes, *A o tona tapu, ua maheleia i na apana elua, te tapu alii, te tapu atua* ‘His kapu was divided into two sections, the chiefly kapu, the godly kapu’ (Kirtley and Mookini 1977:51). J. Waiamau illustrates the practice (March 9, 1865):
He nui, a lehulehu wale na Akua o Hawai’i nei; a ua maheleia lakou i na apana pakahī, a me na inoa pakahī no hoi. Eia kekahi mau apana i maheleia’i. Na akua lapu, na akua heleloa, na akua unihipili, na aumakua, na akua hanai kalaiwaa, akua mahiai, akua hoolanawaa, akua hoounauna, a pela wale aku. Aka hoi, aole au i kaiia mai, e hoike pakahī aku ia lakou, a me ka lakou mau hana, o na akua hoounauna kai noi ia mai ia’u e hoike aku, a eia no ia. “Na Akua Hoounauna o Hawai’i nei.” O Kapo, Kanemilohai, Pua, Keawenuikauohilo, a me Kūamu, oia na akua hoounauna o Hawai’i nei i ikeia ma keia moolelo.

‘Many and innumerable are the gods of our Hawai’i; and they were divided into individual divisions and also with individual names. Here are some divisions into which they have been divided. The ghost gods, the gods who travel far, the helpful souls or fetcher gods, the ancestral gods, the fed gods of the canoe makers, farming gods, gods who help keep canoes afloat, gods to be sent on errands, and so on. But I have not been directed to make them known individually along with their activities. The gods to be sent on errands are those I have been asked to make known, and here it is indeed. “The Gods to be Sent on Errands of our Hawai’i.” Kapo, Kānemilohai, Pua, Keawenuikauohilo, and Kūamu, these are the gods to be sent on errands of our Hawai’i to be seen in this report’.

The great number of Hawaiian gods is first divided into classes or categories, which can then be studied individually, usually through lists of names. Similarly Hukilani writes Ekolu mahele nui o na Akua o Hawai’i nei ‘There are three large divisions of the Gods of Hawai’i’:

1. Na Akua kane,
2. Na Akua wahine,
3. Na Akua okoa:
‘1. The male Gods,
2. The female Gods,
3. The separate Gods’
He then writes, *E noonoo mai kakou i ka mahele mua* ‘Let us consider the first division’: 1. *Na Akua kane. Iloko o keia; ekolu mea nui* . . . ‘1. The male Gods. Inside of this, there are three large/important things . . . ’; he provides a sublist of three items with arabic numerals. After some discussion he turns to 2. *Na Akua wahine. He ekolu mahele o na Akua wahine* ‘2. The female Gods. There are three divisions of the female gods’, and provides a list of three items with arabic numerals. Each of these lists has a list within it, each with a formal introduction—*eia ko lakou mau inoa/Eia ko lakou mau inoa/Eia na inoa* ‘here are their names/Here are their names/Here are the names’—and a conventional list conclusion. The third category— 3. *Na Akua okoa* ‘3. The separate Gods’—is divided into two categories: *He elua no mahele o na Akua okoa* ‘There are indeed two divisions of the separate Gods’, which are 1. *Ka mea pili iluna*. 2. *Na mea pili ilalo nei* . . . ‘1. The thing related to “above.” 2. The things related to “down below here”’. A list is provided for each of these subcategories.96

“No ke aloha” July 10, 1865, defines the word *aloha* in general and then divides it into various types: *Ua maheleia keia mea he aloha iloko o kekahī mau papa, ma ka hoonohonoho ana penei* ‘This thing *aloha* is divided into several divisions, with the following organization’. Ten numbered items follow, separated by semicolons: e.g., 8. *O ke aloha aina* ‘8. The love of the land’. These items are not however independent of each other: *I loko o keia mau papa kaawale, hookahi no huina o lakou malalo o ka huaolelo aloha* ‘In regard to these separate divisions, there is a single grouping/uniting of them under the word *aloha*’. This mental organization corresponds to reality, because all these different types of *aloha* come *mai ka Uhane hookahi mai* ‘from the one [Holy] Spirit’. The word *ho’okahi* is used for both the mental and the cosmic order. *Aloha* is indeed found in all things.

Similarly, on a postcontact topic, the incoming foreigners are described thus in *Ka Mooolelo Hawaii* (Dibble 1838: 31 f.):
Ma keia mau moku i holo mai ai na kanaka o kela ano keia ano kela helehelena keia helehelena. Aka, ina i maheleia lakou e like me ke ano o ko lakou naau, elua wale no poe kanaka; o kekahi poe, ua hoolohe lakou i ka ke Akua mau kauoha, a o kekahi poe, aole i malama lakou i ke Akua.

‘On these boats arrived men of this and that type, this and that countenance. But if they are divided according to the type of their insides, there are only two sorts of human beings: some people listened to the commandments of God, and some people did not honor God’.

Hawaiians were equally conscious of their use of attributes in creating lists. Malo refers to attributes:

Clouds can be grouped by color, *ua kapa ia nae ma ko lakou ano ko lakou mau inoa* ‘their names were called by their character’; and by location, *ua kapa ia lakou ma ko lakou mau ano iho* ‘they are called by their character’ (n.d.: vi 3, 4).

Malo provides a list of pig types organized by color (xiii 5–6) and then a separate list organized by other attributes (section 7); he then states of dogs, *ua kapaia ma ke ano o ko lakou mau hulu* ‘they are called by the character of their fur’; the same words are used of chickens, along with the further remark *e like me ke ano o na hulu o lakou, pela no ke ano o na inoa o lakou* ‘like the type of their feathers, thus indeed the character of their names’ (section 8). Malo then continues with a bird list of another attribute, *he mau manu hiihu* ‘wild birds’.

Loincloths and skirts can be grouped by the materials with which they are dyed; therefore, *e like me ke kapalapala ana pela inui ona inoa* ‘just like the staining, thus the names were many’ (xvi 10).

Those who fished big fish were called *he poe lawaia nui* ‘big fishermen’, and those who fished small were called *he poe lawaia liilii* ‘little fishermen’.97
In the above quotation from Waiamau (March 9, 1865), into the traditional place of an attribute—after the word eia used to introduce a list and the list of names itself—the author places in quotation marks the title of his essay, which is also the attribute on which the list is based. Malo (n.d.: xv 3–4) creates a general discussion by extracting the attributes of the lists he will recite. He can also mention categories that could form attributes for lists he does not provide. Attributes could become subjects of dispute in the contest of wits, as will be seen below.

Once a category was created, all items belonging to it should be discovered and inserted into it, achieving the ideal of completeness, as is clear in the hoʻopāpā ‘contest of wits’ (vs. Hallpike 1979:181; compare 194). Items can be conceptualized as bits of information. Some objects are recognized as singular, ungrouped, or one of a kind. That is, they form a category of a single item: for instance, Hookahi ka Mano i kona ano . . . hookahi ke Kahala i kona ano, hookahi Kamahiamahi ikona ano ‘The shark is singular in its type . . . the Amberjack is singular in its type, the dolphin fish is singular in its type’ (Malo n.d.: xv 18). As will be seen below, one tactic in the contest of wits is to create a category with an attribute that fits a single item alone and then to challenge the other side to find another.

Significantly, the great majority of the attributes used by Hawaiians in creating lists can be easily recognized as observational rather than symbolic. The wordplay found in several lists (e.g., Beckwith 1919:317) may derive from the prior naming of the items themselves—for example, because of the observation of similarity of form—rather than from the formulation of the list.
itself. Similarly, any symbolic character found in lists of ritual offerings derives from their prior selection as offerings, not from the list itself, which was based on the observation of the objects that were in fact offered. The observational character of attributes is most easily recognized in lists of material objects, but is equal in genealogies, lists of good and bad historical chiefs, vocabulary groups of ethical terms, and so on. This observational, rather than symbolic, emphasis accords with the hierarchical organization of lists, to be discussed below.\textsuperscript{102} The observational character of list attributes is significant for the understanding of the place of symbolism in Hawaiian culture.

In view of the importance of observation in Hawaiian life, thinking, and education, the basis of categories in observation meant that they were reliable and could be used with confidence. Hawaiians seem to show limited interest in borderline cases, that is, in items that are hard to categorize or that cross categories or divisions. For instance, a basic division in Hawaiian thinking is that between \textit{uka} ‘upland’ and \textit{kai} ‘sea’; the two form in fact a fundamental organizing pair to be discussed below. Yet a potential borderline case like the Hawaiian monk seal is rarely mentioned. In the \textit{Kumulipo} (lines 327–361), birds are divided into those belonging to \textit{uka} and \textit{kai} rather than being considered as crossing boundaries. Although varieties of the \textquote{\textit{o’opu} ‘gobey’} can live in or spend a stage of the development in both fresh water and salt water, they are not described as crossing the boundaries of \textit{uka} and \textit{kai}, but are categorized as \textquote{\textit{o’opu kai} ‘salt-water gobey’} or \textquote{\textit{o’opu wai} ‘fresh-water gobey’}. Kepelino remarks that the \textit{āhole}, unlike other fish, lives in both fresh and salt water, but does not base any large points on the fact, although he can mention social and religious uses of other fish.\textsuperscript{103} The ritual use of the \textit{āhole} is in fact based on its name “to strip away,” not on its borderline character (Titcomb 1972:59 f.). Similarly Kepelino recognizes the mammalian character of the whale, classed as an \textit{i’a} ‘fish’, but does not expand on it (July 2, 1867:11 47); nor were whales ritually
significant. Kepelino (July 2, 1867: 773) can note explicitly that the bristle worm is not placed under the category, papa, of fish or of sea slug, without finding the singularity a challenge to the intellectual system. Oddities can indeed be used in sayings and especially riddles, and creating categories with criteria that fit only one item is an activity of the contest of wits. But even those categories must be either true to observation—as must any new categories introduced into discussion—or accepted as wordplay. Hawaiians seem more interested in striking phenomena, like the strength and fierceness of the shark, rather than in borderline character. This is not to say that borderline cases were never considered significant. Freshwater eels were used only for ritual purposes and not eaten, whereas sea eels were. Kepelino records a religious explanation, expressed in Christian terms, for flying fish, and they were used in religious practice. Birds, especially the owl, are considered to communicate between the sky and the earth or between the gods and humans. Such cases do not however seem to be causes for confusion. A conventional and handy method of handling certain odd cases was to use the word hapa ‘half, part’. Children of mixed blood were called hapa haole (the race could be specified more closely), and transvestites or transexuals could be called a poe hapa ‘hapa people’ (Kamakau December 14, 1867).

Significantly the word hapa is a loan from the English half, which suggests that the problem was felt and thus handled only in the postcontact period. The entire subject deserves a full study.

The structure of lists can be informal or formal. Informal lists are those that, without conventional title or conclusion, are set in the grammatical structure of the sentence:

*a hula iho la ka hula ka laau . . . a me ka hula alaapapa* ‘then was danced the stick dance . . . and the dramatic dance’ (Kamakau of Ka’awaloa in Fornander 1919–1920: 3 ff.).

*a kaumaha aku la i ke akua ia Kunuiakea . . . a ia Kukaohialaka* ‘and prayed to the god, to Kūnuiākea . . . and to Kūka‘ōhi‘aalaka’.
This god list has probably been taken from the prayer described (god lists are conventional in prayers) and has been integrated into the grammar of the prose (Kamakau of Ka‘awaloa in Fornander 1919–1920:15).

*e ako ai i na hale, ia hale pahu . . . a me hale umu, a pau na hale i ke kukulu ia* ‘to build the houses, this drum house . . . and earth-oven house, until all the houses were constructed’ (Malo n.d.: xxxvii 47).

The famous formulation of chiefly morals by Kepelino (1932:141), quoted in chapter III—a word list created in his powerful style—demonstrates the literary quality possible in the use of the form.

Informal lists need not be irregular or the spontaneous creations of the author, but can be based in various ways on earlier formal lists or on tradition. A list given by Kamakau of Ka‘awaloa is as regular as a formal list and is probably based on one. Informal lists used by Kepelino seem to be based on a formal one he uses shortly before. The same material could clearly be presented in a formal or in an informal list. Two examples from Kamakau of Ka‘awaloa, described in Appendix VI, are most probably based on chant, as are informal god lists. Informal lists of animals, food, and offerings as well as of weapons display many similarities, which reveal their traditional bases in learning and practice. The lists of land names beginning with *wai* are informal in the received texts of the Kamapua‘a literature, but are undoubtedly traditional (Charlot 1987:31).

A great variety of forms can be used for formal lists. The simplest would be a straight list, for example, of names, without introduction or conclusion but not imbedded in a sentence structure. This simplest form is rare, but is occasionally found. Kamakau (June 2, 1866) writes *E ola ana no nae kekahi poe kahiko i ike i na mea kahiko o Hawaii nei* ‘Some old people are indeed living who have seen the old things of our Hawai‘i’. He follows this statement with a list of names and places of residence. Later
in the same article, he writes *No ka mea, ua kaawale o Hawai‘i i na aupuni ekolu, a me na Moi ekolu* ‘Because Hawai‘i was divided into the three governments and the three kings’. He then provides a parallel list of their names and places. I would categorize these two lists as formal because they are grammatically independent of their preceding sentences. Those sentences could however be considered introductions to their respective lists, to which in modern punctuation they would be connected by a colon. Conversely, the looseness of some informal lists within the grammatical structure of a sentence might argue for them being considered somehow formal.

A much more common form is that of a list provided with an introduction. This introduction can be very short: *Pela no* ‘Thus indeed’ followed by a straight list of names (Johnson and Mahe-loha 1975:156). However the introduction most often includes the attribute of the list. That attribute can also be given separately, as will be seen in several examples. Introductions can be either created by the author or stereotyped, conventional, and traditional. A list introduction can be quite simple, for instance, *Ka inoa o na Kahuna* ‘The names of the experts’, followed by a comma and a straight list of four names (Kauhane January 26, 1865). Introductions can increase in size until they become quite elaborate. On the shorter end of the spectrum, Kepelino (1932:99) introduces two lists with the simple introductions *Ka na kane mau hana* ‘The occupations of the men’, and *Ka hana a na wahine* ‘The occupation of the women’. Kamakau of Ka‘awaloa writes *ekolu pule o keia kakahiaka, he waipa, a he kuwa, a he kuwi* ‘there were three prayers of this morning: a request prayer, and a special event prayer, and a *kuwi*’. Such introductions can be lengthened: *i keia wa, ua nui na mea ona hou, mai na aina e mai, he Rama Falani Kini* ‘in this time, the new intoxicating things are many from foreign lands: rum, brandy, gin’ (Malo n.d.:xiv 16). At the far end of the spectrum, the author can extend the introduction to the point that he feels obliged to start again. Kamakau of Ka‘awaloa starts
a formal list with a conventional introduction, *Eia ka inoa o na malama kaua ole* ‘Here is the name of the months without war’, but then adds so much explanatory material that he feels obliged to start again, *eia na malama kaua ole ehiku* ‘here are the seven months without war’. The power exercised by the form on the author is evident.

The above introductions, except the last, are creations of the authors. Stereotyped, conventional introductory forms can be recognized from their distribution. A common one is *He nui* . . . ‘many are . . .’. The author of “No ka Pule Kuni Anaana mai Hawaii a Kauai” (1860) writes *He nui wale na akua o lakou* ‘Very many were their gods’ and provides a straight list of six names. Such expressions can be found also without lists.

An even more common list introduction is the use of *eia* ‘here is’ or ‘here are’, many examples of which can be found. ‘Ī’ī writes (March 5, 1870), *Eia na hoa kuka o ia aha: Kamehameha I., ka Hooilina Moi, Kalaikuahulu, Nahili, Heleino, Kaioea, Keaweopu a me Kuhia* ‘Here are the discussion companions of this assembly: Kamehameha I, the Royal Heir . . . and Kuhia’. Kamakau writes (March 5, 1844), *Eia ua mau wahi hua olelo pohihi nei* ‘Here are these little obscure words’, and provides a paragraph consisting of the words. Such lists appear in great numbers (Appendix VI). Expressions with *eia* are also common without lists, being used frequently to move to another point, as with the expression *eia kekahai* ‘here is something’. *Eia* list introductions can even be used without a list (e.g., Malo n.d.: xvi 16, xvii 7).

To the form of introduction and list can be added a termination, which can also be either created by the author or conventional:

‘Ī’ī October 23, 1869, *O na mai i oleloia, oia ka li, wela, nalulu a me ke pani, a pela aku* ‘The sicknesses reported, they were chills, fever, headache/stomach ache, and stomach pain and choking, and so on’.
Eia na inoa o kekahi poe o lakou: Kaalaenuiahina, Kahuilaokalani, Kaneikaulanaula, a pela wale aku ‘Here are the names of some of the people: Ka’alaenuiahina, Kahuilaokalani, Kāneikaulana’ula, and so on’.

Kekoa October 14, 1865: introduction, Oia na keiki i hanau eepa mai, aia hoi ‘These are the children who are marvelously born, they are indeed’; a list of five items; termination, a me na mea like ‘and similar things/people’.

Conventional terminations tend to be hyperbolic, such as aole no paha i pau i ka helu i keia mau ia ‘the enumeration of these fish is perhaps indeed not exhausted’ (Malo n.d.: xv 15, also 7, 11), which is similar to the use of a he nui phrase for the termination. Original terminations can be more factual: ua koe paha ke kahi mau ia o keia ‘some fish of these [the type of the list] perhaps remain’ (Malo n.d.: xv 9, also 10). Malo (n.d.: xv 20) uses both types of termination: ua koe no paha kahi mau ia, aole no i pau ma keia helu ana ‘a few fish perhaps remain, they are not exhausted by this enumeration’. Terminations can also be found without lists, but may sometimes indicate that a list is being used as the basis of the discussion.

Into this form—introduction, list, and termination—can be inserted explanatory material. A concise example can be found in Malo (n.d.: vi 12), clarified by punctuation in my translation: eia na ua, he ua kona he ua nui loa ia, he ua hoolua, he ua nui no ia, he ua naulu, he ua uuuku ia, he ikaika nae ‘here are the rains: a southern, leeward rain—a very big rain this; a northern, windward rain—a big rain this; a shower—a little rain this but strong’. Similarly xiv 15 contains an introduction, Eia na ai hou, mai na aina e mai ‘Here are the new foods from foreign lands’; a straight list of names, he Palaoa . . . Ipu ‘flour . . . melon’; and a termination, a me na mea e ae he nui no ‘and the other things, numerous indeed’. After Ipu and before the termination, a small
explanation has been inserted, *kalua, a ai maka* ‘baked, and eaten raw’.

Lists can be numbered in both classical form—in which the numbers were stated—and in new forms, in which arabic numerals and typographical devices are used. Some modern forms could have been introduced in the process of publication. Such numbered lists can be the basis of large discursive units, as will be seen below. An early example of a numbered list can be found in Kamakau of Ka‘awaloa (Fornander 1919–1920: 9, *o ke kahuna mookuakahi . . . awalu, a o ke kahuna ia ia ka hale o Papa*), a list of eight types of priests presented in regular form: the term for the type of priest is followed by the number, *akahī . . . awalu*. The arabic numerals in his two other numbered lists (31, 35) are similarly placed after the item they number, which fits comfortably into Hawaiian grammar, and may be due to an editorial replacement of a more traditional wording. A similar placement of numbers is found in Kanuha (March 17, 1866).

A widespread form of list is a series of stereotyped lines, sentences, or clauses. A simple example can be found in Malo: *O ka iwi ole kekahi koi, o ke alahe‘e kekahi koi, he hao no kekahi koi* ‘The fang bone is an adz, the *alahe‘e* wood is an adz, the metal indeed is an adz’.115 This form can be provided with introductions and terminations:

Fornander 1916–1917: 567: a list of stereotyped lines, presented in a column, introduced by *Elima lakou nei, elimu umu, elimu wahie, eia na wahie*. The parallel lines consist of a name followed by *ke kanaka, he [name of wood] kona wahie*.

Fornander 1919–1920: 207, a list of waves and appropriate surfboards, introduced by *Eia na inoa o na papa a me ka nalu*. Two sets of two lines each are set up as two separate paragraphs. The first line of each set parallels the other and provides the name of the board with its length in parentheses. The second line
of each set, again parallel to each other, provides the name of the wave and a brief description of it.

217, introduction, Eia ke ano o na pua. The list consists of four parallel sentences beginning with inā; termination, a pela aku no.

Such parallel lines are found often in more extended compositions:

Malo n.d.: xviii 48–53: 48, introduction, he nui ka inoa o kona poe kanaka; 49–51, the list consists of short, parallel sentences, o ka mea . . . he konohiki ia; 52, the list continues with the addition of alternative names; termination, he nui . . . mau ano. This section is a component of a larger one, 47–55.

Such parallel lines are common in lists used in chants, in which parallelism is a common device, and indeed a question can arise as to whether a passage is a list or a chant. A number of such lists can be found in the Kumulipo and consist usually of stereotyped lines with points at which one or more different elements can be added, a type of fill-in-the-blanks:

Hanau ka Pe'a, ka Pe'ape'a kana keiki, puka
Hanau ka Weli, he Weliweli kana keiki, puka

‘Born was the starfish, the small starfish is its child, it emerged.
Born was the holothurian, the small holothurian is its child, it emerged’.

Such lines, which were in all likelihood used in education and guessing games, could be expanded into larger fill-in-the-blanks stanzas, which could express the highest teachings and demonstrate the seriousness of the practice. Such stanzas were also used in the contest of wits.

Fill-in-the-blanks forms can be found in other genres, such as those composed to help memorize medical information; ‘Īi's
blanks can be filled from other texts. In prayers and ritual dialogues, the word *mea* ‘person’ can be used for the blank. After giving examples of ritual questions and answers using both *mea* and real names, ‘Īi states that if this practice had continued, the names of the contemporary chiefs would be inserted. Conversely, a list chant of islands can be abbreviated by ceasing to use the stereotyped lines and simply providing the names used to fill in the blanks.

Kamakau describes the use of *mea* in discussions or interrogations about genealogies, which were also transmitted in certain forms. Genealogies can also be provided with list-type introductions, such as *Eia na inoa*, indicating that they were considered a type of list in Hawaiian thinking. The development of single-source genealogies—A to B to C, etc.—such as those found in the *Kumulipo*, may have been influenced by lists. On the other hand, the use of the genealogical form was extended to materials that Westerners would consider impersonal.

All of the above types of lists and devices of lists can be used in longer discussions. Most simply, an author can use a large number of lists in his discussion (e.g., Kamakau August 24, 1867, four lists in two columns of text). An author can also make lists a meaningful part of the rhetoric of the occasion. Kamakau wants to emphasize the richness and variety of Hawaiian culture, so he uses a large number of lists with the traditional introduction (and occasionally termination), *he nui* ‘many are the . . . ’, as well as using the expression independently of lists in his own rhetorical passages (Kamakau December 14, 21, 28, 1867).

Lists can also provide the basis and the form itself of extended compositions. For instance, a discussion can consist of a series of explanations of related items, each explanation starting with the name of an item. A list introduction and conclusion can be attached to such discussions. A regular list can be given followed by an extended discussion of each item. Examples of such compositions can be found in Appendix VI.
A numbered list can form the basis of a larger composition, as can be found frequently in nineteenth-century Hawaiian texts. A discussion can consist of numbered sections, the subjects of which are most probably taken from a list. A regular numbered list can be followed by an extended discussion of each of its items, which can be numbered or not. As shown in Appendix IV, this type of organization can be found in a missionary text and is used by such Western writers as Gibbon. The extensive use of this organization in Roman Catholic Hawaiian-language literature may indeed have influenced Kepelino. The form is however simple and proximate and could have been developed in classical Hawaiian tradition from the practice of inserting information into lists.

The works of Malo, Kamakau, and Kepelino cannot be understood without attention to their uses of lists, an adequate discussion of which would require complete commentaries. Some notes on the subject, especially on Malo’s *Ka Moolelo Hawaii*, are provided in Appendix VI.

Lists were used in a wide variety of literary genres and social situations in Hawaiian culture. For instance, Opunui describes an oral message sent in the form of a list. Lists were an influence on style, supporting the rhetorical devices of vocabulary accumulation, repetition, and sequencing. Narrative series moving to a climax resemble counting formulas and chants (Beckwith 1919: 321).

Lists are very close to poetry in Hawaiian literature, and those composed of parallel lines are often difficult to differentiate from chants. Indeed, the lists themselves may have been chanted. Kuapu’u can provide list introductions to wind chants of Kūapāka’a—*Eia na makani o Hawaii* (May 8, 1861) and *Eia na makani o Maui a me Molokai* (May 15, 1861)—indicating that he thinks of them as a type of list. Conversely, lists of counted items are an important chant genre. Counting is also found in riddles.
The word *helu* ‘to count’, which can also mean ‘to list’, can assume some of the senses of the English words *recount* and *account*. *Mai helu* ‘Do not helu’ means do not count or list past grievances, such as favors one has done for someone now accused of ingratitude. One can *heluhelu* a chant. An *uē helu* is a chant of wailing in which, for instance, one recounts the events of the life of deceased and of the poet’s relationship with him or her. That is, narration is expressed as a type of enumeration. Similarly the stereotyped lists of words to describe the growth of a plant and the decline of old age follow a chronological sequence. *Heluhelu* was later used for ‘to read’.

Lists can in fact form the basis of stories, such as that of Kamapua‘a’s transformation into different bodies, which become parts of his system of *kino lau* ‘many bodies’. Indeed, lists themselves can function as narrative, as seen clearly in the use of itineraries, to be discussed below. A very simple example of a list being used for a narrative purpose can be found in a chant that lists in parallel sentences the different people—chiefs, warriors, men, women, and children—who have entered the temple enclosure (Elbert 1959:111). In the *Kumulipo*, the Māui section contains a numbered list of ten exploits (lines 1995–2034), which served as a memory device for narrating the exploits in their proper order. A long list chant purports to recount the saga of Kamapua‘a. Histories of chiefs can be composed as lists of combats (Charlot 1977:495 f.). The number given to a battle of the chief Lonoika-makahiki is probably evidence of the use of such a list (Fornander 1916–1917:327). Examples of the narrative use of lists can be found in prose as well:

Malo n.d.: xxxvIII 68–70: *Eia na lii i pepehi ia e na makaainana no ka hooluhi* ‘here are the chiefs who were killed by the commoners because of their burdening’. This introduction is followed by a list in parallel form: initial name, statement that the chief was killed (the last two were just ejected), by whom, and where, with occasional additional information. This is also a good
example of the expansion of a list with information; in this case, that information is historical, which turns the list into a sort of narrative.

LXII 15–16: Eia kekahi mau kupuna, ‘Here are some forebears’. This introduction is followed by a list of names, o Punaimua . . . Kaniuhi, which is fairly regular and contains some concise information like location. After the last name, Malo writes, aole ilohe ia ka moolelo okeia poe ali, o ko Kanipahu kailohe ia, ‘the story of this chief has not been heard; that of Kanipahu has been heard’. Malo then tells the story of that chief. This example demonstrates how lists could be expanded with stories.

Kaawa February 2, 1865: 1: Eia kekahi mau aina a lakou i noho ai, ‘Here are some lands where they resided’; a straight list of four names.

2: he nui wale kana mau hana, ‘many indeed were his deeds’. This introduction is followed by a list of story summaries in regular form, an example of the list being used for narrative.

Similarly, lists can be used to articulate process or provide instructions.135 Such lists are of obvious educational value and can be used as memory aids and as an esthetic element in prose and poetry, a salient example of which is provided by conventional descriptions of plant growth.136

As already mentioned in the descriptions of a number of texts, lists were manipulated in a variety of ways. For instance, lists could be transferred from chant to prose and from formal to informal, that is, from being independent to being dependent on the syntax of a sentence. The form of a list of the same items could be varied and lists could be combined.137

Items of lists could be reclassified, that is, they could appear in different lists under different attributes.138 Aholo (1861: 2, 4) provides first a general list of gods invoked in medicine and then divides them into separate lists according to the sacrifices they receive. A full study of the use of individual items in different
lists would increase the precision of our understanding Hawaiian culture. As mentioned above, reclassifying is a capacity separate from classifying itself and usually requires training. Both capacities were recognized and accorded prestige in Hawaiian culture; for instance, unusual classifying and rapid reclassifying are important parts of a *hoʻopāpā* ‘contest of wits’.

Moreover, the practice of reclassifying influences thinking, supporting the ability to view an object from different perspectives and to shift one’s perspective rapidly (compare Needham 1979:7). This ability is supportive of the Hawaiian capacity to tolerate a variety of traditions with contradictory positions as more or less self-contained universes of discourse. For instance, when the Hawaiian religious teacher Kalāhikiola Nāliʻiʻelua visited my class on the pig god Kamapuaʻa in 1979 (Charlot 1987:11), he was asked by a student whether that god was a *kino* ‘body’ of the god Lono. He answered that, no, Kamapuaʻa was independent of Lono. Another student then mentioned that Mary Kawena Pukui had written in her book on Kaʻū, Hawaiʻi, that the pig god was in fact a *kino* of Lono. Yes, replied Nāliʻiʻelua, he was a *kino* of Lono. The contradiction is resolved by recognizing that Nāliʻiʻelua was answering each time from the perspective of a different tradition. In Nāliʻiʻelua’s own tradition, Kamapuaʻa was independent of Lono; in Pukui’s, he was a *kino* of Lono. Nāliʻiʻelua tolerated each tradition and could speak in its terms. He felt no need to deny the tradition to which he did not adhere. This use of perspective is a partial explanation of the practice found in a number of Hawaiian religious teachers of presenting clearly modern discourse as the teachings of the ancestors. Nāliʻiʻelua would do this often in perfect good faith. That is, for him the novelty of the perspective did not sever the link to the people of old. The perspective could shift and still be a part of the process of tradition. Similarly Hawaiian chants and songs can shift rapidly from one speaker to another without causing confusion for the audience.
Lists could also be created, a practice supported by the simplicity and handiness of the various list forms, and arguments need to be developed to differentiate between new and traditional lists, both of which can use classical list forms.\textsuperscript{139} The use of purely Western list forms would be an argument for the novelty of a list.

Some lists are clearly new, because they are described by the author as such or because their contents are postcontact.\textsuperscript{140} The use of a list, characteristics of its composition, or the perspective of its attribute might be so clearly personal or postcontact that they could be used as arguments for the novelty of the list itself.\textsuperscript{141}

 Conversely, the precontact character of the contents of a list provides a strong, but not definitive argument for its traditional character, especially if the list is of clear utility for such occupations as fishing and farming, areas in which such lists were used extensively. This argument is especially strong for subjects such as traditional religion, ritual, cultural practices, and technology that were no longer maintained.

 The distribution of lists and their use in a number of different fields can be used as an argument for their traditional character, an obviously large research project.\textsuperscript{142} The fixity of lists, such as those of types of sea conditions, weapons, and foods or offerings, is a further argument.\textsuperscript{143}

 The style of a list may provide arguments for its traditional character. For instance, a number of lists follow the older practice of using the singular where Westerners would use a plural; for instance, \textit{he nui ka inoa} \ldots ‘many are the name’ rather than \textit{nā inoa} ‘the names’.

 Because traditional lists are transmitted orally, they tend to be formed over the years in a way that facilitates that process. Like proverbs and the tales of the people of the land, they tend to drop extraneous elements and become smoothened, regularized, and
simplified. They express the essentials with all possible precision, concision, and clarity in order to make them easy to grasp and remember. Because formally structured materials, such as those formulated in parallelism, are easier to retain (compare, e.g., Beckwith 1919:328), a tight, regular structure tends to impose itself increasingly as a list is transmitted. Moreover, because lists are put to practical use, they and their attributes tend to be specialized, grouping those materials alone that pertain to the function of the list. The items of a traditional list tend therefore to be clearly related to each other rather than mixed and inconsistent. This is true even of vocabulary lists of faults (Malo n.d.: xxi 3–9, 12).

Characteristics opposite to those discussed above can be used as arguments against the traditional character of a list, judging it either a pure invention of the author or perhaps a discursive use of an older list. I have used this argument in discussing several of Malo’s lists and passages. Irregular lists of heterogeneous materials would not be long transmitted in such form. On the other hand, a good writer like Kepelino can compose complicated, new lists with all the stylistic virtues of traditional ones, and such rhetorical devices as parallelism are a regular element of original composition. Style is therefore no certain indication of the traditional character of a list. Even Malo can list foreign, material objects with simple precision.

In general however Malo loses clarity and consistency when unsupported by traditional lists, which renders easier the separation of his received materials from his own original compositions and uses of older materials. Significantly the apparently traditional lists are used more extensively by Malo in those areas in which they would be expected, such as fishing, farming, and crafts. Indeed, he does not use lists in his Christian tract (1837), a subject for which he had received no traditional lists. Moreover, the great amount of information that Malo provides had not been reduced earlier to writing and therefore had to be learned by him
from the oral tradition, that is, by the traditional verbal devices. That he in turn reproduced these in his written work explains in large part his value for the following generations: he had preserved not only the knowledge of the past, but the verbal means by which it had been transmitted.

Organization through Paired Opposites

At a higher level of intellectual organization, Hawaiians had a number of paired opposites, dualities, or dichotomies under which they could organize either the whole of their knowledge or parts of it. These pairs are correlative or reciprocally self-defining (up/down, inside/outside) and truly complementary in that together they constitute a whole (sky/earth, land/sea, male/female, night/day) and thus can be used in formulas to express completeness. The pairs are applied as contradictories, admitting no middle ground, rather than as contraries; that is, in any given application, an item is identified wholly with one or the other term. Finally these pairs are distributed not only through Polynesia but world-wide. The classical Hawaiian system of organizing knowledge could therefore be described by such terms as dualistic, dyadic, polar, or binary. This method of organization is now recognized as ancient and possibly primordial, and its full distribution has yet to be surveyed or explained.

Those same pairs of terms could be used within subordinate levels, individual subjects or fields, or even lists or pairs of single items. For instance, luna/lalo ‘above/below’ could be used as the overall framework of a discussion and as an organizing principle of the lists included in one of those major categories. As stated earlier, the Hawaiian emphasis on similarities among objects and fields supported the extension of the same principles to the different areas of the whole field of knowledge.

As with lists, such categories can be classified as
observational, such as up/down, or symbolic, such as extensions of the male/female or night/day pairs. The distinction cannot be applied however without reference to the native world view. For instance, the genealogical model for the origin and development of the universe articulated in the *Kumulipo* would justify the literal division of all things into male and female. Conversely, observational categories such as up and down easily assume symbolic character and connotations, and that symbolic character can change or shift with the context or frame of reference. The interpreter of a text must therefore be attentive to the particular emphasis of the author.

In Hawai‘i, the observational categories clearly form the basis for symbolic uses. Most lists seem to have been formed for practical purposes, for which observation would provide the criteria, and to have received symbolic associations secondarily, associations that could in turn be put to practical use (compare Needham 1979: 22 f., 25, 67 ff.). For instance, a list of land plants paired with sea plants will remain constant whether the male/female pair is applied to it or not. To the pair above/below different symbolic characters can be ascribed: the usual is, respectively, male and female, but *luna* can indicate a chief, which is consonant with the designation of chief as *lani* ‘firmament’. Male/female can also be applied to the observational left/right. Moreover, symbolic ascription can change according to context. For instance, a rock when considered as being on land would be grouped in the category of things belonging to *uka* ‘land’ or male; but the rock might have a female shape as opposed to other male shaped rocks and so could be considered female. Name, similarity of form (often following a land/sea dichotomy), and physical and behavioral characteristics were the bases for the symbolic and ritual use of fish (e.g., Titcomb 1972: 45 f.).

In general, Hawaiians seem to emphasize the clarity of their categorizing rather than cases of ambiguity. The upsetting of the order is expressed by a reversal of placement. In the Pele
literature, the world order is *hulihia* ‘overturned’: *hulihia luna nei ia lalo, hulihia lalo nei ia luna* ‘this above is overturned to below, this below is overturned to above’; this theme is so prominent in the Pele literature that a genre of chant was named by its opening word: *hulihia*.149 In the famous prophecy of Kapihe, *he iho mai ana ka lani a e piʻi ana ka honua* ‘the sky will come down and the earth will climb up’. This was interpreted to mean that those who were above would be brought low, and those who were below would be raised up.150 Disorder is therefore a violence against the system rather than a part of the system itself.

Similarly, Hawaiians did not mix their categories: they did not think of male *in* female and female *in* male or life *in* death and death *in* life. Sex and fertility are not mentioned in sorcery chants. Indeed, a Hawaiian audience was upset when a foreign poet translated a chant that joined love to death in accepted Western fashion.

On the other hand, Hawaiians used their organizing devices with creative freedom. For instance, a pattern found in Hawaiian chants extends the male/female pair to a third member, as in a genealogy (Charlot 1983b:66 f.). A tripartite organization—*uka, waena* ‘middle’, *kai*—is probably based on the three economic or use zones of a land division.151 That is, organization could be modified for observational or practical reasons.

The Hawaiian organization of knowledge provided a clear and handy method for placing a large number of items or details. The individual items were identified by names and terms. These were grouped in lists with clear attributes. These lists could then be coordinated hierarchically with other lists. Lists and groups of lists could ultimately be organized under the most basic categories. Hawaiian discussions usually move in the opposite direction, from general to specific, from big to small. For instance, in discussing plants, one starts with the basic categories of land plants and sea plants and can then descend into those categories to the required level of detail. Similarly one can move mentally from a
particular item, to the particular list in which it had been placed, to the place of that list in one of the two ultimate categories being used.

This placing of items is a form of understanding: one knows where they belong in the cosmos. The well-known cosmic orientation of Hawaiian thinking—seen, for instance, in the tendency to place every subject in the widest possible context rather than isolating it—can be recognized in the organization of all items under categories that relate clearly to the limits of the universe. Hawaiian cosmic thinking is practical as much as anything else.

Moreover, as seen in the above discussion of memorization, individual items are recalled more easily when they have a clear mental place. The Hawaiian system of organizing knowledge can be understood, therefore, as a very extensive mnemonic device or memory aid.

The place of such pairs in education is indicated by the fact that they have been used in lullabies and children’s songs from classical times until today. A lullaby with the line—*E hina iuka e,* / *Hina i kai e* ‘Rock landward/Rock seaward’ (J. S. Emerson 1919: 35)—is an example of the early inculcation of the directions as well as of the connection between chant and gesture. *Luna/lalo* and *uka/kai* are used in a children’s chant by Pa‘ahana Wiggin and her daughter Mary Kawena Pukui, which gives with remarkable concision a picture of the universe organized by the four basic directions.\(^{152}\)

The above method of binary organization is connected to many aspects of Hawaiian language and thinking, all of which were mutually reinforcing. For instance, in language, the directionals *aku* ‘away from the speaker’ and *mai* ‘towards the speaker’ are used constantly (Elbert 1951:351). Paired opposites are used commonly, such as *akua/kanaka* ‘god/human’, *ali‘i/kanaka* ‘chief/subject’, and *ola/make* ‘life/death’. Antithesis is a major device in rhetoric and poetry. In literature, little heroes beat big bullies, Kamapua‘a’s water fights Pele’s fire, and the two gods divide the
island of Hawai‘i between themselves, he taking the verdant lands and she the rocky. As with other educational devices, a practical aid influences thinking and then becomes an esthetic element.

Binary thinking can support an esthetic of balance or equilibrium, which can be felt strongly by a people trained to present complete forms, such as stories or lists, rather than fragments: the mental pattern demands to be completed. I have suggested, for instance, that Malo composes some original sections in an effort to balance traditional material in a new perspective (e.g., Malo x, xv 1–2). Pāka‘a ‘has memorized also the individual names of the winds from Hawai‘i to Ka‘ula’ ua paanaau pu hoi iaia ka inoa pakahi o na makani mai Hawaii a Kaula (Nākuina 1902a: 21), and has taught them to his son Kūapāka‘a. When Kūapāka‘a performs the wind chants, his father scolds him:

_Ua hewa oe i ko kahea e ana ae nei i ko Kauai makani, no ka mea, ua kahea mua iho nei oe i ko Hawaii, oia ka welelau makani o ka hikina, nolaila, o ko Kaula makani kau e kahea mua ai, oia ka welelau makani komohana, aohe hoi o ko Kauai._

‘You were faulty in your calling already on the winds of Kaua‘i, because you first called on those of Hawai‘i. That is the eastern extremity of the wind. Therefore, the winds of Ka‘ula were yours to call on first: that is the western extremity of the wind, not indeed those of Kaua‘i’.

Lorrin Andrews (June 13, 1832: 49 f.; 1834a: 166) was puzzled when he encountered this aspect of Hawaiian thinking early in his work in Hawai‘i. He writes that, although “Oral instruction is better understood,” Hawaiians sometimes do not understand the missionaries’ preaching. He gives as an example a sermon of his own:

The body of the sermon was taken up in running a parallel between the feelings, conduct and fears of a man perishing with thirst, and one earnestly seeking the salvation of his soul; and
supposed a man perishing with thirst on top of the mountain near to us.

Andrews later discussed the sermon with “a respectable looking man,” who asked him:

“What is the name of that man who lives on the mountain?” Without replying directly to his question, I said, “Did you hear my sermon?” He replied, “Yes.” “Did you understand it?” “Yes, it was exceedingly plain.” “Well” said I, “what did you learn from it?” “Why,” said he, “[“]there were two men, one up on the mountain and one on the seashore here; the one on the mountain was thirsty and wanted the other to bring him some water.” “Was this all you heard?” He replied, “Yes, that was all of it.” Besides losing the whole tenor of the sermon, the man on the seashore was from his own imagination.

The Hawaiian had apparently been so impressed with Andrews’ image, placed in the real setting of their location, that he was unconsciously compelled to complete the pattern: the *uka* with the *kai*. Moreover, Hawaiian literature would not leave an expressed longing unsatisfied; the man’s very thirst demanded that water be supplied. Similarly a Hawaiian medical practitioner prayed to *Jehova makua i ka lani, makua i ka honua* ‘Jehovah, parent in the sky, parent on the earth’ (K. July 2, 1859).

Andrews was later more positive about this aspect of Hawaiian thinking (April 23, 1875:30):

[Hawaiian poets] rigidly observe a relation when things answer to things and words to words, and also the proportion of one verse to another, and this relation appears both in the idea and in the number of the words: hence, they observe a rhythm of proportions and a harmony of sentences.

This tendency to equilibrium is still a strong part of Hawaiian thinking. At a concert in the 1970s, a singer explained to the
audience that she wanted to start her set with a religious song because the previous singer had been a little too suggestive “and there must be balance in all things” (compare Hallpike 1979: 407).

My reading of the primary Hawaiian sources convinces me that the organization of Hawaiian thinking in paired opposites encourages a tendency to consider both sides as equally important or in equilibrium. (I emphasize that this is a tendency because a given text can of course apply different symbolic values to a member of a pair.) I do not therefore apply to Hawaiian thinking certain structuralist theories that describe this organization as a means of imposing a hierarchy; I would not consider one member of the pair always dominant, and so on (see the discussion in Needham 1987: 102–186). In Hawaiian thinking, both pō and ao have their place (Charlot 1983a: 124 f.); this is true also of Māori thinking (Margaret Orbell, personal communication). Even where ethnographic evidence can be claimed of the social dominance of one member of a traditional pair—for instance in male/female and chief/subject—the use of the pair itself, when seen in its full extension, tends to give both members an equal weight (Charlot 1985a: 3 and note 11). Primary Hawaiian sources can therefore be used to revise opinions commonly expressed in the secondary literature about gender and class relations and indigenous views of them, especially since such opinions have often been formulated without reference to those sources or have used them only in translation. On the other hand, a people’s thinking can diverge significantly from its life-style and social organization, certain intellectual areas can be compartmentalized, and so on (compare Needham 1987: 233). Hawaiian literature exists in sufficient quantity to study the question in detail.

Furthermore although Hawaiians used the pairs to divide items—and could emphasize this division in a pair like life and death—I have the impression that they usually emphasized the connection created by the pairing rather than the opposition of its parts. This would accord with the general tendency to
emphasize similarities over differences. For instance, land plants are opposed to sea plants through placement, but are connected by form and sometimes name. Moreover, it is their connection to each other that makes them powerful in medicine and ceremony. The emphasis on connection could have arisen from the long tradition of using the elements of the pairs together and from the impression of similarity resulting from careful observation. Both these factors could have worked as a counterforce to the abstraction necessary to formulate the mental pairs (compare Needham 1987: 207–217). Similar pairs are described as being *piri*, related to or connected to, each other in a Society Islands text (Charlot 1985b: 172 f.); the Hawaiian cognate is *pili*.

Nevertheless, the organization of knowledge should not simply be equated with a world view. For individual thinkers, the organization serves as a framework within which can be found many important variations and differences. For instance, all star experts could use the up/down pair, but could have very different systems, nomenclature, origin traditions, and practices. Malo can incorporate a good deal of new material into his received framework. Nonetheless, the framework was one of the most important means of thought and communication used to create and express individual or group positions or views. Individual items could be placed, whatever the differences of opinion in certain cases. A universe of discourse, a mental context, was accepted through which views could be exchanged. Moving beyond the limits of that framework required an originality and creativity that could be easily recognized, as in the work of the chanter Keʻāulumoku. Possible influences of the organization of knowledge should therefore be studied, for instance, the extent of use and precise application of the basic pairs and their relation to subjects and fields. Moreover, the absence of major Western distinctions, such as human/nature and human/animal, is significant for defining Hawaiian thinking and differentiating it from Western.
Finally, the binary organization of knowledge influenced practice in many ways. For instance, in medicine, the expert begins his diagnosis by defining whether the malady comes mai loko ‘from inside [the family]’ or mai waho ‘from outside’ and then applies the procedure that properly follows from that decision (ma hope ‘behind’ can also indicate the latter in pig divination, Malo n.d.: xxviii 7). In the pani ceremony, a five-day treatment with one plant will be terminated with the ingestion of its traditionally paired opposite: a land plant by its related sea plant, and vice versa (Luomala 1989:304 f.). The many and various uses of binary pairs in Hawaiian culture is a vast subject that remains to be treated in detail. The following discussion is confined to general points.

In Hawaiian literature, pairs of opposites are often used to express completeness, such as big/little discussed earlier. A number of these can be used together for emphasis. Complete rule, sovereignty, or dominion is expressed by ‘O luna, ‘o ‘lalo, ‘o uka, ‘o kai and variants, as in two ancient sayings or laws. Rule over Kaua‘i is conferred with the words, O oe ke ‘ili o Kauai a puni, o oe maluna a ma lalo, mauka, a makai, ka moa a me ka maka ‘You are the chief of all Kaua‘i. You are the one above and below, landward and seaward, the cooked and the raw’ (Fornander 1918–1919:405). Kamehameha expresses the fullness of rule as O luna a me lalo nei, a o uka a me kai ‘Above and here below, and landward and seaward’ (‘Ī‘ī February 6, 1869). The pairs are used in a chant to express the same point (Roberts 1926:291):

No‘u o luna a no‘u a [sic: o] lalo
No‘u o uka no‘u o kai
No‘u o na wahi a pau o loa

‘Mine above and mine below
Mine landward, mine seaward
Mine all the places’.
Both pairs are joined to express the great power of Pele in fighting other gods. They are also used in the children’s chant by Pa’ahana Wiggin and her daughter described above.

In the Kalapana/Kaipalaoa tradition of a contest of wits, the young hero is told by the experts:

\[
\text{Pale o luna, pale o lalo, pale uka, pale kai, pale waho, pale o loko nei, e kapu o loko nei no makou . . .}
\]

‘Above is barred, below is barred, landward is barred, seaward is barred, outside is barred, inside here is barred on our behalf . . .’

The boy later uses the same formula against them with the variant ending \text{pale loko, pale waho nei} ‘barred inside, barred outside here’ (also Nākuina 1902b: 35).

In another version, the completeness of the boy’s education is emphasized (Fornander 1916–1917: 575):

\[
\text{ao iho la me ka makuahine a pau na mea a pau loa, o ko luna o ko lalo; o ko uka o ko kai; o ko ke ao o ko ka po; o ka make o ke ola; o ka hewa o ka pono; lolo iho la a pau . . .}
\]

‘he studied with his aunt until every single thing was done: the things of above, of below; of the upland, of the sea; of the day, of the night; death and life; wrong and right; a graduated expert in all . . .’

These same elements can also be used without being grouped so clearly into pairs. For instance, Kamakau (December 21, 1867) makes the point that chants had many subjects with the words:

\[
\text{Ua hana ia ko ka lani, ko ka lewa, ko ka moana, ko ka honua, ko ka la, ka mahina, na hoku a me na mea a pau.}
\]

‘Treated were the things of the firmament, of the upper spaces, of the ocean, of the earth, of the sun, the moon, the stars and all things’.
Many texts can be found in which more than one pair is used as a completeness formula:

Malo xxxiv 25, in a prayer, lani/honua, mauna/moana, pō/ao, for completeness.

ʻĪʻī August 28, 1869, luna/lalo, uka/[kai], for completeness, in a prayer.

Kepelino 1932:183 f., e.g., kua/alo, uka/kai, pō/ao, in a chant.

Manu April 30, 1894, -nui and -iki in names in a chant; also -lani and -nuu.

Nākuina 1902b: e.g., 35 f., 56, luna/lalo, uka/kai, pō/ao, loko/waho, aku/mai; and parallels; a part of the conventional hoʻopāpā ‘contest of wits’ form.

“Kaao Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” June 14, 1911:14, uka/kai and pono/hewa, in a chant.

N. B. Emerson 1915: 229 f., uka/kai and luna/lalo, in a chant.

Fornander 1916–1917: 359, Mauka/makai/Ma nae/Malalo.

Fornander 1918–1919: 615, luna/lalo, uka/kai, in a prayer.


Handy and Pukui 1972: 141, luna/lalo, Mai kahi kihi a kahi kihi/Mai ka hikina a ke komohana, uka/kai, loko/waho.¹⁵⁹

On the available evidence, not all completeness pairs were used to organize knowledge, although they had the potential. Their exact use must be defined on the evidence of the texts. For instance, alo ‘front’ and kua ‘back’ were used by Kamakau to describe Pākaʻa’s complete knowledge of the individual land divisions. The fact that the pair is found elsewhere, usually in the order kua/alo, demonstrates that it is traditional.¹⁶⁰ To my knowledge however, the pair is not used to organize large amounts of information.
Similarly, the pair *loko/waho* ‘inside/outside’ is found frequently as a completeness formula. ‘I‘i accepts his parents’ advice because they have studied *ma loko o waho o ke kanaka* ‘from the inside to the outside of the person’.

Kamakau expresses the completeness of Ka‘ahumanu’s rule: *Nona o loko, nona o waho, nona na‘līi, nona na . . .* ‘hers the inside, hers the outside, hers the chiefs, hers the . . .’. The pair also has a **limited** organizational function in that it can be used in the contest of wits and in medical diagnosis to distinguish family members from non-family members. But to my knowledge, the pair is not used for organizations of larger amounts of material other than occasionally according to its literal meaning. The pair can also be used quite normally in descriptions, for instance, of making a canoe (Kawaikaumaiika-makaokaopua October 26, 1922; December 7, 1922b). The pair *mua/hope* ‘before/behind’ can be used in the same ways, as can other less frequently used pairs.

The pairs of terms that were used to organize large, indeed potentially universal bodies of knowledge were *luna/lalo* ‘above/below’, *lani/honua* ‘sky/earth’, *uka/kai* ‘landward/seaward’, male/female, and *pō/ao* ‘night/day’, usually stated in the same, stereotyped order and found elsewhere in Polynesia. The first three are the most commonly attested, and the last seems to have had a limited, high intellectual use. An item could be placed or understood by location, gender, or time.

Each of these pairs had its advantages and disadvantages and could be selected for greatest utility for the task at hand. For example, *luna/lalo* and *lani/honua* are instantly recognizable as expressions of completeness and provide a basic cosmic framework. Indeed, one of the first items learned by a child was to *helu pō* ‘count the nights’, a system based on observing the sky. But in listing the items related to each member of the pair, the result would tend to be unbalanced. Moreover, *lani/honua* does not explicitly include the ocean.

*Uka/kai* appears less complete but permits a very balanced presentation of a large amount of material. Male/female connects
items to the genealogical view of the origin and development of universe, but has a predominantly ritual practicality.

The pair *pō/ao* has the unique advantage of expressing temporal sequence, such as the development of the universe in the *Kumulipo*. However when individual elements need to be placed in the universe as they originate, the *pō/ao* pair must be supplemented by the others. For example, plants arise in the *pō*, but they have to be placed *uka* and *kai*. Even as a temporal sequence, *pō/ao* can require further differentiation: the composer of the *Kumulipo* felt the need further to divide his sequence into sixteen wā ‘periods’.\(^\text{164}\)

I emphasize again that the selection of the pair to employ would most probably have been based on practical reasons, just as the sorcerer would use another prayer if the first one failed (J. S. Emerson 1918: 33). Accordingly an author can use more than one organizing pair at a time.

Location: *luna/lalo, lani/honua*, and *uka/kai*

*Luna/lalo* can be used as a simple completeness formula: e.g., *ua piha loa mai luna a lalo* ‘it was very full from above to below’ and *ua aoia ke kanaka mai luna a lalo i ka alo ana* ‘the person was instructed from above to below in dodging’\(^\text{165}\) ‘Ī‘ī also uses *lani/honua* as a completeness formula.\(^\text{166}\)

The combination of the two pairs in a famous proverb defines the ultimate framework of the universe: *He lani i luna, he honua i lalo* ‘The sky above, the earth below’. The proverb can be used to express the point that everything is secure because everything has or is in its place.\(^\text{167}\) To reverse the two would be a social and cosmic catastrophe, as in the famous prophecy of Kapihe. Both pairs can also be used singly or together to organize subordinate sections, and *luna/lalo* can be used to describe objects.\(^\text{168}\)

*Luna/lalo* can be used in an explicitly cosmological context, such as *ka papa i luna* and *ka papa i lalo* ‘the stratum above’ and ‘the stratum below’ as well as in related conventional phrases,
such as *ke ā luna me ke ā lalo* ‘the upper jaw and the lower jaw’.

The last phrase has been used to articulate stages of Māori education (Buck 1931: 58). *Lani/honua* has a cosmic reference in the famous saying, *Uē ka lani, ola ka honua* ‘The sky weeps, the earth lives’.

*Luna* and *lalo* are also traditionally related to social structure, as seen in the connection of chiefs to the above. They are related also to *ola* and *make* ‘life’ and ‘death’: “*E make paha, e ora paha = i runa te aro? i raro te aro?* To die perhaps, to live perhaps—upwards the face? or downwards the face?” 172 ’Ī elaborates on this ritual question to express the finality of death (March 20, 1869): *iluna no pau ke ola, a waiho ana ilalo ke kino make* ‘above indeed life is finished, and the dead body is laid below’. The connection to life and death is used in a significant gesture: the victorious Kahekili receives Kalaniʻōpuʻu’s envoys with his face up (Fornander 1969:1155).

*Luna/lalo* and *lani/honua*, sometimes with *uka/kai* and other terms, can also be used to organize material, as seen in lists. The cosmic connection is particularly clear in the birth chant for Kauikeaouli, which is organized by a series of questions as to who owns the *luna* and the *lalo*, a play on the expression of sovereignty described above; the pairs *lani/honua* and *pō/ao* are also used. *Luna* and *lalo* can also be used in simple descriptions and within subordinate sections for organization.

The pair *uka* and *kai*, usually in that order, is widely and variously used. For instance, Malo regularly moves in his discussions from the land to the sea. The order may be based on the common Hawaiian practice of always facing the sea with one’s back to the land. This appears to be the attitude described in a Hawaiian lullaby described above—*E hina iuka e, /Hina i kai e* ‘Rock landward/Rock seaward’ (J. S. Emerson 1919:35). Movement between *uka* and *kai* shows that one can go everywhere.

The pair is commonly used as a completeness formula and can be extended in recognizable ways. For instance, *ʻai* ‘vegetable
food’ and i’a ‘fish/flesh food’ can replace the usual terms (Pukui 1943: 214). A star expert says to Kamehameha I, *He ai no ko uka, he ia no ko kai, ai no kaua i ka momona o Hawaii* ‘Food indeed of the uplands, fish indeed of the sea—let us eat indeed of the fruitfulness of Hawai‘i’177 *Pau Pele, pau manō* ‘Finished off by Pele, finished off by sharks’ (Pukui 1983: number 2617), meaning doomed and without hope of refuge, is a focusing of the conventional pair.

_Uka_ and _kai_ can be used to organize quantities of materials, as seen in the lists of the *Kumulipo*. Plants to be learned could be studied from the sea to the mountains (Kekahuna n.d.: 3). Extended families were divided into those living in the uplands and those by the sea; they would complete their diet by mutual exchange (Handy and Pukui 1972: 183). Kepelino (July 2, 1867: 165) remarks on the similarity in _kaina_ ‘kind’ between the _pokipoki kai_ and the _pokipoki uka aina_.

_Uka_ was considered male, and _kai_ female, as in Sāmoa, and the pair was used in ritual and in story.178 The use of _uka_ and _kai_ became so habitual that it was a major part of the Hawaiian tendency towards mental balance, as seen above in the report of Lorrin Andrews on the way a Hawaiian understood his sermon (Andrews 1834a: 166).

Malo’s (n.d.) material is organized largely through the pairs _luna/lalo, lani/honua_, and _uka/kai_ both in overall structure and in subordinate sections. After discussing various traditions of the origin of the universe, he describes in chapters V and VI the basic framework of the universe. Chapter V defines the basic directions, which are divided into those related to the sky (sections 1, 2) and those related to the _mokupuni_ ‘island’ (section 3; _uka_ and _kai_ are mentioned; also section 12). In his complicated and at points debatable description of directions, Malo makes further use of _luna/lalo_ (sections 4, 5), _lani/honua_ (sections 5, 13), and _uka/kai_ (section 7).179 Malo also organizes his Christian arguments with _lani/honua_ (Malo 1837: 14–20, 29).

Malo’s chapter VI is titled *Ke kapa ana i ko luna me lalo*
'The calling/naming of the things of above and below', with *luna* occupying sections 1–19 and *lalo* sections 20–21. *Lani* and *honua* appear in section 2. Section 21 appears to be an original composition stimulated by the *uka/kai* pair, suggested by section 20. In fact, Malo proceeds to use that pair to organize his next chapters, VII–IX for *uka* (VII, parts of the island; VIII, rocks; IX, plants) and X for *kai*. He then abandons this scheme, but his chapters, especially on the more traditional subjects and fields, can be easily fitted into one of the pair.

The recognition of Malo’s framework—obscured in the translation along with his other forms—provides the shape for what to a modern reader appears to be a bewildering accumulation of items. To Malo and his original readers, the framework was so present to the mind that he could concentrate on filling it completely with the traditional and memorized items of information, information that needed to be transmitted to the next generation. Those who had received a classical Hawaiian education possessed the necessary balance between framework and data, between global and articulated thinking (Cole and Scribner 1974: 82–85), between holism and sequential thinking. Accordingly in literature, original schemata could be developed when needed to coordinate details (e.g., Charlot 1987: 11, note 41). When the classical verbal organization of knowledge was lost for many Hawaiians, part of a larger crisis of morale and identity, the result was an emphasis on detail that was often not balanced by the larger perspective. Details could thus lose their cosmic resonance and their connection to wisdom, Hawaiian culture could appear to be a loose collection of minutiae, and the great search could degenerate into pedantry and antiquarianism. At its worst, however, such diminished practice was redeemed by the strong emotions involved and the conviction that Hawaiian identity depended on the knowledge of Hawaiian culture.
**Place Knowledge**

The organization of knowledge by the spatial pairs *luna/lalo, lani/honua*, and *uka/kai* is connected to the emphasis in Hawaiian culture on place knowledge, a potentially all-encompassing field that includes human, social, cultural, political, and historical geography and provides symbolism and means of expressing ideas and emotions.\(^\text{180}\) Place knowledge has an extensive influence on literature and other fields and can be found in unexpected subjects. For instance, in medical literature, the point of origin of a disease can be given a prominent place in the material to be memorized about it (chapter V). This emphasis on place knowledge can be found throughout Polynesia, but with older exceptions,\(^\text{181}\) is little represented in secondary literature, a reflection perhaps of the current problematic neglect of geography in Western education.

Kanuha (March 17, 1866) considered this interest in places, and especially in itemizing the features of the place, a racial or cultural characteristic:

\[
\text{A iloko o ko’u noonoo ana, he keu aku no kakou o ka lahui kuekaa o ke aloha, o ka helu wale ia no ia o na wahi mea a pau, ina paha he malihini puka, he makamaka hele, he mea i make.}
\]

\[
\text{Alaila, o ke kuekaa aku la no ia o ka helu papa ana mai i na mea ai, a hiki i na mea aahu, mai na mea aahu a na mea o ka hale, mailaila aku a na mea ulu, a pela aku i na mea o ka lepo, laau, pohaku, na wa, a me na kau, a mahina hoi, &c., &c., a maluna’e nae o keia mau mea a pau, ekolu wale no mau mea mau e helu ai, o ka ua 1, o ka makani 2, a me ka la 3. Ua aloha ia ka la no kona welawela, hulili, lailai, kualiilii, kuawa, etc. A ke noho nei kela mea keia mea me ka pau ole o ka hoomanao ana i na ouli, na hiohiona o kahi i hanau ai, i noho ai hoi me na makua, i hoewe ai hoi a kupa, a me kahi i holoholo ai mai ka manawa kamalii a nunui wale.}
\]
'In my thinking, we are indeed the greatest people for doing detailed research out of love; this is indeed the gratuitous listing of all things, whether on the occasion of an arriving visitor, a friend who has traveled, or a person who has died.

‘Then there would be seeking of knowledge, the listing of the things to eat to clothes, from clothes to domestic articles, from there to growing things, and in the same way to the things of the soil, plants, rocks, periods, and seasons, and months/moons, etc., etc. And above all these things, there were only three things that were constantly listed: the rain 1, the wind 2, and the sun 3. The sun was loved for its warmth, sparkle, calm shining, dimming, return to shadow, etc. And this and that person is living without ceasing to contemplate the characteristics, the features of the place in which he was born, in which he also lived with his parents, in which he was also rooted until he became a true native of the place, and the places to which he traveled from the time he was a child until he was big’.

Similarly, Pukui writes:

[stories of famous places] were freely discussed. It was a matter of pride to the people of a locality to have many places of interest to point out to a visitor and to know the legends connected with each one. The more noted places there were, the greater the pride of the inhabitants who knew, loved and named even the rocks and trees.182

The broad and intense interest of Hawaiians in place knowledge was noticed by the early visitors to Hawai‘i. Hawaiians plied the earliest foreigners arriving in Cook’s ships with questions about the physical, economic, governmental, and religious characteristics of their homelands (e.g., Beaglehole 1967:625):

very inquisitive about our Manners & Customs; the Questions that he ask’d would alone be a proof that these people have a great Variety of Ideas, he ask’d after our King, our Numbers,
how our Shipping was built, & our houses, the Produce of the Country, if we ever fought, Who was our God, & such like.

This was a continuation of the practice of exchanging information among aliʻi during visits to other courts (e.g., Nākuina 1902a:2f., 128). Later Kamehameha II impressed Ellis (1984:446ff., 450) with his inquisitiveness, memory, knowledge of the world, and desire to see England and other countries.

The practice of exchanging information about places was common also among the lower social ranks; Ellis (1984:343) describes visitors singing songs from their homes in reciprocation for hospitality. R. C. Stewart (1990:161) reports of receiving strangers to the village in the early twentieth century:

The reason for the invitation was to get the latest news of the people and places the stranger had just come from. We were his very interested listeners.

The interest in place knowledge along with the usual childhood training in observation can be seen in the large amount of space that ʻĪʻī and Kānepuʻu devote to the description of the places they visited as children. The breadth, detail, and precision of their descriptions are impressive as well as the fact that they remembered them into adulthood and even old age.\(^{183}\) Such descriptions confirm that place knowledge was regularly included in the education of children. Children were also exposed to the considerable literature connected to place knowledge. The author of “He Moolelo Kaa no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” (May 12, 1921) recalls listening as a child to a famous chant about Keʻei, which he gradually memorized, and explains the traditional story used in it and place expressions. Place names were also used in children’s chants and games (e.g., Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:38).

Place knowledge was expressed in an extensive literature, which was a field of study. Place knowledge was in fact
prestigious,\textsuperscript{184} and superiority of knowledge could become a point of controversy, as seen in contests of wits and in the exchange between Kamaka Stillman and Kohala-nui-Kohala-iki.

As with almost all important fields, place knowledge could be professionalized in the expert called \textit{kuhikuhipu'uone}, described by Kamakau (December 28, 1867):

\begin{quote}
O na palena aina no hoi mai Hawaii a Kauai, ua ike no ka poe kuhikuhi puuone. O ka loina o ke Aupuni, o na kanaka, o na kulana o na hale, ke ola a me ka make . . .
\end{quote}

‘The \textit{kuhikuhipu'uone} knew the land boundaries also from Hawai‘i to Kaua‘i. The rules of the Government, the people, the sites of the houses, life and death . . .’

Similarly, Bicknell (n.d.:5) writes:

\begin{quote}
Kuhikuhipu'uone means chorography. Each professor of the art is a walking encyclopedia, and knows all the particulars relating to the surface of this group of islands. The names of lands, their positions, divisions, boundaries—everything, in fact, connected with them is committed to memory.
\end{quote}

In the Society Islands, the expert in place knowledge was called \textit{tātā'ōrero}, the cognate of the Hawaiian \textit{kākā'ōlelo}, ‘word/speech fencer’ or ‘orator, advisor’. Georg Forster writes (1968:428):

\begin{quote}
Besides the priests, there is also in every district one or two teachers, or tata-o-rerro, like Tootavaï, who are skilled in theogony and cosmogony, and at certain times instruct the people in these things. The same persons likewise preserve the knowledge of geography, together with their ideas of astronomy and the division of time.
\end{quote}

The connection with cosmogony is significant. The child Kānepu‘u (March 5, 1868) connected his ideas of travel and individual places to the classical picture he had of the cosmos even as late as the 1830s.
As with other fields, place knowledge was organized first by names—of places, winds, streams, rocks, famous inhabitants, and so on—all of which are used prominently in Hawaiian literature. Kanuha (March 17, 1866) urges older people to explain the names of rains, winds, and days—which are used in chants and narratives—to the younger generation: o na oleloao, a me na wehewehe a ka poe kahiko noonoo noiau, oia na olelo waiwai ‘the instructive statements and explanations of the thoughtful and wise older people, these are the valuable statements’. Authentic information from the inhabitants of a place is the most useful. People need to understand the meanings of the names in order to speak correctly and avoid mistakes (the author provides an interesting example of how his own speculation on the meaning of a name was corrected by someone who knew the genuine tradition). Those names were based on observation and the vocabulary used to express it: for instance, the names of the winds. All such knowledge was used in the literary genres related to places: many items were used to evoke a place. So the knowledge of them should be spread, laha. Kalaaukumuole (March 31, 1866) responded to Kanuha’s article, answering some of his queries. Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua (November 1, 1923) explains the place names of Kīlauea by providing the story on which they are based. From prophets and keepers of the gods, he learned chants in order to know better the land of Pele’s lava.

Names could also be gathered into lists, such as the wind chants of the Pāka’a story. Lists of place names most often took the form of itineraries. Memorized place names could be recited as if one were traveling around an island. ‘ī regularly organizes his descriptions and place knowledge, including stories, along the itineraries and even trails of his excursions. Itineraries also play a large role in other genres, both classical and modern, and were probably a factor in their development. For instance, chants and songs about an island can be organized as if the singer were making a trip around it. Kamakau (February 15, 1868) describes
a *mele helu kanaka* ‘a song to count people’: *E hoomaka ma Waikiki ka helu ana, e helu ia ka nui o na kanaka o kela ahupuaa o keia ahupuaa a puni o Oahu* . . . ‘The counting begins at Waikīkī; the quantity [of people] of this and that land section is counted all around O‘ahu. . . .’ Hawaiian newspapers are filled with reports of trips, one of the earliest new genres developed.¹⁸⁹

The intense interest in places, especially *wahi pana* ‘storied places’, influenced practice, especially in the love of visiting, pilgrimage, and sightseeing.¹⁹⁰ This was an educational experience as well as a pleasure. ‘Ī‘ī describes traveling to see all the things he had heard about, the delight of sightseeing, and seeing a Maui seaweed that reminds him of one at home.¹⁹¹ He speaks of *wahi makaikai nui* ‘big sightseeing places’, of sightseers watching surfing, and of people using the *makahiki* procession as opportunity to sightsee.¹⁹² The child Kānepu‘u is astonished and very excited at the idea of people traveling to another place and wants to go with them (March 5, 1868). Kānepu‘u’s father is always wanting to go sightseeing, sometimes alone, sometimes with his family, to learn about places, visit family, and perhaps discover a better place to live. When Kānepu‘u accompanies him, he tells his son place names and connects places to his own experience.

Sightseeing was a normal activity of chiefs.¹⁹³ When visiting a place, they would be accompanied by people who were knowledgeable about it (Pratt 1920:14 f.). The preparations for a chief’s trip created a good deal of excitement among his people (Nākuina 1902a:16 ff.). Many wanted to accompany the chief on his travels, but only useful people were allowed to go (“He Moolelo no Pakaa” October 24, 1867). People would accompany others on their travels in order to sightsee (Nākuina 1902a:127 f.). The large number of postcontact Hawaiians who took jobs as seamen in order to see the world can be understood in this context.

Missionary teachers found that Hawaiians were particularly interested in geography. In 1832, Dibble writes, “the geography, because it contains some things pleasing meets with a much
readier market than the scripture of eternal life.” They therefore found the subject useful for inculcating new ideas and ways of thinking, and “the fundamental principles of geography” were made one of the requisites for entrance to Lahainaluna. The teachers were helped in this by the fact that their idea of geography was similar to the Hawaiian idea of place knowledge: along with physical features, it included types of government, education, stage of progress in enlightenment, religion, and good and bad points; or what is called political geography today. Students were thus able to join their classical interests to the foreign subject. For instance, the high point of a hōike ‘display examination’ at the Wailuku boarding school for girls, was an English-language pageant in which eight girls represented eight different islands and contested the superiority of each: ua hai mai oia i kana mau mea kaulana me ka akena nui i kona mau pono ‘she proclaimed her famous things with great boasting about the things that were proper to her’.

Hawaiian students were especially interested in maps and map making, which resulted in the famous Lahainaluna copperplate engravings, produced under the direction of Lorrin Andrews. The important geography book by Whitney and Richards (1832) was composed for use with a map and even contained an exercise in map reading.

The new geography had a noted impact on Hawaiian views:

The geography, in connection with the maps it contains, is said to have occasioned much wonder among the people, with regard to the comparative size of their islands. What before had seemed to them a considerable part of the world, has dwindled down to a very insignificant point. Of course their views have been a good deal enlarged.

Malo (1837: 9; July 19, 1837) can therefore use the new knowledge to argue against the idea that Wākea is a god. Did he indeed make human beings? If he made the Hawaiians, did he also make
the foreigners from other lands? O Akea anei ke akua nui o na kanaka a pau? Ina pela, ua maopopo he Akua no ‘Is Wākea the great god of all human beings? If so, it is clear that he is indeed a god’. Malo uses a genealogical argument to return to the first human beings. Who was it who made them? Malo is making the point that Wākea has now been revealed as a local god, and Hawaiians have been given a new world view that has created new religious needs and requirements.

*Gender: Male/Female*

The male/female pair is found in Polynesia and indeed worldwide. The *Kumulipo* develops the genealogical model of the universe originating from male sky and female earth and developing as a family tree through succeeding generations that complete the universe (Charlot 1983a: 45, 121, 126). In this use, the male/female pair is applied universally. The antiquity of this notion is proved by Polynesian parallels and by older levels of tradition incorporated into the *Kumulipo* itself, such as the archaic stanza used in the first four sections, in which male and female are represented respectively by Wai‘ololī ‘narrow water’ and Wai‘ololā ‘broad water’. These terms have been identified for the *Kumulipo* with two streams in Waikāne valley, O‘ahu (Charlot 1990: 12), but were used elsewhere as well. Genealogies could be used also to organize individual fields, for instance, stars (Johnson and Mahelona 1975: 39 f.).

The male/female division is felt in Hawaiian culture today, as illustrated by a student paper by Olga Kalama (1986):

When I was a youngster, I spent much time growing up in Waimea, Oahu. My grand-aunt had a home on the beach side of Waimea Valley. Very important to us was the water that flowed
down the valley from the mountains to the sea. This water provided us with food, drink, and pleasure.

Many-a-time my grandmother would sit near the stream to wash her clothes on the rocks. We talked about many things. One of the things I remember her saying was that everything in life had to do with man and woman, or male and female. I asked her what she meant. She said it just meant the way you looked at the world around you.

For instance, this water in Waimea Valley. That narrow part over there is called Wai‘ololi. This is the male part like the male sex organ. Then the wide part over here is called Wai‘ololā and represents the female part. As the two parts join it is like a sexual union. The result is water full of food such as fresh to brackish water fish and limu [seaweed], even crab and ōpae [shrimp].

That such male/female categorizations were taken literally can be seen in the tradition of the ‘ili‘ili hānau o Kōloa ‘birth pebbles of Kōloa’ in Ka‘ū. The smooth stones are male, and the ones with pits or crevices are female. In the crevices are tinier pebbles, the babies, which fall off or are born.²⁰³

The male/female pair is used widely for organization. In the Kumulipo, besides the overall genealogical organization, the first five sections have a parent pair. Genealogies are of course organized through male and female, and the genealogical form can be extended to a variety of materials. Right is considered male and left female, so the right side represents the male side of the family and the left the female in divination.²⁰⁴ The tenon and mortise in roof construction were called ule ‘penis’ and kohe ‘vagina’.²⁰⁵ As in Tongan medicine, plants were also divided into male and female.²⁰⁶

In the archaic stanza of the Kumulipo mentioned above, pairs of land plants and animals are paired with ones from the sea, which are kia‘i ‘ia ‘guarded’ by their land member. This indicates that the
Land member of the pair is male and the protected sea member is female because the male is generally considered to be physically above the female and also to be her protector. In Sāmoa also, *uta* is male, and *tai* is female (Moyle 1981:21). The pair *uka* and *kai* is therefore related to male and female just as *luna* and *lalo* are (Johnson and Mahelona 1975:40). The male/female distinction can also be an opportunity for individual speculation, such as that thunder is masculine and lightning is feminine (Green and Beckwith 1928:15).

The male/female dichotomy was important in the organization of society, in which many activities, functions, and occupations were divided by gender.

The pair is prominent also in different types of prayer and ritual. Land and sea plants were used in medicine and sorcery (Kamakau 1964:139). In a number of prayers and rituals, the right side or right hand as male was identified with the god Kū and the female left with Hina. The fisherman carried the offerings to his male ancestral gods in his right hand and those for the female in his left (Kamakau 1976:64). Male/female as right/left was used prominently in omen reading, divination, and so on. The male/female connection probably explains the use of right/left for *kapu/noa* ‘tabued/free of tabu’ (Kaawa December 9, 1865).

The male/female pair is connected to the Hawaiian sense of balance, a reflection of their genealogical view of the origin of the universe. In prayers for positive purposes such as fertility, a male god or list of male gods is first called upon followed by a goddess or list of goddesses; their conjunction produces the object of the prayer. Malo (xxxiv 7) is very clear on the structure of this type of prayer: after giving the list of males, he writes, *pau na kua kane, alaila kahea i na kua wahine* ‘when the gods are done, then call on the goddesses’. Kamakau of Ka‘awaloa (Fornander 1919–1920:5) describes the priest advising the king to offer a pig to his god and a loincloth to his goddess. ‘Ī‘ī (July 3, 1869) describes a house for gods and another for goddesses.
Finally, the male/female pair as used in genealogies has an explanatory function. People can be understood from their family background. Indeed, given the genealogical model of the origin of the universe, all things can be understood from their generation.

*Time: Pō/Ao*

As a cosmogonic framework, the pair *pō/ao* has a long history in Polynesia. As so used in the *Kumulipo,* it is applied universally and in its articulation can subsume the other major pairs. *Pō/ao* is thus particularly appropriate as a completeness formula, and the line from the *Kumulipo,* *Po wale ho*—‘i ‘Only night’, is a strong expression of the incompleteness of the universe. *Pō/ao* has many other uses in Hawai‘i, for instance, for contrast.

The great advantage of the *pō/ao* pair is its reference to the passage of time. It can therefore be used to articulate the development of the universe and human beings—their life process, cultural progress, and history, a major concern of Hawaiian thinkers (Charlot 1983a:122–126). The individual can be understood by being placed in time at the proper point of his genealogy and in his moment in history.

**EDUCATION AND OTHER LITERARY FORMS**

All Hawaiian literary forms can be considered to have an educative function. For instance, one of the primary purposes of education was the preservation of information (Rae 1900:243, quoted above). I will mention only some salient literary forms and uses. An obvious example of an educational genre is prose instruction, of which many examples can be found. These instructions are related to instructional lists and chants.

The use of narration in education has already been mentioned
several times and is increasingly studied as a method of instruction and communication with unique capacities (Carrithers 1990:199 f.). Cautionary tales, trickster stories, and stories that contrast smart and dumb people have a clear educative function to which interpretation should be alert (e.g., Johnson 1957:31). Historical reports preserved past events (Rae 1900:244 f.) and provided models of proper and improper conduct. Hawaiians are still conscious of this function of narration; in the words of an elderly woman at a meeting on March 3, 1979, “Hawaiians taught by telling stories.”

Hawaiians recognized genealogies as a more secure historical source than reports. However as in Sāmoa, genealogies could provide the framework within which stories could be inserted, as will be discussed in chapter V. Malo (n.d.:I 10 f., II 3–7, III) begins his discussion with genealogies. Fornander (1969 II) organizes his ethnohistory of Hawai‘i by means of genealogies and the stories attached to the chiefs mentioned in them. In an article on his research, Kamakau writes that he has learned genealogies and then adds (October 28, 1865): O ka Moolelo o kela ali‘i o keia ali‘i, ke ali‘i maikai o ke Aupuni, ke ali‘i hookaumaha ‘The Story of that chief, of this chief, the good chief of the Government, the burdensome chief’. These stories are clearly moralizing. He then asks about the stories of different ruling chiefs, providing long lists of names, and invites the help of knowledgeable people:

Owai na‘Lii me ka poe naauao a me ka poe kahiko i koe, e hiki ke hai mai i ka Mooolelo o keia poe Ali‘i; a e huipu me a‘u i ka noonoo i ko kakou Mooolelo Hawaii.

‘Who are the Chiefs and the wise people and the old surviving people who can tell the History of these Chiefs and join with me in reflecting on our Hawaiian History.’

Contemporaries of Kamakau were similarly interested in Hawaiian history and evaluating the available sources, such as genealogies, stories, last testaments, and chants.
Polynesians recognize the use of chants in the preservation and transmission of information.\textsuperscript{216} Indeed, the chants themselves preserve obsolete terms and pronunciations.\textsuperscript{217} Chants in the *Kumulipo*, the story of Pāka‘a, and elsewhere, which list large numbers of items, were in all likelihood used for these purposes.\textsuperscript{218} One of the most grandiose examples is the canoe chant of Kana,\textsuperscript{219} which incorporates a large amount of vocabulary and information and stimulates the same sense of wonder at erudition described for the audience of Kūapāka‘a. These uses of chant continue in Hawai‘i with songs as well.

Chants were also used to transmit history: *O ka inoa nae o ka makuakane, he inoa kaulana loa ia a hiki i keia wa, a ua paa no hoi i ka haku ia i ke mele* ‘But the name of the father is a very famous name up till the present time, and it has indeed been fixed by being plaited [composed] into the chant’.\textsuperscript{220} Chants could therefore be used by nineteenth-century Hawaiians and others as sources for writing and even reconstructing history.\textsuperscript{221} Chants were also preserved from historical situations, as seen above. In education, such chants could have been provided with explanations; for instance, a standard method of interpretation consists of providing the historical or other context in which the sometimes obscure symbols, allusions, and references of the chant make sense, as seen in ‘Ī‘ī’s story of Kala‘imamahu, described above.\textsuperscript{222} Chants that contain high or esoteric teachings, such as the *Kumulipo* stanza mentioned above, may have been accompanied by prose explanations, as was done in Sāmoa with the genre *tūlagi* (Charlot 1988:302 f.). Such was the practice in modern times of the Hawaiian teacher Samuel Lono, whose teaching was encapsulated in a short chant that he used as the basis for his teaching. Similarly I have watched other teachers, such as Charles Kenn and Kalāhikola Nāli‘ielua, present their information by reading an older published text, and commenting on it. Kamakau himself seems to have used Malo in much the same way for his newspaper articles. The postcontact practice of using written texts as bases
for oral presentation is probably influenced by the Christian use of the Bible.

Chants were also used for giving instructions, for instance, in navigation (Johnson and Mahelona 1975:145, 147). Certain chants or passages in chants are themselves clear instructions or descriptions of processes and were in all likelihood memorized for that purpose, as were riddles.\(^{223}\)

Chants were used prominently in formal education. For instance, medical students would rise early and perform a long chant (Kekahuna n.d.:3). Chants provided rhythm for physical exercises, as reported by Emma Ahuena Taylor (1934:23): wrestling, using the club, spear-throwing, “all of these things had to go by the ‘pa’ (rhythmic beat) . . .”; “We always chant to the pupil how to swing that club and this club . . . .” In a concert of the Hālau Hula o Hoakalei, led by the hula master Hoakalei Kamau‘u, the dance to the chant KAUWIKI, Hula Ihe (spear) appeared to be such a spear exercise, with thrusting and parrying in rhythm. Spear dances are a genre (Tatar 1993:9). Rhythmic motion could be used in other activities, such as planting (Charlot 1979:50).

Hawaiians extended their use of literary forms to Western education, in particular, the chanting of their lessons to facilitate memorization:

> When they first began to learn to read and spell, it was impossible for them to repeat a column of spelling, or recite a lesson, without chanting or singing it. They had one tune for the monosyllables, another for the dissyllables, &c. and we have heard three or four members of a family sitting for an hour together in an evening, and reciting their school lessons in perfect concord.\(^{224}\)

This practice continued into the 1830s as described by Kānepu‘u: the teacher would call out, kāhea, a word and the students would repeat it in chorus, using the practice of kāhoa, or beginning a chant with others then joining in.\(^{225}\) This method was used in
reading as well. Chanting was also a prominent part of the hō’ike, the public examinations, which were held as a ceremonious festival. Of the first in 1820, Bingham reports:

One of their exercises on this occasion, particularly engaging to pupils and spectators, was the cantilating, in concert, and with a degree of Hawaiian enthusiasm, one of their lessons committed to memory, and which they were accustomed to teach to their acquaintances, at their places of abode.\(^{226}\)

New types of chants were composed for Western school subjects, such as an alphabet chant and one for the multiplication tables.\(^{227}\) A long modern chant or song to help to memorize fish is in alphabetical order and in jingle rhythm (Kepelino July 2, 1867: 55 f.). A chant to learn the vowels is a list chant with Biblical allusions (E. C. Smith 1955b:15). A higher level example is the famous mele ma‘i ‘genital chant’ for Kapi‘olani, which ends with the presentation of a list of the vowels, using eia.\(^{228}\) When danced, the list is accompanied by large arm gestures that shape the vowels, which was again a school practice in learning the letters of the alphabet. As Kānepu‘u reports, the students would answer the teacher in chorus me ke kuhi o na lima me he hula ala, oiai, e aweawe mai ana no paha ka hula o ka wa kahiko ‘with the gesturing of the hands like hula, that is, the hula of the old time was perhaps being faintly reflected’.\(^{229}\) Similarly many of the motions of schoolwork, such as lifting pens, seem to have been done in drill (Kamakau April 25, 1868).

In both classical and adapted Western education, the use of literary forms, music, and rhythmic movement or dance, contributed to the mood of learning. Stories stimulated the imagination, and chants trained in visualization. Along with information, the student absorbed the considerable esthetics of Hawaiian culture.\(^{230}\) Jacobus Boelen describes young Hawaiians happily singing and dancing on deck (Broeze 1988:80). Missionary descriptions of Hawaiians practicing reading in their own way show that they felt
a good deal of enthusiasm and delight. Similarly ‘Īi can describe classical prayers and ceremonies as le‘ale‘a ‘delightful’, a corrective to the sometimes protestantized view of Hawaiian religion in the secondary literature. Beauty is an integral part of Hawaiian culture, including education.

SUBJECT AREAS AND BODIES OF KNOWLEDGE

As seen in many of the earlier examples, lists are used not only singly but often in conjunction with other lists and materials. These can be simply set side by side in a discussion as needed. Lists can also be coordinated or grouped by subjects as seen clearly in Malo’s lists relating to fishing. Since such groups of lists are found elsewhere—for instance, in the fish lists in Fornander and Kepelino—they can be recognized as traditional collections of materials. Since the fish lists did not wholly suffice for instruction in the profession, they were used along with other information recorded. The whole set of information, including a number of different subjects, can be recognized as a field, such as fishing or farming. The fact that Malo, Kamakau, Kepelino, and other writers group their lists and information on such subjects as the gods and rituals, societal structure, and the organization of the court and the priests argues for those being fields as well.

A field was thus a collection of related subjects articulated in a variety of literary forms and other methods of transmission. Martial arts included spear fighting, club fencing, evading, and so on. Medicine included midwifery, bone-setting, pharmacology, and so on. Each of those subjects could in turn be considered a field with its own subjects; for example, evading included dodging, jumping, and ducking. Fields were therefore organized hierarchically. Traditional lists of the subjects of individual fields will be provided in chapter V.
A field could be developed when the amount of related subjects or materials became large enough to require organization. For instance, the vocabulary of ethics became so large that it needed to be gathered into lists. Those lists in turn needed to be organized, which was done under the pair *pono* ‘right’ and *hewa* ‘wrong’, a pair that could be used as the title of the field (e.g., Fornander 1916–1917:575). Historical models and cautionary tales could be organized under the same rubrics. Descriptions of the court, on the other hand, were arranged in the order of the hierarchy, with lists of officials supplied at the level of their rank. Such fields are recognizable as practical interests that require instruction. The identification of these subjects and fields, a large research project, would provide valuable information on classical Hawaiian culture.

The knowledge of a number of different fields could be a body of knowledge, comparable to a body of literature (Charlot 1987:1). Families, specialists, and schools possessed bodies of knowledge, which they passed down through the following generations, adding materials in the process (e.g., Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:57). The curriculum of the school of Pāmoa, quoted in chapter V, is an extended list of subjects and fields that represents the body of knowledge of a school (Kamakau September 23, 1865a). Another curriculum—including politics, history, science, martial arts, literature, and sports—is sketched in a passage on chief Kakuhihewa of Hawai‘i (Sterling and Summers 1978:229). The process of transmission of a field within a family can be studied in the work of Kepelino, if indeed his father was the informant of Jules Rémy in 1853: their discussions of chiefs and priests overlap largely in content and significantly in their traditional presentation: lists of items followed by sections explaining them.234

The literature on *ho‘opāpā* ‘contests of wits’ mentions the fields and subjects learned and demonstrates ways of organizing them (Beckwith 1922:320). Kamakau (December 22, 1870)
provides a detailed list of the subjects studied by Pākaʻa: He kanaka naauao o Pakaa, a ua aoia oia ma na oihana naauao me ka makaukau loa. Eia na oihana naauao i aoia ia ia ‘Pākaʻa was a learned person, and he was educated in the professions of knowledge with great readiness. Here are the professions of knowledge taught to him’. Kamakau organizes these into four groups. The first is land knowledge, including the lands and the ahupuaʻa ‘political land divisions’ from Hawaiʻi to Kauaʻi; the front, alo, and the back, kua, of the lands; the winds of the different lands and the sea; and the rules and customs of the different lands. The second group of materials concerns matters of the ocean and navigation: navigation out of sight of land, weather signs, winds, and stars. The third group contains some elements of the second but adds the knowledge of handling and righting a canoe. The fourth group centers around paddling, but includes all the knowledge—some of which overlaps previous groups—needed to become the chief boatman of Keawenuiaʻumi, the basis of Pākaʻa’s power. The list is characteristically Hawaiian in its inclusion—in a Western view—of both intellectual and practical or physical subjects; in Hawaiian thinking, however, they were all ‘oihana naʻauao ‘professions of wisdom or knowledge’. Moreover, the groups are organized around the paired opposites of land and sea. Also that same pair is used within the first group in the contrast of land and ocean winds. A more minor organizing pair, front and back, alo and kua, is also used in that group.

These same elements can be found in Kamakau’s description of Pākaʻa’s education of Kūapākaʻa (December 29, 1870):

_Ua naauao keia keiki, a ua makaukau i ka hoopaapa [sic] olelo, a ua akamai loa ma ka hookele moana, a ua paanaau loa ia ia na makani o ka aina a me na makani o ka moana, a ua akamai loa i ke kilokilolani, a ua akamai loa i ke ano o na ao a me na hoku, a ua naauao loa i ke ano o ka pii ana o ke au iluna a ilalo, a me na la au pale iwaho, a me na la e pale ai ke au i ka aina, a ua_
maopopo ka puka ana o kela hoku hookele waa, a me keia hookele i kela manawa i keia manawa o ka po mai ke ahiahi a hiki i ke kakahiaka, a ua ike ia na malama a me na la makani ino iloko o kela malama a o keia malama iloko o ka makahiki, a e like me ke akamai o kona makuakane, a pela no ke akamai i loaa i kana keiki ia Kuapakaa.

‘This child was wise and was ready/prepared for contests of words. He was very knowledgeable in ocean navigation, and the winds of the land and the winds of the ocean had been firmly memorized by him. And he was very knowledgeable in the observation of the sky, and was very knowledgeable in the types of the clouds and the stars, and was very wise in the ways of rising of the current up and down, and the days the current would block the oceanside, and the days the current would block the land. And he understood the rising of this canoe-steering star, and this steering at this and that moment of the night from evening until morning. And the months and days of bad winds within this or that month of the year were known. Just like the knowledgeableness of his father, so indeed was the knowledgeableness obtained by his son, by Kūapāka’a’.

Nākuina (1902a) articulates the education of Pāka’a and his son with the same devices:

ua a'o mua aku la o Laamaomao ia Pakaa i ka inoa o na makani a pau, na pule a me na mele a me na paha, a ua pau ia mau mea i ka paa ia Pakaa. ‘La‘amaomao first taught Pāka’a the names of all the winds, the prayers and the chants and the spontaneous songs, and these things were exhaustively fixed by Pāka’a’ (21).

As Pāka’a grew in size and beauty, ua piʻi pu ae hoi me kona ike, akamai a me ka maiau i na hana a pau o ke aloalii o Keawenuiaumi; ua pau iaia na loina o ka lani a me na ano o ka honua, oia hoi ka mahiai ana a me na mea a pau e pili ana ilaila, ke kilo hoku a me ka holo moana ana, ka hookele waa, ka noho ana o uka nei o ka aina, ka lawai'a a me na ano hana e ae
no a pau . . . ‘there grew also along with them his knowledge and intelligence and carefulness in all the works of the presence/court of the chief, Keawenuia’umi; he learned exhaustively all the rules of the sky and the characters of the earth, that is, farming and all the things related to it, the observation of stars and ocean travel, canoe navigation, the way to live in the uplands above the inhabited areas, fishing and all the other types of work . . . ’ (27).

Pāka’a has two rivals: ua maopopo hoi ia laua na loina a pau o ia hana. He ike hoi ko laua i na ouli o ka lani a me ka honua, ka la malie a me ka la ino . . . ‘they understood all the rules of this work. They had knowledge also of the signs of the sky and the earth, the calm day and the stormy day . . . ’ (30).

Nākuina also mentions the name chants composed by Pāka’a for Keawenuia’umi as one of the first things he taught his son.235

Similarly, the riddling chief in the story of Kalapana learns na ike, na hana, ame na mele hoopapa apau ‘all the pieces of knowledge, the actions, and the chants of the contest of wits’ (Nākuina 1902b:6); he learns also na nane huna oia hana ‘the hidden riddles of this work’ (8). Kalapana’s father learns slowly na olelo hoopapa ame na loina apau o ia hana, a ua paa iaia na mea e ae apau ‘the speeches of the contest of wits and all the rules of that work, and all the other things were learned firmly by him’ (9). But he fails to obtain completely two categories: ka moku kele i ke kai ame ka aina nui o ka makani ‘the island surrounded by sea and the big lands of the wind’; that is, he learns all but one item of each of the two categories and so loses the contest and his life. These two categories are mentioned later with the same titles: oia ka moku kele i ke kai, a oia no hoi ka mea i pa ai o kona makuakane, ame ka aina nui o ka makani ‘that is, the island surrounded by sea—and that is indeed the thing by which his father was beaten—and the big lands of the wind’.236 Kalapana, on the other hand, learns na olelo hoopapa apau ame na mele hoopapa apau ‘all the speeches of the contest of wits and all its songs’ (13). One must also learn
about all the equipment used in the contest, *na mea hoopapa ame na lako hoopapa apau*.

As seen in the above discussion of lists and fields, Hawaiians organize their knowledge hierarchically. Larger categories contain smaller ones, and lists contain sublists. Hawaiians clearly articulate such hierarchical organizations. In his discussion of the year, Malo begins by stating, *Ua mahele ia na wa, me na malama, ma loko o ka makahiki hookahi* ‘Within the single year are divided the periods/seasons with the months’ (n.d.: xii 1). The year is thus divided hierarchically into three levels: the year as a whole, the two seasons, and the months within those seasons. *Maloko o ka makahiki hookahi elua no wa, o ke kau, o ka Hooilo* ‘Within the single year, the seasons are indeed two: the warm season and the Rainy Season’ (section 2). Each season is introduced—*eia no ke kau* ‘here is indeed the warm season’ and *Eia nohoi ka Hooilo* ‘Here is also the Rainy Season’—and general information is given about them. He then states that inside, *maloko o*, each season are six months (section 4). Those months are then listed separately with information: *Eia no na malama o ke Kau* ‘Here indeed are the months of the Warm Season’ (section 5, with termination, *malaila e pau ai ko ke Kau mau malama eono* ‘there are done the six months of the Warm Season’) and *Eia no na malama o ka Hooilo* ‘Here indeed are the months of the Rainy Season’ (section 6, with termination, *malaila e pau ai, ko ka Hooilo mau malama eono* ‘there are done the six months of the Rainy Season’). Malo descends from the largest category towards the smaller ones or from higher to lower, a characteristic of hierarchical thinking. In contrast, in his discussion of time, Andrews (1829:1) moves in the opposite direction. Kepelino’s (1932:83 ff.) discussion of the year is organized in Hawaiian fashion. In his discussion of dream lore, Kepelino (1932:115–123) starts with large categories—*Ua maheleia ka moe uhane ma na papa elua* ‘The dream is divided into two classes’ (115): propitious and unpropitious, deliberate and
non-deliberate. After giving examples of good dreams, he turns to bad ones, which he introduces (119 ff., Part 3) and then groups into two subcategories (121 ff.).

Hawaiian society was itself organized hierarchically—family, chiefs, priests, temples, and so on—and Hawaiian descriptions of those subjects are also formulated hierarchically. For instance, Malo’s description of political land divisions (n.d.: vii 4–8) descends from the island, mokupuni, which is ka mea nui ‘the big thing/category’, through successively smaller divisions. At each level of division, he states A ua mahele [hou] ia . . . ‘And it was divided [anew] . . .’; maloko ‘within’ or malalo ‘below’ express subordination in the hierarchy. Similarly in his description of society, Kepelino (1932: 147) starts with society as a whole and descends through the ranks, using malalo iho to indicate subordination. Such hierarchical descriptions are used very practically in defining administrative and tribute responsibilities. The development of specialization also follows a hierarchical pattern: a general field is divided into parts that become specialties.

Moving from general to particular, from big to small, high to low, and from category to detailed contents is characteristic of Hawaiian thinking (e.g., Fornander 1919–1920: 161, 175). This practice demonstrates that the organization of knowledge was present in the minds of Hawaiians and provided the structure for their thinking and discourse. Moreover, the differences between the levels of hierarchy were considered significant, as seen, for instance, in Kamakau’s description of his differences with the famous genealogist A. Unauna:

Ma na Mookuaauhau nui; ua like pu no, aole kue kana i ka’u, ua like no. Ma na Mookuaauhau liili o iloko o na Mookauhau [sic] nui. Malaila ka like ole o kekahi me kekahi.

‘In the big genealogies, it is indeed the same; his do not oppose mine, they are indeed the same. In the small genealogies within the big genealogies—there is the dissimilarity of one with the other’.
The hierarchical organization of knowledge was an aid in its transmission, memorization, and recall. Indeed, modern researchers have found that a structured curriculum is more effective for Hawaiian students (Sloat 1981:10 ff.).

RECALL, RETRIEVAL

Once information has been memorized, it must be retrieved from long-term memory. Being able to do so is one component of intelligence and successful thinking (Baron 1988:119). All the devices discussed above can aid in that process; for instance, the good mental organization of memorized materials makes them easier to retrieve (e.g., Baron 1988:72 ff.). Indeed, retrieval or recall itself reinforces and helps in the maintenance of memory. Hawaiian memory retrieval games would have served this function as well.

Hawaiian awareness of memory retrieval problems is seen in the history of the chief Lonoikamakahiki. He is engaging in a series of contests of wits with the O‘ahu chief Kakuhihewa, who is being aided by two former advisors of Lonoikamakahiki, now his enemies.241 They feel their new master will have the advantage in that Lonoikamakahiki is he alii inoa ole, translated literally ‘a chief without a name [chant]’ (277; also 309). The phrase is however rhetorical and cannot be taken literally. Lonoikamakahiki, like any Hawaiian high chief, has several name chants, a fact known to the advisors; two of those chants are provided in the text.242 He is also capable of memorization, as seen in his memorizing a chant through the night and being able to chant it the next day (277, 283–289, 307 ff.).

Lonoikamakahiki’s problem is memory retrieval, which is very precisely described (307 ff.). His wife arrives and chants her husband’s name chant, to which he is supposed to respond by chanting hers. He knows the chant but cannot remember it, so he looks fixedly at his former advisors because they know the chant
themselves. He is looking for a prompt (not for them to do the chant as in the interpretative translation). They refuse to help him, and he later threatens them with a horrible death. Fortunately the first four lines of his wife’s name chant finally come to him, and he can put them together with a few other lines he snatches up. Kakuhihewa complains that he chants other people’s name chants but not his own. Lonoikamakahiki then *hana pū ‘works with’* his wife to perform his name chant. Curiously, Lonoikamakahiki later had mental difficulties that may have been of a type, the Fugue state, associated with memory problems.

Lonoikamakahiki was seen to be requesting a prompt from his erstwhile advisers and was furious when it was refused. Such prompting is described in Hawai‘i and elsewhere in Polynesia. Prompting, like other devices, has developed into an esthetic element in hula: the lead dancer calls out the first word or words of the next section, which is then chanted and danced.

Memory can also be jogged by association. Kalapana remembers an item in the category ‘āina makani nui ‘lands of many winds’ when the wind-invoking chant of the kite-flying Hilo children comes into his mind (Nākuina 1902b:94).

Games were developed for retrieval. A number of such games have been described for Polynesia, and they most often take the form of contests (Harms 1969:143): ‘the character of a contest. [Successful play] depends either on quick reaction or on as large a knowledge and as large a vocabulary as possible’. Contests can consist of simply naming objects within categories, as in *mana, “An educational game”* on Mangareva (Buck 1938:183):

> all the names of men, women, and children of the archipelago; of the animals, insects, birds, and fish; of places on land and sea; of plants, corals, shells, and even stars. The one who failed first lost the game.

More common are guessing and riming games. As with other wordplay, these can be imbued with power; “A charm
mentioned in folk tale is ‘to name every word that ends with lau’” (Beckwith 1919:319 f.). Such games could also be cast in a cosmic structure. In a Samoan game, one side gives the name of a bird, and the other must answer with a fish name that rimes with it (Harms 1969:145). This is the form of several non-riming lists in the Kumulipo. Other educational forms could be used, such as the itinerary: memorized place names would be recited as if one were traveling around an island (Rae 1900:243). Such games were used by both adults and children and provide a context for Kūapāka’a’s statement that the great chants of Hawai‘i island are he mea paani wale no na ko onei kamalii ‘just a plaything for the children of this place’ (Nākuina 1902a:53).

**MANIPULATION OF KNOWLEDGE: RIDDLING**

The games mentioned above involve a certain amount of manipulation of knowledge. That is, education and training involve not only the retention of memorized materials but their use as well, a use that in itself would reinforce retention. Moreover, memorization alone would tend to stiffen the mind; exercises in manipulation are needed to retain its free play. The thinker has to be able to recategorize materials, look at them from new perspectives, use them to solve problems, apply memorized materials to new contexts, and innovate creatively on the basis of tradition. In the story of the Ka-Miki (“Kaao Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki” January 24, 1912:17), a competitor in contests of wits and martial arts, the hero has two gods. The job of one is to ku a hoolohelohe, ku a hoolonolono, ku a hakilo ‘stand and listen, stand and hear, stand and observe closely’. The other god is also named Ka-Miki, a significant name, no ka miki i na olelo hoopapa, i na olelo akamai a nanenane, a i na mea no apau loa ‘for the quickness/alertness in the speeches of the contest of wits, in the smart sayings and riddling, and in all things’. Finally knowledge has to be tested, as
seen prominently in the ho’opāpā ‘contest of wits’ and in the practice of modern Hawaiian teachers.

In classical Hawaiian culture, a major means of achieving the above ends was riddling.

Such performances require a very ready memory, as well as an active wit. (Beckwith 1922: 327)

It demands complete objective knowledge about the material world, a retentive memory, and quickness in matching analogies, either in the sounds of words or in descriptive elements of objects. (Beckwith 1932: 333).

Riddling can be found in most cultures, but in classical Hawaiian, it became a central characteristic, an integral part of the power and beauty of the culture. A large body of riddles was and continues to be created, and riddles constitute an important literary form, related in many ways to other genres. Far from being a practice primarily of intellectuals and the upper classes, riddling was enjoyed by all classes, as seen in the stories told of it and in the various types of subjects employed. The Hawaiian newspapers published many letters on ancient and modern riddles, often using new materials, such as the Bible and Western artifacts and practices. These letters merit a full study.

Riddling can be related to—and indeed entered into—many aspects of Hawaiian culture, thought, and life. The author of “O Hawaii Naauao I'o No” (May 25, 1922) comments on the current newspaper discussion of proverbial sayings:

He oiaio, ma ke ana [sic: ‘ano] naauao, aole paha he lahui i like me keia, i loaa ka holo laula o keia mea he naauao mai o a o o ka aina, iwaena o na kanaka, mai na alii a na makaainana; na kanaka nui ame na kanaka iki, a pela aku.

‘It is true. For the characteristic of wisdom, there is probably no race like this one that has achieved the wide spread of this thing,
wisdom or wise sayings, from one end of the land to the other, among the people from the chiefs to the commoners, the great people and the small people, and so on’.

Hawaiians came to regard the literary practice of multiple meanings and their interpretation as a distinguishing characteristic of their culture. The author of “Kekahi Mau Olelo Hawaii Naauao” writes (May 18, 1922):

\[\text{Aole paha he olelo ma ke ao nei, i like mai me ka olelo Hawaii, ka loaa o ka manao iloko o na huaolelo pokole loa. I keia mau mamalaolelo e ikeia ai ka naauao o na kanaka o ke au kahiko.}\]

‘There is perhaps no language in this world like the Hawaiian language for achieving the meaning within very short words/statements. In these sentences is seen the wisdom of the people of the olden time’.

He provides several sayings and states that different interpretations are possible. He then asks:

\[\text{Auhea la na olelo a na lahui e aku i hiki e hoopili mai i keia mau olelo Hawaii? Aole loa!}\]

‘Where are the statements of other races that can be compared to these Hawaiian statements? There are none at all!’

Hawaiian is not only beautiful to hear, but it has meaning. He worries however that people are beginning to lose the ability to perceive that meaning. Now is the time to return and to recover this ability for future generations. The language must not be lost.

Most evidently, the Hawaiian interest in riddles had a strong influence on literature, reinforcing the tendency towards wordplay, symbolism, levels of meaning, and hidden meanings, \textit{kaona}.\textsuperscript{249} The influence of riddling on other genres can be overt. A riddle can be included in a chant, and a conventional statement
of the contest of wits can be used as a saying. The structure of the great chant on the water of life, *He Mele no Kane*, is based on a ritual question that could be used in a riddling contest: *he ui he nīnau* ‘a question, an inquiry’.

Under the influence of riddling, poetry can become hermetic and even euphuistic (Beckwith 1922: 330 f.):

> It is likely that puzzling metaphor and pun became the fashion during a special period of Hawaiian history—that period which was dominated by the brilliant group of traditional island chiefs who appear in this set of stories and which is said to represent the high water mark of Hawaiian intellectual energy. Its taste dominated later art. The simplicity of the archaic style was probably vitiated by the riddling tendency, and the result is an incoherent elaboration of riddles which even in the noblest of the later chants of Hawaii remain unintelligible to the Hawaiians themselves. Scandinavian and Irish native art met with the same fate, and probably through a similar domination of wit over the imagination among an aristocratic circle closed to the uninitiated.

The riddling tendency in literature can be seen also in less conventional examples, for instance, in Kānepuʻu’s teasing joke of dating his childhood memoirs a hundred years in the past and claiming he was translating them from an old history.

Many factors supported the Hawaiian emphasis on multiple meanings in literature. A saying preserved by Kalāhikiola Nāliʻielua coincides with modern scholarship in considering the Hawaiian language itself, with its many homonyms and simplified grammatical structure, as the basis of such tendencies: *Haele pū ka huaʻōlelo me ka nane* ‘The word goes together with the riddle’. Riddling was therefore one of the factors in the formation of Hawaiian thinking, a “habit of mind” that looked for analogies and double meanings (Beckwith 1919: 322 f., 325 f.), part of the general mental tendency to perceive relations, similarities of form, and so on. The author of “Kekahi Mau Olelo Hawaii
Naauao” states (May 18, 1922): *Nui ka naauao o na kupuna Hawaii o kakou, i ke kii ana i na huaolelo hoopilipili* ‘Great was the wisdom of our Hawaiian ancestors in finding words/sayings that related things, were figurative, and made points’. In Hawaiian practice, the literal meaning, the original referent was never lost, but preserved its own beauty and value:

*no ka ulu keia mau olelo, a ua pili no hoi i ka ulu, eia nae, aole no ka ulu wale ka manao. O ka mea nui . . .*

‘these statements are about the breadfruit, and they relate indeed to the breadfruit, however the meaning is not about the breadfruit alone. The important thing . . . ’ is the application of the saying.

Hawaiians were capable of apprehending conventional symbolic communication as easily as direct and could be uncomfortable if they perceived a double meaning they could not identify, as Kamehameha does when he suspects a *kaona* is directed towards him.²⁵³ A riddle can be used as a model for anything secret.²⁵⁴ A riddle, just like a proverb, also made a point. Thus, *nane* can be used to translate the *fables* of Aesop (Johnson 1975: 214) or to refer to an ominous or portentous remark. ‘Ī‘ī (July 10, 1869), relates an episode from his childhood: he was crying from fatigue while walking with some adults, when one of them uttered the *nane* that the approaching foreigners did not like children who blubbered. The use of hidden meanings in Hawaiian literature lends it a power not found in the literature of other peoples (Kalaiwaa May 29, 1924):

*akamai ma ka haku ana i na mele, a ua nani loa na huaolelo, a ua okoa loa ka mana (kaona) i hana ia na mele Hawaii.*

[the Hawaiian race is] ‘intelligent in the composing of chants, and the words are very beautiful, and the power (hidden meaning) with which Hawaiian chants are made is very different’.
Riddles and proverbial sayings can be used also to mask meaning; they can express thoughts that cannot be understood by all (S. K. K. November 1, 1923):

_‘The story that relates to these uttered words [and thus provides their interpretation] is the thing that shows the depth and profundity of these words, and for this reason probably these words are called words of wisdom or a wise saying’._

S. K. K. gives as an example _ka huaolelo loea iwaena o na wahine kukukapa_ ‘the saying of an expert among the women who beat tapa’; _Ke ike nei kakou i ka naa[u]ao hohonu o na olelo no'eau a keia poe o ke au kahiko_ ‘We see the deep wisdom of the wise sayings of this people of the olden time’. Riddling or hidden speech could be used to offer hidden insults or to confuse people who should not know what one is communicating. Similarly a traveler could reply to overdirect questions with evasion or riddling to confuse possibly hostile gods (Green and Beckwith 1928:11). A riddle might be used to mask a criticism of a group or of the government so as not to turn its members into enemies.

Riddles, like proverbs and chants, require interpretations, which can differ (“Kekahi Mau Olelo Hawaii Naauao” May 18, 1922). Responding to a call to help the Bishop Museum collect proverbial sayings and riddles to preserve for posterity, Z. P. W. Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopa responded with a very practical interpretation of a saying, while Samuel K. Kekoowai provided a more religious one. Such interpretation requires research. Lio-kakele describes the work done to solve a riddle (September 29, 1911):
oiai ua imi ia a ua nowelo ia e ua loea la iloko o ke ala pohihihi o ka oihana ike kahuna o ke au kahiko i kapa ia ka Oihana Loulu Heiau Akua.

‘that is, [the subject] was searched and delved into by that expert along the entangled path of the occupation of priestly knowledge of the olden time that is called the Occupation of the Godly Temple of Loulu [a medical temple].’

Other intellectual games can be found that are similar to riddling, for instance, the guessing of string figures. Hawaiians could also use symbolic gestures and practice riddling behavior. Kaopulpulu tattoos his knees “as a sign that the king had turned a deaf ear to his admonitions” (“Traditional Account of the Ancient Hawaiian Prophesy” 1903:109; also 110 f.). An advisor urges Kamehameha to use a symbolic, riddling gesture to avoid conflict with Kaumuali’i, the chief of Kaua‘i; the latter chief’s advisor uses the very same analogy (‘Ī‘ī October 30, 1869). A riddling behavior practiced today among Hawaiians is acting nuha ‘sulky’ or perturbed without explanation until others guess what what the trouble is and move to correct it; the sulker need not take responsibility, since he has made no complaint.

Words and gestures or deeds can be combined in a riddling way. The deed might fit the words explicitly, but not the ordinary or conventional understanding of the words, producing a kind of wordplay (Beckwith 1970). Formal riddles could be combined with gestures or performed in a relation similar to that between chant and hula (McAllister 1933:91 f.).

Familiarity with such practices disposes Hawaiians to suspect a cryptic meaning when a slight unusualness is sensed in words or deeds or in their combination. At a meeting of the ‘Ahahui ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i, on June 17, 1978, the Hawaiian religious leader Kalâhikiola Nāli‘ielua told a version of the famous story of
Kalākaua’s forgetting a promise he had made to give a position to his companion, David Kamaʻiopili, in the event that he gained the throne. One day the companion was playing billiards with the new king and hit a ball to the rim of a pocket. “Almost there,” he said, “but not quite.” Kalākaua realized the remark contained a hidden meaning, thought about it, and remembered his promise.

Kilau Pali E— (September 28, 1922) relates another version of the story in significant detail. He begins by referring to the general practice: O ka hohonu o ka manao iloko o kekahi hopunaolelo i manao ole ia, he anu nui ia olelo, o ia ka noelau ‘The unsuspected depth of meaning within some statements—such a word is important—it is a word of wisdom/a wise saying’ He then narrates the story behind the saying. Kamaʻiopili was a friend of J. M. Kapena, the governor of Maui and Molokaʻi, and often played billiards with him. He resented however the fact that the governor was giving positions to others but using him merely as a billiard partner. He consoled himself with his knowledge that the governor was a wise man. One day, Kamaʻiopili missed an easy shot and said, Kahaha! I ke alo iho la no ka hoi ka ulu, a o ka hala iho la no ka hoi ia ‘Astonishing! The ball was right in front of my face, and yet it faulted/passed by’. People thought about the event: Mai ia manawa mai, ua lilo keia olelo i mea kamailioia e na mea a pau ‘From this time, this statement became something that everyone talked about’. It was in fact condensed into a saying that people used when they missed a shot: I ke alo iho la no ka ulu, a hala—‘The ball was right before my face, and it passed by—’:

Nolaila ua lilo keia olelo a Kamaiopili i olelo hoopaaani na na mea apau, me ka ike ole, a maopopo ole, he mea anu nui koʻikoʻi iloko o ia mau hopunaolelo.

‘Therefore, this statement of Kamaʻiopili became a playful saying used by everyone, without their knowing or understanding that there was something important and serious inside this statement’.
When Kapena mentioned the saying to Kalākaua, the king recognized that it had a hidden meaning and asked: *Heaha ka mana'o nui iloko o keia mau olelo a Kamaiopili?* ‘What is the important meaning inside these words of Kama'iopili?’ An advisor answered that it referred to the fact that although Kama'iopili was a companion of the Kapena, he had not yet been given a position. Admonished, the governor stated:

_Auwe no ka hoi ka nui o kuu naaupo e! Eia ka no'u no neia mau olelo ana e pahenehene mai nei. Ka! pololei, pololei o Kamaiopili, imi no hoi ka noeau o ka olelo a iloko o ka ulu pahupahu e waiho ai, ke kaona o ka mana'o, nui ka ike._

‘Alas indeed for the greatness of my foolishness! It is me these words are mocking. So! Kama'iopili is right, right, to have sought the wisdom of the saying even inside the billiard ball that is left, the hidden point of the meaning. Great is the knowledge’.

Kapena appointed his friend magistrate for Moloka'i, the saying became famous throughout the islands, and a song was composed about the story.

Kama'iopili’s meaningful action depended on Kapena’s possessing the wisdom to understand it. Such actions and sayings are used by Hawaiians in confrontations designed to test a person. In the presence of Liholiho, ‘Ī'ī was suddenly posed a trick question on which his career most probably depended. The question tested ‘Ī'ī’s learning, mental readiness, morals, and loyalty. The appropriateness of ‘Ī'ī’s answer was recognized by the audience and later by his mother, to whose training and precepts he gave the credit. In this century, Mary Kawena Pukui was finding a possible informant uncooperative when she unexpectedly asked Pukui a question (n.d.:1604 [3]):

_By the suddenness of her question, I knew that she was trying the ho'opapa to find out how much folklore I knew. The ho'opapa was_
a form of riddling or asking questions as a ‘feeler’, to see whether the other person knew the answer or not.

When Pukui answered successfully, the informant became unusually helpful.

I myself have experienced two examples of testing as a sort of riddling by Hawaiian teachers, techniques they probably acquired in Sunday Schools or Bible classes that used traditional methods. In a third year Hawaiian class in 1976, Sarah Nākoa had given us as homework a Bible text to translate. At the next class, we realized that she had expected us not only to have translated the text but to have learned it nearly by heart. One of her questions was based on Genesis xli 49: “How many grains of sand were there?” When none of us could answer, she quoted the text with some disappointment: no ka hiki ole ke helu aku ‘because of the inability to count [them]’; there were countless grains of sand. The question was in fact a double trick: in the text, the quantity of Joseph’s grain had been described as e like me ke one o ke kai ‘like the sand of the sea’. The second example occurred in a course I co-taught with Kalāhikiola Nāli‘ielua. He started once to speak about Jesus and wanted the class to guess which Gospel passage he had in mind. He performed a number of actions, including walking in a dramatic way around the center of the room. Since no one was able to guess his meaning, he had to tell us that Jesus was walking to Jerusalem.

**Contests of Wits**

The practice of riddling has a structure that provides the basis for more developed forms of the contest. Riddling is a contest in which there are two contestants or sides. The contest has a certain content: one or more verbal genres, sometimes combined with gestures and tricks. One side knows the riddle, that is, it knows
the answer and challenges the other side to find it. The riddle must hide the answer sufficiently for there to be a challenge, but it must provide enough information to enable the other side to find the answer. That is, the challenge must be fair. Accordingly the encounter follows an etiquette and rules that are understood, traditional (with local variations), or negotiated. There must also be definite and fair methods of deciding points and finally winners. The decision makers can be the contestants themselves, which is appropriate when the riddle is known. For instance, an older child knows a riddle and can therefore judge whether a younger one has solved it. In more complicated cases—for instance, if the solution is not set but requires creativity—the proposed solution has to be judged as appropriate. This can be done by the contestants themselves, the audience, a referee, or combinations of these persons. Finally the winner receives some reward, from fame to riches, and the loser some punishment, from shame to death. Beckwith (1922: 329 note 34) reports that the shameful memories of defeats were passed down in families.

Such a contest can be elaborated and formalized to different degrees in a culture that relishes competitions of all sorts. That is, a riddling contest must itself be placed within the general context of contests, ho'okūkū, and display, which are widespread and varied practices in Hawai‘i and Polynesia as a whole (Kirtley 1971: H, Ko–K99, No–N99). Such contests follow the same general structure and even etiquette, can use the same terminology, and can also result in the death of the losers, for instance, of a race. This structure is mentioned often in Hawaiian literature and is used to articulate long narratives. As in the martial arts, women can be teachers and contestants against men.

As with other occupations, contests of wits are connected to pride of place. Because of his pride in his home island of Hawai‘i, Kalapana’s father wants to best the famous ho‘opāpā players from Kaua‘i; when his son wins, he takes the tabu flag of his opponents back to his home island as a sign of victory. The Kalapana/
Kaipalaoa tradition is clearly from the big island. Conversely, Kaua‘i can be proud that one of its sons bested a Hawai‘i islander on the local subject of Puna (Poliokaipolia September 12, 1919). The competition of locals against the outsiders is indeed a theme of contests of wits.\textsuperscript{263} This opposition was common because of the practice of traveling to display one’s knowledge and skill in contests of wits and martial arts with people of other locations.\textsuperscript{264} The locals prepare themselves when they hear of the impending arrival of such experts.\textsuperscript{265} They also enjoy the advantage of familiarity with their own rules (e.g., Nākuina 1902b: 29 f.).

A unifying element of such contests is the view that they all involve knowledge. Thus, Hawaiians can mix contests of wits with those of martial arts. One contestant invites another to move from the wits section of their encounter to the martial with the words, \textit{e aho e pau ka nanenane, a e le‘ale‘a kakou ma na ike ame na ikaika o kakou . . . ‘it is better to put an end to the riddling and to enjoy ourselves with our knowledge and strength’}.\textsuperscript{266}

Accordingly, the word \textit{ho‘opāpā}—or occasionally \textit{ho‘opa‘apa‘a}—can be used for a broad range of referents, such as an argument, a disagreement about a boast, or a martial arts contest.\textsuperscript{267} Contests of wits can be described in martial terms, and a chief can use both martial and \textit{ho‘opāpā} terminology to challenge his dissenters:\textsuperscript{268}

\textit{Ahu—a pane!! he pane kau, he hoolohe ka‘u, a nau no hoi, a na‘u no hoi, oo na ihe a kaua.}

‘It has been stated, now answer. Yours is to answer, mine is to listen. Yours indeed, and mine indeed. The spears of both of us are thrust out’.

Because of this range of referents, some authors feel the need to differentiate with epithets the \textit{ho‘opāpā} of wits.\textsuperscript{269}

Some contests concentrate on knowledge and cleverness.\textsuperscript{270} Throughout Polynesia, such contests of wits are widely practiced and the subject of a large amount of literature.\textsuperscript{271} Hawaiian contests
of wits were pursued with great seriousness from comparatively informal children’s games (Handy and Pukui 1972:10) to the professional ho’opāpā. A simple encounter consists of opening the contest with a question that is answered by a chant; this chant is in turn bested by another chant; and victory is acknowledged in this friendly contest. Such contests can be unceremonious and non-technical, with comparatively little preparation, at least on one side (Kapunohu, Fornander 1918–1919: 419 ff.). Such small riddling episodes can be found within more extended, variegated contests of wits (e.g., Nākuina 1902a: 92, 99; compare 74 ff., 85).

Larger contests can be more prepared, use more ceremony and technical terminology, and include a wider range of elements, as seen in the traditions of Pāka’a and Kūapāka’a (Beckwith 1922: 318). Such contests prove in a variety of ways the intellectual ascendancy of one side. Especially common are combinations of contests of wits and the martial arts, as in the Kepaka’ili’ula story. A contestant could in fact be famous for both (Fornander 1916–1917: 511).

The story of Pīkoiaka’alalā is a famous example of such an extended and variegated contest: a combination of rat-shooting and wordplay, allusions, and chants to prove he has won. The opponents meet and set the rules of the contest (Fornander 1916–1917: 455), which proceeds with the godly help of the protagonist’s rat relatives (455 ff.). Judgement is provided by the acceptance of points by the audience (457 ff.). Pīkoiaka’alalā’s opponent hits the required ten rats on his first shot. Pīkoiaka’alalā prays to his godly rat relations and hits ten by their whiskers, a better shot. With the same shot, he hits a bat and refers to an old onomatopoeic saying or chant to prove it should be counted as an extra rat. In the second contest, he hits an old woman and applies the conventional description of old age—haumaka’iole “Blurred eyes of a rat”—to prove that he has won. In the third contest, he hits the kua’iole “Upper ridgepole of a house,” a word that could be understood as “rat’s back,” and refers to a conventional saying.
His opponent is disgraced:

“ua haule loa kona akamai i lalo a me kona kaulana. Ua lilo ke akamai a me ke kaulana no Pikoiaka'alala, i ka pana iole

‘his cleverness fell completely with his fame. The [recognition of] cleverness and fame went to Pikoia'Kalala in hitting rats’.

A similar contest is narrated at length in the story of Lonoikamakahiki. Lonoikamakahiki has a reputation as an expert in the ho'opāpā, so when he travels to O'ahu, the local chief Kakuhihewa and his court prepare for him (Fornander 1916–1917: 275). A chiefess from Kaua‘i wants to sleep with Lonoikamakahiki because of his reputation as knowledgeable, and he does so in order to obtain from her contest materials that will be unknown to his opponents. The new song he obtains enables him to win the first round in the contest of wits. A numbered series of different sorts of contests follows: a fishing contest in which Lonoikamakahiki receives extraordinary godly help (291–299); a race to shore (299–301); a board game, kōnane (301ff.); and a contest about whether the gourd of Lonoikamakahiki contains the bones of six chiefs (309–321). These contests all involve wits; even the fishing and the race include trickery.

The formal ho'opāpā is the ultimate professionalization of the contest of wits. That is, such contests follow the normal Hawaiian pattern of refining and elaborating a common practice. Contests of wits can therefore be placed on a spectrum from informal to formal and ceremonious, simple to elaborate, spontaneous to prepared, and from requiring ordinary education and training to demanding special schooling.

Contests of wits employed a terminology that increased in elaboration with the formality of the contest, an example of the tendency of Hawaiians to canonize a vocabulary for a particular purpose or subject. When some fishermen meet Kalapana, they want to elicit information from him but cannot stop him from
using his ho'opāpā tricks, which they cannot understand. One fisherman says, Ua lohe wale au, o ka pani o ka hoopapa, he i aku no, ua pai a ua noa ‘I have heard that the closure of the contest of wits is a statement “It is tied, the kapu is lifted”’. Once they have made the statement, the boy will have a normal conversation with them.

Contests of wits also included a variety of literary genres, such as riddles and different types of chants. Kaui (November 13, 1865) writes of the need to study na mea hoopapa ‘the things of the contest of wits’, including na mele o kela ano keia ano hoopapa ‘the songs of this and that sort of ho'opāpā’. These chants could be of very high quality. Stereotyped prose passages and chants were composed especially for the ho'opāpā itself and together with the other genres contributed to the esthetic delight, the le'ale'a, of the contest. An invitation to a contest of wits includes le'ale'a and walea ‘enjoy’ (Kepakailiula, Fornander 1918–1919: 403). Kaui makes the editorial remark:

E kaomi iki ka puu i ka ono o na huaolelo pape [sic: pāpā] a ke kanaka makua a me ka ke keiki . . .

‘The Adam’s apple is a little pressed down with the deliciousness of the contest words of the elders and the boy . . . ’

The specific genres of the formal ho'opāpā will be described below.

Contests of wits can include or even consist of non-verbal elements, such as tricks that do not depend on words, except perhaps to set them up. In the story of Kapunohu (Fornander 1918–1919: 419 ff.), the first two tricks are non-verbal, while the third includes statements that are essential to the trick. Most contests seem to have been combinations of verbal and non-verbal elements.

Non-verbal tricks usually needed to be prepared beforehand, as in the Kapunohu story and in more elaborate contests (Lonoika-
Adequate preparation was a sign of cleverness and mākaukau ‘readiness’, as in Kalapana’s preparation of elaborate tricks for his encounter (e.g., Nākuina 1902b:28 f., 38 f.). The trick of preparing food beforehand so as to appear to prepare it with extraordinary quickness is found widely, from the folksy Kapunohu story, to the Kalapana/Kaipalaoa tradition, to the historical narrative of the great chief ‘Umi (Elbert 1959:131–135), an example of the influence of the trickster genre on narratives of high politics. The trick is a reflection of the educational and servitor ideal of accomplishing tasks with celerity, ‘eleu. Kaipalaoa wins a set of such tricks when he finishes all first (Fornander 1916–1917:581).

The hoʻopāpā player usually has a gourd containing his equipment and prepared tricks, which he uses often in the contest. This was probably based on the gourd used by travelers to carry their effects, and the hoʻopāpā gourd could be used for ordinary purposes (Nākuina 1902b:27). Nākuina emphasizes the preparation and use of the gourd and its equipment (1902b:9, 13 f., 17, 29, and throughout the contest); indeed Kalapana uses his gourd to prove that he is really a hoʻopāpā player (25 f.). While the traveler used a gourd, the local had his hale hoʻopāpā ‘house for the contest of wits’.

Contest actions combined with words could be very serious, as in the ordeal section at the end of the Kalapana/Kaipalaoa tradition, described below, which ends in death. Such combinations could be elaborate. In the story of Kaipalaoa (Fornander 1916–1917:581 ff.), his opponents perform a hula with two lines of people, all chanting and dancing. The boy matches their performance by chanting and dancing, using a doll as his hoʻopa’a ‘chanter’. His opponents argue that their hoʻopa’a speaks and the boy’s does not. He counters with wordplay on the saying pa’a ka waha ‘close firmly the mouth’: the word hoʻopa’a implies that that performer should be silent.
A fully developed contest of wits therefore included two elements, verbal and non-verbal, which could be connected through wordplay, symbolism, and allusions.

Contests of wit were conducted with a definite etiquette. Just as in martial arts contests, the locals were supposed to call out an invitation to the outsiders.\textsuperscript{284} Disagreements could occur, for instance, on which side should go first, \textit{lele mua} (Pukui and Elbert 1986: \textit{lele} 1). The rules of politeness and hospitality could be interpreted as requiring the guests to proceed, and this could be an advantage in a martial arts contest, for example, in alternating punches, or in the last bloody ordeal round of the Kalapana/Kaipalaoa tradition. A \textit{ho'opāpā} chant can contain an invitation for the outsider to take the first turn (Kau'i November 20, 1865). In a contest of wits, however, going first apparently put one at a disadvantage in the contest: it was probably better to feel out the opponent and appraise his skill. Moreover, one would not want to waste a good piece of information one could use later or lose a round by using an insufficient one. Kalapana's opponents complain that they are losing because they have to go first; the boy would fail if he had to.\textsuperscript{285} As a result, the two sides often contend about who should go first (“Kaao Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” January 17:16). In such a disagreement, the chief acting as the third party states, \textit{aohe malihini i lele mua mai, na kamaaina no ka mua, a he hope ka ka malihini} ‘no newcomer has gone first; the first turn is done by the locals and that of the newcomer is after’.\textsuperscript{286} Once this contest structure is identified, one can recognize the emphasis when a newcomer does go first, for instance, because he has prepared a trick.\textsuperscript{287} On the other hand, the person first presenting a chant that the opponent had to match had a clear advantage; the opponent had to compose a chant on the spot.

Even more powerful than etiquette were the formal rules of the contest. Besides \textit{loina}, the word used for these is \textit{kānāwai}
'law', which like *kapu*, has a religious, self-enforcing power in Hawaiian culture and must be obeyed even when dangerous. In the last section of the Kalapana/Kaipalaoa story, if the boy has his teeth broken, his opponents must follow the rules and give him his fatal turn (e.g., “He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902:6). Earlier in the contest, Kalapana’s opponents proscribe, *pale*, the inside of the house to him, so by the rules of opposition, he can proscribe the outside to them; they must then stay inside the house to their great inconvenience. When they want to nullify the adverse effects of the round, they must make their appeal in religio-legal language: *Ua noa ke kanawai! Ua noa loa, aohe pale* ‘The law is nullified [the *kapu* of the law is lifted]. Utterly nullified, no proscription’. Kalapana must agree in the same terms: *Ae, ua noa ke kanawai, a ua weheia ka pale a kakou, hemo no hoi ka oukou, hemo no hoi ka‘u* ‘Yes, the law is nullified, and our proscription is opened up. Yours is loosened indeed, mine is loosened indeed’ (Nākuina 1902b:45f.). Contestants use the rules to force their opponents to perform certain actions. To get the boy to come landward, his opponents manipulate him to make someone go seaward (Kaipalaoa, Fornander 1916–1917:577ff.).

The compulsion of the rules is due partly to the religious character of such contests, especially the formal *ho‘opāpā*. In the taunts and challenges of that contest, a contestant names his god and promises to sacrifice his opponent to him. A contestant’s god helps him during the contest. The good chief who acts as a third party in Kalapana’s contest tells him (Nākuina 1902b:78f.):

*ua aloha mai la no kou akua hoopapa a haawi mai la no hoi i ka ike ia oe, a ua palekana oe i ka make a lakou nei i manao ai nou.*

‘your *ho‘opāpā* god has loved you indeed and has indeed conferred knowledge on you, and you have been saved from the death these people intended for you’.
Later in the contest, when Kalapana seems to be in trouble with a certain category, the chief tells him (93):

\[Aohe \text{ no } hoi \text{ oe e kanaenae ae i ko akua hoopapa la, malia no hoi o lohe mai ia oe a aloha mai, loaa ka hoi ka kaua aina makani nui.}\]

‘You indeed do not pray to your ho’opāpā god. Perhaps indeed he would hear you and love you, and our “land of many winds” would be indeed obtained’.

Some contest rules were local or needed to be negotiated or announced (e.g., Kepakailiula, Fornander 1916–1917: 403 ff., 513 ff.). Others were an integral part of the contest; for instance, if one could not proceed, one lost. Kalapana’s mother explains the ho’opāpā:

\[He \text{ hoopilipili olelo ana ia, a i ka wa e loaa ole ai o kau olelo pili, ua pa oe, a ua eo . . .}\]

‘It is a verbal comparing, and at the time when you do not get your comparing statement, you are hit and defeated . . .’

Kalapana can therefore complain when his opponents procrastinate (Nākuina 1902b: 73 ff.). Rules could be appealed to in questions of procedure or substance. Disputes in the ho’opāpā will be discussed below.

The judgement of a round or the resolution of a dispute could be decided by the contestants themselves. Etiquette seems to have ruled that this was the proper procedure, so Kalapana can complain when his opponents refuse to admit defeat but wait for the third party to judge (Nākuina 1902b: 73 ff., 78).

The contestants can however accept a third party as a referee or judge, like the marshall for martial arts contests. The good
brother of the bad chief assumes this role in Nākuina’s story of Kalapana; out of *aloha* for the boy, he decides to *kōkua* ‘help’ and is called a *kōkua* through the story (Nākuina 1902b:49). Kalapana describes the function of a referee (1902b:73):

:oia wale no ka mea e lohe nei i ka’u mau pane apau i na hana
hoopapa a oukou, a oia wale no hoi ka mea e pane mai nei, e
hooia mai ana hoi i ka loaa io a me ka pai o ka oukou mau hana
hoopapa ia’u.

‘he is the only person listening to all my answers in your
ho‘opāpā activities, and he is also the only person answering
me, confirming me in my getting right answers and tieing or
matching your ho‘opāpā actions toward me’.

Despite his love for the boy, the third party rules in his favor only when he is correct and must otherwise rule against him because he cannot *kokua hewa* ‘help wrongfully’ (92). The third party becomes important in disputes, as seen below.

The crowd or audience at a contest can also act as a third party. Kauʻi (December 4, 1865) describes the audience as *me he Aha Jure la* ‘like a jury’. The support of the crowd is important in cases of cheating or resistance to paying one’s bet as in the Kepaka‘ili‘ula and Kalapana/Kaipalaoa stories.

Wagers are important in the contest of wits as in other contests in Hawaiian culture. The terms can be set (e.g., Kauʻi November 13, 1865), and new bets can be made as in the contest of Pikoika‘alalā and throughout the contest between Lonoikamaakahiki and Kakuhihewa. Wagers can range from unimportant items to lands, positions, and even death. Such a death or the taking of a body part is considered an offering to the god of the contest winner. Kalapana considers the opponent’s death the only definitive display of one’s knowledge: *Aohe ike . . . aohe ka hoi i make ka hoa hoopapa, aia a make ea, maopopo ka ike* ‘There is no knowledge . . . if indeed the hoʻopāpā companion does not die; if he dies, the knowledge is clear’ (Nākuina 1902b:75).
Finally, gamesmanship and psychological manipulation seem to have been factors in contests of wits, as is clear from the threats and taunts in the traditional *hoʻopāpā* chants. Older opponents underestimate younger ones, for instance, not believing a boy would be brave enough to stay out after dark (Nakuina 1902b:26, 38 f., 42).

A contestant can overwhelm his opponents by the number of items he brings into play. He can humiliate them by unexpected or brilliant uses of items, a kind of flourish. Countering his opponents’ six *pā o Waimea* ‘walls of Waimea’ with his ten *pā o Waipiʻo* ‘walls of Waipiʻo’, the boy adds the wordplay flourish that Waipiʻo itself is *paʻa i ka pali* ‘fixed by cliffs’ (Kauʻi November 20, 1865). Countering *Ka hua . . . ahu i lalo* ‘The fruit . . . heaped below’, the boy includes the wordplay *Kahua-a-hale* ‘House platform’. In his countering list of items with *lau*, the boy includes the withering *lauoho* ‘hair’ (Nākuina 1902b:59 f.); in his list of *ala* ‘ways, paths’, he adds a play on a famous saying: *He ala-iki ko kahuna—e, Ke ala-hele o Kalapana* ‘The kahuna’s is a narrow path/The path of Kalapana’. Both items are emphasized by the third party in his judgement that the boy has won. A contestant can fool his opponents by hesitating or appearing to be in difficulty, only to dash their hopes (e.g., Nākuina 1902b:61, 77 f., 93 ff.).

**The Literature of the Contest of Wits**

Contests of wits were widely popular and involved intellectual stimulation and interesting personalities. Understandably, they inspired a literature, much of which belongs to a genre that follows the basic structure of the encounter described above and adds special motifs. Some of these motifs are conventional in Polynesian literature, such as a boy being teased by his peers because he is fatherless and going to his mother to enquire about his father. Others are emphasized or developed within the genre. In the
traditions of Pāka’a and Kūapāka’a, Kalapana/Kaipalaoa, and Ka-Miki, the youth of the boy protagonist is emphasized against the age of his opponents. Indeed, the opposition is used frequently in the matching and contrasting wordplay and the psychological ploys of the two sides of the ho‘opāpā as well as in the general drama of the stories. These uses can be compared to stories that pit little heroes against big opponents. The emphasis on youth may be rooted in the popularity of such games among young people (e.g., Poliokaipolilia September 12, 1919), on the connection of such games to education, and perhaps, very speculatively, on a sense that young people’s minds were more flexible.

Very common is the motif that the protagonist is good and his opponents evil, which reflects the Hawaiian view that knowledge and morality are connected. A corresponding motif is that the protagonist is revenging a wrong committed by his opponents. In Kau, the boy states (December 18, 1865):

\[\text{ua loaa ae nei no hoi na iwi o ko’u makuakane, ke kumu nui hoi o ko’u hoomanawanui ana i ka hoopapa, e like me kana kauoha i ko’u luauui makuahine}\]

‘the bones of my father have indeed been obtained—the great reason for my patience in the contest of wits—according to his last command to my own mother’.

A motif apparently developed in the genre is that of the helper of the protagonist, often a local who can provide special information to the newcomer. Such help could be considered cheating (“Kaao Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki” April 10, 1912: 14), which explains the force of the occasional accusations of the opponents.

Hawaiian riddling story motifs and traditions could be combined with Western ones (Johnson 1975: 63).
Accounts of the formal ho’opāpā are distinguished by the special sequence of chants and prose pieces that structure each round of the verbal contest. This structure is an extended example of a fill-in-the-blanks form, consisting of fixed elements and ones that are varied by the contestants. The identification of this sequence enables the reader to recognize variations that may be due to actual practice or to the author’s tendency. For instance, Kaui and the author of the Kaipalaoa story in Fornander clearly imply that the full sequence was used for each round, but state that they will shorten it for the modern reader by the common nineteenth and early twentieth-century technique of omitting repetition. Kaui writes (November 27, 1865), ua pakuwa wale ia kakou na huaolelo hoopapa ‘the ho’opāpā statements are simply tedious for us’. His readers have been patient with the full form in the previous installment and up to this point in the present one, but from now on o na kumu hana wale no ka kakou e heluhelu ai, aka nae, aole kakou e haalele loa i na huaolelo pane ‘we will have to read only the subject, but we will not utterly abandon the answering statements’. He therefore presents the variable chants (including fixed lines at the end and his own stereotyped prose introduction of each speaker), not the full form. He begins by including the judgement of the third party, but omits it further on. Similarly the author of the Kaipalaoa story (Fornander 1916–1917: 585) states in parentheses that the statements that follow are like those already recorded; nolaila, e waiho ia olelo paku-a ‘therefore, this tedious statement will be left out’. He provides only the variable sections with indication of the speaker (585–591, 595). Other authors leave out sections of the sequence or shorten the individual speeches without notice.303 Finally knowledge of the sequence enables the reader to recognize which contestant is speaking, even if he is not otherwise identified.304
Kauai (November 20, 1865) is particularly concerned with presenting the formal verbal contest in an understandable way to his readers. He explains:

Auhea oe e ka mea e hoonanea ana i ka heluhelu, ke hoakaka iki aku nei au i ke ano o na olelo ana, i mea e huikau ole ai, penei hoi, ua mahele ia i na mahele ekolu.

‘O person enjoying himself in reading, I will explain a little the character of the statements in order to avoid their being confused, thus: they are divided into three divisions’.

He lists the chief’s side, the boy’s, and that of the chief’s brother, who is acting as a third party or kōkua ‘helper’. In a round, the chief’s side will go first (I will call this side the opponents), then the boy will respond, and finally the third party. This basic structure can be elaborated.

The full sequence of hoʻopāpā statements can be found in the major versions of the Kalapana/Kaipalaoa tradition: Kauai, Nākuina, and the Fornander text. Shortened versions can be found in other texts. Minor variations can be found among the three major texts and within each, variations that in all likelihood reflect practice. Finally the same section can be set in type either as chant or prose. In any case, at least most of the set pieces were probably cantillated. The sequence could be used for non-verbal materials, as will be seen below. It could be used also to invite the opponent to start and to enquire about him; the opponent could in turn use the form in responding (Kauai November 20, 1865). These are however extensions of the primary use of the sequence, which is for the verbal contest of wits.

The contest is divided into rounds, which are structured by the sequence. Before a round, a contestant can be challenged to proceed (Kauai November 27, 1865). A round starts when the opponents pose a problem or state the kumu hana ‘subject’ of the round (Kauai November 27, 1865, calls attention to the kumu
hana). This can be done in a fill-in-the-blanks chant in which the first two lines are stable and the last three variable (Nākuina 1902b: 56):

\[
\begin{align*}
A \text{ hu}a-a-\text{p}a\text{e}, & \ a \text{ p}a\text{e} \ m\text{ai} \\
He \ p\text{a}n\text{e} \ k\text{oonei} & \ h\text{oo}l\text{o}h\text{e} \ k\text{o} \ o\text{n}a \\
E\text{i}a \ k\text{a} \ m\text{e}a \ u\text{k}\text{a}n\text{a} \ n\text{ui} & \\
I\text{l}o\text{k}o \ o \ k\text{u}u \ h\text{a}l\text{a}u \ l\text{a} & -e \\
O \ k\text{a} \ w\text{a} & -a.
\end{align*}
\]

‘It is stated, so respond, respond to us.  
On this side a statement; on that side, listening  
Here is the thing that carries much baggage  
Inside my long house there  
The boat’.

The first two lines are shortened in “He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” (1902) to A hua a pane, he hoolohe koonei and attributed to the boy as a challenge to his opponents to proceed (compare “Kaa Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki” April 10, 1912: 14); and the problems throughout are regularly set in chant. Kaui (November 20, 1865) usually gives this section in prose, for instance, in this round, Eia ka ukana nui iloko o kuu halau nei la—e, o ka waa ‘Here is the big baggage [or thing that carries the big baggage] inside my long house: the boat’. He has however used the fuller form earlier, so he is probably abbreviating here. After the first two lines in his chant, he adds the third, He uiui, he pane, he ninau, ninau ia ‘An enquiry, a response, a question, it is questioned’ (compare the long related taunt in Nākuina 1902b: 37). The Fornander text of Kaipalaoa and “Kaa Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki” (January 17, 1912: 16 f.) usually pose the subject in chant although prose can also be used.

In Kaui and Nākuina, this section of the form is followed by a long and gory prose threat. The boy will die because he will not be able to solve the problem, the subject of which is mentioned again. In problems of completeness, to be discussed below, the
opponents claim that they have selected, ‘ōhi, every item that belongs to the category; ‘aʻohe koe ‘nothing remains’. They will squash the boy’s eye with the butt of the staff of a kāhili “Feather standard”, so that the jelly will flow, which will be food for their hoʻopāpā god—who is named—and for their teachers—also named. They will break the boy’s tooth, and he will die. The earth oven that is being heated is not for an animal or for anyone else, but for him, because of his faulty mouth. They have prayed in sunshine and in rain; they have studied night and day. It is done and over with; ‘aʻohe koe ‘nothing remains’. Shortened versions of this threat are used in the Fornander text (which sets a portion of it as chant), “He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” (1902), and “Kao Hoonia Puuwai no Ka-Miki” (compare April 10, 1912:14 f.), cited above.

In the next section of the form, the boy claims that he will be able to solve the problem, the subject of which he mentions. He then repeats the previous long prose threat, substituting the names of his own hoʻopāpā god and teacher. Nākuina regularly begins this section with the exclamation, kāhāhā! ‘Amazing’! In Kaui, Nākuina, and “He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” (1902), the boy also introduces the expression mō ke kī la make (Appendix VII), which will be important later in the narration. The Fornander text of this section parallels that of the previous one.

Since the boy has not however provided his solution, his opponents now challenge him in set terms to proceed; in Kaui and Nākuina, A hua a pane. A fuller form seen earlier can be used later by Kaui, which the Fornander text sets as chant:

A hua, a pane,
He pane ko ona,
He hoolohe ko onet.

This section is omitted in “He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” (1902).
The boy’s answer often begins with *e pane ana* ‘answering’ and is divided into two parts: (1) an insult (Kaui and Nākuina) or prayer section (Fornander), and (2) the solution to the problem, which is expressed in a form parallel to that used by the opponents. Nākuina (1902b:70) and the Fornander text (Fornander 1916–1917:593) can separate these two sections with a brief explanation, which demonstrates that they are aware of the division described above. Kaui gives this section in prose, the others in chant. This section can also be used to explain the answer. The boy then adds a prose challenge that mentions the subject again and asks whether he is right (Kaui, Nākuina, Fornander 1916–1917:593 ff.).

The final section of the form is the decision on the round, in which the contestants, the third party, and the audience can participate. This section is regularly used for explanations. Nākuina (1902b:57) has the third party explain first why the boy’s answer is right and then the principle of completeness:

\[ \text{ua olelo ae nei hoi lakou nei ua pau loa, aohe koe, ua loaa ae la no nae kau mea ukana nui.} \]

‘they said that [the items] were completely exhausted, none remained. But your thing that carries much baggage was obtained’.

Nākuina himself then explains, *A pai ae la keia hana hoopapa a na kanaka makua i ke keiki* ‘This ho‘opāpā work of the elders against the boy was thus countered’.

Such a complicated sequence indicates the seriousness and level of expertise required in the ho‘opāpā. The literary quality of the sequence added to the delight of the contest, but the violent threats it expressed were felt by the participants. In the round on *lō* ‘earwig’, described below, the superiority of the boy’s answer is due in part to his unconventionally including the death mentioned in the fixed section of the challenge—*make paha auanei*
ke keiki ‘the boy will probably die’—along with the kumu hana ‘subject’ (Kaui December 4, 1865).

As in sequences of hula dances, the subjects of rounds can be related to each other, for instance, those on the boat and the long house. However the subjects are usually completely different.

The sequence of statements is used regularly in the contest of wits, but with variations; for instance, when the boy goes first or materials such as disputes are inserted. Sections can be repeated, omitted, or used in other places (e.g., Nākuina 1902b:81, E pane ana is used to begin). In Kaui (December 4, 1865), the boy's statement of the subject and answer are joined instead of being given as two separate speeches. Nākuina (1902b) can shorten statements: e.g., the threat of the chief (79, 87 f.). He can also lengthen them: e.g., the boy’s claim that he can find an answer (83, 85, 87); and the boy’s chant, lengthened by the inclusion of the subject and the criteria (70). A prose introduction to a list chant can be used (Nākuina 1902b:57 ff.).

Variations can reflect an author's tendency or use of narrative devices. After he has begun abbreviating the form, Kaui (November 27, 1865) includes the boy’s formal statement that he can find another item and inserts an explanation by the third party; Kaui does this probably to clarify the complicated round and to express the third party’s sympathy for the boy. Nākuina inserts materials very freely into the sequence, for instance, a long chant that breaks the sequence, but provides an opportunity for a spectacular display of mental agility (1902b:65 f.). He can add dialog between sections of a sequence (73, 75, 86) or between rounds (87). These insertions express Nākuina’s themes: e.g., an opponent admits defeat and recognizes the knowledge of the boy (73). Nākuina can insert explanations (e.g., 75, 83 f.) and describe psychological reactions and tricks, a tendency of his work (Nākuina 1902b: e.g., 68, 71, 73 f., 89). Explanation is regularly provided by Nākuina within the hoʻopāpā statements (e.g., 16 f.). He can repeat elements of a sequence when someone hesitates. Nākuina can use the sequence
also for expressive purposes. For instance, the boy uses the long prose threat because his opponents are hesitating and because he gets angry (62 f., 66 f.); similarly, his opponent, the evil chief, uses the long threat after the boy delays (77 f., 84).

The non-verbal elements or combinations of elements of the formal hoʻopāpā are similarly elaborated. For instance, the sections of the Kalapana/Kaipalaoa stories about the pahu kapu ‘tabu post’ and the lepa ‘flag’ of the opponents are combinations of action and wordplay as in simpler contests, but much more complicated.\textsuperscript{310} Nākuina (1902b) presents the episode in some detail and with much useful explanation. On the way from the shore to the hale hoʻopāpā ‘the house for the contest of wits’, the opponents have set up a tabu post. The sea side of the post is the aoao noa ‘non-tabued side’ so one can go up to it. But the land side of the post is tabu. That is, one cannot proceed landward without countering and thus neutralizing the post (27, 29 ff.).

The boy is a newcomer and thus unfamiliar with local Kauaʻi practice. He must therefore recognize that the post is an element in the contest of wits and noʻonoʻo ‘think actively’ about what to do. The boy decides to set up a better post. He begins by claiming that their post is not really tabu, but just called tabu. Their post is of wood, whereas his will be the fish kikākapu “Various species of butterfly fishes” (all glosses in double quotation marks are from Pukui and Elbert 1986); he kapu hoi paha, no ka mea, ua komo ke kapu i ka inoa o ka iʻa ‘it is tabu perhaps, because the tabu enters into the name of the fish’. The trick is based on wordplay and on the Hawaiian view of names as really connected to their referents. Such wordplay is common in riddles (Judd 1930: e.g., riddles 83, 95, 100, 102, 103, 105). The boy buries the fish on the non-tabued side of the post, which is thus paʻi ‘countered’. He can now proceed and arrives at a second post, which he neutralizes with the fish kapuhili “A butterfly fish,” using the same reasoning in the same words (30); it is now paʻi. On the second post is a lepa ‘flag or banner’, which he counters with a ʻōʻililepa “Squaretail filefish,”
with the explanation _ua komo ka lepa i ka inoa o ka i'a_ ‘the banner enters into the name of the fish’. Again, his is a real _lepa_, whereas theirs is merely _he wahi apana kapa_ ‘a bit of _kapa_.’ Because their banner was on top of the pole, he buries his _ō'ililepa_ in the same hole with his _kapuhili_.

In doing so, he mentions that he is a _keiki_ ‘child’. The entire situation and procedure is based then on action and wordplay and a complicated set of oppositions: tabu side/non-tabued side, land side/sea side, local/newcomer, elders/child, erected/buried. A further opposition is that between what is truly or intrinsically tabu, because the tabu is actually in its name, and what is extrinsically called or designated tabu. More speculatively, the opposition of wood and _kapa_ to fish may be based on the opposition _uka/kai_ ‘land/sea’, mirroring the two directions of the physical situation of the event.

Later the announcement of the boy’s actions—or the springing of the trick—is framed in an adaptation of the sequence of _ho'opāpā_ statements described above. At the beginning of the contest, the sequence is used to elicit background information from the boy. The boy takes the first turn in the contest in order to claim that he has performed all the actions described above, as well as others, and that his counters are true whereas theirs are merely metaphorical. The opponents deny that he has performed them, and when they are proven wrong, the boy wins the round.

When the boy is invited inside the house, similar rounds are played. To give just one example, a play is made on the word _kala_, which means both the inside end of a house (Pukui and Elbert 1986: _kala_ 7, _hākala_) and a “Surgeonfish (_kala_ 3).” This wordplay is used in a riddle (Judd 1930: riddle 75). When the boy’s opponents want to deny him an end of the house to sit in, he pulls a _kala_ fish from his gourd. Nākuina treats this as a contest of completeness: the opponents say they have _ohi . . . i na kala apau_ ‘taken all the ends of the house’. In these rounds, elements from the sequence are used in narration, but the concentration is on
the subjects themselves. At the end of these small contests, Kauʻi (November 20, 1865) has the third party judge that the boy has beaten his opponents in two areas na ʻolelo ʻi-ke ‘repartee’ and na mea ai ‘foodstuffs’, the famous trick of the prepared food. Nākuina (1902b:55) expands on this: ua eo kakou ma na ʻolelo hoo-papa, ua eo kakou ma na hana hoo-papa, a ua eo no kakou ma na mea ai ‘we have been beaten in the hoʻopāpā statements, beaten in the hoʻopāpā actions, and beaten indeed in the foodstuffs’.

The elaboration of the hoʻopāpā can be seen in comparing the final round of the Kaipalaoa version with that in Kauʻi. In Fornander, the contest is won by the person who can find the last word with the syllable ʻi, a simple form of completeness test. The gruesome dismemberment is an element of the chant only, although the opponents are killed in the end. The Kauʻi conclusion is similar to the martial arts combats that follow contests of wits in other stories. The opponent chooses a big stone with which he breaks the boy’s teeth. The boy proves however that he can still eat and therefore will not starve. At his turn, the boy takes a little stone and ties it to a haft, turning it into an adz. He then holds the adz over a series of parts of his opponent’s body; the opponent must find the word with the syllable ʻi for the indicated body part. Each time he fails to find the appropriate word, the boy cuts the part until finally the man is dead; thus the expression, Mō ke ʻi la, make ‘Cut the ʻi there—dead’ (Appendix VII). The bad chief meets an even more ignominious end.

Participation in the formal contest of wits clearly required education, training, research, and testing, descriptions of which form an important part of the related traditions. In the hoʻopāpā, reference is often made to education. In the long prose threat, one refers to one’s teacher and long study. One also disparages the education of one’s opponent. Kalapana’s opponents chant to him, Aohe paha i ao a makaukau ‘Perhaps [you] have not studied until ready’ (Nakuina 1902b:37). The crowd is indignant at such a serious charge. In his answering chant, the boy includes
the line, *Ua aoia no au a makaukau* ‘I have indeed studied until ready’. Conversely, one can be praised for one’s good education (“Kaao Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki”):

*nui io no ka ike o ke a’o ana*

‘really great indeed the knowledge from the education’ (January 24, 1912: 16).

*Ua pololei olua e na keiki, nui io no ka ike ame ke akamai i ka nanenane, a ku io no ka hele ana e hoopapa, ua nui ka ike o ke a’o ana i ka hoopapa.*

‘You two are right, O children. Really great indeed are the knowledge and cleverness in riddling, and really appropriate your travel to engage in the contest of wits. The knowledge from the education in the contest of wits is great’ (April 10, 1912: 15).

In a round on items with the word *lau*, the third party asks the boy whether he has learned all the *lau* and has one to add (Kauai November 27, 1865). Kalapana tells his opponents they will die *i ka nele o oukou i ka hana hoopapa ole* ‘because of your lack of *ho’opāpā* actions’ (Nākuina 1902b: 69). Worried about losing, the evil chief asks his experts, *he wahi hana hoopapa aku no koe a kakou?* ‘is there some *ho’opāpā* action left of ours?’ (Nākuina 1902b: 79). Opponents can claim in set terms that they have more tricks (Kaipalaoa, Fornander 1916–1917: 579–583). Nākuina can explain that Kalapana is just pretending to be in trouble (1902b: 93 f.):

*oiai ua loaa mua no kana aina nui o ka makani, no ka mea, ua ao mua mai no o Kalaoa iaia i ka mea e hana ai ina e hiki na hana hoopapa i ka aina makani nui*

‘for he had obtained earlier his [category] great lands of the wind, because Kalaoa had taught him earlier what to do if the *ho’opāpā* actions reached the lands of great winds’.
Such education was not of course confined to professionals of the contest of wits. Riddles themselves are excellent teaching and testing tools. For instance, many riddles could have been used for testing that are based on processes and are thus related to prose instructions and certain types of lists and chants.\textsuperscript{317} A riddle on the stages of a lobster (Judd 1930: riddle 107) can be related to the different names given to fish as they grow. A riddle on the stages of human life can be related to the clichés about old age, mentioned elsewhere; the theme can be developed into a magnificent riddle chant to be performed with gestures.\textsuperscript{318}

**The Basis of Riddling in Education and Training**

The contest of wits is the elaboration and professionalization of elements that are already present in classical Hawaiian education. What begins as a testing device is refined into an art form, following the general trend of Hawaiian culture towards specialization and professionalism. As a result, the ho'opāpā can be understood best in the general context of education.

Many of the previously described elements of Hawaiian education can be found in the ho'opāpā. Close observation of natural phenomena is necessary for the solution of many of the problems posed and is used to check claims.\textsuperscript{319} Contestants must listen carefully, and the word ho'olohe is used in the sequence of statements. The actions of the ho'opāpā are to be done quickly, and tricks such as that of the previously prepared food are designed to create such an impression.

Words must of course be used correctly,\textsuperscript{320} and memorization is essential for the knowledge of the ho'opāpā terminology and forms and the content of the subjects. Accounts of contests emphasize the need for no'ono'o ‘active thinking’: ua hewa no ka lakou olelo mua, me ka noonoo mua ole ‘their first statement was
indeed wrong because they had not thought before making it’ (Kau`i November 20, 1865; see also November 27, 1865). Nākuina regularly emphasizes active thinking (1902b: 26 f., 29 ff., 36); Kalapana is praised, _He kamalii kou kino, aka, he kanaka makua ka noonoo_ ‘Your body is that of a child, but your thinking is that of a mature person’ (27).

Place knowledge is as important in the contest of wits as in Hawaiian education and culture as a whole. In the contest related by Poliokaipolia (September 12, 1919), the winner knows more about a particular place than the loser. Kalapana displays his place knowledge in chants even outside of the contest setting (Nākuina 1902b: 19 ff.). The subjects of a number of contest rounds are based on place knowledge, as will be seen below: the walls of Waimea and Waipi`o, the paths of Kona, the winds of Hālawa, and in the climactic round of the Kalapana/Kaipalaoa tradition, the islands of the Hawaiian chain. The completeness of the boy’s education in places is emphasized as the reason for his victory.⁴²¹

The Organization of Knowledge

The contest of wits is based on the organization of knowledge transmitted in Hawaiian education and cannot be fully understood outside of that context (Beckwith 1922: 326 ff.; 1932: 333). Basically, each round consists of presenting a category described by an attribute, listing all the available items that fit the category, and claiming that the list is complete. The opponent must then add another item, thereby proving that his opponents’ claim is false. That is, the round is a test of completeness, an essential point in Hawaiian education.

In many cases, the subject or _kumu hana_ is straightforward and can be imagined in an ordinary educational or recreational setting, such as listing items connected to a place (Poliokaipolia September 12, 1919). In more elaborate contests of wits, Kūapāka`a
can name all the men in a canoe, and Lonoikamakahiki can produce the bones of six chiefs. Such straightforward categories and attributes can be used in the formal hoʻopāpā; their peculiar difficulty is that they are often so well known that finding an omitted item is difficult; wordplay and matching items from another category are therefore acceptable:

Subject: things inside boat (Kauai November 20, 27, 1865). The opponents challenge using a list with a conventional introduction: Eia na ukana nui iloko o ka waa, e kau nei iloko o kuʻu halau nei la ‘Here are the many ship’s supplies inside the boat that is set inside my long house here’. A long list follows, terminated by a conventional hoʻopāpā claim: Pau loa, aohe koe . . . ua ohi ae nei makou a pau ‘Fully exhausted, nothing remains . . . we have selected everything’. The boy answers with a formal list introduction: Eia na ukana nui iloko o kuʻu ipu nei la ‘Here are the many supplies inside my gourd here’ (the two subjects are connected to the previous round). The boy’s list has items that match those of his opponents, but which are carried in a gourd rather than a canoe.

Subject: things in the long house related to the word lau (Nākuina 1902b:59 f.). The opponents challenge using a list with a conventional introduction: eia na mea lau o loko o kuʻu halau nei la ‘here are the lau things inside my long house here’. The claim of completeness is made: O na mea lau no apau ua ohi ae nei makou apau, Aohe mea koe ‘We have selected all the lau things; nothing remains’. The boy counters with his own list: eia ka mea lau iloko o kuʻu waa ‘here are the lau things inside my boat’. Kauai (November 27, 1865, some text missing) has the third party explain the principle of the contest, also referring to the boy’s education: He mea lau kau e ke keiki, ua olelo anei lakou nei, aohe mea lau i koe, he lau hoi paha kau e ke keiki, ua lako muu no oe i ka lau o na ano a pau ‘Do you have a lau thing, boy? Haven’t these people said no lau thing remains? Maybe you have a lau also, boy. You have been indeed provided earlier with the lau of all sorts’.
Subject: hua ‘plants’ that are *ahu i lalo* ‘heaped below’, plants with buried corms or edible roots.\textsuperscript{324} After the list is recited, the boy is taunted, *Aohe paha auanei au hua ahu i lalo e ke keiki?* ‘Perhaps, boy, there is indeed no plant of yours that is heaped below?’ The boy counters with a list that uses hua in the sense of egg or seed. The third party decides for the boy: *ua olelo ae nei hoi lakou nei, ua ohi lakou nei i na hua i lalo a pau, eia ka hoi he mau hua no i koe* ‘these people said they had selected all the *hua i lalo*, but here are indeed some *hua* that remained’.

The boy’s answer is based on the wordplay with another sense of hua as a round object. He can therefore list the sun, the moon, and the stars. In further wordplay, he applies the verb hua to clouds, the wind, thunder, and lightning.

The above two rounds are combined in “‘No ke Keiki Hoopapa, Oia o Kalapana’” (n.d.: 33 [2] f.), “He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” (1902: 4), and the story of Kaipalaoa (Fornander 1916–1917: 595). This arrangement, perhaps the original one, makes clearer the opposition of *luna* ‘above’ and *lalo* ‘below’. In “He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” (1902: 4), the opponents state: *ua manao wale no kakou i ka hua o lalo, koe ka hua o luna, loaa no ka iala hua, a pakele no keia* ‘we thought indeed only of the *hua o lalo*. The *hua o luna* remained, so his *hua* was obtained and he escaped’. Nākuina (1902b: 65 ff.) inserts into the sequence a grandiose combination of the two rounds in one chant, an extraordinary display of mental dexterity. The boy first teases his opponents: *Ae, ia’u, i kahi keiki hoopapa o Puna e ahu ai ilalo na hua kau iluna o oukou* ‘Yes, it is for me, a ho’opāpā child of Puna to heap below your *hua* that are set above’. He then recites a chant in which, couplet by couplet, the opponents’ *hua* that are set above (63) are struck by the wind and heaped below, *ahu i lalo*. He thus uses his opponents’ own chant to trap them. He then taunts them that they will lose *i ka nele i ka mea hua kau ole iluna, pa ia iho la e ka makani Kona a ahu ilalo* ‘for lack of the *hua kau i luna* that is struck down by the Kona wind and heaped
below’. This is however Nākuina’s insertion, and the judgement of the third party returns only to the hua that are heaped below.

Subject: ‘āina pā ‘lands of walls’. The opponents challenge with six pā o Waimea ‘walls of Waimea’, and the boy counters with ten pā o Waipi‘o and a flourish, described above.

Subject: the ala or ala hele ‘paths’ of Kona. The boy counters by adding sea ways.

Subject: the seven hau of Kohala, countered by place names and one wind name from Kona (Kaipalaoa, Fornander 1916–1917: 591 ff.).

Subject: ‘āina makani nui ‘lands of great/many winds’ or winds of Hālawa. The boy counters with a chant on Ka‘ū, which causes the dispute discussed below.

Subject: moku kele i kai ‘islands reached by sea’; moku kele i okia e ke kai ‘islands reached and cut off by sea’. This is the climactic round of the Kalapana/Kaipalaoa tradition—in which the boy wins by adding the island Mokuola—and will be discussed below.

As seen in the above examples, an answer can be straightforward, such as adding the little island Mokuola to a conventional list of islands or new examples related to hau or lau. Such items, when actual objects, are called ‘i‘o ‘real’. An added item can however be based on wordplay, which is called ho‘opili or ho‘opilipili, most generally, to bring things together (Appendix VII).

An answer can consist also of a countering list, which must be constructed according to certain rules, rules that are based on the Hawaiian view of language and traditional or established oppositions. For instance, in the first contest described above, the boy’s countering list contains items that match those of his opponents, but which are carried in a gourd rather than a canoe. In the second contest, the boy’s boat list matches the long house list of his opponents; the opposition of boat and long house has been established in the previous rounds, so the boy can use it in
this one. The boy can also use the *luna/lalo* ‘up/down’ and *uka/kai* ‘land/sea’ oppositions to construct a counter list. The boy’s list of Waipi’o walls can be counted against his opponents’ list of Waimea walls: the names are related and both lists fall into the general category of *āina pā* ‘lands of walls’. This use of oppositions, discussed further below, is not arbitrary, but conventional in the organization of knowledge, and is a further indication of the basis of the *ho‘opāpā* in classical Hawaiian education.

The ability to produce such a counter example or list was a test of the contestant’s knowledge, memory retrieval, mental agility in rearranging information, literary training and skill, and quickness of execution. (The long formulaic chants did in fact provide the contestants with time to think.) Nākuina (1902b: 83 ff.) describes the production of a counter chant. The opponents have challenged the boy with a chant on occupations in which a person *kahuli* ‘turns or rotates’ something. The first part of the first line of their chant is *O ka pi‘ina aku i Paeokahuli* ‘The ascent of Paeokahuli’. The place name contains the word *kahuli* and is probably a play also on two words used in contests: *pā* ‘hit’ and *eo* ‘beat or win’. The opponents claim they have selected, *ohi*, all *ka mea kahuli* ‘the turning thing[s]’. The boy stalls because he needs to *no‘ono‘o* ‘think actively’. He knows turning things, but *aohe ana aina kahuli o ka inoa e hoopilipili aku ai* ‘he had no turning land, the name of which would match’ Paeokahuli. He then remembers the first line of his opponents’ chant and decides to connect his chant to theirs by choosing the opposite of *pi‘ina* ‘ascent’: *O ka iho‘na aku i Paeokahuli* ‘The descent of Paeokahuli’.

The ordinary method of passing a completeness test is to recite all the items. The ordinary method of winning a completeness contest is to provide an additional item or the last item. Just as those methods can be complicated in the *ho‘opāpā*, so can the completeness problem itself, for instance, by being extended to non-verbal or combined verbal and non-verbal rounds, as seen above. In the verbal subjects, the challenge is articulated as a
category with an attribute. These can be straightforward and conventional, as the categories described above, which are conceivable as educational devices to test knowledge of plants, places, and so on. The category can however be unusual and require the opponent to find quickly items that fit the unfamiliar category. For instance, the opponents challenge the boy with a list of occupations in which a person *kahuli* ‘turns over or rotates’ something. Such a list seems to have no practical purpose, and its attribute describes a very minor part of the occupations mentioned. The list was in all likelihood designed for a contest of wits and could be trusted to be unfamiliar to the opponent. The opponent must then search his memory for observed actions that could be added to the list or must compose a counter category with somehow similar items. The boy counters with a list of corporal disabilities that force someone to *kahuli* a part of the body, the word providing the necessary relation between challenge and response. None of the items in either list is unusual, but their classification is; that is, items have to be sought individually and regrouped to fit an unfamiliar category.

Moreover, as in regular riddles, the attributes or category descriptions can themselves be tricky, often by being metaphorical. Such metaphors can be used in the *hoʻopāpā*, for instance, the sun, *lā*, as a *lōʻula* ‘red earwig’ (Kauʻi December 4, 1865; discussed below). But the usual method is to use an accurate but difficult description of a real object. To identify the item from the description requires a firm grasp and retention of even its minute characteristics. Such tricky attributes are essential to the contest use of a special type of category, discussed above: ones with a single item. According to Malo (n.d.: xv 18), the shark, the amberjack, and the dolphin are each the single items of their individual categories. In the *hoʻopāpā*, a challenge can be made made using a category that has an attribute so restricting that only one item can fit it, an item that is then named along with the claim that nothing is left. The attribute is usually descriptive of an actual object, that is, it is only
rarely metaphorical. The opponent must then find a counter item that is either real or based on wordplay.

Subject: the object inside the long house that carries much baggage: Eia ka ukana nui iloko o kuu halau nei la-o ka waa ‘Here is the great baggage inside my long house here: the boat’. The boy counters with the gourd, which the third party accepts in Nākuina (Nākuina 1902b:57): he hookahi no ka ipu, he nui nae ka ukana oloko ‘the gourd is a single thing, but there is much baggage inside it’.

Subject: the ‘a’ama crab has a yellow back and ten legs. The boy counters with the ula “spiny lobster.”

Subject: the pinao ‘dragonfly’ is a manu lohelohoe or manu luheluhe ‘droopy bird’. The boy counters with the ‘ūhini “Longhorn grasshopper.”

Subject: the ‘ōopu is the only fish that has no house except rock. The boy responds with the ‘ōopu kai ‘sea ‘ōopu’.

Subject: the puhiōilo “Infant eel” has hookahi kapa ‘a single tapa’, the kapa kahakai ‘seashore’; an attribute based on wordplay. Nākuina narrates this round in some detail, illustrating the use of attributes and criteria of inclusion in a category. The opponents claim that they have selected, ohi, all ka i‘a kapa ole ‘the tapa-less fish’. The evil chief narrows the criteria: aole e pai keia hana hoopapa a makou ia oe, aia wale no a loaa kau i‘a kapa ole i kono pu ka puhi iloko o kona inoa, alaila, pai, a ola oe, a ina e loaa ole, make oe ia makou ‘this ho‘opāpā action of ours will not be countered by you unless indeed you get a tapa-less fish with puhi inserted into its name. Then it will be countered, and you will live. But if it is not obtained, we will kill you’. Nākuina explains (76 f.): Ua manao o Kalanialiiloa o keia hoohaiki ana mai ana a me keia kaupalena ana ana a ka i‘a e komo ana ka puhi iloko o kona inoa oia la ka mea e make ai ke keiki ia lakou ‘Kalanialiiloa was of the opinion that this, his narrowing and limiting of the fish to one with puhi inserted into its name would
be the thing by which the boy would be defeated and killed by them’. The opponents are encouraged and say twice: *make hoi ke keiki ia kakou, ua nele i ka 'ia kapa ole i komo pu ka puhi iloko o ka inoa* ‘the boy is defeated by us; he lacks the tapa-less fish with *puhi* inserted into its name’. The boy defeats them with the *pā'o'o-puhi* fish at the *kapa-kaheka* ‘reef edge’.

Subject: the plant that is *kumu 'ole* ‘rootless’. In the Kaipalaoa story, the opponents use the *kauna'oa* or *kauno'a* “native dodder,” which is *proverbially* the *lā'au kumu 'ole* ‘rootless plant’. The boy then counters with the *punawelewele* ‘spider web’. Kau'i (November 27, 1865) and Nākuina (1902b: 67 f.) reverse these attributions—the boy counters with the *kauna'oa*—and Nākuina has the third party explain at length that the boy’s answer is better because the *kauna'oa* is a real, ‘i'o, plant and his opponents’ answer is merely *ho'opilipili* ‘comparing’. I argue that Kau'i and Nākuina have reversed the order to express their tendency to prefer the *i'o* to the *ho'opilipili*, as discussed below. The *kauna'oa* is by far the easier answer of the two.

Subject: the *i'a momona* ‘fatty fish’ is the *'inamona* or *'akimona 'kukui* nut relish’, a wordplay found in a riddle. The boy counters with *'ina* “Small sea urchin” *momona* ‘fatty’. The opponents had started their chants with wordplay on two place names, Kalapana and Kaimu, implying that the boy would end by being cooked in the *imu* ‘earth oven’. The boy reverses the order to make the lines mean that what is cooked in the *imu* will be for him.

Subject: a dead thing given to a living thing: the rat to the owl countered by the cowry shell lure to the squid. This example will be discussed below.

Subject: *ka mea nanahu* ‘the thing that bites’. The opponents state that the *lā* ‘sun’ is a *lō 'ula* ‘red earwig’ that bites the farmer’s back. The boy counters with the toothed-leaved *kala* seaweed (a play on *ka lā* ‘the sun’) and the shark that can bite the fisherman’s back. His answer is based on wordplay and on the opposition
Because of the complication and contentiousness of the *hoʻopāpaʻa*, categories, attributes, and the criteria for a correct solution need to be made explicit. These can also be tightened as the contest proceeds. Disputes can arise, especially towards the end of a contest, and opponents can be required to explain their answers and justify their appropriateness (e.g., Kaipalaoa, Fornander 1916–1917: 585). The claim of correctness is indeed a regular part of the sequence of statements in the contests of wits.

Nākuina (1902b: 91f.) explains a category dispute in detail. The subject is *aina makani nui* ‘land of great/many winds’. The boy’s opponents have offered a chant of the winds of Hālawa, Molokaʻi. The boy counters with a place chant of Kaʻū, Hawaiʻi. The evil chief rejects this response:

```
Aohe ia he aina makani nui . . . no ka mea, he hookahi wale no wahi makani o Kau au i helu mai nei.
```

‘This is not a land of great winds . . . because it is only one little wind of Kaʻū that you have recited’.

The boy asserts his claim to correctness: *He aina makani nui io kaʻu* ‘Mine is a real land of many winds’. The third party judges:

```
Aohe nui o ka makani o Kau au i helu mai nei, nolaila, aole i aloa [sic: loaʻa] kau aina makani nui
```

‘The winds of Kaʻū that you have recited are not many/great, therefore you have not obtained your land of great winds . . .’.

The boy bases his claim on the place saying, *O Kau nui aina makani—e!* ‘Great Kaʻū, land of wind’. But the third party answers:
Aole ia he aina makani nui, no ka mea, ua hewa kau mele ana, ua kaa ka nui i ka aina, oiai ua hana mai nei oe ‘O Kau nui,’ aina makani, ina oe i hana mai nei, ‘O Kau, aina makani nui,’ ina la paha ua pono.

‘This is not a land of great winds, because your chanting is false. The nui has been applied to the land. That is, you have done for us “Great Ka‘ū,” land of wind. If you had done “Ka‘ū, land of great/many winds,” then it would have been right’.

A major dispute erupts in the climactic round of the contest in Kauai (December 4, 1865): the subject is moku kele i kai ‘islands reached by sea’ or moku kele i okia e ke kai ‘islands reached and cut off by sea’. The opponents perform a chant with first a list of the islands of the Hawaiian chain and then a long list of the criteria needed to fit the category: growing plants, air-breathing animals, houses, hills, mountains, a temple, and human residents. The boy performs a long chant filled with non-island place names and ends with the two verses, Ku ana nei moku i kai, o Hinamakanui,/He moku kele i ke kai ‘This island is standing in the sea, Hinamakanui,/An island reached by sea’.

His opponents ask the third party whether the boy is right, and he replies that he knows the island, which is merely he moku lawai-a i ka wa malie ‘an island for fishermen in the time of calm’. An occasionally submerged rock, it does not fit the criteria of the category; it has no plants, houses, or people e lilo ai la hoi i moku kele i okiia e ke kai ‘so as to become an island reached and cut off by sea’. The crowd however reacts in favor of the boy: Aohe he moku a ke keiki i okiia e ke kai—e! ‘Isn’t the boy’s island one cut off by the sea!’

The boy then says he has not finished the chant and names Moku‘ula, claiming in a section parallel to the chant of his opponents that it fits each individual criterion of the category: Ua okiia e ke kai a kaawale ‘It is cut off by the sea and separate’. The
last lines of his chant challenge his opponents to recognize the correctness of his response. The evil chief appeals again to the third party, who pronounces the boy the winner and states in detail that his answer fits all the criteria: *he moku io no o Mokuola* ‘Mokuola is a real island’.

The constant repetition of the category, attribute, and criteria indicates their importance in the contest and dispute. Similarly, in “He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” (1902: 6), the attribute, *kele i kai*, is clarified by a repeating line in chant: *Ma ka waa ke ala e hiki ai* ‘The way it is reached is by boat’. The opponents try to include every appropriate item—*ua noke lakou i ka helu papa mai Kaula mai a Hawaii* ‘they persisted in listing from [westernmost] Ka‘ula to [easternmost] Hawai‘i’—and, therefore, Nolaila, can challenge the boy to add one more item. *Mokuola is o ko ia nei moku i pakele ai* ‘the island by which he escaped’.

Solutions of problems also admit of degrees of accuracy. That is, two solutions could both be correct, but one would fit the category and criteria better or add supplementary factors. Such an evaluation of answers may have become necessary with the professionalization of the contest and the increasing expertise of contestants and elaboration of the subjects. This is clear in the non-verbal or combination subjects. The boy argues at length that his post, flag, and other pieces of equipment are better, as seen above, and he wins a round because his mat is made of finer materials (Nākuina 1902b: 29–31, 51 f.).

Most evaluations of degrees concern fitting the attribute or criteria of a category. In the subject, a dead thing given to a living thing, the dead thing of the opponents was the rat given to an owl, and the boy’s a cowry shell lure given to a squid. The boy’s answer is better because the shell is dead from the beginning, whereas the rat is alive at first and must be killed by the owl. The boy’s *‘ina momona* ‘fatty sea urchin’ fits the category *i‘a momona* ‘fatty fish’ better than his opponents *‘inamona* ‘kukui nut relish’, because it is a real fish (Nākuina 1902b: 86 f.). The boy’s droopy bird eats, but
his opponents’ does not ("No ke Keiki Hoopapa, Oia o Kalapana" n.d.: 33 [2]).

Supplementary factors can also be used in an evaluation. Both the opponents’ crab and the boy’s lobster have a yellow back and ten legs, but the lobster is bigger. The boy’s *hua* that are *ahu i lalo* ‘heaped below’ are better because they go deeper, as deep indeed as the house foundation of the god of the underworld: *O ka-hua-a-hale o Milo, ahu ilalo, ilalo, ilalo lilo loa* ‘The house platform of Milo, heaped down, down, down, until completely lost’ (Nākuina 1902b: 62). Conversely, his *hua* that *kau i luna* ‘rest above’ are better because they are higher than those of his opponents. A complicated round is that of the opponents’ chant on the sun as an earwig that bites the back of the farmer, countered by the boy’s chant on the seaweed and the shark that bites the fisherman. The judgement takes account of the threat of death in the set portion of the verbal sequence of the contest. The boy’s item is better because the shark really kills, while the sun just heats.

Such evaluations can express a tendency of the author. I have argued above that Kauí and Nākuina have reversed the attributions of the answers on the *lā卤au kumu ‘ole* ‘rootless plant’ in accordance with their, perhaps modern, tendency to prefer items that are *‘i卤‘real*’ to those that are *ho’opilipili* ‘metaphorical or compared’. This tendency is expressed in a little exchange of statements using the words *‘i卤* and *ho’opili*, which they alone insert into the verbal sequence, and in their treatment of the tabued post, the flag, and so on, as explained above. For instance, the boy proceeds landward until he reaches the *hale ho’opāpā* of his opponents, which is surrounded by a stone wall and one made of the bones of defeated opponents, including the boy’s father. Directly in front of the opening of the bone fence, the boy erects a *paukū ki* ‘a section of ti plant’. He claims his fence is real because it grows entire in the mountains and therefore needs only to be erected. Theirs on the contrary is constructed or put together, *ho’opilipili*. The wordplay
is based on that sense of *hoʻopilipili* and another used often in the contest, ‘metaphorical’. This basis for judgement continues to be used for the contests inside the house of the contest of wits. For instance, the boy has a *moena io* ‘real mat’, while his opponents have *he moena olelo wale* ‘a mat in word only’ (Kauʻi November 20, 1865). The boy sits on his *kala* ‘fish’, when his opponents deny him a *kala* ‘end of the house’; the third party judges (Nākuina 1902b: 51):

> Ua loaa io kou kala e ke keiki, a he kala io no kou, a ke noho io mai nei oe iluna o kou kala, he ole loa lakou nei, he pili wale aku no.

‘Child, your *kala* has really been obtained, and yours is a real *kala*, and you are really sitting on your kala. But not at all these [your opponents] here; theirs is only *pili*.’

The third party repeats the word ‘*iʻo* and plays on the word *pili*, which can mean either the type of grass from which the house is made or ‘relate to’ the basis of *hoʻopilipili*.

In such disputes and evaluations of answers, the contestants can refuse to admit defeat or to accept the judgement of the third party (Nākuina 1902b: 88), even though required by etiquette and fairness. In some cases, force can be applied by the audience.

**The Use of Paired Opposites**

Reflecting its basis in Hawaiian education, the content of the *hoʻopāpā* is organized into categories with items and, at a higher level, according to paired opposites. Beckwith writes of the contestant (1932: 333): “It is the natural philosophy of opposites which he must master.”

Opposition is indeed essential to the structure of the contest
itself, as seen in the line from the fixed verbal sequence: *A hua a pane, he pane ko ona, he hoolohe koonei* ‘It is stated, now respond. Response over there, listening over here’ (e.g., Kauai November 20, 1865). The contest is described as a conversation, dialog, or repartee: ‘ōlelo kīkē and *kūka'i ʻōlelo*. Kauai (November 27, 1865) describes *ka pane aku, a pane mai, me he mau loio la* ‘the responding this way and responding that way like a bunch of lawyers’. Indeed, the protagonist of the Kalapana/Kaipalaoa tradition is recognized as a *keiki ho'opāpā* ‘child of the contest of wits’ by his use of opposites.

As seen above, responses in the contest must match the challenge, that is, there must be similarity: *ka ke keiki mau olelo pani, e like no nae me ka ke kanaka makua* ‘the child’s closing/winning statements were indeed similar to those of the elder’ (Kauai November 20, 1865). Besides the similarity, the boy had introduced an opposition: his opponents were claiming the *loko* ‘inside’, so he claimed the *waho* ‘outside’. The response must have therefore a balance of similarity and opposition.

Opposition can also be used to manipulate the opponent. The boy’s opponents force him to come landward by having him make someone else go seaward (Kaipalaoa, Fornander 1916–1917: 577 ff.). By having his opponents threaten him with death, the boy ensures that they will suffer the same penalty if they lose (e.g., Nākuina 1902b: 42 f.).

Opposites can also be invested with a certain point. When the fishermen tell Kalapana that he, the child, should not be short-tempered, he throws the same words back at them, the old men (Nākuina 1902b: 18 f.). The men laugh and admit that they were wrong. Nākuina explains how Kalapana’s response was not a mere *tu quoque*. The men had made their statement because they had lost their temper. The boy’s response revealed the truth of the situation, and the men were caught. In Hawaiian morality, elders should be more patient than youngsters.
Verbal Opposites

I have already mentioned or discussed a number of examples of non-verbal opposites used in the contest of wits, for example, the use of a big rock and a little rock for the ordeal section of Kauai (December 18, 1865). The verbal opposites mentioned are equally numerous and varied: the contrast of long house and boat, ascent and descent, farmer and fisherman, young and old, and so on. Other opposites can be brought occasionally into play: e.g., kū/moe ‘standing/lying down’; alo/kua ‘front/back’; and keiki mā’ona/makua pōloli ‘satiated child/hungry elder’.351

However, the paired opposites used most regularly in the contest are those that are basic to classical Hawaiian education. The luna/lalo ‘above/below’ pair has been seen in the rounds on hua that are ahu i lalo ‘heaped below’ and kau i luna ‘set above’. The pair can be used to create matching items or counter examples.352 Lani/honua ‘sky/earth’ is used infrequently (“Kaao Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki,” January 17, 1912:16).

Uka/kai ‘land/sea’ is used frequently in riddles353 and has been seen in the rounds on the ‘o’opu kai ‘sea ‘o’opu’, the farmer and the fisherman, and the paths of Kona. The distinction was the basis of a number of other passages in the contests, such as the attempt to have the boy move from the shore inland and the tabued land side of the post as against the non-tabued sea side.354

Pō/ao ‘night and day’ is used regularly in the threatening prose challenge of the verbal sequence as a completeness formula: one cannot lose because one has studied night and day. A very complicated chain of correspondences is developed in “Kaao Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” (January 17, 1912:16 f.). The basic pair is luna/lalo. To this pair, the alternating contestants apply the following corresponding and unconventional pairs: luna = pō ‘night’ and lalo = honua ‘earth’; luna = pō and lalo = moku ‘island’; luna = ao ‘day’ and lalo = moku. Ao is emphasized in the final chant. The contestants have applied unconventional pairs to
luna/lalo. They have started with pō and have continued until they reached ao. The contestant who reached ao first achieved pani ‘closure’, because he arrived at the end of the pō/ao pair; thus he won (see also January 24, 1912:17).

The loko/waho ‘inside/outside’ pair of opposites plays a large role in contests of wits. Instead of betting for land, Lonoikamakahiki bets for the inside of the house in which his opponents are sitting (Fornander 1916–1917:281ff, 289ff.). When he wins, they have to exit, and since the door is narrow, he can kill them one by one. They realize it was a pili ‘ino ‘evil bet’, admit defeat, and beg for mercy. Similarly in the Kalapana/Kaipalaoa tradition, the opponents forbid the inside to the boy, so he can forbid the outside to them.355 Their situation becomes intolerable, and they have to beg to have the law lifted.

As seen above, these pairs of opposites can be used in combination. In the repartee between the boy and his opponents when they try to get him to move landward, the land/sea pair is used with the child/elder pair as well as with other opposites: to land and to swim; to come up and to go down.356 The pairs can also be used in combination as completeness formulas, for instance, in the chants with which one side pale ‘forbids’ the inside or the outside or the outside to the other.

The contest of wits is therefore a very complete elaboration of the testing in classical Hawaiian education.

EXPERIENCE

Memory is essential for living and effective action, but experience is necessary as well. Experience is the origin of memory and adds to its store (Baron 1988:69). Experience also provides the personal knowledge of what we have learned from education and tradition. The young fisherman learns the names of the different colors of ocean water, but must see them himself and connect them with
the vocabulary for his knowledge to be complete. *Ma ka hana ka 'ike* ‘Seeing/knowing is in doing’ (Pukui 1983: number 2088). Hawaiian education thus encouraged experience in its emphasis on observation. As a result, hearing about the *wahi pana* ‘storied places’ merely whetted one’s appetite to visit them oneself, and one’s own experience of the place would be a part of one’s chant in its praise. Experience was also a means of validating teachings or testing claims, as has been seen above.

Hawaiians clearly distinguish between hearsay about something, *lohe 'ōlelo*, and seeing it with one’s own eyes, *'ike maka*. Malo describes the coordination of traditional knowledge and experience (n.d.: xxxviii 97):

> Elua kumu nui aka poe kalaimoku, o ko lakou ao ma na olelo akamai a ka poe kalaimoku kahiko, a oko lakou noho mau meia alii aimoku a make aku, noho hou aku, a make aku, aike pono i ke ano o kela lii aimoku, keia alii aimoku, me ko lakou lohe mai i ke ano o na lii aimoku kahiko.

> ‘There were two great sources for the people who were ministers of government, their learning of the intelligent sayings of the governors of old and their own constant residence with this ruling chief until he died, new residence until [the next one] died, and seeing correctly the character of this ruling chief and that ruling chief, along with their hearing about the character of the ruling chiefs of old’.

Similarly the *kuhikuhipuʻuone* ‘geomancers, land experts’ combined a store of transmitted knowledge about the land along with techniques for finding new elements, such as water (Kamakau December 28, 1867). Medical practitioners also combine learning with experience, as will be seen in chapter V.

The practice of combining transmitted knowledge with personal experience was carried over into the postcontact period. Haleʻole emphasizes the amount of research he did himself (April 20, 1865) and says that such work is the criterion of credibility.
when two scholars disagree: *Owai la ka mea nui o na mea elua?*

*O ke kanaka noho wale iho no anei me ka imi ole? O ke kanaka imi paha?* ‘Which is the important person of the two? The man who just stayed at home without searching? Or the man who searched perhaps?’ (June 1, 1865). Hale‘ole’s choice of words evokes the classical Hawaiian idea of *ka ‘imi loa* ‘the great search’ (Charlot 1983a:115–126). Similarly Kohala-nui-Kohala-iki (May 17, 1911) contrasts the work of Kamakau with that of his opponent in controversy:

> O ka moolelo i kakauia e S. M. Kamakau, ua looa ia ma kona imi a huli ponoi ana me ka ninaninau ana i na poe kahiko o na Kohala e ola ana ia mau la, ma ka wa i hoounaia ai no ka imi ana i ka mea pololei o ka moolelo o Kamehameha, a ua hoolahaia ma ka M. H. 1860 a mahope mai.

‘The history written by S. M. Kamakau was obtained by his own personal search and investigation with the frequent questioning of the old people of the Kohala regions who were living in those days, at the time he was sent to search out the truth [the correct thing] of the history of Kamehameha, and it was disseminated in the year 1860 and after’.

Kamakau’s account would surely have been controverted by the learned people of his time, if he had been incorrect.

From contact until today, the experience of Hawaiians has been important in the evaluation of their culture. They observed that many foreigners were not punished for violating godly tabus. On the other hand, Hawaiians could not believe that their gods did not exist, because they themselves experienced them. They could not agree that their medical practices were without value, because cures were in fact effected. Such experiences posed many intellectual and emotional problems for Hawaiians, but they also insured that the proposed solutions would not be simple or uninteresting.
Creativity must be recognized as an essential part of education and culture, which is constantly being recreated (Bruner 1986: 122–125, 127, 149). Indeed, creativity is an inescapable component of all human thinking and activity: “Though we think of creativity as being extraordinary, it is in fact a routine aspect of the human constitution” (Carrithers 1990: 200). Education can never be mere transmission; one cannot master a subject or activity until one can be actively creative within it. In Piaget’s motto, “To learn is to invent” (Bruner 1986: 141). Moreover, the emphasis on observation, on seeing for oneself, ensured that creativity was at the basis of Hawaiian education.

Different cultures however can recognize and honor creativity to differing degrees. Classical Hawaiian culture conferred prestige, fame, and reward on innovative and creative people. Salient examples are the highly original and appreciated poets Ke‘äulumoku and Nī‘au to whom could indeed be applied such Hawaiian words for singular and outstanding as kūha‘o, kū kahi, and po‘okela.

Even in questions for which tradition enjoyed great authority, such as historical models, the model or prototype had to be fitted to the actual case: in order to “make judgments on the basis of similarity of new instances to old exemplars, or remembered examples”, “the thinker must figure out which terms of the new problem correspond to which terms of the old one” (Baron 1988: 78; also 77). This procedure goes beyond remembering: “Narrativity is inherently creative both in constructing narratives and in connecting them with the real world.” Kalapana meets two fishermen who no‘ono‘o ‘reflect’ on his unusual way of speaking and decide he fits the category of a keiki ho‘opāpā ‘boy contestant of wits’ (Nākuina 1902b: 18). The same need to fit knowledge or models to actual cases is found in the professions. Hawaiian war experts based their judgements on historical examples, but had to
fit the battle type to the particular terrain (Malo n.d.: xxxviii 81). The lexicon of dream symbols had to be applied to the particular case. The proverb ‘O ke kahua mamua, mahope ke kūkulu ‘First the foundation, afterwords the constructing’ (Pukui 1983: number 2459), emphasizes the foundation, but makes clear that it is laid to be built upon.

The use of models can be dangerous if one fixates on one or a few instead of consulting a wide range of possibly applicable prototypes (Baron 1988: 372). The ideal of completeness encouraged Hawaiians to deliberate upon a large number of memorized models and cautionary tales, resulting in the long deliberations recorded. Attending such conferences would have provided an education in the methods to be used. Disagreements could arise about the correct interpretation of a model. ‘Ī’ī thinks that the lesson to be learned from the death of his half-brother Maoloha is that it is dangerous to go to court. ‘Ī’ī’s mother interprets the case differently: the judgement of the court was correct, and Maoloha was to blame for various faults, which ‘Ī’ī should and can avoid (‘Ī’ī July 3, 1869).

Hawaiian creativity was evident in their interest, indeed delight, in innovation, which was the ultimate origin and the source of the continuing expansion of tradition. The author of “He Moolelo Kaa no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” (May 12, 1921) describes ke ano mau o ka lahui Hawaii, he poe aapo loa i na mea hou e hoike ia mai ana ia lakou ‘the constant character of the Hawaiian race, a people that grasps much the new things shown to them’. Hawaiian literature often reports this strong interest in new things.

Innovation was noted and prestigious. For instance, the chief Keawe was famous for the innovation of not performing his name chant while surfing (‘Ī’ī June 5, 1869). A maika ‘bowls’ player became known as akamai because of his famous innovation (‘Ī’ī October 9, 1869). Kūapāka’a is careful to give his father the credit for what he taught him and created: a nana no hoi au i ao na hana
a pau i haku ia e ia nou ‘from him indeed I learned all the works which were created by him for you’ (Kuapuu June 19, 1861). Innovation was rewarded, such as one with ‘awa (Titcomb 1948:108).

Such innovation was clearly appreciated, as can be seen in the religion, material culture, and the visual arts (Charlot 1980; 1983a:21–35, 146 ff.). Pāka’a innovates a sail and wins a race; the public e mahalo ana hoi i ko ia nei akamai, a me ka noono[o] i ka imi mea hou ‘was appreciating indeed his intelligence and thoughtfulness in searching out new things’ (“He Moolelo no Pakaa” October 24, 1867). In Nākuina’s version of the event (1902a: 9 ff.), he states that Pāka’a’s discovery was mawaho ae o na mea maa mau ‘outside of the customary things’ (9). The public’s reaction is:

e mahalo ana hoi i ko ianei akamai a me ka naauao i ka imi ana i mea hou e pau ai ka luhi o ka poohiwi i ka hoe.

‘they were appreciating indeed his intelligence and wisdom in searching out new things so that the fatigue of the shoulder in rowing would be ended’. (15 f.)

Ma’ilou praises Pāka’a for his invention:

e kaulana ana hoi kou inoa, no ka mea, o oe hookahi ka mea mua loa nana i noonoo a penei iho la e pau ai ka luhi o ka poohiwi i ka hoe.

‘your name will be famous indeed, because you alone are the very first person to think of a way to end the fatigue of the shoulder in rowing’. (11).

This interest in novelty continued into postcontact times. Kānepu‘u describes the first time he saw a horse, the way he and his friends observed the strange customs of a haole family, and the visit he and the other children made to a new mill. Hawaiians were quick to observe Western technology, study it
critically, and put it to use, often in conjunction with traditional techniques and for traditional purposes. Such interest could be of the highest importance. The author of “He Moolelo Kaa no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” emphasizes the visit to and sea voyage made on Cook’s ship by Kamehameha and Kekūhaupio in order to inspect and learn from it, its equipment, and its crew: the visit later proved a mea hoonaaauao ‘thing that made them wise’ a mea kokua ‘helpful thing’, and a mea hoomakaukau ‘thing that made them ready or competent’.

The interest in Western technology was inevitably influential on the Hawaiian world view, which is emphasized by the author of “No na mea hana e pono ai o Hawaii nei” (April 4, 1834). A chief tells Kamehameha:

_Eia ke Akua mana; o ka pu. Aole mana o ke akua kii, a me na akua e ae a pau loa. Alaila hoomaopopo iho la o Kamehameha i ka pu._

“‘Here is the powerful god: the gun. There is no power of the idol and all the other gods.’ Then Kamehameha understood the gun’.

The author lists the first things the commoners obtained from the foreigners and concludes:

_Nolaila, ua haalele lakou i na mea kahiko; a ua huli ma na mea hou a ka haole i lawe mai ai i Hawaii nei._

‘Therefore, they abandoned the old things and turned to the new things that the foreigner brought here to Hawai‘i’.

Indeed, the novelty of Western education was one of its initial attractions (e.g., Martin, Lyman, Bond, and Damon 1979: 61, 71).

John Papa ʻĪ‘ī was famous for his interest in new things, which gave him the reputation of being one of the mea hou ‘new people’ (M. A. Richards 1970: 127). His obituary states that he became a court advisor because of his knowledge of new things and talent
Ma ka pae mua ana mai o na Kahuna Hai Ola, ma ko kakou nei kapakai, ua haawiia ke ao ana iaia malalo o ke alakai ana a ka Makua mua Rev. H. Bingham, ma ka olelo Hawaii a haole. Mahope koke iho o kona maamaa ana i na ike i ao ia iaia, ua hoomaka oia i ke ao kula ana a me ka mahele olelo pu ana me Binamu. No kona lilo e ana i kanaka makaukau, ua lilo oia i hoa kuka no Kauikeaouli. No kona maamaa loa i ka noho ana imua o ke alo alii me ka hoopono, ua lilo oia he kanaka i makemake nui ia, a no ka loli hikiwawe ana hoi kekahì ma ke ano hou.

‘With the first landing of the Priests Proclaiming Life here on our shore, teaching was given to him under the guidance of the first Father, the Reverend H. Bingham, in the Hawaiian and the foreign language. Shortly after he became familiar with the subjects of knowledge taught to him, he began to teach school and to translate together with Bingham. Because he had already become competent, he became a companion and advisor to Kauikeaouli.

Because of his great familiarity with correct behavior before the face of the chief, he became a person who was greatly prized, and also because of his quick change into the new ways’.

‘Ī‘ī’s own writings support this characterization. He is generally interested in and impressed by new sights (February 12, 1870): a tree with a branch trained to form an arch (July 24, 1869); an odd practice with coconut trees, he mea hou ‘a new thing’ (March 19, 1870); ships, which he visits along with the crew (August 7, 1869); and the first people from China, who arouse general curiosity (January 8, 1870). He proudly mentions innovative Hawaiian adaptations of foreign technology: the new peleleu boat, said to be faster than foreign ones, and Hawaiian sails, said to be more efficient.364 ‘Ī‘ī visits the construction site of a foreign style house,
talks with the men involved, praises their skill, and remembers their names and their statements about the seriousness of their work (February 26, 1870). In doing this he follows classical Hawaiian practice: the names of technical innovators would be remembered, and they could even be turned into the ‘aumākua ‘patron gods’ of the profession.

Innovation and creativity were an accepted later stage of education. For instance, one would start with memorized prayers and later learn to compose spontaneous ones. The student needed to demonstrate his ability to manipulate the materials of his field in order to graduate. As a past master, he gained fame by innovation as well as by displaying the knowledge he had received. Indeed, the same forms that helped in memorizing and recall could help in composition. Nākuina (1902b:83 f.) provides a description of the noʻonoʻo ‘deliberating’ of Kalapana during a contest of wits. The protagonist must answer his opponents in two parts: things that turn over and an appropriate land. He has the former items but no good place name. He then remembers that the first line of his opponents’ chant referred to the ascent at a certain place. He would therefore be allowed to find an opposite for their line not in another place name but in the descent at the same place they used. He thus innovates within the rules and checks their move. Indeed, a problem for the morale of the first Hawaiian students in Western schools was that they found it difficult to manipulate the new knowledge and move creatively beyond their lessons, as will be seen in chapter VI.

Similarly one could “graduate” into maturity. ʻĪʻi (February 12, 1870) leaves the court temporarily to join his father. When his father protests, ʻĪʻi presents his arguments for doing so. That his father accepts them shows that ʻĪʻi is making progress in his reasoning and in gaining the respect of others for his opinions. Being able to formulate reasons and views is a characteristic of the mature human being.
NOTES


2. The line Hoi uhane i Hawaii e ke alii kuli ‘You will return as a ghost to Hawai’i, O unhearing chief’ and variants are used of Keawenuia’umi, Kuapuu May 1, 1861; “He moolelo no Pakaa” November 21, 1867 (compare E na’lii kuli o Hawaii la—e ‘Oh deaf chiefs of Hawai’i there’; Loaa oe e ke Alii hookuli ‘You are caught, oh deaf-acting chief’); Nākuina 1902a:66; Fornander 1918–1919:89.

3. Pukui 1942:376. Handy-Pukui 1972:91. Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972:127; 1979:39, 48 ff. The role of observation has been studied in Polynesia and other cultures. Ritchie and Ritchie 1989:115 f., on learning crafts. For primary cultures in general, see Cole and Scribner 1974:177; Hallpike 1979:105–109; also 224–235, observation is influenced by thinking. Pihi June 13, 1863, denies that naʻauao ‘wisdom’ can be apprehended through the five senses, na ike Elima, a borrowed concept that marks his opinion as a Westernism. Observation is clearly physical for Hawaiians and is the first step towards wisdom. In the Kamehameha Early Education Project, the role of observation in education was much discussed, e.g., Jordan 1983:286; Speidel, Farran, and Jordan 1989:67, 75. Education for the disabled is not discussed specifically in the texts I have studied, but blind experts are mentioned in chanting, “Hawaiian Bards” 1892, and martial arts, Elbert 1959:169 ff.

4. Kaelemakule March 28, 1863, describes a dying person: aole ike i koe, aole lohe ‘no sight remained, no hearing’. “Kaao Hooniua Puuwai no Kā-Miki” June 21, 1911:15, the loser of a combat waiho ana iluna ke alo ua pau ka ike, pau ka lohe ‘was left face-up; seeing was finished, hearing was finished’.


7. ‘Īi November 27, 1869; February 26, 1870. See also the discussion of innovation below.


10. Kekoa September 30, 1865. Such statements are found often in the literature. Laanui January 4, 1837. Dibble 1838: 21, 104, accounts possibly based on eyewitnesses. Kuaea September 23, 1865, Ua ike maka a lohe pono hoi au . . . ‘I have indeed witnessed with my eyes and heard correctly . . .’. Ekaula November 4, 1865. Kānepu‘u February 20, 1868, the author witnessed the process of making tapa. Tī March 12, 1870, many experiences of sorcery phenomena. Kamakau August 4, 1870, witnesses of the ceremony described are still living; August 18, 25, 1870, the author was an eyewitness to the success of certain medical practices. Spencer 1895: 48, the author was an eyewitness to the efficacy of a treatment. “Kaa Hooniu Pauwai no Ka-Miki” February 15, 22, 1911. “Ka Oihana Lua a mawaii Lahuui [sic]” July 19, 1923, the author bases his report on his own experience.

11. Tharp 1989: 352 f., 356 f. Compare Jordan 1981: 18 f.; Jordan, D’Amato, and Joesting 1981: 33 f.; Jordan, Tharp, and Vogt 1985: 29–37. The need for verbal development is emphasized by Speidel, Farran, and Jordan 1989: 70 f., 74 f. The evaluation of the verbal skills of contemporary Hawaiian students is often complicated by their use of non-standard English. Certainly some of the difficulties observed in such studies may be due to the students’ attempts to speak standard English in the school setting. The wide loss of the Hawaiian language has affected many aspects of modern Hawaiian thinking. See also the discussions in chapter VI and Appendix I.


14. Fornander 1916–1917: 325–331, Lonoikamakahiki regularly heeds his priestly advisors in battle (also 324 n. 2); 339 ff., his enemy Kamalālāwalu does not heed the advice of his good counselor, the famous Lanikāula; 343–347, on the contrary, he follows the deceptive advice of advisors who are really on the enemy side and are giving good advice to Lonoikamakahiki, who heeds it.

Kamakau February 2, 1871, when Kamalālāwalu receives conflicting advice, he listens to what he wants to hear rather than the truth. He threatens his dissenting experts with punishment once he returns successfully from his invasion of Hawai‘i. He then heeds the deceiving advisors of Hawai‘i, even when he has good reason to suspect them.

Kamakau January 12, 1871, Lonoikamakahiki himself can be he alii hookuli me ka malama ole i na oleloao a kana mau kahuna a me kana mau
kakaolelo 'a deaf-acting chief who does not observe the teachings of his priests and his word-fencers/orators'. As a result, some of his advisors leave him and go to another chief me ka manaolana he alii hoopono a me ka hoolohe i na mea a pau a na kahuna a me na kakaolelo e ao aku ai 'with the hope that he would be a chief who would act correctly and listen to all the things the priests and word-fencers taught him.' Because Lonoikamakahiki later abandons himself to his violent emotions, he goes mad and nearly loses his kingdom.

Similarly Pi'ilani of Maui does not follow the kauoha 'last will and instructions' of his father and mistreats his younger brother and sister, Kihapi'ilani and Pi'ikea, which leads to the loss of his position, Fornander 1916–1917: 237–255.

19. Kānepu‘u March 26, 1868. This game seems to have been named ho'oholoholo.
22. Pukui and Elbert 1986: at word. Also Handy and Pukui 1972:188.
26. For example, Wilkes 1845:54. Martin, Lyman, Bond, and Damon 1979:57, 63 f., 121. L. F. Judd 1928:70 f. “He Moolelo Kaa no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” March 3, June 2, August 18, 1921, condemns sports as a distraction at certain times.
28. Handy and Pukui 1972:7–14. See also the listings at hale in Pukui and Elbert 1986; Dunis 1990:124–127. Selected examples suggest the range of
uses. The Hawaiian homestead was divided into several structures, such as the *mua* ‘men’s house’ and the *hale noa* ‘family house’. The *hale pe'a* was the ‘menstrual house’ to which a woman could retire. Fishermen had a special hut that was tabu to women because they were not allowed to touch the equipment. Canoe makers built a shelter in the mountains, Kawaikaumaiakamaokaopua November 16, 1922. A *papa'i kilu* ‘kilu shed’ was a small temporary hut in which the aristocratic game was played; an enclosure could be built also for the commoner version ‘*ume*. Commoners may have had a house for drinking ‘*awa*, Titcomb 1948:120. A separate house could be built for a birth, Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:12, and to treat a corpse, Kekoa September 30, 1865; Pukui and Elbert 1986: *pū'o'a*. Temporary and permanent houses were built for various religious purposes, e.g., Fornander 1916–1917: 461 ff.; Green and Pukui 1936: 30; Handy and Pukui 1972: 147. A number of particular structures were built within the precincts of large temples. The practice continued for new uses: Kamehameha built a special house for the dollars he was earning in trade, ʻĪ‘ī March 26, 1870; compare Pukui and Elbert 1986: *olowalu, oloalu* 2. A hut was used to collect taxes, Barratt 1988: 185.

The building of specialized houses may have been practiced more in Hawai‘i than elsewhere in Polynesia. For instance, Hawaiians were the only ones to build specialized medical temples, Larsen 1952: 14. This intensive practice may have been based on the unusual amount of specialization in Hawaiian culture.

30. “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” August 11, 1921. See also the discussions of these subjects in chapter V.
33. Oliver 1974: 85, for prayer chants, “the petitioner bolstered his memory by means of a tally consisting of a bundle of sticks or a frond of coconut . . .” Métraux 1971: 405, in the Tuamotus and Society Islands “chants were embodied in material objects: sticks, plaited pandanus, or coconut leaves,” and knots may have been used in the Cook Islands; such “mnemonic devices developed into sacred accessories associated with chanting that had only a remote link with their original function.” Métraux 1971: 403 ff., doubts that Easter Island pictographs were mnemonic devices.
34. Lavondès 1979: 185, the use of knots in the Marquesas. Métraux 1971: 405. For Māori notched bones, see Kaepler 1982: 86 f.; doubted by
Métraux 1971: 405. Hawai‘i: Mellen 1958:160, each genealogist had “his sacred ball of knotted olona card [sic: cord], the kaula hipu‘u, a mnemonic device . . .”; Bechwith 1972:143; Rubellite K. Johnson in a lecture on February 2, 1992, stated that knots, strings, feathers and other objects were used for genealogies, general records, taxes, and contributions to ceremonies; references in Tatar 1993:307. However, no such practices are mentioned in the earliest sources, although Hawaiians were anxious to list traditional parallels to Western culture. Bastian 1883:25, mentions the use of marks on tapa to record genealogies, but it is not clear whether he is discussing Hawai‘i.

35. Birth: Kamakau August 26, 1865:1 (so I interpret the passage, he wahi pohaku kona wahi hoailona). Death: Kamakau September 9, 1865a, ke ku nei ka pohaku Hoomanao i kona make ana a hiki i keia la ‘the Memorial stone to his death stands to the present day’. See also Kamakau January 5, 1867.


38. See chapter V on medicine and sorcery. “He Moolelo Hawaii: O Kaiakea” July 25, 1902, pebbles are used in a ceremonious reading of omens. “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” March 31, 1921, the chief Kahekili seems to use piles of pebbles to work out the displacement of troops and tactics.


45. Kepelino 1932:115. Chants clearly needed memorizing, but stories were memorized as well, as can be seen in the numerous examples of authors explaining old or rare words that had been transmitted with their texts, e.g.,
Fornander 1918–1919:713; compare Fornander 1916–1917:541, memorization not mentioned explicitly. ‘Ī’s greater linguistic ease and clarity when telling a story may be due either to his comfort in the story genre or to the fact that he is recounting a work that he has semi-memorized, September 4, 1869.

46. ‘Ī December 4, 1869; January 29, 1870, he uses the word maʻa ‘familiar’.

47. “He Moolelo nona Wahi Pana o Ewa” January 13, 1900. The full text of the passage is:

E nee mai kakou i Puuokapolei. O kela puu kekahi puu kaulana loa i ka wa kahiko. Mai kela puu mai i haku ia ai kekahi mele i kamaaina i ka poe lealea o ka wa kahiko, ua haku ia apuni Oahu nei, a ma ia mele e oli ai ka poe Pukaula a me ka poe Ukeke laau, ka poe kimo pohaku, hua Noni, hua kukui paha.

Ua helu ia ka inoa o keia mele ma ka inoa o ka aina, a oia kaʻu e panee aku nei imua o ka poe aole i loaa a paa naau i neia mele. E like me na mele kahiko i loaa ole i kekahi poe, a loaa hoi kahi i kekahi poe: [chant follows].


49. Kamakau December 29, 1870. See also, e.g., Nākuina 1902a: 21.

50. “Ka make ana o Ka Mea Hanohano Ioane Ii” May 7, 1870. A. November 5, 1853, on Malo: “the great activity of his mind, and his retentive memory.” Kuykendall 1932b: 79, Malo “was a great favorite, when young, with the chiefs on account of his smartness and his acquaintance with their songs, dances, and other amusements, in all of which he was able to lead and direct.” Kamakau was praised for his memory and stated that after the loss of many of his materials on December 16, 1865, he had to rely on it; Kamakau October 28, 1865; Kamakau 1988: 15, 22 [Chun]. Bingham 1981: 481 f. “Ua Hala o Mrs. Kamaka Stillman” August 7, 1924. Contemporary Hawaiians praise people who know the complete lyrics of many songs and scorn people who try to sing a song without knowing all the words.


52. “He Moolelo Kao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” May 12, 1921, paa-naau. The passage is based on Dibble 1838: 10 f., who does not mention memorizing.

53. Dibble n.d.: 2090 f. and the discussion on manaʻo in chapter II.

54. Preservation: Barrère 1980: 22, 39; Imaikalani June 9, 1911. Lost:
Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua January 11, 1923; August 7, 1924. See the discussion of genealogy and history in chapter V.


56. Nākuina 1902a: 34. Kuapuu April 24, 1861. Fornander 1918–1919: 75. See also “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio” December 16, 1920, a good student has ano aapo ‘the character of grasping/snatching’; December 23, 1920, ano aapo maoli; December 30, 1920, akamai aapo.

57. Luomala 1955: 60; also 43. Judd 1930: proverbs 187 (quickness); 559, 600, 601 (against slowness). “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” May 26, 1921. Nākuina 1902b: 6, 9 (the less talented learn slowly). Edith J. K. Rice in Rice 1923: 4, bards and storytellers “were skillful in the art of the apo, that is, ‘catching’ literally, or memorizing instantly at the first hearing.”


60. Compose: Andrews April 30, 1875. Memorize: Fornander 1916–1917: 277; Roberts 1926: 60. Composition by single line was used in other situations as well, Ellis 1984: 462 f., and Andrews above.


63. Boswell 1987: 600, a method of scoring the speaking voice was developed in the eighteenth century in order to transmit recitation techniques of famous speakers to posterity. German composers have been interested in the musical possibilities of the speaking voice.

64. Kuykendall 1947: 109, at a graduation ceremony in 1831, Hawaiians “delivered orations which they had written and committed to memory.” Wise June 14, 1911: 20, reports that members of the Hale Naua would memorize the duties and rules of that organization from a written copy, which would then be burned. Similarly in Sāmoa in the early 1970s, chiefs would memorize materials from chapbooks they had somehow obtained and then burn the manuscripts so that others could not learn from them.


December 17, 1834, provides a good example of naming within a family: a priest names an infant he has saved after his god. “Na inoa o na kanaka Hawaii” April 21, 1858, suggests that the problem of Hawaiian names being non-specific as to gender could be solved by placing kāne ‘male’ or wahine ‘female’ after the name. An editorial note says that foreigners do not follow such a practice.

There was some regional variation in vocabulary and pronunciation, e.g., Andrews 1836:14 f.; Poepoe March 20, 27, 1908; Fornander 1919–1920:345 f.; 1969:11 59, local speech differences were lessened after Kamehameha’s unification of the islands; Titcomb 1948:110 f.; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:25. Chiefly language was not much differentiated from that of commoners, Andrews 1836: 15; but priests had special uses, e.g., Malo 1951:125 (Emerson); Pukui and Elbert 1986: ʻelekū 4., ʻelemoe 2.

67. Ellis 1984:464. Many examples will be given in chapter V. Brigham 1908:117–120, house building terms. E. C. Smith 1955a:26, six words for fragrance. N. B. Emerson 1915:95, note o, “Ku-ka-la-ula . . . the ruddy glow that appears on a mountain horizon just before sunrise.” Malo 1951:191 f., 199 f. (Emerson), Hale Nauā terms. Fornander 1916–1917:441, canoe terms. ʻIʻi regularly mentions terms: e.g., April 2, 1870, the right side of a boat is called ʻekea; the left, ama. Religious terms and expressions were numerous, as could be expected from the fact that the priests were intellectuals and educators. More examples will be given in chapter V.


word to Hawaiian, Johnson and Mahelona 1975: 161. Such explanations provide much information about the state of the Hawaiian language at different stages of its history.

Extended examples of explanations of words can be found in Kepelino January 1860: 30. Ekaula March 23, 1865, divides ‘aumakua into ‘au and makua. This article may have prompted the even longer discussion in Hale’ole April 6, 1865, discussed in the text; he also discusses the word Huli-toa, which is accepted in Pukui and Elbert 1986, but very rare. L. H. Kanepuu June 1, 1865, responded to Hale’ole’s article, providing most interesting information.

Grant Tolentino, a student in my course Understanding Hawaiian Religion, University of Hawai‘i, fall 1991, wrote in an essay:

I go fishing every year with my father and uncles. They tell me all the names of the fish. They also tell me to take a good look at it . . . I really know it’s important to them to keep the tradition going (the Hawaiian tradition) and to pass it down to the next generation.

Tolentino asked his grandmother why Hawaiians learn names:

She first told me about when she was a little girl and how her grandparents taught her. It was always taught with respect. Respect was their number one priority when Hawaiian concepts, phrases, and (legends) religion were taught. Tutu also spoke of how the old days were very strict. Children were never allowed to speak, only listen. Learning names? she says! My Tutu said, “It was for identity purposes how the gods and certain people would act, would match their names. But,” she said, “learning these names takes a lot of respect and pronunciation was very important. If a name was pronounced wrong, it would mean death or a painful penalty during the days of the ali‘i’s and kahunas.” She mentioned that laziness was uncalled for. When it comes to speaking, one should never be lazy, because it means no respect. Respect was a real powerful word in my grandmother’s vocabulary or her reaction.

Names, she stated, also provided an exactness of reference and evoked many associations.

73. Rae 1900: 245, the chiefs prided themselves on “preserving purity and expressiveness of their language.” Beckwith 1919: 319, note 1, “Tripping
and stammering games were, besides, practiced to insure exact articulation.” Chanting: Handy and Pukui 1972:84, 141 f.; “Ka Oihana Lua a Hawaiʻi Lahui” August 2, 1923, describes the flow of a properly performed chant.


Zwiep 1991:152, Hawaiians were taught to distill rum in 1809. Compare Lehua December 15, 1866, who provides technical terms for painting: ka lole (Canvass [sic]), ka papa-hele (Staging).

76. For example, Kepelino July 2, 1867:1 38. Rémy 1859: 7 f., 10–15.


78. E. V. W. 1931. See also Dibble 1839:76, 135–138. Q. November 3, 1853. A Häolé 1854, 306, students “have been boring away at their intellectual pursuits amid all the poverty of their native language.” Johnson 1976:118 f. McLoughlin 1986:358, missionaries complained that there were no words for Christian doctrine in Cherokee. See also Hutchison 1987:32.


81. Malo n.d.: XXI 3 (he aihue), 4 (he powa). Kamakau August 26, 1865: 1, pahu i ka ihe and oo ihe seem to be used as general terms for spear fighting.


84. Pukui and Elbert 1986: kani 1, mention only the phrase as a verb. In a song, the expression is joined to another loan word: Kanikani pila me
"ka waiolina‘They play the fiddle with the violin’; more probably, the original sense of pila‘fiddle’ has been lost and the expression is being used as ‘to make music’: ‘They make music with the violin’, Williamson 1976: 144.

85. For example, Andrews 1974: 515–519. A good deal of new vocabulary or uses can be found in the missionary school texts, such as grammatical or new geographical terms; Andrews 1829: 1 (time), 2 f. (measurements), 3 f. (geographical terms), 6 (Maloko o ka palapala a Hawaii nei, he hua, he leo, he hualoele, he hopunaolelo, he olelo, a me na kiko), 7 (Eia ke ano o na kiko i kauia maloko o ka palapala, followed by the names for punctuation marks, 7 f.). Bishop 1868b: 1 f., terms for education. These school texts can be studied against classical Hawaiian texts. Malo xxxiv 37 f., a new type of boat leads to a new sense of word moku. Kamakau September 21, 1867, writes he makuakane, he hualoele hou keia i ka wa palapala ‘male parent, this is a new word from the time of writing’; the word makuakāne is standard for father today. Reinecke 1969: 26 f. Compare for Náhuatl, León-Portilla 1988: 26 f., 29, 31 f., 59, 246 f.

Other stylistic changes were made through perhaps the unconscious influence of English. For instance, plurals began to be used in ways that were conventional in English but not in older Hawaiian. Of course, Hawaiian had gone through many previous changes; the use of mō‘ī for ‘king’ may be late.

86. Andrews 1974: 4. See also W. D. Alexander’s “Introductory Remarks” to the dictionary, 11, 13 f. Alexander 1864: 6, “The learner [of Hawaiian] should write out lists of words which are nearly or quite synonymous, and learn to discriminate between them.”


89. Beckwith 1919: 113–321. Luomala 1938: 43, “This love for the sounds of the language together with a keen intellectual and philosophic interest in classification has developed some of the most characteristic features of the native literature. Lengthy genealogies have been invented for personified, abstract qualities, and for objects, and people.” Elbert 1951: 349 f., “Antithesis, repetition, and catalogues are the most prominent of these features that seem to a large extent to be aesthetic embellishments, as well as means of pleasing the gods by prolonging the prayers and ritual, and as mnemonic aids for perfect
repetition of long ceremonials . . . Long catalogues or lists provide aesthetic satisfaction and afford desired length . . .” Titcomb 1972:50, on Malo’s fish lists: “Groupings by such criteria cannot have been of any use to the Hawaiians, except as an exercise for the mind, a play, unless it were to assist memory.”

Lists have been used as memory aids and literary devices as well as for display in other literatures, for instance, classical, medieval, and Renaissance Western literature; e.g., Cairns 1979:132 ff.; Rabelais Gargantua, Quart Livre, chapters xxx–xxxii; these practices are a legacy, I would argue, of the oral period. In contemporary American literature, for instance, the contents of a medicine cabinet are listed by J. D. Salinger in Franny and Zooey, and books of lists have become popular entertainment.

90. Cole and Scribner 1974:100 ff., 117 f. Baron 1988:75–78: 75, “three general mechanisms that seem to be used in learning to classify new instances: learning of defining features and characteristic features; prototype abstraction; and exemplars.” Needham 1979:3, “A classification is a systematic set of classes, a class being regarded as a conceptual grouping of things . . . by virtue of particular resemblances . . .” ”We cannot think about the world, including human society, unless we divide it into classes . . .”; 15, the indigenous criteria of classification need to be studied; 65, the members of “monothetic” categories share at least one feature; “polythetic” share “a preponderance of defining features,” as in Wittgenstein’s family resemblances; also 63–67. Hallpike 1979:171, 174–177, 182 ff., 194, 196–202, 208.

The Hawaiians’ use of prototypes is found in their use of historical models and analogies and frequently more informally, for example, in the classification of fish, e.g., Kepelino July 2, 1867:1 37, 50, 59, 61, 70, 11 8, 21, 38, 71.

91. Beckwith 1919:320, writes “Certain numbers, too, have a kind of magic finality in themselves; for example, to count off an identical phrase by ten without missing a word . . .”; she provides examples. The number ten is used in a number of prayer chants that seem to be formulas for generating and directing power. In two prayers of Kawelo, nights are counted from one to nine, and in the place of ten is chanted lele wale ‘fly unobstructed’, the stereotyped ending that releases the power of the perfectly recited prayer, Elbert 1959:45 ff.; compare Malo 1951:23 (Emerson). Before battle, a priest would chant a prayer that counted men from one to nine, the tenth being counted Alele, in the same sense as the previous example, a prayer for victory and a curse, Naimu September 23, 1865. In a prayer chant, sharks are counted from one to nine, and the tenth puka ‘emerges’; the word lele appears in the next line, Gutmanis 1983: 15. Counting from one to ten appears in one of Kūapāka’a’s powerful chants, Kuapuu May 29, 1861. These are among the best examples of the power of lists

The number ten is used elsewhere in Hawaiian culture. For instance, Hale’ole organizes priestly occupations into ten large divisions, Fornander 1919–1920: 69. Sets of ten days were used in ceremonies, Malo n.d.: xxxvii 5, 118; and of ten pigs in offerings, xxxvii 102. A chant of Lonoikamakahiki arranges a series of (mostly) place names under categories formed by the numbers from two to ten, Fornander 1916–1917: 285 ff. In the Hale Nauā, one was obliged to trace one’s lineage back ten generations, Malo n.d.: xxxi 9, xxxviii 36, 39. Fornander 1916–1917: 455, Pīkoiaka’alalā hits ten rats to win a contest. In the game of pahe’e ‘dart throwing’, the person won who first reached ten, Kuapuu March 26, 1868. In Kepelino’s 1932: 25–33, modern Kumuhonua religious teaching, the earliest age is divided into ten wā ‘periods’. A postcontact children’s counting chant counts from one to ten, Pukui 1943: 211.

Such uses of the number ten are probably the basis of the use of the word ‘umi ‘ten’ to indicate fulness or completion as in the Kumulipo, lines 493 f., and in the chant Keohokalole by Makue (Fornander 1919–1920: 538, line 4, i umi ka pua; possibly Fornander 1919–1920: 47). Ultimately the special meaning of ten may derive from finger counting, in which one reaches a complete count with ten. For the use of ten among the New Zealand Maori, see Ballekom and Harlow 1987: 15 f., 20; Ruatapu 1993: 42, 97; Tremewan 1992: 250, 305, 315, 318 f.

The symbolic use of numbers in Hawaiian culture is a large subject, e.g., Kirtley 1971: Z71.1, 6, 12, 16.1, 2; Pukui 1942: 361. ‘Ī April 2, 1870, gives an interesting example of the use of numbers: after an overturned canoe had been righted at sea, it would be paddled strongly forward and backward to help throw out the water; the person directing the operation would call out for five paddle strokes from the crew and count them as they were done, Akahi, Alua, Akolu, Aha, Alima. The audience counts the winning strokes during a single combat, Fornander 1916–1917: 169.


95. Malo n.d.: xl 27–30. Section 27, the attribute, *ma ke one e noho a* i, is connected to the previous explanation by *ina*; list, *he weke* . . . *Kule paha*.; termination, *a mena ia noho ma ke one apau*. Section 28, coordination with *ina*; attribute, *ma ke ahua e noho ai*; list, *he maomao . . . palapala*; termination, *a me na ia noho ahua a pau*. Section 29, introduction, *O kekahi mau ia ma kaili kai eholo a*; a straight list of names, *he malolo . . . he aha*.; termination, *he nui na ia holo makaili kai*. Section 30, introduction, *O kekahi mau ia noho no ma ka lua*.; a straight list of names *he Mano . . . he Hee*.; termination, *he nui no na na ia noho ma ka lua*. Malo adds his own comments. The structure of lists will be discussed below. Compare the fish lists in Fornander 1919–1920: 177–191.

96. Hukilani November 19, 1864. Kauwahi October 10, 1861, *Elua no mahele nui o ka hoomana ana ma ke ao nei, a maloko oia mau mahele nui, ua lehulehu na mahele okoa o kela a me keia*. Oia hoi keia, o ka mahele mua, oia ka poe hoomana i ke Akua Kahikolu, a o ka lua, oia ka poe hoomana Pegana 'There are two large divisions of worship in this world, and inside these large divisions, there are many separate divisions of this and that. There is also this point: the first division is that of the people who worship the 'Trinity, and the second, the people of Pagan worship'; he then gives a conventional list for each division. Kamakau September 23, 1865a, *ua mahele ia ke aupuni o Oahu i elua apana*. O Waialua, o Waianae, me Koolauloa, oia ka apana elua. O Ewa, Kona, a me Koolaupoko oia ka apana akahi 'The government of O'ahu is divided into two sections. Waialua, Wai'anae, and Ko'olauloa; this is the second section. 'Ewa, Kona, and Ko'olaupoko; this is the first section'; November 4, 1869, *Ua maheleia ke kukulu i na inoa eha . . .*: compare September 15, 1870. Pohakuopele March 12, 1920, three *mahele* of a proposed riddle. Kalaiwaa May 29, 1924, three divisions. Compare "No ke kapu kahiko a me ke kapu hou" December 5, 1834, *Ua mahele ia ka manao o na 'lii . . . penei, o ke kapu o na alii, a me ke kapu o na heiau, a me ke kapu o na akua a pau loa 'The opinion of the chiefs is divided . . . thus: the kapu of the chiefs, and the kapu of the temples, and the kapu of all the gods'. 'Ohi and *māhele* can be used for purely physical activities as well, such as dividing fish into piles, Poepoe August 28, 1908.

97. Malo n.d.: xl 22; see also 23. Both these classes include a large number of subclasses, as is clear from this section of Malo's book.

98. Malo n.d.: xlv 4; compare xv 1. Compare also:

there are many differences in cumulus clouds; *he nui no nae ke ano o ka opua, aia no nae ma kona ano e like ai, e kapa ia aku no kona inoa ma ia ano* 'many indeed are the types of the cumulus cloud; in its character, they are alike; its name is called indeed from this character' (v1 5).
He nui kainoa ona kapa, ua kapaia ma ke ano o kaka wahine hooluu ana, e like me ke ano o ia hooluu ana pela no ke ano e kapa ia aku ai ‘Many are the names of the tapas, called by the type of the woman’s dyeing; according to the type of this dyeing, so indeed the type is called’ (xvi 8).

pela no ka nui ona inoa ma ka hooluu ana a ka wahine ‘thus the quantity of the names is according to the dyeing of the woman’ (xvi 9; also 10).

He nui ka inoa o na kanaka, ua kapaia ka inoa ma ke ano o ka lakou hana ana ‘Many are the names of the human beings; the name is called by the character of their work’ (xviii 70).

ua kapa ia ka inoa o na waa ma ko lakou ano ‘the name of the boats is called by their character’ (xxxiv 35).

The use of the word ‘ano seems to include both class and individual characteristics, and the two may be used simultaneously. The above practice is different from that of giving proper names to objects, for which people tended more to consult their own desires, Malo n.d.: vi 13, 19.

Kepelino July 2, 1867, is particularly clear in his designation of categories and attributes, for which he uses the words papa, ‘ano, and kaina, a loan word from English kind. Because a fish has scales, it enters into the papa of the scaled fish (i 4, 28, 30, ii 27), compared to those without scales (i 8). Fish can also be grouped by color or coloring (i 11, ii 56), body type or shape (i 11, ii 28, 54, 63 [kii kino]), behavior (i 61, ii 4, 12, 28, 36, 42, 59, 60, 71, 72), and edibility, goodness, or deliciousness as well as method of preparation (i 11, 30, 34, 39, 40, 61, ii 12, 25, 74) and catching (ii 16, 18, 43). The papa of flying fish is ano manu ‘in the character of a bird’ (i 51). A curious modern category used as a list attribute is ano dala ‘in the character of a dollar [coin]’ (i 15, 55, ii 68). Grouping by color can be opposed to grouping by shape (i 2). These attributes can also be expressed informally or as part of the description (i 8, 9), as seen clearly in a comparison of the formal ii 59 with the informal ii 60, 66, 67, and the examples above for ano dala. Similarly items can be explicitly excluded from a category (ii 71, 73). Of molluscs, Kepelino (ii 74) states that they are classed as ia ‘fish’ because they are eaten but that they do not fit into other categories applied to fish. Compare riddles based on the fact that one usual characteristic of a category is missing in the item, Judd 1930: riddles 65, 116, an example of a literary form being based on the organization of knowledge in education.

The word *helu* ‘count’ can be used for the single item of a category, Nākuina 1902b: 92. On the importance of this as a sign of intellectual development, see Hallpike 1979: 176, “There are no isolated elements, i.e. elements not belonging to a class. This amounts to saying that all the elements must be classified and that, if an element (x) is the only one of its kind, it must give rise to its own specific (but singular) class.”

For example, Malo n.d.: xv 5–16, 19–20; XL; Fornander 1919–1920: 177–191; Titcomb 1972: 50 ff. Titcomb questions the usefulness of such lists “unless it were to assist memory.” That was however one of their most important functions; the vocabulary itself could be preserved only by memorization. Needham 1979: 69 f., contrasts the role of symbolism to “instrumentalism” in the formulation of lists. Hallpike 1979: 200, 209. I do not discuss the accuracy of lists. See N. B. Emerson’s criticisms of Malo, Malo 1951: 20, 201 f.; compare 27; on the other hand, at least one of Malo’s lists corresponds with modern classification, 47. In any case, lists must have been useful or they would not have been transmitted. Margaret Orbell comments (personal communication): “Useful, yes, but in some more general way characteristic of Hawaiian thought—[lists] are not used by the Māori, who (I’m beginning to realise) thought quite a lot differently.”


Āhole: Kepelino July 2, 1867: i 6; compare ii 28, 57, 61. 63. Other: Kepelino July 2, 1867: i 8, 11.


Titcomb 1972: 146. Compare Judd 1930: riddle 46, where the border-line character of freshwater fish for Hawaiians may be used.


For the following discussion, the bulk of my examples can be found in Appendix VI. In the published texts, the punctuation is quite flexible: periods, commas, semicolons, colons, or no punctuation at all can separate a list from its introductory and concluding material; I have occasionally included examples in my quotations. Insertions into a list can also be variously punctuated or left unpunctuated. This follows the irregular nineteenth-century practice in which various punctuation marks could be used simply to register a pause. The analysis of a text must therefore be based on the words themselves. Punctuation can however be significant: as seen in the Waiamau March 9, 1865, text quoted above, quotation marks can be used to enclose an attribute, designating it as the “title” of the list.

In the nineteenth century, arabic and roman numerals could be used to mark items in a list. Earlier forms of lists use words, and they may have replaced numerals in reading. In Kaawa April 27, 1865, printed marks are used.
to designate different types of strokes, a device impossible in the oral tradition. Signs are used similarly after names in “Papa Inoa o ke Kula Nui o Lahainaluna” May 19, 1858. Other typographical devices can be used; for instance, lists can be set up in columns. Examples will be noted. Some of these modern devices may have been introduced by the editors.

108. Fornander 1919–1920: 5. This list is described in Appendix VI.

109. Kepelino 1932: 89, e kohia‘i ika pia, pia, a me ka uhi; Nolaila, o ka uhi, hoi, pia, pia, he mau hua io . . . ; Hoi, pia, pia, uhi, he mau hua mimino . . . ; based on 87, Eia ua mau hua la: O ka pia, pia, hoi, uhi, olena a me ka awapuhi.

110. See Appendix VI. Compare the lists in Malo n.d.: xvi 1, xix 28.

111. Fornander 1919–1920: 19 ff. The quotation is a separate sentence despite the punctuation in the original publication. I would also classify as simple, formal lists those in which the entire sentence is composed of a list and its attendant introduction, even though the introduction or the title of the list is placed elsewhere than at the beginning of the sentence (other elements, such as a termination and explanations, may be present as well). An illustration of this can be found in a description of fishing in Fornander 1919–1920, which contains lists that are in all likelihood traditional in that profession. Some of the lists are clearly formal:

177, eia na ia e loaa; followed by a straight list.
Na ia e loaa.; followed by a straight list.
Eia na ia o keia upena; followed by a straight list.
Eia na maunu; followed by a straight list.
O ka ia e loaa; o ka puhi wale no; an example of a “list” with just one item.

179, o na ia e loaa, o ke kumu, ka uhu, a pela aku.
[The attributes of the above lists, the type of fishing used, are given in the immediately preceding discussion, a further indication of the relation of attribute to introduction form.]
185, O ka ai a keia ia o ka mahimahi; followed by a straight list of three items.

Similar lists in the same description of fishing use the flexibility of Hawaiian syntax to place elsewhere the subject of the sentence, which corresponds to the introduction or title of the list:

177, he aama . . . heepali, with the subject of the sentence at the end, ka maunu.
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187, *He muhee, he opelu, he hee ka maunu o ke kahala*; the subject of the sentence is at the end.
189, *he malolo ka maunu, he ula, he lelepo, a pela aku no.*; the subject of the sentence is placed inside the list.
189, *he hinalea, he aawa, he moano, a pela aku, kona maunu.*; the same construction as on page 177; the subject of the sentence comes after a typical list termination.
191, *he ohua a me ka akilolo, na ia o keia upena.*; the subject of the sentence is at the end.

The contiguity of these lists and their probable traditional character argue for the formality of the latter type. At times however such lists would be hard to distinguish from informal ones.


113. For example, Malo n.d.: xviii 22, *He nui no na.* . . . Kamakau August 17, 1867. *Eia kekahi* and variants are used conventionally to proceed to a new point, Malo n.d.: e.g., III 8, IV 8 (also *i lohe ia*), 12, 13, V 11, 13, VI 6, XI 18, XVIII 7, 12, 13, 32, 59–61, XIX 27, XX 4–6, XXI 4–7, 9, 11, 14, 17–20, 25, XXIII 3, XXVII 7, XXXI 18, XXXIII 6, XXXVIII 9–14, 16, 30–33, 46, 49, 51, 53, 63, XXXIX 21; Johnson 1976: 78, 190; Kaawa April 20, November 25, 1865.

*Pēlā* is used to organize more often than to introduce lists, e.g., Ekaula March 23, 1865. Compare Malo n.d.: xxv 5, *penei ka hana ana*; section 8, *Penei e hana ai.* *Inā* can be used both in lists (Malo n.d.: xviii 27, *eia no ua mau kapu la*; sections 28–31, list of kapus organized by *ina*; three terminations in section 31, *he nui no na kapu . . . mau kapu*) and in parallelizing rhetoric (e.g., Malo n.d.: xviii 14, 20–21, 32–34, 36–38, 74, XX 13–16; XXVII 2, 6–7, 9 [also *penei*]; xxviii 26). Compare Ekaula March 23, November 4, 1865, *Eia kekahi mau loina . . . ike maka*; the following discussion is organized by *ina*.

114. For example, Malo n.d.: xviii 53, *aole paha ipau ika helu ia ko lakou mau inoa, a me ko lakou mau ano*; also section 55; xxii 9, *aole pau i ka helu ia.*

115. Malo n.d.: xvii 6. Examples can be multiplied: xxxiv 39–40, terminated by a sentence that could have served as an introduction, *oia . . . hou*; xxxvii 106, the list seems separate from the syntax and consists of parallel sentences, *he lau na puaa . . . he lau ka oloa,* terminated by *he mau kanaka kekahi e kau ma ka lele*; lxii 1–13, a list of parallel sentences about chiefs. Fornander 1919–1920: 169, *He kekee . . . kekahi.*


119. ‘Ī’ī October 16, 1869. Chun 1986:10 f., 43 f. See the discussion in chapter V.


123. Kamakau October 28, 1865. See the use of *mea* by A. Unauna November 8, 1842: 63.


125. For example, Johnson and Mahelona 1975: 39–43. Luomala 1938: 43. Chun 1986: 12 f., 42. More examples will be provided in chapter V.

126. Opunui January 16, 1849. See also Appendix VI. Charlot 1987: 141.

the conventional formula for including all the gods by calling on them by kini ‘40,000’, lehu ‘400,000’, mano ‘4000’, e.g., J. S. Emerson 1918:35.


129. Pukui and Elbert 1986: helu 1. For examples of this use, see Malo n.d.: xxi 1; Kānepu‘u February 27, 1868, helu mai la oia i ka nui o na malama . . . a penei ka helu ana a lakou; ‘Ī‘ī September 25, 1869; “Kaa Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki” January 24, 1912:18; Fornander 1919–1920:460, line 13; “Ka Oihana Lua a Hawaii Lahui” August 2, 1923; Johnson and Mahelona 1975:42. English parallels can be found in such expressions as “count for something” and “numbered among the living.”

Counting is mentioned often in contests of wits. Kaui November 13, 1865, listing the items of a category. Nākuina 1902b: 41 (counting turns), 65, 68, 71, 92 (listing items). Fornander 1916–1917: 319 (items are numbered), 403 ff., 515 (the contest riddles are numbered).

Listing may have been understood as counting even if the numbers were not expressed; listing may have been accompanied by finger counting gestures, which would provide a basis for the importance of the number ten. Also people may have counted the number of items they had in a list in order to make sure they were reciting the list completely—“recounting a list.” For instance, during a pause in a presentation, mention is made of the number of items already displayed and the number that remain, Fornander 1916–1917: 319.


135. Kepelino 1932:151, Eia na ano o ka hookupu ana; a regular numbered list of type of people and what they give; this list could have provided instructions for the ceremony discussed. Malo n.d.: XXXIII 22, the regular parallelism suggests a basis in a list. “Kaao Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki” January 17, 1912: 17 ff. For non-list instructions, see below.


Varied: e.g., Malo n.d.: IX 14, o Kahapuu, o Kemau, o Kaili, he mau laau ai ia keia i ka wa wi; XIV 10, Eia na mea ai ia i ka wa wi, he Hapuu, he Ma’u he līi. Combined: e.g., Fornander 1919–1920: 175, two lists are combined; introduction, He nui no hoi na mahele . . . ahiahi; first list, he hahamau . . . luhee, terminated by a pela aku; second list, he maunu . . . laau, terminated by a pela aku.

I provide only a few examples of various degrees of formality. Malo n.d.: VIII 4, 8, Luau; 5, 8, Kumuone; IX 14, 16 and XIV 10, 14, famine lists; IX 7, 14, Puai/pua; 20, 21, pili; XV 17, 19, honu and ea. A number of items are shared between the lists in Malo n.d.:IX and XIV. The attributes of the former are generally types of plants or woods and their uses while those of the former are foodstuffs. Note the difference in the attributes for ‘ulu ‘breadfruit’: IX 13, food and material for doorways and canoes; XIV 7, food only:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>XIV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ohia</td>
<td>3, 13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ulu</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pala</td>
<td>16, 20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compare Kepelino 1932: 115, 123–135, 147. See also Hallpike 1979:194.

Malo n.d.: XVI 16, clearly designates his proposed list as itemizing new, introduced types of tapa; introduction, Eia na kapa hou . . . Kamehameha III nei; he does not however provide that list, but writes o ka Lole ke kapa hou ‘cloth is the new tapa’. He then starts a new list introduction, he nui ka inoa o na Lole ma ke ano nae o ka hooluu ana, the attribute of which is the same used in his discussion of traditional tapa in sections 6–10. Malo is clearly organizing a list of new cloths that is based on traditional lists of tapa. XVII 9, a list in classical form of new types of ko‘i ‘adz, axe’; introduction, Ua nui . . . koi; list, he Lipi . . . he Kila kahi koi; termination, oia na koi hou mai; appended comment, ua haalele ia na Koi pohaku ikeia wa.

For example, ‘Ī‘ī September 25, 1869, Eia hoi ka hoohalike ana o na malama ma ka helu haole me ka helu ana a ko Hawaii nei; the list itself depends on typography. Malo n.d.: XIII 26–29, XIV 15–17, XX 28–30, XXXIII 32, 34; compare the addition of a new item to a traditional list, XXXIV 35, i na nui kaihu, he ihu nui ia waa, he kupe ulu kahi inoa.

Malo n.d.: XXI 13, 20, the author uses his invented framework of a
traditional games and sports list to reevaluate its items. The traditional list can be reconstructed from the elements common to both sections: introduction, ka puni lealea; the list includes noa, maika, heihei waa, heihei nalu, heihei holua; termination in section 20, a me ia lealea aku ia lealea aku. Following the missionary opposition to such games and sports, Malo renders them negative in section 13 by saying they were condemned because they were occasions of gambling. He then adds a number of other condemnable items that are considered positive values in other Hawaiian texts. In section 20, Malo compiles an original list of things that are pono ‘righteous’, as a balance to the earlier, mostly traditional lists of things that were hewa ‘bad’; to do this, he uses the traditional sports and games list, but adds the negative ole to ka puni lealea and states that the righteous act is to haalele i ‘abandon’ the items listed.

142. For example, Malo 1951:110 [Emerson on xxx 3]. Beckwith 1972: 50f.

143. Note the fixity of the attribute for lists of famine foods in Malo n.d.: ix 14, he mau laau ai ia keia i ka wa wi; 16, he mau laau ai ia keia i ka wa wi; xiv 10, Eia na mea ai ia i ka wa wi; 14, he mea ai ia keia ma ka wa e wi ai. For spear lists, see Appendix VI.


145. On correlatives and complementaries, see Needham 1987:45, 53f., 84–101, 198f. Many aspects of such systems are discussed by Needham 1979:7, 31f., 57–60, binary opposition or polarity is basic and widespread, perhaps “a natural proclivity of the human mind” (see also 25ff.); 7, when there are “two major categories under which everything is classed,” one can speak of “total and unlimited classification”; 8, the most common method is “not in two great classes . . . but in the symbolic linking of categories by pairs,” such as right/left, male/female, sky/earth, water/land, which “identifies individual categories of things by opposition according to context . . . each pair of opposites constitutes a little genus in itself, in which the two complementary categories are the species”; 8f., such a method can also be used to rank categories; 56f., more complex systems may be developed from simpler ones, although there may be a limit to the complexity possible or useful; 60ff., the fact that few categories are used and are so similar world-wide may be due to the fact that there are “natural points of attraction” in the environment. The development of such pairs is not a result of simple observation but requires abstraction, Needham 1987:207–217. Hallpike 1979:97f., 224–235. An obvious example of the wide
distribution of the paired opposites is the use of *lani* ‘sky’ and *honua* ‘earth’ in Genesis 1:1. Some structuralist theories of such organization will be mentioned below.

On “the pairing of opposites” in Hawai‘i, see, e.g., Beckwith 1970:3. Hawaiians did have unitary expressions, such as *na mea a pau* ‘all things’ and *ke ao nei* ‘this universe’, but these were not used to organize knowledge. They had therefore no all-inclusive single categories, but several all-inclusive pairs.

146. Needham 1979:15; 19, “So whereas classification is essential to thought and to social action, symbolism is not essential to classification”; 20, symbolic classification “is the expression of an intricate theory about the real constitution of the universe”; “it is a speculative theory of a metaphysical kind . . . a symbolic classification can encapsulate a philosophy”; 23, “by reliance on the systematic connections among them, i.e., on the symbolic classification, the traveler can find guidance in the direction of his life”; 31 ff.; 61, “The connotations of the individual categories are not fixed . . .”.


150. Prophecy: N. B. Emerson 1909:99; Pukui 1983: number 282; Judd 1930: proverb 472; compare proverb 193, the point depends on the fact that there is no *lalo*; Kamakau November 4, 1869, expands on the prophecy. Interpretation: e.g., Pukui and Korn 1973:13; Charlot 1983a:109–112; compare Handy and Pukui 1972:204. S. May 23, 1860, writes that Kapihe was considered a madman and tells the story of his meeting Kamehameha I. S. provides a long version of the prophecy:

\begin{verbatim}
E hui ana na aina,
E iho mai ana ko ka lani,
E pii aku ana ko lalo nei,
E iho mai ana ke Akua ilalo nei,
E kamailio pu ana me kanaka;
E pii mai ana o Wakea iluna,
E iho aku ana o Milo ilalo,
E noho pu ana ke Akua me kanaka.
\end{verbatim}

‘The lands will be joined together
The things of the sky will come down
The things below will climb up
The God will come down here below
And will be talking with human beings
Wākea will climb up
Milo will come down here below
The God will be living with human beings'.

S. writes that the prophecy should be interpreted by knowledgeable people; he wahi io paha koloko ‘there is perhaps some truth in it’.

Kapihe is probably basing his prophecy on Ke'āulumoku’s Haui Ka Lani, lines 13 f., Fornander 1919–1920:369; the theme of overturning is prominent throughout that chant. Compare Charlot 1991b:135 and note 83.

151. Beckwith 1932:333, Po iuka, po iwaena, po i kai. Judd 1930: riddles 4, 24, 81, 190 (with luna/lalo); compare 52, 110, 249. Malo n.d.: vi 21, is probably an original addition to the luna/lalo scheme. Occasionally, a member of a pair is omitted, such as a chant with luna but without lalo, “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” July 21, 1921. Compare Needham 1987:230 f.


153. Nākuina 1902a:60. See also Fornander 1918–1919:97.

154. Moreover, Hawaiians could use different forms of organization for different materials; for instance, the thread of a story or report could be expressed as the kuamo’o ‘backbone’, e.g., Kānepu‘u March 26, 1868. Compare Handy and Pukui 1972:51, for a use that suggests the image was based on family. The backbone was also an image for a genealogy or family line.


157. Kauí November 20, 1865. See also Nākuina 1902b:34.

158. Compare Kamakau July 21, 1870, sorcerers call on a multitude of gods: ko ka lani a pau, ko ka hikina, ko ka akau, ko ka hema, ko ke komohana, ko ka mauna, ko ke kai, ko ka wai, ko ka aina, ko lalo o Milu ma ‘all those of the sky, of the east, of the north, of the south, of the west, of the mountain, of the sea, of the fresh water, of the land, of the underworld of Milu and his like’; Kamakau August 4, 1870, ko ka lani, ko ka lewa, ko na kukulu, ko ka moana, ko ka honua, ko na wahi a pau loa ‘those of the sky, of the upper spaces, of the columns/direction, of the ocean, of the earth, of all the places’. “He Moolelo Hawaii: O Kaiakea” 1902, Ua ike lakou i na mea o ka lewa ame na mea o ka
moana ame na mea o ka honua maloko o na oihana a lakou i loea ai ‘They knew the things of the upper spaces and the things of the ocean and the things of the earth within the occupations in which they were expert’.

159. See also “O ka Hoapono ana o ka Poe Kahiko i na Mea i Ikeia” August 8, 1834, lani/honua, ‘ai/i’a, luna/lalo, uka/kai, na’e/lalo. Kalauau November 11, 1835, pō/ao, male/female. Kānepu‘u May 9, 1860, honua/lani, mawaho/maloko in a chant. Kamakau September 23, 1865a, good times are described as he momona mauka, he momona ma kai, he lani iluna he honua ilalo ‘sweet things upland, sweet things seaward, sky above, earth below’; June 24, 1869, he ai o uka, he ia o kai ‘vegetable food of the uplands, flesh food of the sea’. Iliwai June 1, 1867, kai/uka, po/ao. Elbert 1959:71, nui/iki, loa/poko. Compare Johnson and Mahelona 1975:40, two names: the man is Kalaniiluna, the woman, Kahonualalo; thus three pairs are used together. Elbert 1959:51, paired opposites in names: iki/nui, waho/lalo.


162. Kamakau October 7, 1865c. The choice of the pair may have been influenced by the emphasis on family in the passage, that is, she ruled over family and non-family alike. See also Pukui 1983: number 2541. Loko/waho can be used also in antithesis, e.g., ‘Ī‘ī October 30, 1869 (domestic/foreign); J. G. M. Sheldon and Piilani 1906:71; Fornander 1919–1920: 413, lines 62–66; Handy and Pukui 1972:199; also, Beckwith 1919:617.

163. Mua/hope used as a completeness formula and in simple descriptions: Kauʻi December 18, 1865, mai ka mua a ka hope; Kepelino July 2, 1867:14, 17, 20, 22, 23, 34, 38, 46, 47; Kamakau June 24, 1869; Kawaikaumaiikamakakoaopua November 23, 1922; December 7, 1922b; Gutmanis 1983:47.

A large number of other completeness formulas can be found, such as from head to foot or tail (‘Ī‘ī July 17, 1869; “Kaao Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” June 21, 1911:14; J. S. Emerson 1918: 33; Handy and Pukui 1972: 184; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:247; compare Bingham 1981:257), from sunrise to sunset or east to west (Malo 1951:11 [Emerson]; J. S. Emerson 1918:31, 33), from this corner to that (e.g., Kepelino July 2, 1867:138 ‘from one corner to the
other’), and from the zenith to the horizon (Malo 1951:11 [Emerson]; Titcomb 1948:147), and kū/moe 'standing/reclining' (Kakelamaluikaleo October 3, 1913). These and other pairs can be found in Malo n.d.:v, and Appendix VII. Some of these can be used to organize knowledge, for instance, Malo n.d.:xl. 16, uses nui and iki 'big and small' for fish nets and traps. Compare Barratt 1987:34, gods were divided by spring and autumn.


165. 'ī August 7, 1869; also, Anonymous November 18, 1865. See also Hukilani November 19, 1864, quoted above. Kamakau August 4, 1870, ua pau o luna, ua pau olalo; September 29, 1870. Kaelemakule March 28, 1863, mai lalo mai a luna o kuu kino. J. S. Emerson 1918:20.


171. See the prophecy of Kapihe above. Fornander 1918–1919:477 ff. Compare Elbert 1959:99, the victor is above, and the loser below.


173. Malo n.d.:xxiii 19–22. Fornander 1919–1920:53 ff. Both texts are described in Appendix VI. Other examples of the two pairs used together and with further pairs have been given above. Compare Malo July 19, 1837:14, who organizes his rhetoric by honua/lani, maluna/malalo.

174. Pukui and Korn 1973:14–19. The pairs can be used in the same way
in Society Islands chants of the origin of the universe, Charlot 1985b: 169 f.


177. Kamakau July 13, 1865; see the similar statement, September 23, 1865a, quoted above. The pair ‘*ai* and *i’a* is an interesting example of one with a limited extension and context of use. On *i’a*, see Malo 1951: 47 (Emerson).


179. Debatable: Malo 1951: 11 (Emerson). Some of the confusion of Malo’s text may arise from the fact that Hawaiians had lost the use found elsewhere in Polynesia of *kū* in the sense of north and *moe* in the sense of south; these senses survived only in the priestly terms *'elekū* and *'elemoe*. Malo or a predecessor may have been trying to make sense of archaic terms by applying current uses to them. Malo may also have been extrapolating from a missionary influence, Whitney and Richards 1832: 1, as discussed in Appendix IV. Kamakau November 4, 1869, follows and expands Malo. Directions could be used in divination, Malo n.d.: xxviii 13. The limited organizing use of the pair east/west has been mentioned above. I have not found an example of the four directions being used as an organizing framework, although they are mentioned along with many other elements in Kamakau July 21, 1870, quoted above.

180. Charlot 1983a: 55–78. I have read that Hawaiians on land could situate themselves by reference to the portion of the sky they were under, but I have been unable to find the reference; the practice was common in navigation. For a rich discussion of place, see, e.g., Kamakau December 22, 1870. An interesting example of places as means of expression is their use to make points about persons. Kuapuu May 1, 1861, has a series of taunts against chiefs and places, a negative use of place knowledge. In a series in a later installment, Kuapuu May 29, 1861, the places are mentioned, but not the chiefs: *hoomaka hou no a Kuapākāa e kahea, a i kona kahea ana ma ka inoa ia o na aina i kahea ai, aole ma ka inoa o na alii* ‘Kuapāka’a began again indeed to call out, but in his calling out, it was in the names of the lands that he called, not in the names of the chiefs’. The audience however can identify the chief of each land, so the expression is merely indirect. Nākuina 1902b: 21. Fornander 1916–1917: 315–321. Compare Pukui 1983: numbers 105, 339. Gods are connected to places and share their character. Place names record history, e.g., “Mooolelo no Kawelo”
September 26, 1861 (a place is named because the kite of Kawelo’s rival landed there); Kamakau August 26, 1865: 1.

181. For example, Augustin Krämer on Sāmoa; Henry 1928.


183. As discussed above, ʻĪʻī provides throughout his writings very precise descriptions of places, their winds, architecture, and the habits of their people. As usual with place knowledge, he was using both personal observation and received traditions. He is careful to locate a place name, May 29, 1869. Kānepuʻu February 27, 1868, describes his own homeland. When he visits another place, March 5, 1868, he describes its population, prosperity, school and attendance, physical environs, principal food, the differences in the foods of the wealthy and the poor, houses, a horse, the weather, and the big waves. In discussing the same place, his father speaks of the advantages of living there, the weather, lack of kapus laid down by the konohiki ‘overseer’, and good food possibilities. Kānepuʻu describes other localities as well, March 12, 1868. Kai-liehu June 12, 1865, can list the winds of Hāna, Maui, because he lived there from the time he was born until he was ten years old.


186. For example, ʻĪʻī May 8, 1869, in a historical account; October 23, 1869; December 25, 1869–January 15, 1870: December 25, 1869, ala hele ‘trails’ in Honolulu; January 1, 1870, the story or report of poe powa ‘robbers’ in Mākaha, an example of a narrative being inserted into an itinerary; January 8, 1870, an Origin Story and allusions to stories inserted into the itinerary; January 15, 1870, trails in Waikīkī; February 5, 1870; February 19, 1870, stories connected to places he mentions; February 26, 1870, ʻĪʻī follows trails in his mind; April 30, 1870, the itinerary of a race. Compare Kānepuʻu March 12, April 2 (the itinerary of the return of his father’s body), 1868.

on place knowledge in his training for the contest of wits. Is this ignorance just a plot device or the hero’s ploy to meet people?

188. Charlot 1833:65 f. Kauʻi December 4, 1865, in a contest of wits, the boy hero does the winning chant on place knowledge in the form of a large itinerary.

189. Keʻliiumiumi December 26, 1834. Kamakau June 20, 1838. Compare the prominence of travel and itineraries in Laanui March 14, April 25, 1838.


191. ‘Ī‘ī July 10, 1869; February 5, 1870; January 8, 1870 (in order of reference).

192. ‘Ī‘ī January 8, 1870; May 14, 1870; October 2, 1869 (in order of reference).


195. Thinking: Andrews 1835:143; R. Armstrong 1860:7, “Geography is a favorite study with the natives, and considering their isolated position, its importance to them can hardly be overrated.” Lahainaluna: “Sandwich Islands. Plan of a High School for Teachers” 1832:189.

196. “No ka Pono o ka Hoikehonua” February 14, 1834. This breadth of interest is clear in Whitney and Richards 1832. See also the discussion of history in chapter V.


199. Whitney and Richards 1832:1 f., 4, 6 f.; the exercise is on page 7. Martin, Lyman, Bond, and Damon 1979:198.


203. This explanation was given by a kama‘āina of Ka‘ū in the documentary film Kapu Ka‘ū, 1988, by Na Maka o ka ‘Aina, Puhipau and Joan Lander. See also “Na Ilili Hanau o Koloa” February 10, 1911.

204. Genders of sides: Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:181. Divination: Fornander 1919–1920:127 ff., 133. The connection of right and left to gender is not present in the divination described in “Ka moolelo o Kawelonaakalailehua” March 7, April 4, 1863. See also above.


207. Handy and Pukui 1972:163, with kua/alo. This principle seems operative in the story recorded in Kelly 1980:99. In prebirth divination, the expectant mother is asked for her hand; an upturned palm indicates a girl, downturned a son, Green and Beckwith 1924:232 f.; perhaps an image of a sexual position. Kū ‘Standing’ is the male god; Hina ‘Leaning/Reclining’, the goddess. Compare the use of color, Pukui 1942:379. See also Judd 1930: riddles 75, 159.


212. Formula: e.g., Aholo 1861:3; J. S. Emerson 1892:22; Judd 1930: proverb 274; riddles 32, 191, 220; Gutmanis 1983:22, 46; Kānepu‘u March 5, 12, 1868, for “all the time”. Kumulipo: line 11; compare Luomala 1985:297.


214. For example, Handy and Pukui 1972: literature, 10, 153–156, 159, 166; sayings, 167, 179, 183, 194.

215. For example, Malo n.d.: XVI, XVII, XXXIII, XXXIX; July 25, 1843. 'ī


221. For example, Kamakau August 26, 1865: 2; February 2, 1867; chants are used prominently in the materials gathered in Kamakau 1991. Fornander 1969: 1198 f., 111, 123, 126 f., 154. Charlot 1985a: 32.

222. ‘Ī’ī September 18, 1869. See also, e.g., Kepelino 1932: 71–75. Elbert 1959: 85, 89, 275–287.


224. Ellis 1984: 462. See also, e.g., Bingham 1981: 127. Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 58. Compare Blackburn 1808: 85 f. Music education was mentioned in the reports of the Board of Education. R. Armstrong 1860: 5, “Singing is an exercise of which native children are particularly fond; it tends to make the school a pleasant place; to supersede old heathen songs, and to wipe out old heathenish ideas; to inculcate refined sentiments . . .”; “occasionally a teacher is devoted to teaching singing in several adjacent schools.” Gibson 1886: 21, singing is a great accomplishment of the students; “The result may not, however, be so much due to superior teaching as to the natural ability of the Hawaiians for music.” C. R. Bishop 1892: 25 f., encourages singing instruction; 1880: 7, curiously, he states that most teachers do not see the value of vocal music.

225. Kānepu‘u February 27, 1868. This method is mentioned frequently, e.g., Chamberlain n.d.: 21; February 4, 1825. Neither text states explicitly that the class chanted their response. For an example of the classical practice, see


Titcomb 1948:131, 145. On the word, see the unusual discussion of Kepelino January 1860:30.


229. Kānepuʻu February 27, 1868. Kepelino July 2, 1867:1 5, uses of the shape of the letter V in a description. In his educational Utopia, Goethe 1961:166, recommends learning to write along with music so as to practice hand, ear, and eye. The method has and is being found useful elsewhere. Curiously, the use of songs and rimes was not found effective by the keep project, Speidel 1981: 27 f.


233. For society lists, see, e.g., Kauʻi December 18, 1865. Kamakau April 25, 1868. Kaaie April 24, 1862: alii, kahuna, makaainana, kauwa. Lists of court offices and personnel are frequent. Short lists: Whitney and Richards 1832: 161, kahu, kuhina, kiaaina, konohiki; the account seems based on the polity of Kamehameha I; “He Moolelo no Pakaa” November 7, 1867: kilo, kahuna, kuhikuhi puuone; Kamakau May 2, 1868: naʻiʻi, ka poe koikoi, na koa; na kaukau alii a me ka poe koikoi; Nākuina 1902a: 17, kahuna, kilo; 35, kilo, kahuna, kuhikuhi puuone; 39 f., kahuna, kilo, kuhikuhipuuone, hookele waa; 54, kahuna, kilo, kakaolelo; 63, hookele, kahuna, kilo, ka poe ike apau; 65 f., kahuna, kilo, ka poe i pau ka loina no ko lakou ike; 77, hookele, kahuna, kilo, ka poe i pau ka loina; Elbert 1959:99: kahuna, kilo, kuhikuhipuuone. Long lists: Kamakau March 23 [sic: 16], 1867a; December 22, 1870; Kepelino 1932: 123–135. Compare Kepelino’s list with Rémy 1859:6 ff. Rémy’s items correspond to Kepelino’s numbers 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13. Rémy’s source may have been the father or a forebear of Kepelino, as discussed below. Fornander 1918–1919: 477 ff.

Subjects or fields are mentioned also in non-Hawaiian language literature, e.g., A. November 5, 1853: “a knowledge of national affairs, the genealogies of the chiefs, the tabu system, traditions, &c. Malo became very distinguished in all these branches . . .”

234. Rémy 1859:6 ff. Kepelino 1932: 4 (Beckwith); 123 ff., followed by an extended discussion. Kepelino’s presentation has more items and fuller expla-
nations. The two disagree on their tripartite division of Hawaiian society, Rémy 1859:6; Kepelino 1932:125. Kepelino probably includes the priests with the nobles and emphasizes the kauā, whom his father ignores. Fornander 1969:1199ff., corrects Rémy’s informant.

235. Nākuina 1902a:34, 119. Fornander 1918–1919:75, 79, 135, also mentions the songs of the chief and all the other things that pertained to the chief, that is, courtly etiquette and means of service.

236. Nākuina 1902b:14; also 16ff. The latter category is used in “Kaao Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” April 10, 1912:14.


238. Compare Kepelino July 2, 1867:19, 29, 40, 43, 1171.

239. For example, Malo n.d.: XXXVIII 43. Kepelino 1932:151, Eia na ano o ka hookupu ana ‘Here are the types of tribute-giving’.


242. Fornander 1916–1917:285–289 (283, taught to him by his kahu; known to his advisors, 289), 303–307. Hawaiian negations must be understood in their context. For instance, Malo n.d.: XXI 10, aohe kanawai oia wa ‘there was no law at that time’; Malo knows of traditional kānāwai ‘laws’, but either refers here to Western, written law or is describing a general lawlessness. Compare XXIII 16 ff., in which two lists of gods worshipped by women are accompanied by the statement that the majority of women did not have a god; Malo is referring to gods of specialists and of particular ranks and cults; he is not referring to the ubiquitous family gods.


245. Compare Baron 1988:111, on the distinction between crystallized and fluid intelligence.


247. For example, Judd 1930:66–91. Riddles have not always been identi-
fied in Pukui 1983. Riddles from stories of contests of wits can also be transmitted separately, Pukui 1983: numbers 1347, 2183.

A full study needs to be done of riddle forms, which can be short descriptive phrases or sentences, the reference of which had to be recognized. A short description often starts with *ku‘u ‘My’, e.g., Nākuina 1902b:72, *Kuu manu luhelu-he*; 85, *Kuu i‘a, kuu i‘a momona*; also, 86 ff., 91 f.; Pukui 1983: number 1935. “No ke Keiki Hoopapa, Oia o Kalapana”: 33 [2], formulates a riddle in the Western form of a question (though this is indicated merely by the punctuation), “*Kuu manu luheluhe, a ike i ka wai la luhe?” “He Pinao.” Compare Polio-kaipolia September 12, 1919, “I aloha la hoi oe ia Puna i keaha?” ‘Why do you love Puna?’ The use of direct questions is usually considered rude in Hawai‘i. One elicits information by implying an interest or suggesting a possibility. In simple riddling, one poses one’s problem without stating or implying in the formulation that it requires some response. The opponent is then free to accept the challenge or not.

Riddles can be in the form of chants. No title n.d., consists of a series of short lines: “All these lines are plays upon the names of familiar places on the island of Maui.” Each line is therefore a separate riddle, and together they form a chant. McAllister 1933:91, is a grandiose riddle chant. For process riddles, see below. Riddles and proverbial sayings are discussed in similar terms by Hawaiians; both require interpretation. Riddling has been studied extensively by Beckwith, e.g., 1922, 1932, 1970 (see index). On the relation between riddles and sayings, see Beckwith 1932:332 f.

248. Hallpike 1979:111 f., doubts that the general population could have understood proverbs such as the Samoan examples he cites, but I know from experience that in the early 1970s, such proverbs were in general use. Beckwith generally overemphasizes the chiefly character of riddling; see the quotation below.


251. N. B. Emerson 1909:257f. Compare *He Mele no Nuhou* 1874. Nākuina 1902a:74, *He ui, he ninau owai ko oukou poe inoa?* in a chant; also 75. For more examples, see Appendix VII.


257. The call: “Na Olelo Noeau” September 21, 1922 (I mea e hiki ai e malamaia na olelo noeau ame na hana naauao apau a ka lahui Hawaii ’In order for all the wise sayings and wise deeds of the Hawaiian race to be preserved’; the genres requested are ‘ōlelo no’eau, ‘ōlelo ho’okā’au na‘auao, ‘ōlelo ho’okā’au kūli’a, and na‘e, along with explanations of the hidden meanings, kaona. The Hawaiian writers were responding to a particular enquiry by Kelsey January 18, 1923. Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua February 1, 1923a. Kekoowai February 15, 1923; February 22, 1923. Pukui 1983: number 1154; Pukui reads hāna ‘alert’, whereas all the others read hana ‘work, activity’.
259. ‘Ī‘ī July 31, 1869. The translation published in Li 1959: 55, omits part of the text.
260. Terminology: “Kaao Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki” June 21, 1912; Appendix VII. Death: e.g., Kuapuu June 12, 1861; in Nākuina 1902a, 1902b, the losers of races are killed. The description in Poepoe January 8, 15, 1909, of a contest of the counter-hiding game pūhenehene resembles the ho’opāpā: the contestants have a teacher, technical terms are used, the rules are set beforehand, godly help is invoked, and the audience ensures fairness.
264. For example, “Kaao Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki” January 17, 1912: 16; February 7: 18; February 24, 1912; and throughout this section of the series. Fornander 1916–1917: 269 ff.
266. “Kaao Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki” January 24, 1912: 18; compare April 10, 1912.
Puuwai no Ka-Miki” February 14:16 f.; June 21:14 f.; April 10, 1912.


271. For example, Turner 1884:132 f. Beckwith 1970:461 ff. Luomala 1938:16, “In Tahiti the art of playing on words was called paraup-iri, and it was taught in the native schools of learning”; 1955:48.


274. For example, Kamakau 1961:111:111. Challenge: “Ke Alii Aloha ole i kona Kaula/O Hua ke Alii, a o Luahoomoe ke Kaula” June 16, 1864. See Appendix VII. Conversely, Kamakau December 29, 1870, uses hoopaapaa for a contest without an element of wit.


276. For example, Turner 1884:132 f. Beckwith 1970:461 ff. Luomala 1938:16, “In Tahiti the art of playing on words was called paraup-iri, and it was taught in the native schools of learning”; 1955:48.


279. Appendix VII. Beckwith 1922:326.

280. For example, “Kaao Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki” January 17, 1912:16 f.; 18, riddle. See also the place chants in the Kalapana/Kaipalaoa tradition, e.g., Nakuina 1902b:92; Kaipalaoa, Fornander 1916–1917:585, 591.

281. Kauʻi November 20, 1865. For a vivid expression of the image, see Bina Mossman’s song He ‘Ono, Elbert and Mahoe 1970:48 f.


283. The Kalapana/Kaipalaoa tradition, e.g., “No ke Keiki Hoopapa, Oia o Kalapana” n.d.:32 [1], 35 [4].


289. Nākuina 1902b: 12; see also 69, 79. Kaipalaoa, Fornander 1916–1917: 577ff., Aohe hiki i ke kanaka makua ke olelo hou aku i ke keiki ‘The elder was unable to speak anew to the child’.

290. For example, “Kaao Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki” January 24:18; April 10, 1912: 14 ff.


297. Vs. Beckwith 1922: 329 f., who holds that all ho’opāpā stories are variations of the same story; in other writings, she does not seem to hold this view. Traditional structural elements of the Hawaiian story form can be identified, Charlot 1977b. In the first contest of Pikoia’alalā, Fornander 1916–1917, an introduction is interrupted by narrative: 453 ff., Na ‘lii . . . aole ana pana iole [narrative] No Mainele . . . pana hookahi ana. There are two conclusions: 457, (1) Nolaila, eo . . Kaulamawaho (the conclusion for the combat story itself), and (2) Nolaila, ua maopopo . . . ia kaaao (stating that Pikoia’alalā’s relations are rats, which connects the story to the complex as a whole). Elements of a single story form can be identified in Poliokaipolia September 12, 1919, although narrative is interspersed among them: introduction, no keia keiki . . . Malaea kii, with the meeting narrated in the middle, Ma ia wahi . . kekahi i kekah; more introductory information is given in paragraph 3 (Eia with some explanation that the contest involves place knowledge); more introductory material in paragraph 4. The Kapunohu story, Fornander 1918–1919: 419 ff.,
is told as a series of three trickster stories of the same form, with introduction and transitions, Charlot 1977:484. The Lonoikamakahiki contest, as seen above, involves a numbered series.


303. For example, “Kao Hooniuia Puuwai no Ka-Miki” January 17, 1912:16 ff. “No ke Keiki Hoopapa, Oia o Kalapana’” n.d.:33 [2]–37 [6], abbreviates the sequence but presents it very regularly: the boy asks his opponents to proceed with the words, Ahua a pane, he hoolohe koonei? They state the subject and threaten and challenge him. He takes up the reply, sometimes with a repetition of the threat, and then provides the answer.


306. The description resembles strongly that of the graduation sacrifice of an eyeball to the god of wrestling, “Ka Oihana Lua a Mawai Lahuui [sic]” July 19, 1923.

307. At this point, Kaui and Nākuina insert an exchange of statements using the words i’o and ho’opili, which is not found in the other texts. See also Kaui November 20, 27, 1865; Nākuina 1902b:56, 58, 67. I would argue that it is an expression of one of their themes, which will be discussed below.


somewhat differing versions are found in “He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902: 4; “No ke Keiki Hoopapa, Oia o Kalapana” n.d.: 32 [1]; Kaipalaoa, Fornander 1916–1917: 577.

313. Nākuina 1902b: 50. Nākuina treats all the rounds in the house in unusual detail as examples of completeness. The opponents say the boy does not have an item needed for comfort in the house, and he pulls one out of his traveling gourd: grass to spread on the ground (51), a mat (51 f.), tapa (52), pillow (the boy just folds up his tapa without a word, 53), and food and prepared food trick with all the necessary tools (53 f.). The opponents say the boy has a dirty loincloth and give him an old one; the boy claims he has one, takes it out of his gourd, and taunts his opponents that their loincloths are dirty (52 f.). The Kaipalaoa story, Fornander 1916–1917: 579–581, also treats these rounds as tests of completeness.

319. Phenomena: Kaui November 27, 1865: the problems of the kauna‘oa, ‘a‘ama, pinao, puhī’ōilo; December 4, 1865: ‘iole and pueo, and the lō. All these will be discussed below. Claims: Nākuina 1902b: 46 f. At a crucial moment in the contest, Kalapana recalls having been in Hilo and hearing children flying kites and calling on the winds, Nākuina 1902b: 94.
320. Note the boy’s use of the choice form amoa as opposed to his opponent’s more ordinary amo ‘ia in Kaipalaoa, Fornander 1916–1917: 591.
321. For more examples, see Kaipalaoa, Fornander 1916–1917: 585 ff., 591.
329. Compare Beckwith 1922:327, “to compose a similar riddle which will parallel the first as exactly as possible and present an equally striking analogy.”
330. For further examples of matching chants, see the story of Kaipalaoa, Fornander 1916–1917:585 ff.
332. Kauʻi November 20, 1865. Compare Nākuina 1902b:56 f., with the clearer *ka mea ukana nui* ‘the thing of much baggage’.
337. Compare Kauʻi November 27, 1865, *Aia a loaa kau i-a, he inoa puhi, e like me ka makou* ‘You have to get a fish with a *puhi* name, just like ours’.


342. Nākuina 1902b:91 f. This passage is found only in Nākuina’s version of the Kalapana/Kaipalaoa tradition. Kalapana is fooling his opponents by making them believe he is in trouble, but in fact he is well trained in the subject (93 f.). Nākuina is leading up to the climactic round on islands. He may also have had a special interest in wind chants and names because of his work on the tradition of Pāka’a and Kūapāka’a, Nākuina 1902a, in which they play a prominent role.


353. For example, Judd 1930: riddles 1, 24, 110, 190, 251; 42, ‘āina/kai.


361. Kānepuʻu March 5, 1868; March 19, 26, 1868; April 2, 1868; in order of reference.
363. “He Moolelo Kaaʻo no Kekuhaupio” May 5, 1921; also, May 12, 1921, emphasis on the inspection of the cannon and on the war potential of foreign boats. Compare the interest of Kamehameha and Kekūhaupio in the new mākini battle tactic, May 26, 1921. Malo and Kamakau were also known to be interested in new things, e.g., Kamakau 1988:18 f. (Chun).
Hawaiian society itself was an educational environment. Within that society, different educational institutions can be identified. The institution on which all the others were based was the extended family.¹

THE EXTENDED FAMILY

The structure of the Hawaiian extended family has been studied, and I will discuss here only its educational aspects. Most important, the family was a foyer of culture with its own religious, historical, literary, and artistic traditions.² Families perpetuated their genealogies, the histories of their ancestors, and their special religious and professional practices. They composed and transmitted birth chants, name chants, genital chants, hula, and dirges, along with place and love songs, stories, and sayings. Families taught morals and wisdom of which the elders were considered repositories and models. Through informal and formal education, knowledge was transmitted along with world views, attitudes, principles, and styles.
Such teaching continued through the nineteenth century, as can be seen from the complaint of L. Pule, *Mai ao aku hoi oukou e na Elemakule i ka oukou kuhihewa i na keiki, moopuna, a pela aku* ‘Oh Elders, do not go on teaching your errors to the children, the grandchildren, and so on; errors such as non-Christian teachings about the fate of the soul after death.’ Indeed, important Hawaiian writers of the nineteenth century descended from families that transmitted such valuable knowledge and used it in their work. Many contemporary Hawaiian families have preserved their traditions in memory and in writing and continue their educative function. I have been told of one family that meets once a month to learn songs, stories, and dances, a practice that strengthens the family as a group as well as its individual members. The study and publication of family traditions, as done for instance by John Topolinsky, is an essential contribution to our understanding of Hawaiian culture.

Extended families had a general cultural competence, having members who could provide for most of the family’s ordinary needs. For instance, a family member would be competent in midwifery, and an expert or professional was needed only in cases of difficult births.

Besides this general competence, families tended to practice specialties. These could range from farming and fishing, to crafts, to sports and martial arts, to medicine, and to the highest levels of intellectual and priestly activity. For instance, Kamakau reports (February 10, 1870): *I ka noho kapu ana iloko o mua, i na he oihana kahuna ka oihana a na makua a me na kupuna, alaila, o ka oihana no ia e ao ai* ‘In the tabu residence inside the *mua* ‘men’s house’, if the priestly occupation was the occupation of the parents and ancestors, then this was indeed the occupation that was taught.’ Kamakau then provides a list of occupations that were traditionally connected to families. Expertise in the *ho‘opāpā*, the contest of wits, is described emphatically as a family trait. As a result, the gods invoked for professional purposes were often
family gods. La‘amaomao, the ancestor of Pāka’a’s family, is a good example of such a deified ancestor and professional god. Because professions were connected to family, they were also connected to rank. Specialties associated with commoners included farming, fishing, and house and boat building (Malo n.d.: xviii 69). The highest priestly ranks were reserved for the highest priestly and chiefly families.

Similarly, official positions tended to be passed down in families, from the kahu ‘keeper’ of a local shark god, to head fisherman, to prophet, to the highest positions at court, for which one’s genealogy was checked. Kamakau of Ka‘awaloa describes the role of a specialized priest, he pule kapu loa no keia na ke kahuna hono, he loina no ia no ka luakini, a he kauoha no na kona makua ia ia ‘This was a very tabu prayer recited by the hono priest; this was indeed a rule of the temple and a charge/bequest of his father to him’ (Fornander 1919–1920: 27). Kaiākea, the polymath, court advisor, and governor of Moloka‘i, teaches his knowledge to his children and passes his official post to his son Kekuelike (“He moolelo Hawai‘i: O Kaiakea” July 25, 1902). The great Pāka’a’s rank and talents also descend to him from his ancestors, his ancestral gods help him, and he trains his son to assume his official positions.

Hawaiians attribute to nature much of what Western culture attributes to nurture. Families are considered to pass on personal characteristics as well as talents, and all such family traits are carefully noted (Handy and Pukui 1972: 47 [ewe and welo], 160 f.). In fact, artistic talents, such as musical, and certain types of intelligence, personalities, and disorders are considered by psychologists to run in families. Although Hawaiians recognize acquired skills, non-familial appearances of talents, and newly discovered aptitudes for novel tasks, family talents are generally considered by Hawaiians to result in superior achievements. For instance, Nākuina contrasts ka ike maoli ‘the real knowledge’ of the inherited aptitude of Kalapana’s family for the contest of wits to he ao
maoli ‘a real learning’, of an aficionado, Puni Hoopapa. In any case, the environment of such an occupationally oriented family—with its role models, encouragement, and informal and formal learning opportunities—was an education in itself. Hale‘ole reports that he was not one of the siblings selected to be formally educated in the family’s priestly profession, but because so many were being trained, he heard about it, he lohe wale (Fornander 1919–1920:67 ff.); he received more formal instruction from the man to whom he was later given in adoption.

The connection of specialties to families contributed to the stability of society in that people tended to accept inherited positions. Moreover, the provision of specialized services was assured to the society by the fact that they were the prestigious prerogatives of recognized social units. Finally, the fact that one could be selected as a student because of one’s talents and interests—as well as by the inspiration of a god—allowed for flexibility.

The education of children was considered a family duty that was shameful to neglect: he nui ka‘u mea i ao ai i ko‘u wa kamalii o ka hula ka mua, o ka mahiai, o ka lawaia, a me ka epa ‘Many were the things I learned/was taught in my childhood: the first was hula, farming, fishing, and mischief’. The child represented the family to the outside world and contributed practically to the prosperity of the family. The author of “No ka Pono a ka poe kahiko i ao mai ai i ka lakou mau keiki” (March 14, 1834) writes that boys were taught farming and fishing so that they could attract a wife: i makemake ia mai ai e ka wahine; a ina he kaika-mahine, pela no e ao ia ai, i moe i ke kane ikaika i ka mahiai, a i ka lawaia ‘so that he would be desired by the woman; and if it were a daughter, she was indeed taught thus so that she would sleep with the man who was strong in farming and fishing’. Similarly, he writes that chiefs sacrificed so that their sons would become important chiefs and their daughters would marry such nobles. John Papa ‘Ī‘ī provides a picture of the education of a gifted child
in whom the family had placed its hopes for the maintenance of its position at court.

Education was the means of perpetuating the family as a cultural unit. The methods of education also reinforced the family structure. Children were taught to respect the knowledge of their elders (Pukui 1942: 376). The exercise of knowledge was considered a *kauoha* ‘command, charge, or bequest’ from the ancestors or elders. Older children were taught by elders from an early age (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 49 ff.). Older children would be appointed caretakers for younger ones, which gave them maturing responsibilities and adultlike experiences; the practice also reinforced the sense of hierarchy within the younger generation. A particular child was selected to be the *punahhele* ‘favorite’, who would be given special training to assume the senior or leadership role in his or her generation; this child was usually the *hiapo* ‘first-born’. The system admitted, however, the flexibility of choosing another sibling should the firstborn prove unsuitable. The family decided whether a child would be sent to study under an expert. Many occupations inside and outside the family were connected to gender. Accordingly, after an early stage, the living quarters of the sons and daughters were separated, the boys moving into the *mua* ‘men’s house’, and boys and girls were given separate tasks and training. In sum, the family decided who would receive what knowledge and to a certain extent how it would be exercised.

I will discuss only the aspects of child-rearing or enculturation most important for my subject of the family as an educational institution, providing texts useful for further study. Methods of education are discussed elsewhere in this book.

Education, like other aspects of family life, was highly regulated. Chiefly and priestly families elaborated and formalized even more strictly practices found generally in Hawaiian families.

Hawaiians divided life into stages—generally, *keiki* ‘child’, *ōpio* ‘youth’, *makua* ‘adult’, and *elemakule* and *luahine* ‘elder’,
respectively male and female. These stages could be elaborated (Kukahi Mei 1, 1902: 64). The early part of life was in turn divided into stages, which were often connected to abilities in language or performing tasks.20

Teaching was informal and formal. For instance, in daily life, children would hear a good deal of literature and could remember chants and stories. As elsewhere in Polynesia, literature could also be taught formally to children.21 ‘Ī‘ī (January 29, 1870) is good at chanting because he was taught by his mother. Kūapāka’a is taught family chants by his father Pāka’a:

\[
i \text{ka wa i loaa ai iaia ka olelo, hoomaka iho la o Pakaa i ke ao ana} \\
i \text{ke ketki i na hana a me na mele ana i haku ai no Keawenuiaumi}
\]

‘at the time that he [Kūapāka’a] obtained the power of speech, Pāka’a began to teach the child the works and the songs he had composed for Keawenuia’umi’.

Kūapāka’a later states, \[
nana no hoi au i ao i na hana apau i \\
hakuia ai e ia nou, a’u e hana aku ana ia oukou e lana mai ana.
\]

‘by him indeed I was taught all the works that were composed by him for you, which I was performing for you all while floating on the sea’.22

I have already described the education of a child for the contest of wits.

Mary Kawena Pukui (n.d.) has provided an extended discussion of how stories were taught in her family. Story telling, ha’i ka’a’o, was a serious occupation, and students were chosen with care and even tested for their reliability and good memory (1602 [1]–1605 [4]). “Should a young person wish to learn from an old one other than his own grandparent, he asked permission to become a pupil and if accepted, became a member of that household” (1602 [1]). The listener remained silent and made “No unnecessary movement”; “Strict attention had to be paid to every
word of the narrative.” When someone interrupted, she drew the scolding, “Daughter, story telling is not a game. If you want to learn, listen. I don’t have to tell what I know” (1605 [4]). Stories of ghosts or spirits were avoided “as the things talked about were often attracted to the place” (1602 [1]). Pukui learned stories from her grandmother who told them as she rolled pandanus leaves for use in plaiting. “After two or three nights had passed, she would have me retell them to her . . . When I made a mistake, she would say, gently ‘Aole me ia, me neia’ (Not that way, it is this way) and then she would repeat that part so that I would learn it correctly”; which was more important than telling the story in an interesting way (1602 [1] f.). If the story contained a chant, “I learned the chant by reciting it back to her during our story telling period” (1603 [2]).

I myself experienced such formal story telling in the mid-1970s. My very young children asked Mrs. Lydia DelaCerna of Kahana Valley, O‘ahu, to tell them a story. She first asked them whether they really wanted to hear one. When they assured her that they did, she had us all sit down and then told the story in very measured language, ending with a big smile of delight in the story.

Knowledge of stories and sayings was necessary to understand chants, and such knowledge attracted favor and prestige:

A person well versed in all three, story telling, poetry and figurative sayings found himself a favorite of his chief. Especially if the figurative sayings (‘olelo ho‘oka‘au) were humorous (ho‘omake ‘aka) and amused the hearers. One versed in both history and legends was said to be pa‘a mo‘olelo.23

Stories also stimulated the imagination of the child, trained him in visualization and the use of language, and added esthetics to the learning process.

As is clear from Pukui’s account, the selection of students was a critical step in education. This was particularly true when
a student was chosen to move beyond general competence to a family specialty. The process of selection started with various forms of prenatal divination, the reading of signs, and practices during pregnancy designed to influence the expected child. An extended discussion of these is provided in the series “Ka Moolelo o Kawelonaakalailehua.” When a chiefess becomes pregnant, her husband sends his priest and a servant to fetch a kahuna ‘specialist’ in prenatal divination e nana i ka opu o ke Alii ‘to look at the belly of the chiefess’ (March 7, 1863). The specialist gives detailed instructions in preparation for the ceremony: a runner must fetch special water in a basket and run fast enough so that it will not all drip out before he arrives. The ceremony is then described in detail and explained. The specialist arrives with different flowers in his right and left hand. While the chief and courtiers watch, he chants and places the flowers in the special water. If a rainbow appears, the child will be good; if mist, it will be a keiki ano e ‘a strange child’. The results of the ceremony are negative. Some want to kill the specialist, but the chief decides to wait and see if the prognosis was correct. The child is indeed extremely abnormal and is buried. The chiefly couple decide to have another child (March 21, 1863). The specialist interprets weather signs and performs a ceremony to divine whether the chiefess is really pregnant (April 4, 1863). The specialist is summoned again at the time of the birth and again performs a divination ceremony. This time the wānana ‘prediction’ is that the child will be good (April 11, 1863). The specialist orders that the grandparents not give the child a name, but the difficult birth proves that they have disobeyed him. The problem is resolved, the divination ceremony is performed again, and weather signs are read. All necessary procedures are followed at the birth, and all the signs are favorable.

The child’s character and future could be interpreted by birth day according to Hawaiian astrology, by the accompanying weather signs, and by the success of all conventional procedures
related to birth. Some of these had a formative influence, as did the naming of the child.

The child’s body and movements were interpreted, often by specialists. In Kawaiulua (September 26, 1861), the mother’s parents hāhā ‘feel’ the child with their hands and haʻi ‘announce’ their wānana ‘prognosis’, which concerns both the body and the character of the child. When the prognosis for Kawelo is outstanding, they provide special rearing for him. Kānepuʻu (February 20, 1868) describes the procedure as it was done for him. His mother took him to her own mother and another woman, who were both specialists in kilokilo ‘omen or sign reading’. They examined the child’s body and made a detailed and complicated prognosis of his character and future, a prognosis that combines old and new, traditional Hawaiian religion and Christianity. Poignantly, they stated that he was gifted for several of the traditional intellectual and religious occupations, occupations that had no equivalents in the postcontact world. In his talents and inclinations, Kānepuʻu/ Kānewailani was born out of his time, and his troubles would reflect this. Similarly, the practice of body reading was developed for the precontact culture and seemed at a loss when dealing with the new. Such a prognosis was not itself considered formative or determinative, but could have influenced the views of the family about a person and even the person himself.

As the child developed, he is carefully observed to see if he is capable and suitable for his proposed role (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:36, 44). The father in a family of priestly specialists chose to teach the son who he saw noho mālie ‘acted calmly’ (Waimea May 18, 1865). The child Pākaʻa is described as the perfect candidate for formal education (“He Moolelo no Pakaa” October 24, 1867):

I ko Pakaa wa kamalii, he keiki akamai a noonoo oia, he hiki ke imi oia i ike nono ma ka nana ana aku i ka hanaia mai e kekahi poe, o kela ano hana keia ano hana, a he hiki no ia ia ke imi i
‘In Pāka’a’s youth, he was an intelligent and thoughtful child. He was able to seek knowledge for himself by looking at the work done by other people, this and that type of work. He was indeed able to search for knowledge by himself alone, without being taught, and in his knowledge, he was intelligent in several types of work . . .’

That is, Pāka’a displays an unusual capacity for observation and an extraordinary personal desire for knowledge.

At ten years of age, John Papa ‘Ī’ī was selected to serve at court because he had shown himself to be ‘eleu ‘quick and energetic’, mākaukau ‘ready’, and a hard and constant worker (June 12, 1869; February 19, 1870). He was religious and well-behaved and so was allowed to accompany a priest to a temple ceremony (July 10, 31, 1869). He displayed his leadership abilities by directing and rewarding other children and having them imitate his innovations (July 10, December 4, 1869).

Relationships with peers—in cooperation, competition, and leadership—are considered an indication of character and adult possibilities. A child can display chiefly qualities, like inviting his playmates to eat.27 Kawelo’s childhood victory over Kauahoa in kite-flying presages his adult victory in battle (Fornander 1918–1919:3 ff.); after he beats Kauahoa also in a pissing contest, Kawelo is convinced of his superiority.28 Kawelo later shows such a precocious skill in the martial arts and wins such renown that he shames his older brothers.

Distinguishing oneself in sports is a motif of hero tales, indicating their importance in the selection process. Hale‘ole describes a future champion of the martial arts (October 3, 1861):

_Eono paha puni (makahiki) o ka mua, hoomaka koke kona ikaika e luku i na keiki hoa paani ona, a i ka umikumamawalu o kona_
mau makahiki, alaila ike maopopo ia aku la ka mahuahua o ka pii ana o kona ikaika, a hala na puni he iwakalua, lilo loa oia i keiki kaulana a puni o Hawaii.

‘At six rounds (years) began quickly his strength at beating his playmates. Then in his eighteenth year was clearly seen the great increase of the rise of his strength, and after his twentieth year, he became very much a famous child in all Hawai’i’.

He displays his strength to such advantage that even the chief is frightened (also, Hale’ole October 17, 1861). Children can compete in artistic activities as well (e.g., Damon 1935:456).

Children can also be tested or tried in various ways for aptitude or character. The need for a potential student to succeed under observation and testing introduced flexibility into the selection process and allowed family members to rise through merit and inclination (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972:44 f.; 1979:56 f., 250). In modern times at least, tensions can arise when a selected child does not want to accept the responsibility of special education or when the parents cannot accept the fact that a sibling they have not selected is in fact more capable and interested.

Finally, though there appears to be some evidence that the selection process was more formal for boys than for girls—Kawelo’s sisters are not submitted to a prognosis—this may be an accident of our sources. Girls were indeed selected for family tasks (Varigny 1874:12), underwent a formal selection process for hula academies, and could perform important religious functions for which they must have been selected.

Every family member was potentially a teacher in some sense, especially in informal education. For formal education, however, particular teachers were identified and could be relatives of every sort. Grandparents were prominent teachers of children, which ensured the continuity of the youngest generation with the past. The hiapo ‘firstborn’ male child was often given to the paternal grandparents, and the firstborn female to the maternal. An
especially gifted child could be given to the grandparents as well (Johnson 1981: 4 f.). In commoner families, sex education was provided by the grandparent of the same sex (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 79). Grandparents who were experts in a field could provide professional training. The special relationship with grandparents can be found in Hawaiian traditions, such as that of Kamapuaʻa, and continues in Hawaiʻi and Polynesia today (Ritchie and Ritchie 1989: 112).

As could be expected, the child’s father was often his teacher, especially when he was a specialist. Even when a son was being educated by other experts, the father could supervise the process, intervene, and take over the teaching himself, as seen in the story of Lonoikamakahiki (Fornander 1916–1917: 261).

Mothers taught their daughters (e.g., Kalama 1986) and could advise their sons (Rémy 1859: 47). The mother’s professional teaching activity is extensive in traditions such as that of Kalapana/Kai-palaoa (along with the aunt) and in John Papa ʻĪi’s memoirs.

A man could be taught by his wife. Kawelo learns the martial arts from his wife and her father, and Kalapana’s mother teaches her husband.

Children could also be sent to an expert, who accepted the child as a family member (Handy and Pukui 1972: 90). In a practice called hānai, Hawaiians could give a child to another to rear, usually a relative. This was often done for educational purposes, as described by Kamakau:

\[
I \text{ ka lilo ana o ke keiki na hai e hanai, ua ao ia kekahi mau keiki i na hana naauao a me ke akamai ma na oihana ike i ao ia}
\]

‘In the transfer of the child to others to rear, some children were taught the wise works and the intelligence in the intellectual occupations that were taught’.

Hawaiian children, especially those from noble families, were often entrusted to one or more kahu ‘guardian or governor’, who
would assume various responsibilities for them, including educational. The names of the kahu of important chiefs were handed down as significant in historical traditions, and their good care could become proverbial (Pukui 1983: number 1346). The names of kahu reveal in fact family and political connections. For instance, it was considered significant that the Maui chief Kahekili sent two chiefs to be the kahu of the young Kamehameha of Hawai‘i, considered possible evidence of parentage. A kahu could serve his ward, especially an important chief, all his life and maintained a close and influential relationship with him. Kahu could be involved in important government decisions. Kamakau (April 25, 1868) reports that the throne was conferred on Kamehameha III by na kahu alii me na Kuhina a me na‘Lii ‘the chiefly guardians and the ministers and the chiefs’. Kamehameha III later entrusts Kaua‘i to his kahu Kaikio‘ewa (Kamakau April 18, 1868).

A kahu could be, but did not need to be, a family member; in either case, he or she was treated in the same way. A kahu is, therefore, in a middle position, so to speak, between family teachers and non-family experts. ‘Ī‘ī, who had a close relationship with his own kahu, has a number of stories about people who held the position; stories that may have been used in educating a future servant of a chief. For instance, Kamehameha risked his life to rescue his embattled kahu and teacher of the martial arts, Kekūhaupi‘o. ‘Ī‘ī tells an important family story about Keaka and Luluka, Kamehameha’s former kahu hānai “foster parents.” They were worried because they had not received news of their ward, now a chief on Hawai‘i. Because of their aloha haehae ‘tearing love’, they sent a son to learn how Kamehameha was faring. So anxious were they for news that they devised a signal to be given from sea on his return, so they would not have to wait until the son landed. On his trip to Hawai‘i, he carried a loincloth as a present for the chief to use as a dry one after surfing, an example of good service. Kamehameha accorded him a remarkable amount
of time, and the son prepared to return. After the two had said good-by, the son turned to enter the canoe and suddenly heard Kamehameha behind him singing the name chant of Keaka. He turned to hear it to the end, conscious of the great honor the chief was doing his family. The son returned to his family, signaling from sea that Kamehameha was well. When he told the family the story of Kamehameha singing Keaka's name chant, Pane mai hoi o Keaka, “Nona aku la no ia inoa.” A pela iho la ka lilo ana oia inoa no Kamehameha ‘Keaka then responded, “Let this name song be for him.” And in this way was the name chant ceded to Kamehameha’.

The role of kahu was an important point of conflict with Western education, most particularly at the Chiefs’ Children’s School run by Amos Starr and Juliette Montague Cooke. The royal children and their kahu were extremely affectionate with each other; one woman kahu expressed her affection by saying that she wanted to die before her ward. Guardians and children followed the Hawaiian custom of sleeping together as did parents and children (Korbin 1990:11). This aroused the opposition of the Cookes (M. A. Richards 1970:86, 111, 120), who went so far as to make sleeping alone an official punishment. The kahu were very worried about the children, especially because of the current fears of depopulation. They would become alarmed if a child were sick and bring food to the children, who often went hungry, and even alcoholic drink to the older ones.

The Cookes felt that the kahu spoiled the children, were resentful of losing their old positions, and enjoyed an undue influence over their wards. Mrs. Cooke wrote on the death of Kalauwalu: “He was the principal kahu of Alexander (the heir apparent), and has been opposed to our school because it would deprive him of his office. He had more power over the boy than the King” (M. A. Richards 1970:47).

The Cookes found, however, that they could not dispense entirely with the kahu, and John Papa ‘Īi was assigned, in my
interpretation, as a sort of official school *kahu* and mediator between the two systems. In this capacity he performed both very important and very minor tasks for the bodily welfare of the children, as was probably true of classical guardians.  

When later one of the older boys experienced real problems, the government appointed ʻIʻi his *kahu* and William Richards his probably financial “guardian” (M. A. Richards 1970: 280), an interesting combination of two systems. Significantly, the word *kahu* was used later for various supervisory positions in the educational system and the church.

Once a child was selected for special education, the course was rigorous, as is clear from a number of descriptions. When the parents of Henry ʻŌpūkahaʻia were killed in war, his education was assumed by his maternal uncle (*Ka Moolelo o Heneri Opukahaia* 1867: 7–10), who was a *kahuna*: *He kahuna akamai keia i aoia e Hewahewa, ke Kahuna Nui o ka heiau o Hikiau* ‘This man was a knowledgeable *kahuna* who had been taught by Hewahewa, the High Priest of the Hikiau temple’ (10). This uncle seems to have been the *kahuna* of the maternal side of the family (11), and a paternal uncle was also a *kahuna*: *he kahuna ke kaikaina o kuu makuakane* ‘the younger brother of my father was a *kahuna*’ (13). With this family background, *aoia iho la oia i ka oihana Kahuna o ka wa kahiko. He keiki hoolohe o Opukahaia* ‘he was taught the priestly occupation of the olden time. ʻŌpūkahaʻia was a child who listened’ (10). He was not interested in farming and fishing; *O ke ao kahuna wale no kona makemake nui* ‘Priestly learning alone was his great desire’.

*A loaa ia Opukahaia ka ike i na mea o ka oihana kahuna, alaila, kukulu iho la oia i kona wahi heiau pohaku maloko o Heleheleka-lani; a kukulu no hoi i hale maluna iho o kona wahi heiau, me ka malama ana i keia mau Akua ekolu, o Lono, o Kukaohialaka, a o Kukailimoku.*

ʻWhen ʻŌpūkahaʻia obtained the knowledge of the things of the
kahuna profession, then he built himself his own little stone temple inside Helehelekalani; and he built also a house on top of his little temple, with the care of these three Gods, Lono, Kūkaʻōhiʻaalaka, and Kūkāʻilimoku’. (10)

The care of such important gods was extremely complicated and required much knowledge. Selection of children for training in specifically religious functions remains important today, both for those who follow the traditional religion and in Hawaiian-Christian churches.

John Papa ʻĪʻi discusses his education in detail, and I use points from his writings throughout this book. ʻĪʻi belonged to an extended family with a tradition in court service that was several generations long and that formed part of the family history taught to him (June 12, 1869); interestingly, ʻĪʻi uses Luluka as a sort of extended family name. In his own time, several relatives held important governmental posts, such as Papa, Kamehameha’s physician and ʻĪʻi’s main contact at court (February 5, 1870), and Kuīhelani, whom ʻĪʻi visits (January 8, 1870). Such successful family members were material helps to the family, whereas unsuccessful ones could bring death upon themselves and even put the whole family in danger (July 3, 1869). The family needed intelligent children to educate, who could then be sent to court and eventually support their parents (July 3, 1869). ʻĪʻi received this specialized education primarily from his mother, but other family members added to his training; for instance, Papa gave ʻĪʻi advice on serving his chief (February 5, 1870). Once ready, ʻĪʻi had to leave his family and go to the chief who would become father and mother to him (July 31, 1869). The emotional cost of this for both the young ʻĪʻi and his family is clear. Later ʻĪʻi left the court without permission because he missed his mother and was scolded for doing so (January 15, 1870). Before returning to court, he took a loving farewell from his mother, who prepared things for him to take and asked
people to care for him (January 29, 1870). His father accompanied him on his trip in order to be with him a little longer.

Winona Beamer (1976) has described in detail her specialized education in her family, which was and still is famous for hula. Hula had been a family tradition from precontact times and was prominent in the family history (11, 13 f., 15, 25). The specialty was practiced mostly by women, with at least one expert in each generation, whose stories were passed down (23, 29 f., 52 f.). The family had its own treasury of chants: “Families orally handed down such chants within the bloodlines and they couldn’t be used by others.” (84). Such chants could be revised and rededicated to new family members. The family hula and chants were considered religious and included ceremonies (80, 62, 139), although these could later be modified and reinterpreted as honoring natural forces and Hawaiian culture in order to avoid conflict with Christianity (71 f.); “serious hula students take an oath . . . to help perpetuate hula” (26). The family hula tradition was important for the emotions and morale of the family and permeated all their lives, a result of the emphasis on the feeling necessary for true artistic expression (26, 62, 66, 73). The hula was important also as an influence on the thinking and world view of the family. The family character of the tradition was reflected in the distinctive Beamer style (73):

These are some of the things that distinguish our hula from the many, many styles of hula that other families teach. And not only are there family styles, but each island also has a distinct style for hula.

Hula education was done first in the close family. The young children were taught breathing lessons and games and other exercises to train their observation and inculcate a certain religious view (50, 55 f., 59, 72 ff.). They then received regular hula lessons (62 f., 66). Non-family members could be taught as well, but
the family children were expected to work harder (81). A family member also headed a traditional hālau hula ‘hula academy’, which was conducted according to the classical religious rules (30 f., 35, 37, 41, 44 f.).

Winona Beamer began at an early age to distinguish herself in such instruction, and her grandmother, who had adopted her (66), chose her as her punahele ‘favorite’: “She had been looking a long time for the child to receive her special knowledge” (56). The reasons for her selection included a deep response to the hula itself, talent, and steadfastness (56, 81). Her grandmother began teaching her chants when she was eight (80 f.); by the age of ten, she was asking many questions about the hula and writing down the answers (80). Winona Beamer carries on the family tradition today.

PEERS

Peer groups and relationships are unusually important in Hawai‘i and Polynesia as a whole, and children go through a phase in which they associate mostly with each other and enjoy much independence from family control. The idea seems to have been that they would learn about the rigors of life through actual, more or less unsheltered practice: Ka moa i hānai ‘ia i ka lā, ua ‘oi ia i ka moa i hānai ‘ia i ka malu ‘The chicken raised in the sun is better than the chicken raised in the shade’. The missionaries and other foreigners felt that Hawaiian children were unruly and undisciplined, a result of parental neglect or lack of supervision. Some of their observations may have been accurate for a time of some social disintegration, but some of them were undoubtedly due to misunderstandings—for instance, of the practice of hānai ‘adoption’—and to opposing philosophies of child rearing. The lives of the missionary children were structured to an extraordinary degree even for the period:
“Unstructured play was suspect, especially after the age of seven or eight. . . .”\textsuperscript{51} For such reasons, especially the sexual knowledge and openness of Hawaiian children, the missionaries separated their own, emphasized the need to reform the Hawaiian family, and planned boarding schools to isolate some Hawaiian children from their environment in order to educate them correctly. The very establishment of compulsory Western education reduced the time available for this period of the life of the Hawaiian child. Kānepu‘u was reduced to playing with his peers after school (March 19, 1868).

Some Hawaiians agreed with the missionary view. Papaiku writes:

\begin{quote}
mai hookuu wale aku me ka auwana wale ana o ke keiki mai ke kakahiaka a po ka la, no ka mea, he mea mau no i kekahi poe kanaka o Hawaii net ka hookuu wale ana i na keiki e hele ma ka lealea, aka, aole nae i ao aku na makua ia lakou, ua ae aku lakou i ka makemake o na keiki.
\end{quote}

‘don’t just let the child go in mere wandering from morning until the end of the day, for this is indeed a constant practice of many native people of our Hawai‘i—just letting the children go around having fun; but the parents don’t instruct them; they agree to the desire of the children’.

\begin{quote}
he mea mau ia i na kanaka Hawaii, o ka hoolohe ana i ko na keiki manao
\end{quote}

‘this is a constant practice of the Hawaiian people to listen to the opinion of the children’.\textsuperscript{52}

Hawaiian parents did indeed treat their children with great affection and regard (Pukui 1983: number 719), but they certainly recognized the need for parental supervision.\textsuperscript{53} As can be seen from the accounts of ‘Ī‘ī and Kānepu‘u, parents taught their children continuously, watched their conduct among their peers,
scolded them, and advised them when their children approached them for help. As discussed above, peer behavior was observed closely by parents for purposes of selection. Older people could even make equipment for children’s games (Kānepu’u March 26, 1868). The amount and character of parental control would have varied in individual cases. Paleka (1879) argues that the classical care of children, *pūlama*, was one of the positive points of the culture and reviving it would help with the problem of depopulation. In the olden days, Hawaiian women were not barren but had ten or more children; *ua piha ka aina i na kamalii* ‘the land was full of children’. This was in large part due to the methods of child rearing: *ka malu o ke kino o na poe opio malalo o ka pulama ia o ka wa kahiko, oia keka hi pono oia au naaupo i ike ole ia i keia wa* ‘the sheltering of the body of the young people under the *pūlama* ‘system of children being cherished’ of the olden time, this was a correct aspect of that benighted time that is unknown in this period’; this point is important for *ke ola lahui* ‘the life of the race’. Paleka emphasizes a classical Hawaiian virtue: *ina e nele ka maemae o na ohana a me ka poe opio, aole no e ulu pono ka lahui* ‘if the cleanliness of the families and the young people is lacking, the race will not grow correctly’.

Among their peers, children were free to create their own world, which as seen in descriptions of their play, was largely an imitation or reflection of the adult. For instance, they could compose their own prayers and chants, as Kānewailani’s playmates do to tease him (Kānepu’u March 26, 1868). Children also reproduced the social hierarchy, assuming adult roles with chiefly children acting as leaders for the others.\(^5\)\(^4\) Personal leadership qualities could also manifest themselves among peers. Although his paternity is unknown, ‘Umi acts as a natural leader—generous, likeable, and good-looking—creating a sort of court in which he directs even those children who were thought to be his social superiors.\(^5\)\(^5\)
The child’s life among his peers was obviously a learning experience on many levels (chapter II). Jordan (1983:288) found that in contemporary Hawai’i, peer teaching employed two methods used by Hawaiian mothers: modelling and intervention, demonstrating a continuity in teaching styles from the home to the peer group.

Kānepu’u reports that peers reinforced the classical views of children, including the picture of the cosmos, views usually learned originally from their parents (N. K. March 21, 1868). He and his peers shared and reinforced for each other the idea of the sky as solid and attached to the ocean and the mountains (Kānepu’u February 27, 1868). This view fitted his perceptions, and such conceptions continued in Hawai’i into the time of his writing (March 5, 1868). When his father decided to go on a trip, the child thought deeply about it, *nalu*, and decided that there must be a hole in the firmament that his father could pass through. Later when he went up to the mountain and could not see the joining of earth to sky, he revised his view, deciding that the joining must be like a rainbow that moves farther away as one approaches it. Peers also filled the child with false information, for instance, the view that people die in the order of their age, which the child believed even though he had contrary evidence. Kānepuʻu provides a valuable and realistic picture of the child learning from his community and his peers, subjecting received views to his thinking and observation, and revising his opinions.

**EXPERTS**

Polynesian cultures generally recognize particularly knowledgeable and skillful persons as experts in different fields, an expertise based on, but rising above, the high level of general competence. For instance, tapa making was a family craft of women,
including chiefly women, and a general competence was considered normal. But tapa making could also be developed into a fine art field with its own vocabulary and specialists in different stages of production with their own craft gods. A tapa-beating temple, *heiau kuku kapa*, is reported. Tapa making as a specialized craft could also be practiced by a family, and a place could become famous for its tapa making. The various implements used in tapa making may also have been craft specialties.

The intensity of specialization in classical Hawai‘i—the tendency to develop ordinary activities into specialties, occupations, and professions—was extreme. The number of recognized specialties far exceeded those in Sāmoa (although curiously, house building, the most prestigious and organized Samoan specialty, is not reported as one in Hawai‘i). Specialization could encompass an entire field, such as hula or geomancy, or could result from dividing a field into different areas, each of which would be developed into a specialty. For instance, tapa making could be apportioned among *ka po‘e kuku kapa* ‘the people who beat the tapa’, *ka po‘e kāpalapala* ‘the people who stamped’ the tapa with a design, and *ka po‘e ho‘olu‘u* ‘the people who dipped or dyed the tapa’. Each of these three groups had its separate god, respectively, Lauhuki, La‘ahana, and Ehu. In dragging a log down from the mountains for boat-building, one person specialized in a particular chant (Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua January 11, 1923). Major temple ceremonies were divided into parts, each with its own priesthood. Similarly, particular sites and buildings could be dedicated to special uses, as could utensils. Riddling and the *hoʻopāpā* ‘contest of wits’ are specializations of education itself. The practice of dividing fields into exclusive specialties was extended to Western occupations, such as housework (Grimshaw 1989:111). This division of a field into areas for specialization follows the hierarchical pattern of Hawaiian thinking of moving from the general to the particular.
Specialties had *loina* ‘rules’, a word that encompasses everything from the most practical tips to rituals and ceremonies. The word was used later for Western education; Pihi (June 13, 1863) writes that the *loina* and *rula* of the ministry of education must be followed. Rules were such a prominent part of a specialty that ‘Īi’s phrase (October 16, 1869) *kona loina hana* can be translated ‘profession’.

Specialties were also permeated with religious practices—such as professional or occupational gods (e.g., Malo n.d.: xxiii 5)—as will be seen below. Indeed, the word *kahuna* is glossed in English with separate words like expert, specialist, and priest, but the Hawaiian word covers all those aspects, which should be felt whichever English gloss is used.

The reasons for this tendency to specialization beyond apparent necessity are many, but I would emphasize the habits of multiplying the traditions and elaborating the practices of a profession along with the ideals of completeness and perfection. Specialization encouraged the formalization and ritualization of the educational process itself, as can be seen in the elaboration of the process of selection. Finally, specialties were family or personal property and, as sources of pride and prestige, were jealously guarded. This tendency towards specialization influenced the development of society—tradition assigns the establishment of specialties to the great chief ‘Umi—and should be considered along with factors such as population increase in discussions of the Hawaiian development of chieftainship.

Specialization led to professionalization, which can be observed on a scale of intensity. A specialist was a recognized expert in a certain field to whom people could apply for service when in need. An expert who spent a significant amount of time working in his specialty or who received a significant amount of his livelihood from it could be considered a professional. This could vary in degree. For instance, everyone could dance...
on informal occasions. Talented dancers could give occasional performances for reward. Certain highly skilled dancers spent most of their time performing and received most of their livelihood from their art. Certain professions consumed less time than others. For instance, a boatbuilder might not be commissioned often or steadily to construct major canoes, but he would be the recognized expert to approach when the need arose. In some fields the ‘ailolo and hōʻike graduation ceremonies would have clearly marked the line between the generally competent and the expert or professional. But graduation ceremonies are not reported for all fields, and status could have been conferred by reputation.

Experts served their families as specialists and teachers and, if sufficiently renowned, attracted clients and students who were not family members. Conversely, a child could be sent away to study a specialty with a family member or an unrelated expert. A person could become a priest by birth into a priestly family or by selection as a student in the profession (Malo n.d.: xxxviii 26). In the same way, a god like Pele could be an ‘aumakua ‘family god’ for the family and, if sufficiently powerful, an akua for non-family.

Learning from an expert could be temporary and limited in scope. Lonoikamakahiki learns a chant overnight from a Kauaʻi chiefess to be used in a contest of wits (Fornander 1916–1917: 275 ff.). Instruction from a resident in the local rules of such contests is a motif of the related literature.

But instruction by experts was usually so regulated as to constitute a formal school to which the student was apprenticed (Handy 1965: 55 f.). These schools usually were structured according to the model of an extended family (chapter IV), each with a distinctive tradition, set of practices and beliefs, and style. They also ranged from small schools under a single expert in a certain specialty to large institutions with several teachers and a large curriculum. For instance, a chief set up a school for the firstborn
of the families under his rule to which he appointed *kela kumu ike keia kumu ike ma ka lakou Oihana*. *Ua ao ia na oihana ike a pau* ‘this and that teacher of knowledge in their Occupations. All the knowledgeable occupations were taught’.67 Kamakau lists the subjects and fields taught at *ka hale Aupuni* ‘the Government house’ called Pāmoa (September 23, 1865a):

\[
O \text{ ka } \text{ hana nui maloko o keia hale, o ke kakaolelo, o kalaiaina, o ka haikupuna, o ke kuauhau, o ke kaa kaua, o ke kaa laau, o ka oo-ihe, o ke kilokolo [sic: kilokilo], o ke kuhikuhi puuone, o ke Ao-hoku, o ke konane, o ke ao mele kupuna Alii a mele Alii, o ke kukini, o ka lelepali, o ka maika, o ka pahee, o ke kui, o ka uma, o ka honuhono, o ka pinao, o ka mokomoko. O na hana hooikaika kikino a pau, o ka mahiai, a me ka lawaia.}
\]

‘The great work inside this house was word-fencing/oratory, governing, the stories of the ancestors, genealogy, the conduct of war, club-fighting, spear-thrusting, omen-reading, geomancy, Astronomy, *kōnane* ‘a board game’, the teaching of the chants of the Chiefly ancestors and the Chiefs, running, cliff-jumping, bowling, dart-sliding, boxing, hand-wrestling, seated wrestling, jumping, hand-to-hand fighting. All the exercises to strengthen the body, farming, and fishing’.

Such larger institutions departed in some practices from the family model. For instance, the teacher could be assisted by one or more of his advanced pupils, like the *poʻopuaʻa* in the hula academies or the *hope kumu* ‘deputy teacher’ of a medical school (Kekahuna n.d.: 3). Curiously, in the early missionary schools, Hawaiian students objected to being taught by monitors chosen from among their fellow students, when the American teachers wanted to introduce the Lancastrian method that had been effective in the United States.68 The promotion of some students seems to have excited the jealousy of the others, and they may have perceived the missionary teachers as superior to an important degree.
Because of the existence of many experts and schools in the same field, students would travel in order to study a variety of traditions, as seen prominently in the education of Kalapana/Kaipalaoa in the contest of wits. Certain places were in fact famous for their specialties, such as Moloka‘i for net making (‘Ī‘ī January 29, 1870) and Kaua‘i for canoe building, where (Broeze 1988: 85):

the largest and most beautiful canoes that can be found in the islands were made. We were assured that the island of Atooi had always been the principal workshop of the islands in these matters.

A large number of specialties are reported about which little is known. I will concentrate on those for which there is a comparative abundance of information on education and training, discussing particular aspects of each occupation in the appropriate section.

**Farming**

Farming was the basis of the economy and a specialty of the commoners, but was practiced by chiefs as well. The practice of farming included a vast amount of practical knowledge, vocabulary, and ritual. Farming skill was emphasized and remembered, as in the case of Pāka‘a, whose plots on Moloka‘i are still pointed out. The farmer could pride himself on his expertise, calling himself in a chant *ka mahi‘ai nui* ‘the great farmer’, and a special term was used for the expert taro farmer.

**Fishing**

Fishing was also a specialty of the commoners, but constituted part of a chief’s education and was a regular part of their histories
in which the names of their teachers were often remembered.\textsuperscript{75} Such teachers could be rewarded with land as were court priests (Elbert 1959:45). The expertise of fishing is emphasized in the literature along with vocabulary and specialties within the field.\textsuperscript{76} The \textit{lawai'a nui} ‘big or head fisherman’ was a professional who occupied a regular and prestigious court position, functioned as a teacher of apprentices, and participated in the major temple ceremonies.\textsuperscript{77}

Fishing was permeated with religious beliefs and ritual practices which continued through the nineteenth century and in many cases up to the present day.\textsuperscript{78} Kalaaukumuole (November 24, 1866) describes such religious observances—prayer and the separation of menstruating women—which he carefully disavows. Iliwai (June 1, 1867) reports that a fisherman Kahelua and his wife Wailua are teaching a fishing prayer, which is in fact effective. \textit{Koʻa} ‘fishing shrines’ were regularly used.

\textbf{Canoe Making}

Canoe making was a major, prestigious profession, a local specialty and object of pride, and as such, was highly regulated: \textit{He nui no na loina akamai i ke kalai ana i ka waa} ‘Many indeed were the intelligent rules of boat carving’.\textsuperscript{79} Religious beliefs, vocabulary, literature, and practices were a prominent part of the occupation and were taught along with the craft.\textsuperscript{80} The specialty was divided into subspecialties, each of which was elaborated.\textsuperscript{81}

Kamakau (December 29, 1870) describes a \textit{kahuna kalai waa akamai lua ole} ‘boat carving expert of peerless knowledge’ who built bigger and better boats than previously known. He became a favorite of the chief, was ennobled, and was appointed \textit{i luna maluna o ka poe kahuna kalai waa a puni o Hawaii} ‘overseer over the people who were boat carving experts of all Hawai‘i’, a position analogous to that of the head fisherman.
In a series of articles published in 1922 and 1923, Kawai-kaumaiikamakaokaopua provided a detailed description of the profession as he had learned it, a description that accords with the earlier sources. I will summarize the relevant points in the author's own order. He begins by praising the profession itself (October 26, 1922):

O ke kalaiwaa, o keia kekahi o na oihana pookela loa; me ka nui o ka ike ame ka noonoo o ke poo e hiki ai keia hana.

‘Boat carving is one of the very highest occupations; a work possible only with greatness of knowledge and the active reflection of the head’.

He then provides some of the history of the profession, which demonstrates its prestige and was probably transmitted as part of the education provided by the expert; it is in fact a history of the school. A chief from Hawai‘i traveled to Maui to seek a canoe carving expert. Other chiefs offered to give him a canoe, but he wanted his own expert, a favor granted by Kamehameha I. The expert Panila left with his whole family for Hawai‘i, where he became an important person, favored by his chief, and was joined later by two other experts. The author knew Palikauoha, the son of Panila, when he was very old but still very akamai. The experts from Hawai‘i taught the profession to numerous family members and perhaps non-family as well. The author’s father was a student as was also the grandfather of Mrs. K. S. L. Desha; a man who was ke pookela ma ka ike kalaiwaa, ame kapili waa ‘the best in the knowledge of canoe carving and assembling [additions after carving]’. The author, now old, and his friend would accompany the experts.

The author now begins his description of the occupation itself. The first step was to seek the right tree in the mountains. Once there, the experts and their helpers first built a little house, which was very important. They worked always Me ke akamai,
ame ke ahahele o ka noonoo ‘With intelligence and with carefulness of thinking’. They worked religiously as well: O na kahuna kalaiwaa apau, he poe akua kalaiwaa ko lakou mai ke kuahiwi ‘All the canoe carving experts had their gods from the mountain’ all the way to the shore. There were three main gods for the occupation among whom one would choose: e koho ai i kau akua e makemake ai ‘to choose the god you want’. Indeed, the experts and their helpers had the power to do the enormous quantity of work they accomplished because they had godly help: aole i nele kekahi kahuna kalaiwaa, i ke akua ‘not a single canoe carving expert lacked a god’ (November 16, 1922).

Kawaikaumaiikamakaokapua describes the felling of a tree, using and explaining special terms, as he does elsewhere. The learning of such terms was in fact a major part of his education (February 8, 1923).

The author emphasizes the joy of expert work: o ka poe akamai, ua like keia mea he waa, me he mea paani lealea la na lakou ‘for knowledgeable people, [making] a canoe was like joyful play’ (November 23, 1922). He emphasizes also its beauty:

\[
\text{iho iho la ke ko'i kukulu, a ilaila oe e ike ai i ka poe akamai i ke kau o ka pa-ka o ke ko'i kukulu aole uuku a nunui kekahi pa-ka he like loa, a he nani oe ke nana aku.}
\]

‘the straight-edged adz would descend, and there you would see the knowledgeable people in the settling of the shaving produced by the adz: one shaving wasn’t big and the other small; they were all alike and beautiful for you to see’.

The author then describes in great detail a religious ceremony with an adz prayer that mentions the postcontact anvil (December 7, 1922a). Traditional sacrifices were offered by the canoe carving expert and a prayer was made to all three occupational gods for knowledge and power. Nonetheless the author states that he was taught that the old tabus were no longer in force: a noa ae la no
hoi, ke ano o ke aʻo kahuna kalaiwaa ana o ka wa kahiko, i koʻu aʻo ana ‘the character of the teaching of the canoe carving expert is now noa ‘non-sacred’, as I was taught’. The reader should note that this elaborate ceremony was being performed for an ordinary canoe, not one for a special purpose or extraordinarily large.

The author then describes the rule that if a bird pecks at a tree, it is hollow. He finds it odd that God would give this knowledge to a soulless bird, but not to a human being with an immortal soul. After this Christian speculation, he provides the name chant for the goddess Lea.

Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua then describes the first carving of the log, again using the traditional terms (December 7, 1922b). This work also was done with godly help: o Kupaaikeʻee aku ka mea nana e hoomaikai a palahinu ‘Kūpāʻaikeʻe was the person who made it good until it was polished’. The author went with other students to the mountain forest to join the experts. When he was there, the experts asked him if he wanted to learn. When he assented, his own father gave him religious instruction, telling him about the three gods and the need for him to choose one: Aia no nae i ka mea a kou manao e lana ana ‘There is indeed the one in whom you can hope’. Two of the gods were male, but he chose the third, the female Lea. The author’s father worked under the experts’ gaze as their teaching assistant; the word used is pookahuna, which recalls the head student, poʻopuaʻa, of the hula academies. The father sent his son to the shore to fetch items to be used in a ceremony, which would make their mountain work fruitful.

The author describes the felling of a tree with its rula ‘rules’, part practical, part ceremonial. Throughout, Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua emphasizes the loina ‘rules’ of the profession, as seen above. Indeed, all the work in the mountain must be correct for the subsequent work to be correct on shore (December 14, 1922).
The author now explains seven terms for kinds of trees, differentiated by shape. His descriptions follow a regular form. Such forms were used in Hawaiian education in order to transmit information in more easily memorizable form. The description starts with the phrase *O ka laau e ku pololei ana* ‘The tree that is standing straight’; *pi‘o* ‘curved’ is used once instead of *pololei*. The description is then given followed by a comma and, with some variations, *ua kapaia aku ia laau waa he* . . . ‘this boat tree is called a . . .’; the particular term is then provided. This discussion ends with a sentence that recalls terminations of formal lists: *O keia mau mea i hoikeia ae la maluna he mau inoa ia i kapaia no ke ano o ka laau* ‘These things shown above are names by which indeed the type of the tree is called’.

Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua then describes the dragging of the log from the mountain to the shore, with the accompanying calls and chants (December 21, 1922; January 11, 1923). He again emphasizes the joy of the work: *O keia hana o ka huki waa, he mea lealea loa kei i kekahi poe* . . . ‘This work of pulling the boat was a very joyful thing for some people’ (January 11, 1923). The author learned a particular task: *Ua a‘o au i ke pale waa ana* ‘I learned canoe-warding’. This seems to consist of occasionally pushing the log, so that it does not bump into things; the task required someone young and quick, who could jump rapidly from one place to another. As they were descending, he kept calling from the front, and the person in back kept listening to him. The author states that he did this in 1890 and gives the name of the expert (January 11, 1923).

The logs were soaked in the sea for several weeks and then pulled out and carved. Among the specialists involved in the production of the canoes were the makers of sennit cord used to lash the canoe (February 1, 1923b): *he poe okoa no ia e hana ana i na puluniu, a he kakaikahi loa oia poe i a‘o i ka hana ahapuluniu* ‘this was a separate people that was working with the coconut husks,
and very few indeed were the people who learned sennit making’ (January 18, 1923). They were paid very highly with a pig. This is another example of the intensity of Hawaiian specialization; the making of sennit cord is a common practice in Sāmoa.

The author describes the lolo ‘brain’ or dedication ceremony for the finished canoe (February 8, 1923). The experts ate the head or brain of the pig, and a prayer was made to the gods of the profession, in which the words were said: *Ua paa ka waa, a e hoolanaia aku ana i ke kai, o kona aina ia e huli ai i ka loaa ame ka waiwai* ‘The boat is firmly fixed and is floated out onto the sea; this is its land in which to seek gain and riches’.

**Star Lore, Navigation, Watercrafts**

Knowledge of stars was important for many reasons including practical and religious calendrical activities, omen reading, and navigation; functions that constituted parts of the education in the field and that were often joined. For instance, Kamakau states (July 13, 1865):

_Eia ke kumu i ao ai ke Kilo Hoku. Ua ike i ka manawa e hiki mai ai ka pilikia, ke kaua, ke auhulihia o ke Aupuni, ka mai ahulau, ka wi, ka make; a me ke ola._

‘Here is the reason for studying star observation. He saw the time when trouble would come, war, the overturning of the government, epidemic, famine, death and life’.

Kamakau adds a cautionary tale about a *Kahuna Kilo*, ‘[Star] Observation Expert’ who warned Kamehameha I against invading Kaua’i; when his warning was ignored, the army being prepared for the invasion was afflicted with a famous epidemic. Star knowledge also had a very practical function: *Ua ao ia he Kilo Hoku no ka hokele moana, i makaukau no ka holo ana i . . . ‘Star
Observation was taught for navigating on the ocean, to be prepared to travel to other places.

Similarly, Nākuina describes knowledgeable navigators (1902a:30):

\[ua maopopo hoi ia laua na loina a pau o ia hana. He ike hoi ko laua i na ouli o ka lani a me ka honua, ka la malie a me ka la ino . . .\]

‘all the rules of this work were also clear to the two of them. They had knowledge of the signs of the sky and the earth, the calm day and the stormy day . . .’

Although everyone was expected to have a general competence in star knowledge and its applications, expertise was highly appreciated, and experts, such as the chief Hoapili, were famous. Expertise could also be a family specialty. Pāka’a teaches navigation to his son, and their two opponents for the position of court steersman are brothers.

The detailed information available on education in star knowledge and navigation demonstrates that it followed the normal pattern of classical Hawaiian education. A special, named house was the site of education. The single teacher accepted students from the age of ten or older. Stars and their positions and loina ‘rules’ were taught with the aid of a gourd, and a gourd was also used in navigation (Johnson and Mahelona 1975:72 f., 155 ff., 145, 147). The names of stars and terms used in navigation were a prominent part of the curriculum (Johnson and Mahelona 1975: 72 f., 143, 146–149, 155 ff.). These words were arranged in lists. To each star was attached a mo’olelo ‘story or report’, which would include such information as the origin of its name, stories connected with special uses, such as navigation and omens, and practical information; some of these mo’olelo have been lost. ‘Īī’s (April 16, 30, 1870) stories related to water knowledge are probably examples of such reports; they provide models or illustrations of the general
points he makes. Other verbal information was transmitted in a stereotyped or regular form to facilitate memorization (Kamakau August 5, 1865, paragraphs 6–9). After instruction inside the house was completed, the students were taken outside by the teacher at night, lay on their back, and identified the stars in the sky.

This knowledge was then applied to navigation: *E ao oe i na loina o ka moana* ‘You learn the rules of the ocean’; for instance, the days when the current rises *i luna* ‘up’ and when it breaks *i lalo* ‘down’ (Kamakau August 5, 1865). With such knowledge, one will be *mākaukau* ‘ready, prepared’ to navigate; *E lolo oe i kau mau oihana i ao ai i paanaau ia oe* ‘You will be an expert/graduate in your different occupations learned and memorized by you’. You will also be helped by the power of the Christian God as you sail the dangerous ocean. That is, expertise is the basis of safety, and godly help is needed in special situations. ‘Ī’ī (April 16, 1870) affirms that much was known about stars because they were a subject of education and encourages training in modern navigation.

Most if not all aspects of watercraft could become specialties. Everyone needed to have some knowledge of the winds, but Kamehameha II had *na mea nana makani* ‘the people who looked at the winds’, who climbed mountains and hills to observe them better (‘Ī’ī January 15, 1870). Everyone needed to be able to right an overturned canoe, but the task could be formalized with *kānāwai* ‘laws’, taught formally, and in practice directed by an expert, as was done at Kamehameha I’s court and to his son Liho-liho (‘Ī’ī April 2, 1870).

Similarly, children learned in their play to paddle, but they could also receive special instruction from parents (‘Ī’ī July 31, 1869). Paddling could also be formalized with a vocabulary and *loina* and *kānāwai*, which could differ among experts and were appreciated.90 Stories were told of famous paddlers—cautionary ones for their mistakes and tales of their famous deeds, in which they displayed their expertise (‘Ī’ī April 30, 1870). A good paddler
could become the favorite of a king and be given lands. Expert paddling could be an element of group display, for instance, in the famous visit of Kalani‘ōpu‘u to the ship of James Cook, depicted by the ship’s artist John Webber. Kamehameha was formally instructed in paddling (ʻĪʻī April 30, 1870):

_O na kanawai nae no ka hoe ana, he mea mau no ia i ka wa kahiko, a ua ao ia o Kamehameha I., ma ia ano a akamai_

‘The laws of paddling were always practiced in the olden time, and Kamehameha I was taught in this way until he was knowledgeable’.

Watercrafts were considered intellectual occupations, and such words as _akamai_ ‘intelligent, knowledgeable’ and _ma'alea_ ‘clever’ are used in praise or denied in criticism.91

**Sports**

Sports were and continue to be extremely popular in Hawaiian culture and are mentioned frequently in the literature, both narrative and expository.92 Sports, and especially surfing, were indeed so popular that they could tempt people away from their duties, later inviting the condemnation of missionaries.93 Sports were also a subject for origin stories, stories of experts, chants, and sayings.94 Sports prowess was a reason for pride and fame, and success could involve godly help.95

The importance of education in a sport can be illustrated by reports about surfing. Surfing was generally practiced and was important for water safety. Surfing was also considered an activity that had different types and _loina_ ‘rules’ and required knowledge and intelligence.96 As such, it included ritual and was taught both in the family and at court; _‘ailolo_ ‘graduate’ can be used of an expert.97 Indeed, one of the purposes of surfing expertise, as
of other types of knowledge, was display, *hō‘ike*, even competition, and crowds would watch surfing appreciatively and indulge in betting. Expertise could, therefore, render the surfer famous, as in the case of Kamehameha I and II, Ka‘ahumanu, and others, and surfboards were handed down proudly in families.

‘Ī‘ī reports on Kamehameha I being taught surfing by his kahu ‘guardians’ and by a famous expert (February 27, 1869; May 14, 1870). A local expert taught Ka‘ahumanu to surf a certain area by making signals with a flag from shore (May 14, 1870). As in other fields, education in surfing required learning the pertinent names and terms, for instance, *Na ano nalu a me na inoa* ‘The kinds of waves and the names’. These were arranged in lists such as of boards and of surfs by location, description, and name along with occasional related local stories. The student had also to learn to observe the surf, checking its height by signs. Indeed, experts from another area would sit out the big waves and watch *na keiki kamaaina o ua nalu la* ‘the local children who were familiar with that surf’ (‘Ī‘ī May 14, 1870). Mistakes were fatal, so surfing education was serious.

**Martial Arts**

The martial arts were a major activity in classical Hawai‘i, and chiefs took care to maintain the conditioning not only of their experts, but of their general population as well, both for possible mobilization and for character building. In a war between territorial chiefs, the entire able-bodied adult population could fight, including women and all classes (Ellis 1984:124 f., 149 f., 152 f.). Similarly, in England from the time of Edward III to Henry VIII, archery practice was compulsory on Sundays and holidays.

Sports such as running, *pahe‘e* ‘dart-sliding’, and *ke‘a pua*—exercising with sugarcane tassels used as darts or spears—were
related to martial arts and were played by both children and adults. This may have been true also of rat shooting, although bows and arrows were not used against human beings (Kamakau September 23, 1865a). Indeed, running was an important part of warfare, and a sham battle could be conducted with tassels (Golovnin 1979:187). Children would fight among themselves, both spontaneously and informally and in imitation of formal contests. For instance, 'Ī'ī and his friends watched the boxing during the annual Makahiki festival, and 'Ī'ī provides an important report. People would leave everything and rush to watch the boxers, who were usually known and even famous and seem to have belonged to different schools. The crowd would cry out during the contest, and boxing fans would follow the Makahiki procession to watch more contests. Enthused, 'Ī'ī and his friends set up little imitation Makahiki gods and held formalized contests among themselves.

Similarly, children had rock fights that involved large numbers of participants, could result in children being hurt, and could establish a child’s reputation as a fighter. A whole community of adults could also be ordered to conduct a rock fight, so that the chiefs could evaluate their skill in throwing and dodging and thus their readiness for battle. Such general competence in rock fighting was deadly, as it was in Sāmoa when I was there in the early 1970s. In the nineteenth-century Kaona revolt, a group of men throwing stones was able to drive away a posse armed with guns, killing one of its members. In the subsequent inquiry, the question of premeditation turned on whether the stones had been stockpiled or were simply picked up from the ground for the occasion.

Rock fighting was also a martial art with conventional organization and training. A grandfather could teach the ‘ai ‘strokes, points’ in the family (“Kaao Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” June 14, 1911:13f.). Specialists in the art were known and could display their prowess in combat and exhibition matches, accompanied
by the usual literature like taunts (“Kaao Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” February 7, 1912: 18; February 14, 1912: 16 f.).

Similarly, children played at spear fighting, and everyone learned to handle and dodge spears and appreciate displays of prowess and contests; it was also important in actual combat. The art was also considered an ‘oihana ‘ike ‘knowledgeable occupation’ and as such was the subject of formal instruction, especially at court, and was attended by religious practices. Such instruction involved the organization of verbal materials into lists, notably the spear lists that occur often in descriptions of combat, and other literature. A dance performed by the hula academy of Hoakalei Kamau’u, the Hālau Hula o Hoakalei, seemed to be based on spear exercises, with thrusting and parrying in rhythm. The ‘ailolo ‘graduation ceremony’ involved a real combat, not a mock one (Anonymous November 18, 1865).

Like other fields, the martial arts were developed beyond general competence into a large number of specialties, each of which was professionalized. One could be an expert in one field but not another, and completeness of education was an ideal both within a specialty and in knowing as many specialties as possible. Martial expertise was particularly important for chiefs and constituted a large part of their training and of the traditions about them, including the names of their teachers.

A martial art was, therefore, an ‘oihana ‘ike ‘knowledgeable occupation’, with its kānāwai ‘laws’ and loina ‘rules’. Martial contests were called hoʻopāpā, and intellectual terms were applied to experts. Koko (June 19, 1865) even applies the important phrase he Hawaii imi loa ‘far-seeking Hawai’i’ to activities in the martial arts.

As with other important occupations, certain families and places could specialize in martial arts and education in them. Students would learn in the family and, if selected, could be sent to non-family experts (for Polynesia, see Buck 1931: 57). Selection
was based on observed aptitude, body type, and omens (Fornander 1919–1920: 147ff.).

Schools were usually taught by one master at a designated site. Characteristically, when Kamehameha I gathered three major experts to teach lua ‘hand-to-hand fighting’ at his court, he established separate sites where each one could teach according to his own laws (‘Ī‘i October 16, 1869). In the same way, Kamehameha had gathered gods of conquered territories, each with its own kahu ‘keeper’. One school had twenty-four students from the court. Training lasted two months, and ‘Ī‘i praises the knowledge of the teachers, which was traditionally Hawaiian and untouched by foreign ways. When Kamehameha left the locality, he closed the schools (‘Ī‘i January 15, 1870). Similarly, the spear fighting taught at Kamehameha’s court had more rules than the individual schools and was perhaps an amalgamation of several schools (‘Ī‘i August 7, 1869). Gideona La’anui (March 14, 1838) describes briefly his martial arts training at the court: he and his kahu were trained in a special house called Kaihekukui ‘The Kukui Spear’ separated by a fence, and the name of their teacher was Keauhulikuli. Students would travel to different schools to study (‘Ī‘i May 15, 1869).

As in other fields, names and terms—for pieces of equipment, strokes, holds, and so on—were a large part of the education and could be organized into lists for memorization. A number of subject lists, many of which are similar, show the organization of the field:

*na hooukakaua nui a me na kaua el[elo?]lua, na kaua poipo, na kaua moemoe, na kaua powa, o na kaua hoohaehae, o na kaua hoohalua . . .

‘large scale attacks and double-pronged battle formations, night attacks, ambushes, raids for plunder, battles of decoying and deception, traps’. (Kamakau December 28, 1867; some glosses are uncertain)
‘Kakuihewa was educated in the things of war: spear throwing, club fighting, backwards throwing, rear guarding, cutting, slinging, thrusting’. 118

“Kao Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki” provides a subject list for dodging (February 14, 1912:17): *pela no hoi ka lua ole o ka ike a me ke kuliu o Ka-Miki ma ka alo, ka lele ame ka palemo, a pakelo elike me ka olal[i] o ke ale ‘thus indeed was the peerlessness of the knowledge and depth of Ka-Miki in dodging, jumping, and ducking, and he was slippery like the slickness of a wave’. Other literary forms were connected to the martial arts, such as taunting, victory chants, and sayings. 119 Physical training was naturally an important part of education in the martial arts, as will be seen below. Education in the martial arts concluded with a formal graduation ceremony, the ‘ailolo, which usually involved displaying one’s expertise in combat. 120

Display was indeed one of the prime activities in the martial arts and took many forms, from informal contests (Elbert 1959: 35 ff.) to highly organized ones. Several contests are described in “Kao Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki.” In one (April 10, 1912:14 ff.), the opponent is a woman, Kamaoa, who is both an expert in the contest of wits and a martial artist. After a round of the ho’opāpā, they proceed to the martial arts. She invites them into the house to contend in *mokomoko ‘hand-to-hand fighting’. The protagonists refuse the food she offers before the contest. The contest is accompanied by literary forms, such as chants and taunts, and each side *mahalo ‘appreciates’ and praises the other with traditional praise terms: ‘ike, ikaika, miki, ‘eleu, and mākaukau. Ka-Miki wins with godly help and by using *ka ai hoopau a kuu kumu hoopapa aiwaiwa ‘the terminating stroke of my marvelous ho’opāpā teacher’. The knowledge of the loser is ho’oha’aha’a ‘brought low’.
A more formal contest is described in another installment (June 21, 1912:13 ff.). A large crowd, the ‘aha le'ale'a ‘crowd of pleasure’, is gathered in an open place ‘kahua le'ale'a ‘field of pleasure’, to watch the contest. The contest is directed by the luna o ka lā ‘overseer of the day or marshal’, nana e malama na lealea o ka la/ nana e malama na hana o ka la ‘whose it is to care for the pleasure of the day/whose it is to care for the work of the day’. The marshal begins each round by kāhea ‘calling out’ to the mohō ‘contestants’. The marshal also announces the sport to be played, the rules to be followed, the rewards or punishments, and the winners. The contest is accompanied by literary forms, such as boasts and taunts. The winner uses his favorite thrust and godly help. Winners are mahalo ‘appreciated’ and praised with conventional terms—‘eleu, ikaika, maka'ala, ‘ike, miki, and koa—and win rewards and honor. The loser is ho'oha'aha'a ‘brought low’. The teacher of the winner is very proud. In his narrative, the author uses motifs, such as locals versus newcomers and young heroes versus older experts, and explains the old weapons.

People would travel to display their prowess against local champions. Prowess was displayed also in battle and in mock battles used for training and as part of the annual Makahiki ceremony. ‘Ī‘ī uses the expression ke kaua pā'ani ‘game battle’, and Kamakau (August 26, 1865:1) uses the expressions ka pahukala and ke kaua pahukala for such encounters. Audiences would appreciate the prowess displayed, and a martial artist could win great fame and reward. Mehe‘ula, the Lunakoa ‘head warrior’ of Kalani‘ōpu‘u, had a story or report told about him that received the title “na kui a Meheula” ‘the blows of Mehe‘ula’ (‘Ī‘ī February 6, 1869). Such fame clearly reflected on the artist’s teacher, whose name could live on through the student (“He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” January 6, 1921). ‘Ī‘ī, speaking of Kekūhaupi‘o, he hoa ao pale ihe pu no hoi me Kamehameha ‘a companion of Kamehameha in learning how to ward off spears’, states (February 6, 1869):
Ua kaulana pu aku no hoi me Kamehameha kana hanai, mamuli hoi o ke akamai o ke kumu, nana i ao ia laua i ka alo ihe.

‘He indeed became famous along with Kamehameha, his ward, because of the knowledge of the teacher, who taught the two spear dodging’.

Similarly, great fights could be remembered along with their winning strokes, and even be the source of a place name (Kamakau August 26, 1865:1). The stories and educational lineages of such champions would constitute a history of the field to be transmitted to students (e.g., “He Moolelo Kaa o Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” December 23, 1920). Such stories continued with postcontact weapons (e.g., Fornander 1918–1919:501 ff.).

As in any field in which performance is important, the martial artist had to apply his knowledge to a particular situation or opponent. War experts based their judgements on historical examples (Malo xxxviii 81). A hand-to-hand fighter had to be able to counter a hold he did not know (“He Moolelo Kaa o Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” February 3, 1921). New fighting methods could be developed, such as the mākini “many points.” Hawaiians fighting in the Civil War in the Negro units—the Hawaiians were considered ‘ili ‘ula’ula ‘redskins’—reportedly taught their fellow soldiers to dig holes to escape gunfire (Koko June 19, 1865). Hawaiians had early begun learning Western warfare while continuing their traditional exercises as well (e.g., King 1989:51, 94 [1824 and 1825]). Creativity was thus an integral part of the martial arts.

The need for godly help is also prominent in the literature. Such religious activities as omen reading and rituals were important in the conduct of war. Favorable omens were needed to accept a student and to graduate one in spear fighting (Fornander 1919–1920:147 ff.). At the graduation ceremony for Kamehameha and Kekūhaupi’o, a prophecy was made that came true (‘Ī‘ī February 6, 1869).
An examination of the comparatively abundant literature on lua ‘bone breaking hand-to-hand combat’ reveals the interconnection of all the above aspects of education in the martial arts. In order to give the reader an example of Hawaiian exposition, I will follow the series “Ka Oihana Lua a Hawaii Lahui” July 12–August 2, 1923, supplementing it with earlier sources. The author begins by stating (July 12, 1923):

*O ka oihana lua (ha’iha’i) a na kupuna i kaulana, he oihana ia i a’o kumu ia, a ailolo, a he akua ko keia poe i ailolo i keia hana, i kapaia kona inoa, o Ku’ialua*

‘The lua occupation ([bone] breaking) done by the ancestors was famous. It was an occupation that was taught by a teacher until graduation, and there was a god of these people who graduated in this work: his name was called Ku’ialua [Blow of the Lua].’

Hale’ole (Fornander 1919–1920:149 ff.) emphasizes the role of the *kumu lua* ‘lua teacher’ as well as the need for the student to obey him strictly. S. W. Nailiili (June 5, 1865) writes of the famous teacher Kahimakanalele, *Ua koho ia mai oia i kumu ao lua no Kauai a puni, a ua nui kana mau haumana i ao ai* ‘He was chosen to be the lua teacher of all Kaua‘i, and many were the students that he taught’. The art could also be a specialty of a family or a place.128 The name of the god was well known (e.g., “No na Kahuna Hawaii” n.d.:564). Hale’ole (Fornander 1919–1920:151) states that the god had to be strictly obeyed or he would punish the student. Omens were crucial for selection; when the skin cracked on the part of the pig assigned to Hale’ole in the divination ceremony, the teacher told him, *aole hiki ia’u ke ao, ua ino ka lolo* ‘I cannot teach you; the brain/ceremony was bad’. Before instruction, the student would stamp his feet outside the house as a form of worship of the god; the teacher would stamp his feet in response and admit the student. Ka’awa (April 27, 1865) states that the student must learn
three things, the kāina or ‘ai ‘strokes’, the puka ‘escapes from holds’, and the pule i ke akua aumakua ‘prayers to the ancestral god’ of the lua.

The author of “Ka Oihana Lua a Hawaii Lahui” (July 12, 1923) states that he does not know the origin of lua, but probably ua hookumuia no ia ike iwaena o keia lahui mai ke akua mai ‘this knowledge was founded in this people from the god’, that is Ku‘ialua. Kaua‘i was famous as a place for lua, and the author tells a story of a famous Kaua‘i lua expert beaten by the Hawai‘i expert Pe‘ape‘amakawalu. He mentions other such stories, revealing the existence of a history of the art like those of other branches of the martial arts and other professions (e.g., Fornander 1918–1919: 499 ff.).

Education was conducted mai ka wa kamalii mai ‘from childhood’ while the body was still ‘olu ‘supple’; a stiff body would break when bent. Other authors mention a type of body called moa lawa ‘husky chicken’ or lawa ‘husky’ that was considered appropriate for lua.129

The author of the series then provides a formal list of the three subjects he was taught (July 12, 1923):

Introduction, He ekolu ano . . . i keia hana ‘Three types . . . in this work’; he then provides a list—with the numbers written out in Hawaiian, ka mua, . . . ka elua . . . ka ekolu, . . .—of the three ‘ano he was taught: ka lalau ana me ka lima ‘seizing with the hand’, ka ohi‘u ana me ke kookoo kauila ‘poking with the staff of kauila wood’, ka hoohei ana me ka laau i kapaia he Pikoi (Ikoi) ‘snaring with the stick called pikoī’.

Snaring is mentioned elsewhere as a part of lua (Fornander 1919–1920:149). This list is an example of a prominent part of lua education as well as other fields: the development of a terminology and the organization of terms and phrases into lists.130

Such terms, often poetic, constitute a major part of the series under discussion and are used by the author in his descriptions.
In the installment of July 19, 1923, he starts a long list of terms that continues into the third installment of August 2, 1923, and includes ninety-nine items. He begins with the introduction, *Eia ka inoa o na ai a ka lua hopu lima i kapaia e ka poe lua* ‘Here are the names of the strokes of the *lua* of grasping with the hands as called by the *lua* people’. He gives a lengthy explanation only of the first and then begins his list again with another introduction, *Eia na inoa o na ai lua a na kupuna i kapa ai* ‘Here are the names of the *lua* strokes as called by the ancestors’. Each item consists of a name and is numbered with an arabic numeral followed by dash. At the end of his list, he states:

*Aia no paha he mau ai i koe o na inoa mai keia papa inoa aku, a oiai he nui na halau i a’oia ai keia ike iwaena o keia lahui, pela like ole ai na ike i loaa, a pela no hoi i puka ai ka lakou olelo o i [sic: ‘oia] hoi e, hookahi halau i a’o ai.*

*Ma kekahi mau ai lua he like no na holo ana o ka ai, a ma ka inoa nae, okoa i kekahi.*

‘There are very probably some strokes the names of which were left out of this table of names, and since there were many academies in which this knowledge was taught among this people, thus the knowledges obtained were not alike; thus indeed was uttered their saying, that is, [about there not being] “just one academy in which it is taught.”

‘With some *lua* strokes, the application of the stroke was the same, but just in the name, some were separate’.

The author makes further remarks about the names listed—some strokes were for staff fighting and some for fighting with tapa—and adds the name of another staff stroke.

The explanation of the first item—similar to the *mo’olelo* ‘reports’ connected to stars—illustrates the information that was attached to such terms. The Kaohaimoeoe is described as *ka pahapaha (olelo hole’ale’a) imua o ke anaina aha kanaka e nana ana i na mea e lawelawe ana ia hana* ‘the spontaneous chant
(rejoicing statement) before the assembly of people gathered to watch the persons taking up this work’ (July 19, 1923). The chant was apparently performed when the contestant made a successful move: *Penei ka paha kepakepa a ka mea e holo ana i ka ai lua* ‘Thus the rapid chant of the person applying the lua stroke’.
The author then quotes the chant, the first line of which is *A, o Kaohaimoee, ka ai* ‘The stroke is Kaohaimoee’. The name of the stroke is used both for the chant and apparently for the whole procedure.

The chant continues (August 2, 1923) with the contestant’s naming himself, boasting that he will win, and taunting his opponent. As explained by the author, this chant involves the praise of the contestant’s teacher: *he mau huaolelo no hoi e hapai ana i ka inoa o ka mea nana i a’o iaia a ike* ‘words indeed that raise up the name of the person who taught him until he was knowledgeable’.

In the chant can be found the lines *Helu au i na ai a kuu kumu a lau* ‘I count the strokes of my teacher until I reach very many’ and, referring to himself in the last line of the chant, *Na ka haumana Olohe lua a Kuioiomooa* ‘By the Expert lua student of Kuioiomooa’, probably the name of the teacher. Other literary forms were connected to lua, such as the stories mentioned above.\(^{131}\)

The author of “*Ka Oihana Lua a Hawaii Lahui*” (July 12, 1923) states that lua fighters did not wear clothes and bound up their loincloths or skirts, so that their opponents would not be able to grab them.

*O na haumana o ia ka pahuku, a o ke kumu o ia ka mea holo i ka ai lua, me ka haha’i mai ia oe i ka inoa o ka ai, ke ano o kou hopu ana, ka hookulana ana o kou kino, ka hoalu ana, ame ka wili ana i kahi e paa ai ia oe o kau pahuku.*

‘The students were the target, and the teacher was the person who performed the *’ai lua* ‘lua stroke’, with the announcement to you of the name of the stroke, the way you were grasped, the
placement of your body, the slackening, and the twisting to a place where your target could be held fast by you’.

The students were also taught to lay someone across their thighs and to crush their testicles.

_Aia a pau na ai i ka paanaau ia oe ame kou mau hoa, a ike ke kumu ua makaukau oe i ka holo ana i ka ai, a mimo hoi ke kiina me ka nunununu ole, alaila a’o mai ke kumu i ka wehe ana o keia ai, kela ai i a’o ai ia oe, me kou mau hoa, i kuma [sic: kumu] e hiki ai ia oe ke wehe i ka paa i manaoia_

‘When all the strokes had been memorized by you and your companions and the teacher saw that you were ready to apply the stroke and also that the stroke was capable and without grunting; then the teacher would teach the opening up of this or that stroke/hold that he had taught you along with your companions, so that you would be able to open up the firm hold planned [for you]’.

This same sequence of training and memorizing is described by Ekaula (April 13, 1865).

Instruction could last for a long time: _Aole no he pokole o ka manawa e a’o ai i keia hana, he mau mahina loihī, eono a eiwa paha_ ‘The time in which this work was taught was not short: several long months, perhaps six or nine’. Instruction could in fact continue for years if the teacher felt the student was not mākaukau ‘ready’.

_Aia a ike ke kumu, ua like pu ka ike o na haumana me kona, alaila a’o i ka ai laau_ ‘At the point where the teacher saw that the knowledge of the students was equal to his, then he taught the strokes with a staff’. But he did not teach them the stroke of Kawelo and his wife, another instance of the use of historical examples in education.32 _He nui na ai a ka lua iloko o keia wahi laau kookoo_ . . . ‘Many are the strokes of _lua_ related to this wooden
staff’, each of which has its own *loina* ‘rules’ (July 19, 1923). The *inoa kaulana* ‘famous names’ of the strokes appear in literature: *e ikeia nei ia mau olelo iloko o na kanikau ame na moolelo o kekahī mea i haalele mai i keia noho ana (make)* ‘these words/names are seen inside the dirges and the stories of some people who have left this residence (are dead)’. The rules of the strokes of snaring with the *pīkoi* were separate. The author explains some of them and refers again to the story of Kawelo and his wife, naming the stroke by which their famous opponent was snared and the club stroke with which he was killed, along with the name of the club itself. He then quotes a chant in which such names are used. The rhetoric or poetry of the martial arts is used throughout the series. A stroke named *koupu* is the final one learned and is used for displays of expertise before an ‘*aha leʻaleʻa* ‘pleasure assembly’.

After witnessing such a demonstration, the audience recognizes the skill of the practitioner: *e kapaia ai e ke anaina he olohe lua, a papahi ia aku hoi ka inoa hoohanohano nona o Kapuhiinuwai* ‘he was named by the assembly a lua expert, and the glorious name Kapuhiinuwai was also conferred on him’. Another stroke is described, which is connected to a name or saying.

The author then broaches the important topic of the *kānāwai* ‘laws’ of *lua* education:

_Elike me ke ano o ke aʻo (kula) ana a ka Hawai, he mau rula (kanawai) ko ke aʻo ana, a e malama loa oe ia mau rula kauoha kanawai._

_I na no e haki ia oe kekahi huna iki o ia mau rula (kanawai) e uku ana oe i ka puaa no ia wahi anuu liilii._

_Ina aole oe e uku elike, me ka olelo a ke kumu, aole e aʻo mai ana ke kumu ia oe._

‘Just like the character of education (school) of the Hawaiian, there were a number of rules (laws) of teaching and learning, and you observed most carefully these several law command rules.

‘If some little part of these rules (laws) was broken by you, you
would pay a pig for this little sacrificial platform. ‘If you did not pay according to the statement of the teacher, the teacher would not teach you’.

Other writers emphasize similarly the importance of the laws of learning *lua* (Kekahuna n.d: 1). Haleʻole writes *He nui na kanawai kapu o ke akua o ka oihana lua* ‘Many were the tabu laws of the god of the *lua* occupation’; if a practitioner broke one, he would be punished by the god (Fornander 1919–1920: 151; also 149).

The author of “Ka Oihana Lua a Hawaii Lahui” (July 19, 1923) emphasizes that all the laws of the profession had to be followed until the student was ready for graduation. At that point, the teacher would order the students to seek a *puʻaʻa kumulau* for the graduation ceremony, a pig that had borne many offspring to ensure that *i lau ka ike, lau ka makaukau, lauahi na lima i ka hopu ana e ma ka hoa pale* ‘the knowledge would be much, the readiness would be much, the hands would wreak much destruction in grasping the resisting companion’. Both wordplay and symbolism are involved in the choice of sacrifice. The author writes of a second graduation ceremony:

{o ia ka lolo i ka onohi maka o ko kanaka, a o ia lolo, na ke akua ia o keia oihana lua i kapaaia e ko Hawaii lahui, o Kuʻialua, a no keia lolo onohi maka, ka mea i puka ai o ia olelo a kahiko, “o ka onohi kaʻu o kahi [sic: kahe?] walewale.”

‘This was the graduation with the eyeball of your human being, and this graduation/offering was done by/for the god of this *lua* occupation, called by the Hawaiian people Kuʻialua. It was because of this eyeball graduation that this saying was uttered of old: “the eyeball I have taken is just jelly/flows jelly”’.

The saying is similar to a threat used in the contest of wits, discussed in chapter IV. Ekaula (April 13, 1865) writes that the student was instructed until he was *akamai* ‘knowledgeable’. At the graduation ceremony, a pig was divided among all the students. The
A graduating student had to kill a man to show his skill. He would then give the corpse to the teacher, who would poke its eyes with a lava rock (perhaps a play on the body type called lawa) to get the walewale ‘jelly’, which was drunk by those at the ceremony. Not all schools followed this whole ceremony. Hale’ole, writing against Ekaula, denies any cannibalism in the ceremony (April 24, 1865): He oiaio, ua olelo na kumulua a makou, “o ka lolo hope loa, he kanaka.” Aole nae he ai i ke kanaka ‘It is true that our lua teachers said “the last brain/graduation is a human being.” But this is not an eating of a human being’. It meant rather that the combat at the graduation, the ‘ailolo ‘brain eating’, was successful if the opponent was hurt or fell. Hale’ole (Fornander 1919–1920:149) mentions also an earlier ceremony with ka pua’a hōailona ‘the omen pig’; after ten days of instruction, the ceremony would be held to ascertain by omens whether the training should continue.

The prayer for the graduation ceremony described in “Ka Oihana Lua a Hawai‘i Lahui” was ‘awa’a‘awa ‘bitter’; the author provides kekahi mau lalani o ka pule lolo maka onohi kanaka ‘some lines of the human eyeball graduation prayer’, which addresses the god and includes many lua terms and the line: Ho mai he ike i ike nui ‘Grant knowledge, great knowledge’ or ‘Grant knowledge so that knowledge be great’ (Noenoe Silva).

The author feels such information is important and should be passed on to the new generations. The author himself could not write of these things if he had not been an eyewitness to them. In fact he learned them from his grandfather and practiced them, although he abandoned his study before he graduated.

In his explanation of the first item in the long list of lua terms discussed above, the author describes a display contest. A place would be full of ka poe makaikai ‘sightseers’ (August 2, 1923). The contestants, all graduates, would not stay outside but enter keia kahua le‘ale‘a . . . iloko no o ka hale nui akea i haliia i ka moena ‘this pleasure field . . . inside the big, wide house that was spread with mats’.
This *lua* display entertainment was called an eyewitness-assembly stroke and included the encouraging chanted song statements that the person recounted who was applying the *lua* stroke to his companion.

But if he did not succeed and was held in turn by his opponent, *o ia ka wa o kona hoa e paha iho ai i kana mau olelo kaena, a hoike i ka inoa o kana kumu a'o* ‘that was the time for his companion to chant his boasting statement and to display the name of his teacher’.

*‘There are inside these spontaneous chants performed by these people a number of important, traditional flowings of the language, showing the dazzling and deep character of the meaning of these words.’*

These songs were difficult to understand in the author’s day.

In front of the assembly, the author continues, the contestants seemed as soft as cats, but if you met them in a lonely place, they would seem like lions or Bengal tigers. Because of this character, they were called *he po'e pōwā* ‘robbing, plundering people’. Motives for learning *lua* varied: *o kekahi poe no ke ake i ka waiwai, a o kekahi poe no ka hookelakela ike* ‘some people indeed because of the desire for riches, and some for the excelling and display of knowledge’. The moral use of *lua* was a crucial topic, and a teacher could be praised for using his knowledge only in positive ways (“He Moolelo Kaaio no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” December 23, 1920).
After his discussion of the long list of stroke names discussed above, the author returns to education in *lua*, emphasizing its completeness:

*e a'o ana oia i na ike apau o ka alo maka ihe, ka pololu ke Kaala, ake ka ma-kini, aia a makaukau ke kanaka me ia mau ike, alaila ua lehia oia he koa*

‘he was teaching all the different knowledges—dodging the point of the spear, the long spear, the Sling, and the bunched spears. When the person was prepared with these different knowledges, then he was expert, a warrior’.

The student would then learn running, so that if he became too tired in battle to continue, he could use his last strength to get away and be able to return rested to the fight; *nolaila ia mau olelo noea a na kupuna “a'o no ke koa, a'o pu no i ka holo”* ‘therefore, the wise saying of the ancestors, “learn indeed to be a warrior, learn also indeed to run”’.\textsuperscript{134} The author emphasizes that the fighter was not running because he was scared, but to be able to return refreshed to the battle. He mentions a warrior famous for this about whom a traditional saying was composed.

The learning of *lua* was of life-and-death importance:

*Ia wa no e a'o pu ai i ka oihana ha'iha'i (lua,) a'o no a lehia, a o ia ike i a'o ai a makaukau he mea no ia e pale ae ai i ka make i kekah manawa.*

‘At that time indeed, they were learning the [bone] breaking occupation (*lua*), learning indeed until they were expert; and this knowledge that was learned until they were ready was a thing to ward off death at certain times’.

The author illustrates this point with a story of the chief Kameʻeamauk, in which he mentions the strokes used and includes a saying. This story provides only one such example; *He nui na kanaka i kaulana ka inoa i keia hana, a he mau wahine*
Many were the men whose names became famous in this work, and a number of women. The author finishes his series with a long story about Pe'ape'a and his travels to display his knowledge (compare S. W. Nailiili June 5, 1865).

The series “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhau-pio”—a late source but one based on family traditions and largely in accord with earlier reports—portrays in detail the education and career of a famous champion of the martial arts. Already at the age of eight or nine, Kekūhaupi'o begins to show his capacity for the martial arts, *kona ano mikimiki mau i na mea kaua* ‘his constantly alert and energetic character for the things of war’ (December 16, 1920). He is both enthusiastic and physically stronger than his contemporaries; he can even beat older boys and distinguishes himself in a rock fight with children from another place, standing alone against many. A *kahuna* of Hikiau temple observes Kekūhaupi'o and prophesies to the boy's father that he will be a famous warrior. The boy should, therefore, study the ‘*ike Kahuna* ‘priestly knowledge’ and the ‘*oihana koa* ‘warrior profession.’ Kekūhaupi'o's father is himself a warrior, so he himself begins to teach his son spear fighting, hand-to-hand fighting, wrestling, and running. This will be the first stage of the boy's education, and later he will study with people who are ‘*ailolo* ‘graduates’.

Kekūhaupi'o practices very much, throwing a spear at the trunk of a coconut tree in front of the house, which represents a human being. He begins by throwing from a position close to the tree and then increases the distance. When he is *akamai* ‘knowledgeable’ at this task, his father teaches him to defend himself against spears, using blunt practice spears. The three stages of this study are learning to ‘*alo* ‘dodge’, to *pale* ‘parry’, and to *lālau* ‘seize’ the opponent’s spear. The father begins by demonstrating the moves and then discusses them with the boy. The son learns very well, especially the third stage, and will later teach the art to Kamehameha.
Kekūhaupiʻo proves himself talented and assiduous (December 23, 1920). He practices with his peers, and they become his students. When he is twelve, his father hires for him Laʻamea, a professional teacher in spear fighting and club fighting, a specialty with a history full of famous stories and practitioners. As soon as the expert begins with na ai mua o ke ao ana ‘the first strokes of the education’, he realizes Kekūhaupiʻo’s worth and prophesies his fame. The boy is already mākaukau ‘prepared’ because he has been given a solid base, hoʻokahua, by his earlier instruction. He is also talented and exceptionally strong. The boy’s father urges the teacher to impart his complete store of knowledge as well as rigor and morals, including the love of chiefs.

After two years of instruction, Kekūhaupiʻo at fifteen surpasses his teacher. The teacher worries that he might be challenged by his student at his graduation ceremony and be killed, so he advises Kekūhaupiʻo’s father to send him to Koaia, a teacher of lua who is a relative of Laʻamea and known to use lua only for moral purposes. The father asks his son, who agrees to go and sets out with Laʻamea. Koaia checks Kekūhaupiʻo’s body type, especially his long hands, and decides that he can win lasting fame through this student. Kekūhaupiʻo assures him of his love, so that Koaia can teach him all he knows without fear of being eventually killed. Instruction includes many tabus and the help of the lua gods. The father supports his son with food and clothing while he is studying.

As he nears the end of his education, Kekūhaupiʻo has both knowledge and quickness of mind, unusual strength, and the long hands and fingers important for a lua fighter (December 30, 1920). His graduation will be correspondingly remarkable: he will catch a niuhi ‘man-eating shark’, rather than a man, and eat its eye. Preparations for the ailolo include prayers and offerings at the temple, omens, and the student’s remaining impervious to
fear. The catching of the shark demonstrates the student’s talent and prowess, his listening to his teacher, and his being favored by godly help and omens (January 6, 13, 20, 1921). The final stage of the graduation will be an omen of the student’s career (January 20, 27, 1921; February 3, 10, 17, 1921). The right eye of the shark is offered to the god Kāne, and a sacrifice is made at a temple of Lono. They then repair to a temporary structure built for the graduation. Kekūhaupiʻo prays to the god of lua and eats the left eye of the shark without showing disgust, his inner disposition constituting a good omen. He also eats a piece of ‘ulu ‘breadfruit’, an auspicious wordplay on ulu ‘to grow’, applied to his good qualities. The student must then fight the teacher in several arts; the teacher feels he is still superior. This fight is conducted privately, without witnesses, and is described at length and in great detail, with traditional clichés, martial arts terms, and explanations for the modern reader. Kekūhaupiʻo wins, contributing to his fame as a student who beat his famous teacher. The graduate and his teacher have a final feast together, and Kekūhaupiʻo returns home.

Through displays of his prowess, he wins a great reputation, is sought by chiefs, and chooses to join Kalaniʻōpuʻu, who appoints him teacher and kahu ‘guardian’ of the young Kamehameha (February 17, 24, 1921; March 3, 1921). He also teaches other young people in anticipation of their serving his chief and ward (also, June 2, 1921), and the two of them distinguish themselves in battle (e.g., March 10, 1921). Kekūhaupiʻo now acts as Kamehameha’s kahu and battle companion, and together they travel to experts in order to learn new methods of fighting (April 21, 1921; May 26, 1921). The also explore the ships and equipment of Captain Cook, sailing out together in his boat (May 5, 12, 1921). In his later reign, Kamehameha emphasized the education of his courtiers and others in the martial arts, as seen above.
Hula

Hula, the traditional dance of Hawai‘i, was and continues to be a major activity of Hawaiian life and is intimately associated with many aspects of culture and thinking, including religion. As such, it was a target for foreign, especially missionary criticism, and thus for governmental attempts at regulation and even suppression. For instance, the author of “He mau Hana Pono Ole Maanei” (November 12, 1845: 91) asks that David Malo write against hula and chant. H. H. Paleka (October 11, 1879) includes hula along with the old religion, kawa, and Hawaiian medicine among the things Hawaiians should abandon. Ka‘ahumanu banned public performances in 1830, and they required licensing for a fee in 1851. Hula schools and performances continued, however, with considerable public support, and King Kalākaua accorded full recognition to the art, providing a prominent place for it in government ceremonies and prompting a great revival at the end of the nineteenth century (Barrère 1980: 1 f., 40 f., 43, 49–55). Hula has continued to grow in importance and is a major component of the contemporary Hawaiian renaissance.

Like other controversial subjects, hula was discussed at length in the Hawaiian-language newspapers, and the articles, editorials, and reports available provide much information on the art as practiced at the time (Barrère 1980: 43, 45–49). The conventional stance is support of the missionary opposition to the hula on the grounds that it is pagan and distracts from school and work.

“Na Hulahula” (January 28, 1857), using pejorative slang for the dance form instead of the correct term, hula, reports that the reviving hula schools are becoming rivals for the government ones: Lā lawe aku ia na haumana o na kula Aupuni no na kula aku, a ua hookomoia lakou iloko o na kula hulahula "The students of the government schools have been taken out of the
schools and entered into the hulahula schools’. Some say they have the approval of the king, but that is not true. A jury has concluded that there is no harm in the hula, but the best people think otherwise. The question is important for the perpetuation of the race. Some parents think that girls who can dance the hula will attract foreign husbands, but the type attracted give diseases to the girls, and they die. Some high-placed people, foreigners, and Hawaiians support the revival of hula, but it will lead the people back to paganism, and that will be their death.

Kumu Haole (July 15, 1857) writes that men, women, and children are watching hula with great appreciation, mahalo, and that it is their great desire, which they follow tirelessly, while neglecting other occupations. But hula has only bad results; A heaha la ke kumu o ka holo pupule i ka hale hula? He lealea wale no i na mea hoohua i ka pono ole, a me ka waiwai ole ‘And what is the reason for this crazy running to the hula houses? Merely pleasure in the things that result in unrighteousness and profitlessness’. Girls get corrupted, as in earlier bad times. The directors of the hula, o na luna o ka hula, show a palapala ‘document/license’ from the premier legalizing their activities, but they will bring sickness and death.

S. W. P. (November 18, 1857) reports on a large revival of hula with ka poe i ike i na hana o ka wa kahiko ‘the people who know the works of the olden time’; A ua lilo lakou i mau kumuao no keia hana lapuwale ‘They have become teachers for this worthless activity’. People are not lazy when doing the hula; O kekahi poe o lakou he pookela iloko o keia hana; ua makemake lakou i ka uku o ka hewa e like me Balaama ‘Some of them are supreme in this activity, and they desire the reward of error just like Balaam’, a Biblical reference. The author went to see the hula himself and thought that some of the teachers displayed marks of sickness. He saw a big hula gathering at Kaluanui, O‘ahu, for which people paid varying amounts. Hula distracts people from useful work;
children—including three of his own students—are being taken out of school and sent to study hula. The whole country will return to darkness, idolatry, and evil deeds.

Ladana (June 2, 1858) writes on the hula practiced at Lā‘ie, O‘ahu, and its results. There was a big hula presentation on April 30, with a crowd of over 600 people, who had left their own work. The performers were paid over sixty dollars. Young women dressed in traditional skirts chanted, gestured, and looked immodestly at the crowd, asking half-a-dollar for a honi ‘nose kiss’. Many evil results will come of this, including neglect of work and school and other dishonesty.

Simeona P. (October 29, 1864) has researched the hula revival and provides the names of fifteen male teachers and six female ones. Hula is against Christianity and the school laws. The government should intervene.

Honolulu (July 6, 1865) reports that the hula and old Hawaiian games are being revived and are particularly popular among the young.

Kanuikino (September 5, 1867) reports that all people, young and old, like the hula at Mānā, Kaua‘i. They start the hula in the morning and continue till midnight. They have built a large grass lanai ‘porch’—probably a three-sided house for performance—and have covered the floor with mats. A heiau ‘temple’ has been built at the entrance, where the students chant a prayer, kānaenae, to their goddess Laka, a prayer that the author quotes. Up to now, only the call to church and school has been heard in the locality. Now only the hula drum is heard; it has conquered all. People give food and money. Three young women dance in front of their teachers, who handle the musical instruments. Some of these children were going to school, but now they ‘have been entered by their parents in the hula school’, ua hookomo ia e ko lakou mau makua iloko o ke kula hula. The author regrets this devil’s work and thinks it will lead to the harm of the people.
Kawelaakawai (March 21, 1868) reports that young girls are being taught hula. He has seen this himself. The teacher, Kuaino from Honolulu, chanted while his students danced—the author quotes the chant—and later the students and others chanted. The audience very much enjoyed listening.

The opposition to the hula expressed in such writings reveals the effort, even the heroism, that was needed to perpetuate the art. Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua (December 7, 1922c) could later praise the author of a hula chant as ke po’okela no’ea‘u ‘the supreme person in wisdom’ and explain the kaona ‘hidden meaning’ of the chant by telling the story it refers to. People will give money for such a good hula:

*He nui loa ka poe o Kona nei i paa keia hula. Aole i a‘o mamua i ka wa i hoopaiia ai hoomaka e hula.*

‘Very many are the people of Kona who have learned firmly this hula. It was not taught earlier in the time when it was punished to begin to hula’.

Interestingly many contemporary young Hawaiians find education in hula academies more compatible than that in the public schools.

After the family, hula academies, *hālau hula*, are the most wide-spread survival of the formal institutions of classical Hawaiian education. The literature on the subject is vast, and I will summarize here.  

Dance was an activity in which a general competence was expected. People would sing and dance informally on receiving or greeting visitors (e.g., Barratt 1988:323). Hula was also a very popular activity at court, and the stories of historical chiefs like Kawelo can mention their ability or lack of it.  

*‘Ī*‘ī writes that the foreigner Marin became akamai ‘knowledgeable’ in the staff hula
and describes the passionate interest of Liholiho, later Kamehameha II, in drumming— Kaneke (kāeke, either bamboo pipes or coconut drums) and pahu ‘drum’—which he was taught a ua makaukau io no ‘until he became genuinely ready’ (January 1, May 28, 1870). Peers would apparently continue dancing in groups into their teens.\textsuperscript{140}

Hula was and is still a local and family specialty.\textsuperscript{141} This family education could be highly formal. Mrs. Eleanor Hiram Hoke described in my class how her parents had given her as an infant to her grandparents to rear as a hula student. On receiving her, the grandfather conducted a ceremony in which he prayed a pig to death and then touched the different parts of the pig’s body to the corresponding parts of the infant’s. As a child, Mrs. Hoke had to follow religiously an elaborate set of rules and had herself to be treated according to stringent regulations, which made school attendance difficult. In the house was an altar to Laka with picked plants that remained green even though not set in water. The plants would wilt if the young Mrs. Hoke transgressed a rule, and a ceremony had to be performed and new plants picked to restore the altar. Mrs. Hoke was graduated at the age of seven.\textsuperscript{142}

Similarly, the mother of the recently deceased hula master Daryl Lupenui took him as an infant to the seashore and dedicated him to Laka, the goddess of the hula.

Family learning can be developed into a genuine hālau hula ‘hula academy’. Beamer (1976:30 f.) writes that her great grandmother was sent by her parents to study with a great aunt in a formal academy. The academy was run according to the classical rules. Students were “between the ages of 3 and 16 and stayed a short or long time, depending on their spiritual, mental and physical prowess.” Students stayed in the academy most of the time and needed a password to reenter (31); they were not supposed to socialize with outsiders (35). The teacher, a man, had much authority (37, 51), and many of the activities were religious:
prayers, gathering plants in the mountains, following the rules of the academy, attending the altar for Laka, and graduating with ceremony (41, 44 f., 50 ff.). Beamer’s great grandmother stayed in the academy for ten years.

This academy of the Beamer family followed the structure documented elsewhere. An academy would usually be under a single teacher, who would have his distinctive traditions, literature, religious practices, teaching methods, and style. Further personnel could include the kōkua kumu ‘teaching assistant’ and the po‘opua’a ‘head student’ with his assistant, the paepae; a ho‘opā’a ‘chanter’; and a ho‘oulu “the guard stationed at the door”. Modern academies often have an alaka‘i ‘lead dancer’. Education was conducted under strict rules, including sexual abstinence. Traveling to study at different academies was normal (N. B. Emerson 1909: 38 ff.). Learning included the memorization of much literature and of the many types of dances, the names of which could be organized in lists.

Material on the religion of the hula academies is abundant. Traditions connect the origins of the dance to the gods, who remain prominent in the conduct of the art. Education and performance are accompanied by numerous rites sometimes in temples dedicated to the art. The gods can teach chants and dances in dreams, and learning and performing hula can include uncanny experiences. The graduation of the dancer is an occasion for much religious ritual and omen interpretation, and the student must demonstrate the effectiveness of his or her art, for instance, by arousing the desires and emotions of the audience. Displays and contests have always been prominent activities in the field. As in any such art, innovation and creativity are important, and the names of the great teachers and inventors of dances are preserved in historical traditions of the dance.

Hula masters and performers can become professional in the strict sense of earning most of their livelihood through their art.
A master and his troupe could be attached to a court, where they might occupy an official position. Also interested students could organize themselves and hire a teacher.\textsuperscript{153}

The hula academies influenced the response of Hawaiians to Western schools. Kamakau compares the practices of the hula academies with those of Western schools (April 25, 1868): \textit{O ke ano o na kula i ka wa kahiko, ua like ke ao ana me ke kūloa ana o na aha-hula} ‘The character of the [Western] schools in this early time—the teaching was like the \textit{kūloa} of the hula assemblies’; Pukui and Elbert (1986) define the \textit{kūloa} as the “name of the lengthy ceremonies on the night before graduation day in hula . . .”, and the word is used also for other long ceremonies. Kamakau is referring to the late study of people preparing for the \textit{hō’ike} ‘school display’, and other descriptions of that ceremony resemble hula performances (Kuykendall 1947:108 f.).

\section*{Medicine}

The primary and secondary literature on Hawaiian medicine is vast,\textsuperscript{154} and I can, therefore, summarize most points and confine most of my references to primary or lesser known sources. Hawaiian medical knowledge displays the usual spectrum from general competence to expertise, with medical experts constituting a major profession in the strict sense of being paid for services.\textsuperscript{155} Indeed, Hawaiians seem to have developed medicine to a higher degree than any other Polynesians. The spectrum can be illustrated by midwifery, which included the inducement of conception. Most births could be handled by competent family members—and could become a family specialty—and experts were called in only in unusually difficult cases. Midwifery could also be invested with religious traditions, such as the revelation of knowledge by a god.\textsuperscript{156}
Medical education followed the traditional Hawaiian pattern (Luomala 1989:305–311). A general competence could be learned within the family, which transmitted its medical knowledge and literature (Johnson 1957:28). At more advanced levels, the field was divided into medical specialties that demanded formal training for expertise (e.g., Kamakau August 11, 1870). If a family specialized in medicine, the family member could become an expert through teaching by relatives.\textsuperscript{157} If not, the potential student was sent to the school of a non-family expert or to medical centers or temples, phenomena almost unique to Hawai‘i.\textsuperscript{158} Selection of a student depended on religious signs and the personal qualities and interest of the student:

\begin{itemize}
  \item his name or genealogy, his mother’s pregnancy cravings, omens at his birth, and family visions or dreams; and, on the boy’s part, his possession of a good memory, consideration for others, interest in medicine, eagerness to observe and learn, generosity, and carefulness and reverence in ceremonial duties.\textsuperscript{159}
\end{itemize}

Training—as well as practice—was invested with rules and lasted many years as the student advanced through stages towards graduation.\textsuperscript{160} Graduation required both the demonstration of knowledge by reciting memorized materials and the successful conclusion of the ceremony with its religious elements (‘Ī‘ī October 16, 1869). Similarly, training and practice were often conducted at special sites, for instance, houses built for the purpose, bedecked with ti leaves, considered protective, and marked with a white flag.\textsuperscript{161} A graduate could then travel to learn from other experts (Luomala 1989:308). The patients themselves could travel to be treated by special experts, although the expert usually came to the patient.\textsuperscript{162} Indeed, as with other professions, certain places were famous for medical practitioners (‘Ī‘ī October 30, 1869).

Medical education and practice were permeated by religion, which clarified and strengthened the treatment.\textsuperscript{163} Diseases could
be natural or could be caused by ghosts, ‘aumākua ‘ancestral gods’, gods, or sorcerers, which entailed the inclusion in medicine of sorcery or countersorcery.¹⁶⁴

Medicine in general originated from the gods, as articulated in the major legend of Lonopūhā and other founders of medicine, who were deified and worshipped in medical temples.¹⁶⁵ These deified founders were the beginners of lines of experts: O ke poʻo kahuna mua o ka papa kahuna haha, o Kamakanuiaha‘ilono ‘Kamakanuiaha‘ilono was the first head priest/expert of the division of the hāhā ‘diagnosis by feeling’ expert division; he taught Lonopūhā (Kamakau August 25, 1870):

a o ka lilo no ia o Lono i kahuna lapaau, a ua kapaia o Lonopuha ke poomua o ka oihana lapaau, a o ka aumakua mua ia o ka poe kahuna lapaau haha.

‘and this was the development of Lono into a medical expert, and Lonopūhā was called the first head of the medical profession, and he was the first ancestral god of the people who are medical experts in hāhā’. Later famous experts would be joined to that line, such as Palaha—who diagnosed intestinal blockage and performed a famous autopsy—and his father, both credited with inventing the enema, as discussed below (Kamakau September 22, 1870):

A ma keia mau hana a Palaha, ua kaulana oia ma ka papa kahuna lapaau, a ua komo laua a elua ma ka papa moo kahuna Lonopuha.

‘And because of these deeds of Palaha, he became famous in the division of medical experts, and the two of them entered into the lineage of the Lonopūhā experts’. ‘Ī‘ī’s relative Papa, doctor to Kamehameha I and founder of several medical temples, was also a famous practitioner of this line.¹⁶⁶ Other medical specialties had their own lineages: Aole i kulike na moo laau lapaau a keia mau papa kahuna lapaau ‘The medical
lineages of these several divisions of medical experts were not identical’ (Kamakau August 11, 1870). In the medical literature, famous cases are also mentioned along with the treating experts and formed a part of the history of the profession.\textsuperscript{167} Indeed, as will be seen below, a regular literary form was used to record the particulars of the first observed instance of a sickness and its treatment.

Gods could also provide more particular instructions. For instance, the poison gods of Moloka‘i tell the story of their origin to Kāneiākama, teach him their plants, work, names, and ritual instructions; he follows them and becomes rich (‘Ī’ī March 12, 1870; also October 23, 1869). Gods could make particular revelations through dreams and inspiration or possession.\textsuperscript{168} Particular medicines or elements were linked with certain gods, which ensured their efficacy.\textsuperscript{169} Experts could work with an akua makani ‘wind god’, who could possess them to aid in diagnosis and treatment.\textsuperscript{170} Learning and practicing medicine were filled with rituals, including divination, and their associated literary forms.\textsuperscript{171} Prayers were a major medical genre,\textsuperscript{172} and medical temples were an almost unique Hawaiian development.

As elsewhere in Polynesia, the introduction of Christianity resulted in syncretic medical practices.\textsuperscript{173} A number of nineteenth-century newspaper reports demonstrate this point:

Ikeloa April 18, 1863, the medical expert seems to be acting like Jesus in the Gospel miracle stories. He uses na makani ano akua ‘the god-like winds’ in his simultaneous treatment of four patients with different sickenesses. As kahuna nui ‘high priest/expert’, he gives orders to na kahuna malalo iho ona ‘the experts under him’. He is possessed and tries to have the patients’ sickenesses transfer themselves onto his helpers: i kuhi au he oiaio, e hele io ana la keia mau mai a pau i oleloia maluna, mai ke kino mai o ka poe nona ia mau mai maluna o kona mau kahuna, a e ola ae hoi ka poe nona ka mai, aole ka!’ ‘I thought it was true that all these sickenesses mentioned above would really go from the body
of the people who had the sickness onto his [sub-]experts, and the sick people would be cured; but no!' The author cites Biblical texts about Jesus and his work that were probably the basis of the expert’s dealings, but there was no transfer; it was all just hoopsu-nipuni ‘deceit’.

Kailiwela October 29, 1864:2, the expert says that the *akua makani* ‘wind god’ working through him is Jesus and will heal the patient. The people give the expert food and three dollars. The expert prays to Jehovah for the sick person and reads passages from the Bible. In dialog with his *hoahele* ‘companion’, the possessed expert applies the passages to his procedure (3). The wind god possessing the expert claims to be the Messiah and uses strange language: *namu aku la, penei, “sipi, sipi, sipi, &c. Paka, paka, &c.”* ‘he mumbled thus . . .’. He smokes tobacco and laughs and later mumbles “*ki, ki, ki*”. The expert then gives the true name of the wind god as “Kamalamalama”.

Healing became an important mission of the later Hawaiian-Christian churches, which combined Christianity with aspects of traditional culture. An early example is the work of the Reverend John Kekipi:174

Sickness and pain are punishments or signs from god (Kekipi 1903:10 ff.). Kekipi separates himself from traditional Hawaiian medicine and successfully defends himself against charges of idolatry (13 f., 17 f.). But he acts traditionally, for example, in revealing *i ke kumu i hiki mai ai kela ma‘i maluna o ke alii* ‘the source from which that sickness came upon the chief’ (18). Kekipi heals through the power of the Spirit, and his success demonstrates the authenticity of his mission for those who believe in him (13 f., 21). The *ola* ‘life’ he promises seems to include health as well as eternal life (16).

As in any field that deals with individual cases, observation was crucial in medical training and practice.175 Kamakau writes
that the expert had to fit the prescription to the patient (August 25, 1870):

_Ô ka ike lihilihi, a o ka ike alawa, a me ka ike hana. Oia ka ike kupono no ke kahuna paaaoao, a me ke kahuna ea._

‘Knowledge by critical observation, knowledge by insight, and knowledge by practice. This was the appropriate knowledge for the expert in children’s medicine’.

The combination of knowledge and observation is the most effective (September 1, 1870):

_Ô ka poe ike ma ka lihilihi a ma ka alawa, a i huipu me ka ike haha, he oi aku ko lakou ike a me ko lakou akamai, a i ka nana maoli ana me he poe kaula la paha ko lakou ike, a me ka lakou koho ana._

‘The people knowledgable by critical observation and insight—combined with knowledge by feeling, hāhā—their knowledge and intelligence were superior, and, seen truly [or from a native perspective], their knowledge and their diagnosis [whether a disease was fatal or not] were perhaps like that of prophetic people’.

Kamakau discusses the terms _lihilihi_ and _‘alawa_ as used in this context (see also these entries in Pukui and Elbert 1986). The expert would not interrogate the patient, but would identify the malady by feeling, hāhā, his body. He would then ask the patient if that was the problem, and the patient would agree: _Ô keia ike, he ike keia na ka lihilihi, a he ike nui no hoi keia_ ‘This knowledge is a knowledge by critical observation, and this is indeed a great knowledge’. With _‘alawa_ knowledge, an expert could diagnose the patient from a distance, apparently by visualization and by some indications in the behavior and perhaps the words of the people sent to fetch him, for instance, that they would be unable to obey the tabus necessary for the healing procedure.
Observation was naturally important for the advancement of the field. One of the most famous cases of observation and innovation is that of the invention of the enema by Palaha when his father’s intestines were blocked, a case that demonstrates that Hawaiians were “on the threshold of scientific investigation” (Larsen 1952: 15). Kamakau reports:

O Palaha ke kumu mua nana i noonoo i ka pono o ka hahano. Penei ke kumu mua a Palaha i noonoo ai ‘Palaha was the first teacher/source whose it was to think of the correctness of the enema. Here is the first reason/source that Palaha thought about’. Palaha observed that a blocked stream is putrid and is cleaned out by a burst of fresh water; a pela o Palaha i noonoo ai a maopopo ‘and thus Palaha thought until it became clear to him’. Palaha experiments with a dog, a hoomaopopo oia i ka pono o ka hahano ‘and he made clear the correctness of the enema’ for his father’s problem; a i kona hoao ana, ua maopopo ka pono o ka hahano malalo, a me ka hoonaha iho maluna ‘and in his trying, the correctness of the enema [applied] below and the breaking [of the blockage] above was made clear’. The individual case must be observed correctly to obtain either a breaking of a blockage or a firming of the intestines. He is not, however, able to cure his father, who asks his son to perform an autopsy on him after he dies. Palaha does so and learns the nature of the problem and its place. He, therefore, becomes famous and a member of the lineage of his profession.

The best attested training in observation concerns the use of pebbles to teach the students to feel, hāhā, the body of the patient. A large number of pebbles were laid out in the shape of a human body representing significant body points. The teacher would work from the feet to the head, naming and explaining the part of the body and the sicknesses connected to it, including symptoms, the development of the disease, treatments, and results. The student was thus trained so that the problem e maopopo ai ma ka nana ana a me ka haha ana ‘was clear by looking and feeling’
(ʻĪi October 16, 1869). Kamakau describes this procedure in detail (September 1, 1870):

The teacher begins with the pebbles of the feet: *I ke kau ana o ke kumuao lapaaau i ka iliili mua ma ka waaawae, alaila, o ka hoomaka no ia o ka hoike i na kumu mua o ka mai e loaa i ke kanaka* ‘In the setting by the medical teacher of the first pebbles on the feet, there, this was the beginning of the showing of the first sources of the sickness incurred by the human being’. The teacher works his way up the body *a hiki i ka lauoho o ka piko o ke poo* ‘up to the hair on the fontanel of the head’. The students listen attentively: *Ke ao la ke kumu, ke noho la na haumana me ka makaala, a me ka malama loa i na mea i ao ia* ‘While the teacher teaches, the students sit with alertness and with great retention of the things being taught’. Kamakau provides a long list of the matters discussed. *I ka pau ana o ke ao ana ma ka iliili a makaukau ka haumana me ka wale waha, me ka paanaau o na kulaana mai a me na loina a pau mai ka pu o ke poo a ka manea o na waaawae, a ua lewa ka waiho ana o ke kino a pau* ‘When the instruction with the pebbles was finished and the student was ready to the point of knowing all by heart by memorizing the places of the sickness and all the rules from the topknot of the head to the toenails of the feet, and he was totally familiar with the lay of the whole body’; then the teacher would take his students with him to visit patients. He would have them feel the patient—either from the head or the feet—and attempt a diagnosis to see if it was the same as that of the teacher.

The extensive use of literature in medical training and practice has already been mentioned, with examples such as origin stories, historical traditions, ritual statements, and prayers. Specifically educational uses are also attested. A vast number of terms and names for diseases, medical materials, and treatments needed to be memorized by the student. This vocabulary could be organized in lists, of which many examples are recorded both in classical and modern form.
Uaua March 2, 1867, *oia keia mau-ka* papaku, *ka* neowaiiku, *ka* waiopua, *ka* niu, *ka* pou, *ka* eho, *ka* haikala *a me kekahi mau mai e ae*. ‘these are these diseases: [names], and some other diseases’.

Kalaaukumuole March 30, 1867, introduction, *Eia na inoa o ka laau me ka mai* ‘Here are the names of the plants and the diseases’. A list set as a paragraph follows in regular form: *Mai* ‘disease’ [name], the plant used as medicine, sometimes accompanied by instructions. An informal terminating paragraph contains the words *ua koe aku no kekahi laau, me ka Mai* ‘some plants and diseases indeed remain’. The author admits that he does not know the *laau* ‘plant’ for one *ma‘i* ‘disease’, and states that the *laau* for *Mai aloha, Mai kuoha*, venereal disease, is *huna* ‘hidden’.

Kamakau August 11, 1870, introduction, *Eia ke ano o na kahuna lapaaau;* ‘Here is the type/are the types of medical experts’. The list consists of eight items starting with the word *Papa* ‘division’ followed by an arabic numeral. There is no termination.

Kamakau August 18, 1870, introduction, *Penei kekahi mau mai, a mau loina ma ka nana ana i na kulana o na mai paaooao* ‘Thus are several diseases and rules for observing the position of the *pā‘oa‘oao* diseases’. The items of the list are numbered with written out Hawaiian words, *O ka mua*, etc., followed by the name of the disease. The first is *muhee*, while the others are the same word with an epithet.

Kamakau September 15, 1870, introduction, *Eia ka papainoa o na laau paaooao* ‘Here is the table of names of the *pā‘oa‘oao* medicines’. The items are presented irregularly. A termination is used, *He nui na laau i koe o ka papa laau lapaaau paaooao a me ka ea* ‘Many are the plants that remain of the table of medicinal *pā‘oa‘oao* and *‘ea* plants’. Kamakau adds a few names after his list.
Kamakau September 15, 1870, a list of offerings. Introduction, *Eia ka alana a me na mohai*, ‘Here is the free offering and the prescribed offerings’. A simple list of items follows, with the termination *a me na pono e ae e kupono ai i ka ahaaina* ‘and the other correct things appropriate for the feast’.

Kamakau September 22, 1870, *Ekolu laau kupono i ka pehu; o ka liki, o ke ehu, a me ka laau hoonaha* ‘Three plants/treatments are appropriate for swelling: astringent, spray, and purgative medicine’. 179

A completed list can be followed by longer explanations of each item, a form observed in other fields. 180 Listing can also be hierarchical. 181

Finally, pairs or dualities, used generally by Hawaiians in mental organization, are used in medicine (Luomala 1989:304). *Uka/kai* ‘land/sea’ is used to divide plants and other medicines and to pair them, one member of each pair belonging to one category and the other to the other. In the *pani* ‘closure’ ceremony, the patient ingests the member of the pair opposite to the one that has constituted the primary medicine of the treatment. These pairs were conventional, were used elsewhere as in sorcery, and appear in the *Kumulipo*. 182 The male/female pair was exceptionally important in medicine—perhaps because of its direct connection to fertility and life—being used extensively in ritual. 183 Kamakau writes (August 18, 1870):

> *ua olelo ka poe akamai, he kane ka ea a he wahine ke pā‘ao‘ao, a ua huipu keia mau mai malalo kekahai a maluna kekahai, a he pono e lapaaau pu ia laua i ka manawa hookahi.*

‘the knowledgeable people said that *ea* was male and *pā‘ao‘ao* female, and these two diseases were joined together, one on top and the other on the bottom, and it was correct to treat the two together at the same time’. 
Loko/waho ‘inside/outside’ is used to define whether a sickness has originated or been sent from within the family or outside it (e.g., Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:150).

A number of other literary forms were used to organize information. A chant could describe a treatment (Chun 1986:9, 37, 42 f.). Diseases could be placed on a genealogical line or organized as a genealogy with treatments, a typical extension of the genealogy form (Chun 1986:1, 8 f., 12, 36, 47).

A major literary form was devised to organize several pieces of information about a disease."I"i seems to connect the form to the 1806 campaign of Kamehameha to increase the knowledge of medicine after the ‘ōku‘u epidemic and designates the information included in the form:

_Ua hoomaopopo ia no hoi malaila ke kulana mai a me kona laau kupono a me na loina a me na hope o ka lapaaau ana. No keia mea hoi, ua hanaia a ua hakuia hoi a paanaau na kulana mai a me ka laau a me ka mokupuni i ulu mai ai ka mai, pela ka laau, penei:

‘There indeed was made clear the position of the disease and its appropriate plant/medicine and the rules and the results of the medical treatment. For this reason indeed, were worked and composed for memorization the position of the disease and the plant and the island in which the disease arose, [and] in that way the plant/medicine, thus:’

‘I”i then provides the form twice in fill-in-the-blanks style. The first example is:

_“Ku i Niihau ke one, he mea ke one, he puua mea ka puua, he mea ka aahu, he mea ka mai, a he mea ka laau.

‘It arose/arrived on Ni’ihau, the sand/beach; [blank], the sand/beach; a [blank] pig, the pig; a [blank], the clothing; a [blank], the disease; and a [blank], the plant’._
The second example is the same except that Kaua‘i replaces Ni‘ihau. ‘Ī‘ī can write the form also as “Ku i mea ke one . . . ‘It arose/arrived on [blank], the sand/beach’ (October 23, 1869). The form was used as a series (October 16, 1869):

\[ A \text{ pela wale aku no a pau na mokupuni i ka hoopili ana o ka mai a me ka laau, pela no ka puaa a me ka aahu. } \]

‘And so on indeed until all the islands were exhausted in the connection of the disease and the plant; in the same way indeed the pig and the clothing’.

‘Ī‘ī emphasizes that this form was devised for purposes of memorization by the people learning medicine:

\[ A \text{ o ne ia [sic: neia] mau mea a pau i hanaia a i hakuia hoi a paa-naau } \]

‘And all these things were worked and composed also for memorization’.

Hekekia (November 11, 1835) provides an early example of the same form. He begins with a list introduction: \[ Eia ka mai, a me ka laau lapaaau o keia aina ‘Here is the disease and the medical plant of this land’ . \] He then lists nine sections, each in strict form except for the occasional omission of the first he one:

\[ Ku i [place name] ke one; he one [descriptive word] ke one, he [identification of sick person] ka mai; he [name of plant] ka laau. \]

For the last item, he provides information about the plant (see also the Chun 1986 references given above). Such memorization was characteristically important in medical education, as in other fields. Other informational forms could also be placed next to each other to form lists, as will be seen below.
The form described above can be used in part or can influence less formal and complete expressions. The form itself seems to be an elaboration of a shorter form, used for instance by ‘Ī‘ī (October 16, 1869) in a narrative: he hokale kona mai, he pauku ka laau ‘his sickness was a mastoid infection; the root of the kā‘ēe vine is the plant’. This same short form—He [blank] ka ma‘i, he [blank] ka lā‘au—is used to introduce other descriptions of medical treatments; an even shorter form is the second half of the line used on its own to designate the plant used.\(^{187}\) Parallels to the short form can be found in other fields, for instance, in a form for memorizing winds: O Makaweli ka aina, o Punohuula ka makani ‘The land is Makaweli, the wind is Pūnohu‘ula’ (Poepoe August 5, 1910).

Fuller and more modern forms of case reporting can be found in later Hawaiian documents, and some of them are in all likelihood the result of government licensing acts that stipulated that the licensee “shall keep records of his practice of medicine, and shall enter correctly in such records all the business done by him.”\(^{188}\) The book reproduced in Gutmanis (1977:160–185) appears to be such a book of records, and the case reports follow a definite form: date, name of patient, sex of patient, place of residence, description of medical problem including place in the body, medicines, description of treatment, and result. This information is usually presented in stereotyped language, usually fill-in-the-blanks forms. Some case reports are accompanied by petroglyph-like representations of the body, with the affected places marked with dots, recalling the pebbles used in classical training. Medicines and treatments can also be described in generally regular form without reference to individual cases (Chun 1986:15–21, 52–65).

Spencer (1895) appears to be a compendium of such record books, which are sometimes quoted verbatim, like those marked “E. H.” (Elia Helekunihi, Gutmanis 1977:258). Treatments are often subtitled Papahana a [name] ‘Work division of . . . ’ (Spencer 1895:
13, 16 f., 18, 20 ff., 24, 26 f., 29 ff., 37, 43, 60 f., 62). Although many passages are given in a discursive Western style (e.g., 15), Spencer seems at times to follow his sources closely since the styles of such sections often display differences, for instance, in their list forms. Also one set of instructions is given colometrically (21 f.). Certain forms, however, are used extensively. Most basically, ingredients are identified (the plant and its useful parts), followed by instructions on how to prepare and apply them, the latter called Ka hana ana (e.g., 26–31, 34 f., 37, 40 f., 43–47). Instructions for preparing the medicine can be differentiated from the instructions for applying it (30). Special instructions can be given for applying a given remedy to children (43, 45). The word inā can introduce special cases or variants (e.g., 14 f., 21–25, 28 f., 42 f.). A description of the disease can be added before the ingredients, resulting in a form similar to that in the medical expert’s book reproduced by Gutmanis (24, 26, 44). Comments can be added at the end (e.g., 29, 46 f.). These forms can be combined as a sequence or list (e.g., 60, 68).

 Literary forms were used also during treatment. The expert could use a conventional interrogatory to help identify the problem and could give instructions and explanations to the patient and the family. The interaction between the expert and his clients was in fact formalized with rules.

As elsewhere in Polynesia, the practice of medicine became a point of conflict with foreigners, especially Christian missionaries. Missionaries naturally objected to the connection of Hawaiian medicine to Hawaiian religion. That connection—along with the importance of health in Hawaiian thinking—resulted in a competition between Western and Hawaiian medicine as supporting evidence for their respective religions and cultures. The positions in the debate were not, however, simple. The missionaries recognized that Hawaiian medicine filled a need that was beyond the capacity of the few Western doctors available. Moreover, most missionaries recognized the efficacy of a number
of Hawaiian treatments, and the missionary doctor Gerrit Judd studied Hawaiian medicine and adapted a number of its practices in his teaching of Western medicine.¹⁹⁴

Hawaiians on the other hand soon realized that introduced diseases did not respond to traditional medicine, applying to Cook’s men for the treatment of venereal disease.¹⁹⁵ Moreover, Hawaiians recognized that some traditional practitioners were not in fact knowledgeable but quacks.¹⁹⁶ On the other hand, Hawaiian medical treatments could be efficacious, and certain Hawaiian medical problems did not respond to Western treatment.¹⁹⁷ Hawaiian doctors were, therefore, to be consulted for Hawaiian problems, and foreign ones for foreign (O. A. Bushnell 1967: 397).

Finally, attitudes to Hawaiian medicine were closely connected to evaluations of the traditional culture. Medicine could, therefore, become an element in the Hawaiians’ assertion of the correctness and value of their own culture. For instance, the only violent revolutionary of the nineteenth century, J. W. Kaona, was accused of working as he kahuna lapaa pu hoopunipuni ‘a deceitful medical expert’ (Edward August 24, 1867). He was reported to have claimed on Hawai‘i that he had raised someone from the dead in Honolulu, thereby validating his claim to be the millennial prophet Elias. Similarly, he contrasted himself as he kumu uku ole ‘an unpaid teacher’ to the foreign missionaries, who demanded payment for books and other articles. The issue of payment was important in the debate on medicine, as will be seen below.

For many reasons, Hawaiian medicine survived the nineteenth century even among convinced Hawaiian Christians and often in syncretized form, and continues to be practiced today.¹⁹⁸ Hawaiians, therefore, became bimedical as well as bireligious and bicultural. This attitude was encouraged by the impression that “Jehovah cared only for the soul and not for the body’s ills.”¹⁹⁹ However, Hawaiian medicine never ceased to be a subject of vituperative controversy, often related to governmental regulation.
Perhaps the majority of writings on the subject are hostile to Hawaiian medicine, using against it a rhetoric that quickly became conventional with its canonical vocabulary: Hawaiian practitioners are idolatrous, deceitful, greedy for pay, and ineffective.

Aholo 1861, uses the word *wahahe'e* ‘deceitful’ throughout.

Though he recognizes that there are some good Hawaiian medical practitioners, the vast majority are untrained quacks given to theatrics, *hana keaka*, which they practice in secret for payment (6, 10 f.). In the epidemic of 1853, practitioners said they could cure people and received offerings and performed ceremonies, but they were ineffective (6 f.). Moreover, they use pagan practices: gods, prayers, tabus, and offerings, though there are no more temples (1–5). Such practices are against the Bible and Christianity (2, 7). Hawaiian medicine is similar to sorcery in that they use the same pagan means (1, 9). Indeed, many practitioners are from Moloka‘i (5), which is famous for sorcery. All foreigners are against Hawaiian medicine (7). Some natives will doubt practitioners and visit a Western doctor; but others leave the doctor for a practitioner (5). Practitioners scare people, and people die because they do not consult a Western doctor (10). Hawaiian medicine contributes to depopulation and should be abandoned in fidelity to Christianity (10).

Bicknell n.d. [probably 1880s]: 4, distinguishes between “First, kahunas who practice medicine only; second, those who preface their incantations with Scripture . . .” Hawaiians think sickness is “a visitation from God” (6) and, having little confidence in foreign doctors, patronize their own. If their gods do not help them in their sickness, converting them to Christianity is easier (6 f.). “With few exceptions, church-members serve Jehovah during health, and the gods in sickness” (7). The Hawaiian needs to be convinced that Jehovah rules over the body as well as the soul. “It is on the sick-bed that his true character is revealed.” Even “the native pastors fear the Kahunas and dare not oppose them; the
sick therefore are neglected,” and that is the best time to win them over (8). “Not on the public arena, but in the chamber of the sick, is where the decisive battle between Christianity and the Kahunas has to be fought.” Bicknell provides the testimony of a church member who used Hawaiian medicine (10).

Kehukai December 15, 1866, argues that because of depopulation, a school should be founded to teach Hawaiians foreign medicine. People are being killed by false medical practitioners still practicing the old religion. On the other hand, foreign doctors think only of their own good and do not love the Hawaiian people.

“Native Testimony to the Prevalence of Idolatry” May 1889: 34 f., reports that “influences kindred to the infamous Hale Naua have been actively at work. The fact has not unfrequently been reported to us of certain Hawaiian pastors permitting the employment of kahunas with their enchantments for sick members of their families, and even of such a pastor himself being attended in his last sickness by a kahuna with his idolatrous arts.”

“No na Kahuna Hawaii” n.d.: 561, reports that Hawaiian medicine is being taught along with the old religion. Where do medical practitioners get their power? From Satan. They use fear, not of Jehovah, but of Pele, Hi’iaka, Kapo, Kūamu, Palamoa, Kālaipāhoa, Mano, Mo’o, etc. (562). They take money and blame others for their failures. They use omens and prayers. They are trusted because ao mai la lakou ina kanaka e malama ina Anela kiai oia hoi na Aumakua ame na Unihipili oia ka mea e ola ai ke kino ‘they teach people to care for the guardian Angels, that is, the Ancestral Gods and the Spirits; this is what makes the body live’. Moreover, the experts/priests think they can harm people, and people believe the devil will listen to these bad people the way Jehovah listens to his servants. In fact, some of the Hawaiian treatments work, especially those involving possession rather than physical illness. But it is better to go to foreign doctors.200
A number of authors take a middle position with varying emphasis on the positive or negative aspects of Hawaiian medicine:

K. July 2, 1859, writes that from the time of Bingham until today, pagan-type medicine continues in Hawai‘i among chiefs and commoners just as in rest of the world. *He oihana maikai maoli.* *Aka, eia ka hewa, o ka hoomanakii a me ka pule i na kanaka make, e kauoha ana i ka la, i ka hikina, i ke komohana, i na aumakua no a pau a ka pouli a me na kanaka e ola nei, ke lawe pu lakou i keia oihana* ‘It is a genuinely good occupation. But here is the error: idolatry and the prayer to dead people, calling on the sun, on the east, on the west, on all the ancestral spirits indeed of the dark night and people who are living now, if they also take up this occupation’. Different sorts of omens are used. At the beginning of the treatment, with the guardian of the patient sitting by, the expert chants and shows *i ka aoao o ka make a me ka aoao o ke ola. I ka make aumakua, a me ka make anaana, hoounauna, a me ka hoopiopio* ‘the side of death and the side of life; death by ancestral spirit, and death by sorcery, sending spirits, and death by suggestive gestures’. Divination is performed with piles (of pebbles) and prayer to see whether the sickness can be cured. The expert prays for *mana* ‘power’ and *ola* ‘life, health’ first to the male ancestral gods, then to the female, and then to the Hawaiian gods Kū, Lono, Kānehekili, Kānewāwahilani, Lā‘iehau, Pele, Hi‘iaka, and Wahine‘ōma‘o. He then prays to *Iehova makua i ka lani, makua i ka honua* ‘Jehovah, parent in the sky, parent on the earth’.

P. July 2, 1859, responds to the above, saying five wrongs are committed in the practice described: idolatrous prayer to false gods and dead people; including the name of the true God with false ones; deceitfulness; taking money for divination and treatment; and placing people in mortal danger through false treatment. It
would be better to suppress all this activity under the law against idolatry.

W. N. P. June 8, 1865, warns against bad medical practitioners. If a companion dies because of bad treatment, the news is quickly spread, ho’olaha, through the newspaper. People think this will stop the deceitfulness of the practitioner, but such persons are accustomed to deceiving. Following the instructions of a medical expert is expensive and onerous, so one should be careful to whom one goes for treatment: 

E pono no ke ninau mua i ke ano o ka hana a ke Kahuna, a ina i maopopo ke Kahuna ike i ka lapaaau, alaila e haawi i na makamaka mai o kakou aku i ka poe makaukau ‘It is indeed right to first enquire about the character of the work of the Expert, and if it is clear that he is an Expert knowledgeable in medicine, then entrust our companions to the people who are prepared’. If the expert is practicing idolatry and deceit, he should be reported and punished, as several have been. Such bad practitioners drag the race backwards, and people again ‘look to the type of old pagan workings’, a e nana i ke ano o na hana pegana kahiko. One must be alert against ka po’e kipi ‘rebellious people’, or there will be trouble for us and the new generation.

‘Ī’ī October 16, 1869, argues that the old medical practitioners combined knowledgeable physical therapy with prayer, and the prayer was positive: 

he ano ninau la i ke Akua i ka pono a me ka hewa o ka lapaaau ana ‘a type of asking the God about the correctness or error of the medical treatment’. In contrast, today 

ua awiliia ke ano lapaaau maoli e na mea ano hoomanamana a hoonohonoho akua, a he hoopunipuni wale no ‘the authentic type of medicine has been adulterated by people of an idolatrous type who use a possessing god, and it is only deceit’.

Others take a more positive view of Hawaiian medicine, while recognizing the problems involved with certain practitioners:
Ami October 10, 1861, bases his opinion on the commonly accepted views of the reasons for population loss. He writes that in contrast to this age, in the time of Kamehameha I, Hawaiians were numerous, both chiefs and commoners, and had many children. The reasons for this were that the society lived in concord and parents listened to the teachings of their parents in regard to child rearing. *Ua pepehi wale na makuahine i ka lakou mau keiki no ka nui o ka hanau ana o na wahine ia wa* ‘Mothers would even kill their children because of the quantity of births of the women of that time.’ Some died by crime and in wars, but women kept giving birth, and the population count remained high. Moreover, the order established by Kamehameha and his *māmala hoe kānāwai* ‘Law of the Broken Paddle’ solved many problems and ameliorated the situation. So how does that dark age compare with this age of light? Young women today do not obey their parents, but just gad about. The author asks God to provide young women who will rear children and produce a larger population.

Kaina December 10, 1864, describes an effective medicinal plant, the *Pawele,* along with instructions for its preparation and use. He argues against *awa,* rum, and tobacco.

Kalua April 2, 1870, argues that it is right to explain some sicknesses and *na laau kupono no ia mau mai* ‘the plants/medicines appropriate for these sicknesses’ that are effective. He describes treatments for fractures and wounds, first identifying the ingredients and then detailing their use, following discursively the standard medical literary form. Such problems can be solved by Hawaiian medicine better than by foreign: *aole hoi e like me ka na kauka haole he oki no a moku loa* ‘not indeed like that of the foreign doctors—a cutting even to complete severing’ of body parts. He then discusses the treatment of children’s and women’s diseases, using the same form: *ua i keia [sic: ‘ike ‘ia] ke ola a me ka oiaio maoli o keia mau ano laau a na kahuna Hawaii* ‘the
life/healthiness and the genuine truth of these kinds of medicine of the Hawaiian experts is apparent’. He then discusses illnesses caused by broken vows, offending family gods, and so on, comparing the godly punishment incurred to the troubling caused by a bad conscience. He recommends repentance and ritual offering as a cure. After discussing one further physical malady, he terminates in conventional form: *A he nui wale aku na ano mai e ola no i ke kahuna Hawaii* ‘And many indeed are the kinds of illness cured indeed by the Hawaiian expert’. The right treatment is necessary for effectiveness, but this is true also for foreign doctors, who do not always succeed. Some Hawaiian medicine and medical practitioners are good, even if some are deceitful.

“*Kekahi mau Oihana Lapaau a na Kahuna Hawaii*” May 21, 1870, objects to the above statements of D. W. Kalua about broken oaths causing illness and his comparison of this to the actions of conscience. Such statements might mislead young people because it seems *e lawe mai ana oe i na manao kuhihiwia a na kupuna o kaua me he mea oiaio la* ‘you are accepting the mistaken opinions of our grandparents as something true’.

Nakookoo June 11, 1870, states that health is important for the perpetuation of the Hawaiian race and its progress in Christianity. However, *aole pono e hilinai nui loa ia ka pono a me ke ola o keia lahui mamuli wale no o na Kauka haole (Doctor) aka, he pono no e hoakea ia na kahuna-lapaau Hawaii, mamuli o na mai ano Hawaii* ‘it is not right that the good and health of this race be entirely entrusted only to the foreign Doctors, but it is indeed right that the Hawaiian medical experts be increased because of the specifically Hawaiian diseases’ Since Christian times, there have been two main sorts of diseases that have befallen people and led to death: foreign diseases and Hawaiian diseases. There are also two sorts of medicine to cure the sick-foreign and Hawaiian-and the two are not the same. It would be best then, contrary to the current law, to increase the Hawaiian experts so that there would be a sufficient number on the
different islands to treat the Hawaiian diseases. Also the foreign doctors live mostly in Honolulu. Hawaiian medical practitioners could care for their own families and protect them. In the olden time, the population was larger when Hawaiians were following pagan rather than Christian ways. Were they immune then from disease? Did they have foreign doctors and foreign medicine to cure them? He trusts that e alakai ana no paha ko kakou noonoo kanaka mamuli o ka haina kupono ‘our human reasoning can indeed perhaps lead us to the right answer’. The government should be petitioned on behalf of Hawaiian medical practitioners. Many cases of illness in the author’s own family were cured by such experts. Medical practitioners do not cure all their patients any more than foreign doctors do. Some practitioners are in fact deceitful; the author has suffered from them. But the good ones are more numerous than the bad. Some experts have real knowledge, but they are confused in the public mind with the bad. Bad practitioners should be punished because they do real harm. But the readers should support the increase of good medical experts before the legislature.

Later writings are more aggressively and polemically positive about Hawaiian medicine, an attitude supporting and supported by a resurgence of ethnic pride.

Spencer 1895: 3 f., states that there is much demand for a book on Hawaiian medicine, just as other countries have books on their medicine and medical schools. Indeed, the new generation should recognize the usefulness and value of traditional knowledge, which Spencer emphasizes, was the result of formal education (3 f., 5, 9 f., 48, 64): he ike ia i a’o nui ia a ailolo imua o ka ihu o ka puua me ka eehia ‘this was a knowledge that was thoroughly taught until graduation before the nose of the pig with reverence’ (9). Such a book may be opposed by idolatrous kāhuna, who do not want such knowledge to be published. But such a book will protect people against deceitful and pagan-type practitioners (5), against whom Spencer uses the conventional rhetoric: na anō
lapaaau makani wahahee me na hana hoopuni ‘the types of lying wind-god medicine and deceitful workings’; na hana keaka hoo-punipuni, a me na ano pule wahahee i ke diabolo ‘the deceivingly theatrical workings and the types of lying prayers to the devil’ (10). Spencer bases his writing with confidence on na Kahuna Hawai‘i Oiaio ‘the True Hawaiian Experts’ (9), such as the collections of Malo, Kalākaua, E. Helekunihi, and others (4, 9 f.).

Wise January 25, 1911, begins a series of articles on Hawaiian medicine, most of which seems to be taken literally from Spencer with the addition of even more positive rhetoric.

J. G. M. Sheldon and Piilani 1906: 133–151, contains a dialog or debate, written by Sheldon, between two Hawaiians on the comparative value of native and foreign medicine. Faced with the great problem of depopulation (141–144, 150), why should Hawaiian medicine be banned? Because in the au hou ‘new age’, old things should be abandoned. True, many things are now mixtures of old and new, like hula and the Hawaiian language spoken today. But Hawaiians should revive the good things of the olden time, including medicine (141). There are two divisions relating to this question: home and family living and bodily health. The unity of both is needed for health. Old stories and sayings, as well as the reports of Captain Cook, demonstrate how populous Hawai‘i once was (141 f.). The reason for this was that health and medical practices were good, and medical practitioners deserved praise (142 f.): la mau la, he Hawaii ka mea mai, he Hawaii ke Kahuna a na ka Hawaii e imi, e hoomakaukau a e hoohana ka laau Hawaii ‘In those days, the sick person was Hawaiian, the Expert was Hawaiian, and it was by the Hawaiian that Hawaiian medicine was sought, made ready, and worked’. Now Hawaiian medicine is suppressed, and experts are jailed. The result is depopulation (144 f.). Foreigners—whites, Chinese, and Japanese—bring their own medicines to Hawai‘i, which are appropriate for them and which they are allowed to use (145). But those medicines are not appropriate for Hawaiians, and Hawaiians are not allowed to use
their own. As a result, the foreign population is increasing, while the Hawaiian is decreasing. Western medicine is good for Western diseases (146). The author does not oppose its use; so why oppose Hawaiian medicine for Hawaiians? Traditional medicine had many advantages, for instance, in bone setting. The wife of a foreign doctor was helped by Hawaiian medicine (146 ff.); she was treated e like me ka mea maa mau ia kakou Hawaii ‘in the way that is perpetually customary to us Hawaiians’ (147). Consequently, that doctor respected Hawaiian medicine. Few real experts are left, and they are in hiding (149). Quacks are giving Hawaiian medicine a bad reputation. The Board of Health is not staffed by people knowledgeable in the field, so when a Hawaiian expert applies for a license, they ask many questions and then refuse him. As a result, true Hawaiian medicine is being suppressed, and quacks are increasing, along with depopulation (149 f.). Foreign medicine cannot cure Hawaiian diseases (150):

aole loa i loaa i ka malihini ia lihi ike e lapaau e like me ko ka ike o ke keikipapa o ka aina i loaa ka ike a me ka makaukau huna a kapu mai na kupuna lilo loa mai e lawelawe i ko kakou mau ano mai me ka kakou mau laau ponoi i hooulu ia mailoko mai o ka opu aloha a lokomaikai o ka honua a ke Akua i hana ai a i hoolawa mai ai no kana mau mamo e noho ana ma na kihi eha o ka poepoe honua ‘the foreigner has not at all obtained even this little bit of medical knowledge like that knowledge of the child of the land whose family goes back many generations—who has obtained hidden and tabu knowledge and readiness from the ancestors from immemorial times to handle our several types of sickness and our own plants that have been grown from inside the beloved and benevolent bowels of the earth made by God and well provided for the benefit of his descendants who live at the four corners of the earthly globe’. God has given each people what they need for their health, and they should be allowed to use it.

One writer, Pakele (November 12, 1864), went so far as to urge a return to the old religion and its efficacious gods as a solution to
the problem of depopulation. Indeed, during the 1820s, Hawaiians opposed to the mission had blamed depopulation on the new religion and culture (e.g., W. Richards June 1, 1824:710a).

The view of Hawaiian medicine as basically useful but mixed with pagan and harmful practices led to attempts by both Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians to reform the profession by recognizing and supporting the acceptable elements (O. A. Bushnell 1967:396 ff.). For instance, several letters published in the Hawaiian-language newspaper *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* on March 2, 1867, are answers to questions posed by a meeting of the Ahahui Laau Lapaau ma Wailuku ‘Medical Society of Wailuku’ in December, 1866, and assigned to Hawaiian experts.  

Uaua states that *he poe kahuna akamai i ka haha ana* ‘knowledgeable experts in hāhā (feeling)’ were able to diagnose illnesses and cure them. Many knowledgeable people have died. Uaua mentions the famous Kūa'ua'u: *kekahi kahuna kaulana i noho ai ma Wailuku nei; a ua lohe au i kona mooolelo lapaaau, a ke waiho nei ke kope i kekahi* ‘a famous expert who lived here in Wailuku; I have heard of his medical report and that a copy is left with someone’. He names three other practitioners; *ua pau nae i ka make. Aka, aole nae paha i pau loa, malia paha ua ao haumana no lakou, a ua kakau paha i Buke, a waiho i na hoolina, a haumana paha* ‘but they are all ended in death. But perhaps not completely ended; perhaps they taught students and perhaps wrote books and left them to their heirs or perhaps their students’. Some knowledgeable people are still living. Such medicine is not necessarily attached to idolatry, *aole pili hoomanamana a hoomanakii no hoii*. Medicine can be separated from sorcery and genuine medical practitioners from false ones.

J. K. Unauna argues that if Hawaiian medicine is not practiced, the race will die. But that medicine is hindered by the law. The government’s *Papa Ola* ‘Board of Health’ is not competent to judge Hawaiian practitioners, whose numbers must be increased to replace the many who have died. It was good to establish the
Medical Society of Wailuku, and practitioners should be brought together, so their information can be studied and explained and turned into a book, *a lilo i Buke*.

The interest in publishing Hawaiian medical information in a book can be found elsewhere. Kamakau writes:

*Ina e hoonohonoho ponoia ka moolelo o na mai, a me ka hoono-honoho ana o ka moolelo o na laau, a e loaa ka Buke Anetomia Hawaii no na mea pili kino, a pela na moolelo o na kulana mai a me na laau lapaaau.*

‘If only the report about the diseases were put down correctly along with the report on the medicines, and the Hawaiian Anatomy Book were obtained for the things relating to the body, and thus for the reports of the positions of the diseases and the medical plants’.

In all this controversy, most of those in favor of Hawaiian medicine emphasized its plants or treatments, and those who were against it emphasized its religious connection. This is the context in which Kamakau’s own extensive writings on Hawaiian medicine must be understood, writings in which he attempted to do justice to both aspects of the subject. Like others, he was an eyewitness to the efficacy of Hawaiian treatments (Kamakau August 18, 1870). The problem was to provide an explanation of Hawaiian medicine that made it acceptable in the new situation. Kamakau can interpret positive medical results as due to faith, which connects Hawaiian medicine to Christian faith healing (August 18, 1870). He can also present excuses for some of the faults recognized in Hawaiian medical practice. For instance, practitioners sometimes failed—giving traditional medicine a bad reputation—because they accepted cases they knew were fatal; the reason they did this was that they felt *aloha* for the patient (September 1, 1870). Medical practitioners did accept offerings, but this was not selfish. The feast for the ancestral gods
was shared with the patient’s family, and poor people did not have to offer as much as rich. A few offerings would suffice if the god *aloha mai* ‘loved the people’ (September 15, 1870).

He develops a further, ambitious argument; the one used later by Sheldon. God made the earth and thus the potential medicines in it. Correct knowledge about the earth and its elements enables people to practice correct medicine. The correctness of Hawaiian medicine is proven by its results. Therefore, the medical knowledge of the Hawaiians is ultimately given by God (August 25, 1870; September 1, 1870; September 15, 1870). According to Kamakau, this view provides the proper perspective on the religious aspects of traditional medicine. For instance, the rules of training and practice had a positive purpose (August 25, 1870):

*He mau kanawai a he mau rula no ke ao ana, he ao no a loaa ka ike, a loaa ke akamai, a pili ka aumakua lapaaau i ka haumana, ke hoolohe a malama a hiki i ka wa e ailolo ai.*

‘There were laws and rules for learning, a learning indeed to obtain knowledge, to obtain intelligence, for the medical ancestral god to cleave to the student, if he listened and kept [the rules] until the time of graduation’.

The connection of medicine to God is shown in the primary importance of prayer, even if directed to the Hawaiian gods:

*O ke ao i ka pule ka mua, oia ke kumu a me ke alakai o ka ike a me ke akamai o ke kanaka e alakai ana i ke kanaka e ike i ka lapaaau, a me ka ike ana i na mea pohihihi iloko o ke kanaka mai, a nolaila, o ke akua ke alakai o na mea a pau, o ke akua ke ola palena ole, a nolaila, ua hilianai na mea a pau e ao ana i kela oihana i keia oihana i ke akua.*

‘The first thing is learning the prayer; this is the source and the guide of the knowledge and intelligence of the human being, leading the human being to know medicine and the knowledge of
the obscure things inside the sick person. And, therefore, the god is the leader of all people, the god is boundless life, and, therefore, all people trusted in learning this or that occupation in the god'.

In Hawaiian, the Christian God is also referred to as “the god,” which along with the phrase “boundless life,” contributes to the Christian tone of the passage. When Kamakau continues, he is clearly referring to the Christian God, saying that He does not give the same gifts to all. Moreover, Kamakau argues—turning Christian rhetoric against Western medicine—some peoples do not rely on God for their medicine but on themselves and their schooling, which leads them to strange practices, like cutting into the skin:

*aole ma ke alakai ana o ka mana o ke akua ia lakou, aka, ma ko lakou alakai ikemaka ma ka imi naauao. A o ko Hawaii imi ana i ka papa kahuna lapaa. O ke akua ke kahua, o ka lua o ka pule, o ke kolu o ka papa o ka mai, o ka ha, o ka papa o ka laau. O ka lima o ka papa o ka make, o ke ono o ka papa o ke ola.*

[They proceed] ‘not in their being led by the power of god, but in their being led by their own sight in the search for wisdom. But in the Hawaiian's search within the medical division, the god is the foundation, prayer is second, the division of the disease is the third, and the fourth is the division of the plant/medicine. The division of death is the fifth, and the division of life is the sixth’.

Kamakau identifies the prayer as the Kumuhonua, probably a part of a movement to provide a modern interpretation of traditional religion under the influence of Christianity (September 1, 1870). He claims that this prayer had priority over the other prayers to other gods: *Oia ke kahua mua e ao ai ka haumana, a paanaau ka pule me ka wale waha i ka haumana* ‘This was the first foundation the student was learning, and the prayer was memorized by the student until he could recite it faultlessly’.
With this apologetic basis, Kamakau can then offer positive interpretations of criticized aspects of traditional medicine. For instance, countersorcery has been described as idolatrous and deceitful. Kamakau recognizes that there were false practitioners, but *aole pela kekahi poe, ua ike maoli no, a ua nui ka poe i ola ka mai, a he ano papalua ka oihana kahuna lapaau* ‘some people were not like that, but really knew indeed, and many are the people whose disease was cured, so the occupation of medical expert was of two types’ (September 15, 1870). Such problems cannot be cured by medication, but some Hawaiian practitioners were able to find solutions, which were applied earlier and are used today. This knowledge was given by the true God, but the good expert had to take care of his body and *na kanawai o ka aina a me ko ke Akua* ‘the laws of the land and those of God’; otherwise he would not be able to give a correct prescription.

Similarly, Kamakau defends the beliefs and practices concerning maladies caused by ancestral gods. Such problems were the base of many illnesses, which could be successfully treated with medication only after the problem with the ancestral god had been solved (September 15, 1870). The experts in this type of medicine had a bad reputation as idolatrous because of their prayers and ritual offerings to ancestral gods and dead people; but the few real experts did save people. Such maladies are difficult to cure as Hawaiian practitioners and foreign doctors have seen (May 12, September 22, 1870). Ancestral gods were usually protective and were credited often with saving people from mortal dangers, such as sorcery. But now the ancestral gods have become powerful enemies, punishing people for a long list of faults, such as neglecting them, not following their rules, and breaking oaths. As a result, people now want to be freed from their power. Different offerings can be made to the ancestral gods, and chiefs had elaborate rituals for theirs (September 29, 1870). Kamakau articulates his own theology of ancestral gods: they and other gods are all subsumed under the four great male gods and five female
ones. The ancestral gods are in fact *na anela kiai kino o ke kanaka* ‘the angels who guard the body of the human being’; a physical emphasis that Hawaiians found lacking in Christianity. Even today, these gods fetch people who die and return to speak with people. They are not wandering souls without responsibility. The good person died in peace as he saw the gods coming to fetch him.

Kamakau thus concludes from the effectiveness of Hawaiian medicine that it must be given by God, who cares for all the earth’s peoples regardless of their religion. If Hawaiian medicine is given by God, the religious practices necessary for its success must also be ultimately justifiable within the divine dispensation. Hawaiian religion and culture can, therefore, be interpreted to accord with and even to complete the Christianity of the missionaries: they are justified as effective in the world created by God.

**Sorcery and Countersorcery**

Sorcery and countersorcery were related to medicine, and the two could be taught together. For instance, Kamehameha I used sorcery gods exceptionally for healing himself, as he did when he was dying and regular medicine was unable to help him. Kamakau reports of his own time that the regular medical profession is decreasing in influence—due to its inability to deal with foreign diseases—and many people are turning to sorcery experts under the impression that they have more power (August 11, 1870):

*He a ola ka ke kahuna lapaaau, a he a make hoi ka ke kahuna anaana, a he o i no ka kahuna anaana mamua o ka kahuna lapaaau. Nolaila, lawe lua ke kahuna anaana i na aoao elua, o ka make a me ke ola.*

‘The medical expert has a [ritual] fire of life; the sorcery expert has also a fire of death, and the sorcery expert is superior to the
medical expert. Therefore, the sorcery expert takes on the two sides: death and life’.

Some Hawaiians indeed prophesied that the Kālaipāhoa poison gods of Moloka‘i would live again and transform their death-dealing work to life for the Hawaiian race (Kamakau July 21, 1870).

An illustration of this connection between sorcery and medicine is provided in a report by Kalaeokaena (October 13, 1866). To cure the sickness of his wife Kaumu, a man named Papa obtained from Wahahe‘e (perhaps a fictitious name: ‘Lying’) a bundle containing the wood of the poison god of Moloka‘i. Wahahe‘e later contracted leprosy and was moved to that island. Kaumu’s sickness worsened, and Papa took her to Kaoao, apparently a Christian minister. When he saw the bundle, he demanded as a Christian that they burn it and its contents, which was done publicly. He insisted also that Kaumu eat pig for one week (similar to a medical treatment), probably because she had been observing traditional eating tabus. People waited to see whether the poison god would punish these actions, but nothing happened. The author is surprised that these traditional practices are still followed iloko o keia mau la a Kristo e kinai nei i na akua liilii ‘within these days in which Christ is suppressing the little gods’. Similarly, “Native Testimony to the Prevalence of Idolatry” (May 1889: 35) publishes an extract of “a letter of one of the best of the native school teachers” that states that Hawaiian ministers are worried to work against idolatry for fear of being killed “by the power of these sorcery gods.” As seen above, Aholo (1861) lumps Hawaiian medicine together with sorcery because they use the same pagan means. Indeed, the prayer he quotes (1861: 3) is an untraditional combination of healing and sorcery prayers, an example of the nineteenth-century mixing of literary genres.

Such activity continues today. I was told by one older Hawaiian man that if his family had trouble with another family, they would go to reason with them. If after several attempts, the
trouble continued, “Then we go to our gods.” An older Hawaiian woman described to me how she had destroyed an akua lele ‘flying god’ who had been sent against her and how she later made up a sorcery bundle, pū‘olo, and placed it under the house of a hostile family. Families are still referred to as “keeping bundles,” that is, practicing sorcery against their enemies.

A knowledge of sorcery and countersorcery was considered necessary for self-protection. ‘Ī‘ī writes (March 12, 1870), Ua oleloia nae hoi, o ka mea ike ole i na ka-ina o ia ano ke make, a o ka mea ike aole oia e make ‘It was just said indeed that the person who did not know the hits of this type was the one who would die, but the knowledgeable person, he would not die.’ Accordingly, a contemporary hula master instructs her students in rudimentary sorcery and countersorcery so that they will be able to recognize any negative religious actions taken against them.

In the view of many Hawaiians, sorcery and countersorcery experts can, therefore, be either good or bad, and the need for moral character in practitioners is especially acute.²⁰⁵ If the expert was morally good, sorcery was he oihana hemolele a maikai ‘a perfect and good occupation’ (Kamakau July 21, 1870). Kamehameha even used the worship of sorcery gods to pray for the life of king, chiefs, and people (Kamakau July 21, 1870).

This view is markedly different from the global condemnation by foreign missionaries, who argued against sorcery with a rhetoric that became conventional with such words as wahahe‘e ‘lying’ and ho‘opunipuni ‘deceitful’ (e.g., Aholo 1861: 8 ff.). Whitney and Richards, in stating that no mortally poisonous plants existed in Hawai‘i, argue that sorcerers purporting to use such plants were merely playing on the fears of the people; when someone thought he was the object of sorcery he became frightened and stopped eating, which led to death.²⁰⁶

As in medicine, however, the Hawaiians’ personal experience disposed them to take the subject more seriously.²⁰⁷ Kamakau refutes specifically Whitney and Richards in his discus-
sion of sorcery. The famous Kālaipāhoa wood of Moloka'i was indeed not poisonous in itself, nor by ritual imparting of power, ho'omanamana, but by the indwelling of the appropriate gods. Ho'omanamana was accorded the plants only after their character had been recognized (May 12, 1870). Moreover, victims were not killed merely by fear, because animals who touched the gods' house died as surely as people who approached the house without due respect; this was seen even by foreigners (July 21, 1870). When Kamakau witnesses a type of sorcerer save two people from choking to death on a fish, he exclaims in Christian language, “Pomai-kai ke ola na ke Akua” “Happy is the life given by God”. However, later in the same installment, describing a classical ceremony, he states Kupanaha ka hana a na diabolo ‘Wondrous is the work of the devils’. Hawaiians were clearly ambivalent about sorcery. Aholo (1861) calls it deceitful but states also that: Pela i pau ai ka nui o na ali'i o keia Pae moku . . . A pela no hoi na makaainana ‘Thus were killed the majority of the chiefs of this Archipelago . . . And thus also the commoners’ (8, 10). In any case, Kamakau states (August 4, 1870), Hawai'i was not the only place to have sorcerers; they are described and condemned in detail in the Bible.

The typical praise words na'auao, akamai, and kaulana, were applied to persons knowledgeable in sorcery; such persons also often gained riches, waiwai. Kamakau writes, he hana nui a na kahuna i ao i ka anaana, a he hana kaulana ‘a great work done by the experts who were educated in sorcery, and a famous work’ (Kamakau August 4, 1870); studying sorcery was he oihana kapu me ka laa loa ‘a tabu occupation with great sacredness/consecration’ (Kamakau July 21, 1870).

Indeed, Kamakau (August 4, 1870) uses traditional, formal training as the main criterion to differentiate between the old-time, moral sorcerers and modern ones. In the old days, the kuni sorcerer worked and spoke openly without fear of chiefs:
he mana i ka wa kahiko, a o ka poe i ao pololei ia ua io no ia lakou ka mana, aole e hiki ke olelo ae ka poe i ikemaka i ka mana he wahahoe

‘there was power in the olden time, and it was true that the people who were trained correctly had power; the people who were eyewitnesses to the power could not say that it was a lie’.

Contemporary sorcerers are different. Some have learned, others have not. Most do evil sorcery and do it in secret. Some just pick up the sense of a prayer without the proper words and confuse the different types of sorcery, old and new.

Sorcery and countersorcery were often family specialties, each family having its own gods and guarded prayers, which were considered most powerful: although Uli is the main sorcery god, “each tribe has its respective deities for these occasions” (Ellis 1984: 295). Kaiākea leaves his gods, knowledge, and moral advice to his children (Kamakau July 14, 1870). Certain localities were famous for sorcery, especially Moloka‘i. Sorcery was well known as an expertise. Ellis reports that “The sorcerers were a distinct class among the priests of the island” and the general field of sorcery was divided into specialties with their own prayers and rituals.

The literature on sorcery was extensive. Prominent are traditions of the origins of sorcery in general and particular types of sorcery. For instance, Kamakau writes that sorcery is ancient but does not go back to the beginnings, the time of Wākea. Its origins are to be found in the two sisters, Uliiuka and Uliikai, the former of whom became the ‘aumakua ‘anā’anā ‘ancestral sorcery goddess’ for sorcerers and countersorcerers (Kamakau July 21, 1870). The famous stories of the Kālaipāhoa gods and those who appeared to Kaiākea provide the origins of particular traditions of sorcery.

The history of sorcery was transmitted in detail, along with the names of the succeeding kahū ‘guardians’ and kāhuna ‘priests’
of the different gods. The general picture is that sorcery was tightly controlled by the chiefs until the time of Kamehameha, who used it more extensively. Moreover, the political and social disturbances of the time encouraged people to turn to sorcery both for protection and to attack others, including innocents. According to Kamakau, the spread of sorcery even to commoners accelerated after 1812—when Kamehameha increased and restructured the practice of sorcery, making it an important part of court worship—and continued strongly until 1830: *a mahope iho o ke au ainoa, a ina makahiki mua o ke au ao palapala; a oia ka manawa i ike pinepine loa ia* ‘just after the time of free eating [the breaking of the eating kapu] and in the first years of learning writing, that was the time that [various sorts of sorcery] were seen very frequently’ (July 14, 1870; also July 21, 1870). People from Moloka‘i traveled to other islands to teach sorcery. Kamakau (August 4, 11, 1870) reports that sorcery continued into his own day and was witnessed by himself and others.

Prayers were especially important in sorcery because the work was done largely by the god or gods addressed: *Hookahi no popo laau lapaaau nui a ka papa kahuna anaana. O ka pule* . . . ‘A single great medicinal plant bundle [was used] by the division of sorcery experts: prayer . . . ’. Accordingly, memorizing prayers was the basis of training:

\[
aia wale no ka lakou hana, o ke ao i ka pule, a o ke kuili i ka po me ke ao, aia no a paa ka pule e like me ke olioli a me ke mele i wale i ka waha ka pahee, aole e lohe ia ka anapuu
\]

‘their work was just learning prayer, and praying in the night as in the day, until the prayer was indeed firm/memorized like a chant or song so that it slipped smoothly through the mouth; there was no unevenness’.

This prayer was effective, as seen in descriptions of the graduation ceremony below, although there were types of sorcery that
depended on the sending of a spirit rather than the power of the prayer (Kamakau August 4, 1870).

Although prayer was the major means of sorcery, some plants and other devices were used, the names of which were arranged in hierarchical lists as in other branches of Hawaiian education. Specialized sorcery terminology can be seen in the names of the different branches and the use of such terms as kāina ‘sorcery hits’. Sorcery education was among the most rigorous. The prospective student had to be accepted by an expert to whom he brought many offerings ma ka inoa o ka aumakua o na akua anaana, a ma ka inoa o ke kumu ‘in the name of the ancestral god, of the sorcery gods, and in the name of the teacher’. If accepted, a special house would be built for the instruction, and the student would be taught intensively, usually in groups of three to five; memorizing prayers night and day, learning the kāina ‘hits’, and the use of such devices as pebbles for incantations and divination. Education was initiated by prayer, surrounded with tabus, and included many testing ordeals, such as eating disgusting things.

The sorcery graduation ceremony was spectacular. Favorable omens were needed to ensure the moral character of the candidate, since the immoral or faulty use of sorcery was dangerous both to others and to himself. The student had to prove his self-control by eating disgusting things. Most important, the student had to demonstrate the power of his prayer, most clearly by killing someone:

_Eia ka hana mua, o ke ao ana a loaa ka pule a ailolo, ma hope o ka lolo ana, kia ka pule._

‘Here is the first work: learning until the prayer is obtained and until graduation, and after graduation, the prayer is aimed/directed’.
The student had to state publicly who would die, when, and of what malady (Kamakau August 4, 1870). Other spectacular effects of the sorcery prayer are reported: breaking rocks, drying up living trees, making fire appear from a rock or green tree, and so on.\textsuperscript{223}

If the whole ceremony was successful, the teacher would proclaim that \textit{oia ka haumana i koho ia mai e ke Akua, e malama i ka pule} ‘this was the student chosen by the God to care for the prayer’ (Kamakau August 4, 1870). Each graduation ceremony tested a certain degree of knowledge, so students could proceed through ten or twenty such ceremonies:\textsuperscript{224}

\begin{quote}
\textit{ua nui ka lolo ana me ka nui o ka loa o na loina o kela kulana o keia kulana o ka oihana pule, ua pau o luna, ua pau olalo, ua like pu ke kumu me ka haumana . . .}
\end{quote}

‘the size of the graduation accorded with the greatness of the extent of the rules of this or that grade of the occupation of prayer; the above was exhausted, the below was exhausted, the teacher and the student were alike’.

A teacher was careful not to impart all his knowledge for fear of being killed by his student (e.g., Kamakau September 21, 1867).

\section*{Dream Lore and Interpretation}

Dream lore was an important part of Hawaiian culture and has continued through the nineteenth century up to today.\textsuperscript{225} Families teach to children their own traditions of customary meanings and interpretations for practical purposes.\textsuperscript{226} The seriousness of the occupation is shown by the fact that it makes possible the interpretation of \textit{na ouli o ka moe uhane e pili ana i ka make a me ke ola} ‘the signs of the dream that were relating to death and life’ (Fornander 1919–1920:127). Dream interpretation could also
be taught as an expertise, teachings that spread throughout the community: *He mea ka moeuhane i aoia i ka wa kahiko e ka poe moemoea, a laha ia olelo-ao mai o a anei* ‘The dream was something that was taught in the olden time by dream people/interpreters, and this teaching-statement spread here and there’.227

Characteristically, a terminology was developed for dream interpretation. The dream itself is a *moe ‘uhane* “Lit., soul sleep”, which can be shortened to *moe* ‘sleep’, when the context is clear; the dream is a genuine vehicle of communication.228 The dream contains signs, *ōuli* or *hō’ailona*, that need to be interpreted, *wehewehe*; the word *ha’i* is used for the telling or the interpreting of a dream.229 The meaning of the dream is connected to *ke ‘ano* ‘the type’: *wehewehe aku la i ke ano o ka moe* ‘interpret the type [and thus the meaning] of the dream’.230 Thus, *‘ano* itself can be translated “meaning.”

Literary forms are also used in dream interpretation. For instance, a dream can be communicated in the form of a chant.231 As in medical education, memorization was important. Kepelino (1932:115) states that there was a great unity of dream interpretation in Hawai‘i; *a paanaau maoli no ke ano me he Katekimo la i hele a hani i ka wa kamalii* ‘and in childhood the type/meaning was indeed memorized like a Catechism until learned perfectly’.

Regular forms, similar to medical case reports, were devised to facilitate this process.

Fornander 1919–1920: 127–131: items begin with *O keia kekahilo* kahi o na moe . . ./O kekahilo keia o na moe . . . or Ina [paha] ua . . .

Kepelino 1932: 115–123: *Aia hoi*; an optional reference to the dream; *ike* what he saw; followed by *Ke ano*; followed by *Ka haina/Haina*. A variant is *He ano oia*: (119). *Ka pili*; sometimes supplements (121) or replaces (123) *Ke ano*. A shortened form can be used: a short description of the dream followed by *Ka haina/Haina* (121).
In the above two examples, the forms are arranged as lists. Dreams could be divided hierarchically into large classes using conventional terminology: *Ua maheleia ka moe uhane ma na papa elua: o ka moe maikai, a o ka moe ino* ‘The dream was divided into two divisions: the good dream and the evil dream’. The pair male/female, connected to right/left, is used within interpretations (Fornander 1919–1920: 127 ff.). This conventional dream lore needed naturally to be applied to individual cases (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 175 ff.).

**Genealogists and Historians**

Genealogies and the various genres used to transmit historical materials are of major importance in Hawaiian culture (compare Bruner 1986: 78). Moreover, I would argue, Hawaiian thinking was basically historical. Historical allusions are constant in Hawaiian conversation and literature. For instance, each major island was connected by conventional phrases to a famous chief—Hawai‘i o Keawe ‘Hawai‘i of Keawe’, O‘ahu o Kākuhihewa ‘O‘ahu of Kākuhihewa’, and so on; these universally known phrases required some knowledge of the historical chiefs named. Such historical allusions can be found in chants, proverbs, and stories of all kinds. For instance, the *mele inoa* ‘name songs’ of chiefs—which had to be memorized by their dependants—contain allusions. People were acquainted also with the stories of gods, heroes, and sports champions.

Reference was constantly made to the past in order to understand the present. For instance, Kamakau describes as ignorant of history those who thought Western learning would be restricted by the government to the chiefs and be denied to other capable people (January 21, 1869): *he poe ike ole i ke ano o ka aina a me ka lahui, a me ke ano o ke au o ka noho ana o ka poe Moi o ka wa kahiko* ‘a people without knowledge of the character of
the land and the race as well as the character of the period of the reign of the Kings of the olden time’. That is, chiefs would always encourage education and employ the best possible experts at their court. Good and bad historical chiefs provided positive and negative models for ethical teaching. Political decisions were made after searching through all possibly relevant historical precedents, which provided yet another reason to preserve historical traditions: to lose a model or precedent was to lose a possible solution. This practice accorded with the Hawaiian honoring of ancestors and ensured the continuity of the future with the past; in Burke’s words (1993: 33): “People will not look forward to posterity, who never look backward to their ancestors.”

In the nineteenth century, Hawaiians produced an enormous amount of historical writing, which is important for the material it preserves, the views it records, and for its witness to the continuing appreciation of ancestral culture and ethnic identity. In contemporary Hawai‘i, genealogy and history are being pursued as a major part of the Hawaiian renaissance. Perhaps the worst distortion of the atemporal anthropological approach to Polynesian cultures has been its ignorance of this pervasive historical dimension.

Families of all ranks depended on genealogies to establish their identities and claims. Those genealogies were necessarily related to those of other families, which connected the individual family to a large portion of the population and its history. Similarly, family histories were kept, which also related the family to the general history of the society. Professions and schools of experts kept their lineages and histories. At the highest intellectual level, the genealogical picture of the origin of the universe—as expressed in the Kumulipo—included the history of gods and human beings.

As in other fields, Hawaiians were expected to have a general competence in history, on which competence were based several levels of expertise. A member of the family would be entrusted
with learning its genealogies and stories, and more broadly knowledgeable experts occupied prestigious positions in society and at court. Townsend writes (1900: 35 f.):

the learned class held vast stores of it in their memories. Every chief worthy of consideration was assumed to be able to chant his own genealogy through many generations and the heroic deeds of his illustrious ancestors. And even the common people were made measurably familiar with the main outlines of their country’s history.

The transmission of historical material was oral in classcal Hawai'i. A standard expression for the oral tradition is the frequently used expression *ua 'ōlelo 'ia* ‘it is said’ and its variants, an expression that can also be used for gossip and news and extended to writing.236 Similarly, the word used for learning the oral tradition, *lohe* ‘to listen, hear’, can be extended to research in general (e.g., Hale'ole June 1, 1865). Genealogists are called *ka po'e kū'auhau*. People who maintain the oral historical narratives are called *ka po'e mālama mo'olelo* ‘the people who care for the stories’ or *ka po'e pa'a mo'olelo* ‘the people who have fixed or memorized the stories’; the sense of *mālama* ‘care for’ was extended to recording in writing.237 Something about which no information can be found in the received tradition is not *mao-popo* ‘clear’; for instance, *Aole no i maopopo ka moolelo no ka make ana o ua Keawe nei* ‘The story of the death of this Keawe is not clear/known’ (ʻĪ‘i June 5, 1869). *Akaaka* or *akaka* ‘clear’ can also be used in this sense. *Hāʻule* ‘fall’ is used for the loss of an item from the oral tradition; *po'omuku* and *po'opo'omuku* ‘shortened, cut short’ are used for presentations that are abbreviated or incomplete;238 *pa'a kāpekepeke* is “vaguely, incompletely recorded, as a legend.”239 Passing time covers over the events of the past (Pukui 1983: number 379), which must then be extracted (Pukui and Elbert 1986: ʻiʻi 4.). I have seen no Hawaiian text in which the
past was indicated by the directional *mua* ‘front’ and the future by *hope* ‘back’, as claimed by some writers today.

Literary forms were developed in which information could be transmitted orally. These forms were grouped in two areas that are the main foci of Polynesian thinking: land and family (Charlot 1983a:55–112). The fundamental Polynesian and Hawaiian historical genre is the genealogy, which had major and well-known functions. The importance of the form is demonstrated by the extension of its use to other subjects, most obviously, for the articulation of the origin of the universe in the *Kumulipo* and in the lineages of teachers of different occupational schools. Missionaries were surprised to find that Hawaiians favored the genealogical passages of the Bible to memorize (e.g., Andrews 1834a:167).

Families kept their genealogies, often assigning the task to one person. Genealogy was—and still is—a preeminent field for experts—*ka poʻe kūʻauhau*—some of whom were famous and occupied positions at court. At the expert level, the family context was perpetuated in two ways: certain families specialized in genealogical knowledge, and the expert himself had to possess a noble lineage in order to learn the genealogies of other chiefs. As in other fields, the genealogist had to identify his teacher to validate his role.

The evidence is divided on whether genealogies were kept secret and, if so, how secret. Obviously, family lines and connections were public knowledge at least in broad terms and were in fact an important part of the prestige of a chief. Kamakau (January 26, 1867) states that there was much ignorance about genealogies among both chiefs and commoners, but he may be referring only to the recent past. Secrecy was an issue in the controversy between Kamakau and the expert genealogist A. Unauna, discussed below (Chun in Kamakau 1988:14). Criticizing Kamakau’s article on genealogy (October 25, 1842), A. Unauna (November
8, 1842: 63) argued that genealogies were not revealed to non-family members and that chiefly genealogies were learned only by those of chiefly blood. Unauna, therefore, criticized Kamakau for revealing secret information in order to make himself famous. In his reply, Kamakau (February 14, 1843) did not address directly the question of secrecy, although his claim to have reconstructed the genealogy himself rather than having learned it from someone else may have been intended as a defense. In a later article, however, Kamakau (October 28, 1865) described people learning the genealogies of others. Kamakau (September 12, 1868) argued that ka moookuaiah kupuna 'the ancestral genealogy' was kapu only on the island of Hawai‘i; mai Maui a Kauai aole i kapu; he mau Hale Nauwa ko lakou (he hai kupuna ke ano) ‘from Maui to Kaua‘i it was not kapu; they had several Hale Naua (the nature of which was to proclaim one’s ancestors’). But in a still later article, Kamakau (June 24, 1869) stated that genealogies were kapu loa ‘greatly tabu’, but genealogical information could be obtained from other genres, such as chants. Kamakau is clearly inconsistent on the question of the secrecy of genealogies, an inconsistency that was probably found in his sources. 

Genealogical claims were controversial. Genealogies could be slanted or reformulated to support one chief and degrade another. To judge claims, the Hale Naua was established, staffed by expert genealogists, who used a formal interrogatory to ascertain the lineage of the claimant until the tenth generation.

The genealogical literary form could include just names, or short descriptions could be added. Short historical reports or stories could also be attached to names. Ideally, the people named in a genealogy had to be identified as well as named; that is, the genealogist had to be a historian as well: ua makaukau hoi i ka moolelo o kela a me keia ali‘i [the genealogist] ‘was also prepared in the story of this and that chief’. Such are the people that Kamakau praises (October 28, 1865):
Aka, o ka poe i ao i ka Mooolelo, a Mookuauhau me ka naauao a me ke akamai i kela mea i keia mea, ke kakaolelo me ke kalaiaina, oia ka poe i kapaia he poe akeakamai io. A ua naauao io lakou

‘But the people educated in History and Genealogy with wisdom and intelligence in this and that thing, oratory and governmental administration, these were the ones who were called people who truly sought intelligence. And they were really wise’.

Such completely educated people are disappearing (Kamakau June 2, 1866):

_Ua pau iho nei i ka make, ua poe kahiko nei i ao maoli i na mea kahiko, a me ka hoonohonoho ana i ka mooolelo alii, a me ka mookuauhau alii, a me na mooolelo kaua, a me na mooolelo aupuni o ka noho ana o ka wa kahiko._

‘They are ended in death these old people who were truly educated in the old things, and the arranging of the chiefly history, and the chiefly genealogies, and the war stories, and the reports on the governmental organization of the olden time’.

Expert historians—_ka po'e mo'olelo_ ‘the story people’, _ka po'e mālama mo'olelo_ ‘the people who cared for the stories’—were important in the society and at court.\(^{251}\) Ka’awa writes that such wise experts, whom he calls _haku mooolelo_,\(^ {252}\) have learned from childhood and can answer accurately their chief’s questions about history. The stories of historical chiefs provide examples. If the chief heeds them, he will live; if not, he will die. Each island has its own historian, and many have attained high positions at court.

At present, some people are less completely educated: _Ua ao ia keia poe ma ka ike kuauhau kupuna, a ua koe aku ka nui, aole keia poe i ao ia i ka Mooolelo Hawaii_ ‘These people are educated in the knowledge of ancestral genealogies, but the greater part remains; these people have not been educated in Hawaiian History’ (Kamakau September 12, 1868). They did not learn what
Kamakau did from his sources and *ko‘u poe kupuna* ‘my forebears’. The genealogist A. Unauna was able to teach only genealogies to the queen, so he and others did not know Hawaiian history. So he summoned Kamakau to O‘ahu *e ao au i ka Moiwahine i ke kuauhau kupuna alii me ka moolelo Hawaii, a me na ano a pau o ke aupuni Hawaii i ka wa kahiko* ‘so that I would teach the Queen the genealogy of the chiefly ancestors with the history of Hawai‘i along with all the types of Hawaiian government in the olden time’. Kamakau (March 21, 1868b) insists that in his series on Hawaiian history, he provides both genealogies and their attached stories: *me ka malama i ka moolelo me na kuauhau maloko o ka moolelo* ‘with care for the history and the genealogies inside the history’. In Kamakau’s work in fact, history has become the framework of his narrative rather than genealogy.

Genealogy provided, therefore, the classical framework of the historical narrative and was filled out with the related stories. The genealogy was, in fact, considered a more secure historical source than the stories; in Malo’s words: *aole he pono loa ona mooka ao, elike me na mookuauhau* ‘historical narratives are not greatly correct like genealogies’. Stories had to be authenticated—some indeed were simply fabricated—and different versions noted. The fact that this Hawaiian practice is parallel to the Samoan (Charlot 1992a: 40–44) demonstrates that it is Polynesian and thus precontact.

Within the family, genealogy was taught along with the connected stories and other literary forms. Pukui writes:

> Genealogists learned not only the names and family connections but also the genealogical chants and the stories of each chief and chiefess; where he was born, what he did and all about him.

Family history was, however, related to general Hawaiian history and could, therefore, be used by historians for broader purposes. Indeed, the *Kumulipo* demonstrates that the family was
connected to the universe as a whole (Charlot 1983a: 45, 121–126). An excellent description of such a broadly educated family expert is provided by Wilkes (1845: 121):

[they] listened to one of these long traditions from a young man named Kiwe, a descendant of one of the “tradition bearers,” who were employed specially to hand down the traditions in their family, and were thus the depositaries of the oral archives of the nation . . . Kalumo, the chief scribe, . . . was sent for, and began to question him relative to the traditions. Kiwe began by describing various great chiefs and their genealogies, but nothing relating to their feats or actions [with one exception] . . .

Other family-related genres were available to the classical Hawaiian historian. The last testaments, kauoha, of great men were memorized and transmitted. Histories could be organized as a narrative series of combats. Chants could contain historical information, for instance on famous chiefs: Ua komo o Kakuihewa [sic] a me na’iili o Oahu i na mele kupuna ‘Kakuhihewa and the chiefs of O’ahu entered into the ancestral chants’ as well as becoming the proverbial chief of his island. Chants could also be historically important in themselves, as Ke’aulumoku’s ‘Au’a ‘Ia. Old chants ‘Pertained to the government, the land, and the chiefly majesty’, E pili ana i ke aupuni i ka aina i ka hanohano ali‘i (Kamakau march 21, 1868b). Those learning to compose koihonua ‘genealogical chants’ were under kapus similar to those of genealogy students (Kamakau December 21, 1867). The position of court chant expert was a family heritage with the responsibility of preserving historical traditions in the genre. Kamakau emphasizes that genealogical information can be found in chants and discusses a mele helu kanaka ‘chant to list people’, which recorded population. He writes that he would like a newspaper column to publish na mele kahiko ano nui ‘the major old chants’ that are historically important (March 21, 1868b). The first use of a chant as a source for a published Hawaiian-language history
appears to be Whitney and Richards (1832:154 f., not printed colo-
metrically).

After the introduction of writing, families were able to record their traditions in family books: “The book is valued as a sacred possession [sic], even more priceless than the Hawaiian Bible . . .” (Johnson 1957:27). Such books along with other manuscripts are an important, though unexplored factor in nineteenth-century Hawaiian historiography.

Besides the family focus emphasized above, the cultural emphasis on place knowledge—especially that of one’s own place—encouraged the learning of history. Many topics and genres were connected to the land, as discussed in chapter IV. Among those most knowledgeable about local traditions would have been minor chiefs, who were generally more sedentary and whose families would have been attached over a number of generations to a certain place. Kamakau (June 2, 1866) may be referring to such people when he writes of kekahi poe Kaukaualii i ike i ka moolelo Hawaii ‘some Lesser Chiefs knowledgeable in Hawaiian history’. Kamakau felt that the 1841 historical society should have hired traveling researchers (September 9, 1865b):

*e ninau i na wahi kaulana me na’lili kahiko i noho i kela wahi i keia wahi. Oiai e ola ana kekahi poe kahiko o ka aina-Aka, i keia manawa, he poe malihini ke noho nei maluna o ka aina.*

*Ina makemake kekahi e ninau i ka poe alii oia wahi au i lohe ai, e hoole mai auanei kela kanaka, he malihini au no Hawaii, a pela wale aku.*

‘to ask about the famous places and the ancient chiefs who lived in this and that place. That is, there were living then some old people of the land. But at this time, newcomers are living upon the land.

‘If someone wants to ask the chiefly people of a place “what you have heard about it,” that person will perhaps refuse, saying, “I am a newcomer from Hawai‘i island,” and so on’. 
“No ka Pono Kahiko, a me ka Pono Hou” lists this lack of settledness as one of the evils of the new age. Place knowledge also contributed to the organization of historical materials. Most important, the genealogies and histories of the chiefs were traditionally grouped by islands, and each island had its historian (Ka‘awa December 23, 1865). This method was to have an important influence on nineteenth-century historiography, as will be seen below. Hawai‘i could also be conceived as an entity, a totality in itself, in opposition to the distant land of Kahiki. Hawaiians themselves could be opposed to haole ‘foreigners or non-Hawaiians’; a word used for the god Kamapua‘a, who comes from Kahiki and in the precontact chant of Kūali‘i (Charlot 1987:17; 1985a:33). The Kumulipo sketches a history of Hawai‘i within the development of the universe, but there is no evidence of any attempt in classical times to coordinate all the particular traditions of Hawai‘i into a unified narrative, a massive task indeed.

Nevertheless the ideal of completeness did encourage the acquisition of mastery in several genres. Pukui writes (n.d.:1606 [5]):

A person well versed in all three, story telling, poetry and figurative sayings found himself a favorite of his chief. Especially if the figurative sayings (‘olelo ho‘oka‘au) were humorous (ho‘omake ‘aka) and amused the hearers. One versed in both history and legends was said to be pa‘a mo‘olelo.

In his own work, Kamakau uses genealogies, narrative traditions, and chants. The two cultural foci of Hawaiian historical thinking explain some of the interests and emphases found in the traditions. These emphases can be found in the traditions themselves and in the lists of research topics and questions published by the nineteenth-century Hawaiian historians. The interest in genealogy and education explains the emphasis on the details of the birth and
upbringing: parents, birthplace, circumstances of birth and rearing, childhood, selection, teachers, and education and training. The emphasis on the famous deeds of chiefs and experts can also be placed in this context: the 1841 historical society emphasized na Moolelo kahiko o na’ili mai Hawai‘i a Kauai ‘the old stories of the chiefs from Hawai‘i to Kaua‘i’ (Kamakau September 9, 1865b).

The field of place knowledge emphasized the origins of land features and ultimately the universe; an emphasis that, along with the general Polynesian preoccupation with origins, influenced historical interests. Malo (July 1, 1847) enquires about the origins of customs, religious practices, and the Hawaiians; he asks about first instances. Similarly, the 1841 historical society expressed the traditional Hawaiian emphasis on origins: the place from which Hawaiians migrated; the first ancestors, chiefs, and kauā ‘under-class; the first people who went to Kahiki; the first people of Kahiki to come to Hawai‘i; the first foreigners to come to Hawai‘i; and the first boats. Kamakau (November 18, 1865) also mentions the earliest known or remembered war or battle. Medical experts were interested in the site of the first reported case of a disease. Hawaiians thus continued to address their traditional historical concerns even after being introduced to Western historiography.

Once historical materials were collected, they had to be evaluated. Like Samoans, Hawaiians could distinguish between fact and fiction, had a concept of historicity, and could deal critically with their received traditions. In genealogical work, for instance, it was certain that a chief had a great-grandfather. His identity could be disputed, but his historical existence could not. Non-genealogical traditions were treated generally in the same way: some historical foundation was assumed behind the possibly varying traditions (indeed, nineteenth-century and contemporary Hawaiians seem often excessively tolerant of speculation). For instance, the author of “Ka hopena no ke kaiakahinalii” (April 25, 1834) can write: Ke manao nei au ua oiaio ke kaiakahinalii, aka o na huaolelo ma
‘My opinion is that the Kai a Kahinali‘i [flood] was true, but the statements in this story, really, these statements are foolish’.

As stated above, Hawaiians recognized levels of security in the literary forms they used to transmit historical traditions. The most secure were those forms that were both memorized and contested until a general consensus was reached: genealogies and kauoha ‘last wills’. Less secure were forms that were memorized but less often contested, such as chants. Least secure was narrative prose, which was not articulated to facilitate memorization and which could be varied by the individual story-teller. As a result, prose versions could be checked against chants and indeed constructed from them.

The method of dealing with traditions was formed by the educational ideal of completeness: one learned as many of the varying traditions on the subject as possible. All those traditions were considered a body of material on the particular subject, and the learned person should be able to display his knowledge of them in his presentation. Thus, the Hawaiian religious teacher Kalāhikiola Nāli‘ielua could state in my class on Kamapua‘a that the pig god was not a kino ‘body’ of Lono and then later assert that he was. The students were confused because they did not add the phrase that was self-evident to Nāli‘ielua: “in a certain tradition.” Nāli‘ielua’s own opinion was the latter, but his method demanded that he acknowledge the existence of other traditions when giving his own view or tradition.

The method of learning and presenting an entire body of traditions on a subject and subsequently making one’s own evaluations and choices is found throughout the nineteenth century. Kamakau writes (August 25, 1866):

Ke makemake nei e loaa ka oiaio; a me na Mookuauhau pololei, no ka mea, ekolu Mookuauhau e waiho nei ia‘u. Pela mai kela ia‘u: Auhea ka oiaio?
‘I wish to obtain the truth and the correct Genealogies, because three Genealogies have been left to me. That person asks me: Where is the truth?’

Similar methods are found, for instance, in examining a number of historical precedents before making a decision. Moreover, the availability of alternative traditions had advantages in an oral culture. Different teachers, hula academies, and other schools could preserve their individual traditions without being challenged simply because they were distinctive. Room was allowed for flexibility, variety, and creativity. An expert use of such genealogical ambiguity was made by Kamehameha I: the succession of chiefs rumored to be his father—Kalani‘ōpu‘u, Keōua, and Kahekili—follows the sequence of those whose power he sought to assume or conquer (Charlot 1985a: 59).

The classical interest in history has continued through the nineteenth century until the present day. The oral tradition has been perpetuated, recorded in writing, and used continually by historians. Historical narratives and reports were major literary genres during the nineteenth century, as demonstrated by the vast amount of texts published in books and especially in newspapers. These texts are important, not only for the information they preserve, but as expressions of the Hawaiians’ appreciation of their own culture and history and as articulations of their views of themselves. As such they were and continue to be supports for Hawaiian morale. Therefore, despite their frequent concentration on detail and anecdote, the Western category “antiquarian” should not be applied to such texts. All such details are witnesses to the ‘imi na‘auao ‘search for wisdom’ of Hawaiian culture. The details of net making, for instance, had been sought by the ancestors, who found the best, most beautiful methods to accomplish their tasks. All these cultural achievements of the olden days should be preserved for future generations.
This enterprise was, however, controverted from both the side of Hawaiian traditionalism and the new Christian consciousness. Thus, A. Unauna could dispute, on the basis of traditional practice, the propriety of Kamakau’s publishing genealogies. Publication also threatened the prestige that the knowledgeable person enjoyed in the oral culture. Wilkes describes the reaction of the historical expert Kiwe (1845:121):

Many interrogatories were put to him, but he soon became sullen and refused to answer; he told us he had discovered our intention, and that he knew we were going to put what he said in a book, that everybody might read it, and, therefore, he would give us no further information . . . for, according to Kiwe, by relating them he would lose his occupation as soon as they were printed.

Other writers counter such views with arguments for publishing materials in books: they should be kākau ‘ia ā pa’a ‘written down until fixed’. Hulikahiko writes that the knowledgeable people are disappearing, a constant theme of the literature of the time (December 3, 1864):

\[ a \ i \ o l e \ e \ k a k a u i a \ a \ p a a \ i a \ m a u \ m e a , \ e \ n a l o \ l o a \ a u a n e i . \ N o l a i l a , \ k e \ p a i p a i \ a k u \ n e i \ a u \ i \ k a \ p o e \ i k e , \ e \ k a k a u \ k o k e \ l a k o u \ a \ h o o l o h e \ a k u , \ i \ i k e \ n a \ h a n a u n a \ m a \ k e i a \ h o p e \ a k u \ i \ k e \ a n o \ o \ k o \ l a k o u \ p o e \ k u p u n a . \]

‘if these things are not written down until fixed, they will disappear completely. Therefore, I am encouraging knowledgeable people to write promptly and listen/do research, so that future generations will know the character of their forebears’.

The greatest obstacle to writing Hawaiian history was the conventional view that the premissionary period was ke au na’aupō ‘the period of dark entrails/the benighted time’. The effort to study and record the deeds and achievements of the ancestors seemed to accord them a certain value; the effort was, therefore, controversial and required justification. The debate
on the value of Hawaiian history was indeed a major portion of the general debate on the value of Hawaiian culture as a whole. Despite general support, some missionaries were uneasy about the publication of Sheldon Dibble’s *Ka Mooolelo Hawaii* (1838). Lorrin Andrews reported (September 15, 1843): “The work is very deservedly popular here and there is a great call. It will, however, not please *all the mission*”; “There is matter enough for another volume fully as interesting as that now published.”

John Waiohinu (September 6, 1862) criticizes the current writing on the time of Kamehameha I as an encouragement to the revival of na’aupō ‘benighted’ elements in Hawai‘i. Such writings are harming *O ka poe e hele huikau nei i ka wa i hala, i ka wa hoi o na kupuna o kakou, oia hoi ke au ia Kamehameha I* ‘The people who are wandering confused in the period that is past, that is, the period of our forebears, that is indeed, the time of Kamehameha I’. Waiohinu is perturbed by the authors of such histories:

*aole o ka poe i pili pegana wale no kai lilo i mau kumu e mahuahua‘i ka ino iloko o keia mau mea; aka, o ka poe ake akamai kekah kai mana o hoia o keia mau mea i hana naaupoia.*

‘not only the people who have clung to paganism are the ones who have become teachers to spread and strengthen the evil inside these things; but people who seek intelligence are also those who opine that these things are true that were done benightedly’.

Waiohinu thought that the time of Kamehameha I was past along with its religion now that Hawaiians are in the time of na‘auao ‘enlightenment’. Similarly, the author of “He Mau Hana Pono Ole Maanei” (November 12, 1845) urges David Malo to write on hula, chant, and so on, to demonstrate that they are bad; that is, historical and cultural research should have a Christian polemical purpose.

The majority opinion in the nineteenth century was, however, in favor of writing Hawaiian history (e.g., Hale‘ole June 15, April
This position was supported by two attitudes that were shared by both classical Hawaiian and Western culture: a general appreciation of history and a moralizing view of history writing. W. H. Uaua (February 2, 1849) justifies the study of Hawaiian history by that of Biblical and foreign history; the enlightened people, na kanaka naauao, of different races study such subjects:

*ua hoomaopopo ia e lakou na mooolelo o ka wa kahiko, a ua kakauia e lakou a paa i mau ohe nana e ikeia’i na hana ino a me na hana maikai o kela Aupuni keia Aupuni; i mea no hoi e ikeia’i na hana maikai a me na hana ino a na kanaka naauao a me na haipule o ka wa kahiko.*

‘the histories of the olden time have been made clear by them and written down until fixed as telescopes by which are seen the evil deeds and the good deeds of this and that Government; in order indeed that may be seen the good deeds and the evil deeds of the wise and the pious people of the olden time’.

In the same way should be studied:

*i kekahi mea i hana ia ma Hawaii nei i ka wa o Kamehameha I, ua olelo ia he ali’i haipule ia, he ali’i noonoo, a he naauao no hoi ma ke kaua ana, a me ka hana ana i na kanawai*

‘some things done in Hawaii’i in the time of Kamehameha I; it is said he was a pious chief, a thoughtful chief, and wise also in warfare and in making laws’.

His laws, strength, and firmness of opinion became a source of happiness for his descendants.

*Pela hoi, o ka ike ana i na mooolelo o kela Aupuni keia Aupuni a me ka noho ali’i ana o na Alii kahiko a me na hana i hanaia e na kanaka naauao o ka wa kahiko. He mau ipukukui ia e hoomala-malama mai ana i ke alanui o ka poe hele hope. A ua pomaikai na kanaka o keia wa ma ia mau kumu alakai.*
‘Thus indeed is the knowledge of the stories of this and that government and the reign of the ancient Chiefs and the deeds done by the wise men of the olden time. These are lamps to light the way of the people who come afterwards. And fortunate are the people of this time in these guiding teachers’.

The people will be happy if they assent inwardly *i keia mau kumualakai o ka wa kahiko* ‘to these guiding teachers of the old time’.

“Mooolelo Hawaii” (April 7, 1858) mentions the histories of Dibble (1838) and John Fawcett Pogue (1858) and states that some people ask what is the *waiwai* ‘value’ of Hawaiian history; *He nui ka waiwai i ka poe heluhelu me ka noonoo* ‘The value is great for people who read thoughtfully’. Such histories provide information about the deeds and ways of living of the ancestors, which gives much enjoyment to *ka po'e na'auao* ‘wise people’; more research should, therefore, be done. Such histories describe also the problems and evils of the old time—such as idolatry, human sacrifice, war, and the situation of commoners—and so encourage people to seek new knowledge. This is true also for *nā ‘āina na’auao* ‘the enlightened lands’, as seen in the newspaper serial on British history (the author may know also Artemus Bishop [1838], in which similar points are made). The British also were pagans, idolaters, and given to war and plunder, but their history shows how they changed and developed:

*ka pono o ke aupuni, ka waiwai, a me ka hanohano o na makaainana me na ‘līi, o Beritania. He aupuni ikaika loa kela e noho nei, a ma kona mooolelo, ua akaka loa ka mea e ikaika ai, o ka naauao; a me ka pono Keristiano, oia na kumu.*

‘the rightness of the government, the riches, and the elevation of the commoners and chiefs of Britain. That is the strongest nation today, and in its history is made very clear what made it strong: enlightenment and Christian righteousness—these are the sources’.
History shows what makes a race *pono* ‘right’ and what makes it unfortunate, *pō’ino*. Hawaiian history is thus a fit subject for children in schools.

Kamakau argues often for the value of historical writing and study (October 28, 1865):

> He mea maikai loa ka imi ana i na mea i haule a nalowale o na mea kahiko o Hawai‘i nei; a ke imi nei kakou e loaa mai me ka pololei, a e lilo ia i waiwai na na hanauna mahope aku nei i ka wa pau ole.

‘It is a very good thing to search for the things that are fallen and have disappeared of the things of old of our Hawai‘i; and we are searching to obtain [them] with correctness so that they may become treasures for the later generations for time without end’.

The task also has importance for the world. Moses, Esra, Matthew, Luke, and others gave abbreviated versions of genealogies in the Bible. Hawaiians should work *e lawa pono ai na mookauahau o ka honua*. O ka Baibala ke alakai ‘so that the genealogies of the earth will be brought up to proper sufficiency. The Bible is the guide’. Indeed is history tabued in Christian lands (Kamakau September 12, 1868)? Hawaiians learn the histories of other countries. Hawai‘i is now a Christian country without pagan tabus. To say that Hawaiians should place a kapu on their history is *ka manao keakea pegana* ‘the obstructive, pagan opinion’.

In announcing his history of the Kamehamehas, Kamakau affirms the value of historical research for the gaining of wisdom and for the younger generation. Moreover, foreigners themselves state that the government of Kamehameha I was successful at maintaining peace and order even in comparison with Christian governments, which have waged so many wars. Lorrin Andrews has compared Kamehameha to the Roman chiefs of old and has said that Hawaiian history should be translated into English so that Kamehameha could become a model for European rulers.272

Such a high estimation of Kamehameha is general in
nineteenth-century Hawaiian writing. ‘Ī‘ī (January 29, 1870) praises the pagan Kamehameha as wise and pious and compares him to the pagan centurion Cornelius in the Acts of the Apostles, chapter X. ‘Ī‘ī often uses such Biblical references and parallels, appropriating the Biblical past to Hawaiian methods of understanding historical and contemporary events (e.g., ‘Ī‘ī April 3, May 15, 22, June 5, 1869). Similarly, the Biblical teaching of God’s providential guiding of history could be applied to recent Hawaiian history as a preparation for the coming of the missionaries, a Christian religious validation of that history and the study of it.  

Finally, Kamakau (September 12, 1868) argues that Hawaiian historiography is encouraged by the government, and he urges that it be taught in the schools (June 2, 1866):

\[
Ua\ makemake\ paha\ na\ Kuhina\ o\ ke\ aupuni\ a\ me\ ka\ Papa\ naauao,\ 
\text{e\ ao\ ia\ ka\ moolelo\ Hawaii\ maloko\ o\ na\ kula\ o\ ke\ aupuni,\ a\ e\ lilo\ ia\ i\ kumu\ e\ hoonaaauao\ ai\ i\ ka\ moolelo\ kupa\ o\ ke\ aupuni\ o\ Hawaii.}
\]

‘Perhaps the Ministers of the government and the Board of Education would like Hawaiian history to be taught inside the government schools, and it would become a source [for students] to be made wise in the native history of the nation of Hawai’i’.

Despite this general agreement on the value of writing Hawaiian history, a residue of the older views continued to cause characteristic emotional frictions. Kamakau (March 23 [sic: 16], 1867b) includes a dialogue with an older family member named Maika‘i, who approaches him to express formally his manaʻo ‘opinion’. Maika‘i begins by asking Kamakau what he is doing. Kamakau answers that he is writing about the ruling chiefs of Hawai‘i: \textit{O na mea kahiko a ʻoukou i ao mai ai la, malaila au e hoolaha nei ‘I am disseminating the ancient things you all taught me’}. Maika‘i allows the possible value of this but warns, \textit{mai kuhikuhi wale aku oe i na}
mea huna a ko kupuna—Ua nui no ka poe i ike i ke kuauhau, aole no lakou i ike i na aoao a pau ‘don’t just reveal the hidden things of your ancestors—Many indeed are the people who know genealogy, but they do not know all the sides’. Kamakau should not wear himself out while others use to their own credit the information he has distributed. Moreover, Kamakau is in bad health. Maika‘i concludes solemnly, E hoolohe oe i kuu kauoha, a me kuu mau olelo ao ia oe, mai hoohehelelei wale aku ia hai. E waiho malie a ka wa kupono ‘Listen to my parting command and my teachings for you. Don’t just scatter [your information] to others. Reserve it quietly for the proper time’. Kamakau bids his relative farewell but affirms, ina i hooloihi ia mai kuu wahi ola kuululu nei, e hoolaha no au i ka oukou mau mea huna, a e kuailo no au i na kupua o ka aina ‘if my little shivering life is lengthened, I will disseminate your hidden things, even if I be cursed and destroyed by the daemons of the land’.

The very positive evaluation of Hawaiian history as a field raises the suspicion that the Hawaiian historians might present their materials too positively, but they are courageous in describing the aspects of their culture and the people and events of their history that they judge negatively. Both negative and positive models and lessons were sought in classical Hawaiian historical traditions. La‘anui (January 4, 1837:61) indeed interprets Kamehameha’s prohibition on his wife Ka‘ahumanu’s taking a lover as a general disapproval of adultery; but he gives a more realistic account later (March 14, 1838:82). The frankness of these historians can in fact be shocking for some contemporary Hawaiian students, imbued with a more idealized vision of their ethnic past.

Hawaiian writers can sometimes be tendentious because they are embarrassed. For instance, running away when necessary was an important lesson in the martial arts; according to a famous proverbial saying, to learn to be a warrior was to learn to run. 274 ‘Ī‘ī (September 11, 1869) is matter-of-fact about this aspect of warfare, but the author of “Ka Oihana Lua a Hawaii Lahui” (August 2,
1923) feels impelled to describe it more positively: if the warrior was too tired to continue fighting, he would use his last strength to get away and rest so that he could later return refreshed to the battle; he was not running away because he was scared. “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” (December 16, 1920) goes even further: he interprets the saying about learning to run to mean learning to chase (but compare March 3, 1921). The same author is embarrassed by the report in Dibble’s history about a Hawaiian imitating the gestures and speech of the first foreigners: he condemns that Hawaiian as *kolohe* ‘mischievous’. 275

An indication of the acceptance of Hawaiian history as a legitimate enterprise was its great popularity with readers, as seen in the large amount of newspaper space devoted to the subject. “Makemake” (1860) issues an invitation to the old people *mai ka wa mai o Kalaniopuu* ‘from the time of Kalani‘ōpu‘u’ to send *na Kaao o ka wa kahiko a me na Kaao hou* ‘the Tales of the olden time and new Tales’ to the newspaper *Ka Hoku Loa* for publication; potential authors are asked to write clearly and correctly. J. A. Nau‘i complains that Dibble’s history of Hawai‘i (1838) was not widely available, and most copies have now been used to tatters. He, therefore, plans to republish it in installments in the newspaper *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. 276

The interest in Hawaiian history is attested also by the establishment by Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians of organizations to pursue research in the field. I have discovered information on the following, but there were probably more such organizations. The Sandwich Island Institute was founded on December 12, 1838, to collect information on Polynesia and “the adjacent coasts” (Eds. H. Spect. 1838:27 f.). Of particular interest was the old religion and its continuing influence on the natives (28):

—the *Tabu* system, its extent and character, and the influence it may have exerted on the minds of those who have abandoned their ancient system of religion, and embraced, nominally at
least, the religion of the gospel, in modifying their views of Christianity—

A museum was started for Natural history and “specimens of native manufacture”; and the “Political, Social and Moral relations of its inhabitants” would be studied. In the inaugural address T. C. B. Rooke (1838) emphasized the need to investigate Hawaiian history and culture both for their own sake and for purposes of comparison. A collection of traditions and chants was made (“Miscellaneous” 1838: 423).

Kamakau (September 12, 1868) discusses ka Ahahui imi moolelo Hawaii ‘the Society to research Hawaiian history’, which was founded at Lahainaluna in 1839 and lasted until 1841. The known members coincide, however, with the better attested society called variously Ahahui imi i na mea kahiko o Hawai‘i nei ‘Society to research the ancient things of our Hawai‘i’, Ahahui imi i na Moolelo kahiko ‘Society to research the old Stories/Traditions/Histories’, or the Royal Hawaiian Historical Society, founded in 1841 and lasting until 1845. In 1863, a society of the first name was established to continue this work. In the same year, the Archaeological Society was also founded in Honolulu. In 1880, the governmental Board of Genealogy of Hawaiian Chiefs was established, which had the extensive brief of collecting, evaluating, and interpreting genealogies, chants, historical records, chiefly bones, and artifacts, and conducting scientific research.

The purpose of the Board was articulated in “He mau Rula o ka Papa no ka Hoakoakoa ana i ka Moolelo Kahiko Hawaii a me ka Mookauahau o na Alii Hawaii/Rules of the Board for Collecting Ancient Hawaiian History and Meles, and the Genealogy of Hawaiian Chiefs” (ca. 1882: 1 f.):

Pauku 6. Na ke Kakauolelo e kope i ka Mookauahau o na Alii Hawaii a me ka Moolelo Hawaii Kahiko me na Mele pu kekahi i aponoia e ka Papa maloko o kekahi buke kupono no ia mea.
Pauku 7. O na hana nui a ka Papa, oia keia: 1.–E houluulu, hana, hooponopono a kope i ka Mookuauhau o na Alii Hawaii. 2.–E houluulu, hana, hooponopono a kope i na Moolelo Hawaii Kahiko i hoolaha a hoolaha ole ia. 3.–E houluulu, hana, hooponopono a kope i na Mele i hoolaha a hoolaha ole ia, a e kope pu i ke kumu a me ke kaona o ke Mele, ke kahiko a me ka moolelo o ka wa i haku ia ai maloko o ka Buke Moolelo. 4.–E kope i ke kapu o na Moi a me na ‘Lii Hawaii.

Section 6. The Secretary shall keep a record of the Genealogy of Hawaiian Chiefs and Ancient Hawaiian History and Meles as may be approved by the Board in a Record Book suitable for that object.

Section 7. The principal duties of the Board shall be, viz: 1.–To gather, revise, correct and record the Genealogy of Hawaiian Chiefs. 2.–To gather, revise, correct and record all published and unpublished Ancient Hawaiian History. 3.–To gather, revise, correct and record all published and unpublished Meles, and also to ascertain the object and the spirit of the Mele, the age and history of the period when composed, and to note the same on the Record Book. 4.–To record all the tabu customs of the Mois and Chiefs.

The best known and still active Hawaiian Historical Society was founded in 1892 (D. D. Johnson 1992). In these organizations and projects, Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians worked together. The existence of such associations is characteristic of the collaborative character of much historiography in Hawai‘i.

A brief sketch of the writing in the field from the work of Whitney and Richards in 1832 to that of Abraham Fornander into the 1880s reveals the three main problems that needed to be faced by historians: the evaluation of historical sources, the organization of the historical narrative, and the moral assessment of the Hawaiian past.
Earlier explorers and visitors had made enquiries into Hawaiian history and culture, and Francisco de Paula Marin had collected a large number of texts, now lost. During his visit to Hawai‘i in 1816, Adelbert von Chamisso had been prevented from working as extensively as he desired with Marin, but on returning to Germany, he did systematic work on Hawaiian culture, especially the language; work that had an impact on European intellectual history. Individual Hawaiians such as Malo had also begun to record historical materials at least as early as 1827 (Malo 1987: viii f. [Chun]; Chun 1993: 2).

After these individuals, collaborative efforts began with the work that initiated the publication of history in Hawai‘i: Samuel Whitney and William Richards world geography school book, *He Hoikehonua* (1832). Kamakau writes (June 2, 1866):

> Ua hoomakaia ka ʻimi ana i ka moʻolelo Hawai‘i i ka A.D. 1829 me ka 1830 a 1831. Ua paiia i ka A.D. 1832. Ua hoolahaia ke [sic: ka?] pai ana o ka Hoikehonua. Ua hoolahaia he mau wahi moʻolelo Hawai‘i iloko o laila.

‘Research into Hawaiian history was begun in 1829 and 1830 to 1831. It was printed in 1832. The printing of the *Hoikehonua* was disseminated. Several Hawaiian stories were disseminated within it’.

Historical research and writing began, therefore, before the founding of Lahainaluna and for the purpose of publishing schoolbooks. Whitney and Richards (1832) present to students the different parts of the world with their geography, peoples, and history. Chapter 4, *O ka hoakaka ana o na moku ma ka Moana Pakipika* ‘The Explanation of the Islands of the Pacific Ocean’, contains a section on *Na Moku o Hawai‘i* ‘The Islands of Hawai‘i’ (152–168). The section is organized by islands, which coincided with the classical Hawaiian presentation and influenced later histories. Short historical reports are included for Maui (154 f.), O‘ahu
(156), and Moloka‘i (157), for which a chant and place names are used (154 ff.). A negative view of pre-missionary Hawaiian culture is sketched along with a positive view of the situation after the introduction of the palapala ‘writing’ and kānāwai ‘law’ (160–163, 165 f.). A sketch of the Hawaiian government, however, emphasizes the ideal of pono ‘correctness, rightness, righteousness’ (160 f.). The postcontact period of Hawaiian history is no longer organized by islands but by the major events of contact and the deeds of Kamehameha I and the central government he founded (161–167). The authors begin with an influential discussion of the disadvantages of the oral tradition (161), treated below. They take the Hawaiian side in their discussion of Captain Cook and his death (160, 163 f.) and give a positive description of the career of Kamehameha I (164 f.). After Kamehameha’s death, the new regime abolishes portions of the old religion and suppresses a traditionalist revolt (165). The missionaries arrive, are allowed to stay by Liholiho, Kamehameha II, and begin the process of Western education at the court. The evaluation of Liholiho is, however, mixed: Ao aku no lakou i ke ali‘i, a ikaika no ia i ke ao i ka palapala, aole hoi i malama pono ma ka mea ana i ao ai ‘They taught the chief indeed, and he was strong in learning reading and writing; however, he did not always keep properly the things he was taught’. Liholiho leaves for England, where he dies, and is succeeded by Kaniukeaouli, Kamehameha III (165 f.). The peaceful transition is credited to Western education: No ka palapala paha ko lakou kaua ole ana ia wa ‘Because of the palapala perhaps they did not make war at that time’ (166). Kamehameha III then dedicates his kingdom to the palapala. The section on Hawai‘i concludes with a discussion of the reasons for the current depopulation: wars, an epidemic in the time of Kamehameha I, infanticide, and—by far the greatest cause—venereal disease (166 f.). Christianity is the only remedy for Hawai‘i: if Hawaiians keep the commandment against sexual misconduct, the land will be repopulated (167).
In discussing this work, Kamakau (June 2, 1866) states that the Protestant missionaries had searched for *kekahi poe kanaka kahiko Hawaii* ‘some old Hawaiian people’ but had been unable to find many. At that time, however, there still lived knowledgeable people; he lists Kepo'okūlou of Nāpō‘opo‘o, (Kelou) Kamakau of Ka‘awaloa, Ka‘eleowaipi‘o of Kailua, Kuakahela of Kekaha, Hawai‘i, ‘Auwae of Wailuku, the Lahaina chief and chiefess Hoapili, the former high priest Hewahewa and his family, and some minor chiefs. Kamakau’s point seems to be that such major informants began to be consulted only after Hawaiians had entered the field, working with Dibble at Lahainaluna. As a result, the Hawaiian traditions in the *Hoikehonua* are scanty; a problem that remains in the field, especially with the continual loss of informants: *ua nalowale pu lakou me ko lakou ike, a me ko lakou akamai i ka moolelo Hawaii* ‘they have disappeared together with their knowledge and intelligence in Hawaiian history’.

Nonetheless, Whitney and Richards (1832) laid a foundation that was to influence later writers. The *Hoikehonua* was a school-book used to educate many of the Hawaiian historiographers. The book was also immediately popular. In the year of publication, Dibble reported:

There is quite a call for the Geography—we have disposed of it only where it is to be taught as a study in school & find our supply very inadequate. (October 23, 1832:1)

the geography, because it contains some things pleasing meets with a much readier market than the scripture. (November 9, 1832:2081)

Furthermore, the practice of attaching one’s own work to that of one’s predecessors resulted in the early development of a tradition of Hawaiian historiography, many of the elements of which can be traced to the *Hoikehonua*. Historical narrative was joined to descriptions of the culture and the government. The
precontact period was organized by islands, and the postcontact by major events, the career of Kamehameha, and the actions of the central government. The precontact period was presented more briefly and sketchily than the postcontact. Whitney and Richards’ emphasis on education and their conception of progress as well as their evaluations of historical figures were widely followed. Their brief attempt to define the Hawaiian character would connect that subject to history and stimulate Hawaiian authors to their own formulations (chapter VI). Finally, particular sections of the Hoikehonua would form the basis of particular discussions through the nineteenth century, notably that of depopulation.284

History was made a subject in the curriculum of Lahainaluna, which became a training ground for future Hawaiian historians such as Kamakau and Hale‘ole. Malo, an older student, had begun his historical work at least as early as 1827, as seen above. The students were acquainted with the classical use of Hawaiian historical traditions, which was also the method of their informants. They were also working with their foreign teachers, who had Western methods of historiography. The Lahainaluna students were, therefore, the group that developed a modern Hawaiian historiography on a bicultural foundation. The evidence for this process can be found in the first Hawaiian newspapers Ka Lama Hawaii (February 14–December 26, 1834) and Ke Kumu Hawaii (November 12, 1834–May 22, 1839), which were published at Lahainaluna. Students were encouraged to contribute articles of their own interest, and these included historical materials, reports on culture, classical and modern literature, and criticism of current government policy.285

A major historical article was a genealogy by Kepo‘okūlou (August 19, 1835), which started with Hāloa, continued to Kamehameha I, Liholiho and his wife Kamāmalu, and ended with Kamehameha III. The article identifies the home of the author as Ka‘awaloa, which was also that of the famous Kelou Kamakau, author of a most important historical report (Fornander
1919–1920: 3–45). As seen above, Samuel Kamakau mentions Kepo'okūlou as one of the learned men of the time, and the article influenced, I would argue, the important and controversial genealogy by Kamakau (October 25, 1842), discussed below.

Most important, Hiram Bingham (August 19, 1835) appended a note to Kepo'okūlou’s genealogy, which reveals in detail the response of the Western teachers. He begins by addressing the author a me ka poe i ike, i lohe hoi i ka noho ana o naʻiliʻi o Hawaiʻi ‘and the people who know/have seen and also heard/researched the lives of the chiefs of Hawaiʻi’ (133). Kepo'okūlou has displayed, hō’ike, the genealogy:

_Ua hai mai oe ia makou i ke kuauhau . . . a na makou e pai ma ke Kumu Hawaii i paa loa ia, i maopopo hoi i na kanaka a me na keiki a pau ma Hawaii nei ma ia hope aku._

‘You have proclaimed the genealogy to us . . . and it is for us to print it in Ke Kumu Hawaii so that it will be fully fixed, so that it will be clear indeed to all the people and the children in Hawaiʻi here from now on’.

The theme of fixing traditions for posterity has been discussed above. All of the chiefs mentioned by Kepo'okūlou have died except Kamehameha III; Bingham, therefore, has further questions about them: _Pehea la hoi ko lakou noho ana? E hai mai ka poe i ike, a i lohe hoi. I ka manawa hea ko lakou alii ana?_ ‘What indeed was the manner of their life? Let the people answer who know/have seen and have also heard/researched. At what period was their reign?’ The periods of the later chiefs are known, but not of the majority listed. Bingham wants to coordinate Hawaiian with Biblical history. How much time has elapsed from Hāloa to the present? Bingham then presents a long list of questions (133 f.):

_Eia kekahi. Heaha ke ano o keia alii kela alii? Heaha ka hana a lakou i hana‘i? Pehea hoi ka noho ana o na kanaka i ko lakou_
'Here is another point. What was the character of this and that chief? What was the work that they accomplished? How indeed was the life of the people during their reign? Who were the chiefs subordinate to this and that chief? What were their deeds? Who were the good chiefs of Hawai‘i? Who were the warrior chiefs?
Who were the chiefs who governed without war like Kauikeaouli [Kamehameha III]? Who were the rebel chiefs? Who were the chiefs who inherited the government justly, from their parents to themselves? Who was the chief who protected the people justly with inner goodness? Who was the chief who wrongly burdened his people? Who was the chief who did not wrongly burden the commoners? Who was the chief who did not scold and become angry with the chiefs under him? Who was the chief who lived correctly with only one wife? How many wives were there of this and that chief? How many children were there of this and that chief? How many chiefs had no children? How many chiefs traveled to foreign lands?

‘Who was the chief who was very knowledgeable in fishing and farming? and war? and peaceful governance over the land? Who was the chief who was strong in the care of the gods? Who was the chief who did not covet another’s wealth and did not indeed just take it? Who was the chief who did not gamble? Who was the person who gambled great sums? What were the deeds of their wives? What were the actions of the chiefs of Maui to the chiefs of Hawai‘i? What did those of O‘ahu and Kaua‘i do to the chiefs of Hawai‘i? Who were the chiefs who ruled over all these islands from Hawai‘i to Ni‘ihau? Who was the chief who killed another chief? Who were the chiefs who were killed in war? Who was the chief who died and people did not fight [for the succession]? Who was the chief who truly desired that all the people would turn to correct deeds alone so that their souls would live?

‘Hear, O Kepo‘okūlou and you also, the people knowledgeable in Hawaiian history; answer these things I have asked about the chiefs of Hawai‘i and their views/intentions in doing this or that thing that they did; so that we may know correctly the things that are correct and the things that are wrong, the things that prosper and the things that injure here in Hawai‘i; so that it will be clear also that the correctness of Jesus is greater than theirs’.

Many of Bingham’s questions coincide with Hawaiian historical interests and emphases, for instance, the great deeds of the
people of old. He is less interested than Hawaiians in the details of
the birth and upbringing of chiefs; interests that accorded with the
traditional Hawaiian emphasis on genealogy and education. He
also does not ask about origins and first instances, a major inter-
est of the Hawaiian historians. Bingham’s questions are, therefore,
a culturally foreign response to a Hawaiian historical form.

Most important, Bingham’s questions can be recognized as
the sometimes explicit and sometimes implicit context of much
later Hawaiian historiography. First, Bingham and the Hawaiian
historians share a moralizing view of history, with an emphasis
on useful good and bad examples. Malo (July 1, 1847) also asks
possible informants about chiefs who are pono ‘correct, just’ and
hewa ‘wrong’. But Bingham clearly applies Christian ideals to
precontact times with the expressed tendency of proving the
superiority of the new over the old. The problem of judging the
past by the new, introduced moral standards had to be addressed
by Hawaiians and was an important part of their evaluation of
their past and of their character as a people. Hawaiians would
have to deal with two moral systems in their evaluations: classical
and Christian. The two moral standards could of course conflict,
for instance, on whether it was good for a chief to patronize the
hula and have a professional court thief.286 Facing the problem,
Gideona La’anui writes of Kamehameha I (March 14, 1838: 83):

> He aliʻi maikai o Kamehameha, maopopo no hoi kekahi mau hana
pono o ke kino, hewa no hoi kekahi mau mea i ka ʻike ana iho nei
i keia mea hou. Aka, hoi ia wa, ua hui pu ka pono me ka hewa he
like wale no ia manawa.

‘Kamehameha was a good chief, who understood indeed some
correct things of the body and was indeed mistaken about some
things in the view of this person of the new time. But at that time,
the correct and the wrong were joined; they were alike indeed at
that time’.
La’anui is probably writing in response to Bingham in the above and in his earlier praise of Kamehameha (January 4, 1837). P. also seems to be answering Bingham’s questions when he praises Kamehameha I and his government: he did not pepehi kanaka ‘kill people’. The connection to Bingham’s questions is clear when Kaaie (June 12, 1862) asks, Owai ke alii o lalo nei i pono ka noho ana? . . . Owai ke alii o lalo nei i hewa ka noho ana? ‘Who is the chief here below whose way of life was righteous? . . . Who is the chief here below whose way of life was wrongful?’.

Second, Bingham also asks for information that goes beyond the genealogical form. For instance, a genealogy would follow a certain line of descent, and Bingham asks about the other children. Bingham’s questions about women, subordinate chiefs, and commoners, reflect particular interests of the mission; they could be answered by historical and cultural reports. Bingham’s questions about interisland relations are addressed to a historical tradition organized by family and island and are asked from the broader perspective of Western historiography; he thus raises a problem that was already present in the work of Whitney and Richards (1832) and continues until today, as will be seen below. Similarly, his asking about dates raises the problem of the relation of Hawaiian history to world history. The influence of Bingham’s questions was great and can be seen clearly in the article of P. (March 30, 1836), who provides the names of further children of the chief mentioned and of other chiefs of his time and discusses interisland relations. Indeed, Bingham’s questions were being repeated and answered by even later writers. For instance, Kaaie (April 24, 1862) writes that no one chief ruled over all the islands in precontact times.

The first full-length treatment of Hawaiian history, Ka Mooolelo Hawaii, edited by Sheldon Dibble (1838), was a group effort. Dibble became a teacher of history and other fields at Lahainaluna in 1834. In 1836, he began to collect Hawaiian
historical materials for use by his students. In order to do this, he “first made out a list of Questions, arranged chronologically according to the best of my knowledge” and then enlisted the help of ten of his best students as researchers. Among them were Malo, A. Moku, Kamakau, and Hale’ole. Dibble discussed the questions with the students until he was sure they understood them; he then sent the students “to the oldest and most knowing of the chiefs and people . . . ”. The informants included ‘Auwae, the chief Hoapili, probably others of the knowledgeable people listed elsewhere by Kamakau, and many more. Information on more recent events could be supplied from the memories of the older students themselves (Dibble 1838: *He Olelo Hoakaka*). Each student wrote down the materials he had collected and then met with Dibble and the other students:

> Haawi na haumana ia mau mooolelo a lakou i kakau ai i kekahi kumu o ke kula, a nana no i hookuikui a i hooponopono no ka pai ana, a nana iho no hoi kekahi mau olelo maloko.

‘The students gave the stories they wrote to a teacher of the school, and he joined them together and corrected them for publication; and he also inserted some statements himself’. (Dibble 1838: *He Olelo Hoakaka*)

At the time of meeting each scholar read what he had written—discrepancies *sic* were reconciled and corrections made by each other, and then all the compositions were handed to me, out of which I endeavored to make one connected and true account. Thus we proceeded from one question to another till a volume was prepared and printed in the Hawaiian language. (Dibble 1843: iii f.)

Similar school research projects, some directed by Dibble, would later add to the body of historical material.

A full-scale treatment is needed of *Ka Mooolelo Hawaii* and its immense influence, which continues even today.
instance, stylistic discrepancies could be used to identify sections as originally separate student papers, and the tendencies of the editing process could be recognized. I will concentrate on one aspect of the editing: the curious placement of the precontact material. Dibble (1838:1–6) begins with a negative assessment of the historical value of Hawaiian traditions, a brief discussion of the origin of the islands, and speculations on the first migrants and possible pre-Cook non-Hawaiians; the last speculation includes some treatment of Hawaiian traditions. These chapters had been published in Ke Kumu Hawaii and appear to be Dibble’s own contributions to the book; for instance, the negative assessment corresponds to his preface, He Olelo Hoakaka. Dibble then moves directly to the arrival of Cook (6); that is, he completely omits traditional Hawaiian history, except for the minor traditions mentioned above. In fact, he dismisses Hawaiian sources on early history (1, 3). Curiously, after the chapter on ships that arrived after Vancouver (31 f.)—that is, well along in his postcontact narrative—a chapter appears on the genealogy of the chiefs from Wākea and Papa, sky and earth, until Kamehameha (33–36). The chapter begins with a negative paragraph by Dibble in large type, followed by a traditional opening of a genealogy in small: Eia na inoa . . . ‘Here are the names . . . ’ (32). The parents of Wākea and Papa are identified, and those two are called the first ancestors of the Hawaiian people, both chiefs and commoners. Typographical marks at certain names in the genealogy refer to stories and other information about the personages published after the genealogy (37–41). Genealogy and stories are thus organized in a new manner possible with printing.

In view of Kamakau (October 25, 1842), discussed below, this was probably a project of Kamakau and his fellow students and was in all likelihood stimulated by the genealogy of Kepo'okūlou (August 19, 1835), whom Kamakau (October 28, 1865) later refers to as a source. Dibble seems to have simply inserted it here. Moreover, the discussion questions he provides at the bottom of almost
each page of the book are reduced in this chapter to one: *Ua maopopo anei he pololei ke kuauhau o na`lili?* ‘Is it clear that the genealogy of the chiefs is correct?’ (32). The negative answer is given in Dibble’s first paragraph of the chapter and earlier on page 3, quoted below. This suggests that Dibble’s students forced their precontact research onto their skeptical editor.

A short chapter follows on the character of Hawaiians and their society (42 ff.), which may have been suggested by the comparable section of Whitney and Richards, but bears the marks of Dibble’s own characteristically negative rhetoric. In sum, Dibble’s treatment of the large body of precontact Hawaiian historical traditions was obviously inadequate in *Ka Mooolelo Hawaii*.

This inadequacy probably stimulated the emphasis on those traditions in the historical society founded in 1841. All but one of the research subjects distributed to the members by Dibble and Kamakau are precontact (Kamakau September 9, 1865b). Among the known members of that society are three who worked with Dibble on his history: Malo, Moku, and Kamakau. They were joined by two who are not listed as students at Lahainaluna: Keoni Ana and Timothy [?] Ha‘alilio. The work done by the society members appears to have been extensive, and material gathered by them was used in Dibble’s English-language history (Kamakau 24, 1868). Kamakau felt that the disbandment of that society and the death of Dibble deprived the world of a complete Hawaiian history. Kamakau writes that researchers should have been hired on the four major islands to gather material from informants, most of whom had since died.

However, the materials developed by the members of the society—as well as those from the late 1820s and 1830s—were not all lost. Kamakau states that the research of the 1841 society was used in Dibble’s English-language history of Hawai‘i published in 1843. This is but one indication of the largely hidden but central role of unpublished manuscripts. Indeed, the history of Hawaiian historiography and literature in general
will not be completely understood until the quantity, quality, and use of nineteenth-century manuscripts is appreciated. For instance, “Mau Mea Kahiko” is composed of translated extracts from the now lost Spanish-language journal of Francisco de Paula Marin. Haleʻole records his research on Kamehameha I until ua piha he Buke nui i ka Moolelo o Hawaii nei ‘a large book was filled with the History of our Hawai‘i; he mentions a Buke Kuau-hau ‘Genealogy Book’ from which he takes material from page 480. He extracts a genealogy from ka Buke Mookuauhau a S. M. Kamakau ‘the Genealogy Book of S. M. Kamakau (May 4, 1865). Haleʻole’s famous novel Laieikawai was taken from a manuscript book (Haleʻole’s own contribution needs to be assessed); the story was dated August 1844 and comprised 375 pages. The story of Painahala was recorded in the same book, dated October 1847, and comprised 363 pages. The book contained also the stories of Kūali‘i, Mo‘ikeha, and Lonoikamakahiki, and perhaps others (November 29, 1862). Hawaiian-language manuscripts and manuscript books can still be discovered today.

Kamakau, in his own voluminous writings, was able to use materials gathered by Haleʻole and S. D. Keolanui for the 1863 historical society. Abraham Fornander described his work with that society:

I employed two, sometimes three, intelligent and educated Hawaiians to travel over the entire group and collect and transcribe, from the lips of the old natives, all the legends, chants, prayers, &c., bearing upon the ancient history, culte [sic], and customs of the people that they possibly could get hold of. This continued for nearly three years.

He complains of the lack of informants but states that “I am now in possession of probably the greatest collection of Hawaiian lore in or out of the Pacific” and thanks Kalākaua, Lorrin Andrews, John Rae, Kamakau, Naihe, S. N. Hakuole, Kepelino, and Jules Rémy (Fornander 1969:1 v.f.). He has also consulted the “manu-
script collections” of Malo. Fornander himself “never omitted an opportunity in my intercourse with old and intelligent natives to remove a doubt or verify a fact.” Fornander’s collection of texts was published eventually in the *Fornander Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folk-Lore* (1916–1920).

The most important writer whose work circulated in manuscript was David Malo. For instance, Malo had been assigned the chief ‘Umi as a research topic by the 1841 society, and his essay survives in an unattributed chapter in Pogue’s history of 1858, *Ka Moolelo Hawaii.* Pogue also used extensive materials from Malo’s most important account of Hawaiian culture and early history, *Ka Moolelo Hawaii,* which circulated widely in manuscripts and was extracted in newspapers.

Pogue’s history is based principally on Dibble (1838), but he makes important changes in its organization. After providing briefly the geographical location of the islands, he records Hawaiian traditions of their origins, refuting them with the modern scientific view (Pogue 1858:5); in this section, he is following Malo with some additions and omissions. He then gives the Hawaiian traditions of the first human beings and follows a genealogical line from Wākea and Papa to the chiefs who came from Kahiki (6 ff.), a section based partly on the precontact materials in Dibble. A long section is then inserted of new material from Malo on classical Hawaiian culture (8–31). Further historical material (31–34), again based partly on Dibble, leads to the genealogy in Dibble (1838:33–36; Pogue 1858:34 ff.) discussed above; the genealogy is presented without the notes because they have been absorbed into Pogue’s historical narrative. Diblee’s chapter on possible pre-Cook foreign arrivals (1838:4 ff.) is placed after this genealogy (Pogue 1858:36 f.) and is followed immediately by the chapters on the arrival of Cook. That is, Pogue has placed his materials in a much more chronological order. He has also returned to the practice seen in Whitney and Richards (1832) of joining histori-
cal narrative with cultural description. Pogue was probably influenced by the English-language history of Hawai‘i by James Jackson Jarves (1843), which he mentioned in a letter to Armstrong on the writing of his history (April 3, 1858).

Fornander returned to a more traditional organization, when he used his collected materials for historical purposes. His English-language An Account of the Polynesian Race, Its Origin and Migrations and the Ancient History of the Hawaiian People to the Times of Kamehameha I, published in three volumes in 1878, 1880, and 1885 (Fornander 1969:xii [Helen Doty]), was certainly influenced by recent European studies of linguistics and oral literatures. The first and third volumes formulate his now rejected theories on the origins of the Polynesians. The second volume is a history of Hawai‘i from traditional sources. Beginning on page 67, after discussing the earliest traditions, he organizes his narrative largely along genealogical lines and by island. As a result, a large chapter on the island Hawai‘i from ‘Umi to the death of Kalani‘ōpu‘u (95–205), contains the story of Cook in Hawai‘i, told at some length, using both Hawaiian and foreign sources (157–200). Fornander then backtracks to ‘Umi’s contemporaries on Maui and brings the genealogy forward to Kalani‘ōpu‘u’s contemporary Kahekili (205–219). He carries his narrative to the death of Kahekili in 1794, trying to retain his Maui focus, but he must broaden his narrative to include many events on other islands, such as the rise of Kamehameha I (219–260; also 260–269). Fornander then backtracks again to pick up his genealogies on O‘ahu (269–291) and Kaua‘i (291–298). He finally returns to the point at which he left his Hawai‘i narrative and carries it forward to his conclusion at the battle of Nu‘uanu in 1795, by which Kamehameha I conquered O‘ahu (299–349).

The awkwardness of Fornander’s organization illustrates one of the three great problems that faced Hawaiian historians from their first bicultural efforts at Lahainaluna. The first was
the evaluation of their sources; the second, the proper method to organize their information within a historical narrative; and the third, the moral assessment of the Hawaiian past.

The first two problems were raised in an early controversy between Kamakau and A. Unauna. Kamakau published a large genealogy from the earliest period to Kamehameha and his children (October 25, 1842; translated by McKinzie 1983:xix–xxv). This genealogy is an expansion and modification of the one published in Dibble (1838:32–41), and a later version may be one published by Hale’ole (May 4, 1865). Kamakau apparently combined the new version from different sources and claimed that this was the central genealogy from which others had branched out.

In response, Unauna (November 8, 1842:63) criticized Kamakau for revealing what he felt was secret information. He also pointed out mistakes in Kamakau’s work and stated that the information given by Kamakau seemed to be just picked up: *aohe pono me he apo wale la* ‘it is not correct; it is just as if it were grabbed up foolishly and uselessly’ (64; also 63). He then accused Kamakau of not being properly educated in the oral tradition: *Mai hana i ke kuauhau me ka lohe ole* ‘Do not work on genealogy without listening’ (64). What he meant—and was understood to mean—is clear from Kamakau’s reply: Kamakau had not followed the traditional course of genealogy instruction with a recognized expert. Unauna was apparently sensing the difference between Kamakau’s article and traditional genealogical work. In the same issue—in an article written without knowledge of Unauna’s own—Kamakau (November 8, 1842) made some corrections in his genealogical information.

In a full reply to Unauna’s article, Kamakau stated that Unauna had been taught by ‘Auwae and is famous for his knowledge among Hawaiians and foreigners, but he can still make mistakes that Kamakau can correct (February 14, 1843:92 f.). Kamakau himself is a student of Lahainaluna, working with other students there, and has reconstructed the genealogy from his
research: *Ua kakau au i keia kuauhau ma ko‘u noonoo ana a ma ko‘u akamai iho, aole ma ko hai manao, aole ma ke ao ana i ke kuauhau; ma ke akamai wale no ka hana ana* ‘I wrote this genealogy with my thinking and my intelligence, not with someone else’s opinion, not by learning genealogy; the work was done only with intelligence’ (91 f.). Kamakau had obviously studied genealogies, otherwise he could not have written his article. His point is that he had not learned them in a traditional way from a master, whose tradition he accepted. Thus, he cannot cite his teacher the way Unauna can cite ‘Auwae. Kamakau was working in a new way that he was developing with his fellow students. Most particularly, though he does not say so, he was using an earlier publication. Kamakau goes on to argue that the genealogists of old came back to life, they would be happy to see his work.

He then divides genealogical history into four periods, clearly his own reconstruction: *E mahele ia ke kuauhau i na wa i mea e maopopo ai ‘The genealogy is divided into the periods in order for it to be clear’* (92). He has added some materials himself *me ka noonoo, a me ka maiau* ‘with thought and care’. The older practice listed only the principal child through whom the genealogy was traced; Kamakau adds the other known children. That is, Kamakau is supplementing the traditional genealogies with materials taken from other sources, such as historical narratives. Otherwise, he argues, people will think that Hawaiian parents had only one child. Without saying so, he is also providing information requested by Bingham (August 19, 1835). Kamakau states that Hawaiian historical genealogies are now reasonably well established. Something new is needed: the joining of the different branches. The earlier knowledgeable people developed genealogies in straight lines, without the branches:

*O na kuauhau a ka poe i kapaia he poe akamai, ua hana pololei lakou, aole hoomanamana, ua hookoa ia na manamana; ua kapaia he kuauhau okoa kela mana keia mana; aka he hana*
'The genealogies of the people called knowledgeable—they worked straight; they did not make branches. The branches were separated. This and that branch was called a separate genealogy; but this was a benighted procedure of the olden time. The new thing is what is superior to the old things’.

The new method—developing a complete, composite genealogy of different branches—is superior and may be influenced by the new possibilities introduced by writing. Similarly, in the Dibble team, the separate stories of the students had been reconciled and joined together to form a continuous narrative.

Kamakau then challenges Unauna to present his information, to display his akamai ‘knowledge, intelligence’ and noiau ‘wisdom’ (92 f.). He poses a series of difficult questions to Unauna and challenges him to develop a correct genealogy without using any of Kamakau’s materials, an impossible condition. He concludes his article by taunting Unauna, saying that if Unauna does not do this, he will be ridiculed by the students of Lahainaluna.

In controverting Unauna, Kamakau emphasized his own creative intelligence over his sources. This was an extreme position, especially in the field of genealogy, and Kamakau was careful later to emphasize his fidelity to his knowledgeable informants and his harmony with Unauna himself (October 28, 1865):

Ma na Mookuauhau nui; ua like pu no, aole kue kana i ka’u, ua like no. Ma na Mookuauhau liilii iloko o na Mookauhau [sic] nui. Malaila ka like ole o kekahi me kekahi.

‘In the big Genealogies, [we] are indeed alike; his do not oppose mine; they are indeed similar. In the little Genealogies inside the big Genealogies, there is the dissimilarity of one with the other’.

He agrees on genealogies also with David Malo and Iakobo Malo.
Kamakau also worked with chief Hoapili and consulted Kalaiheana and Kepoʻokūlou, about the value of whose work he is somewhat grudging. Kamakau was usually careful and proud to list his sources: *O hilinai au ma ka pono a koʻu poe kupuna kahiko, a me naʻLii naauao i na mea kahiko* ‘I trust indeed in the correctness of my aged elders and the chiefs wise in ancient things’. Clearly it should be agreed that ‘we should care for the correct thing that our forebears taught us’, *i malama ai kakou i ka mea pololei a na kupuna i ao mai ai* (Kamakau October 14, 1865).

This respect for traditional sources and informants was the normal position of nineteenth-century Hawaiian historians. The general view was that the knowledgeable people—many of whom were very impressive—were dying and their valuable information needed urgently to be recorded. Journals and newspapers were used to solicit information, for instance by Malo. He calls on the journal *Ka Elele* ‘The Messenger’ to go out with his questions to *ka poe kahiko i koe* ‘the old people who remain’: who were the good and bad chiefs; where did the Hawaiians come from; what information is available on Paʻao, Moʻikeha, and Pili; who knows the genealogies, the *Kumulipo*; and so on? But informants were often reserved, and obtaining information from them was difficult: *Ua loaa ke kuauhau o ka Mooolelo o kela alii keia alii, ua paakiki loa, aole e loaa wale* ‘The genealogy of the History of this and that chief has been obtained; it was very onerous; they are not obtained easily’. Koko calls for aid (June 26, 1865):

> Auhea oukou e oʻu mau kupunakane a me na kupunawahine, E! E! e ala mai oukou a hai mai i na wahi olelo kahiko o ko kakou aina nei, o na ano Mooolelo kahiko, mai huna aku iloko o ka oukou mau ipu kuaaha; “Eia la he au hou keia.”

‘Oh my male and female elders, arouse yourselves and proclaim the old tales of our land, the types of ancient History. Do not hide them inside your altar calabashes; “Behold, this is a new age”’. 
As a result, historical work is incomplete. Kamakau thinks he obtained the greater part of the available information for his history, but *koe ka mea aʻu i ike ole, a i lohe ole, a i ao oleia e aʻu* ‘the thing remains that I did not know, did not hear, and was not learned by me’ (Kamakau September 9, 1865b; also January 26, 1867).

A vivid picture of working with informants is provided by S. P. K. (March 13, 1839): two letters in response to an enquiry, dated February 21, 1839, and March 4, 1839, are combined into an article in *Ke Kumu Hawaii*. The opinion of the author’s correspondent is that Hawaiians believed that a god image was powerful because the spirit, ‘*uhane*, of the god entered it, and when they prayed to the image, they thought it was the spirit inside it that heard the prayer. S. P. K. found that some of his informants, *ka poʻe ‘ike* ‘knowledgeable people’, agreed with this opinion and others did not. The author carefully differentiates among the three views he heard, which he establishes through careful, follow-up questions.

Some people did not have a clear understanding of their practice and simply said *aole maopopo ia mea* ‘this thing is not clear’; *aole maopopo i kekahi poe ke ano o ka lakou manao ana* ‘*ku i ka lakou hoomana ana* ‘the nature of their opinion about their worship is not clear to some people’. A second group thought that they indeed worshipped the image or the shark that was a god:

*Aka, ke i mai nei kekahi poe, aole hoomana lakou ma ka uhane, ma ke kii no o ka laau a me ke kino pono no ka mea i hoomanaia.*

‘But some people told me they did not worship the spirit; the image of the wood and the body itself was indeed the thing worshipped’.

Some of these felt that the spirit did not enter the image because, under observation, the image did not move or do anything extraordinary.
The third opinion, however, was in the majority and was articulated in detail: the spirit of the god is the object of worship. Moreover, the soul, ‘uhane, of a deceased relative or friend can be made to reside in a wooden image, or stone, or some other thing, and worshipped and used as a god. The information obtained by the author is detailed and contains items that I have not seen elsewhere. For instance, the word ‘ūhini is used not for the separated soul itself, but for the container, as it were, in which the soul resides, similar to the wood or stone, mentioned above. Whatever the container, it is the soul that is worshipped. The author says that this practice is found widely and considered true; the worshipped souls or gods really do help their kahu ‘guardians’. He refers to a Hawaiian story as an example of this. The source of power is in fact the ‘uhane; if it leaves, the object has no power. The container—for instance, the body of the shark in which the ‘uhane resides—is cared for, but it is always the ‘uhane itself that is worshipped. The ‘uhane can communicate with the worshipper through possession, dreams, and conversation.

After presenting these different views, the author now renders his own judgement. In his questioning, the author has found that his informants could not identify the place or source from which the ‘uhane came to enter into its container: Hoole mai lakou, aole kumu o ka uhane i hele mai a noho ‘They denied [this]; there was no source from which the ‘uhane came to reside’. The author uses the Bible to show that the soul of a dead person returns to the true God; the spirit they are experiencing must, therefore, be the Devil’s: o ko Satana mana no ia a me kona uhane ‘this is Satan’s power and his spirit’. His informants, however, would not agree to this: Lohe lakou i keia, a ae iki mai, me ka manao no, no ke kanaka ka uhane i noho ai ‘They listened to this and agreed a little, but with the opinion that the spirit that resided was from the [deceased] human being’. The author feels that they need more time to realize the truth of his opinion.

In his second letter, he reports that he has pursued his
enquiries with the people who feel that the spirit is the object of worship and the image is *he mea hoomanao wale no* ‘only a thing to remind one’. The spirits worshipped include the great gods Kāne and Lono. The author himself has been affected by his enquiries and his informants: *Ua pohihihi nae ia’u ke ano o keia uhane a lakou i manao* ‘the character of this spirit they mean is just obscure to me’. He knows only of Jehovah and the devil, and his opinion is that the devil is at work here; however, *He kanalua ko’u, ma keia mea, aole maopopo ke ano* ‘I have a doubt about this thing; its character is not clear’. The author asks David Malo, the great Christian polemicist, about the question; *O kona manao no ia, ma ka uhane ka hoomana; aka, aole akaka pono i kona manao kahi o kela poe uhane* ‘This is indeed his opinion: the worship is for the spirit; the place [of origin] of those spirits is not rightly clear in his opinion’. That is, Malo refuses to agree to the author’s Christian interpretation. In fact, Malo had earlier used such Hawaiian beliefs in arguing against atheism (e.g., 1837: 5f.).

S. P. K.’s article illustrates the great care with which Hawaiian researchers made enquiries and the variety of opinions they discovered. The reader can also see that the informants, however polite and indeed Christian they might have been, would not allow a Christian interpretation to be imposed on their views and experiences. This was true also for such a committed Christian as David Malo; he was true to his traditions and perceptions. The author’s own final confusion testifies to his sensitivity and intellectual honesty as well as to the impressiveness of his informants. Finally, S. P. K.’s article conveys strongly the emotional and intellectual significance of such research for the Hawaiians of the time: it could prove to them that their culture had indeed powers that could not be explained by the introduced religion and culture.

Once information was obtained, it had to be evaluated, just as in classical historical practice. A prime problem for any historian is posed by the differences among sources. Sometimes the information provided by different sources is complementary, so
they can be used together to compose a more complete account (Kamakau November 18, 1865). But often irreconcilable discrepancies are found among sources. In nineteenth-century Hawai‘i, the discussion of this problem involved the whole subject of the oral tradition as opposed to written documents. Hawaiians were acutely aware of the oral character of their traditions and the information they were still gathering from knowledgeable people. Nineteenth-century judgements of that oral tradition were ambivalent. On the one hand, the flexibility and variability of the oral tradition were recognized and closely connected to other aspects of the culture; different traditions were important subjects of study, and their differences permitted creativity and tolerance among schools. On the other hand, the experts of classical Hawai‘i had evaluated traditions and disputed their authenticity.

The value of writing was recognized quickly by Hawaiians and applied early to the discussion of history. In 1823, William Ellis (1984:296) was told by some old priests that their own traditions “were as authentic as the accounts in our book, though ours, from the circumstance of their being written, or, as they expressed it, ‘hana paia [sic: pa’a ‘ia] i ka palapala,’ (made fast on the paper,) were better preserved, and more aakaaka, clear, or generally intelligible.” (Akaaka or akaka is a word used conventionally in this way in Hawaiian discussions of history.)

This was the conviction of the missionaries and formed their influential approach to Hawaiian history. Whitney and Richards begin their general history with the statement (1832:161):

Aole i akaka pono ke ano o na kanaka i noho mua’i ma Hawaii nei; aole hoi i akaka ko lakou wahi i holo mai ai. No ka palapala ole a ka poe kahiko, a no ke kuhi wale aku o kekahi poe, nolaila ua pohihihi loa, aole i akaka na mea i hanaia i ka wa mamua kahiko loa.
'The character of the people who first lived in Hawai‘i is not rightly clear; nor also is clear the place from which they came. Because the ancient people did not have writing, and because some people had mere suppositions; therefore, it is very obscure; the things done in the earliest period are not clear'.

After Whitney and Richards, such an introductory discussion of sources and criticisms of the oral tradition became conventional. Dibble (1838) returns often, emphatically, and in much the same words to the theme of the uncertainty of oral sources:

The majority of the information in the book is probably correct, but some may not be, no ka mea, o kekahi mau olelo, he mau olelo kahiko loa, a ma ka naau o na kanaka i paa ai, aole ma ka pepa, nolaila, ua paa kapekepeke, aole i pololei loa.

because some statements/stories are very old and were fixed in the entrails of people [memorized], not on paper; therefore, they were fixed imperfectly, they are not very correct’ (He Olelo Hoakaka).

O ka mooolelo kahiko loa no Hawaii nei, ua powehiwehi ia. Eia ka mea e akaka ole ai, o ka ike ole o na kanaka o ia wa i ke kakau palapala. Ua paa kekahi mau mea ma ka naau o ka poe kahiko, aka, ua paa kapekepeke no, aole i paa pono. He oiaio kekahi a he wahahee kekahi. O ka mooolelo no na makahiki hou mai i hala iho nei, oia ka mea akaka iki.

‘The oldest history of Hawai‘i is obscure. Here is the reason why it is not clear: the people of that time did not know how to write documents. Some things were fixed in the entrails of the people of old, but they were fixed imperfectly indeed; they were not fixed correctly. Some things are true and some, deceitful. The history of the more recent years is somewhat clear’ (1).
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Ua paa i kekahi poe ke kuauhau o na'lii mai ka wa kahiko mai a hiki i neia manawa. Ua pololei iki paha ia kuauhau aole paha i pololei loa, no ka mea ma ka naau wale no ka paa ana, aole ma ka palapala.

‘The genealogy of the chiefs from the ancient period until this time was fixed by some people. This genealogy is perhaps a little correct, but probably not very correct, because the fixing was in the entrails only, not in the document/writing’. (3)

No ka ike ole o ko Hawaii nei poe kanaka, ia manawa, i ke kakau palapala, nolaila, aole i paa na mea kahiko. Ua paa kapekepeke no ma ka naau o kekahi poe, aole i paa pono.

‘Because the Hawaiian natives of that time did not know how to write documents, therefore the old things were not fixed. They were fixed indeed imperfectly in the entrails of some people; they were not fixed correctly’. (4)

Mai manao kakou, he pololei loa keia kuauhau, no ka mea, ma ka naau o na kanaka wale no i malamaia'i, aole ma ka palapala.

‘Let us not think that this genealogy is very correct, because it was kept only in the entrails of human beings, not in writing’. (32)

Pogue (1858: 3) follows Dibble down to the wording. Hawaiian history is not akaka ‘clear’, but pōwehiwehi ‘obscure’, because Hawaiians did not know writing, kākau palapala: Ua paa kekahi mau mea ma ka naau o ka poe kahiko, aka, ua paa kapekepeke no, aole i paa pono ‘Some things were fixed in the entrails of the old people, but they were fixed imperfectly indeed; they were not fixed correctly’. Pogue, however, adds a new passage that follows Malo closely (n.d.: 1, especially 8) and is probably influenced by Kamakau (February 14, 1843) and Pogue’s own experience of disputes among Hawaiians:
Eia kekahi, he nui na mookuauhau o Hawaii nei, aole nae i kulike loa lakou kekahi i kekahi, okoa ke kumu o kekahi mookuauhau, okoa ke kumu o kekahi; manao kekahi poe, o ka lakou ka pono nui loa, a pela no ke kue ana o na mookaaao, okoa ka lohe o kekahi, okoa ko kekahi, aole i like pu na lohe e pono loa ai.

‘Here is another thing: there are many genealogies of Hawai’i, but they are not in exact agreement among themselves. One genealogy has a separate source, another a separate source. Some people think that theirs is the one that is absolutely right. In the same way indeed there is opposition among the stories: one person has heard something separate, another person has heard something separate. The hearings are not alike so that they could be very correct’.

Each of the three major genealogical traditions of Hawai’i has its adherents:

aole like ka manao o keia poe a pau, aka, kue kekahi i kekahi, no ia mea, pohihihi no ia mau mea kahiko, aole i akaka lea ia, he oiaio kekahi, a he wahahee kekahi.

‘the opinion of all these people is not alike, but one opposes the other. For this reason, these old things are indeed obscure; they are not transparently clear. Some are true and some deceitful’.

Faced with discrepancies in the oral traditions, these foreign historians reacted with the blanket judgement that they were faced with obscurity. Hawaiian historians were, however, classically trained in the use of different traditions. Their attitude towards such discrepancies admitted, therefore, of more nuance, even when they seemed to be agreeing with the foreign view.

In general, certainly, the words of Malo (n.d.:1) echo the foreign view and could thus be used by Pogue (1858); they were in fact based on Whitney and Richards (1832) and Dibble (1838). Hawaiian historical traditions about the earliest times are not very clear, aole i akaka loa: ua pohihihi wale no ka nui ‘the majority are
obscure’ (1 1). The reason for this is that the ancient Hawaiians did not know writing (1 2, 3), but memorized their traditions:

{o ka paa naau no kaka poe kahiko palapala, i hoopaa, i na mea kahiko a pau, a lakou i lohe ai.

‘memorization was the writing of the old people with which they fixed all the old things they heard’. (1 4)

Memorization can be faulty and thus the traditions are obscure and discrepant, and the majority of them are incorrect (1 4–6). Moreover, the different traditions gave rise to disputes in which some people thought the traditions they had heard were those that were pono loa ‘very correct’, especially in genealogies (1 7, 8, 10).

Despite this general view, Malo does not condemn Hawaiian traditions entirely as a source: ua [a]kaka uuku paha kekahih mau mea oia mau olelo ‘some things of these statements are perhaps a little clear’ (1 1); ua pono paha kekahih mau lohe kahiko, pono uuku paha ‘some things heard of old were perhaps correct, perhaps a little correct’ (1 5). For instance, Whitney and Richards (1838:161) had written of the original settlers’ homeland aole hoi i akaka ko lakou wahi i holo mai ai ‘nor also is clear the place from which they came’. Malo, in contrast, writes Aka, o na wahi o lakou i noho ai kai haiia mai ‘But the places where they lived were told’, if not their settlements and rivers.305

Kalimahauna (February 27, 1862) develops this point in some detail: ua paa mua i ko Hawaii nei poe kahiko ka inoa o Kahiki, a ua paa o Kahiki maloko o na mele, a me na pule, a me na kaaao, o ka poe kahiko o Hawaii nei ‘the name of Kahiki was first memo-

rized by the olden people of Hawai’i, and Kahiki is fixed within the chants, prayers, and tales of the people of old of our Hawai’i’. He provides a formal list of these names introduced by the words: Eia kekahih mau inoa aina i paa ma na mele ‘Here are some names of lands that were fixed in the chants’. He then develops
two possible theories: no ko lakou aloha paha ia Kahiki, a me Hawaii kapa lakou i kau wahi o Maui, o Kahikinui, a kapaia keia pae Aina o Hawaii, ina i ole ia o Hawaii paha, ke kanaka i noho mua ai, o Maui paha, Oahu paha, o Kauai paha, a make lakou kapa ia paha ka aina ma ko lakou mau inoa ‘perhaps because of their love for Kahiki and Hawaii, they called a Maui place, Kahikinui ‘Great Kahiki’, and this chain of Lands was called Hawaii. If this was not the case, perhaps Hawaii was the person who first lived in that place, perhaps Maui, perhaps Kaua’i, and when they died, the land was perhaps called after their names’. The latter theory, entertained at one time by Kamakau, is a Polynesian folk motif.

The problem is how to deal with such sources. Significantly, Malo introduces a word that had not been used in the discussion by foreigners: manamana ‘branches, branching’. The first use is negative: memorization led to differences of opinion, so that lilo loa na lohe i mea manamana a pono ole maoli ‘the things heard turned into something branched until truly incorrect’ (17). Malo next uses manamana in a context in which it had a conventional place in classical Hawaiian culture: genealogical study (10). As seen above, Kamakau (February 14, 1843) describes traditional genealogists working by separate manamana. Malo indeed states that there are different Hawaiian genealogies; Aole i like me ko Adamu moo kuauhau ka hookahi wale no, aohe manamana e ae ‘They are not like Adam’s genealogy, the single one indeed; there are no other branches’ (n.d.:10). But Hawaiian genealogists were accustomed to working with separate genealogical branches, recording them, evaluating them, supplementing and combining them, and so on. Despite all the problems involved, Hawaiian genealogists did not abandon their sources as obscure, but saw them as a somehow interrelated body of material to be used critically. Therefore, at the end of his introductory discussion, Malo can write of the three major Hawaiian genealogies in relation to those of Tahiti and Nu’uhiwa: ua like pu na moo kuauhau me ko
lakou ‘the genealogies are similar to theirs’ (111). After Malo’s earlier remarks, this statement is astonishing, unless the reader has perceived that he is now writing in a Polynesian, Hawaiian way about the problem; that is, he has moved from a foreign context to a native one, from an emphasis on differences to an emphasis on similarities. Malo is thus introducing into the discussion a classical Hawaiian approach and solution to the problem. Similarly, he can relate the differences among traditions to other aspects of the culture: people had different opinions about traditions just as they had about gods (19).

An acknowledgment of the different branches or versions of Hawaiian traditions leads the historian to the classical Hawaiian method of dealing with them: one learns as many as possible and presents them before evaluating and using them. Thus, Malo presents various contradictory traditional models of the origin of the islands before presenting the opinions of Western science, arguably as a newly introduced branch. The value of such materials is thus recognized, and the practice of collecting them is validated—however they will be finally judged and used. Nineteenth-century Hawaiian historians indeed followed the practice of describing variant traditions, even if they ultimately rejected some in favor of others.

The model of branchings was used conventionally, not only for genealogies, but for historical traditions in other literary forms. A branch could refer to a version of a story. J. H. Kānepu’u (February 8, 1868) answers a list of questions about a published story and states O ko kakou imi ana aku i ka oiaio o na moolelo kahiko, he mea paakiki paha ia ‘Our search for the truth of the old stories is perhaps difficult’. He mentions S. K. Kuapuu’s series on Pāka’a and S. M. Kaui’s on Pikoia’alalā. All such authors are involved in a common quest:

O ko kakou makemake io no ia o ka loaa o kekahi mea oiaio loa.
Ua lohe no kakou i ka olelo a ka poe kahiko “he lehulehu na mana
o Kamapuaa." Ina ua oiaio loa kau a me ka lakou nei ae, alaila e hoomaopopo loa kakou ka ma [sic: mea] oiaio.

‘Our true desire is to obtain something very true. We have indeed heard the statement of the old people “multitudinous are the branches/versions of Kamapua’a.” If yours and these others’ [works] are very true, then we will make very clear the thing that is true’.

As seen from several examples above, the word *maopopo* ‘clear’ is used for historical traditions that are known. Similarly, Keawekolohe, referring to the long tale of Kana, writes (December 12, 1860): *he like ole ka malama ana o ka poe kahiko, aole hoi paanaau, a pela no na mele* ‘the keeping [of this story] by the people of old was not identical—it was not memorized—and so also the chants’. His version of the Kana chant differs from one published earlier; *No ka paanaau ole i ka poe nana i malama, keia hemahema* ‘This awkwardness is due to the fact that it was not memorized by the people who kept it’. He is, however, eirenically content to complement the other tradition with his.

For Hawaiian historians, Malo’s formulation of the problem became authoritative, even conventional, and was given a typically dense expression by the great writer Kepelino: *Ma ka mooolelo Hawaii, nui na mana* ‘In the story of Hawai’i, there are many branchings’.307 This literal meaning must be supplemented by an underlying one characteristic of the author: *mana* as power. *Okoa ko kekahi, okoa ko kekahi* ‘This person’s is independent, that person’s is independent’. This is true of other aspects of the culture: in the traditions of the gods, *he nui na mana* ‘many are the branches’. So also in the traditions of creation and the oldest period. If this creates a problem, there is a methodological solution:

*Nolaila, aole like ka waiwai o na mana a pau i hoikeia mai e ka poe mooolelo. Aka, ua hui mai au i ka hapa pololei a kela mea keia mea i pololei iki ai.*
'Therefore, the value is unequal of all the branches made known by the people who tell the story. But I have brought together the correct portion of this and that thing so that [my account] will be a little correct'.

Nākuina also acknowledges the diversity of traditions and explains how he handles them: *Ohiia, houluuluia, waeia a hooponoponoia* ‘Gathered, collected, selected, and edited’. In his introduction to his book on Pāka’a, he writes (1902a: inside front cover):

> He nui na mana o keia moolelo, a o ua mau mana like ole la i loaa mai oia ki houluuluia, waeia a hooponoponoia me ke akahele loa, a kakauia ma ka olelo Hawaii oiaio maoli o ke au i hala.

‘Many are the branches/versions of this story, and these differing branches that were obtained are the ones that have been collected, selected, and edited/corrected with great care, and written in the genuine, true Hawaiian language of the time that is past’.

In the introduction to his book on Kalapana, he explains at greater length (1902b: 2):

> He nui na mana o keia moolelo, no ka mea, he paanaau a kau aku i ka mamo, nolaila, ua like ole ka mea i paa, loaa ae la i kekahi a haule hoi i kekahi, pela i like ole ai, a o ua mau mana like ole ‘la i loaa mai, mamuli o ka hookolo, huli, niele, ninau ame ka noii ana oia ki houluuluia, waeia a hooponoponoia me ke akahele loa, a ke waihoia aku nei imua o oukou e like me ka maemae i hiki ia’u ke hana.

‘Many are the versions of this story because they were memorized and laid before the descendants. Therefore, what was fixed was not the same; it was secured by one person and let fall by another, and thus it was not the same. But these many dissimilar branches/versions—obtained through investigation, searching,
questioning, asking, and research—these have now been collected, selected, and edited with great care and are placed before you with all the flawlessness of which I am capable’.

Similarly, the author of “He Moolelo Kaa no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” (April 17, 1924) mentions discrepancies in historical reports from the time of the battle of Nu‘uanu to the cession of Kaua‘i to Kamehameha I by Kaumuali‘i. But one should not blame the old people who transmitted their knowledge orally rather than in writing. The reader himself must choose between variants: na ka mea heluhelu no hoi e wae ae no i kekahi mau mea, ae waiho aku no hoi paha i na mea ana i mana ao ai ‘it is the reader’s also to select some things and also perhaps to leave the things according to his estimation’. The author himself seeks to be comprehensive—Aole no nae i nele kekahi mau mea waiwai ano nui ‘No important, valuable things are missing’—and to organize materials from different authors. This use of varying traditions is illustrated by the fact that Kamakau (January 26, 1867) can offer more than one account of an event.

Such attitudes encouraged authors to be more accepting and perhaps even appreciative of diversity. The author of “He Moolelo no Pakaa” (October 24, 1867) recognizes the differences between his version and the one published in 1861 by S. K. Kuapu‘u—aole nae hoi i kulike loa ka‘u me kana, a ua kulike no hoi ma kekahi wahi ‘mine is certainly not identical with his, but they are similar in certain places’—but because of the scarcity of people who have kept copies and the high number of people who want to hear the story again, he offers his version to the newspaper readers.

S. F. Napua opio (June 1, 1865) wrote a letter to the newspaper correcting what he considered a mistake in the version it had published of the story of ‘Umi, lacing his remarks with a reference to Wa‘awa‘aiakina‘aupō, the storied example of stupidity. He based his view on ka moolelo i humuhumu buke ia, oia la hoi e hookahi halau i ao ia ai ‘the story sewn into a book; that is, there is a single
academy in which [the true version] is taught'; a reversal of the saying, ‘Aohe pau ka ‘ike i ka hālau ho’okahi ‘Knowledge is not exhausted in a single academy’ (Pukui 1983: number 203). The next week, J. K. Kaunamano (June 15, 1865) entered a vigorous retort: that his opponent’s version is sewn into a book does not mean that all academies teach the same:

_ua hilinai oe ma na mea i paiia ma ka Buke, me kou manaoio o ka pololei loa na mea i paiia mamua o na mea i kamailio ia ma “Ke Au Okoa.” Aole anei i like ka hemahema o kau kamailio ana me ka hemahema oia buke Pela no, ua like loa._

‘You believe in the things that are printed in the Book, with your faith in the great correctness of things printed before things discussed in Ke Au Okoa. But isn’t the lack of expertise in your discussion like that of this book? Yes indeed, it is in fact the same’.

Napua opio’s biggest error is in stating that all academies teach the same version. On the contrary, _aole loa i like ka ike o ka poe akamai nana i malama i na mooolelo lehulehu wale o Hawaii nei_ ‘Not at all alike is the knowledge of the experts who care for the countless stories of our Hawai‘i’. For Kaunamano, discussion in the newspapers seems to be categorized as or near oral communication.

Among the foreign experts, Abraham Fornander was probably influenced by European studies of the Bible and the classics in his positive appraisal of Hawaiian sources and in his methods of working with them.  

Hawaiians seem quickly to have become accustomed to working with both oral and written sources—both books and newspapers—in their historical and cultural research. G. Puuloa (Fornander 1918–1919: 659) states that he obtained his information from Dibble (1838) and _Mai kekahi poe kahiko mai e ola nei_ ‘from some old people who are still living’. Hale‘ole (May 4, 1865) does his own personal research, but also takes some materials from Kamakau’s writings. Thomas Spencer (1895:118) calls Malo _He_
kaka olelo kaulana, a he loea noea kakau moolelo ‘a famous orator and wise expert in writing history’, joining the oral and the written traditions. The introduction of writing apparently did not weaken generally the position of the oral tradition, as reported for Tonga (Rutherford 1977:213). Kamakau (October 14, 1869) is explicitly unimpressed by publication since mistakes are made in books, and information obtained orally could be preferred to that in publications.

Both oral and written materials were used in education as well (e.g., M. A. Richards 1970:226). Family ledgers, in which can be found both family traditions and general information, were in all likelihood used for instruction within the home. For instance, the ledger of S. E. K. Papaai of the Kamaka family of Waikāne, O‘ahu, contains a list of important dates in Hawaiian history.

Whether the sources were oral or written, Hawaiians maintained a critical attitude towards them, and their criticisms merit study by modern historians. For instance, Hale‘ole (April 24, 1865) writes against generalizing: *Aole oia kaao ka mea e lawe mai ai a hoopili no ka lahui-kanaka holookoa* ‘This tale should not be taken and applied to the whole race’. Kamakau (October 14, 1865) enters into controversy according to the principle that they should all ‘be searching to obtain the truth of our ancestral stories’, *e imi ana i loaa ka oiaio o ko kakou mau mooolelo kupuna*. Hawaiian writers were also critical of their own work (Hale‘ole in Fornander 1919–1920:69). Hale‘ole (May 4, 1865) publishes a genealogy in the hope that it will stimulate a debate, *ho‘opa‘apa‘a*, that will result in greater accuracy. Perhaps Kamakau and Unauna will enter into the debate along with other people; *he mea nani nae ke hoopololeiaiia mahope o ka hoopapaapaa ana* ‘it will be just a beautiful thing if corrected after a debate’. Malo (n.d.: xviii 2, 27, 56) carefully distinguishes his own theories and opinions from tradition. ‘Ī‘ī (May 22, 1839) is careful to identify his own speculation: *pele paha keia, ina aole, ua kuhi hewa ko‘u manao* ‘it was perhaps thus; if not, my opinion is erroneous’. 
Kamakau (October 28, 1865) also wants to publish his materials so that they can be criticized and corrected. He is worried that when he dies, people will take his work as their guiding source or teacher, *i kumu alakai no lakou*; but it contains errors, factual and typographical, and some dates and sections have been omitted (Kamakau February 15, 1868) Editors forced him to shorten his section on the time of Kamehameha I; yet despite all these problems, the greater part of his publications is correct (Kamakau January 26, 1867). Such errors and omissions in individual writers made collaboration imperative: all knowledgeable people should join together to compose several books of Hawaiian history and tales; in this way, *ua loaa ka Buke Hawaii oiaio* ‘would be obtained the true Book of Hawai’i’ (Kamakau February 15, 1868). Kamakau addresses his fellow workers as his *hoa’loha kakau Moolelo* ‘Historian companions of aloha’.

After the problem of the evaluation of their sources, Hawaiian writers faced that of the best method of organizing their historical materials into narratives. The traditional organization was to group by islands the main sources, genealogies with connected stories, as is clear from, e.g., Kamakau (October 28, 1865). Reports of interisland contact—visits or wars—were conventionally told from the perspective of one personage or side. This organization accorded with the general focus of Hawaiian culture on family and locality, and was used widely by nineteenth-century historians. As president of the historical society founded in 1841, Kamehameha III wanted *ka moolelo i paa hoi mai ka mua a ka hope. Ko Hawaii moolelo, ko Maui, ko Oahu a me ko Kauai* ‘the history fixed from the beginning to the end: the history of Hawai’i, of Maui, of O’ahu, and of Kauai’.

There are, however, major disadvantages of this traditional organization when a history of all the islands is desired, for instance, from the *Kumulipo* to Kamehameha III. Simply telling the history of one island after another is clearly unsatisfactory and was never attempted, to my knowledge. Fornander’s (1969:11)
method was to tell the history of one island up to a certain point and then backtrack to bring the other islands up to date. Not only was this confusing, but the islands did not provide satisfactory common points at which they could all be divided into periods. As a result, Fornander’s chapter divisions are arbitrary. He begins a chapter on Hawai‘i with the words (1969:11 95 f.):

We again commence our review with this island, not because of any political preponderance that it may have exercised over the other members of the group . . . but on account of its geographical position solely, it being the most eastward.

Finally, as is clear from Fornander’s history, the traditional organization is unsuited to dealing with periods in which local history was dominated by larger events, such as the interisland conflicts during the reign of Kalani‘ōpu‘u. In any case, after the arrival of Cook, the histories of the individual islands became clearly too connected for the traditional organization to be adequate.

Through books and newspaper serials, as well as through teachers like Dibble, Hawaiians became acquainted with Western historiography, which was less focused on family and locality and more consequently chronological or linear. In fact, Western historiography itself was and still is exploring the broadest appropriate context for historical understanding: from biography and annals of kings, to local and national histories, to histories of broad regions like the Mediterranean, to world history. For the missionaries, the broadest context was world geography, understood as what is called today political geography (chapter IV). John Henry Newman described the nineteenth-century field in his letter to Orestes Brownson of December 15, 1853, inviting that American scholar to join the faculty of the Catholic University in Dublin (Dessain and Blehl 1964:505):
how much more fertile a subject of thought is the province of Geography! Viewed under its distinct heads as physical, moral, and political, it gives scope to a variety of profound philosophical speculations, which will at once suggest themselves to your mind. It treats of the very stage and field of all history; of the relation of that field to the characters of nations, to social institutions, and to forms of religion; of the migration of tribes, the direction and course of conquests and empires, the revolutions and extention of commerce, and the future destinies of the human race.

As seen above, Whitney and Richards (1832) placed Hawaiian history in such a context; and on a smaller scale, Bingham (August 19, 1835) posed questions about interisland relations and the coordination of dating with history outside Hawai‘i. The speculations by Hawaiians and foreigners on the origins of the race and its place in world history were the least successful aspect of their work. Nineteenth-century Hawaiian historiography could thus be profitably studied from the perspective of the mutual influence and coordination of traditional and Western forms of organization. For instance, the formulation of a central genealogy and its division into four periods by Kamakau (February 14, 1843) is an early example of such coordination, and history in general becomes for him the framework into which both genealogies and stories are placed.

Another method used by Kamakau was to formulate a linear narrative but to backtrack with genealogical and family historical information when he introduced an important person. This method is criticized in a generally favorable commentary on Kamakau’s work by G. W. (December 16, 1869). The author appreciates Kamakau’s writings but has a suggestion: the materials should be organized by islands from Hawai‘i to Kaua‘i. The chiefs of Hawai‘i should be discussed with all the available information related to their reigns. Then Kamakau should move on to Maui and continue until he reaches Kaua‘i. He should do this
until he reaches the time of Kamehameha I. This organization is less confusing and enables the reader better to follow the chronological sequence. When Kamakau introduces individual chiefs, he should not go back into their genealogical origins and forward to their descendants. The organization of the Bible and the foreign histories published in the newspapers is less confusing. But all Hawaiian history should be recorded from the highest chiefs to the famous deeds of the lowest classes, *na lopa kuakea*.

G. W.’s remarks demonstrate that the traditional organization of history was considered convenient and intelligible. His terminal date for the use of that organization, Kamehameha I, corresponds to the organization of Whitney and Richards (1832). Indeed, solutions to the problem of organization did not progress beyond Pogue (1858), although individual narratives became perhaps increasingly linear, as seen in “He Moolelo Kaa no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” (December 16, 1920–September 11, 1924); a process aided perhaps by an increase in the emphasis on stories. Contemporary historians such as Kuykendall and Gavan Daws have simplified their task by simply ignoring precontact history and beginning with the arrival of Cook, when Western historical documents become available. But postcontact history cannot be understood without precontact, so the problem of using Hawaiian historical traditions is inescapable. A better solution will perhaps be found only when a comprehensive, scholarly history will be attempted from archeological evidence and from a full use of Hawaiian and foreign sources.

The article by G. W. (December 16, 1869) is interesting for two further points. First, his emphasis on chiefs and famous deeds articulates a traditional concern of Hawaiian historians. Finally, G. W.’s interest in a history—as opposed to an ethnography—of the lower, indeed the lowest, classes, was not acted upon until recently with the beginning of ethnohistorical research.316

Despite its problems and limitations, postcontact historiography remains one of the greatest achievements of Hawaiian
culture. Hawaiian historians preserved a vast amount of history and ethnography, defended the value of their past and thus their culture, provided a context in which Hawaiians could understand themselves and the rapid changes of their time, and articulated a critical yet supportive image of themselves.

PRIESTS AND TEMPLES

Priests, or specifically religious experts, were important court personnel; they also enjoyed an institutional independence that was the result of a long societal development (Charlot 1985a:55). Through gradual elaboration and specialization, the functions of chiefs and priests, originally united in the head of the extended family, were unsystematically separated and assumed by different persons. Successive stages of this development did not destroy earlier ones, but added to them.

As a result, religious practitioners can be found working on several levels, as seen in other areas of Hawaiian expertise (e.g., Malo n.d.:xxiii 7). In a family, one member of each generation, who showed a particular aptitude, was chosen to care for the family gods. As in other fields, the family connection continued through the higher levels of priestly expertise. For instance, different types of higher level priesthood were often passed down in families.317 The occupational expert would perform the ceremonies necessary for his work. For instance, the fisherman made the normal offerings and performed the ceremony for a new net (Fornander 1919–1920:121). When extraordinary problems or difficulties arose—such as an obstructive shark—a professional religious specialist could be called in for help. In certain fields such as image making, the collaboration of a priestly expert with the occupational expert was expected (Malo n.d.:xxxvii 37; 1951:180 [Emerson]). At the regional and later national levels, long and complicated temple ceremonies were performed by professionals
under the direction of the court for the success of the occupations that contributed to the prosperity of the society as a whole (e.g., Fornander 1919–1920: 31–35). Finally, long ceremonies were also devised for specifically religious functions like the empowerment of a new god image.

Specialization in religious fields such as temple ceremonies was apparently more intense than in any other area of Hawaiian culture. A large number of different types of priests are mentioned in the literature, each of which had its proper rules, functions, literature, lineages, and history. These different priestly occupations were arranged hierarchically under a kahuna nui ‘great or high priest’, who had a professional capacity in all of them. The highest levels of the priesthood were traditionally attached to a chiefly court, but in Hawai‘i, priests had begun to establish a certain independence, which included economic: for instance, the god Kamapua‘a gave to priests the lands of windward O‘ahu the names of which begin with wai-. This growing independence introduced tensions in Hawaiian society that were unresolved at the time of contact. Kamehameha’s restructuring of the religion included placing religious functions firmly under his control; for instance, he himself could assume the role of high priest (Kamakau June 24, 1869).

Priestly professions were eminently ‘oihana ‘ike ‘occupations of knowledge’; indeed, priests were expected to be knowledgeable in other fields as well as their own. Accordingly, priestly education was the strictest in every aspect, starting from infancy if the student belonged to a priestly family. Each specialty had its own subjects; for instance, the kahuna kuhikuhi pu‘uone ‘geomancers’ studied the designs of old temples, even those in ruins (Malo xxxvii 14 f.; 1951:177 [Emerson]). Study could be supplemented by traveling to different experts.

Priestly instruction could be given by an individual expert, as seen in the discussion above. However, temples with their priestly
personnel were the second educational institution, after the court, in which instruction was provided by several experts in different fields, forming the faculty, as it were, of what could be considered a university of Hawaiian learning. Temple education was for both priests and chiefs. Kamakau reports on the education of the chief Kihapi‘ilani (August 26, 1865: 1):

> Ua laweia oia e ke kahuna e hanai i ka moku. O Mauoki hoi ka heiau i ku i ka moku ma ka olelo a ke kahuna. Ua hanaiia oia a nui, a ua ao ia i ke koa me na oihana kakaolelo, me ke akamai hoi i ka oihana hana.

‘He was taken by the priest to be reared on the island/land section. Mauoki was indeed the prominent temple of that land according to the statement of the priest. He was reared until he was big, and he was educated in being a warrior with the occupations of word-fencing/oratory, and also with knowledge of work occupation[s].’

The fabulous hero Palila is taught martial arts in a temple (Fornander 1918–1919: 137, 373), which endows him both with skill and with godly assistance (147–151). Moreover, his association with the temple and its god results in his having elua ano, he ‘kua, he kanaka ‘two natures: a god and a human being’ (137); he may also be godly on his mother’s side (145). In fact, a ceremony must be performed for him to turn into a human being, lilo i kanaka. This abnormal tradition may be based on the idea of māna ‘a trait that one receives from family or a teacher’. That is, because Palila had been reared in the temple, he had taken on some of the characteristics of the god. Temple education may, therefore, have conferred a special prestige, similar to that of being born in a special place.

I have found no information on the organization of temple education, but in all likelihood it followed the hierarchy of specializations, presided over by the high priest.
The court—the kahi ali‘i ‘chieﬂy place’ or the alo ali‘i ‘chieﬂy face or presence’—was a major center of culture in classical Hawai‘i. Like families and localities, each court had its special style or way of doing things. To give a minor example, Kuapu‘u implies that a special tapa was created at the court of Keawenuia‘umi. People visited other courts in order to learn their literature and practices and to exchange information, thereby disseminating and circulating, laha, cultural accomplishments (e.g., Kamakau October 25, 1842: 52). Courtly creations spread also to commoners, and commoners were employed and their cultural accomplishments adapted by the court. Courtly culture and education should be seen as one end of a continuum of elaboration that begins with the maka‘ainana ‘the people of the land’.

A fully developed court of an important chief contained numerous ofﬁcials, learned people, craftspeople, and experts, who are mentioned often in Hawaiian literature. Many of these positions were hereditary, but the family candidate had to be approved by the chief, and people could rise above their inherited station by merit. The presence of such people added not only to the efﬁciency but also to the prestige of a court and to the glory of the chief. Accordingly, chiefs would actively seek to enlist experts in their service. Conversely, experts would seek, sometimes daringly, to attract the attention of the chief—a process called ‘imi haku ‘seeking a chief’—so that they might be invited to make their career at court, where they would be richly rewarded. People were in fact trained speciﬁcally for court service, as seen in such cases as those of Kūapāka‘a and John Papa ʻĪi and his family: ua hoolako ia a makaukau i ola honua, a pela no ka poe imi haku a imi ali‘i o ka wa kahiko ‘[they were] equipped until ready to make the earth live, and thus indeed were the people of the olden time who sought a leader and sought a chief’. As often at courts, where the ruler’s favor is decisive,
obtaining and retaining a position involved intrigue, as is clear in the story of Pākaʻa.\textsuperscript{332} Once an expert was appointed to a court position, morality dictated that his primary loyalty was to the chief, although he was clearly attentive to his own advantage and that of his family.\textsuperscript{333} When necessary—that is, when the proper expert was not regularly employed or a particularly difficult matter had to be decided—a chief could seek assistance or advice from experts outside his court.\textsuperscript{334} In postcontact times, kings and chiefs continued to collect experts and advisors, including foreigners.\textsuperscript{335} For instance, the chiefess Kīnaʻu kept the Western-educated native teachers with her instead of allowing them to be sent out to teach (Kuykendall 1947:112). Chiefs used their experts also in the acquisition of Western knowledge, sending their teachers to Lahainaluna when it opened.\textsuperscript{336}

At the court, functionaries and experts worked together within a certain organization, which probably varied according to the traditions of the individual court and the characters of the personnel.\textsuperscript{337} Court officials enjoyed great power, being consulted by the chief and advising him even in morality; this power was particularly clear in the chief’s council.\textsuperscript{338} Valued advisors could, therefore, bargain with their chief, as does Pākaʻa.\textsuperscript{339} Because of the power and importance of their activities, court personnel are discussed in religious terms.\textsuperscript{340} Theoretically, the chief made the final decisions.\textsuperscript{341}

The concentration of expertise at a court resulted in its being a center of education.\textsuperscript{342} Merely associating with learned men and listening to their conversation was considered educational (Malo n.d.:xviii 6). Experts could offer formal education as well; Kekūhaupiʻo and his family helped in teaching the young people at the court of Kamehameha I.\textsuperscript{343} The subjects taught covered the different occupations of Hawaiian culture, as seen in the discussion above.\textsuperscript{344}

The principal students at a court were the children of chiefs, and the accounts of their education are a prominent part of the
traditions about them. The history of Lonoikamakahiki contains a long section on his education, various aspects of which have already been discussed. Entrusted to his teachers, Lonoikamakahiki is exceptional in that he learns by questioning (Fernander 1916–1917: 257–263). His father intervenes to teach the child himself when his opinions begin to appear odd (261). When older, the child receives training in several martial arts from a special teacher, who conducts a graduation ceremony with omens (263). Later Lonoikamakahiki travels around the island of Hawai‘i with two kahu to further his education (265). He studies the contest of wits with an expert and then practices with his peers (265 ff.). He later travels to test himself against others in the martial arts (269). His famous ho‘opāpā contest on O‘ahu has already been discussed.

The close supervision of Lonoikamakahiki’s education by his father reveals the basis of court education in that of the family. Other family members could also be involved, such as grandparents (Elbert 1956–1957: 107 f., 110). Kamakau (September 28, 1867) emphasizes that the son of Kamehameha I, Liholiho, was kept at his father’s court rather than being sent away for his education. Liholiho was thus able to associate with his father. Moreover, his father personally instructed him and his siblings, instruction that emphasized morals: Ua ao aku no hoi o Kamehameha i kana mau keiki i ka moolelo o ke aupuni a me ke akua ‘Kamehameha indeed taught his children the history of the government and the god’. ‘Ī‘ī (March 26, 1870) similarly emphasizes Kamehameha’s instruction of Liholiho, which was done in the council house after a meeting. Kamehameha used historical chiefs as good and bad models of the principle that the king or highest chief should care for the justice and happiness of both chiefs and commoners. Kamehameha taught his son also farming, fishing, and other professions, along with religious ceremonies. The moral teachings imparted were passed down to Kamehameha’s heirs and to government organs, and ‘Ī‘ī credits much of the success
and perpetuation of the monarchy to Kamehameha’s morality. Kamehameha himself was pleased with the results of his moral teaching, praising Liholiho for his ahonui ‘patience’ in not joining a rebellion in order to succeed more quickly to the kingship (īi August 14, 1869). Others also appreciated this chiefly behavior of Liholiho.

Young chiefly children could also be sent with a teacher or teachers to a paliuli ‘green cliff’, a country retreat to be reared and educated.347

Education at the court could also be offered to other students. Court functionaries transmitted their knowledge to their own family and others: Ua ao ia i na pua a me ka mea e [Kuhikuhiʻuone and kilokilo] ‘were taught to their children and other people’ (Kamakau June 2, 1866). The chief Māʻilikūkahī took all the firstborn of his realm to rear and educate: A malaila i hanai iho ai oia i na keiki makahiapo a na makaainana me na’Lii ‘And there he reared the firstborn children of the commoners and the chiefs’. The different experts at the court taught them their specialties: kela kumu ike keia kumu ike ma ka lakou Oihana. Ua ao ia na oihana ike a pau ‘this and that knowledgeable teacher in their Occupations. All the knowledgeable occupations were taught’.348

NOTES


and is respected by the educated people of the outside world,” a good means of which is to teach the children to research their own family, work that would contribute to the field.

3. Pule February 11, 1857. “No ka Pono a ka poe kahiko i ao mai ai i ka lakou mau keiki” March 14, 1834. Kānepu’u February 20–April 2, 1868, provides many examples. Compare Baron 1988:87. Much of this family education escaped the notice of foreigners; for instance, R. Armstrong 1858:24, writes that little education was provided in Hawaiian homes. Similarly, modern scholars have missed such education in their research (Appendix I).


7. For example, Kuapuu April 17, May 8, 1861. Kaui November 13, 20, 1865. Nākuina 1902b:4 (the grandfather teaches his four children), 5, 7, 8 (the opposing chief must be good because he has been taught by Kalapana’s uncles: ”He i—ke,” wahi a Halepaki, “pehea no auanei e nele ai ka ike ua aoia e Halepāiwi ame Halepāniho, kuu mau kaikunane” “Some knowledge!” said Halepaki, “how could knowledge be lacking when he was taught by Halepāiwi and Halepāniho, my older brothers”), 9 f., 15 f.


11. Family, rank and talents: Kamakau December 22, 1870; ”He Moolelo no Pakaa” October 24, 1867; Nākuina 1902a:1 f., 4, 9 f., 21, 33, 63; Fornander 1918–1919:73, 91. Ancestral gods: ”He Moolelo no Pakaa” November 7, 1867; Nākuina 1902a:20, 36. In his modernizing, Nākuina 1902a:121 f., 126, human-
izes the family situation of the protagonists and expresses concern for the families of supernumeraries caught up in the story, 87, 106–118.

12. Nākuina 1902b: 4; a further sign is that the chief learns slowly, as does Kalapana’s father [the talent is inherited from the mother’s family], 6; for the use of *maoli*, compare 24, 31, 38.

13. “No ko’u Wa i Hanau mai ai, a Hiki mai nei i nei Manawa” December 17, 1834. See also, e.g., “No ka Pono a ka poe kahiko i ao mai ai i ka lakou mau keiki” March 14, 1834, parents taught their children much and were therefore highly regarded by them. Kamakau February 3, 1870. Versus Ritchie and Ritchie 1979:107. When the early missionaries complain of Hawaiian parents neglecting their children’s education, they are referring to that offered in Western schools. Education in Hawaiian subjects and fields was continuing in the home. Western education itself was assumed as a family activity, e.g., Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:58.


15. Fornander 1919–1920:27, quoted above. Nākuina 1902b emphasizes throughout that Kalapana is acting according to his father’s last *ka’uoha*, e.g., 26.


18. ‘Ī’ī October 23, 1869, describes the process as a kind of birth. Kamakau December 14, 1867, the boys learn farming and fishing, and the girls, tapa making, dyeing, and plaiting. Kamakau states that the conventional gender division of labor was observed only on O‘ahu, Kaua‘i, and Moloka‘i and that on Maui and Hawai‘i, women did some men’s work and were very good at it, *mākaukau*. He himself feels however that men should do the heavy work and women the work related to the house. He blames the unusual situation on Maui and Hawai‘i on the heavy exactions of chiefs. Kamakau February 3, 10, 1870. Kānepe‘u February 27, April 2, 1868, writes that the youngest children played together, but later the girls worked and played separately, although he occasionally played with them; girls played both games the boys did and some that were played only by girls; February 27, 1868, his older sister at fifteen took

19. For example, Kamakau September 2, 1865: 1; January 5, 1867, i ka hale kapu no ka hanau o ke keiki a ke ali`i ‘the birth of the chief’s child took place indeed in the kapu house’; February 10, 1870. Fornander 1916–1917: 541. Pukui 1983: number 467. Charles Kenn (public lecture, February 24, 1976) distinguished between the training of commoner kāhuna, in the sense of religious experts, whom he called kahu kahu`ana, with the sense of servant or caretaker. These were educated usually in the family, graduated, and recognized. This type was the original form: the kahu was the body guard of a chief, and kahu-kahu meant apprenticing a person to become an expert in a particular field. A higher type was however developed: the kāhuna ali`i, the noble kāhuna, of which there were two classes, the priestly being superior to the chiefly. The child candidate for the kāhuna ali`i, who was to be trained in the ability of his father, was “sanctified” or “deified”, ho`ola`a ke keiki, was dedicated to his ancestors, and underwent an initiation ceremony in which he was introduced to the ancestors who were great in the field.


22. Nākuina 1902a: 34, 119; 63, the chants are considered family possessions; 6, Pāka`a himself learned some literature from an uncle. Fornander 1918–1919: 91.

23. Pukui n.d.: 1606 [5]; modern orthography, ho`omāke`aka. A. November 5, 1853, reports that such knowledge was the source of Malo’s being favored: “He was a great favorite when young, with the chiefs, on account of his smartness, his acquaintance with their songs, dances and other amusements, and hence able to administer largely to their love of pleasure.”

For role creation in general, see Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972: 43 ff., 189 f.; 1979: 6 f., 44 f.


26. Keaopolohiwa June 12, 1862, writes:

Oia hoi na hana akamai o ka hoike mua ana i na pomaikai e hiki mai ana o ke kanaka ma ke kuhikuhi ana o ka ila o ke kanaka.

O ka ila o ke kanaka, he mau hailona no ia no ke ano o ke kanaka . . .

‘These are indeed the knowledgeable deeds of the first showing of the future blessings of the human being in the designating of the birthmark of the person.

The birthmark of the person—these are indeed divination signs of the character of the person . . . ’

Such signs reveal the person’s fate, personality, and desires.

See also Fornander 1918–1919: 3; 1919–1920: 135–139. Elbert 1959: 33. Green and Beckwith 1924: 232 ff., 243 ff. Pukui 1942: 365. Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 27 ff. See also the discussion in the section on martial arts of the body type moa lawa or lawa. This examination corresponded to that performed by the kahuna pāhoa or usually five days after birth, which concentrated on the physical well-being of the child. Compare Taylor 1934: 23, a student is chosen because of a birthmark. A body reading could be done of an adult, Elbert 1959: 131. “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” June 16, 23, 1921, describes a very elaborate prophetic reading of the career of Kamehameha I, when he was already an adult.


29. Fornander 1916–1917: 161, boating. Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 56 f. Pukui n.d.: 1604 [3] f., “the steep trail of the kahuna at the head of the valley where boys in training for the priesthood were made to climb after completing a course. Should he show some fear, he was not ready to go on but must re-study, for a kahuna must learn to be fearless even at the cost of his life.”

30. “Mooolelo no Kawelo” September 26, 1861. In Nākuina 1902b: 10, Kalapana’s father charges his pregnant wife to teach the contest of wits to the child only if it is a boy. The reason for this is, however, that the child will
be taught to revenge the father, if necessary. In fact, the contest of wits is a profession taught by the women of the family.


32. Kamakau February 3, 1870. Pukui 1942:376. Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:36. Compare Handy and Pukui 1972:90, 179 ff. For chiefs, Elbert 1956–1957:1107 ff., 110. Kānepu‘u February 20, 1868, was the favorite of his paternal grandfather by whom, it was decided, he would be reared; but he was nursed by his mother, and since the grandfather lived with the immediate family, he was reared by his parents along with his siblings, receiving special attention from his grandfather.

33. “Ka Oihana Lua a Mawai Lahuui [sic]” July 19, 1923, martial arts, lua. In a version of the Kalapana story, “He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902, the hero is trained in the contest of wits by his grandmother.


35. Johnson 1981:8. ‘Īi February 12, 1870, states that he preferred his father to his mother, but she figures much more prominently in his writings because she was the one who educated him.


38. Malo n.d.:xviii 49; January 7, 1845. ‘Īi March 6, 1869. Kamakau September 23, 1865a; September 21, 1867, Ka‘ahumanu was the Kahu Alii Hanai of Liholiho; the name ‘Īi was based on a sound made by the child Liholiho and was given to Papa, his kahu; June 24, 1869. Kepelino 1932:125. Fornander 1969:II 136, 270, 272. Fornander 1916–1917:257–262. Green and Beckwith 1928:4 f. Titcomb 1948:130 f. Compare Kamakau of Ka‘awaloa, Fornander 1919–1920:7. Young chiefs could be taken by a single couple to an isolated place to be educated, Sterling and Summers 1978:167; a practice ‘Īi June 30, 1866, attributes to the frequent uprisings and warfare of the time. The work of the kahu was supervised, and a child could be taken away from him if it was unsatisfactory, ‘Īi June 12, 1869.


41. ‘Ī‘ī March 6, 1869. On kahu in battle, compare Ellis 1984:125, 210. On the account given immediately below, see ‘Ī‘ī February 27, March 6, 1869; Ii 1959:7 ff. See also August 21, 1869. ‘Ī‘ī himself had several kahu, e.g., July 24, 1869; he can use the word loosely to refer to people who cared for him temporarily, July 10, 1869. On such stories of kahu, compare Laanui March 14, 1838.


43. M. A. Richards 1970: 317. Similarly, the princess Nahi‘ena‘ena was extremely upset when separated from her steward, whom she had known since infancy, Missionary Letters, Volume 2, n.d.: 743a.

44. M. A. Richards 1970: e.g., 48, 113. Also Martin, Lyman, Bond and Damon 1979:31, 81.


46. Education: e.g., Chun 1987:viii, Malo is called kahukula “school master” while at Lahainaluna. In official documents pertaining to education, the position called kahu is often translated variously into English, suggesting that the Hawaiian term was primary. The “directors” of Lahainaluna were called kahu: “whose duty it shall be to watch over the interests of the school; to point out the course of instruction to be pursued; and to make an annual report to the mission,” “Sandwich Islands. Plan of a High School for Teachers” 1832:189. Church: e.g., Paleka 1879, kahu ekalesia.

47. For example, January 8, 1870. Compare “No ko‘u Wa i Hanau mai ai, a Hiki mai nei i nei Manawa” December 17, 1834.

Jordan, D’Amato, and Joesting 1981: 33 f. Jordan, Tharp, and Vogt 1985: 26, note that peer groups were more important than originally thought by the keep researchers.

49. Pukui 1983: number 1484. Judd 1930: proverbs 213, 425. Speidel, Farran, and Jordan 1989: 67, “Perhaps children who are expected to be more independent of adults have more experiences that develop visual, observational, and manipulative skills. This would fit with the hypothesized ‘observational learning complex’ . . .” Native Hawaiian Educational Assessment 1993 1993: 30, sibling care-taking has produced “independence, self-sufficiency and strong social skills.”

50. “Sandwich Islands. Extracts from a Letter of Messrs. Green and Dibble, dated at Hilo, Oct. 4th, 1831” 1832: 221, “The vagrant habits of children and members of every family, and the total disregard they show to the injunctions of their parents or others over them, is a melancholy proof of the low state of domestic discipline. Here begin those habits of moral delinquency, which grow up and strengthen with their strength. Here then must begin the reforming influence, by introducing family government among their parents”; “Early education” is needed for moral training; 223, children are difficult to educate: “Their restive minds, impatient of restraint, and their ungovernable habits at home, present a very serious difficulty in the way of bringing them under the discipline of schools.” “Mission to the Sandwich Islands” 1833: 456. J. S. Green 1838: 36, 41. Dibble n.d.: 2094. Missionary Letters, Volume 7, n.d.: 2151. Bingham 1981: 367. Kuykendall 1931: 165; 1947: 108. Martin, Lyman, Bond, and Damon 1979: 31, 64, 74. Grimshaw 1989: 159, 171, 174. Zwiep 1991: 168, 170 (“children in this country are brought up in their own ways, the parents seldom attempting to govern them”), 256, 264 f. Wilkes 1845: 242, states that parents were under the control of their children after they had grown up. A number of writers urge parents to care for their children and encourage them in Christianity and Western schooling: e.g., “No ka Pono a ka poe kahiko i ao mai ai i ka lakou mau keiki” March 14, 1834; Malo May 23, 1838.


52. Papaiku May 12, 1858. The Hawaiian author of “No ko’u Wa i Hanau mai ai, a Hiki mai nei i nei Manawa” December 17, 1834, agreed with this assessment; he writes that as a boy he stole and played: au loa i na ino o ke ao nei ‘I swam fully in the evils of this world’; see also his “Ka hope o ke koena” December 20, 1834. Compare “Kaao Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki” February 7, 1912: 17, the mature children of the heroes’ opponents consult together to decide whether they will follow parental advice and not continue the fight.

54. For example, “Mooolelo no Kawelo” September 26, 1861. Elbert 1959: 33 ff.

55. Kamakau November 10, 1870. The competition for and establishment of status among members of contemporary peer groups is important in my observation of Hawaiian and Samoan children. See Gallimore, Boggs, Jordan 1974: 173 ff., and note the provision of food as a source and sign of status as in classical Hawaiian culture. Jordan, D’Amato, and Joesting 1981: 35. See Tharp 1989: 350 f., on the use of peer organization in the social organization of the classroom. The hierarchy of peers has generally been neglected, e.g., Ritchie and Ritchie 1979: 80–87. Roland Tharp told me that a projected peer leadership study for the KEEP project was not done and that he generally agreed with the Gallimore studies (personal communication, November 27, 1990). The observed lack of competition among Hawaiian peers inside Western schools may be due to the social context.


60. Kaawa December 2, 1865. Kamakau December 14, 1867, writes, O na kane no hoi kekahi poe loea ma ke ano hana malo a me ka pau wahine—He poe hapa no nae ka poe i ao ia maia aoao, ua kapaia lakou o ka poe hoolu a kapalapala a Ehu’ Men were also indeed some people who were expert in the type of work of making loincloths and women’s skirts—The people who were taught this side were a half people [transvestite or transsexual]; they were called the dyeing and stamping people of Ehu’. The use of loea may have a feminine connotation in this context (see the discussion of the word in chapter I). Kānepu‘u February 27, 1868, mentions ka poe ike i ka wai hooluu ‘the people knowledgeable in dye’ and quotes a saying about them Na ua o ka hooluu ‘The rains of the dye’.

62. In his series on boat-building, Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua uses the word often in different senses, alternating with the loan word *rula* ‘rule’: November 16, 1922, *o ka rula ia o ke oki ana o ka laau koa waa* ‘this is the rule of the cutting of the koa tree for the boat’; December 7, 1922a, if the ‘elepaio bird pecks the tree, it is not solid; December 7, 1922b, *He rula ia no ke oki laau waa ana* ‘This is a rule for the cutting down of the boat tree’, a very practical set of instructions; December 14, 1922, the boatbuilders would mark chosen trees so that others would not take them; *He rula keia mai ka wa kahiko loa mai ahiki no i keia wa.* ‘This is a rule from the very ancient time all the way until this time’; if someone does take a marked tree, *aole ia i pili i na loina kalaiwaa.* ‘this does not conform to the rules of boat building’; *Eia no keia loina no na laau waa.* ‘Here indeed is this rule for the boat trees’, speaking of omens, still observed in his time. Compare Kepelino July 2, 1867: 119. The practice of calling different sections of a ceremony *loina* may be due to the fact that they were the specialties of different priests, e.g., *Tī* August 21, 1869. Compare Nākuina 1902a: 76, on the reading of weather signs.

63. Damon 1935: 455, defines *‘oihana* ‘profession’ as “*Oi: highest, or supreme; hana: work. That is, skilled work of the highest order.*”

64. For example, Kuapuu June 5, 1861. Rémy 1859: 18, “*Le peuple havaïen honore les constructeurs de pirogue et les grand pêcheurs, comme des citoyens privilégiés. Les chefs eux-mêmes leur accordent de la considération. Mais il faut dire que la position honorable qu’ils occupent dans la société, ils la doivent à leur habileté dans leur métier, plus qu’à autre chose.*” Handy and Pukui 1972: 102ff., workers and craftsmen were feasted.


69. Kauai November 13, 1865. “*He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna, Hawaii*” 1902. Fornander 1916–1917: 575. Nākuina 1902b: 6, 7, 9, 14. See also Kekahuna n.d.: 2, the student of priestly knowledge would study under one expert and “then travel from district to district learning from old kahunas to learn all departments; but specialize on one or two departments . . .” For post-contact travel, compare Golovnin 1979: 201.

70. Calabash making: Jenkins 1989: 71, general knowledge; 46, 101–105, vocabulary and concepts; compare 222 on basketry. Wilkes 1845: 81, a chief
works as a preacher, schoolmaster, fisherman, and maker of wooden bowls.

Adz-making: Kamakau December 21, 1867, *he hana akamai no ka imi ana e loaa ai ke koi* ‘a knowledgeable work indeed was the searching to obtain the adz’. Nimmo 1990:65.

Bird catching: Abbott 1992:106. J. S. Emerson 1892:17, mentions La’e, the god of bird catchers. Kaawa December 9, 1867, mentions the *po’e kono manu* ‘the people who entice the bird [with a bird call]’ and the *po’e pi‘i pali* ‘the people who climb the cliff’, whose god is Kâneholopali; he may be referring to the same set of people. Kuinae May 8, 1872: 87 [4], states that bird catching was a means for commoners to solve their economic problems because the feathers were so valuable. Judd 1930:proverb 216, a bird catcher is mentioned in a saying. Wilkes 1845:134, mentions “a celebrated bird-catcher.”

Mat plaiting: Brigham 1906:53.

Prophets and prophetesses were selected by the different methods recorded for other occupations, adapted canonical interpretations to individual cases, were used as court advisors, and could be remembered in history, Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:110 f., 269–279; Fornander 1916–1917: 245.

71. Basis: Judd 1930:proverb 159. Commoners: Malo xviii 69. Chiefs: e.g., Laanui March 14, 1838, Kamehameha farmed and fished; Dibble 1838:54, 56 (Kamehameha I); Kamakau August 19, 1865; November 18, 1865, he includes farming among the activities of a good chief; Elbert 1959:173; Tatar 1993:322, Kamehameha I is praised as a farmer in a chant. Kaeppler 1993:119, mentions an agricultural or cultivating hula.

72. The literature on the subject is vast, e.g., Kamakau 1976:23–55; Green and Beckwith 1924:9–11; Handy and Handy 1972. Malo n.d.: xxxix 15, terms for those who did much farming or little (the criterion is the amount of work).


76. Vocabulary: e.g., Malo n.d.; xxxix 22 f., different terms for fishermen depending on the size of fish they sought; 1951:212 f. (Emerson), terms or names for nets and hooks. Specialties: Kamakau December 14, 1867. “He Moolelo Kaaop no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” January 13, 20, 1921, shark and other types of fishing; Pāka‘a possesses the knowledge of a special kind of fishing, Kuapuu June 5, 1861.


79. Profession: e.g., ‘Ī’ī March 6, 1869; March 26, 1870. Local: Broeze 1988:85. Regulated: Kamakau December 21, 1867; see also Forndar 1919–1920:143, kānāwai.

80. Gods: J. S. Emerson 1892:17; Kamakau February 2, 1867a, Kūpulupulu and Mokuhāli‘i, O laua na akua o ka poe kalai waa o ka poe kahiko ‘These two were the gods of the canoe carvers of the people of old’. Rituals, vocabulary, and prayers: Forndar 1916–1917:439ff., the famous canoe chant of Kana with its many terms; Kānepu‘u May 9, 1860, states the chant is a canoe dragging chant or prayer; “He Mau Olelo Ku i ka Noeau” June 20, 1919, ke mele ano pule kalai waa ‘the chant of a canoe carving type’; Forndar 1919–1920:143–147; Henriques 1926; Nimmo 1990:64f.; Tatar 1993:28.

81. Kamakau December 29, 1870: kahuna o ki waa ‘boat cutting specialist’, kahuna kua waa ‘boat hewing specialist’, kapili waa, who added parts after the carving of the hull, and those who dragged the canoe log to the shore for finishing; a single man could perform more than one of these functions. Forndar 1919–1920:143ff. Malo XXXIV 30, expert in lashing. Hauling the canoe log: Malo XXXIV 17–20; Forndar 1918–1919:633ff., a man rode the log to guide it. I have spoken with a woman whose family specialized in the last occupation for which there was a special god.

82. Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua November 16, 1922. Compare Kalaaukumuole April 14, 1866.

83. Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua December 7, 1922b; also December 14, 1922; November 23, 1922; January 11, 1923, pale waa; February 8, 1923. See also, e.g., Hale‘ole October 17, 1861, pale waa; Kamakau June 15, 1865.


85. Waiamu September 16, 1865. Kepelino 1932:79–85. Wilkes 1845: 41–44. Bingham 1981:229, 238. Sahlins and Barrère 1973:30ff. Hawaiian star knowledge has been the object of modern study; see Kittelson 1981:index Astronomy, especially number 1684; Johnson and Mahelona 1975. As far as I can see, the possible influence of missionary schooling, e.g., Whitney and Richards 1832:6, has not been adequately examined.
86. General competence: Sahlins and Barrère 1973: 30. ʻĪʻi stresses the need for a general water knowledge for safety, including swimming and surfing, January 29, April 2, 1870, weather signs, and righting an overturned canoe. In such matters; ʻĪʻi distinguishes between *ka mea ike* ‘the knowledgeable person’ and *ka mea ike ole* ‘the person without knowledge’, April 16 1870. Kamakau December 14, 1867, the competence of fishermen.

Expertise: Johnson and Mahelona 1975, record phrases for experts and provide translations: 158, *ka poe Ao-Hoku; ka poe i ike i ke Ao-hoku o Hawaii nei; ko Hawaiʻi nei poe Ao-hoku*; 159, compared to Western scientists, *ko Hawaiʻi nei poe Ao-hoku, a . . . ka poe akeakamai*; 161, *Ua ao ia kekahi i ke kilo hoku, a ua akamai loa*; 163, *he hookelewaa kaulana oia no ke akamai; poe kilokilo hoku* (omen readers). Kamakau August 5, 1865, records the names of experts; this important article has been translated by Alexander 1890. Sahlins and Barrère 1973: 30, “There was a class of persons whose profession it was to watch the motions of the stars.”

87. For example, Kuapuu April 24, 1861; April 17, 1861, on the duties of the steersman.


89. Kuhelani November 19, 1856, begins his list with the conventional introduction, *Eia no ka inoa o ia mau Hoku* ‘Here indeed are the names of these Stars’. The list consists of names and ends with *oia ka inoa o na hoku la-e* ‘these are the names of the stars’. See also Kupahu December 30, 1865. Kamakau August 5, 1965, paragraph 11. Johnson and Mahelona 1975: 158–170.

90. “ʻHe Moolelo no Pakaa” November 7, 1867, possible terms for instructions in paddling. Rules: ʻĪʻi April 2, 30, 1870.


93. For example, Kepelino 1932: 95. “ʻHe Moolelo Kaao no Kuhapio/Kekuhaupio” May 26, 1921. Martin, Lyman, Bond, and Damon 1979: 63 f.

94. The literature is vast. For example, Judd 1930: proverbs 95, 139. Bruce 1976: 113.


96. ʻĪʻi August 7, 1869, *loina; May 14, 1870, ike, akamai; May 28, 1870, akamai* as opposed to *poe hawawa* ‘awkward people’, *loina* for different activities in surfing; *Ua nui wale keia ano akamai* ‘Very great/many is this type of knowledge’. Kamakau August 19, 26; November 18, 1865: 1, *akamai*. 
101. Boards: ‘Ī‘ī May 28, 1870. Surfs: ‘Ī‘ī May 14, 1870; ‘Ī‘ī begins by giving a list full of information which receives a semi-conventional termination: a he mau nalu no i koe ma na moku iloko o ia mokupuni ‘a number of surfs indeed remain in the sections of this island’. He then adds a list with just the names and locations of the surfs, ending with A anei la, pau na mokupuni, a pau no hoi na nalu a‘u i hoomaopopo ai, a ia oukou aku hoi ke koena ‘Probably that is indeed all the surfs of all the islands that have been made clear to me, and it is up to you [to add] the remaining ones’. ‘Ī‘ī apparently felt compelled to complete his list. Fornander 1919–1920: 207, a list of boards and surfs.
102. For example, Malo n.d.:xxxviii 61. Barratt 1987:40, 64. “No kekahi hana kahik[o]” March 21, 1834, categorizes the martial arts along with boat racing and sexual impropriety as bad activities of the old culture, but in doing so uses traditional praise words and statements: the body is rendered ikaika ‘strong’.
103. ‘Ī‘ī October 2, December 4, 1869. See also Barratt 1988:219.

111. ‘Ī July 31, 1869, aohe no hoi he akamai a koe aku ‘there was indeed no knowledge that remained’ in spear throwing and dodging, a conventional expression of completeness; August 7, 1869, ua aoia ke kanaka mai luna a lalo i ka alo ana ‘the person was trained from top to bottom in dodging’. Elbert 1959:93, 103, the limits of Kawelo’s knowledge.


113. ‘Ī August 7, 1869, kanawai of the schools set up by Kamehameha; October 2, 1869, loina and kanawai of boxing. Hale’ole in Fornander 1919–1920: 147 ff. (spear), 149 ff. (lua).

114. Ho‘opāpā: “Ka Oihana Lua a Hawaii Lahui” August 2, 1923. Intellectual terms: S. W. Naillili June 5, 1865, akamai i ka lua; to describe a tie: aohe mea o laua i pio, ua pii like no laua a elua, ma ka ikaika a me ke akamai i ka oihana lua ‘neither of the two was subdued, the two indeed attained the same height of strength and knowledge in the lua profession’, so the two exchange malos; Anonymous November 18, 1865, akamai; ‘Ī February 6, 1869, akamai in spear dodging; July 31, 1869, akamai in spear throwing and dodging; August 7, 1869, akamai in spear handling, etc.; October 2, 1869, akamai, of boxers. “Kaao Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-miki” June 14, 1911:15, a person is identified as he kumua'o lua, kaka-laau ame na ike e ae he nui ‘a teacher of wrestling, club fighting and many other types of knowledge’; June 21, 1911:15, he olohe a he aiyaiwa maoli ‘an expert and genuinely marvelous’; January 24, 1912:18, ‘ōlohe. Koko June 19, 1865, akamai of Hawaiian soldiers during the American civil war.

115. For example, Elbert 1959:55–63. Kamakau August 26, 1865:1, O ka hana nui a ko Lihue poe alii i ka wa kahiko, oia hoi ke ao ana i ka lonomakaihe, a nolaila mai na kumu akamai ‘The great work of the chiefly people of Līhu‘e in the olden time, was teaching the art of spear throwing, and from there came the knowledgeable teachers’. ‘Ī May 15, 1869, the chiefs of Ka‘ū were famous for club fighting. “Kaaoh Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki” June 21, 1911:14. For lua as a family specialty, see below.

116. ‘Ī October 2, 1869, uses the image of different fishing huts for the different schools of boxing, probably a reference to the special houses constructed for instruction. For lua, see below.


118. Kamakau September 23, 1865a, shooting rats with arrows is also mentioned. Compare Kamakau August 26, 1865: 1, ke kaa laau, lono makaihe, ke kaka-laau ‘club fencing’, and ka pahupahu laau ‘spear thrusting’. Fornander 1918–1919: 503, a list of martial arts, ua ao oia i ke koa a me na hana a pau o ka wa kahiko oia ka alo ihe a me ka maa, ka lua, a me na hana a pau loa; translation page 502. “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” December 16, 1920, ka oo-ihe ‘spear thrusting’, ka mokomoko hakoko ‘wrestling’, ka holo kukini ‘running’.


126. For example, Fornander 1918–1919: 457; 1919–1920: 149 ff. “Kaa Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” February 14, 1912: 18, credit is given to ka mana o na kupunawahine ‘the power of the grandmothers’ and the hoʻopāpā gods; June 14, 1911: 14, the god of the opponent changes sides during the combat.

128. “Ka Oihana Lua a Mawaii Lahui [sic]” July 12, 1923, place; July 19, 1923, the author was taught by his grandfather. Hale’ole April 24, 1865, was instructed in lua by his grandfather and grandmother; he mau kumu lua nui laua, no loko ae o ka pal [break in paper; “school”?] o Kekuaokalani ‘the two were important lua teachers within the [school?] of Kekuaokalani’; Hale’ole’s parents and his younger brother learned lua at the same time. “Kaa Hoioniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” February 7, 1912: 17 f.; June 21, 1911: 14. “He Moolelo Kaa no Kuoapio/Kekuapio” December 23, 1920. Places would compete in the martial arts, Ellis 1984: 199; Pukui 1943: 208.

Kristina Kikuchi wrote an M.A. thesis on lua under my direction in 1995. She did not read this section of my book, but I did provide her with my sources. She included more sources and information in her thesis than I discuss here.


130. See also Ekaula April 13, 1865. S. W. Nailiili June 5, 1865: ‘iliki ‘to attack’, pa’a ‘made fast in a hold’, wehe ‘to loosen a hold’, hemo ‘free of a hold’. Beckwith 1919: 621. Gutmanis 1983: 97 ff. “Lua” n.d. “Lua Fighting—George Kalama” n.d. Kaawa April 27, 1865, provides a major list, marking those items that are special to women; see Appendix VI; Pukui and Elbert 1986: fight. Some words may take on a special sense in lua; for instance, kūlana refers specifically to the placement or posture of the body in “Ka Oihana Lua a Hawaii Lahui” July 12, 19, 1923.

131. For example, Judd 1930: proverb 225, riddle 238. Pukui 1983: number 312. For more on boasting, see S. W. Nailiili June 5, 1865.

132. Also July 19, 1923; the title contains two typographical errors: “Ka Oihana Lua a Mawaii Lahuu [sic]”.

133. S. W. Nailiili June 5, 1865, uses the word le‘ale‘a frequently; “E lealea auanei” ‘Let’s have fun’, is an invitation to fight.


136. Charlot 1979. Beamer 1976: 9 f. Beckley 1932: 26 ff., emphasizes the connection between voice training and world view: when the child learned to use his voice properly, he placed himself in harmony with his environment; the child would begin with physical exercises and learning chants and gradually begin to understand the symbols and be able to compose himself.


142. A tape-recording was made of Mrs. Hoke’s talks in my class and given to the Hawai‘i-Pacific Collection of the University of Hawai‘i; it cannot be located at the time of writing.


146. Malo n.d.: l1iv 3–4. See also Pukui 1943:219; 1980:92. Beamer 1976: 45. Barrère 1980:22, 39. Kaeppler 1993: hula terms are mentioned throughout, e.g., 67–75, 121–126, 163, 235 ff.; 79, dances, especially important ones, should be perpetuated as taught; 173, an example of this can be shown from twentieth-century films; 103, the twentieth-century hula master Pua Ha‘aheo’s kept a chant book, an example of the use of writing to support memorization.


151. Innovation: e.g., King 1989:41, for a postcontact example. Historical


155. General competence: Handy, Pukui, and Livermore 1934: 5, 16. Expertise is generally recognized, but there can be disagreements about the antiquity of particular practices; compare William Richards in Sahlins and Barrère 1973: 35, "formerly there were no physicians, and no medical treatment of diseases whatever," except for rudimentary treatments. Medicine was first developed extensively after an epidemic in the time of chief Alapa‘i in the late precontact period; "The practice of medicine took its rise at that time, and from that time there has been a distinct class of practicing physicians. Their number however and their practice was quite limited until a great pestilence which prevailed in time of the reign of Kamehameha I, since which time there has been no want of native physicians or native medicines." Kamakau August 11, 1870, calls medicine an ancient profession, he oihana kahiko loa; in the old days, many people practiced medicine, September 15, 1870; but it began to be neglected because there were few indigenous illnesses and foreign ones had not yet been introduced. Therefore, children's medicine and sorcery were the branches most practiced. Kamehameha responded to the devastations of foreign diseases by having medicine taught at court. At this time, the school of medicine of Lonopūhā was revived, ua hoala hou ia; o Kuauau ke kahuna o ka mookahuna o Lonopuha, a ua ao ia na ‘lii a oia ke kumu i laha hou mai ai ka oihana lapaaau, a ua lilo ka oihana kahuna lapaaau i oihana kaaulana i ke au o Kamehameha I ‘Kūa‘ua’u was the priest/expert of the priestly line of Lonopūhā, and the chiefs were taught, and he was the teacher/source by which the medical profession spread again, and the medical profession became a famous profession at the time of Kamehameha I’ . Luomala 1989: 305 f.

Kānepu‘u March 5, 1868, the expert who treats his mother is a friend of his father’s younger brother, who perhaps recommended him. Ellis 1984: 333, states that there were many experts, but "there are none who exclusively devote
themselves to this employment.” Papa, ‘Ī‘ī’s relative, is a counterexample.

Payment: ‘Ī‘ī October 16, 1869, a pig was brought to the expert from the sick person; the amount of payment varied according to the number of diseases to be treated. Ellis 1984:335. “No na Kahuna Hawaii” n.d.:562. Kekahuna n.d.:3, gifts are given to a good doctor, but a sorcerer charges an actual fee. Handy and Pukui 1972:145, “payments, offerings and feasting.” Luomala 1989: 308 f., the conventional pig offering was for the ancestral gods, but was eaten by the expert and others. In the nineteenth century, some experts worked without pay, Kaliwiwaably October 6, 1866, as do most of the contemporary experts with whom I am familiar.


158. On experts, see Larsen (also 1952:11) and Gutmanis in previous footnote. On centers and temples, see Davison 1927b:3 (shrines); Larsen 1952: especially, 14; Gutmanis 1977:42 f.; Luomala 1989:306 f., states that they are attested for Tahiti. ‘Ī‘ī August 7, 1869, calls them heiau ao lapaau ‘temples to teach medicine’.

159. Luomala 1989:305. Also Larsen 1952:11. Gutmanis 1977:37. “No na Kahuna Hawaii” n.d.:561, lists the inspiration from a god among the many reasons for entering the profession (another is kuko hewa ‘wrongful desire’); 562, he distinguishes between na kahuna i ao ia ame ka poe i uluhia ia ‘the experts who have been taught and the people who have been possessed/inspired’.


161. Ellis 1984:332 f. ‘Ī‘ī October 16, 1869, teaching was done at Peleula in medical temples, ilaila e lolo ai na haina a me na loina lapaau ‘there were being taught to mastery the medical sayings [or offerings] and rules’; graduation took place in front of a temple; February 19, 1870. Kamakau September 14, 1867; August 25, 1870, he halelau kahi e ao ai i ka poe haumana ‘a leaf house was the place where they taught the students’; September 15, 29, 1870. Chun

162. ʻĪʻī February 19, 1870. Ellis 1984: 335, reports that famous eye experts were fetched from great distances.


164. Handy and Pukui 1972: 142 f., distinguish natural sickness, maʻi kino, cured with herbs, from ʻaumakua sickness, which requires prayers and offerings. Kamakau September 29, 1870, provides a list of ways of dying, some of which he seems to present as “natural”: O ka make ohemo wale; o ka make ulia wale . . . ‘Death just from weakness; death just from accident . . . ’; Kamakau discusses at length sickness caused by ancestral or other gods and emphasizes the inefficacy of physical remedies and the need for religious, September 15, 22, 29, 1870. Compare Hallpike 1979: 457 ff. The position is however controversial; many would consider no medical problem to be purely “natural” in Hawaiian culture. On the connection to sorcery, see Ellis 1984: 291–295, 333; Kamakau September 14, 1867; August 11, September 15, 22, 29, 1970. Luomala 1989: 289, 306 f. Uaua March 2, 1867, defending Hawaiian medicine, differentiates polemically between it and sorcery, which is idolatrous. Sickness caused by ancestral gods is mentioned often, e.g., H. H. P. September 22, 1866, he aumakua ka mai ‘the sickness is of the ʻaumakua type’.

165. ʻĪʻī October 23, 1869, strangers from Kahiki bring sickness to Hawaiʻi, which is cured by Kamakanuiaʻilono. So sickness and treatment arrived at the same time. The chief Lono’s foot wound is treated by the medical expert, and Lono says he wants to learn medicine. The expert transfers his knowledge to him by spitting into his mouth. The chief, now named Lonopūhā, follows the expert, learning from him. He becomes famous and is summoned by Milu (the god of the underworld), who appoints him his medical expert. Special houses are built for treatment, and Lonopūhā teaches medicine to Milu, who is too impatient to follow instructions. In a cautionary episode, Lonopūhā later brings Milu back to life and emphasizes that he should obey his doctor and not be an aliʻi kuli ‘deaf chief’ (also March 5, 1870). ʻĪʻī’s relative Papa belonged to the medical order of Lonopūhā, and ʻĪʻī probably learned his version of the tradition from him. Compare Chun 1986: 1–6, 27–34.

aumakuas, there were individual, occupational, and professional aumakuas. A medical practitioner recited the names of his aumakuas—deified healers—to add power and confidence to a treatment.”


167. ‘Ī‘ī October 16, 1869. Spencer 1895: 47, 64 f. Spencer 1895: 45, mentions that the medicine discussed was used for spear wounds in the olden days, showing that such remedies continued to be transmitted and were, as in this case, applied to new medical problems; see also 64 ff.; 66 f., a traditional story form is used to transmit historical information: introduction, O Muleiula . . . Oahu; narrative, e hookohi ana . . . a kanu iho la malaila.; conclusion, Oia ke kumu e puua nei na wahine i ke keiki.

168. Inspiration: “No na Kahuna Hawaii” n.d.: 561, No ka Uluhia ona uhanehaukae ame na Aumakua i hoakua ia, no ka mea, aole he Kahuna kekahi poe mai na kupuna mai, makua, i na keiki, aole no hoi i hele aku e ao no ia hana, aka, i ka noho ana o keia mau Akua lilo iho la lakou i mau Kahuna ‘From the Inspiration/Possession of the unclean spirits and the deified Ancestral Gods, because some people were not Experts from their ancestors, from parent to child, nor because they went to learn this work, but by the sitting/possession of these Gods, they became Experts’. Dreams: Kamakau September 15, 1870. Handy, Pukui, and Livermore 1934: 17, the original medical knowledge was revealed by ancestral gods in dreams; this practice continues. Handy and Pukui 1972: 129, compare 143.

169. For example, Handy, Pukui, and Livermore 1934: 14 ff., 18 ff.


“Kahuna Lapaaau Hoopunipunii” May 4, 1865, reports that a medical expert named Kalai tried unsuccessfully to get, loa, the wind of Ka’anapali, Maui; Pau ole no hoi ka eka o na kahuna kanaka ‘The trickery of the native kahunas is indeed not ended’. That this was done for medical purposes is not stated.


174. Kekipi 1903. This book was translated as a class project by Morrison 1984. Davison 1927b: 4, states that new medical practitioners are mixing traditional practices with Christianity for a type of faith healing. Compare the postcontact saying that emphasizes the traditional moral emphasis of Hawaiian medicine, Judd 1930: proverb 414.

175. Spencer 1895:56. Larsen 1952:11 (students would not practice, but

176. Kamakau September 22, 1870. See also Chun 1986: 16, 54 f.

177. Ekaula November 4, 1865. 'Ī July 24, October 16, 1869. Kamakau 1964: 108. Handy, Pukui, and Livermore 1934: 12, the pebbles were laid on tapa and mats; in the postcontact period, a system of signs was used. Chun 1986: 51; compare 36. Luomala 1989: 308. The completeness formula “From head to toe” may be connected to this practice, Handy and Pukui 1972: 184; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 247. Kamakau September 1, 1870, uses this expression, mai ke poo a na wawae, although he describes the teaching process as moving in the opposite direction.


179. See also the lists beginning with Eia in Chun 1986: 15–17, 20 f.; lists of other types can be found, 17 f. Ekaula November 4, 1865, eia na hoailona 'here are the signs'. For modern lists, see Spencer 1895: e.g., 15, 32 f., 36. Kamakau September 15, 1870, Ka papa laau hoopiopio a hoounauna, a Ka ina, a somewhat modernized list introduction used as a subtitle. Compare Kalua April 2, 1870, an article largely organized as a list with the conventional termination A he nui wale aku na ano mai e ola no i ke kahuna Hawaii 'And many indeed were the types of diseases healed indeed by the Hawaiian expert'. Lists appear to be the basis of a number of discussions, even when not presented formally, e.g., Kamakau August 25, September 15, 22, 29, 1870; September 22, 1870, the subtitle—O ka papa laau. 'The table of plants'—introduces an informal discussion of plants, descriptions, and instructions for use, followed by the conventional termination, He nui loa ka laau hoonaha e ae a ka papa kahuna laau lapaaau ‘Very many are the other purgative plants used by the board of medical experts’.

180. Kamakau August 11, 18, September 1, 1870. Chapter IV and Appendix VI.

181. Kamakau August 18, 1870, Elua no mai ikaika . . . O ka paaao ko mua, a o ka ea ka lua. Elua no ano o ka ea . . . ‘Two indeed are the strong diseases . . . The first is the pāao‘ao, and the second is the ‘ea. Two indeed are the types of ‘ea . . .’; September 22, 1870, Elua mau mai nui a kea papa kahuna a manao nui ai; o ka pehu a me ka ohao; eha no eno [sic: ano] o ka pehu ‘Two big
diseases were greatly pondered by this division of experts: dropsy and swelling. There were indeed four kinds of swelling; Kamakau lists them and discusses them informally.


183. ʻĪʻī April 10, 1839, when his father was ill, people prayed and sacrificed to naʻkua kii ‘idols’ morning and evening: ua loihi no ka lakou hana ana pela, he mau akua kane, a he mau akua wahine e like me ka hana mau a ko Hawaii nei mamua ‘their acting thus was indeed long; male gods and female gods, according to the constant practice of those of Hawai‘i in earlier times’. K. July 2, 1859, one prays first to the male ancestral gods and then to the female. Poheepali 1861, the medical expert states that the problem is caused by he aumakua unihipli ma ka aoao o ko makuawahine, he kihawahine hoi ma ka aoao o ko makuakane ‘an ancestral spirit on the side of the mother and also a female lizard-type god on the side of the father’. Kamakau September 14, 1867, in treating Kamehameha I, the expert wanted to build two houses, one for male gods and the other for female. Spencer 1895:62. Larsen 1952:10. Chun 1986: 8 f. (diseases are divided into male and female), 21. Handy, Pukui, and Livermore 1934:8, 24. Luomala 1989:304.


185. ʻĪʻī October 16, 1869; ʻĪ 1959: 46. The dating of the form is indicated also by the emphasis on the first instances of the diseases, possibly conceived of as introductions, as translated by Chun 1986:44 f. Note also that the full chant given there, as well as ʻĪʻī’s Lonopūhā story, October 23, 1869, follow an itinerary from the westernmost islands to the easternmost. This is the traditional route of Pele’s immigration from Kahiki. A. F. Bushnell 1993:147 f., states that Hawaiians could identify sources of origin for illnesses; 149, Tahitians were “blaming specific European visitors for their various ailments.”


1895: 58. Instructions form part of a larger literary form to be discussed below. Compare the dialog in Waha May 18, 1865.

190. Ekaula November 4, 1865. Spencer 1895: 47.

191. O. A. Bushnell 1967: 396 f., 403 f. Rutherford 1977: 129–132. Western medicine contributed to missionary success in Tonga. For missionary objections see, e.g., Ellis 1984: 333; Ta Moo-Atua a me na Tāao o tā Honua nei 1858: 17 f. The canonized vocabulary against Hawaiian medicine—for example, wahae‘e ‘lying’ and ho‘opunipuni ‘deceitful’—comes from missionary discussions on the subject, e.g., Whitney and Richards 1832: 159, 162. Aholo 1861, is a full Hawaiian presentation of the Christian position. Similarly, controversy had developed over Cherokee medicine, McLoughlin 1986: 380, 385 (also 18 f.).

192. For example, W. Richards June 1, 1824: 710 f. Richards, Andrews, Spaulding, and Chapin 1833: 263. ‘Ī April 10, 1839.

193. For example, Clark 1838: 349. O. A. Bushnell 1967: 396, 405. Compare Aholo 1861: 1, 8, Koe nae na kahuna ike maoli ‘However, the experts with genuine knowledge remain [are excepted from the general condemnation]’. Entirely negative judgements of Hawaiian medicine can however be found, e.g., “Mission to the Sandwich Islands” 1833: 456; O. A. Bushnell 1993: 108 ff., 119 f., 253 f. Dibble 1839: 123 f., is characteristically negative on native medicine.

194. Ellis 1984: 333, “they certainly manifest an acquaintance with the medicinal properties of a number of indigenous herbs and roots, which is commendable, and may hereafter be turned to a good account.” Titcomb 1948: 166. Judd: O. A. Bushnell 1967: 404 ff.; 1993: 118 f.; Luomala 1989: 310. The appreciation of traditional Hawaiian medicine is shared by other Western doctors, e.g., Davison 1927a: 2, especially in its emphasis on treating the whole family or community, e.g., Handy and Pukui 1972: 143 ff.; O. A. Bushnell 1993: 94–100. “Instructions given by the Prudential Committee to the Rev. Sheldon Dibble, About Returning to the Sandwich Islands Mission” 1839: 174, recommended the assignment of “a medical professor” to Lahainaluna.


199. Luomala 1989:296. For examples of Hawaiian depreciations of the body under the influence of Christianity, see, e.g., “No ka hewa o ka manao nui ma ke kino” May 2, 1834, the author has difficulties expressing a balanced view of proper and improper care of the body and of emphasis on the this world or the next. Malo May 23, 1838, tells his dying daughter: *he mea ole ke kino, a no ke aha la oe e manao nui ai i kou kino iho? no ka mea, e make ana ko kakou kino a pau loa* ‘the body is nothing, so why do you regard greatly your own body? For the bodies of every one of us die’; *o ka manao ana ma ke kino, he make ia, aka, o ka manao ana ma ka Uhane, he ola ia a me ka malu* ‘regarding the body is death, but regarding the Spirit is life and peace’.

200. Many more examples can be found, e.g., Paleka October 11, 1879, and Appendix VIII.

201. Uuaa March 2, 1867; O. A. Bushnell 1967:397f. Napela March 2, 1867. J. K. Unauna March 2, 1867. Kalauakumuole March 30, 1867, reports that he is sending his list of plants and diseases to *na Komike o ka Aha Hui lapaaau* ‘the Committees of the Medical Society’ for use as a criterion for judging people claiming to be knowledgeable in Hawaiian medicine.

202. Kamakau September 22, 1870; Kamakau is referring to Gerrit Judd’s anatomy book first published in 1838, Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 166. “Na Kahuna Lapaau Hawaii” April 2, 1870, the author is saddened *i ka ike ana i kekahi kahuna lapaaau Hawaii i aeia e lapaaau, e lola [sic: lolii] ana i buke kakau no kana mau hana, maloko o ka Hale Kuai Buke o Wini* ‘by the sight of several Hawaiian medical experts who have been permitted to practice medicine and turn [their practice] into a written book about their works, inside the Bookstore of Whitney’; the author is against such people because they drink ‘awa, worship false gods, and deceive people. The demand for a book is one reason for the publication of Spencer 1895: 3 ff. Gutmanis 1977: 184 f., a medical book is passed on.

203. The reference to guardian angels may indicate that Kamakau was supported in his thinking by the more tolerant Roman Catholicism to which he had been converted. More Christian influence can be found, I would argue, in such statements as Kamakau July 21, 1870: the expert could help people, and his god would care for him until old age.

204. Luomala 1989:306 f.; also 291 ff. Ellis 1984: 291–295, sorcery “though it has survived the destruction of the national idolatry, and is still practiced by many, it is entirely discontinued by the principal chiefs in every island, and by all who attend to Christian instruction” (295). ‘I’i February 27, 1869. Kamakau
July 14, 1870. On Kamehameha: Kamakau September 14, 1867; July 21, 1870; this action of Kamehameha’s seems to be a personal innovation: exploring the depths of the most dangerous powers. General: Kamakau 1964:119–140.

205. Kamakau September 21, 1867; June 24, 1869, Kuakini learned sorcery but did not practice it because he was a good man; July 14, 21, August 4, 1870, the Ma'iola wood from Maunaloa, Moloka'i, could counteract the poisonous Kālaipāhoa wood, whereas no such remedy exists for opium and other foreign death-dealing substances; August 11, September 15, 1870. Kekahuna n.d.: 3, gifts are given to good doctors, but bad sorcerers charge a fee; the sorcery expert can do positive medicine, but some types perform only negative works. Ta Moo-Atua a me na Taa o o ta Honua nei 1858:17, also faults sorcerers for receiving pay, an argument used against Hawaiian medical practitioners. Ellis 1984:293, emphasizes the fee. Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:161 f. Luomala 1989: 289. Compare ‘Ī‘ī March 12, 1870.

Some Hawaiians, such as Kamakau July 21, 1870, could argue that morality and piety could protect against sorcery and sorcery gods, but this was not generally accepted; innocent victims could be harmed, Kamakau July 14, 1870. Indeed, Hawaiians still fear that children will be the easiest targets for sorcerers.

206. Whitney and Richards 1832:159, 162. Ta Moo-Atua a me na Taa o o ta Honua nei 1858:16 f.; sorcerers can have no power over Christians (17). “No na Akua Kii” September 8, 1866, agrees that people died of fear. Aholo 1861: 8, refers to the use of na laau make ‘poisonous plants’. The missionaries themselves had been accused of causing depopulation by sorcery, e.g., W. Richards June 1, 1824: 710a. Naluuaui, Hopoe, Li [‘Ī‘ī], and Kauwahi, March 13, 1839, and ‘Ī‘ī April 10, 1839, report the case of a woman who was afraid she was a victim of sorcery and conclude that she was pupule ‘mentally ill’; ‘Ī‘ī polemicizes against the belief in the power of sorcery.

207. ‘Ī‘ī March 12, 1870. Kamakau August 4, 1870.

208. For example, ‘Ī‘ī March 12, 1870. Kamakau July 14, August 4, 1870.

209. For example, ‘Ī‘ī March 12, 1870. Ta Moo-Atua a me na Taa o o ta Honua nei 1858:16, who mentions also Kaua‘i and Honokōhau on Maui. Kamakau May 19, July 14, 1870; July 21, 1870, he mentions a famous prayer of O‘ahu.

210. Ellis 1984:295. Specialities: Pali May 25, 1865; Kamakau July 21, August 4, 1870, ua oka ke ano o ka pule a me na oihana ‘the type of the prayer and the occupations were separate’; J. S. Emerson 1918:18 ff.

211. For example, ‘Ī‘ī March 12, 1870. Kamakau May 12, 19, July 14, 1870.

212. ‘Ī‘ī March 12, 1870. Kamakau May 19, July 14, 21, 1870.


215. Kamakau September 15, 1870, subtitle, Ka papa laau hoo'opi'o a ho'ounauna, a Ka ina [sic: kāina] ‘The table of plants for ho'opi'opi'o and ho'ounauna sorcery, and hits/strokes’; several are listed informally; subtitle, Ka papa laau a ka poe kahuna anaana ‘The table of plants [medicines, treatments] of the sorcery experts’; list introduction, Eia kekahi laau nui a ka poe kahuna anaana ‘Here is an important plant/treatment of the sorcery experts’, followed by one item, an oven, with instructions; Eia kekahi popo laau a ka poe kahuna anaana. O ka hainaha ‘Here is a plant/treatment bundle of the sorcery experts: apotropaic actions’; several are described.

216. Pukui and Elbert 1986: at word. Ī‘ī March 12, 1870, he mau kaina o ka make ‘some hits/strokes of death’. Kamakau September 15, 1870. Kirtley and Mookini 1977:55. Stereotyped expressions and the words waho and loko were used as in medicine, Pali May 25, 1865. Word play was also used, e.g., Handy and Pukui 1972:145, as were omens, Kamakau September 21, 1867.


218. House: Kamakau August 4, 1870, the house is surrounded by a wooden fence that others cannot pass. Learning: Kamakau July 21, August 4, 1870; Kirtley and Mookini 1977:55. Pebbles: Kupahu June 15, 1865; J. S. Emerson 1918:23 f.; Fornander 1919–1920: 5 and page 4, note 2; Andrews 1974: kahaloa; Pukui and Elbert 1986: ‘aeokahaloa. Sorcery experts could also explain the ceremony to be done, just as medical experts would explain their proposed treatment, Kamakau August 4, 1870. Sorcerers could also utter prophecies and curses, Kamakau August 11, 1870. Flags were used to mark the site of a ceremony, Kamakau September 21, 1867.

219. Prayer: Kirtley and Mookini 1977:55. Tabus: Kamakau July 21, August 4, 1870. Eating: Kamakau July 21, August 4, 1870; this was also used in ceremonies, Kamakau August 11, 1870, and as a test for the martial arts; eating something disgusting seems to have proved the student’s self-control.

220. Omens: Kamakau August 4, 1870, pela no kela hoailona, a me na loina a pau ‘thus indeed that omen and all the rules’; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:161 f. Dangerous: Kamakau August 11, September 15, 1870.


222. Pali May 25, 1865. Kirtley and Mookini 1977:55. Kekahuna n.d.: 3, “Kia no i ka ‘i’o pono-’i [‘To aim at one’s own flesh’] was to pray one’s own relative to death in order to graduate as a praying-to-death kahuna. One would
eat the eye or the ake ['liver'] of the one prayed to death. If it was one's own grandchild the kahuna would bundle its bones to hoomana, or worship, till it became an unihipili that he could send on various spiritual missions.” Johnson 1957: 32.


225. For example, Ai August 30, 1879, writes to the newspaper request- ing help in the interpretation of a strange and powerful dream; he is ridiculed by the editor. Dream interpretation became a part of Hawaiian Christianity, Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 184 f. Kepelino 1932: 115–123, articulates his theory of dreams.


230. Fornander 1916–1917: 443. Also Kepelino 1932: 115–121; Kepelino sometimes uses pili ‘application’, 121 ff. Manaʻo is used less frequently in this context, Fornander 1916–1917: 537, or for the response of the person involved, Fornander 1916–1917: 443; 1919–1920: 127. Interpreting the dream requires noʻonoʻo ‘active thinking’: noonoo ae la ia i ke ano a me ka manao ‘she thought actively about the type and the meaning’; and that type and meaning may or may not be loaʻa ‘obtained’, Fornander 1916–1917: 537.

231. Fornander 1916–1917: 443; a prophecy and a saying are also used in this story, 443 ff. Kepelino 1932: 117 ff., cites a saying.

232. Kepelino 1932: 115–119, propitious dreams with the subtitle serving as the list introduction; 119–121, dreams about food, introduced by He nui wale no na moe . . . hoowalewale, &, &; 121–123, unpropitious dreams with the subtitle serving as the list introduction; 123, termination: He nui wale na ano moe . . . heluia.

233. Kepelino 1932: 115. Kepelino also divides dreams between those that occurred without thinking and those that were prepared by thinking about a particular subject. The last two sentences in this section are untranslated in the publication: ‘But other dreams were connected merely to the fatigue of the
body. The dream was a messenger about the things related to the body that would occur, Hawaiians said.

234. For example, “Ka Oihana Lua a Hawaii Lahui” July 12, 1923. Ellis 1984:271, 298 f., however found historical knowledge uneven.

235. For example, Malo LXI 10, 18, an epidemic is compared to a precontact one; compare Dibble 1838:40. Kamakau August 24, 1867, a story of ‘Umi is used to understand an action of Kamehameha I; September 28, 1867, another story of ‘Umi is used to explain the hiding of the cadaver of Kamehameha I. ‘īī June 12, 1869, compares Liholiho’s progress to that of Keawe. Malo November 22, 1837, uses the stages of Kamehameha I’s career to understand the later progress of Christianity in Hawai’i. Examples could easily be multiplied.

236. Ua ‘ōlelo ‘ia: e.g., Fornander 1916–1917:21; Malo III 3, IV 8 (also i lohe ia), 12, 13, 21, v 12; ‘īī June 5, September 11, 1869, May 14, 1870. Gossip and news: ‘īī September 18, 1869. Writing: e.g., Kamakau October 14, 1865; the expression encompasses published materials in newspaper discussions; compare Kaunamano June 15, 1865, kamaʻilio ‘conversation’ is used for an exchange of letters in the newspaper.


238. Kamakau October 28, 1865; February 15, April 18, 1868. The terms mentioned in this section are used frequently; besides the texts cited below see, e.g., Kalimahauna February 13, 27, 1862; Kaaie June 12, 1862; Kamakau October 14, 1869.

239. Pukui and Elbert 1986: at word. For example, Kamakau October 14, 1869.

240. Kamakau December 28, 1867; October 7, 1865a; translation in McKinzie 1986:18. Unauna November 8, 1842:63, genealogies were used to solve disputes among chiefs by demonstrating their family relationship. Malo n.d.: XVIII 9–11, XX 23, 25, 26 (genealogists investigated possible marriage partners to establish their suitability; see also XVIII 9–17), XXXVIII 28 (the chief minister consulted genealogists on the lineages of chiefs). Kaawa December 23, 1865, the genealogy of a captured chief was studied to see if he was a relative and should be spared. Kamakau December 28, 1867, the court genealogist studied the genealogies of candidates for court office. Handy and Pukui 1972:196 ff. Bargatzky 1987:161, 187, has identified a genealogical core (Kernstück) used for memorizing in Sāmoa. On the possible use of non-verbal memory aids by genealogists, see chapter IV.

241. Malo n.d.: XXI 1, the genealogical model used for hewa ‘faults’. 
Johnson and Mahelona 1975:39 f., a genealogy of stars; those connected with months are male, and their companion stars are female; the genealogy begins with Pō and Ao; 41 ff., a genealogy of stars. Johnson 1976:174–177, a genealogy of months. The use of the genealogical form in medicine and teacher lineages have been discussed above.

242. Wilkes 1845:121. Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972:127, 190. For New Zealand, see Buck 1931:57, he learned first the genealogy of his own family and then those of others. See also Appendix III. Compare the possession of sacred cords by families, Kamakau November 4, 1869.

243. Malo n.d.:xxxviii 34 (ka poe akamai ikuahau), 37 (kapoe kuauhau), 39 (ka poe ku auhau). Kamakau February 14, 1843; October 28, 1865; June 2, 1866, some experts were better than others; December 28, 1867, O ka poe kuauhau, he poe kaaulana no lakou ‘Genealogists were indeed famous people’. Beckwith 1972:35 f., on genealogists at court.

244. Kamakau June 2, 1866, genealogy was an oihana alii nui ‘high chiefly occupation’; only those with a mookahuna ‘expert lineage’ were taught. Pukui n.d.:1605 [4], genealogists should be of noble blood; “Commoners were not trained to memorize and recite the genealogy of the chiefs.”

245. For example, Kamakau October 7, 1865a. See also the controversy between A. Unauna and Kamakau, described below.

246. Kamakau June 24, 1869, the Kamehamehas assumed the kapus of other families and depreciated their lineages; after the battle of Nu’uanu, in which Kamehameha conquered O’ahu, the genealogists and haku mele ‘chant composers’ of Hawai‘i raised the genealogies of their chiefs and connected them to the chiefs of Maui, O’ahu and Kaua‘i, but knowledgeable people did not accept their claims (this may have been a reason for adopting a second criterion of rank, closeness to Kamehameha [Charlot 1985a:5f.]); December 28, 1867, Ua hoololi ae na‘lii o Hawaii i na mookuauhau kupuna o Oahu a me ko Kauai mookuauhau i mau kupuna no na alii o Hawaii ‘The Hawai‘i chiefs changed the ancestral genealogy of O‘ahu and the genealogy of Kaua‘i into ancestors for the chiefs of Hawai‘i’; also October 31, 1868; October 28, 1865, genealogists would try to raise lineages: Pela ka poe kuauhau, he poe piikoi, a hapai no i kona kupuna a kiekie, a hoohalike no i kona kupuna a like me ko ka Moi ‘Genealogists were thus, a pretentious people, and raising indeed his ancestor to the heights, and fabricating indeed for his ancestor a similarity even unto that of the king’; December 28, 1867, genealogists defended their chiefs. Compare Fornander 1919–1920:233, 257, 307; 1969:11 243 f., 394. Malo n.d.:xx 25, 26 (genealogists defended the genealogies of their clients). Charlot 1985a: 4. Kamakau October 28, 1865, raises the ethical issue of the occupation,
stating that bad genealogists use their knowledge and skill to pry into the negative points of the past, but good ones work with positive wisdom. On genealogical challenges, see, e.g., McKinzie 1986:127–142.


249. For example, McKinzie 1983:17 f., 23 f., 33 f., 37–40, 54, 58, 75; 1986:11–16, 18, 24, 27, 57 f., 90 f., 102, 106 f., 112 f., 115, 120. Kamakau August 25, 1866, ka mookuauhau a me na moolelo e pili ana i ka mookuauhau ‘the genealogy and the stories connected to the genealogy’. Dibble 1839:18, “This genealogy embraces the names of seventy-seven kings. Stories are connected with most of this long list of kings, which doubtless are a mixture of truth, forgetfulness, and fancy.” Compare the traditions inserted into the genealogical sections of the Kumulipo, Beckwith 1972:99–136. When the narrative element is prominent, a text can be called a moolelo kuauhau ‘genealogical story’, Mckinzie 1986:57; for examples see 36 ff., 57–60. A genealogy itself can be called a moolelo, McKinzie 1986:75. Genealogical introductions to stories or complexes—ones that provide the parentage of the main characters—may be ultimately based on the connection of stories to genealogies. This is particularly likely in stories of chiefs, e.g., Fornander 1916–1917:161, 257.

250. Kamakau December 28, 1867; see also October 28, 1865. Kamakau August 25, 1866: Heaha kou meemee e hialaai ai? O ke kukulu i ka Moolelo Alii kaulana o Hawaii nei, a me na moolelo o kela a me keia, me ka hoopili mai i na Mookuauhau o kela me keia, i mea e kaulana ai ke akamai o ka hoonohonoho pono ana, a he mea ia e naauao ai ka hanauna Hawaii mahope aku ‘What is
your favorite occupation in which you delight? The construction of the History of the famous Chiefs of our Hawai‘i, and the stories of this one and that one along with the joining of the Genealogies of this one with that one, so that the intelligence of their correct administration will be famous; this is something by which the Hawaiian generations to come can be made wise’. For examples of his procedure, see Kamakau September 2, 1865; February 15, 1868; June 24, 1869; February 2, 1871.

251. Fornander 1916–1917:337, 347. Kepelino 1932:135, *ka poe mooolelo* occupy a court position that is passed down in a family. “He Moolelo Kaa no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” July 14, 1921, *poe paa mooolelo* ‘people who have memorized firmly the story’. That stories were transmitted in at least partially memorized texts is demonstrated by the frequent explanations of words that are rare or no longer familiar; e.g., Fornander 1918–1919:713. Compare Rémy 1859:11, priests; Fornander 1916–1917:27, a priestess keeps historical traditions, explains them, and uses them to instruct the hero. The term for the expert follows the literary genre—genealogy or narrative—but one person enjoyed both terms when he or she was knowledgeable in both. Close to historical narratives is the important Polynesian and Hawaiian genre of gossip. I was once conversing with a knowledgeable Hawaiian and praised one of his friends for his wonderful stories of nineteenth-century personalities. “I can match him story for story,” was his reply, “and my stories are true!”


254. Malo n.d.:LVIII 32; compare his remarks in section 3. See also Rae 1900:243.

255. Kamakau September 9, 1865b, *Pela ke ano o na Moolelo Kaao, aole oiaio, i haku wale ia no* ‘The character of Tale Narratives is thus: they are not true, but indeed simply fabricated’; for instance, the story of Uweuwelekehau *i hakuia no e Kaahumanu me Haalou, wahine a Hewahewa* ‘was really composed by Ka’ahumanu and Ha’alo’u, the wife of Hewahewa’. Hale’ole April 24, 1865, opposes an author who uses the story of Halemano as historical because *he kaao wale iho no ia* ‘it is just a tale’; the people in the story were *akua* ‘gods’, not human beings like us. ‘Ī’ī September 4, 1869, abnormal behavior shows a story is fiction rather than a real event. Kānepū‘u February 8, 1868. Malo n.d.:LIX 16; different versions are mentioned in 7, 16 f., and LVIII 3. Different versions or traditions: Fornander 1918–1919:545–549; “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/
Kekuhaupio” July 14, 1921. Story telling was an art form, Kaawa December 23, 1865; Rae 1900: 244 f. The word kaʻao can be used for historical narrative as well, as seen in the title “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio”; also Haleʻole June 1, 1865, na moolelo Kaao o Hawaii nei. “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” January 6, 1921, seems to use a story to reconstruct a historical event.

256. Pukui n.d.: 1605 [4]. Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972: 190. Compare for New Zealand Buck 1931: 57, “When I was still going to college, an old man handed over to me a book in which my blood uncle had written down the family and tribal pedigrees. We had several sessions together during which the old man related to me various historical incidents that had occurred during the periods of various ancestors. Thus with the pedigree as a skeleton, he clothed the various bones with the flesh of historical incidents, so that my family and tribe assumed a bodily form that has ever lived in my imagination and thoughts.”

257. ʻĪʻī April 17, May 8, 22, 29, June 12, 1869. Kamakau March 23 [sic: 16], 1867b, he uses older family members as informants; April 6, 1867, he describes his informants for his remarks on Cook. Kahulunuukaumoku, whom he saw before she died in 1835, was the daughter of Kuohu, high priest of Kauaʻi, eye-witness to Cook, and an ancestor of Kamakau. Other family informants verify that Cook’s men spread diseases. Kaneakahoowaha, another ancestor, met Cook and was an eye-witness to his deeds. “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” May 5, June 9, 1921, chooses to follow the family traditions of Kekūhaupiʻo rather than Kamakau and others; the author refers to family traditions, January 13, 20; May 12, 1921. Genealogies and stories could be used in general for historical enquiry; “No ke aloha” July 10, 1865, uses them to answer positively the question whether the Hawaiians of old had aloha. Kalimahauna February 13, 1862.

258. Kamakau September 2, 1865: 2; April 18, 1868. “No ke kauoha a Kaa-humanu ma kona make ana” March 28, 1834, the classical literary form is used for a Christian missionizing purpose. For Sāmoa, see Charlot 1992a: 34–37; the article is a general discussion of Samoan historical texts. Hanlon 1988: xvii, discusses genres used in historical transmission on Pohnpei.


262. “Hawaiian Bards” 1892, “the profession of a minstrel ranked as high
here in Hawaii as in Wales. It was a hereditary office like that of the orators, who were employed as spokesmen on all public occasions of special interest. The bards, some of whom were blind, were the living archives of the isles. From father to son as [sic] handed down the songs and legends which constituted the History of Hawaii-nei, and their sole occupation was to preserve these, and sing them to ever-willing ears. Thus alone were the annals of the nation preserved.” Barrère 1980: 22, 39 (Barrot: “Singers and dancers were the historiographers of the country. In their memory the ancient traditions were preserved”). Ellis 1984: 462. Fornander 1969: 11 56. Edith J. K. Rice in Rice 1923: 4.

263. Genealogical: Kamakau June 24, 1869. Mele helu kanaka: Kamakau February 15, 1868; he mentions other types of chants used for history. See also Kamakau October 14, 1865; January 19, 1867.

264. “No ka Pono Kahiko, a me ka Pono Hou” July 25, 1834. Compare Gibson 1886: 8, “the natural impulse of the Hawaiian to change his place of residence.” This appears to be an example of postcontact change in Hawaiian culture.

265. For example, Kamakau November 18, 1865. Townsend 1900: 35, “prophesies, prayers, creation myths, religious poems, hulas, etc.”

266. For example, Malo July 1, 1847, poses research questions. “Mooolelo Hawaii” April 7, 1858, subjects for research. Hulikahiko December 3, 1864, provides a long list of subjects kupono ke imihia a hoolahaia mai ‘proper to be researched and disseminated’. Hale’ole April 20, June 1, 1865. Kamakau September 9, 1865b; June 2, 1866; April 18, 1868, he poses detailed questions; August 31, 1867, he seems to turn such questions into riddles.


269. For example, Fornander 1918–1919: 545–549. Kawaikaumaiikamakahua November 1, 1923.

270. Kamakau September 9, 1865b, explicitly directs Hawaiian history to the correction of foreign misconceptions of the Hawaiian character. Compare Buck 1932b: 406, “Students should be encouraged to take pride in the past history of their race and the native institutions that are good”; teachers should take care “to ingrain into the minds of the students that their own culture is important and is respected by the educated people of the outside world.”

271. For example, “No ke kauoha a Kaahumanu ma kona make ana” March 28, 1834. Sidebar September 27, 1834: Ka mooolelo pokole no kekahi poe kanaka i ka wa kahiko; he mea e naauao ai na kamalii o keia aina ‘The brief
report about some people of the olden time is something to enlighten the children of this land; a quotation from Paul supports this view. Pogue 1858: 3. Classical literature could also be used for Christian moralizing; e.g., “No kahi mau hewa hou a me kahi mau hewa kahiko” May 9, 1834. Compare the more scholarly appreciation of William Hillebrand in Editorial February 27, 1862.

272. Kamakau March 21, 1868b; see also February 15, 1868. Kaukaliu October 17, 1861. Later writers used the same arguments; e.g., “He Moolelo Kaa no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” December 16, 1920; July 7, 1921. For examples of the highly positive view of Kamehameha in Hawaiian historical reports, see, e.g., Laanui January 4, 1837; March 14, 1838; Malo November 22, 1837; November 22, 1837; “Pehea o Hawaii nei e Hoomau ai i kona Kuokoa?” March 5, 1881, his success in using foreigners in government; “He Moolelo Kaa no Kuhaupio/ Kekuhaupio” passim. Charlot 1985a: 5–8. On Kamehameha as a moral model, see chapter III.

273. Malo November 22, 1837. Dibble 1838: 84 ff.; compare 81; 95, 102, 111, 113, for later Hawaiian history. “He Moolelo Kaa no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” May 5, 1921. See also chapter I.


276. Naui August 9, 1862. Naui states mistakenly that the book was written at Lahainaluna in 1842; he may be thinking of Dibble’s English-language history published in 1843. His text has some slight differences from Dibble’s. Kamakau June 2, 1866, finds young people insufficiently curious about Hawaiian history.


278. Kamakau September 9, 1865b. Kamakau 1988: 13 [Chun]. Finney, Johnson, Chun, and McKinzie 1978: 314 f. See also Dibble 1843: v, “A Royal Historical Society.” The date 1845, given in Kamakau’s article, is that of the death of Dibble, who was the Society secretary; Kamakau gave Dibble credit for much of the activity of the Society. Kamakau October 24, 1868, he nui no na la o Kamehameha III i noho Presidena ai e hoolohe ai i na moolelo a na Lala o ke Ahahui ‘Many indeed were the days that Kamehameha III sat as President and listened to the reports of the Members of the Society’. Kamakau October 28, 1865, mentions interviewing Iakobo Malo in 1842 at ka Ahoolelo ma Luaehu ‘the Conference at Lua’ehu’, Maui; they were both hoa ‘companions’, partici-
pants or members, of the Conference. Dibble July 1, 1844, writes, “I enclose a minute of the proceedings of a Committee of the Hawaiian Association . . . ”; but the reference is not clear. Chun 1993:iii f., 5, 18.

279. Hale‘ole June 1, 1865, the society was founded in March 1863. Fornander 1919–1920:69; 68, note 2, “This was a Hawaiian Society formed in response to a call by S. M. Kamakau, to collect traditionary material for publication in the native press at that time, and in aid of Fornander’s researches.” Kamakau, 1988: 16 f. (Chun), gives the name as Ahahui imi i na mea kahiko and says it was founded on Maui.


281. For example, Makauole June 12, 1865. Kamakau August 25, 1866; December 1, 1866; April 6, 1867.


283. “Sandwich Islands. Extracts from a General Letter of the Missionaries, Dated June 28th, 1831” 1832: 73, Whitney and Gulick were asked “to prepare a tract on civil history” and J. S. Green, on ecclesiastical. Dibble 1843:v, states that the May 1831 General Meeting expressed a desire for “a more full and definite history.”

In preparing this section I have read the letters of the missionary authors in Missionary Letters, Volumes 2, 3, and 4, and consulted the Sheldon Dibble files at the HMCSL up to 1844; they contain some materials on the English-language version of his history. I have also read the relevant sections of The Missionary Herald, 1832–1833, 1838–1839, 1841–1842. Further information may be available elsewhere.

284. Whitney and Richards 1832: 166 f. “Aloha oe e Aneru” April 18, 1834. Dibble 1838: 86 f.; compare 1839: 23 f., 43, 123. J. S. Green 1838: 42 f. The same four reasons for depopulation—frequent wars, epidemics, infanticide, and venereal disease—were given earlier by Ellis 1963: 16, and probably represent the consensus of the mission. Rémy 1862: LIII–LIX, advances significantly beyond this early discussion. He dismisses infanticide, war, famine, and human sacrifice as causes and finds the principal cause in the low birth rate and high infant mortality (LIV ff.). These last are the results of prostitution and the resulting venereal disease, which has become hereditary. Women who wish to practice prostitution obtain abortions and try to render themselves sterile. Alcoholism is also a cause of depopulation (LVI). The government and the missionaries attempted to counteract these evils with laws against alcohol and prostitution, laws resisted mainly by foreigners (LVII). The epidemic of 1853 and the neglect by the chiefs of their people have also contributed to depopulation. Rémy then
formulates a pioneering discussion of culture shock: “l’effet désastreux des changements trop brusques apportés par la civilisation dans les habitudes des insulaires” ‘the disastrous effect of too brusque changes brought by civilization onto the habits of the islanders’ (lvii f.). Traditional life was healthful, but foreigners introduced new desires for material goods that tempted Hawaiians to go without food and to prostitute themselves. The wearing of Western clothing combined with Hawaiian bathing habits led to fatal lung diseases. Tobacco, inhaled and kept in the lungs as long as possible, was also pernicious. Others have also mentioned the prohibition of dancing and public games for the purpose of preventing “des occasions de scandale et d’immoralité” ‘occasions of scandal and immorality’ (lviii). But in doing so, “ils ont supprimé d’excellents moyens hygiéniques, en condamnant à une triste et malsaine immobilité” ‘they suppressed excellent hygienic means, in condemning [them] to a sad and unhealthy immobility’ (lviii f.). Swimming itself is permitted only on Sunday (lx). “Et cette funeste influence d’une race civilisatrice n’est pas particulière à l’archipel havaiien” ‘And this fatal influence of a civilizing race is not particular to the Hawaiian archipelago’ but can be found throughout Polynesia. Why do such peoples die rather than being reborn under the rays of civilization? “C’est, il faut le dire, parce que trop souvent la civilisation ne se sert que d’instruments corrompus, qui deviennent facilement corrupteurs, et qu’elle ne jette loin des ses grands centres que sa lie et son écum” ‘It is, it must be said, because too often civilization employs only corrupted instruments, which easily become corruptors, and because civilisation scatters far from its great centers only its dregs and its scum’. L. F. Judd 1928:70 f., also mentions culture shock. See also O. A. Bushnell 1993:242–248, 273–295.

On the general influence of Whitney and Richards 1832, see, e.g., “No na mea hana e pono ai o Hawaii nei” April 4, 1834, ka wa kahiko ‘the olden time’ is defined as pre-Cook. Laanui January 4, 1837.

285. Historical materials: Ka Lama Hawaii: “No ke kauoha a Kaahumanu ma kona make ana” March 28, 1834. “No na mea hana e pono ai o Hawaii nei” April 4, 1834. “No ka hewa o ka manao nui ma ke kino” May 2, 1834, the chief Boki is used as a bad example. “No ka hiki ana mai o ka malamalama i Hawaii nei” May 9, 1834. “No ke Kaua i ka Wa Kahiko” May 16, 1834, on the weapons used in antiquity in the West, especially those mentioned in the Bible. “No ka Pono Kahiko, a me ka Pono Hou” July 25, 1834. “No ko’u Wa i Hanau mai ai, a Hiki mai nei i nei Manawa” December 17, 1834; “Ka hope o ke koena” December 20, 1834, memoirs. Ke Kumu Hawaii: P. March 30, 1836. Laanui January 4, 1837; March 14, 1838, memoirs; April 25, 1838, memoirs. Malo November 22, 1837. “Kamehameha” September 26, 1838, a description of Kamehameha I
taken from a book by a foreigner, perhaps Archibald Campbell. Kalapauahiole November 7, 1838, an interesting tradition of Captain Cook. “Mau Mea Kahiko” December 5, 1838. Tī April 10, 1839; May 22, 1839. See also the publications by Dibble.

Reports on culture: *Ka Lama Hawaii*: “No kekahī hewa a me ka pono” February 24, 1834. “No ka Pono a ka poe kahiko i ao mai ai i ka lakou mau keiki” March 14, 1834. “No kekahī hana kahiko[0]” March 21, 1834. “No na mea hana e pono ai o Hawai‘i nei” April 4, 1834. “No ka Pono Kahiko, a me ka Pono Hou” July 25, 1834. “No na Mea Kahiko” August 1, 1834, historical materials and childhood memoirs. “No ke kapu kahiko a me ke kapu hou” December 5, 1834. Compare “No ke kani kau ana o ke Kane i ka wahine i ka lilo ana i ke Kane hou” September 1, 1834. *Ke Kumu Hawaii*: Kalauau November 11, 1835.

Classical literature: *Ka Lama Hawaii*: “He hapa o ke mele no ka mele ana o Keeaumoku o ke Alii o Maui” February 14, 1834 (reprinted in *Ke Kumu Hawaii*, “He hapa o ke Kanikau no ka mele ana o Keeaumoku o ke Alii o Maui” December 24, 1834). “No ke Kaiakahinalii” April 18, 1834; “Ka hopena no ke kaiakahinalii” April 25, 1834, the story is recorded in superior Hawaiian and in classical form: introduction, time transition, narrative, and terminal sentence, *pau keia olelo* (April 25, 1834). “No kahi mau hewa hou a me kahi mau hewa kahiko” May 9, 1834, uses classical literature for Christian moralizing.

Modern literature: *Ka Lama Hawaii*: Malo August 8, 1834 (reprinted in *Ke Kumu Hawaii*, Malo October 28, 1835). Students also seem to be developing a new Christian rhetoric and the new genre of a trip report, based on the classical interest in place knowledge: Ke’liiumiumi December 26, 1834; Kamakau June 20, 1838.


The authorship of most of the above articles is not established. Other materials will be mentioned below.

286. For example, Kaiai June 12, 1862. Kamakau June 24, 1869. The stories of famous court thieves are a subject of Hawaiian literature.

287. P. March 30, 1836. Malo n.d.: lx1 2, 4–9, seems also to have Bingham’s questions in mind.

me Davida Malo, Moku, me na kanaka noiau e ae, ma na mea Hawaii ‘after much consultation with David Malo, Moku, and other people wise in Hawaiian things.” Kamakau October 28, 1865, mentions discussing genealogies with David Malo in 1837; 1888:13, 17 [Chun]. Hale’ole in Fornander 1919–1920:69. Fornander 1918–1919:506, note *. School compositions by Kamakau, Moku, and others can be found at the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum Archives and the Hawaiian Mission Children’s Society Library. See my discussion of such school forms in Appendix IV.

289. ‘Auwae and Hoapili: Kamakau June 24, 1869; October 28, 1865, Hoapili. List: Kamakau June 2, 1866, discussed above; October 28, 1865, Kepo’okūlou and a Kalaiheana, not on the list, are mentioned, but not clearly in conjunction with Dibble 1838. More: Fornander 1969:11 167.


291. Dibble published several chapters of Ka Mooolelo Hawaii in Ke Kumu Hawaii before the publication of the book: Dibble June 22, 1836, is Dibble 1838:42 ff. (unsigned but with “—Mooolelo Hawaii” at the end); Dibble July 20, 1836, is Dibble 1838:1 ff. (signed with his initials); Dibble March 1, 1837, is Dibble 1838:4 ff. (signed with his initials); Dibble March 29, 1837, is Dibble 1838:6 ff. (“—Mooolelo Hawaii”). These chapters are the most editorial portions of Ka Mooolelo Hawaii and contain, I argue, Dibble’s most personal contributions to the book. There are occasional slight differences in wording between the earlier and the later texts. Both Hawaiian oral traditions and Western written sources are used. Dibble 1835a contains historical material. Dibble’s first wife died during this project on February 20, 1837, after eleven months of great suffering from an apparent stroke. Of his three children by her, one died in 1834 and the other in 1838. Dibble traveled to the mainland and returned in bad health to Lahainaluna in 1840, where he died in 1845.

Kamakau October 28, 1865, states that he edited the final work along with Dibble. Fornander 1969:11 167, writes of Malo as the author of the work. Influence: e.g., Kamakau 1988:17 (Chun), Kamakau used Dibble’s book for the organization of his own writings; Chun 1993:18, 21; Charlot 1977a:74. Stokes 1931 criticizes Dibble’s methods, conclusions, and influence, often basing his points on speculation.

292. Kamakau October 24, 1868. Dibble 1843:v, “A Royal Historical Society has also been formed, by means of which some information has been gained.”

293. “Mau Mea Kahiko” December 5, 1838. This was apparently the first publication from the journal; see Gast and Conrad 1973:151–154. Bastian 1881:68, states that many manuscripts are available for study. The use of manu-
scripts is mentioned frequently, e.g., Fornander 1919–1920: 535–540.

294. Hale'ole June 1, 1865, he worked from 1841 to 1861 on the history of the Hawai‘i chiefs. When appointed Luna Ka‘apuni ‘Traveling Editor’ for the newspaper Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika in April 1862, he did research on Kamehameha I on the islands of Maui and Hawai‘i for five months and then returned to Honolulu. The 1863 historical society appointed him and Keolanui as a committee to do research on the history of Kamehameha I, which they started on O‘ahu, spending money for informants and other expenses (also April 20, 1865). On April 15, 1864, he went to north Kohala on Hawai‘i for nine months of research before returning to Honolulu. Hale'ole in Fornander 1919–1920: 69, says he himself later used materials gathered from as early as 1837. Chun 1993: iii, 13 ff., 20 ff.

295. Kamakau 1888: 16 f. (Chun); for Kamakau’s career, see 12–22 (Chun). Hale'ole June 1, 1865, writes that Kamakau has done research from 1836 to 1848.


297. Pogue 1858: 81–86. See also Malo n.d.: lxvi–lxvii. Kamakau September 9, 1865b, regrets the unfinished character of the essay: Aole nae i pau pono . . . he nui no na hemahema ilaila ‘But it was not properly completed . . . there are indeed many imperfections in it’; also October 24, 1868. “Mooolelo Hawaii” April 7, 1858, announces the serial newspaper publication of Pogue and its future publication in book form.

298. Malo n.d. Malo 1951: xii (Emerson). Kenn 1978: xi (Nawahine King Joerger). Pogue was criticized for taking too much from Malo, Malo 1987: xxiii f. (Chun); see also Pogue to Armstrong, April 13, 1858: “Mr. Bond protests against my publishing anything from Maro’s book. As I supposed you had made some arrangement with him in regard to the book I have used it as if it belonged to you. I have extracted largely from it. What is to be done in the case?” He writes that he will not give Malo’s book to Bond without Armstrong’s permission. Kamakau October 24, 1868, makes statements that are very puzzling. After mentioning Malo’s work with Kalimahauna, discussed below, he states, oia no kela Buke a Rev. J. F. Pogue i kakau ia eia me kekahi poe haumana ‘this is indeed that Book by the Reverend J. F. Pogue, written by him with some students’. Kalimahauna told Kamakau that many copies of their work were made, used to tatters, and repaired. Finally, Ua kakau ia ka Buke mooolelo mai ka mua
a ka hope, alaila haawi aku e pai, a e hoolaha, a e hana buke ‘The history Book was written from the beginning to the end, then it was given over to be printed, disseminated, and made into a book’. However, the only parts of Pogue that clearly come from Malo are the introductory ethnographic section and the essay on ‘Umi. The former may have been an earlier and shorter version of the final Ka Moolelo Hawaii. On the evidence now known to me, I would speculate that Pogue took a fresh copy of Malo’s Ka Moolelo Hawaii and joined it to the revision of Dibble (1838) that he had done with the help of several students.

Kamakau September 12, 1868, mentions the presence of the manuscript of Malo’s book in the Waihona Buke Halealii along with Kamehameha IV’s manuscript book of Hawaiian history. Poomaikelani ca. 1884:8 (Hawaiian and English), mentions two manuscripts by Malo: “Buke kumu” “Original” and “Moolelo kahiko” “History”; Malo’s genealogical work is discussed on 16f. (Hawaiian), 16 (English) (seven other genealogy books are mentioned, including one by A. Unauna). Bastian 1881:67; possibly 1883:104. Malo 1987:xix (Chun): Chun 1993:6–8. Charlot 1992b.

There are a number of unsolved problems in the history of Malo’s work, primarily whether he wrote one book or two: the one that survives and a history of Hawai‘i to the times of Kamehameha I (the surviving book takes the history to the time of ‘Umi). On the latter, see the references in Chun and Kamakau August 25, 1866. The evidence of the list of questions in Malo July 1, 1847, is ambiguous; they could have been used for either book. In the Poomaikalani reference above, two books are mentioned, but a number of manuscripts were connected to Malo, Fornander 1969: i v.f. Kamakau October 28, 1865, does mention Malo advertising for information for his history of the chiefs of Hawai‘i, Maui, Lāna‘i, Moloka‘i, and O‘ahu. Kamakau October 24, 1868, writes in an important passage:

O na Buke Moolelo a Davida Malo; ua paipai o Rev. S. Dibble me Rev. L. Aneru me ka haawi aku o laua i na ninau ia Davida Malo, i ole e huikau ke kakau ana i ka Moolelo Hawaii. Ua kaapuni no o Davida Malo, o Kalimahauna ke kakauolelo ma kekahi mau mea pohihihi ie [sic: ia] ia

‘The History Books of David Malo—the Reverend S. Dibble and the Reverend L. Andrews supported by giving questions to David Malo so that the writing of the Hawaiian History would not be confused. David Malo made a circuit [for research], and Kalimahauna served as the secretary in several things that were obscure to him’.
(W. D. Alexander also helped, Kamakau December 1, 1866.) Kamakau mentions books in the plural. Since Dibble died in 1845, Malo must have begun his writing before that date. In 1847, he received a stipend to support his work and was able to afford the above-mentioned secretary, Chun 1993:6 f.; compare Kamakau August 25, 1866. If the Carter manuscript is the original of the surviving book, the handwriting in it by another hand may be the secretary’s, Malo 1987:xxv (Chun). *Ka Moolelo Hawaii* is conventionally dated from 1839 to 1841, but I agree with Chun (Malo 1987:xxii–xxv; 1993:7 f.) that this date is too early. The book is not as stylistically polished as Malo’s other writings, e.g., Malo 1837, and appears to be unfinished. I surmise then that Malo died before he could finish it and see it published. All the possible references to a second book—one about the history of Hawai‘i to Kamehameha I—are to a work in progress, and I suspect that Malo never finished a manuscript on that subject. Kamakau does not mention using or hearing about such a finished work in his own extensive writing on the same subject. Andrews, who had encouraged Malo, later urged Kamakau to write about Kamehameha I, Kamakau August 25, 1866; Chun 1993: 21. In all likelihood, he would not have had to do so if he had known of a book by Malo on the subject. Some of the materials gathered by Malo may have been used by Kalimahauna February 13, 27, March 27, 1862.


300. Kamakau October 28, 1865; he states that he wants to meet with such people; if they correct him, he will agree with them. See also, e.g., Kamakau October 14, 1865; March 21, 1868b; September 12, 1868, missionaries can attest to the accuracy of his account of recent history even if not of the olden time; September 12, 1868; 1988:17 f. (Chun). Chun 1993:19, 21, 23.

301. For example, “Journal of Mr. Armstrong on the Island of Maui” 1836: 245, describes a Hawaiian man who is probably ninety years old: he is poor, “but his countenance was animated, and he spoke feelingly. He said, ‘I was a lad in the reign of Kahe-Kili, and I saw the wars of Tamehameha, but I have lived till just now, without knowing right and wrong.’” Hakuole July 1, 1857, describes an old man in Waikiki named Kamaukoli, who was around six years old when Cook arrived and saw seven wars. The author of “He mooolelo no Kalaipahoa” September 18, 1861, spoke with Honolii, who had acted as the kahu ‘guardian’ of the poison god. Poli January 5, 1865, mentions his old informants. Makaoule June 12, 1865. Koko June 26, 1865, mentions an informant born in the time of the precontact chief Kūali‘i. Kamakau September 9, 1865b;
December 1, 1866, one can still find old informants to show younger people the battle fields; January 26, 1867; April 6, 1867, the daughter of the woman who slept with Cook on Kaua‘i; the daughter died in 1834; 1988:14 (Chun). Spencer 1895:70. Kawaiakumaiikamakaokaopua November 1, 1923. The members of the historical society founded in 1841 were directed to Hawaiian informants, and missionaries on the different islands were sent questions about their localities. The theme of the disappearance of sources has been mentioned several times in this work. Note that both male and female informants were used, and women would in fact have been the main informants for certain occupations.

302. Malo July 1, 1847. “Makemake” 1860. Kamakau October 28, 1865: gives long lists of names and asks Owai na’Lii me ka poe naauao a me ka poe kahiko i koe, e hiki ke hai mai i ka Mooolelo o keia poe Alii; a e huipu me a’u i ka noonoo i ko kakou Mooolelo Hawaii ‘Who are the chiefs and the wise people and the surviving old people who can tell me the History of these chiefs and join with me in thinking about our Hawaiian History’; June 2, 1866.


304. Examples are numerous. E.g., Dibble 1839:14, 18. Ta Moo-Atua a me na Taa o ta Honua nei 1858:6f. Kukahi February 1, 1902:2. Fornander 1916–1917:11, 19 ff. “No ka Olelo Hawaii” September 12, 1834, asks in catechism fashion:

21. I ko oukou ike ana ea, heaha ka maikai nui o ka palapala?
O ka hiki ana o ka manao ke hoounaia aku i kahi loihii, a me ka ike pono ia o ka manao o ka poe kahiko mai kinohi mai, a i keia wa, a ia wa aku . . .

‘21. In your view, what is the great good of writing?
‘The capability of sending an opinion to a distant place and the accurate knowledge of the opinion of the ancient people from the beginning, to today, and into the future . . .’

Literacy is valuable because ke paa ka manao i ka palapalaia ‘the opinion is fixed on the paper’ so that it can be ‘widely broadcast and carefully guarded so that the good opinion will not disappear’, hoolaha nui a malama loa i nalowale ole ka manao maikai. Dibble 1835a:1 ff., an advantage of writing is that we can learn the ancient history of the Israelites and people connected to them. Kamakau October 14, 1869: ua kue ka malama ana i ka lohe o ka poe mahope loa, aole i like pu, a maanei kakou e ike ai i ka pololei o ka kekahi poe, a i ke kekee pono ole o ka kekahi poe ‘What was kept in the hearing of later people was
conflicting—it was not identical—and for this reason we see the straightness of some people’s statements and the incorrect crookedness of those of others’; ua ku kapekepeke loa ka ka hoopaa naau ana o na hanauna mai mahope loa ‘What was memorized by later generations stands very incomplete’.

305. Malo n.d.:1 2; see also III 6–8, for his reasoning. Bastian 1883:28. The defense of the historicity of Hawaiian traditions continued late, e.g., “He Moolelo Kaa no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” February 10, 1921, and below.

306. Malo n.d.:II; also III, on the first people. Malo evaluates Western scientific opinions in much the same words he uses for Hawaiian traditions: they are mana’o ‘opinions’ that are not necessarily pono loa ‘greatly correct’ because they are no ka naau mai ‘from the guts, from human rumination’ (rather than from revealed knowledge), Malo n.d.:11 9, 12. Pogue 1858:5 f., omitted or did not have some significant remarks in Malo’s discussion. Hale’ole May 4, 1865, mentions different genealogical traditions of origins and asks auhea la o ka poe e ola nei e hiki ke hai mai i moolelo pololei loa e pili ana i ka mookuauhau o ka hanauna Alii o keia lahui?’ where are the people living today who can proclaim the absolutely correct story relating to the genealogy of the Chiefly ancestry of this people?’ Compare Kamakau October 14, 1869. Kukahi February 1, 1902: 11–17, on the origin of the Hawaiian islands; May 1, 1902:53–58, on the origin of the Hawaiian people. Newspaper series on the traditions of Pele and Hi‘iaka used the method described above, as I will discuss in a later article. On Sāmoa, see Charlot 1991a:132.


309. For example. Fornander 1919–1920:233, 239–245, 257, 307; 1969:II 102, 108. When Rustic February 15, 1862, complained about the obscenity of a publication of the story of ‘Umi in Ka Niupepa Kuokoa and urged that it be stopped, Editorial February 27, 1862, replied forcefully and published a letter by Dr. William Hillebrand that contains an important defense of the value of Hawaiian texts.


311. ‘Ī January 30, 1869, disagrees with Dibble; March 20, 1869, corrects Dibble; February 19, 1870, corrects a chronology of events in the career of Kamehameha I; March 26, 1870, foreigners have published reliable reports on Hawaiian sails. Hoa’loha February 29, 1868, criticizes Kamakau and poses
questions for him to answer. Kamakau September 9, 1865b, corrects mistakes in some published newspaper accounts; October 28, 1865; June 2, 1866, mistakes are being made in newspaper accounts and by Pogue even about Kamehameha I: Ua kuhihewa kekahi poe opiopio ma kekahi poe elemakule i ke alakai a ka moolelo Hawaii i kakau ia e Mr. Poguea 'Some young people and some older people have been deluded under the leadership of the Hawaiian history written by Mr. Pogue'; August 25, 1866, some foreigners say Kamehameha not worth study because he was just a warrior, but they are clearly wrong; January 5, 1867, he disagrees with the view that Hawai‘i did not have chiefs, so they needed to be fetched from Kahiki, and supplies a list of early chiefs; January 26, 1867, he corrects the errors of an informant by consulting others; colleagues should not be cross when they disagree; April 6, 1867, British accounts of Cook omit criticisms of him because they are not in their national interest; February 15, 1868, corrections of a published story of Kana; September 12, 1868, Pogue is faulty and incomplete; October 14, 1869, Hawaiian traditions are symbolical, and foreigners and young people are mistaken when they take them literally (he is formulating Kumuhonua traditions); 1988:14 (Chun), foreigners do not know as much about Hawaiian culture as they claim to. For Kepelino, see Charlot 1983a: 116 ff. “He Moolelo Kaa no Kuhauipio/Kekuahupio” May 5, 1921, the author follows family traditions rather than Kamakau and other sources; May 12, 1921, he disagrees with Fornander and mentions Jarves; May 19, 1921; June 9, 1921, he follows family tradition against a published source. Hale‘ole June 1, 1865, mentions Unauna, Kuhia and Hakaleleponi as critics. Bush and Paaluhi January 5, 1893, state that oral traditions change through time and tend to become fabulized. Makaule June 12, 1865, states that mistakes in a published article are probably typographical errors and provides corrections.

312. Kamakau September 9, 1865b; compare November 18, 1865, he will not write about certain chiefs until he writes the history of Maui; January 26, 1867.

313. Kamakau February 15, 1868; compare September 12, 1868.

314. Books: Whitney and Richards 1832; Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: index entries for Bible and History. Other Western methods were used by Hawaiian historians. For instance, Kamakau February 2, 1867b, compares Hawaiian place names with those in New Zealand and argues that their similarity verifies Hawaiian traditions; January 19, 1867:1, he uses language comparison to argue that Pa‘ao came from New Zealand; see Chun 1993:21. See also Johnson 1976:96–99.

315. For example, Hawaiians originated from Adam and Eve and therefore knew the true God, but their knowledge and morals degenerated through

316. Bingham August 19, 1835, had posed this as a topic. Kamakau August 25, 1866, complains that his contemporaries are working only on the genealogies of chiefly families; he would like a history of and for the common people as well.


323. Sterling and Summers 1978: 68, after the defeat of the O‘ahu chiefs by Kamehameha, “To preserve the folk-lore of their homeland, Oahu, the exiled
high class priests or kahunas founded a school at Pokai bay for instructing the youth of both sexes in history, astronomy, navigation, and the genealogies of their ancient chiefs and kings . . .” Westervelt 1963a:224f., a daughter “dwelt under the care of guardian chiefs and priests by a temple” and was “perfected in all arts pertaining to the very high chiefs.” Compare Bryan et al. 1986: 249. Handy 1965:56f. Kenn March 23, 1976, stated that eighteen different colleges were located around a temple, in which different arts and professions were taught; each learning institution had its own gods, traditions, and power. For New Zealand, compare Buck 1931:57f.

324. The practice of temple priests wearing their hair long like the hair of gods depicted in statues may be related to this view. Lonoikamakahiki takes for a god an old high priest whose hair reaches to his loins, Fornander 1916–1917: 265. Hoomea, the long-bearded person who never shaved and discussed “his former greatness & present situation” with Stephen Reynolds, may have been a priest of the former official religion, King 1989:188.

325. Kuapuu May 22, 1861. Other arts were practiced at court as mentioned above. See also, e.g., N. B. Emerson 1909:91; Barratt 1988:270.


327. On positions inherited within the family, see Appendix III. On the relation of family and merit, see Ellis 1984:155, 411f., 424, 462.

328. Rémy 1859:31, experts at ‘Umi’s court. Kamakau January 12, 1871, when Lonoikamakahiki recovers his sanity, ua hoʻoponopono hou oia i kona aupuni, a ua maikai kana mau hana ana i ke aupuni a me kona malama ana i ka poe ikaika i ka hoe waa, i ka poe akamai i kela oihana i keia oihana, a i kela keia oihana i keia oihana ike [sic] a me ka poe akamai i ke kaua ‘he regulated
anew his government, and his deeds related to the government were good as well as his care for people strong in paddling, for people knowledgeable in this or that occupation, and in this or that knowledgeable occupation, and people knowledgeable in war’. Nākuina 1902b: 7. Johnson 1976: 214, the famous people at the court of Kamehameha I. Judd 1930: proverb 454. Efficiency: Pukui 1983: number 680, to overlook an expert is a disadvantage for the court; Judd 1930: proverb 298; ‘Ī December 18, 1869, Kamehameha I encouraged professions for the good of the land, e imi i ka maluhia ‘to seek peacefullness’; January 22, 1870, when a leak develops, Kamehameha knows the expert to summon; Kuapuu April 24, 1861, Pāka’a’s efficiency is appreciated by the chief when he compares it with the awkwardness of the rivals who have displaced him; June 19, 1861, a chief regrets the possible loss of his fishermen and their expertise. Efficiency was often measured by the comfort of the chief, Nākuina 1902a: 4, 29, 75, 77, 79–83, 119 f., 122 f.

329. Kalimahauna March 27, 1862, Kamehameha I drew experts to him: Ua wae mai oia i mau kukini nona, a me ka hoe waa, a me na kalai waa, a me na lawata, a me kela mea ike keia mea ike i ka hana, aole oia i koho mai i ka poe ike ole i ka hana ‘He chose runners for himself, and the paddler, and the canoe carvers, and the fishermen, and this and that person knowledgeable in an occupation; he did not choose people who did not know an occupation’. ‘Ī October 23, 1869, Lonopūhā becomes famous for the practice of medicine; A no keia kaulana, ua hoouna aku o Milu i kana elele, e kii ia Lonopuha ‘And because of this fame, Milu sent his messenger to fetch Lonopūhā’. Kamakau December 22, 1870, Keawenuia’umi is praised for gathering experts and craft–people to his court; he ali'i imi nui i ka poe naauao o ka aina ‘a chief who greatly sought the wise people of the land’. Nākuina 1902b: 5, fame in hoʻopāpā brings experts to the attention of the chief. The fame of Kūapāka’a’s race draws the attention of the court and the chief; Kuapuu June 12, 1861; Nākuina 1902a: 112; Fornander 1918–1919: 133. “Ke Alii Aloha ole i kona Kaula” April 28, 1894. “He Moolelo Hawaii” July 25, 1902, the priest of Kamehameha I advises him to seek Kiiākea. Johnson 1976: 214.

330. Kamakau 1961: 111; July 13, 1865, a father trains his son in navigation and puts him into a dangerous situation so that he can demonstrate his knowledge and skill in a striking way and thus attract the attention of the chief. Experts can use tricks to appear even more efficient than they are; Kuapuu May 22, 1861; Fornander 1918–1919: 113–117. Such demonstrations and tricks are often necessary to surmount the obstacles raised by the resident experts, as is clear in the case of Pāka’a and Kūapāka’a. Compare the postcontact report of a chanter who was excluded from a concert offered to a visiting chiefess,
but circumvented the organizers and sang to the chiefly approbation, Pukui 1949: 257; Luomala 1955: 44 f. Rewards: e.g., the Pāka’a tradition, Kuapuu June 19, 1861; Nākuina 1902a: 26 ff., Pāka’a receives lands and riches as his reward (6, Kuanuuanu receives lands, but clearly for administration); Forndner 1918–1919: 73, 135; the Kalapana tradition, Nākuina 1902b: 7, 10.

331. Kamakau January 5, 1871. Kuapāka’a: Kuapuu May 22, 1861, the boy is appreciated for his mature actions and because me he mea la ua noho i kahi ali‘i, no ka makaukau o keia keiki ‘it was as if he had lived at court, because of the preparedness of the child; May 29, 1861; “He Moolelo no Pakaa” November 21, 28, 1867; Nākuina 1902a: e.g., 21, 27, 34; Forndner 1918–1919: 75, 79, 135. ‘Ī: ‘Īī July 10, 1869. “He Moolelo Kaa no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” February 17, 1921.

332. Nākuina 1902a: e.g., 30 ff., 103; 32, Pāka’a does not want anyone but the chief to be over him. Also Forndner 1916–1917: 353–363.

333. ‘Īī July 31, 1869. “He Moolelo Kaa no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” May 26, 1921, service to the chief is placed above that to the family; July 7, 1921, make‘e ali‘i ‘devotion to the chief; Kekuhaupio neglects his family to stay with Kamehameha; March 10, April 21, 1921, the author states that a subject had to obey his chief even against his better moral and practical judgement, an extreme position. Contrast Forndner 1916–1917: 569.

334. ‘Īī October 30, 1869, an advisor from outside the court is used in the negotiations between Kamehameha I and Kaumuali‘i of Ka‘au‘ai. “He Moolelo no Pakaa” November 7, 1867, chiefs, commoners and expert canoe makers are brought in to build boats. Kamakau February 2, 1871. Forndner 1919–1920: 107. Vancouver might be considered an unusual case of such an outside expert, ‘Īī June 12, October 30, 1869.

335. For example, Golovnin 1979: 191, Kamehameha I’s Western experts. Barratt 1987: 139, 64, 81, his council of foreign advisors. “Pehea o Hawai‘i nei e Hoomau ai i kona Kuokoa?” March 5, 1881, treats Kamehameha I as a model to emulate in his use of talented foreigners in government. William Richards was placed in such a position when he agreed to lecture the chiefs on political economy.

336. Kamakau May 2, 1868; see also January 21, 1869, Chun 1993: if.

337. Malo n.d.: xxxviii 1–9, is the description that has become conventional in the secondary literature; also xviii 47–55. Forndner 1918–1919: 477 ff. Descriptions of different functionaries working together: Kupahu June 15, 1865; Forndner 1919–1920: 107. Organization: e.g., Hale‘ole in Forndner 1919–1920: 130 f., mentions ke kahuna nui o ke kakaolelo “the high priest of the order of counselors.” Images of the house and body are used for the organization of
the government and land, Malo n.d.: xxxviii 1–3, 28–33. Kamakau April 25, 1868, the image of a ship. In contrast to the probably over-systematized reports on the duties of the different offices, there seems to have been some overlap of functions; e.g., Nākuina 1902a: 35 f., officials perform divination; Fornander 1916–1917: 331, 335; 1919–1920: 109, a kākāʻōlelo ‘orator’ interprets clouds. As seen in earlier discussions, a single person could have several specialties and thus offices. Haleʻole in Fornander 1919–1920: 143, states that someone born in a certain month will be he kanaka akamai i ke kilokilo a me ke kakaolelo ‘a person knowledgeable in omen reading and oratory’. Pāka’a has a number of court duties; e.g., Kuapuu April 17, 1861; Kamakau December 22, 1870. Descriptions of offices and their functions are variable and complicated, e.g., kākāʻōlelo ‘word-fencer, orator’: Kamakau August 17, 1867; ʻĪ‘ī October 16, 30, 1869; Nākuina 1902a: 37; Fornander 1919–1920: 139 ff. New positions could be established, such as that of the head man at a postcontact market, King 1989: 192.

338. Consult: “No ka Pono Kahiko, a me ka Pono Hou” July 25, 1834, chiefs were obliged to listen to their advisors, who included commoners, subordinate chiefs, and priests; disregarding their advice could lead to death. Kuapuu April 24, 1861. Sahlins and Barrère 1973: 29, William Richards writes, “I think it can not with propri[e]ty be said that any king governed according to his will. There were powerful restraints imposed on that will, by custom, by fear of other chiefs, and by the counsels of a certain class of men whose business it was to rehearse proverbs and instruction, as handed down from their ancestors. The same class of persons often prophesied of judgement in case their instructions were not regarded”; also pp. 23 f. Whitney and Richards 1832: 160 f. Fornander 1918–1919: 479. Kepelino 1932: 132.

Advice: Dibble 1838: 69, Kalanimoku uses a nature model. Malo n.d.: xviii 7, 74, 75, moral advice. Fornander 1916–1917: 325–329, priestly advisors in battle (also 324 n. 2); 481, a priest gives advice on how to outwit a ghost or god; 517–521; 1918–1919: 263, 459; 1969: 1146, the priest advises his chief to kill the chief priest of his enemy. Elbert 1959: 99, 103; 1956–1957: 1 105 f., Elbert questions the moral emphasis found in Malo and others since it is not evident in the narratives about chiefs; such reports may be idealized or more prescriptive than descriptive. Cautionary tales about chiefs who ignored their counselors have been discussed above.

on Kamehameha III; January 21, 1869, an important discussion of the limits of the king’s power in relation to the council and subordinate chiefs. ‘Ī’ī October 30, 1869; March 5, 1870, Kamehameha I’s ‘aha kūkāmalū ‘privy council’ has also a religious function: praying to a god to lead rebels to death; March 26, 1870. Fornander 1969:11 290, the council of chiefs deposes the king (on the council, see also 300 f.). Malo n.d.:xxxviii 75–78, states that the public council was used merely to ratify decisions taken secretly by the chief and his kālaimoku ‘chief minister’; 92–93, that minister was not greedy for prestige or riches but was content with the power behind the scenes. Kalimahauna March 27, 1862, discusses the council at some length: ua koho aku o Kamehameha i kekahi poe kanaka akamai i ke kakaolelo, a me ke Kaakaua, i mau hoa olelo nona ‘Kamehameha chose some people knowledgeable in oratory and Warfare as his speech-companions/advisors’. He would consult this group before a decision. If they agreed with his ideas, he would then consult his ministers. If they also agreed, the decision was made. When a minister died, lilo iho na keiki a ua poe Kuhina nei i poe Kuhina no Kamehameha, aole nae e like loa me ko na makua olelo ana ‘the children of those Ministers became Ministers for Kamehameha; but [their advice] was not very similar to the statements of their parents’.


340. Kupahu May 11, 1865, the two advisors at ‘Umi’s court were both kāhuna ‘priests’ and kāula ‘prophets’. Naimu September 23, 1865, a chief’s priest helps him to victory through prayer and good advice. Fornander 1916–1917:265. Lonoikamakahiki’s kahu are kāula ‘prophets’ and haipule ‘pious’, so they possess mana; also 293–301, 311, 331, 339 ff.; 1919–1920:139, (kahuna kakaolelo), 141 (na kakaolelo o ka oihanakahuna). ‘Ī’ī October 30, November 13, 1869. Kamakau February 2, 1871, the advice of experts is called wānana ‘prophecy’. “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhapio/Kekuhaupio” August 18, 1921, Kekūhaupio is far-sighted and fearless because he is both a chief and a priest and also a kuhikuhipu’uone ‘geomancer’. Pukui and Elbert 1986: at word. Kamakau December 28, 1867. Compare Fornander 1916–1917:517.

341. Kuapuu May 8, 1861. Kamakau August 17, 1867, Kamehameha I consults a number of experts before he finds the advice he finds most practical and rewards the person who gave it to him (the use of pūhenehene is odd in this context and could refer to divination; see Westervelt 1916:346, for another anomalous description of the game). ‘Ī’ī January 22, 1870, the expert says a leak is plugged, but Kamehameha I decides to return to shore. ‘Ī’ī’s August 14, December 18, 1869, praise of Kamehameha’s patience seems to include an appreciation for his capacity for long-term planning.
343. “He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” August 4, 1921. Malo xxxv 18, chiefs are educated by a priest.
344. For sports, see also ‘Ī‘ī May 8, August 7, 1869. For priestly knowledge, Kepelino 1932:63. Sterling and Summers 1978:229.
348. Kamakau September 2, 1865:1. See also Fornander 1969:11 89. Beckwith 1970:441, a chief assembles all the children born on the same day as his son.
The missionary teachers in Hawai‘i did not find their students’ minds a *tabula rasa* but already formed by their traditional culture and its educational practices. This prior formation caused problems for Western schooling that cast light on Hawaiian thinking; indeed, the descriptions of those problems can be adequately understood only against the background of classical Hawaiian education. These problems and their connection to culture were recognized by both sides, and the many documents available on the subject make possible the study of the culture change promoted by the introduction of Western education. For schooling, particularly Western schooling, can radically change the ways people think, analyze, answer questions, and solve problems. Conversely, the study of other cultures clarifies our own, and the missionaries, who began with a generally ignorant and negative view of Hawaiian culture, increased their appreciation with their expertise.

The Western schools in nineteenth-century Hawai‘i were, therefore, the sites of an unusually intensive and thorough experience of cross-cultural contact and communication. In earlier chapters, I have made a number of points about Hawaiian
thinking, often using missionary sources. The most important of these are the writings of Lorrin Andrews, the first principal of the High School at Lahainaluna and future scholar of Hawaiian language and literature, who along with his fellow teachers was in close, continuous, and sometimes exasperated contact with Hawaiians and observed very closely their mental and learning processes. Cross-cultural psychology is a complicated and difficult subject, and the many views developed on the thinking of so-called traditional, primitive, or primary peoples are controversial.² The early missionaries to Hawai’i were not trained psychologists and did not conduct modern experiments, but many of their observations and conversations with Hawaiians resemble those reported by modern researchers and can be used with caution as evidence in certain questions. Missionary statements must, however, be accurately understood. I will quote extensively because most of the materials are either unpublished or not easily available.

Firstly, Andrews emphasized repeatedly that Hawaiians were in no way deficient in mental ability or desire to learn. Indeed, his students, all adult, were among the most gifted men in the nation and included David Malo, in the first class at Lahainaluna, and Samuel M. Kamakau, in the second; many of these students went on to make important contributions to various fields.³ I quote several passages:

No allowance has been made for the stupidity or dullness of the people, because such stupidity or dullness, it is believed, does not exist; or at least to any such degree or in any such form as to require any change in the ordinary methods of disciplining the mind.⁴

No want of disposition or ability on the part of the scholars . . . (Andrews October 1, 1834: 44)

that Hawaiians are capable of being taught any art or science,— that they are desirous to learn . . . (November 24, 1835: 34)
You will not understand me to say, the Hawaiians are destitute of minds, *by no means.* All my accounts show facts to the contrary.\(^5\)

The minor reservation expressed in the first quotation from 1832 may refer to the difficulties Hawaiians were having in mathematics, but no such reservation is made in the later quotations, and the missionary teachers were generally positive about the mathematical capabilities of their students.\(^6\)

Secondly, Andrews was a pioneer in his recognition of the connection of thinking to culture, a connection he saw in other areas.\(^7\) For instance, a problem for the early native schools was the Hawaiian “method of teaching by proxy” (Andrews 1834a:160):

> When a teacher considers himself as having become expert . . . that is the point where he thinks he ought to stop, and generally does stop, and give his work up into the hands of others . . .

Andrews connected this practice—seen in classical Hawaiian education, for instance, in the *poʻopuaʻa* “Head pupil in a hula school”—to the culture in general:

> This system of laboring by proxy, however, is not peculiar to schools, but runs through all the affairs of government, from the highest *kuhina* [“minister”] of the king, to the pipe-lighter of the most petty officer: and it is very easy to see that unless stopped or corrected, it will be an effectual bar to the establishment of good native schools.\(^8\)

For Andrews, knowledge “enters all the interstices of the curiously wrought moral & intellectual structure of man, as well as all the outward forms of civilized Society” (June 13, 1832: 2). This view had important consequences for his thinking. The first was that any attempt to help the nation had to be based on a “study [of] the ancient customs, history, laws, political maxims, and literature of the Hawaiians” (Andrews 1836: 21); one needed to “become acquainted with the language of the people—with their
manners and customs and habits &c and gain an access to their hearts” (November 3, 1829:1). Similarly the problems of education “would not be easily understood without an intimate acquaintance with Hawaiian character & Hawaiian manners & customs” (October 1, 1834:52). For instance, the poor performance of early Hawaiian students in mathematics should be blamed not on want of ability, but on the fact that (1834a:166):

they have no use for arithmetic in their ordinary transactions. They have very little buying and selling among themselves, and hence there is no stimulus, except the love of thinking, which is here considered a burden, instead of a pleasure.

Andrews’ definition of thinking will be discussed below.

The second consequence of the connection of culture to thinking was that the educational effort necessarily included a radical cultural transformation, including both information and ways of processing it:

In raising up a people sunk so low as were the people of these islands on the arrival of the first missionaries, nothing must be left to inference; everything is to be taught . . . (Andrews June 13, 1832:5)

we are obliged to teach in a formal manner many things to this people which are easily understood by the most illiterate in civilized countries, or which they would find out by inference. And we are called upon frequently to answer questions which appear to us foolish. (1834a:165)

Every thing useful must be taught. It will not grow up in the land itself. (October 1, 1834:57 f.)

The educational effort needed to include a transformation of the students’ attitudes and lifestyles: “Along with knowledge the scholars ought to be taught industry and good habits.”9 This transformation demanded the destruction of the old to prepare
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the way for the new: “in overturning the habits & manners & customs of a people a great deal is to be undone before but little can be done” (Andrews October 1, 1834: 62). But “So fixed are their old bad habits” (June 13, 1832: 47), that little progress is made: “They enter the school heathens as it relates to manners, habits & morals & go away so.” The necessary transformation could not be effected by the social intercourse normal in Western countries, “for they are all alike unthinking” (Andrews 1834a: 167). It had to be done, therefore, by a conscious educational effort: “the school has the same transforming influence on the manners & habits that education has in all countries” (October 1, 1834: 52).

The educational effort of the Hawaiian mission could not, however, be confined to studies; it had to be a total cultural program. Andrews argued (April, 1835: 1) that Lahainaluna should be turned into a boarding school so that the teachers could exercise constant supervision over the students and prevent any outside social or cultural influences. For the same reason, Andrews and the other missionary teachers felt that young adults and especially children would make more promising students. Teaching had started with the chiefs and their courtiers and had then been extended to adults and only afterwards to children. Although Andrews felt that “teaching children is thought by the people generally to be small business,” children learned better because their minds were “more ductile.” For instance, Hawaiians learned to read musical notes, “But to give the notes their proper sounds is more difficult. The children are the most successful in efforts of this kind” (Missionary Letters, Volume 7, n.d.: 2174). As a result, Andrews concluded “that we must begin with children or the most of our labor must be lost, I mean as far as civilization and mental improvement are concerned” (December 2, 1835: 4).

The project of radically transforming Hawaiian culture by means of education required starting at the most basic level of communication: words. In this, Andrews and the other teachers achieved unconscious agreement with classical Hawaiian educa-
tion. Indeed, their intense work with the Hawaiian language and growing appreciation of the literature provide a nearly complete picture of their developing relation to Hawaiian culture as a whole.

Andrews was unusually sensitive to problems of cross-cultural communication. In his opinion, the key to successful education was language understood in connection to literature and culture (Andrews 1836: 21):

the language ought to be carefully cultivated. And it is hoped that it will be a point aimed at by all who become residents, patiently to study the ancient customs, history, laws, political maxims, and literature of the Hawaiians, that they may know where and how to apply the helping hand.

The problem of education in Hawai‘i was, therefore, to communicate foreign information and ways of thinking in the Hawaiian language, which had been formed for native requirements. As a result,

we are deficient as teachers—deficient in modes of expression necessary or best adapted to convey instruction to their minds, and when we attempt the preparation of books, we find the language utterly deficient in words proper to convey ideas which lie at the foundation of morals, religion, science & the arts.12

The difficulty lay partly in the gap between the missionary ideas and the Hawaiian language, which required the enlargement of the vocabulary, as discussed in chapter IV. The difficulty lay also, as noted early by King Kamehameha II, in the teachers’ lack of language preparation (Kuykendall 1947: 104). Andrews agreed strongly with this view (June 13, 1832: 50 f.):

It has been the universal practice of missionaries to these islands to commence their missionary work by teaching school . . . The very idea of teaching a school presupposes an ability to com-
municate knowledge; but how can he do this when the teacher is utterly unacquainted with the language of his pupils. Suppose a learned pundit on his first arrival at Boston should set himself up for a teacher of the English language? Though we might applaud his zeal we should not soon expect to see much advance in his pupils. And yet something like this has been the manner in which every missionary has commenced & carried on his work. I did so when I first arrived at the islands; but I would not do it again. This in part perhaps will account for the unfaithfulness in teachers. They have never yet seen a well conducted school; because no one has taught school who has been qualified to communicate instruction. Even after a residence of above four years among the people and writing & preaching a great many sermons I am puzzled every day for want of words & terms to communicate ideas to my scholars.

Andrews has left valuable remarks on the difficulties the missionaries faced in learning Hawaiian. The language was extremely flexible and permitted a wide variety of correct expressions for the same point. There were no authoritative documents written by the Hawaiians themselves on their language, and the supply of written materials that could be consulted was small, though growing. As to informants,

Some are so unaccustomed, though they may be masters of their own language, to the business of correcting others, that they let any thing pass which they themselves understand, however awkward it may be when compared with the real purity of their language.

The disposition of the Hawaiians to accommodate themselves to the ignorance of those who consult them, is a difficulty in the way of getting pure expressions. When consulted respecting any word or phrase, their object seems to be to find out how much the person consulting them knows respecting the point himself. And if he appears to know anything they will tell him he knows every-
thing. Or in giving a definition, they will give such as the person understands as synonymous, without much regard to precision or definiteness in the case; and it is only by a long series of questions that the desired information can be obtained.\textsuperscript{13}

Clarissa Armstrong describes a more informal way of learning Hawaiian than that used by the male missionaries:

Teaching & talking is the best way to learn the language. We can read as soon as we get the sounds of the letters-but do not know the meaning of many words. We ask the natives the meaning, & they express it by signs & talking-in this way we catch several words in a sentence, & learn how to arrange them. If we do not fully understand, repeat the question to some others, & continue to ask till we get the same explanation several times from different natives. Then try to explain it to ourselves, when they are pleased to help us, for they are delighted to have us learn their language. Sometimes in walking out, I have commenced asking some native questions, such as-what have you,-or the name of a thing. He would set down his calabash & begin to talk, others seeing us talking would come & talk too, till I found myself surrounded by nearly unclad natives.\textsuperscript{14}

In her farewell speech to Hawai‘i, she spoke of the difficulty she had learning the language, but \textit{Ua paanaau koke i’au [sic: ia’u] ka huaolelo aloha, a aole loa no e poina ana} ‘I memorized soon the word \textit{aloha}, and I will indeed never forget it’ (“Na Olelo Hope a Limaikaika Wahine” October 23, 1880).

The need to learn Hawaiian became quickly apparent when the early preaching and instruction in English proved ineffective.\textsuperscript{15} The importance of language became even clearer over the years, and Andrews and others argued that persons from the mission should be set aside to specialize in teaching and also in language and in the difficult task of “writing, translating & compiling books
The largest task of translation was of course the Bible, with which the missionaries took particular care. Translation was done from the original Hebrew and Greek, which raised important difficulties of its own (Missionary Letters, Volume 7, n.d.: 2083). Andrews’ letters to the Board are filled with requests for the books necessary for the basic interpretation of the original text.

Even more difficult was the translation of that text into Hawaiian, which the missionaries were still learning. As was their practice, the missionaries relied on learned Hawaiians: *ua koho ka mea unuhi i kanaka akamai ma ka olelo Hawaii, e kokua mai, i pololei ka olelo* ‘the translator chose people/natives knowledgable in the Hawaiian language to help so that the language would be correct.’17 The difficulties included all those of language and culture. In his translation of the Bible, William Richards was assisted by David Malo, who had earlier taught him Hawaiian (Kuykendall 1932b: 79). Richards described his work on the Gospel of Matthew in a letter of January 31, 1825 (Missionary Letters, Volume 2, n.d.: 723a):
My inability has lain in my ignorance of the language . . . The course I pursue is this. In the morning I take Knapp’s Testament, Schleumen’s Lexicon, Dodnedge’s exposition and a few other helps and strictly examine the passage I design to translate. In the afternoon, Maro [Malo], my teacher comes, and Taua, the Tahitian [sic]. I give the passage to Maro according to the best knowledge I have of the language. Then Taua gives it to him from the Tahitan translation, then Mano (?) puts it into pure Hawaiian & I write it down. When he uses a hard word I put the word in my vocabulary and carry it to the chiefs so as that I may be sure to get its correct meaning. I then read the translation to a number of people to see whether they understand it.

. . . In this way I learn the language faster than by any course that I can pursue. Since I began this translation. I have learned about two thousand new words.

. . . Mano [sic] keeps a copy and from his more than a dozen have commenced taking copies.

When we are engaged in the translation it is really very pleasing to watch the countenance of Maro and see how he is affected by the different truths. Among the passages which seemed powerfully to affect his mind I may mention, “In Rama was there a voice heard”, “The foxes have holes & the birds of the air have nests” also the history of our Savior’s temptation in the wilderness, together with all his parables, figures & illustrations as I have since commenced this translation. We are familiar with a thousand figures, which in our language & to our minds are forcible & beautiful. But attempt to use them in this language & to this people & they vanish. Not so with the illustrations of our Saviour. They are always understood & they touch the heart.

Draft translations were “carefully revised” by the translator, then sent to other missionaries for review, and revised again before printing. Missionaries felt that a “thorough review” was necessary before reprinting and that Hawaiian language materials should not be printed without the supervision of someone who knew the language. The linguistically sensitive Andrews argued,
“It is my opinion that the Sandwich Islanders will never have a good translation of the Bible until some of them shall be able to read the originals” (November 15, 1833: 4); it was “essentially necessary” that they learn the ancient languages to achieve an adequate translation (October 1, 1834: 41).

Andrews and the other missionaries saw clearly the difference between correct and incorrect usage and between poor expression and expression that was pure and idiomatic. They were interested also in the effectiveness and forcefulness of expression. Their linguistic standards were high; and they did not want to adopt the “dialect” used by many foreigners in Hawai‘i. As a result, aside from their perceived need to introduce certain new words for foreign concepts, the missionaries in their writings developed generally in the direction of a more Hawaiian style.

A late but clear example is the 1867 Hawaiian translation of the 1818 English-language Memoirs of Henry Obookiah, which

.ua hooponoponoia kekahi mau hemahema o ua buke nei. O kekahi mau mea hoi, ua hookomo hou ia, no ka moolelo a Rev. S. W. Papaula i imi ai ma Kealakekua, Hawai‘i.

‘corrected certain mistakes/awkwardnesses of this book. Certain new things were also added from the account that the Reverend S. W. Papaula sought in Kealekekua, Hawai‘i’.

The opening of the English version is not in Hawaiian style, gives the mother’s name as “Kummóoolah” (Dwight 1818: A2; 1990:1, “Kumm’o’olah”), and states that the father’s name is unknown. Ka Moolelo o Heneri Opukahaia (1867: 7) corrects the mother’s name, as well as that of the subject, and supplies the father’s. Most important, the first sentences of the book are now in the form of a classical Hawaiian genealogical story introduction: O Keau ka makuakane, o Kamohoula ka makuahine. Hanau mai la na laua keia keiki, o Opukahaia . . . ‘Keau was the father, Kamohoula the mother. This child was born to the two: ‘Opūkaha‘ia . . .’

In this example and others given throughout this book, the
work on language for educational purposes was clearly a collaboration between Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians. In their work together, both sides experienced culture change. The Hawaiian language was enriched with new words and uses, and the Western students of the language were gradually introduced to its beauty, subtleties, and traditional expressions. As the foreign teachers adopted these in their speaking and writing, their minds were in turn culturally influenced, as can be seen in Andrews’ admiring remarks on Hawaiian language and literature quoted in earlier chapters. Despite the programmatic depreciation of Hawaiian culture in comparison to Western, many foreigners valued the study of Hawaiian historical traditions (chapter V). Hawaiian language and literature also attracted much positive attention.

Many foreigners took an early interest in Hawaiian literature, and collecting examples seems to have been a common practice of visitors to the islands. The first Hawaiian poems were transcribed during Captain Cook’s expedition. Don Francisco de Paula Marin, who settled in Hawai‘i in 1793 or 1794 and remained until his death in 1837, made a large collection of Hawaiian chants. He offered these for copying to the German writer Adelbert von Chamisso, who visited Hawai‘i in 1816 and 1817 on the Russian ship Rurick. Unfortunately Chamisso was denied permission to remain temporarily in Hawai‘i to do this, but he maintained his interest in the Hawaiian language, publishing in 1838 the first Hawaiian grammar, an important contribution to the linguistics of the time.

In Hawai‘i itself, Hawaiian language and literature were considered important for sovereignty, were the subject of learned articles, and were included in the curriculum.\textsuperscript{22}

W. D. Alexander’s “Essay on the best mode of teaching Hawaiian” (1864) is one of the earliest and most extensive discussions of the topic. Since “The Hawaiian is not one of the literary languages of the world” and has “but little original literature,” “The
idea of its being taught in an institution of learning on the same footing as Latin, Greek or French is a novelty & an experiment” (1). However, because of its interest as a member of the Malayo-Polynesian language family and “its simple & philosophical structure,” it has been studied by “some of the greatest scholars of the age.” Conversation is needed to learn Hawaiian, but speaking and writing require also a knowledge of the grammar (2 f.). Hawaiian can in fact be reduced to rules: “Few languages are so regular & symmetrical, in their structure” (3 f.). German and French scholars theorize excessively on too small a foundation in fact, but Lorrin Andrews has based his work on “pure idiomatic examples of the language as used by the natives themselves” (4). Also needed is a grammar “which shall discard all the methods & terms of Greek & Hebrew grammar, and exhibit the language in its childlike simplicity.” (He also mentions the “guttural break in the middle of words”). Alexander recommends the use of the Ollendorff method, that is, the study of the grammar “combined with progressive exercises in writing, and with the translation & analysis of some Hawaiian classic,” such as the New Testament (5). Similarly “The ‘Moolelo Hawaii’ [Dibble 1838], if expurgated, is an excellent reading book, as it mainly consists of genuine, idiomatic native composition” (6); he also recommends Malo’s booklet on Christian teachings (1837). In contrast, S. N. Hale'ole’s “Laieikawai is totally unfit for the purpose, & we believe that its influence on the masses of the people is demoralizing.” Students should memorize the Bible and word lists, paying particular attention to the distinctions between near synonyms. They should translate business papers and legal forms into Hawaiian and use that language as a medium of instruction for a regular subject. Learning arithmetic would be an aid to students in doing business with Hawaiians, as it would “accustom them to those numerical terms & phrases, which are of most frequent occurrence in doing business with Hawaiians” (6 f.).

In his “Introductory Remarks” to Andrews dictionary, published in 1865, Alexander emphasizes again the scholarly interest of the
Hawaiian language (Andrews 1974: 7 ff.) and, within the context of the linguistic ideas of his time, is also more positive about Hawaiian literature (11):

Although, in a scientific point of view, the Hawaiian may seem to be one of the most attenuated and degenerate dialects of this family, we believe it to be practically one of the most copious and expressive, as well as the richest in native traditional history and poetry.

Andrews is even more positive. Laieikawai and other “fine specimens” of Hawaiian literature, although ignored by foreigners in Hawai‘i, “might be collected and printed and whose moral influence would be no worse on Hawaiian minds than the famous Scott’s Novels are on English readers” (1974: 4). Hiram Bingham was more ambivalent, rejecting the traditional literature because of its sexuality, but greatly admiring the new, “truly beautiful” Christian literature produced by Hawaiians.23

Western education agreed, therefore, with classical Hawaiian on the fundamental importance of language and literature. They agreed also on the importance of memorization and memory training. These were major means of intellectual formation in nineteenth-century Western education—a still powerful heritage of our oral past that was undergoing the long process of being modified and weakened by the increasing use of writing. Memorization was used by the missionary teachers in the classroom, in examinations and school presentations, and in Sunday school.24

The missionary teachers found that the Hawaiian practice of memorizing soon became an important factor and problem in their work. The memory skills of the Hawaiians were quickly apparent. Clark writes (1838: 345), “Their memories are uncommonly tenacious, and their minds are susceptible of a high degree of cultivation.” Andrews gives an example from mathematics class of “the tenaciousness of their memories” (October 1, 1834: 33 f.; also 1835: 143):
the one whose turn it was to answer would commence making his calculations aloud so that all might hear; after advancing a step or two, something would occur to turn off his attention, or he would stop to enquire about some part of the data or if any slight interruption should occur, he would stop short his reasoning—ask a question perhaps of some one sitting by or talk of something entirely foreign from his question & when done, commence his reasoning again precisely at the point where he stopped as though nothing had occurred & so if interrupted two or three times in a single question would never go back a single step beyond when he left off the last time. This fact both surprised and pleased me as it afforded evidence of strength of mind sufficient at least for mathematics. Four or five of the twelve monitors were exceedingly quick & correct in their calculations.

Memorization continued to be a particular strength and source of pride for Hawaiians in Western education. J. W. Kupakee (November 28, 1868) praises as a model for others an old man who memorized a chapter of Genesis a week in order to prepare himself for death. The political leader Joseph K. Nāwahī was praised for his powers of memorization in his studies (J. G. M. Sheldon 1908: 3, 21). Memorization could confer a certain amount of social standing in class. Kānewailani memorizes the roll, so is appointed to call it. He does it so quickly that the children have to get to class on time, and the older boys beat him for the bother (Kānepu‘u March 19, 1868).

Memorization, however, became a problem for the teachers because the Hawaiian students relied on it too much; that is, “there is no faculty of mind brought into exercise but memory.” Memorization has in fact its limits, as recognized by modern psychologists: “People cannot know things simply by memorizing them and believing them.” Both teachers and students would memorize materials as items or data and then fail to use them—by intellectual processes known to the missionary teachers—in order to advance their knowledge. For instance, they would memorize
the answers to mathematical questions without learning the processes by which they were obtained. This shift of emphasis from memorizing materials to learning new mental processes was an important difference between the traditional and the introduced education. The former function was necessarily more important in an oral culture than in one in which writing was available; in fact, much of the function of memorization had been replaced by the process of reading and researching documents. Hawaiian students were, therefore, reverting to their culturally more familiar educational emphasis when faced with their new tasks in school. Andrews connects this problem clearly to Hawaiian culture (1834a:159):

The ideas of natives as to what the nature of instruction is, has been and probably is now to as great extent a hindrance to improvement. The opinion is almost universally prevalent, that the whole of instruction and the benefit to be derived from it, consist in being able to read, or saying over the words in a book, or out of it, as the case may be, with very little or no regard to the meaning. To this their highest views aspire. To this point they are encouraged to aim by their teachers: and naturally enough; for it is considered a great acquisition by them, and even the very best have scarcely reached it. To get ideas from what they read, is no part of their school instruction; though now and then it seems that a sentiment contained in the school-books has made its way to the conscience. But most of those who have made much advance in this respect, have lived near the missionary stations, or have frequently attended our public worship.

In connection with this may be mentioned the habit of committing to memory. At this the natives have shown a great deal of readiness. Like all barbarous nations they have been accustomed from time immemorial to commit to memory their legends, tales, war-songs, odes, etc., by hearing them repeated by others, and it was not found difficult to transfer this practice to the school, and make one reader the organ of communication to the whole
school. And whole schools have been found able to repeat fluently the Pia-pa, the Sermon on the Mount, or the Ui, without being able to read a sentence. The business itself of committing to memory, has been of very little value to this people, as they were accustomed to it before; and the matter committed, even if retained, is of no great profit without the proper application of the other faculties of the mind, but lies like useless lumber in a storehouse; and if not retained is certainly of no value. Mental improvement, it is well known, is obtained only by the exercise of all the faculties of the mind in due proportion. While, therefore, as before, it may be admitted that some few have gained real matter for reflection from what they have committed to memory, it is very evident that a vast majority of the scholars rest perfectly satisfied with their attainments when they have the words in their memories. This is manifest by the avidity with which they commit to memory long lists of names contained in genealogies, and even abstract numbers; and when it is done feel as fully rewarded for their trouble, as though they had gained a new chapter on morals or religion.

Similarly, Sheldon Dibble was worried that Hawaiians might simply memorize the conversion stories of others and narrate them “as their own experience.”

Memorization created a clear problem in the teaching of reading: students would memorize the text and then pretend they were reading it, even though they could not:

The reading consists in saying over the words in a book very slowly, with many stops, and repetitions, and blunders, until repeated so frequently as to be fixed in the memory . . . Committing to Memory. At this the natives have ever shown themselves very skilful; but the ability to repeat and the fact that they do repeat the Pia-pa, and the Ui, and the Mataio, and other books from beginning to end, does not imply that they can read a word. (Andrews 1834a: 157)
[the teacher sits with the *Pia-pa* ‘alphabet book’ before “ten to a hundred” students, only some of which have books] The teacher begins; says *A*. The scholars all repeat in concert after him, *A*. The teacher then says *E*. They repeat all together, as before, *E*, and so on, repeating over and over, after the teacher, until all the alphabet is fixed in the memory, just in the order the letters stand in the book; and all this just as well without a book as with one. The abbs [mss.: abc’s] and spelling lessons are taught in the same way. (159)

Hawaiian sources describe the same practice (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:58). Kānepu’u writes of his father and others his age: *aole nae o Maoloha ma i ike pono i ka heluhelu, he paanaau wale no* ‘Maoloha and the others did not really know how to read; it was only memorizing’ (February 27, 1868). In teaching the younger people, probably of the family, Maoloha would call out lists of names for them to imitate in calling back. Maoloha was teaching them what he himself had learned from *na kumu aopalapala* ‘the teachers of the palapala’, but he had learned *ma ke ano paanaau nae, aole ike i ka hua* ‘just in the way of memorizing, he did not know the letters’, and with some misunderstanding. Kānewailani learned the letters later, capitals and minuscules. He also learned spelling by the same method: the teacher would say a word, and the students in chorus would spell it back and use it in a short sentence. While saying the letters, the students would make descriptive gestures, *me ke kuhi o na lima me he hula ala* ‘with the gesturing of the hands like the hula’. If a student could correctly spell the name of the fish humuhumunukunukuapua’a, *alaila, ua akamai kela haumana, a lilo i kumu* ‘then that student was smart and became a teacher’ (Kānepu’u March 5, 1868). Such methods made it easy for students to memorize texts rather than learning how to read them: *ua akamai nae kekahi poe ma ke ano paanaau, me he mele la, a o kekahi poe hoi, me ka ike maoli no i ka hua* ‘some people were smart in the way of memorizing, like a chant, but other people indeed with the genuine knowledge of
the letters’. Kānewailani knew people who had memorized the catechism and several chapters of the Bible.

Because Kānewailani successfully played hooky for so long, he was behind his peers when he was finally forced to go to school (March 19, 1868). As a result, he had to sit in the beginning or A class with the little children. When asked to play the teacher for the alphabet lesson, he found that he remembered what he had learned from an earlier teacher: *na hua nui pakahi a me na hua liilii pakahi o ka papa A, oiai, aia no iloko ona kahi i waiho ai me ka poina ole* ‘the single capitals and single small letters of the A class, that is, there was a place inside of him where they had been left without being forgotten’. He experienced difficulties, however, when the teacher progressed to the *hua palua* ‘sets of two letters’:

\[
aole no he loaa ia ia, oiai, aole oia i lohe mua; a o kela mau hua pakahi nae i olelo mua ia ae nei, aole no he ike pono i ke ano o ka hua, he paanaau wale no.
\]

‘he did not grasp it because he had not heard of it before; and as to those single letters mentioned earlier, he really did not understand correctly the character of the letters; it was just memorization’.

Multiplication tables could be memorized as well.

Teachers had, therefore, to devise means to distinguish between memorizing and reading, *ma ka naau aole me ka maka* ‘by memorizing [literally: ‘in the entrails’] not with the eye’ (Dibble 1835b:5). Dibble (1835b:3–9) provides a number of techniques, including the use of *huaolelo palua* ‘sets of two letters’ and *huaolelo pakolu* ‘sets of three letters’, which had given Kānewailani so much trouble. Students should not be shown the text from which another student is reading, the teacher should skip around in the text rather than following it in sequence, and so on. Most important, texts should be changed often (8):
'For after three or maybe four readings of this document, it should then be abandoned and you should read in some new document, because if they are reading in this document for long, the words inside it will be memorized by them, and they will read in the entrails, not with the eye, just as in their reading of the Child’s ABC’.

Learning reading was an achievement—as anyone will acknowledge who has tried to learn shorthand or other writing systems—an achievement that the Hawaiians enjoyed in community or in chorus, to the surprise of their teachers: “They are in the habit of uniting in companies, to read their lessons aloud, as with one voice.” Significantly they were less adept at reading individually in class, which was a standard school exercise of the time. This weakness is curious in view of the classical Hawaiian ideal of speaking well and the exercises that were developed to promote that skill (Beckwith 1919: 319, note 1). But the difference between group ease and individual awkwardness has been observed also in twentieth-century classrooms. The missionary teachers were disturbed that both teachers and students would hold the book the wrong way and sometimes read in an incorrect direction. Andrews described the problem as he saw it (1834a: 167):

It is a very common thing to see two, three, four, and sometimes as many as six persons, all reading out of one book at the same time, all reading loud, and each in a different place. When six are reading at once, the process is this. The book is laid down on the ground; or if in a house, in the middle of the room, at the center.
The persons then prostrate themselves around as radii from that center, with their heads over the book. Hence to some the book must be right end up, to others wrong end up, and others must read towards them, or from them, as the case may be. They always read loud in all cases, and generally each reads in a different place, though within the compass of the two pages spread before them. I have never noticed a native read silently to himself, and get any idea whatever. These remarks apply particularly to the best scholars on the islands.

Andrews’ particular preference for silent reading and meditation was culturally based, most probably a part of his Pietistic heritage: the silent reading of the Bible as a form of devotion. That such reading is an innovation is illustrated in the puzzlement of Augustine of Hippo when around 382 A.D. he saw Ambrose of Milan reading silently to himself (Confessions, Book VI, Chapter 2). Reading aloud in groups was common in the West through the nineteenth century and continues in many contexts today. Hawaiians were clearly enjoying their newfound skill and sharing their pleasure among themselves. Moreover, their reading aloud is another indication that they considered writing a kind of prompt for oral performance, as discussed in chapter IV.

The other problem raised by Andrews was one of the most discussed among the Western teachers throughout the nineteenth century: reading comprehension. Their difficulty in understanding the problem was twofold: cultural and psychological. As to culture, the teachers did not recognize adequately the Hawaiian cultural adaptations of reading, such as their performing their reading and their use of writing as a memory aid for the spoken word. Moreover, the teachers did not appreciate fully the advantages of oral instruction for Hawaiians: Hawaiians simply understood better what they heard. I have given several examples of Hawaiians meditating upon chants, sayings, and statements to understand their meaning (e.g., ʻĪʻī August 28, 1869). Classical
Hawaiian culture in fact idealized the understanding of oral communication—in performance or in memorized form—which was basic to their whole educational system. The difficulty Andrews noted of not extracting ideas from reading lay in the unfamiliarity of the medium of writing. In classical Hawaiian culture, one knew a verbal communication truly when it was memorized or *pa’ana‘au* ‘fixed in the guts’. Having a communication on a piece of paper to be consulted was sufficiently different to require an adjustment in thinking and procedure.

As to psychology, the teachers did not make the important distinction discovered by modern psychologists between reading as “decoding” and reading comprehension. What was apparent to the teachers was that Hawaiians did not move immediately from decoding to comprehension, as Andrews describes with examples:  

The worst thing in their *reading* is, that they get no ideas. I have taken great pains to ascertain this fact, and I am convinced that ninety out of a hundred that are called readers, hardly know that any meaning *ought* to be attached to the words. Indeed, a great many think there is a kind of mystery, or perhaps magic, in reading. Their notion is, that they must say over a word or two, or a sentence and then from some quarter or another a thought will come to them; that is when they have any thought [mss.: thoughts] at all. I have spent hours at a time in the High School trying to make the scholars believe that a word written on paper or printed in a book, meant just the same thing as when spoken with the mouth.

It is my opinion that the people attach very little if any more meaning to what they commit to memory, than to what they read. I mention only one fact that we have all noticed as singular. No chapter in all the New Testament has interested the people so much as the genealogies in the first of Matthew and third of Luke, and none have they been more desirous to commit to memory.
The rows of figures also put down as sums in the little Arithmetic, have all been very accurately committed to memory without the least idea of the nature or design of numerical figures, except the name and numerical value.\textsuperscript{33}

The teachers, therefore, devised a number of techniques to promote and ensure reading comprehension. Andrews (1829:8) urged that the students be taught to read slowly and with understanding. Students learned a Bible verse a day, and they were “particularly questioned as to their understanding of what they commit to memory, and every exertion is made to explain in full whatever they do not understand.”\textsuperscript{34} Similarly in the KEEP project, the Kamehameha Early Education Program of the 1980s, great emphasis was placed on reading comprehension, and the value of some of the techniques used by the missionaries, such as focused questions and testing for understanding, was rediscovered.

The missionary techniques were successful, and positive appraisals of Hawaiian reading comprehension can be found as well as reports of Hawaiians understanding texts.\textsuperscript{35} The classical ideal of understanding oral communications was transferred to literary materials. The author of “No ka Noonoo” (April 18, 1834: 2) praises people who *Huli mau no o [sic: i] ka palapala me ka noonoo nui i ko loko* ‘Search constantly in writing with much thinking about what is contained therein’. S. P. K. (March 13, 1839) writes that he has received *kau palapala ninau hoakaka no ka mea hoomana kii, ua heluhelu au a maopopo no ia’u ke ano maloko, a me na ninau* ‘your letter with questions for clarification about the idolator; I read it until the meaning inside it was clear to me as well as the questions’.

Reading comprehension is complex, and many different factors could have been at work in the problems Andrews described. Among these, modern psychologists have found with Hawaiian students and others that culture plays a major role. That is, much of the problem of reading comprehension may have been due
to cultural unfamiliarity with the content and means of communicating it. This could be a factor in oral communication as well (Kānepu‘u March 19, 1868). Certainly the great popularity of newspapers and books—and especially writings on Hawaiian subjects—argues for the Hawaiians’ comprehension of what they read. In fact, some of the early difficulties may have been a result of cultural resistance. One Hawaiian teacher stated, “I did not regard your instructions any further than to learn to read. The meaning of what I read, I did not regard” (Richards, Andrews, Spaulding, and Chapin 1833:263).

Cultural reasons may have been partially responsible also for a related phenomenon noticed by Andrews: the Hawaiian students seemed to conceive of their role as merely absorbing the information supplied by the teacher rather than actively working with it. The subject interested Andrews and, in almost a stream of conscious, he joins many of the themes of his reflection:

I have frequently been amused to hear them tell what notions they had formed of instruction at the time they entered school. They had supposed they should have nothing to do but be passive recipients of knowledge—that they should have nothing to do but remember what the teacher told them. The idea of any mental effort in themselves was never thought of. Simple questions in practice would often come up, like the following; How many are twice 25? Instead of calculating they would set to guessing supposing it to be found out in that way. Their answers would be something like this; twice 25, it is thirty perhaps, forty perhaps, & then say to me what do you think of it? Before I had much experience, I used to reply it is fifty. “Yes, well it is fifty is it? Just as you say, for you know, we are ignorant.” As was observed before, I found it a great labour to get them to think for themselves. This remark however applies particularly to instruction in school. I would willingly have put up with any objections, opposition & contradiction if I could have succeeded in putting them in a way of thinking. In some things however I have found them stubborn
enough, particularly in matters relative to their manners & customs.

Andrews makes clear that he is talking about the ideas the students brought with them to the Western school, that is, “The ideas of natives as to what the nature of instruction is” (Andrews 1834a:159). Indeed, in classical Hawaiian education, students would concentrate on absorbing knowledge while in the presence of their teacher and use that knowledge actively in other settings. The main means of absorption was memorizing, and the demeanor of the students was one of respectful, obedient, and unchallenging attention to the teacher, the sole and voluntary source of his or her oral tradition. Only after mastering the field and graduating were students fully active and innovative; they could even challenge their teacher. Similarly, questioning was and still is considered nīele ‘nosy’ when done by children, but is perfectly appropriate in other contexts, for instance, when done politely by adults receiving strangers. For the Western teacher, this combination of elements during the period of instruction creates the appearance of passivity, a mistake that is still made frequently by newly arrived teachers in Hawai‘i schools in regard to both Pacific Islands and Asian-American students. Contemporary children also tend to “shut down” when faced with adult authority figures (Jordan 1983:292).

Western teachers from the missionaries until today have felt that they could not achieve their goals unless they modified the behavior of their Hawaiian students. Memorization needed to be largely if not entirely replaced by reading and research, and the mind needed to be trained by active participation in a dialog with the teacher. C. R. Bishop recorded progress (1882:11):

In place of the route [sic: rote] and routine system of instruction, which has been too common in many of the schools, there has been a more general adoption of methods of teaching, awakening
in the pupils increased activity of mind and habits of independent thought; leading them to understand and use their own powers; teaching them to think, compare, reflect, and decide for themselves.

The Western teacher must, therefore, allow considerable liberty to the students, which creates a student-teacher relationship different from the classical Hawaiian one. As discussed in chapter III, this caused some confusion for the Hawaiian students. Andrews reported their saying “that I must be their teacher and their chief. I told them I would be their teacher, but not their chief” (1835:137). In fact, Andrews consciously strove to create a new relationship. For instance, on one occasion, students refused to follow his directions for the construction of a house and later found that he was right (Andrews 1835:139). Andrews explained their conduct:

This is only one of a multitude of the petty whims of ignorance, with which I have been obliged to contend. It was, however, owing in part to my method of instruction. Had I assumed the authority of a chief over them from the first, they would never have disputed my word or plan. But it had been my object to break up that passive obedience, and to require a reason why they did so and so, and why they thought so and so; hence I allowed them to dispute my word and my opinion, at all times, if they thought it not correct. The above I suppose to be the fruit of such instruction . . .

In the end, the students learned a valuable lesson “besides the influence it had on them in causing them to think for themselves, and be convinced only by evidence.”

In this context can be understood Andrews’s principal criticism of his Hawaiian students, the Hawaiian teachers, and others: that they did not think. Hawaiians, he argued, knew very little before they began their education, and they were unable to build
on their acquired knowledge without help. I quote him at length:

[Teachers were of good character] But their literary qualifications were of course exceedingly scanty. The Pia-pa, therefore, in most cases, was all they could teach, for it was all they knew. And it is remarkable that the teachers have shown very little skill in teaching themselves; in other words, have added nothing of consequence to their stock of knowledge by their own exertions.

[They continue working with only what they originally learned unless they] again attend a school taught by some missionary. Either the mist of ignorance is so thick that the light cannot penetrate; or the system of instruction is too scanty to enable them to get ideas from what they read, or to teach them to combine ideas so as to form new ones; or from wrong notions of what instruction in itself consists; or all these causes together; the fact is notorious. Generally poor readers when they commence teaching, they continue so from year to year, without apparently making the least progress in the art of reading; and so in other things.

[Arithmetic has been little taught except when an individual missionary emphasized it.] And even then it has been confined to the first rules, for want of terms in the language to convey the ideas. Probably no native, by himself, has been able to get the least information from the tract on arithmetic, except perhaps the names and numerical value of the figures. The same is true with regard to a portion of the Ho-pe no ka Pia-pa, or supplement to the spelling book. (Andrews 1834a: 157)

[They desire books, but do not understand them;] scarce a single idea has been gained that was intended to be conveyed, except where it has been taught and explained by some one of the missionaries. The same is true with respect to the Helu [arithmetic book]. The native cannot be found, who, without any instruction, was able to understand any principle it contained, or to under-
stand any rule. The truth is, a *palapala* is a *palapala*; it is all new to them, and all considered equally good. They have been told, that the perusal of these and similar books constitutes the difference between them and ourselves; that they are able to make people wise; and what is still more, most of our books we are able to call the word of God. (160)

[the teacher Mokee learned the “ground rules of arithmetic” in 1828] At his examination in 1832, he had not added a single new sum, and probably had not gained a single new idea respecting arithmetic, though he had been teaching it at least every week for nearly four years.37

Andrews was admirably precise in defining what he meant by thinking (December 2, 1835: 2):

I may state as evidence that they do not think unless driven to it, that they have no idea of generalizing, or of deducing a general rule from particular cases, or of drawing a conclusion from premises made ever so clear; hence they need the same instruction to teach them how to use their knowledge as they did in giving them the original ideas.

This definition comprehends his observations cited earlier on Hawaiian memorizing as opposed to understanding, on vocabulary, and on Hawaiians considering “thinking . . . a burden, instead of a pleasure” (Andrews 1834a:166). His definition is also the same as that used by modern psychologists: as opposed to learning and remembering, “thinking is an extension of the evidence (present in the stimulus material or the memory) to produce something new” (Cole and Scribner 1974:145). Moreover, the points Andrews raised are among those studied by modern cross-cultural psychologists, and their interviews with traditional peoples are very similar to those recorded by Andrews in the last century, as will be seen below. In sum, Andrews was making accurate observations of genuine differences in thinking. These he seems to have
discussed with his students, who were apparently making similar observations from their side: “The scholars have frequently said to me, ‘we can’t think as you do’” (Andrews December 2, 1835:2).

Connected to the problem of the Hawaiian teachers’ thinking was that of their communicating their knowledge to their students. The very same difficulties arose:

[Efforts needed to be made] to raise the qualifications of teachers, not only as it respects knowledge, but also in the art of communicating instruction to others. (Andrews 1834a:158)

[the teachers’] stock of information was exceedingly scanty. And it appears, also, from observation, that they have been slow in making improvements by their own exertions. But suppose their stock of acquired ideas to have been considerable, still they were entirely ignorant of the art of communicating knowledge to others, except in the same forms in which they had received it themselves. And further, that which they had learned themselves was all new to them, and its connection and relation to any of the affairs of life were not at all apparent. Such teachers could not make wise scholars. (158 f.)

The teachers’ “ignorance as to the method of teaching” was the reason they relied on repetition and rote memorization, as described above (159). Andrews recommended:

let the process of teaching scholars to think, be commenced and persevered in. Let no great stress be placed on committing to memory, but in understanding what they are about. Let the people be encouraged to learn to read, and get information by reading; and let the practice of getting the palapala by rote, be discouraged.38

The key to Andrews’ view can be found in his remark that he found his students “stubborn enough, particularly in matters relative to their manners & customs” (October 1, 1834). That is, Hawaiian thinking was connected to Hawaiian culture, as has
been seen above in Andrews’ discussions of memorizing and vocabulary: “The whole language shows that they never have been a thinking people. Their habits & manners show that everything is considered individually” (December 2, 1835: 3). More generally, “the circumstances of a Hawaiian’s life” made them “unthinking” (December 2, 1835: 1 f.):

What is there in the condition of Hawaiians to make them otherwise than unthinking? They are born & grow up literally like wild asses’ colts. One half of their food grows spontaneously, and in procuring the other half, there is no faculty of mind brought into exercise but memory. They need little or no clothing.—They have no necessity for laying up anything for tomorrow.—Hence they have no property to care of [sic]. (I speak of them as they were.) Their ancient religion required no mental effort. Their priests told them what to do & it was death to do otherwise. Their sports & wars, therefore, were all that called forth their mental energies. Add to this, the sensuality in which they indulged, and and [sic] it must be that they are an unthinking people.

The historical inaccuracies in Andrews’ views are important in determining the limits of his experience of Hawaiian culture at this point in his career. The cultural assumptions of his remarks help define his view of thinking as the Western style of ratiocination described in the passage cited earlier (Andrews December 2, 1835: 2). This is clear also from his examples.

Andrews’ connection of education and thinking to culture is now a recognized field of research. Culture and environment influence perception; they also influence “cognitive styles” in problem solving (Cole and Scribner 1974: 82–85, 95 f.) and the development and use of certain problem-solving skills rather than others (152, 193 f.). Thinking in traditional cultures is not illogical in the strict sense of violating the law of contradiction, although there are people in any culture who do not think logically (145, 160, 168). Rather, mental processes are the same across cultures,
and cultural differences consist of emphases and uses. That is, problem solving involves “functional systems” that are “flexible and variable organizations of cognitive processes directed toward some fixed end” (193). Furthermore, problem solving “in ways that are pervasive and compelling, is always seen as a component of a larger behavioral network in which perception, memory, classification, and all other cognitive processes play a role” (170). Identifying those processes and describing their use within a context as complex as culture is a difficult task (173).

A mental process that has been identified prominently—indeed idealized—as a difference from Western thinking is the supposedly nonlinear or nonsequential way of thinking of primary peoples; primitive holism is opposed to Western analysis. The missionary teachers were less positive. Dibble described “The first obstacle” to enlightening the Hawaiian mind as one that cannot be easily expressed in words. It is an almost entire destitution of the power of reflection-of originating thought, or of carrying on a continuous chain of reasoning. Among the uneducated heathen, (I speak not of those trained in schools,) instances are very rare of those who have strength and discipline of mind enough to connect three links of a chain together, and come to a satisfactory conclusion.39


The savage has in his mind a picture of the whole action, and does not always abstract or separate the principal circumstance from the accessory details.

Andrews described the first time he used in the classroom a new book on “intellectual arithmetic” (now called mental arithmetic):40 for much mental discipline in a little space this little book has exceeded all others they have yet had. After going half way through the book they were astonished at themselves. When I
commenced with it they laughed at the simplicity of the questions on the first page & said it was like the child’s Arithmetic. I turned over thirty or forty pages of the manuscript & read off several questions; they thought of them awhile and said, Nobody knows these things; they are exceedingly entangled. I told them they would soon comprehend them if they would go straight on from the beginning of the book. They said, perhaps so. Some time however after they had passed over the place which they thought so difficult they asked me when they should get to the hard questions I had formerly read to them? On being told they had passed over those questions without making a mistake, they exclaimed, What fools we were!

The problem faced by Andrews’ students was not one of ability—they learned the lesson—but of lack of familiarity with the type of exposition he used in this case. Sequential thinking was not, however, utterly foreign to them. Basic survival is impossible without an ability to execute a linear process, and Hawaiian process sayings have been noted in chapter IV (e.g., Judd 1930: proverb 521). The classical Hawaiian education by observation could involve throwing a student in media res; but more linear instruction could be provided. Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua was taught boat-building in sequence from the beginning (October 26, 1922–February 8, 1923). In any case, a graduate would need to know the complete sequence of a process from beginning to end, as seen in the descriptions of professions in chapter V. I would describe Hawaiian thinking as both linear and holistic, with the former placed firmly in the context of the latter. Indeed, all thinkers require some view of the whole and processes for operating within it. Differences from Western thinking are those of emphasis and use.

Andrews’ passages about his students’ problems in learning mathematics are very similar to interviews recorded by modern cross-cultural psychologists. The type of reasoning expected by Andrews is a cultural creation: “even the seemingly simple matter
of responding to such a problem in its own terms is a learned convention” (Cole and Scribner 1974:161); knowing even where to begin solving such a problem can be impeded by cultural differences (159). In general, people think reasonably about problems within the sphere of their knowledge and experience. But without special training, they balk at being asked to draw a conclusion based entirely on logical relations among restricted premises, a “failure to accept the logical task” (162). Respondents can refuse to answer on the ground that they have no experience or knowledge of the matter; they can give arbitrary answers or answers based on their views. In more extended discussions, respondents go beyond the stated boundaries of the problem—adding facts, experience, and knowledge of personalities and social structure—in order to arrive at a conclusion with content that seems culturally realistic and socially appropriate. In the words of Edmund Burke:

I cannot stand forward, and give praise or blame to any thing which relates to human actions, and human concerns, on a simple view of the object, as it stands stripped of every relation, in all the nakedness and solitude of metaphysical abstraction. Circumstances (which with some gentlemen pass for nothing) give in reality to every political principle its distinguishing colour, and discriminating effect.

In just this way, Hawaiians would rely for information on observation, experience, and reliable reports; they would also seek to extend a particular problem to the outermost limits of its relevance in order to solve it adequately. A contemporary political problem was studied with the aid of the most numerous historical examples possible and with an emphasis on the persons involved. The origin of the human individual was traced back to the origin of the universe. This procedure was influenced by the ideal of completeness, by the view that all things were related, and by the setting in life of the procedure itself: thinking was used to
solve effectively the problems of real life with all its complexity. Among the many consequences of this procedure is the Hawaiian and Polynesian emphasis of similarities over differences, although both of course were recognized.

Westerners also reason within a cultural context. For instance, Andrews (1834a: 165) complained of a “foolish” question. A pious woman had died on the Sabbath:

Some few days after her death, the question was agitated among our Lahaina church members, whether or no she could now be happy? And the conclusion pretty generally, if not universally, was that she must be miserable, since the last act of her life consisted in dying on the Sabbath; in other words breaking the Sabbath; and as they had been taught that there was no repentance after death, it was not discoverable at all by them how she could be saved. This reasoning was among the best informed people of Lahaina, who have enjoyed almost ten years of faithful instruction. Kaio, my teacher, who for thought, reflection, and knowledge of the Scriptures, stands third, if not second, on the islands, was completely puzzled with the question, and came to me for a solution.

The Hawaiians described were drawing an admirably logical conclusion from their premises, but they were not adding all the material that would render the conclusion realistic and appropriate for a Christian of Andrews’ type. He correctly analyzed the problem as the ignorance of “many things . . . which are easily understood by the most illiterate in civilized countries, or which they would find out by inference”; that is, cultural assumptions. Similarly, Samoans, constantly puzzled at non-Samoans’ lack of savoir-vivre, coined the expression palagi valea ‘foolish foreigners’. Many other examples of cross-cultural incomprehension can be found in Hawaiian history.

Western schooling transforms the way people deal with such problems (Cole and Scribner 1974: 164–168). However, because of
the cultural context of learning and thinking, problems arise when Western schools teach Western concepts and ways of thought by Western means to students from other cultures (Tharp 1989). Not only is the content of instruction unfamiliar but also the means of communication. In the KEEP project, the greatest success was achieved by designing teaching techniques compatible with the culture of the students and helping them to understand the materials “within the context of their personal experiences or background knowledge” (Roland Tharp 1989: 355 f.) writes that “all instruction should be contextualized in the child's experience, previous knowledge, and schemata”; and this should be done at the classroom, curriculum, and policy or school management levels.

The problem of cultural difference and change was much more acute for the Hawaiians of the early nineteenth century than those of the late twentieth; the persistence of the problems—and thus of the Hawaiian way of thinking—is all the more remarkable. When people change a world view, “something is lost by adopting the new system—not just the innocence of childhood, but also a way of understanding certain things” (Baron 1988: 88; also, 87). Andrews himself recognized cultural unfamiliarity as an educational problem: native teachers were ineffective because “that which they had learned themselves was all new to them, and its connection and relation to any of the affairs of life were not at all apparent.” Cultural unfamiliarity can weaken such basic mental processes as memory (Cole and Scribner 1974: 139), and understanding is hindered when the student cannot readily form a clear and strong image of the subject to be learned.

Hawaiians in the nineteenth century, just like their descendants in the twentieth, found it easier to learn when the form of instruction was nearer to the classical ones to which they were accustomed. For instance, “Oral instruction is better understood…” (Andrews 1834a: 166). The Hawaiians who increased their store of knowledge and learned better the new Western way of
thinking were those who returned for further direct schooling from a missionary teacher (157) or who had frequent contact with missionaries (160; also 161):

Now it is known that there is a direct address made to the people at every station, at least three times a week, by one of the missionaries; besides something done more or less in direct teaching; and to this should be added, and by no means least, the direct and frequent personal interviews that take place between the chiefs and other more intelligent people on the one part, and the missionaries on the other. These conversations are frequently of the most interesting kind on a variety of subjects; and in them, perhaps, a missionary conveys in a single hour more information than ever the people could get from native teachers, for these have it not to give.

Andrews emphasizes the content of the conversation, but its oral form is clearly crucial. Significantly the keep project demonstrated the advantages of oral instruction for Hawaiian children and designed classroom techniques to use as much as feasible the cultural forms of communication familiar to the students.46

Andrews’ problem as an educator was, therefore, to find the best means of changing the Hawaiians’ way of thinking, that is, of training them in the Western way: “It will be a vast work to get this people to be a thinking people” (November 15, 1833: 2):

the great point to be gained is to give the people mental improvement; not merely knowledge, but the ability to employ knowledge to some practical purpose—in other words, to teach them to think, and to think to some end.

Here is the labor, to wake up the almost inert mass of mind, and excite it to action—to rouse the dormant energies of the people that have slumbered for ages—to teach them their own resources, mental, moral, and physical. (1834a:162)

[at the high school] The course of instruction should speedily
embrace every branch of learning or literature calculated to call into action every faculty of the human mind. There will be no want of students, nor want of ability in students, except the influence of hollow minded ignorance. (164)

Again at this point in his career, Andrews seems unacquainted with important elements of Hawaiian culture, such as the great and continuing place of sports, a position complicated by the fact that the mission was opposed to many of its traditional forms. To achieve the goal of education on “minds undisciplined or but partially so,” Andrews asked:

what the great or principal studies of the school should be in order to discipline the mind? Should they be Languages or Mathematics or both? . . . 1rst. The minds of the scholars are not so well, or so naturally adapted to mathematical studies as to some others. 2ndly. It appears that the islanders have at present very little or no use for mathematics beyond common Arithmetick & Navigation. 3rdly Though mathematics tends to discipline and strengthen the minds, it is more of a specific discipline than a general one; adapted to a particular business rather than the common occupations of life. I speak here only of their influence comparatively.

But on the other hand, my experience in past years in America has led me to the following conclusion respecting the study of languages. That when rightly and thoroughly conducted, the study of the ancient languages tends to improve & discipline the mind equally with mathematics, and in addition, leaves the mind much better prepared to engage in other studies—to investigate moral truths and better fitted for the active duties of life.48

Andrews was following his “taste for literature” (December 21, 1836: 3), which influenced his selection as well: “My books were principally classical & theological” (5). He was also returning to the roots of the Western tradition in the Bible and the classics,
the schooling in which formed the basis of the Western educational system itself:

the Bible ought to be a standard, classic—text-book in the business of education—that it ought to be read in the original where it can be.49

Training in Greek and Hebrew would also prepare the Hawaiian students to provide a more adequate translation of the Bible (Andrews November 15, 1833: 4; October 1, 1834: 41). Since Hebrew materials were lacking, Andrews began an experimental class in Greek with twelve students and was gratified that it was succeeding “As a means of intellectual improvement and mental discipline, independant [sic] of the knowledge obtained. . . .”50

Andrews also began a comparative study of Hawaiian:

An attempt also was made to direct a class in the study of the Grammar of their own language on the inductive method and some progress was made. This was found useful in various respects; the mental discipline was considerable, but the want of technical terms rendered the study difficult as well as the total dissimilarity of the language itself with any civilized language. (October 1, 1834: 27; 1835: 141)

The two studies Hawaiian Grammar & Greek Grammar at the same time have had a mutual influence on each other very beneficial, though there is scarcely anything common to them both. (October 1, 1834: 42)

Andrews was soon “trying to write something like a comparative view of the two languages English & Hawaiian”51 and went on to do important work in Hawaiian language and literature.

Besides reflecting the higher educational standards of his time, Andrews’ ambitious program testifies to his regard for his students’ capabilities: “It is perfectly demonstrable that they can learn the dead languages” (Andrews October 1, 1834: 41).
Indeed, the later Kepelino, besides being a great stylist in Hawaiian, learned Greek, Latin, English, and French (Kepelino 1932: 5 [Beckwith]). An educational emphasis on language and literature was certainly compatible with classical Hawaiian culture and education.

Hawaiians were proud of their accomplishments in Western education, but their schooling involved also negative experiences that affected their emotions, lowered their morale, and hindered learning. Problems with education were added to the more general ones faced by Hawaiians at the time: massive culture change with its resulting stress, anxiety, depopulation, apprehension about sovereignty, and so on. A number of these general problems had a direct bearing on education.

The most general was the depreciation of Hawaiian culture as opposed to Western in the great process of culture change. The *au hou* ‘new age’ was described as *naʻauao* ‘enlightened’ in opposition to the *au kahiko* ‘olden times’, which were *naʻaupō* ‘benighted’. Many prominent and ordinary Hawaiians wrote in support of this view, which became the conventional one in discourse. Malo continued to use its rhetoric even when it was inappropriate to his point. The concentration on Western subjects in the schools supported the depreciation of traditional learning. This constant attack on Hawaiian culture—if only in the form of condescension—harmed morale and was the beginning of the embarrassment and shame some Hawaiians still feel for their own culture. For instance, Hawaiians began to consider their stories “foolishness” and to decline to tell them to foreigners. Hawaiian traditions began to be validated by comparing or equating them with Western. Similarly foreigners would be called upon to testify to an extraordinary event, as if the readers would not believe Hawaiians. However, although Westernization seemed triumphant, Hawaiians preserved important areas of continuity with their past, and resentments were building:
But let the tide of popular favor turn against us, and we believe thousands would eagerly return to their lying vanities; and here would stand up an exceeding great army to avenge the destruction of their fallen gods!55

Western education was an important means of establishing this view and the new ways:

the school has the same transforming influence on the manners and habits, that education has in all countries. (Andrews 1835:147)

[the best educated Hawaiians have] the same relation to the mass of common people that Sophomores in colleges do to the mass of people in the United States both in point of knowledge gained & also of mental improvement. (Andrews October 1, 1834:59 f.)

The schools played a key role also in the fundamental change of world view undergone by the Hawaiians. Over the millennia, Hawaiians had developed a world view in which all the elements they observed were placed and in which they were expert. That view had now to be recognized as inadequate and replaced with a foreign one with which they were unfamiliar. Emblematic of this change is the adoption of Western time reckoning. Learning to count the days was one of the first things a Hawaiian child learned in the classical system (chapter IV). Learning a new calendar put even the most knowledgeable Hawaiian in the position of a beginner. Moreover, a knowledge of intellectual context is crucial for learning; unfamiliarity with the new world view made the learning of all new materials more difficult because their function, purpose, and importance were not immediately clear. Replacing a world view is one of the greatest causes of culture shock and its resultant anxiety. Many Hawaiians must have felt overwhelmed by the new perceptions and information they needed to assimilate (compare Bruner 1986:46 f.). Finally, the new world view
demanded a different emotion about the universe: rather than being the beautiful and ultimate framework of life, the universe was secondary to the creator God and through sin had become fallen Nature (Charlot 1986: 447 f.).

Classical Hawaiian education had established ceremonies that clearly designated a person as an expert. Western education also had graduations and positions, such as that of a teacher. However, because of the connection of religion and civilization, church membership became an important recognition of one’s assimilation of Christianity and Western culture. The missionaries’ reluctance to admit Hawaiians as church members and even tardier appointment of Hawaiians to positions of leadership was, therefore, discouraging. Part of the problem was intellectual. The missionaries wanted the Hawaiians to reach an authentic understanding of Christianity and expected that they could do so. This included a comprehension of such teachings as transubstantiation (Bingham 1981: 252 f.) and a strict Calvinism. The critic of the mission, Stephen Reynolds, reported an early sermon by C. S. Stewart:

Said we must abandon our worldly pursuits to be able to attend to things in the world to come—but let us do all we could, it would avail us nothing!! that there are great numbers of Righteous people, in the world, who do not sin!!

The missionaries in Hawai‘i as elsewhere found that they had to simplify their Christian preaching and make it more dependent on clear duties and rewards and punishments. But they never advanced to the notion of a need for an authentic native theology (Hutchison 1987: 122), and their emphasis on sin was perhaps too effective on a people suffering from problems of morale. Dibble writes (1839: 264):

Especially did they [the missionaries] insist on the sin and danger of rejecting an offered Saviour. The hearts of the people were
tender; and under such truths as I have named, the house of worship was often a scene of sighing and of weeping.

The missionaries did not, however, trust such shows of emotion. Hawaiians might seem to be Christian (Richards, Andrews, Spaulding, and Chapin 1833:263):

But they are ignorant, even of some important doctrines of the Bible; manifest great ignorance of their own hearts; no strong feelings of self-loathing; low views of the character of God; do not cling to the Savior with those strong feelings of endearment that are manifested by converts among you; and frequently we discover traces of some of their former heathenish views and feel- ings.

Such remarks and the attitudes that accompanied them must have been deeply wounding to Hawaiians. In fact, the early proselytes were often perplexed as to the means of convincing the missionaries of their good intentions. As seen above, many would observe which testimonies convinced a missionary and then memorize it for their own use. For the Hawaiians, this meant learning the correct lesson well; for the missionaries, it meant that they were not speaking from the heart. This and other difficulties are the early provocations to the eventual founding of independent Hawaiian-Christian churches. Hawaiians were already beginning to form loose associations more or less their own and to develop their own approach to Scripture interpretation, “that mystical construction on the language of Scripture which they are now too prone to do.”

More particular political problems could be related to the schools. Many Hawaiians were worried by the appointment of a growing number of foreigners to government office. This culmi-nated in 1845 in a widespread and articulate protest movement, one of the members of which was David Malo. The king and the
government defended themselves in wounding terms with the argument that the expertise of the foreigners was necessary for the proper conduct of affairs. In the view of Hawai’i’s rulers, therefore, over twenty years of Western education had not yet produced Hawaiians capable of assuming such positions. In the same year, a missionary stated that “no Hawaiian is yet competent to superintend a system of education” (Kuykendall 1947:351). The training of such personnel was in fact one of the purposes of the schools (e.g., Kamakau January 21, 1869).

The problems of the early Hawaiian students in Western schools were, therefore, greater than normal for Western students. They had to learn new materials that needed to be understood in a new mental context or world view. Moreover, they had to learn them through unfamiliar methods of teaching and learning. The classical methods of observation, listening, and memorizing proved of limited use in learning new ways of thinking and problem solving. Conversely I have observed the difficulties of non-Hawaiians in a Hawaiian learning situation: they find it very difficult, for example, not to be allowed to ask questions. I myself find it impossible to learn a language without a book.

Early education was also moved from the family into the new environment of the school with its different customs, for instance, regarding food. This was disruptive of traditional education, the family, and the whole pattern of childhood—especially when children were removed to boarding schools, which caused resentment. Such a change of setting hinders learning through its very unfamiliarity.

Moreover, education at home placed learning and information in a real-life situation, where their relevance was clear. In Western schools, students had the additional intellectual problem of integrating the materials learned into their view of their lives. This problem was true also of higher education. Lorenzo Lyons wrote in 1835:
another obstacle arises from the want of objects in prospect to draw out the latent energies of the pupils & stimulate them on in the acquisition of the knowledge. They do not look forward to the office of ministers, physicians, lawyers, magistrates, or any post of respect, honor, or usefulness, as is the case with pupils in our own country. In the absence of these & similar motives, is it a matter of wonder that they should evince a want of application? The love of knowledge is a sufficient motive for some, but all have not this love.64

This consideration was particularly important because in classical Hawaiian education an important reason to learn a subject was its waiwai ‘value or usefulness’ both to the student and to others. The positive attitude of the teacher towards the students’ capacities is naturally important for successful teaching (Jordan 1981:16). Hawaiian students were able to recognize the attitude of their Hawaiian teachers, but were often confused by that of the Western ones, as seen in the descriptions of Kānepuʻu. Moreover, the missionary teachers, who often appear overworked and exasperated, frequently used pejorative terms of their students, both directly to them and in writing to others.65

An important part of education is learning to master what one has learned, to use it, to be innovative, and to recreate one’s culture (e.g., Bruner 1986:149). This ability was the recognized hallmark of the Hawaiian expert (chapter IV), and in 1816 or 1817, Hawaiians took pleasure in teaching a Radak native less acquainted with Western ways than they were (Barratt 1988:150, 153f.). However, missionary teachers reported that their early students were most often unable to use creatively their acquired Western knowledge. The Hawaiians’ longing for mastery can be perceived in their enthusiasm for those skills they did achieve, such as reading, and for Hawaiian subjects, like history and grammar, when they were introduced into the curriculum—an introduction that was also a validation.66 The pride in Hawaiian
teachers and administrators arose from the same cause. Much the same situation prevails today.

Problems in school affected the student’s very identity and self-image, which are produced in part by education. A fundamental change in education can affect the students’ conception of themselves and their role in life. Most basically, learning problems can lower the students’ self-esteem. Grown men, selected for their intelligence to be the first students at Lahainaluna, had to start at the beginning (Andrews October 1, 1834: 26):

The very title page they considered an insult to their understanding. They said, This is a Helu kamalii, (a child’s arithmetic,) what have we to do with a child’s arithmetic? We are grown men. Give us something for men to learn.

Andrews (October 1, 1834: 33) reports his students exclaiming, “What fools we were!” Images of Hawaiians as unthinking and lazy begin to be recorded, the beginning of a stereotype. Most important, Hawaiian culture inculcated a legitimate pride in one’s accomplishment, a practice that accorded with its positive view of human beings and the cosmos. The missionaries found that Hawaiians had “no strong feelings of self-loathing” and were anxious to abase their stubborn pride.

The factors described above produced stress and anxiety in Hawaiian students, as can be seen in the reminiscences of Kānepu’u. Anxiety hinders learning, which in turn produces further anxiety. The situation became tragic at the Wailuku Seminary:

The boarding-school for native girls was the pride of the place. It was a pleasant sight to watch the little girls spreading the table and eating with plates, knives, forks, and spoons, or neatly dressed and at work in the flower garden, where each pupil had a patch to cultivate, or to see them in the work-room, learning to sew, knit, spin, and plait straw, also to crochet tidies and edging.
The malady prevailing among them, which had created such a panic among the parents and guardians as to endanger the permanence of the institution, was a low, nervous fever. The doctor called it marasmus. Several had died already, and many were sick. It was undoubtedly caused by the great change in their habits of living. Unaccustomed to any restraint, irregularly fed, without mental or physical effort required of them, and spending most of their time in the open air, the change was too great, too sudden to be made safely, and without preparation. It became necessary to allow more hours of unrestrained freedom and exercise.71

The considerable accomplishments of Hawaiians in Western education must be appreciated as a triumph over emotional difficulties as well as intellectual ones.

Hawaiians, once masters of their honored crafts, poets and wits in their own language, gave way to generations discouraged and embarrassed in school systems designed by and for Western culture. (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979:232)

Indeed, many of the same emotional difficulties are faced by Pacific Islands students today.

The intellectual and emotional difficulties produced by the negative view of Hawaiian history and culture resulted in a countermovement. As stated earlier, Hawaiians followed a curve found in other cultures undergoing the process of Westernization: initial enthusiasm for the new is tempered by criticisms arising from experience; these criticisms prompt a revalorization of the traditional culture that inspires efforts at accommodation and synthesis.

Important for this process are the tenacity and quality of the traditional culture: how deeply that culture has formed the people and how high a view they can hold of its achievements. Almost all descriptions of Hawaiians—from those of missionaries withholding church membership to contemporary teachers discussing difficulties in public schools—testify to a cultural continuity that
is astonishingly strong. That Hawaiians have remained Hawaiian despite all obstacles and predictions is a major example of the unsuspected strength of traditional cultures in the modern, industrial, and international world. Indeed, even when Hawaiians desired to Westernize themselves, they found they could not do so to the satisfaction of foreigners. Some Hawaiian Christian churches even invented a ceremony called 'Oki 'Ao'ao ‘Cutting Off the [Hawaiian] Side’ to remove traditional religious feelings and experiences, but they remain an important part of Hawaiian Christianity (Charlot 1986: 445 ff.).

Cultural tenacity—willed or unwilled—resulted in the biculturalism described in this book, a biculturalism that has achieved synthesis only in certain areas. In education, not only have traditional institutions been perpetuated, but also attitudes and teaching methods that make themselves felt in mental and emotional friction. For instance, the child is punished for asking questions at home and for not asking them in school. The tensions are greatest when Hawaiian subjects are taught with Western language, concepts, and teaching methods. One of my Hawaiian students prefers to converse with his elders rather than listen to university lectures that “change my mind around” and alienate him from a Hawaiian way of viewing his culture and himself. Listening to the elders conveys Hawaiian knowledge along with the emotion that makes it convincing and indeed real. The foreign lecture, without the Hawaiian feeling, distorts the information itself.

Most important, the perpetuation of culture preserved an area of mastery and creativity for Hawaiians. This was true also in adapting their traditional culture to the modern world. They were responsible for selecting the cultural elements to be preserved and the ways in which they would be modified. Hawaiians were inescapably the final judges of the value of their modern culture, and the nineteenth-century newspapers are filled with their discussions and disputes. Many of the questions raised are still being debated—notably in discussions of Hawaiian Christianity—but
the recognized, the authorized debaters are the Hawaiians themselves.

The revalorization of Hawaiian culture was accompanied by criticisms of foreigners, many of which continue to be made today. As the first historical foreigner in Hawai‘i, Captain James Cook was taken early as a negative prototype. Kamakau (April 6, 1867) defends himself against charges of smearing Cook by detailing his faults: he was irascible and killed people unjustly, and his men introduced venereal disease into the islands. His attempt to take Kalani‘ōpu‘u hostage was He keu no o ka hookano ‘The very height of arrogance’. If a monument should be built to anyone, it should be to the man who killed Cook, Kalanimanookaho‘owaha. Except for Vancouver, the British who came to Hawai‘i were ke keu o ka poe hana ino ‘the greatest evil-doers’, perpetrators of atrocities; Auwe! Auwe!! Ke Aupuni kaulana i ka poe Karistiano, he auakee nae ka hana ‘Alas! Alas! The Government famous among Christian people, its doings are just dishonest’.

Moreover, foreigners come to Hawai‘i to settle and go into business, rather than returning to their homelands (Kamakau August 26, 1869). Some missionaries did return home, but many have stayed as well as their descendants, who are exploiting Hawai‘i and the Hawaiians in business and becoming high government officials (compare Hutchison 1987:89). Hawaiians become punihaole ‘fascinated and fooled imitators of the foreigners’, who begin to set the tone for life in Hawai‘i: ka! he wa nui keia o na Loio haole akamai, na Lunakanawai Kiekie akamai ‘Bah! this is the great time of the smart foreign Lawyers, the smart High Judges’ (Kamakau May 18, 1868). A plethora of lawyers has not resulted in a peaceful reign in other countries:

O Hawaii nei wale no ke aupuni i maluhia ka noho ana, mai ka makahiki 1797 a hiki mai i ka makahiki 1819, mamuli o ke akamai o Kamehameha I. i ka hoomonopono aupuni ana.

‘This Hawai‘i is the only government whose reign has been peace-
ful from 1797 until 1819 because of the intelligence of Kamehameha I in organizing the government’.

Trouble has arisen from foreignness and sectarianism:

*O ka hoopili haole ana ke kumu o na pilikia mai a Kamehameha III. a me ka pili hoomana a hiki wale i keia manawa.*

‘Imitating the foreigner—along with religious sectarianism—have been the cause of the troubles from the time of Kamehameha III until today’.

Good education and fair and equal government over religion and the schools would bring peaceful independence. Similarly the difficulties in the Society Islands are due to the French. In islands under native rule, the chiefs and people flourish (a reference to depopulation in Hawai‘i).

The defense of Hawaiian history and culture—discussed throughout this book—was undertaken in the context of continuous attacks against them. For instance, James Bicknell (July 3, 1862), starting his ministry in Honolulu, wrote to a Hawaiian-language newspaper to complain that:

in visiting from house to house, I find that the *Hoku o ka Pakipika* is exerting a baneful influence on the morals of the people.

since your aim seems to be to sap the foundation of Bible Christianity, I am bound to oppose you.

the heathenish songs with which the *Hoku o ka Pakipika* is interspersed, have a tendency the very antipodes of civilization. If the people must have poetry, why not give them translations from the poets of christian countries?

It is not by turning the minds of the people back to the obscenities of heathenism, that the Hawaiian nation is to be elevated and enlightened, but by leading them forward to a glorious future.
He gave the editors a month to reform or he would attack them. The letter was translated into Hawaiian along with an untitled editorial reply: Bicknell was ordained to preach the gospel *aole o ke kue i kekahi nupepa maoli* ‘not to oppose some genuine Hawaiian newspaper’; *ua hookumuia keia nupepa e paiia ai na manao o na kanaka maoli, aole no ke kokua ana i kekahi aoao hoomana* ‘this newspaper was founded to publish the opinions of the genuine people/Hawaiians, not to help some religious party’. They want to publish pleasurable pieces along with spiritual ones, and Bicknell should not criticize them, if he disagrees with them. The public should decide

\[i \text{ ka pono a me ka pono ole o keia nupepa. Ua aneane no e pau loa ke kue ana o na misionari mua, eia ka ke ku mai nei he “Daniela hou.”}\]

‘the rightness or lack of it of this newspaper. The opposition of the first missionaries is almost completely over; but now indeed rises a “new Daniel”’.

Like other Pacific Islanders, Hawaiians have been pleased when foreigners showed interest in and respect for their culture (e.g., Kalaiwaa May 29, 1924).

Some pro-Hawaiian arguments were overt. The author of “He Naaupo Atei ka Lahui Hawaii?” argued against accusations made even by learned foreigners that the Hawaiians of old were pagans, cannibals, and abandoned in filth. Such statements start in books and then spread to newspapers; now they are encountered in conversation. The considerable knowledge and learning of the Hawaiians shows they were *na’aauao* ‘enlightened,’ not *na’aupō* ‘benighted.’ They were indeed smarter than Hawaiians today.

Similarities between Hawaiian culture and Christianity were often used in argument. Kamakau (February 2, 1867b) quoted an old prayer and stated that it was not sorcery or devil worship; in
fact, some words from this prayer were used in a Christian one. The pious family said this effective prayer at morning and evening to give life to the king, chiefs, and commoners. The author of “Na Iliili Hanau o Koloa” (February 10, 1911) used Christianity and the power of God to authenticate the belief in the birth-giving pebbles of Kōloa. Malo (July 19, 1837:13 f.; 1837:5 f.) used traditional Hawaiian beliefs and practices as arguments for the existence of God and the soul.

Pro-Hawaiian arguments could also be more or less covert. In one of the most extended discussions of the subject, Paleka (October 11, 1879) wrote as an advocate of Christianization, at least in part because of its material advantages, but sought to discriminate among the elements of the traditional culture. He was positive about Hawaiians themselves:

*he lahui maikai; o ke kiekie no paha keia o na lahui a pau o ka moana Pakipika. He lahui ikaika, he maikai na oiw, he lahui ola.*

‘a good people; this is perhaps the highest of all the peoples of the Pacific ocean. A strong people, the physiques are handsome, a vigorous, healthy people’.

They were not lazy in the old days, but *he ikaika i ka hana* ‘strong in work’. When the heavy work rules imposed by the chiefs were dropped,

*ua haule pu kekahi mau pono i ike ia malalo o kela noho ana ano naaupo. O ka noho ana mikiala ma na hana kino kekahi o ia mau pono . . .*

‘several right things fell with them that were seen under that benighted-type life-style. Energetic living and the bodily practices were some of these right things . . .’

The chiefs made the people work, and indeed a lazy people cannot live. Moreover, *ka malu o ke kino o na poe opio malalo o ka pulama ia o ka wa kahiko, oia kekahi pono oia au naaupo i ike ole*
ia i keia wa ‘the sheltering of the body of the young people under the special protective care of the olden time, this is one of the right things of that benighted period that is not seen in this time’. But such care was important for survival. Paleka saw the Hawaiians of his day as living in a kōwā ‘an intermediate space or time’ between the old and the new, the pagan and the Christian, the traditional and the Western: kahi a ka lahui kanaka e ku nei i keia wa, he kulana ia mawaena o ka malamalama me ka poelele ‘the place where the native people stand in this time; this is a position between the light and the darkness’. Just as at dawn, the light falls on the land but does not yet penetrate into the hollows and valleys. Similarly, many old religious practices are left; aole i naauao loa ka poe e hana ana ia mau hana ‘the people who do these things are not greatly or completely enlightened’. Maloko o keia kowa ka lahui Hawaii e ku nei a e poai nei, mawaena o ka pono kahiko a me ka pono hou ‘In this intermediate space, the Hawaiian people is standing and going in circles between the old rightness and the new rightness’. Will they continue doing this until they disappear—like people swimming in circles till they drown—or will they move forward to a new position, ke kulana hou? The remainders of old practices do not form a kahua ‘foundation’ to which the people can return:

O ka pono no ka lahui i keia wa, oia no ka hookau hakalia ole aku maluna o ke kahua hou i waiho ia mai imua o lakou me ka inoa o ka pono Kristiano. E pau ka poai wale ana, me ka waiwai ole, mawaena o ke ano kahiko a me ke ano hou. E hele imua, e haalele, a e hookuu aku i na koena hana o ke au pegana. E hoohaulike me na lahui naauao o ka honua nei, ma na mea ano nui a pau e pono ai.

‘The rightness for the race in this time is to place itself without hesitation upon the new foundation that has been laid before them in the name of Christian rightness. Let the vain and useless circling end between the old type and the new type. Go forward,
abandon and put aside the remaining activities of the pagan period. Conform to the enlightened peoples of this earth in all the important things to be right.

Hawaiians should imitate the hygiene of the foreigners for their survival. Christianity should be used to construct the government and individual rights; to help body and soul. Traditional religion, dance, 'awa, and medicine—all the practices that harm the body and thinking—should be abandoned for the sake of the next generation. The race will live with faith in the Word of God:

*Aole hiki i ka lahui ke hoi i hope. Ua paa ka puka, ua helelei ke kahua o hope. O ka hele imua ke ola.*

‘The race cannot go back. The opening is closed; [the stones of] the former foundation are scattered. Going forward is life’.

As negative as the above may appear, in the context of the time, Paleka was acknowledging that there were some good aspects of the original culture that needed to be given a Christian covering in the new age.

Such views and arguments were important in discussions of education. The author of “E A'ō Pono i na Keiki” (September 21, 1922), who discusses positive aspects of traditional Hawaiian culture, finds that some foreign subjects taught in the schools are *kulike ole* ‘inappropriate’ for Hawai‘i and Hawaiians; they are too harsh, rough, and cold for *ka ohaoha a pumehana o ke aloha* ‘the friendliness and warmth of aloha’. Hawaiian children are being taught foreign but not Hawaiian ways and becoming arrogant. Whites and Japanese in Hawai‘i follow their own ways, use their own adornments, practice their own recreations, and speak their own language in their own assemblies. They do not adopt Hawaiian ways because Hawaiians have not made them clear. If foreigners understood Hawaiian ways, they would adopt some without abandoning their own. In the same way, Hawaiians should adopt
some of the rules of other peoples without abandoning their own.

The debate about culture was ultimately one about Hawaiian character. The focus of the debate, the source of evidence on the question, was predominantly history. This was largely because of the Hawaiian practice of continuing to discuss a question within the context in which it had originally been raised. The first published account of Hawaiian history had included a short summary of Hawaiian character (Whitney and Richards 1832:159 f.), and Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians continued to link the subject to their historical discussions. Moreover, both Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians had a moralizing view of history; judgement of historical events included that of the people involved in them. The discussion of Hawaiian history itself was strongly influenced by its division into a benighted and an enlightened period, and Dibble and others stressed the negative character of the former. In this context, the revalorization of Hawaiian history, discussed in chapter V, was also one of Hawaiian character: history would be pursued in order to instruct posterity in the achievements of the past.

Hawaiian writers were frank about the many problems of classical Hawaiian society and about the bad deeds of the past. Moralizing involved bad examples as well as good. But when Hawaiians looked into their past, they could see that they were a remarkably interesting people: practical, energetic, passionate, innovative, artistic, and literary. They could see also that their culture had inculcated a deep moral concern in all ranks, a concern that influenced family, community, and government. The teachings of morality had indeed been internalized and had created a cultural personality that was deeply impressive.

Despite their criticisms, Whitney and Richards provided a positive description of Hawaiians, referring to one of the highest ideals of Hawaiian culture (1832:159 f.):
He lahui kanaka oluolu ko Hawai‘i nei. Ua lokomaikai i na mali-hini.

‘Hawai‘i’s is a gracious native race. They treat newcomers with inner goodness’.

Kepelino clearly had this text in mind in his lapidary statement (1932:141):

A o ka loina nui o na ‘lii Hawai‘i nei, o ka haahaa o ka oluolu, ke aloha a me ka lokomaikai

‘The great law of the chiefs of our Hawai‘i was lowliness, amenity, welcoming affection, and inner goodness’.

In his formulation, Kepelino used the word that was basic to the Hawaiian discussion of Hawaiian character: Hawaiians distinguished themselves from foreigners primarily through their aloha. Kamakau begins a long discussion of Hawaiian character with the statement that they were he lahui hoolohe ‘a heeding people’: they obeyed their chiefs more fully than is found in Christian nations. Other peoples are huhu koke ‘quick to anger’ and cannot be controlled by their superiors. Here in Hawai‘i, foreigners are heard swearing and using bad words, a more serious practice in Hawaiian culture than in Western. Not just among na haole hoomaloka ‘the godless foreigners’ is seen

ke ano huhu o ka lahui haole keokeo, o ka poe no kekahi i kapaia he poe kahunapule a he poe misionari, a he poe hoomauhala loa lakou me ka huu . . .

‘the angry character of the white foreign race; some of them are indeed the people called ministers and missionaries; they are a people constantly holding grudges with anger . . .’

Some missionaries—he poe lili ino loa ‘a people very greatly
angry’—have even been guilty of physical violence against Hawaiians. Hawaiians compare well:

> O ke aupuni o Hawaii nei, he aupuni aloha alii, he aloha ka leo i ka pane mai, he aloha ka olelo, he aloha ke kamailio pu ana . . .

> ‘The nation of Hawai‘i here is a nation that loves its chiefs; the voice is loving in responding, speech is loving, conversation together is loving . . .’

The kings and chiefs have *aloha* for the commoners and all the people, as seen in the example of Kamehameha I. This behavior is not for material gain, *aka, no ke aloha oiaio maoli* ‘but because of true, genuine/native love’; *ke aloha kamaaina o ka aina* ‘the native-born, well-known *aloha* of this land’. The many foreigners living now in Hawai‘i hamper this *aloha*, this generosity and caring. Some newcomers even think that this *aloha* is benighted and foolish because it is not selfish and commercial:

> I keia wa, ua aneane e pau a e nalowale ke aloha oiaio o ka lahuikanaka Hawaii, no ka lilo loa o ka poe opiopio i ka hoomahu-i mahope o ke ao ana a na haole, a me ka lakou mau kumu nana i ao.

> ‘In this time, the true *aloha* of the Hawaiian race has almost ended and disappeared because the young people have gone over entirely to mimicking [the foreigners] because of the teaching of the *haole* and the teachers who have instructed them’.

But Hawai‘i has no beggars as other countries do. Hawaiians invite travelers into their homes and adopt their relatives’ children; *o ke noi ka loaa* ‘to request is to obtain’. But now people are being taught foreign ways: to be selfish, hard, commercial, and legalistic.

*Aloha* became a topic for historical research. The author of “No ke aloha” asks whether the people of old Hawai‘i indeed had *aloha*. Aloha can be found in the genealogies and the many
stories of love; *E! kahiko maoli no ke aloha i Hawaii nei* ‘So! aloha is truly ancient here in Hawai‘i’. *Aloha* is found in the chants of the chiefs from the time of Kamehameha I: *malaila kakou e hoomaopopo ai i ka nui o ko lakou aloha, a me ka oiaio hoi o ke aloha ana* ‘in them we realize the greatness of their aloha along with the truth of the practice of aloha’.

*Aloha* has been very widely accepted by Hawaiians as the characteristic that distinguishes them from all other peoples. The influential minister Akaiko Akana discussed in 1918 what should be learned from the different races and concluded (1992:12): “from the Hawaiians:—‘aloha’—tenderness, hospitality and love of the beautiful.”

In the context of education, *aloha* is the most basic motive of the great search and the best response to the beauty it discovers. True *aloha* demands that one learns as much as one can about the object of one’s love; in the words of Kanuha (March 17, 1866), Hawaiians are *ka lāhui kueka‘a o ke aloha* ‘the people who do research out of love’. *Aloha* is also the final wisdom of that search: *Hana no‘eau ke aloha* ‘Love is an act of wisdom’.

Most important, true to its nature, *aloha* should be shared. Hawaiians have a role in God’s plan (Kamakau August 25, 1866):

> a e kapa pono ia mai ko kakou lahui i ka manawa kahiko he pegana he lahui naauao, a he lahui i hoohanau ia mai e ke Akua.

‘and our people of the old period, a pagan one, was rightly called a wise people and a people that God caused to be born’.

Similarly Akana writes (1992:10):

> We would not have been created if the Almighty had not had a definite purpose to be worked out through and by us for an expression of His universal good.

However much Hawaiians have learned from the West, they still have their culture to teach the world.
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12. Andrews July 1, 1833: 12; also, October 1, 1834: 53 f.

13. Andrews 1836: 17 f. On learning Hawaiian and the frustrations of being unable to communicate, see, e.g., Martin, Lyman, Bond, and Damon 1979: 29 f., 32, 37 f., 41, 44, 196; 133, missionary children were forbidden to learn Hawaiian; Zwiep 1991: 200 f. Schütz 1976: 84, on the linguistic limitations of the missionaries. Kaninau December 5, 1868, says that Andrews was a better translator than speaker with foreign officials: aole hiki ia ia ke olelo mai, no ka mea, ma ka unuhi palapala wale no kona makaukau ‘he was not able to talk because in translating documents alone was his readiness; his capacity in Hawaiian is not mentioned.


20. Bingham 1981: 153. Andrews 1974: 1, writing the dictionary involved “a thorough examination of every word, either by consulting intelligent Natives or by examining the usus loquendi from such manuscripts as could be obtained, or from books . . . ”; 2, he studied printed and written texts, “giving the preference in all cases to such as were written by Chiefs to other Chiefs, and such as were written by one intelligent Hawaiian to another”; “The Author has ever sought after the best and purest Hawaiian he could obtain”; indecent words were omitted. Compare the method described by W. Richards in translating the Bible, Missionary Letters, Volume 2, n.d.: 723a, cited above.

22. Bingham 1981: 482, describes blind Bartimaeus as “a distinguished master of his mother tongue.” Andrews 1836, 21, the preservation of language is important for that of the nation and the people. The now depreciated articles on Hawaiian and Polynesian languages by the intellectual John Rae September 27, 1862; October 4, 24, 1862, aroused respect for Hawaiian as an ancient language and were used in arguments for the antiquity of Hawaiian culture. Curriculum: e.g., “Miscellaneous” 1838: 428 ff., the study of Hawaiian by the Principal [Andrews] and the advanced students at Lahainaluna has resulted in compositions, some of which have been published in _Ke Kumu Hawaii_, and in Andrews’ scholarly “Peculiarities of the Hawaiian Language” 1838. Much material on language study has been gathered by Schütz 1994. Similarly, foreigners were attracted to Náhuatl, and chairs in the language were established at Mexican seminaries and universities even before chairs in Spanish language and literature, León-Portilla 1988: 28, 46, 54 ff.


27. Dibble 1839: 148; n.d.: 2091, “A worthy member of the church, named Bartimea, after hearing him give a relation of his feelings, advised him not to communicate the exercises of his mind, lest all the people should commit his narration to memory & flock about the missionary to tell it as their own experience.”

28. “Sandwich Islands” 1825: 142. See also Andrews October 1, 1834: 32.

29. Andrews 1834a: 158. “Letter from Mssrs. Clark and Emerson, Dated Dec. 3, 1832” 1833: 366, “The practice of learning by rote has been, in some measure, discontinued, and the good effects appear in a manifest improvement in the art of reading. Very few, however, who are put down as readers, are able to read with propriety and fluency.” C. R. Bishop 1880: 6, “Many of the schools still retain the mechanical style of reading, and the monotonous drawl, which is one of the unfortunate results of the old method of circuit by word or syllable, and concert reading.” However, R. Armstrong 1853: 57, mentions “the ease and elegance, with which the children learn to read their own language.”


31. For example, Richards, Andrews, Spaulding, and Chapin 1833: 268,
“Having never been accustomed to gaining knowledge from books, they fail of understanding them, as they would the language of common conversation.” Andrews 1835:139, “so much pains were necessary to make them get ideas by reading, that much of the religious influence that might have been expected was lost.” C. R. Bishop 1882:11, “In a few of these schools, however, the memorizing process still lingers. The pupil must recite the exact text, no attention whatever being paid to the thought which the words express. This pernicious practice fixes the attention on words rather than thoughts. The words memorized are soon forgotten, and the thought expressed in them often never obtained”; 1890:24. Gibson 1884:10; 1886:12 f. Grimshaw 1989:160.

32. Andrews 1834a:166. “Mission to the Sandwich Islands” 1833:455. “One of the missionaries relates this curious fact, that teachers had ingenuously expressed their surprise on hearing that words had the same meaning in books, which they had when spoken from the lips.”

33. Andrews 1834a:167. See also Andrews July 1, 1833:12 f. (Thurston).

34. Richards, Andrews, Spaulding, and Chapin 1833:261; 268, students need books with subjects that are easily understood. “Mission to the Sandwich Islands” 1833:456, people should be questioned about the meaning of sermons; 456, the verse-a-day method.


36. Andrews October 1, 1834:22 f.; also 1835:140.

37. Andrews 1834a:165. See also Andrews June 13, 1832:25 f., “their knowledge moreover is mere knowledge with little or no mental improvement”; October 1, 1834:63, “grown up without any mental discipline.” Compare “No ka pono o ka imi ana” March 28, 1834.

38. Andrews 1834a:163f. I had a similar experience in the late 1970s with the Hawaiian religious teacher, Kalāhikiola Nāli‘i‘elua. He was an expert teacher in his own mode, but when he was asked to teach a beginning Hawaiian-language class out of a book, he did not venture beyond the first lesson, which was the only one he had experienced with a trained teacher. I believe his own experience of Western schooling was too limited for him to feel he could attempt the second lesson without further instructions. Similarly, when we co-taught a college class, he felt at first that he had to confine his lecturing to a close reading of the assigned texts.

40. Andrews October 1, 1834: 33; 1835: 141, 143 (“The study of this work has done more than all our other books in teaching the scholars to think”). Mental arithmetic continued to be taught, R. Armstrong 1858: 9. Andrews is probably using the book on the subject published in 1833, Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 84; his students are referring to the arithmetic book for children, first published in 1832, number 74.


42. Burke 1993: 7 f.; also 60, “their abstract perfection is their practical defect”; 61 f.

43. For example, Dibble 1839: 141, describes “a discussion, whether it was pono—right, or hewa—wrong, for parents to give away their children.” He is surprised “that the prominent idea of right with them was merely convenience,” thereby showing his incomprehension of the practical dimension of that word. He himself senses that he is understanding pono from the English gloss: “I cannot believe that they pronounced the practice pono in our sense of the word right, but merely in the sense of convenience.” He also cannot understand or at least approve of the practice of hānai ‘adoption’.


45. Andrews 1834a: 159. Compare R. Armstrong 1854: 6. Andrews may have tried to introduce the study of Greek because he felt the culture of the classical world was in many respects similar to the Hawaiian. He writes November 15, 1833: 5, “I fully believe that a class might be taught to read & understand the Greek Testament much sooner than they could to read & understand the English Testament.” To this he adds the note, “I think I may safely add the Hawaiian Testament especially if much stress is laid upon understanding it.”


47. For example, Clark 1838: 339, schools have “accomplished much good by turning the people from their sports, their pastimes, and their vices to the palapala.”

48. Andrews November 15, 1833: 3 f.; also 1834b: 170.

49. Andrews November 15, 1833: 4; also, October 1, 1834: 56.

50. Andrews October 1, 1834: 41; see also November 15, 1833: 5 f.; 1834b: 170; 1835: 145, 147. “No ka pono o ka imi ana” March 28, 1834. Clark 1838: 344, later reported:
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time on the part of the teacher, and the paramount importance of other

studies.

51. Andrews December 21, 1836:19; also 1835:143, 145.

52. For example, Bingham 1981:359, the opinion of Kamehameha III;
also L. F. Judd 1928:116, “What was esteemed in ancient times, is of little value
compared with what we know now.” “No ke kapu kahiko a me ke kapu hou”
December 5, 1834, the old kapus are bad, but the new ones connected to Chris-
tianity and the written laws are good. “Ka oihan a a ka poe i malama i ka pono
a me ka poe malama ole i ka pono” May 2, 1834, even some church members
are wandering in the wilderness, listening to people possessed with evil spirits,
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part of missionary writings, e.g., A. Bishop 1838:271, 274, 282, 284 ff. For the
similar case of Mexico, see Knight 1986:500–503, 522, 524: modernizers used
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entific, and capitalist state based on the Puritan work ethic of the United States
and Western Europe; they underestimated the tenacity of the people’s customs
and beliefs.

53. In combating modern disbelief in the existence of God and in a
future judgement, Malo asserts that even the ignorant people of old were not
atheists; he continues however to equate bad beliefs with the old ways, Malo
August 2, 1837:19 f.; 1837: 5 f., 12 f., 20, 25, 30 f. Similarly, at a 1994 meeting of
Hawaiian-Christian ministers, some used pejorative terms even when trying
to speak positively of Hawaiian culture.

54. Wilkes 1845:186. See also, e.g., Zwiep 1991:95, 124 f., 167, 179 f. Much
of the secretiveness of Hawaiians about their culture originates, I would argue,
in this period and should not be projected into earlier times. Parallels can be
found in other countries. For the Cherokee, see McLoughlin 1986:348 f., 354,
360 ff.

55. “Sandwich Islands. Extracts from a Letter of Messrs. Green and
Dibble, dated at Hilo, Oct. 4th, 1831” 1832:219. A. Bishop 1838:284, reported
that there was “no open opposition”; “pure, unmixed heathenism is no where
to be found, not even in the lowest grades.”

Hutchison 1987:80 f., 86–89. Kuykendall 1947:339, the first Hawaiian minister
was ordained in 1849.
57. Bingham 1839:210, used Hawaiian poetry to demonstrate that Hawaiians could understand Christianity; 1981:102, 400. On the theological issues involved, see Charlot 1986.

58. King 1989:68; see also 78, 102, 188. Blackburn 1808:39, felt that the previous preaching to the Native Americans had been too intellectual and dogmatic.


60. Hawaiians could read the negative comments published about them. C. C. Armstrong 1831–1838:21 (June 29, 1834), “It is dangerous to have any thing published that is unfavorable to the foreign residents here, or to the natives, because it is used to injure the progress of Christ’s cause.” McLoughlin 1986:377, the Cherokee read published accounts by missionaries and did not like them.


64. Missionary Letters, Volume 7, n.d.:2174 f. “Papa Inoa o ke Kula Nui o Lahainaluna” May 19, 1858, indicates however that most of the graduates of Lahainaluna were well employed. “He Mea Hoolaha Ike” December 26, 1834, suggested the hiring out of Lahainaluna students and perhaps teachers to earn support.

65. Directly: Andrews 1835:137, tells the students that “if their house fell down, they would suffer a loss, as well as the ridicule of the ignorant.” Writing: Tinker 1830–1831: entry for July 20, 1831, “Eight of the Islanders delivered o- rations which they had written & committed to memory. Gov. Adams came on the stage—forgot his piece, & was extremely awkward [sic] and ludicrous in his appearance.” Richards, Andrews, Spaulding, and Chapin 1833:264 f., a Hawaiian wants to learn English, “but our past experience had taught us to consider the task of learning English a hopeless one for the natives of these islands, until they have lexicons or some more facilities than they now have. We know of only two individuals who have made any considerable progress, and they have had foreigners for their associates.” Andrews 1835:140, “This was a good specimen of Hawaiian carelessness.” Dibble n.d.: 2090 f. Missionary Letters, Volume 7, n.d.:2081. Overwork: e.g., Dibble 1839:265 f. There are reports of the happy relations of missionaries with Hawaiian children, e.g., Missionary Letters, Volume 4, n.d.:1183.

66. Similarly, the invention of the Cherokee writing system helped morale, McLoughlin 1986:350.
67. Kelsey 1926: 5. Kamakau February 28, 1838: 79 ff., proposes that Hawaiian teachers meet together once a year *e like me ka poe misionari* 'like the missionaries'; he is taking a leadership role and seeking to establish a Hawaiian group separate from that of the foreign teachers.


72. For example, Kalapauahiole November 7, 1838. See also the discussion of historiography in chapter V.

73. "He Naaupo Atei ka Lahui Hawaii?" January 31, 1898. Hale'ole April 24, 1865, also refutes accusations of cannibalism in the graduation ceremony for *lua* and in reports that Cook's entrails were eaten; the lack of cannibalism was a reason for the great development of agriculture in previous generations.


76. Kamakau August 26, 1869. The missionaries were aware of the problem of the bad example furnished by foreigners, e.g., Dibble 1839: 33 f. For the Native Americans, see Blackburn 1808: 39, 418.

APPENDIX I

Recent Studies Relating to Hawaiian and Polynesian Education

A NUMBER OF RECENT STUDIES are useful for the subject of this book and demonstrate the continuity of several aspects of classical and traditional education. James and Jane Ritchie are especially sensitive and capable, for instance, in their assessment of the interaction of cooperation and competition.¹

My research and experience diverge, however, in several points from the views expressed in recent studies of contemporary Hawaiians and other Polynesians. Some differences may be attributable to historical changes, since I am dealing with an earlier period. For instance, the documentary evidence from the past does not suggest as great a dependence on peers as observed by contemporary researchers; on the contrary, family elders and experts continued to play a major role in the education of the child and adolescent.² The Native Hawaiian Educational Assessment 1993 states (1993: 30):

Hawaiian youth who grow up as independent, “floating” members of multi-household, extended family systems—with little involvement by birth parents—may be at particular risk for social and academic difficulties during adolescence.
The authors advise greater parental intervention even if this may be contrary to the culture (31); “this suggestion might be viewed as interfering with existing cultural patterns” (57). Such parental involvement would not, however, conflict with my description of classical Hawaiian education; the contemporary problem may be a symptom of the modern and harmful degeneration of the culture.

Moreover, recent studies concentrate almost exclusively on informal, even nonverbal education. Little or nothing is said, for instance, about the transmission between generations of family traditions and Hawaiian culture, which I know from personal experience was being practiced in the area of O'ahu that was studied by Gallimore, Tharp, and others. Similarly, little is said about formal education in such institutions as the hālau hula ‘hula academies’ in Hawai'i or the faife'au ‘pastor’ schools in Sāmoa, which were a prominent feature of Samoan life when I was there in the early 1970s.

These institutions address several of the authors’ concerns. For instance, the Ritchies emphasize the need for “a rich environment of verbal understanding and experience.” In Sāmoa, I found this need being satisfied—even for children before the recommended age of adolescence—in a variety of ways, such as public speeches, church services, telling of stories, explaining of proverbs, and eloquent conversation. An emphasis on correct speech and traditional literature was common among the people I met and can be documented by such books for young people as Ma'ia'i (1964) and Mailo (1972). In fact, high school students in the early 1970s could be quite knowledgeable about classical Samoan poetry; each class would compose a chant for important school occasions, and good poets among the students were admired. Students who were especially interested in Samoan literature would interview older chiefs and memorize the chants they gave to them. Similarly, I have been told by New Zealand
Māori that they would listen to speeches at ceremonies and were even required to speak and sing.

The contrast between Polynesian and Western education can, therefore, be overdrawn (Ritchie and Ritchie 1989:125, also 127 f.). The oral transmission of the enormous amount of information accumulated in precontact times—environmental, genealogical, historical, literary, and so on—clearly required a systematic and disciplined effort. Moreover, certain Hawaiian and Polynesian concepts and ideals continue to influence people today, such as the idea of knowledge as prestigious, the power of the word, and the drive for excellence to be displayed in competition.

NOTES


2. See chapter V. Compare Weisner and Gallimore 1977:175 f.


4. Wist 1940:7–12, is a pioneer in emphasizing formal education. Keesing 1947: 47 ff., mentions both formal and informal.

APPENDIX II

The Use of the Hawaiian Language in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries

The wealth of documentary material available in the Hawaiian language constitutes a valuable resource for many fields. Among those materials are precontact works passed down through the oral tradition; materials from the contact period, written down at the time or shortly afterwards; and materials from the different postcontact periods, in some cases reaching up to today.

The flourishing Hawaiian-language literature of the nineteenth and early twentieth century is largely unknown and clearly understudied, due to the fact that few scholars have learned Hawaiian. There is even a general impression of a “decline” of the Hawaiian language during the nineteenth century, which is usually based on the 1935 dissertation of John E. Reinecke (1969) and implies a decrease in the number of speakers and in the social importance of the language. Reinecke argues also for a decline in the quality of Hawaiian. Walch (1967:363 f.), who does not cite Reinecke, writes even more drastically: “The Hawaiian language which developed, grew, and began to flourish in such a short time, died in an almost equally brief period.” Reinecke himself, in an
important statement written shortly before his death, lamented (1987:74):

Because it was the only serious attempt in print, it has been followed too blindly by a lot of people. They did not realize that it was the work of an amateur without linguistic training and advice.

Because of the extraordinary influence of Reinecke’s work, it requires critical examination. Hawaiian language and literature and even linguistics were not the subjects of Reinecke’s book or his areas of expertise, as he clearly states. The few remarks he makes about the Hawaiian language serve merely as historical background for his main topic and are based on the very few documents and interviews he cites. He did not himself know the language and was unread in the literature. For instance, when he writes, “The natives do not appear to have apprehended to any great extent the undermining of their tongue” (46)—an opinion repeated later by others—he is clearly unacquainted with the discussions on language problems in the nineteenth-century Hawaiian-language newspapers and is ignoring the government report on education by Mataio Kekūanāo‘a that he discusses on the same page.¹ That report is in fact a remarkably prescient discussion of language policy and has, as far as I know, no contemporary parallels elsewhere. Moreover, Kekūanāo‘a’s report is only one of many Hawaiian voices on various aspects of the subject. Thirty years earlier, the author of “No ka hiki ana mai o ka malamalama i Hawaii nei” had argued:

{o ka olelo kahiko o keia mau aina aole i pai ia. Auhea oukou e na lii malama aupuni, e ae ana i ka naauao, e ae mai oukou, e pai ae na moo kuauhau kupuna ma ka olelo honua, no ka mea o ka olelo kahiko no ia o keia mau aina, malia paha o pau oukou i ka hala e aku, nalo wale loa ka olelo kumu o Hawaii nei mai ka mole mai. A i ole e pai ia la ea! he hoailona ia no ka na‘lii malama i ka mea kahiko.
The author of “Kumu Olelo Hawaii” (February 1, 1862) is happy to learn that Lorrin Andrews’ dictionary is almost completed (it appeared in 1865); it will provide definitions of words e like me ka na haole ‘like the foreigners’ [books]. The government should support the work and the cost of publication; he nui ka makemake o na haole e ike i ka olelo Hawaii, a pela ho i na kanaka maoli, he makemake e ike i ka olelo Beretania ‘There is much desire among the foreigners to know the Hawaiian language; and in the same way the natives desire to know the British language’. The author of “Kumu Olelo Hawaii” (May 24, 1862) supports the call for government support of the dictionary. More such examples will be given below.

Finally, Reinecke is unaware of the socially competitive character of much Hawaiian expertise. When a Hawaiian states that he is one of only a handful of surviving knowledgeable people, Reinecke takes the claim at face value.

Besides these general points, particular criticisms can and have been made of Reinecke’s positions or those derived from his work. On the crucial point of the decline of the number of Hawaiian speakers, Reinecke has been to a certain extent misunderstood. He states perfectly clearly that in 1893, “some nine-tenths of the pure Hawaiians and six-tenths of the Part-Hawaiians were still literate in the native language” (1969:140 f.). He thinks that all the pure Hawaiians in 1930 spoke Hawaiian—for some that was their only language—and he cannot say how many of the
part-Hawaiians did (38; also 31, 33 f.). The decline he describes is in the proportion of Hawaiian-speakers to the total, multi-ethnic population (49 ff., 141). The Hawaiian population seemed to be declining in absolute numbers, so the language was being “spoken by a dwindling race” (50).

Reinecke’s arguments and conclusions on this point have been convincingly refuted.\(^3\) Unknown to most of his followers, Reinecke himself conceded the point (1987:74):

I have found quite a bit of corroborative evidence for the widespread use and importance of Hawaiian at least through the 1910s. For example, the transcripts of interviews from the Kona Oral History project show how widely Hawaiian was spoken by other nationalities in what was one of the strongholds of Hawaiian. And Larry Kimura found there were some individuals (Natives) no older than I who were more at home in Hawaiian than in Pidgin.

This is true also of a number of older Hawaiians with whom I myself have spoken.

In fact, the evidence for the predominant use of Hawaiian by Hawaiians and the majority of the non-Hawaiian population through the nineteenth century and even into the twentieth century is overwhelming. Besides the evidence cited in arguments against Reinecke, in the materials referred to below, and throughout this book, a host of smaller indications attest to the fact. W. D. Alexander notes by the title of the English manuscript of his “Essay on the best mode of teaching Hawaiian” (1864): “written for the Hawaiian Evangelical Association, but not read before them in English.” He begins his essay with “I need not argue the importance of a knowledge of Hawaiian at this late day, & before this association”.\(^4\) Advertisements for translators can be found in the late nineteenth century.\(^5\) The circulation of Hawaiian-language newspapers was many times larger than English-language ones into the twentieth century.\(^6\) Arguing that more Hawai-
ian-language books and newspapers are needed, Q. (November 17, 1853) complains that they are “hardly to be expected from a government that, professedly native, has its only organ in a language not understood by one in two thousand of its subjects.” The English-language sections of Hawaiian newspapers were more a service than a necessity. In *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, “Our English Column—To our English-Reading Patrons” (July 6, 1865) states that the editors have been so busy “that it has been impossible for them to look after ‘The English Column’”; “But we have not at all relinquished the purpose of having a few paragraphs each week in the good old Mother-tongue of so many of us.” The editors of *Nuhou: The Hawaiian News* announce their change from an English-language to a predominantly Hawaiian-language newspaper with an aggressive editorial: they have ended *keia pepa haole* ‘this foreign paper’ in order to ‘raise up a native paper’, *e hoala i pepa kanaka*, which will instruct the *lehulehu* ‘multitudes’ of all the islands. The editors hope that they have shown the foreigners the error of their arrogance, which they based on their own nations, and of their lack of love for the Hawaiian race. Now the editors will turn to the remaining task of explaining to Hawaiians their rights. Henceforth, they will debate in Hawaiian rather than in *na olelo pakake a ka haole* ‘the gibberish languages of the foreigner’.

In my own research starting in the early 1970s, I have been told often by older Hawaiians that Hawaiian was the language commonly used among them. Moreover, they stated that Hawaiian was the common language on plantations early in this century and that it was considered uppity, *ho'okano*, to speak in English. Indeed the first Chinese plantation laborers are reported to have learned Hawaiian, not English. On Maui in 1856, “Cantonese Chinese storekeepers and the Fukienese laborers found it easiest to communicate with each other in the Hawaiian language.” In the early twentieth century, the child Sarah Nākoa needed to be urged to learn English in school and turned to pidgin Japanese when she could not understand the teacher (Nākoa 1979:19). R. C.
Stewart (1990: 157) writes of his childhood between 1913 and 1920: “I spoke Hawaiian at all times at home, but I spoke English at play.” Fred E. Lunt, who attended primary school at Lā‘ie, O‘ahu, from 1902 to 1906, told me that the Hawaiian children spoke Hawaiian at home, pidgin in the schoolyard, and the best English they could in the classroom. The plantation hands spoke pidgin to Lunt’s father, who spoke no Hawaiian, and learned to communicate with the Japanese and Korean workers in a simplified (or perhaps pidgin) version of their own languages. When Lunt returned to Hawai‘i in 1922 to work as a Mormon missionary until 1926, he and his colleagues had to learn Hawaiian as the best means of communicating their message. The use of Hawaiian began, however, to decline toward the end of his mission.

Through the 1920s, Lydia DelaCerna and all the other Hawaiian children she knew spoke Hawaiian with their family at home and English at school, where it was the language of instruction. Her mother and the other parents encouraged their children to learn English in order to do well in school and to speak with *haku hana* ‘work leaders or bosses’ and others. Some parents refused to teach their children Hawaiian for fear that it would hinder their careers. But when Hawaiians gathered, they would usually speak Hawaiian, and when Mrs. DelaCerna visited Honolulu, she would hear people speaking Hawaiian in the street. Martha Beckwith can write as late as the early 1940s (1942: 255):

> written Hawaiian is almost lost to popular usage and probably not more than two per cent of young Hawaiians read and write the language, although all especially in out districts, speak it after a fashion and understand it when spoken.

One reason for the continued use of Hawaiian was that most Hawaiians were uneasy with English and thus—because of the high standards of the Hawaiian ideal of speaking well—were hesitant or reluctant to speak it. English had been introduced to Hawai‘i with Captain Cook and had been amusingly imitated
by Hawaiians then and later. Early visitors report Hawaiians speaking English with varying degrees of fluency, but the majority found learning and pronouncing foreign languages difficult. (The English of the foreigners was itself not always correct [Bingham 1981:103].) This situation continued through the nineteenth century, for instance, with Queen Emma using excellent English and her correspondent Peter Kaeo using faulty (Korn 1976: e.g., xix, xxxii). A poor grasp of English could be found even among educated Hawaiians. L. writes in 1908:

As far as education goes—either general or special—the Hawaiian Minister has little to set over against that of his more favored brother of other lands. He knows nothing of the ancient languages in which the Scriptures were written, which he reads, as a rule, only in the Hawaiian version . . . His knowledge of Theology is meagre, and that of two or three decades ago . . . He reads little or nothing for the sufficient reason that there is nothing to read. Few of them—I refer to the middle aged men—read English with sufficient case [sic: ease] and fluency to enjoy reading, and fewer still are able to enjoy or profit by any professional reading . . . he isn’t a student in our sense of the word.

Moses Nākuina—who was very learned in Hawaiian literature and an excellent translator in both directions between Hawaiian and English—was, nevertheless, insecure about his English. On his 1907 trip to the mainland, he explained (1907: 3):

\[
\text{aole au i hoonaauao ia ma na Kula Kahunapule kiekie, nolaila aole e hiki ia'u ke wehewehe pono i ka olelo a ke Akua ma ka olelo haole, aka, e hiki no ina ma ka olelo Hawaii.}
\]

‘I was not educated in the high ministerial schools, so I cannot explain correctly the word of God in English, but I can indeed if in the Hawaiian language’.

He would be happy to talk in English about the work of the mis-
sion in Hawai‘i. He was glad to have memorized hymns in English because he was not provided with a book. His later talk in English astonishes his audience as would one in Hawaiian by *kekahi haole malihini* ‘some foreign newcomer’ (1907: 9 f.). In Nākuina’s report of his 1909 trip to a meeting on the mainland, he states that he memorized some English-language hymns for the occasion (1909: 3). Nākuina was concerned about the impression the Hawaiian delegates would make with their English. One of them joked about his own bad English, but did well; the delegate who had graduated from the Kamehameha Schools spoke correct English, as did another who spoke often with foreigners. The problem of creating a bad impression with faulty English has continued in such fields as politics up to today (e.g., D. D. Johnson 1991: 97).

Similarly, elderly Hawaiians whom I knew in the 1970s, although they in fact spoke excellent English, always felt *kakanalua* ‘doubtful’ and *hemahema* ‘awkward’ in the language, which made them prefer to communicate in Hawaiian whenever possible. That is, they felt the Hawaiian ideal of language excellence had to be applied to English as well; they were thus embarrassed by and opposed to the use of pidgin English. This sentiment is important, I would argue, for the current discussion of the origins and development of pidgin in Hawai‘i. References to pidgin English are, however, too scattered and too clearly presented as exceptional to support speculations about their being the predominant mode of communication in nineteenth-century Hawai‘i.

An important part of Reinecke’s argument for the decline in use of Hawaiian was that the language was not being adopted by non-Hawaiians: “Except for missionary and Part-Hawaiian families, few foreigners learned Hawaiian fluently and well” (1969: 34) and part-Hawaiians would not have “the same incentives to perpetuate those traditions in carefully chosen Hawaiian” (31). To support his point that foreigners did not learn Hawaiian well, Reinecke writes that traders “mispronounced [the language] most
barbarously if one is to judge by the spelling that they used” (25). One cannot of course do that, especially in view of the complicated history of Hawaiian orthography. Reinecke’s primary point is based on an interview with one person, and Reinecke admits the need for corroboration. Nevertheless as with so many of his views, this position has continued to be maintained.

However, foreigners are reported to have learned Hawaiian at the court of Kamehameha I early in the nineteenth century. ‘Ī‘ī (August 14, 1869) states that Jean Rives learned the language quickly and that foreigners serving the king were me he poe la lakou i hanauia ma keia pae aina ‘like people who had been born in this chain of islands’, which would seem to refer to language as well (January 22, 1870). Foreign courtiers communicated in Hawaiian without, inviting comments about its poor quality. Marin was sufficiently learned in the language to make a large collection of ritual chants. Indeed the missionaries were aided at first by Hawaiian-speaking foreign residents (Barratt 1988:264).

Later in the century, Kekūanāo’a (1864:7) writes that “all native, and most of the foreign born subjects in the Kingdom, can express their ideas clearly [in Hawaiian]”; he states that those who hold Hawaiian to be a “mean and despicable” language are only “those foreigners who have not the ability or disposition to acquire it”; “the foreigner, who pretends to be disgusted with the soft and easily articulated native language, merely, because he cannot speak it, and does not care to exert himself to acquire it” (11). Andrews writes of foreigners who learn Hawaiian “with considerable success, so as to speak, write and transact ordinary business in it”; the difficulty they experience is with the poetic symbolism, and he complains that they ignore the literary productions in Hawaiian newspapers. Examples can be cited of non-Hawaiians who earned a distinguished place in Hawaiian literature—such as Henry M. Whitney and Walter Murray Gibson—and also of foreign scholars in the field, like Abraham Fornander and W. D. Alexander. Hawaiian-language newspapers apparently had a large
non-Hawaiian readership. R. K. Johnson (1976: 58) writes that the editor H. M. Whitney “was equally aware that the haole audience was fluent in Hawaiian and took a sophisticated interest in the native culture.” The editors of Ka Nonanona write (Untitled July 4, 1843: 5):

*He nui na haole i lawe i ka Nonanona, aole hoi ike maopopo lakou i ka olelo Hawaii, a nolaila ua pailia ka olelo a ke aliinui o Amerikahuipuaia ma na olelo elua. O ka pono ole o ka hoohalike ana kekahi; aole maopopo loa keia olelo ma ka olelo Hawaii.*

‘Many foreigners subscribe to Ka Nonanona, even though they do not clearly understand the Hawaiian language; therefore the speech of the president of the United States has been published in both languages. The resemblance may not be correct in part; this speech is not completely clear in the Hawaiian language’.

The translator, apparently an English-speaker, will attempt only the general sense. Into the 1920s and later, Lydia DelaCerna has stated, Hawaiian would be spoken by foreigners who had married Hawaiians and by many whose families had been in Hawai‘i a long time; however, foreigners arriving in Hawai‘i during her youth did not learn Hawaiian unless they were working as missionaries.17

The Hawaiian spoken by foreigners varied in quality, descending even to a broken or pidgin Hawaiian that is now considered important in the history of the development of pidgin English in Hawai‘i.18 As with pidgin English, examples are presented as amusing oddities, which argues against pidgin Hawaiian being a dominant means of communication. More prominent in publications were the foreigners who achieved scholarship in the language and literature and whose work has been used throughout this book and will be discussed below.

Reinecke, however, argues for a general decline in the quality as well as the quantity of Hawaiian spoken. An important basis for judgement would be the quantity and quality of the literature
produced, and on this point Reinecke's ignorance of Hawaiian is a fatal handicap, for the extensive and impressive Hawaiian-language literature of the nineteenth century is a closed book to him. He writes of the language as "almost lacking in literature" (1969:50). Since Reinecke, others have repeated this view. For instance, I heard the novelist O. A. Bushnell state in a television interview that Hawaiian literature collapsed on contact with foreigners. The only nineteenth-century work he could mention was Kalākaua's *The Legends and Myths of Hawaii* (1972), which, he added, was in English and edited and probably written by R. M. Daggett.

Reinecke does write, "There was the prospect of creating a native literature of some promise" (30), based on the Bible and including "legal documents and government papers. But there were also a few works of more substantial worth—e.g., historical accounts, legends and romances," translations, and newspapers. Nonetheless, in these works, "the Hawaiian language was clothing itself with a literature in the Western style." For instance, Hawaiian newspapers "were influenced by English idiom and journalistic style" (29). The main source for this view is John H. Wise, who apparently influenced Reinecke strongly when he interviewed him:

> Literary Hawaiian began rapidly to disappear. John H. Wise told the author in 1933 that "probably I could count on the fingers of my two hands" the Hawaiians who could at that date understand the inner meaning of the old poems. The purity of the Hawaiian language had suffered from the contact with English during the whaling period, but now, reduced in prestige and utility as it was, the language was bound to suffer much more.\(^{19}\)

Reinecke agrees that English was a "destructive influence" on the "poetic and religious special language."\(^{20}\) Kalākaua's nativistic cultural movement "may . . . for a short time have bolstered the prestige of the Hawaiian language," but the overthrow of the court
“was probably the critical blow to the prestige of elevated Hawaiian speech” (36 f.), and classical composers no longer transmitted their knowledge.

Some support for this position can be found. But Reinecke was clearly unacquainted with the important teachers, composers, and hula masters who form our living link to earlier times, although he mentions elsewhere the perpetuation of song composition (142), which depended on symbolism. Indeed Damon writes (1935:456), “Poetry was, and still is, a very living thing among Hawaiians”; a remark still true today. “Literary Hawaiian” should therefore not be identified exclusively with the older compositions any more than literary English should be restricted to pre-twentieth-century works. The highest classical Hawaiian poetry, whether old or new, undoubtedly presents problems of comprehension, some of which are described by the expert Lorrin Andrews; but this is true of most literatures.

Moreover, Reinecke argues that the very integrity of the language was being lost as a result of the influence of Western schools and English (1969:26–30). His remarks on this subject cannot be supported by Hawaiian texts or by modern language theory. For instance, basing himself on an interview with John F. G. Stokes, he writes that “a slight carelessness became evident. Kamakau . . . was careless of his particles” (29). Stokes apparently had an ideal of regularity that cannot fit Hawaiian; the variable use of particles is, if anything, a characteristic of classical style. According to Reinecke, the influence of English on Hawaiian vocabulary and style, with little reciprocal movement (1969:35 f.), diluted the “purity” of the language:

In the long run, however, the native language would have lost prestige and would have lost its purity and its literary quality. (88)

The native Hawaiian language consequently declined in importance, prestige, and purity. (193)
Such a static view of linguistic purity cannot be applied to living languages. Both Hawaiians and foreigners in the nineteenth century had an ideal of language purity, but it did not include an absence of change.\textsuperscript{23}

Language change is, however, an important topic and can be followed through a wealth of foreign and Hawaiian nineteenth-century texts.\textsuperscript{24} Various aspects of the phenomenon are discussed throughout this book, such as the loss of vocabulary and Hawaiian efforts to preserve words (chapter IV). Such vocabulary loss is normal when aspects of a culture are lost or replaced—such as religious teachings, ritual genres, crafts, and customs—along with educational and other institutions (the closing of the Hawaiian-language schools in the late nineteenth century was certainly deleterious, as seen below).

The problem of vocabulary loss is aggravated in an oral culture without means of preserving vocabulary beyond teachers and informants who can transmit words as well as explain them. As seen in chapter IV, Hawaiians recognized this problem and expended a great deal of effort to salvage and understand vocabulary. Hale'ole (April 6, 1865) writes: \textit{he mea pohihihi ka imi ana'ku i ka mole a me ka welau oia huaolelo “Aumakua”‘the search for the taproot and the tip of this word ‘aumakua [‘family god’] is entangled’.} Hale'ole’s reference to the root and the tip of the word designates it in its completeness, but may also include the development of the world from its original meaning to its present use. The sense of the word is clear, but no one now knows the root meaning (my term). The people who \textit{kapa'ku ‘called or coined’} this name died hundreds of generations ago. Referring, I would argue, to the original meanings of key terms, which are still in fact used, Hale'ole writes:

\begin{quote}
\textit{A nolaila o na olelo kumu o keia Lahui, ua aneane e nalo aku, a e lilo ana ke kamailio a me ka olelo o keia manawa a me ka hanauna e hiki mai ana ma ke ano hou.}
\end{quote}
‘Therefore the basic, source words of this Race have almost disappeared, and the conversation and language of this time and of the coming generation are changing into a new type’.

Everyone knows what ‘aumakua means and to what it refers:

_A o ka hooakaka maoli ana i ke ano o kana kumu a welau paha; aole oia hanauna i koe e ola nei e hiki ke hoomaopopo mai i ke ano maopopo oia mea, ke kuhihewa ole au._

‘But probably for the authentic explanation of the character/meaning of its base and tip—this surviving generation now living is not able to clarify the clear meaning of this thing, unless I am mistaken’.

Hawaiian vocabulary was supplemented and occasionally replaced by loan words (chapter IV), also a process that was discussed. On the occasion of the appearance of the newspaper _Ka Nuhou_, Kaimikuokoa (1854:1) explains that the word _nū_ is a loan word from English. The word _hou_ is Hawaiian for _new_. Therefore, to say _nūhou_ is the same as saying _hou hou_ ‘new new’:

_a nolaila he HOU-HOU ka inoa maoli o ia pepa ke unuhia ma ko kakou olelo o Hawaii nei. Aka, aole heva malaila; noa no ka NU a me ka NU HOU aku. Aole kue ia mea i ke kanavai; hiki no i ke kanaka Beritania e mare pu me ka vahine Havaii, a pela no ka huaolelo beritania a me ka huaolelo havaii, hiki no ke mare pu, a ke lilo laua i mea hookahi._

‘therefore _NEW-NEW_ is the real name of this paper when translated into the language of Hawai‘i here. But there is no fault in that; there is indeed no tabu on _nū_ or on _NU HOU_. This does not contravene the law; the British person can marry the Hawaiian woman, and in the same way indeed, the British word and the Hawaiian word can marry and the two can become _one_.’

In an extended discussion of the problems of the Hawai-
ian language in the nineteenth century,\textsuperscript{25} N\textsuperscript{****} emphasizes the importance of language (November 29, 1873):

\begin{quote}
O ka olelo Hawaii, oia ka olelo a keia lahui. O ka olelo a kekahi lahui, oia ke ki e wehe ai a ike lea i ka manao, ka makemake, a me na pono nui o na kanaka a pau oia lahui.
\end{quote}

‘The Hawaiian language is the language of this race. The language of a race is the key to open and to see clearly the thought, the desire, and the great rights/values of all the people of that race’.

Hawaiian is clearer than other languages, the author argues, so it can be learned quickly by people who want to \textit{ike pono i keia olelo} ‘know the language correctly’. The first ancestors, the people who founded the language, spoke it with great correctness and skill, so that the language was \textit{pololei} ‘correct’ and \textit{maʻemaʻe loa} ‘very pure’ at that time. In their desire that it remain so, they laid down the \textit{palena kūpono} ‘proper bounds’ that need to be observed. But now \textit{kekahi hapa nui} ‘a large proportion’ of the race has left the proper bounds laid down by ancestors and have \textit{hoʻolauili} ‘changed and twisted’ the language \textit{me ka hoopili wale mamuli o ke alakai hewa ana a kekahi poe malihini ike ole i ka olelo Hawaii} ‘along with foolish imitation because of the faulty leadership of some newcomers who do not know the Hawaiian language’. Because of constant conversation with such \textit{poʻe hāwāwā} ‘incompetent people’, the Hawaiian language has become \textit{huikau wale, a ano hemahema loa} ‘foolishly mixed and of a very awkward character’. So one must now enquire how the language should be spoken correctly. Good language is like good work, helpful and useful: \textit{pela no ka olelo Hawaii maikai, he mea ia e pono ai ka lahui o Hawaii nei} ‘good Hawaiian language is thus: it is something for the good of the race of our Hawaiʻi’. But Hawaiian is now like a good road that has been littered with rubbish, especially by members of the new generation. One must separate out the bad elements and speak correctly.
Many types of Hawaiian are spoken today, but the author will discuss four main types:

1. *Ka olelo Hawaii maemae maoli.*
2. *Ka olelo Hawaii awilia.*
3. *Ka olelo Hawaii hoopili wale.*
4. *Ka olelo Hawaii hooano e ia.*

‘1. Truly, authentically pure Hawaiian.
2. Hawaiian that has been mixed.
3. Imitative Hawaiian.
4. Hawaiian that has been made strange’.

(1) Pure Hawaiian is from the ancestors and includes *ka hapa nui loa o ka kakou mau huaolelo* ‘the great majority of our words’, which should be correctly used. Pure Hawaiian consists then of correct grammar and a sparing and justified use of loan words.

(2) Mixed Hawaiian contains true Hawaiian words along with words from foreign lands. Thus the languages of two very different peoples are mixed, like a mixture of *poi* made from sweet potato and *poi* made from taro. An example is a sentence that is correct except for the substitution of the loan word *iu* ‘you’. Loan words are used not only where no Hawaiian equivalent is available, which is perfectly proper, but also when unnecessary; for instance *kaea* ‘tired’ is used instead of one of a number of good Hawaiian words. In these examples also, the grammar is correct.

(3) Imitative Hawaiian is derived from foreigners who speak Hawaiian before they have learned it completely (December 6, 1873). Some Hawaiians speak this type when conversing with those foreigners. The author’s examples are of non-idiomatic usage or bad style rather than incorrect or pidgin grammar. One should not say *ku’u maka* ‘my eyes’ because the eyes must be one’s own; *maka* itself is sufficient. Some of these faults are now printed in government school books and are spreading bad Hawaiian.
(4) In Hawaiian that has been made strange:

\[ \text{ua hookahuliia paha na hua, a i ole ia, ua pakui wale ia mai he mau hua olelo ano ole, i mea e nalo ai, a i ole ia, i mea e lealea a i ka poe e kamailio ana.} \]

‘the words have been perhaps turned around; or if not this, some nonsense words have simply been joined to them in order to hide the sense or to amuse the people conversing’.

People become so accustomed to this playful Hawaiian that they lose their ability to use the regular language. This fourth kind of Hawaiian is again not a pidgin, but consists of types of play language. Similarly, the author of “No kahi mau hewa hou a me kahi mau hewa kahiko” (May 9, 1834) complains, \[ \text{ua nui na olelo hou a na kanaka i i mi ai i me[a] hoonalonalo no ka lakou olelo ana; eia ua mau olelo la ‘there are many new languages used by people seeking something to hide their speech; here are those languages’: he includes play languages, \textit{haole} ‘foreign or English; Spanish, Kaua’i (dialect or local words?), sign language (using gestures to spell words), and substituting numbers for letters. The Hawaiian interest in language and desire to manipulate it was clearly appropriating new possibilities.} \]

Much later, the author of “Na Anoai” (July 27, 1922) was making some of the same complaints. White people are now learning and teaching Hawaiian and introducing errors and changes of expression. The old invitation is \“He mai\”, but people are now saying \“Hele mai,\” \textit{ano hou keia \“Come here\”; this is of a new character.} Even slight changes in meanings of expressions cause problems with translations in court. People turn words around, saying \textit{Kalamii} for \textit{Kamalii} and answer good Hawaiian with pidgin, \textit{ka namu pa\’iai}. Similarly, the author of “Kekahi Mau Olelo Hawaii Nauao” (May 18, 1922) complained \textit{e nalowale ana ka nani o ka olelo, a e lilo aku ana i olelo hapa-Hawaii \“the beauty of the language is disappearing and is changing into a half-Hawai-}
ian language’. The children of today speak like foreigners; *Aole hoi o kela olelo pahee, nani, elike me ka‘u i lohe ai i ko‘u mau la kamaiki* ‘It is not that smooth, beautiful language, like the one I heard in my childhood’.

Hawaiians were thus very aware of language change, but the process and the reactions to it were much more complicated than Reinecke describes.

Into the early twentieth century, Hawaiian was clearly being spoken by the majority of the population. Can one say then that its social role was diminishing in other ways? Reinecke makes several generalizations about social, economic, political, and population changes “rapidly weakening the vitality of the native tongue” and displacing it in normal communications.\(^{27}\) The lapidary judgement of Kuykendall—by 1850, “English had long since become the principal medium of business, government, and diplomacy”—has been repeated, often in the same words.\(^{28}\) Some nineteenth-century texts can be cited in general support of this view; for instance Gibson (1886: 4) argues for the extension of English-language instruction with the words:

The English may be said to be the prevailing language of this kingdom, legally and industrially. The decisions of the highest tribunals of the land are in English; the commercial houses keep their books in English; it is the language of the plantation and of the industrial arts generally.

However, important as Gibson’s remarks are, none of these points has been established by a thorough examination of nineteenth-century Hawaiian texts. On the contrary, the modern academic view reflects the bias of those who cannot use such texts and are forced to rely almost exclusively on English-language sources. Moreover, the narrow focus on commerce, government, and diplomacy has reinforced the bias. For instance, many small countries with languages that are little known outside their borders have used a major international language in diplomacy.
This focus with its over-reliance on English-language sources has influenced much of the academic and popular writing on Hawaiian history. The following are just a few points that should be taken into consideration in a comprehensive survey of nineteenth-century language use in Hawaii.

Commerce, especially international trade and importing, would be an appropriate field for the use of English, and a number of nineteenth-century statements insist that that language predominated in the field. Commerce was also concentrated in the few cities, especially Honolulu, Lahaina, and Hilo with their unusually numerous foreigners. Evidence exists, nevertheless, that Hawaiian was used extensively in business. For instance, Kauwahi’s Hawaiian-language law book contains legal and accounting forms that cover the field. Moreover, one of Reinecke’s sources states that Hawaiian was still being used in business at the end of the nineteenth century. The businessman Sanford B. Dole published in Hawaiian literature, and Helen Chapin recalls that non-Hawaiian businessmen of her acquaintance were proud of their knowledge of the language (personal communication). Similarly, “Mana ka Olelo Beretania” (May 23, 1902) protests a new government ruling that doctors need to know English to practice in Hawaii; medical knowledge should suffice.

English was used extensively in government in the nineteenth century, which has prompted a number of generalizations, such as that of W. C. Smith, on whom several writers rely: “English was tending to become the language of communication in governmental affairs.” Because such generalizations are not established by a comprehensive survey, mistakes are made. For instance, Day (1985:167) writes, “By the 1870s, however, English had replaced Hawaiian as the original language of government papers. The Hawaiian versions were translated from English, which was referred to for meaning.” However, Poomaikelani was written in Hawaiian, the English being labeled a translation...
(1884: 1 of English). Earlier documents are clearly referred to as translations: *o ka ka Moi palapala i unuhiia'e ma ka olelo Beretania. A o ua mau palapala la, ua unuhiia e kahi mau Misionari*. . . ‘the King’s documents were translated into the British language. These documents were translated by some missionaries’. The varying English translations of the stable expression *kahu kula* argue for the Hawaiian being the original, not only in language but in concept; the government was still “thinking in Hawaiian.” An exact survey of government documents and their translations is feasible and would provide precise data on the question. My impression is that documents were increasingly but never exclusively or necessarily composed in English until the practice was mandated by the Organic Act of 1900. Reinecke is certainly wrong in stating that the language was “not well adapted to the exact uses of the lawmakers and the courts”; postcontact Hawaiian legal language can be elegant, idiomatic, and precise.

Documents are only one form of governmental communication. Legislative debates and privy council meetings were conducted in both languages with the aid of translators. Political meetings from big to small, newspaper and book publications, campaigns, and political songs continued to be largely in Hawaiian (e.g., D. D. Johnson 1991: 63, 242).

Like so many relevant subjects, the use of English and Hawaiian in government was discussed widely in the newspapers. The author of “The English Language as a Qualification for Office” (July 5, 1862) writes:

>We noticed last week that the Legislature had returned to first principles by proposing that office-holders should be acquainted with the vernacular of the country.

This was done in opposition to those who held that “no candidate for any important court or judicial office should be appointed who is not fully conversant with the English language.” In fact, foreigners were originally appointed to office only until they could
be replaced by Hawaiians, “as soon, and as fast, as they should have acquired sufficient education to qualify them for the same.” But the educational system has failed to achieve this goal:

Now, with the ever increasing demands of civilization upon this people, whether in their foreign or domestic relations, it is self-evident that the acquisition of the English language ought to have formed the ground-work on which that education at least which looked toward preferment, should have rested. Has it been so? Where has the Lahainaluna Seminary landed its graduates? In the District Justices’ Courts, occasionally in the House of Representatives, in the Marquesan and Micronesian Missions, and in a few of the home pulpits.—Very well as an initiatory step; and after that? Pau; no more.—That is their first and only steps [sic] on the official ladder, and even there the English language is crowding them sorely to the wall.

The author’s solution is to “Extend the English schools,” so that all Hawaiians are able to speak English, and “the native will assert his priority over the foreigner”:

but in the meantime . . . do the next best act of justice toward the Hawaiian people and appoint no foreigner as an officer under the Government who is not well acquainted with the vernacular.

[The House wishes] that in all future appointments a more consistent regard should be had to that primary qualification of a judicial or executive officer—that of understanding and making himself understood—not by the better educated and select few, but by the great mass of the people, whose grievances he is sent to redress, whose conformity to the laws he is appointed to enforce.

A law requiring English ability would result in “compelling nearly all the present native incumbents of offices to leave, and excluding respectable natives from the Legislature of the country,” thus
angering the population and supporting those who are against English-language education; the author is opposed to “any oppressive or exclusive measure that might only wound the keenest susceptibilities of the people without advancing the desired object.”

Clearly Hawaiian was used extensively and at many levels of governmental activity. This is the view also of Hawaiians who wrote after the overthrow of the monarchy and the Organic Act of 1900, which mandated that official governmental activity be conducted in English. Kaleiopu (June 23, 1910) writes that Hawaiian is being destroyed by forbidding it as the language of government. Moreover, when English and Hawaiian documents do not agree, the English prevails as the *ka ʻōlelo kumu*; the expression would usually mean ‘the hereditary language’, but is used here either ironically or as ‘source or basic language’. This is the death of Hawaiian as a language of government, legislation, and law. Prince Kūhiō tried to revive Hawaiian—not as the language of the race, because it continues to be the normal language of conversation—but as *he olelo mana ma ko kakou hooponopono aupuni a kau kanawai ana* ‘an authoritative language in our management of government and law’. But the government refused, because its power, authority, and life are connected to the English language. Similarly, Olelo Hawaii (June 30, 1910) decries the damage done to Hawaiian by excluding it as a language of government and urges politicians who love the language to work for its reintroduction into the schools and legislature.

The use of Hawaiian in schools was indeed a critical subject of debate, which divided emotionally and intellectually both the Hawaiian and the foreign communities through the nineteenth century. The debate reached down to the basis of the culture, as seen in the words of W. R. Castle (1894: 2): “The chief object” has been to teach students “to think as well as to speak and write English.” A good example of an exchange on the topic was initiated by “Kapu ka olelo Hawaii ma Lahainaluna” (March 7, 1868).
author editorializes on a student letter reporting a decision made by the teachers and students of Lahainaluna:

“*e hookapu loa ia ke kamailio ana ma ka olelo Hawaii, a e namu kawalawala wale no i na wa a pau, a ina e kamailio aku kekahi ma ka olelo Hawaii, e hoohana ia oia.*”

“that conversation in the Hawaiian language be strictly forbidden and at all times only foreign, barely intelligible language should be used; and if someone converses in the Hawaiian language, he should be given extra work”.

This is like taking away mother’s milk from children and giving them cow milk. The children will waste away because

*o ka ai a ke Akua i hoomakaukau ai no lakou, ua oi ka pono manua o na ai e ae a pau loa. Aloha wale na kanaka opio i hoo-nele loa ia ke kamailio ana ma ka olelo a ko lakou mau makua.*

‘the food that God has prepared for them—it’s rightness is greater than all the other foods. Alas for the young natives who are deprived of conversation in the language of their parents’.

Why is this evil effort being made to make the children learn the foreign, English language? Is it to prepare them to become Americans at the time when our Hawai‘i will be made a part of the United States of America, as is being noised about? Is this the intention of Lahainaluna? We should not despise the smooth, delightful Hawaiian language, *ka olelo nani o ke one hanau o kakou* ‘the beautiful language of our birth sands’. If the students learn to talk gibberish, they will not reach the educational level of the first, famous students of Lahainaluna, men like the Reverend Moses Kuaea and S. M. Kamakau. They will not reach that level if they have to stumble along in English alone, unless they are people who started speaking English very young. If this is to be the policy, Lahainaluna should have only foreign teachers and
the Reverend Kuaea should return to a place where the Hawaiian language is known. The view of this author and others that the children’s and even the older students’ intellectual development would be retarded if they were taught in a foreign tongue has been confirmed by modern psychologists.

C. B. Andrews (March 21, 1868) replied to this editorial by stating that the insolent student’s letter should have been checked before false information was spread. No ka iini nui o na haumana o Lahainaluna nei e loaa ka olelo Beretania ‘Because of the great desire of the students of Lahainaluna to acquire the British language’, they themselves decided:

“E hoao mua i kela a me keia mana a ma ka olelo haole, a i hema-hema, alaila, kamailio maoli no.”

“To try first [to express] this or that opinion in the foreign language, and if it is awkward, then to converse indeed in the native language”.

The editor would hear more than enough Hawaiian at Lahainaluna. C. B. Andrews appreciates the great desire of the students to add some English proficiency to the great number of things they learn in Hawaiian. The students are embarrassed by the criticism and teasing they frequently hear about their elder brothers who graduated earlier from Lahainaluna: “Aole hiki i ka Lahainaluna ke kamailio haole” “The Lahainaluna student cannot speak English”.

The topic of language in the schools is no less emotional in the current reevaluation of Hawaiian history in the light of the loss of many aspects of the native culture, including language. The nineteenth-century debate is the earliest I know on national language policy in a non-Western country and should be studied comprehensively in a world historical context. The subject is difficult to understand historically because the intellectual and emotional climate has changed so radically and because the
tragic outcome for the Hawaiian language tempts the reader to
demonize pro-English language views. I emphasize therefore that
the subject was not easy, obvious, or simple; it involved practical
and philosophical or ideological considerations. Could English,
a foreign language, be taught to the Hawaiian population with
the educational means available? Should English be taught as
a subject or be made the medium of instruction? Should Eng-
lish supplement or replace the national language? The debate
included such topics as the adequacy and viability of Hawaiian as
a language in the modern world, the greater wealth of published
materials in English, and the relation of the national language to
sovereignty; in Laura Fish Judd’s words: “it was a maxim with the
Mission that in order to preserve the nation, they must preserve
its speech” (Kuykendall 1947: 360). Many aspects of this problem
continue to be debated today in various parts of the world. For
instance, English has been adopted by the educational systems of
many countries with different native languages and is widely used
as a medium of instruction in Polynesian nations. Indeed some
left-wing literary critics urge Third World writers to use such lan-
guages as English and French in order to reach a wider audience,
even though their own languages may be endangered by lack of
modern literary production. My discussion will concentrate on
the few points relevant to my subject of language use.

Some general considerations are helpful in understanding
the positions taken in the debate. Firstly, many of the writers on
the subject assumed the superiority of English as a language.40
This view was, however, strongly disputed at the time. Kekūanāoʻa
(1864: 7) defends vigorously the capacity of Hawaiian as “a full and
comprehensive language, that can be read and written by almost
every individual in the land; it is in some respects inferior, while
in others it is superior to the English”; Hawaiian is not “unfit to
convey foreign ideas to the native mind.” Moreover, Hawaiian like
any other language can be developed to fit new circumstances and
needs; “we have a language, known to be far superior to those of
nations during the dark ages, who then had no written language of their own, but who are now the most enlightened people of the earth.” He returns to this theme (11), arguing that schools must be conducted in Hawaiian precisely in order “to introduce the social laws of highly cultivated life among our people”:

This may seem new and strange to those, who are not aware that the Hawaiian language is capable of as refined an expression, as any language in the world; but, it is high time, such foreign ideas should cease to cramp the advancement in knowledge, of an independent Kingdom, through the medium of its own language.

Kekūanāoʻa’s position was seconded by many Hawaiians and foreigners at the time, and no educated person would hold the opposite position today.

Secondly, English was promoted as a means of access to a vastly greater amount of published material, a point conceded by all, as far as I can see. The missionaries had experienced personally the difficulties of providing Hawaiian-language educational materials; those responsible for developing such materials today for language immersion schools are finding the task equally onerous. As a result—after some early missionary hesitations about English opening Hawaiians to evil influences—no one argued against some teaching of English to Hawaiians; knowledge of both languages was considered advantageous.

Thirdly, historical understanding of the debate has been distorted by the incorrect view that the Hawaiian language was declining through the nineteenth century. In fact, disputants, government officials, and even the strongest advocates of English assume the predominance of Hawaiian as the national language. Some quotations will demonstrate the way this assumption influenced several aspects of debate and policy. R. Armstrong (1852: 46) states that diverting money from Hawaiian to English schools would harm “a mass of native children”; spending all available money on English-language schools would be “a most serious
national calamity” (1855: 4):

To change the language of any people, especially to introduce a language so difficult for the Hawaiian as the English, must necessarily be a work of time, labor and expense. But while this tedious up hill process is going on, let every Hawaiian youth be taught at least to read and write his own language, which however barbarous to civilized ears, is full of sweetness and melody to his.

Later Armstrong (1860: 19) finds parental support for English-language schools

only in the more populous places, such as Honolulu, Lahaina, Hilo and Koloa, where there is a dense population and more wealth than in the remote places, and where the English language is in daily use.

Sereno E. Bishop reports on the use of English at Lahaina:

This fourth item constitutes the only addition to the time given to the study of English.

No study in Hawaiian has been dropped, nor has any reduction been made in the amount of time and attention devoted to them. On the contrary, we believe that a considerable increase of attention has been given to several studies in Hawaiian, especially Higher Mathematics, Arithmetic, Bookkeeping and Natural Philosophy.

As some apprehension is understood to have been felt among the brethren of this Association that there is a tendency disposition to promote the study of English in this Seminary at the expense of the Hawaiian, tending towards the ultimate substitution of the former for the latter, I wish to state our views, for the purpose of removing such an apprehension.

1. We fully recognize the fact that this Seminary was established and continued by the Mission as a place of learning for Hawaiians in the use of their own tongue [Kula no ka poe Hawaii
ma ka lakou olelo ponoi]. We wish to continue it as distinctively a Native School, and this we understand to be the unchanged intention of the Board of Education. One high school at least seems to be needed where Hawaiians can be educated without a previous knowledge of English. Otherwise the largest class of promising native youth would be excluded from the means of a higher Education [pehea la e loaa ai ka naauao i ka hapa nui o na keiki maikai ma keia Paeaina?].

2. We regard the study of the English language as a very important adjunct of a higher education for Hawaiians, and occupying the place which the study of Ancient and Modern languages does in English and American Schools, both as an important method of discipline for the mental faculties, and as leading to a noble and useful accomplishment. We believe that a Hawaiian who is wholly ignorant of the great language of business and Commerce as well as of legislation, art and Science which prevails in this group, and whose vocal organs are untaught to articulate any but the 9 consonant sounds known to Hawaiians, can by no means be esteemed a well educated person.

3. While therefore teaching the English language as a branch of knowledge in this school, we desire to teach it as efficiently as due attention to the preponderating element of Hawaiian will permit. We encourage our scholars to expect practical benefit from it, and to make as much use of it as they can in ordinary conversation, as the easiest means of making progress in it.

C. R. Bishop writes (1878: 4):

The popular demand is for English. Our Select and Higher Schools are now all taught in the medium of the English language; and its introduction in the Common Schools, however desirable, eventually, must be a gradual work, because in many districts the people are so scattered that the Schools are necessarily small; and the English language, which, under the most favorable circumstances, is difficult to master, is so little used that there is no practice in it outside the School-house, and until many more natives are available as teachers in English,
the expense of such teaching will be too great to be generally afforded. In the Schools away from the centres of business the knowledge which may be acquired in a few years, through the medium of the language of the people, is of more practical value than any mere smattering of a foreign tongue, which may cost more than double as much in time and money.

Bishop later writes (1880: 9):

The continuance and increase of public day schools for teaching Hawaiians the English language has been construed to imply the gradual supplanting of the Hawaiian by the English language, and the final extinction of the Hawaiian language; and the Educational Committee of your Honorable Body at its last session expressed grave doubts as to the wisdom of such a policy. The Board do not admit that in the establishment of English Schools they aim at the suppression of the Hawaiian language. It is not evident that the Hawaiian tongue can be so easily rendered obsolete. The experience of other countries rather strengthens the belief that the Hawaiian will continue to be the chiefly spoken language of the country as long as the race exists. And hence the Board do admit the impracticability of properly educating Hawaiians only in a tongue other than their own vernacular. They believe knowledge of the English language a very desirable acquirement for Hawaiian youth; but as long as their mother tongue continues the language chiefly used in the intercourse, business and courts of the Kingdom, they should be taught also to read and write this correctly.

The Hawaiian people want English language instruction, and the schools that provide it are generally of a higher quality (9 f.):

Hence it will continue to be the policy of the Board to establish and maintain at centers of population throughout the Kingdom good English Day Schools. And it will also be their aim, wherever
practicable, to have the Hawaiian pupils in these schools taught to read and write the Hawaiian language, in addition to the usual English studies.

A difficulty for learning English is that “Many of those who are being instructed in it, are, out of school hours associating with those who think and speak almost wholly in the native tongue” (1890:2 f.). This situation will improve as the use of English spreads. Two years later, Bishop writes (1892:4):

Native children living at home and attending the day school make very little use of English, except during the few hours of recitations; on the playground and in the street they use either their native tongue or a mixture of the two languages. In the towns and villages and about the plantations, they hear the English spoken, and have some practice in it, but in the country districts they do not have even those advantages.

The subject of debate that was most obviously influenced by this widespread use of Hawaiian was that of the practicality of an extensive use of English. The early experience of the missionary teachers argued against it: they had had little success in using English in the early schools, and Western education had spread dramatically only after the change to Hawaiian as the medium of instruction and after the production of Hawaiian-language reading materials.\textsuperscript{43} Hawaiian-language education had in fact been a great success and a source of pride for both Hawaiians and foreign teachers.\textsuperscript{44} As a result, even heads of the Board of Education could disagree on the practicality of an emphasis on English.\textsuperscript{45}

The assumption of the security of Hawaiian is important for understanding the positions taken by the various sides during the debate. First and foremost, all of the pro-English advocates cannot be viewed as attacking the Hawaiian language and consciously contributing to its eventual loss, although a few English advocates can indeed be so understood. As head of the Board of
Education, Richard Armstrong was a strong and early advocate of the use of English in schools:

With the exception of the Royal School, instruction in the English language is not contemplated in the school laws of this Kingdom, but the time is at hand when it should be . . .

Armstrong’s position was connected to his view that English “must, eventually, become the language of the natives” (R. Armstrong 1852: 45); “the introduction of the English language to the natives, which bids fair to produce a revolution in time, in the language of the nation, and do more for the civilization of the native race, than all our other schools besides” (1855: 20). Language change was necessary for Hawaiians:

- to maintain their position among the white race
- a knowledge of it [English] is becoming more and more indispensable to the native, to enable him to cope with the white man. Without it, he is lame in every joint, and as a gentleman of much observation has remarked, will bye and bye be a “stranger and an alien on his own soil.”

The process of change would be long and arduous: “The language of a nation is a part of its very being and never was and never will be changed except by a very gradual process” (1858: 12). To this end, Armstrong recommended that:

- the most direct and effectual method of bringing about a revolution in the language of the nation, and of substituting the English for the native, will be to teach the English to the females, who are to be the future mothers and nurses of the children . . . All the world over children learn the language of their mothers and nurses, and Hawaiians are no exception to the general rule. The surest way . . . to give a new language to a people is to give it to the females, the mothers and nurses. They will give it to the next generation. It will then become the household language, and soon the language of the multitude.
Armstrong emphasizes the need to train teachers of English and to transfer financial support from the Hawaiian-language schools to English-language ones.49

Armstrong’s extreme advocacy of English prompted, I would argue, Kamehameha IV’s restructuring of the Board of Education in 1855 and his appointment of Kekūanāo‘a as head after Armstrong’s death in 1860 (Kuykendall 1953:106 ff.). Kekūanāo‘a’s report of 1864 was an eloquent argument for Hawaiian at a moment of intense debate, and the policy of the Board of Education turned temporarily against the extension of the use of English.50 However, Armstrong’s view eventually triumphed, as can be seen from the post-overthrow education reports. W. D. Alexander writes:

Schools taught in the Hawaiian language have virtually ceased to exist and will probably never appear again in a Government report. Hawaiian parents without exception prefer that their children should be educated in the English language. The gradual extinction of a Polynesian dialect may be regretted for sentimental reasons, but it is certainly for the interest of the Hawaiians themselves.

The advance during this decade has been tantamount to a complete linguistic revolution, and is in line with the general progress of the country.

The work of making English the language of the country is well nigh accomplished. Eight years ago the idea that all our schools could be taught in English was almost scouted. Today it is an accomplished fact.51

The majority of the English language proponents, however, clearly did not contemplate the replacement of the Hawaiian language. These would include the many Hawaiian parents and politicians who supported and even impelled the extension of the use of English, voicing one of Armstrong’s own concerns: “the
reason they generally gave was a most sound and intelligent one, that without it—*they will, by-and-by be nothing, and the white man everything.*” The ardent pro-Hawaiian nationalist Walter Murray Gibson was following his constituency when he advocated English while head of the Board of Education. He did not, however, plan or even foresee the loss of the Hawaiian language (1884: 2):

[Hawaiian parents] though devoted to the independence of their country, and entertaining a strong national sentiment, yet recognizing that in the course of events the English language must be the prevailing tongue of this Kingdom, they readily promote its acquisition by their children in order to afford them an opportunity to have access to the vast accumulations of knowledge recorded in the foreign language. Yet I trust that the Hawaiian language will be long preserved in all its ancient purity among the Hawaiian people.

Like Armstrong, he argues for the use of English (Gibson 1886: 1–8). Foreigners admire the good English spoken by Hawaiians (1). Hawaiians are proud of their nation and appreciate and support education. They also want their children to be taught English (2 f.), “seeking faithfully the best sources of information and the best vehicles of instruction” (3):

The Hawaiian in his own Legislative Assembly, where he has always had an overwhelming majority over the foreigner, has practically voted in favor of a discrimination against his own language.

English is widely used in Hawai‘i, and immigrants want their children to be taught English:

In giving preference, however, to schools taught in the English
Hawaiian is a beautiful language, and is transmitted by parents to their children. Minimal school instruction is needed for the language: “With one or two hours per week, a Hawaiian boy or girl will soon learn to read and write the native language.” The same amount of time should be devoted to instruction in the language for Hawaiian children in English language schools. Teaching all children English gives them an equal start in life. Just as in the United States, a common language is needed to unite the different races in one nation; English is the best choice for that language in Hawai‘i.

That the pro-Hawaiian Gibson could make such statements reveals that the debate was intellectually difficult. Similarly, Abraham Fornander, who labored to preserve Hawaiian literature, advocated the use of English in the schools. The position of such people can be understood only in the context of the widespread, vigorous use of Hawaiian in the community; that is, many simply assumed that the survival of the Hawaiian language was assured and that English could without danger be emphasized in the schools as a supplement to the national language. The language of the school seemed only a small part of the use of language in the whole of life, and they did not foresee the harm that would be done to Hawaiian by an academic emphasis on English in combination with other factors. Even with the historical experience of the Hawaiians available for study, such problems are difficult to see. American Samoans can still be heard to say that the language need not be taught in the schools because “everyone speaks Samoan.” I have, however, been told that American Samoan children are beginning to speak English together when at play. Similarly, in late nineteenth-century Hawai‘i, C. R. Bishop observed (1890:28):
one of the main objects of the course is to give the children a good knowledge of colloquial English. Many of the teachers have been very successful in this, and the children have been induced to speak English in the play-ground.

The number of students taught English in government and private schools certainly grew through the nineteenth century from a very small percentage until Hawaiian language schools were finally suppressed entirely. In his 1896 (?) report on education with historical statistics (22), W. D. Alexander could write (21):

“As predicted in the last report, the schools taught in the Hawaiian language are dead.” The parents of the fifty-nine students at the three remaining schools have petitioned that they be converted to English schools: “in the next report, Government schools taught in Hawaiian will have no place.” The conclusion is not, however, justified that those students were being transformed from Hawaiian to English speakers or even that the numbers represent a growing percentage of English to Hawaiian speakers, although there was a shift in population. On the contrary, there is evidence that the use of English as the medium of instruction caused educational problems: teachers had to revert to Hawaiian both for their own convenience and that of the students, and effective instruction in the course subjects was subordinated to the need for language instruction. The same problems are found in American Sāmoa, where English has been imposed as the medium of instruction. However, the gradual replacement of Hawaiian by English in the schools, in combination with other factors, had an undeniable influence on the loss of the native language.

I agree with Reinecke, his contemporary informants, and later scholars that Hawaiian suffered from the post-overthrow abolition of Hawaiian-language schools, which had generally the same effect the American population would suffer if English-language schools were replaced with those of some foreign tongue. I believe also that a post-Annexation collapse of morale convinced
many families that it was useless to pass on the language in the home. The abolition of Hawaiian-language instruction and the replacement of many Hawaiian teachers certainly was a factor in that collapse. An old Hawaiian named Nalimu told Theodore Kelsey (1926:5):

> We were all Hawaiian boys then, studying from books written in our own language. Now there are few of our race in Hilo Boarding School. All the teachers are white men. All the books are written in the foreign tongue of the haole.

Nonetheless, at least until the middle of the twentieth century, Hawaiian was not merely “a patois of little practical importance outside the home.” Reinecke himself mentions its use in politics, religious organizations, songwriting, and some teaching, “But as a literary tongue the Hawaiian language seems to be doomed . . . only an unexpected strong nativistic movement could save it” (1969:142). Fortunately, the current Hawaiian Renaissance has inspired major, even heroic, efforts for the preservation of the language, including immersion schools. Similar efforts are being made for other native languages such as New Zealand Māori and Náhuatl (León-Portilla 1988:210–214).

The veritable decline of Hawaiian that began in the post-overthrow period was discussed extensively in both English and Hawaiian publications. J. G. M. Sheldon and Piilani (1906:133–141) lament the loss of old-style Hawaiian. Kaleiopu (June 16, 1910) argues that the Creator has given each race its language, which is its responsibility, and which cannot be taken away by any other power. Governments and rulers may change, but a language disappears only with the disappearance of the race. Many races have kept their language even under foreign rule. The Hawaiians’ life, government, law, and literature were conducted in Hawaiian. When foreign languages arrived, they *moe pū* ‘slept with’ Hawaiian. Government was conducted in Hawaiian and English, and finally the government and independence were snatched away.
But the Hawaiian language did not change; *e mau ana no ia a e hoi pu ana no me kakou iloko o ka opu o ka honua* ‘it endures indeed and will return indeed together with us into the bowels of the earth’.

*Olelo Hawaii* (June 30, 1910) argues that *na aupuni nui naauao* ‘the enlightened governments’ of this world do not make their people forget their language or hinder its perpetuation and spread; they do not obstruct the teaching of foreign languages or prevent the establishment of schools and the appointment of teachers to teach their language to their people. It is different with Hawaiian; *Eia, ua hoopau a ua kipaku aku kakou i ko kakou mau kumu i hiki ke a'o mai i ka kakou mau keiki ma kana* [sic] *olelo ponoi* ‘Here! we have stopped and kicked out the teachers of ours who could teach our children in his/her [sic] own language’. Students today are thus becoming incompetent in Hawaiian. Some will ask *heaha ka waiwai* ‘what is the value’ of teaching the children Hawaiian; *Oiai, ua Amerika kakou i keia manawa* ‘That is, we are American at this time’, and the American language is what people want to be taught to our children. All agree that it is *pono* ‘right’ to teach children English.

*O ka waiwai o ko kakou a'o ana i ka kakou mau keiki, i ka kakou olelo ponoi (kumu) oia no ka loa mai o ko kakou hoomaikai ia mai e ka mea nana i haawi mai ia olelo ia kakou, owai ia? o ke Akua no.*

‘the value of our teaching our children in our own (hereditary) language is to obtain our blessing and prosperity from the person who gave us this language. Who is he? God Himself’.

God gave each people its language, and forgetting or disrespecting Hawaiian is doing the same to God. Politicians should promote the reintroduction of Hawaiian into the schools and into the government.

The author of “Ka Olelo Hawaii” (March 30, 1911) supports a
bill to provide time in schools for the teaching of Hawaiian. The
Japanese and Chinese care for their mother tongues; a o kakou
hoi na keiki oiw o ka aina ke ano nalowale aku nei ka olelo
makuahine o ko kakou aina ‘but we, the native children of this
land—the mother tongue of our land is almost disappearing’. We
should rightly perpetuate our beautiful language for a few more
years. Traveling teachers are hired for other subjects; a teacher
could travel and teach a single hour in several schools. If this is
not done to perpetuate Hawaiian, ka olelo aloha o ka aina hanau,
alaila, aole i loihi na makahiki i koe a o ka nalo loa no ia o ka olelo
Hawaii ‘the beloved language of the land of our birth, then the
years remaining will not be long, and this will be the final disap-
pearance of the Hawaiian language’.

The author of “Ka Olelo Makuahine a ka Lahui Hawaii” (April
10, 1912: 25) writes that since different nations are recognized by
their language, I ka manawa e nalowale ai ka lakou olelo lahui, o
ka nalowale ana no ia o ia lahuikanaka ‘At the time when their
racial language disappears, this will be the disappearance of that
race itself’. American Negroes lost their language, so they are no
longer an independent race; they are just Americans. Hawaiians
will be like Negroes if they lose their language; in fact they are
now treated as such when they go to America and speak English.
The language must be maintained to preserve a separate iden-
tity. Hawaiians are American citizens, but they are distinct; they
are not Negroes or Filipinos, but Hawaiians. Few years seem to
remain for the Hawaiian language, and now is the time to establish
language schools to revive it. Some students are good at English,
but cannot explain their lessons to their parents in Hawaiian. The
shocked parents say, “You’re Hawaiian, but you’re unable to know
the meaning of the lesson in your own language.” Some children
speak the language like malihini ‘newcomers’ The Japanese and
Chinese have their language schools; Hawaiians should establish
 theirs and provide for Hawaiian language instruction in the gov-
ernment schools even though English may be ka olelo waiwai o
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keia au ‘the valuable language of this time’ (26). Teachers colleges should train teachers in Hawaiian as well as English. Now is the time to act, before the disappearance of the language and with it the race. The same points were made ten years later by the author of “Kekahi Mau Olelo Hawaii Naauao” (May 18, 1922) and can be heard today.

The twentieth-century decline of the Hawaiian language is beyond dispute, but that decline should not be projected back into the nineteenth, with its numerous vital, prolific, and creative writers, several of whom are of world importance. The merit of Reinecke’s essay was to open a discussion; but his conclusions and views must be evaluated on the basis of a comprehensive study of the Hawaiian-language materials he himself was incapable of using. History is most assuredly written by the victors when they cannot read the language of their victims.

In the question of nineteenth-century language use, as in other questions of Hawaiian history, two consensus can be found: one of those who know Hawaiian and one of those who do not. The same predicament exists in other historical fields that have developed largely without a basis in the native language literature. For instance, a small band of scholars is using Náhuatl texts to correct distortions in Mexican historiography caused by an unbalanced reliance on Spanish-language sources. Scholars should agree that communities with minority languages deserve the same respect and thus the same academic standards as other human beings.

NOTES


2. “No ka hiki ana mai o ka malamalama i Hawaii nei” May 9, 1834. This is the commonly expressed opinion throughout the nineteenth century, and no evidence exists for the speculations of Day 1985: 170, the missionaries’
“making Hawaiian a literary language may have undermined its uniqueness, its distinctness from other languages”; “it may have helped to kill it as a spoken language.”


4. Alexander 1864:1. S. E. Bishop 1868b, exists in both English and Hawaiian versions, with interesting differences resulting in all likelihood from its being read in Hawaiian: English and Hawaiian page 3, “brethren of this Association” is kākou ‘we inclusive’; English pages 4 f., and Hawaiian page 4, “which prevails in this group” is ma keia moana Pakikipika ‘in this Pacific ocean’.


6. Helen Chapin, personal communication. Compare Kamakau November 18, 1865, who wants the circulation of Ka Nupepa Kuokoa to rise to 4000 or 5000 subscribers before he begins a project. Versus Day 1985:167, a typical underestimation of the importance of the Hawaiian-language newspapers.


8. Martin, Lyman, Bond, and Damon 1979:128 f. Versus Day 1987:170, 172, whose work is largely speculative. Compare R. Armstrong 1856:11, “it would be a great gain were these Chinese required to learn the native language, or the English.” “Kula Pake ma Honolulu Nei” November 28, 1868, expresses approval of the establishment of a school for Chinese children born in Hawai‘i i hoonaauaoia ai lakou ma ka olelo namu a ka haole ‘so that they may be educated in the foreign language of the foreigner’; the children have a desire e ike maoli i kela olelo ‘to have a genuine knowledge of that language’. Compare Glick 1980:173 f., on schools for teaching English to Chinese.

9. Glick 1980:9; 13; 32, a planter stated in a 1930 interview that “it didn’t take long for some of the Chinese to pick up Hawaiian. Hawaiian was the first language they learned here”; 339, Chinese names were Hawaiianized (not Anglicized). English could be learned along with Hawaiian; 93, one Chinese “perfected both his English and Hawaiian”; also 94, 97, 217, 379. Reports of the use of English seem to increase as the nineteenth century progressed, e.g., 57, 71, 99.

10. Interviews with Lydia DelaCerna of October 13, 1990, and March 28,
1991. Harold Furuya grew up with Mrs. DelaCerna and confirmed her description, June 25, 1994: the children of Kahana Valley spoke the language of their parents at home and English at school and when playing with children of other ethnic groups.

11. Dibble 1838: 11. ʻĪ December 11, 1869. Kamakau February 2, 1867a; this article contains also a typical language joke based on the similarity in sound but contradiction in meaning between the Hawaiian intensifier nō and the English negative no; English speakers would understand the opposite of what Hawaiians were saying. Fornander 1918–1919: 426–429. Chapter IV.


17. Interviews with Lydia Delacerna of October 13, 1990; March 28, 1991. Harold Furuya stated on June 25, 1994, that his father did not live with the
other Japanese in Kahana Valley but among Hawaiians; this was the reason he learned the language, and he enjoyed very much speaking it. Mrs. DelaCerna remembers his Hawaiian as *hapa*, that is, mixed with Japanese.

18. Dibble 1838:11, portrays a Hawaiian’s imitation of the Hawaiian spoken by Cook’s men: *aloha kahiki, aloha haehae, aloha ka wahine, aloha ke keiki, aloha ka hale*. King 1989:273, *nuinui loa*. Hoikeke March 8, 1858, provides examples of the Hawaiian spoken by a Chinese immigrant: *Pane mai la ua Pake nei me ka olelo ino, hahu launaole, “Ia oe ia, wahi, Come! Come!! Kanapepeki”,* *Olelo ae la ua Pake nei, “Aole o’u manaio i ko’u ola, ina make au.”* ‘Ī July 10, 1869, provides a dialog in pidgin Hawaiian between two foreigners and Hawaiians: *He-aha ana no ia? Pehea olelo ana no oe ka haole? Maikai no ka haole, keiki no aole maikai, nuinui loa uwe; Ina he keiki uwe loa a na ole, maua no lawe iaia.* Sheldon and Kaluaikoolau 1906:20, 25, 28, 34. Other examples are reportedly being collected. Compare Bingham 1981:153. Hawaiian is sufficiently difficult for even knowledgeable people to be modest; the learned Kelsey January 18, 1923, wrote, *aoele e hiki ia’u ke kakau i ka olelo Hawai me ka pololei loa ’I am unable to write the Hawaiian language with great correctness’.*


20. Reinecke 1969:29; he writes that “the cultural changes also destroyed such secret dialects as *kake*.” However, chants labeled *kake* can be found in the Hawaiian newspapers; *He Mele Kake No “Nuhou”* November 25, 1873; *He Mele Kake No “Nuhou”* December 2, 1873; *He Mele Kake No Nuhou* December 30, 1873; possibly the last two lines of Anakanaka October 31, 1861.

21. W. D. Alexander in Andrews 1974: 14, perhaps one of Reinecke’s sources. Bush and Paaluhi January 5, 1893. Rae 1900: 244, reported that the language used in story telling had changed (Rae is probably writing around 1855, 243 note 1); compare Johnson 1957:25. “He Mau Olelo Ku i ka Noeau” June 20, 1919, provides a canoe chant and speaks of its importance for the new generation: *a pela lakou e ike ai i ka hohomu kuli’u a noeau o ka olelo Hawaii, a lakou e olelo pahemahema nei i ka lakou olelo makuahine e hoohemahema nui ia nei i keia wa ‘and thus they will see the great depth and wisdom of the Hawaiian language and that they speak awkwardly their mother tongue which is being much neglected at this time’. ”Ka Oihana Lua a Hawaii Lahui” August 2, 1923, states that contemporaries find *lua* ‘martial arts’ songs hard to understand.

22. Andrews April 16, 23, 1875. Andrews 1836:14, states that “The *meles* and *kaaos* (songs and legends) of the ancients are understood and recited by the people of the present time,” probably because a purely oral language does
not spread innovations quickly. In his dictionary, however, Andrews 1974:4, did not emphasize the language of those genres or of philosophy.


24. For example, Golovnin 1979:212 and note 11. Barratt 1987:133. A study of nineteenth-century translations between the two languages would be valuable for this subject.

25. November 29, December 6, 1873. This essay has been used as a source for pidgin Hawaiian, but none of the examples the author provides fits that category.

26. Another example is ka’u pepeiao ‘my ear’, which involves the above point and also the substitution of the a-possessive for the o-possessive, the correct form for body parts. The second mistake reinforces the false impression of the first. (The point is interesting for the current anthropological debate on the supposed Polynesian composite view of the person.) The author mentions this substitution of possessive forms as well as the incorrect use of i and ia and the sequence of clauses: the person speaking should be referred to before his statement, unless a short phrase like wahi ana ‘his statement’ is used).

27. Reinecke 1969:30, also 32, 36 f., 43, 48 f. Compare Day 1987:171, “The Hawaiian language . . . lost much of its prestige, and declined in importance relative to English”; he argues that this is a reason that pidgin began to be based on English!


29. Such statements are numerous in the Board of Education reports, in which they are used in arguing for the extension of English-language instruction. R. Armstrong [1850?]:27, “the English language which for many years past has been the language of business, throughout the group”; 1852:45, “the English language, which has been, for years, chiefly the business language of the Islands”; 1853:58, “so much of the business transactions of the nation is done through the medium of that language”; 1854:9, 12; 1858:11. Gibson 1886:4. Compare W. Richards 1847:10, “Why is it that the trade of our country and many other kinds of business are conducted by foreigners?”—their “intelligent industry.”


Language” 1903: 7, “Hawaiians who speak only their native tongue find it difficult to obtain employment. Time was, thirty years or so ago, when it was necessary for every foreigner to learn Hawaiian . . .”

33. W. C. Smith 1933: 17. English was the dominant language used for governmental purposes by the Cherokee, McLoughlin 1986: 287, 352.

34. Kaninau December 5, 1868. Compare Kuykendall 1947: 348, note 40, on the 1840 school law: “No complete translation of this law has been printed . . .”; also 352, note 58.

35. Kuykendall 1947: 347, note 39; 348, note 41; 352. See chapter III.


38. Earlier, R. Armstrong 1852: 45, had used a similar description to argue for extended English-language instruction: “Every native who holds an office, or attempts to do business on the Islands, especially near the white settlements, is embarrassed, at every step, for want of a knowledge of the English language. Embarrassment is felt, too, in every member of the government, from the want of persons well acquainted with both the Hawaiian and English languages, and this difficulty is increasing, from year to year, as the white population increases in numbers, wealth, and importance”; 1855: 18, he writes that the education department needs “a good clerk who understands both the native and the English languages.”

39. Primary and secondary sources on the language debate are numerous, and a major study of the subject could be done of this early example of national language policy. The work of Kuykendall has provided the basis of most of the modern secondary discussion; see Bibliography and 1947: 106 f., 360, 366; 1953: 106–114. Hutchison 1987: against the use of English in Hawaiian schools, 78, 80, 82–85, 134; for the use of English, 98. Besides works discussed below, see e.g., Diell 1838: 23 f., 31 ff. Bingham 1981: 101 ff. Q. November 17, 1853. H. H. P. September 22, 1866: 3. Martin, Lyman, Bond, and Damon 1979: 219. The sources do not always distinguish between teaching English as a subject and using it as the medium of instruction. An exception is Na Haumana o Lahainaluna May 29, 1865: students of Lahainaluna complain of O ko makou nele i ke kumu ole e ao ai ma ka olelo Beritania ‘Our lack of a teacher to teach in the British language’. There are only two teachers currently at the school, Pogue and L. Aholo, Alexander being away; aka, aole nai i waiho wale ia ua olelo Beritania nei me ke ao oleia ‘but this British language is not simply left
without being taught’. Pogue is trying to fill in the gap: *ua ao mai no oia ia makou ma na olelo elua, oia hoi ma ka olelo Hawaii ma na buke Hawaii, a ma ka olelo Haole ma na buke Haole* ‘he is indeed teaching us in both languages, that is, in the Hawaiian language with Hawaiian books and in the foreign language with foreign books’. It was better when three teachers were available. The students therefore ask *i kumu hou e ao ai ia makou ma ka olelo Beritania* ‘for a new teacher to teach us in the British language’.

Important sources for the debate are the reports of the head of the Board of Education. His title and the name of the governmental body changed through the nineteenth century as can be seen from the bibliography, and I have simplified the situation by using only “Board of Education.” All these reports seem to have been composed in English; I have found Hawaiian versions of 1866, 1868, 1870, 1872, all labeled translations.

English was emphasized in schools for the Cherokee and other Native Americans, not always with success; e.g., McLoughlin 1986: 299, 353, 356, 361, 378; Hutchison 1987: 65, 67 f. León-Portilla 1988: 56 ff., on teaching Mexican Indians Spanish.

40. R. Armstrong 1858: 11 (teaching must be done in Hawaiian “until this can be done in a better tongue”), 23 f.; compare 1855: 21, “the strong, clear rays of the English tongue, begin to break in upon the native mind all over the group.”

41. R. Armstrong 1852: 45 f.; 1853: 58; 1854: 9, 12 f.; 1858: 11. As a result of this view and the above, the missionaries had to defend their use of Hawaiian as the medium of instruction in the schools, e.g., Bingham 1981: 101 ff.

42. S. E. Bishop 1868a: 3 ff. The report was written both in Hawaiian and English. I have inserted the Hawaiian text of two key passages in brackets.

43. For example, R. Armstrong 1852: 45. Although Andrews was initially against the teaching of English (and other modern languages) to Hawaiians (November 15, 1833: 4 f.), he later changed his mind (*Missionary Letters*, Volume 4, n.d.: 1300 [Andrews, Clark, and Dibble, November 16, 1836]) and wrote the Hawaiian textbook on the subject (Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 147 [1837]). Clark 1838: 344. Kuykendall 1947: 360 f., the mission was generally against the teaching of English until 1854.

44. W. Richards 1847: 11, “most of the people under middle age and above the age of early childhood” are able “to read and write a little.” R. Armstrong 1853: 57, “the ease and elegance, with which the children learn to read their own language”; 1854: 4, he calculates that three-fourths of the adult population (over 16) are able to read Hawaiian. Compare “No ka hiki ana mai o ka malamalama i Hawaii nei” May 9, 1834.
45. R. Armstrong was strongly in favor of the use of English, e.g., 1854:12 f. Mott Smith 1876:61 [sic: 16], takes the opposite view: “The Government cannot undertake to educate the children at the public expense above the grade of the present Common Schools, nor to introduce into these Schools, any other than the Hawaiian language, as a medium of instruction . . .”

46. R. Armstrong 1850:27; see also 1852:45–48; 1853:66 f.; 1854:12 f.
47. R. Armstrong 1852:46; 1854:12; see also 1854:9. “The Hawaiian, therefore, who would keep pace with the age in which he lives, must learn the English language”; 1855:7, “preparing the native race to meet the white man on something like terms of equality.”

48. R. Armstrong 1855:12 f.; 1856:14; most Hawaiians, however, prefer that their sons learn English; see also 1858:25.


50. Kuykendall 1953:111 ff.; also 279, note 140. S. N. Castle October 4, 1864:5 (unnumbered), “In the Privy Council the expediency of attempting to teach English as generally as the Polynesian [sic: The Polynesian] has advocated for some years past has been very fully discussed for two days, and a change in this respect will doubtless be inaugurated. Mr Varigny, Judge Robertson, Judge Andrews[,] Mr Harris[,] & myself taking ground against the practicability of its general introduction whilst Mr Wyllie and Mr Hopkins took the ground of the Polynesian in times past.”


52. R. Armstrong 1853:66; see also 1850:27; 1854:12. However, Armstrong 1858:16 f.; 1860:18 f., noted a decline of the Hawaiian parents’ interest in English. Mott Smith 1876:15. C. R. Bishop 1878:4; 1880:9, 11 f.; 1890:9, no Hawaiian school is closed “without the especial appeal of the parents whose children attended the school”; 22 f. Gibson 1886:9 f.


54. Statistics are given in the reports of the Board of Education. R. Armstrong 1850:27; 1851:1, “the number of children on the Islands, who are acquiring a knowledge of the English language is increasing from year to year” (1848–200; 1849–236; 1850–421); 1853:62, 13,948 students are taught in Hawaiian, 353 in English; 1855:19; 1856:13; 1860:18. Mott Smith 1876:13, “the [Hawaiian-language] Common Schools are still the Schools where the great majority of the children receive instruction.” C. R. Bishop 1878:1; 1880:1, of 7,164 pupils, 4,078 are in Hawaiian language schools; 5, the Common Schools “are taught almost entirely in the Hawaiian language, and by native Hawaiians”;
8, in Select Schools, “The English language is the chief medium of instruction”; 1882: 1, for the first time, Hawaiian-language students are in the minority (3528 out of 8046), which may be the result of the loss of the majority position in the population; 4, “considerably more than half of the children of the nation are now being trained in English, while the remainder receive instruction in the Hawaiian language.” Gibson 1884: 5, 2841 out of 8723 students are studying in Hawaiian; 11, “The time is probably not far distant, when there will remain in the Kingdom very few Schools taught in the Hawaiian language”; 1886: 4, 26. C. R. Bishop 1890: 9, Hawaiian schools “are in fact almost extinct”; the decline of students taught in Hawaiian is traced from 6274 in 1870 to 768 out of 10,006 in 1890. C. R. Bishop 1892: 4, 94.8% of the students are being taught in English, and the remainder are now trying to learn that language; 25 f., “Now that the back of the language work has been broken and a solid foundation laid,” standards can be raised. W. R. Castle 1894: 2, 98% of the students are being educated in English”; 22 f., the statistics of change are given; Hawaiian schools persist only in isolated areas; the conclusion is that “the schools taught in the Hawaiian language are practically dead.”

55. R. Armstrong 1853: 58, “the great disadvantage of pursuing the study of English and native at the same time”; 1856: 14, even for teachers in English schools, “some knowledge of the Hawaiian language is necessary to success; at least without it, the progress of the pupils is very slow and unsatisfactory at first . . .” ; 1860: 18, in English schools for natives, the students are “learning the English language, during more or less of the time.” Gibson 1884: 12, in Select Schools, English is “the only medium of instruction”; because most of the students are Hawaiian, “the various branches taught are generally made more or less subservient to the one great object of these schools, which is to teach Hawaiians the English language”; 1886: 6–9, most of the effort goes into English language teaching. See also the quotation from C. R. Bishop above.


57. Reinecke 1969: 38. Kimura 1983: 196 f., emphasizes the continuing effort to preserve Hawaiian by families, the press, and the churches. “Minutes of the Annual Meeting of 1908” 1908: 125, “experiments that were under way introducing occasional English speaking services in Hawaiian churches at specially favorable points.”
APPENDIX III

Family and Rank

The role of the family and the structure of Hawaiian society have been the subjects of recent discussion. Some claim that the fundamental place of the extended family as described for instance in the works of Mary Kawena Pukui is a postcontact development under foreign pressure from an older society centered on chief and rank. That older society would be marked by a strong differentiation between aliʻi 'chiefs' and makaʻāinana 'commoners'. A major difference between the two would be that in Hawai‘i, as opposed to other areas of Polynesia, commoner families did not keep genealogies or kept shallow ones at best; and that they were genealogically unrelated to the chiefs.¹

This view of Hawaiian society—which would separate it radically from related Polynesian cultures—cannot be supported on the evidence of Hawaiian sources, in which the family is centrally important and provides the conceptual, organizing model for other areas. For instance, the Kumulipo, basing itself on a long Polynesian tradition portrays the development of the universe as a genealogy. Major gods are usually connected to or grouped in families. The family provides a model for the relationship of chiefs to subjects and for schools.²
The chiefs themselves are based in families, as seen in their use of genealogies, and most traditional Hawaiian politics must be understood by reference to family connections. Moreover, many court offices were passed down in families, and family connections, as seen in ‘Ī‘ī’s account, were all-important for a career in chiefly service.³

Among commoners, as elsewhere in Polynesia, family connection conferred such rights as land and water use, and extended hospitality. Moreover, professions and crafts were commonly attached to families (chapter V), so that the very production of the society must be understood as based and organized in the family. Essential for the orderly procedure of society, family identity and connection were established elsewhere in Polynesia by genealogies. What indication can be found that Hawaiian commoners formed an exception to this rule?

The main text on which this theory is based is Malo (n.d.: xviii 60, 61). The context of these statements is important. Malo is discussing the tradition that both chiefs and commoners descend from the same primordial parents, Papa and Wākea.⁴ How then did they separate into two different ranks? To answer this question, Malo develops two theories of his own. The first is based on practicality: people felt the need for leaders, so they raised some from among themselves to that position (Malo n.d.: xviii 2–6). Malo emphasizes that he has no tradition on this point and that it is just an opinion: aole nae i hai ia mai ke alii i hana mua ia pela, he manao wale no keia ‘but the chief that was first made thus is not proclaimed; this is only an opinion’ (section 2). He then provides much traditional information on the chiefs and the court; he also gives his own mana‘o ‘opinion’ that the tabus are not ancient (section 27). He then returns to the problem of the separation of chiefs from commoners, using the same word he has used of his first theory: aole ihai ia mai ka mea i kaawale ai kanaka me nalii ‘the reason why commoners were separated from chiefs has not been proclaimed’ (section 56); that is, it is not in the oral tradition.
Malo provides again his own theory, the second in the chapter. At the beginning, all were chiefs, and some lost their rank and became commoners through various kinds of misconduct. This second theory is the exact opposite of Malo’s first. In section 60, he imagines a chief who has acted so badly that he has been exiled *a poina loa ka mano ana ia ia* ‘the thought/memory of him has been completely forgotten’. N. B. Emerson (Malo 1951:60) has translated “all recollection of him and his pedigree was lost.” The addition “and his pedigree”—which has apparently influenced the secondary literature—is based on Emerson’s interpretation that “the passport to recognition” as a chief “was that one’s pedigree should be vouched for by the genealogist. One’s pedigree being forgotten he must fall to the rank of the commoner” (Malo 1951:63 note 17). In section 61, Malo imagines chiefs who wandered until they became despised, *a malama ole ia ko lakou mooku auhau kupuna e ka poe ike i ke kuauhau* ‘and their ancestral genealogies were not kept by the people knowledgeable in genealogy’.

The above text does not bear directly on the question of whether commoners kept their genealogies. First, it is about chiefs, not commoners. Second, it says that other people forgot the bad chiefs’ genealogies; it does not say that they and their family did. Moreover, Malo is clearly referring to a primordial age, in which people would have remembered their genealogies back to their beginnings. He is not referring to his own times or recent history. Finally, he is formulating theories, not transmitting a tradition or describing a practice. Nonetheless, the text can be reasonably held to offer an *indirect* argument for commoners being distinguished from nobles by the fact that they do not have genealogies. A text by Kamakau bearing on the question will be discussed below.

Fortunately, this one text of Malo’s is not the only piece of evidence on the question. Most important, Malo himself states elsewhere that *makaāina* could show their genealogies in the Hale Nauā up to the tenth generation. Any interpretation of
Malo (n.d.: xviii 60, 61) that would deny genealogies to commoners must account for this second text.

Moreover, a number of other texts refer to the existence of genealogies among commoners. Ka’awa (December 23, 1865) divides genealogies into two categories, those that *pili ana i ko na’l ii* ‘relate/belong to the families of chiefs’ and those that *pili ana i na makaainana* ‘relate/belong to the commoners’. He provides some of the former, but states, *Ka moolelo o na kanaka, (aole i loaa ia’u ke kuauhau.)* ‘The history of the commoners, (I did not obtain the genealogy)’. He clearly knows, however, that some exist. I would add parenthetically that people published their genealogies in the nineteenth century for the purpose of proving some noble connection, following the classical practice of using a genealogy to establish one’s rank as high as possible. I do not know of examples of genealogies published for the purpose of proving that one was purely *makaainana* or *kauā*. Kauā ancestry was generally hidden into modern times (Handy and Pukui 1972: 205).

Kamakau mentions *mookanaka* ‘non-chiefly genealogies’ and *mookauwa* ‘genealogies of the kauā or underclass’ and states of genealogical work in the Hale Nauā: *He hana nui keia mawaena o na’l ii a me na kanaka koikoi* ‘This was an important work among the chiefs and the prominent commoners’ (Kamakau December 28, 1867). The latter group, *ka po’e ko‘iko‘i* ‘the weighty/important/prominent people’, refers to distinguished and powerful non-chiefly individuals and families, the existence of which has been generally ignored by scholars. In a society list, they are clearly distinguished from chiefs and even from commoners: *na’l ii, na kaukau alii, ka poe koikoi o ka aina a me na makaainana* ‘the chiefs, the minor chiefs, the prominent people of the land, and the commoners’.  

Similarly, commoners could have genealogical chants: *na mele koihonua o na keiki punahele a na makaainana* ‘the genealogical chants of the favorite children of the commoners’
Moreover, commoners, like chiefs, could have sacred cords (Kamakau November 4, 1869):

_Ua nui loa na aha o keia alii, he aha okoa ka hoailona o na'lii nui, he aha okoa ko na'lii me na kaukaualii a hiki i na makaainana._

‘Very many were the cords of this chief; a separate cord was the sign of the high chiefs, a separate cord of the chiefs and the minor chiefs down to the commoners’.

The _makaʻāinana_ ‘people of the land’ as a group were in fact heterogeneous. A defeated chief or disgraced priest or other functionary could escape to live incognito as a commoner away from court. As a result (Kamakau, November 3, 1870),

_Iloko o na makaainana, he poe alii, he poe kaukaualii, he poe koikoi, he poe maka hanohano, na keiki makua, i hoopunahele ia._

‘Among the commoners were chiefly people, low chiefly people, prominent people, people of exalted faces, the children of important parents who had been made favorites’.

The family would transmit the knowledge of their origins, so that when chiefs, priests, or prophets were lacking at court, they could be found in this population pool. This practice was recommended late in the nineteenth century. The author of “No na 'Lii o Hawaii Nei” (November 18, 1873) responded to the suggestion that all the chiefs were passing away so none would be left to be king: _he mau alii no ke ola mai nei, aia ma na kuaaina_ ‘there are indeed some chiefs who are living; they are among the backcountry people’. He lists male and female chiefs who _noho ano hookuaaina_ ‘live in an assumed backcountry character’.

Even as backcountry a family as Kānepu‘u’s had such a tradition: his distant _kūpuna_ ‘ancestors’ had arrived at a _kulana ki‘eki‘e_ ‘high position’, but had gone to _noho ma kuaaina_. Nolaila, _ua hooahaahaia a ano ilihune maoli, a ua mau mai ka ilihune a hiki ma ia Maoloha_ ‘live with the backcountry people. Therefore they were reduced to real poverty, and this poverty lasted down
to Maoloha’, the father of Kānewailani/Kānepuʻu (February 20, 1868). In fact, Kānepuʻu starts his narrative by stating his genealogy to his grandparents (February 20, 1868). He calls this ke kuauhau o Kanewailani ‘the genealogy of Kānewailani’ and mentions explicitly that he has left out the earlier ancestors and their families; later sections of the narrative make it clear that his family is very extensive. His family also possessed a transmitted history and lands, which he lists and which in all likelihood had histories attached to them.

In an interview (October 13, 1990), an older Hawaiian woman revealed to me that she belonged to such a family. There was much competition among noble families, and only one could be on top. Her mother’s family had been defeated and had gone to the backcountry to live incognito. The local chief would have expelled them if he had known their identity, and their enemies would have sought to do them harm. They therefore took pains to keep their identity secret. When the boys were sent on errands, they were told not to fraternize. When the mother went to town, she traveled some distance before changing into her city clothes. The family always knew its descent: ‘ike ʻo lākou ʻo wai lākou ‘they knew who they were’. But the mother was persuaded only with difficulty to reveal the genealogy to her daughter. Such a situation was the context for much of the secrecy surrounding names and genealogies. For instance, the woman’s family did not put its names on gravestones.

Connections to nobility were apparently common among makaʻāinana, and a source of pride, so that knowledge about them was transmitted. I myself have spoken on this subject with few Hawaiians who could not make some such genealogical claim. An important reason for the high frequency of noble connections was the practice of liaisons between male and female nobles and commoners, which occurred so often that it was expressed in conventional phrases and sayings (Pukui 1983: number 668). Such liaisons could be important in a family’s history. In the 1970s, I
was shown an unpublished family chant revealed by the patriarch on his deathbed; I interpreted it as a curse on anyone who would kill the child begotten by a famous chief of the contact period and born to a woman in the family who was a dancer. I was then told that such was the family tradition.

Moreover, such liaisons, when fruitful, were subjects of boasting by chiefs as evidence of their potency and fertility:

\[
A \text{ pela na pua alii akua i ike aku ai i na keiki a kanaka, a iho aku la ilalo, aka, aole no kanaka kuaaina i nele i na kupuna alii ole, a pela no ka poe kauwa . . . ua lilo lakou i poe keiki kanaka}
\]

‘Thus the godly, chiefly offspring saw the children of commoners and descended downwards, but there is indeed no backcountry commoner who is lacking in a chiefly ancestor, and so also indeed the kauā people . . . they became people with commoner children’ (Kamakau November 10, 1870).

\[
a \text{ua lilo lakou i mau kupuna no na'lii a me na makaainana}
\]

‘and they became ancestors of chiefs and commoners’ (Kamakau December 22, 1870).

\[
he \text{ kupuna laua no na 'lii a me na makaainana}
\]

‘the two were ancestors of the chiefs and the commoners’.\(^8\)

Some backcountry people became uppity because of their genealogical claims, which was resented.\(^9\)

Kamakau (December 28, 1867) states that such practices led to genealogical accusations among the chiefs and that \(Oia \text{ ke kumu o ke kapu ana o ke kuauhau i na makaainana a me na keiki a ka noanoa} \) ‘This was the reason for laying a kapu on genealogies among the commoners and lower class people [or the people who were offspring of such mixed-rank unions]’. Kamakau is presenting this prohibition as a novelty against an older, more widespread practice; that is, commoners had earlier been keeping such genealogies and an effort was now being made to prevent them from
doing so. This statement raises a number of questions. If there was such a prohibition, when was it proclaimed and by whom? Kamehameha I was the first chief who could have enforced such a prohibition throughout Hawai‘i; is this another of his innovations? In any case, I have no evidence that any such prohibition was successful.

Similarly, Kamakau writes that genealogies were without value for commoners. Parents did not want their children to pretend to noble status, so they did not teach them their genealogy beyond the father, mother, and grandparents. Kamakau thus implies again that at least up to a certain period, more genealogical information was indeed known. How children could have been kept in ignorance of their genealogies beyond their grandparents is hard to imagine in practice. Children were often reared by the grandparents, who in turn would have known about their own grandparents. Would grandparents never have mentioned their own parents and grandparents to their grandchildren? In fact, one of the main purposes of this child-rearing practice was to preserve the continuity with the past.

Indeed a number of common family practices would have required a knowledge of family background. Families would pass on special names that would link the generations (e.g., Pukui 1983: number 2484; compare 2107, 2171). Some knowledge of the previous holders of the name would in all likelihood have been transmitted along with the name, just as it is today. Commoner families as well as noble ones had ‘aumākua ‘family gods’ (e.g., Ekaula March 23, 30, 1865). They are important in the foretelling of Kānepuʻu’s career (Kānepuʻu February 20, 1868). These ‘aumākua were usually deified ancestors, and some historical knowledge of them was retained. The genealogy of the kauā was established from the time of Papa and Wākea. Nobles employed genealogists to make sure they did not marry anyone with kauā blood (Malo n.d.: xx 20–26). Kauā would naturally try to hide their background, so
genealogical research was needed to identify them (Kamakau November 3, 1870). Because commoners also avoided marrying kauā, some public knowledge was necessary of the family background of commoners, because any marriage partner could conceivably have one or more kauā ancestors.

Family clearly played a central role in all levels of Hawaiian society, and many family practices transcended social differences. Classical Hawaiian society did not have a sharp, class-like division between nobles and commoners; rather it was a spectrum with the highest chiefs at one extreme, the kauā at the other, and, in between, a continuum of fine and ever shifting gradations of rank combined with recognized social prominence. Wide differences were easily recognized, but the continuity among closer levels allowed for flexibility, claims, controversies, politics, and judgement.13

Significantly the lowest rankings of the chiefs and the highest rankings of the commoners shaded into each other, most easily by the commoners claiming a noble member for their genealogy. The family of John Papa ʻĪʻī provides a detailed example. They had noble ancestors and so were eligible for certain court positions, which was in fact a family tradition. But their positions at court were not simply inherited, as some higher ones were, but had to be earned by education, talent, and skill, and retained by hard work and efficient service. Their family history and connections gave them opportunities, but the family candidate for any position had to be gifted and well educated. Such families had to retain their status by continuous, efficient service; in turn, the maintenance of status was a powerful incentive to excel. Similarly, a person without noble ancestors could be retained by a chief because of his skills.

Moreover, my reading of Hawaiian sources suggests that in large extended families, there was considerable variety in work and career. As a result, some members would do court or “chieflly” work and others work that was normally associated with
commoners (though the difference is often problematical). For instance, in ʻĪʻī’s family can be found chiefly retainers, administrators, and medical priests, but ʻĪʻī’s father does a variety of jobs unconnected to the court, including dyeing loin cloths (ʻĪʻī July 24, 1869, ʻoihana hoʻoluʻu malo). The family traditions recorded by ʻĪʻī seem quite similar to the situation in his own time: a large extended family, the members of which can pursue quite different careers. They could also hold very different political loyalties; some of ʻĪʻī’s relations were kahu of Kamehameha I, and others tried sorcery against him (ʻĪʻī February 27, 1869)! An adequate description of classical extended families would, however, require a study of all the families for which we have evidence—identifying all the family members and following their careers—and would go far beyond the limits of this essay.

Such a study should be part of a larger reevaluation of received and novel descriptions of Hawaiian society, a task burdened by modern and especially American preconceptions. For instance, nobles seem to be depicted either as the American stereotype of an English lord or as the American ideal of a glad-handing politician. Similarly, in contemporary discussion, the word commoner often seems loaded with modern connotations, as if it referred to some uneducated, uncultured, proto-proletarian underclass. In medieval England, the commoners were those who had the right to use the commons and were thus important and honored members of the community; thus the House of Commons. Commoner families could be as ancient, distinguished, and respected as those with titles. Similarly, the makaʻāinana were not at the low end of the social spectrum, but in the middle. Their usually long-held rights to land and water use and their family traditions of crafts and professions made them the broad economic basis of the society. Their vital cultural activities in all fields of literature, the arts, and religion were the basis for the elaborations of the noble classes. Finally, the commoners were not devoid of political responsibility; Kamakau emphasizes their role in the process
of overthrowing a chief of O‘ahu and offering the rule to the chief Kahahana (March 23 [sic: 16], 1867a).

In view of the classical place of the family in Hawaiian culture, the increase in its role today should not be exaggerated. As in other Polynesian societies, the family was always the social, emotional, and even mental bedrock. Through the rapid and profound changes since contact, the family was the part of Hawaiian culture that changed the least. Marie Keesing writes (1947: 49):

> In general, the traditional customs of child rearing appear to be very persistent even under conditions of extensive acculturation, as might be expected in matters which touch so intimately the group security and integrity.

Some years later, Gallimore, Boggs, and Jordan could still write:

> it is probable that child rearing practices and attitudes toward children are a part of the culture that has not come under direct attack by Westerners, as was the case with religion, land tenure, and so on. Thus it is not too surprising to find that the various groups of Polynesians still share some socialization patterns.\textsuperscript{15}

Many other aspects of the traditional family, such as religion and specialization in the arts, were perpetuated as well.

Thus, in extremes, the family became a last resort for those in need of stability, a last stand for ethnic identity, and a last center for cultural education and experience. On an analogous situation on Pitcairn Island, Ritchie and Ritchie write (1979: 26):

> It was the Polynesian identity which survived. Perhaps this is because, at the core of the cultural continuity lies the particular relationship between women, children, and the community that surrounds them. In the last analysis the person who instructs the young is the final arbiter of what enters or leaves the succession of cultural continuity over generations. But even before that, the most basic level of all, of experiences before one had language to express them, of feelings about oneself, the outside world, other
people, the first and last inescapable patterns of cultural identity, was laid by whatever it was that everyone around one shared.

In Polynesia in general, the culture was constructed on the basis of the family with a series of increasingly elaborated levels. After contact, those levels were lost or retreated back towards the more basic. In Hawai‘i, the temple religion was destroyed, but family religion remained; the highest levels of formal education at the temples and courts were dissolved, but schools of individual experts and family education endured. Theologies were no longer fully articulated, but folk beliefs persisted.

The historical difference was therefore not in the basic importance of the family, but in the lack of further traditional opportunities to satisfy emotional, cultural, religious, and educational needs. Kānepu‘u (February 20, 1868) was taken as an infant to have his body read as a prognosis of his future: his mother was told that he had talents that could have been valuable for traditional religious occupations, ones that were no longer practiced in postcontact Hawai‘i. As a result, he would suffer troubles in his life and work. This unfortunate situation is currently being corrected by the Hawaiian Renaissance and the establishment and popularity of other educational institutions, such as hula academies.

The second historical difference, less widespread, was the shrinking of the values and practices of the extended family inward towards the nuclear and then even towards the female component inside the home, the very center of stability; a process that seems to have begun early. In this historical case, the traditional separation of tasks and roles by gender favored the women; more of theirs survived the postcontact developments than the men’s. This has resulted often in differences in psychological problems among men and women.

Again, for an indigenous, minority group in a rapidly changing world, the cultural element that changes least is the ultimate
provider of stability and identity. Many Hawaiian families have of course preserved their traditions, and others are currently rediscovering theirs, thus broadening the basis of support for a Hawaiian lifestyle and identity.

NOTES


3. Court offices: Malo n.d.: xviii 18. Kamakau August 17, 1867, the chief calls ka poe ike i ke kakaolelo a me na keiki a kona poe kakaolelelo i aoa e ko lakou poe makua i pau i ka make ‘the people who know oratory and the children of his orators who were taught by their deceased parents’; December 28, 1867, the court genealogist vets candidates for office to make sure they are of the right family. Nākuina 1902a: 28, Pāka’a shares with his Kaua’i family the riches he has earned at the court of his Hawai’i chief. Luomala 1989: 312. Compare “He Moolelo Kaa no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” May 26, July 7, August 4, 1921. Ellis 1984: 155, 411f., 424, 462, most high positions were hereditary in families, but a candidate needed to be approved by the chief, and one could rise in merit above one’s rank. More examples are provided in chapter V. ‘Ī’ī: e.g., July 10, 1869; February 5, 1870. See also the main text.

4. Malo n.d.: xviii 1. See also Kamakau October 25, 1842; October 27, 1870. Kaaie April 24, 1862. Malo 1837: 9, uses the argument that Wākea could not have made the haole as an argument against his divinity.

5. Malo n.d.: xxxviii 36, 40–42; 200, Emerson disagrees on the authority of his own informants.

6. Kamakau April 25, 1868; May 2, 1868, ka poe koikoi; mailaila i noho ai na’lii a me ka poe koikoi a me na koa e malama ana i ka Moi a me ka Papu ‘there resided the chiefs and the prominent people and the warriors guarding the King and the Fort’; na kaukau ali‘i a me ka poe koikoi ‘the lower chiefs and the prominent people’; January 21, 1869, refers to Daniel ‘Ī’ī, David Malo, and others as poe koikoi (the chief Hoapili is mentioned earlier but does not seem connected to the designation). Malo was in the words of Bingham 1981: 318, “a shrewd plebeian.” Compare Kawaiakamaikamakaokaopua October 26, 1922, na ali‘i nui a ko‘iko‘i; “No ko’u Wa i Hanau mai ai, a Hiki mai nei i nei Manawa”
December 17, 1834, on his father who was from Hōnaunau: *He kupa nolaila, he kamaaina nui nolaila* ‘He was a native of that place, an important child of that land.’ Andrews 1836: 15, mentions “those who have held a middle rank between chiefs and common people”; he describes Malo as “standing between the chiefs and the common people,” Chun 1993: 5. Other examples are given below.

7. See also Kamakau October 28, 1865; November 4, 1869. Malo n.d.: xviii 23, 24; xix 24, refers to people with recognized chiefly genealogy living in the backcountry, sometimes with the due honors of their rank. Kepelino 1932: 197. Compare Elbert 1959: 103; 102 n. 75. The fact that chiefs could live incognito in the backcountry indicates a certain commonality of good manners throughout the society. Living together could at times have encouraged a group solidarity; Kau December 18, 1865, the commoners and the minor chiefs join together against the high chief.


10. Kamakau October 7, 1865a; he argues also that genealogies are no longer useful in modern times, because one gets one’s value from one’s own no’ono’o ‘thinking’ and ‘ike ‘knowledge’. The knowledge of genealogies was tabu to commoners, but they have now risen through their na‘auao ‘wisdom’ and akamai ‘intelligence’. Pukui n.d. 1605 [4], expert genealogists should be of noble blood; “Commoners were not trained to memorize and recite the genealogy of the chiefs.” This statement of Pukui’s, as most others published on the subject, is difficult to apply directly to the question under discussion. She certainly does not state that commoners were not trained to keep their own genealogies.

11. Versus Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 294, which may describe the practice of a particular family. Kamakau 1964: 77, the ceremony of deifying a relative as an ‘aumakua included a means of marking the body it would assume so that it could be identified. I have talked with Hawaiians who had historical knowledge of their ‘aumākua, and such knowledge would have been unavoidable in the case of deified historical chiefs like Kamehameha I.


13. Compare Ellis 1984: 155, 411 ff. Kamakau December 28, 1867, refers to o ke alii kiekie, ke alii haahaa a me ke alii makaainana ‘the high chief, the low chief, and the commoner chief’. Malo n.d.: xviii 26, a person could be “merely called,” olelo waha ia, noble because of his office or knowledge.


16. Kānepu‘u February 20, March 5, 12, April 2, 1868, presents his father as unusual in that he stayed with his wife and family and provided food for them in advance by farming if he had to leave on a trip; the father also leaves his own land and family to seek medical aid for his wife elsewhere. Gallimore, Boggs, and Jordan 1974: 74 f., 77–81. Compare Ritchie and Ritchie 1989:113. Cultural changes were harder also for Native American males than females, McLoughlin 1986: 62.
Hawaiians had learned much about the West before the arrival of the missionaries in 1820, and sporadic attempts had been made at more formal education in Western subjects. The missionaries themselves founded a large number of schools, which were extremely popular. The question must then be raised whether some or all of the elements I identify as belonging to classical Hawaiian education might be the products of foreign influence. I discuss the general subject of early Western education in Hawai‘i in chapters I and VI and several particular points elsewhere. I will confine myself here to the exemplary question of Western influence on the literary forms used in education, using lists as the primary example.

The use of Hawaiian resources wherever possible seems to have been a general policy of the mission, as seen in their response to the Hawaiian practice of memorization. The likelihood is therefore that Hawaiian educational forms would be used when practical and unburdened with ideological difficulties and that their use would increase as the missionaries became more knowledgeable in the language and as they moved from direct
translations of foreign texts to paraphrases and summaries and finally to original works written in Hawaiian. This surmise is in fact borne out by an examination of the early mission imprints, most of which I cite for convenience by number from Judd, Bell, and Murdoch (1978), adding the year in parentheses or brackets. Many educational texts of the mission are in fact translations of foreign schoolbooks and catechisms and preserve their forms, which can even be extended to other subjects, as seen in a Roman Catholic geography text in catechism form (Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 249 [1842]). Books continued to be published with little or no Hawaiian stylistic elements (e.g., Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 98 [1834]; number 263 [1843]).

A clear illustration of the above points is provided by missionary uses of the basic Hawaiian educational form: a list beginning with *eia* ‘here are’ (chapter IV and Appendix VI): often *eia ka inoa o . . .* ‘here is the name of . . .’ or *eia nā inoa o . . .* ‘here are the names of . . .’, both followed by several items. This form is widely distributed in Hawaiian literature and does not translate directly into a common or idiomatic English equivalent. I will mention also the use of Western-style titles, without an initial *No* ‘about’, which is used in those of Hawaiian style.

This classical Hawaiian list form is not used in the earliest texts even where appropriate, specifically in the first alphabet lists (in 1828, it will be used for a list of punctuation marks, as seen below). The earliest alphabet list is Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 1 (1822; illustration page 2), which is mostly in English and uses a typical Western form for the title. All the lists are in Western style, and all titles for lists are in English and in Western style. Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 3 (1823) is just the alphabet itself with no other text. The lists in the first Hawaiian version, *Ka Be-A-Ba* (Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 5 [1824]:1 ff.), and in number 9 (1825), are all in Western style. Western styles of lists continue to be used in educational texts:
Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 61 (1830): 4, *Na Hua* is a Western-style title under which is placed a list printed in three columns.

Number 269 (1844), is a late work but without noticeable Hawaiian stylistic elements; Western-style lists are used throughout.

Such Western-style lists without Hawaiian devices can be found in general use in later Hawaiian-language writings.\(^1\)

In the translation of the Bible, the Hawaiian list form is used sparingly in the many opportunities available, such as those texts in which a similar Hebrew phrase is used. For instance, the Hawaiian form is not used in Genesis IX 18, 19, X 31, although it was already known, as can be seen from Genesis XXV 13, Exodus I, 1–4, VI 14, 16 (Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: numbers 44, 46 [1829]). The Hawaiian list form is apparently used more extensively in the books translated later (e.g., First Chronicles I–IX, XI 10 f., 26–47).

In other translations, the list form can be used, either extensively (Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 161 [1837, by Andrews]: 1 f., 6 f., 8 f.) or infrequently (Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 247 [1842]: 9, *Eia na keiki mua a Adamu laua me Ewa, o Kaina a me Akela* ‘Here are the first children of Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel’). The list form is used extensively in one translation (Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 103 [1834]):

21 (number 34): *Eia na inoa o na wahi a lakou i hoomoana hou aku ai, ma ke ala,* followed by a simple list.

23 (number 1): *Eia na inoa o ia mau lahuikanaka,* followed by a simple list.

24 (number 8): *Eia na inoa o ko lakou kulanakauhale nui.* [simple list], *elima lakou.* (Note the punctuation).

29 (numbers 9 and 10): *Eia na inoa* (compare page 31).

See also 32 (number 21) and 34 (number 24).
A comparison with the original English text (Worcester 1832) shows that an English equivalent of the classical Hawaiian list form was not found there but was added in the translation, for instance:

19 (number 34): “Their next places of encampment were . . .”

20 (number 1): “inhabited by seven nations, the descendants of Canaan, namely, the . . .”

21 (number 8): “Their chief cities were . . .”

Although lists are used extensively in Worcester 1832, none resemble the classical Hawaiian list form described above.

The list form was used more often in original works in Hawaiian, either sparingly (Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 147 [1837; by Andrews], only page 3) or, more usually, quite freely.

The earliest examples of the use of the *eia* list form in school texts date from 1828. In the original Hawaiian-language composition by A. Bishop, *Aritemetika: Oia ka Hoike Helu* (Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 38 [1828])—which also uses titles both with and without *no*—all the lists are in Western style except: *Eia ke ano o na numera:* ‘Here is the meaning or character of the numbers:’ (2). The use of the singular for *ke ‘ano* is in the older Hawaiian style, as in lists starting *Eia ka inoa o . . .* ‘Here is the name of . . .’ and containing more than one named item. The list that follows is a set of stereotyped numerical computations in digits and mathematical signs, that is, untraditional material; *a pela aku* ‘and so on’ closes the list. This is followed by *Eia no kekahi* ‘Here is something’ followed by a series of definitions in words of numbers broken by some expository material and terminated by *a pela aku no.* The initial phrase thus is not used to introduce a list but to pass to another point, also a traditional use. On page 3, *Eia no ke ano* is used thrice to introduce not a list but an explanation of a mathematical sign. This first use of the *eia* introduction is obviously awkward and tentative, and the author has not clearly distinguished it from other rhetorical uses of *eia.*
He Hope no ka Pi-A-Pa, by Lorrin Andrews, uses the eia form more expertly and also Hawaiian-style titles (1 ff., 6):

2, eia ka inoa o na hoailona maloko, followed by a simple list.

7, Eia ke ano o na kiko i kauia maloko o ka palapala, followed by list of punctuation marks (compare numbers 252 [1843] and 268 [1844]; illustration in Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: 92 f.).

Compare 4, Eia ke ano o ka moku, not used for a list, and the different Hawaiian list forms on the same page: He nui loa ka inoa o na wahi maluna o ka aina and He nui loa ka inoa o na wai, both followed by simple lists.

The eia form has clearly become familiar in Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 110 (1835):

5, Eia na hua, a me ko lakou inoa, followed by a list of musical notes.

10, Eia na hoailona hoomaka a me ko lakou inoa:

15 ff., a series of sections in regular form, Eia ka (items numbered from three to eight) o na hoailona.

28, Eia na inoa ehiku o na huamele a pau, followed by a simple list.

Compare 39, a series of sentences in regular form with underlined variants, perhaps based on the Hawaiian fill-in-the-blanks form.

The Hawaiian form can be used along with Western-style lists, as seen already above: e.g., Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 228 (1841; a translation by Andrews):

7, Eia na inoa (underlined).

9 f., a numbered list: O ke kahi, O ka lua . . . (either Hawaiian or Western).

61, a Western-style list.

Ke Kakaulima: He mea ia e pono ai na kula (Judd, Bell, and
Murdoch 1978: number 124 [1835]), is a good example of a mixture of styles. The title of the book is in Western style, but the title of the preface is in Hawaiian, *No ke Kakaulima*. On page 1, a typical list introduction—*Eia kekahi pono o ke kakaulima*.—is placed before, not a list, but a discursive exposition of the advantages of writing. On page 2, *Eia kekahi mau mea e pono ai ke kakaulima* (in italics) is placed before a numbered list, most items of which are discursive rather than following a regular form. The result is a combination of Hawaiian and English styles in one list. This can be found also in Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 147 (1837): 3, *Eia na inoa o na hua o ka Olelo Beritania*:, followed by four columns with subtitles. The Hawaiian list form could also be used for new contents, such as Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 236 (1842): 7 f., which is also a mixed form: *Eia* followed by a series of numbered paragraphs.

Whitney and Richards (1832) is an original composition in Hawaiian and provides another good example of the mixture of styles. The writers were by this time sufficiently experienced to use Hawaiian expressions with some creativity. For instance, to express the long day in the polar regions, they used the classical expression *pō ka lā* ‘the day turns to night’ with the negative (6): *aole e po ka la* ‘day does not become night’. The unconventionality of this simple change expresses neatly the unusualness of the phenomenon.

III, a Western-style list.

2, *Meneia*:, with a spreadsheet.

2, *maheleia*, and a list of names.

7 f., a list numbered with Roman numerals.

39, *Eia na mokuna*:, followed by two rows of numbered lists, a combination of styles.
53, *Eia na inoa*, followed by a simple list.

60, a list in pure Western style.

61 f., *Eia hoi na mea*, followed by a simple, informal list.

115, *Eia na inoa o na moanawai nui loa*.

121, *Eia na inoa o na moku*.; followed by a list with a note on left side, thus a stylistic combination.

152, *Ekolu no mauna nui ma Hawaii*,., followed by a list of three names.

154, *Eia na moku*, followed by a simple list of districts.

159, *Eia na holoholona kahiko o Hawaii nei*, followed by a simple list.

*Eia na holoholona hou mai* [list] a me kekahi mau mea e.

162, *a mohai aku i kanaka . . . a me ka ai*, an informal offerings list based on traditional ones.

166 f., a list of sections with Roman numerals.

168, *Eia ka inoa o na moku nui*, followed by a list of names.

169, *Eia ka inoa o kekahi mau aina liili i*, [a list of names], *ua nui loa na aina liili i*.

170, *Eia ka inoa pakahi o na aina*, followed by a list of names.

178–194, Western-style lists.

This mixture of styles is important for the study of Hawaiian prose as an early chapter in the influence of Western literature on Hawaiian. Interestingly, David Malo, who uses the classical Hawaiian list form extensively when writing about Hawaiian culture, uses it not at all in his early booklet of Christian teaching (1837). The reason for this is, at least in part, that traditional
lists were not available for this new subject, whereas he could use many such lists when writing about traditional Hawaiian culture. The pure and fluent Hawaiian he uses when dealing with new subjects could have provided a model for later authors.

When used as in the above examples, the smaller Western literary forms and devices are easily distinguishable from classical Hawaiian ones. This is true also of general style. For instance, the rhetoric encouraging school teachers\textsuperscript{3} is quite distinguishable from Hawaiian statements on education, even though many of the same words are used.

On the other hand, a number of forms or organizational devices could have been common to both Western and Hawaiian culture. Itineraries are common in the Bible and in the school books based on it (e.g., Worcester 1832:11 ff., 48–51), but the form is so widespread in Hawaiian literature as to be recognized as indigenous. Similarly, the organization of an exposition by key words (e.g., Worcester 1832:32–41, 45 f.), is sufficiently handy and widespread not to require influence, especially in an oral culture.

Other cases are less clear. For instance, the form of a list followed by paragraphs explaining each item is used by Comstock (1829:8–11), which was translated into Hawaiian by William Richards and published in 1834 (Mookini 1985:xi–xiv, 125–129), with the Hawaiianizing addition of eia na inoa (Mookini 1985:125) for “the following” (Comstock 1829:8). This form of organization was therefore at the least supported by Western schools. In view of its simplicity, wide distribution, and closeness of fit with other uses of lists, I would argue that it was not wholly a foreign introduction, but is a case of overlap between Hawaiian and Western practices (chapter IV and Appendix VI). Similarly, the conventional Hawaiian forms of discussion organized by initial terms and of lists constructed of parallel sentences can be found in Comstock and its translation.\textsuperscript{4} I would argue for the same reasons that these are cases of overlap; the use of parallel sentences
is too firmly established in Hawaiian literature—and too widespread an oral literary device—to be merely an introduction.

Larger Western forms of organization are in all likelihood the basis for a number of nineteenth-century Hawaiian-language essays that follow one or more basic structures and that were in several demonstrable cases class assignments. Sheldon Dibble early devised a list of questions with his students, which they then used to elicit information from informants on Hawaiian history. David Malo (July 1, 1847) later followed the same method, in all likelihood while writing *Ka Moolelo Hawaii* (chapter V). The series of essays under the title *Na Moolelo mai na Kupuna Mai* ‘The Reports from the Elders’ in Fornander (1918–1919: 571–687)—which were probably school assignments—also seems to be based on sets of questions, which are probably to be found in the subtitles. The organization of the essays differs according to type-description, instructions on how to do something, and so on. The essays in the series, *Kahuna Kahiko*, which appeared in *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, Volume 4, from January 5 to April 14, 1866, were also products of a school project (Kirtley and Mookini 1979: 67 ff.). Waimea writes *Ua waiho ia mai ia'u keia kumu manao, a na'u e hoike pakahi aku i ko lakou ano, a me ko lakou hana* ‘I was given these subjects, and it is up to me to show one by one their character and work’. He then provides a numbered list of three topics, which is followed by three numbered paragraphs discussing them. Anonymous and Kupahu follow the same organization. The frequent mention of assigned subjects and themes and the similarities of organization in the essays of the series are the results of their being products of a school assignment. The above essays can be studied in detail for nineteenth-century acculturated forms of organization and exposition.

The cultural influence in the schools was not however one-sided. Hawaiians early imposed the educational forms and practices of their own culture on Western education. For instance,
memorization was used extensively and chants were composed and used as memory aids (chapter 4). In this context can be examined the important subject of the influence of missionary education on the writings of David Malo. I will look at only one aspect here and that briefly: the influence of the geographical sections of the early school books on his presentation of the Hawaiian cosmos.

Missionary school books or chapters on geography are different both in content and presentation from classical Hawaiian discussions of the same field, although in view of Malo’s intense study of all Hawaiian-language books, the possibility of some influence needs to be investigated. Judd, Bell, and Murdoch 1978: number 155, is a straight translation from the English, and I see no influence on Malo. On the other hand, clear verbal influence can be found from Andrews’ He Hohe no ka Pi-A-Pa (1829; original edition 1828) and Whitney and Richards (1832). Both books are based on foreign materials but are original compositions. Since Andrews was newly arrived in Hawai‘i, I suspect that he had extensive help with the Hawaiian language; the good Hawaiian of Whitney and Richards (1832) with its use of classical forms argues for their receiving help as well. The latter book is clearly based on the former in its general outline and in relevant sections. For instance, Andrews’ description of the connection of north with the right hand and south with the left is the basis for Whitney and Richards’. Whitney and Richards’ following description of the directions is an expansion of Andrews’ as are their descriptions of lands and waters.

Malo knew both books and may indeed have helped write them. In any case, he used them when composing his Ka Moolelo Hawaii (n.d.). For instance, the connection between north and south and the right and left hands, mentioned above, is used in very near wording by Malo. In his presentation of the views of foreigners on the origin of the islands, Malo is quoting with few variations Whitney and Richards. Similarly, his discussion of the
peopling of the islands uses the same book. In both these cases, the views presented are clearly labeled as foreign, not as traditional Hawaiian.

Identifying Malo’s use of these books makes possible a more precise description of his own views. For instance, despite its disguising rhetoric, the conclusion of his discussion of the origin of the islands seems to leave the question at least potentially open (n.d.: 11 13). Also though Whitney and Richards state that nothing is securely known about the peopling of the islands and nothing can be found in Scripture on the subject, Malo develops a theory of the Hawaiians as possibly a lost tribe of Israel, using Scripture and cultural similarities. This theory can be found elsewhere in Hawaiian literature by both Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians and reaches a nineteenth-century culmination in the Kumuhonua literature, which used Biblical and Hawaiian traditions to reconstruct a tradition prior to both. Hawaiian Mormons have developed similar ideas.

The two schoolbooks may also have had an influence on the sequence of subjects in Ka Moolelo Hawaii. The most arguable possibility is the placing of a section on directions before the section on the cosmic framework. Andrews places sacred history before the section on directions, and Whitney and Richards place a historical section towards the end of their discussion of Hawai‘i. Similarly, Malo places an origin and early history section at the beginning of his work (n.d.: i–iv) and, with some repetition, a more complete historical section at the end (lviii–lxvii). Malo’s chapters II to IV might have been suggested by Andrews (1829: 2, paragraphs 3 f.). Malo’s long section based on uka and kai (chapter IV), may have been influenced by Andrews (1829: 3 f.). The expression of the latter, Elua mea nui ma ka honua, he aina, he wai ‘There are two big things on the earth, the land, the fresh water’ (3) are nonsense in classical Hawaiian terms (honua is being used by Andrews for the earth as globe), but could have been understood as approximations of uka and kai. The unusual
plural of Malo’s chapter X, *No na Kai* ‘About the Seas’, may have been influenced by the school book’s *He nui loa ka inoa o na wai* ‘Very many are the names of the waters’.¹⁹

On the other hand, the differences between Malo’s work and the schoolbooks are great. Andrews (1829:1) explains *pō* and *ao*, rather than using the pair as basic. Andrews has no ‘above’ or ‘sky’ section, and the one in Whitney and Richards (1832: 6 f.) is completely different from Malo’s treatment. The placement of Malo’s section on time reckoning (n.d.: xi) seems uninfluenced. Moreover, Malo adheres to the classical terms when describing the cosmos. For instance, he does not adopt the ‘āina/wai distinction from Andrews, described above, but keeps the old terms *luna/lalo* and *uka/kai*. He does not adopt the considerable new geographical nomenclature offered by Whitney and Richards. He does not make the distinction between *moana* and *kai* found in the schoolbooks or use the word *oki* for division as in Whitney and Richards.²⁰

Finally, the basic organizing pairs used by Malo are so widespread in Hawaiian literature and also in Polynesian that the basic scheme of Malo’s presentation can be firmly acknowledged as classical and any influence on it as comparatively minor.

In sum, Malo is conscious of the differences between Hawaiian traditions and foreign ones and is perfectly capable of differentiating between them. This can be seen also in his explicit contrast of Hawaiian and Biblical genealogies (n.d.: 10) and in the separate lists he makes of foreign or newly introduced items. The detailed differentiation between one’s own traditions and those of others was normal in classical Hawaiian culture, and the training in that practice could have been applied to differentiating between indigenous objects, traditions, and views and the novel foreign ones. As a result, when Malo states that he is presenting older traditions, the reader can accept his claim with confidence. Older traditions meant for Malo those in which he was reared during the reign of Kamehameha I as well as earlier ones. But I
have found no evidence of Malo being genuinely confused about old and new, Hawaiian and foreign. He can however apply the new Christian morality to old practices.

As stated above, the influence of Malo or other Hawaiians on *He Hope no ka Pi-A-Pa* and Whitney and Richards cannot be excluded. The newcomer Andrews would have needed help with the language. The descriptions of Hawaiian places in Whitney and Richards (1832:152–158) depend on traditional Hawaiian knowledge and occasionally quote traditional place sayings and expressions. Their historical information (1832:154–157, 160–166, 170) is based in large part on Hawaiian traditions; for instance, they express the Hawaiian side of the death of James Cook.

The above is merely a sketch of a very few aspects of the mutual influence of Hawaiian and Western education. The subject deserves a full treatment as an excellent example of culture contact and one for which a large number of sources from both sides are available. In any case, I have provided enough information to demonstrate that Hawaiians were not simply passive recipients of Western education and that their own traditional education made a significant contribution to the development of postcontact education in Hawai‘i.

NOTES


7. Waimea May 18, 1865. Kirtley and Mookini 1979: 92. See Appendix VI.


9. For example, Kaawa December 23, 1865, might give the actual form of the assignment or Kumumanao.


12. Malo n.d.: vi 2. Is Malo’s debatable statement that people facing in different directions would use different terms, n.d.: vi 8, 9, a mistaken extrapolation from a basically foreign way of viewing the subject? The difficulty with that theory is that the school book descriptions and Malo’s section 2 fit the Hawaiian terms but have no connection to English ones. The school book was probably written with Hawaiian help at this point, and Malo’s mistake is his own. For Malo’s use of moe, compare Tī January 8, 1870. Kamakau November 4, 1869, is in all likelihood based on Malo’s discussion. See the discussion in chapter IV.


18. This section is based at least partially on Malo’s manuscript of the story of ‘Umi (chapter V). The history comes to an abrupt end, and Malo’s lost or projected historical volume may have been the completion of this work. See chapter V.


20. Moana and kai: Andrews 1829: 4; Whitney and Richards 1832: 3. ‘Ōki: Whitney and Richards 1832: 2, 152 f., 155; examples of new terms: 4 f., moanawai for great lakes, Poai waena for equator; loan words are also invented.
APPENDIX V
Onomatopoeia

The real connection of names and words to their referents is basic to understanding the Hawaiian view of language and many aspects of its use. Onomatopoeia supported this view and was thus unusually important in Hawaiian literature and thought.¹ Hawaiians recognized many of their words as onomatopoeic, especially those connected with birds and other animals (Pukui and Elbert 1986):

he’u, the hoot of an owl and also a sound made in chants or prayers.

ko’u, a cluck (not identified as onomatopoeic in the dictionary).

li’o, li’oli’o, “name of the sound of made by the ‘a’o bird; to call thus” (compare Fornander 1916–1917: 397 lines 53, 61).

‘owā, ʻoā, “Cry of the ʻaukuʻu, heron, which suggests ‘owā; to cry thus.”

uli, a cock’s crow.

Examples could be multiplied (e.g., Hyde 1887: 58), and Hawaiians applied their talents to the new animals introduced by foreigners. Oau was one way of reproducing the sound of a cat (Malo 1951: 41
These onomatopoeic words could be identified as the basis for the name of the animal, the best known being the ‘elepaio “A species of flycatcher”, proverbially “the bird that says its name,” a strong indication of the closeness of the name to its referent. Kepelino emphasizes bird calls throughout his discussion of birds (February, March 1859, January 1860) and lists several, the names of which are derived from their call:

the ‘io “Hawaiian hawk”, the call of which is fuio. (Kepelino February 1859: 10)

The ‘iwa “Frigate or man-of-war bird”: A o tana tani he iff, a no ia, ua pana tona inoa mamuli o te ano o tana tani. Iff, oia te tani: a o Iva ta lave'na inoa. Nolaila, o Iva ta mea tani i ta iff: a o iff te tani a Iva. ‘Its call is an iff, and because of this, its name is well known because of [or is sounded after] the character of its call. Iff, this is the call: and ‘iva was taken as its name. Therefore, ‘iva is the thing that calls the iff, and iff is the call of ‘iva.’ (12; also Sterling and Summers 1978: 116)

‘alalā “Hawaiian crow”, its call, au..a; O tona inoa ua tapaia mamuli o te ano o tana tani. ‘Its name is called after the character of its cry’. (14)

Nēnē “Hawaiian goose”, its call Unele! Unele! (14). The word is itself onomatopoeic for “To chirp . . . to croak”, etc.

Hulimai’ia “reddish-brown, honey-sucking bird (no data)”, its call hulinm-mmaiah. (March 1859: 18)

Kōlea [t olea] “Pacific golden plover”, its call tolea (21).

Kioea “Bristle-thighed curlew”, its call a..a tioea. (21; possibly olo-tele, 22)

The name of the ‘akakane “Hawai’i ‘ākepa (honey creeper)” [atatane or atatani] is based on a non-onomatopoeic word that describes its call. (24)

Alokele, its call, alo ma..teoteo. (27)

‘Elepaio, its morning call, Elleffaiio. (27)

These statements are indications of the closeness of words to their referents in Hawaiian thinking. They are in fact examples of the Hawaiians’ general manner of observing and listening closely to their environment, as expressed by Winona Beamer (1976:15): “Perhaps the dance was born for Hawaiians in some far away wild-wood as sweet winds set young green saplings clicking, tapping, pounding. . .”

Animals and elements can speak to human beings in real life as well as fable.3 The ‘elepaio can cry ‘Ono ka i’a ‘The fish is delicious’ and more.4 In one story, the nēnē calls out I nele, i nele ‘Lacking, lacking’.5 The introduced turkey can also be considered to have a significant cry.6 In an extended passage of great eloquence, Kepelino writes of the delight of seeing the ‘akakane in the forest and hearing its call (March 1859:24):

me he mea la e me . . memele ana: E hoonaniia, e oliia, e me . . memelia ta Hatu, e lite me ta hiti, no tona lotomaitai ia tatou. Oia, e me . . mele! Oia, e me . . memele!

‘as if it were singing and singing: “May the Lord be glorified and chanted and sung and sung again in all the ways we can for his inner goodness to us. Yes, sing and sing! Yes, sing and sing again!”

Moreover, the communication of birds is connected to their use as omens, as linked by Kalaaukumuole (April 14, 1866). A missionary publication mocks the Hawaiian belief that the cry of birds, vaa puha! vaa puha! ‘hollow boat! hollow boat!’ , can tell the tahuna talaivaa (kahuna kālaiwa’a ‘canoe building expert’) that a log is not as solid as it seems from the outside; after all, other
countries build even bigger vessels without making sacrifices and hearing birds cry, *motu puha! motu puha!* ‘hollow ship! hollow ship!’.

The Hawaiians’ interest in onomatopoeia had a strong influence on their literature. The cries of birds can be mentioned and used. In the *Mele Inoa no Kihapi‘ilani* ‘Name Chant for Kihapi‘ilani’ are found the lines:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ka leo o ka manu} \\
\text{Ka lupo o Kīwa‘a} \\
\text{‘O Kīwa‘a ka manu ē—} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The voice of the bird
the *lupo*-cry of Kīwa‘a
Kīwa‘a is the bird oh—.

In stories, as seen above, bird cries are mentioned, and they can convey messages. Onomatopoeia is an important element in classical Hawaiian poetry. Hawaiian poets also developed means of creating onomatopoeic impressions of new sounds. A line on the crackle of gunfire—*I ka pa‘apa‘a‘ina i ke alo pali* ‘In the crackling along the cliff face’—recalls one from a Pele chant: *Hekili pa‘apa‘ina i ke ao* ‘the thunder crackles in the cloud’. In a political protest song after the loss of Hawaiian sovereignty can be found the lines (Testa 1895: 87; text regularized):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{No wai kēia ōmole gini,} \\
\text{E kohākohā nei kani ka ‘umoki?} \\
\end{align*}
\]

For whom is this big bottle of gin,
Popping sounds the stopper.

Onomatopoeia was used extensively in prose as well: *ua lohe lākou i ka halulu me he nū makani la* ‘they listened to the deep noise like the roaring of a wind’ (Nākuina 1902a: 60). A dog and a lizard fight, *e nahu ana kekahi i kekahi* ‘one was biting at
the other'; the hs give the sound of the rushing jaws (Fornander 1918–1919: 417). A prose report describes the firing of big guns: *e pohāpohā ana nā pōkā malalo a ma na ‘ao‘ao o mākou* ‘the shells were bursting below and to the side of us’ (J. G. M. Sheldon and Piilani 1906: 44).

Such onomatopoeia and imitation entered into many aspects of Hawaiian life, as did any imitation and observation. Children would play games in which they crowed like roosters or in later times neighed and stamped like horses. The children of Nānākuli who chanted with a quaver from the breadfruit trees may have been imitating birds (*Ī‘ī July 17, 1869*).

Imitating sounds was part of Hawaiian education, especially voice training for chanting in which such imitation reinforced the onomatopoeia of the words: a child “is taught to imitate the various bird calls and songs of the feathered kingdom, the chirpings of the crickets, the satisfied grunts of pigs after a hearty meal or the frightened yelping of the watch dog in pain” (Beckley 1932: 27). Just as children were taught to imitate with their bodies the movements of branches, so they were taught to imitate with their voices winds, waves, and waterfalls. As a result, people listening to a chant could wonder whether they were hearing a human voice or the sounds of their environment. Similarly, the playing of nose flutes and drums could be understood as words or messages.

At the level of professions, the bird catcher who was *atamai* in bird calls would catch his prey. As a component of education, such knowledge of sounds became part of the formal contest of wits, the *hoʻopāpā*. Kaipalaoa wins a round by using the squeak of a rope, *‘uwī*, for the squeak of a pig, *ʻi*.

Such imitation could be used with the greatest seriousness. In an important temple ceremony, people would imitate in their prayers the voice of the type of animal in which their god was embodied and the chief would be asked by the priest to listen to the voices of the animals (Kamakau of Kaʻawaloa in Fornander
1919–1920: 19). The similarity of the sound of the prayer to the sound of the animal embodiment seems to create a stronger connection between worshipper and god and to imbue the prayer with a greater power.

NOTES

1. An earlier version of this appendix was published as Charlot 1992c. In that article, the prose passage from Fornander 1918–1919:417, was mistakenly listed as poetry. I am indebted for one point to Roy Alameida, who wrote a paper for my spring 1992 graduate seminar on Kepelino’s essays on birds.

Phonetic symbolism can also be found, for instance, the use of i (compare Cole and Scribner 1974:57 f.; Hallpike 1979:410–413) The word wi means “To squeal . . . any high shrill sound” (Pukui and Elbert 1986: at word) and can be used effectively, often comically, in poetry, e.g., N. B. Emerson 1915: 32; Fornander 1916–1917:457; Malo 1951:44 (Emerson); compare Judd 1930: proverb 197. A serious use of the vowel sounds is found in the Kumulipo, lines 118–119. I have been told that kī refers to the high sound of a drum when tapped near the edge, and pā to the low when tapped at the center; compare Kaeppler 1993:183. The sounds –ī and –ā may have been considered to be at opposite ends of the sound spectrum and thus to represent wholeness or completeness, like the Greek alpha and omega. The sounds are often used in contrasting pairs, e.g., Fornander 1919–1920:445, line 30. This view might be found in the use of the sound in pairs of names, especially the conventional Kanikawi and Kanikawā, e.g., Fornander 1919–1920:249, 507; Beckwith 1919:627; also, Ulwe, Ulweleka, Maalaka, and Maalaki, Fornander 1916–1917:527. On –ī and –ā in New Zealand Māori, see Tremewan 1992:554. Interestingly, John Rae September 27, October 4, October 24, 1862, used onomatopoeia and significant sounds as the basis for his theory of Polynesian languages in a series of articles that attracted much attention in Hawai‘i.

2. Hyde 1887:58. For the New Zealand Māori, see Orbell 1985:196 f. Compare Teilhet-Fisk 1991:57, the sound of the tapa anvil is compared by Tongans to the cry of a bird.


7. Ta Moo-Atua a me na Taao o ta Honua nei 1858:19. For the cry, see Fornander 1916–1917: 459.

8. Fornander 1919–1920: 412, lines 34–36, text regularized. The whole passage, lines 27–33 is highly onomatopoeic. Lupo is defined in note 19 as “the sound of its supposed voice in singing”; the word is not in Pukui and Elbert 1986. Compare the bird cries in the chants, Fornander 1916–1917:397, 589. Charlot 1978:13 f.

9. I give just a few examples:
Fornander 1916–1917: 535, third poem, line 3, the sound of the ‘ō‘ō bird.

N. B. Emerson 1915:
54, lines 1, 3, the stutter-step glottals.
99, Wahiawà chant (Charlot 1983a: 40 f.).
118, line 8, glottal, ks, and i-sounds for thunder.
189, line 6, os and ks for deep resonance of rocks.
221, lines 24–25, pounding sounds of ks.
229 f., lines 36–37 (Charlot 1983a: 24).

The Pele chants published by N. B. Emerson are full of such onomatopoeic passages, e.g., 1915:197 ff., 204 ff., 219–223. See also Pukui and Elbert 1986: paka. J. S. Emerson 1924: 17, last line, the bursting of Portuguese men-of-war.


15. Kepelino February 1859: 10. Also Kaawa December 9, 1867.
16. Fornander 1916–1917: 581; for another example, see 457.
TO AVOID BURDENING the text, I have assembled in this appendix most of the references to lists and organizing words and expressions. I give them in summary form with comments and include some of the original punctuation.

INFORMAL LISTS

Kamakau of Kaawaloa (Fornander 1919–1920: 3–45; translation on facing pages):

3, paragraph 4, god list, ua mau akua laau . . . Hiiaka; the proper names, Kapo, Hiiaka, and perhaps Kalaipahoa, are used as adjectives.

5, o ka mea akua iliili . . . palo ua hoomana ia i kana pule; the parallel contraction of this list argues for its being usable as a formal list, but in this text, it is set in the grammatical construction of the sentence.

17, paragraph 6, aole he walaau, aohe ahi a mai, aohe puua alala mai, aohe ilio aoa mai, aohe keiki uwe mai ‘there was no talk, no
fire burned, no pig squealed, no dog barked, no baby cried'; the passage describes the mood in the night and is a beautiful piece of prose; it is probably based on a chant and uses onomatopoeia.

19, paragraph 1, *me ka leo o ka moa . . . puaa*.

29, paragraph 2, *o Pele . . . Kamohoalii ko kekahih*; this list is embedded in the sentence, but has a sort of introduction, *ko lakou mau akua wahine*, and is constructed in strict parallelism: [name] *ke akua o kekahih, a [name] ko kekahih*.

31, paragraph 3, *ua hoomalu . . . aoa mai*; this list is similar to the one on p. 17, using some of the same words; it has been expanded and is less regular; the similarities and differences between the two lists demonstrate their creative use.

35, paragraph 2, *o Haleokaloa . . . Haleohiu . . . mahamaha*; a list of two items in partial parallelism.

39, paragraph 3, *i ka ilio . . . a me ka ia*; a list of offerings to the chief; *a me na mea no a pau loa* is added at the end as in a formal list.

41, paragraph 4, *a kapu kanaka . . . ka ohona ia Lono*; a list of things put under a kapu; some parallelism with *e kapu*.

Compare 23–25, a loose passage based on a list of people and what they received in a ceremonial distribution.

Malo (n.d.):

vi 3, 4, clouds are grouped by color; the use of parallelism, *ina*, argues for the passage being based on a list, but Malo expands it with explanations.

xxii 24, *na ipu laau . . . huewai*; a list of container names, set loosely into the syntax.

Informal lists are frequent in Malo, e.g., xx 18, 19, xxx 8, xxxvi
Aholo 1861: 4, an informal list in a sentence: *A o kekahi mau akua . . . a me Hopoe.*

‘Ī‘i October 30, 1869, column 3, the list is embedded in a sentence about the gathering of chiefs by the phrase *oia hoi o* followed by a list of names in two columns of three names each with a seventh placed at the bottom between them; note the use of typography.

Kamakau October 28, 1865, the author states the need for information about chiefs and provides lists of names of chiefs arranged in paragraphs with *Pehea* at beginning of each.

Kepelino 1932:

17, *Kihawahine . . . a pela aku.*

149, *E na ‘lii nui . . . na kuewa i ka wahie . . . a me na mea a pau*

*Liuili na ‘lii . . . ka wahie . . . laumaia, a pela ‘ku.*

151, *5 umeke . . . ilio*

161, *puhelo . . . koala.*

Kirtley and Mookini 1977 (Kepelino Pepa 1):

43, section 4.

45, section III.

53, *Lave oia i tetahi mea . . . he ivi paha, he maiuu paha, he lauoho paha.*

57, *a ua tapaia he Aumatu . . . he Tilotilo, &. &.*
63, Hoomatautau e na’lii . . . teia ano.

65, he paani . . . puili, &.

Kaawa May 4, 1865, the last two paragraphs.

Kanuha March 17, 1866, an informal rain-name list and a modern list with prose explanation.

“He Moolelo no Pakaa” November 7, 1867, an informal list of chiefs in stereotyped sentences after the first; a mahope [mai].

Nākuina 1902a: 30, a list of chiefs and their places, printed after a period and in a column of stereotyped lines; depending on hoonohoia before the period and continuing into a non-stereotyped final section of the sentence; compare 40 f.

Nākuina 1902b: 13 f., A makaukau na mea apau, oia . . . ame na mea ai no apau.

Fornander 1918–1919:

217, ua waiho mumuku na aina o Hualoa 1, . . . Kamilo; a long list firmly set within the sentence structure.

455, i ke kanaka . . . ilio.

465, Kukulu ihola o Kamehameha i na heiau; the next paragraph consists of a list in regular form—the name(s) of the temple(s) followed by the name of its (or their) location; this list is very loosely connected to the sentence and could easily be presented independently.

611, ma Kamaile . . . Maui nei.

613, e kaumaha aku i na aumakua kalai waa, oia; followed by a list o Kupulupulu . . . Kanealuka; and finally a he lehulehu aku no
na mea i koe.; this is basically the full form of introduction, list, and conclusion, but it is embedded in a sentence.

615, the statement that maile grows, followed by a list of locations, ma na kuahiwi . . . hauliuli.

Fornander 1919–1920:

71, O ke ao ana i ka lua, ke kui, ka oo ihe, a me na ano hakaka e ae. . .

117, he wela . . . hoowahawaha i na mea e ae; a series of three words designating the reactions caused by false love.

Informal Lists of Animals, Food, and Offerings

Kamakau of Kaawaloa (Fornander 1919–1920):

19, paragraph 1, moa . . . manu . . . ilio . . . puaa; paragraph 2, iole . . . manu . . . moa; these lists seem to be based on the ritual questions given in paragraph three, manu . . . moa . . . ilio.

paragraph 2, i ka puaa, a me ka moa, a me na malo; an informal list based on the formal one of offerings in the immediately following prayer: Eia ka puua, a me ka moa, a me ka malo.

43, paragraph 1, ka puua . . . uhau . . . kulolo . . . awa . . . ka awa; a list of things eaten by the person representing the god whose image he carries.

Malo n.d.:

xix 4, puua . . . ilio . . . moa, informal list of animals raised by backcountry people.

xxxvi 20, 40; these two informal lists of foods at the Makahiki
ceremony share three items—kulolo, maia, awa—out of seven and five items.

xxxvi 68, a food offerings list, he kalo, he uala, he ulu, he maia, he niu, he puua, framed by the phrases na mea ai apau maloko and na mea ai no apau maloko.

xxxvii 106, puua . . . maia . . . niu . . . ia ula . . . oloa . . . kanaka, offerings.

xxxviii 13, ia . . . puua . . . maia . . . niu; a list of things prohibited to women.

xxxviii 63, ka ai, ka ia, ke kapa, ka malo, ka pau, a me na waiwai a pau maloko; things kept by a chief in his storehouse.

Kaaie April 24, 1862, an informal offerings list for a heiau: i puua, i niu, i maia, i hoola, i ia ula, i moa, a ia mea aku a ia mea aku.

Kamakau September 2, 1865: 1, puua, ilio, moa; ai, puua, ilio, moa, i-a.

Oleloa March 13, 1839, I puua uuku, i amaama, i maloula, i awa. . .

Kupahu June 15, 1865, puua hiwa, ka moa lawa; maia . . . niu . . . ia-ula.

Kekoa October 7, 1865:

i puua, i ilio, i kapa, i malo, a me na waiwai e ae no hoi.

I puua, i ilio, i kapa, i pa-u, Puakai, i kapa moelola, i Leihulu, a me kahi mau mea e ae.

O ka puua, o ka ilio, ka upena, ke olona, ke kapa, ke pa-u, ka malo, ke koi-pahoa, ka waa, a me kela waiwai keia waiwai . . .
Kauai December 18, 1865, *i na hoolua puaa, na kulolo, ka poi palau.*

Kepelino 1932: 101, *puaa a me ka niu, ka ia ula*; compare p. 103.

Kirtley and Mookini 1977 (Kepelino Pepa 1): 53, *Huli no hoi oia i ta moa lava, ta ilio lava, ta puaa hiva, a me na mea e atu paha.*

Fornander 1918–1919:

511, a formal list, *Eia na mea e lawe ai;; puaa hiwa, moa lawa, puawa hiwa, niu hiwa, ia ula.*

611, *i ka puaa, ka ia ula, ka ia ele . . . e ae.*

Fornander 1919–1920: 53, *me ka puaa, ka niu, ka maia ame ka aahu.*

**INFORMAL LISTS OF WEAPONS**

Malo n.d.: xxxviii 59, *ina Ihe, Pololu, Laau, palau, Kuia, ka ala, Ke kuieluia, a me kapa kiko.*

Fornander 1916–1917:

251 ff., *ua makaaukau i na mea kaua he nui wale, ka pololu, ka ihe, ka elau, ka laau palau, ka maa, ka pikoai, ka pohaku, ka laau, a me na mea e ae.*

467, *me na pololu, me ka ihe me ke kuia, me ka elau, me na mahiole, me ka ahuula, me ka manele auamo.*

Fornander 1918–1919:

377, *ka ihe, ka pololu, ka elau.*
453, *E hiki no iaia ke alo i na ihe, elau, pololu, pohaku, iloko o ka manawa hookahi.*

471, *me ka pololu, ka elau, ka ihe.*

475, *o ka ihe, ka pololu, ka elau.*

477, *i ka ihe a me ka pololu, a me ka elau, nou ka pohaku . . . i ka ihe a me ka pololu*

483, *o ka pololu a me ka ihe . . .*

485, *o ka pololu a me ka ihe, ka elau, ka newa, ka pahoa, a me ka pikoi lua.*


**FORMAL LISTS**

**Malo:**

xviii 44, *He nui,* a list of chiefly sinner types.

xxi 3–9, *he/e nui* with vocabulary lists; compare section 12.

xxxii 3–5, introduction in 3, *He nui no na kua i noho a olelo mai;* termination in 5, *he nui no na kua i noho mai;* the material in between is clearly based on a list and uses fairly regular parallelism: [name] + *kekahi akua i noho,* with inserted explanations.

xxxiv 33–35, introduction in 33, *he nui na inoa o ka waa ma ke kapa ana a kanaka,* the following section is organized by the use of the word *ina* and contains much explanatory material; in 35, at the end of the list of traditional boats, *ua kapa ia ka inoa o na waa ma ko lakou ano* (a non-traditional boat is then mentioned).

xxxiv 39–40, a list of five items is given in short, parallel sentences, followed by the termination *oia na waa ma keia wa hou.*
Lists

XL 2, introduction, *He nui . . . kii aku*.; the list is fairly regular; termination, *ma keia mau mea e loaa mai ai ka ia*.

XL 29, introduction, *O kekahi mau ia ma kaili kai eholo ai*; a straight list of names, *he malolo . . . he aha*; termination, *he nui na ia holo makaili kai*.

XL 30, introduction, *O kahi mau ia noho no ma ka lua*.; a straight list of names, *he Mano . . . he Hee*; termination, *he nui no na na ia noho ma ka lua*; Malo adds his own comments.

See also IX 20, XIX 22, 24.

Kepelino 1932: 161, introduction, *O na ia maloo ka mea ono loa ma ke kalua ana*.; a list of three items; the first and third have *paha* after them; termination, *a pela ‘ku*.

Kepelino March 1859:

18, *Elua ano o ta Alae, he nutu ula tetahi, he nutu tea tetahi*.

20, *Elua tulana o ta Moa, he moa tiovea tetahi, a he moa haa tetahi*.

Kepelino July 2, 1867: I 10, II 27, lists similar to the above; *he nui* is used I 38, 39, 40, 44, 45, 49, 50.

Kaawa April 20, 1865: introduction, *Na wahi e noho ai na Lapu*.; a fairly regular list, *ma ka po . . . moana*, with changes of the word for “in” or “on”; continues with explanation.

Kaawa May 4, 1865, introduction, *Ua kapaia lakou, na kupua o Tahiti. He kupua . . .*; a straight list of names with *a me* before the last.

Kekoa September 30, 1865, paragraph 3.
Fornander 1918–1919:

469, an unusually long introduction, *O na kokua o Kamehameha . . . hana ana*.; a straight list of names, *o Keeaumoku . . . o Kamanawa*.

477 ff., introduction, *Eha kuhina malalo ona*.; a straight list of four names, the same as those immediately above.

Fornander 1919–1920:

53, two lists with the same form: *Ko luna mau mea i hoomana ia*.; a straight list of terms, *La . . . anuenue; Ko ka honua mea hoomana ia*.; a similar list, *Honua . . . aina*.

55, four more such lists with shortened titles, *Ko ke kuahiwi; Ko ke Kai; Ko ka aina; Na aumakua*.; the same lists made up of terms alone, except *a pela aku* after second.

69, *He umi no mahele nui o ka oihana kahuna*.; followed by a straight list with *a me* before the last two items.

Elbert 1959:101 ff., introduction, *Penei ka mahele ana o Kawelo ia Kauai*; a parallel list of places and the persons to whom they were given, *no Kamalama, Kaeleha . . . o Kona no Kamalama*; variation at the end, *o Kauai a puni no Kawelo*.

J. G. M. Sheldon 1908:272, introduction, *O keia malalo iho na oihana like ole a Joseph K. Nawahi i lawelawe ai, oiai oia e ola ana*.; a column of his different positions and occupations.

Formal Lists with *Eia*

Kamakau of Ka’awaloa (Fornander 1919–1920):

31, paragraph 2, introduction, *Eia ka inoa o na malama kaua a ke ali*; list, *o Dekemaba . . . ia 3.*; termination, *Pau . . . kahuna*; numbered with both foreign and Hawaiian terms.

35, paragraph 4, a formal list similar to that on p. 31, paragraph 2; there are two introductions because the author has included so much material in the first that he starts again: *Eia ka inoa . . . kahuna*; explanatory material, *aole e kaua . . . i keia aina*; second introduction, *eia na malama kaua ole ehiku*; list, *Mei . . . ia 7.*; termination, *Pau na malama kaua ole a ke ali*i. Interestingly both examples occupy parallel places within their respective sections.

Malo:

Iv 5, *Eia kekahi mau inoa aina i paa ma na mele*; a straight list of names, *o Kahikihonuakele . . . Nuuhiwa*; after the comma, a second, truncated introduction, *na aina ma na Kaao*; a straight list of names, *o Upolu . . . Kuaihelani*; after the comma, a third, truncated introduction, *na aina ma na pule*; a straight list of names, *o Melemele . . . Hanakalanai*. In this series of three lists, Malo omits the *Eia* phrase in the second and third, giving only the attribute of the list; the relation of introduction form to attribute is thus made clear.

Ix 21, *Eia na mauu*; a straight list of names.

Ix 22, introduction, *Eia na laau ai ia*; a list of straight names *he popolo . . . luau*; termination, *oia na mea ai ia e kanaka*.

Xiv 10, *Eia na mea ai ia i ka wa wi, he Hapuu, he Ma’u he Iii*.

Xiv 16, *Eia na wai ma Hawaii nei*; a list of three items with attached explanations.
xiv 17, Eia na mea ona iimi hou ia; items with explanations.

xv 5–16, 19–20, a series of eia lists of different types of fish with clear, observable attributes and sometimes with terminations.

xxi 12, Eia keia mau hewa, no ke kane no, ano ka wahine hoi; a straight list of terms; termination, a me na me na mealike eae he hewa no keia.

xxi 13, Eia na mea hoohewa ia e na haku aina; a list with appended explanation.

xxiii 4, Eia na inoa . . . hoomana ana; a straight list of names, o Ku, o Lono, o Kane, o Kanaloa; explanation attached.

xxiii 16, Eia no na kua . . . e na wahine; a list of names with explanations.

xxiii 17, Eia hoi ko na lii wahine . . . hoomana ai; a straight list of names with an explanation at the end, he moo ke ano o keia mau akua.

xxiii 8, Eia hoi kona alii kane . . . hoomana ai; the same list of four gods as in section 4 along with others in a list with a different attribute; the list ends with conventional phrases for the multitude of gods.

xxiii 9, Eia na kua . . . wahi; a list of gods of places, arranged by lani/honua ‘sky/earth’ and mauna/moana ‘mountain/ocean’, one god for each area.

xxiii 10–22, continued listing of place gods in less regular style; the termination is at the end of 22, Ua nui . . . keia wahi. Malo may be expanding a traditional list.

xxiii 4, Eia wale no . . . e ike maka ai; an obviously new list based on anti-idolatry and anti-Popish rhetoric, with the large amount of explanation interfering with the regularity of the form.

xxiii 4–26, is clearly by Malo and organized characteristically for him by the use of ina and using his own created parallelism.
xxx 3, *Eia na mea i papa ia, aole e ai ka mea mai;* the second clause of the introduction could be described as explanation; a straight list of names *kahee . . . kapipipi,* followed by *a me na ia a ke kahuna i manao ai aole e ai ka mea mai.*

xxxi 9, *eia na ia e imi ai;* a straight list of names, but preceded by *i,* as if dependent on *‘imi,* adding an element from informal lists, *i kala . . . i awa.*

xxxiii 34, *Eia na ipu hou mai,* a list of two items separated by *a me.*

xxxvi 31, *Eia na waiwai . . . akua makahiki;* a straight list, *he hulu oo . . . he pai ai,* with an explanation added at the end of *na ke amo akua.*

xxxvii 74, *Eia na mea e pule ai;* a parallel list but in *i . . . ole* construction (praying for something not to happen; an element from informal lists) and with explanations, *i Ua ole mai . . . a ao.*

xxxviii 15, *Eia kekahi mau ia i kapu ia o ka Opelu, a me ke aku;* followed by explanation.

xxxviii 58, *Eia ka inoa o ko ke ali i nui mau kanaka;* a straight list of terms, *he Malalaioa . . . he kauoe;* termination, *aole paha i pau keia mau inoa.*

xxxviii 68–70, *Eia na lii i pepehi ia e na makaainana no ka hooluhi;* a list in parallel form: initial name, statement that the chief was killed (the last two were just ejected), by whom, and where, with occasional additional information; a good example of the expansion of a list with information.

LIX 2, *Eia na lii mai Wakea mai;* a straight list of names, *o Haloa . . . Liloa;* genealogical material presented as a list.

LXII 15–16, *Eia kekahi mau kupuna;* a fairly regular list of names, *o Punaimua . . . Kaniuhi;* his own comment (as in LIX, sections 1, 2), *aole ilohe ia ka moolelo okeia poe ali, o ko Kanipahu kailohe ia;* Malo then provides the story of that chief; an example of how
lists could be expanded with stories or have stories attached to them.

“No kahi mau hewa hou a me kahi mau hewa kahiko” May 9, 1834, ua nui na olelo hou a na kanaka i imi ai i me[a] hoonalonalo no ka lakou olelo ana; eia ua mau olelo la.; followed by a paragraph consisting mostly of expressions in regular form.

Kamakau:

March 5, 1844, Eia ua mau wahi hua olelo pohihi nei.; followed by a paragraph consisting of single words.

November 4, 1869, Eia ka aha kahiko a me ke alii nona ka aha kapu alii i hookumu mua ia a hiki i ke au o ke alii hope loa.; followed by sections that give information in a regular form.

Kānepu‘u December 31, 1856, eia na olelo ino; followed by a long, simple list.

Aholo 1861:

2, Eia no na inoa o kekahi mau akua o kekahi kahuna lapaaau.; followed by a list of names (Pele and Kuamu are given as groups); termination, a me na akua e ae . . . he nui no koe.

4, Eia hoi na inoa o kekahi mau akua, he puaa hiwa ko lakou mohai.; followed by a list of names; no termination.

Kepelino 1932:

39, Eia hou kekahi mau inoa o laua.; one column of names with Kane and Wahine to the left margin; a use of typography (compare p. 35).

49, Ma ka mooolelo Hawaii nei, ekolu mau nuu po, eia;; three items, O ka po . . . a me . . . Kumu-honua po.
77, *Eia ko lakou mau inoa*; a list of names with inserted information on the first, *O Makalii . . . a o Polohilani*.

87, *Eia ua mau hua la*; a straight list of names with *a me* before the last; this list is used informally twice on p. 89.

97, *Eia ka inoa o ua mau po la*; the list has been omitted by the editor.

139, *Eia na mea pili loa ma ka aoao ali*; the section that follows may be based on a list but contains so much explanation that all regularity has been lost.

155, *Eia na mauu maikai no ke poi*; a straight list of names with *a me* before the last; an emphatic repetition of the introduction serves as a termination, *oia ka mauu maikai loa no ke poi, oia ka mauu ai*.

159–161, *Eia na la kupono no ke kanu ana i keia mau mea*; a straight list of names, *O Hilo . . . Muku*; a loose repetition of the introduction again serves as a termination, *He mau la maikai wale no ia no ke kanu ana*.

“No ka Pule Kuni Anaana mai Hawaii a Kauai” 1860, *Eia na mea i lawe ia mai*; a list of three items finally identified as *o ka mea make*.

Kuapuu May 1, 1861, column 1, *Eia na ali i o na moku eono o Hawaii, malalo ae o Keawenuiaumi*; a list in strict parallel form, *no [place] o [name], no Kohala, o Wahilani . . . Anua*.

Kalimahauna March 27, 1862:

*Eia ka inoa o kona mau Kuhina*; followed by a list of names.

*Eia hoi ka inoa o ka poe akamai*; followed by a list of names.

Kauhane January 26, 1865, discussing the gods categorized under *Kū, he mau Akua e ae malolo o keia Akua. Eia na inoa*; a straight list of names, *o Kapuhi . . . o Kualanawao*; termination, *O keia*.
mau Akua a pau malalo iho lakou a pau o Ku. . . . Eia na wa e hoomana‘i, o na wa pilikia, a me na la kapu,

Kaawa February 2, 1865: 1, Eia na Kaikunane o Pele;; a column of names with explanations in parentheses.

Eia na Kaikaina o Pele;; a column of names without explanations; both lists are examples of the use of typography.

Kaawa February 9, 1865, Eia kana mau kane manuahi: O Aukelenuiaiku, no Kahiki; a me Lohiauipo, o Haena, Kauai.

Kaawa April 27, 1865, Eia ka inoa o na ai; the author explains that the terms are Māui nomenclature and that he is putting them in alphabetical order. The list of lua strokes is given in a column with typographical symbols. A termination is placed at the end, He nui aku no paha na inoa . . . Papa inoa.

Holokahiki March 2, 1865, Eia hoi kekahi mau akua . . . ia‘u; list of god types with a me before last. The same items on this list appear in different order in a prayer below, demonstrating the use of lists in prayer and how those lists could be used elsewhere.

Waiamau September 16, 1865, He elima no ale, a eia hoi ko lakou mau inoa:; a list of five names with attached explanations in fairly parallel form.

Kekoa October 14, 1865, Eia na keiki i hoomanaia e na makua, ke hanau mai, o na keiki mea makua, a o na keiki hoi i hanau kupana ha mai; oia wale no na keiki i hana hoomanaia e kekahi mau makua o Hawaii nei i ka wa kahiko.

Ekaula November 4, 1865, eia na hoailona;; a straight list with a before the last item.
Kaawa November 25, 1865, Eia hoi na po kapu; a straight list of four items with a me before the last.

Kaawa December 2, 1865, Eia hoi na aina ana i haawi ai; a list of lands on islands in regular form except that the parts of the last item are reversed.

Nākuina 1902b: 13, Eia kekahi o na lako hoopapa a ke keiki: . . . ame kekahi mau mea e ae i kupono no ka hoopapa.

“He Moolelo Hawaii: O Kaiakea” July 25, 1902, Eia na inoa o kana mau keiki i aia ai ma keia mau hana:.

Fornander 1918–1919:

269, Eia ka inoa o na keiki a laua, na keiki kane, a me na kaikamahine. Na Kane; a straight list of names; Na wahine; a similar list.

479, two introductions are used because so much material was added to the first; the first introduction, Eia hoi na kanaka akamai . . . naauao; the second, Eia ko lakou mau inoa a me ka lakou mau hana; a list of names with identification of his work or office, Kalaimoku . . . kikoola.

511, Eia na mea e lawe ai; followed by a straight list, puaa hiwa, moa lawa, puawa hiwa, niu hiwa, ia ula.

703, Eia na inoa; a list of names with ame before the last one and some explanation of the first two people named.

Fornander 1919–1920:

123 ff., Eia na la maikai . . . maia.; ten paragraphs with initial word in italics and followed by period; some subordinate lists.

167, Eia ke ano o na la kanu; the list consists of initial term fol-
lowed by a colon before a description, an example of the use of typography.

175, *he mau ia kona, eia na inoa*; a straight list. The word *kona* ‘his’ refers to the fishing god stone, discussed earlier; another example of the relation of the attribute to the introduction form.

179, *Eia na inoa*; a straight list; termination, *a pela aku no*.

*Eia ka ia, he hinalea wale no, aohe ia e ae*.; an example of a list of only one item.

*eia na ia*; a straight list of three items.

181, *Eia na ano o ka hee, a me na manawa*; a set of fairly parallel sentences, providing the time of day and the fish, *I ke kakahiaka ... pukoa*.

185, *Eia na inoa o ka mahimahi*; a straight list of three names.

201, *He laau i kalai ia, eia na inoa*.; a straight list; the attribute is given before the *eia* introduction.

211, *eia na inoa*; a straight list of names.

Elbert 1959:

63, *Eia na akua*; a list of two items connected by *a me*.

251, *Eia na inoa o na keiki a laua*; a list of names with brief descriptions.

J. G. M. Sheldon 1908:

83 f., *Eia ka poe ano koikoi i akoakoa ae malaila*; a list of names with titles and occasional mention of spouses (compare 81 f.).

169, *Eia na poe i kamailio ma na mea e pili ana ia po*; a list of names with titles, *Na Rev. O. Nawahine ... Aluli; a me* is used twice.

*Eia ka Aha . . . nohoalii;* a list of four names in a column with comma and title.

Johnson 1976:

104, *Eia no ka inoa o ia mau Hoku;* a long straight list; termination, *oia ka inoa o na hoku la-e.*

126, *Eia malalo iho nei, na inoa;* besides the name, two other attributes are given; below, three columns are set, one for each attribute, with a title over each column; an example of the use of typography.

148–154, *Eia* lists with names presented in columns without ‘o; a use of typography with older elements.

214, *Eia ka inoa o kona mau Kuhina;* a straight list of four names; only the last one is not preceded by o.

*Eia hoi ka inoa o ka poe akamai;* a straight list of four names.

McKinzie 1986: 113 f., *Eia na mamo a Kaholialale (k);* a straight list of names; three have places attached.

**Numbered Lists**

Kamakau of Ka'awaloa (Fornander 1919–1920):

31, paragraph 1, introduction, *Eia ka inoa o na malama kaua a ke ali;* list, *o Dekemaba . . . ia 3;* termination, *Pau . . . kahuna.* Both Hawaiian and loan names are used for the months.

35, paragraph 4, comparable to the above list; introduction, *Eia ka inoa o na malama kaua ole . . . keia aina; eia na malama kaua ole ehiku;* numbered list, *Mei . . . ia 7;* termination, *Pau na malama kaua ole a ke ali;*
Malo July 25, 1843, *Eia na mea i makemake nui ia ai ka awa*; the first item is not numbered; *Eia ka lua, ... Eia ke kolu, ... Eia kekahi, ...*

ʻĪʻĪ:

April 3, 1869, column 1, six reasons to be happy in six paragraphs, each beginning with numbering, *Ma ka helu mua ... Ma ka Helu* 6 (1–4 given in Hawaiian, 5 and 6 in Arabic numerals), and a stereotyped first clause, *e hauoli [nui] ae kakou no ka mea,* This is a personal composition with non-traditional material.

column 3, *Elua mau kumu e maopopo ai ia ano.*; two items preceded by Arabic numerals.

June 5, 1869, columns 1–2, two things for which Keawe was famous; introduction, *Elua mau mea kaulana o ua Keawe nei*; the first item is not numbered; the second starts *Eia hoi ka lua o na mea kaulana.*

November 20, 1869, column 1, introduction, *eia pela*; a numbered list, 1. *O kona manao ... pepehi kanaka.*

Kamakau:

February 14, 1843: 92, *E mahele ia ke kuauhau i na wa i mea e maopopo ai.* [in italics]; followed by a list of four periods numbered with Arabic numerals; after “1,” *Eia na wa; ka wa mua.*; within “2,” *oia ka wa elua;* within “3,” *oia ka wa ekolu.*; within “4,” *Oia ka wa eha.*;

September 9, 1865a, a list of three items beginning with *He* and numbered with Arabic numerals; a second example is given below.

September 14, 1867, column 2, introduction, *Penei na hoailona ...* ; the first item is not numbered, but the following are, *O ka lua, Akolu.*; termination, *oia na hoailona a me na ouli e hai mai ana i ka pomaikai a me ka maluhia.*
October 7, 1865: a list of six items with Arabic numerals, each starting with *No ka/ke*. There is no formal introduction or termination.

August 17, 1867, after *Eia na kumu hana*; advice is given in the form of a list of points with Arabic numerals.

April 18, 1868, *Eia na ninau kupono*; followed by a list of questions.

January 14, 1869, *Eia ka manao i kupu mai iloko ona*; followed by three paragraphs, starting with Arabic numerals and *He aina kaulana o Maui*.

**Kepelino:**

February 1859: 15, *Eia te ano*; numbered list, 1. *Ua etepue . . . tai hohonu*.


**Kepelino 1932:**

Chapters and subtitles are regularly numbered.

9, two types of primordial night.

13, *Eia na kanawai e malama’i lakou*; a numbered list.

13, *Ua nui . . . ; a numbered list.

15, *Eia hou kekahi mau inoa a lakou*; a numbered list.

23, *Eia na inoa oua [sic] mau kapu la*.; a numbered list.

39, *Eia ke ano o ka inoa o kana wahine*.; followed by the subtitle *Wahine*.; and then by a numbered list with some explanatory material.

41 ff., assembles sections of a chant, numbering each one; a non-traditional practice.

53, *Eia na kanawai o Kane*.; a short, numbered column with some parallelism.

59, *Eia na ano o ka Heiau*.; a numbered column with some parallelism.

65, *Eia na kanawai o ka papa I*.; a numbered column with some parallelism.

65, *Eia na kanawai o ka papa II*.; a numbered column with some parallelism.

81, *Eia ua panana la*.; a numbered list, just one word for each item.

83, *eia na inoa a ua mau malama la*.; three numbered columns, items consisting of a single name.

83, *Eia na ano inoa . . . hoku-loa*.; a numbered list of long items with some parallelism.

93, The author informally explains the beauty of the month. *Eia*: introduces an irregular, numbered list.

99, *Eia ka poe hana ole i ka wa kahiko*.; an irregular numbered list.

101, *Eia na lawehala make . . . kahuna-kii*.; an irregular numbered list; termination, *a pela ’ku*.

123, *He nui . . . Pae-aina*.; an irregular numbered column.

125, *Eia hoii na loina . . . aupuni*.; an irregular numbered column.
125, *Eia hoi na loina... Puloulou*.; an irregular numbered column.

151, *Eia na ao o ka hookupu ana*.; a regular numbered list of type of people and what they give.

Numbered lists with little or no conventional stylistic elements are common in Kepelino, e.g., 9, 11, 15 (first), 23 (bottom), 39, 53 (bottom), 67, 81, 99 (second), 121, 125 (third), 139. Kepelino July 2, 1867: i 9, 43 (*eia*), 44, 49, ii 71, 74.

Oleloa April 25, 1838: 95 f., a bulleted list:

- *Eia ka mea akahi* 1.
- *Eia ka lua,* 2.
- *Eia ke kolu,* 3.
- *Eia ka ha,* 4.
- *Eia ka lima,* 5.
- ...
- *oia ke ono,* 6.

Hulikahiko December 3, 1864, discussed in the text.

Kaawa May 25, 1865:

*Eia kekahi mau Heiau a‘u i lohe. No Hawaii, o Puukohola, a me Mailekini.*

*Ko Wailuku nei:* followed by numbered list in column. *A he nui wale aku no,* a termination.

Naimu September 23, 1865, introduction, *He eha oihana hoomana i loaa ia‘u i ka hele ana i ke Kaua*.; he has previously given this as the title of this number of the series and again in quotation marks, so it is the theme (probably assigned) of his essay. He then provides a series of numbered paragraphs: the first is numbered 1;
then, *Eia hoi ka lua*, *Eia hoi kekahī*, *Eia hoi ka ha* . . . ; a mixture of modern numbering and classical Hawaiian.

Kekoa October 7, 1865, *Ekolu no manawa*; the first two discussed are not numbered, but the third is preceded by *Eia ke kolu*.

Kaawa December 23, 1865, introduction, *Elua no mahele o na Kuauhau wahi a ka poe kahiko*.; two parallel phrases preceded by Arabic numerals. He states that there are four types of composers, *He eha ano o na Hakumele ma ka manao o ka poe kahiko o Hawai nei*.; the types are not listed, but four sections, starting with designation of the type of song, are provided with Arabic numerals. The fourth contains a sublist: *Elua mahele o na mele. Akahi, he mele ku i ka moku. Elua, he mele pili i kona mau lealea iho*.

“*Ka Oihana Lua a Hawaii Lahui*,” 1923, a list in classical style, *He ekolu ano au e a‘o ai i keia hana, ka mua, ka lalau ana me ka lima, ka elua ka ohī‘u ana me ke kookoo kauila, ka ekolu, ka hoohei ana me ka laau i kapaia he Piko* . . .

Kānepu‘u:

February 20, 1868, column 3, a numbered list inside a sentence, separated by semicolons, 1, *o Waihau*; . . . 4, *o Aikao*.

March 5, 1868, *eia na poe i hele pu, 1 Maoloha k, 2 . . . 9 Kekahiliao w*; information is added about the last person.

Hakuole July 1, 1857, introduction, *eia ka nui o ia mau ka‘au a me ko lakou mau inoa.*; Arabic numbers are provided for 1–4; 1 and 3 consist of a single name; 2 gives three names for the same war; 4 gives two names for the same war. Hakuole states that the informant saw three more wars but did not obtain the names.

Fornander 1918–1919:
365, *he nui kona mau hoapaio. O ka mua . . . ; o ka lua . . . ; o ke kolu . . . ; o ka ha . . . ; o ka lima o ke 'kua.*

613, *eia ka inoa o na maha o ka laau e kalai ai;* a numbered list, *l, maha . . . 4, maha unu.*

Fornander 1919–1920:

119 (Hale'ole), a numbered list of fishing kapus, discursive but with some parallelism; this passage may be based on Western-style laws.

177–191, paragraphs or sections starting with Arabic numeral and word or term of fishing; cited also below.


J. G. M. Sheldon 1908:

79 f., introduction, *79, Eia kekahi mau kumu hoopii i hoomao-popoa;* 80, three numbered paragraphs starting off with subject.

160–165, a long introduction, *160, Eia paha kekahi mau mea . . . kanaka;* five numbered sections starting with italicized “titles”; section 5 has a sublist of *lettered* paragraphs.

309, the author discusses bills opposed by Nāwahi; *Oia keia;* a numbered column of five bills.


Kawaikaumaiikamakaokaopua November 16, 1922, introduction, *Ekolu akua kalaiwaa;* followed by a list of three items numbered with Arabic numeral and period; the name of each god is followed by a semicolon and a short identification.
Kalaiwaa May 29, 1924, introduction, *Ekolu mahele o keia kuo*; followed by three paragraphs numbered with Arabic numerals without periods.

McKinzie 1986:

18, a numbered list of reasons why chiefs liked genealogy experts, clearly the author’s own composition.

112, *eia na kapu*; a numbered list in column.

114, *Eia . . . lehulehu*; a genealogy with the children numbered.

117, *Eia na keiki*; a numbered list.

Johnson 1976: 180 ff., *Eia kekahi mau mea e kaulana'i ua awawa ala. Hoomaka mai ka i aku*; a numbered list with (except for 20, 21) initial place name or material object, with added explanation. Number 20, is a sublist of gods; *O na akua o Kamapuaa*; a numbered list: 1–3, initial name plus explanation or identification; 4, the identification first then the group name; 5., *He poe akua e ae*, followed by a sub-sublist.

**EXTENDED COMPOSITIONS BASED ON LISTS**

Malo n.d.:

VI 3, on clouds. Clouds are named by color, which is used as the attribute of the list, *ua kapa ia nae ma ko lakou ano ko lakou mau inoa*; a list from section 3 to the first part of section 4; the attribute is changed to place, *ua kapa ia lakou ma ko lakou mau ano iho*.

Section 5, goes to *opua* clouds, *aia no nae ma kona ano e like ai, e kapa ia aku no kona inoa ma ia ano*; the attribute is whether the particular cloud predicts good or bad weather.

Sections 6, 7, *o na ouli ma ka lani*; the list of clouds as weather
signs is organized in parallel sentences beginning with *ina*; the weather prediction is always expressed by *he oulī* blank *ia/no/keia*; termination, *he nui na oulī ua e ae*.

Section 8, a list of types of weather, organized with *ina* and in semiregular form.

Section 9, a list of rain types, organized with *ina* and in semiregular form.

Sections 10, 11, in regular form, but the information may have been gathered for foreigners.

XIII 4, *Eia na Holoholona ma Hawaii nei*; a list with the name of each item in initial position followed by explanatory material; the following sections are based on the above list; subsections from list in section 9.

Sections 5–7, *puaa* ‘pig’: section 5, *O ka puaa ka mea nui*, forms a sort of title of the section connected to the item in the list in section 4, *o ka Puua o ka mea nui*; a list introduction, *he nui nae ke ano o ka puaa*.; followed by a list through section 6, organized by color in parallel sentences beginning with *ina*.

Section 7, *Eia keia*, changes the subject; organization by *ina* continues, but with noncolor attribute (section 8 contains general information on how things are named).

Section 8, Malo states that birds and chickens are named according to their colors, but no list is provided.

Section 9, *Eia ka inoa o na manu hiihu nui ae*.; the attribute is clearly stated to be big, wild birds; Malo starts with *he Nene* and in sections 10–12 discusses different birds, starting each section with a name and adding information consisting of description, use, and method of capture (two items in section 11).

Section 13, *Eia na manu hiihu lii iho*; the attribute is clearly stated to be small, wild birds; sections 13–16, names with information.
Section 17, *Eia kekahi mau manu, e noho ana ma ka loko kai, a me ka loko wai*; a different attribute; the list starts with *o ka Alae*, and continues through section 19, with initial name followed by information.

Section 20, *Eia na manu luu kai*.; the same type of list continues through section 22.

Section 23, *Eia keia poe manu mai ka lewa mai lakou*.; a similar list; *he Kaupu, . . . maoha kahi hulu ona*, is very regular and may be the original memorized list Malo is expanding.

Section 24, *Eia na manu ai ole ia*.; a straight list of names, terminated by *he mau mea ai ole ia keia*; the mention of an edible bird is appended.

Section 25, *Eia na mea kolo hihiu*.; a straight list without termination.

Sections 26–29, new, introduced animals, arranged in lists with an *eia* introduction; an extension of the traditional form to new materials.

Section 26, the first sentence is a typical speculative preface by Malo, of a type to be discussed below; introduction, *eia na holoholona hou . . . akolu nei*.; a list of name followed by information continues through section 27.

Section 28, *Eia na manu mai na aina e mai*.; two names with information.

Section 29, *Eia na mea, lele hou mai, . . . ole ia*; a straight list of names, *he Makika . . . Uku lele*.; a new list, introduction, *Eia na mea kolo*.; a list with information, *he Iolelapaki . . . Moonihoawa*; a short termination, *he mau mea hou keia*.; Malo closes with one of his speculations, *e nui mai paha na mea hou ma keia hope aku*.

The above is a good example of one type of Malo’s organization, one based closely on lists. After providing an initial list, he discusses the items on it, providing more information and some-
times subordinate lists. The organizing devices are therefore names organized into lists that are then set within a hierarchy of lists.

xiv organization by initial names:

Sections 1–2, O ke kalo ka ai; section 1 is Malo’s own composition; section 2 begins with a conventional introduction, He nui no ke ano o ke Kalo.

Sections 3–5, He uala kahi ai; section 6, O ka Uhi ke kahi ai; section 7, O ka Ulu ke kahi ai; section 8, O ka Maia kahi ai; section 9, O ka Ohia kahi hua ai ia.

Section 10 breaks the regular form with a famine food list; introduction, Eia na mea ai ia i ka wa wai, he Hapuu, he Ma’u, he Ii; information is appended.

Section 11, O ke Ki ke kahi mea ai ia; section 12, O ke Pia, he ai pono ke ka lua; section 13, O ka Pala kekahi ai; section 14, O ka Pia ke kahi ai.

Sections 15–17, three eia lists of names followed by information.

xvi, the chapter is based on lists, but Malo has used them very freely, inserting a good deal of information on process. Some list elements are visible: sections 6, 7, 9, are organized with ina; section 9, termination, pela no ka nui ona inoa ma ka hooluu ana a ka wahine.; section 10, termination, e like me ke kapalapala ana pela i nui o na inoa.

xviii 54, Eia kahi mau inoa . . . ; free composition, but probably based on a list.

xviii 68–70, using a list form—e.g., He nui no na inoa, o na kanaka makaainana,—but varying the devices, including parallel sentences in section 69, which results in an impression of free composition.

xxii, this chapter is Malo’s own composition for foreigners on
things considered *waiwai* ‘treasures, valuables’ in Hawaiian culture and is based on different lists from particular areas, which he joins in various ways to his chosen theme; for instance, by the use of phrases such as *kahi i kapaia he waiwai* (12), *kekahi, i kapaia, he waiwai* (13, also 9, 10, 24, 26), *ke kahi waiwai* (15, 16), and *kahi mea waiwai* (23). The contents are heterogeneous and includes newly introduced items and even the word of God (30)!

Sections 1–2, 5–13, 15–19, 23–26, the general use of initial term of discussion item to create order; there is some lack of parallelism, as in sections 18–19.

Section 13, states that the *hale* ‘house’ is a *waiwai*; this is Malo’s composition and connects the traditional list of house types in section 14 to the theme of his chapter.

Section 14, *He nui nae ke ano o na hale*; list of three house types with descriptions; termination, *he nui no na hale e ae i hana ia e kanaka*.

Section 20–22, a list of fish hooks.

Section 20, introduction with reference to the people of old, *He nui nae ka inoa o na makau . . . i kapa ai*; some explanation; *eia ka inoa o na makau*.

Section 21, a straight list; a short description after the last item.

Section 22, termination, *O ka inoa . . . makau ea*.

Section 27, a termination for the whole list of *waiwai*.

Section 28, *ua nui na waiwai hou mai i keia wa, no na aina haole mai* ‘many are the new valuables in this time from foreign lands’; animal list, *ka Bipi . . . he moa no*.

Section 29, other categories of introduced items, *manu, lolé, koi, buke kanawai*; no lists are given, but these categories could provide attributes for such lists.
Section 30, the word of Jehovah as truly the most important new waiwai.

XXIII 8–15, introduction in section 8, *Eia no ko kanaka . . . lii*); a list organized in sentences or paragraphs of different people in different occupations, *o/O ka poe*; each one is followed by a list of his god or, more usually, gods.

XXXIII 20, 23, 25, 27, 29–31, the discussion is organized by initial word or expression.

XL 16, introduction, *He nui . . . lawaia*; a regular list of four items, two pairs of names *upena* ‘net’ and *hinai* ‘fish trap’, distinguished by *nui* and *iki*. This list is followed by a short discussion of hook fishing and diving. The following lists constitute sublists.

Section 17, *Eia na upena lawaia*; the list continues through section 18, *he papa hului . . . Uluulu*., and consists of names with occasional short explanations.

Section 19, *Eia na lawaia makau*.; a simple list of names, *he kaka lawaia . . . Upupalu*.

Section 20, *Eia na lawaia hinai*.; a simple list of names, *hinai Kula . . . oopu*.; termination, *ua koe paha kekahi o keia mau hinai*.

Section 21, *Eia hoi mea luu*.; a straight, regular list, *he luu honu . . . . kala*; probably a termination, *he nui no na ia luu ia*, with added information.

XL I 1, *He nui no na hana*; a list-type introduction but used to introduce the whole section on pleasures. Malo may be depending on his title, *Na Hanalealea*. Compare with lists in xix, 24, and xxI 13, 20; Malo follows their order in his discussion and thus seems to be expanding them.

XL I, is about the game *ume*.; section 2, *O ka ume*. XLII through LVII are each devoted to a pleasure. Through LVII, each has title that names the subject, but section 1 starts again with the name
of the pleasure and a similar phrase; the section is thus a mixture of old and new styles.

LVII, is titled *No na hana lealea liilii e ae* and begins *He nui no nahana lealea liilii iho*; a straight list of names, *he koi . . . he pana iole*; termination, *ua koe no hapa kekahi mau hana lealea*; a final item is appended, *he kuielua kahi*. This passage seems to serve as a closure for the whole section, perhaps an expansion on the usual termination.

XVIII 4–5, *Eia . . . a me na lii*; discussion of individual points, each starting with *ia ia*.

XVIII 27–31, *eia no ua mau kapu la*; parallel sentences organized by *ina*; terminated in 31, *he nui*, used three times.

“No na mea hana e pono ai o Hawaii nei” April 4, 1834, *Eia ko Hawaii nei mau mea . . . Eia na mea a lakou i imi ai i ka wa kahiko; i mea e pono ai ko lakou noho ana*; followed by a series of paragraphs in which the subject is presented in the first words.

“No ke Kaua i ka Wa Kahiko” May 16, 1834: 2 f., a numbered list followed by numbered paragraphs using the list item as a subtitle.

Pakele November 12, 1864, a chief is named and then his gods; an extended list with sublists; the length of the lists supports his arguments.

Kalaaukumoule March 30, 1867, a letter to the editor organized largely as a list, introduction, *Eia na inoa o ka laau me ka mai*; followed by a list typeset as a paragraph, in regular form: *Mai [name], plant used as medicine sometimes with instructions; an informal concluding paragraph containing the words ua koe aku no kekahi laau, me ka Mai.*
N. K. March 21, 1868, *Eia na kumu . . . o Hawaii nei.;* followed by four paragraphs numbered with Arabic numerals.

ʻĪʻī:

April 3, 1869, column 2, the individual points are organized by the use of a stereotyped first sentence, *Kupanaha no-.*

August 7, 1869, column 2, a discussion of sports, probably based on a list.

May 28, 1870, column 1, a description of three types of surfboards; the subtitle of the section is like the introduction to a list; the name of the surfboard to be discussed begins its section; there is some parallelism of construction with much information; a sublist is provided for the third type.

Kamakau December 22, 1870, columns 2–3, *Eia na oihana naauao i aoia ia ia.*

Kepelino 1932:

57, section 28, a preliminary, unnumbered list of three items followed by unnumbered paragraphs with initial term from the list; no article is used, *ʻo ka,* which seems a Westernism.

79 ff., sections distinguished by initial name and also by subtitles and subtitle numbers; a combination of classical and modern devices.

147, a short section on society, each paragraph starting with the term for one set of people.

153, section 8, the first paragraph contains a list in traditional form; introduction, *He nui na ano mahiai kalo*; followed by a list organized in parallel lines. This list is followed by paragraphs, each of which begins with one of the terms on the list.
155 ff., the list of four items is in the subtitle terminating with *a pela ‘ku*; six paragraphs; the first four begin with a word from list, in order, and the last two must be represented by the termination.

157, the same thing organization is used twice (compare 159–167).

Kepelino July 2, 1867, the preface on p. 1 serves as an extended introduction to the whole composition, which is composed of a series of sections, one to each fish, including subordinate lists.

151–54, after an initial list, the items are discussed in separate sections.

Kalaaukumuole April 14, 1866, *He lehulehu nae ka pule ana, he nui na inoa o na Akua. He nui ka pule ana, okoa ka kekahi, okoa ka kekahi ma ka pule ana. Eia na inoa Akua malalo nei*; a list of eight parallel sentences beginning with *He Akua* and adding the province of the god’s power or something about the god and the god’s name. The next paragraph may be a chant. The last part of article under the subtitle *Kona Ano a me ka Pili ana* contains four explanatory paragraphs, each of which starts with the name of one of the first four gods on the above list; these paragraphs follow the order of that list.

Poli January 5, 1864, a long introduction, *A eia kekahi oia mau hana . . . mohai Akua*.; paragraphs with sublists, not numbered; the first, *O ke kino o ka puua*, is followed by a pig list of straight terms with one explained; the second, *O ke kino o ka moa*, has two items with an explanation of the second; the third, *Ka ia ula, ke kapa ula*, is followed by three more types of *kapa*, the last explained. The last item reminds the author of a story, which he tells. After the story, a new paragraph contains (possibly after *Ka malo ula*) a food list and a bird list, all interspersed with explana-
tion. A final paragraph contains a termination, Nolaila hoi; o ka pau loa ana o na mohai Akua, aka, he nui okoa'ku no koe.

Pali May 25, 1865, elua ano Kahuna anaana, he Kahuna uhau hui kekahi, he Kahuna aihamu kekahi.; each type is discussed in a section that begins with the term for it.

Kailiehu June 12, 1865, starts with an introduction, Eia malalo nei na inoa o na makani o Hana, Maui Hikina, e hoike ana i ko lakou nui, a me ka lakou mau hana.; the author states that he lived in that place from birth to ten years of age, so that he knows its winds. Ten paragraphs follow, beginning with the wind name (two in the last paragraph) in italics followed by a period; the description of each wind is fairly regular. In the last paragraph, he states that he has finished and bids farewell.

Kupahu December 16, 1865, He nui wale na ano hula . . . , with attached explanation; Eia iho ko lakou mau inoa pakahi.; a straight list of terms terminated by a me na ano hula aku i koe.; this list is followed by unnumbered sections, each of which starts with an italicized term from the preceding list.

Waiamau December 23, 1865, a description of types of sports; introduction, He nui a lehulehu wale na hana . . . , with explanation; paragraphs starting with the name of a sport; the second to the last paragraph, O ka piliwaiwai, has a sublist, Eia kekahi mau mea e pili ai.; then five items are listed and numbered with Arabic numerals; a termination, a me kekahi mau mea e aku.

Johnson 1976:272–278, a series of articles organized by unnumbered paragraphs with initial name:

The first article, 272, Eia malalo nei na inoa o na makani o Hana, Maui Hikina, e hoike ana i ko lakou nui, a me ka lakou mau
hana.; some explanation is provided, followed by a list; the article ends with *Ua pau* and a final greeting.

The second article, 274 ff., a list as above with more of a formal framework.

The third article, 276 f., *Eia malalo nei na inoa o na makani o Niihau, ka Mokupuni o ka haole, e hoike no au i ka hana a kela a me keia makani, e hoomaka ana kona helu ana ma ka Akau,* a list as above; the last paragraph, *Oia na inoa o na makani o ka Mokupuni holookoa o Niihau nei. Ua pau,*; followed by a farewell.

**LARGER COMPOSITIONS OF NUMBERED LISTS**

P. July 2, 1859, argues against an expressed view about Hawaiian medicine. Except for a brief introduction and final paragraph, the article is composed as a list: *Eia ka hewa,* followed by five items numbered with Arabic numerals, not in stereotyped form.

Kehukai March 30, 1867, argues that dreams are the result of a person’s strong desires, not of his spirit traveling. The article is organized as a list: introduction, *Eia na mea maopopo . . . ka moe uhanë,* followed by six numbered paragraphs with initial Arabic numerals, usually in regular form, *Ina . . . Alaila . . . e like me/pela*; there is some variation in the elements included; followed by an informal “concluding” paragraph. A new list is then begun: introduction, *Eia na mea maopopo ma keia hoakaka ana,* followed by the first item, formulated as a paragraph of irregular form; the second paragraph is marked by the Arabic numeral 2.

N. K. March 21, 1868, an article largely organized by a list.

‘ĪʻĪ April 3, 10, 1869, columns 3 f., *Haule mua ana . . . Haule akolu*
ana . . . Haule aha ana; an original composition organized as a list with preceding numeration in Hawaiian.

Kamakau:

December 14, 1867, Eia hoi kekahi kumu; five paragraphs beginning with Arabic numerals; a very loose composition.

October 27, 1870, a discussion of types of chiefs, organized by paragraphs starting with an Arabic numeral and (usually italicized) term for the type to be discussed.

Ta Moo-Atua a me na Taao o ta Honua nei 1858:

2–6, a list followed by numbered sections using the items of the list as titles; this seems clearly Western.

6–11, Eia te tumu . . . malamalama io; a list of four items with Hawaiian numbers, followed by numbered sections using the items of the list as titles; a sublist in section 2, Eia tetahi . . . tuhiheva'i; an unnumbered list followed by numbered sections starting with the items listed.

11–15, an informal list followed by numbered sections using the items listed as subtitles.

15–20, Eia tetahi; no list, but numbered and titled sections.

This book of Roman Catholic controversy may have influenced Kepelino; he may also have had a part in its composition.

Kepelino July 2, 1867:

II 71, a numbered list, only the last item of which is described.

II 74, a numbered list of three items, described in sections 75–77.
Kepelino 1932:


85–97, a discussion of the months in numbered chapters, with the name in the chapter title and at the beginning of the text of each section; a combination of classical and new or Western style.

99–113, a discussion of moons with same organization as above.

155, *Penei ka hana no ke poi ana.*; three sections initiated by *Ina he . . .*; a loose composition.

Kirtley and Mookini 1977 (Kepelino Pepa I):

57, an incomplete list ending with &. &; 59–61, sections starting with a word from the list.

59, paragraph 2, *Elua mea nui iloto o ta anaana, o te ta . . . mate, o te tala ola. Eia te ano: [explanation]. Eia ta lua: [explanation]*

Kaawa May 4, 1865, three numbered sections on three meanings of *kupua*; the third section contains a list, each item of which begins with *He/he kupu* and provides name and identification and/or story summary.

Kaawa December 23, 1865, states that there are four *ano* ‘types’ of *hakumele* ‘composers’; these are not listed; sections numbered with Arabic numerals starting with the designation of the type of song; section four has a sublist, *Elua mahele o na mele. Akahi, he mele ku i ka moku. Elua, he mele pili i kona mau lealea iho.*

Kupahu December 30, 1865, introduction, *eia malalo iho nei kekahi mau hoku, a me ko lakou ano, a me na hana a lakou.*; four sections numbered with Arabic numerals and starting with the
designation of the subject or subjects; the second section contains a list of twenty-six items of differing length, sometimes numbered with Hawaiian words and sometimes with Arabic numerals.


Fornander 1919–1920: 177–191, fishing discussed in titled chapters with numbered paragraphs that contain subordinate lists, which are often *eia*-lists.

J. G. M. Sheldon 1908: 79, a list of three paragraphs explaining reasons; very informal and Western.

**LARGER COMPOSITIONS BASED ON PREVIOUS NUMBERED LISTS**

Malo n.d.: xii 22, *Eia na inoa o ua mau kapu la*.; a list of four items numbered in Hawaiian (the number is mentioned at the end of section 21). The discussion in section 23 proceeds through the items in the order of the list.

Kepelino 1932: Kepelino regularly uses this form of organization.

11–13, 11 bottom, a list numbered in Hawaiian, *Eia ka mua*; . . . *o ka ‘lua*, . . . *ekolu*, . . .; 13, three paragraphs with Arabic numerals and starting with an item from the previous list.

19–25, a numbered list, preceded by *He nui wale* . . . *eia*; this list is used to organize the following discussion by numbered paragraphs.
23, section 13, two numbered sublists.

123–141, numbered lists at the beginning of a long discussion organized by initial term, with subtitles; a subgroup at p. 139 of similar form: initial numbered list followed by section organized by initial terms from the list.

195 ff., in English by another author; numbered paragraphs or sections, starting with the term to be discussed.

Holokahiki:

March 2, 1865, quotes a source “He elua mau mahele o na akua”; a list of two items with Arabic numerals; two paragraphs numbered and starting with the same phrases used in the above list. The first of the paragraphs has a sublist, Eia kekahi mau akua a lakou i hoomana ai; a straight list of names; termination, a nui aku no.

March 16, 1865, a numbered list of two items in the “title” (the first paragraph has been used as title) followed by two Arabic numbered paragraphs starting with the same words used in the list. The first of the two paragraphs has a sublist, Eia lakou; three names, before the third a me ka laua keiki.

October 21, 1865, He elua no ano o ke umikamalii ana.; a numbered list; two Arabic numbered paragraphs with a word from the list used as a sort of section title.

October 28, 1865, He elua wale no ahaina i malama nui ia.; a numbered list of two items followed by the same organization as above.

Waiamau November 11, 1865, eia no lakou; an unnumbered list of types of people in quotation marks from the title of his article; sections numbered with Arabic numerals and beginning with a word from the list. The third section has a sublist, he elua inoa
o keia poe, he hapa kuakea, a he Lopaikihelewale. The fifth section has a numbered sublist of two items after he elua no ano o na kauwa.; two sections starting with a word from the list; the second section starts with an Arabic numeral, but not the first.

Anonymous November 18, 1865, a numbered list of four items followed by numbered sections starting with a word from the list.

The above items from the series Ka Hoomana Kahiko are likely examples of a form used in school. Waimea May 18, 1865, and other examples are discussed in the text.

Kuinae May 8, 1872, an article organized as a list: 84 (1), the author poses a question and then begins his answer with an introduction that uses a conclusion form, He nui, a, he lehulehu . . . Kapena Kuke; 84/85 (1 f.), a short list with written and underlined Hawaiian numbers followed by the article and the name of the occupation, “Akahi. O ka mahi ai.”; 85 (2), a conclusion, A he nui aku no na hana liiili i koe; 85–88 (2–5), the author then gives an explanation of each item, starting with two short paragraphs that act as introductions; this is followed by short sections preceded by Arabic numerals in parentheses; 88 (5), a general conclusion, He nui aku no na hana i koe mamua o ka hiki ana mai o Kapena Kuke, i Hawaii nei.

Fornander 1918–1919: 577, a list of two items preceded by Arabic numerals, followed by two unnumbered sections explaining the items.

J. G. M. Sheldon 1908:

40 f., Eha mahele o na hale iloko o Kapalakiko.; a list numbered with Arabic numerals of four house types; short sections, similarly numbered and preceded by the same words for the house
type used in the preceding list (slight variation in 3) and a
description (from a letter by Nāwahī).

284, lists Nāwahī’s qualities in a column with Hawaiian numbers
in front; 284 ff., four paragraphs with Arabic numerals and start-
ing with underlined quality from previous list.

MALO’S USE OF LISTS

I have already discussed a number of Malo’s uses of lists. An
adequate discussion of the subject would require a full commen-
tary on Ka Moolelo Hawaii. The following notes concentrate on
several ways in which Malo uses lists in the larger sections he
composes, which he often does with the aid of larger organizing
devices.

In general, Malo bases his organization on words, which are
gathered into lists, which in turn are placed in a hierarchy; this is
the classical Hawaiian organization of material, and most of the
material he records would have been transmitted to him by tradi-
tional means. Malo also presents a number of lists of new, foreign
items, lists which he may or may not have formulated himself.
Malo’s personal contributions to his work are prefaces and expla-
nations in which he presents his material to a non-Hawaiian or
nonknowledgeable audience and in which he articulates his own
personal views and speculations (as he can do in other contexts,
e.g., xxix 14, ua mano’o . . . akua maoli). In his original sections,
he often refers to olden times or to the people of old, indicating
his distance from the purely traditional culture just as his lists of
new, introduced items indicate the character of his own times. A
number of Malo’s chapters or sections share the same structure:
traditional material presented in a traditional way is framed by
Malo’s own preface at the beginning and sometimes by lists of
newly introduced items and Malo’s concluding comments at the
end. The sections of traditional material start with general categories, which are then articulated with items, which are usually organized into lists (e.g., v–vii). Malo can also insert his own comments and explanations into sections of traditional materials. He can also compose whole sections by reorganizing received materials in new ways, usually as a response to foreign teaching.

vi 14–19, a short example of a typical Malo section.

14, Malo’s own preface, with characteristic mention of olden times; Malo uses a stereotyped fill-in-the-blank form after kapa ai.

15, Eia na inoa o na makani; he Kona, with a long explanation of the Kona or hema ‘south’ type of wind, through section 16. There is a sublist of particular Kona winds in 16: introduction, he nui ka inoa o na Kona; five parallel items—he followed by name and short description, that is, the fill-in-the-blank form given in 14.

17, the north-south organizing pair is completed by the corresponding akau ‘north’ wind, the Hoolua, name and description.

18, starts a new organizing pair, uka/kai, with the mauka ‘landward’ wind, He hau, which is described discursively.

19, completes the uka/kai pair with kai ‘sea’ winds; an irregular, informal section of general information and alternative names, composed by Malo. A formal termination, he nui ka inoa . . . i kapa ai, is followed by Malo’s personal evaluation of the traditional practice.

vii 4–8, successively smaller political divisions of land from the whole island down, an example of traditional hierarchical organization; the word mahele ‘divide’ is used for the process: the mokupuni ‘island’ is ka mea nui ‘the big thing/category’; at each level of descending the hierarchy, Malo states, A ua mahele [hou] ia . . . ‘And it was divided [anew] . . . ’; malalo ‘below’ is used to designate subordination in the hierarchy. This very organized part of the chapter seems traditional.
Sections 9–13, *Eia kekahi mahele ana i ko ka mokupuni,* a categorization by land types rather than by political divisions; this seems to be Malo’s own composition, being much looser and less organized and fixed and with few conventional organizing expressions; however, a general pattern is followed *mau uka a kai* ‘from land to sea’, a basic traditional organizing principle. The heterogeneous contents seem more appropriate to a foreign readership.

Sections 14–24, this loose collection with little parallelism of terms for land features is probably also Malo’s own composition.

viii 1, seems to be Malo’s composition; it contains very general information with only one traditional rhetorical or organizational device: he proceeds from big to small, from the mountains to dust. He uses this organization elsewhere and it corresponds to the movement from large categories to the details—and sometimes progressively smaller details—within them.

Sections 2–8, traditional lists; two *he nui* introductions in section 2 and a termination to the whole section in section 8, *he nui no paha na pohaku i koe, aole i pau i ka helu ia.* Sections 3–8 have lists with *eia* introductions and clear attributes. The particularity of these traditional lists contrasts with the loose generality of section 1.

ix section 1, is similar to section 1 of the previous chapter: Malo’s composition of very general information, proceeding from big to small and mentioning the people of old.

Section 2, contains less general information, possibly being used as an introduction to the following.

Sections 3–22, contain the traditional information, organized by initial name or term followed by a description of its use (the Arabic numerals number the sections, not the items listed). Some regularities of style can be identified, but this is generally a free composition based on a list.
x, this chapter seems to be Malo’s composition. He has gathered a number of lists with different forms and attributes—color, use, fish caught—and added other heterogeneous materials (section 13 lists adjectives for ocean weather, the first of which Malo tries to connect to kahi ‘place’). He has then arranged his materials by place from uka ‘landward’ to kai ‘seaward, out to sea.’ The result lacks the rigor and exactitude of traditional sets of materials.

xi, a modern discursive description of the subject with few conventional elements and done from a largely postcontact perspective. Malo can be observed here on his own.

Section 13, a traditional list form; introduction, Eia kekahi . . . wahine; the list was originally separate from the sentence structure, but the initial article o has been changed to i, assimilating the list into the sentence; a straight list, o or i ka puaa . . . Niu; a me kekahi mau ia introduces a second straight list, o ka Ulua . . . Hailepo; a first loose termination, a me kekahi mau mea kapu e ae, is followed by a more formal traditional one, aole i pau i ka helu ia; Malo adds further explanation.

xiii 1–3, clearly Malo’s composition, a typical original preface to a section with references to olden times and Malo’s own speculations. A more organized and traditional section follows.

xiii 4, o ka Puua o ka mea nui; the next phrase, iki ae, leads to the next item, the dog; that is, Malo is again proceeding from big to small (this section and the following have been described above).

xiv 1, Malo’s own preface for non-Hawaiians.

Section 2, introduction, He nui no ke ano o ke Kalo.; the principle of naming, color, provides the attribute, ua kapa ia no nae ka inoa ma kona ano.; the list is organized in parallel sentences beginning with ina; termination, he nui no na inoa o ke Kalo ana kanaka i kapa ai; further explanation is appended.
Section 3, an organization similar to the above for ‘uala.

Sections 4, 5, a loose composition by Malo with reference to introduced items. The following sections based on initial names have been described above.

xv 1–2, a confusing collection of heterogeneous elements related to fresh water fish; Malo even includes freshwater weeds. Descriptions are summary and vague, and traditional devices lacking (note the use of aia instead of eia in section 1). Malo seems to be somewhat at a loss when he lacks traditional lists, such as those available to him for sections 5–20. He seems to have created this section in order to have an uka ‘land’ section to balance his traditional kai ‘sea’ section; uka is placed before kai, in traditional fashion. He must therefore reach for material—such as freshwater weeds.

Sections 3–4, a general introduction to the following lists constructed by Malo by extracting the attributes of those lists.

Sections 5–16, 19–20, a series of eia lists of different types of fish with clear, observable attributes and sometimes with terminations. This is the type of material most easily adapted to Hawaiian lists; as a result, these lists are, I argue, most clearly traditional and can be used to evaluate others.

Section 17, uses an eia introduction but does not introduce a list with a clear attribute, Eia keia mau ia ano like, ‘Here are similar i’a’; two items are described, honu ‘turtle’ and ‘ea “Hawksbill turtle”; the name is followed by a description and explanatory termination for both. The introduction is clearly Malo’s own; that is, he uses the list form, but not a traditional list.

Section 18, discusses three fish that are singular, Hookahi ka Mano i kona ano . . . hookahi ke Kahala i kona ano, hookahi Kamahimahi i kona ano; parallelism is used in the articulation of the three items, but the first has been expanded with information; a termination for all three, he mau ia ono keia ke ai ia.; I see
no good basis for a final decision on whether this is a traditional
list or Malo’s original composition.

LISTS IN LITERATURE

Lists are used extensively in Hawaiian literature, and examples
are referred to in the text. The following examples are intended
merely to suggest some of the range.

LISTS IN CHANTS

Malo 1951:228 (Emerson).

Kamakau October 14, 1865.

Na’u No September 1, 1866, all lines except the last are parallel:
Mele kekahi no/i/e/ma/me.

Testa 1895:58, a list of islands.

Nākuina 1902a:66–75, the wind chants in all the Pāka’a versions
are list chants.

J. G. M. Sheldon and Piilani 1906:62, it is difficult to decide
whether this is a list or a chant, demonstrating the closeness pos-
sible to the genres.

Fornander 1916–1917: 439 ff., the canoe chant of Kana; 1919–1920;
209, sea list in chant.

Handy and Pukui 1972: 85 f. (body parts), 140.
Titcomb 1948: 107 f., list of pairs in chant; *Elua laua*.

Johnson and Mahelona 1975: 41 ff., a chant of the genealogy of the stars connected to a chant about the months and their characteristics.

Beckwith 1972: 38, on lists in the *Kumulipo*.

**LISTS IN PRAYERS**

Malo n.d.: xxiv 8, two lists in short prayer: *Eia ka puaa, ka niu, ka maia, ka awa; e ku, e Lono, e kane kanaloa na kua, na aumakua*.

Section 9, more lists in prayers.

xxxvi 36.


Kamakau 1976: 31, a stereotyped sea list.


“He Moolelo Kaao no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” August 25, 1921, a stereotyped sea list.


Kirtley and Mookini 1977 [Kepelino Pepa I]: 47, several lists in prayers.
Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 127 f.

Barrère, Pukui, and Kelly 1980: 92 [Pukui], a dog and cloud list in prayer.


**God Lists in Prayers and Chants**

Malo n.d.:

- xxxiv 7, a Kū list in a prayer; male and female lists.
- xxxiv 18, a Kū list in prayer; different gods in section 25.
- xxxv 15, god and offerings lists in prayer.

Kamakau 1964: 30 ff., 57 ff.

Ekaula March 30, 1865, two god lists in chants.

Kaawa April 27, 1865, male and female god lists without the rest of the prayer!

“He Moolelo no Pakaa” November 14, 1867.

Nākuina 1902a: 47, a god list in a chant (also in parallels).

“Moolelo Kaa no Kuhaupio/Kekuhaupio” July 21, 1921.

N. B. Emerson 1915: 146, 201, a god list in a prayer.

J. S. Emerson 1892: 17.

LISTS IN RITUAL STATEMENTS OR RESPONSES

Kamakau of Kaawaloa in Fornander 1919–1920: 7, *I ilio . . . moa a nui loa*; this seems to represent a series of similar stereotyped requests; 19, an informal list in a ritual statement, *i ka leo o ka iole . . . moa*.

Kepelino 1932: 149 ff.
A number of terms and expressions are used regularly in the *hoʻopāpā* and in discussions of it. Some of these belong to the ritual sayings or verbal sequence of the formal contest; others seem to have been merely conventional or are found frequently in the particular sources used. I have included some words because of their connection to Hawaiian education. I have been inclusive rather than exclusive in my selection. Some of the words listed are rare, being found exclusively or almost exclusively in this context; others are used elsewhere in different contexts and sometimes with different senses. I do not include every example, but attempt to give some idea of how widespread and frequent the use of this terminology is. For glosses, consult Pukui and Elbert 1986.

*Aia la*

used often, e.g., Pīkoiakʻalalā, Fornander 1916–1917: 457, to claim that a point is correct.
Aia. Aia ho‘i hā!

“Kaaao Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” January 17, 1912: 17, to claim that a point is correct.

‘Alo

Nākuina 1902b: 36, to dodge, to escape in a contest.

‘Auwae lena

Nākuina 1902b: e.g., 18, 56, 58, a taunt against older opponents.

Eo

Kaua‘i November 20, December 4, 1865.

“Kaaao Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” January 24: 18; April 10, 1912: 16.

“‘No ke Keiki Hoopapa, Oia o Kalapana’”: 35 [4].

Poliokaipolia September 12, 1919.
**Haʻi, haʻina**

can mean both the saying of a riddle and answering one.

Kuikanoa May 12, 1858. answer.

Kauai November 20, 1865.


Kepakaʻiliʻula, Fornander 1918–1919: 403 ff., 413.

**Hāʻule**

“*He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna*” 1902: 4, for losing.

**Helu**

Nākuina 1902b: 68, for giving an answer to a riddle.

**Hemo**

The closure, *pani*, is loosened so one can escape.

Kuikanoa May 12, 1858: *A loaa ka hewa, hemo ka pani.*

“*Kaa Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki*” January 17, 1912: 18, *a paa loa olua, aohe mea nana e wehe a hemo.*

**Hoʻohālike**

Nākuina 1902b: 74.

**Hoʻohuli**

“*Kaa Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki*” January 17, 1912: 18.
Ho’okoe

Nākuina 1902b: 73.

Ho’omanawanui

Kauai December 18, 1865.

Nākuina 1902b: 44.

Ho’ole


Ho’opa’apa’a

“He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902: 6, column 1, for dispute, apparently distinct from ho’opāpā.

“No ke Keiki Hoopapa, Oia o Kalapana” n.d.: 39 [7].


Ho’opāpā

used very frequently.

Nākuina 1902b: 12, definition.


Lonoikamakahiki, Fornander 1916–1917: 267, 271, 275, etc.

pāpā

Kepaka’ili‘ula, Fornander 1916–1917: 513, for ho’opāpā, used in this case for martial arts; 515, for riddling.
Hua

hua as response in Tahitian, Emory 1938: 62, n. 41.

Ā hua ā pane


Pukui 1983: number 11, a hua a pane and extension used in the ho'opāpā.

Kauai November 20, 27, 1865.

“He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902: 4.

“No ke Keiki Hoopapa, Oia o Kalapana” n.d.: 33 [2]–37 [6].

Nākuina 1902b: used frequently; e.g., 78, ka a hua a pane ana.

“Kaa Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” June 14, 1911: 14, a hua, a pane, a lohe; January 14, 1912: 17; January 17: 16, to ask a question; 17, A hea a pane (typographical error?); April 10: 14, said to start the contest, but then, a mamua nae o ka pane ana; that is, the rules are being established, so the expression seems to have been somewhat divorced from its original meaning; when the rules are agreed on, they go back to A hua a pane.

“Ke Alii Aloha ole i kona Kaula/O Hua ke Alii, a o Luahoomoe ke Kaula” June 16, 1864, Ahu—a pane!! he pane kau, he hooloh e ka’u, a nau no hoi, a na’u no hoi, oo na ihe a kaua; the expression is used neither for the contest of wits or for martial arts, but merely metaphorically.

Pane

used in the verbal sequence and regularly for contest exchanges in all versions.
Kauai November 20, 1865: col. 1, seems to refer generally to the discourse in the contest of wits; col. 2, *huaolelo pane*, is used even when going first, and statements of both sides are called *pane; olelo pane*; November 27, December 4, 18, 1865.

“He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902: 4, for a statement, not a reply.

“No ke Keiki Hoopapa, Oia o Kalapana” n.d.: passim.

Nākuina 1902b: used regularly, e.g., 18 f., 33 f., 37, 47 f., 52 f., 56 f., 71.


**E pane ana**

Kauai November 20, 27, 1865.

Nākuina 1902b: used regularly in the verbal sequence, 56, 58–62, 80, 81 (used for starting).

“Kaa Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” January 17: 17; January 24: 16 f., to answer a riddle; April 10, 1912: 14, to answer a riddle, 15.

**Kāhāhā**

Nākuina 1902b: used regularly in the verbal sequence.

Poliokaipolia September 12, 1919.
**Kaena**

Nākuina 1902b: 29 ff., 51, 79, announcing a successful move or countermove; 69, general boast that winning; 79 f., 83, completeness claim; 89, bragging.


**Kāhea**

“He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902: 4.


**Koho i ka nane**


**Kuailo**

A riddling term not found in the main sources used.

Pukui and Elbert 1986: *kuailo*.

Pukui 1983: number 1856, ‘*Eu no ka ilo, make!*’

Poepoe December 16, 23, 1910, uses the term for the answer to the riddle. I have not listed the other terms used by him in the passage referred to.
See also Pukui and Elbert 1986: kuāilo; which has been considered the term employed.

*Kumu*

used in senses other than teacher.

*Kumu hana*

the subject of a round.

Kauai November 27, 1865.

*kumu hoopapa*

the subject of a round.


*Kumu pili*

the subject of a bet

Lonoikamakahiki, Fornander 1916–1917: 281, 295, 311 (*Auhea kau kumu e pili ai*?).

*Lanakila*

Kauai November 13, 20, December 18, 1865.

“He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902: 6.

Nākuina 1902b: 37, 33, 37.
Le'ale'a

Nākuina 1902b: 28, for the contest of wits.

Lonoikamakahiki, Fornander 1916–1917: 291 ff., 297, for the protagonist’s emotions during the fishing contest.

“Kaa Ho’oniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” April 10, 1912: 15, I pa ka hoa hoopapa le’ale’a; used frequently in the series.


Kepaka’ili’ula, Fornander 1918–1919: 403.

Like loa

Kaipalaoa, Fornander 1916–1917: 579, for a tie.

Loa’a

Kuikanoa May 12, 1858.

“He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902: 4.

Nākuina 1902b: used for both catching the opponent and getting an answer, 28, 33, 51 f., 56, 66 ff., 69, 70 f., 73, 75, 79, 80, 92 ff.

“Kaa Ho’oniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” January 17: 16, loa’a ka pane, 16, 17, 18, pane a panai; January 24: 17 f.; April 10, 1912: 14, Pane a loaa.


**Loea**

Nākuina 1902b: 17, 22.

**Ma‘a**

Kapunohu, Fornander 1918–1919: 419.

**Mau**

for a bet.
Kaipalaoa, Fornander 1916–1917: 585 (?)..

**Mau‘u**

Nākuina 1902b: 33, *he iki pua mauu*.

**Make**

to lose a round or a game.
Kaui November 13; 20, 1865, *make aohe ola*.
Mō ke kī la, make

Used frequently in the Kalapana/Kaipalaoa traditions.

mō = short for moku, as in mō ka piko

ke = definite article

kī is translated by Fornander and accepted by Beckwith as “joint.”

I would argue that the expression is based on word play: kī is being used as a syllable: if you cut a part of the body that has the syllable kī or ki in it, death follows. Examples are kipo‘ohiwi (in dictionary along with kihi po‘ohiwi), and ki-hi-po‘o and ki po‘olua. Miki’au is the winning entry.

Samuel H. Elbert disagrees, arguing that the expression is short for Moku ke kino la, make ‘[if your] body breaks, [you] lose’ (personal communication).


“He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902.


Beckwith 1922: 328 f.

Pukui 1983: number 2183.

Nane, nanenane


Kapunohu, Fornander 1918–1919: 419.

Noʻonoʻo

See the text for Nākuina 1902b.


ʻOhi

used in the set portion of the regular verbal sequence.


ʻO ia

Pukui and Elbert 1986: ʻoia.


Nākuina 1902b: 73, e hooia mai ana hoi i ka loaa io a me ka pai o ka oukou mau hana hoopapa iaʻu.

Ka olelo hooholo

“Kaao Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki” April 10, 1912: 16.

Olioli

Kaua November 20, 1865, for the method of posing the subject.
’Ōlohe

“He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902: 4.

“Kao Hooniu a Puuwai no Ka-Miki” January 24, 1912: 17 f.

Pā

Kaua November 13, 1865.

Nākuina 1902b: pa a eo i; pā victim iā beater, 6–10, 14, 22, 24, 26–29, 37, 77; 12, pa and eo in the definition of the contest; 10, 26, pa a make; 10, Hala i kahi, pa mai la i kahi, if missed by one opponent, hit by the other.

“Kaa Hooniu a Puuwai no Ka-Miki” January 24, 1912: 17, probably in the sense of hitting the answer.

Pa’ā

to be caught by an opponent.

Nākuina 1902b: 27.


“Kaa Hooniu a Puuwai no Ka-Miki” January 17, 1912: 18, a pa a loa olua, aohe mea nana e wehe a hemo.

Pa’i

to counter or tie or to be countered or tied; used very frequently.

Handy and Pukui 1972: 171, pa’i a pa’i. “for a tie between two contestants in a game.” Before the game, the points and
wagers were discussed and agreed upon. Then each contestant slapped the other’s hand in turn, *hoʻopāpā lima*.

Pukui 1983: number 2572, for an explanation of the sense.

Kauai November 20, 1865.

“He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902: 4, *paʻi ae la a paʻi ia mau hana a lakou, paʻi hou.*


Nākuina 1902b: 11, 16, 29, 30 f., 33 seq., 48 (*ua pai kakou*), 57, 62, 71, 73, 75 f., 81, 90, 93.

19, *ua pai, ua noa marks o ka pani o ka hoopapa.*

8, *pai ke poo,* to beat someone; compare 17, 24.


_hoʻopaʻi_

Kepakaʻiliʻula, Fornander 1918–1919: 401, sense of punish, used outside of contest; 405, for the punishment of the loser of the contest.

_hiapaʻiʻole_

for an expert; someone who does not like to be tied in a competition.

Kauai November 20, 1865.

Nākuina 1902b: 24, *paʻiʻole.*

**Pakele**

to escape by countering the move of the other side.  
“He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902: 4, 6.

Nākuina 1902b: 82, 89.

**Pale ola**

Nākuina 1902b: 35, a blow intended to win.

**Pani**

to bring a round to a close so that the opponent cannot proceed; to close a contest.

Kuikanoa May 12, 1858, *A loaa ka hewa, hemo ka pani.*

Kauai November 20, 1865, *olelo pani.*

Nākuina 1902b:

19, *o ka pani o ka hoopapa* ‘the closing of the contest’.

36 (*paniia . . . a paa . . . make*, no way to ‘alo ‘dodge’), 43, 48, 78.

“Kaao Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki” January 17, 1912: 18, *ka nui akamai o keia keiki ma ka hoopapa olelo ame ka hoopilipili ana i kela ame keia olelo pani a laua e kii mai ai.*

**Pili**

to bet; see *kumu pili* above.

Nākuina 1902b: 81.


**Pili**

word play, comparison, metaphor.

Nākuina 1902b: 21, 27.


**Ho’opilipili**

Kauai November 20, 1865.

Nākuina 1902b: 12, 31 f., 39 f., 83.


**Pilikia**

Nākuina 1902b: 36 f.

**Pū**


**Puana**

“He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902: 4, in place of *pane*. 


Puka

Nākuina 1902b: 27, to escape being caught by the opponent.

Puni

Nākuina 1902b: 32, to catch the opponent.

Wahahe'e

used frequently to dispute an opponent’s claim.

Kauai November 20, 1865.

Nākuina 1902b: 38 f., 42, 45.


Walea

Kapunohu, Fornander 1918–1919: 419.


Multiple terms

Kauai November 20, 1865: He uiui, he pane, he ninau, ninau ia.

Nākuina 1902a: 74 f., He ui, he ninau.

Kaipalaoa, Fornander 1916–1917: 587, ua like a ua pa‘i, aohe paa o ke keiki, for a tie.
“Kaao Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki” January 17: 18, *hoopapa olelo* ame *ka nanenane, i ka hoopapa olelo, i ka hoopapa nanenane* ame *ka lawaia upena kuu no kaheka . . . ,* ka nui akamai o keia keiki ma ka hoopapa olelo ame ka *hoopilipili* ana i kela ame *keia olelo pani a laua e kii mai ai, a paa loa olu, aohe mea nana e wehe a hemo; January 24, 1912: 16, *akua hoopapa nanenane a hoopapa olelo, hoopapa olelo, hoopapa nanenane,* *hoopilipili kamailio*; 17, i na olelo hoopapa, i na olelo akamai a nanenane, a i na mea no apau loa.

**THE KALAPANA/KAIPALAOA TRADITION:**
**PERSONS AND PLACES**

**Protagonist**
Kauai November 13, 1865, no name given.

November 20, 1865, tease names: O-a-makuaole, Akeke makua ole.

“*He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna*” 1902, Kalapana.

Nākuina 1902b, Kalapana.

p. 12, tease names: O-a-makuaole, Akeke-makua-ole.


“*‘No ke Keiki Hoopapa, Oia o Kalapana’*” n.d., Kalapana.

**Father of Protagonist**
Kauai November 13, 1865, Kanepoiki.

“*He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna*” 1902, Halepaki.
Nākuina 1902b, Kanepoiki.
“’No ke Keiki Hoopapa, Oia o Kalapana’” n.d.: 32 [1], Halepaki.

Mother of Protagonist

Kaui November 13, 1865, Halepaki; Kapalaoa is her real name and also the place where the family lives.

“He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902, the character is not used.

Nākuina 1902b: 3, both Halepaki and Kapalaoa, youngest sibling.
21, Kalaoa.

Aunt of Protagonist

Kaui November 13, 1865, Kalaoa.
Nākuina 1902b, Kalaoa, third sibling.
Fornander 1916–1917: 575, Kalenaihaleauau, wife of Kukuipahu, younger sister of protagonist’s mother.

Grandmother teaches protagonist

“’No ke Keiki Hoopapa, Oia o Kalapana’” n.d.: 32 [1], Pohakuualae.
“He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902, Pohaku-aalae.
Places (Pukui, Elbert, and Mookini 1974: at names)

Kauʻi November 13, 1865, Kapalaoa, Kona Akau [North Kona], Hawaiʻi.

“He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902, Kalapana, Puna, Hawaiʻi.

Nākuina 1902b:

3, Kapalaoa, Kona, Hawaiʻi.

19, Kalapana, Puna, Hawaiʻi.

21, Kalaoa.


“No ke Keiki Hoopapa, Oia o Kalapana’” n.d.: 32 [1], Puna, Hawaiʻi.

Protagonist’s Hoʻopāpā God

Kauʻi November 20, 1865, Kanepoiki.

“He Moolelo no ke Keiki Hoopapa o Puna” 1902, Kanepoiki.

Nākuina 1902b: 56, Kanepokiʻi [possibly a misprint]; Kanepoki elsewhere, so Kalapana is using his dead father as his god.

Fornander 1916–1917: 583, Kanepaiki.


Name of Protagonist’s Gourd

Kauʻi November 13, 1865, Lonoaipu.

Nākuina 1902b: 14, Lono-a-ipu.
**Kaua‘i Chief, Opponent**

Kalanialiiloa in all versions.

**Brother of Kaua‘i Chief, Opponent**

Kaua 1865, no name given.

Nākuina 1902b, Kelii-o-Kapaa.

**Teachers of Kaua‘i Chief, Opponent Halepaiwi**

Kaua 1865, he is the older of the two brothers.

Nākuina 1902b, he is the oldest of the four siblings.

Fornander 1916–1917, Halepaiwi is the name of the bone fence.

**Halepaniho**

Kaua 1865, the younger brother.

Nākuina 1902b, the younger brother.

**Opponents of Protagonist**

“‘No ke Keiki Hoopapa, Oia o Kalapana’” n.d.: 3 [1], Makaluakou from Hawai‘i; 33 [2], Makaluapo/Makaluapou.

**God of Kaua‘i Chief, Opponent**

Kaua November 20, 1865, Kaneulupo.

Nākuina 1902b: from 56, Kaneulupo.

Fornander 1916–1917: 583, Kaneulupo.
HAWAIIAN NEWSPAPERS CONTAIN numerous reports on nineteenth-century Hawaiian medical practices. The following is merely a selection, which illustrates some of the materials available for further study. The historical content of such articles is provided in the main text.

Oleloa (March 13, 1839:83) describes a case in which a medical expert was summoned to cure a six-year-old girl. The expert blamed the mother, saying *Nou ko ia nei make ana, o ke akua aumakua no, o oukou he akua mana* ‘You are responsible for her death; your ancestral god is a god of power’. The mother asks what she should do, and the expert gives her a list of offerings, *kalokalo aku i ko olua akua aumakua* ‘pray to the god of you two’. They should bury the plants and then *hoi mai olua, alaila lapaaau i laau maoli, alaila ola ka mai* ‘you two should return; then [I] will do the treatment with real plants; then the sick person will live’. The father asked for advice from the author, who said they should not follow other gods: *e waiho loa aku i keia mau mea, e oki loa aku* ‘leave these things far behind; cut them off completely’.

J. L. Nailiili (August 5, 1848) reports that a medical practitioner named Aikane piled tapa on top of a sick person, claiming
that his god would revive the patient once dead. The author thinks the law should proceed against this practitioner. This seems to be a sweating treatment, described elsewhere. A warm tapa is a medical symbol (Ekula November 4, 1865).

Opunui (January 16, 1849) describes a practitioner named Halekii from Wailupe, who uses a possessing god. The author gives his physical description because he travels to work in different locations. Halekii claims to be able to raise a person who has been dead twenty days. He sent one of his students named Papa to people who were preparing a funeral. The message was given as a numbered list: they should not bury the person because the mana of Halekii can raise him back to life. The answer was made that Halekii should first prove this by reviving some of their other dead relatives.

Poheepali (1861) reports a case of which he himself was an eyewitness. The patient was very weak, and the family sent for a medical practitioner. Hoailona iho la kela, me ka puu iliili, ahi [uhi?] iho la me ka hainaka, a mahele i kela puu keia puu ‘That one made a divination ceremony with piles of pebbles; he covered them with a handkerchief and divided two piles’. He prayed low as in sorcery and then announced that the problem was not caused by another person, but by two ancestral gods, one on the male and one on the female side of the family. The family had committed a fault and was now being punished. The practitioner gave instructions for the appropriate sacrifice: Oia ka uku e oluolu mai ai keia mau aumakua, a o ke ola no ia o keia mai. Aole i lapaauia, a ola wale ae no ‘This is the offering to placate these ancestral gods, and this is the life of this sick person. [The patient] is not to be treated with medicine; [the patient] will just live’. The instructions were followed, but the patient did not improve. It is not good to worship any other god but Jehovah. People are not abandoning na hana o na pouli ‘the works of the dark night’. Church members should not follow such practices.
Kapehe (June 14, 1862: 2) writes that Kahalekai—he wahine kahuna ia no ke Aupuni ‘this is a kahuna woman for the Government’ [licensed?]—had a dream of pigs eating her and then a dream about a whirlwind. She told her husband about it, but he was not sympathetic. Later she died in her sleep. An old woman and her husband tried to revive her but failed. Kahalekai had been a medical practitioner who specialized in diseases caused by ancestral gods; she would advise people on the sacrifices needed to dissipate their anger. But she could not help herself. The author calls on such practitioners to stop their evil activities (2 f.).

Alapai (July 24, 1862) reports that a medical practitioner criticized the first one called in and replaced him. The practitioner then disagreed with the patient on what the medical problem was. The practitioner ejected everyone and then persuaded the patient to wehe i ke kapa ‘open the tapa [clothes]’. The practitioner then did the same, and the writer judges, he ano hoopunipuni ka hana ana ‘the procedure was of a deceitful nature’. The practitioner predicted when the patient would recover. This did not happen, so the practitioner visited again. He had the patient drink kawa without any good effect. The practitioner asked for a long list of foods. The people obtained them, but the practitioner did not return. They searched for him in vain and have now waited a month.

Kaelemakule (March 28, 1863) warns the readers against deceitful practitioners: as in the Bible, you will know them by their fruits. He calls on the islands to look at a covetous practitioner, Kalolii from Ha’aheo, Hilo, who is trying to hide his deeds. The story of this case is told with a conventional form.¹ On March 9th, the family fetched the practitioner, who made a potion; some was poured in the eye, and the patient was made to drink the remainder. This did not help. A piece of coconut was burned, part of which was put on the fontanel and part eaten. This also did not help. On March 10th, the practitioner said that if the pain
increased that day, the patient would die. If the strange thing resting on the patient left, the patient would live. The patient’s pain increased, and the practitioner came again. He performed a divination ceremony and said *aole no waho mai ka make, nana iho no ka make*, “death is not from the outside, but death is indeed from the person himself”. The author told the practitioner that now was the time for him to do his work, if he knew what to do. The practitioner asked for their tapa cloths and covered the patient completely with several tapas, saying that with this method *hanu maikai* ‘good breathing’ would be gained. The author asked how the patient would be able to breathe when covered. After five minutes, the patient said, *pau loa kuu aho* “my breath is finished”. The practitioner said to wait half an hour; the sweat would then run, and the *makani* ‘wind’ would be able to *holo* ‘run’ inside the body. The patient said, *nui loa mai la kuu wel, mai lalo mai a luna o kuu kino, pulu loa i ka hou* ‘my heat is very great, from the bottom to the top of my body, very soaked with sweat’. The practitioner said that was good. When the author and another person heard the hard breathing under the tapa, they insisted that it be opened. There they found *aole ike i koe, aole lohe* ‘no sight remained, no hearing’. About a minute later, the breathing stopped, and the patient was dead. The practitioner tried to revive him unsuccessfully and then expressed his regret to the saddened people: *ku mai kela a mihi me ka pono ole o kona manao* ‘he stood and regretted the incorrectness of his opinion’. The author was an eyewitness to this and warns the readers.

Kekaula (May 9, 1863) writes about a woman practitioner named Makala, who is *hoopunipuni* ‘deceitful’ and *wahahee* ‘lying’. Kapua was the sick girl. Her recognized father is named Keoni, and his younger brother is named Haupu. Haupu was sent to call Makala and took the customary *awa* with him as an offering to her. The practitioner was asleep, and Haupu waited until she awakened to engage her in conversation. Makala asked who the father of the patient was. When Haupu said Keoni, she expressed
doubt, and Haupu said that the real father was Kamiki. The practitioner had twelve students, whom she ordered to put on ti-leaf head leis and hold a ti leaf in their hands. She sent Haupu ahead, saying that they would follow. At the home of the patient, the practitioner sat on the right side of the door and asked the patient where the pain lay. The practitioner moved the pain around the patient’s body but could not make it leave. She then asked the head student, Mahinaula, to treat the patient, following what was taught: *a kana hana ana, a ua like pu no me ka hana a ke kumu nana ia i ao mai* ‘his work, was indeed like the work done by the teacher who taught him’. When that was ineffective, the majority of the students worked with their ti leaves, but the pain did not leave the patient. Most of the students and other people sat down. Water was brought in a gourd that was bound with sennit. The practitioner asked the father if this was to bind the girl. A new gourd was fetched that was unbound, and the water from the bound gourd was poured into it. Plants were fetched, and a potion was made. The practitioner had people drink the water and then asked the patient if she was feeling better, but there was no improvement. The practitioner had the door of the house removed and stood in it looking like a spider web. There was still no improvement. The patient was then taken to another house, and the practitioner ordered that a pig be cooked. She then called Ekau to come and chant with her a chant calling on Kāne and Hina and mentioning the *Wai ola a Kane* ‘the living water of Kāne’. This also was ineffective. The practitioner then ordered the student Kaaiuula to lie on the stomach of the patient, who said this did not make her feel better. The practitioner then asked for food for the patient, but *hoopuka ae la ua Kahuna nei i ka huaolelo weliweli loa*. “Make——e!” ‘that Expert then uttered the frightening statement: “Dead!”’. The students all breathed out, and the treatment was brought to an end. The author thought such deceitful practices were finished. He had heard that Makala and her husband Kaaialii were members of the church of Lahaina,
but they are members of the church of the devil. Other church members are following Makala.

Kino (July 4, 1863) writes about a woman medical practitioner named Kaai from Waimanalo, who had formerly been good, but has turned bad. The patient had a sharp pain in the shoulder blade, and Kaai said it was not serious and that she could cure it. She asked whether the patient had given a dress away and was told that it was true. The practitioner said *aole he pilikia, aole make aumakua, aole make i kela ame keia mea* ‘it is not a big problem, not death from ancestral gods, not death from this or that person’. She attempted a treatment, but the pain increased. The practitioner was then possessed by the god Ulunui, who said that only this practitioner could cure the patient and that the sickness came from the husband of the older sister of the patient. The pain increased. The possessing god then named the gods or spirits inside the patient: the first woman of the same name as the patient and one other person. People fetched taro leaf and ‘awa for those spirits. The practitioner drank the ‘awa and slept. Later the practitioner said that the sickness has been transferred to her: *Ua lele mai nei ka mai ia‘u* ‘The sickness has leaped onto me’. The practitioner pretended to feel all the pain, but the patient continued to feel it also. The practitioner then said a special house was needed for the treatment, along with a dog and dresses, *i mau lole pani no na lole i lilo* ‘some dresses as a closure for the dresses that were given away’. The treatment lasted two months, and the practitioner used a number of *akua makani* ‘wind gods’, who are named in a formal list: *a eia ka inoa o ua mau akua ala ona. O Ulunui, Kalehuamakanoe, Ulamealani, Kukona, a pela aku* ‘and these are the names of those gods of hers: Ulunui, Kalehuamakanoe, Ulamealani, Kukona, and so on’. The treatment was unsuccessful, and the patient died. The practitioner then threatened with death the patient’s relatives who supposedly were sending sickness to her, but the only one to die was the patient. Her threat
was therefore like dry thunder, which threatened a rain that did not appear.

S. (July 18, 1863) reports a man named Kamaka and his wife Kaeho practicing Hawaiian medicine in Waiāhole Valley, O‘ahu. They claimed a girl was being killed by her mother, but they could cure her for a fee. Kamaka said he would have the soul of the mother sit on top of the older brother and asked for her name. Kamaka then prayed to the mother to sit on top of the brother and return the life of her daughter. He did this for four days, but nothing happened. He then asked for a chicken and pig, but his work with them was equally ineffective. The practitioner was disconcerted and left.

Keolanui (November 19, 1864) writes that a practitioner named Kahale from Hilo was once a good man, but wanted a comfortable life without having to work for it, so he decided to say he had an *akua makani* ‘wind god’ named Kahoali‘i, the brother of Pele. Kahale works as the *haka* or seat of the god to sit upon, *noho*. His followers and others treat him as a chief, making offerings to him and following tabus related to him. The possessing god uses unusual Hawaiian words for things, which makes them appear ‘ano ‘ē strange’. The practitioner said that *he Akua hoounaumo* [sic: ho‘ounauna] ‘a god to send on errands’ was sitting on top of the patient causing the sickness, which he treated with a potion. The missionary J. Bibkell [Bicknell?] from ‘Ewa visited the patient and said he was being treated falsely. But the people followed the practitioner, and the patient died. The practitioner claimed that he was called too late and, in a *wānana* ‘prophecy’, that the patient was killed by an ancestral god. He also said that the patient would have lived if he had treated him himself rather than through his god. But then why did he use his god, whom he clearly uses to gain prestige and reputation? The practitioner offered as a further excuse that they called in a foreign doctor. Some people believed the practitioner, but when the patient died,
he moved away. People should be wary: *Ma Puuloa ka nui o ka poe wahine hoonohonoho Akua* . . . ‘In Pu‘uloa is the majority of the women who practice with sitting/possession gods . . .’.

The author of “‘Pau ole ka epa o Hawaii la’” (February 16, 1865) writes of a medical practitioner named Kalaau. A girl patient had been taken to a foreign doctor who said her illness was not serious. The practitioner told the patients he could cure her within a week and took her to his place at Waikīkī. The family paid him a great deal, some of which was used as an offering to the ancestral gods of the patient. The rest was eaten by the patient, the practitioner, *a me kona mau hoa e ae no hoi* ‘and also by his other companions’. He received money from the family and put some of it under and some on top of the patient and left it there. The practitioner then took the money, saying, *e waihoa ana ua dala nei na ke akua aumakua, a me ke akua keiki* ‘these dollars will be left for the ancestral god and the child god’. The patient did not improve, the family took her back, and the practitioner was convicted in court to hard labor.

Kauhane (April 6, 1865) reports on a practitioner named Manu from North Kona, Hawai‘i. He claimed to be able to extract a child during a difficult birth. Pig, taro leaf, and other things were given to him. The practitioner had the patient stand up, shook her hands, and urged the baby to come out. The practitioner wanted $70.00, but the money was not given to him. The author describes the practitioner and warns people against him.

Waha (May 18, 1865) writes of a practitioner named Kau, who used a feast of chicken for divination and prophesied, *wānana*, that if the patient lasted three days, he could cure him. He also performed a divination ceremony that resembled the game *pūhenehene*, in which a stone was hidden. But his false prediction was *ho‘opunipuni* ‘deceitful’. After the patient died, the practitioner predicted from a moon omen that two more people would die. One person was so frightened that he moved away. The author
thought such practices were over. People should not be deceived and should trust in god.

Kaliwaabo (October 6, 1866) writes that a practitioner named Lota Petana Mookahoko is working without pay in Hau'ula, O'ahu. The author describes his physical appearance. The practitioner got plants from the mountains, inserted flowers into the thatch walls of the room where the patient was, and decorated the patient with leis. These things were done to appease the ancestral gods who had been neglected. The practitioner ordered that all the tapa be changed and prayed to the ancestral gods. A pig was ordered to be prepared for the closing ceremony of the treatment: all was supposed to be eaten with ‘awa except the head and remains, which were to be put with some ‘awa for the spirits into the house of the patient. He then told the wife of the patient that she should visit him in his own house, apparently for sexual purposes. When she refused, he prayed to the ancestral gods as a kind of love magic. He then told the wife that he could blind her husband. An attached editorial states that the law should proceed against this practitioner. All the details were not printed, because they were improper. People should not fear such practitioners. Similarly Aholo (1861:6) alleged that a woman medical practitioner demanded sex.

In “Kahuna Lapaau Hoopunipuni” (November 17, 1866), the editor summarizes a letter from Hilo. A practitioner named Kaaanaa, when fetched, asked first to have ‘awa, which he used for divination in a bowl. He predicted that if the patient could have pig and sugarcane in one day, he would live. The patient died.

Manuia (November 22, 1879) writes that an unlicensed practitioner took four dollars, drank much ‘awa, and used prayer and a god, but did no good. He made the patient go out at night despite his weakness, which was bad treatment. The author advised the parent to get a foreign doctor, but the parent was angered by the suggestion. Other parents fetched a doctor, who said the illness
was consumption, which he could not cure because the patient was too weak. The author knows people who have died under treatment by Hawaiian medical practitioners. They are paid, but the patient dies.

NOTES

1. Introduction: Eia ma ka apana . . . o Kalolii kona inoa. A titular sentence is then given: A penei ka moolelo o ka loaa ana o kona hoopunipuni. A time reference transition uses the modern calendar: I ke awakea o ka poakah iho nei, la 9 o Maraki . . . ; and exact date and time references are used throughout. The narrative begins: kii aku la o Mrs. Kaumealani . . .

2. On such transference, compare Barratt 1988: 209, when man falls sick, his wife and female relations wail, tear their hair, and scratch their faces “in hopes of thereby affording him some relief, indeed a complete cure.”
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