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MINUTES
ANNUAL MEETING
February 7, 1935

The annual meeting of the Hawaiian Historical Society was held in the auditorium of the Library of Hawaii at 7:45 o'clock on the evening of February 7, 1935, President Henry P. Judd being in the chair.

The reports of the President, Treasurer, and Librarian were read, accepted, and placed on file for the annual report of the Society.

The report of the Nominating Committee was next read and the nominees presented by the committee were duly elected, as follows:

President, Rev. Henry P. Judd

Trustees (to serve until the annual meeting in 1937):
   Edwin H. Bryan, Jr.
   Thomas W. Ellis
   Walter F. Frear.

The following program was then presented:

Dr. Donald W. Rowland of the University of Hawaii dis-coursed upon "The Establishment of the Republic of Hawaii."

Mr. John F. G. Stokes, with the aid of charts, gave a talk upon the subject, "The Paternity and a Biographical Sketch of Kaoleioku."

Professor Ralph S. Kuykendall of the University of Hawaii presented a study of "The Earliest Japanese Labor Immigration to Hawaii."

The meeting was then adjourned.

R. S. KUYKENDALL,
Secretary.
REPORT OF HENRY P. JUDD, PRESIDENT OF THE HAWAIIAN HISTORICAL SOCIETY
FOR THE YEAR ENDING FEBRUARY 7, 1935

To the Members of the Hawaiian Historical Society:

The past year has not been marked by any special activities of a spectacular nature. The work of the Society has gone forward quietly and our officers and members have done their part in accomplishing the aims of the organization.

During the year there have been two centennial celebrations which should be recorded here, first the founding of the Waioli Mission in 1834 was celebrated on October 21, 1934 by a large group from all parts of Kauai, together with relatives of the Alexander family, founders of the mission. A most interesting historical paper was read by Miss Mary E. Alexander, granddaughter of the late Rev. William P. Alexander, pioneer in Waioli.

The second celebration was in January, 1935 at which time the centennial of the building of the Baldwin House in Lahaina, Maui, was observed with a fitting program, and a plaque placed on the house to commemorate the event.

A most commendable feature of the past year has been the publication of two noteworthy missionary biographies—of William Patterson Alexander, already referred to as pioneer missionary at Waioli, Kauai, and of Lowell and Abigail Smith, missionaries on Molokai and Oahu. The Alexander book was done by Miss Mary E. Alexander, while that of the Smiths was written by Mrs. Walter F. Frear, granddaughter of the Smiths. The life of Lucy G. Thurston was reprinted by “The Friend” as the two former editions of this well-known biography are out of print. Other biographies of the missionaries are to be undertaken in the next few years and it is to be hoped that this fruitful field will arouse an even greater interest in the history of these islands. As the period of the early missionary days gradually fades away into the long vista of history, it is important that an accurate chronicle of the life and times of the veterans from 1820 onward be avail-
able. A needed work is that of biographies of the missionary mothers; their part is often overlooked in stressing the labors of the missionary fathers.

A suggestion from the library authorities will soon come to the Society in concrete form. It concerns a possible new location of our rooms, involving moving from upstairs to the downstairs location now being occupied by the "Hawaiiana Room" and the room immediately mauka of that room. Balancing the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed plan, it remains true that the new arrangement would make our collections more available to the general public and we would have considerable more publicity. It is well that the Society should know at this time that such a plan is under consideration.

It is increasingly evident that we should reach out and secure a larger membership than is at present enrolled on our books. As the late Bishop Restarick pointed out in one of his annual reports as president a few years ago, if each member were able to secure one new member during the year we should then have a healthy membership roll.

Respectfully submitted,

HENRY P. JUDD,
President, Hawaiian Historical Society.
TREASURER’S REPORT
February 20, 1934, to February 5, 1935

INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance in Commercial Account as of February 20, 1934</td>
<td>$ 445.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation fees</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues Kauai Historical Society</td>
<td>291.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Reports and Publications</td>
<td>44.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Olaa Bond</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Davies Bonds</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend on von Hamm-Young stock</td>
<td>14.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 954.60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISBURSEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dues California Historical Society</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues Business Historical Society</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues American Historical Association</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellen Associates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Meeting notices, mailing reports, and changes in mailing list)</td>
<td>26.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian Printing Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(stamped envelopes and billheads)</td>
<td>24.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of books</td>
<td>27.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Chemical Co.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamehameha Schools (Binding Books)</td>
<td>34.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise of the Pacific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(375 Copies of 42d Annual Report)</td>
<td>559.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Trust Co. (Safe Deposit Box)</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Auditorium (Library of Hawaii)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage Stamps</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax on checks</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 706.23</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance in Commercial Account as of February 5, 1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 248.37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENDOWMENT FUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance on Savings Account February 20, 1934</td>
<td>$ 939.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Savings Account</td>
<td>32.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Bonds</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends on von Hamm-Young stock</td>
<td>44.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,101.94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two $1000 Theo. H. Davies Bonds, Par Value</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One $1000 Olaa Sugar Co. Bond, Par Value</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Shares von Hamm-Young Preferred Stock</td>
<td>995.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash—Commercial Account</td>
<td>248.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash—Savings Account</td>
<td>1,101.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$5,345.31</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS W. ELLIS,
Treasurer.

February 11th, 1935.
Audited and found correct:

D. W. ANDERSON.
REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN
1934

To the Officers and Members of the Hawaiian Historical Society
Ladies and Gentlemen:

Every year increases the importance of our library for historical reference and research. It may be of interest to note a few of the subjects involved.

One worker desires information on the status of Hawaiian women and the Kuhina-nui; another on the riot of 1874 when David Kalakaua was elected king. A student in Lahaina writes for material on missions in the South Seas, and another inquirer on Maui for legends of Kolekole pass and the sacrificial stone. Interest in the subject of early education has brought students to the library for the history of Lahainaluna Seminary, the Wailuku School for Girls and the Hilo Boarding School.

A letter from Chicago calls for information on Herman Melville in Honolulu; another from Harrisburg, Penn. on the Gallician immigrants of 1897, and what became of Dr. Nicholas Russell, prominent coffee planter in Olaa, Hawaii, and one time President of the Senate? Local people have come seeking a sketch of Mrs. Bernice Pauahi Bishop; of the life of John A. Cummings; of the life and character of Kamehameha IV. A writer calls for marine disasters and Mark Twain's account of the wreck of the "Hornet" in 1866. The question of the nationality of John Young is always with us, and correspondence on the subject increasing.

"Who was the first white man to make the ascent of Haleakala?" was solved with the aid of Miss Judd, librarian of the Hawaiian Mission Children's Society. She found an account of the trip made by Rev. William Richards, Rev. Lorrin Andrews and Rev. J. S. Green in August, 1828. This month our Governor will cut a lei opening an automobile road to the summit of this vast mountain, up which they toiled on foot more than a century ago.

It is gratifying to report on the interest shown in the publications of the Society. The Managing-editor of the Canadian Historical Review requested a copy of our last report for review;
a collector in Seattle ordered two copies of the same report, because it contained Judge Howay’s article on the ship “Eliza.” A research worker in Berkeley is writing on Russians in the Pacific and wants a copy of Paper No. 6, which contains Dr. W. D. Alexander’s article “Proceedings of the Russians on Kauai, 1814-1816.” The Huntington Library in California not only sent an order for reports which they lacked, but applied for membership. Two book firms on the mainland sent requests for a complete list of our publications, with contents and prices. Typed lists were forwarded and have brought in orders.

Last March it was found necessary to send several hundred volumes to the Industrial Chemical Co. for fumigation. Twenty-two volumes of serials and continuations were sent to Kamehameha School bindery, whose workmanship proved very satisfactory.

A few new titles have been secured through purchase and gift: “Summer Cruising in the South Seas”, by Charles Warren Stoddard; “One Summer in Hawaii”, by Helen Mather; “Wrecked among Cannibals in the Fijis”, by William Endicott, a journal kept in 1829, and printed by the Marine Research Society of Salem, Mass. in 1923.

“The Life of Captain James Cook, the Circumnavigator”, by Arthur Kitson which we bought, is supplemented by two pamphlets recently published in Australia, and donated by Mr. John A. Ferguson of Sydney. “Lieutenant James Cook and his Voyage in H. M. Bark Endeavour”, by Frederick Watson, editor of Historical Records of Australia; and “Captain Cook’s Cottage”, by Hermon Gill, the story of the house in Yorkshire, England, where James Cook lived as a boy, and which was bought at auction, taken down and rebuilt in Fitzroy Gardens, Melbourne, Australia, as a birthday gift to the city on her centenary.

A copy of “Around Cape Horn to Honolulu on the Bark ‘Amy Turner’ in 1880”, by Dr. Lloyd Vernon Briggs of Boston, of which only 550 copies were printed, was secured through a second-hand catalog. It gives the experiences of a sixteen year old boy on the long voyage, an interesting history of the “Amy Turner”, once familiar in these waters, and impressions of Honolulu society in the 80’s.

To our small shelf of fiction, we have added “The Lord’s Anointed”, by Ruth Eleanor McKee, a novel of Hawaii, which
has aroused much interest in the human side of the pioneer missionaries. It was a surprise to be remembered by the Ford Motor Co. of Dearborn, Michigan. They sent us a copy of "The Triumph of an Idea; the story of Henry Ford", considered a very fine account of the wonder-worker, and his Ford car.

When Mr. George A. Odgers, formerly a teacher in the Kamehameha Schools, was preparing a thesis on "Education in Hawaii, 1820-1893", he was a frequent visitor at the library. Through the courtesy of Miss Pringle, librarian of the University of Hawaii, we have a typed copy of his manuscript, an important acquisition.

Two splendid gifts have been added to the biographical section: "Lowell and Abigail, a Realistic Idyll", the story of her grandparents, Rev. Lowell and Abigail Smith, by Mary Dillingham Frear, was presented by the author. "William Patterson Alexander in Kentucky, The Marquesas, Hawaii," by a granddaughter Mary Charlotte Alexander, was presented by Mrs. Emily Alexander Baldwin, Mrs. Maud Baldwin Cook and the author. Both biographies, compiled from journals and letters, and privately printed, are invaluable historical records.

Three very recent gifts should here be noted. When our President, Rev. Henry P. Judd returned from Kauai last week, he brought a copy of "Kula-o-Kapaa, 1883-1933", which is a history of school and community, somewhat illustrated and dedicated to the actors in school and sugar; compiled under the direction of Mr. George S. Raymond, Principal of Kapaa School on Kauai. It is a fine record of half a century of the activities of a public school.

Hon. Walter F. Frear sent us two copies of his pamphlet, "Anti-missionary Criticism, with Reference to Hawaii", a scholarly paper read before the Honolulu Social Science Association, January 7, 1935 and printed by request. "Japanese Cultural Influences in Hawaii", reprinted from the Proceedings of the Fifth Pacific Science Congress held in Canada in 1933, is a most acceptable gift from the author, Mr. John F. G. Stokes.

I wish to express publicly thanks and appreciation for all the gifts and exchanges which add so much to our resources.

Respectfully submitted,

CAROLINE P. GREEN,
Librarian.
The Hawaiian monarchy was overthrown in January, 1893, and a provisional government established in its place. The revolution had as an objective immediate annexation to the United States. A commission was sent to Washington and a treaty of union negotiated, but before final action could be taken in the American senate it was withdrawn by the incoming Cleveland administration.

Some months of marking time then followed. The Provisional Government remained in power in the islands, and still maintained hope of annexation, or at least the establishment of a protectorate. These hopes were ended when Cleveland attempted to bring about a restoration of the monarchy.

Attempted restoration failed, but annexation was dead for the time being. The leaders in Hawaii then turned to plans for a more permanent form of government. This idea had been considered as early as August, 1893, but mainly as an aid to annexation negotiations. Now it was necessary for Hawaii to govern itself for an indefinite period, and it was desirable to arrange a more representative system of administration. The Executive Committee of the Provisional Government therefore began to devote more and more attention to the idea.

The first definite public mention of reorganization occurred late in January, 1894. At this time a more representative legislative body was suggested; this was followed by a suggestion that the whole system be made more satisfactory. The Executive Council was ready to go ahead by the middle of February, and an act was therefore passed which authorized the calling of a constitutional convention, some members of which would be elective. Annexationists immediately organized an “American Union Party” in preparation for the election, and nominated candidates. A few
independent candidates also entered the race, and some subsequently won in the election. Due to the requirement of an oath of allegiance to the Provisional Government, however, all members of the convention were in accord with the general plans of the administration. Control in the convention was assured in case of need by the presence of a majority of appointed members who were of the party in power.

The problems of the convention, as listed by a contemporary observer, were (aside from the framework of government itself): dual or alien citizenship or suffrage, Japanese, Chinese, and possibly woman suffrage, Chinese immigration, contract labor, and annexation. The convention had the experience of a considerable constitutional history to guide it, and more particularly, a draft constitution which had been prepared by the Executive Council aided by leading citizens. While this draft was considerably modified in detail by the convention, it was followed in principle. The form of government, as finally arranged, was a republic of the American type. The executive was decidedly weak, however, and an advisory Council of State was added. Orientals were excluded from the franchise by citizenship requirements. Control of the government by the party of the revolution was insured not only by an oath of allegiance but by fairly high property qualifications for membership in the legislative bodies, and for electors of the upper house. The convention in general lowered qualifications set in the original draft. The constitution was promulgated by the convention without reference to popular vote, and the president was also named by the same body.

The Republic of Hawaii was officially established on July 4, 1894. While government in the new state was definitely under the control of a particular group, the constitution had been written with democratic principles in mind, and with attention to the welfare of the islands as a whole.
THE EARLIEST JAPANESE LABOR IMMIGRATION TO HAWAII

By RALPH S. KUYKENDALL
Assistant Professor of History, University of Hawaii

[The article by Mr. Kuykendall has been published by the University of Hawaii as No. 25 of its series of Occasional Papers, and may be obtained from the Director of Information Service, University of Hawaii, at a small charge. The following brief abstract has been prepared by Mr. Kuykendall for this Report.]

This study deals with the Japanese immigrants who came to Hawaii as contract laborers in 1868. The enterprise was initiated and arranged by Eugene M. Van Reed, who had a commission as Hawaiian Consul General for Japan. Van Reed obtained permission from the Shogunate officials at Kanagawa for the sending of 350 Japanese laborers to Hawaii. The laborers were recruited by a Japanese contractor and had already gone on board the ship when, as a result of civil war in Japan, the Shogunate officials were replaced by officials of the Mikado. The latter recalled the passports previously issued to the intending emigrants, and declined to issue new passports except on conditions that Van Reed would not accept. He finally informed the officials that he intended to send the laborers on the strength of the permission previously given. About 150 were accordingly sent from Yokohama on the Scioto, arriving at Honolulu on June 19, 1868.

The article tells of the experiences of these Japanese laborers in Hawaii and of the difficulties in which Van Reed found himself as a result of his action in this matter. Ultimately, an ambassador was sent by the Japanese government to Hawaii to settle the affair with the Hawaiian government. An amicable adjustment was made, part of the laborers being returned to Japan in the spring of 1870 and part of them remaining to serve out their three year contracts. At the expiration of the contracts, a small number of the laborers were returned to Japan at the expense of the Hawaiian government, but the greater part elected to remain permanently in Hawaii and the Japanese government gave them permission to do so.

An indication is also given of the relation between the labor immigration question and the making of the first treaty between Hawaii and Japan.
GOVERNESS RUTH KEELIKOLANI, GRANDDAUGHTER OF FIRST WIFE

KONIA, DAUGHTER OF SECOND WIFE

BERNICE PAUAHI, DAUGHTER OF KONIA

DESCENDENTS OF KAOLEIOKU
INTRODUCTION

"Who does not know that it is the first law of history that it shall not dare to state anything which is false, and consequently that it shall not shrink from stating anything that is true?"

Whatever the cause, many statements in Hawaiian history are shown, by comparison with contemporary records, to be either untrue or neo-mythic. Unfortunately such statements, through lack of criticism and much repetition, are now accepted as established history or fact, and so the errors are perpetuated. In such uncritical repetition, the writer assumes his share of responsibility.

Analyses of some of the points referred to have been published by the Hawaiian Historical Society and elsewhere [50-53]. The need of others is shown by the divergences from accepted fact which strike the eye when reading the early journals. One of these divergences suggested the preparation of this paper which, if its representations are correct, will indicate that the last-known descendant of Kamehameha I was Kamehameha V, and not Bernice Pauahi (Mrs. Bishop) as stated and published in and since 1884.

Obviously the subject is not capable of absolute proof because it depends upon the recognition of the paternity of a chief who, with his attributed fathers, died over a century ago. However, a correlation of such facts as have been preserved will indicate

---

1 Grateful obligation is expressed for comments on the MS draft or for information furnished by many, including Mr. Bruce Cartwright, Mr. V. S. K. Houston, Col. C. P. Iaukea, Miss Maude Jones, Rev. H. P. Judd, Professor R. S. Kuykendall, Mrs. Mary Pukui, Mrs. A. P. Taylor, Mrs. Lahilahi Webb, Mr. Wm. F. Wilson and, in part, the Bernice P. Bishop Estate.
TABLE I
RELATIONSHIP OF CHARACTERS DISCUSSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kalaniopuu, k.</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Kanekapolei, w.</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Kamehameha, k.</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Kalakua, w.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keoua-kuahuula, k.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keoua, w.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kekuanaoa,* k.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pauahi, w.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ruth (Luka Keelikolani) | Bernice Pauahi (Mrs. C. R. Bishop) | Kamehameha IV & V |

#—married
k.—kane, “male”
w.—wahine, “female”
*—Same man
very strongly the growth of another neo-myth, and that the earlier records are far more likely to be correct than the later statements.

The chief mentioned is Kaoleioku, who died in 1818. He was the maternal grandfather of Ruth (Luka) Keelikolani, Governess of Hawaii island, and of Bernice Pauahi (Mrs. Bishop), founder of the Kamehameha Schools. When mentioned in MSS and publications predating 1843 and in many of later date, he is recorded as the son of Kalaniopuu, king of Hawaii island. In that year he is listed in a local history as the son of Kamehameha I. By 1867, it is inferred that in 1791, Kamehameha proclaimed as a fact his paternity of Kaoleioku. Later writers make the matter more positive, until today it passes for history in most quarters.\(^2\)

The plan is to examine and discuss all available original references to the paternity of Kaoleioku, and to offer such reconstruction as the records indicate. Then, with the identification of Kaoleioku as a friend of Captain Cook’s in 1779, a biographical outline of the chief will be given, embodying all the scanty references to him which have been found.

Table I arranges the generally accepted relationships of the chiefs to be mentioned, with queries leading to the point at issue.

In order to avoid unnecessary repetition, other points are listed here as not seriously challenged, and therefore acceptable as historically correct:

1. Kalaniopuu (Kaleiopuu or Terreeoboo) was king of Hawaii island when Cook arrived.
2. Kalaniopuu had two sons by his favorite and secondary wife Kanekapolei.
3. Kanekapolei was the mother of Keoua-kuahuula and of Kaoleioku.
4. Keoua-kuahuula was publicly assassinated in the presence of Kamehameha, who preserved Kaoleioku’s life.
5. Kaoleioku was the maternal grandfather of Governess Ruth and Mrs. Bishop.\(^3\)

\(^2\) Formerly believing the account to be true, because of the weight of authority behind it, the writer has communicated it to very many people and also affirmed it by publication [49].

\(^3\) Among Kalakaua’s MSS is a note to the effect that Kalaikupule was the father of Konia, Mrs. Bishop’s mother. A chief of this name was king of Oahu, and the story is absurd if the reference be to him. He died about 1795, and Konia was born about 1807.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kamehameha, the father</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Kalaniopuu, the father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assertion of paternity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Affirmation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Claimed by Kamehameha in 1791</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denial implied</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaler [48]</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Bell [2], apparently on Kamehameha's authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corny [10]</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoleioku's daughter [33, p. 13]</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Malo, MS genealogies [37]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1838-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamakau [30]</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Genealogy, Keawe's descendants [23]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Consul [6a]</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Consul [6b]</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1854-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fornander [18]</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Friend [20b]</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>1857 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander [1, p. 307]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson [16]</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Pacific Commercial Advertiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krout [33, p. 2-6]</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Chiefess Kakaaniau [45b]</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Royal notification [56]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuykendall [34a]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1865 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stokes [49]</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Kalakaua, MS genealogies [28]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Estate, letter [4a]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1865 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current references in English</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Kalakaua, MS [29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now accepted as fact by nearly all of foreign blood and by some Hawaiians</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1872 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Genealogical Board [42a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1883 The Friend [20b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1898 Queen Liliuokalani [35]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1920 High Chiefess Kekaaniau [45b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1935 Now accepted by some of the older Hawaiians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X—affirmation
O—denial
Thus the problem is the dispute over Kaoleioku's paternity, whether Kalaniopuu or Kamehameha.

**Paternity of Kaoleioku**

The references to this subject may be segregated into three groups: (1) That affirming that Kamehameha was the father of Kaoleioku, (2) That inferentially denying it, and (3) The statements that Kalaniopuu was Kaoleioku's father. Table II lists the dates when the information was gathered or recorded, and will serve as a summary of comparisons.

The earliest published reference to the paternity of Kaoleioku by Kamehameha is given by Dibble [13, p. 202] in his history issued in English in 1843:

Pauahi, a wife of Liholiho [Kamehameha II], daughter of Kaolioku [Kaoleioku], a son of Kamehameha I, which son was born before the conquest [1782 or 1795].

Perhaps the news of the paternity was recent, because Dibble omits reference to it in the English version of his history published in 1839 [12] and also (a matter of greater significance) from the version published in Hawaiian in 1838 [11]. Obviously, Dibble did not receive the information until after 1838—about twenty years after the deaths of Kaoleioku and Kamehameha.

In 1867 Kamakau, a pupil of Dibble's, writes that Kaoleioku was the *keiki makahiapo* "first-born child" of Kamehameha [30c]. Kamakau also states that Kanekapolei bore three sons, twins named Keoua Kuahuula and Keoua Peale to Kalaniopuu, and Pauli Kaoleioku to Kamehameha [30a, c].

Keoua-kuahuula and his younger brother Kaoleioku had for many years resisted Kamehameha's attempts to conquer the whole of Hawaii island, but finally agreed, on Kamehameha's invitation, to surrender and make peace. On reaching Kamehameha at Kawaihae, they found assembled his chiefs and soldiers before whom Keoua-kuahuula was assassinated. Kaoleioku was spared, as Kamakau describes [30b]:

O Pauli Kaoleioku hoi a me kona poe ma kona mau waa kaulua, ke lana mai la no ma kahi kaawale. Hoouna aku la no hoi o Kamehameha me ka peahi aku e pae mai i uka, aohe make o uka. Hoole mai la no hoi o P. Kaoleioku, aole e pae i uka. Olelo aku hoi o Kalaimamahu ia Kamehameha, "Ke hoole mai nei ke keiki a kaua, aole ka e pae i uka nei, aia a loa a aku ke kanawai alaila pae mai i uka nei." Ke olelo ae nei hoi o Keliimaikai, "E make no ia, ua make aku la no kona kaikuaana,

---

*Later shown to be an alternate name of Kaoleioku.*
oia no hoi kona moepuu o kona kaikaina. Ina no hoi e make oe, owau aku no hoi kou moepuu.” Pane mai hoi o Kamehameha i ka hua o ke ola, “E make hoi i ke aha ka kaua keikii i loa a i ko kaua wa heu ole? E noho mai ana ko i ala makuahine me ke kapu a Kalaniopuu, a no ke kono iloko o kona makuahine, loa a me malama iloko o na la popilikia. Oia hoi ka kaua ola nui o keia la.” Kahea mai la no hoi o Kamehameha me ka i mai, “E Kalaimamahu, haawiia’ku ke kanawai no ke keiki a kaua.”

On account of its ambiguity, the most important passage is italicised. It has been submitted to seven Hawaiian interpreters, whose translations may be represented by two versions.

Pauli Kaoleioku and the people in his double canoe were afloat off. Kamehameha beckoned with his hand to land—there is no death ashore. Kaoleioku refused to land. Kalaimamahu said to Kamehameha, “Our child refuses, he will not come ashore; when the amnesty is assured, then he will land.” Keliimaikai then said, “He must die; his elder brother having died, the companion-in-death should be the younger brother. Were you to die, I naturally would be your companion-in-death.” Kamehameha replied with words of life, “Why should our child die, begotten in the time of our hairlessness?"

1. His mother was the wife of Kalaniopuu and because of intercourse with his mother, was begotten the one who will guard us in the days of distress. That is our great life-saving work these days.

2. His mother was living under the tabu of Kalaniopuu, and because he was part of his mother, he was assured of protection in the days of misfortune. Furthermore, he is our main preservation these days.

Kamehameha then called out, saying, “O Kalaimamahu, let the amnesty be proclaimed for our child.”

Despite the ambiguity of the language which, as the words fall, might indicate that the paternity belonged to Kalaimamahu, Kamehameha or Keliimaikai, or even some one else, most of the interpreters came to the conclusion that Kamehameha intended to mean that Kaoleioku was his. However, persisting through both versions is the implication that Kamehameha preserved the life of Kaoleioku, not because he was his son but because it would be distinctly advantageous to their party to do so. This accords with Kamehameha’s behavior pattern, as discussed on p. 30.

References Nos. 22; 24; 25; 26; 31; 34; 41.

Kalaimamahu was the elder brother of Kamehameha, and Keliimaikai, soon to be mentioned, the younger.

“The child.” Throughout the passage, the term translated “our” is the inclusive first person dual, namely, “thy and my.” “Our child” has no necessary implication that the child was begotten by one of the speakers, but is a reference to a younger relative or friend by an older person (see quotation on pp. 23-4). In addition, under the Hawaiian system, relatives of one generation are “children” to those of previous generation, “brothers or sisters” to each other, and “parents” to those of the succeeding generation. To designate one’s own child, the qualification “own” is added.

The Hawaiian expression is we heu ole, “period of hairlessness,” but by extension it has come to mean “prepuberty,” “infertility,” etc., and by further extension, “virginity.” It has gone so far that Keiki o ka wa we heu ole becomes in part synonymous with keiki makahipao, “first-born child.”
In his work, published in 1880, Fornander is very positive in his statements concerning Kaoleiokou’s paternity [18, p. 312]: (1) “It was bruited . . . at the time of his birth that Kamehameha was his real father, and” (2) “in after life the latter so acknowledged it.”

Concerning the first statement, Fornander alone publishes it, and that more than a century after the event. No such note appears on any of the genealogies examined.

Illustrating the second point, Fornander gives an account in connection with the assassination of Keoua-kuahuula [18, p. 334]:

One of the versions of this tragedy, current among the last generation of the Hawaiians, was, that Keliimaikai, the younger brother of Kamehameha, interceded for the life of Keoua, but in vain, and that when the second division of Keoua’s escort, in the charge of Kaoleioku, arrived, Keliimaikai insisted that he should also be slain, saying to Kamehameha, “You have killed my Hanai [foster child or parent], and I will now kill yours.” To which Kamehameha replied, “He shall not die; he is the child of my youth;” and ordered his elder brother Kalaimamahu to proclaim a cessation of the slaughter.

The Hawaiian text for this passage has not been found. Perhaps it was not committed to writing, or the version may have been an adaptation from Kamakau’s account quoted above. Kamakau was Fornander’s authority for very much material published as historical.

All subsequent statements affirming Kamehameha’s paternity of Kaoleioku may be traced directly or indirectly to Fornander, who, among the foreign residents and many Hawaiians was regarded as a very great authority on genealogical matters. It was through him, more than any other that the paternity discussed came to be so generally believed.

For the consideration of the second group of references, implying a denial of the truth of the first, it will be remembered that Kamehameha is alleged to have proclaimed publicly his paternity of Kaoleioku—“Proclaimed to the world”, as one enthusiast has explained it. Since such a proclamation is said to have been made in 1791, Shaler’s journal entry made on Hawaii in 1804 is enlightening. The passage is quoted fully for later reference [48]:

9 Through the death of his brother, Kaoleioku had become the representative of the opposition party, which was still of consideration. One interpreter explained that the killing of Kaoleioku would be analogous to killing the goose that laid the golden eggs [26].
He [Kamehameha] is, however of a humane disposition, and has ever used his best endeavours to soften the ferocity of his adherents. By his own personal interference, he saved the life of the young brother of Tuwarzraho [Kiwalao], who is at this time in the full enjoyment of his hereditary estates, and is treated by him with kindness, and the respect due to his rank. As far as has been in his power, he has restored their estates to the conquered chiefs, and he takes great pains to attach them to him, by acts of kindness and indulgence: . . ."

Kiwalao was the eldest son of Kalaniopuu, by Kalola, and the chief whose life was saved was clearly Kaoleioku. Had Kamehameha claimed the latter as his son in 1791, the information could not have been forgotten by 1804, when Shaler wrote his account. The light of a king's son is not hidden under a bushel.

The implication is somewhat similar in Corney's account of the mortuary rites over Kaoleioku in 1818 [10, pp. 86-8]. Corney was an interested observer, and, since he had been visiting the Hawaiian Islands since 1814, he was no stranger to Hawaiian ways. Yet, he makes no mention that Kaoleioku was King Kamehameha's son.

The matter of titles may be a guide. In 1855, Ruth Keelikolani and Lot Kamehameha, said to have the same father, received appointments to office from Kamehameha IV [7a]:

By Authority. . . At a special Privy Council, ordered by the King, on the 18th instant [January, 1855], it pleased His Majesty to make the following further appointments, viz:

His Royal Highness General Prince Kamehameha to be Chamberlain, in lieu of A. Paki, resigned.


Lot Kamehameha and the king were full brothers, and grandsons of Kamehameha I through his daughter Kinau. Ruth was the granddaughter of Kaoleioku through his daughter Pauahi. Were Kaoleioku the son of Kamehameha, then Ruth would be the second cousin of the king on the side of royalty, and one of the few remaining descendents in the line of Kamehameha. Some dignification of title might have been expected for Ruth were she descended from Kamehameha.10

Konia, Kaoleioku's daughter, seems to have repudiated Kamehameha as an ancestor. Gilman [33, p. 13] records her great

10 Notice of Mrs. Bishop's marriage in 1850 indicated that she was previously known as "Miss" Bernice Pauahi. Ruth, then Governess of Hawaii, was married in 1856 as "Her Excellency." In 1880, Fornander refers to Ruth as "Her Highness" and to Mrs. Bishop as "Hon." [18, p. 313]. Alexander, in 1891, ignores both designations, although applying "Princess" to Likelike in the same paragraph [1, pp. 306, 330]. It is obvious that the title "Princess" found in more recent years attached to the names of Ruth and Mrs. Bishop was only a courtesy title, and has been misleading.
anger with a foreigner who had been compiling local genealogies. As explained:

The trouble arose from the introduction (by one of the family) giving as an ancestor a royal person not generally recognized as a legitimate ancestor, though the descendents were very ambitious to have it so acknowledged.

In the "royal person" rejected by Konia, Kamehameha may be recognized at once. Her direct denial is recorded by another authority (cf. p. 25 below).

In 1872, during the last illness of Kamehameha V, the British Consul discussed the possible succession in his official correspondence. Two of the three candidates mentioned in the various letters were [6b]:

the half-sister [Ruth] . . . has no royal blood . . . [but] amongst the chiefs . . . is the favourite candidate, because she would place several others in presumptive relation to the throne.

Prince William C. Lunalilo . . . is of the highest rank . . . undoubtedly nearest to the throne . . . No one denies that Lunalilo has the best right to the throne.

Italization has been added. In 1868, on the same subject, Kamehameha V is quoted as saying that Lunalilo "represents the old line, and, as such, commands their [the natives] suffrage [6a].

Alexander [1, p. 298] also agrees with these statements: "Prince William C. Lunalilo was generally considered to be the highest surviving chief by birth." Since Alexander and all others agree that Lunalilo was the grandson of Kamehameha’s brother Kalaimamahau, it is clear that in 1872 Ruth and her grandfather Kaoleioku were not believed to be descended from Kamehameha. The consul’s note alone, namely no royal blood, should establish that because "royalty" only began with this line (cf. p. 31).

High Chiefess Kekaaniau was descended from Kamehameha’s eldest brother. She was a contemporary and school mate of Kamehameha IV and V, Lunalilo, Kalakaua, Queen Emma, Mrs. Bishop and others at the Royal School. Writing her memoirs in 1920, at the age of 85, after reading Kamakau, Fornander and no doubt others on the subject, she states that Kaoleioku was the son of Kalaniopuu [45a]. Then with quiet cynicism, she gives this account of the episode at Kawaihae [45b]:

"Refrain; no chief even of the highest rank shall endanger the life of my keiki," he [Kamehameha] proclaimed, referring to Kaoleioku. ("Keiki" means an own son, a nephew, a cousin's son, or even a friend’s son.)
The voice of authority saved the young man's life. It also established Kaoleioku's family thereafter as belonging to the Kamehameha line.

For the third group, the references affirming that Kalaniopuu was Kaoleioku's father may be followed in reverse chronological order.

The opinion of High Chiefess Kekaaniau has just been given. In 1934 another denial of the accepted story was received, and was attributed to the late Miss Lucy Peabody, regarded as a genealogist of note [43]. According to the account, Kaoleioku was the son of Kalaniopuu by Kanekapolei, but, Kaoleioku's life being in imminent danger, as Keliimaikai poised his javelin, Kamehameha called out Na‘u kela keiki o Kaoleioku, "That is my son Kaoleioku." According to the explanation, the claim was not of paternity, but a resource because promptness was essential. Foreigners who had observed Keliimaikai at practice with the javelin, commented on the accuracy and force of his delivery. The explanation has all the appearance of truth.

The late Queen Liliuokalani did not accept the modern story. Quoting genealogies in her book, published in 1898, she repeats Kamehameha-Kaoleioku line, taken from Alexander (who followed Fornander), remarking [35]:

A comparison with those given in App. F will show that Mr. Alexander's able work is not entirely correct regarding the ancestry of Mrs. Bishop and Queen Emma.

The genealogies the Queen approved gave Kalaniopuu as the father of Kaoleioku.

In 1883, The Friend printed Ruth's obituary, and stated that "her [great] grandfather was King of Hawaii when Cook discovered the islands." This statement, of course, confirms the Kalaniopuu-Kaoleioku line. However next year in Mrs. Bishop's obituary, The Friend gives the modern story, quoting Fornander. The incident illustrates Fornander's great influence.

In 1883 the official Board of Genealogies affirmed the correctness of the Kalaniopuu-Kaoleioku line [42a].

About 1865, several private contributions on the subject were made by Col. David (later King) Kalakaua, who was regarded as a genealogist of authority. Governess Ruth had challenged the right of Likelike (Kalakaua's sister) to carry kahili—the feathered standards indicating high chiefly rank. In a family letter on the subject, he quotes many genealogies which give the
Kalaniopuu-Kaoleioku line [27]. The same information occurs in a book of genealogies written by Kalakaua in 1865 [28], and in another of his books, undated but written about the same time or soon after, is an account of the Kawaihae episode, in Hawaiian [29].

Kalakaua says that there are many reasons for denying the truth of the story, but admits that Kamehameha said during the contention with Keliimaikai: e ola ka‘u keiki o ka wa heu ole, “My child of the hairless period shall live.” On hearing this statement, the guardians of the king denied the paternity, for good and sufficient Hawaiian reasons then presented. Kalakaua finishes with two statements:

Kaoleioku had four fathers. Kalaiopuu, Keawemauhili, Kaumaku and Kamehameha all had intercourse with the same woman Kanekapolei. Konia's denial that she was descended from Kamehameha, but from Kalaniopuu was frequently heard. Thus Kaoleioku told her: he was not of Kamehameha, but indeed of Kalaiopuu. Also Kanekapolei said that Kaoleioku was of Kalaiopuu and not of Kamehameha I.

The statement is weakened by bringing in the name of Kanekapolei, who was well on in years when Vancouver saw her in 1793 [54, III, 247]. However, those writing in Hawaiian frequently ignore quotation marks, and it may be read as though Kaoleioku is quoting Kanekapolei. If so, no better authority on the subject could be found than Kanekapolei herself.

A clear enough confirmation of Konia's claim was provided by Gilman in the passage quoted on p. 23 above. The "royal person" she rejected from her genealogy could have been none but Kamehameha, because no other name would have met the ambitions of the descendents.

Kalakaua and his sister Liliuokalani represent the Kalakaua dynasty. They deny the Kamehameha-Kaoleioku genealogy. Opinion in the time of Lunalilo, Kamehameha's grand-nephew was similar. The five members of the Kamehameha dynasty, so far as their opinions have been expressed in print, held to the view that Kalaniopuu begat Kaoleioku, as will be noted.

Konia died in 1857. The published official notice was as follows [56]:

Sir,

By order of His Majesty the King [Kamehameha IV], I hereby notify you that Konia, the widow of Paki, and grand-daughter of Kalaiopuu, who was King of Hawaii at the time of Captain Cook and who is mentioned by the latter under the name Terreeoboo, died . . .
The newspapers, The Polynesian and the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, carried similarly worded obituaries, which included the sentence [42; 44]:

The deceased was a chiefess of very high rank; her father was Kaoleioku, whose father Kalaniopuu was uncle to Kamehameha I.

An elaborate genealogy found among the papers of the Henriques Estate and compiled about the same time, namely, the reign of Kamehameha IV, carried the same information [23].

The earlier the reference, the more positive does Kalaniopuu's paternity of Kaoleioku appear. David Malo, Hawaii's most reliable historian, compiled a book of genealogies beginning in 1827 and ending about 1846. He assigns to Kalaniopuu and Kanekapolei, two and only two sons, the first named Keoua II, and the second Kaoleioku [36].

Bingham was in close touch with the chiefs from 1820 to 1841 (much closer than was Dibble) and accredits the paternity to Kalaniopuu [5].

The missionaries, who toured the island of Hawaii in 1823, received similar information (15, p. 232) listing:

Kaoreioku; youngest son of Tariopu [Kaleiopuu or Kalaniopuu], a former King of Hawaii.

The earliest reference found so far, wherein Kaoleioku may be recognized by name, is in the journal kept by Edward Bell [2] on the Chatham, tender to Vancouver's ship Discovery. Apparently Bell's informant was Kamehameha himself. In order to regulate the conduct of the natives with the foreigners, Kamehameha took a station on the flagship, Discovery, and selected high chiefs for the other two vessels. The chief placed on the Chatham

was one of the younger sons of the unfortunate Terreeobo, the late king, his name was Toreeotoo.

The form of this name "Toreeotoo", written by one of the earlier voyagers over forty years before Hawaiian orthography was established, is an unusually good rendition of the name "Kaoleioku." "Terreeobo" of course is well recognized as Kaleiopuu or Kalaniopuu.

The occurrence was on January 14, 1794, three years after Kamehameha is supposed to have proclaimed Kaoleioku publicly as his son! Obviously Bell is recording the facts, and since his
journal entry may be accepted as a contemporary record, made without bias, and has been supported by many trustworthy authorities, it must be concluded that nearest to the truth is the statement that Kalaniopuu was Kaoleioku’s father. The conclusion will be strengthened if we re-examine the authorities claiming otherwise.

One absurdity may be first referred to. Kamakau and Fornander state that Kaoleioku died in 1816, Fornander adding that Kaoleioku was then about 60 years old. On this basis, his birth-year was 1756. Marin, who knew Kamehameha for about 25 years, states that he was 60¼ years old in 1819, when he died. Thus Kamehameha’s birth year was 1758, or, on the figures quoted, two years later than that of his alleged son.

Of the opposing authorities, Dibble is most untrustworthy as a historian [51]. One of the statements he published as “faithful history” is that Captain Cook passed the night with the Princess of Kauai on his ship, although Cook had been dead three weeks before the princess reached the ship! Dibble also is the first to publish the story that Kamehameha was not the son of Keoua, the accepted father, but of Kahekili, King of Maui, and that the latter acknowledged it [13, pp. 41, 45].

Kamakau exceeded Dibble, his instructor in history, in the number of misstatements it has been possible to check. In the present reference he repeats the paternities Kahekili-Kamehameha-Kaoleioku of Dibble, and makes other astonishing statements, namely, that Peleioholani, King of Oahu, was the real father of Kalaniopuu, and the latter, the real father of Kahahana, who later occupied the throne of Oahu. These statements are entirely irregular and are supported neither by accepted genealogy, nor by the account of Hawaiian royal mating customs described by the reliable David Malo.

Fornander generally accepted the statements of Dibble and Kamakau with but little critical analysis.

A curious inconsistency exists however, and is important to note. While the three writers mentioned state that there was irregularity in the paternity of the kings referred to, yet they quote the names of the officially accepted fathers when reciting the genealogies. Fornander goes farther than the other two, and inserts in the genealogy the name of the chief Kaoleioku as the
son of Kamehameha. All genealogies compiled before Fornander began his work, so far as they can be examined, show that the accepted order was Kalaniopuu-Kaoleioku. Fornander's sincerity most certainly may be questioned on account of these inconsistencies, or else he was grossly negligent as a historian.

To one honestly seeking historical accuracy, the foregoing representations should bring about acceptance, without question, that the earlier recorded information was correct, namely, the paternity of Kaoleioku by Kalaniopuu, and that it was changed later for reasons not yet discussed. But it is human nature for us to believe what we want to believe. In previous analyses [50-53], as well as the present, has been observed a local unwillingness to look squarely at facts which conflict with fancies, and if the fancy be intriguing enough and become vogue, it replaces the fact.

The principal defense point of the fancy is generally the question of possibility. If the possibility may be demonstrated, then it becomes confirmation of the fancy as fact. The question of probability is entirely ignored.

Many of these "possibilities" are to be anticipated. In the matter of ages for instance—the best information is that Kaoleioku was born in 1767 and Kamehameha in 1758, so that the latter was nine years old when the former was born. Now, since the dates are only estimates, they may be moved a few years either way, and Kamehameha be represented as old enough to be a father!

For another, the story is told that the old Hawaiians never gossiped about the chiefs, hence the matter of Kaoleioku's paternity remained buried in the early days. Such reticence is not confirmed by the early journals, nor by the class of information which has survived.

For yet another, the statement is met that near relationship to the ruling chief was always concealed for fear of jealousy on the part of the king and possible danger to the person. Such relationship, if superiority be claimed and blazoned forth, might well be regarded as rebellion and so dealt with. Nevertheless, in former days, it was not considered good form to brag about one's high lineage, although it would be known and discussed by others.

Were the Kamehameha-Kaoleioku alleged relationship con-
cealed, as might be inferred, attention might be drawn to the existence of schools of genealogy described by Malo as presided over by the king [37, pp. 254-5]. At these, applicants for government offices presented themselves and established their relationship to the king. Genealogical schools continued. One was conducted by Malo, and later, a Board of Genealogy [42a] was maintained by the government. Both affirm the Kalaniopuu-Kaoleioku line as has been shown.

**Reconstruction**

The writer's contribution to the list of possibilities will be a theoretical reconstruction of the modern story and its acceptance, based on early traditions and customs, later history and human motives.

For the possible origin of the story, we may consider the training of young chiefs and Kamehameha's liberalism.

The curriculum of the young chief included instruction in all Hawaiian knowledge, not merely in fishing, agriculture, warfare, history and so forth, but in sex life. The latter instruction was imparted by some older woman in the family or attached to it, when the pupil had reached a suitable age. Such of course was the age of puberty.

That Kanekapolei was the one so to instruct Kamehameha, as stated by an informant, is thus possible. But she being one of the wives of the king, more probably the duty fell to some other woman.

However, conception following such co-habitation is very doubtful. Seeking the Hawaiian point of view on this matter, the answer invariably quoted the case of Kamehameha-ailua as demonstrating the possibility (and inferentially the probability).

This Kamehameha-ailua, generally known as Kamehamehainui, heir to the throne of Maui, was raised by his two *kahu*, man and wife, on Molokai. On the completion of his training he was returned to his father King Kekaulike on Maui. Kekaulike enquired of the male instructor concerning the different branches of knowledge imparted and, satisfactory answers being received, asked the woman: "Does he know woman?" She replied, "I have not so instructed him." "Return to Molokai and instruct him," the king ordered. Due to the contact, the woman conceived, according to the tradition.
This account, regarded as conclusive by some, supplies very poor evidence on examination—especially when the woman is still living with her husband. Kamehameha-nui had apparently graduated in all the knowledge a chief and leader of his people was expected to acquire in his training, and such was certainly no light matter. This young chief, therefore, must have been either in late adolescence or early maturity when his delayed instruction in sex was given, and no question of his fertility need arise. At the age of puberty, it well might.

With Kamehameha I, it was different. The best information available is that he was nine years old when Kaoleioku was born. However, he came to be known as Kamehameha the Great in later days, which may be rendered in Hawaiian as Kamehameha-nui. This raises the possibility that the story of the Maui king was adapted to Kamehameha through confusion of the names.

Kamehameha's unusual humanity is another possibility for the origin of the story. His contemporaries adhered to the policy of removing real or potential enemies by death. As may be shown by many examples quoted from history, Kamehameha pursued the policy of winning over his enemies and employing them in his service. Shaler's observation quoted on p. 22 above and written in 1804 will serve as one illustration.

The great blot (and that certainly undeserved) on Kamehameha's character, is the blame for the assassination of Keouakuahuula, his cousin and foster-brother, and also his bitter enemy for nine years, who came to make peace. That Kamehameha planned it is unthinkable, in view of his behavior pattern in this respect, and is also denied in the earlier publications [15, pp. 112-3]. The murder was done by the most powerful of the chiefs, as a matter of policy so he claimed. It took place at a distance from Kamehameha, although in sight, and was undoubtedly done too quickly for the intent to be perceived. Then, warned by the death of one foster-brother, Keoua-kuahuula, Kamehameha could and did take measures to protect the other, Kaoleioku.

What Kamehameha really said will never be known, because his remarks were not written down until about 75 years after they were supposed to have been made. If Kamakau garbled the speech and the second translation (see p. 20 above) were
correct, then it is evident that Kamehameha was urging the beneficial policy of sparing Kaoleioku and gaining over his followers. Peace would thereby be assured to the island.

In subsequent years, contrasting the killing of one brother with the saving of the other, and hearing a garbled version of the Kamehameha-nui account, the Kamehameha-Kaoleioku story may well have been originated as a rationalization of the circumstances. Neo-myths now current have evolved from less.

The motive for adopting the change is obscure at first glance. Many claimants of distinguished ancestry are met with today, but the stimulus in these cases appears to be only personal pride. Under the ancient system little difference, if any, occurs between the chiefly rank of Kalaniopuu and Kamehameha. Of course, Kamehameha loomed much greater, especially in a material way. He became emperor of a group of kingdoms, and furthermore his dynasty was present. Kalaniopuu was remote and his kingdom limited.

However, the conflict arose in modern times. The lines of Kamehameha's children and of other high chiefs were becoming sterile and well nigh exterminated. Lesser chiefs were coming to the fore as potential occupants of the throne. In addition, foreign civilization had brought in ideas of European royalty and court precedence, and of individual land ownership. But permeating all was the surviving ancient system which gave the most remunerative offices to the nearest relatives of the king [cf. 37, pp. 254-5].

Under the old customs, there was no idea of royalty analogous to the European. The king was the head chief, or the divine head of a group descended from the same ancestor. Even after Kamehameha united the island kingdoms, he remained "the big chief." However, Kamehameha II visited England and following his death, his retinue were received at court in 1824. After 1842, Kamehameha III was instructed in the ways of European royalty (52, pp. 5ff). The princes Alexander and Lot (later Kamehameha IV and V) visited France and England in 1849-50, and the increase in royal formality was marked in their reigns. And ideas of precedence began to burn the relics of ancient chiefliness. A little later, Fornander noted down the remark [19]:

Strange how people are scrambling for Alii-ship and connections nowadays, that would not have been allowed 30 years ago.
Many books of genealogy came into existence [21], and the end is not yet.

Aggressively moving through this turmoil was Ruth, the granddaughter of Kaoleioku, whose family claimed descent from Kamehameha. Ruth is found declaiming her high rank (55), deprecating that of Likelike (27) and elevating herself above Kalakaua (6b). The last was when she was a candidate for the throne, vacant through the death of Kamehameha V.

Obviously Konia, Ruth’s aunt, was not among those scrambling. Gilman’s note (p. 23 above) makes that clear. Nor is there any evidence that Mrs. Bishop was interested in the subject, but rather the contrary. The Bishop Estate published two letters indicating that Mrs. Bishop was offered the throne by Kamehameha V, but refused it [3]. The interest of her husband is indicated because, after her death, he applied to Fornander to prepare her “pedigree and genealogy” [19]. Fornander is the one chiefly responsible for the acceptance of the legend that Kamehameha was the father of Kaoleioku.

Another influence, no doubt, was the change in the land system. Under the ancient regime, the king was the sole owner of the land and partitioned it among his chiefs. But the holdings were impermanent, and were revocable at the king’s will, at his death or at the death of the holder. Until foreign influences made themselves felt, there was thus no security of tenure. In 1825, during the minority of Kamehameha III, the chiefs, by mutually agreeing to do so, established the hereditary principle for their holdings received from the king, although theoretically, still subject to confiscation for cause. Within twenty-five years thereafter, both chiefs and commoners began to receive fee simple titles to land they held or occupied. On this account relationship became of increased importance for the purpose of inheritance. Genealogical books increased in number, and conflicting claims were carried to court.

Thus modern changes suggest motives for the modern story, and synchronize fairly well with its appearance, development and spread.

**LAST DESCENDENT OF KAMEHAMEHA I**

In recent years, this designation has customarily been applied to Mrs. Bishop [20b; 1, p. 307] in the belief that Kaoleioku
was Kamehameha's son. The evidence presented above should carry conviction that this is not merely a modern belief, but is erroneous. With the removal of Kaoleioku's descendents as such from present consideration, Kamehameha V seems to have been the last of the line of Kamehameha I.

According to Bingham, the founder of the dynasty had twenty-four children. Except for the nine mentioned by Fornander and Alexander, nothing is known of what became of these children. It may be assumed that their lines are extinct, because of the modern claimants for distinction, none have been bold enough to claim Kamehameha I as an ancestor.

Of the other nine and their descendents, it has been often stated and never disputed that Kamehameha V was the survivor, and on this basis he may be designated as the last descendent of Kamehameha I. High Chiefess Kekaaniau [45] so designates him, she having been his schoolmate, contemporary, and nearest surviving cousin.

KAOLEIOKU WITH CAPTAIN COOK

The identification of Kaoleioku has been followed back to the time of Vancouver in 1794 by means of contemporary notes, and to 1791 with references from tradition. Some further identification is required before he may be recognized as a companion of Captain Cook.

Such enquiries are in part necessitated by a statement appearing in the Hawaiian Historical Society's report for 1902 [16, p. 22] to the effect that Kanekapolei was the wife of Ku-uku, head-fisherman of Puna, with whom Kamehameha was punalua, or co-husband, and thereby became the father of Kaoleioku. A current version repeats the account, but gives the wife's name as Kane-kuikapolei. That the story is another neo-myth may be well recognized by reference to the early authorities already quoted. Whether or not Kanekapolei was the wife of Ku-uku at one time, no records have been produced to prove it, nor that she was other than Kalaniopuu's wife when Kaoleioku was begotten.

In 1779, when Cook visited Kalaniopuu on Hawaii, the king is noted by various officers [9; 14; 32; 46; 47] as accompanied by or living with "his Queen," "his wife" or "his favourite wife," whose name they spelled Kanee-cappo-rei, Kanee Kaberaia,
Kainee Kabareea, Kahna-Kubbarah and no doubt in other ways. Thus her identification with Kanekapolei, the wife of Kalaniopuu mentioned in the histories and genealogies is without question. Furthermore, as is evident from the information gathered, she was a recognized wife and not a mere concubine. The royal wife had been Kalola, the very high-born princess of Maui and of more tabu than Kalaniopuu, who bore his heir Kiwalao. In those days, princesses remarried as they chose, and Kalola bore a daughter to Keoua, the father of Kamehameha. Then, apparently, Kalaniopuu turned to Kanekapolei, who had been his wife for at least seventeen years when Cook arrived.

The next point is the identification of “the two very handsome youths”, aged sixteen and twelve years, the sons of Kalaniopuu and Kanekapolei, and who were frequently Cook’s companions on board the ship in 1779 [8; 32; 47]. Fornander identified them as Keoua Kuahuula and Keoua Peeale, and his identification has been widely followed, although it should have been questioned immediately. For instance, he indicates that Kaoleioku’s birth year was about 1756. The youths, born in 1763 and 1767 would both have been younger. Yet Fornander intimates and others assert that Kaoleioku was junior to Keoua-kuahuula! “Keoua Peeale” will be discussed presently, and the probability indicated that it was an alternate name for Kaoleioku.

The journal entries in 1779 definitely show that Kalaniopuu had three sons living, and not more than three who were recognized. One was borne by Kalola, and the other two by Kanekapolei. It was common information and, furthermore, was communicated to Lieut. King by the priests of Hikiau temple [9, pp. 154-5], in whose hands was the preservation of the genealogies.

Fourteen years later, namely in 1793, Manby learned (from the same group of priests) that Kalaniopuu was survived by three sons. This king died in 1782. Manby’s reference is [38]:

Altho’ Tomaha Maha [Kamehameha] is the acknowledged King of Owhyhee, he is an usurper as he seized on the throne immediately on the death of the late King Tereeoboo. Altho’ Tereeoboo left three sons the two eldest made an attempt to recover their rights, their party was defeated and they gloriously fell struggling for their inheritance.

The sons who died, as has never been questioned, were Kiwalao,
son of Kalola, and Keoua-kuahuula, one of the sons of Kane-
kapolei. With the limitation of recognized sons by the early
journals, and the assertion of Malo that Kalaniopuu and Kane-
kapolei had two, and only two sons, one of whom was Kaoleioku,
obviously he must have been Kanekapolei’s surviving son whom
Bell met in 1794.

The method of proof by elimination may be attacked by
presenting other sons of Kalaniopuu. For instance, Fornander
lists six wives of Kalaniopuu, and also a fourth son, Kalaipaihala.
In some genealogies such paternity is denied. However, Kalai-
paihala and his mother were not recognized as legitimate in the
time of Kalaniopuu, or their names would have been mentioned
by the genealogical priests when discussing the succession to the
throne.

In 1793, Bell met a chief, said to be a son of Kalaniopuu,
but Vancouver, who also noted the circumstance, was told that
he had been borne by Namahana, widow of the king of Maui and
wife of Keeaumoku [2, p. 70; 54, III, 272]. Kalakaua gives the
same story. The young chief was Kuakini, and he has come
down in history either as the son of the king of Maui, or of
Keeaumoku who claimed him [53, pp. 42-3].

A more serious attack, not on the ground of probability, but
because it has been so generally published and accepted, is the
modern assertion that Kanekapolei bore three sons, Keoua Kuah-
huula and Keoua Peeale to Kalaniopuu and Pauli Kaoleioku to
Kamehameha. The first to publish it was Kamakau, but it be-
came generally accepted through Fornander.

However, the assertion arouses suspicion almost as soon as
it is examined. The binominal system indicated by the names was
distinctly modernistic in Hawaii. Kamakau states that Keoua
Kuahuula and Keoua Peeale were twins, born in the order named,
but Fornander identifies them as youths whose ages were observed
to be 16 and 12 years respectively. Finally, Fornander points
out that neither tradition nor history mentions Keoua Peeale,
although in the nine years conflict for Kalaniopuu’s throne, Ki-
waloa, Keoua-kuahuula and Kaoleioku are all recalled. The ex-
planation must be either that Keoua Peeale died young, or that it

11 The name written by Kamakau and Fornander as “Keoua Kuahuula” should be
written “Keouakuahuula” according to wider Hawaiian usage. In this paper the
Keoua names have been hyphenated for more rapid recognition.
was an alternate name.

In 1779, the names of the two youths were Mawheeree and Maooee according to Lieut. King [32]. The Hawaiian forms of King’s spelling may be readily recognized as Mauhili and Ma-ui. No other diarist gives the name of the elder\(^{12}\) of the youths, but that of the younger is also given as Kaoowa [8] and Keowa [47]—good renditions of the Hawaiian “Keoua.” Thus, the younger of the two was known by two names in 1779. Instead of further complicating the matter, this circumstance simplifies it.

Like the other Polynesians, the Hawaiians were and are wont to change their names frequently, and to exchange them with other people. This is more common in youth than in maturity or old age.

Kamehameha had many names, among which Paiea, Kunuiakea, Kekukaapoaokalani and Papaleaianaku‘ualoha have been noted. His father was first known as Kalanikupuapaikalaninui, and later as Keoua; another name was Kaleikini. Four names of his royal queen have been preserved, namely, Keopuolani, Kai, Makuahanaukama and Kalanikauikaalaneo. An 18-year old chief bore three names, Kuakini, “Quoti” and Wakea in 1793-4, and so on. These names were not used together, but were distinct, adopted at different times or used for different occasions.

The fact that two brothers have borne the same basic name is not surprising. Keoua was a favored name. Other favorites noted in the genealogies, Keawe, Kanaloa, Mahi, Kawelo, Maui etc. have been borne by several in the same family. Such names however were combined with some qualification as an integral part, although in familiar address, or in reference where the subject is well known, the basic form was used.

Thus we have learned from Kamakau and Fornander on the one side, and from Cook’s officers on the other that the younger of the youths bore the name Keoua. He also went by other names, such as Ma-ui. The officers have also shown that he was the youngest son of his parents, a point clearly stated by Malo and others for Kaoleioku. It is conclusive then that Keoua

\(^{12}\) He may be identified clearly as Keoua-kaahuula through Meares’ reference in 1789, when Meares learned of “a compact with Terreemoweereee, the surviving son of Terreeoooboo, who lived on the weather side of the island, to dispossess Tome-homy-hay [Kamehameha] of his rank and power” [40]. In Hawaiian form “Terreemoweereee” is either Ke ali‘i Mauhili, “The king or chief Mauhili,” or the words were run together, meaning the same thing. Keoua-kaahuula was the chief of the region mentioned and the surviving son of Kalaniopuu who most bitterly opposed Kamehameha.
or Keouapeeale, Ma-ui, Kaoleioku and perhaps others were names for the same person.

It might seem that Kamakau and Fornander, obsessed with the idea that Kaoleioku was the son of Kamehameha by Kanekapolei, and having correct information (1) that Kanekapolei bore two sons to Kalaniopuu, and (2) that one of the names of the younger was Keoua, were unable to recognize the identity of this Keoua with Kaoleioku.

A motive for one of the name-changes may be suggested. The chief was best known as Kaoleioku, which name was not recorded in writing until 1794. His first wife, generally known as Keoua, bore other names. Sometimes at marriage, among the Polynesians, a new name was assumed by the bridegroom, or conferred upon him by the bride. No doubt the event was similarly commemorated by the bride. Possibly, then, the chief Keoua-peeale at his first wedding, conferred the name Keoua on his bride, and adopted that of Kaoleioku.

In the references subsequent to Cook, Kaoleioku is mentioned as a high chief. Lieut. King learned from the priests that Kaoleioku and his brother could not ascend the throne because their mother was a woman of no rank [9, p. 156]. Later he refers to her as “of high rank” [9, p. 164]. Ellis makes the matter clearer by stating that she was “not of the blood royal” [14, p. 187]. The comparison of course had been with Kalola, her co-queen and senior in rank.

Fornander had two accounts of Kanekapolei’s ancestry [18, p. 205]. One group claimed that she was “the daughter of Kauakahiakua, of the Maui royal family; by others she is said to have been of the Kau race of chiefs.” Malo [36] gives her genealogy (Table III) which shows that she was descended from King Umi by his first wife Kulamea. She was certainly a member of the chiefly class, though somewhat remote from the direct royal line. The ancestry of Kalaniopuu has often been published, and is the royal line of Hawaii. The high prestige of Kaoleioku, therefore, is natural.

Concerning Kaoleioku’s age: Lieut. King says he was about twelve years old in 1779, and “used to boast of his being admitted to drink ava, and shewed us, with great triumph, a small spot in his side that was growing scaly.” In his MS journal, King has
TABLE III
GENEALOGY OF KAOLEIOKU, FROM MALO'S MS

Umi, k. # Kulamea, w.

Kapunanahuanuiamum, w. # Kauo, k.

Kawahineokalani, w. # (1) Kaneakauo, k. (2) Hiiakaakauo, w. # Napua, k.

Akahiwahaloa, w. # Keaweanapua, k.

(1) Ma (2) Leoha # Maloleiauiwi

(1) Umiiwiula, w. # Piena, k.

Kanekapolei, w. # Kalaiopuu a Kaimamamo, k.

(1) Keoua, II, k. (2) Kaoleioku, k.

#—married k.—kane, “male” w.—wahine, “female” (1), (2)—order of birth
it that the "young son pointed to us some places on his hips that were becoming scaly, as a mark of his being long indulged in this Liquor."

Admission to drink *awa* may well indicate the admission to temple worship in the company of the adults, or, ceremonially, a recognition of the youth as a man. With many primitive people, this takes place at puberty. Since Kaoleioku had long indulged in *awa*, he was probably some years past puberty. Therefore King's estimate of Kaoleioku's age in 1779 as about 12 was fairly good. It might have been 12 or more. We may thus set the birth-year of Kaoleioku as not later than 1767, and compile such biographical notes as are available.

**Biographical Sketch of Kaoleioku**

1767. Born, youngest son of Kalaniopuu, king of Hawaii island, and his favorite wife Kanekapolei. Cousin and foster-brother of Kamehameha I.

1776-8. Admitted to *awa* drinking.

1778. Accompanied his father in the invasion of Maui island.

1778, Dec. 1. With his brother Keoua-kuahuula and cousin Kamehameha, slept on board Captain Cook's vessel "Resolution", when off the Maui coast. Since Cook's vessels were regarded as "temples," the stay overnight probably had a religious significance to the natives, because their worship ordained spending certain nights in the temples.

1779, January. Returned to Hawaii island with father, brother and Kamehameha.

1779, Jan. 25. With father, mother and brother, visited Cook's ships.

1779, Jan. 26 to Feb. 4. With his brother, was a great favorite with Cook and frequently on board. Is mentioned more often than his brother.

1779, Feb. 14. Witnessed Cook's death. With his father and brother, he had already accepted Cook's invitation to spend the day on board and proceeded ahead to the pinnace, where he was seated at the time of the massacre. Greatly frightened at the firing, he asked to be put ashore again, which was done.

1779, Feb. 21. Accompanied Cook's body to the ship.
1782. Probably at battle of Mokuohai, where Kiwalao was killed by Kamehameha’s forces, and escaped with his brother Keoua-kuahuula.

1782-91. Undoubtedly assisting Keoua-kuahuula in his wars against Kamehameha and Keawemauhili.

1791. With Keoua-kuahuula, came to Makanao, in Kau, and asked or was induced to ask for safe conduct to Kawaihae, in order to surrender to Kamehameha.

1791. Proceeded to Kawaihae. Keoua-kuahuula and seven companions in the first canoe were assassinated by Keeaumoku. Kaoleioku and companions in the second canoe were protected by Kamehameha.

1791 or later. Reinstated in possessions by Kamehameha.


1795. Accompanied Kamehameha in his conquest of Maui and Oahu. (Broughton noted that but one important chief, old and nearly blind, remained behind on Hawaii island.)

1796. Probably returned with Kamehameha to Hawaii island and aided in the defeat of Namakeha.

1804. Noted by Shaler as in “full enjoyment of his hereditary estates.” Assumably then, Kaoleioku was in charge of Kau.

Kamehameha is said to have kept all his high chiefs around him, so that they could not plot against his government. No doubt, until this time, Kaoleioku was kept in attendance on Kamehameha.

1815. Accompanied Kalaimoku and other high chiefs to Oahu, to guard it against the Russians.

1816. Aiding in the construction of the fort at Honolulu.

1816, Dec. 23. Marin’s journal entry: “This [day] Caricou [Kaoleioku] robbed me of all my Taro Plants.”

1816-8. Said to have taken from Mokuumeume [Ford Island] in Pearl Harbor, human bones for making arrow points.

On this subject, Corney has the following little known note:

One evening after supper the man [native caretaker] gave us an account of a singular affair, which occurred to him when he first got charge of the island. He was one night awoke by some person calling him by name, and telling him to attend to what he said; he looked up, and was much terrified on beholding the pale form of the late King Pereorance [Peleioholani] before who told him, that as he valued his life so must he perform what he enjoined: which was, to go to the cave,
where he would find his bones with the bones of several great chiefs; he was to take them from thence and convey them to a place of safety, out of the reach of a chief Tereacoo [Kaoleioku], who would come the next day with a party to search the island for the bones of the king and chiefs, to make points for their arrows to shoot rats with, (they think there is a charm in human bones, and never any other sort).

The next day according to the prediction, the chief came and searched the island; the man told him that as the island and all that was on it belonged to a white man of whom Tameameah was very fond, he ought not to come there to search for bones, when there were so many on the main island. The chief took no notice, but searched and took several bundles of bones with him, but not those of the king and chiefs. Tereacoo departed, and on the ensuing night the deceased king and many chiefs appeared to the man, and thanked him for what he had done, assuring him that the white man would protect him, and that he should one day become a great man. Mr. Manning [Marin] was as superstitious as the native, and declared he had heard many instances of a similar nature.

1818, Feb. 19-24. Death of Kaoleioku in Honolulu, and burial. R. C. Wyllie's extracts and translations from Marin's diary are as follows:

Feb. 19. This day in the morning died Cariocu [Kaoleioku], and I went to breakfast on board and a canoe left for Vehi [Hawaii] with the news of the death.

Feb. 20. I went to my garden and they have been praying for the funeral of Cariocu.

Feb. 21. This day there was mourning for Cariocu—this night they burned him.

Feb. 24. This night they threw Cariocu into the sea.

Marin's very brief notes are elaborated and clarified by Corney, who was an interested observer. Corney's remarks are important because they probably represent the only record by a foreign eye witness of the manner of preparing a chief's body for interment. Earlier voyagers had attempted unsuccessfully to watch the process. The account by Malo differs somewhat from that of Corney, which is:

About a week after our arrival, a chief, named Tereacoo [Kaoleioku] died suddenly; he went to bed well over night, and in the morning got up, and according to custom, smoked a pipe, after which he lay down and died. All the natives were immediately tabooed, or prohibited from going on the water; they all appeared to be in great grief, crying and making a dreadful noise. They commenced knocking out their teeth, cutting off their hair, and burning their flesh with the bark of a tree; both men and women going about quite naked, to demonstrate their grief.

On the death of the chief, the priests assembled; they fenced the house in for about fifty yards square with wands, having white flags flying on them. None of the natives dare come inside this fence, though several thousands of them were collected round it. There was a large fire made on the outside of the house and inside of the fence or prohibited space; the priests then began cutting up the body. They brought the heart out, and set it in the fire, praying very devoutly while it was
burning; after which they collected the ashes, put them in a calabash, or
gourd, slung it to a pole, and spread a beautiful feather cloak over it.
Then two of the chiefs, Hikanées, or confidential men, took the pole
on their shoulders, and ran towards the water, crying out very loud,
"Noho, noho!" (which means sit or lie down); as these men passed,
all the natives lay down and stripped themselves. They walked up to
their middle in water, and deposited the ashes; afterwards the liver and
all the inside were treated in the same manner. At sundown this part
of the ceremony ceased, and a crier went round the village, calling out,
that if any man, woman or child, were seen out of their houses, or showed
a light or fire, or even smoked a pipe, after 8 o'clock that evening, they
would instantly be put to death. These restrictions extended not only
to the white people, but even to the ships in the harbour; nay, hogs,
dogs, fowls, etc., were not allowed to be out, lest they should make a
noise, nor were the ships suffered to strike the bells next morning.
At sunrise the Taboo was taken off the ships, but still remained on
shore. This day the priests were employed burning the flesh off the
bones, and scraping them quite clean; the ashes were deposited in the
sea; the bones were then carefully packed up, and a large double canoe
despatched with them to Owhyhee. Six hours after the canoe sailed, the
Taboo was taken off the bay, and the canoes were allowed to go on the
water; in this manner they employ ceremonies towards all the people
of rank.

In Corney's account, the proceedings occupied two days. Marin's dates indicate six days. Probably Corney wrote from
memory, but correctly enough as to facts.

Kamakau's account, written in 1867, adds nothing of im-
portance to that of Corney. Kamakau's date 1816 should be
changed to 1818 as a matter of course.

The bones of Kaoleioku were deposited in the royal mausoleum,
Hale o Keawe, at Honaunau on Hawaii [49].

1818, June. Apparently Kaoleioku's spirit was restless.

Continuing Corney's account of Mokuumeume, above:

Mr. Manning went out to walk about; in a few minutes he returned
in a terrible fright and perspiration. Seeing him look so wild, I asked
him what was the matter; when he got more composed, he told me, very
seriously, that as he was walking by the prickly-pear trees, saying his
prayers and counting his beads, he saw the Chief Tereacoo, who had died
about a month since, walking before him, attended by a number of
people dressed in the white cloth of the country. I laughed heartily at
this relation, and tried to persuade him it was all imagination; but he
still persisted in having seen the spirits.

Kaoleioku is said to have married twice, first Keoua and then
Luahine. At the time of his death his wife was named Manono,
according to Kamakau. She may have been a third wife, or the
name was only alternative for one of those just mentioned.

The unchallenged publication, since 1884, of the claim of
Mrs. Bishop being the last of the Kamehameha line (on the mis-
taken assumption that it included Kaoleioku), indicates that the
Kaoleioku line is now extinct.

Available portraits of Kaoleioku's descendents precede the
present article.

---

18 Probably, "two of the chief's aikanes."
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