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ABSTRACT

Ioane (John) Kaneiakama Papa ʻĪʻī began serving in the royal household of King Kamehameha I as a kahu aliʻi (attendant or guardian for an aliʻi) in 1810, when he was ten years old. As a kahu aliʻi, ʻĪʻī was highly familiar with the inner workings of the royal household. He went on to become a respected statesman who was privy to the shifting modes of governance adopted by the Hawaiian kingdom. ʻĪʻī’s intelligence and his good standing with those he served resulted in a great degree of influence. At the end of his life, he also became a biographer and memoirist who published accounts in Hawaiian of the key events in his own life and in the lives of others during the sixty years that he served his kings, his nation, and his people. As a privileged spectator and key participant, his accounts of Hawaiian aristocracy and his insights into early nineteenth-century Hawaiian cultural-religious practices are unsurpassed.

Over the years, ʻĪʻī faced many personal and political changes and challenges in rapid succession, which he skillfully parried, brushed aside, or grasped firmly and then used to fend off other attacks. He was a highly significant figure, and as a contribution to the ongoing reconsideration of nineteenth-century Hawaiian intellectual and political history, this dissertation takes a close look at the life of this extraordinary man who served five kings over six decades.

While recent scholars have to varying degrees noted ʻĪʻī’s importance in Hawaiian history, his life has been largely neglected as a topic of study. The few scattered lines devoted to him merely tombstone epitaphs in relation to the vast archive available about his life, his political achievements, and his cultural contributions as a writer. Only one self-written text claims to depict his life, but as I will show, especially in its present English-language state, it falls far short of doing so. What might we learn from examining his life and his writings? This dissertation seeks to answer this question; in the process, it will pay homage to a remarkable man.
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HO‘OLAUNA: INTRODUCTION

As the sun reached its apex on July 31, 1847, hundreds of spectators watched as an imposing man with dark piercing eyes came forth to meet his adversaries. Tall and powerfully built, he was dressed in a black suit with a yellow feather cape draped over his broad shoulders. He walked toward twenty men armed with long spears, and stopped when he was within throwing distance. He stood there empty-handed, his eyes fixed on his opponents. Suddenly, the spears began to fly. He seized the first one out of the air, and then another, and used them to parry the remaining missiles. When the spearmen finally depleted their arsenal, the man stood there unharmed, a spear in each hand. But the battle was far from finished. He flung his two spears at his weaponless adversaries, and then quickly began picking up the fallen spears around him, throwing them one after another until he had forced his rivals to flee. The spectators cheered throughout.

The man who put on this exhibition of lonomakaihe (the art of parrying and throwing spears) was Ioane (John) Kaneiakama Papa ʻĪʻī, a respected statesman and aliʻi (of noble rank), and the subject of this dissertation (Appendix A). My description of this event relies on Henry L. Sheldon’s (29 Oct. 1881) and Henry Hodges Parker’s accounts of the celebration (41) commemorating Rear Admiral Richard Thomas’ restoration of Hawaiian sovereignty in 1843, after Kamehameha III had ceded control of his kingdom under duress to Lord George Paulet five months earlier. The striking visual of ʻĪʻī wearing the insignia of chiefly rank and a western suit while facing spears can stand as an extended metaphor for his life. Over the years, ʻĪʻī faced many personal and political changes and challenges in rapid succession, which he skillfully parried, brushed aside, or grasped firmly and then used to fend off other attacks. He was a highly significant figure, and as a contribution to the ongoing reconsideration of nineteenth-century
Hawaiian intellectual and political history, this dissertation takes a close look at the life of this extraordinary man who served five mōʻī (an aliʻi who had supreme jurisdiction or power over a district or island, Pukui and Elbert 251) or the aliʻi over six decades.

John Papa ʻĪʻī began serving in the royal household of Mōʻī Kamehameha¹ as a kahu aliʻi (attendant or guardian for an aliʻi)² in 1810, when he was ten years old. As a kahu aliʻi, ʻĪʻī was highly familiar with the inner workings of the royal household. He went on to become an influential statesman, who was privy to the shifting modes of governance adopted by the Hawaiian kingdom. ʻĪʻī’s intelligence and his good standing with those he served resulted in a great degree of influence. At the end of his life, he also became a biographer and memoirist, who published accounts in Hawaiian of the key events in his own life and in the lives of others during the sixty years that he served his mōʻī, his nation, and his people. As a privileged spectator and key participant, his accounts of Hawaiian aristocracy, and his insights into early nineteenth-century Hawaiian cultural-religious practices, are unsurpassed. What might we learn from examining his life and his writings? This dissertation seeks to answer this question; in the process, it will pay homage to a remarkable man.

While recent scholars have to varying degrees noted ʻĪʻī’s importance in Hawaiian history, his life has been largely neglected as a topic of study. The few scattered lines devoted to him are merely tombstone epitaphs in relation to the vast archive available about his life, his political achievements, and his cultural contributions as a writer. Only one self-written text claims to depict his life, but as I will show, especially in its present English-language state, it

¹ By Kamehameha, I intend Kamehameha I. His sons and grandsons who succeeded him will be designated respectively as Kamehameha II, III, IV, and V.

² Unless indicated otherwise, all translations in this dissertation are mine.
falls far short of doing so. While it is common practice to begin a dissertation with a literature review, because there is a dearth of substantial scholarly writings about ʻĪʻī, I will be integrating a review of resources available about his life into the arguments of each of the following three sections in this Introduction. The section titled Disrupting a Discourse of Sufficiency provides readers with what they need to know about *Fragments of Hawaiian History*, the only text that claims to depict ʻĪʻī’s life. That same section also provides information about the only extensive treatment of ʻĪʻī as an intellectual, which is found in M. Puakea Nogelmeier’s *Mai Pa’a I Ka Leo, Historical Voice in Hawaiian Primary Materials, Looking Forward and Listening Back*. The section Contextualizing ʻĪʻī’s Series within a Larger Discourse: ‘A’ohe Pau ka ‘Ike i ka Hālau Ho’okahi provides readers with what information about Hawaiian language resources, including ʻĪʻī’s own series. The section titled Kānaka Maoli Strategies for Recording and Celebrating Life and the section titled Kānaka Maoli Values and Aesthetics as a Paradigm for Researching and Interpreting Kānaka Maoli Intellectual Production provide readers with theoretical and critical materials, indigenous and otherwise. Lastly, the section titled Entering the Archive: Sources and Resources for Telling the Mo’olelo of John Papa ʻĪʻī provides information about the various archives that records ʻĪʻī’s life and public contributions.

**Disrupting a Discourse of Sufficiency**

ʻĪʻī left behind an extensive body of writing. However, what most people know about ʻĪʻī comes from one book, *Fragments of Hawaiian History*, an English-language adaptation of his 1866–1870 life writing series from the Hawaiian-language newspaper *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. Published in 1959, this now virtually canonical adaptation recasts Hawaiian history by employing Western aesthetic and social science assumptions. In the process, much of what ʻĪʻī
wanted to represent and emphasize gets lost. The only extensive discussion of 'Īʻī appears in M. Puakea Nogelmeier’s *Mai Pa'a I Ka Leo: Historical Voice in Hawaiian Primary Materials, Looking Forward and Listening Back*, published in 2010. Nogelmeier’s emphasis is not however on 'Īʻī or biography. Rather, he discusses 'Īʻī’s writings and *Fragments* as part of his discourse of sufficiency argument about certain Hawaiian language texts, and most notably Samuel Mānaiaikalani Kamakau’s, translated into English. For reasons that will become very clear, Nogelmeier’s work on 'Īʻī is critical to and a point of departure for my own discussion of his life and intellectual contributions through the three series published at different times in the newspaper *Kuokoa*.

For Nogelmeier, the term “discourse of sufficiency” describes the ideological and political consequences of the “long-standing recognition and acceptance of a small selection of Hawaiian writings from the 19th century as being sufficient to embody nearly a hundred years of extensive Hawaiian auto-representation—Hawaiians writing for and about themselves” (1–2). As he further explains, although discourse “can be simple dialogue,” it can also include “whole formations of practices, systems, prevailing mindsets, and the institutional and financial support for the perspectives that gain credibility and acceptance” (4). These formations are mutually informing and sustaining, and Nogelmeier argues that with few exceptions, the English-language translations of Hawaiian-language primary sources have created and reinforced such a discourse of sufficiency. Above all, the translations of works by four Kanaka Maoli intellectuals—

---

3 *Mai Pa'a I Ka Leo* is based on Nogelmeier’s dissertation for which he received a doctorate in anthropology in 2003 (viii fn3).

4 Kanaka Maoli (Kānaka Maoli, plural) and ‘Ōiwi (singular and plural) are identity markers I use interchangeably with Hawaiian.
Kepelino, Davida Malo, Samuel Mānaiakalani Kamakau, and John Papa ʻĪʻī—came to be considered together as sufficient to represent Hawaiian experience as observed by Hawaiians in the nineteenth century. In short, most of what the world knows about Hawaiian attitudes or beliefs is drawn from heavily edited and often truncated English-language translations of a very small handful of Hawaiian texts. As Nogelmeier makes clear, this is a big problem: “Not only do these translations inadequately represent even the originals from which they were taken, but they further compound the problem by eclipsing the larger body of original writings that remain unrecognized” (xiii).

Painstakingly comparing ʻĪʻī’s original newspaper series with Fragments, Nogelmeier concludes “that the entire set of 73 columns published by ʻĪʻī were originally extracted for translation by [Mary] Kawena Pukui, but the editing of that translated text resulted in only 65% of those writings being included in the English publication. Seven columns were deleted entirely, and the remaining 66 columns were used in part or in whole” (150–1). The editorial production of Fragments can stand as representative of the problematic results not only for this biography itself, but for any ensuing research and publications that supposedly rely on Kānaka Maoli intellectual and historical contributions, but just as often appropriate, misrepresent, and decontextualize them. Fragments of Hawaiian History, in short, fragments a coherent Hawaiian understanding of history.

Intent is a critical factor in the production of translations, because it not only parallels the assumed or desired function of the original text, but often drives the selection of texts to be translated. Nogelmeier identifies the following markers of intent in the problematic English translations of works by Kepelino, Malo, Kamakau and ʻĪʻī: editorial constraints, extraction, decontextualization, translation, reordering, editing, and elision (vii). In a little-known recording
of a speech given at the Bishop Museum when presenting *Fragments* to the public in 1959, editor Dorothy Barrère offered a few words about how some of these forces affected the production of ‘Ī‘ī’s translated text. Barrère credits cultural expert and translator Mary Kawena Pukui with bringing ‘Ī‘ī’s text to light (Lecture). After happening upon these articles, Pukui realized their importance, soon discovered the writer’s identity, and began collecting them. The initial selection of this text as a good candidate for preservation and translation was therefore made by the museum’s in-house translator and recognized Hawaiian cultural expert for nā mea Hawai‘i (things Hawaiian).

By the late 1930s, Pukui had completed a translation of ‘Ī‘ī’s series, which was then archived and made available to scholars. According to Barrère, “Clarice Taylor used this translation as a basis for some of her little tales about Hawai‘i” (Lecture). But the value of Pukui’s manuscript is not limited to its usefulness for those unable to read the Hawaiian-language original. Comparing her initial translation with ‘Ī‘ī’s newspaper series also offers insights into her translation strategies and the eventual production of *Fragments*. At some point after the publication of *Fragments*, however, Pukui’s translation went missing. In *Mai Pa‘a I Ka Leo*, Nogelmeier reports that “Unfortunately, Pukui’s original, full translation of the articles seems to have been discarded when the final editing of the text for English publication was finished, and no record of her original translation remains . . . ” (147). Because my search was equally unproductive in 2007, I translated ‘Ī‘ī’s account of Puna‘aikoa‘e for my M.A. thesis (Brown “Ka Po‘e Mo‘o”). And a few years later, John R. K. Clark asked to use my translation in *Hawaiian Surfing: Traditions from the Past*, because he too could not find Pukui’s manuscript.

---

*I will explain the significance of this account later in this introduction*
As my doctoral research progressed, I continued to search in particular for Pukui’s translation of ‘Ī‘ī’s third series, “Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii” [Fragments of Hawaiian History] ⁶ After several unsuccessful visits to the Bishop Museum Archives, I was ready to give up for good, but Bishop Museum archive technician Tia Reber suggested I try one last folder, containing Pukui’s hand-written manuscript An Expression of Affection for Ka-ʻimi-haku. Original Translation of ‘Kanaenae aloha no Kaʻimi-haku’ by John Papa Ii. Kuokoa 5 Dec. 1868 - 7 May 1870. This proved to be a translation of ‘Ī‘ī’s second series, so I purchased a photocopy of this two hundred and forty-five page manuscript, and gave up searching for ‘Ī‘ī’s third series. This copy sat in my bookcase for two weeks; when I finally examined it, I realized it was too thick to be a translation of the five-installment Kekūanāoʻa’s series. With great excitement, I thumbed through the manuscript’s last few pages. It proved to be Pukui’s translation of ‘Ī‘ī’s third series, which she rightly understood as a continuation of the second. If nothing else, this account reveals something about the challenges facing those who conduct archival research on nā mea Hawaiʻi.

As the in-house translator at the Bishop Museum for many decades, Pukui gathered and translated an enormous number of ʻŌiwi writings that scholars have and continue to use when publishing research about nā mea Hawaiʻi. Most of the holdings in the Bishop Museum collection known as the “Hawaiian Ethnological Notes Collection” (HEN) were Pukui’s. Because of the vast knowledge she acquired from her own family, from elders in the larger Hawaiian community, and from her own extensive research, her translations are profoundly culturally literate. And yet, given the immense amount of work she did, often at the request of others, it is not surprising she could not always fine-tune her translations. Most notably for my

⁶ I will discuss these series and their titles more in depth shortly.
purposes, a comparison of her translation manuscripts (The Life, An Expression) with ʻĪʻī’s published Hawaiian language series reveals that she did not translate two installments from his third series “Na Hunahuna,” published on June 26, 1869 and April 16, 1870. The first is entirely devoted to the execution of ʻĪʻī’s older brother Maoloha, and to establishing ʻĪʻī’s kinship with Keʻeaumoku, an important historical figure (26 June 1869). The second is a continuation of ʻĪʻī’s discussion of the arts of canoe paddling and navigation (16 Apr. 1870). ʻĪʻī alludes to Maoloha’s death in several installments, and clearly Maoloha had committed a grievous infraction (12 June, 3 July, 4 Dec. 1869, 9 Oct. 1870). But because ʻĪʻī gave the full story in the June 26 1869 installment, he did not repeat the particulars later, leaving curious readers mystified. I suspect that Pukui did not collect this installment when gathering together ʻĪʻī’s series, in part because although in the manuscript she neglected to translate a few passages for other installments, she eventually caught those omissions, and included them in Fragments. The Maoloha installment probably wasn’t in her gathered materials.

Pukui also did not hesitate to cut out ʻĪʻī’s evangelical Christian passages, which she indicates with ellipses in her manuscript. Since Barrère makes it clear that Pukui took it upon herself to gather and translate ʻĪʻī writings (Lecture), these cuts seem to have been her own decision. As a result, the manuscript does not reflect the degree to which ʻĪʻī’s explicitly Christian values shaped his perspective on his life and his life writing. And yet, even with these cuts, Pukui produced a far longer manuscript than what eventually appeared as Fragments. The typescript I have prepared of Pukui’s handwritten translation of ʻĪʻī’s three series, including my translation of the two missing installments but not of the missing evangelical passages, is 333 double-spaced 8” by 11” pages with 1” margins, and 113,881 words. Excluding paratextual features such as the preface, foreword, table of contents, glossary, and index, the typescript of
Fragments is 199 pages with 65,305 words. In short, 40% (134 pages) of Pukui’s translation did not make it into Fragments.

In his forward to Fragments, and speaking for the Bishop Museum, Kenneth P. Emory says that “The work was originally conceived to provide material for anthropological study by specialists” (xii). Nogelmeier, who contacted “Barrère, who was selected to edit the translated manuscript,” reports that she “said that she was asked by the Bishop Museum director to leave out legendary material and to select those topics that might be of interest to anthropologists and to the descendants of John Papa ʻĪʻī” (150). And yet, although my comparison of Fragments and ʻĪʻī’s three series confirms much of the “legendary” material excluded, it also appears that substantial portions of those passages about ʻĪʻī’s life that might have interested his descendants have also been removed. The director Barrère refers to was Alexander Spoehr, a well-known social anthropologist and archaeologist (Oliver 297–8). Given his disciplinary interests, his desire to produce an ethnological text is unsurprising. He would have been less concerned with depicting ʻĪʻī’s life, and more committed to foregrounding information about the cultural practices of the early monarchy period.

But this impulse is problematic in several ways. First, although Fragments claims to honor ʻĪʻī and his knowledge, it takes liberties with his voice and strictly imposes a western, chronological understanding of history. Second, Fragments downplays ʻĪʻī as a remarkable and distinctive Kanaka Maoli intellectual and historian, assigning him the principal role of native informant while paradoxically relying upon his authoritative voice. Informing the production of Fragments therefore are familiar and problematic discursive practices driven by Western-centric perceptions about Kānaka Maoli—their Maoli culture and cultural practices, their intellectual and artistic productions, their language, and their nation, and their physical environment. These
perceptions arise from ideological assumptions underpinning the intertwining discourses of authenticity and authority, which are always about power. As he unfolds his own discourse of sufficiency argument, Nogelmeier also acknowledges the practice of othering in institutional settings and within disciplines such as anthropology, the discipline in which Spoehr—and Nogelmeier—were trained (7). Western (read American and European) ideas about the Other will inevitably influence negatively perceptions about ʻŌiwi narrative art (genre, form, content, and orality versus literacy discourse) and also help determine readers’ taste in Hawaiʻi-related literature, which in turn affects what texts are produced about nā mea Hawaiʻi. The editorial constraints Spoehr placed upon Barrère must therefore be considered as at least partially the product of ethnocentric Western academic bias that characterized the study of indigenous peoples and cultures during his lifetime, and has continued long after.

In his discussion of problematic practices in the translation of moʻolelo, Nogelmeier identifies what he calls an “epistemological overlay,” or “dominant overwriting”: “where Hawaiian writings have been clearly reworked to fit and reinforce Western intellectual paradigms” (29). Part of this overwriting includes ignoring how Kānaka Maoli understand their moʻolelo (132). Spoehr’s request for an anthropological text that excluded “legendary material” is an example of this practice. Dominant overwriting also ignores or devalues ʻŌiwi aesthetics, by which I mean Hawaiian ways of understanding and being that draw upon the senses, and all other pleasurable modes of knowing, to inform and guide ʻŌiwi artistic-intellectual expression. Neglecting to take into account Kānaka Maoli narrative art forms is an example of Western othering that has historically misrepresented us, and worked to our detriment. Barrère’s explanation reveals that ʻĪʻī’s series were re-ordered in accordance with a Western lens that sharply distinguishes between legend and history. Nogelmeier further notes that in the case of
Samuel M. Kamakau, his writings were reordered in keeping with another Western assumption that *history* can be separated from *culture* (131–2; my emphasis). And pointing to a similar imposed division between fact and literature, Noenoe Silva notes how Western scholars try to “read political history in isolation from the stories (and poetry and songs) surrounding it in the same texts” (“I Kū” 28). From a Hawaiian perspective, all of these supposed binaries are inextricably intertwined in a holistic approach to the creation and transmission of knowledge that mirrors our relationship with and understanding of our environment. Because the universe Kānaka Maoli know is a web of interconnected and genealogically related elements—gods, humans, land, sea, sky, and everything therein—this awareness underpins our poetical approaches to creating and relaying knowledge.

As Nogelmeier observes, “While the English language has clearly different meanings for terms like history, legend, and culture, Hawaiian language does not have the same semantic boundaries.” Instead, “The Hawaiian word moʻolelo . . . is a single concept in Hawaiian conveying multiple meanings, encompassing what in English would be considered as history, ethnography, myth, legend, account, description, tradition, etc.” (132). Because any single Western term is insufficient to transmit the cultural complexity of moʻolelo, we should further explore the Kanaka Maoli understanding of moʻolelo before falling back on Eurocentric designations for the sake of expediency. According to Mary Kawena Pukui, *moʻolelo* derives from two words: *moʻo* and ʻōlelo, or *series of talks*, a union reflecting a long history of oral tradition (Pukui and Elbert 245). Our moʻolelo continually demonstrate that our kūpuna did not sharply distinguish between legends and history, but wove them together in the most beautiful of ways. Most importantly, moʻolelo are much more than just a literary genre, because they serve as receptacles or archives (waihona) of and vehicles for transmitting ancestral knowledge. When
moʻolelo are therefore divested of cultural-religious-historical context and reframed according to Western understandings of genre, epistemological connections are inevitably broken, and knowledge is lost. Furthermore, due to a complex set of well-known historical circumstances, many Hawaiians today can only access our moʻolelo through translations. Thus problematic discursive practices have not only distorted or silenced the native voices that spoke traditions into being and transmitted them across generations, but because of the corresponding loss of the Hawaiian language, they also contribute to the erosion of ʻŌiwi culture.

In *Legendary Hawai'i and the Politics of Place: Tradition, Translation, and Tourism*, Cristina Bacchilega discusses the consequences of reframing moʻolelo according to a Western aesthetic: “Naming—always already a renaming—has been a powerful tool of colonial rule and cultural appropriation” (9). Re-framing and re-naming go hand in hand with othering and the silencing of the indigenous voice, and when this process also involves the disappearance of a language, the rupturing and fragmenting of tradition is even more extreme. The politics of erasure necessarily at work in Eurocentric translations is therefore an act of violence—perhaps unconscious at times, but that does not mitigate the damage, especially in light of the long history of Westerners imposing their beliefs, customs, education, and language on the Hawaiian people—in short, the history of colonialism in Hawaiʻi.7 As a result, today, many ʻŌiwi cannot access Hawaiian-language texts, and while I do not believe that translation should always be condemned, its possible effects, and their motivations, must be taken into account in any study, for the reasons already outlined.8

---

7 For a detailed treatise on this topic, see Noenoe Silva *Aloha Betrayed.*

8 See Hoʻouluumāhiehie and Nogelmeier for an example of a persuasive translation.
A single example of how cutting “legendary” material can rob a text of valuable insights into the Kānaka Maoli belief system can stand for many others. On the 4th, 11th, and 18th of September, 1869, ‘Ī‘ī published an account of the ali‘i Puna‘aikoa‘e to explain the physical characteristics of certain female images worshipped in the Kapu Loulu ritual, part of a larger ceremony connected with the consecration of a luakini, a specific kind of heiau, or structure designated as a place of worship, associated with war and keeping a ruling ali‘i’s reign stable, and where human sacrifices were offered. Kalamainu‘u, a mo‘o akua (reptilian water deity), seduced Puna‘aikoa‘e while he was surfing near Waimānalo on O‘ahu (4 Sept.). She led him to Moloka‘i, where she held him captive in her cave. Puna‘aikoa‘e was already mated to Walinu‘u, an elder sibling of the volcanic deity Pele (4 Sept.), so when Puna‘aikoa‘e escaped from Kalamainu‘u, he sought refuge with the Pele clan (11 Sept.). A battle ensued between Kalamainu‘u and her mo‘o relatives and the Pele clan (18 Sept.). Kalamainu‘u lost an eye; Haumea, who fought on Pele’s side, had her nose broken (18 Sept. 1870).

Only six paragraphs of this substantial account appear in Fragments (44–5). But this mo‘olelo is important because mo‘o are powerful and significant figures in ‘Ōiwi culture, and a part of an epistemological foundation upon which Kānaka Maoli have constructed the worldview from which we interpret our history and culture. Predominantly female, mo‘o are fierce and reptilian-like akua associated with water. Several were worshipped as war deities: Kalamainu‘u, Kihawahine, Walinu‘u, Walimānoanoa. Haumea was also a war deity, as was her transfiguration Kāmeiha‘ikana, and both Haumea and Kāmeiha‘ikana have a mo‘o form (Brown 166–172), and Walinu‘u is also a transfiguration of Haumea (Brown 166–172; Beckwith Hawaiian Mythology

---

193). Especially for those of us for whom they are ancestral guardians, many contemporary Kānaka Maoli consider moʻo sacred. But because in the act of creating *Fragments*, ʻĪʻī’s series was reframed and cut in accordance with western understandings of the genres “legend” and “history,” these moʻo passages considered “legendary” were excluded.

Furthermore, the divestment of these supposedly minor genres from being associated with John Papa ʻĪʻī paradoxically continued a Western appropriative tradition that had already consumed the moʻo narratives. Although both Thomas G. Thrum and William Drake Westervelt translated ʻĪʻī’s account of Punaʻaikoaʻe, and included it their folklore collections, neither of them identified their source. In *Hawaiian Mythology*, renowned folklorist Martha Beckwith even noted that Thrum and Westervelt versions of Punaʻaikoaʻe relied on “an identical source,” but still did not identify the contributor (193). This failure to cite ʻĪʻī could perhaps be explained because he did not sign his series, and establishing who contributed unsigned articles is no easy task. But any of these translators and scholars could have at least cited the publication information. Apparently they felt they did not need to, because it was from a Hawaiian language source. It is highly probable that Pukui, when she translated ʻĪʻī’s series, became aware of this appropriation, since the Thrum and Westervelt texts had already been published. But most scholars and the general public are not, even though Thrum and Westervelt’s texts are still in print, and regularly consulted. The original Hawaiian account remains in obscurity, these old English translations are still the “authoritative” texts, and the sharp curtailing of the series version in *Fragments* also contributes to this state of affairs.

10 Nogelmeier also identifies ʻĪʻī as Thrum’s source (37fn56).

11 Thrum eventually cited the name of the series when he republished this account in 1923 as “Punaaikoaee (Puna Tropic-Bird Eater).”
And all of these later translations depart substantially from the original. Comparing ‘Ī‘ī’s version of Puna‘aikoa‘e with the translations by Thrum (“Punaaikoaæ—An Ancient Tradition of Oahu”) and Westervelt (“Puna and the Dragon”) reveals that both are notably shorter than the original. ‘Ī‘ī’s account is 5,908 words in length. Thrum’s is 2,830, and Westervelt’s is 2,006. More of an adaptation than a translation, Westervelt’s version takes the most liberties with the original text. But Thrum’s and Westervelt’s texts are problematic for reasons that go far beyond appropriating abbreviating ‘Ī‘ī’s account. As Bacchilega has argued at length, Thrum and Westervelt both recast mo‘olelo to promote Hawai‘i as a desirable tourist destination in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century (16, 65–6, 72–6, 79–95, 101), and ‘Ī‘ī’s mo‘olelo was woven into this larger project. Even Pukui’s translation truncates the mo‘olelo, coming in at 4,269 words (An Expression 61b–67). My own rounded off at 5,000. But then, Pukui’s translation did not appear in full in Fragments, another example of how problematic discourses have led to a (mis)representation of Hawai‘i. This single instance of appropriation, suppression, and refashioning therefore offers us a range of examples of how epistemological violence perpetrated against Hawaiians reframed ‘Ī‘ī writings in ways just as egregious as Spoehr’s request that Barrère distinguish between the historical, the anthropological, and the legendary, and then cut accordingly. While this dissertation is a critical biography on ‘Ī‘ī, a preliminary discussion of how his writings have been (ab)used has therefore not only been necessary to provide a genealogy and context for these publications, but also to make the reader always aware of how Hawaiian mo‘olelo have been reframed and appropriated through translation.
Contextualizing ʻĪʻī’s Series within a Larger Discourse:

ʻAohe Pau ka ʻIke i ka Hālau Hoʻokahi

While ʻĪʻī’s original life-writing series offers valuable information about and insights into his childhood and early experiences as a kahu, it hardly presents a full picture of him as an adult, a husband, a father, or a statesman. This dissertation provides such a picture, one necessarily and carefully set within Hawaiian history and culture. And yet, although ʻĪʻī’s role in shaping Hawaiian history has been understated or overlooked entirely, the actual archival record of his life and intellectual contributions is extensive. From this body of data, a detailed and complex portrait of his life and legacy emerges. Indeed, for certain periods it is possible to map out the monthly, and even weekly, progression of his activities.

The Hawaiian-language newspapers and other Hawaiʻi archives offer us access to the multiplicity of Hawaiian intellectual traditions, preserved through the spoken word for countless centuries before being written down, and often published. A discourse of sufficiency is the antithesis to these recorded multiple genealogies of knowledge and practices. This rich worldview is memorialized in a ʻōlelo noʻeau, or didactic and often poetical saying: “ʻAʻohe pau ka ʻike i ka hālau hoʻokahi,” which Pukui translates as, “All knowledge is not taught in the same school” (ʻŌlelo Noʻeau 24). Pukui offers this simple interpretation—“One can learn from many sources”—and the ʻōlelo noʻeau itself appears in Hawaiian-language newspapers in debates over variants and variations in moʻolelo (Opio; “No na Kaaο”). Different versions of an account of a person or event, the origin of a god or a practice, or even a specific genealogy were published and often heatedly discussed, testifying to the vibrancy of Kānaka Maoli culture in times of great change. As Nogelmeier explains, “The dialogue-like quality of newspaper interaction, especially by the 1860s, presupposed a responsive readership that was knowledgeable about oral tradition
and printed resources” (108). These debates often motivated Kānaka Maoli to pen their own knowledge and understanding of certain traditions, and submit them for publication, which the editors highly encouraged. The awareness of an informed and literate readership affected how people wrote, but also they read—knowing that the whole populace saw an error would be motivational to correcting disparities. Further research on ‘Ōiwi perspectives on variation and debate would be a major contribution to Hawaiian studies in general.

In the case of Samuel Kamakau and John Papa ʻĪʻī, disagreements led to two foundational works on the same historical period. As Nogelmeier notes, the two men “were writing simultaneously in the late 1860s and included many references to each other’s work in their respective columns. Their styles of referencing each other were quite different, but the interaction continued through the 2-year sequence columns by John Papa ʻĪʻī” (154–5). Readers would have been highly aware of the interplay between the accounts of these two respected intellectuals, because “They were both published in the same newspaper, Ka Nupepa Kuokoa, until January of 1869, when Kamakau’s serial was taken up by Ke Au Okoa. These were the two main Hawaiian-language newspapers of the time” (155). Significantly, while readers sometimes submitted vehement responses to Kamakau’s writings, ʻĪʻī at least in print did not receive such treatment (146). Perhaps the autobiographical nature of ʻĪʻī’s writing, and his status as a statesman, might have made disagreeing with his memories and conclusions a greater challenge.

How then did Kānaka Maoli negotiate the multiplicity of intellectual-cultural-historical traditions across time and place, and how did these debates affect further Kānaka Maoli intellectual production? Dealing with this two-part question is not only important to understanding ʻĪʻī, it is also necessary for any study of Kānaka Maoli intellectual production. As Nogelmeier suggests, the simultaneous publication of historical series by ʻĪʻī and Kamakau
certainly led ʻĪʻī to cover certain topics. In fact, examining closely his authorial asides led me to a surprising discovery. As I will later show, at a critical point in ʻĪʻī’s second series, something Kamakau wrote changed the course of the other chronicler’s writing; in fact, it resulted in ʻĪʻī’s third, and by far the longest, series.

A brief overview of what ʻĪʻī actually wrote, and in what order, in Ka Nupepa Kuokoa will be useful at this point. Fragments drew from three series ʻĪʻī published between 1866 and 1870. By title and content, the first two were primarily devoted to honoring, celebrating, and recording the life of another person. The third, far more wide-ranging series was more focused on the memories of its very prominent writer. The first series was a tribute to aliʻi wahine (a female of high-ranking genealogy) Victoria Kamāmalu, which had seven installments that ran between June 2 and August 18 in 1866 (2, 9, 16, 30 June, 14 July, 4, 18 Aug. 1866). This memorial was for his hānai (foster) daughter, whose full name was Victoria Kiheʻaheʻa Kamāmalu Kaʻahumanu (9 June 1866), and who was sister to Alexander Liholiho (Mōʻī Kamehameha IV) and Lot Kapūaiwa (Mōʻī Kamehameha V). The first four installments were titled “Ke ola a me ka make ana iho o Victoria K. Kaahumanu” [The life and death of Victoria K. Kaahumanu] (2, 9, 16, 30 June 1866), the fifth was titled “Victoria K. Kaahumanu” (14 July 1866), the sixth was titled “Ola ana a make ana o V. Kamamalu” [Life and death of V. Kamamalu] (4 Aug. 1866), and the seventh was titled “Ola a make ana o ke Kama Aliʻi” [Life and death of the Royal Child] (18 Aug. 1866).12

12 Although the installments bear different titles, I will refer to the series as “Ke ola.” I am following Pukui’s lead here, as she titled her translation manuscript “The Life and Death of Victoria K. Kaʻahumanu” [Ke ola a me ka make ana iho o Victoria K. Kaʻahumanu] (HEN 1:2943–2977).
His second series was a five-installment tribute to Mataio Kekūanāoʻa, the biological father of Kamāmalu and her brothers. This second series ran between December 5, 1868 and January 30, 1869. The first installment was untitled (5 Dec. 1868). The second and third were titled “Kanaenae Aloha no ka Imihaku” [A eulogy of aloha for the ‘Imi haku] (19 Dec. 1868, 2 Jan. 1869). The fourth and fifth installments were titled “Kanaenae aloha no ka mea i make” [A eulogy of aloha for the deceased] (16, 30 Jan. 1869). ʻĪʻī’s third series was “Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawai,” which provided the title Fragments of Hawaiian History. This long third series, containing sixty installments, ran from February 6, 1869 to May 28, 1870. From February 6 to July 17, 1869, the series was titled “Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawai.” From July 24 to September 4, 1869, it was titled “Hunahuna Moolelo Hawai.” From September 4, 1869 to May 28, 1870, it was titled “Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawai.”

Although their titles suggest they are separate endeavors, the third series is a continuation of the second, because in the first installment, ʻĪʻī resumes an account unfinished from the last article in the second series. After the first few installments, the third series takes on a distinct life of its own, although actually, signs of a shift in focus were already appearing in the final installments of the second series, where ʻĪʻī starts offering genealogical information on certain aliʻi in the extended household of Kamehameha in connection with their kapu (prohibitions, ʻimihaku).

---

13 The term ʻimi haku has a multi-layered significance. In its most literal sense, ʻimi haku refers to someone who seeks (ʻimi) a lord or master (haku) to serve. Other connotations are explicated in Chapter 5.

14 Although the installments are either untitled or have different titles, I will refer to the series as “Kanaenae.” I am following Pukui’s lead here, as she titled her translation manuscript “Original Translation of Kanaenae aloha no Ka‘imi-haku.” Pukui’s translations of ʻĪʻī’s series are listed under his name in the works cited portion of this dissertation.
restrictions, or interdictions that could be practical in nature or related to the sacred).

Significantly, after explaining the origins of these kapu, ʻĪʻī refers to Kamakau—not by name, but by the title of his series “Ka Moolelo Hawaii”: “‘Ka noho Aupuni io o Kalaniopuu a me Kiwalao,’ i oleloia ma ka Moolelo Hawaii, mamua iho nei, a he kapai15 hoi o Kamehameha, wahi a ka mea nana ia moolelo. Aka, e ike ana kakou i ka oiaio io o ia moolelo, no ua Kalaniopuu la ke Aupuni o Hawaii” [During the rule of Kalaniʻōpuʻu and Kīwalaʻō, according to the contributor of Moʻolelo Hawaiʻi in the latest installment, Kamehameha was an usurper. However, we will see the actual truth of that account regarding Kalaniʻōpuʻu and his reign] (30 Jan. 1869). Immediately after this aside, ʻĪʻī begins his promised rebuttal: a treatise on Kamehameha that lasts for seven installments (30 Jan., 6, 27 Feb., 6, 13, 20, 27 Mar. 1869). The second installment marked the beginning of his third series.

ʻĪʻī’s account about Kamehameha deals with a moment in history when the ruling aliʻi of Hawaiʻi and other islands were battling for supremacy. These battles ultimately motivated Kekuʻiaipoʻiwa II to order her young son Kamehameha to grant Kalaniʻōpuʻu the right to “hai-kanaka” [offer human sacrifice]. Because only a ruling aliʻi had the right to offer such sacrifices, she was therefore giving her support to Kalaniʻōpuʻu in his fight for supremacy. According to ʻĪʻī, Kamehameha had inherited the right to hai kanaka from Keākealani wahine (6 Feb. 1869), the aliʻi wahine who ruled all of Hawaiʻi Island at one point. Her son Keawe succeeded her when she died (3 Apr., 29 May 1869): “[O] Kalaniopuu ke ʻLii, ma ka waiho ia ana o ke aупuni iaia, mai ua keiki (Kamehameha) nei ae a laua” [Kalaniʻōpuʻu was the Aliʻi, because the reign was given to him by that aforementioned child (Kamehameha) of theirs] (27 Feb. 1869). ʻĪʻī is

---

15 The term kapai is clearly a typesetting error. It should read kapae [kāpae], which is in keeping with ʻĪʻī's explanations regarding Kamehameha’s right to rule in connection with Kalaniʻōpuʻu and Kīwalaʻō.
therefore arguing that Kamehameha was no usurper, but was merely taking back from Kalaniʻōpuʻu, or rather Kalaniʻōpuʻu’s son Kīwalaʻō, what he had given in the first place. This is clearly important to ʻĪʻī. He reiterates this point at the end of the sixth installment, when he informs his readers that Kamehameha was the person who enabled Kalaniʻōpuʻu to rule, and Kalaniʻōpuʻu’s son Kīwalaʻō as well (20 Mar. 1869). ʻĪʻī’s seventh and final installment on this topic is dedicated to consolidating his argument (27 Mar. 1869).

What is also important is that within this detailed argument about political authority, ʻĪʻī begins weaving the first narrative threads of his familial connection to Kamehameha. Whether these initial references to his own life were part of a strategy to establish his authority over Kamakau’s regarding the history of Kamehameha remains unclear, and hasty readers might have missed these subtle references. When however ʻĪʻī clearly and thoroughly delineates these familial connections four months later, he is definitely making a claim for his discursive authority (June 12, 1869). First, ʻĪʻī claims a right to write about Kamehameha’s life because of his proximity to the royal family. The court was composed of high-ranking members of the royal family, and the vast number of individuals who served them day and night. ʻĪʻī’s account draws on his relatives’ and his own experiences as chiefs in service to Kamehameha. These people were either directly involved, or eyewitnesses to the events he describes. Second, ʻĪʻī establishes he is a ranking aliʻi, with close direct and indirect ties to members of the royal household. But third, only after he dismantles Kamakau’s claim about Kamehameha does ʻĪʻī’s series take on the qualities of a memoir. The third series’ title may stress its historical content—“Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii (my emphasis),” but ʻĪʻī’s autobiographical voice becomes strongest here, as he reveals details about his genealogy and his childhood memories. Though always framed in relation to historical events, these reminiscences also identify what ʻĪʻī himself considered life-
changing moments that propelled him on the journey that led to his becoming the retired
statesman writing down these recollections.

Disrupting the discourse of sufficiency demands a paradigm shift in how we study
nineteenth- and twentieth-century ʻŌiwi literary production. We must go beyond simply mining
a Hawaiian language text for cultural or historical data, and commit to a critical examination of
its paratextual features. What can analyses of prefaces, paratext, and authorial asides reveal about
the motives, theories, and methods of Kānaka Maoli writers?\textsuperscript{16} Our understanding of how
competing intellectual traditions were debated should also lead us to consider how the titles for
ʻĪʻiʻi’s series provide evidence of how he understood the function of his own writing. ʻĪʻiʻi’s writing
back to Kamakau also informs us about the complex ways that intertextuality engendered literary
production. His initial writing back to Kamakau triggered important memories of his youth,
which then changed the course of his series. A single statement by one newspaper contributor
(Kamakau) therefore seems to have engendered the creation of an entire series by another. And
this series, which might not have been written otherwise, became the basis for most of
\textit{Fragments of Hawaiian History}, not only a canonical text for the study of nā mea Hawaiʻi, but
ironically enough, one of texts mined in the production of a reductive discourse of sufficiency.

\textbf{Kānaka Maoli Strategies for Recording and Celebrating Life}

Because this dissertation is framed as a life-writing project, two important questions to
address are “What are traditional Hawaiian strategies for recording and celebrating lives?” and
“How does life writing by Kānaka Maoli intersect with or differ from Western life writing?”

\textsuperscript{16} For an example of this methodological approach, see Cristina Bacchilega \textit{Legendary Hawaiʻi and the Politics of Place: Tradition, Translation, and Tourism}. 
These questions are doubly relevant for me: I am a Kanaka Maoli chronicling the life of a Kanaka Maoli life writer for a doctoral degree in English.

ʻŌiwi strategies for preserving and transmitting knowledge about the lives of others are many and diverse, and ʻĪʻī’s own writings either practice or incorporate aspects of several of these narrative approaches. In addition to moʻolelo most generally, which I have already discussed, other Kanaka Maoli life writing genres include mele koʻihonua (chants celebrating the connection between gods, humans, and place), moʻokūʻauhau (genealogy), mele inoa (chants commemorating names), mele maʻi (chants commemorating the sacred procreative potential of genitals), kānaenae (poetic chants eulogizing gods, people, places, or things), and kanikau (poetic laments referencing gods, people, place, and nature). Long before the advent of literacy in Hawaiʻi, these oral forms of life depiction were highly developed arts in their own right.

In addition to these narrative strategies, there is also kaʻao, which merits an extended discussion. Kaʻao is a genre that has been characterized as lacking the historicity of moʻolelo, and consequently, has been described as purely fanciful, but it has also been described as a narrative approach to relating history. Mary Kawena Pukui translates kaʻao as “Legend, tale, novel, romance, usually fanciful; fiction” (108). Lorrin Andrews explains kaʻao as “A legend; a tale of ancient times,” and “traditionary story; a fable,” or a “history in the manner of a story” (223). According to Samuel M. Kamakau, “Pela ke ano o na Moolelo Kaao, aole oiaio, i haku wale ia no” [Like so the Moʻolelo Kaʻao, no truth, just made up] (ʻKa Moolelo o Hawaii Nei” 9 Sept. 1865). P. W. Kaʻawa called kaʻao, “He mea pili i ka noho hoonanea ana o na ’Lii, he mea lealea maoli no. He mea hoopau molowa paha. Malaila ka olu o kekahi poe ma ka paa o na kaao” [It is something connected to the enjoyment of the chiefs, a thing of true pleasure. Perhaps it is
something to quell idleness. Some people find pleasure there, in memorizing the traditional tales] ("Ka Hoomana").

In actuality, genealogies, moʻolelo, and kaʻao are genres that overlap—a mele koʻihonua, such as the Kumulipo, which is a genealogy and a sanctifying prayer for an aliʻi, may inform moʻolelo, which in turn, may inform kaʻao. For example, the Kumulipo references the deity Haumea’s entering the breadfruit tree by virtue of her godly powers (Beckwith The Kumulipo 236). ‘Īʻī related a version of this account as the ending for his moʻolelo on Punaʻaikoa’e (“Na Hunahuna” 4, 11, 18 Sept. 1869). Kamakau published his version in his series “Ka Moolelo o Hawaii Nei” (29 June 1865). Joseph Poepoe offered his version in his series “Ka Moolelo Hawaii Kahiko” (2 May 1906).

In 1893, in their introduction to Hiʻiakaikapiolepele, John E. Bush and Simeon Paʻaluhi commented on the dynamics of oral transmission and evolution of moʻolelo: “E like me ke ano mau o na moolelo o ka wa kahiko, i haawi waha ia mai kahi hanauna mai a kekahi hanauna, ua lilo mau ke ano o ka moolelo, a ua hookikepakepa ia iho i kela a me keia manawa e ka poe malama mookuauhau moolelo” [As always with the moʻolelo of old, transmitted orally from one generation to the next, the moʻolelo constantly evolved, altered each time [it was told] by the people who preserved the continuity of the moʻolelo] (5 Jan. 1893). Although Bush and Paʻaluhi are referring to their version of the Hiʻiakaikapiolepele tradition, their observation holds true for other variants, and applies to other moʻolelo published in Hawaiian-language newspapers. Bush and Paʻaluhi add: “A mai ia wa i kuakaao a ka moolelo io maoli o keia ohana a hiki i keia la, a lilo ai hoi na hana i hookuiia me ka huakai imi kane a Hiiaka i hele ai, he mau hana hookalakupua” [And from the time that the actual moʻolelo of this family was transformed into a kaʻao until this day, so were the exploits associated with the man-seeking voyage on which
Hi‘iaka went transformed into wondrous acts] (5 Jan. 1893). This statement calls attention to the close relationship between mo‘olelo and ka‘ao, and the way that these two genres overlap. Mo‘olelo can be transformed over time by multiple re-tellings into ka‘ao, which, as Bush’s and Pa‘aluhi’s statement seems to imply, is a genre that transforms historical figures into heroes (or even anti-heroes) whose exploits may take on heroic proportions.

Another example of the interrelation between mo‘olelo and ka‘ao pertains to a narrative penned by S. N. Hale‘ole, “Ka Moolelo o Laieikawai.” In his preface to the first installment, Hale‘ole explained, “He umikumamawalu makahiki me ekolu malama ka malamania‘na o keia Moolelo Kaao, e ka mea nana e hoopuka nei keia moolelo maloko o kana Buke Moolelo, e hoomaka ana ma ka malama o Augate, M. H. 1844” [It has been eighteen years and three months that this Mo‘olelo Ka‘ao has been kept by the person who will publish this mo‘olelo in his Mo‘olelo Book, beginning in the month of August, 1844] (29 Nov. 1862). From his comment, it appears that mo‘olelo and ka‘ao, at least in this case, are interrelated genres. The owner and editor of Ka Nupepa Kuokoa, Henry M. Whitney, republished Hale‘ole’s mo‘olelo as a book the next year, but the title was changed to Ke Kaao o Laieikawai. It is clear by the title that this book was assigned the genre of ka‘ao; however, the front matter of the book notes, “Kakauia mailoko mai o na Moolelo Kahiko o Hawaii nei” [Written from ancient mo‘olelo of Hawai‘i]. What to say of this account first published by the writer as a mo‘olelo and later as a ka‘ao?

With the appearance of Hawaiian newspapers, these oral forms of life depiction gradually became written and published works as well, and the number of examples is vast. In addition, as Kānaka Maoli became familiar with literary works from other nations and traditions, they began producing sequential life narratives that resembled western life writing, but which also drew upon the poetic, formal, and cultural conventions of ‘Ōiwi spoken word life depictions.
Translation also became part of the process. As Bryan Kamaoli Kuwada points out, “newspapers . . . published Hawaiian-language biographies of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Napoleon Bonaparte, Benjamin Disraeli, Lord Horatio Nelson, and William Gladstone, just to name a few” (118). A notable example of a western life narrative that was then translated and published in Hawaiian newspapers is Edwin W. Dwight’s biography of Henry ‘Ōpūkaha’ia. Originally published in English in 1818 in Philadelphia, it ran as a series in Ka Nupepa Kuokoa from September 9, 1865 to March 24, 1866 (“Ka Moolelo o Heneri”). This biography is the first life narrative about a Kanaka Maoli written by a westerner, but according to Dwight, written “several years before his death,” based on ‘Ōpūkaha’ia’s own writings about his life, which Dwight then supplemented with his own and others’ recollections of ‘Ōpūkaha’ia, and the sermon given at the funeral (6, 120–6). ‘Ī‘ī mentions ‘Ōpūkaha’ia three times in his series (“Na Hunahuna” 3 Apr., 12 June, 23 Oct. 1869). By a comment ‘Ī‘ī makes it is clear that he read either the series or the biography when he states, “A ma keia kaua ana, i aneane ai e lilo ke ola o H. Opukahaia i ka make, wahi ana” [And in this battle, H. ‘Ōpūkaha’ia nearly lost his life, according to him] (12 June 1869).

On Oct. 26, 1867, Ka Nupepa Kuokoa announced that 2,000 copies of the Hawaiian-language edition of ‘Ōpūkaha’ia’s memoir were for sale for 25 cents at the newspaper’s office (“Ka Moolelo o Heneri”)—the first life narrative in book form about a Kanaka Maoli.

According to David Forbes, “the introduction has corrections and some additional notes on Obookiah made by the Rev. S. W. Papaula” (3: 446); a comparison of the book with the last installment of the newspaper series reveals that Papaula’s notes appeared there as well (Ka Moolelo). Most notably, however, the Hawaiian-language versions integrated Kanaka Maoli poetic conventions. The book even begins with a partial genealogy for ‘Ōpūkaha’ia and an
explanation of the meaning of his name (7), and ends with a chant for him (103). Dwight’s original was clearly altered to suit Hawaiian sensibilities.

Here, a comparison with Western life writing genres is helpful. Kanaka Maoli texts that echo western-style life writing genres tend to fall into the category of memoir even when the writers specify that they are writing about themselves (autobiography), or about another person (biography). The distinction here lies in how focused the text is on the self, as opposed to the self and others, or exclusively on a single other. The term “memoir” accords more with Kanaka Maoli assumptions because the individual-other relationship is always central to the narrative. As Bonnie J. Gunzenhauser explains, “Most fundamentally, autobiography is a self-produced, non-fiction text that tells the story of its writer’s life” (1: 74), whereas “Memoirs,” according to Helen M. Buss, “personalize history and historicize the personal” (2: 595). The distinction is an important one. Kānaka Maoli rarely focused narrowly on self. As for biography, it is always slipperier to pin down. “Because it borrows from and overlaps with other genres,” writes Ruth Hoberman, “biography—‘the history of the lives of individual men, as a branch of literature’, in the words of the Oxford English Dictionary (which notably fails to mention women!)—is a notoriously difficult form to define” (1: 109). This is because, as Hoberman points out, biographies often have elements that overlap with the genres of autobiography and history, and commonly rely on creative or poetic embellishments that border on fiction. What distinguishes biography from autobiography, however, is “its characteristic split between biographer and subject.” What distinguishes it from history is that biography’s “scope is limited by its subject’s birth, death, and actions,” and with regard to biographies that take poetic liberties, Hoberman explains that their “distinction from fiction rests on an extratextual relationship between author
and reader: for a book to work as a biography, its readers must believe it to be ‘true,’ based on verifiable evidence in a way that novels need not be” (109).

Those familiar with Kānaka Maoli narrative aesthetics will immediately recognize that mo‘olelo have similar characteristics, and nineteenth-century Hawaiians familiar with western life writing noticed, and drew upon the similarities between biography and mo‘olelo—though in mo‘olelo, writers commonly establish the validity of their account and their own discursive authority through genealogies of person, place, or thing, origin stories, explanations about place (including winds), and other specifically Hawaiian evidence. John Papa ʻĪʻī’s life writing embodies a Kānaka Maoli approach to depicting lives, communicating the spirit of when he lived. His newspaper series does not easily fit into any single western life-writing category—the installments are autobiographical for long stretches, biographical at others, or even contain passages that suggest spiritual confession and conversion narratives. “A spiritual autobiography,” John D. Barbour writes, “is a person’s attempt to interpret his or her life in relation to the norms of a religious tradition” (835). This theme is woven throughout ʻĪʻī’s third series, but is especially pronounced in his accounts of his early childhood. Furthermore, a speech at Kawaiahaʻo Church in 1841 was clearly a confession-conversion narrative (“John Ii’s Speech”, see Chapter 3), focused as it was on “turning points” in lives, including “religious, philosophical, or political conversion” (Sheringham 1: 233).

Many life narratives were published in the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Hawai‘i. In addition to those published in the Hawaiian newspapers, a number of life depictions were published as books and pamphlets. In the late nineteenth century, especially after

---

17 For treatises on ʻŌiwi life writing in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, see Bryan Kuwada, and Craig Howes.
the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom in 1893, writing and publishing live narratives became a political act. Craig Howes notes, “Virtually all Hawaiian biographies and autobiographies published as books date from after 1885, as do some huge serial biographical narratives in the newspapers. The stated reasons for publishing those lives often echo those offered for American biographies” (61). As ho’omanawanui points out, “The importance of mo’olelo was recognized by earlier Kanaka Maoli intellectuals who collected, published, and wrote about their importance to identity and nationhood, rallying Kanaka Maoli to social and political action” (“Mo’olelo” 2). In other words, not only are life depictions inspiring, but have the potential to affect change.

Kuwada argues, “Biographies of great men and women were published to honor their memories, but also to achieve Hawaiian cultural ends—to provide worthy models for emulation and to call the populace to political action” (120). Howes explains, “Whether in Anglo-American, Hawaiian, or hybrid-forms, then, life writing was a major tool for defending Hawaiian sovereignty from global, though predominately American interventions” (61).

Examining the cultural significance, rhetorical strategies, and literary aesthetics of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Kanaka Maoli life writing can offer us insights into the embodied reality of being Kanaka Maoli, and a deeper appreciation for the poetics of ʻŌiwi narrative art. Furthermore, as Howes argues in his treatise “Micro-Traditions in American and Hawaiian Auto/Biography,” studying Hawaiian life narratives is also relevant to the study of Hawaiian and American history. Howes explains, “Wherever, whenever, and in whatever ways they have been produced in Hawai‘i, and in America, I think a closer look at such lives might ultimately make the entire nation, and its history of print culture, look very different” (74). In Classical Hawaiian Education, John Charlot cites ʻĪtī’s third series extensively.18 Charlot states,

18 John Charlot Classical (xvii, xxi, 8, 44, 96, 179, 341, 390, 396, 398, 400, 402, 421, 550, 733).
“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 to both estimate the consequences of past and present and also to innovate and create” (xiii). In other words, the study of Hawaiian life narratives has multiple applications for diverse disciplines.

From my own perspective as a Kanaka Maoli deeply invested in my culture, reading ‘Ōiwi life depiction feeds my mind and spirit, and strengthens my understanding of who I am. Although more than a century may separate me and other Hawaiians from our fellow ‘Ōiwi who shared their powerful testimonies about what it meant to be Hawaiian, our experiences intersect. Certain challenges our ancestors faced are still ones we face today. Like them, we fight for our right to be nationally autonomous (political sovereignty), to express ourselves according to an ‘Ōiwi aesthetic (rhetorical and compositional sovereignty), to control how we educate our children (pedagogical sovereignty), and to nurture and be nurtured by our ‘āina (food sovereignty). But we have the benefit of knowing how their history has played out, and Kānaka Maoli life writing provides us with that knowledge.

**Kānaka Maoli Values and Aesthetics as a Paradigm for Researching and Interpreting Kānaka Intellectural Production**

My approach to chronicling John Papa ʻĪʻī’s life is grounded in ‘Ōiwi values and aesthetics. This biography is based on extensive research and critical analysis, and my main objective is to tell his full story as much as can be recovered. A related goal, in the words of Noenoe Silva, is “re-establishing our connection to our own intellectual history” (“Nā Hulu Kupuna” 44). This dissertation draws attention to the rich and diverse aspects of ‘Ōiwi literary
and theoretical production. Carrying out these goals requires a constant interrogation of the records, often produced by others, that already represent our past and our kūpuna. As Maori theorist Linda Tuhiwai Smith has explained, research as a practice has historically been a primary tool for dehumanizing indigenous peoples, and for justifying or excusing the physical, spiritual, and intellectual violence perpetrated against them. The term itself “is inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism” (1); I would add that in the case of Hawai‘i, it is linked to similar interventions by the United States of America.

Kānaka Maoli hold each other accountable. We all have our individual and collective kuleana (set of rights and responsibilities) to our community. As an indigenous scholar and academic, however, I am not only all too aware of how research has impacted, and continues to affect us, but also of how my own intellectual efforts and interactions with my students can affect our lāhui Hawai‘i (Hawaiian nation and Kānaka Maoli) in both positive and negative ways. This is not an overestimation of my own work's importance; it is an acknowledgment of my accountability to my lāhui, meaning all ‘Ōiwi, past and present. In *Voices of Fire: Reweaving the Literary Lei of Pele and Hi‘iakea*, ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui reminds us that as “kahu (caretakers) of knowledge, we are responsible in differing degrees to our disciplines, colleagues, and the institutions we work in, but we have equal responsibilities to our kūpuna, ʻāina, and lāhui Hawai‘i (Hawaiian nation)” (xv). Because indigenous politics are inseparable from our intellectual production, kuleana was foremost in my mind during the process of researching and writing a critical biography of John Papa ʻĪʻī. Kuleana entails recognizing outstanding Kānaka Maoli, and for far too long ʻĪʻī’s contributions have been downplayed or overlooked. Well-known in his lifetime, he was also remembered for years afterward. It is today’s generation that needs to be introduced to him.
Kuleana shapes the production and transmission of knowledge. As hoʻomanawanui explains, “Hawaiian cultural protocols serve as guidelines for research, particularly the value of kuleana (right, responsibility). In academic inquiry, kuleana is applicable to the concept of one’s right to information or to share information, as well as one’s responsibilities in this knowledge and sharing” (14). ʻĪʻī was above all a public figure. Because he was a prominent statesman who served many political capacities, he left an extensive public archive. I treat this information as noa (free from kapu). He was discussed, praised, and criticized by Hawaiians in print when he was alive. And yet, while ʻĪʻī held official positions in political, economic, educational, social, and religious institutions, the details of his life and the finer points of his service deserve more attention. Beyond his undeniable contributions, he was also an interesting person who lived in interesting times. As a result, although his various appointments and duties will require me to provide details related to governance, law, economics, diplomacy, and religious, political, and cultural history, John Papa ʻĪʻī is the focus of this biography. Any such explanations are therefore subordinate to developing an understanding of ʻĪʻī’s contributions, and their significance to Kānaka Maoli then and today.

For this reason, in this dissertation, I stress the value of Kānaka Maoli service to aliʻi, which has often been overlooked as a topic for scholarly treatment. Aliʻi relied heavily on kahu; without them, earlier Hawaiian society would not have been possible. But as Kanaka Maoli Kanalu G. Terry Young explains, “The standard approach to the study of Hawaiian history has been to focus on the Aliʻi Nui as leaders of a stratified society who held power and wielded it as they saw fit” (iii). To date, the only extensive treatment of lower-ranking aliʻi who served governing aliʻi is not surprisingly Young’s, who disrupts another discourse of sufficiency by extending his attention beyond the mōʻī, and stressing the importance and value of kahu within
Hawaiian society. Both Young and I see a focus on the service of the kahu as directly related to kuleana. In ‘Ī‘ī’s case, his sense of duty was the product of his genealogy and his parents’ wishes for him. But because ‘Ī‘ī was such an important kahu to a sequence of the highest-ranking ali‘i throughout his lifetime, and because his kuleana necessarily changed and evolved in response to the changing times, his life offers unparalleled insights into how lower-ranking chiefs could and did serve the governing ali‘i in the nineteenth century.

_Fragments_ reduced or cut the many explanations ‘Ī‘ī provides about the kuleana of kahu because like other works of the late territorial and early statehood period, it privileged the early monarchy and its cultural practices, while largely ignoring the important roles lower-ranking ali‘i like ‘Ī‘ī played in society. Such a focus ignores the holistic nature of Hawaiian society, and therefore stands as another case of othering and epistemological violence. To appreciate ‘Ī‘ī, and his kuleana, we must link his achievements as a statesman to the duties of the young boy who first carried a future mō‘ī’s spittoon. Deeply ingrained in him from his early childhood, his commitment to service never left him.

For many reasons, writing a Western-style hagiography, or a saint's life, is not my intention. But the truth of the matter is that ‘Ī‘ī’s life was relatively and remarkably free from scandal. As many contemporaries and his obituaries attest, he was an upright, loyal, hardworking man who cared deeply for his family, his friends, his ali‘i, and his lāhui. What makes for interesting narrative in his life therefore lies in how he negotiated the many challenges he faced—challenges that many of his fellow Kānaka Maoli faced, and continue to face. At many moments, however, I have to touch upon the frailty of human nature. It is impossible to understand ‘Ī‘ī, or the people he served or struggled with, without venturing into such shadowy areas. And I do accept the premise of much Western biography that even the most famous
figures in history were fallible, and that exploring their full humanity gives us an even greater appreciation for how they rose above their weaknesses to achieve greatness.

**Entering the Archive:**

*Sources and Resources for Telling the Moʻolelo of John Papa ʻĪʻī*

A substantial archival record documents ʻĪʻī’s public contributions and his character—the advice he offered, the decisions he made, and the reasoning behind them. In my discussion on the links between a discourse of sufficiency and ʻaʻohe pau ka ʻike i ka hālau hoʻokahi, I stressed the importance of being attentive to paratextual features when studying Kānaka Maoli intellectual production. ʻAʻohe pau ka ʻike is not only an ʻōlelo noʻeau, but an implied method of inquiry that can only enhance our historical cultural-intellectual knowledge base.

For this reason, ʻaʻohe pau ka ʻike was at the forefront of my mind as I searched for information on ʻĪʻī. Any holistic approach to depicting his life requires consulting diverse archives, and paying attention in the process to the various political and social circles he frequented. ʻĪʻī moved fluidly between communities. As a member of the aliʻi class, he was an intimate of its highest-ranking members. Starting out in the court of Kamehameha I, he directly served Kamehameha II, and was instrumental in raising Kamehamehas III, IV, and V. Assigned by Liholiho to become thoroughly familiar with the missionaries and what they might have to offer, he also gained their respect, and after his own conversion, he served the Protestant mission in many public and personal ways. As a statesman, negotiator, and even hostage, he came into contact with foreign admirals, consuls, sea captains, and merchants. As a member of the House of Nobles, he joined Kānaka Maoli and other legislators in assemblies from 1840 to 1868. He also had many blood relatives and extended family, though most of them preceded him in death. And he was the owner of substantial land holdings, including the ahupuaʻa of Waipiʻo (Oʻahu)
where hundreds of people lived under his direction and authority (*Native Register* 5: 511–4). Members of these diverse groups knew ʻĪʻī under different kinds of circumstances—personal, official, prolonged, brief, friendly, or antagonistic. Many of ʻĪʻī’s acquaintances also left records about the historical events and issues in which ʻĪʻī was enmeshed. Their individual contributions—letters, journals, testimony, even published works—helped me to construct a more holistic portrait of John Papa ʻĪʻī. Certain aspects of a person’s character only appear through interactions with others.

As all responsible researchers can attest, poring through archives is a time-consuming though necessary, and occasionally rewarding, process. But researching and writing a life poses special challenges, and I have probably experienced most of them. Foremost among these is the fact that biographers amass an incredible amount of data, but like historians, necessarily use only a fraction of it. Gathering is essential, but selection is the key, and this has certainly been true for me. Had I included all the data I found, this dissertation would be at least twice as long—and in my opinion, far less compelling. I have chosen to highlight those moments in ʻĪʻī’s life that speak most to my project, which is to tell the story of a Kanaka Maoli who faced the spears of change and lived to tell the tale. This decision helped greatly in the selection process. Certain aspects of and incidents in ʻĪʻī’s life shed light on this challenge more than others. In other cases, however, excluding data is more about maintaining the narrative flow. For example, although I found ʻĪʻī’s 1829 letter to Levi Chamberlain requesting ink (he had run out) charming, there proved to be no convenient place to insert it into the narrative—except here, where it fits quite nicely as an example.

Though his own three life writing series obviously reveal the most about ʻĪʻī’s understanding of his own life, his letters, official documents, and other publications are also
important sources. ‘Ī‘ī’s personal and professional correspondence offers insights into his public life, often touching upon matters absent from his memoirs that help fill in certain gaps. These documents, however, rarely offer any access to his private life. I have yet to find a letter to any of his wives or to his hānai daughters. In fact, when ‘Ī‘ī was off O‘ahu on government business, he wrote often to Amos Starr Cooke who ran the Chiefs’ Children’s School, where ‘Ī‘ī was a kahu for the royal children. In a few of these letters, he sends his regards to Sarai, his first wife, suggesting that he had not sent a separate letter to her. Even when expressing an opinion or offering advice, his letters to his ali‘i, his colleagues, and even his friends are guarded, and carefully phrased. Such letters are held at the Hawai‘i State Archives, the Bishop Museum, and the Hawaiian Mission Houses Historic Site and Archives. I have even found a photograph of a letter ‘Ī‘ī wrote to Rev. Hiram Bingham in 1829 on the website of a British auction house. It sold for $6,710 (‘Ī‘ī Letter to Bingham Bonhams Lot 363).

Though nineteenth- and twentieth-century Hawaiian-language newspapers are indispensible, the Hawaiian Kingdom English newspapers and American gazettes are also important sources of information. For the latter, I relied on the electronic archive Chronicling America. As for the Hawaiian-language former, most newspapers published during ‘Ī‘ī’s lifetime were first recorded on microfilm, and later scanned. They are available today on the electronic archives Ulukau and Papakilo Database. Both have a word-search option, which is only possible because a large number of newspaper pages have either been typed out or OCR scanned. But the search option is hardly fail-proof, first because not all of the papers have been processed, and also because ‘Ī‘ī’s name is often misspelled, due either to variations in practice, or typesetting errors. I therefore examined all available Hawaiian-language newspapers published during ‘Ī‘ī’s lifetime (1834–1870), since they are so important as a source. In addition to his life-writing
series in *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, and the various announcements he prepared in his official roles, ‘Ī‘ī himself published letters to the editor. Other Kānaka Maoli contributors reference him, including the newspaper editors, and news articles not only provide information about ‘Ī‘ī as a public person, but also about his personal life—including some very mundane details. For instance, one newspaper reported that ‘Ī‘ī had a minor accident while driving his horse and buggy. He crashed into another carriage, but fortunately no injuries were sustained, although his buggy was deeply scratched (“No Hon. Ioane Ii’). That this incident was considered news perhaps suggests how well known ‘Ī‘ī was.

One of the most fascinating sources of information about ‘Ī‘ī’s service is the record for the Privy Council meetings from its beginnings in 1845 to 1870, since he was a member for almost this entire period. Nearly 6,000 pages long, this collection of the minutes is written in both Hawaiian and English. The account of each meeting was approved at the beginning of the next, making this the Council’s official record. Not surprisingly, this underused archive contains a wealth of information about the inner workings of the Hawaiian Kingdom. It also provides insights into the extent of Kānaka Maoli agency, as the council members and the mōʻī dealt with one diplomatic and domestic issue after another. And as meeting follows meeting, the council members themselves emerge vividly as individuals—what they thought, what they argued about, and what they agreed on. Finally, the minutes provide details found nowhere else on a variety of subjects; for instance, that the Council approved naming a street after ‘Ī‘ī (see Chapter 5).

Legislative records in Hawaiian and English for the Hawaiian Kingdom are also extensive, and valuable for similar reasons. I have found it useful to cross-reference the official minutes with the summaries published in the Kingdom’s Hawaiian- and English-language newspapers—some remarkable differences emerge. Other sources are the official documents of the departments of
the Hawaiian Kingdom, such as Foreign Office and Executive (F.O. & Ex.) and Internal Affairs records.

Because ʻĪʻī was not only a landholder himself, but an executor of the wills for several land-wealthy aliʻi, and the guardian of several land-wealthy minors, I also consulted Bureau of Conveyances (BOC) records. Comparing these transactions with Probate designations, court records, and even the Māhele Book proved another profitable endeavor. Another important resource was the collection of Native and Foreign Land Registers, with the accompanying Native and Foreign Testimony records. This archive offers information about the location and size of ʻĪʻī’s land holdings after the Māhele, the names of his neighbors and tenants, and the reasons given for his claim. The testimonies often include genealogical information as well.

Because the Hawaiʻi missionaries were avid letter writers and journal keepers, they left behind an impressive written record of their experiences. Beginning even before the arrival of the first company sent by the American Board of Commissions for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), detailed journal entries chronicle their daily lives, and also provide information about important historical and political moments, and even about what people were wearing. For instance, Lucy Goodale Thurston notes that when Liholiho first sent ʻĪʻī and Kahuhu to learn from her husband, Rev. Asa Thurston, they were dressed in white, and in what she considered “a civilized manner” (42–3). Amos Starr Cooke and Juliette Montague Cooke’s letters and diaries are perhaps the most informative. Because ʻĪʻī was a kahu for the royal children at the Chiefs’ Children’s School from 1840 to 1852, and because he and his wife lived at the school, he figures prominently in the Cookes’ writings (see Chapter 3). Writings of such missionaries as Rev. Richard Armstrong, and especially Dr. Gerrit Parmele Judd, are particularly informative, because they both served as Privy Councilors, and worked closely with ʻĪʻī in official capacities. Whether consuls, admirals,
sea captains, sailors, or merchants, foreigners who visited or lived in Hawai‘i often prove to be valuable sources of information on ʻĪ‘ī and the historical events in which he played a part. In one journal, as we will see, Captain Cyrille Pierre Théodore Laplace provides one of the few truly negative portraits of ʻĪ‘ī.

The cache of materials related to ʻĪ‘ī’s life that I draw upon in this dissertation offers proof that nā mea Hawai‘i-related documents are plentiful and accessible. But gaps in the historical record remain, and frequently, there is little or no documentation for what ʻĪ‘ī’s thoughts or motivations might have been at critical moments. Sometimes, the archive lets the researcher listen in on what seems to be a riveting conversation, but without being able to ask the people involved about its particulars. A few of ʻĪ‘ī’s letters provide a tantalizing glimpse into fascinating situations, but more often than not, the letters from his correspondent are missing. But in my role as biographer, it is sometimes necessary to say something about ʻĪ‘ī’s inner life, and when archival research proves unfruitful, I must exercise what Robert Warrior in his study of Native nonfiction identifies as “critical imagination,” or “garner[ing] the resources of imagination to tease out meaning from what would otherwise be ineffable” (xv). ʻĪ‘ī himself exercises such critical imagination when he imagines Kamehameha’s gloomy feelings about having to order the execution of his longtime attendant’s son for an infraction (“Na Hunahuna” 26 June 1869). And I too bring my imaginative judgment to the act of retelling. ʻĪ‘ī’s memoirs and letters must be set by the biographer into their own historical period, but I must also acknowledge my own perspective as a Kanaka Maoli who has seen how ʻĪ‘ī’s historical moment played out: the fall of the Hawaiian Kingdom, and the subsequent attempted assimilation of Hawai‘i and Kānaka Maoli into the United States of America. In short, critical imagination is not just filling gaps; it is the act of reading itself. Or as Warrior puts it: “Reading . . . moves beyond
mining information from a text or merely extrapolating pertinent facts from the biography of an author. It is, in contrast, a process that highlights the process of meaning through the critical interaction that occurs between a text as a writer has written it and the text as readers read it” (xiv). “Meaning,” in short, “is derived from the space between these two” (xiv), and despite the many differences between ‘Īʻī’s experiences in his days, and those we have in our own, certain commonalities create a relational space and narrative. When I read ‘Īʻī’s recollections, the resulting space where meaning is derived also becomes a temporal and conceptual piko—an umbilical cord—connecting Kānaka Maoli across time through the medium of moʻolelo.

And yet, as Kanaka Maoli historian Noelani Arista points out, it is not enough to read historical sources from their own place. Scholars must, to the degree they can, make themselves culturally literate to read them effectively (“Listening to Leoiki” 69). Arista’s assertion is another way of stressing the need for culturally appropriate paradigms informed by Ōiwi values and aesthetics when engaging in the challenging practice of reframing moʻolelo. My own approach follows her lead in treating Ōiwi narrative genres and literary devices as both “historical source and interpretive method” (“Navigating” 663). Moʻolelo have been generally undervalued as legitimate archives of Hawaiian knowledge. Often relegated to the supposedly inferior status of legends and folktales, these moʻolelo in fact mirror Hawaiian understandings of their physical reality—both place and space. Other Ōiwi genres such as moʻokūʻauhau, kanikau, and ʻōlelo noʻeau have been treated similarly, but Ōiwi narrative arts can and should inform critical paradigms developed for their study.19 In ‘Īʻī’s case, while his life writing has been mined for

---

19 For treatises on Ōiwi narrative art and literary and rhetorical devices as historical sources and theoretical paradigms, see kuʻualoha hoʻomanawanui (Voices), Noelani Arista (“Listening to Leoiki”; “Navigating”); and Brandy Nālani McDougall and Georganne Nordstrom “Ma Ka Hana.”
historical and ethnographic information, scholars have paid little attention to the poetics of his
texts and his narrative strategies for depicting lives. I hope to show that ʻĪʻī’s newspaper series
offer important insights not only into traditional Hawaiian methods for recording and celebrating
lives, but also how these narratives evolved after the introduction of literacy. One of my
objectives in depicting ʻĪʻī’s life is therefore to honor Hawaiian aesthetics.

**Kuamoʻo: Moʻokūʻauhau and Moʻolelo**

The kuamoʻo (backbone) of Hawaiian culture is literally moʻokūʻauhau. We perceive the
world genealogically—everything is relational. In its narrowest sense, moʻokūʻauhau refers to
biological lineage, but as an ʻŌiwi theoretical and philosophical construct, moʻokūʻauhau stands
for relationality. Moʻokūʻauhau includes intellectual, conceptual, and aesthetic genealogies; even
more importantly, moʻokūʻauhau is chronologically plural, extending in vertical, horizontal, and
diagonal directions through time. And in terms of intellectual endeavors, moʻokūʻauhau refers to
the worldview we have inherited as ʻŌiwi, which informs how we conceive, reason about and
understand thought and artistic production. An intellectual moʻokūʻauhau refers to a person’s
genealogy of knowledge—how specific moʻo ʻōlelo [series of words] have been generated,
learned, or passed on. And moʻokūʻauhau also refers to genealogies of power, and the capacity to
effect change. Related to kuleana, these considerations are enmeshed in the historical struggles
that characterize the sum of Kānaka Maoli experience—past and present. And as an aesthetic
construct, moʻokūʻauhau refers to poetic devices we have inherited that inform and guide our
artistic-intellectual expression.

ʻŌiwi are genealogically related to what we call Kō Hawaiʻi Pae ʻĀina. As Pualani
Kanakaʻole Kanahele has said, “I am this land and this land is me” (23). If we do not understand
the impact of place and environment on Hawaiian ontology (ways of being) and epistemology (ways of knowing), then we cannot fully appreciate or learn from Hawaiian culture, beliefs, language, and even verbal and visual art. In other words, cultural literacy and personal identity are both grounded in the land. Or as Shawn Wilson puts it, “the shared aspects of an Indigenous ontology and epistemology is relationality (relationships do not merely shape reality, they are reality)” (7). This relationality informs all the metadiscursive practices of moʻolelo, as well as the information conveyed. Metadiscursive practices include genre specification, titles, subtitles, prefaces, introduction, greetings, authorial asides, closing remarks, complimentary closings, and caveats. Such practices can be examined to lay bare the ideological assumptions lurking within the non-Kānaka Maoli writings about Kānaka Maoli, their culture, their knowledge, and their beliefs. Or Kānaka Maoli narrative strategies can be evaluated using what can be called a mohala ka pua approach. This is an apt metaphor for the strategies Kanaka Maoli narrators use to frame a moʻolelo (the lehua bud, or pua), moving it forward from the moment it first appears to readers until it has fully unfurled (mohala). Mohala therefore stands for both the framing of the narrative and the strategies that move the narrative forward, while each narrative element (character, event, place, character action) stands as one of the many stamens of the unfolding pua lehua.

The unfolding of a moʻolelo is rarely straightforward, for ʻŌiwi narrative strategies resist the common Western penchant for linear explication with little embellishment. Like spider webs, moʻolelo are intricate creations, and how the spider creates can itself be read as an allegory for traditional Kanaka Maoli narrative techniques. A spider weaves by releasing silken strands that are then carefully connected as the spider goes back and forth, up and down, and crosses here and there until the web is filled out. And just as this method for constructing its web is informed by the countless spiders that have gone before, likewise, ʻŌiwi storytelling reflects the countless
generations of Kānaka Maoli who, as a collective, have contributed to the formation of a uniquely Hawaiian poetics. As I write this moʻolelo, I strive to respect my ʻŌiwi heritage. Although ʻĪʻī became a staunch Christian, his writing also testifies to just how firmly grounded he was in these Hawaiian ways of being, knowing, and telling. This is yet another aspect of ʻŌiwi writing that needs exploring. How did those Kānaka Maoli who embraced Christianity not only navigate the transition from the traditional belief system they had inherited to the new religious system they adopted, but also adapt their modes of expression to record this shift? In ʻĪʻī’s case, we can learn from how he represents his various genealogies, his direct kinship ties, the kinds of service he provided as a kahu, and his early childhood. Ola nā iwi [the bones live] is a well-known ʻōlelo noʻeau that refers to descendants who uphold their kuleana to care for their elders just as their elders had cared for them, forming a chain of respect and reciprocity between generations across time. I would extend this ʻōlelo noʻeau to include meiwi, those rhetorical devices or elements that like bones provide the structure of Kānaka Maoli verbal and written art. Hiapo Perreira identifies four metadiscursive practices as meiwi: 1) “Kīkahō Kualehelehe,” 2) “Kōkua,” 3) “Hopena,” and 4) “Kuhia” (xv). The first “imposes the writer’s personal thoughts”; the second “provides further explanation of a particular event”; the third signals “present-day results from within the story”; and the fourth is a “reference to knowledge from another source” (xv). A legacy of oral tradition, these strategies also preserve ʻŌiwi knowledge and kuanaʻike (worldview). Whoever uses meiwi either to structure or to analyze narratives insures that ola nā (me)wi iā lākou (meiwi live because of them). To perpetuate meiwi is to perpetuate our culture, so being attentive to how ʻĪʻī uses these rhetorical strategies also provides further insight into how writers like him not only navigate transitions from traditional to Western-influenced
institutions, but also how they weave their written narratives as literary extensions of an enduring oral tradition.

My Moʻolelo of John Papa ʻĪʻī

This Introduction has provided the rationale for this life-writing project and an outline of my methodology developed in response to Nogelmeier’s discourse of sufficiency argument and the ongoing reconsideration of Hawaiian knowledge production. My intent has been to explore the implications of Nogelmeier’s work not only for reconsidering the life and writings of someone like John Papa ʻĪʻī, but also for the conscious adoption of research and analytic methods that draw upon Kanaka Maoli epistemology and aesthetics. I have embedded a literature review into this discussion, enumerated and described the many archives of primary sources, and also stressed the importance of specific kinds of cultural literacy when reading and interpreting these materials.

Because ʻĪʻī’s life was essentially one of service to the Kamehameha lineage and to the Hawaiian Kingdom, he must be discussed in relation to the mōʻī and aliʻi nui he served for nearly six decades. Changes in the lives of his royal charges meant changes in his own life, and each change modified ʻĪʻī’s status, and for many years increased his responsibilities. Such changes obviously included, but are certainly not limited to, the deaths—often untimely—of those whom ʻĪʻī served. Whether as the catalysts, the beneficiaries, or the victims of changes in the social, cultural, religious, economic, and political realms, these aliʻi mark off not only our understanding of this history, but also influence the structure of my moʻolelo. Important transitional moments and periods in the lives of ʻĪʻī and the aliʻi he served are the rationale not only for my chapters, but also the divisions within chapters.
Chapter one sets the political stage in the Hawaiian Islands at the time of ʻĪʻī’s birth. When he began his service in 1810, Kamehameha had just finished uniting the Hawaiian Islands under his rule. ʻĪʻī was born into a lineage with the right to petition for entry into the royal court as kahu. But it was not a privilege without its perils, and ʻĪʻī had to prove himself worthy of trust and respect. I examine ʻĪʻī’s genealogy because of its importance to understanding the kuleana of kahu aliʻi in the social, cultural, and political systems of his time, and also the evolution of this important service to aliʻi. This chapter chronicles his early childhood, his entrance into court, and his early experiences as a kahu to Liholiho, or Kamehameha II. This chapter closes with Liholiho’s death in England.

Chapters two and three chronicle ʻĪʻī’s life during Kauikeouli’s (Kamehameha III) reign, which lasted nearly three decades, and was marked by many critical transitions and events. As a trusted advisor and a statesman, ʻĪʻī played a role in virtually all of them. Because the mōʻī increasingly relied on ʻĪʻī’s advice, he placed him in important roles that elevated ʻĪʻī to prominence as a statesman—a role that complimented, but was in certain ways distinct from that of kahu aliʻi. Juggling a great number of duties, ʻĪʻī was a key figure in nearly every public arena, constantly traveling here and there to fulfill his various kuleana. Chapter two covers ʻĪʻī’s service to Kamehameha III from 1824 to 1839. This chapter closes with the conclusion of the Laplace affair, in which ʻĪʻī played a special role, marking the beginning of his career as a statesman. Chapter three covers ʻĪʻī’s service from 1840, the year that the Hawaiian Kingdom established its first constitution, to 1854, the year the mōʻī died.

Chapter four recounts ʻĪʻī’s life from 1854 until spring of 1868, which covers his service to Alexander Liholiho, Kamehameha IV; this mōʻī’s death; and the ascension of Lot Kapuāiwa to the throne as Kamehameha V. During these years, ʻĪʻī faced the challenges of dealing with a
new generation of aliʻi coming into power. His life would continue to be marked by the deaths of people he had either known in his youth or come to love in his adulthood. This chapter closes with ʻĪʻī’s forced retirement in 1868, after systematic efforts to oust him from the government.

Chapter five covers from the spring of 1868 up to his death in the spring of 1870. Far from being a tragedy, his retirement proved to be one of his most productive periods. An utterly unexpected occurrence in the last year of his life would mark it as one of the best, and during this time he also embarked on what is arguably his most important achievement—his life writing series. This final chapter explores ʻĪʻī’s motives for depicting lives, and evaluates his accomplishments. An account of his death, which occurred before he had finished his series, and of the tributes paid to him, conclude the dissertation. I also provide a few final words about his legacy.
Ioane Kaneiakama Papa ‘Ī‘ī was born in an age when highborn ali‘i were considered divine, intrepid warriors performed feats that bordered on the superhuman, and genealogy largely determined a Hawaiian’s lot in life. ‘Ī‘ī’s lineage created his possibilities for social mobility, influenced his upbringing, shaped his character, and weighed in on his life-choices. The trajectory of ‘Ī‘ī’s life was largely set long before his birth when two relatives, the hoahānau (sibling or cousin) Keaka and Luluka, accepted the responsibility of raising Kamehameha. ‘Ī‘ī was then destined to serve highborn ali‘i—a perilous occupation. When he was seven, his older brother Maoloha was strangled to death for a crime he committed while serving Kamehameha. Three years later, ‘Ī‘ī was thrust at the age of ten into the royal household to fulfill his kuleana (set of rights and responsibilities) by serving Liholiho, the sacred son of Kamehameha and Keōpūolani. ‘Ī‘ī avoided being implicated in deadly court intrigues, and successfully negotiated the kapu (taboo, prohibition, or restrictions, often in connection with the sacred) surrounding the ali‘i with whom he interacted on a daily basis. That ‘Ī‘ī survived his service was no mean feat, given his age. When he was nineteen, Liholiho became mō‘ī and abolished the religious system that had been in place for centuries. Thrust into a spiritual void, within a year ‘Ī‘ī discovered a new religion that would further shape his character and profoundly influence his life choices. He was swept into uncharted waters by political riptides that brought unfamiliar dangers and new opportunities. Somehow, he navigated all these currents of change with a discerning eye and a steady hand.
ʻĪʻī’s Lineage and Connections to Members of the Royal Court

As Hawaiian historian and genealogist Lilikalā Kameʻelehiwa explains, “When recounting a history in Hawaiian terms, it is . . . important to examine the beginnings of and the relatedness of the players. These genealogical relationships form the parameters of cultural patterns inherently reproduced in Hawaiian history” (3). A Hawaiian approach to chronicling ʻĪʻī’s life must situate him genealogically within his own lineage, and in relation to the aliʻi he served. Indeed, moʻokūʻauhau is a conspicuous thread throughout ʻĪʻī’s series, and I follow his example. While providing extensive genealogical information for aliʻi, he subtly drew attention to his own status, but always within the parameters of proper behavior. It was considered bad form, even for governing aliʻi, to boast of their high lineage (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1: 158). As Mary Kawena Pukui notes, “Aliʻi of junior family line were taught not to boast of or seek advantage from their aristocratic connections, but to ‘O nā aliʻi nui ke hapai ʻia: Let only the highest chief be elevated’” (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 2: 227). Because ʻĪʻī was famous for acting with decorum at all times, as befits an aliʻi, this is perhaps the reason he did not disclose his full moʻokūʻauhau in his series.

It is clear that some of ʻĪʻī’s earliest ancestors were illustrious, and that his own aliʻi status derives from the choices some of his forebears made. Kameʻelehiwa remarks that highborn aliʻi diluted the prestige of their descendants when they mated with lower-ranking aliʻi and makaʻāinana (commoners) (285). For this reason, an illustrious lineage often had many branches whose relative prestige differed greatly. In their complexity, moʻokūʻauhau suggest an ʻōhiʻa lehua tree, whose branches extend upward and outward, its roots hidden from sight beneath the ground, yet radiating ever outward as they creep endlessly downward. Recovering genealogical information is therefore never a straightforward task, and while my efforts to
uncover ʻĪʻī’s complete lineage have been predictably unsuccessful, disentangling the known
genealogical threads provides a better understanding of his life and his kinship with powerful
nineteenth-century ali‘i through blood ties, marriage, and service.

ʻĪʻī was born near the Hanaloa fishpond in Kūmelewai on the peninsula of Waipiʻo on the
island of Oʻahu during the Hawaiian month of Hilinehu in 1800. ʻĪʻī calculated his birthdate as
August 3, which correlates to the lunar phase Hoku (“Na Hunahuna” 12 June 1869; Kalei
Nuʻuhiwa, personal communication). Children born under Hoku tend to be “humble, patient,
loving, and prosperous” and are destined for fame (Poepeoe and Kepelino qtd. in Nuʻuhiwa 67).
In ʻĪʻī’s case, this prognostication proved accurate.

His mother was Kalaikāne Wanaʻa Pahulemu. Because at the time of his birth Kalaikāne
had two kāne (male partner, man, male), Kuaʻena Mālamaʻekeʻeke and Kaiwikokoʻole, ʻĪʻī was
poʻolua (doubly fathered). Her attendants called her Wanaʻa, suggesting perhaps that her
chieflly rank kept them at a distance like the spines of a sea urchin. Her family fondly called her
Pahulemu, or shoved from behind, for her poor surfing skills. (She was unable to catch a wave
unless someone started her off with a push). Wanaʻa named ʻĪʻī after Papa ʻĪʻī, her kaikūnāe (a
female’s brother or male cousin) and Kamehameha’s medical kahuna (expert; plural form is
kāhuna) (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 12 June 1869). Papa ʻĪʻī was also Liholiho’s kahu, and the name
ʻĪʻī originates from the vocalizations Liholiho made as a child (Kamakau Ke Kumu 200).
Kuaʻena’s hoahānau Kaneiakama, a favorite among the female aliʻi at court, honored the baby
and his parents by giving him her name (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 17 July 1869). When ʻĪʻī became a
Christian, he chose the name Ioane (John).

ʻĪʻī had many siblings from his mother’s previous unions, and he names a few of them.
By Kānepi Pilulua, Wanaʻa had Kamaloʻo (m) (12 June 1869). By Kamahauluaʻe, Wanaʻa had
Haʻaloʻu (m), Ke ʻimo lāʻau pālau a Keʻeaumoku (f), and Maoloha (m) (12 June 1869). ʻĪʻī identifies Wanaoʻa as Kamahauluaʻeʻs kaikuahe (a maleʻs sister or female cousin) and that the name Ke ʻimo lāʻau pālau a Keʻeaumoku (Snapping war club of Keʻeaumoku) marked a kinship with Keʻeaumoku-pāpāiaheae (26 June 1869). ʻĪʻī stressed his close ties to this important war general and councilor to Kamehameha, a kinship confirmed by Auhea Kekāuluohi, Keʻeaumokuʻs granddaughter (ʻĪʻī “Ke ola” 16 June 1866, “Hunahuna” 26 June 1869; Kamakau Ke Kumu 72, 78, 152, 167, 190). Keʻeaumoku was the son of Kūmaʻaikū (f) and Keawepoepoe (f) (Kamakau Ke Kumu 78; “Mookuauhau” 8 June 1896). Keʻeaumokuʻs children were very important historical figures who had central roles in ʻĪʻīʻs life. By Nāmāhana, Keʻeaumoku sired Kaʻahumanu (f), Kaheiheimālie Hoapiliwahine (f), Kahekīlikeʻeaumoku Keʻeaumokuʻōpio John Cox (m), Kaluaikonahale John Adams Kuakini (m), and Kekuaipʻia Līlia (Lydia) Nāmāhana (f) (“Mookuauhau” 8 June 1896; Kamakau Ke Kumu 79, 201). By Kalolowahilani, Keʻeaumoku sired Keakakilohi (m) (Kamakau Ke Kumu 79). As we will see, Kalolowahilani was ʻĪʻīʻs relative. Kaʻahumanu and Kaheiheimālie both became Kamehamehaʻs wives. Before this, Kaheiheimālie was the wife of Kamehamehaʻs half-brother Kalaimama, and by him she had Kekāuluohi (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 30 Jan. 1870; Kamakau Ke Kumu 75, 252). Kekāuluohi was a wife to Kamehameha and Liholiho (Ke Aupuni 190, 252). By Kamehameha, Kaheiheimālie then had Kīnaʻu, who also became Liholihoʻs wife (252). Kīnaʻu would establish a close relationship of mutual respect and affection with ʻĪʻī; she would also be the subject of his first biographical writing.

Although ʻĪʻī was poʻolua, he claimed Kuaʻena as his sire because he did not resemble Kaiwikokoʻole, suggesting that ʻĪʻī took after Kuaʻena (“Na Hunahuna” 12 Feb. 1870). ʻĪʻī offers little genealogical information for Kuaʻena. Significantly perhaps, ʻĪʻī did not name Kuaʻenaʻs
parents, noting instead his collateral kinship connections. Kuaʻena was hoahānau to Kaneiakama, whom ʻĪʻī identified as aliʻi (17 July 1869). Kuaʻena was also related to Nahiolea, a father of Mataio Kekūanāoʻa (12 June 1869), who was also poʻolua, his fathers being the aforementioned Nahiolea and Kiʻilaweau (“Kanaenae” 5 Dec. 1868). ʻĪʻī claimed a close kinship with both Nahiolea and Kiʻilaweau, implying that the former was his hoahānau and the latter was his kaikuaʻana (same-sex elder sibling or cousin) (5 Dec. 1868). Kekūanāoʻa’s and ʻĪʻī’s lives would be profoundly intertwined. They served in the royal court at the same time, and they both went on to become respected and extremely influential statesmen. ʻĪʻī would also play an important role in the lives of Kekūanāoʻa’s children. By Pauahi, Kamehameha’s granddaughter, Kekūanāoʻa sired Ruth Keʻelikōlani (another poʻolua, her second sire being Kāhalaiʻa) (Kamakau Ke Aupuni 47, 133). By Kīnaʻu, Kamehameha’s daughter, Kekūanāoʻa sired David Kamehameha, Moses Kekūaiwa (m), Lot Kapuāiwa (m), Alexander Liholiho (m), and Victoria Kamāmalu (f) (134). Alexander would become Kamehameha IV, Lot Kamehameha V, and Victoria Kamāmalu the kuhina nui.

Kuaʻena was also kaikunāne (a female’s male sibling or cousin) to the highborn Kamakahukilani Kamakaheikuli (ʻĪʻī “Kanaenae” 19 Dec. 1868, 30 Jan. 1869, “Ka Hunahuna” 12 June 1869). Kamakahukilani, Kalola, and Kalolowāhilani were the daughters of Kauhiʻaimokuakama (m) and Luʻukia (f) (Kamakau “Ka Moolelo” 30 Sept. 1865). Kauhiʻaimokuakama’s parents were Kekaulike (m) and Kahawalu (f). Luʻukia’s parents were Kainahopukahi (m) and Kauokuʻu (f). Both Kauhiʻaimokuakama and Luʻukia descended from Piʻilani, mōʻī (supreme ruler) of Maui (30 Sept. 1865).

By her uncle Kekuamanohā, Kamakahukilani had Kālimoku (m), Kahakuhaʻakoi Wahinepio Kamoʻonohu (f), and Boki Kamāʻuleʻule (m) (ʻĪʻī “Kanaenae” 19 Dec. 1868, “Na
Kekuamanohā was the son of Kekaulike (k) and Haʻaloʻu (w). Kekuamanohā was also full brother to Keʻeaumoku’s wife Nāmahana (“Mookuauhau” 8 June 1896). By Kalaimamaanā, Wahinepio had Kāhalai’a (m) (“ʻĪʻī “Hunahuna” 18 Sept. 1869). Kalaimamaanā was the son of Keoua (m) and Kamakeheikuli, and half-brother to Kamehameha (Kamakau Ke Kumu 75). By Kamehameha’s son Kīa’u, Wahinepio had Kekauʻōnohi (f) (“ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 18 Sept. 1869). Wahinepio became Kamehameha’s wife and Kekauʻōnohi became Liholiho’s. Thus, through Kuaʻena, ʻĪʻī was closely related to many extremely important members of the royal court either by blood or by marriage—most importantly, perhaps, Kālaimoku, Boki, and Kekauʻōnohi.

Through his mother, ʻĪʻī also claimed kinship with Kūihelani, whom he identified as a highborn aliʻi with many wives, attendants, and bodyguards. Kūihelani was a favorite of Kamehameha, who made him konohiki of some of his lands, and at one point, the co-governor, along with Kahānaumaikaʻi, of Oʻahu. Wanaoa took ʻĪʻī with her when she went to visit Kūihelani, her hoahānau (8, 22 Jan. 1870). Another source states that ʻĪʻī’s family was related to Kauluna’e, Nā’aiokala, and Kamo’onohu, and that by Kalanihōʻā, ʻĪʻī was a direct descendent of Kauakahiakua (“Fragment”). If so, ʻĪʻī descended from Kekaulike as well (Ahlo, Walker, and Johnson 121).

As ʻĪʻī alludes to when explaining his mother’s name, Wanaoa was high enough in rank to have some sort of kapu connected to her person. He identifies her parents as Pōaeae-wahine (f) and Kalāʻaumaloʻo (m) (12 June 1869). Pōaeae-wahine descended from the famed blind warrior ʻĪmaikalani, an expert in the art of lonomakaihe, which as we know, ʻĪʻī mastered as well (29 May, 26 June 1869). As for Kalāʻaumaloʻo, he was Luluka’s hoahānau. ʻĪʻī therefore claimed kinship with the Luluka clan, with all that implied, and no one ever seems to have
publically disputed this claim. This tie is the crucial one, because it confers the most significant character of his ali‘i status by securing his eligibility for service to Kamehameha.

ʻĪʻī states that Luluka’s descendants were numerous and all carried his name (12 June 1869). His wives were all named Keaka. By Keaka a Mulehu, an ali‘i of Maui, Luluka sired Kamahaulua’e (Maoloha’s father). By Keaka, he sired Holomaialuhe (m). And by Keaka a Akipo‘o, Luluka sired Papa ʻĪʻī (m) and ‘Ilip’eahi (f) (12 June 1869). ʻĪʻī reports that this last union produced other children, but at this point he does not name them. Perhaps they were Kalaiheana, Keawekolohe Ho‘omākaukau, Manuia, and Kamano (26 June 1869; 5 Feb. 1870). Papa called Kalaiheana ʻĪʻī’s makuakāne (father or uncle) and in Kalaiheana’s land-claim testimony for Koaopa, he identified Papa and Wanao‘a as his generation’s elders and Wanao‘a their kaikuahine (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 5 Feb. 1870; Kalaiheana and ‘Auwa‘a).

As for the illustrious Luluka, he was the son of Luahine (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 12 June 1869). Palena, Paia, and Luahine were full brothers. ʻĪʻī explains, “ua pii ka Luwahine mau mamo a i ka moo o Haloa, oia hoi, o Keakealani-kane, ka makuakane hoi o Keakamahana, a kupuna ia Keakealani-wahine” [Luwahine’s descendants traced their lineage to Hāloa through Keākealani-kāne, the father of Keakamāhana, who was Keākealaniwahine’s grandparent] (12 June 1869). In other words, Luahine was highborn, because Keākealani-kāne, the paternal grandfather of Palena, Paia, and Luahine, was a descendant of ‘Umi a Līloa (“Mookuauhau” 31 Aug. 1896). In addition, Palena, Paia, and Luahine were also “pili hoahānau ia Kauaua, Alapai, Keawe, a me Keaaumoku na kupuna o ia poe a pau” [were hoahānau to Kauaua, Alapa‘i, and Ke‘eaumoku, having the same ancestors]. Ruling ali‘i recognized Palena, Paia, and Luahine as highborn relatives (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 12 June 1869).

Given the Luluka family’s distinguished ancestry, it is natural to ask about the
circumstances that led to so many of them becoming court attendants. Luluka was kaikunāne to Keaka Kalopelekai (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 6, 27, Feb. 1869), Alapaʻi’s “wahine kapu” (sacred wife) (Kamakau Ke Kumu 11). This designation speaks to Keaka’s high status. As for Alapaʻi, he was Kamehameha’s uncle because Alapaʻi’s brother Haʻae sired Kamehameha’s mother Kekūiapoiwa II (“Mookauahau” 21 Sept. 1896). When Kamehameha was five, Alapaʻi took custody of him, making Keaka his kahu hānai (principal tutelary, foster parent) (Kamakau Ke Kumu 3). Only trustworthy family members became kahu hānai, because by virtue of their genealogies, hightborn children were not only a potential political threat to other ruling aliʻi, but also an obstacle for power-hungry lower-ranking aliʻi. Kamehameha was a poʻolua, his sires being Keoua and Kahekili, among the most powerful aliʻi of their time (Kamakau Ke Kumu 2, 166). Because Kamehameha’s rise to power was prophesied, an aliʻi named Keawemauhili suggested killing him before he became a threat: “E o u20 ka maka o ka wauke oi opi opio” [Pinch off the bud of the paper mulberry while it is young] (Desha 24 Feb. 1921). Keaka enlisted her numerous kaikunāne, and most notably Luluka, to help her care for and protect Kamehameha. They became his personal guards (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 6, 27 Feb. 1869). Despite Keaka and Luluka’s impressive lineages, then, they chose to dedicate their lives to service, raising a high-ranking chief to adulthood.

When Kamehameha was nineteen or twenty, Alapaʻi died and Kamehameha’s paternal uncle Kalaniʻōpuʻu (Keoua’s elder brother) placed him at Hōlualoa (6, 27 Feb. 1869). Keaka and her kaikunāne followed Kamehameha there, continuing to serve him. At one point Kalaniʻōpuʻu removed Kamehameha from Keaka’s care and placed him with his wife Kānekapolei at Kaʻū. But over the years, Keaka and Luluka had developed a deep affection for Kamehameha, which

20 From the context of this sentence, “o u” should read “ou” [ʻōʻū], or to “pinch off” (Pukui and Elbert).
he clearly returned, and they missed him. Keaka sent Luluka, Mulehu of Maui, and Kamahauluaʻe to check on him (27 Feb., 6 Mar. 1869). When Kamehameha saw Kamahauluaʻe, he asked about Keaka, and when Kamahauluaʻe was leaving, Kamehameha chanted, “Ike aku ia Kalopelekai / Ku la o Kalaieha i Kona” [When the gaze poses upon Kalopelekai / The fourfold quietude settles upon Kona] (27 Feb. 1869). When Keaka heard about this sign of deep affection, she declared, “Nona aku la no ia inoa” [The name and chant are now his]” (6 Mar. 1869).

Motivated by their love for Kamehameha, Keaka and Luluka sent their children to serve him, establishing a family tradition of service to this chief. Kamahauluaʻe, Kamalo, Wawae, Papa, and others pledged their lives to Kamehameha, becoming his personal attendants just as he was beginning to gain fame as a warrior (13, 27 Mar. 1869). Wherever he went, they followed and fought by his side. Between 1780 and 1796, eighteen major battles took place in the archipelago. Twelve of these were either started by Kamehameha, or were attacks upon him (Dukas 71–74). By 1795, Kamehameha was mōʻī of Hawaiʻi, Oʻahu, Maui, Lānaʻi, Molokaʻi, and Kahoʻolawe, a feat unparalleled in Hawaiian history (Kamakau Ke Kumu 74, 149, 177). In 1810, the year that ʻĪʻī began his service, Kamehameha finally gained control over Kauaʻi and Niʻihau by diplomatic means (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 30 Oct. 1869; Kuykendall 1: 50). When he moved his court to Oʻahu, he put the Luluka siblings in charge of his residence in Puaʻaliʻiliʻi in Waikīkī. Through his generosity, they prospered (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 12 June, 3 July 1869). Papa even owned his own ship, Papa (29 Jan. 1870). And their children would become the third Luluka generation to serve Kamehameha.

Between late 1796 and early 1797, Honolulu was ravaged by an epidemic known as ʻōkuʻu (a dysenteric illness) (Kamakau Ke Kumu 166). Many Luluka clan members died, including Wanaoaʻa’s husband Kamahauluaʻe and some of her children (ʻĪʻī “Hunahuna” 26 June
1869). The court therefore needed to replace the kahu lost in the epidemic, and Wanaoʻa’s offspring were eligible for service because she was a member of the Luluka clan. Partly because she had a family reputation to uphold, and partly because her children’s survival would depend on their training, she was very thorough in their education. To appreciate fully how Wanaoʻa prepared her children for the incredible opportunities and the harsh realities of life as a kahu, it will be helpful to outline the particulars of this ancient institution at the time when Kamehameha was mōʻī.

**Realities of Life as a Kahu to Highborn Aliʻi: ʻĪʻī’s Early Childhood and Education**

By 1810, the only remaining opportunities for social advancement and acquiring wealth were marriage and service. In earlier times, gaining wealth and power through war, and the resulting control over ʻāina and natural and human resources, were options. After Kamehameha elevated his personal and familial status through successful wars and strategic marriages to the point of uniting the Hawaiian Islands under his rule, he kept a tight rein over the ambitions of other aliʻi. But he continued the practice of selecting kahu, who benefited from the wealth and generosity of their aliʻi, often becoming very prosperous in their own right. Broadly speaking, the job of a kahu, or personal attendant, was to perform mundane tasks for an aliʻi, or to cater to an aliʻi’s material needs. Kahu often belonged to a junior branch of a ruling aliʻi’s family (Handy and Pukui 199), which perhaps explains why Pukui and Elbert define kahu aliʻi as a “Royal guardian in the family of a high aliʻi.” Several people might carry out the same duty, or one person could carry out several duties. Medical kāhuna like Papa cared for Kamehameha’s health, and Keawekolohe was one of the mōʻī’s executioners. But these two were also kahu hānai (kahu who raise a child) for Liholiho, a duty they shared with Kalaiheana and Manuia (ʻĪʻī “Na
Hunahuna” 26 June 1869; Kamakau Ke Kumu 200). A generation later, ʻĪʻī would himself juggle being a kahu aliʻi for several children with his many governmental duties for the mōʻī.

Although eligibility to serve was largely determined by lineage, age and skills were decisive factors when assigning duties. ʻĪʻī’s many statements about attendants suggest that young kahu usually began their service with such simple duties as caring for an aliʻi’s malo or spittoon, or fanning an aliʻi with a kāhili (feather standard). These were ʻĪʻī’s first duties for Liholiho, which he shared with Manuia (ʻĪʻī “Hunahuna” 15 Jan., 5 Feb. 1870). Kalapauahiʻole cared for Kamehameha’s spittoon, a task he shared with Papa’s son, Kalakua, who also cared for the mōʻī’s kāhili and moena (mat for sitting or sleeping), and fetched or carried whatever he needed (3 July 1869). These kahu accompanied their aliʻi wherever they went, whether to announce their arrival, carry their possessions, or run errands. ʻĪʻī’s older brother Maoloha took his father’s place as kahu for the house where Kamehameha kept his belongings (26 June 1869).

As meritorious young attendants matured, they were assigned other duties. ʻĪʻī eventually became a kahu for Kamehameha’s female war deity Kihawahine (“John Ii’s Speech”).

The life of a personal attendant was fraught with danger. Even when carrying out simple tasks, kahu needed to follow strict protocols because highborn aliʻi, their belongings, and their residence were surrounded by kapu. As ʻĪʻī notes, “They were called gods by some” (“John Ii’s Speech”), so attendants underwent rigorous training that included learning about kapu aliʻi because life depended on it. Since many kapu surrounded the aliʻi they served, kahu were constantly alert when carrying out their duties, or even walking about the court, for if they erred, the punishment would be harsh. Kahu were only truly safe when they were alone, which was not very often. Above all, kahu needed to be judicious. If for example a personal difficulty could potentially affect their ability to carry out their duties, they needed to ask for help. Young kahu
often made dangerous or even fatal mistakes, because wisdom tends to come with age and
experience. Some children, like ʻĪʻī, were lucky enough to be astute and careful, but this was not
his older brother Maoloha’s case, which proved his undoing.

ʻĪʻī’s memoirs record how important a role religion played in his education, which is not
surprising, given religion’s importance in Hawaiian society. Often referred to as the ʻAi kapu,
the state religion had been in place for centuries, permeating and regulating nearly every aspect
of the culture, and making religion and politics inseparable (Kameʻeleihiwa 23–5, 36, 80–2). The
ʻAi kapu takes its name from the idea of ʻai (food and food consumption) being kapu (sacred and
therefore in need of restriction). Kameʻeleihiwa translated ʻAi kapu as “sacred eating” (25) and
Noelani Arista as “restricted eating” (“Davida Malo” vi). From the time of his childhood, and as
an adult, ʻĪʻī was rigorous in observing the ʻAi kapu. In his autobiographical writings, he stresses
his parents’ piety, and seems to imply that their religious fervor was laudable even if it was
misdirected (10, 17 July 1869). Even before encountering the missionaries, ʻĪʻī’s own extreme
devoutness was one of his defining traits, and after he embraced Christianity, others felt his piety
bordered on the fanatical (Laplace 441). He testifies to his own childhood orthodoxy in an
account of a visit to relatives who lived on the windward side of Oʻahu (10 July 1869). While ʻĪʻī
was staying with his kaikuahine, he made sure to eat outside of her house because “he keiki
malama akua oia, a he ano haipule no hoi” [he was a devout child who honored the gods]. By
this time, ʻĪʻī had clearly undergone the kā i mua, which marked a boy’s entrance into the world
of men, and barred him from eating with women (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1: 113).

One of ʻĪʻī’s childhood duties was to procure fish at the fishponds of Puʻuʻopae. Without
fail, each time he went, his mother reminded him to set apart fish for the male and female deities
(ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 10 July 1869). When ʻĪʻī finally remembered to do this on his own,
Wanaoʻa praised him. She also told him, “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 ninaia mai ai, ua kupono no ia oe ke hai aku, ‘eia ae no’” [Be responsible for leftover food and anything else you are given to care for, and when you are asked about them, you will be able to respond, ‘Here it is’]. Because ‘Īʻī was promisingly pious, his family began sending him with kāhuna when they made offerings to the Hanaloa fishpond gods (10 July 1869). This kuleana suggests that ‘Īʻī was being inducted into this area of religious observance.

Wanaoʻa also prepared ‘Īʻī to serve at court by teaching him how to perform the kapuō to announce the kapu noho (31 July 1869). A warning cry, the kapuō is an example of how crucial a kahu’s role could be as a mediator between aliʻi and makaʻāina. The kapu noho is an aliʻi kapu that obliged “everyone to sit in the presence of a chief, or when his food container, bath water, and other articles were carried by” (Pukui and Elbert 133). The object Wanaoʻa taught ‘Īʻī to carry while performing a kapuō was a kāʻei, or “a sacred cordon, baldric, or sash” (109). The “highest symbol of authority” (109), kāʻei were priceless artifacts, carefully guarded and handed down through generations because the feathers were valuable (Brigham 3), and because kāʻei were imbued with the mana (spiritual essence or power) of aliʻi who had worn it (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1: 91).21 When ‘Īʻī saw his mother airing one out, he found it beautiful but disquieting. He described it as “he malo hulu manu, ua piliia ka hulu mamo me ka hulu apakane, a ua hakuia maluna o ka upena nae, a he pae niho kanaka ma kona poo” [a feathered loincloth of mamo and apapane feathers fixed to a net with a row of human teeth at its ends] (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 31 July 1869). Because the bones of the dead are sacred, the teeth may have belonged to vanquished enemies, since such desecration would be the ultimate insult (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1: 109).

21 See Charlot “The Feather Skirt of Nähiʻenaʻena” for a discussion on mana in connection with clothing.
This kāʻei is quite similar to the famous kāʻei kapu o Līloa preserved at the Bishop Museum (Pukui and Elbert 109). Wanaoʻa must have had the right to use this kāʻei, inherited perhaps from a deceased male relative. It is highly unlikely that any aliʻi would have given permission to use his kāʻei, and using it without such permission would have meant execution.

About this time, ‘Īʻī’s cousin Kalakua was involved in an incident that put the entire family at risk. He was suspected of having worn the mōʻī’s malo (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 3 July 1869), and during the ensuing investigation, he was kept in isolation and interrogated. The Luluka family learned that should Kalakua be found guilty, they would all be burned to death for the crime of a single member. For this reason, they were rounded up—men, women, and children—like prisoners and brought to Lualualei in Waiʻanae. Meanwhile, the entire royal family left Honolulu via canoe for Waiʻanae, except for Liholiho, who went by foot, stopping at Kūmelewai for the night. ʻĪʻī was sent to inform the tenants of their land to supply and prepare the fish, dog, poi, and coverings needed for the travelers. Once in Waiʻanae, the Luluka family waited for eight days before they learned their fate. Happily, Kalakua was absolved of the crime. It turned out that Kalakua’s malo was similar in pattern to one of Kamehameha’s. ʻĪʻī concludes by saying, “Pela ka hookuuia ana o ka ohana o Luluka i ka make mainino, a no ia mea, ua kapa ae kekahi o lakou i na keiki i loaa ia lakou mahope mai, o Lualualei ka inoa” [Thus the Luluka family was spared from an abominable death, and because of it, some of them named the child they had afterward Lualualei] (3 July 1869).

Sometimes, however, the family was not so lucky. ʻĪʻī’s older brother Maoloha began serving at court as a boy, and by the repeated use of the descriptor keiki for him, ʻĪʻī indicates

---

22 ‘Īʻī was not yet a kahu for Liholiho (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 3 July 1869). Shortly after this incident, ʻĪʻī explains, his mother began taking him to the court.
that his brother was still very young when he died in 1807 (26 June 1869). Maoloha was
strangled for taking Kamehameha’s pūkeawe lei from the storage house, and trading it with a
peddler for food. Caring for an ali‘i’s personal belongings was a very important duty for reasons
that went far beyond simply keeping them clean and safe. Because clothing and lei were assumed
to absorb their owner’s mana, death-dealing practitioners used such objects as maunu (bait) to
harm their owner (Pukui and Elbert 243; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1: 19, 28; 2: 17). Trading the
mō‘ī’s lei for food was therefore doubly egregious. It was thievery, and the lei could have been
used to harm the mō‘ī.

Ka‘ahumanu discovered the theft when she spied the peddler wearing the pūkiawe lei she
recognized as her husband’s (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 26 June 1869). Others must have been present
when Kamehameha spoke with Maoloha about the theft, because someone told ʻĪʻī enough for
him to describe this conversation in detail. But using some degree of creative license, ʻĪʻī also
speculated that Kamehameha was deeply troubled when he asked Maoloha about Papa’s
whereabouts, and discovered that he was away from court at that moment. ʻĪʻī believed that Papa
could have saved Maoloha: “Aka, aole nae i ike ia ko ke ’lii manao no ia mea, aka, pela no nae i
ka nana aku” [Although the ali‘i’s thoughts on that subject remain unknown, it was probably so]
(26 June 1869). Despite his affection for Keaka and Luluka, Maoloha’s grandaunt and
grandfather, and even though Kamahauluaʻe and Papa ʻĪʻī, Maoloha’s father and uncle, had
faithfully served Kamehameha since they were all boys, in the end, Kamehameha ordered his
executioners to kill Maoloha. Another layer of pathos marks this tragedy. Because Keawekolohe
was one of the mō‘ī’s executioners, he had to strangle his nephew, or forfeit his own life for

23 “The black-eyed Susan (Abrus precatorius)” whose “small round red and black seeds” were “used for
leis, rosaries, and costume jewelry” (Pukui and Elbert 351–2).
refusing to carry out the mō‘ī’s command. Such were the perils of serving high-ranking ali‘i. Not even children were exempt from execution if they broke a fatal kapu, and an entire family could potentially be punished for the mistakes of its young members.

Papa was grief-stricken when he learned of his nephew’s death (26 June 1869). As for his mother, Wanao‘a, she sent her seven-year-old son ‘Ī‘ī and his older sister Ke ʻimo lā‘au to where the executioners had buried Maoloha’s corpse. And so they made the long journey from Kūmelewai to Pāwa‘a—the first time ‘Ī‘ī visited Honolulu, and which under different circumstances would have been exciting. After viewing their brother’s final resting place, they returned home. Years later, ‘Ī‘ī asked for and received land in Pāwa‘a (Native Register 5: 512); it is only natural to wonder if this lot held his brother’s remains. Maoloha’s death understandably traumatized ‘Ī‘ī, and in his later writings he refers to him frequently (12, 26 June, 3 July, 27 Nov., 4 Dec. 1869, 9 Oct. 1870). And equally understandably, ‘Ī‘ī’s parents used Maoloha’s fate as a cautionary tale about the dangers of life at court. Knowing all too well the consequences of violating a kapu ali‘i, they constantly stressed the importance of what they were teaching ‘Ī‘ī for his very survival. When he was nine, he asked his mother why she was sending him to where he might meet the same fate as his brother. Her answer offers ‘Ī‘ī crucial insight into the role and nature of the kahu. Wanao‘a explained that although he came from her body, he belonged to their ali‘i, and that their family’s prosperity depended on service to the chiefs. She then told him that he was ready because he had so internalized his lessons that he could teach himself once he was at court (3 July 1869).

To survive his service, ‘Ī‘ī would have to be a good judge of character, because petty jealousies, animosity, ambition, and even cowardice created dangerous situations at court. ‘Ī‘ī recalled that his parents frequently contemplated and discussed human nature in both deeply
philosophical and practical terms, and that they advised him to do the same, for it would bring
wisdom. One of the most important lessons Wanao‘a taught ʻĪ‘ī was the value of patience and
tolerance. After returning from a visit to Kaneiakama, ʻĪ‘ī told Wanao‘a that he and his playmate
had been bullied, and that if the bullies ever came to Kūmelewai, he would get his revenge (17
July 1869). His mother advised him to imitate Papa’s tolerance towards others, because it would
serve him well once he was living at court. Wanao‘a was undeniably teaching ʻĪ‘ī forgiveness
and humility, but she was also speaking to the reality of being an attendant. Should revenge
backfire, it could have dire consequences. ʻĪ‘ī thought deeply about her advice, and put aside his
thoughts of vengeance. His next visit with Kaneiakama went better. This time, his aunt and uncle
were on the Nānākuli side of the Wai‘anae district, fulfilling one of their duties by overseeing the
fishing there. ʻĪ‘ī happened upon a group of children, sitting on the branches of breadfruit trees
like birds and chanting in perfect unison, though in a manner unfamiliar to him. Because of the
prolonged quavering of their voices, he struggled to make out the words of the chant, and when
he tried to make his own voice sound like theirs he was unsuccessful, until he imitated a boy who
tapped his throat with two fingers (17 July 1869).

ʻĪ‘ī’s recollections reveal a childhood that was far from carefree. This account of the
children in the trees is one of the few times he seems to be relatively unworried, and even
enjoying himself. Given the path lying before him, ʻĪ‘ī’s childhood was one long lesson on how
to survive his impending service as a kahu ali‘i. During his next visit to Kaneiakama, he learned
that Kālaimoku’s wife, Kūwahine, had run away with Kuakini, and that Kamehameha had given
Kālaimoku permission to set fire to every house owned by ali‘i until Kuakini returned her, or her
whereabouts were discovered (ʻĪ‘ī “Na Hunahuna” 17 July 1869; Kamakau *Ke Kumu* 177–8).
Becoming extremely anxious, ʻĪ‘ī asked to return to Kūmelewai immediately to see if his
parents’ home had been destroyed. Though relieved to discover that his parents and their home were unharmed, his reaction suggests he was justifiably traumatized by such earlier experiences as the Kalakua incident and Maoloha’s death. Terrible things could suddenly happen. On another occasion, ʻĪʻī went to Honolulu with his attendants Mela and Kiwalaʻō (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 10 July 1869). That ʻĪʻī had his own servants suggests something about his parents’ prosperity. They could afford help. At some point, ʻĪʻī became tired and insisted that his kahu carry him. They refused because their backs were loaded with supplies, and when ʻĪʻī began crying and would not stop, his kahu tried to scare him into silence by pointing out two white foreigners, and telling him that haole did not like crying children. (As ʻĪʻī would later explain, country children like him were wary of haole.) This trip was clearly a formative one for him. Though he would remember and critique his attendants’ methods, he also would admit that children can be stubborn, and years later, when he himself became a kahu for many royal children, he would treat them carefully, and though strict, he was also affectionate. ʻĪʻī would also get over his fear of haole.

The following year, ʻĪʻī had his first real encounter with his uncle Papa, when helping his own kahu deliver thatching materials for Papa’s medicinal heiau houses (24 July 1869). (Though ʻĪʻī’s parents had lived at court for a time, because he had been so young, he would not have remembered his uncle (3 July 1869). ʻĪʻī must have resembled his parents, because when Papa saw him, he suspected that he was his nephew. Papa spoke with ʻĪʻī’s kahu and arranged to meet the boy. While the houses were being thatched, Papa and ʻĪʻī passed the time talking—an important conversation, because Papa would have known of Wanaoʻa’s plans for ʻĪʻī, and although the boy was genealogically eligible to serve in court, Wanaoʻa knew that he would need a sponsor. So Papa would have been weighing ʻĪʻī’s suitability for service.

Papa must have found him promising, because Wanaoʻa began taking ʻĪʻī on frequent,
protracted visits to the court. They stayed with Papa and the two boys living with him, Manuia and Kaniukahi. These three were required to spend time with Liholiho (24 July 1869). Born in November of 1797 (Kamakau *Ke Kumu* 200), the future mōʻī was two to three years older than ‘Ī‘ī, so it made sense that he would become one of Liholiho’s playmates. Unfortunately, Liholiho seemed to enjoy making the boys miserable. Whenever he found them sitting closely, he slammed their heads together. Liholiho knew they could not retaliate without forfeiting their lives, and ‘Ī‘ī also knew this, and that therefore the only way he could escape Liholiho’s bullying was to avoid him. Infuriated by this, Liholiho got his revenge. During their visits to court, Wanao’a made sure that ‘Ī‘ī participated in the military training schools that Kamehameha had created for his warriors and attendants (‘Ī‘ī “Na Hunahuna” 24 July 1869). During one visit, there was to be a gun drill, but the field first needed to be covered with grass—a duty that fell to the women at court, regardless of rank. ‘Ī‘ī and his kaikūahine went to gather grass at Kawaiahaʻo. While ‘Ī‘ī was playing there, Liholiho waylaid him and beat him for such a long time that ‘Ī‘ī passed out. Liholiho only stopped when his kahu told him that beating a boy who might serve him was unwise if he wanted the boy to support him when they became adults. When ‘Ī‘ī came to, he was alone. Assuming that he had returned with someone else, his kaikūahine had gone home without him, ‘Ī‘ī lay there until the pain waned enough for him to walk. Slowly, he made his way back to court, where he hid in Papa’s workhouse until Liholiho’s kahu came to tell Papa about the beating. No measures were ever taken. ‘Ī‘ī never said a word about the beating because he had fully internalized what his mother had taught him. He needed to be patient, and so he was (24 July 1869).

Once ‘Ī‘ī had recovered, he reassumed his training. One exercise ‘Ī‘ī found spine chilling was the lonomakaihe, because the two teams had to throw spears at each other (31 July 1869).
Only aliʻi learned lonomakaihe (Fornander 6: 146), and Kamehameha’s skills were legendary, having learned from Kekūhaupiʻo, whose talents bordered on the superhuman (Fornander 5: 452, 470; Desha 26 Jan. 1922). Eventually, ‘Īʻī mastered this art of throwing and parrying spears. Quick reflexes, fearlessness, and maintaining focus in the midst of chaos were essential, and as I have suggested, as a statesman, ‘Īʻī would draw upon these honed skills when the government he served faced one crisis after another.

At some point, Papa decided ‘Īʻī was physically and intellectually mature enough to serve, so the next time ‘Īʻī came to court, Papa asked him, “O Kamokupanee, a o Lualewa, owai kau mea makemake o laua i kou manao?” [Kamokupaneʻe and Lualewa, whom do you prefer?]. Because ‘Īʻī did not understand the question, someone explained it to him: “O Kamokupaneʻe, oia ke ‘Lii makua, a o Lualewa, oia ke ‘Lii opio” [Kamokupaneʻe is the senior aliʻi, and Lualewa is the junior aliʻi]. Because Liholiho was actually present, ‘Īʻī felt uncomfortable stating his preference. He began by underlining that the elder aliʻi was the prosperous aliʻi while the younger was not, but then said “Me Lualewa no hoi paha wau” [Perhaps I will choose Lualewa]. When Papa then stressed Liholiho’s lack of wealth, ‘Īʻī replied “O ka hoolohe no hoi paha ka pono o ke aliʻi waiwai ole, i waiwai ai no hoi, alaila, waiwai pu no hoi me ke kanaka” [Perhaps being under the command of an aliʻi who lacks wealth is best, because when he becomes affluent, his servants will prosper]. Everyone, including Liholiho, approved of this reasoning, and when Wanaʻa heard about this conversation, she rejoiced at ‘Īʻī’s reply, because he had subtly imparted a lesson to Liholiho about kuleana (31 July 1869). ‘Īʻī had managed simultaneously to declare his faith in Liholiho’s potential, to make his own commitment to serving him faithfully, and to remind Liholiho of his own responsibilities towards his attendants.

Papa’s questions are examples of the political strategies and personal agency a senior
kahuna and kahu could wield to influence someone’s destiny. Papa’s own success suggests that he was an excellent judge of human nature and a talented politician. Note how he limited ‘Ī‘ī’s choices of service to Kamehameha or Liholiho—the mō‘ī and the mō‘ī’s heir. But the boy himself showed some cleverness as well. Although he gave a diplomatic and impressive reason for choosing Liholiho over Kamehameha, there had to be more to his decision. ‘Ī‘ī had been abused by Liholiho. Why would he choose him? Because service as a kahu was normally a lifelong career, here we see an instance of ‘Ī‘ī’s maturity and far-sighted intelligence. Despite the bullying, as a young boy ‘Ī‘ī knew that serving the potential heir was the better choice. He also clearly believed that he could gain Liholiho’s favor, trust, and affection. Just as Papa and other members of the court closely observed ‘Ī‘ī to weigh his potential, then, ‘Ī‘ī was studying the members of the royal household, since he knew that he might someday become their attendant.

A few days after his test, Kalaiheana informed Wana‘a that ‘Ī‘ī was to begin his service immediately (31 July 1869). Though he knew this day would come, he was understandably anxious, and especially concerned that his parents would no longer be a part of his life. In fact, Wana‘a confirmed these fears, telling him that Liholiho would now be his parent, providing him food, clothing, and everything else he would need. When his mother bid him goodbye, then, responsibility for ‘Ī‘ī’s life passed from his parents to Liholiho—who was barely older than he was. As ‘Ī‘ī made his way to the court, he rehearsed the rules his parents had taught him. Clearly cautious, long before he reached the compound, he removed all of his clothing except for his malo—the proper protocol when encountering high-ranking ali‘i. He went to the house of Liholiho’s food steward, where he found his ali‘i and the other attendants expecting his arrival. He waited for an invitation to enter and then sat stiffly by the fire pit with his bundle of
clothing—a newcomer, unsure of his place. But the other aliʻi and their kahu were kind to him, and when Liholiho finished eating, ʻĪʻī followed him. A life of service had begun.

To live in Liholiho’s presence meant living enmeshed in protocol. As ʻĪʻī later explained, “When I was about to take hold of any thing belonging to the mōʻī, his kapa, his spit-box, or his kahili, I prepared first my own person, by throwing off every thing except the malo; I could wear no kapa whatever; it was strictly forbidden; then I took hold. I dare not attend to any concern of my own while waiting on the” (“John Ii’s Speech”). Whenever Liholiho ate, a lelea prayer was given, and his kahu were required to sit immobile, with their knees tightly joined, until the prayer and the meal were finished (“Na Hunahuna” 7 Aug. 1869). Attendants needed to monitor constantly their surroundings and the space between them and their aliʻi. Because Liholiho was a kuapala, his back was kapu, so when following him, ʻĪʻī had to walk off to one side (“Na Hunahuna” 7 Aug. 1869; “John Ii’s Speech”). Because the sacredness of Liholiho’s person extended to his shadow, ʻĪʻī had to gauge his distance from it so that he neither stepped into it nor let his own shadow merge with it. If a candle was lit in Liholiho’s quarters, ʻĪʻī had to enter on his hands and knees lest his shadow touch Liholiho. This kapu even extended to the shadow of Liholiho’s residence (“Na Hunahuna” 7 Aug. 1869; “John Ii’s Speech”).

ʻĪʻī’s martial art training continued, as one of twenty-three youths selected to spend three months learning lua in a school that Kamehameha established (“Na Hunahuna” 16 Oct. 1869). Lua practitioners acquire a thorough knowledge of human anatomy, which they use to break or dislocate bones, and inflict pain on sensitive areas to incapacitate or kill (Pukui and Elbert 213). That ʻĪʻī was chosen to undergo lua training suggests he was also destined to be Liholiho’s bodyguard, should the need arise. ʻĪʻī would later use these skills to protect an aliʻi and a few foreigners. Martial art training also insured that attendants could discharge anger and other
negative emotions in a court-approved way (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1: 234–5). A young haole took up residence in Papa’s home, and because this youth was fluent in Hawaiian and had an engaging personality, he was made Liholiho’s companion (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 14 Aug. 1869). This was Jean Rives, whom Liholiho named Luahine (Kamakau Ke Kumu 108). When Rives began teaching Liholiho the English alphabet, ʻĪʻī, Manuia, and Kaniukahi were chosen to learn as well. This selection suggests that they had intellectual promise and were being groomed to serve Liholiho in other capacities, including perhaps dealing with foreigners. ʻĪʻī for instance would later be chosen as his liaison to missionaries. But Rives’ students struggled, and he stopped teaching them after only a few weeks (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 14 Aug. 1869). ʻĪʻī never became fluent in English (Laplace 441; ʻĪʻī Letter to Kekūanao’a, Letter to Ten Eyck; A. Cooke 8: 37–8; Anderson 194).

ʻĪʻī’s memoirs suggest that highborn aliʻi realized that serving them was could be onerous. Furthermore, an overworked kahu was more likely to break the kapu, which could lead to death. Because of the way Hawaiian society was organized, aliʻi depended on the service of many people. It was therefore in the aliʻis’ best interests to make sure their attendants thrived, which included regularly giving them breaks from their duties. ʻĪʻī passed his free time in different ways. He enjoyed exploring Honolulu, and he liked talking to foreigners, seeking them out on his walks. He especially liked the waterfront, because ships fascinated ʻĪʻī. He spent hours watching construction and repairs, and often snuck aboard vessels, always being careful to avoid being discovered. One day, he would actually become a ship captain (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 7 Aug. 1869). Though he clearly enjoyed his own company, thanks to a spirit of adventure and a sense of wonder, he also made friends at court. Every evening, they played on the coconut-tree swing ʻĪʻī had made behind Papa’s house. To regulate the amount of time spent on the swing, he
devised a chanting competition. The young attendant with the most pleasing chant stayed on longer (25 Dec. 1869).

But the lives of young kahu were clearly different from the childhoods of those who grew up outside the court, because of the constant risk of death. These kahu had to be observant, quick thinking, yet patient. A good memory was essential. If they lacked these qualities when they arrived, they either quickly acquired them, left service, or died. ʻĪʻī recalls two near-death experiences during his early service. His first brush involved Liholiho’s spitoon. Because it was the depository for a chief’s spittle, which was sacred, the spitoon was considered an extension of his person. And like other bodily wastes, the spittle needed to be disposed of secretly, lest it become maunu. One day, when ʻĪʻī was carrying the spitoon, its cover slipped off, struck his knee, and flew in front of him. Somehow he managed to catch it (9 Oct. 1869). Had it fallen, he would have been killed like his brother Maoloha, and ʻĪʻī recalls how everyone’s gaze crawled over him as they discussed his escape from death. The second time ʻĪʻī came close to death was when he broke the kapu of absolute silence during a solemn ceremony Papa was performing in the medicinal heiau. Papa had warned ʻĪʻī to stay away, but he hid in a nearby house to watch. Shortly after the kapu of silence was started, ʻĪʻī’s throat began to itch. Although he nearly strangled himself trying to suppress the cough that threatened to erupt, nature ultimately took its course, and much to his dismay and the alarm of those with him, he coughed a few times. Fortunately, no one besides his companions heard; equally fortunately, they did not betray him (9 Oct. 1869).

In 1812, when ʻĪʻī was about twelve, he faced another huge change in his life. Kamehameha decided to relocate the royal court to Hawai‘i (15 Jan. 1870). ʻĪʻī’s account of this exodus, which took several months to accomplish, unfolds over four installments of his series
ʻĪʻī and Manuia were chosen to accompany Liholiho on the canoe carrying Kamehameha’s war god Kūkā‘ilimoku, which they did until Hanauma Bay (O‘ahu). But Papa then decided they should sail to Hawai‘i on his ship, while he went in the canoe with the war god (15, 29 Jan. 1870). Determined to attend his son, Kua‘ena was in one of the other canoes, but Wanao‘a would remain on O‘ahu. (ʻĪʻī never explains why only his father went to Hawai‘i with him.) Understandably sad to leave his mother (29 Jan. 1870), as the preparations dragged out at Hanauma Bay, he felt an overwhelming desire to see her one last time (15 Jan. 1870). He convinced Manuia to go with him to Papa’s home in Kaaaoapa, but they did not tell Liholiho. When Wanao‘a saw them, she immediately scolded them for leaving their ali‘i, but they convinced her to let them stay, and so they passed the day with her. Wanao‘a then returned with ʻĪʻī (15 Jan. 1870), and after speaking with Keawekolohe, a ship overseer, she had the items she had prepared for his journey put aboard Papa’s ship (29 Jan. 1870).

Among those gathered to see ʻĪʻī off from Hanauma were his former kahu and playmates.

The afternoon before ʻĪʻī was to board the ship, a friend gave him two glasses of ti-root liquor.

Intoxicated, ʻĪʻī was inspired to chant, and his mother joined him:

Hiki melemele ka opua i ke kai [Cloud billows turn yellow over the sea],
He kai kuehu lani na ka malie [A tranquil sea reflects the reddish sky],
Ua kaka ulae holo a ka lai [Lizardfish fishers went forth in the calm],
Ikea kaele ike [So many were seen, were seen],
He aka mauli lani no luna [An inky sky above casts shadows],
He hauli no na kuahiwi [Cloaking mountain summits in darkness],
He pane lae no na mauna [Shrouding mountain headlands],
Ke hele nei i kuu maka [Moving before my eyes],

(15, 22, 29 Jan., 5 Feb. 1870).
Ua aa me he oloa la [Glowing like fine white tapa],
Kulu iho nei au i ka po [I become drowsy as night descends],
Lulumi ana ka hiamoe [Sleep rushes in to overwhelm me],
Hoala mai ana iaʻu ke koekoe maka huihui [Chilly dampness rouses me],
Make i ke anu, make i ke anu o Kawanui [Chilled, chilled by the cold of Kawanui],
I na hau lumai waa o na Maihi [By the canoe-dousing wind of the Maihi],
O ka uka wale i Hainoa—la [Shoreward in Hainoa—oh]. (29 Jan. 1870)

This chant’s poetic invocation of the dusk slowly descending, bringing with it a night-induced languor, can be read as both a tribute to leaving his family and friends, and an allusion to his intoxicated state. When that chant ended, ʻĪ‘ī offered five or six more, because he was an expert in chanting, having learned it from his mother. ʻĪ‘ī reported that this valued art was common among aliʻi, who could spend an entire night this way. As for himself, during his visits to court before entering service, his mother often had brought ʻĪ‘ī and his sisters to chant for and with the aliʻi wahine, including Kaʻahumanu. Years later, ʻĪ‘ī would spend an entire day and evening chanting over the corpse of a beloved aliʻi he had raised. ʻĪ‘ī’s kahu also chanted in praise of him, and after kissing his family and friends goodbye the next day, as he boarded the ship, they all chanted his name chants, which he says was an appropriate way to express sadness when parting (29 Jan. 1870). Judging from how many people came to see him off, ʻĪ‘ī was deeply loved—but a kahu belongs to his aliʻi. In his reminiscences, this scene contains the last mention of his mother.
ʻĪʻī’s Transition from Childhood to Adulthood

This was presumably ʻĪʻī’s first trip to Hawai‘i Island, because off the coast of Kaʻelehuluhulu, he mistook the lava plains glistening beneath the noonday sun for flowing water. As the ship neared the shore, ʻĪʻī also spied two women who seemed to be standing very near to the wall of Kiʻope heiau, which disturbed him due to his familiarity with heiau protocol (5 Feb. 1870). He soon learned that the proximity was an optical illusion, caused by the ship’s position in relation to the coastline. In fact, these women were Papa’s kaikuahine Kaʻiliponi and Kamakaheikuli, who soon arrived shipside in a canoe, and informed everyone that Papa was very ill, and offered to take his relatives to him. This news was significant for ʻĪʻī. Papa was not only his uncle, but his sponsor and protector. Kaʻiliponi and Kamakaheikuli left ʻĪʻī outside of the mua (the house where men ate). ʻĪʻī’s relative Kūʻike then invited him in, where he saw Papa lying on his back, with only a few men for company. Kūʻike announced his arrival, and as ʻĪʻī sat down by his uncle, Papa turned his head for a kiss. Papa asked the whereabouts of Kuaʻena, which confused and worried ʻĪʻī, because his father should have already arrived with the canoe fleet. Papa then advised ʻĪʻī that service meant conducting himself properly and obeying instructions: “E malama oe i na ʻlii a kaua a me na ʻlii a pau, no ka mea, na kaua wale no ia poe alii” [Care for our aliʻi and for all the aliʻi for they are ours alone]. After spending the night there, the next day ʻĪʻī followed Papa’s instructions, and went to stay with Kalaiheana. In this way, responsibility for his life was transferred. His personal state of mind was troubled. After kissing Papa goodbye, he left the mua in tears.

A few days later, Kuaʻena finally arrived. ʻĪʻī was relieved to know he was alive and happy to be reunited with him. Kamehameha then decided that the court would leave Kailua-Kona and sail for Kahaluʻu on the canoes that had just landed. ʻĪʻī was to go with Liholiho, and
Kua’ena accompanied them, but returned to Kailua-Kona shortly afterward, after seeing his son settled in with his ali‘i. What happened next suggests that despite ‘Īʻī’s agreement to serve Liholiho, he was not quite ready to fully uphold his promise. He wanted to remain with his father a while longer. Because Liholiho was not yet settled in, Kua’ena and Kalaiheana had received permission to return to Honua‘ula until further notice. ‘Īʻī was stubborn, even in his youth, and he also knew how the court worked. He therefore convinced Kua’ena and Kalaiheana to let him leave with them. When they objected, he reminded them that they had received permission to return to Honua‘ula. ‘Īʻī’s persuasive argument convinced them. Apparently, ‘Īʻī also received permission from Liholiho to leave.

The court had landed at Kailua-Kona during a famine, which is perhaps why the court left for Kahalu‘u. Those who remained in Kailua-Kona experienced great difficulty. Kalaiheana, Kua’ena, and ‘Īʻī were fortunate enough to be invited to stay with Keopu, a native of that place. Luckily for ‘Īʻī, his po‘olua Kaiwikoko‘ole was also one of Kamehameha’s farmers in charge of large farmlands at Kuahewa, upland of Kailua-Kona. These farmers were ali‘i who had the honor of eating in mōʻī’s presence, and in response to the famine, these farmers were retrieving dried fish and vegetable food from the mōʻī’s storehouses in Kailua-Kona, which is how Kaiwikoko‘ole ran into ‘Īʻī. Kaiwikoko‘ole asked Kua‘ena and Kalaiheana permission to take ‘Īʻī to stay with him, where he escaped the worst of the famine (12 Feb 1870). While living with his po‘o lua, ‘Īʻī learned to farm, which added foresight and patience to his work ethic. One day, Kalaiheana sent Kalaikāne (Wanao‘a’s younger hoahānau who had been named after her; 3 July 1869) to tell him that Papa was dying. ‘Īʻī arrived in time to bid him farewell.

Kamehameha eventually settled the royal court at Kamakahonu, where he ordered the construction of the Ahu‘ena heiau (19, 26 Feb. 1870). Liholiho’s residence was at Papa‘ula in
Honua‘ula (5 Mar. 1870), at the opposite end of Kaiakekua (known today as Kailua Bay) in Kailua-Kona. The mō‘ī began preparing Liholiho for the day he would succeed him. Every evening, Liholiho joined his father and his councilors Kalaikauhulu, Nāhili, Heleino, Kaioea, and Keaweopu at the ‘Ili-mai‘a house in Ahu‘ena compound to discuss kingdom business (5, 26 Mar. 1870). ‘Īʻī carried Liholiho’s belongings, which he left with Kamehameha. He then he waited outside until he was needed again (5 Mar. 1870). His later account suggests that he was within hearing distance, because he shares a few lines of a prayer said during these meetings as an example of many others. ‘Īʻī also reports that this council revisited the reigns of earlier aliʻi. In this way, Liholiho learned the consequences of abusing aliʻi, commoners, fishers, and farmers by seizing the fruits of their hard labor (26 Mar. 1870). ‘Īʻī’s constant proximity to Liholiho therefore seems to have also granted him access to the highest levels of governance—knowledge that was preparing ‘Īʻī for his own later career as a councilor and judge.

During the lunar phases Hilo and Kāne, Liholiho presided over the Hikiau heiau rites to safeguard the land—one of his duties as heir. ‘Īʻī accompanied him in the canoe to carry his belongings—the only kahu to do so: “Elua mea noho wale o luna o ua mau waa nei, aohe hoe, oia no ka Hooilina Moi a me ka mea nana e paa ana na mea pili i ke ’Lii opio” [Only two persons did not paddle, the Heir and the one who carried the belongings of the young Aliʻi] (26 Mar. 1870). ‘Īʻī may have also heard or seen these kapu-imbued rituals, and when he himself later became kahu for Kihawahine, he would have been trained to participate in the solemn ceremonies pertaining to female war deities described in his series (“John Ii’s Speech”; “Na Hunahuna” 4, 18 Sept. 1869).

Meanwhile, ‘Īʻī’s relative Kekūanāo’a was serving Kamehameha at Kamakahonu as his messenger and food keeper. Kekūanāo’a was apparently thrifty to the point of being stingy. One
day, Liholiho sent ʻĪʻī to get poi\textsuperscript{24} from the mōʻī (“Kanaenae” 5 Dec. 1868). When ʻĪʻī asked Kekūanāoʻa for food, he said there was none, and told him to ask Kamehameha. Because the court had moved to Hawaiʻi Island sometime in 1813, and the mōʻī died in 1819, ʻĪʻī would have been between thirteen and eighteen years old, while Kekūanāoʻa would have been between twenty-three and twenty-seven (Kamakau Ke Kumu 193). ʻĪʻī then did ask Kamehameha. The mōʻī ordered a servant to bring poi, and when he returned with a covered wooden bowl, Kamehameha lifted its lid to peer inside. ʻĪʻī then could see that it was only half-full. Kamehameha declared, “o kahi ai kupono keia i ke ʻLii la” [this is sufficient food for this Aliʻi]. ʻĪʻī replied, “Alii kanaka ole no ka paha keia” [This is perhaps for an Aliʻi without servants]. The mōʻī said, “Ua ʻike aku la auanei kaua ia kanaka” [You and I have seen that servant]. ʻĪʻī responded, “Ae ka hoi” [Yes indeed]. ʻĪʻī ends this account by suggesting that Kekūanāoʻa had possibly been imitating the mōʻī’s stinginess (5 Dec. 1868). This encounter tells us something about ʻĪʻī’s personality, and about how he navigated the parameters of what little agency he possessed as an adolescent kahu. ʻĪʻī not only remembered this encounter for the rest of his life, but recorded it in his memoirs. His response to Kamehameha was a reminder that aliʻi were responsible for feeding and clothing their attendants in return for their service, and that therefore, he should give enough food to feed Liholiho and his kahu. An apparently amused Kamehameha recognized how ʻĪʻī was stopping just short of being impertinent, while making an important point.

About 1817, ʻĪʻī also accompanied Liholiho to visit Hale o Keawe, or Kāikialealea, a

\textsuperscript{24} ʻĪʻī wrote “ai” [‘ai], which Pukui translated as “food (poi)” (“An Expression” 1). Pukui explains, “Food, or food plant, especially vegetable food as distinguished from ʻiʻa, meat or fleshy food; often ‘ai refers specifically to poi” (Pukui and Elbert 9).
place for the bones of aliʻi who had died in war, and also a puʻuhonua, one of many places where ʻŌiwi could seek refuge when they committed crimes (5, 12 June 1869). It was, in short, a sacred space. This was not ʻĪʻī and Liholiho’s first trip there, but this time Kuaʻena accompanied them, and revealed to ʻĪʻī that an ancestor’s bones were kept there. By the time ʻĪʻī entered adulthood, then, he had become familiar with a remarkable range of cultural sites, practices, and beliefs. He knew a great deal about the different kinds of kahuna and their rituals: “According to the number and offices of the priests so was the number of the deadly kapus, by which men were killed” (“John Ii’s Speech”). He had also witnessed such killings. Around 1818, he later recalled, “I saw three men (Keahi, Kekuanai, and Kane) sacrificed at Hikiau, at Kealakekua at Kona, Hawaii; one for putting on the chief’s maro, another for eating what was sacred, and the third for going out of a kapu house and entering one that was not kapu” (“John Ii’s Speech”). As his later detailed accounts of traditional religion suggest, ʻĪʻī acquired knowledge about worship practices, ceremonies, ritual-related kapu, and punishments at an early age. It would have not been surprising if he had eventually ended up as a very prominent figure in Hawaiian religious observance.

But the kapu system, with everything that implied, was about to end.

The Death of Kamehameha, and the Arrival of the Missionaries

Kamehameha died on May 8, 1819, and Liholiho was declared Mōʻī Kamehameha II (Kamakau Ke Kumu 199). He was twenty-one and a half years old; ʻĪʻī was three months short of nineteen. Kaʻahumanu became Liholiho’s kuhina nui, which can be understood as co-regent. Kālimoku became war general (198). Before he died, Kamehameha had determined that his favorite nephew Kaʻoākekuaokalani would have custody of the powerful war god Kūkāʻīlimoku
(191). Because of the god’s role in gaining and keeping political power (191), ruling the kingdom and caring for Kūkā‘ilimoku were complementary duties—an example of how religion and politics intertwined in the ‘Ai kapu system. But shortly after Liholiho’s ascension, Ka‘ahumanu and Keōpūolani, respectively his hānai mother and his biological mother, urged him to abolish the ‘Ai kapu (Kamakau Ke Kumu 192–4, 207, 209-11; Desha 477-499). These ali‘i wāhine (women of chiefly genealogies) were essentially asking Liholiho to deny the entire pantheon of Hawaiian gods, which would affect those highborn ali‘i who were their descendants, and therefore, divine humans. Ka‘ahumanu’s and Keōpūolani’s desire to end the kapu system has puzzled historians. Samuel Kamakau called this decision “kupanaha [astonishing] and “hiwahiwa lua ‘ole” [unparalleled] (Ke Kumu 206). Kekuaokalani urged Liholiho to ignore their request (209–210). Liholiho wavered, but eventually granted the petition (211). Don Francisco de Paula Marin reported that on November 7, 1819 “all the woman ate pork and they burnt all the churches on the island” (qtd. in Gast 234). As the new mō‘ī’s attendant, ʻĪʻī would have been present when Liholiho sat down to eat with the ali‘i wāhine. ʻĪʻī did not approve: “When Liholiho began to break up the kapus, and men and women began to eat together, I had great abhorrence of his conduct, and even wept aloud in his presence, saying to him, ‘We must forsake this work

25 Giving proper attention to the significance of the ‘Ai kapu and the ‘Ai noa would take me far away from my dissertation’s scope, which is ʻĪʻī’s life. Their import has however received much scholarly attention. The religious, social, and political importance of the kapu system underpins Kamakau’s work on Hawaiian history and culture (Ke Kumu Aupuni). An important monograph is The Polynesian Family System in Ka‘u, Hawai‘i by Craighill Handy and Pukui. For missionary commentary on the abolition of the kapu system, see Bingham (77–9). For a discussion of the mythical origins of the ‘Ai kapu, hypotheses on the reasons of the ali‘i wāhine for wanting to abolish it, and the importance of the ‘Ai kapu in relation to governance and land, see Kame‘elehiwa (23–85).
at once, or god [sic - the gods] will be angry at us” (“John Ii’s Speech”).

ʻĪʻī was devout, and understandably distressed. But the decision infuriated Kekuaokalani, and he rebelled (Kamakau *Ke Kumu* 211–4). Keōpūolani commanded Kālaimoku to wage war against Kekuaokalani (215). The decisive battle took place at Kuamoʻo on Hawaiʻi Island; the rebels lost and Kekuaokalani was killed (216). No historical documentation indicates that Liholiho or ʻĪʻī participated. The abolition of the ʻAi kapu included destroying religion-related structures and objects throughout of the Islands (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 3 Apr. 1869; Thurston 27–8). Those diehard believers who refused to abandon the gods were punished. A kahuna who insisted on openly worshipping the gods was strangled to death (Thurston 27–8). The destruction continued well into 1820, and while some found the end of the ʻAi kapu a reason for great joy, for others like ʻĪʻī, it was profoundly disorienting as they coped with the abolition of the only religion they had ever known. Significantly, ʻĪʻī never discusses how abandoning the gods affected relations between aliʻi and their kahu, or aliʻi and makaʻāinana. After all, highborn aliʻi were considered gods, but somehow Liholiho continued to wield the power of life and death over his people.

In early 1820, in another life-changing event, ʻĪʻī was introduced to Christianity and literacy. The first missionary company of the American Board of Commissions for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) arrived at Kawaihae on March 30, 1820, and anchored at Kailua Bay two weeks later (Thurston 25). The company consisted of Rev. Hiram Bingham and his wife Sybil Moseley, Rev. Asa Thurston and his wife Lucy Goodale, Mr. Samuel Whitney and his wife Mercy Partridge, Dr. Thomas Holman and his wife Lucia Ruggles, Mr. Daniel Chamberlain and his wife Mary Wells, and the printer Mr. Elisha Loomis and his wife Maria Theresa Sartwell (Gulick and Gulick 441). Liholiho gave them permission to stay for one year (Thurston 36). It
was clear to the missionaries that ʻĪʻī had Liholiho’s respect and trust. An “interesting youth,” Bingham later recalled, ʻĪʻī was “one of the two whom Liholiho early, and in a very special manner, placed under the instruction of the mission, to make a fair trial of what our new system could do for the people” (322). Lucy Goodale Thurston reported that through an interpreter, Liholiho had commanded the missionaries “Teach these, my favorites, ʻĪʻī and Kahuhu. It will be the same as teaching me. Through them I shall find out what learning is” (42–3). The mōʻī’s servant would therefore become his teacher, and with his customary tact, ʻĪʻī taught a student who held the power of life and death over him.

ʻĪʻī also had a remarkable power of influence here. Had he found the missionaries’ teachings worthless, Liholiho would presumably have ordered them to leave. The prestige of ʻĪʻī’s new responsibilities was further heightened because Liholiho placed a kapu upon literacy. Only authorized aliʻi and the ʻŌiwi wives and children of haole could learn (42). ʻĪʻī and Kahuhu were further set apart by the clothing they wore when they studied. While the mōʻī and his aliʻi wore malo at their daily lessons, the two designated students wore white western-style clothing (43). At some point, Liholiho stopped coming to his lessons. Alcohol was probably a factor. Marin recorded that Liholiho was drunk almost daily (qtd. in Gast 247–51, 256), and Mrs. Thurston later wrote that “For several months his majesty kept foremost in learning, then the pleasures of the cup caused his books to be quite neglected” (42). But he returned a few months later, he asked ʻĪʻī and Kahuhu to read, and was very pleased with their improvement (43). During this time, a kahuna threatened Mrs. Thurston (49–51). She did not disclose his name or his specialization, but “His standing among the people was formerly very high, so that at his presence they all fell prostrate” (50). Afraid that he might return to harm the Thurstons, ʻĪʻī and Kahuhu slept in the house for two weeks, keeping “deadly weapons by their pillows” (50). Her
description suggests that they had traditional weapons, perhaps clubs or daggers lashed with
shark teeth, which are fearsome to behold. Though clearly such guardianship was an act of
courage arising from a sense of duty, because ʻĪʻī was tall, muscular, and trained in lua, he would
have been formidable in a fight. Within a few years, he would prove fearless even when
outnumbered.

In addition to his lessons from the missionaries, as Liholiho’s kahu, ʻĪʻī would have had
to deal with him whether drunk or sober; eventually, this proved to be training for far longer
dealings with Liholiho’s younger brother, another heavily drinking mōʻī. Between 1820 and
1821, the court divided its time between Honolulu and ʻEwa, after Liholiho decided to move
permanently to Oʻahu (Bingham 132). On one occasion, his drinking almost ended ʻĪʻī’s life, and
his own. In late July of 1821, they left Honolulu with more than thirty other members of the
court. Bingham, who was on Kauaʻi at that time, learned later that although Liholiho had said
they were headed for ʻEwa, when he reached there, he “ordered the helmsman to steer for
Kauai,” a trip for which they were completely unprepared. Despite everyone’s pleas to
reconsider, “the king, half intoxicated, and fearless of dangers,” insisted, and after nearly
capsizing three times, the ship finally arrived at Kauaʻi, where the ruling aliʻi Kaumualiʻi
welcomed them and supplied them with everything they needed (138). (A few months later, on
September 16, Liholiho would repay Kaumualiʻi’s generosity by inviting him aboard,
kidnapping him, and taking him back to Oʻahu, [146].) Bingham recalled that ʻĪʻī asked to pray
with him before returning to Oʻahu, but expressed concern about the proper way to pray to
Jehovah. Bingham advised him, and in his memoirs reported the gist of ʻĪʻī’s prayer: “Our Father
in heaven, we love thee. We desire to thee to take care of us. Take care of the king and all the
queens. Make all the people good. Take care of the land. Make the devils give it up. We thank
thee that the missionaries come here. Take good care of the missionaries here and at Oahu, and
of all good people. May we go to heaven” (146). According to Bingham, “Such were, at that
period, the lisplings of this youthful pupil, once a heathen lad of some rank, entrusted with the
lighting of the king’s pipe, and who at length became an able counsellor in the affairs of state,
and an eloquent advocate of the cause of Christ” (146).

In any case, sometime in this year, it seems clear that ʻĪʻī embraced Christianity with the
same degree of piety he had shown for the religion in which he had been raised. Bingham reports
that the missionaries were so impressed with ʻĪʻī’s devotion that a few of them “would have
readily baptized” him then, although in keeping with the company’s policy, he underwent several
more years of preparation (148). If, as Bingham implies, ʻĪʻī had fully converted well before the
end of 1821, it means he did this well before his mōʻī and kuhina nui. When Kaʻahumanu fell
seriously ill in December of 1821, Bingham said to her, “I trust you are thinking seriously of the
great God and our Savior.” And yet, while she acknowledged that “I think more about him in my
sickness” (148–9), Bingham had to confess that “rising from her illness to comfortable health,
she was still too proud, too independent, too fond of pleasure, gaiety, honor, and amusement, to
take the place of a cross-bearing servant of Christ” (151). As for Liholiho, Bingham recalls that
he “was rapidly wasting the days and energies of his prime by his debaucheries” (151).

That the kahu ʻĪʻī so quickly and fervently embraced Christianity well before the two
most powerful aliʻi is significant and striking. After all, only two years before, ʻĪʻī was begging
Liholiho not to abolish the ʻAi kapu. His conversion therefore speaks both to his independent
nature, and to his spirituality. Though he served his aliʻi loyally, he did not join them in their
lifestyle because of his religious discipline. In all his reflective writing, ʻĪʻī insists that he had
always been pious. But as someone who did not have it in him to be what we would call an
atheist, ʻĪʻī’s options were limited. He could secretly worship the Hawaiian gods and risk death, because Liholiho and Kaʻahumanu had forbidden it. Or he could join the missionaries in Christianity, which his aliʻi, while not yet converts themselves, officially tolerated. What is certain is that after he converted, ʻĪʻī insisted for the rest of his life that he found Jehovah superior to the gods he had once worshipped.

In early 1822, when ʻĪʻī was twenty-one years old, he met the woman who became his first wife. At this time, Liholiho had five official wives (Kamakau Ke Kumu Aupuni 252, 259; Bingham 87; Thurston 34), but took other women to his bed. When the court stopped in Hilo, he met Sarai Hiwauli, who became his “ano wahine” [a kind of wife] (“Moolelo no S”). She also slept with Haʻaloʻu, a member of Liholiho’s entourage, and when the court returned to Oʻahu, Haʻaloʻu brought her with him (“Moolelo no S”). At some point, Liholiho discovered that Haʻaloʻu had also slept with one or more of his aliʻi wāhine (Kamakau Ke Kumu 258). (Marin claims that it was Pauahi, qtd. in Gast 270.) While at Puʻuloa, Liholiho ordered Kōliʻi and Kahalaiʻa to kill Haʻaloʻu (“Moolelo no S”; Kamakau Ke Kumu 258). On October 16, 1822 (Marin qtd. in Gast 270), they killed him while he was sleeping next to Sarai (Kamakau Ke Kumu 258). William Richards wrote that “The executioner gently pulled the woman’s head to one side, and then with a broad axe instantly severed the head of her husband from his body” (qtd. in Sahlins and Barrère 28). A few weeks later, ʻĪʻī took Sarai as his wife (“Moolelo no S”; Kamakau Ke Kumu 258)—presumably, with Liholiho’s permission.

Why did ʻĪʻī wait so long to take a wife, and then marry Sarai so shortly after this execution? Nothing is known about ʻĪʻī’s personal life before this moment—for instance, how sexually active he might have been—but judging from his reported infidelities early on in their marriage, either his libido was strong enough, or his flesh weak enough, to backtrack temporarily
as a convert (“Moolelo no S”). More practically, as ali‘i Sarai and ‘Ī‘ī were equal in rank, so neither lineage would be diluted should they have children. And as the mō‘ī’s main kahu, ‘Ī‘ī would have been a good choice for Sarai, because he was well positioned to provide for her. But perhaps the most obvious reason was that Sarai was stunning (Appendix B). ‘Ī‘ī was about six feet tall (Sheldon 41), and judging from a later portrait of them seated side-by-side, Sarai was near the same height. In any case, ‘Ī‘ī soon gave up his philandering, and Sarai became his life partner in many areas (“Moolelo no S”).

Shortly after Ha‘alo‘u’s execution, Bingham tried to persuade Liholiho to change his ways, but the mō‘ī replied, “He nui loa kuu hewa, my wickedness is very great; but in five years, I will turn and forsake sin” (178). And yet, he clearly wanted ‘Ī‘ī and Kahuhu to continue their studies to perfect their literacy skills. That year, Liholiho gave them a plot of land for a home close to Kawaiaha‘o in Honolulu, where Kahuhu taught school (Native Testimony 2: 306). The mō‘ī also assigned ‘Ī‘ī another duty. The Prince Regent, a six-gun schooner that King George IV of Great Britain had intended to give Kamehameha, was presented to his son Liholiho on May 1, 1822 (Ellis 282; “Mo‘olelo no S”; Bingham 11; Jackson 50). ‘Ī‘ī was named its captain (“Moolelo no S”; Chamberlain 2: 34; 3: 35, 54; 4: 5, 6: 11), and as Bingham recalled, “In navigating it around the shores and across the channels, from island to island, he exhibited commendable loyalty, skill and energy” (11). Sarai occasionally accompanied him (“Moolelo no S”). Given ‘Ī‘ī’s childhood fascination with ships, he must have been thrilled to be in charge of one, and that Liholiho made him captain of a warship suggests how trusted he was.

In 1823, another event began unfolding that profoundly changed ‘Ī‘ī’s life. Liholiho decided to sail to Great Britain to meet with King George IV (Kamakau Ke Kumu 259–260). Ali‘i wahine Kamāmalu and ten others accompanied him: Boki, Liliha, Kauluhaimalama,
Manuia, Kekūanāoʻa, Nāihekukui, Nāukana, Nāʻaiweuweu, James Kānehoa, and Rives (260–1). They left on November 27, 1823 (261); seven months later, Liholiho and Kamāmalu died of measles in London (262). The mōʻi was twenty-six years and four months old. He had ruled for only five years; ʻĪʻī had served him for fourteen. ʻĪʻī never writes about Liholiho’s trip or his death, but he does mention that Kekūanāoʻa may have gone because he was a favorite (“Kanaenae” 5 Dec. 1868). But ʻĪʻī was also a favorite, and the question must be asked why he was not chosen to accompany him. Since Liholiho was leaving on a long voyage, and Kauikeaouli, his brother and heir, was still a child, perhaps Liholiho decided to leave his loyal kahu behind, just in case. Through his relatives who had served before him, and his own long service to Liholiho, ʻĪʻī had a deep understanding of how the kingdom and the court functioned. Liholiho would also have known that Boki and Kekūanāoʻa were markedly ambitious; he may have decided it would be wiser to take them along. Kamehameha had taught him to head off political intrigues by keeping his aliʻi close. Because of his loyalty, his education, his temperament, and his acceptance of the role of kahu, ʻĪʻī was clearly the most sensible aliʻi to leave behind.

ʻĪʻī’s childhood set the foundation for the man he became. His adolescence exposed him to many new kinds of knowledge, as he took on more important duties. During the last few years of Liholiho’s life ʻĪʻī steadily advanced from low-ranking apprentice to preeminent kahu for the mōʻi. With Liholiho’s death, an important and defining era in ʻĪʻī’s life had therefore ended, and a new one began. He would establish new allegiances while proving indispensable to the aliʻi he would serve. He would also adapt quickly to the many profound social and political changes that confronted the kingdom—and managing, even in spite of them, to thrive.
Distinguishing this period in ʻĪʻī’s life was his increasing engagement with missionary teachings as he continued on his journey of conversion, his growing involvement with the literacy movement, and his burgeoning independence. Already predisposed to seriousness because of his childhood and early responsibilities, ʻĪʻī gained a reputation as a stern man with a strong sense of propriety, which made him a trustworthy candidate for many important political positions. He divided his time between serving Kauikeaouli and working with the missionaries, who greatly approved of his zealous piety, although it earned him the animosity of Hawaiian and non-Hawaiian others. As a kahu, the transition from Liholiho to Kauikeaouli required ʻĪʻī to adapt to new circumstances. Since the new mōʻī was about ten years old (Malo; Lohepono; Kamakau Ke Kumu 7), ʻĪʻī was now serving a child and necessarily answering first to the formidable Kaʻahumanu, Kauikeaouli’s hānai mother since the death of Keōpūolani in 1823, but also Liholiho’s kuhina nui, and therefore ruling in his stead when he went to London (Kamakau Ke Kumu 11), and second to Kīnaʻu, who became kuhina nui after Kaʻahumanu, and would herself be the mother of two mōʻī and a kuhina nui. ʻĪʻī also continued to carry out duties Liholiho had assigned him, whether learning about the missionaries, or sailing the Prince Regent as an interisland packet.

ʻĪʻī’s Early Service to Kauikeaouli

News of Liholiho’s and Kamāmalu’s deaths reached Honolulu on March 9, 1825, eight months after they had died (Chamberlain 4: 26; Bingham 260; Loomis 29). The survivors of the
entourage returned to Honolulu with their remains two months later, on May 6 (Chamberlain 4: 39; Bingham 263; Loomis 34). On June 10, Kauikeaouli was proclaimed Mōʻī Kamehameha III (Loomis 37). Kaʻahumanu continued as kuhina nui, and because the mōʻī was too young to rule, she became co-regent. Though she appointed Boki, then governor of Oʻahu, as the mōʻī’s main guardian (ʻĪʻī “Kanaenae” 5, 19 Dec. 1868), she made ʻĪʻī the “hoa no ka wa ai a me ka wa moe, ala ana o ka Moi, a me kahi kahu ekalesia ole nana e haiolelo imua o ko ka Moi mau hoa hele me ka Moi” [companion of the Mōʻī’s eating, sleeping, and waking, and for places where there was not a pastor to speak before the Mōʻī and his traveling companions, he took on that role] (5 Dec. 1868; 16 Jan. 1869). These new duties speak to his standing with Kaʻahumanu. Boki may have had official guardianship, but she did not let him choose the person who would be Kauikeaouli’s constant companion in his daily life. Kaʻahumanu thought ʻĪʻī would also be a beneficial influence as a specifically Christian spiritual advisor.

He had not yet been baptized. Although missionaries praised ʻĪʻī’s piety, they were exceedingly careful about whom they granted full membership in the church. Between their arrival in the spring of 1820 and the proclamation of Kauikeaouli as mōʻī in the spring of 1825, only two ʻŌiwi had been baptized: Puaʻaiki and the aliʻi wahine Keōpūolani. Puaʻaiki (Bartimeus) was accepted into the church on July 10, 1823 (Green 14). Keōpūolani (Harriet) was baptized two months later on September 16 (W. Richards 36; Stewart 77–8). But she was an exception, since it was a deathbed ceremony (W. Richards 36). For most potential converts, the process was formidable. Once missionaries identified promising candidates for baptism, they submitted them to a period of close observation to gauge the sincerity of their commitment, and to see if they regressed in any way. This time was both investigatory and instructional. William Richards posed ten challenging questions to Puaʻaiki during one of their last interviews before
his official induction into the Christian Church (Green 12–3). The first group baptism took place in early December of 1825: Kaʻahumanu (Elizabeth), Kapule (Deborah), Kealiʻiahonui (Aaron), Nāmāhama (Lydia), Laʻanui (Gideon), Kaʻiu (Simeon), Kalaʻaiāulu (Richard), and Kālaimoku’s young son, Leleiōhoku (Joseph)26 (Bingham 277–8, 321; Kawaihao Church 30).

Kaʻahumanu’s conversion led to greatly increased support of the missionaries’ proselytizing efforts, which included the promotion of literacy as an important evangelizing force. ʻĪʻī began to spend substantial periods outside the court with the missionaries, promoting religion and education. On one occasion, Hiram Bingham, Levi Chamberlain, ʻĪʻī, and Kaomi went to Moanalua (a few hours walk from Honolulu) where they preached the Gospel and delivered spelling books, hoping to inspire the creation of a new school (Chamberlain 5: 14). Kaomi, a half-Tahitian and half-Hawaiian who had studied lāʻau lapaʻau (the art of healing) under Boki and Kaʻōʻō, had just declared his commitment to Christianity (Kamakau Ke Aupuni 117; Bingham 251). He would play an important and controversial role in Kauikeaouli’s life, and therefore ʻĪʻī’s. Given his eventual service at the Chiefs Children’s School, it is natural to wonder why ʻĪʻī never had his own school. By this time, James Kahuhu, the other Hawaiian whom Liholiho had placed with the missionaries, had established a school in Waipiʻo that boasted an enrollment of three hundred and eighty-three students (Bingham 297). ʻĪʻī’s service as personal attendant to the young mōʻi undoubtedly was his first priority, but his growing familiarity with western-style education would greatly influence the course of his life by making him qualified and eligible for new kinds of service.

One of ʻĪʻī’s most conspicuous qualities was the intensity of his mental and physical

26 Kālaimoku called himself William Pitt, having “adopted the name of his great contemporary, the great English prime minister, William Pitt” (Kuykendall 1: 53). Leleiōhoku would do the same.
commitment to his duties, even when technically off duty. In late September of 1825, ʻĪʻī heard “he pu kuniahi” [a cannon shot] fired from the direction of Waikīkī beyond Lēʻahi Crater (“Pohaku”) that sounded like the “pu kau poohiwi la i ki lokahiia la nae i ka minute hookahi” [deafening roar of rifles going off at the same moment]. Convinced that a fleet of warships had opened fire, he rushed outside, only to discover that all was calm. But as he stood looking at the ocean, he heard “ka hihio ana [a]e o ka makani me he poka la” [the whistling sound of the wind like a bullet] just above him, and saw a stone crash beyond his house. When he learned from a passerby that a huge stone had landed in a nearby tidal mouth, he ran there. It had “poopoo iho ka paapaakea” [made a crater in the white coral bed]. As more stones began to fall, a “wawa nui” [resounding roar] surrounded Pūowaina. “Aka, he hana kupaianaha no keia no ka mea, ua kuhi aku au he moku e kaua ana, a hiki mai ka poka ilalo nei, he pōhaku, ua eleele o waho a he lenalena iki o loko” [But, this was incredible for I was certain that a ship was engaged in battle until the cannonball fell and turned out to be a stone, black on the outside and yellowish inside]. Presumably, the cause was a meteor. But ʻĪʻī’s immediate assumptions—booming cannon shots, the deafening roar of rifles, and whistling bullets—are all related to Western weaponry.

Honolulu and Lahaina were important ports of call for traders, whalers, and warships, with as many as sixty vessels, many with guns, crowding the harbor during high season (Wagner-Wright xx–xxii; Kuykendall 1: 92–6; Bingham 313–4). In short, the maritime industry opened up the kingdom to new dangers, and ʻĪʻī’s vigilance and sense of duty made him instantly react to any perceived threat.

About this time, the government initiated a moral reform by creating laws based on the Ten Commandants (Bingham 282). The most contentious provisions were those intended to curb illicit sexual relations, including what Bingham called “an embargo on lewd women” (284). This
new policy did not sit well with many foreigners, and their protests became violent, putting ʻĪʻī, among others, into dangerous situations. At this time, the Hawaiian Islands had a reputation as “the brothel of the Pacific” (Anonymous 78). For decades, women had been sleeping with foreigners for novelties such as western-style clothing, mirrors, knives, or articles made of iron (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 20, 27 Nov. 1869). The new law banned prostitution, and women found guilty were punished and imprisoned. As Marin noted on February 20, 1826, “Today they captured 4 or 5 women to make them carry stones for being whores. Each carries 10 stones for the church” (qtd. in Gast 303). The harsh sanctions proved effective, and the number of women visiting ships decreased.

This infuriated captains and sailors alike. On February 22, Captain John Percival of the U.S.S. Dolphin met with Kaʻahumanu to persuade her to lift the ban. Otherwise, he thought the sailors would riot (Marin qtd. in Gast 303). Despite her claims to the contrary, Percival accused the missionaries, especially Bingham, of pressuring the aliʻi into these reforms (Marin qtd. in Gast 303; Bingham 283–86), and his response is an early example of what foreigners often did if their desires were frustrated. When persuasion failed, Percival issued demands and threats. On February 25, he ordered Kaʻahumanu to “free the women imprisoned for whoredom” and release them into his custody (Marin qtd. in Gast 304). She refused. A rumor was already circulating that the sailors planned to “pepehi” (beat or kill) the missionaries and “wawahi” (demolish) their homes (ʻĪʻī Untitled Letter), and on February 26, men from several ships rioted in Honolulu (ʻĪʻī Untitled Letter; Bingham 286). Unaware that anything was amiss, Bingham, Kālaimoku,

---

27 This reference comes from the anonymous author of *Sandwich Island Notes by a Häolé*, who is purported to have been G.W. Bates or George Washington Bates.
Kaʻahumanu, Nāmāhana, Boki, and others had gathered for prayer service on the second floor of Kālaimoku’s stone house (Bingham 286). As a group of Hawaiians, including ʻĪʻī, was heading there to participate in the service, they encountered drunken and shouting foreigners (ʻĪʻī Untitled Letter). The Hawaiian group reached the house just as several sailors were going upstairs to the second floor, but did not follow them (Untitled Letter). These sailors told the aliʻi and Bingham one hundred and fifty men would wreak havoc if women were not allowed to come aboard the ships (Bingham 286). When the aliʻi refused, a few sailors began breaking windowpanes, the shards raining down upon ʻĪʻī and the others (ʻĪʻī Untitled Letter). No one seems to have tried to stop them. When Boki came downstairs, ʻĪʻī proposed tying up the vandals rather than beating them, but an hour later, the sailors came downstairs ranting about the missionaries, and calling them liars for denying they had anything to do with the edict. By this point, all of Honolulu had heard about the sailors’ intentions, and many people had gathered in the vicinity (Untitled Letter).

The rioters headed towards Bingham’s residence to destroy it (Bingham 287; ʻĪʻī Untitled Letter). When he realized their intent, he ran home, with ʻĪʻī and Nāmāhana following to protect him. They found Mrs. Bingham locked inside, with the sailors trying to break in. Spotting Bingham, the rioters surrounded him, shouting insults. Because ʻĪʻī and Nāmāhana were standing next to him, they were also fenced in. The situation was critical. More Hawaiians arrived. The sailors had jackknives and clubs, the Hawaiians were unarmed, and Bingham had an umbrella, which he held over his head (Bingham 287; ʻĪʻī Untitled Letter). He asked the Hawaiians, “ʻAole anei oukou malama mai iaʻu? Do ye not take care of me? ʻKe malama nei no makou’ they calmly replied, ʻWe do take care.’” (287). At that moment, a sailor swung at him, but Bingham reported the blow “was warded off, partly by the arm of Lydia Namahana, and partly by my
umbrella” (287). ʻĪʻī recalled that when Nāmāhana deflected the club, he himself grabbed it, which frightened the rioters, who then tried to flee the scene (Untitled Letter). “It was the signal for resistance for which the natives had waited,” Bingham wrote: “They sprang upon the rioters; some they seized, disarmed, and bound, and to some they dealt leveling blows” (287). According to ʻĪʻī, he and the other Hawaiians roughed up the rioters “no ko lakou kolohe ana mai mamua i ko makou mau aliʻi aole hala, a pela no i pepehi aku ai lakou i ke kumu aohe hala” [for their earlier mistreatment of our faultless aliʻi and for doing the same to our equally innocent teacher] (Untitled Letter). And Bingham explained that “It was a maxim with the Christian chiefs not to resist or contend with foreigners, till the overt acts of the latter placed them clearly in the wrong, and made resistance indispensable” (275). But the images of an umbrella-armed Bingham calling out for help, and first being protected by an unarmed woman from a blow to the head, and then saved from further harm by the actions of a formidable club-wielding ʻĪʻī and his companions, speak for themselves. Nor was this the only time that ʻĪʻī would intervene to protect Bingham, or confront an explosive situation arising from religion and politics.

That same year, ʻĪʻī became involved in a very important mission project. Bingham, Asa Thurston, William Richards, and Artemas Bishop had begun translating the scriptures into Hawaiian (“No ka unuhi”). To ensure that their translations from Hebrew (Old Testament) and Greek (New Testament) into Hawaiian were accurate, they each chose a collaborator who was “akamai ma ka olelo Hawaii” [linguistically skilled in Hawaiian]. They began with the gospels. On Oʻahu, ʻĪʻī worked with Bingham on Luke. On Maui, Davida Malo and Ulumeheihei Hoapili helped Richards with Mark. On Hawaiʻi, John Adams Kuakini and Kēlou Kamakau assisted

Thurston and Bishop on John. ʻĪʻī’s linguistic skills reflected his education. He knew hundreds of chants and could also compose them, having been trained in this art by his mother, who was herself recognized at court for her chanting skills. Since “Great care was taken in the composition of chants and songs because in Native Hawaiian epistemology, language has agency—it is imbued with the power to heal or to destroy” (Brown “Mourning” 377), chanters were known for their linguistic expertise (Pukui “Songs” 247). ʻĪʻī’s series also confirm that he was well-versed in moʻolelo. This intellectual foundation served him well in the translation project, which required him to navigate between vastly different epistemic systems, at times coining new Hawaiian terms to bridge the gap (“No ka unuhi”). This translation project was time consuming.29 The groups worked individually and as a whole, and could discuss one to three verses a day for three months before agreeing on a finished product (“No ka unuhi”). ʻĪʻī’s childhood exposure to his parents’ philosophical conversations on human nature (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 17 July 1869) would have stood him in good stead in these deliberations on the scriptures, because his mind had been trained to think deeply. And these close readings also granted ʻĪʻī the benefits of the missionaries’ training in interpreting the scriptures. Given his growing familiarity with the Bible, and his proficiency in chanting, it is hardly surprising that he became adept as a preacher, one who could offer a sermon extempore (A. Cooke 7: 132).

A minor diplomatic matter in the summer of 1826 shows how Christian-influenced reforms were affecting government business, and calls attention to ʻĪʻī’s piety. On August 5, the mōʻī commanded ʻĪʻī to respond to an English naval captain’s request for assistance in towing his ship, because scurvy had incapacitated his sailors (Chamberlain 6: 17). Because the towing

29 This project would continue over the next decade. The Hawaiian bible was finally printed in 1836, and revised in 1839 (“No ka unuhi”).
would take place on a Sunday, ʻĪʻī sought out Chamberlain to discuss the matter. They decided this situation warranted an exception to the kapu of working on the Sabbath. Such moments increased the missionaries’ respect for ʻĪʻī’s sincere devotion to the Christian faith. On August 31, 1826, ʻĪʻī and five other candidates for baptism were interviewed at Kālaimoku’s house (Chamberlain 6: 21), and again six months later (7: 14). After fifteen months of preparation, these six converts entered into full fellowship on December 9, 1827 (8: 24). The newly baptized retained their birth names but also took a Christian one: Jesse Kahananui, Abel Wahinealiʻi, Abraham Haoa, Lazarus Makahiki, and Ana Makahiki (8: 24). ʻĪʻī chose the name John; he had actually been using it since at least September 15, 1825 (5: 14). These six were the second group to be baptized (Kawaiahao Church 30).

A highly significant outcome of ʻĪʻī’s service to Kauikeaouli around the time he was baptized was a friendship that arose with the mōʻī’s half-sister Kīnaʻu. Because they enjoyed each other’s company, ʻĪʻī frequently visited her after the workday was done (ʻĪʻī “Kanaenae” 16 Jan. 1869). On one of these visits, ʻĪʻī noticed the silence of the royal compound, which was in an isolated area, and realized the mōʻī should have personal guards. (Perhaps the recent riot was still fresh in his mind.) ʻĪʻī shared his idea with a few people, who agreed with him, and the following night, ʻĪʻī, Sarai, H. Hewahewa, N. Kamaunu, and A. Lilinoe arrived at the compound to stand watch as the mōʻī slept. Kauikeaouli heard them approaching, and called out for them to identify themselves. He then came out to ask them about their visit, and when he heard the reason, he accepted, and called on his own men to keep them company. He also consulted Kīnaʻu, who seems to have agreed, and the mōʻī then went to sleep. Kaʻahumanu was informed the next day, and after she too found ʻĪʻī’s idea valid, she appointed additional guards for both enclosures of the house, and shortly afterwards, created five companies who kept watch day and
night. ʻĪʻī had made a valuable innovation—but several months later, Kaʻahumanu and Kekūanāoʻa attended a meeting of the guards at ʻĪʻī’s residence, where Kekūanāoʻa announced that Boki had given him command of the royal guards, displacing ʻĪʻī as the leader. Kekūanāoʻa then proceeded to outline a new system. Only the ʻOkaka, an elite corps, would stand guard inside the royal compound. Everyone else would patrol the external perimeter, and be barred from entry. ʻĪʻī pleaded with Kaʻahumanu to overturn this change. Loyal to his fellow attendants, he said that he had handpicked these guards because he knew and trusted them. They were equally deserving of the honor of protecting the mōʻī; in fact, all of them had at one time or another been kahu to Kamehameha, Liholiho, Kauikeaouli—or to her. ʻĪʻī’s petition failed. When he finished, she expressed some irritation with Kekūanāoʻa, because he had led her to believe that the matter was settled. She then left the meeting (16 Jan. 1869).

ʻĪʻī’s speech apparently resonated with the ʻOkaka, because the next time he went to the royal residence, they did not bar his entry, though they did stop those with him. As ʻĪʻī watched over the external guards, Kauikeaouli joined him. The mōʻī asked if the men were his, and ʻĪʻī confirmed it. Kauikeaouli then confided to his kahu that Kekūanāoʻa was teaching him the art of fencing, but that his behavior depended greatly on who was watching them. If a certain aliʻi wahine was there, Kekūanāoʻa went to great lengths to display his skill. When she was absent, he did not exert himself. ʻĪʻī did not know then that this aliʻi wahine was Kīnaʻu. Sometime later, when he was observing the guards with Kīnaʻu and Kauikeaouli, the mōʻī said that he would like matching uniforms made for the royal guards and himself—trousers with a striped side panel and red jackets. Kīnaʻu offered a bolt of red cloth. Then ʻĪʻī interrupted their conversation with a startling suggestion: “Ae o olua no a elua, kane no a wahine la” [Yes, you two should become husband and wife]. The aliʻi did not agree with ʻĪʻī’s advice, and he dropped the subject (16 Jan. 1869).
1869), but this proposal that these two half-siblings should marry shows that the Christian convert had not completely distanced himself from the kapu system. Unions between closely related high-ranking aliʻi were a traditional practice that preserved the integrity of their lineage (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1: 151). Of course, from a Christian perspective, incest was a vile practice, and the missionaries did not hesitate to condemn it. But at least at this point in his life, ʻĪʻī was not only navigating between two religious systems, but also recognizing the potential political advantages of such a marriage. It is therefore a measure of Kīnaʻu’s trust that even after this advice, she approached ʻĪʻī one night outside of the royal compound, and told him that Kekūanāo‘a was wooing her (ʻĪʻī “Kanaenae” 16 Jan. 1869). This exchange was daring, and potentially dangerous. Like ʻĪʻī, Kaʻahumanu was determined to follow Kamehameha’s instructions that his daughters mate with his sons to preserve their high status (30 Jan. 1869), and when Kīnaʻu and Kekūanāoʻa began an affair, she fell into disfavor with her mother Kaheiheimālie and the kuhina nui, though they forgave her when she gave birth to an heir (16, 30 Jan. 1869). Everyone was therefore negotiating new and old beliefs. Even Kaʻahumanu, who had been baptized in 1825 and who had led the moral reform of 1826, was still strongly attached to the genealogical assumptions that were the cornerstones of the kapu system.

By October of 1827, ʻĪʻī had progressed from being an acolyte of Christianity to its enforcer. When paying a visit to his sick relative, Aniani (Chamberlain 8:16), he learned that a medicinal kahuna had been hired, and that Nāpukana, one of Aniani’s three wives, had built a house for and made offerings to a Hawaiian god. After removing the kahuna, in a harangue ʻĪʻī tried to convince his relatives to stop such practices. He also reported the kahuna and Nāpukana to Levi Chamberlain, who was distressed because the kahuna had been one of their teachers, and Nāpukana had “resided in the missionary establishment in the early residence of the families in
the islands” (8: 6). Clearly, some Hawaiians who had initially accepted Christianity were also returning to the gods and practices related to those gods, or perhaps they had never abandoned them. But Ḥī was not one of them. In his journal, Chamberlain recorded that a child of Ḥī and Sarai passed away the evening of March 1, 1828 (8: 35). Because Chamberlain describes the child as “little,” it must have been a newborn or a toddler at most. Christian services were held two days later, and the baby’s remains were “interred in the burying ground near the church” (8: 35). (If the couple ever had other children, none survived.) Only a month after the funeral, Ḥī wrote to the Bingham’s, asking them to teach Sarai about the virtue of God’s word and the good works that men and women carried out for His ministry (Letter to Bingham 4 Apr. 1828). After a year and a half of preparation, Sarai was baptized on September 20, 1829 (Kawaiahao Church 31), and over the years she gained a reputation as an exemplary Christian with an admirable work ethic. This workload steadily increased as her husband’s responsibilities as a kahu, statesman, and believer increased, and she supported him.

The next year closed on a note of triumph and tragedy. Ḥī was finishing his fifth year of service to Kauikeaouli, who was now about sixteen years old. Conscious of his kahu’s worth as an adviser, the mōʻī officially made him a member of his aliʻi council through a proclamation issued on October 7, 1829. The other council members were Kaʻahumanu, Boki, Kuakini, Manuia, Kekūanāoʻa, Hīnau, ‘Aikanaka, Pākī, Kīnaʻu, Keoniana (John Young II), and Kahuhu (Missionary Letters 3: 1058). Ḥī was now not only the mōʻī’s personal kahu and spiritual advisor, and part of his royal guard, but also an advisor within the highest circles of government. Ḥī’s later unfavorable remarks indicate that he remembered Boki with disdain. This aliʻi’s unbridled ambition led him to plot against Kaʻahumanu, and even talk of killing her (ʻĪʻī “Kanaena” 19 Dec., 2 Jan. 1869). According to ʻĪʻī, because Kaʻahumanu thought her cousin
loved her, she did not understand what their uncles meant when they said that “aole o Poki e hume i ka malo maoli, a hume ia i ka naau o Kamehameha I” [Boki would not wear a real loincloth until he had girded himself with the intestines of Kamehameha I] (16 Jan. 1869). As a third-generation kahu, ʻĪʻī found Boki’s treachery despicable, and as a student of the missionaries, he would have disapproved of Boki’s lifestyle and business practices as well.30 Towards the end of 1829, Boki heard there was an abundance of sandalwood on Eromanga in the New Hebrides (known today as Vanuatu). He quickly put together a large expedition (Chamberlain qtd. in Gulick 125; Kamakau Ke Aupuni 56–7), and perhaps even contemplated establishing himself as ruler of Eromanga (Kamakau Ke Aupuni 57).

The promise of wealth led many other Hawaiians to join. Between four and five hundred aliʻi, soldiers, and crewmen climbed aboard the two ships Kamehameha and Becket (Chamberlain qtd. in Gulick 126; Kamakau Ke Aupuni 57; Chamberlain 15: 23). Many were Boki’s followers and close relatives: Manuia, Kahuhu, and even ʻĪʻī’s father Kuaʻena set sail for Eromanga in early December (Chamberlain qtd. in Gulick 126). The expedition was an unmitigated disaster. The Kamehameha was lost at sea, and an epidemic struck the Becket (Kamakau Ke Aupuni 60). Only twelve Hawaiians survived (Chamberlain qtd. in Gulick 126). Boki and Kahuhu disappeared with the Kamehameha and were never seen again (Native Register 2: 36). Manuia died in the epidemic (60–1), and ʻĪʻī’s father was among those who perished (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 12 June 1869). In one fell swoop, Hawaiʻi lost hundreds of its ruling class and those who served them. ʻĪʻī was now one of the few kahu left with any training or experience.

30 See Gavan Daws “The High Chief Boki” and M. Puakea Nogelmeier “Boki.”
The Wayward Mōʻī

To compound matters, not long after, the generally docile Kauikeaouli began to show signs of rebellion. Whether because of the constraints of being mōʻī, or because he was on the brink of adulthood and resented Kaʻahumanu’s authority, at about eighteen he acquired a taste for alcohol and women. On December 31, 1831, intoxicated, he sent for the young Kalama “for a lewd purpose,” but was thwarted by Charles Kanaʻina, her uncle and hānai father (Chamberlain 12: 5). But four days later, Kauikeaouli slept with Kalama (12: 6), and that night, he forced his attendants to drink rum, telling them that those who did were “his mea makemake loa” [dearest companions] (12: 6). Kaʻahumanu could not find the mōʻī, and when she discovered where he was, she called ʻĪʻī to help her retrieve him (ʻĪʻī “Kanaenae” 30 Jan. 1869). They found him sleeping next to Kalama, and waited there for him to awake. Kaʻahumanu then tried unsuccessfully to convince him to return to the royal residence (30 Jan. 1869). Two days later, ʻĪʻī returned, and his heartfelt efforts to reason with Kauikeaouli brought the young mōʻī to tears (Chamberlain 16: 7). Kneeling with his kahu, he prayed with him and confessed his sins (16: 7). Unfortunately, ʻĪʻī’s influence on the mōʻī was short-lived. Six months later, Kaʻahumanu died, and Kauikeaouli came into full power (Kamakau Ke Aupuni 308). Without her steadfast vigilance, he began a free fall of self-indulgence. He kept ʻĪʻī so busy that the kahu had less time to assist the missionaries (Missionary Letters 5: 1413–4).

When Kaomi became Kauikeaouli’s bosom companion, things turned for the worse (Kamakau Ke Aupuni 116). Kaomi had endeared himself to the mōʻī after healing him and Kalama, but what cemented Kaomi’s position were his intelligence, his story-telling talent, and his ability to amuse the mōʻī (117). He soon had the mōʻī’s ear, and at the height of Kaomi’s influence, Kauikeaouli proclaimed, “He mōʻī kuʻi, he aupuni kuʻi” [A shared kingship, a shared
kingdom] (117). Kaomi had become co-regent. The result was great moral and social upheaval for the nation. Dr. Gerrit Parmele Judd, part of third company of missionaries that had arrived in late March of 1828 (Gulick 342), called this period “troublous”: “The worst state of morals, the greatest oppression and the greatest disorder prevailed” (6). Between Ka‘ahumanu’s death in 1832 and the appointment of Kīna‘u as kuhina nui in 1834, huge numbers of ‘Ōiwi stopped attending church, and many schools on O‘ahu closed down (120). Missionaries began sending promising students to Lahainaluna, a seminary that Ka‘ahumanu and other ali‘i had established on Maui (Kamakau Ke Aupuni 120; ‘Ī‘ī “Na Hunahuna” 3 Apr. 1869).

In March of 1834, Kauikeaouli decided to tour O‘ahu (1). He was about twenty-one, and in his entourage were his sister Nāhi‘ena‘ena, Kaomi, Kekāuluohi, Kekau‘ōnohi, Hoapili, Kahekili, Liliha, Hewahewa, and ‘Ī‘ī (1–3, 5–6). Judd also went on this two-week excursion, and he left an unadulterated and unflattering chronicle of the mō‘ī’s behavior (1, 6). The group was split between revelers and staunch Christians. While the latter urged the ‘Ōiwi to attend church and school, the former drank (1–6). One of the few pleasant moments was an exploration of Pu‘uloa’s lochs by the mō‘ī, Kaomi, Nāhi‘ena‘ena, Hoapili, ‘Ī‘ī, and Judd (1). More often than not, though, Kauikeaouli drank himself into a stupor. Judd once found him “lying on the ground with nothing but a shirt on,” and when he finally got up, he “staggered” away, swearing as he went (2). Just as he had at times with Liholiho, as the mō‘ī’s kahu, ‘Ī‘ī would have had his hands full. But the degree of difficulty was if anything higher. During this trip, Kekau‘ōnohi received a disturbing report that Kauikeaouli and his companions had taken two women against their will. The first woman escaped, because she “made a great outcry and was finally thrust from the boat,” while the second “was abused in the rushes” (2). Kekāuluohi declared to Judd that Liholiho had never done anything like this—but he had never had a companion like Kaomi. And
Furthermore, Liholiho would have been killed had he done so (2–3).

For several reasons, ʻĪʻī must have been profoundly distressed by Kauikeaouli’s metamorphosis. ʻĪʻī felt affection for his aliʻi, but he was now personally a profoundly righteous man. And culturally, there was another critical issue. The mōʻī was failing his people. Though the kapu system had fallen, and Christianity was now the state religion, what had remained constant was the makua-keiki relationship between the ruling aliʻi and the population. This was a moral, social, political and personal obligation, but the mōʻī’s lifestyle was setting an example for moral and social decay. If anything, the political dangers to the kingdom were even more serious. At a time when three world powers—England, France, and the United States of America—were aggressively expanding their realms of influence, the Hawaiian kingdom’s independence hinged on its being perceived as a civilized nation, or at least on the way toward being one. Indeed, repeated threats of a foreign takeover were the storm clouds that would darken Kamehameha III’s reign, and his ability to respond was often profoundly compromised by his behavior.

ʻĪʻī blamed Kaomi and his companions as a corrupting influence. Because of them, Kauikeaouli was no longer heeding his kahu. ʻĪʻī later wrote that because his efforts to help the mōʻī were in vain, he left him to his own devices, and allied himself with pious aliʻi such as Kekāuluohi and Kīnaʻu (16 Jan. 1869). Perhaps the mōʻī’s conduct on the Oʻahu trip led ʻĪʻī to leave his mōʻī’s service. Kīnaʻu enlisted him as her secretary, and during this period she frequently discussed government troubles with him (ʻĪʻī “Ke ola” 2 June 1866). By this time, Kauikeaouli was no longer receiving the customary signs of respect from the aliʻi when in his presence (Kamakau Ke Aupuni 120), and as he increasingly missed his sister, and those who had known him since he was a child, Kaomi’s influence over him began to wane. Eventually, the
mōʻī made peace with Kīnaʻu and appointed her kuhina nui with the name Kaʻahumanu II. Hoapili, Kamehameha the First’s advisor and close friend, and a devoted Christian, became his head guardian (120), and while ʻĪʻī continued working closely with Kīnaʻu, he also resumed his service to Kauikeaouli—but as an advisor, not a kahu.

There was much to be done. The government enacted more reforms, including against alcohol. After Kīnaʻu and Hoapili convinced Kauikeaouli to order the dismantling of stills on Oʻahu, they enlisted ʻĪʻī, who like Hoapili, had established a reputation among his fellow Hawaiians as zealous Christian convert. The extent to which he was respected and feared appears in an anecdote about the rum drinkers of Oʻahu. When they heard that the mōʻī’s guardian Hoapili was coming, they ran to hide the rum, but when ʻĪʻī arrived, they immediately hurled away their glasses, terrified to be caught drinking by him (122). The next step was banning alcohol entirely. On November 26, 1835, Kīnaʻu, Kekāuluohi, Kekūanāoʻa, Kanaʻina, ʻAikanaka, Pākī, Kuhia, Kaholowaʻa, ʻĪʻī and many others signed a petition to Kauikeaouli requesting him to forbid the sale of rum (Kīnaʻu et al). Kīnaʻu enlisted assistance to gather many more signatures. On April 27, 1836, in the missionary-run paper Ke Kumu Hawaii, the petition appeared with the names of two thousand eight hundred and ten Oʻahu residents attached. Two weeks after that, ʻĪʻī published an open letter to the aliʻi, asking them to forsake rum. He ended with an appeal to the mōʻī (“O Ka Hoole”). Though Kauikeaouli himself alternated between abstinence and drinking binges for the rest of his life, he approved the laws against alcohol.

In early 1837, Kauikeaouli decided to move to Lahaina; he would not live permanently on Oʻahu again until 1845 (Kamakau Ke Aupuni 124, 126). As kuhina nui, and often the actual ruler, Kīnaʻu divided her time between Oʻahu and Maui. As her secretary, ʻĪʻī went where she did (“Mei 29”; ʻĪʻī and Kīnaʻu Letter to Kekūanāoʻa; ʻĪʻī Letter to Judd 13 June 1838). At about
this time, the kingdom’s faith-based policies provoked a diplomatic incident that echoed through
the coming decades. Yet again, foreigners would blame Bingham, and ʻĪʻī would step in to
protect him. But before relating this incident, and ʻĪʻī’s role in it, some background will help
prepare for several related critical events that would affect ʻĪʻī’s life in his forties, fifties, and
sixties. Although the Hawaiian kingdom had become a Christian nation, this did not extend to
Catholicism. Like his teachers and the other aliʻi converts, including Kīnaʻu, ʻĪʻī was a vehement
anti-Catholic (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 3 Apr. 1869; Bingham 512). In terms of religion, the belief
that Catholics were idolaters made them guilty of what the Hawaiians themselves had previously
believed. And politically, the aliʻi believed that more than one religion in the kingdom would
lead to social conflict and dissent (Bingham 554; Chamberlain 11: 19–20, 13: 4, 14: 22; ʻĪʻī “Na
Hunahuna” 3 Apr. 1869). The government therefore, as a matter of policy, persecuted Catholics
(Kamakau Ke Aupuni 102–4). Priests who arrived were refused permission to stay, and those
who managed to establish themselves were ordered not to hold church services or baptize
Hawaiians. As early as December of 1831, the government expelled Father Bachelot, a French
national, and Father Short, an Irishman (Jore 32). Those ʻŌiwi who attended services were
punished with hard labor, and even imprisonment (Chamberlain 11: 20, 13: 4–5). In 1832,
American Commodore Downes “took great pains to express to the mōʻi his disapproval of the
policy pursued by the Hawaiian authorities toward the Catholics, both the expulsions of the
priests and the punishment of native adherents of that faith, as being contrary to the practice of
enlightened governments” (Kuykendall 1: 144).

But the persecution continued. Between 1836 and 1837, ʻĪʻī was purported to have been
among those who physically abused Kimeone Pāʻele, a Hawaiian Catholic imprisoned for
practicing his faith (qtd. in Yzendoorn 90). In a formal interview, ʻĪʻī and the others told
missionaries Samuel Northrup Castle, Levi Chamberlain, and Richard Armstrong that Catholic prisoners “were not as a general thing abused or harshly used” (S.N.C.). But in his History of the Catholic Mission in the Hawaiian Islands, Father Reginald Yzendoorn italicized the qualifying phrase “as a general thing” (90)—a number of prisoners were indeed abused because of their faith. As for Pāʻele, ʻĪʻī and the others claimed that he “was treated more severely than most because, as they say, he would not give attention; he uttered things of a quarrelsome character, and did quarrel and disturbed the court and it was almost impossible to preserve order” (S.N.C.). Again, Yzendoorn italicizes the key qualifier “most” (91), which implied that among those Catholics who were abused, Paele received more abuse. Meanwhile, French Commodore Vaillant had learned that Bachelot and Short had been banished, and he extracted a promise from Kamehameha III to “make especially welcome all Frenchmen whom business brought to his lands” (Kuykendall 1: 146–7; Jore 32). But the mōʻī broke his promise in less than a year, which the French would never forget.

On April 17, 1837, Bachelot and Short arrived yet again in the Hawaiian Islands aboard the Clémentine, owned and captained by Jules Dudoit, a British national of French origin from Martinique (Jore 32). The Hawaiian authorities ordered the priests back onto the Clémentine. When they refused, they were forcibly returned. This put Dudoit in a bind, because he had chartered his ship to “an American businessman, William French, established in Honolulu” (32). When Dudoit’s petition to land the priests was rejected, he “hailed down his colors (the British flag), and drew up a deed of surrender of the brig,” which he then gave to British consul Richard Charlton (32–3). Charlton “claimed that the flag had been insulted and burned it [the flag] on the street” (33). Dudoit would later ask for fifty thousand dollars in damages (Bingham 510). As for the priests, they spent three months aboard the Clémentine. When French Captain Abel Dupetit-
Thouars of the *Vénus* and British Captain Edward Belcher of the *Sulphur* arrived in early July, they therefore “became involved in the matters surrounding the expulsion of the Catholic priests” (Forbes 2: 241). Meetings were held with the Hawaiian government to find a diplomatic solution, and as Kīnaʻu’s secretary, ʻĪʻī was there (Bingham 507–8).

Just as Captain Percival had blamed Bingham for the ban against prostitution, British Consul Richard Charlton accused Bingham of writing the edict prohibiting the priests from landing (507–8). The discussion deteriorated when Captain Belcher “threatened to hang Mr. Bingham at the yard-arm,” and in one meeting, a foreign official became so aggressive that Bingham called it an “incipient Lynching” (508–9). Pushed backward and pinned against a wall, when Bingham tried to slip to one side, the man elbowed him with force. At this point, ʻĪʻī stepped between them, and when the official persisted, ʻĪʻī put a stop to it (509). Ultimately, the Hawaiian government let the priests remain ashore until they could find passage elsewhere (Forbes 2: 241), and Dupetit-Thouars exacted “a convention” from the mōʻī that French subjects would be well-treated (Kuykendall 1: 150). Because Hawai‘i did not have a French Consul, Dupetit-Thouars appointed Dudoit, who was later officially given “the title of Honorary Consul” (Jore 33). He would become an important political ally for the kingdom. Conversely, Charlton would cause political strife in the years to come.

In August of 1837, ʻĪʻī turned thirty-seven. That month, Kīnaʻu confided to him that she feared she could no longer conceive children (ʻĪʻī “Ke ola” 2 June 1866). For ʻĪʻī and Sarai, one of their greatest sorrows was being childless, which ʻĪʻī believed was because he had once wronged God by something he had said. As punishment, God had given him a child, but took it away. ʻĪʻī then asked Kīnaʻu, “ina e loaa hou ana ia oe ia mea, alaila, e lilo oe i waiu, o kau ka hānai, a owau ka uha” [if you should conceive again, then you will feed it from your breasts, and
I will be the ʻūhā. She agreed (2 June 1866). ʻŪhā refers to “Foster parent of a chiefly child, or guardian, so-called because he might hold the child on his lap” (Pukui and Elbert 363). That ʻĪʻī felt comfortable making such a request, normally made between peers, speaks to the depth of their friendship. As the daughter of Kamehameha, she far surpassed ʻĪʻī in rank. That she agreed is also significant, for aliʻi did not make such decisions lightly. This act would create a familial bond and lifelong obligations: “Hawaiians did not carry children unrelated to them, and commoners did not touch a chief’s child; carrying a child symbolized love, kinship, and affection” (Pukui and Elbert 68). The link between the Luluka and Kamehameha lines therefore renewed itself through Kīnaʻu’s pledge. Luluka had been Kamehameha’s hānai father; ʻĪʻī would become the hānai father of Kamehameha’s descendant. Had history turned out differently, ʻĪʻī’s future children would then have served this promised child and its descendants.

On November 1, 1838, Kīnaʻu gave birth to Victoria Kalohelani Kaʻahumanu Kamāmaluhaeokalani at the Honolulu Fort (ʻĪʻī “Ke ola” 2 June 1866), and immediately placed her in ʻĪʻī’s care. Kīnaʻu nursed Kamāmalu, but ʻĪʻī and Sarai carried and consoled her when she cried. This proved somewhat contentious. Being a hānai parent for an aliʻi conferred prestige and a potential increase in power, and ʻĪʻī recalled that “ua manao nae na kini o ke kane, na lakou keia keiki, aka, i ka hana ana, aole no i haawiia ia lakou la” [the husband’s relatives thought they would be given the child, but it was not]. In fact, Kekūanāoʻa, now governor of Oʻahu, was extremely unhappy with his wife’s decision, and he poured out his frustration to Kekāuluohi. Despite his own humble beginnings, he was particularly upset because ʻĪʻī was merely a kahu. To this, Kekāuluohi replied, “he kanaka pili loa keia ia kakou ma o Keeaumoku la” [this man is...

31 Kekūanāoʻa replaced John Adams Kuakini as governor in 1834 when the latter moved back to Hawaiʻi Island (ʻĪʻī “Kanaenae” 5 Dec. 1868).
very close to us through Ke‘eaumoku’]. “Nani no” [It was wonderful] (16 June 1866), wrote ‘Ī‘ī years later, and although he was not a vindictive person, it is clear that he still cherished Kekūanāo‘a’s comeuppance.

Because ‘Ī‘ī was Kīna‘u’s secretary, he was often at the fort, where she lived at this time. One evening in early December of 1838, a man arrived there and informed Kīna‘u that a foreign ship had run aground at Waikīkī (“Moku”). Given the recent clashes with foreign captains, the ali‘i were anxious to alert the consuls, but when asked about the ship’s nationality, the man said it was unclear. Kekūanāo‘a then dispatched ‘Ī‘ī to inform the national representatives, while Kaluwahinenui was sent to Waikīkī. What happened next was a cross between a comedy of errors and a wild goose chase. ‘Ī‘ī raced on his horse to alert the American consul,32 who instructed ‘Ī‘ī to tell Kekūanāo‘a to go quickly on horseback to investigate, while the consul remained awake at home to hear more news. Before carrying out this request, ‘Ī‘ī raced to the British consul,33 who was entertaining a group of foreigners. Once informed, he decided to ride with Kekūanāo‘a, and went with ‘Ī‘ī to the fort. The consul, Kekūanāo‘a, and a few others decided to sail rather than ride, and by this time, a large group of men had gathered, and some had already left for Waikīkī. But when Kekūanāo‘a, Pākī, the British consul, and the others arrived where the ship had been reported stranded, they found that the Columbine was perfectly fine. Its captain was merely waiting for the winds to pick up so he could sail.

‘Ī‘ī was a busy man. He was upset at this waste of time, and especially since he now would have to return to the American consul to give him the news. An evening had been wasted,

32 ‘Ī‘ī does not mention the American consul’s name; however, it was probably John Coffin Jones (Editorial Ke Kumu Hawaii 21 Nov. 1838:51; Kanoa).

33 The British consul in question would have been Richard Charlton.
and he was also embarrassed at having spread news that was untrue. So incensed was he about
the entire affair that he actually published his account of that evening in the newspaper Ke Kumu
Hawaii. He closed this report with a biting critique of people who weary others without cause.
While aliʻi should be informed of important events far from the court, when people see a
shipwreck, they should first save the victims. Here ʻĪʻī is praising the virtues of self-sufficiency
and personal initiative, qualities he had himself, and clearly admired. And yet, while he also
criticized the behavior that led to his running around that evening, his account foreshadows what
he would find himself increasingly doing during the latter years of Kauikeouliʻs reign.

On another occasion, because of ʻĪʻīʻs vigilance as a self-appointed enforcer of
Calvinistic values, he would pass a bizarre evening because of a random encounter. On February
19, 1839, while walking home, ʻĪʻī crossed paths with a woman named Kealoha, who said she
was a victim of hoʻopiʻopio, because of a painful “nahu” (bite or bruise) on her mons veneris
(Nalauai, Hopoe, ʻĪʻī, and Kauwahi). Since hoʻopiʻopio practitioners choose where they want to
inflict injury on their victim’s body, and then touch the corresponding area on their own bodies
(Pukui and Elbert 332), in this case, the practitioner would have touched her or his genitals in
order to harm that part of Kealoha’s body. Most people would have walked away, but not ʻĪʻī,
who took her to where he was staying with the aliʻi. Once there, Kealoha told ʻĪʻī there was a
coconut cup containing a surgeonfish tail and a needle in the west corner of a house. They
followed her to this house, owned by a man named Nalauai, where she pounded on the door.
When someone opened it, she went straight to where everyone was sleeping, searched the
northwest corner, grabbed something, and bundled it up in her shawl. She then slapped and
scratched Nalauaiʻs wife, tearing at her clothes. At this point, the aliʻi and ʻĪʻī realized she was
crazy, but soon afterwards, Kealoha began spreading rumors about ʻĪʻī. While the specifics of
these rumors are not mentioned, they were clearly serious enough that Mataio Nalauai, Keluboda Hopoe, Ezera Kauwahi, and ʻĪʻī himself wrote a letter to Ke Kumu Hawaii to set the matter straight (Nalauai, Hopoe, ʻĪʻī, and Kauwahi). The editor also scolded ʻĪʻī’s detractors, telling them to read the letter, which should put an end to the rumors (K. H.). ʻĪʻī also published his own letter about this incident, and lectured his readers about the foolishness of such beliefs (“No ka Hoopiopio”). If nothing else, this bewildering incident reveals how seriously ʻĪʻī took his responsibility to counter any claims that his strong Christian beliefs caused him to despise.

In early 1839, Honolulu had an outbreak of mumps (ʻĪʻī “Ke ola” 30 June 1866). ʻĪʻī and Sarai both had them, but quickly recovered. Kīnaʻu also fell victim, but she had severe complications, including paralysis. She died on April 4 (Bingham 533). ʻĪʻī wrote a eulogy that took up the entire first page, and half of a column on the second, of the May 22 issue of Ke Kumu Hawaii (“He Moolelo no Kinau”). During his six years as her secretary, he came to know her well, and his tribute displays his affection and esteem for her. The last line of the piece was “aole i pau” [to be continued], indicating that another installment was to follow—but this issue of Ke Kumu Hawaii was its last, and ʻĪʻī does not seem to have published his promised continuation elsewhere. Arguably, this tribute is ʻĪʻī’s first published example of life writing.

In the last years of her life, Kīnaʻu had expressed a wish to create a school for all of the royal children. In addition to providing an education, such a school would also insure that the children grew up in close proximity, which Kīnaʻu hoped would prevent them from becoming adversaries. When William Richards taught the aliʻi about political economy, he had suggested that the frequent rebellions and wars of earlier times arose from raising royal children separately—perhaps this lay behind her reasoning. The aliʻi met to discuss how to implement this idea (ʻĪʻī “Ke ola” 30 June 1866), and they agreed that because the next generation would
increasingly have to deal with foreigners, a Western education would prepare them best for assuming key leadership roles. For the missionaries, such a school would provide an opportunity to turn young aliʻi into upstanding Christian leaders (Menton 222). Or as Bingham put it, “As that class of chiefs whom we had found on the stage in 1820 were leaving it, one after another, and younger ones were taking their places, it was deemed highly important to win and educate their juvenile heirs, who were expected eventually to be the acting chiefs of that country” (580). Amos Starr Cooke and Juliette Montague Cooke agreed to run the boarding school (Menton 222), and well before the completion of a building, “Six of the royal children began reporting to the Cookes for instruction less than two weeks after the decision to establish the school had been made” (223). ʻĪʻī was asked to take care of the younger aliʻi while the older ones were attending school (ʻĪʻī “Ke ola” 30 June 1866). With regard to their upbringing and their schooling, ʻĪʻī would become an important part of all of these children’s lives.

After Kīnaʻu died, ʻĪʻī, Sarai, and Kamāmalu moved into the fort (14 July 1866). Sometime later, ʻĪʻī sailed to Kauaʻi and Niʻihau with Dudoit. When ʻĪʻī returned, he found Sarai watching over Kamāmalu as she slept. They sat there together, looking at their beloved hānai child. She awoke, and Sarai gestured to her to look in ʻĪʻī’s direction. When Kamāmalu saw him, she quickly got up off the bed and ran to him. Her father Kekūanāoʻa and everyone present noted and remarked on her attachment to ʻĪʻī (14 July 1866). In every way that counted, he was Kamāmalu’s father. Though many would say later that he was her guardian, Kīnaʻu had given her daughter to him because he did not have children. The case was therefore closer to hānai (adoption), than guardianship. ʻĪʻī was her kahu, but the record indicates he was much more than that.
**A Hostage and Twenty-Thousand Dollars**

The Kingdom’s troubles with the French resurfaced in the summer of 1839. On July 9, Captain Cyrille Pierre Théodore Laplace arrived off Honolulu aboard the warship *Artemise*, which carried fifty-two guns (Birkett 67; “Moo olelo”). French Naval minister Ducampe De Rosamel had ordered him to “enter into official diplomatic relations with the Hawaiian government” (Birkett 67), but Laplace also intended to “put an end either by force or by persuasion to the ill-treatment of which the French are the victims at the Sandwich Islands” (75). He first demanded a hostage who would be released for twenty thousand dollars (“Moo olelo”), which would be held to ensure that the Hawaiian government would uphold the treaty. Should the mōʻi refuse, hostilities would begin at noon on July 12 (“Moo olelo”). Because Kauikeaouli was still on Maui, he gave kuhina nui Kekāuluohi and Kekūanāoʻa the authority to negotiate in his stead (ʻĪʻī Letter to Kekūanāoʻa; “Moo olelo”). On July 10, Kekūanāoʻa asked Laplace to release Timoteo Kamalalehua Haʻalilio, the initial hostage, and accept a man equal in rank to Haʻalilio and himself. He added that both hostages were very important (Letter to Laplace). The exchange happened that same day (Chamberlain 23: 23).

Laplace had very much liked Haʻalilio, whom he described as “un chef, secrétaire et en même temps favori du roi, jeune homme bien fait, de bonnes manières, costume a l'européene, d'une physionomie ouverte, agréable, parlant assez bien anglais” [a chief, secretary, and favorite of the mōʻi, a handsome young man with good manners wearing European clothing; an open and agreeable countenance, and who spoke English rather well] Perhaps this accounts for the substitution; in any case, Laplace detested the replacement, John Papa ʻĪʻī, who was a “créature des missionnaires, ne parlant aucune langue européenne, à l’air faux, à la mine puritaine, se montrant observateur malveillant de tout ce qui se passait autour de lui” [puppet of the
missionaries, incapable of speaking a single European language, with the deceitful air typical of
Puritans, and observed everything around him with a hostile expression] (Laplace 441). Certainly
the missionaries thought he was an excellent representative. In a July 13, 1839 letter to her
mother, Juliette Montague Cooke wrote that Laplace “has had one of our most intelligent and
most lovely dispositioned natives on board as a hostage for the return of the vessel that went for
the King. His name is John Ii. He understands English, and the Commodore has been able to talk
with him some” (qtd. in M. Richards 32). A few days later, she wrote that William Richards
“thought John Ii had made a very favorable impression upon the Captain’s mind” (33).

During his brief stay aboard the Artemise, ‘Ī‘ī sent a letter to Kekūanao‘a, offering
suggestions regarding Laplace’s demands. He advised Kekāuluohi and Kekūanao‘a to ask for
more time to investigate the matter before deciding on a course of action. While acknowledging
that the decision was ultimately theirs, he also recommended seeking William Richards’ advice.
‘Ī‘ī reported that he was being well treated. Laplace had given him his own quarters to sleep in,
and offered him the use of his reading room. ‘Ī‘ī also revealed that Laplace had asked him if
there were any Hawaiian missionaries; ‘Ī‘ī replied there weren’t, but Hawaiians were church
members. His letter ended with his regret that his English was insufficient to explain fully their
side of the matter (Letter to Kekūanao‘a). Meanwhile, everyone was waiting for the mō‘ī to
arrive from Maui. A tense situation became worse, as the July 31 deadline came and went.
Finally, Kekāuluohi and Kekūanao‘a signed the treaty, which French consul Dudoit carried to
Laplace. Kekūanao‘a packed the twenty thousand dollars in four boxes and delivered them
personally to Laplace (“Moo olelo”). ‘Ī‘ī was freed after spending thirteen days aboard the
Artemise.

‘Ī‘ī was clearly more than a simple hostage. He was acting as a statesman, skillfully
assessing the situation, and offering information and sound advice to his political peers. While aboard Laplace’s ship, he conducted himself as an official representative for the kingdom, and though Laplace disliked him, he treated him accordingly. It is also useful to know that ‘Ī‘ī, only a few days shy of his thirty-eighth birthday, had never become fluent in English. In the years to come, he would rely on others to communicate with diplomats who did not speak Hawaiian. His role in the Laplace affair marks the beginning of his career as a statesman, willing to risk his life for the good of his nation. But then, he had always been resilient and even courageous in the face of personal losses and national calamities. Many of his finest qualities came to the fore during this time in his life. His ability to see past appearances, and to discern a person’s true worth, had served him well—for example, his allegiance to Ka‘ahumanu rather than Boki when the ali‘i were picking sides probably saved his life. Manuia, Kahuhu, and his own father chose the other side, and died. ‘Ī‘ī’s stern moral rectitude, his trustworthiness, and his work ethic earned him the respect of ali‘i and missionaries alike. As a result, though he never seemed to seek to better his circumstances, they improved anyway, and he successfully made the transition from attendant to advisor while continuing to serve his ali‘i. This period also confirmed him in his religious convictions and his prejudices. His fervent embrace of Christianity solidified into a degree of zeal that would cause problems in future dealings with Catholics. And while an innate sense of justice was a hallmark of his personality, it also made him at times inflexible. But these traits would only become liabilities many years later. In the next phase of his life, his firmness would prove valuable, as the mō‘ī and the government increasingly had to deal with foreigners attempting to undermine the stability of the kingdom.
CHAPTER 3
PUA KA LOEA KĀLAI AUPUNI – A STATESMAN EMERGES
‘Ī‘Ī’S LIFE FROM 1840 TO 1854

The nature of ‘Ī‘ī’s service to the Kamehamehas evolved over the years, in response to their needs and the changing times. Hawaiian society and kingdom policy were increasingly shaped by interactions with foreigners, and the need to establish diplomatic relations with England, France, and the United States of America. ‘Ī‘ī’s appointments between 1840 and 1854 chart his rise to prominence as a government official and statesman. As a member of the Privy Council and the House of Nobles from their inception, he participated in the highest levels of deliberations in the Hawaiian kingdom. Beginning in 1841, legislative assemblies were held annually except for 1844 and 1869. The only one ‘Ī‘ī missed was the one held in the year he died (Lydecker 16, 18, 23, 25, 29, 32, 35, 51, 55). The Privy Council minutes reveal that while his presence was constant, he was not conspicuous. When he spoke, it was to report on tasks given to him, to ask questions about or assess critically a certain point, or to register his support or firmly express his disagreement. In addition to his many government positions, and the frequent interisland trips they required, he continued working closely with the missionaries—whether taking temporary charge of a Sunday school, giving a sermon for an absent pastor, or helping individuals compose their sermons in Hawaiian (A. Cooke 6: 48; Chamberlain 23: 38; M. Richards 42, 94). ‘Ī‘ī also raised his hānai ali‘i, and other royal children.

Robert Crichton Wyllie, former British consul and later Minister of Foreign Affairs and Secretary of War and the Navy for the kingdom (“Wyllie”), described the 1840s political climate

34 These positions and their significance will be explained later.

35 Lydecker did not offer reasons for the lack of legislative assemblies in these years.
as “the very winter of consular discontent with the King’s government . . . and with the courts of justice” (“Report”). Diplomatic relations between the Hawaiian government and other countries were influenced by a flurry of grievances from foreigners or their consulates. According to Wyllie, one hundred and seventeen grievances from foreigners were lodged against the Hawaiian government: forty-seven by Americans between 1843 and 1846 (Table 3-44); forty-two by the British between 1844 and 1846 (44–97); twenty-five from the French between 1844 and 1845 (98–112); and three in connection with Peru in 1845 (112–117). Kauikeaouli and his councilors were hard-pressed to keep up with the onslaught of grievances and the resulting consular discontent. The British, French, and American consuls all pressed for advantageous economic and political concessions, yet cried favoritism whenever another nation reached an agreement. Notably, England and France both used gunboat diplomacy to force the kingdom into compliance. The French were so contentious that out of desperation, the Hawaiian government considered annexing the kingdom to England or America.

These diplomatic woes were increasingly linked to foreign residents’ land claim disputes. Two controversies in particular revealed the dangers the kingdom was facing, and pushed the government into adopting a private landownership system. ʻĪʻī would be ensnared in the political complications. The first resulted from British Consul Richard Charlton’s claims to prime waterfront land in Honolulu and other areas based on a purported lease agreement with Kālaimoku drawn up on December 9, 1826 (Privy Council 1845–1846 47). The significance of this claim is suggested by the number of times the Privy Council discussed it over the seven years following his initial claim in 1840.36 The mōʻī and his councilors discussed the Charlton

incident in relation to the British and American foreign consuls, who used this claim as a reason for destabilizing diplomatic relations with the Hawaiian Kingdom. The second case was Ladd Brothers & Co, whose owners and investors—William Ladd, Peter A. Brinsmade, and William Hooper—were Americans (L. Parker 113). In 1833, the mercantile company established an office in Honolulu (Kuykendall 1: 189), and quickly expanded its business interests into the agricultural sector, becoming the first company to successfully establish a “permanent sugar cane plantation” in the Hawaiian Kingdom (175). In 1835, the Hawaiian government leased “about a thousand acres” for three hundred dollars a year to the company “for a term of fifty years” for the production of sugar at Kōloa, Kauaʻi (Kuykendall 1: 175). Kauikeaouli and Kauaʻi governor Kaikioʻewa, who signed the lease, also stipulated that the company would pay the government twenty-five cents a month for every Hawaiian they employed. To oversimplify an extremely complicated case, by 1840, the company’s ambitions had exceeded their economic means, and it “contemplated selling their properties and privileges to some person or company having the necessary resources” (189).37 The Ladd & Co. case began during the height of the Charlton affair, but peaked a few years afterward. Between 1845 and 1847, two hundred and ten references to Ladd & Co. appear in the Privy Council minutes.

To understand the challenges the Charlton and Ladd disputes posed for ʻĪʻī and other aliʻi, it is important to recognize how a sense of western superiority towards Hawaiians shaped diplomatic relations. A key concern was agency. As Kaimanaikalani Beamer explains, “Agency refers to individuals’, or culturally affiliated groups’ ability to exercise their will against or within the structures which surround them. Agency should be understood in reference and

37 For more information on Ladd & Company, see Kuykendall 1:175-190, 217; Jarves Report.
opposition to structure” (“Na wai ka mana?” 5). In nineteenth-century Hawai‘i, the politics of agency were tightly intertwined with western ideas about the other, which included “racial theories and stereotypes that assisted European expansionism” (Anne Maxell qtd. in Bacchilega 19). Denying the capacity of governing ali‘i to wield their authority was therefore both a racialized expression of western superiority, and a political strategy for promoting foreign interests. Refusing to accept that Hawaiians could adapt western law to their advantage, or create laws based on Christian values, was tantamount to saying they could not be civilized, and were therefore not fully human. That some westerners saw Hawaiians this way is confirmed by evidence of racial slurs directed at their monarchs. John Cook recalled that James Robinson, a prominent merchant, called Kamehameha III “a damned nigger king” (17), and regarding Kamehameha IV, U.S. diplomat David Lawrence Gregg reported that “I knew there were some about town especially Americans who were in the habit of indulging in disparaging reflections to His Majesty’s disadvantage, calling him a d – n – d nigger and other epithets of a like character” (468). Even someone as closely associated to the ali‘i as Bernice Pauahi’s husband Charles Reed Bishop could juxtapose supposed weaknesses in Hawaiians with the assumed strengths of westerners: “The kanakas, physically, are as fine a race as can be found anywhere, and they are fairly intelligent and clever, but it is not to be expected that they can acquire so soon those virulent [sic] attributes which characterize the white races” (qtd. in “Annexation Essential”). Bishop’s apparent ignorance of the meaning of “virulent” here brings him closer to the truth, perhaps, than he is aware. In any case, it became a pattern that when foreign officials and merchants failed in their attempts to manipulate the monarch, racial slurs were often the result.

As we have also seen, foreigners who found kingdom polices inconvenient would resort

---

38 For a treatise on ‘Ōiwi agency and governance, see Beamer No Mākou Ka Mana.
to blaming the missionaries or haole government officials, because a dismissal of Hawaiian agency was so deeply ingrained that many foreigners were not even fully aware of it. What many also failed to realize, however, was that from a Kanaka Maoli perspective, appointing westerners as government officers was a deliberate political strategy. As Kauikeaouli himself remarked during the Ladd and Company arbitration, “were it not for the foreigners living under his jurisdiction he would require no Foreign Officers” (*Privy Council 1846–1847* 20–1). He insisted that “he could manage his own subjects very easily,” since “his word was always enough for them, but foreigners with great cunning and perseverance often sought to involve him in difficulty, and that by experience he found that he could not get along, but by appointing foreigners to cope with them” (20–1). Such appointees admittedly often possessed such skills as fluency in foreign languages and knowledge of western law and politics, which proved highly useful during this critical time in Hawaiian history. But such foreign officials were often paired with aliʻi officers. For instance, the Treasury Board consisted of ʻĪʻī, Timothy Kamalalehua Haʻalilio, and Dr. Gerrit Parmele Judd (*Buke Oihana* 9 May 1842), with Paul Kanoa later replacing Haʻalilio (*Wyllie Reign* 29). Haʻalilio and William Richards were sent together on a diplomatic mission “to negotiate treaties with Great Britain, France, and the United States” (*Kuykendall* 1: 192). ʻĪʻī also lived at the royal boarding school to help the Cookes raise and educate the nation’s future leaders. He and Wyllie would negotiate a treaty with U.S. Commissioner Anthony Ten Eyck (*Privy Council 1846–1847* 41), and ʻĪʻī, Keliʻiahonui, and Jean Ricord would investigate the rumor of a rebellion on Maui (*Privy Council 1847–1848* 424–6). Such pairings were of course not new. John Young and Isaac Davies became war generals for Kamehameha (*Kamakau Ke Kumu* 99–101), and Young was appointed governor of Hawaiʻi Island (61). During the reigns of Kamehameha and Liholiho, settler Don Francisco de Paula
Marin frequently acted as an interpreter and mediator for aliʻi (Gast 16–17), and of course, Liholiho appointed ʻĪʻī and Kahuhu to observe, learn from, and work with the missionaries.

On April 16, 1840, while living at the fort, ʻĪʻī was present at Kekāuluohi’s and Kekūanāoʻa’s meeting with Charlton to discuss his claim (ʻĪʻī Charlton Interview). In January or February, the mōʻī had sent ʻĪʻī to Kailua-Kona to speak with Kuakini, because Charlton claimed that this chief had seen this lease (“ʻĪʻī ʻKe ola” 14 July 1866). Kuakini firmly denied it (14 July 1866). ʻĪʻī was very familiar with the particulars, and acted as both a witness and the secretary for this formal interview. Charlton asserted, “ua hana ino ia mai na kanaka o Berikania, a ua hoomaluia o Amerika” [the British are mistreated while Americans are protected]. (Representatives from France and the United States of America would later voice this same complaint.) Charlton also threatened, “Ina i pono ole keia hooponopono ana, alaila kuu koʻu hae ilalo a uku nui mai oukou i na kala he 50,000, he uuku ka hihia o Kelemenetine i keia” [If this arrangement is unsatisfactory, I will lower my flag and you will pay $50,000 dollars. The Clémentine affair will be trifling compared to this] (qtd. in ʻĪʻī Charlton Interview). He was correct. The Privy Council rejected the lease’s validity (Privy Council 1845–1846 35, 48b); ever contentious, Charlton continued to lobby, and over the next three years, the dispute would grow into a major diplomatic issue that threatened the kingdom’s independence.

Ke Kula Aliʻi – The Chiefs’ Children’s School

When he returned to Lahaina from his meeting with Kuakini, ʻĪʻī learned that Rev. William Richards, on behalf of the missionaries, had recommended that the aliʻi appoint ʻĪʻī as the kahu for royal students who would attend the planned school (“ʻĪʻī ʻKe ola” 14 July 1866). He was pleased, and when Kauikeaouli asked his opinion, ʻĪʻī said he would take on this duty if he
could board at the school with Kamāmalu. After discussing the matter with Kekāuluohi, and receiving assurance that ʻĪʻī had not changed his mind, the mōʻī said, “e hoi ae no oe me kau keiki malaila, a pela oe e lawe aku ai i kaʻu mau keiki, a ina aole e hoi ae ilaila, aole no hoi e komo ana kaʻu mau keiki malaila” [if you go there with your child, you will take my children, and if you do not go there, then my children will not enter there either]. ʻĪʻī then returned to Honolulu with Kamāmalu and the other royal children who would enroll in the school (14 July 1866). Hawaiians called it Kula Aliʻi [School for Aliʻi] (“Ka Hale”). The missionaries and other foreigners referred to it as the Chiefs’ Children’s School (M. Richards 268). In 1846, the name was officially changed to the Royal School (268). Once the decision to establish the school was made, construction began. “A house was erected in the form of a hollow square,” Bingham recalled, “suited to accommodate a mission family and some twenty boarding and lodging pupils with school-room, parlor, dining-room, bed-rooms, etc.” (580–1). The building was completed in the first week of April 1840 (M. Richards 68), and on May 18, 1840, ʻĪʻī and his family moved into a large corner room between the rooms for male and female students (“Ka Hale”; M. Richards 60–1, 68–9; ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 3 Apr. 1869). He would be the Cookes’ assistant and head kahu for the children (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 3 Apr. 1869).

Between 1839 and 1850, sixteen students attended the school. A memorial plaque in the Kawaiahaʻo Church gives their names and the official positions they later held: Moses Kekuaiwa; Alexander Liholiho, King Kamehameha IV; Lot Kamehameha, King Kamehameha V; Victoria Kamamalu, Kuhina Nui; Emma Rooke, Queen Emma; William C. Lunalilo, King Lunalilo; David Kalakaua, King Kalakaua; Lydia Kamakaeha, Queen Liliuokalani; Bernice Pauahi Bishop; Elizabeth Kekaaniau Pratt; Jane Loeau Jasper; Abagail Maheha; Peter Young Kaeo; James Kaliokalani Kapaakea; John Pitt Kinau; and Mary Paaina. ʻĪʻī would later serve and
advise several of them. In his annual report to the ABCFM, Amos Cooke expressed his approval of ʻĪʻī’s appointment: “Of his standing you are probably somewhat acquainted. He was Kinau’s secretary. He is an almost invaluable assistant as we can trust the children with him and feel that our instructions will be complied with” (qtd. in M. Richards 67, 69). Bingham wrote that “John Li and his estimable wife, Sarai, are attached to the institution, and exercise an important and useful guardianship over these royal and noble pupils” (581). Rev. Sheldon Dibble praised him as well: “John Li, a faithful, intelligent and substantial member of the church, acts as an assistant guardian, and is aided by his wife who is a person of like character. They are able to render very important services and are indispensable helpers in the various arrangements of the family” (291).

ʻĪʻī and Sarai’s assistance was indeed crucial, because they directed or replaced the dozens of personal attendants who normally cared for these young ali‘i. Wyllie explained how this worked: “Each child or pupil has from two to six native attendants, namely: tailors, washers, groom, &c., according to the age, rank and sex of each; and those under the direction of John Li and his wife both most respectable natives.” Furthermore, ʻĪʻī and Sarai “co-operate with Mr. and Mrs. Cooke in excluding these attendants from any intercourse or intimacy with the young chiefs that could communicate to them their own vices, prejudices and superstitious” (“Notes”). As chief kahu, ʻĪʻī mixed the traditional and the new, carrying out his duties with all the dedication demanded by this long-established and honored form of service, but also as a Christian convert who refused to pass along beliefs to which he no longer adhered. But despite the Cookes’ and ʻĪʻī’s efforts, the children still learned about Hawaiian beliefs from their other kahu (M. Richards 58–60, 63, 108). As Bingham admitted, despite a generation of missionary proselytizing, some Kānaka Maoli clung to old ways in the face of the new: “The introduction of
Christianity did not change at once the notions of the chiefs and people on so difficult a subject,” he wrote, and he concluded that it would be some time before this would change (323).

ʻĪʻī’s command over personal attendants seems to have arisen from an earlier, largely unsuccessful missionary attempt to teach the chiefs’ children. According to Sheldon Dibble, “The chiefs all along had been unwilling to have their children excluded from a train of attendants, which they considered as being necessary to the very existence of a chief” (290), and Bingham grumbled that “It had been difficult to detach them from their numerous attendants, and difficult otherwise to teach them in our families, and equally difficult to train them properly in any of the schools for common people” (580). What the missionaries did not account for was the kahus’ deep affection for their charges, and their own thoughts about what a proper education for a young aliʻi was. Even when sent away, the kahu did everything they could to stay near their young chiefs, and carry out their duties. Mrs. Cooke despaired about their influence upon her students (M. Richards 56–60, 62, 65–6, 68, 78, 81, 107), claiming about Alexander Liholiho’s attendant Kalauwalu that “He had more power over the boy than the King” (47). This prince arrived at the school on May 16, 1840 (62) with thirty personal attendants. Five days later, he “made three attempts to escape and go to the Fort.” He was six years old (Wyllie “Notes” 71). That night, frustrated and angry, he bit ʻĪʻī’s wrist as the kahu tried to put him to bed (M. Richards 62). His sister, Kamāmalu, suffered less emotional distress because the people who raised her, ʻĪʻī and Sarai, were there.

ʻĪʻī mediated between the Cookes and the aliʻi, carried out menial labors at the school, and spent time with his royal charges. On August 1, 1840, he accompanied Mrs. Cooke and the children on an outing upland to swim. This journey was on horseback, and the children’s other kahu joined them—“Rather too many” for Mrs. Cooke (79). Two days later, ʻĪʻī went with her
and the children to see off the Thurstons and the Binghams, who were leaving for the United States (79). On August 5, Mrs. Cooke wrote that Alexander Liholiho fell into a well being dug on the property, but was uninjured. Meanwhile, “Moses got very muddy & got angry at John Ii” (79). After Moses calmed down, Mrs. Cooke suggested he apologize, which he did (79). ‘Īʻī owned an “old blind horse,” and on September 4, he let the children ride it (80), and on September 24, he, Mrs. Cooke, and the children visited Commodore Wilkes aboard the Vincennes (83). The affection that ‘Īʻī and Sarai showed the children was especially important because they did not receive it from the Cookes, and as ‘Īʻī’s official duties increasingly cut into the time he could assist with the children—he often had to travel between Oʻahu and the mōʻī’s residence on Maui, and to Kauaʻi and Hawaiʻi Island as well—the consequences were unfortunate. His wife Sarai carried on at the school, and took care of their hānai daughter Kamāmalu, but the Cookes’ journals and letters testify to their growing frustration and resentment towards the students. When they broke school rules, Amos Cooke sometimes lashed the children on the back with a rawhide whip, or hit them with a ruler (A. Cooke 7: 86, 135, 188, 294, 339, 8: 34). By 1850, the Cookes decided to leave the school, and began moving out on June 6 (M. Richards 344). ‘Īʻī, Sarai, Kamāmalu, and Mary continued living there for nearly two more years, before moving into the house known as Mililani, across from the old ‘Iolani Palace, on the Kawaiahaʻo plain (ʻĪʻī “Na Hunahuna” 16 June 1868). The question therefore arises, who was ultimately the more constant presence and educational force at the Chiefs’ Children’s school?

On one occasion, ‘Īʻī’s government service and his duties to the young chiefs came together in an unfortunate manner. On September 28, Amos Cooke wrote that ‘Īʻī had been away most of the day because the government had requested his services. An aliʻi was accused of
killing his wife by poisoning her (5: 300), and on September 30, a jury entirely composed of
Hawaiians sat in judgment over Kamanawa and his accomplice “Lono, captain of the schooner
Hooikaika for the murder of Kamokuiki, wife of the former” (“Trial”). An unsigned letter in the
Foreign Office and Executive files, dated October 5, 1840, reveals that ʻĪʻī was a jury member
(Unsigned Letter to B. M.).39 Kamanawa and Lonopuakau were found guilty (Kamehameha III
and Kekāuluohi “Sentence”; Unsigned Letter to B.M.), and the mōʻī and the kuhina nui signed a
proclamation on October 5 sentencing the two men to death, the execution to be carried out on
October 20 at 11 a.m. (Kamehameha III and Kekāuluohi “Sentence”). Kamanawa was the
grandfather of two students at the Chiefs’ Children’s School,40 James Kaliokalani Kapaakea and
David Kalākaua (M. Richards 84; Chapin Shaping 25), and on October 12, ʻĪʻī gave Mrs. Cooke
a letter from Kamanawa “requesting the privilege of seeing Kali and David before he was
executed” (M. Richards 85). The next day, ʻĪʻī took the children to see him (85). Kali was five
years and four months old while David was two months shy of turning four (Wyllie “Notes” 71).
Especially after serving on the jury, accompanying these little boys to see their grandfather one
last time would surely have been a difficult duty to perform.

The Rise of a Statesman

On October 8, 1840, Kauikeaouli granted his former childhood kahu one of the highest
honors he would ever receive. ʻĪʻī’s name was immortalized in the kingdom’s first constitution,
entered with those of Kekāuluohi, Hoapiliwahine, Kuakini, Kekauʻōnohi, Kahekili, Pākī, Konia,

39 The letter was addressed to a certain B.M., possibly Boaz Mahune, who had helped write the laws for the
1840 Constitution (Translation of the Constitution 4).
Keohokālole, Leleīhoku, Kekūanāo‘a, Keali‘iahonui, Kana‘ina, Keoniana, and Ha‘alilio as “na‘līi malalo o ke Alii nui” [the ali‘i under the high Ali‘i] who would work closely with him (Ke Kumu Kanawai 8). (ʻĪʻī had a hand in writing some of the articles that were adopted (Translation of the Constitution 4).) As Robert Lydecker explains, “Members of this Council were called Nobles, and as such were a degree higher in the rank of chiefs.” This Council was a forerunner of the Privy Council and the eventual formal deliberative body: “This constitution did not create the House of Nobles; it merely continued the old council of chiefs, who were already Members of the Council, to sit in council with the King and Premier” (4). The 1840 Constitution does not set the duration of this appointment, but the 1852 Constitution states that Privy Councilors would “hold their office during His Majesty’s pleasure” (41), while membership in the House of Nobles was a lifetime appointment (43). Although these stipulations would come up in relation to ʻĪʻī in 1855, and again in 1868, he served in both bodies at the pleasure of three mōʻī for over twenty-eight years. The importance of these councilor aliʻi is obvious from their described duties: “No law of the nation shall be passed without their assent,” says the constitution, and furthermore, “It shall also be proper for the King to consult with the above persons respecting the great concerns of the kingdom, in order to promote unanimity and secure the greatest good. They shall moreover transact such other business as the King shall commit to them” (Translation of the Constitution 15–16). ʻĪʻī was now one of the most influential Hawaiians in the kingdom, and as we will see, he would go on to “transact” more “other business” than just about anyone else.

On January 1, 1841, ʻĪʻī offered a Thanksgiving Day speech to the congregation of Kawaiahaʻo Church. Since December 25, in the Western tradition, is Christ’s birthday, it was presumably a good time for a speech giving thanks for God’s gifts. He also transcribed it for The
Polynesian, which then “secured a literal translation,” and published it five months later as a curiosity, a window into “by-gone times,” even though they were only thirty years before (Editorial 9 Jan. 1841; ʻĪʻī “Translation”; Editorial 1 May 1841). The Pacific Commercial Advertiser would publish ʻĪʻī’s speech on Christmas Day in 1856, without editorial comment (ʻĪʻī, “John Ii’s Speech”), and Thomas G. Thrum would include it in his Hawaiian Almanac and Annual for 1890, with the sensational title “Ancient Idolatrous Customs and Kapus of the Hawaiian Peoples (From a Thanksgiving Address of John Ii, delivered in Hawaiian at Kawaiahao Church, Jan. 1. 1841)” (ʻĪʻī “Ancient”). While it undeniably offered valuable insights into religious beliefs and practices, the speech’s greatest significance lies elsewhere. ʻĪʻī was a prominent statesman who was sharing his conclusions about his life under Kamehameha and Liholiho during the kapu system from the perspective of his subsequent conversion to Christianity. Any Hawaiian over forty years old would have immediately recognized the deeper implications of ʻĪʻī’s life. He had spent his youth serving aliʻi when they were considered divine, and had survived. Those who knew what made someone eligible for service would been curious about both his lineage, and his specialized training. And above all, ʻĪʻī’s status as a kahu made him an authority on the last decade of Kamehameha’s reign and the whole of Liholiho’s.

After greeting those gathered to hear his speech, ʻĪʻī gave thanks to God: “His goodness has been very great to us and our nation. It cannot be enumerated. To perceive this we only had to look back to our day of ignorance and sin. Let me tell you some things I myself have witnessed” (ʻĪʻī “Translation”). ʻĪʻī then held forth on the major male and female deities, deity-related rituals, his service to Liholiho, oppressive kapu and how he himself risked death because of them, and the execution of kapu breakers. He also revealed that he had been a kahu for Kamehameha’s war deity Kihawahine. ʻĪʻī was clearly criticizing the kapu system, but he also
was presenting Hawaiians as a religious people: “both chiefs and people placed much reliance in these false gods, because it was said, salvation belonged to the pious alone, and to pray to the gods was the only way to triumph in sickness, in battle, and the pains of death.” How would ‘Ī‘ī’s account have affected listeners taught to feel ashamed of their former beliefs? Perhaps the thought that they had been devout and sincere, even if to the wrong gods, would have offered some degree of comfort. ‘Ī‘ī confessed that he had been a staunch follower, and that when Liholiho decided to abolish the kapu system, he begged him to reconsider: “I had a great abhorrence of his conduct, and even wept aloud in his presence, saying to him, ‘we must forsake this work at once, or god will be angry at us.’”

‘Ī‘ī acknowledged he had been wrong, and that he had come to realize that this system had been oppressive. But, in a rhetorical shift that speaks to ‘Ī‘ī’s skills as an orator, he then argued that Kamehameha, the last mō‘ī who had ruled under this burdensome religious regime, had nevertheless been a good ali‘i, because “unlike former chiefs, he protected and favored the common people, even children, old women and old men.” Even if Kamehameha had worshipped the old gods, he was a good mō‘ī because of his actions. ‘Ī‘ī described some kapu that Kamehameha imposed as good, such as those that conserved agricultural and fishing resources. ‘Ī‘ī then claimed “It is my opinion if Kamehameha was now alive he would be a Christian, and he would confess his sins against the true God.” He rather predictably ended with an appeal “to read the Holy Scriptures, and call to mind the happy changes that have taken place, as well as all the blessings which have been conferred upon us from time to time, as we have received many during the year now at a close” (“Translation”). But the overall tone of the speech suggested that ‘Ī‘ī had matured as an enforcer of Christian values. Whereas formerly he had

41 ‘Ī‘ī is referring here to the Māmala Hoa (also, Māmala Hoe law) (Kamakau Ke Kumu 77, 159, 222).
harangued his fellow Hawaiians, and helped to impose the new religion, here he opted for loving exhortation that empowered rather than humiliated them. And he was also stressing continuity. Although he was giving thanks to the makua lani (heavenly father), to whom Hawaiians owed their salvation and many blessings, his statements about Kamehameha’s efforts to protect and care for them reaffirmed the value of the makua-keiki relationship between aliʻi and their people that had defined ʻĪʻī’s life and service.

On March 19, 1841, ʻĪʻī went from being the kahu of one school to many, when he received a letter from the mōʻī informing him that he would soon be appointed as the kahu (superintendent) of all the schools on Oʻahu (A. Cooke 6: 69). ʻĪʻī’s early assistance to missionaries in establishing and managing their schools, his own experience as a teacher of his fellow Kānaka Maoli, and his role with the Kula Aliʻi, made him the logical candidate for this position. Amos Cooke recalled that the night before, Judd had enlisted him and Armstrong for a tour of Oʻahu schools, but that they cancelled it upon learning that ʻĪʻī would be the superintendent (6: 69–70). This placed control of schools firmly in Hawaiian hands, and Judd and Cooke discussed how ʻĪʻī could assist them when he met with the aliʻi in Lahaina at the upcoming legislative assembly. Judd recommended that Cooke prepare a report regarding the “things” that were “hemahema” (lacking) at the Kula Aliʻi, which ʻĪʻī could then discuss from personal experience with the mōʻī and council (6: 70). This appointment created an interesting situation. As a kahu who assisted the Cookes at the Kula Aliʻi, ʻĪʻī was a subordinate, but now as kahu for Oʻahu schools, ʻĪʻī was their superior. His appointment became official on May 17, during the legislative assembly (Buke Oihana 17 May 1841). Pāpōhaku was chosen as supervisor for schools on Kauaʻi, and Davida Malo was appointed overseer for Maui and head
superintendent (17 May 1841). ʻĪʻī, Malo, and Richards were also asked to draft laws pertaining to the Kingdom’s schools (April 10).

One of ʻĪʻī’s duties was making sure that teachers paid taxes. On June 9, 1841, he met with Father Louis Maigret, who had prohibited his teachers from participating in the mōʻī’s mandatory labor days, a form of taxation (ʻĪʻī “Extract”). Their conversation moved from Maigret’s reasons for interfering to an intense debate over his presence in Hawaiʻi. ʻĪʻī reminded Maigret that he had entered Hawaiʻi several years ago under false pretenses, deliberately hiding from Kīnaʻu that he was a Frenchman and a Catholic priest. ʻĪʻī seems to have accused Maigret of claiming to be a British national. Maigret called ʻĪʻī a liar (“Extract”), and on July 21, French consul Dudoit and Maigret came to speak with ʻĪʻī, presumably about his statements (A. Cooke 6: 120). ʻĪʻī would soon regret his heated discussion with Maigret, who like Charlton would prove troublesome, and who would also complain to higher powers. A few days later, ʻĪʻī left for a day trip to Waiʻalae and Waipiʻo (6: 121). Sarai was still weak from an illness, and unable to carry out her usual duties (6: 121). In her journal entry for July 28, 1841, a harried Mrs. Cooke, overwhelmed by the daily realities of boarding thirteen students, vented her frustration: “Our native assistant is so much occupied with government affairs, school committees and church business that he is of assistance to us only so far as his influence with the children and Chiefs is concerned” (M. Richards 112–113). This statement is quite revealing. By calling ʻĪʻī her “native assistant,” she not only objectified him, but denied the legitimacy of his status as an important statesman. It is also clear here that she found his immediate and present help with her work at the school more valuable than his relationships with the students and the chiefs, which were of course what was central to ʻĪʻī. Is it interesting to note that when Maria Whitney, daughter of missionary Samuel Whitney, became her assistant for a brief period, Cooke first wrote about her
as Miss Whitney (Amos. S. and Juliette M. 225), and then as Maria Whitney, and as an assistant without a qualifier (231). She then returned to Miss Whitney (249). Mrs. Cooke never added a Mister to ‘Ī‘ī’s name. Regardless of how important a role he played in the kingdom, Cooke would never have been able to see past her prejudice, and recognize the incongruity of an ali‘i of ‘Ī‘ī’s caliber carrying out menial labor for her.

Life only got busier for him. On May 9, 1842, the government appointed ‘Ī‘ī, Judd, and Haʻalilio to the newly created Treasury Board (Buke Oihana 9 May 1842). ‘Ī‘ī now held three positions in the government: Privy Councilor, Superintendent of Schools on O‘ahu, and Treasurer for the kingdom. He was of course still kahu at the Kula Ali‘i, and a husband and father. Kamehameha III and the Privy Council then decided to send Haʻalilio and William Richards to “negotiate treaties with Great Britain, France, and the United States.” They set sail from Maui on July 18, 1842 (Kuykendall 1: 192), and since Haʻalilio was if anything more burdened with responsibilities that even ‘Ī‘ī, his absence could only have increased the work expected from ‘Ī‘ī. Two months later, Charlton left for England to “procure justice for British Subjects,” whether residents or traders in the kingdom (1: 211). Bingham saw this as an attempt to “circumvent” Haʻalilio’s and Richards’ efforts at negotiating a treaty with England “by creating a prejudice at the foreign office against the government of the Sandwich Islands” (Bingham 589). General William Miller took Charlton’s place as consul (589), and he proved to be every bit as difficult. The Charlton issue was far from over.

Nor was the Maigret issue. He had written to French officials complaining about the mistreatment of Catholics, and specifically about John Papa ‘Ī‘ī. France responded by sending a representative, and on August 24, 1842, Captain Stanislas Louis Mallet arrived aboard the Embuscade (M. Richards 153; Bajot and Poirré Tables 184). On September 1, Mallet made
several demands to Kamehameha III, most meant to protect Catholics and facilitate Catholicism, but one regarding land that Boki had purportedly given to the French mission (Bingham 590). One ultimatum pertained specifically to ʻĪʻī. Mallet demanded “proof that the Abbé Maigret has signed a writing, by which he acknowledges himself a British subject” (590), and “Should this prove to be a merely calumny . . . I demand that the author of this calumny, John Ii, the inspector general, retract in writing, declaring either that he lied about it, or that he had been deceived. As a Frenchman, I deem it important to be fully satisfied on this point” (591). ʻĪʻī’s heated debate with Maigret the previous summer had come back to haunt him. Mallet then informed the mōʻī that he would communicate any response “to the Admiral, Commander in Chief of the French Forces in the Pacific Ocean” (591), none other than Dupetit-Thouars (Bajot and Poirré Annales 256). Kauikeaouli and Kekāuluohi replied to Mallet’s ultimatums and implied threats with consummate diplomacy. Regarding their kahu, they reported that “When John Ii arrives from Kauai, that case will be adjusted, and if he denies the charge which you have presented, a trial will be granted” (Bingham 591). They also asked Mallet to inform the Admiral that they had “sent ministers to the King of France, to beg of him a new treaty between us and him” (592). Their response seems to have placated Mallet (592) who left on September 8, 1842 (Bajot and Poirré Annales 256). Two days later, Maigret wrote in his journal, “Jean Ii me fait ses excuses” [John ʻĪʻī apologized to me] (qtd. in Jean Charlot n.p.).

Since Catholic priests now knew that complaining to their consuls about real or perceived injustices got results, they became increasingly contentious. Many ran schools, and ʻĪʻī dealt with at first hand the troubles created for school superintendents and other government officials across the Islands. He updated Haʻalilio about the difficulties with Catholics in a nine-page letter (Letter to Timoteo Haʻalilio 12 Dec. 1842), which began with a detailed account of his argument with
Ioteve, a Roman Catholic priest, a month after Mallet’s departure. They had met at Hau‘ula (about thirty miles from Honolulu) to discuss Ioteve’s teachers’ and students’ participation in the examinations in the nearby districts of Kahuku and Lā‘ie. By law, the kuhina nui, governor, and school superintendent presided over such exams, and wherever they decided to stop, the schools in and near that district were required to gather there. Ioteve refused, because he felt Catholics had been mistreated, and demanded that a separate examination be held in Hau‘ula. Had he been the only examiner, ʻĪʻī replied, he would have accommodated this request, but he reiterated that participation was paramount because the teachers would be evaluated. Ioteve then accused ʻĪʻī of misconduct, claiming that he had postponed last year’s examination, and denied certificates to some teachers, which had angered the French consul. ʻĪʻī responded that the teachers were at fault, because they had failed to submit a required report. Most had also refused to let him visit their classes, and the one teacher who did was not even certified. Nevertheless, after putting this teacher’s students through their exams, ʻĪʻī evaluated the teacher, and because he deserved it, he was certified, supposedly showing that none of this had anything to do with them being Catholics. It was simply important for the nation to insure that only competent people became teachers. ʻĪʻī also wrote Haʻalilio that officials on Hawaiʻi and Kauaʻi had similar difficulties. A huge fight had even broken out at Kaʻū, when forty Hawaiian Catholics had ganged up on three school inspectors, severely injuring one of them. In short, the French priests were in ʻĪʻī’s opinion the cause of great trouble, and “ua oi aku ka lakou hana mamua o ka Kapena Laplace” [what they are doing is worse than Captain Laplace] (Letter to Haʻalilio 12 Dec. 1842).

The specter of warships loomed in ʻĪʻī’s mind, but when the fear became true, the British, not the French, would be the culprits. Charlton’s attempt to cause trouble proved successful. On February 11, 1843, Lord George Paulet, supposedly acting on behalf of Great Britain, arrived in
the Hawaiian Islands “for the purpose of affording protection to British subjects, as likewise to support the position of her Britannic Majesty’s representatives here, who has received repeated insults from the government authorities of these islands” (Bingham 593). ʻĪʻī was not on Oʻahu; he had been on Hawaiʻi Island since January 14 (Letter to Kamalalehua 4 Aug. 1843). Paulet presented the mōʻī with six demands, the first two dealing with Charlton and his purported lands, and threatened to open hostilities unless they were met (Bingham 594–5; “No ka Lilo”). Unable to meet these “exorbitant demands,” the mōʻī, under protest, provisionally ceded the Hawaiian Islands to Great Britain on February 25, 1843 (Bingham 596). That same day, Paulet lowered the Hawaiian flag (M. Richards 161).

During Paulet’s occupation of Hawaiʻi over the next five months, ʻĪʻī visited Maui often to assist the mōʻī (ʻĪʻī Letter to Kamalalehua 4 Aug. 1843). He also spent time with Sarai, Kamāmalu, and the royal students. In early April, ʻĪʻī even took the male students to Maui (A. Cooke 7: 79). On April 18, writing from Lahaina, Kekūanāoʻa informed Paulo Kanoa that the mōʻī, royal students, and ʻĪʻī were all returning to Honolulu, and asked him to supply them with food (Letter to Paulo Kanoa 18 Apr. 1843). Two days later, Kekūanāoʻa wrote again to Kanoa, telling him that the fishes he was sending were for the aliʻi who were arriving in Honolulu. He also said that should Paulet ask again for fish, not to give him any (Letter to Kanoa 20 Apr. 1843). On April 21, ʻĪʻī wrote to Kekūanāoʻa, letting him know that he and the children had arrived safely, and that when he had enquired about the men at the fort, he learned there were not as many as before (Letter to Kekūanāoʻa). One joyful event occurred during these trying times for ʻĪʻī and Sarai. They adopted Mary Polly Paʻaʻāina, the daughter of Kekela and Henry Coleman Lewis, in May and enrolled her in the Kula Aliʻi (Wyllie “Notes”; A. Cooke 7: 303–4; Amos S. and Juliette M. 241, 245).
Though apparently not in an official capacity, ʻĪʻī had also been keeping Judd apprised about important developments on Maui. Though Judd had been appointed to deal with Paulet, he resigned on May 10 because Paulet violated the treaty negotiated about the provisional cession (Kamehameha III and Kekāuluohi Letter to Paulet; Bingham 599). On June 4, ʻĪʻī informed Judd that Kauikeaouli had been ill but was improving. The mōʻī had been consistently refusing Paulet’s requests to meet with him, or his offer to sail with him to Hilo and Honolulu (Letter to Judd 4 June 1843). This waiting game of manipulation was taking a toll on ʻĪʻī. In a letter to Amos Cooke on July 5, ʻĪʻī expressed his anguish over how the Paulet Affair was affecting him (Letter to A. Cooke 5 July 1843). Although ʻĪʻī was physically present with the mōʻī on Maui, his heart was with his loved ones on Oʻahu. Sarai was foremost on his mind because she had to care for the children without him. Perhaps he was worried that she was working too hard. He certainly was. ʻĪʻī was hardly a complainer, but in this letter, he mentioned twice that the stress of dealing with Paulet affair made him feel “me he iwi ia la iloko o kuu puu” [as if there were a fishbone in my throat]. He also reported that he had run into Gilman. This would have been Gorham Dummer Gilman, a frequent visitor to the Kula Aliʻi (A. Cooke 6: 140, 7: 78), and later the interpreter for the Ladd & Co. arbitration (Jarves 349). He would become Consul-General to Hawaiʻi for New England (Gilman 105). After a three-hour conversation, ʻĪʻī invited Gilman to stay at his house. The American had no place to go (Letter to A. Cooke 5 July 1843).

ʻĪʻī returned to Oʻahu for a short visit to the Kula Aliʻi. From there, he wrote a letter to Rev. Dwight Baldwin on July 10, explaining that he was waiting for the Keoua so he could sail back to Maui, and that Judd had suggested he board the Paʻalua, which was returning from Kauaʻi. ʻĪʻī also reported that the Boston captain and other foreigners had publicly mocked Paulet in Honolulu. ʻĪʻī ended with a request: “E haawi mai oe i ka like o ka olelo haole au i
unuhi ai o ka olelo a ke alii ia Haku Paulet, ua makemake o G.P. Judd ia mea, no ka mea, ua lawe mai nei au i na olelo a pau a ua Haku Paulet nei ma Oahu nei” [Give me a copy of your English translation of what the mōʻī said to Lord Paulet; G. P. Judd wants it because I told him everything Lord Paulet said on Oʻahu] (Letter to Baldwin). Clearly, ʻĪʻī was operating in the highest circles of advising. On June 12, he told Judd that he disapproved of Paulet’s frequent meetings with the mōʻī, and mentioned that Paulet was now en route to Honolulu. (Letter to Judd 12 June 1843). In another letter, ʻĪʻī warned that Paulet intended to appropriate and dispense funds as he saw fit, but that the mōʻī objected to all of his requests. Judd should be mindful of Paulet’s actions, because he was furious and it might prove necessary to give in to his requests (Letter to Judd n.d.). On July 25, ʻĪʻī returned to Oʻahu with Kauikeaouli, Keoniana, and others (A. Cooke 7: 119). They did not know it yet, but the occupation was about to end. The next day, Rear-Admiral Richard Thomas, having heard of Paulet’s actions, arrived in Honolulu. On July 31, Thomas ended the provisional cession (Bingham 600–603), and a huge event celebrated the restoration of the kingdom. During the festivities, ʻĪʻī offered a speech, which impressed several missionaries. Sheldon Dibble wrote that “John Ii, as orator of the day . . . in a very animated speech expressed the joy of the nation in having the flag restored. He contrasted the pleasure he now experienced with the gloom which came over his own mind and over the nation when he saw the national flag fall to the ground” (407). Dibble further reported that “In strains of native eloquence, of sterling good sense and unaffected piety, he addressed the audience for about twenty minutes” (407). Bingham recalled that “John Ii (a counselor and orator) delivered an animated address suited to the joyous occasion,” and was also struck by how ʻĪʻī “referred to the gloom which had shrouded the nation, and the despondency which had brooded over many minds, but which were now dispelled, and succeeded by hope, and joy, and brightening
prospects” (604). And Chamberlain recorded that the speech was “expressive of the joy which the occasion inspired and calling on all to praise God for his interposition in favor of the nation” (24: 27).

A symbolic cleansing of the nation followed, including a revision of the Hawaiian flag. ʻĪʻī shared the details with Gorham Dummer Gilman: “Ua hala ka wa o Lo Keoki a ua hiki mai ka wa hou a nolaila, e hookahuli no makou i ka hae o Hawaii. Ka mea maluna mamua e hoia ia malalo loa.” Gilman translated, “The time of Lord George has passed, the new times have come in, and therefore we intend to reverse the flag of Hawaii. What was formerly the upper stripe will be placed at the bottom” (Ballou 6). Another outcome of the Paulet affair noted by the missionaries was that whenever Hawaiians found “a man remarkable for honesty, integrity, veracity, and an upholder of the laws, they called him ‘Admirala Toma [Admiral Thomas];’ but, if a person appears destitute of these traits, regardless of good order, and lawless, they call him, ‘Lord George.’” The writer of this anecdote concluded, “Who had a better right to express his opinion respecting those men than an Hawaiian?” (X. Y.). After five months of personal and national stress, August should have been a welcome relief for ʻĪʻī, but he did not take time off to recover. Days after the liberation of the kingdom, the treasury board began the daunting task of tallying up the financial damages Paulet’s occupation had caused. ʻĪʻī, Judd, and Paul Kanoa (the replacement for Haʻalilio, who was still abroad), finished the report on August 4. The damages amounted to twenty-nine thousand dollars—sixteen thousand of them because of a decrease in business, and the government’s inability to collect taxes and interests on loans. Unable to pay its debts, interest had also accrued (ʻĪʻī, Judd, Kanoa qtd. in Wyllie Reign 29).

That same evening, the commander of the U.S.S Constellation held a ball (A. Cooke 7: 128). Along with Judd, ʻĪʻī accompanied the mōʻī, even though balls were not a social activity he
usually participated in, since there would be drinking, and he was a teetotaler. Perhaps he went because the event celebrated the liberation of the kingdom, or perhaps the mōʻī had made a special request. At any rate, six days later, ʻĪʻī in far more comfortable surroundings offered a sermon at church. His theme was “No peace to the wicked”; his presentation was excellent, and the sermon was well received (7: 129). On August 14, Cooke and ʻĪʻī went to church but discovered the pastors, Rowel and Smith, were not there (7: 132). Cooke took charge and began the service, but after two prayers, he asked ʻĪʻī to take over. He preached for fifty minutes (7: 132), and on August 21, he delivered another sermon to a crowd of about five hundred people (7: 136).

The Paulet affair and the demands on his time afterward took its toll on ʻĪʻī’s health. He was forty-three years old and in the prime of life, but he was also overworked and exhausted. On August 30, he took sick, and the next morning, though he insisted on getting up, he fainted while he was participating in the prayer service (7: 142). By September 4, he was much better (7: 143), but he was realizing that his workload was excessive and dangerous. By the end of the year, he had stepped down as superintendent of Oʻahu schools (Records 13), and on March 26, 1844, during a public meeting, he confessed that although “he loved the work of superintendent” he had known that “he could not attend to it as he should” and that he “was glad to have Keikenui take it up” (7: 210).

But he continued his frequent interisland travel on government business (7: 198, 213, 219, 224). And he and the other aliʻi barely had a chance to recover from the Paulet affair when the cases of Charlton and Ladd & Company dropped onto them. After five months of diplomatic hell, they entered what amounted to a political purgatory from 1844 to 1846 because they feared a repeat of the Paulet affair. To summarize an extremely complicated case, on October 30, 1844,
Ladd admitted to the Treasury Board that the company could not repay loans received from the
government to the amount of $9,478.80 (Privy Council 1846–1847 139; Kuykendall 1: 252–5). As a result, “a levy was made on all the real and personal property of Ladd & Co” (139), and a month later, ʻĪʻī and Judd took this “writ to levy upon Ladd & Co.’s property” to Hanalei (Kauaʻi) for Governor Kekāuluohi to sign (Jarves 353). In 1846, this action would put the two public servants at the center of a lawsuit against the Hawaiian kingdom.

In the spring of 1845, a devastating influenza epidemic hit the nation. ʻĪʻī and others suffered personal losses because of it. By April 16, nearly everyone at the school was very ill, including ʻĪʻī (A. Cooke 7: 302). ʻĪʻī and Sarai’s adopted daughter, Mary Polly Paʻaʻāina, lost her biological father Henry Coleman Lewis in the first week of the epidemic (7: 303–4). On June 2, William Lunalilo was summoned to visit his mother and the kingdom’s kuhina nui, Kekāuluohi, who stricken by influenza had been sick for six weeks (7: 307). She died just before he reached the house (7: 312–3). Keoniana (John Young II) would replace her as kuhina nui. Then in the second week of July, ʻĪʻī’s sister passed away. Carpenters working for Amos Cooke made her coffin (7: 318). That summer, ʻĪʻī probably spent more time with brothers Moses Kekūaiwa, Lot Kapuāiwa, and Alexander Liholiho than their father Kekūanāoʻa did. According to Amos Cooke’s journal, ʻĪʻī went riding with them, and took them to Maui (7: 313–4). When Cooke fell from a horse on his way to Waialua and dislocated his shoulder, ʻĪʻī arrived with the boys, built Cooke a stretcher, and hired men to carry him back to Honolulu (7: 324–5). Perhaps this greater attention was a response to the boys’ behavior, which was becoming increasingly rebellious. Around 2 a.m. on August 18, 1845, Sarai discovered they were missing from the school. ʻĪʻī went looking for them and discovered they had been drinking at the house of Moses’ kahu (7: 327). On September 1, ʻĪʻī and Sarai caught Alexander sneaking out, dressed in Moses’
clothes (7: 330–1). The next day, Cooke and ʻĪʻī met with the mōʻī, Kekūanāoʻa, Pākī, Richards, and Judd to discuss the boys’ conduct. Seeking to assert control, Kauikeaouli appointed Judd and Richards to “manage the school” with the Cookes (7: 331). On September 5, Moses went missing. When he returned, he confessed that he had been trying, unsuccessfully, to enter the residence of Kalama, Kauikeaouli’s aliʻi wahine. Cooke discovered that he “had been in the habit of going there clandestinely” (7: 332). Moses also addressed a letter to two commodores, Gov. E. F. Snnibs [sic] and Admiral & F.B. St. Clar [sic], expressing his desire to go to Tahiti because of his mistreatment (7: 332–4). The names were fictitious, but the people were not; his accomplices were a certain Mr. Binns and Mr. St. John (7: 335). As heirs to the throne, and important positions in government, Kekūanāoʻa’s sons were undeniably a concern for ʻĪʻī, and many others.

Then the Charlton affair resurfaced. On August 9, 1845, British Consul Miller addressed the mōʻī and his councilors, with Rev. Richard Armstrong acting as his interpreter (Privy Council 1845–1846 17). Racial bias seeped through his address. Many noted his odd inflection of the term “Native Rulers,” excessively “drawling out the words” (17, 19). After claiming that Britain demanded that Charlton’s lands should be immediately restored to him, “or any person duly authorized by him to take possession thereof,” Miller declared that because his government did not recognize the mōʻī’s ministers as “Native Authorities,” he wished to deal directly with the mōʻī (23, 25). A few days later, the Privy Council discussed the address. Kauikeaouli worried about another Paulet affair (31), but the others saw it as Miller’s maladroit attempt to get the mōʻī alone to press his agenda (37). Although the mōʻī felt that “aole e pono e hookaawale ma waena o na Luna, na Luna maoli a me na Luna haole, ua pau pu lakou i ka hana ma lalo ona a no laila he poe luna lakou nona” [it is not right to make a distinction between his Officers, the native
Officers and the haole Officers, because they all carried out their service under his authority] (34, 35), the council considered appointing a foreign judge because of recent attempts “to get the Governor Kekuanaoa into difficulties and throw the whole [sic] Courts of the Country into confusion” (43).

While dealings with England tottered on the brink of disaster because of Miller, diplomatic relations with France actually improved, as on March 26, 1846, the Hawaiian kingdom and France ratified an eight-article treaty (Published 48). French Consul Perrin, Hawaiian kingdom Minister of Foreign Affairs Wyllie, and Kingdom Treasurer ʻĪʻī signed it (49). ʻĪʻī’s signature was necessary because one article made an important trade concession. All imported items from France were limited to an ad valorem levy of five percent, with the exception of alcohol. In that case, the Hawaiian government would impose a duty it thought “reasonable,” but that would “not be so high” as to deter importation (48). As treasurer, ʻĪʻī was the figure most central to the negotiations, and the result was a landmark in Hawaiian diplomatic history: the first ratified treaty with another nation. As the preamble explained, “Time having demonstrated the expediency of substituting a general Treaty to the diverse conventions mutually consented to heretofore by France and the Sandwich Islands, the French and Hawaiian Governments have reciprocally agreed to the following articles” (47). And ʻĪʻī had been one of three men to ratify it, suggesting something about the power and agency he enjoyed as kingdom treasurer. That same day, an eight-article treaty with Great Britain was ratified. ʻĪʻī, Wyllie, and British Consul William Miller signed this one (Wyllie Treaties 9–10).

On July 13, 1846, the Hawaiian government negotiated an accord with Ladd & Co. “to arbitrate differences.” The company had sued the government for $378,000 (Privy Council 1845–1846 175; 1846–1847 179), ʻĪʻī was one of forty-four witnesses Ladd & Co. wished to
examine (Jarves 22–23). U.S. Commissioner Anthony Ten Eyck agreed to serve as arbitrator (Jarves 25). Jackson Jarves’ 699-page arbitration report, including witness transcripts, reveals that Ten Eyck studiously ignored ʻĪʻī and other Hawaiian agents in his efforts not only to hold Judd culpable for the company’s ruin, but to prove that he was de facto mōʻī (225, 279, 289, 350–1, 354, 396, 459). American Vice-Consul Milo Calkin states this thesis succinctly: “The natives are ignorant of business and depend on some one to manage their affairs with foreigners for them, and Dr. Judd is that man” (Jarves 111, 384, 388; “From the Sandwich Islands”). Because ʻĪʻī was a “native,” though kingdom treasurer, and a negotiator of two ratified treaties with France and Great Britain, by definition he was ignorant, and therefore lacked authority. The arbitration proceedings stretched from August 20 to December 20, 1846 (Jarves 23, 491), and comments attributed to ʻĪʻī in Privy Council minutes indicate he was present for some if not all of the twenty-six arbitration meetings. At one point, Kauaʻi governor Kekauʻōnohi was called to the stand. Ten Eyck wanted to establish who had authorized Robert Boyd, High Sheriff of Oʻahu, to seize and sell Ladd & Co. property, and who had appointed Thomas Pratt, sheriff of Kauaʻi, deputy sheriff under Boyd (350). Boyd had already been questioned on this matter (310–325), and Ten Eyck’s requested Gorham Dummer Gilman, the translator, to ask Kekauʻōnohi, “Why she signed the commission appointing Pratt sheriff of Kauai, at the request of Dr. Judd—what was the reason she appointed him at Dr. Judd’s request.” By leaving ʻĪʻī out of his question, Ten Eyck was denying his role in the affair. Attorney General John Ricord noted the slip: “Put the other with him if you will” (350). Then Ten Eyck rephrased his question: “Well, Dr. Judd and John li?” (351). Gilman then interpreted the answer: “She says they both had about as much to say, one as the other. She consented to their request and gave the appointment” (351). In the aliʻi’s eyes, if not in Ten Eyck’s, Judd and ʻĪʻī had equal authority.
One month into the Ladd & Co. arbitration, Ten Eyck informed the Hawaiian government that the U.S. President he empowered him to negotiate a treaty (Privy Council 1846–1847 41). The Privy Council appointed Wyllie and ‘Īʻī as the kingdom’s official negotiators (41). They were to “hana pu” [work together], or function as equals, and Ten Eyck would have been aware of this (40). On December 14, 1846, just before arbitration hearings ended, ‘Īʻī shared his thoughts on the proceedings at a Privy Council meeting. According to the minutes, “it was clear enough to him that Ladd & Co wished to take advantage of any little matter in their favor, but did not wish that Mr. Ricord should have the same privilege in favor of the King & others expressed the same opinion” (Privy Council 1846–1847 107, 119). He also addressed directly the issues of authority, accountability, and competence. “I have always looked upon Mr. Ten Eyck as a friend of the Government,” ‘Īʻī remarked, “but that those public attacks upon the Government are hostile. Yet that he wishes to consider him as still friendly, notwithstanding the words” (209). ‘Īʻī also found Ten Eyck’s letter of apology for his behavior “insulting.” It is “not an apology to say that the King does not know the Acts of his Ministers, which he does know and is bound to know” (211). ‘Īʻī then explicitly cited his authority: “I was a Member of the Treasury Board at that time, & am responsible for what was done with Ladd & Cos. Property—and I myself informed the King of all, as I always do. Mr. Judd does the same” (211). These remarks show a number of ‘Īʻī’s strengths. His ability to detach his personal interests from political or procedural issues allowed him to make calm and incisive comments on the motives and implications of actions. He had watched the arbitration meetings, and pinpointed Ten Eyck’s aggressive and self-interested tactics. But he also insisted not only that the mōʻī was always informed, but also the integrity of his own actions—and Judd’s—as servants of the kingdom.

On January 17, 1847, the Privy Council discussed the submitted “proposals for amicable
termination of the arbitration” (251). After examining the company’s contract, ʻĪʻī declared it “a document drawn up with little skill” that “might deceive a drunken man, but it will not deceive any man in his sober senses” (257). So much for Calkin’s claim that “The natives are ignorant of business and depend on some one to manage their affairs with foreigners for them.” The problem was not aliʻi ignorance, but barely disguised foreigner arrogance. The kingdom responded emphatically to Miller, Ladd, Brinsmade, Hooper, and the other Ladd advocates. On May 17, 1847, the Privy Council unanimously passed twenty-six resolutions charging Miller with misconduct (Privy Council 1847–1848 1–15), including collusion with several former U.S. officials to the kingdom and the owners of the Ladd & Company “to harass, embarrass, discredit and weaken the Kings Government in every possible way” (9). The mōʻī’s intention was to ask the Queen of England to replace Miller (15–17). On that same day, destitute, and unable “to meet the expenses of prosecuting the arbitration further” (18), Ladd & Company formally withdrew its complaint (Jarves 538–542).

The formal reply to Ten Eyck’s treaty proposal offers insights into ʻĪʻī’s understanding of international power relations. The distinctive handwriting of what seems to be a draft of an official letter attributed to ʻĪʻī, dated March 2, 1847, is easily identifiable as Wyllie’s (Appendix C). Though written in English, the letter has distinct Hawaiian language cadences. The oddness of the letter probably results from the fact that ʻĪʻī never acquired fluency in English, and Wyllie’s Hawaiian was imperfect. They apparently dealt with this obstacle by enlisting the services of Amos Cooke. In the Privy Council meeting on March 13, 1847, Wyllie would recommend hiring him as “Government Translator,” reporting that Cooke had kindly helped ʻĪʻī and himself with translations during “the negotiations of a Treaty pending with Mr. Ten Eyck” (Privy Council 1846–1847 317, 325). Cooke’s journal offers further details about this
collaboration. On February 23, 1847, “Mr. Wyllie sent me another letter to Mr. Ten Eyck to be translated. Ii signed it on his way toward Manoa with Moses” (8: 37). Four days later, Cooke recorded that “Yesterday, Mr. Wyllie sent me notes on Mr. Ten Eyck’s Draft of a Treaty to translate & explain to Ii. In the evening, I showed them to him & interpreted them to him, while he read the Treaty in native. To-day all my leisure time has been devoted to translating it & it only about half done” (8: 38). The journal entry for March 4 notes that “Monday was most of it spent in translating Mr. Wyllie notes in reply to Mr. Ten Eyck Proposed Treaty, even until 11 o’clock in the evening.” He then added, “The next day I showed it to John Ii & left it with him sending the original to Mr. Wyllie. Today he sent word to have one clause of the 21st article expunged. John Ii also sent a letter to Ten Eyck” (8: 38).

Dated March 2, ʻĪʻī’s letter explained that “I do not send to you the notes by Mr. Wyllie and myself to the 22 articles which you propose in Hawaiian, because you do not understand our language.” He was firm that the proposal was unacceptable. Two points speak directly to issues of authority: “I cannot consent with this [,] the king should not be sovereign and supreme in his own dominions or that he should be less so, over your fellow citizens, than over natives or other foreigners.” And ʻĪʻī continues: “Nor can I consent that foreigners should dictate laws to us, or enjoy privileges enabling them to come into the country, without permission of the authorities, to supplant the natives of their lands, and take the whole power into their own hands.” After this rebuke, ʻĪʻī makes a conciliatory gesture, stating that he was aware that favoring Americans was not Ten Eyck’s intent. But in his opinion, the proposed treaty would “prevent the government from assisting those who are great men to obtain justice from those who wish to hurt them.”

Perhaps this ambiguous statement refers to ʻĪʻī’s belief that this treaty would make it impossible for the Hawaiian Kingdom to protect itself from the claims of important foreigners.
also wanted to be directed by the “representatives of the last Legislature,” who expressed a “desire to live quietly and in peace and not to be always in trouble.” The letter ends with a demand for the authority of the Hawaiian government to be recognized: “Give us a treaty that will promise peace and not create troubles—one that will not restrain us in punishing the bad, nor in assisting the good. I am sure you will endeavor to do so, for the President of the United States has recommended you as a good man, and I believe you to be our friend” (Letter to Ten Eyck).

ʻĪʻī speaks here as a witness to the political evolution of the Hawaiian Islands from the latter years of Kamehameha’s rule to that of his grandson Kamehameha III. Foreign ministers—Wyllie, Judd—would come and go, but ʻĪʻī belonged to the third generation of a family who had dedicated itself to serving the Kamehamehas. ʻĪʻī’s investment in the lāhui was motivated by his deep love for his aliʻi and the good of all Kānaka Maoli. But his response is more than simply protective or reactionary. As someone who grew up in a royal court where anticipating the consequences of ambition and power was an essential part of life, he takes the long view, and points out to Ten Eyck the possible political consequences of the treaty’s proposals—they impede the right of the Hawaiian government to act. It was perhaps this insistence on Hawaiian authority and self-governance that doomed the treaty, which never reached the ratification stage (Kuykendall 1: 375–77).

No Wai ka ʻĀina? To Whom does the Land Belong?

In the midst of the Ladd & Company arbitration and Miller’s efforts to sabotage the government, on February 9, 1846, ʻĪʻī was appointed by his mōʻī and peers to one of the most
significant positions in the history of the Hawaiian government—with Jean Ricord, William Richards, Zorobela Kaʻauwai, and James Young, he became one of the Commissioners to Quiet Land Titles (*Privy Council 1845–1846* 111, 116). Their duties were “to hear, consider, and decide upon [,] confirm or reject all claims of natives or foreigners to lands obtained by them previous to the 10th day of December 1845” (113). This effort preceded the Māhele [to divide or share],

43 “the event that legally transformed the Hawaiian system of Land tenure from communal use to private ownership” which occurred in 1848 (Kameʻeleihiwa 3). ʻĪʻī held the position until March 10, 1855, when the project was completed (ʻIi, John)—the only commissioner to serve from beginning to end (“Land Titles”). Especially in the early years, ʻĪʻī’s duties required listening to countless testimonies, and occasionally offering up his own.

44 On November 23, 1846, ʻĪʻī himself made a formal claim for two house lots. The first (claim no. 268) was “on the northeast side of the city of Honolulu” (*Native Register 1 & 2* 36). “The place was unused,” ʻĪʻī testified, “no one lived there before I occupied it. I built a house and a houselot. No prominent person or alii of the kingdom objected to this place at which I built, until now. I began to live in this place in 1828” (36). This lot does not appear on Richard Allen Greer’s map of Honolulu in 1847, suggesting it was on the outskirts. The second house lot (claim no. 269) was in Kawaiahaʻo in Honolulu, where ʻĪʻī had lived with Kahuhu from 1823 until 1829, when Kahuhu sailed with Boki on his ill-fated trip (*Native Register 1 & 2*: 35–6). On Greer’s map, this lot faces Waikīkī Road, across from Kawaiahaʻo Cemetery. A. Waiākea would later testify that

---

43 For treatises on the Māhele, see Chinen, Kameʻeleihiwa, Osorio, Beamer, and Perkins.

44 Cataloguing ʻĪʻī’s many contributions in his ten-year tenure as a Quiet Title Land Commissioner is beyond the scope of this dissertation.
Kaʻahumanu had given ʻĪʻī the first lot, and Liholiho had given him the second (*Native Testimony* 2: 305–6).

In the midst of this process, and only seven months after becoming Commissioner to Quiet Land Titles, he received yet another highly significant appointment. On September 29, 1847, the House of Representatives approved a House of Nobles resolution to appoint ʻĪʻī, Lorrin Andrews, and William Little Lee as Superior Judges, with Lee as Chief Justice (*Journal of the House of Nobles* [1847] 16–17). ʻĪʻī was now one of the highest judicial authorities in the kingdom (Appendix D). Sworn in as Judge of the Superior Court of Law of Equity on January 17, 1848 (*Interior Dept. Book* 2: 221), his lack of fluency in English meant that he normally adjudicated cases conducted in Hawaiian.45

Deliberations on the general principles of dividing the land in the Privy Council intensified as the Māhele itself came closer. On December 11, 1847, Keoniana (kuhina nui), ʻĪʻī, Kekūanāoʻa, and Kanaʻina took turns speaking about the recent legislative resolution concerning “the classes of rights inherent in all land,” which were the “Government,” “Konohiki,” and the “People or Tenants” (*Privy Council 1847–1848* 250). Kauikeaouli declared that although he was a “Konohiki of a great portion of the lands,” and that other konohiki were “only Holders of Lands under him,” he would “only take a part and leave them a part” (250). If a konohiki had four lands, the mōʻī would take three, if three lands, two, and only one land, half (252). Depending on the number of lands a given konohiki possessed, the mōʻī would therefore take three-fourth, two-third, or half. In addition, a third interest in the remaining lands would be held by the government. Some council members objected, and although the minutes do not record

45 In his sixteen years as a Justice of the Superior Court (later renamed Supreme Court), ʻĪʻī sat on countless cases. Cataloging those cases, and his decisions are beyond the scope of this dissertation.
their names, ʻĪʻī seems to have been one of them. On December 14, 1847, ʻĪʻī voiced concerns about the mōʻī’s portion. In his opinion, “such a division would lead to trouble” on historical grounds. Kauikeaouli intended to take five lands out of six, while Liholiho had only taken one out of three (276). ʻĪʻī also felt that “The rights of those who had served in the Wars, or rendered other Services, ought to be regarded” (276, 278). Finally, he recommended that “the principles of the division should be inquired into and perhaps a committee would be the best to do so” (278). Kekūanāoʻa disagreed: “what the King takes is not too much, as the King is the owner of all the Lands” (278). As we will see, the mōʻī, and therefore Kekūanāoʻa’s sons who would become mōʻī, won out. Deliberations continued on December 18 (290), with most of the remarks recorded in the minutes belonging to Kekūanāoʻa and an uncharacteristically vocal ʻĪʻī. Although they differed on several points, they agreed it was imperative to determine which lands were the mōʻī’s before voting on the rules for division (296). Keoniana, Judd, Kekūanāoʻa, and Piʻikoi were appointed investigators (306).

On February 1, 1848, ʻĪʻī himself laid a formal claim before his fellow land commissioners for four lands on Oʻahu, as part of the Māhele (Native Register 5: 512–6). The largest claim was the ahupuaʻa of Waipiʻo: 20,546 acres “from the mountain to the sea” in the district of ʻEwa (Native Register 5: 511; Barrère The King’s Mahele 73; ʻĪʻī Probate 482 1: 68). ʻĪʻī listed one hundred and ten heads of households by name, and provided the numbers of their children—244 in total (Native Register 5: 512–6). Because he did not account for the partners of the heads of households, there were many more than 350 people living there. The second largest claim was Pāwaʻa in Waikīkī. Kamehameha had award this land to ʻĪʻī’s family after emerging victorious from the battle at Nuʻuanu (5: 512). ʻĪʻī also reported that Kamehameha had given his family other land awards—some on other islands, which he did not name (5: 512). ʻĪʻī insis
his testimony that his family members were not konohiki, taking care of the lands for the mō‘ī. The Kamehamehas had given his family control over these lands: “The reasons they, and I, got them, was by the actions of Kamehameha I and Kamehameha II” (5: 512). ‘Ī‘ī’s third claim was for a plot of land in Honolulu, without an exact location (5: 512–3), and the fourth was land at “Waia‘i [sic], with three lo‘i [irrigated taro patch] and a kula [plain watered only by rain] in Honolulu land, in Kalawahine,” that “was transferred to” Sarai Hiwauli in 1830 (5: 517).

In return for receiving these lands, ‘Ī‘ī relinquished eleven: Wākiu (a subdivision in the ahupua‘a of Kāpa‘a in Puna, Kaua‘i); Paikahawai (a subdivision in Kapa‘a); the ahupua‘a Pāpa‘a‘ea (in Hamakualoa, Maui); Kikikiki (a subdivision in ‘Āpuakēhau in Kohala, Hawai‘i); two subdivisions in Niuli‘i ahupua‘a (Kohala, Hawai‘i); the ahupua‘a Waikoloa (Kohala, Hawai‘i); the ahupua‘a Ka‘io‘ainui (Hilo, Hawai‘i); the ahupua‘a of Waipuna‘ulaiki (Kona, Hawai‘i); Lanikele (a subdivision in Honomaku‘u, Kohala, Hawai‘i), and Ma‘ema‘e (in Nu‘uanu, O‘ahu) (Buke Kakau Paa 29–30). These might be the previously mentioned unnamed lands granted by Kamehameha; if so, they testify to his great esteem for ‘Ī‘ī’s family. This inventory reveals that at the time of the Māhele, ‘Ī‘ī was very wealthy in terms of land. He had control over four ahupua‘a, large land divisions which usually ran from the mountain to the sea, and contained at least one major water source. And even after relinquishing many of these holdings, he was still land rich. The twenty thousand acre Waipi‘o award on O‘ahu was a resource-rich ahupua‘a that included fishponds.

On March 30, 1848, the committee charged with investigating the mō‘ī’s lands “presented a book of 225 pages consisting of the lands assigned to the King on the left and those to the Chiefs on the right – also a division of the King’s lands from those belonging to the Government, signed & sealed by the Parties” (Privy Council 1847–1848 404). More than two
years later, August 28, 1850, ʻĪʻī presented the Privy Council with those claims previously laid before his fellow land commissioners (Privy Council 1850 775, 777). His request was favorably received, with two councilors offering accolades. Given ʻĪʻī’s long and invaluable service to the kingdom, Wyllie felt that his claims were more than fair, and moved to accept them (777).

William Little Lee, superior court judge, went even further, arguing that “the Government should abandon all claims [against ʻĪʻī’s lands].” After deliberating, the Privy Council followed Lee’s recommendation, and authorized the Minister of the Interior “to grant the Royal Patents” for the properties ʻĪʻī had requested “without any division or Commutation,” including the house lot he claimed in Maʻemaʻe in Nuʻuanu Valley, and five of the six Honolulu house lots. The sixth would be conveyed “to the Minister of the Interior for the Government” (777). This act was generous. Historian Lilikalā Kameʻelehiwa estimated that aliʻi “relinquished at least 50 percent” of their land holdings to the mōʻī at the time of the Māhele, and “some had to pay the one-third commutation fee, too, which was “paid in ʻĀina rather than money” (219). In ʻĪʻī’s case, while the government did not return the relinquished lands, they waived the substantial commutation fee for those ʻĪʻī kept.

On September 2, 1848, readers of The Polynesian learned that the Sandwich Island News had recently published a malicious editorial that slandered ʻĪʻī (“Fiction”). The Polynesian responded by republishing this editorial side-by-side with its own editorial defense of ʻĪʻī (“Fiction”; “Fact”). The Sandwich Island News had accused an unnamed Quiet Land Title Commissioner of misconduct, claiming he had been instructed to “bounce” his fellow Hawaiians “out of their written deeds” (“Fiction”), which he did, “notwithstanding the signatures of the King and Premier were thereunto severally affixed.” This commissioner was “one of the chiefs high and forward in the ranks of civilization, and who fills a seat on the bench of the Superior
Court of this Kingdom” (“Fiction”). Only ‘Īʻī fits this description. The Polynesian responded by presenting the entire affair as a misunderstanding between an aliʻi and the Hawaiians who had kuleana claims to his land. After listing the claimants’ names (“Facts”), the paper declared that “Nothing can be more undeserved than the attack made upon John Ii” because “no one had more strenuously contended for the rights of the natives” than he had. Like so many other observers, this editor insisted that “Throughout the whole of these transactions, nothing can be alleged against the integrity, honesty and humanity of John Ii” (“Facts”). Though ‘Īʻī held many positions where accusations of corruption could only be expected, the Sandwich Island News editorial is the only public suggestion of unethical behavior that I have found leveled against ‘Īʻī—a remarkable testimony to his reputation as an upstanding, incorruptible government official.

Between late 1848 and early 1849, “Measles, whooping cough, dysentery, and influenza raged across the kingdom” (Schmitt and Nordyke 1). The outcome was devastating: “An estimated 10,000 persons died from these causes, more than one-tenth of the population” (1). Honolulu streets became semi-deserted (A. Cooke 8: 200); stricken at the same time, entire families could not care for themselves or seek assistance (Amos S. and Juliette M. 284). Corpses would be found months later, some “locked in each other’s arms” (284). By October 19, a few of the royal children had fallen sick (A. Cooke 8: 200). On the afternoon of October 21, 1848, Amos Cooke wrote, “Sarai’s father’s wife died” (8: 210). That same evening, wailing echoed throughout Honolulu because William Pitt Leleiōhoku, the son of Kālaimoku and Kiliwehi, and the husband of Ruth Keʻelikōlani, had died (“Make” Ka Elele 24 Oct. 1848: 40; A. Cooke 8: 202). He left behind a six-year-old son, John William Pitt Kīnaʻu (A. Cooke Amos S. and Juliette 245); ‘Īʻī became his legal guardian (Mortgage 4: 166; Deeds 10: 217; 15: 72). By October 31,
all the royal students were sick. Always skilled with his hands, ʻĪʻī built a coffin for Kaiuʻi, an elderly woman, and attended her funeral (A. Cooke 8: 205). By mid-November, Richard Armstrong noted, “Almost the entire population has been prostrate & great numbers die daily in this place” (10). ʻĪʻī and Cooke made rounds “to administer medicine and advice” (A. Cooke 8: 210). Then Moses, the son of Kīnaʻu and Kekūanāoʻa, became extremely ill. Because his misconduct had begun to influence the other children, the Privy Council had expelled him the previous year (Privy Council 1846–1847 304), so he was living with his father (Liliʻuokalani 8). On November 24, ʻĪʻī took the students to visit him (A. Cooke 8: 214). His brothers, Lot Kapuʻaiwa and Alexander Liholiho, remained behind, and were with him when he died that afternoon (8: 214). He was eighteen years old.

Meanwhile, Kauikeaouli was struggling unsuccessfully with inner demons. His councilors could not help him, and their concern for the mōʻī and the political stability of the nation increased. Motivated by a sense of duty, on May 20, 1849, Armstrong preached a sermon to the mōʻī on his dissolute lifestyle (11–12). According to Armstrong, deeply offended, the next day, the mōʻī took Armstrong to task in front of his Privy councilors, telling him that he had no right to expose “his sins before those who had not right to know about them.” Declaring that he would remember this affront for the rest of his life, the mōʻī then “left the council requesting its members to consider what should be done.” But rather than take Armstrong to task, the councilors took advantage of Kauikeaouli’s departure to voice their concerns about the mōʻī. His former kahu offered the most fervent address. Years of frustration caused by dealing with Kauikeaouli came to the fore, as ʻĪʻī confessed that while he understood why the mōʻī was mortified, his “late misconduct” had “deeply wounded” ʻĪʻī (12). Not even the events of 1838 and 1839 had caused him as much anguish (12–13). According to Armstrong’s diary,
'Īʻī declared “There was a time when I stood alone by the side of Kinau in the midst of troubles from the consuls” (13), and declared that as her secretary, he had wielded the pen that “saved the land.” 'Īʻī here uncharacteristically trumpets his own importance to the kingdom. Because at that time Kauikeaouli had been lax in his duties, his kuhina nui Kīnaʻu took control, and 'Īʻī was her agent. During the Laplace affair, the mōʻī actually remained on Maui, letting these advisors on Oʻahu deal with the problem. And yet, “I felt sad then, but feel worse now” [because there is more at stake] 'Īʻī declares (13).

Though despondent about the mōʻī’s behavior, there is no question that 'Īʻī felt a deep affection for his former charge, and that this aloha was returned. Whenever Kauikeaouli succumbed to alcohol for several days, after sobering up he would be profoundly ashamed. But whenever he did manage to abstain for a while, he became miserable and unmanageable ('Īʻī “Keʻola” 16 June 1866). During these bouts, his companions bore the brunt of his misery, and try as they might, they could not ease his discomfort. Then they would send for 'Īʻī, because he was the only one who could help him (16 June 1866). At the end of his remarks, 'Īʻī reminds the council that Armstrong was motivated by his heartache over the mōʻī’s misconduct, so Kauikeaouli had only himself to blame for his embarrassment. 'Īʻī then concludes that he was grateful for this clash, because perhaps it would “bring about a reform” (13). Unfortunately, it did not.

Three months later, on August 15, 1849, Admiral Legoarant de Tromelin arrived aboard La Poursuivant, and began yet another French aggression (Published 1). He demanded a meeting with the mōʻī, Minister of Foreign Affairs Wyllie, and Minister of Finance Judd to discuss “some points whose definitive adjustment is of importance to the maintenance and the duration of the good harmony” between their countries (1). The mōʻī stalled, which so aggravated Tromelin that he informed Wyllie that he would retrieve Kauikeaouli from Maui himself, and asked for a
Threats of domestic and foreign violence multiplied during Kauikeaouli’s last years. On November 15, 1851, a plot hatched by a group of escaped prisoners to destroy the Hawaiian government by murdering the mōʻī and his ministers was thwarted (Armstrong 45). Shortly after, rumors circulated that “desperadoes from California” were scheming to overthrow the Hawaiian monarchy and turn the islands into “a republic.” The Privy Council could presumably muster up military force to squash these kinds of rebellions, but the councilors could not stop their mōʻī from behaving in ways that put the nation at risk. “Some of its members think its [Hawaiian government’s] internal dangers are greater than the external,” Armstrong remarked, and ʻĪʻī declared “that the conduct of the King in going about with his mistress, & his drunkenness, is putting his independence in more danger than arises from the Californians.” Among those
agreeing with ‘Ī‘ī were Armstrong, Kekūanāo‘a, Lee, Bates, and Judd (46). Mounting debts drove Kauikeaouli to petition the government for a loan on March 15, 1852 (*Privy Council 1851–1852* 611, 613). ‘Ī‘ī, Wyllie, and Hopkins were appointed to work with him “in relation to his liabilities and report to the Privy Council a practicable method of relieving him from his present Embarrassment and to secure him from future losses” (613). Then began the daunting task of untangling the mō‘ī’s financial affairs. On June 21, they concluded, “It appeared that the pressing difficulty was a suit by the Administration of the estate of F. R. Vida for $1900,” but in any case, Kauikeaouli was truly penniless. In council, “Armstrong moved that the report be referred to the King with a request that Messrs. Wyllie, Ii & Hopkins be the Trustees mentioned in the report. Lot Kapuāiwa was afterward added to that committee” (671). On July 5, these trustees were officially confirmed as the “Council Board of Finance” (677). Alexander Liholiho would join them sometime later (Commissioners 18). Having put the mō‘ī’s financial affairs in order, the commissioners concluded that “To remedy effectually all such disorders in future, it is only necessary that Your Majesty should buy nothing whatever on credit and sternly forbid every one around you from using Your Majesty’s high name, in order to obtain goods on credit” (73). For some reason, the mō‘ī would later order the publication of two hundred copies of their investigation, entitled *Reports of the King’s Personal Accounts, by the Commissioners of His Majesty’s Privy Purse* (2). Perhaps it was a matter of transparency, so that everyone would see who was at fault for the mō‘ī’s financial woes.

While serving as commissioner to the mō‘ī’s privy purse, ‘Ī‘ī had been carrying out another highly important assignment. On June 21, 1851, the House of Nobles and the House of Representatives had passed a resolution “relating to a Committee of three to prepare a new Constitution, the King to appoint one, the House of Nobles one and the House of Representatives
one” (House of Representatives 1851–1853 107). The House of Nobles appointed ʻĪʻī, the House of Representatives appointed Lee, and the mōʻī appointed Judd (House of Nobles 1851–1852 48; House of Representatives 1851–1853 107, 237). ʻĪʻī argued vehemently against a “clause excluding clergymen from participation in politics,” and he carried the day (Armstrong qtd. in Gulick 262). “I wish you could have heard Hon. John Ii,” Armstrong wrote: “His bursts of Christian feeling moved every heart and some of his strokes would have done honor to Patrick Henry. He is one of God’s noblemen, meek and gentle as a lamb, but where he sees the religion of Christ assailed he is a lion. I do believe he would be a martyr, if called to it” (262). This Committee worked reasonably quickly, and less than a year later, on June 9, 1852, both houses had ratified the new Constitution (House of Nobles 1851–1852 143). On December 13, 1852, ʻĪʻī “took the Oath prescribed by law as Associate Judge of the Supreme Court” (Privy Council 1852–1853 31, 39); he therefore was reappointed as Judge for the Supreme Court Bench under the new constitution. His peers had clearly approved of his performance as Justice of the Superior Court over the previous five years.

On February 10, 1853, the Charles Mallory arrived at Oʻahu with someone stricken with small pox (“The Small Pox”). Six passengers who had been vaccinated were allowed to land “after a salt bath and an entire change of clothes” (“The Small Pox”). Quarantined for two weeks somewhere near Diamond Head, their luggage was fumigated before it left the ship. The mail “was also landed after having been fumigated, the bag changed, and the old one destroyed” (“The Small Pox”). These precautions did not work. On May 13, three cases of smallpox were confirmed in downtown Honolulu (“Small-pox”). “How the disease was introduced, is not known,” reported The Polynesian “It is conjectured, either through the Charles Mallory, or in a large lot of old clothing brought down from San Francisco by the Zoe some weeks ago, and sold
here at an auction” (“Small-Pox”). According to ʻĪʻī, the passengers disembarked at Kaluahole in Waikīkī and the sick man went ashore at Kahakaʻaulana in Kalihi (“Ke Ola” 2 June 1866). Even after the members of ʻĪʻī’s household were vaccinated on June 1, “o ka haalele no ia a nui a holo aku ma na aina hikina” [they all set sail for the Eastern Islands] (2 June 1866). Judging from the eight straight Privy Council meetings ʻĪʻī missed from May 30 to July 13, this trip lasted six weeks (Privy Council 1852–1853 199, 203, 211, 213, 215, 219, 223, 227). ʻĪʻī’s narrative of this flight fills over two instalments (“Ke ola” 2, 9 June 1866). It had its challenges. To prevent the spread of smallpox, some districts barred anyone from Oʻahu entering towns (9 June 1866). In Lahaina on Maui, they had difficulty finding lodgings, and stayed at the fort. At some places, they could not even disembark. This was the case at Hālawa on Molokai; a boat brought them food as they anchored offshore. At Kukuiopaʻe in South Kona, ʻĪʻī heard that the nearby district of Haleʻili was ravaged by smallpox, so he called for Kamāmalu to return to the ship. But whenever he could, he acted on behalf of the people. At Hilo, ʻĪʻī helped build a house to serve as a smallpox hospital (9 June 1866).

In spite of everything, ʻĪʻī managed to turn this escape from death into a holiday for the fourteen-year-old Kamāmalu. One outing stands out. After they landed at Hilo, on the island of Hawaiʻi, ʻĪʻī and Kamāmalu made their way to Kīlauea crater (2 June 1866). It was a moving experience for ʻĪʻī: “halao wale mai iloko oʻu ka mana o hakoikoi me he la o na kupuna a me na makuahine me ke kaikuaana Nahienaena ma kekahi pu, malaila ia wa a ka pele e nonoho mai ana ma kahi aoao” [it seemed to me as if the ancestors, mothers, aunts, and also the elder sibling Nāhieʻenaʻena and others [of Kamāmalu] were also with us, while the lava was on one side] (2 June 1866). He then turns his attention to the lava: “A ma kahi aoao ae hoi, me he mea la e haa mai ana la ko laila pele a ma ko makou alo iho kahi, a ko makou mau wawae e ku ana, me he wai
pipii la iluna ka ulaula o ka pele” [On the opposite side, the lava seemed to be dancing with bent knees before us, while a fountain of red lava spouted where we our feet stood] (2 June 1866). This invocation of the ancestors and the living power of the volcano suggests just how grounded this staunch Christian remained in his culture. To the end of his life, wherever ʻĪʻī walked, his past and his present sensibilities and beliefs overlapped, co-existed, and informed each other.

They returned to Mililani without incident (9 June 1866). The aftermath of the disease was vividly present: “Ia mau la, aole no kau o kana mai o na kaa hale lole lenalena, e lawe pinepine ana i na mea make i kela la keia la, kau ka weli. Aka, ua maikai no ko makou wahi nei aole make” [In those days, an incredible number of yellow-cloth-covered carts made frequent rounds to houses to retrieve the dead. However, our area was fine, no deaths] (9 June 1866).

ʻĪʻī’s adopted daughter Mary Polly Paʻaʻāina ʻĪʻī Griswold had also passed away on May 28, 1853, around the time the trip began, after a lingering illness. She had married J. A. Griswold, and left a two-month old daughter (“Died” The Friend 2 June 1853). (Mary’s adult life remains something of a mystery.)

ʻĪʻī returned to major political upheavals. A movement to oust Judd and Armstrong from the government was gaining momentum (“By Authority” 20 Aug. 1853), and on August 15, 1853, ʻĪʻī served on a committee to investigate petitions received “for or against” the two men (“By Authority” 20 Aug. 1853). Nearly twelve thousand individuals supposedly signed these petitions. The charges against Judd and Armstrong included “inefficiency and misdeeds” that “were artfully concealed from Your Majesty” and “selfish cupidity, political imbecility, and malfeasance in office” (“By Authority” 20 Aug. 1853). Although the committee ruled in Judd’s and Armstrong’s favor, the mōʻī removed Judd from the cabinet on September 3 (Armstrong 48–9). Kauïkeouli did not give reasons for the dismissal, but he might have done it to keep the
peace. Armstrong claimed that Judd’s “annexation schemes had excited suspicion,” and this, when combined with his “general unpopularity” and “private influences hostile to him,” might have signed his political death warrant (49). Annexation was already a source of contention between ʻĪʻī and Judd. As early as 1851, the Privy Council considered annexation as a political strategy. “A general feeling of despondency evidently rested on the minds of the chiefs, &,” Armstrong recalls, and “but one sentiment was expressed viz. that the King should prepare the way at once, to throw himself, in case of hostilities on the part of the French, into the hands of some more powerful government until these difficulties can be settled” (37). British Consul Miller was not interested, so they turned to U.S. Commissioner Severance (Armstrong 37; “Annexation”). Negotiations with the U.S. stretched out over the next few years, continuing after David Lawrence Gregg replaced Severence on July 6, 1853 (Gregg 23).

Despite his dismissal, Judd continued to lobby aggressively for annexation. ʻĪʻī campaigned just as fervently against it (Judd IV 218), even though Kauikeaouli was working with Judd to close negotiations (146). Alexander Liholiho, the heir to throne, was understandably against annexation. “That young man has an ambition to wear a crown and he does not mean to surrender the chances, if he can help it,” Gregg observed, “He has consented to the treaty so far, but wants it to remain in its present condition to be used in case of emergency to his advantage and protection” (198). In early March of 1854, during a meeting regarding annexation, ʻĪʻī “became so enraged that he ordered Judd out of the house” (Miller qtd. in Judd IV 218). Then on March 22, Judd, ʻĪʻī, and Alexander Liholiho outlined their positions on annexation to an audience of Hawaiians at Kawaiahaʻo church (Judd IV 218; Gregg 110, 111). When Judd tried to explain his support for annexation, Hawaiians “hissed” him “into silence.” But they loudly
approved of 'Īʻī’s and Alexander Liholiho’s appeals for “Hawaiian independence” (Miller qtd. in Judd IV 218). This treaty was never ratified.

During the second week of December 1854, Kauikeouli was struggling with “inflamed lungs” (M. Richards Amos Starr Cooke 450), and he was also drinking heavily (Kamakau Ke Aupuni 314). Soon he was extremely ill, and on December 15, 1854, the Privy Council met at nine a.m., in emergency session (Privy Council 1853–1854 323). Keoniana, Abner Pākī, Mataio Kekūanāoʻa, John Papa ʻĪʻī, Jonah Piʻikoi, Bennett Nāmākēhā, Joshua Kāʻeo, William L. Lee, Richard Armstrong, R. C. Wyllie, Asher B. Bates, Lorrin Andrews, and Elisha H. Allen remained in “permanent Session to await the decree of God in relation to the King.” That night, at 11:45 p.m., he died (323). Armstrong speculated that he had suffered from delirium tremens, and it “finally carried him off” (55).

The next morning, the Privy Council met again. Richard Armstrong read Kauikeouli’s will was read in Hawaiian, and William Little Lee read it in English (Privy Council 1853–1854 331). All councilors then accepted the will’s authenticity (331). Kamehameha III had designated Alexander Liholiho heir to the throne, followed by Lot Kapuāiwa, and then Kamāmalu (332, 334). ʻĪʻī was therefore the legal guardian of an aliʻi second in line to the throne. In the last paragraph, Kauikeaouli declared, “I hereby appoint Keoni Ana [sic], William L. Lee, Ioane Ii and Mataio Kekuanaoa to be the executors of this my last will and testament, to act jointly in giving it full effect, and with power to fill any vacancy that may occur by the death, resignation or refusal to act of either of said executors” (336). For John Papa ʻĪʻī, this would be the last time, after almost thirty years of personal service, that he would carry out the wishes of his beloved mōʻī.

Kauikeaouli’s death was obviously the end of an era in ʻĪʻī’s life. It had begun when
Kamehameha II set out on his ill-fated voyage, leaving his kahu ʻĪʻī behind to watch over the ten-year old heir. During Kauikeaouli’s reign as Kamehameha III, ʻĪʻī was arguably the one constant. While others schemed and struggled for power, died or fell out of favor, ʻĪʻī was there.

The mōʻī knew that in all situations, he could depend on his kahu’s loyalty—and also on his sometimes brutal honesty about personal and political matters. Kauikeaouli suffered his entire life from inner turmoil. In his darkest moments, Kauikeaouli would call out for ʻĪʻī to comfort him. Even the mōʻī’s aliʻi wahine Kalama and his closest companions knew that only ʻĪʻī could try, and sometimes succeed, in easing his heartache. John Papa ʻĪʻī was kahu to the mōʻī, and also the only father figure he ever had.

With Kamehameha III’s death, the generation of aliʻi that followed Kauikeaouli and ʻĪʻī rose to power. Many changes followed. These current and future mōʻī—Alexander Liholiho, Lot Kapuāiwa, and David Kalākaua—had been partly raised by ʻĪʻī, whose presence at their school had made their lives more bearable under the harsh administration of the Cookes. They would forget this, or even hold him partially responsible for their suffering. They would also ignore or forget the many instances of his service and valor displayed over the years. While ʻĪʻī’s role as kahu to Liholiho and Kauikeaouli had been a challenging one for many personal and political reasons, both mōʻī knew his worth and had repeatedly depended upon and honored him.

Alexander Liholiho, Lot Kapuāiwa, and David Kalākaua would not. Over the fifteen years left to him, the now-aging statesman would endure private and public humiliation at their hands. He would experience personal tragedies, and one brief unimagined joy. And he would also become one of Hawaiʻi’s most important writers.
During this stage of ʻĪʻī’s life, he was forced to navigate the changes and challenges resulting from the royal children reaching the age of majority and assuming their destined leadership roles. Two of Kekūanāoʻa’s children became mōʻī—Alexander Liholiho as Mōʻī Kamehameha IV, then Lot Kapuāiwa as Kamehameha V. A third, Victoria Kamāmalu, became kuhina nui for her brother Alexander Liholiho. Kekūanāoʻa own influence and power would also increase. Kamāmalu would leave Mililani, the home where she had lived with ʻĪʻī and Sarai since November 1, 1852, to live with her father at Papanene, his residence in Mokuaiakaua, Honolulu (ʻĪʻī “Ke ola” 16 June 1866; “La Hanau”; “Ka Ahaaina a ‘Ka Hui Kuokoa”).

Kekūanāoʻa’s own long-term animosity towards ʻĪʻī could certainly have helped to shape his sons’ relations with ʻĪʻī. Attempts to oust ʻĪʻī from important political positions occur repeatedly during these years, with at least one attempt distinctly personal. Part of the rationale was a larger movement toward maintaining divisions of power within the government. For the first time, ʻĪʻī’s right to hold multiple positions simultaneously would be questioned and contested. In Article 20 of the 1864 Constitution, the concerns would become law: “The Supreme Power of the Kingdom in its exercise, is divided into the Executive, Legislative, and Judicial; these shall always be preserved distinct, and no Judge of a Court of Record shall ever be a member of the Legislative Assembly” (Constitution qtd. in Lydecker 90).

When Alexander Liholiho became Kamehameha IV, the Constitution required him to appoint a kuhina nui (Lydecker 40). The previous aliʻi to hold this office had been Kaʻahumanu (1819–1832), Kīnaʻu Kaʻahumanu II (1832–1839), Kekāuluohi (1839–1845), and Keoniana
(1845–1855) (“Historical Sketches”). Although it was not mandated in the 1840 Constitution, this office was “to a certain extent, hereditary” (“Historical Sketches”). Only high-ranking females related to Kaʻahumanu would hold this office. For this reason, when Kauikeouli made Kīnaʻu kuhina nui, he styled her Kaʻahumanu II. Princess Victoria Kamāmalu should have been her mother’s successor, but because she was only a few months old when Kīnaʻu died, Kauikeouli appointed Kekāuluohi as an interim, and then Keoniana. When Kauikeouli died, Keoniana resigned (“Historical Sketches”); Kamāmalu was now old enough. On January 16, 1855, the mōʻī awarded his sister Kamāmalu her hereditary right. Under the name Kaʻahumanu, she became kuhina nui (Privy Council 1854–1855 49). ʻĪʻī watched as Chief Justice Lee swore in his hānai daughter as the second most powerful person in the kingdom by law (53). According to the 1852 Constitution, “All important business of the Kingdom which the King chooses to transact in person, he may do, but not without the approbation of the Kuhina Nui. The King and Kuhina Nui shall have a negative on each other’s public acts” (Lydecker 40). Although Kamāmalu was now kuhina nui, she was still only sixteen years old, and under the legal guardianship of ʻĪʻī and Kekūanaʻoa, where she remained for three more years, until January 12, 1858, when her fathers were officially discharged “from further duties and responsibilities” (Barnard “Notice”).

Part of ʻĪʻī’s duties as Kamāmalu’s guardian involved managing her massive land holdings. According to Lilikalā Kameʻeleihiwa, she “was the third largest holder of ʻĀina before the Māhele and the fourth largest afterward” (244). Before the Māhele, she had one hundred and sixty-three lands; afterwards she had forty-eight (245). Fortunately for Kamāmalu, as Commissioner to Quiet Land Titles since 1846, ʻĪʻī had acquired an intimate understanding of private land ownership. Working closely with Kekūanaʻoa, he leased and sold a small portion of
her massive land holdings, and also granted loans in her name (Leases 6: 14; 7: 220–1, 256; Mortgage 5: 165, 987; 6: 816; 7: 482; Deed 1: 471; 7: 506, 525). The land transactions ranged from substantial to miniscule. On January 24, 1852, ʻĪʻī and Kekūanāoʻa conveyed twelve parcels of land to James Robinson and Company for $9,325.00—a huge sum at the time (Mortgage 5: 166). On October 12, 1852, they sold three acres to Huaka for twenty-five dollars (Deeds 1: 417). As her legal guardians, they also represented her interests in court. In 1857, Aliʻi wahine Kalama sued ʻĪʻī and Kekūanāoʻa over property near the Honolulu fort, but Supreme Court Justice G. M. Robertson ruled in favor of Kamāmaluʻs guardians (Davis 202, 209).

After the legislative assembly of 1854, ʻĪʻī left his lifetime appointment to House of Nobles to run successfully for election to the House of Representatives. For the legislative assembly for 1855, he is listed as a House representative, but not a Noble, indicating that he did not sit in both Houses at the same time (Lydecker 290). Early election results for Honolulu reveal an extremely close race. ʻĪʻī and J. W. E. Maikai tied with 847 votes, followed by Dr. T. C. B. Rooke and Supreme Court Justice G. M. Robertson, who also tied at 846 votes (“Election Returns”). So the first two candidates tied, winning by a single vote over the next two, who also tied. There is no recorded commentary on this extreme oddity. The final results show that ʻĪʻī was elected for both Honolulu and Kohala, but chose the latter (“Election Returns”). The Privy Council minutes do not offer any insight into ʻĪʻīʻs possible reasons for this move. Much later, he himself claimed that he became the representative for North Kohala to replace Supreme Court Justice William Lee46 who had left for the United States (“Na Hunahuna” 3 April 1869). But this explanation raises more questions than it supplies answers. His account suggests that a Justice of

46 Kamehameha IV had appointed Lee “Envoy Extraordinary to the United States” on March 12, 1855 (Privy Council 1854 –1855 101, 103). On that trip, he negotiated a “Treaty of Reciprocity” (213).
the Superior Court should sit in the House of Representatives, but no such clause appears in the 1852 Constitution. Furthermore, Lee’s only time as a representative was when he served as Speaker of the House for the 1851 legislative assembly (Lydecker 6, 295). ‘Ī‘ī did not however become Speaker of the House in the 1855 session. In fact, he swore his fellow Justice G. M. Robertson into that position (Journal of the House of Representatives 1855 1).

The 1855 session ran for sixty-one days, from April 7 to June 16 (Lydecker 61), and not everyone was happy that Second Associate Supreme Court Justice ‘Ī‘ī, or any judge for that matter, had been elected as a representative. On April 11, D. K. Ka‘auwai received permission “to read a Petition containing 51 names praying that John Ii be not allowed to hold his seat as a Representative, because it was against the Constitution to hold a seat” (Journal of the House of Representatives 1855 16). The petition was tabled (16); five days later, S. P. Kalama “read a Petition from Honolulu containing 50 names setting forth reasons why they think it was unconstitutional for Robertson and John Ii to sit as members of the Legislature” (33, 34). This petition was tabled as well (34). Apparently, certain representatives had mocked the first petition when it was read, which greatly offended the persons who authored it, specifically Uuaa, Kapuiki, Kahaleaahu, Mahoa, and Kimo Puaaloa (34–5). Soon afterwards, J. W. E. Maikai read their petition in response to the reception of their first petition (34). They took great exception to being called foolish, vain, and money-hungry (34–5), and they again questioned ‘Ī‘ī’s right to sit in the House of Representatives, because he was a member of the House of Nobles (34). Several representatives offered their own opinions on what course to take. Characteristically, Representative “Thurston suggested that the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House be ordered to throw this insulting Petition out of the window.” Representative “S. P. Kalama suggested that it be referred to a Select Committee”—which would have amounted to the same thing. Representative
“Dr. Rooke suggested that it be returned to the petitioners.” Ultimately, a vote was taken on whether to table this last petition as well. There were fifteen ayes and ten noes (35); ʻĪʻī abstained. Elections Committee member H. M. Whitney then reported “on the constitutionality of Justices of the Supreme Court sitting as Members of the House of Representatives” (37). A motion was made and carried to refer it “to the Committee of the Whole for consideration” (37).

On April 18, Maikai read yet another petition from Uaua and company who “had heard that their Petition had been objected to as being abusive and insulting” (47, 48). They offered their apologies for any offense, but demanded that whoever was guilty of “the harsh words against them” should also apologize (48). They then requested “that the Petition be referred to some Committee to consider whether John Ii can legally serve as a Member of the House.” A motion was swiftly made and carried to send their petition to the Committee on Elections (49). Two days later, ʻĪʻī’s and Robertson’s eligibility as serving judges was considered (59, 63). After the committee report was read in the House, another vote was taken to “postpone indefinitely” any “consideration of the report.” There were nineteen ayes and five noes; once again, ʻĪʻī abstained from voting (63). On April 23, the Committee on Elections “recommended to table the Petition relating to John Ii” (72); on April 24 (78), the Judiciary Committee47 also “recommended the tabling of the Petition, for the reason that the Constitution had not been infringed upon” (79). By this time, Lee had returned from his diplomatic mission. (The Privy Council had expected him to return in the first two weeks of March 1856 (Privy Council 1854–1855 239). Then, “On the motion of Kalama, the report was returned to the Committee with the instructions that they request Mr. Lee, the Chief Justice, to render an opinion on this ‘subject’”

47 The members of Judiciary Committee were Whitney, ʻĪʻī, Richardson, Austin, and Kaʻauwai (Journal of the House of Representatives 1855 6).
Just to make sure that the initiative was dead, on April 30, “On the motion of J. Fuller it was voted that the report of the Committee on Elections, upon the Petitions against the Honorables R. G. Davis and John Ii, which was adopted by the House, on April 23, be stricken out of the minutes of this House” (Journal of the House of Representatives 1855 100, 105). And on May 12 (134), Lee’s verdict was read. Dated May 1 (139), it unsurprisingly ruled that nothing in the Constitution prevented a judge from serving as a legislator (141). However awkwardly, the issue was resolved.

ʻĪʻī’s decision to leave the House of Nobles for the House of Representatives had other repercussions. On December 17, 1855, while ʻĪʻī was away at Hilo, Lot Kapuāiwa asked his fellow Privy Councilors a question clearly pertaining to ʻĪʻī: “Ina paha i waiho aku kekahi Alii i kana hana alii i mea e kokua ai i ka poe makaainana, a paa ia hana, e hiki anei ia ia ke hoi hou i kona ano alii” (Privy Council 1854–1855 250). Privy Council Secretary Lorrin Andrews translated this question as “whether a chief resigning his privilege of sitting in the upper house for sake of assisting in the lower house, could or ought to resume his place again in the upper house,” and because he was there, he presumably understood the intention (251). But who exactly is being helped, and why, seems ambiguous. Perhaps ʻĪʻī’s move to the House of Representative was done at the mōʻī’s request: it placed a powerful, influential, and experienced statesman in the lower house to glean support for the mōʻī’s agenda and to act as his eyes and years. But Lot’s question seems to dispel this notion. In any case, ʻĪʻī’s decision was unprecedented. The 1852 Constitution clearly stated that membership in the House of Nobles was a lifetime appointment (Lydecker 43), and Robert C. Lydecker’s record of legislators’ service (286–301) reveals that ʻĪʻī was the first Noble to sit in the House of Representatives, and then later return to sit again as a Noble, just as Lot anticipated (290). Several members of the
House of Nobles would later sit in the House of Representatives, but they never returned (287, 290, 300), and several representatives would enter the House of Nobles, but once they did, they remained there (287–91, 293–6, 298–300). The Privy Council minutes do not record any responses to Lot’s query, and ‘Ī‘ī’s eventual return to his life appointment in the House of Nobles suggests that no constitutional basis prevented him from doing so. But given the importance of such a question, it is odd that the minutes do not contain any account of the discussion that would have surely ensued. It is also worth noting that among those present that day—Kamehameha IV, Kana‘ina, Kā‘eo, Wyllie, Pi‘ikoi, Allen, Nāmakehā, Hopkins, Andrews, and Lot—a younger ali‘i broached the topic. Finally, while his question can be interpreted as a legitimate concern about upholding the constitution, because it pertains only to John Papa ‘Ī‘ī, it can also be construed as politically motivated, and personally disrespectful. As we will see, some years later, another young ali‘i who would become mō‘ī asked a similar question, but was harshly criticized for having done so.

As her husband worked for, alongside, or at cross purposes with the young ali‘i he had once cared for at the Kula Ali‘i, Sarai had continued to play an important part in the kuhina nui’s life. Sarai was effectively Kamāmalu’s mother, and her gentle and affectionate nature may have made her a maternal figure for the young Alexander Liholiho and Lot Kamehameha. After Alexander Liholiho married Emma Rooke, his former classmate, in the summer of 1856, they toured the Islands for almost three months (“Ke Kaapuni”). Kamāmalu accompanied them, and although Sarai was not in the best of health, she went with her (Kaona). (‘Ī‘ī was not with them because he was at Hilo, judging cases that required a jury.) On August 7, 1856, they set sail (“Ke Kaapuni”). During the first few days of this trip, Sarai suffered a stroke, which paralyzed part of her face (Kaona). The mō‘ī and Kamāmalu did everything they could for her, but despite Dr. R.
W. Wood’s efforts, she died on August 29. *The Polynesian* reported that “The death of Mrs. Ii had cast a gloom over the whole party, and was particularly felt by the Princess V. Kaahumanu, from whom she had seldom been absent, Mr. Ii having many years ago been appointed the Princess’ guardian” (Editorial 6 Sept. 1856). An obituary for Sarai in *Ka Hae Hawaii* offered her genealogy and particulars of her life with ʻĪʻī (“Moolelo no S”).48 *The Pacific Commercial Advertiser* noted, “She was esteemed by all who knew her, as an exemplary Christian” (“Deaths”). And J. Kaona wrote that Sarai was “i pohaku kihi o ko ke Akua aupuni ma Hawai nei” [a cornerstone for God’s kingdom in Hawai‘i]. She had no equal in Hawai‘i, Kaona explained, and her death was much regretted. *The Polynesian* also noted that ʻĪʻī “has not in all probability heard of the loss he has sustained” (Editorial 6 Sept. 1856). He did not get to say farewell to his beloved companion of twenty-nine years. Because their efforts to have children had been in vain, all that remained were his memories of her.

At the time of Sarai’s death, ʻĪʻī had just turned fifty-six, and she had been about his age. While no longer in the prime of his life, he was not too old to remarry, and he might even father children. The next four years suggest that he was determined to find a partner. On July 9, 1857, less than a year after Sarai’s death, he married Kamaka. The one-line announcement does not give a last name or any other information, except that they were married by “Kalaka,” or Rev. Ephraim W. Clark, the pastor for the First Native Church in Honolulu, which ʻĪʻī seems to have attended (“Mare,” “The Rev.”; “Ecclesiastical”). Sometime between July 1857 and July 1861, Kamaka ʻĪʻī died (“Hoolewa”),49 and was buried with Sarai Hiwauli and a daughter belonging either to Sarai or to her. No other information on Kamaka appears in the newspapers published

---

48 The information from this obituary was reported in Chapter 2.

49 This information is found in an obituary for ʻĪʻī’s third wife, Maleka.
between 1857 and 1861; there is no probate record. She remains a mystery, and we only know
she died because ʻĪʻī remarried. On August 1, 1861, Reverend Titus Coan united ʻĪʻī and Maleka
[Martha] in marriage at Hilo, Hawaiʻi (J. Papa; “Mare” Ka Hae Hawaii 14 Aug. 1861: 79;
“Married” Pacific Commercial Advertiser 8 Aug. 1861). Maleka was the daughter of Kaʻapā,
and the wedding was well attended by Hawaiians and haole (J. Papa). After the ceremony, Coan
gave a wedding dinner at his home. The party moved to the parlor to relax and converse; half an
hour later, the guests began to leave, giving fond farewells to everyone present (J. Papa). Mr. and
Mrs. ʻĪʻī sailed back to Honolulu on August 7 (“Passengers” Pacific Commercial Advertiser 8
Aug. 1861).

Mrs. Maleka ʻĪʻī died of consumption six weeks later on September 12 (“Died” The
Friend 14 Sept. 1861: 56). She was nineteen years old, and was accompanying ʻĪʻī around
Oʻahu, promoting the cultivation of cotton (“Hoolewa”). She was buried with Sarai, Kamaka,
and the daughter that either Sarai or Kamaka had birthed (“Hoolewa”). ʻĪʻī was now sixty-one
years old and thrice widowed. His longest union was with Sarai, and although we do not know
Kamaka’s exact date of death, their marriage lasted no more than three years. ʻĪʻī’s intriguing
marriage to Maleka lasted six weeks. Any children born to these wives had not survived. In a
letter to his mother dated September 22, 1861, Gerrit P. Judd wrote that “The Advertiser will
inform you of the death of John Ii’s fourth wife I think – Strange is it not they should survive so
short a time” (Letter to Betsy Hasting). This comment is odd. The two men had known each
other for decades—how could Judd not know the number of ʻĪʻī’s wives? If he was married to
someone other than Sarai, Kamaka, and Maleka, there is no archival record for her, but he did
take a fourth wife after the writing of Judd’s letter. On January 1, 1862, three and a half months
after Maleka died, Clark united ʻĪʻī and Maraea Kamaunaukea Kapuahi (Barrère The King’s 73)
in matrimony (Editorial Ka Nupepa Kuokoa 11 Jan. 1862). The ceremony was held at Kekūanāo’a’s and Kamāmalu’s residence Papanene. In addition to Kekūanāo’a and Kamāmalu, such notables as Kamehameha IV, Adjutant General John O. Dominis, and Captain Crown of the Russian ship Morge attended. That Kekūanāo’a co-hosted the wedding and its reception, and that Alexander Liholiho attended it, suggests that relations with ‘Ī‘ī were at least civil. As for his new wife, the marriage announcement described Maraea as “kekahi o na pua maikai o ka aina ua nui o Hilo” [one of the fine flowers of the rainy land of Hilo] (Editorial Ka Nupepa Kuokoa 11 Jan. 1862). This wife would survive him.

These domestic upheavals did not seem to effect ‘Ī‘ī’s ongoing service as a statesman. On November 10, 1856, Lot Kapuāiwa moved to name new streets. The Privy Council approved and began deliberating. One of the five names they chose was ‘Ī‘ī Street, which would run “from Nuuanu road toward Punch Bowl Hill, between the Rev. Mr. Bishop’s House and Mr. Robinsons” (Privy Council 1856–1858 104). Though maps of Honolulu do not show a street by that name in that area, that ‘Ī‘ī’s fellow councilors had approved this street name attests to their respect for him at the time.

In March 1857, a maritime tragedy struck, and both Kamāmalu and ‘Ī‘ī were implicated. In addition to making land transactions in Kamāmalu’s name, ‘Ī‘ī also entered into a business venture with her. In 1854, they had purchased a schooner from Kekūanāo’a, and put her into service as an interisland packet. Kekūanāo’a had purchased this British ship (the Chas. Wilson) in 1851, and registered it as Pauahi (Thrum “Hawaiian” 78). Upgraded at considerable cost, the ship was valued at ten to twelve thousand dollars (Editorial Pacific Commercial 23 Apr. 1857; Editorial Ka Hae Hawaii 22 Apr. 1857). ‘Ī‘ī renamed the ship Kamāmalu, and while he was the listed owner, she received the financial benefits. The Kamāmalu transported people, cargo, and
mail from 1854 until March 1857, when it was lost at sea with anywhere from seventy to one hundred individuals between crew and passengers. (Thrum “Hawaiian” 78; Sheldon 9 Dec. 1882), neither a corpse or even a board was ever found. Some other ships’ captains, ʻĪʻī, Armstrong, and others discussed whether to mount a search expedition, but because more than a month had passed, it was deemed useless. The owners were criticized for waiting so long to raise the alarm (Editorial Pacific Commercial 23 Apr. 1857; Editorial Ka Hae Hawaii 22 Apr. 1857), and this attack was by far the worst that ʻĪʻī and Kamāmalu ever received in a public venue. And certainly, the loss of so many lives must have weighed heavily on them.

ʻĪʻī and Kamāmalu were also members of the temperance society Pūʻali Inu Wai (Water Warriors). In the first week of July 1858, they joined upwards of four hundred students at Kawaiahaʻo (“Ka Puali”). ʻĪʻī opened up the meeting with a prayer (“No Ka Pualiinuwai”), and speeches and songs followed. After the last speech at this joyous event, ʻĪʻī thanked the Water Warriors (“No ka Pualiinuwai”). From Kawaiahaʻo, the attendees went to visit nearby schools (“Ka Puali”). Kamāmalu generously provided a feast, with a wide variety of foods served on tables decorated with flowers and fragrant vines beneath a cloth tent (“E ka Hae Hawaii”). Among the teachers attending with their students was H. Lolohi (“Ka Puali”), an alderman of the First Native Church of Honolulu and a headman for the Kawaiahaʻo and Kehehuna schools (J. K.). He often visited the jail to pray with prisoners and teach them about the Bible. About 1857, Lolohi had begun to suffer from debilitating coughs. He grew very thin, which led people to believe he had tuberculosis, and because his family treated him with contempt, ʻĪʻī invited him and his daughter Harriet Kahalekuaʻāina Lolohi to live with him. On May 18, 1859, Lolohi died at Mililani (J.K.; “Make” Ka Hae Hawaii 25 May 1859). Harriet may have continued to live with ʻĪʻī; she died on May 26, 1862, four years after her father (“Make” Ka Nupepa Kuokoa 31 May 172
1862; Barnard “Olelo”). ʻĪʻī served as executor of her estate (Barnard “Olelo), and his charitable act towards them is yet another example of his altruistic nature. It would not be the last time he opened his house to others.

Although ʻĪʻī’s relationship with the now adult Kamāmalu remained as close as ever, signs of discord with her brothers appeared. In early October of 1861, a rumor circulated that ʻĪʻī was about to be dismissed as Associate Supreme Court Justice. Lawyer John L. Nāʻiliʻili heard this news from Kanoa, who had told him that Robert G. Davis was the replacement (Nāʻiliʻili). Deeply moved by his aloha for ʻĪʻī, Nāʻiliʻili chanted a kanikau for him, which he included in his letter to the Kuokoa. He praised ʻĪʻī’s strength and wisdom in troubled times. He celebrated ʻĪʻī’s achievements, equating them with stars poised in the firmament, testaments to his leadership. Nāʻiliʻili insists that the nation joined him in his grief, and closes his letter by asking Kanoa whether the government might give ʻĪʻī another office. Kanoa replied that he did not know (Nāʻiliʻili). A few weeks later, the Kuokoa published a brief editorial about this rumor, and argued that it was inappropriate to disseminate a rumor that had no foundation (“Aohe Oiaio”).

There was in fact a very sound basis for this speculation. On October 3, 1861, Lot Kapūaiwa, acting on behalf of the mōʻī, had sent ʻĪʻī a letter tasking him to resign as Associate Supreme Court Judge (Letter to ʻĪʻī). In what capacity Lot is writing does not appear, and he indicates that the mōʻī had made his request “ma ke ano oluolu no nae” [in an affable manner]. But before writing, Lot had consulted with his father on how to convey the mōʻī’s wishes because “ua halawai pu oliu me ia, a ua manao ole oe i kana mau olelo” [you two met, and you disregarded what he had to say]. The reason for this request is that “ua makemake oia [Alexander Liholiho] e hoonoho i na Luna o ka Aha Kiekie i mau kanaka makaukau wale no” [he wishes to appoint only qualified men to sit on the Supreme Court bench]. Lot Kapūaiwa also told ʻĪʻī, “O
keia manao o ke Liʻi ka Moi ua like loa me ka manao o ka Luna Kanawai Kiekie a me ka Aha Kuhina” [The mōʻī’s wish is supported by the Chief Supreme Court Justice and his Cabinet], and that the letter of appointment for ʻĪʻī’s replacement would be sent by the Kekauluohi that day (Letter to ʻĪʻī). The phrase “only competent men” indicates that this request was not part of the move to separate powers within the government. As Lee had noted in 1855, the 1852 Constitution did not preempt a Justice of the Supreme Court from sitting in the legislature. But it was also true that a Justice sits at the mōʻī’s pleasure—and for whatever reason, Alexander Liholiho was not pleased.

What did ʻĪʻī think when he read this letter from Lot written on behalf of his brother, both of whom he had known since birth, helped raise to manhood during their years at the Kula Aliʻi, and whose sister was the daughter of his heart? What might have crossed the mind of this statesman who had stood firm through one political disaster after another for over thirty years, only to be cast aside by this young mōʻī? As Lot’s letter suggests, ʻĪʻī had disregarded what the mōʻī told him, but what was said remains unknown. Did ʻĪʻī ignore the mōʻī’s request to retire, or was their conversation about another matter? In any case, the fact that ʻĪʻī paid no attention to what the mōʻī had to say suggests that ʻĪʻī had disagreed with whatever he had to say. This would hardly have been the first time that ʻĪʻī had disagreed with his mōʻī, but as a trusted kahu, such friction had always been in his sovereign’s best interest, and especially since ʻĪʻī had over the years shown such wisdom in his thoughts and actions. His physical and mental health was not a problem, because he was still active in the legislature. Whatever the case, ʻĪʻī did not resign. Whether he kept his position because he and the mōʻī came to an understanding, or because he refused to step aside and the mōʻī did not want to deal with the political and personal consequences of forcing him to, remains unknown.
In early November of 1861, ʻŌiwi held a public meeting to discuss possible candidates for the House of Representatives (“Nomination”). Four hundred people attended. During a discussion on social issues, ʻĪʻī identified two evils that needed immediate legislative attention: “the evils arising from prostitution” and “Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika”—“The first he stigmatised as a disgrace to the country and the age, the latter was the sum and essence of all iniquity” (“Nomination”). His vehement opposition to the new newspaper surprised The Polynesian: “who would have thought it!” (“Nomination”). After all, this new newspaper was entirely run by ʻŌiwi. But ʻĪʻī’s objection was formidable, and so was his political sway:

So far did the Honorable carry his aversion to the above newspaper, that, when a gentleman named Keolanui was proposed as a candidate, although he admitted his excellent qualifications and sterling virtues, yet he moved for and obtained from the meeting his rejection because he was connected with the obnoxious journal as a writer and a patron. (“Nomination”)

What was it about the Hoku o ka Pakipika, which had only published five installments at the time of this meeting, that disturbed ʻĪʻī so profoundly? The paper’s purpose and content are probably to blame. As Noenoe Silva has shown, Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika was driven by a profound desire to create an instrument for ʻŌiwi self-representation, and “a need to talk back to the colonizing forces, especially the Calvinists” (Aloha Betrayed 63). As a result, “Moʻolelo and mele that had been suppressed reemerged to inspire and to bind the lāhui Kanaka together, and cultural practices that the missionaries tried to extinguish were enacted again in print’ (10). Because Hoku o ka Pakipika unapologetically celebrated Kānaka Maoli ways of being and knowing, some missionaries condemned the newspaper, and as one of the most fervent and influential longtime converts to Christianity, ʻĪʻī shared their opinion.
In 1863, ʻĪʻī was called upon for a special duty related to a murder with diplomatic implications. On November 6, 1852, a Kanaka Maoli sailor, originally from Oʻahu, murdered “Captain Hussey, of the William Penn, off Strong’s Island” (“Better”). In a case of mistaken identity, nearly ten years later, members of the crew identified Harry Kaheleiki, also known as Heleiki) as the culprit (“Better”; “Ka Huakai”). While being held in a San Francisco jail, his case came to the attention of Dr. L. H. Gulick, who after speaking with him decided he was innocent (“Better; “Ka Huakai”). Gulick informed Consul Charles E. Hitchcock, who came to the same conclusion (“Ka Huakai”). When Kamehameha IV and the Privy Council learned of this case, they resolved that the Hawaiian government should send witnesses to offer evidence on Heleiki’s behalf, and allocated one thousand dollars towards their passage and expenses (Privy Council 1859–1872 99). ʻĪʻī, Charles Gordon Hopkins, Caesar Kapa’akea, and John Koii Unauna (“Ka Huakai”) sailed for San Francisco on February 17, 1863 (“Ma ka poalua”). On April 4, 1863, The Polynesian republished an editorial from the San Francisco Bulletin that dealt with the arrival of the Hawaiian government delegates and their visit with Heleiki. According to the Bulletin, “The most distinguished of these arrivals is John Ii, who is a member of the Privy Council, also of the House of Nobles and Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the Kingdom.” Significantly, the editorial notes that “The intellect of this gentleman is of a high order, and the purity of character as a Judge is held in the same estimation by the white inhabitants of these islands as that with which the United States regard the U.S. Supreme Judge” (Editorial. The Polynesian 4 Apr. 1863: 2).

ʻĪʻī and the others visited Heleiki at the prison “attended by U.S. District Attorney Sharp, Judge Freelon, and Alexander Campbell, counsel for the prisoner, C. E. Hitchcock, Hawaiian Consul, and C. G. Hopkins” (Editorial. The Polynesian 4 Apr. 1863: 2). ʻĪʻī “was the first to
identify the prisoner, of whom he asked many questions until belief ripened into certainty.” ʻĪʻī recalled meeting Heleiki during a maritime incident. He was “a boat boy of Honolulu, who, on the night of the 9th of November 1852, helped to rescue a schooner which was in danger of catching fire from a building on the wharf, that was fired by the sailors of the whaling fleet in the harbor, who were an armed mob ashore.” ʻĪʻī remembers having “also seen and recognized him the next day after that fire.” Kapaʻakea then recognized Heleiki as the “son of one of his people, and identified him as being in Honolulu at the time of the fire,” and shed tears at seeing him. In fact, “There was not a dry eye at this moment, among those present.” After speaking with Heleiki, Kooi offered “many things to prove his identity,” which confirmed that he was in Honolulu when Captain Hussey was murdered (Editorial. The Polynesian 4 Apr. 1863: 2).

Because these witnesses provided evidence for Heleiki’s presence in Honolulu in November 1852, he was acquitted of the crime, for which he would have been hanged (“Better”; “The Kanaka”; “A Screw Loose”; Privy Council 1859–1872 10 Mar. 1864). After nearly a year in prison, on April 15, Heleiki returned to Hawaiʻi with the men who had saved his life (“A Screw”; “Ka Huakai”).

As far as can be determined, this was ʻĪʻī’s only trip to the United States of America. He spent four months there at the height of the civil war, when it was deeply divided over the question of slavery (“Conquering”). What was this experience like for him? One editorial offers some suggestions. During the trial, R.A.S. Wood, a longtime Honolulu resident who happened to be in San Francisco, “testified as to the high standing of the witnesses previously examined, stating particularly that the character of Judge Ii for truth and conscientiousness had no superior in the estimation of the white inhabitants of the Sandwich Islands” (“Examination”). Wood was not there to talk about Heleiki, but as a white man to vouch for brown men testifying on behalf of
another brown man. Another editorial openly raises this issue: “The man’s life is saved, and the innocent escapes a felon’s doom, on the evidence of men belonging to a copper-colored race! Mark you, there are some parts of the professedly civilized world, where the testimony of His Honor Judge Ii would not have been admitted” ("Better"). In a self-congratulatory manner, the editorial concludes that “It is only recently that his evidence would have been admitted in the State Courts of California; but to the honor of the U.S. Court, there was no question on this point” ("Better"). On this trip, ‘Ī‘ī therefore got to study the racial dynamics of America at first hand, and he was probably not impressed. As for the Hawaiian-language newspapers’ accounts of this event, they did not raise this issue. They merely thanked Dr. Gulick (“Ko Kakou”).

**He Inoa no ‘Iolanimaka‘o‘iouli – A Name Chant for ‘Iolanimaka‘o‘iouli**

Then on November 30, 1863, Alexander Kalanikua Liholiho ‘Iolanimaka‘o‘iouli Kūnuiākea Kūka‘ilimoku Kamehameha IV passed away (“Funeral of the Late King”). This was not expected: he was only twenty-nine years and nine months old. Twenty years before, ‘Ī‘ī had gone without sleep as he watched over a feverish nine-year-old Alexander Liholiho (M. Richards 198). Now the kahu passed another night with his ali‘i, ushering him on his journey to meet with his ancestors (“Ka make ana o Ka Mea Hanohano”). While keeping vigil, ‘Ī‘ī intoned chants in Alexander Liholiho’s honor from dusk until dawn (“Ka make ana o Ka Mea Hanohano”). The staunch Christian therefore engaged in the most Hawaiian of Hawaiian practices. Whatever reservations Alexander Liholiho might have had about ‘Ī‘ī, his former kahu, councilor, and sister’s hānai father felt the deepest aloha for him. On the day her brother died, kuhina nui Kamāmalu, advised by the Privy Council, sent a communiqué to the Nupepa Kuokoa proclaiming “Prince Lot Kamehameha, King of the Hawaiian Islands under the style and title of
Kamehameha V” (“Ka Hoalii Ana”). On December 3, only two items appeared on the Privy Council agenda: approving the funds necessary for the funeral, and for the mausoleum that would hold his remains (Privy Council Records 1859–1872 123). This was the last Privy Council meeting ʻĪʻī would ever attend.

On December 21, 1863, Lot Kapuāiwa made his father kuhina nui (Privy Council 1859–1872 3 Dec. 1863). The Privy Council minutes do not give his reasons, but according to Charles Victor Crosnier de Varigny,50 “Kaméhaméha V y appela son père; il demeura entendu toutefois que dans la constitution nouvelle on ferait disparaître cette fonction aussi bizarre que mal définie” [Kamehameha V appointed his father but with the understanding that this peculiar and ill-defined position would be stricken from the new constitution] (186). Once Kamehameha’s spittoon bearer, Kekūanao‘a was now second only to his son the mōʻī in the kingdom. On February 16, 1864, Chief Justice E. H. Allen informed the Privy Council that “Second Associate Justice John II has tendered his resignation to the King, and recommends for approval, the appointment of R. G. Davis to the vacancy of the Second Associate Justice of the Supreme Court” (Privy Council 1859–1872 16 Feb. 1864). ʻĪʻī had carried out himself what Lot had asked him to do years before. On February 18, Kamehameha V finalized his cabinet (“By Authority” Pacific Commercial Advertiser). He made thirty-two appointments, from judges and cabinet ministers to privy councilors. ʻĪʻī’s name was not on this list. He was no longer an official servant of the mōʻī.

What had happened in the last two months since his last Privy Council meeting? Did he retire or was he ousted? If retirement was the reason ʻĪʻī was not a part of this cabinet, then why

50 De Varigny was Kamehameha V’s Minister of Finance from December 24, 1863 to December 21, 1865, and Minister of Foreign Affairs from December 21, 1865 to November 1869 (“De Varigny”).
was this not mentioned in the minutes? The silence is conspicuous. ʻĪʻī had been a Privy councilor for twenty-six years. This alone should have provoked remarks. It is also odd that he apparently did not give notice in person, and the entire affair seems to have been conducted so as to exclude it from any official record. Six years later, ʻĪʻī would offer his own reasons for stepping down as judge. He “resigned on account of infirmity and old age” (qtd. in Hartwell 8). But this explanation is puzzling. He continued to serve as a member of the House of Nobles (Lydecker 290), and four months after his resignation, he toured Kauaʻi with several American pastors (Lilikalani et al.; ʻĪʻī “Aloha Oukou”). Such behavior hardly matched the profile of someone suffering from “infirmity and old age.” ʻĪʻī was as sharp-minded as he had ever been.

His unprecedented behavior on July 28, 1864 during the constitution convention, in which he vehemently denounced the government, offers some clues about the actual motivations for his “retirement” (“Proceedings” 30 July 1864). The catalyst was a heated exchange between Mr. Knudsen and Judge Robertson (also convention Vice-President) on an amendment that turned personal. Attorney General Harris protested, but his own objection included inflammatory remarks that Dr. Judd, who was present, found disturbing. No one called anyone out of order, and suddenly, ʻĪʻī exploded into a tirade about ineptitude and other non-amendment-related topics. Despite Robertson’s repeated commands to come to order, ʻĪʻī refused, insisting that “he ought to have as much latitude as the Attorney-General,” and that “he would leave his seat in the Convention if not allowed to proceed” (“Proceedings” 30 July 1864). He was drawing attention to the Vice-President’s double standards. When Robertson threatened to have the sergeant-of-arms remove ʻĪʻī from the meeting, Judd and Knudsen then raised and sustained a motion for ʻĪʻī’s right to speak. Robertson overruled it, claiming it was out of order. Judd responded that he “did not want to lose so valuable a member on a mere question of order.” What followed was a
public lesson on hypocrisy: Judd, “Why did you not call the Attorney General to order.”
Robertson, “Because no one objected to his remarks.” Judd, “Then why did you not wait in Mr.
Ii’s case? I think a native as good as a white man.” ʻĪʻī was then allowed to finish, but after the
mōʻī clarified “the question before the house and of the inapplicability of his remarks to it, he

On August 10, 1864, Kamehameha V defended the new constitution. In his speech to
legislatures during the assembly, he argued that the only reason Kauikeaouli had appointed
foreigners to his cabinet was because his extreme generosity had ruined him financially (“His
Majesty’s Speech”). With the land division in the late 1840s, Kauikeaouli ended his
impoverishment by taking back the gifts Kamehameha I had made to his aliʻi. Lot condemned
the 1852 Constitution because it was written with foreigners in mind, and he accused
Kauikeaouli of wanting to sell his kingdom to foreign powers, yet again for financial gain, in
1853 (“His Majesty’s Speech”). Lot Kapuāiwa’s rhetoric might have convinced some legislators,
but John Papa ʻĪʻī, a witness and participant to everything described, was listening as well. That
night, he went home and prepared a response and supporting documents, which he delivered the
next day. He began by saying he found certain statements surprising (“Ka Hana”). He then
focused on Lot Kamehameha’s comments regarding Kauikeaouli’s generosity and his pecuniary
embarrassment. ʻĪʻī asserted that Kauikeaouli’s debts to his own aliʻi posed his biggest financial
difficulty, and that the money to pay them came from Kuakini’s estate. ʻĪʻī then described the
nation’s political instability in 1853. The infamous annexation treaty, never offered, was a last
resort for obtaining peace, and foreign merchants and several missionaries had petitioned
Kauikeaouli to annex the kingdom to the U.S., rather than let it fall to France or Great Britain.
He concluded with a lesson to his fellow legislators about political economy, describing at length
the diplomatic and domestic difficulties Kauikeaouli had faced throughout his reign, and their very complicated origins (“Ka Hana”). Though this speech could not have endeared him to Lot Kamehameha, it was certainly in keeping with ʻĪʻī’s sense of responsibility as kahu to tell the truth.

In 1865, the Hawaiʻi Missionary Board commissioned the supposedly old and infirm ʻĪʻī to go to Nuʻuhiwa (Marquesas), with the hope that he would return with Kānaka Nuʻuhiwa who desired to be educated (ʻĪʻī “Palapala”). On February 15, he set sail aboard the Morning Star (“Report of Brig”). Two months later, ʻĪʻī and Mr. Bicknell returned with twenty Kānaka Nuʻuhiwa: an aliʻi, his family and attendants, nine “native scholars,” and three children belonging to “native missionaries” (“Arrivals”; “Report of Brig”; “Na Nuuhiva”; “Passengers”). The Minister of Finance and Dr. William Hillebrand asked ʻĪʻī to care for half of the group (ʻĪʻī “Palapala”). He took eleven; the rest lived with Bicknell in ʻEwa (“Na Nuuhiva”). The Fatu Hiva people ʻĪʻī hosted included Joseph Kieekai and his daughter Hanaia. On June 10, 1865, Kieekai wrote an open letter from Mililani to the people of the Hawaiian Kingdom, thanking them for the aloha shown to his people (J. Kieekai). Sometime during the next few months, he passed away (“He Fatuhiva”), and his daughter Hanaia followed him on October 12, 1865 (“He wahi Mooolelo”; “He Fatuhiwa”). She was about twelve years old, and the presumed cause was an illness from her homeland. She became very close to ʻĪʻī during her short time in Honolulu. In her weakened state, she looked forward to when he returned from his trips, and whenever she heard his voice outside of her room, she cried out his name (“He wahi Mooolelo”). On her deathbed, she confessed to him, “Makau wau i ka make” [I fear death]. He answered, “Mai makau oe i ka make, he hiamoe wale iho no, a ala hou mai no. Ua kuaiia kakou i ke koko o Iesu Kristo ma kona make ana a ola hou mai ia, a pela no kakou, e manaoio ia ia. Ina paha oe e hiki
Do not fear death, it is only slumbering then a reawakening. The blood of Jesus Christ purchased us when he died and then rose again, and so it will be for us who believe in him. If you arrive there, and I arrive later, then call to me, ‘Let us go’]. When Hanaia heard his words, her face reflected her joy. Clasping her hands, she told him, “Nui kuʻu aloha ia oe, e hai aku oe i keia mea i oʻu mau kini ma koʻu one hanau, a o koʻu mau wahi lua kapa, e hooili no lakou, a mahea au e waiho ai; e! naʻu ia mea e malama, i hou mai la, e pule i ka Haku” [I have great aloha for you. You must say this to my dear ones in the land of my birth. And as for my grave clothes, let them gather them, and whenever I am laid, I will treasure it. She added, “Let us pray to the Lord”]. The final lines of this unsigned article suggest ʻĪʻī was the author: “A i ka pau ana o ia a me ka hooko ana, paa mau mai la kona mau lima, a iaʻu i kaawale iki ai ma kahi o ke kauka, o ko ia la wa no ia i naue aku ai, hoi mai au ua hala e aku kela” [When the prayer was finished, her hands were still clasped, and when I left her for a moment to speak with the doctor, that was when she left. I returned but she had already passed] (“He wahi Mooolelo”).

**He Inoa no Kamāmalu – A Name Chant for Kamāmalu**

A far greater personal loss followed on May 29, 1866, when after three months of illness, Victoria Kīheʻaheʻalani Kalohelani KamāmaluhaoKalani Kaʻahumanu joined her ancestors (“Ka Make ana o Ka Mea Kiekie”; “Na Mea Hou”; “Ke alo aliʻi”). She was twenty-eight years and six-months old. Five days after her death, on the same day *Nupepa Kuokoa* informed its readers that

---

51 In 1867, ʻĪʻī sent Kieekai’s casket aboard the *Morningstar* to be returned to Fatu Hiva (“Ke Kupapau”). Hanaia was not mentioned.
she had passed, ʻĪʻī published the first installment of “Ke ola me ka make ana iho nei o Victoria K. Kaahumanu” [The Life and Recent Passing of Victoria K. Kaʻahumanu], his tribute to her (2 June 1866). This series appeared over seven issues of the paper (2, 9, 16, 30 June, 14 July, 4, 18 Aug. 1866). He began by offering his reasons for writing this narrative (“Ke ola” 2 June 1866). A group of youths had asked him to submit an account of Kamāmalu’s life to the Kuokoa. He made it clear that writing about her pained him, because “me he mea kaumaha la keia o ka hoomaopopo ana no ka mea nona keia mau haina, no ke kumakena a me ka paumako” [it seems sad this recollecting of the one whose accounts these are, because of grief and sorrow] (2 June 1866). After this introduction, he described the circumstances of Kamāmalu’s death, and then flashed back to an account of Kīnaʻu handing her to him as a newborn (2 June 1866). Though ʻĪʻī’s series has many of the characteristics of a biographical narrative, because he was her hānai father, many incidents situate him within her life. The moʻolelo is therefore both biographical and autobiographical. What emerges is the depth of his love for her. She was the daughter of his heart, and his series is a shrine to her. Each installment either begins or ends with a kānaenae written for her, varying in length from six to forty-two lines for a combined total of one hundred and fifty-six. With one exception, these tributes end with one variant or another of “Kuu kei—ki! [My chi—ld!]” (I will have more to say about the composition of this series in the next chapter.)

Another indignity at the hands of a young aliʻi and a major decision, both related to the legislative assembly of 1868, made that year highly significant for ʻĪʻī. This assembly sat for fifty-eight days, from April 18 to June 24 (Lydecker 113). On April 27, during the eighth session, David Kalākaua called into question ʻĪʻī’s eligibility to sit in the House of Nobles, and moved for an investigation (Journal of the Legislative Assembly 1868 39, 40). The minutes record three responses to this motion. Minister Charles de Varigny “moved that the Resolution
be referred to a Special Committee to be appointed by the President” (40). Representative J. W. Keawehunahala “moved as an Amendment to the Resolution that all the Nobles show their appointments from His Majesty the King” (40). Representative E. Jones “then moved that the consideration of the Resolution be indefinitely postponed” (40). In the margins of the minutes, all four motions have next to them “Expunged April 28/68” (40).

Missing from this record is any account of the lively discussion that ensued. The Pacific Commercial Advertiser revealed that Keawehunahala took great issue with Kalākaua’s resolution, calling it an affront to "the honor and dignity of the Assembly” ("Legislative Assembly"). “We may as well ask for His Majesty’s Credentials,” Keawehunahala declared: “The whole question was aimed at one member, and as such unfair.” A long discussion followed on how to address Kalākaua’s resolution. At some point, he felt it necessary to claim that he was not motivated by animosity. Keawehunahala responded that because the motion was supposedly not personal, he wished to “withdraw his former amendment, and amend [it] by calling for the Credentials of all the Nobles.” Then Kalākaua objected: “He did not think the Representatives should call for the Credentials of the Nobles, it was against the dignity of the Assembly. The Assembly should act with great deliberation and caution in this matter.” Representative J. Upa then backed up Keawehunahala, saying that Kalākaua’s “motion seemed to him too personal, and to remove this objection would ask that all the Nobles present their Credentials. By the Constitution the King appointed the Nobles.” Then, in a twist, “Keawehunahala defended his motion by a speech on the rights of the Assembly under the Constitution, particularly the rights of Nobles.” In the meantime, W. Claude Jones had been examining the 1864 Constitution, and announced his conclusion: “Representatives have no right to investigate the status of Nobles in this Assembly. By the Constitution of 1864 he could not see that the Representatives or Nobles
had any right to call into questions the rights of others than members of their own bodies” (“Legislative Assembly”).

Although Kalākaua presented his resolution as one concerned with technicalities, and nothing personal, the majority overruled his resolution, which points to his ignorance of the finer points of legislative rules. The 1852 Constitution stated that appointment to the House of Nobles was for life, and the 1864 Constitution had not changed this. When Alexander Liholiho made ʻĪʻī a Privy Councilor, that gave him an automatic right to sit in the House of Nobles. Though Lot Kapuāiwa did not select ʻĪʻī for his Privy Council, no constitutional basis existed for questioning ʻĪʻī’s right to sit in the House of Nobles. In fact, ʻĪʻī had sat in the House of Nobles during the 1864 legislative assembly (86). The Pacific Commercial Advertiser does not show ʻĪʻī as having participated in this discussion. Present in the House of Nobles that day were two men who had served with ʻĪʻī in the Privy Council from its inception: Kekūanāo‘a and Kanaʻina (Lydecker 12, 113). Any comments they might have made were not reported. That these two statesmen, who had worked with ʻĪʻī for decades, did not speak up on his behalf suggests something about the tensions of the time. The next day, on April 28, the majority in the assembly voted to strike Kalākaua’s resolution and the ensuing discussion from the official record (“Legislative Assembly”). The marginal notes do that.

After this session of the assembly ended, ʻĪʻī retired from government service. On May 16, 1868, Nupepa Kuokoa announced, “Ua lono mai makou mai kekahi poe mai, ua waiho mai Ka Mea Hanohano Ioane Ii, i kona noho ana alii [sic] iloko o ka Hale Ahaolelo alii. Ua haohao makou i ka waiho ana mai o keʻlii i noho loihi a i pili loa me naʻlii ma ke ano makua malama, i kona noho ana līi [sic]” [We have heard from some people that the Honorable Ioane ʻĪʻī has resigned from the House of Nobles. We are amazed that the aliʻi who has been for so long by the
side of the ali‘i like a caring father had given up this position] (“Waiho”). Whether the indignity at Kalākaua’s hands influenced his decision is unknown, but given all the challenges and slights of the previous few years, he undeniably ended his long and illustrious career as a statesman on a bitter note. As *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* suggests, his retirement marked the end of an era. Other statesmen would leave their mark in Hawaiian history, but none could claim they had been so involved with the establishment of the Hawaiian kingdom as a constitutional monarchy. ʻĪʻī had served his nation in an official capacity for twenty-eight years. His name was actually in the first Constitution. But his service as kahu to his ali‘i had begun long before then. As part of the third generation of a distinguished family to serve the House of Kamehameha, it is somewhat ironic that ʻĪʻī’s own service would end during the reign of a mōʻī who represented the third generation of the House of Kamehameha. Just as ʻĪʻī would be the last of his ʻohana to serve the Kamehamehas, so too would Lot be the last direct descendant of Kamehameha to sit on the throne. As we will see, when ʻĪʻī went to join his ancestors, Lot Kamehameha did not offer the accolades deserved by a statesman who had spent his life serving his nation. But others certainly remembered him, and preserved his memory for many years after his passing. As for ʻĪʻī himself, though his active political life ended in 1868, it was at this point that he embarked on a project that would arguably be his greatest legacy.
CHAPTER 5

KA PALE ‘ANA I NĀ IHE HOPE LOA – PARRYING THE LAST SPEARS

The ‘Ī‘ī who appears in photographic portraits taken near the end of his life lacks that indomitable spirit found in his earlier ones (Appendix E). His once strong shoulders are now stooped, and his once piercing eyes are dim. Though still thick, his hair is now streaked with gray, and he no longer carefully slicks it down. Untidy tufts stick up about his head. A white scraggly beard covers his strong jawline and deep dimples. In a word, he is old.

Through the many changes and challenges, and the personal and public tragedies, his dignity and his wisdom had remained intact. The ali‘i he had served, his ali‘i peers, the maka‘āinana, and many settlers and foreigners had recognized him as a man of substance. His eloquence had made him the nation’s orator. But in the end, he was denied the ultimate honor of a kahu and a statesman—to die in harness, in office. With his withdrawal from politics, his life came full circle. He returned to Waipi‘o, ‘Ewa, his birthplace, and the home he reluctantly and cautiously left fifty-eight years earlier to begin his service in the royal court of Kamehameha. Whenever he was in Honolulu, he had lived at his Mililani home, in the center of political and religious activity (Harris, Judd, McCully, and Hartwell 334). But while ‘Ī‘ī and others spoke of Mililani as though it was his, Kekūanāo‘a actually owned the lot and house, which he had built for Kamāmalu. When she reached her majority and ceased living with ‘Ī‘ī, she and her father allowed him to live there rent-free—and so did their heirs, Ke‘elikōlani and Lot, the mō‘ī (334, 637).

‘Ī‘ī was two months short of his sixty-eighth birthday when he unwillingly retired. He had served the House of Kamehameha from 1810 to 1868—well over half a century. Only Kekūanāo‘a and Kana‘ina, seventy-seven and sixty-seven years old respectively, could make
similar claims (Forbes 3: 641). These three survivors had seen the political unification of the Hawaiian Islands, and helped transform the nation into a constitutional monarchy. As statesmen and councilors, they had helped steer the kingdom during the long and turbulent reign of Kamehameha III. That Kamehameha V did not appoint ʻĪʻī to his Privy Council made a strong statement. Whatever the mōʻī’s reasons might have been, the aging statesman was persona non grata. Perhaps Lot Kapuāiwa found ʻĪʻī’s truth telling inconvenient. ʻĪʻī’s moral compass impelled him to speak the truth as he saw it, no matter how unwelcome or tiresome or boring it might have been for the young mōʻī or his fellow statesmen.

ʻĪʻī continued to participate in church activities. But by living to sixty-eight, especially during those years of widespread death due to disease, he had survived not only virtually everyone to whom he had been close in his youth, but most of those he had loved and cared for as an adult. Almost no one shared his recollections of times gone by. He therefore lived with the loneliness of being the last of his generation. And yet for later generations, his melancholy retirement has proved a blessing. Had he died still immersed in the kingdom's business, he would never have written what is arguably his greatest legacy—his memoirs. Without colleagues or older family to share his memories with, he turned to the subscribers of Nupepa Kuokoa, who became the waihona, or receptacles, for his memories and knowledge. The catalyst for this endeavor was the death of Kekūanāoʻa. In late 1868, his health had taken a turn for the worse (ʻĪʻī “Kanaenae” 5 Dec. 1868). More than once, ʻĪʻī and Malaea made the long trip from ʻEwa to Honolulu to visit him. On the first visit, ʻĪʻī expressed concern about the state of Kekūanāoʻa’s soul by tactfully raising questions about his own. He urged him ʻe nana i ke keiki hipaa ke Akua, nana e lawe na hala o ke ao nei, no ka mea, ua elemakule kaua, i makaukau mua mamua o
ko kaua hele ana mai keia ao aku” [Behold the lamb of God who takes away the sins of this world, because we are old men and need to be prepared to leave this realm]. The last visit was on November 4. He remained with Kekūanāo’a for three hours, leaving when he fell asleep. ʻĪʻī wrote that they had a pleasant conversation, but he did not include any particulars. It is natural to wonder if they reminisced about their youth, and the people whom they had both known and loved, including their children and royal charges who were no longer with them. These visits suggest that despite a long and troubled history, the two men had made peace with each other.

On the morning of November 24, just as ʻĪʻī was about to begin family prayers with Malaea, a woman brought news from Honolulu that Kekūanāo’a had died the night before. ʻĪʻī immediately penned letters of condolence to Kekūanāo’a’s son and daughter, Lot Kapuāiwa and Ruth Keʻelikōlani (5 Dec. 1868). Only twelve days later, as he had for Victoria Kamāmalu, ʻĪʻī published the first of five installments about Kekūanāo’a in the Nupepa Kuokoa (5, 19, Dec. 1868, 2, 16, 30 Jan. 1869), one of two Hawaiian-language newspapers published at that time (the other was Ke Au Okoa). Whether editor Henry M. Whitney asked ʻĪʻī to write this series, or whether he initiated it himself, remains unknown.

In biographical terms, this life depiction falls into the “warts and all” category, a phrase attributed to the seventeenth-century British general and statesman Oliver Cromwell, who was supposed to have told famed portraitist Sir Peter Lely, “Mr. Lely, I desire you would use all your skill to paint my picture truly like me, and not flatter me at all; but remake all these roughnesses,

---

52 I have already reported much of what ʻĪʻī related in his series on Kekūanāo’a. As indicated in the Introduction, the first column was untitled (5 Dec. 1868), the second and third were titled “Kanaenae Aloha no ka Imihaku” (19 Dec. 1868, 2 Jan. 1869), and the last was titled “Kanaenae aloha no ka mea i make” (16, 30 Jan. 1869). I will refer to this series as “Kānaenae.”
pimples, warts, and everything as you see me, otherwise I never will pay a farthing for it” (Walpole 444). ‘Ī‘ī’s series on Kekūanāo‘a is often unflattering. Indeed, there is only one unqualified moment of praise: “A he oiaio ko kakou mahalo iaia a me ke aloha no ka nui launa ole o kana mau hana, pela no kona lokomaikai nui hewahewa launa ole, a ma ia ano ona i loa mai ai ia’u he mea opio ma kuu poli” [We feel a sincere admiration and affection for him because of his innumerable efforts, and similarly, for his infinite kindness. Because of him, I received a child in my arms]. Despite this praise, ‘Ī‘ī produced an uncompromisingly forthright portrait of a lower-ranking ali‘i who skillfully navigated his way to power, and proved worthy of the positions he held.

At times, ‘Ī‘ī must have felt he was looking in a mirror. When he and Kekūanāo‘a began their service, they were lower-level attendants who were more or less equals in terms of lineage. (Though Kekūanāo‘a would sneer at times at ‘Ī‘ī’s rank, in his letter to Laplace he admitted that ‘Ī‘ī’s genealogy was on par with his own). Kekūanāo‘a went on to surpass ‘Ī‘ī, becoming the father of kings, because of differences in character. Unlike ‘Ī‘ī, Kekūanāo‘a was extremely ambitious. Not content simply to serve, he actively sought power, and if an opportunity to advance did not present itself, he created one. Kekūanāo‘a became a favorite of Liholiho, accompanying the mō‘ī on his trip to England. After the mō‘ī’s death, he then ingratiated himself with Boki, Kauikeaouli’s guardian. ‘Ī‘ī charted Kekūanāo‘a’s rise through his unions with the high-ranking ali‘i Pauahi and Kīna‘u, Kamehameha’s granddaughter and daughter, who consolidated his status by bearing him children. His marriage to Kīna‘u also made him Kauikeaouli’s brother-in-law. The title of the second and third columns in ‘Ī‘ī’s series, “Kanaenae Aloha no ka Imihaku,” is especially telling, because it identifies Kekūanāo‘a as an ‘imi haku (2 Jan. 1869). As ‘Ī‘ī points out in his opening column, because one of Kekūanāo‘a’s
royal offspring by Kīnaʻu (Kamehameha V) was still alive, “Nolaila, ua pono a kupono ka inoa Imi Haku ia ia i hala aku” [Therefore ‘imi haku is an apt name for the deceased] (ʻKanaenae” 5 Dec. 1868). ‘Imi haku refers generally to lower-ranking aliʻi who sought service with highborn aliʻi, much as ʻĪʻī and his family had done for generations. But it also refers to “a chief who marries one of higher rank than himself, or a sister or half sister so that their child will be of still higher rank” (Pukui and Elbert 99). In the Abraham Fornander collection, ‘imi haku is described as “seeking a new master for the betterment of one’s condition” (4: 364 n6). And Kanalu G. Terry Young sees the term as a testimony to ʻŌiwi agency: “ʻImi haku is an example of mediated power. It was a contingency built into ʻŌiwi Maoli society’s rules of governance” (15).

The tone and content of ʻĪʻī’s series suggests that his use of ‘imi haku is distinctly uncomplimentary. In the first column, ʻĪʻī informs readers about Kekūanāoʻa’s humble beginnings as Kamehameha’s messenger and food-keeper. He also describes Kekūanāoʻa’s stinginess, and his attempts to exclude ʻĪʻī from the mōʻī’s royal guards. ʻĪʻī even speculates on whether Kekūanāoʻa had slept with Liholiho’s wives, but managed to keep it hidden from Liholiho, thus avoiding Haʻaloʻu’s fate (ʻĪʻī “Kanaenae” 5 Dec. 1868). The resulting portrait is hardly a panegyric, and it suggests a history of friction and a less-than-perfect relationship between biographer and subject—even if ʻĪʻī did visit Kekūanāoʻa on his deathbed. Nor does ʻĪʻī seem at all concerned about what the mōʻī might think about this portrait of his father, suggesting either that ʻĪʻī felt totally estranged from Lot, or that this Kanaenae might be the final stroke, severing any possibility of a continuing relationship. In any event, this warts and all approach to depicting Kekūanāoʻa’s life contrasts sharply with his rather hagiographic portrait of Kekūanāoʻa’s daughter, Kamāmalu.

If ʻĪʻī’s account of Kekūanāoʻa offended readers, no sign of it appears in the letters
sections or elsewhere in the newspapers. Many probably found it informative and interesting. ‘Ī‘ī composed Kekūanāo‘a’s life based on his own observations. Here was a distinguished former statesman, holding forth on another illustrious political figure who was also the father of the nation’s past and current kings. The account described the two men’s interactions with Kamehameha, Ka‘ahumanu, Kālaimoku, Boki, Liholiho, Kauikeaouli, Kīna‘u—the great figures of the previous era. The only other person offering sustained commentary on these ali‘i at the time ‘Ī‘ī began publishing his portrait of Kekūanāo‘a was Samuel Mānaikalani Kamakau, whose ongoing series on the reigns of Kamehameha I, II, and III, complete with extensive treatments of Hawaiian culture and society, had been running in Kuokoa under different titles since 1865 (Nogelmeier Mai Pa‘a 106).53 ‘Ī‘ī’s references to “Ka Moolelo Hawaii” [Hawaiian History], the title of Kamakau’s series at the time, indicate that he was reading it (‘Ī‘ī “Kanaenae” 30 Jan. 1869; “Na Hunahuna” 6, 27 Mar., 3 Apr. 1869). But he never mentioned Kamakau by name, referring to him only as the writer of the series on Hawaiian history. The two men of course knew one another; their paths had often crossed professionally. Kamakau had been a fellow Land commissioner from December 9, 1848 to August 5, 1850 (“Land”), a Second District Court Judge in 1853 (“Kamakau”), and a legislative representative in 1855 (Lydecker 293). But in addition to his public activities, Kamakau was also a prolific writer, producing “nearly 400 articles, most of which dealt with cultural description, history, legend, and social critique” (Nogelmeier 108). If ‘Ī‘ī had been the nation’s orator, then, Kamakau was staking his claim to being its historian. His tombstone bears the epitaph “He Kuauhau—Historian” (Kamakau Ke Kumu xxiv).

Had Kamakau not been publishing his series, ‘Ī‘ī’s installments on Kekūanāo‘a might

53 Kamakau moved his series to Ke Au Okoa at the onset of 1869 (Ke Kumu 115).
have simply run their brief course, just as his series on Kamāmalu had in 1866. But at some point, ʻĪʻī decided to take on the nation’s historian. Committed to responding to or elaborating upon what he was reading in Kamakau’s series, ʻĪʻī began his third series, “Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii” [Fragments of Hawaiian History]. It would run for sixty installments, and end only with his death. Part of the motivation had to be personal pride. As I have shown, ʻĪʻī was intimately involved in most of the major political and domestic events during the reign of Liholiho, and especially that of Kauikeaouli. But Kamakau barely mentions him (Ke Aupuni 62–3, 122, 157–9, 216–7, 292; Ke Kumu 200, 249, 258). Having been effectively erased from Hawaiian history by the Historian, ʻĪʻī therefore responds by writing himself back into it in his Kekūanāoʻa series, and then at great length in his Fragments. ʻĪʻī’s initial responses to Kamakau also triggered memories that led him to write articles recording what he had learned or observed personally about Hawaiian history, cultural practices, mele, and moʻolelo. Everything we know about ʻĪʻī’s childhood comes from this third series, beginning with the column published on June 12, 1869, although these reminiscences coincide with a remarkable and unexpected event that may also have motivated him to relive his youth, it is interesting and instructive to examine these articles as a response to Kamakau.

When ʻĪʻī published his first column on Kekūanāoʻa on December 5, 1868, Kamakau had recently published what was the first of five installments about the introduction of Catholicism to Hawaiʻi, the persecution of Catholics, and the resulting political conflicts. These columns appeared on October 20, December 19, 26, 1868, and January 2, 7, 1869. (Ke Aupuni 99–106). ʻĪʻī adamantly disagreed with several of Kamakau’s statements. Moʻolelo Hawaiʻi is mentioned

---

54 I have already related much of what ʻĪʻī reported of his childhood.

55 I have already outlined ʻĪʻī’s role in this history.
nine times in ‘Ī‘ī’s columns of March 6, 27, and April 3, 1869, and eight of these references are connected to Kamakau’s remarks on Catholics. By the last article, ‘Ī‘ī’s writing back has turned into a diatribe, which takes up the first third of the April 10 installment. Because he had clearly established that he was responding to the writer of Mo‘olelo Hawai‘i, he no longer referred to him as such.

‘Ī‘ī’s caustic rebuttals may have been why Kamakau moved his series from Ka Nupepa Kuokoa to Ke Au Okoa on January 7, 1869 (“Ka Moolelo Hawai‘i”). If so, then another layer of intertextuality between the two series must be taken into account. Kamakau’s defection is puzzling for three reasons. First, since Kuokoa had more than four thousand subscribers, being a regular contributor carried a certain prestige (“I ka Poe”). Second, Kamakau had been publishing his series in the Kuokoa since 1865, suggesting that the editors highly valued his work. And third, even after Kamakau moved his Mo‘olelo series, he continued as one of the opinion editors until December 25, 1869, when Kuokoa eliminated this position. The lack of any mention of the disappearance of Kamakau’s series’ is equally puzzling. An editorial in Ke Au Okoa explains that it has made room in its pages for Kamakau’s series on the Kamehamehas, previously published in Kuokoa, but gives no reason for the move (“Ka Moolelo Hawai‘i”). Three considerations might explain this state of affairs. First, as we shall see, ‘Ī‘ī’s rebuttals created a counter-narrative to Kamakau’s accounts of certain events. Kuokoa would therefore have been publishing two series treating the same topics at more or less the same time, and with one series systematically pointing out the unreliability of the other. Second, the corrections in the counter-narrative were clearly coming from someone either directly involved in those events, or who had

56 Kamakau’s final column for Ka Nupepa Kuokoa appeared on January 9, 1869 (“Ka Moolelo o Hawai‘i”).
57 This information is usually found on the second page of Ka Nupepa Kuokoa.
spoken at the time to those who had been. The author in short was an eyewitness, and spoke from personal authority. And third, by speaking from this position, ʻĪʻī was constantly calling into question the limits of Kamakau’s knowledge or the reliability of his sources.

ʻĪʻī’s response to Kamakau’s account of Kālaimoku’s baptism by a Catholic priest aboard a French warship in 1820 (27 Mar. 1869) suggests how devastating such authority could be. The ship in question was the Uranie, captained by Louis de Freycinet. Jacques Arago, who sailed as a draftsman with Freycinet from 1817 to 1820, had immortalized this event in a watercolor (Forbes *Encounters* 70–1). ʻĪʻī took issue with Kamakau’s claim that ʻOlohana (John Young I) had convinced Kālaimoku to be baptized.58 According to ʻĪʻī, the person most likely responsible was Jean Luahine Rives (ʻNa Hunahuna” 27 Mar. 1869). ʻĪʻī’s evidence was that Rives was not only French, but later accompanied a priest to the Hawaiian Islands, suggesting that he favored Catholicism. ʻĪʻī also questioned Kamakau’s claim that aliʻi were present at Kālaimoku’s baptism (Kamakau Ke Kumu 101). ʻĪʻī reports that they only found out about the baptism after they visited the ship. The ship’s officer (Arago) who painted Kālaimoku’s baptism had therefore taken artistic liberties by including other aliʻi. Kamakau had not mentioned this picture; by referring to it, ʻĪʻī introduces evidence that apparently supports Kamakau’s claim in order to undermine Kamakau’s authority as a historian. It should be mentioned however, that the cleverness of ʻĪʻī’s attack, and its claims to authority, did not necessarily mean that he was right. Arago, Captain Freycinet, and Rose Freycinet all left accounts of Kālaimoku’s baptism claiming that Liholiho and other aliʻi were present (Arago 107–111; Freycinet 526; Rivière 102–3).

ʻĪʻī’s second objection was to Kamakau’s account on January 2, 1869 of the Laplace incident (ʻNa Hunahuna” 27 Mar. 1869). Kamakau wrote that the mōʻī’s kuhina nui

58 This claim is found in the column published on November 2, 1867 (Kamakau Ke Kumu 210).
[Kekāuluohi] and William Richards delivered the twenty thousand dollars to Laplace. After accusing Kamakau of “mana wale” [just guessing], ʻĪʻī revealed that Kekūanāoʻa and Haʻalilio had carried out the consignment. In his next installment, ʻĪʻī further notes that Richards was not even in Honolulu, but at Lahaina with the mōʻī. They arrived on Oʻahu shortly after ʻĪʻī left Laplace’s ship. Here ʻĪʻī’s authority to correct Kamakau is irrefutable, because he himself was the hostage Laplace liberated after receiving the money—something that Kamakau neglected to mention. At this point, ʻĪʻī mockingly writes, “E oki ae kakou, no ka mea, ua kolekole ka ia la noa” [Let us stop because his noʻa has been exposed]. A small stone or wooden token in a game of the same name, a noʻa “was hidden under bundles of tapa and the players guessed where it was” (Pukui and Elbert (268). When an opponent’s noʻa was discovered, the game was over. In this way ʻĪʻī calls out Kamakau for having tried to pass off conjecture as fact.

ʻĪʻī next took issue with Kamakau’s column of December 26, 1868 (“Na Hunahuna” 3 Apr. 1869), which describes Kaʻahumanu’s role in persecuting Catholics, and concludes that “He naʻaupō me ka hoʻokaumaha ia manaʻo i ko ʻēia wā” [Those of this time consider that belief ignorant and oppressive] (Ke Aupuni 105). ʻĪʻī responds first by praising Kaʻahumanu for ridding the nation of idol worship and human sacrifice, for supporting Liholiho’s decision to allow the first Congregational missionaries to remain, and for promoting Christianity (“Na Hunahuna” 3 Apr. 1869). Noting that Catholics were always quick to accuse the missionaries of being traitors to the nation, ʻĪʻī claims his discursive authority by stating that as a kahu for the Kula Aliʻi, which the missionaries had established in 1840, he could personally confirm that these teachers had helped the nation by educating the children who were now ruling aliʻi. He then took Kamakau to task for claiming that Catholicism is not like the “aoao pegana” [pagan worship], by
observing that both religions involved idols and bloodshed. Clearly, ʻĪʻī’s anti-Catholic bias had not faded with the passing of time.

Then the attack becomes personal, as he comments on Kamakau’s own conversion to Catholicism: “ua haalele oia i kona makuahine nana i hanai i ka waiu a me ka ai paa ma ka makahiki 1858” [in 1858, he left his mother who had nursed him at her breast and weaned him onto solid food]. ʻĪ‘ī tells the story of a fall from grace. Though Kamakau had once enjoyed a certain prestige because he had attended the missionary school Lahainaluna, sat in the legislative assemblies beginning in 1842, and served as a government land agent for Kīpahulu in Maui, his heart did not know God, because his faith was in material things. ʻĪ‘ī then described how in the legislative session of 1855, Kamakau made a motion to give Dr. Lathrop two thousand five hundred dollars for vaccinating people during the smallpox epidemic. The Board of Health had not asked Lathrop to take on this responsibility, and the doctor had apparently not administered vaccines, but only a cup of grated yam or sweetened water. But Kamakau’s resolution received a majority vote, so when the House of Nobles learned of this corrupt proposal, the Nobles voted to oust its supporters from their government positions. Kamakau, a district judge at the time, was one of these, and while Kamakau continued to live in Lahaina, after that legislative session, he was without an official appointment. ʻĪ‘ī does not indicate from what position Kamakau was removed, and Kamakau’s own record of appointments does not offer insights. But he was relieved of his duties as judge three months after the 1855 session ended, and on November 22, 1856, The Polynesian reports that after an “investigation of complaints against Mr. S. M. Kamakau, District Justice of Wailuku, for malfeasance in office,” he had been dismissed from that position (“Circuit”).

ʻĪ‘ī’s attack was sustained and relentless. He writes that in August of 1855, Kamāmalu
stopped at Lahaina on her way to Hawai‘i. Kamakau’s wife asked her for a piece of land called Maka‘aka in Waihe‘e, Maui. Kamāmalu granted her request so that she would have a place to live, and Kamakau and his wife became known for their good works for the church there. For example, they were involved in building a wall for the Waihe‘e church, carried out by people who paid their tax to the mō‘ī in the form of labor. Through such actions, they endeared themselves to the reverend W. P. Alexander. According to ‘Ī‘ī, Kamakau was entrusted with money to buy supplies for church-related construction—more than needed perhaps. Rev. Alexander kept the books, but Kamakau was in charge of purchases. After the work was finished, the ship captain who had been delivering materials sued Kamakau over a breach of agreement. ‘Ī‘ī does not offer particulars, but reports that Kamakau lost the case, and had to pay a fine and all the captain’s court expenses. ‘Ī‘ī then offers personal testimony relating Kamakau’s conversion to Catholicism to this incident. In November of 1855, Kamakau sent ‘Ī‘ī a petition stating that he wanted to buy Waihe‘e Church—the same church he and others had built—which he would then sell to the Catholics for one thousand dollars. The sole person in charge of the money to construct the church, Kamakau blamed its disappearance on the members. ‘Ī‘ī denied his petition.

In the first third of his next installment, ‘Ī‘ī’s exposé continued (10 Apr. 1869). In 1858, Kamakau allegedly tried to buy the land underneath Waihe‘e Church from a woman named Nu‘uhiwa for sixty dollars. After conferring with ‘Ī‘ī, fellow Privy Councilor Richard Armstrong conducted an investigation, and before the transaction was finalized, ‘Ī‘ī interceded with the approval of the president of the House of Nobles. He paid Nu‘uhiwa one hundred dollars, and once that transaction was entered into the record book, he gave the deed to the church, whose members agreed to repay him within a timeframe he established. He then returned the sixty
dollars to Kamakau. ʻĪʻī informed his readers that Kamakau’s ambiguous actions were like those of a wicked man, adding that he had also acted unethically in connection with the church at Kīpahulu—but without offering particulars. With this last shot, ʻĪʻī ended his diatribe. Although some interplay between their historical accounts quietly continued, it was his last mention of Kamakau in his series. Kamakau never responded to ʻĪʻī’s accusations. This is all the more remarkable, because according to Thomas G. Thrum, Kamakau was “self-confident to a fault bordering on conceit that brooked no criticism, and made him a sarcastic opponent, whether as writer or lawmaker” (“Brief Sketch” 45). But Kamakau remained silent, and would later offer ʻĪʻī the ultimate accolade.

Perhaps to the readers’ disappointment, ʻĪʻī then turned to his own personal account of Hawaiian history. The shift to memoir took place in his column of June 12, 1869, which began a nine-installment series devoted entirely to his childhood. From August 21 to October 2, he offered vignettes of important events, religious-cultural-social practices, and notable people. On October 9, he returned briefly to his childhood, and once more on December 4, with an account that carried over into the next installment (11 Dec. 1869). The remaining December installments were devoted to Kamehameha, his children, his life on Oʻahu, and his land awards to aliʻi (18, 25 Dec. 1869).

Somewhere around the time that ʻĪʻī was beginning the second month of his third series, he received remarkable news: Malaea, his wife of six years, was expecting a child. In February of 1869, she was between one and two months along, and by the time “Fragments” transitioned from historical treatise to memoir, they would have been able to feel their child moving. He must have been overjoyed, and perhaps the impending birth had something to do with the focus on his own youth in the published reminiscences of this time. On October 1, 1869, two months after ʻĪʻī
had turned sixty-nine, Malaea gave birth to a daughter at their home in Waipiʻo (“Hanau”). His advanced age drew attention; the birth announcement referred to him as “ka hapauea hanohano Ioane Ii” [the elderly honorable Ioane ʻĪʻī (“Hanau”). They named the child ʻAirene [Irene] Haʻaloʻu Kahalelaukoa (ʻĪʻī Probate 482 1: 6). A few weeks later, ʻĪʻī and his family visited Honolulu, and on October 30, the Kuokoa announced his return, once again calling attention to his advanced years by noting that “Ua lawe pu mai hoi oia me kana milimili o kona wa elemakule kana keiki” [He brought with him his beloved one of his old age, his child] (Editorial Nupepa Kuokoa 30 Oct. 1869: 3).

ʻĪʻī’s trip was in response to a request that he offer testimony regarding the legitimacy of Henry E. Pierce, the son of Henry A. Pierce and Virginia Kahoa Rives (Hartwell 8–9). Before confirming Pierce’s legitimacy with regard to the laws in place at the time of his birth, ʻĪʻī provided a brief autobiography and a summary of his own political career:

I am a native of the Hawaiian Islands, and was born in the year A. D. 1800; was educated by the American Missionaries—one of their earliest pupils. I have enjoyed the confidence of all the Kings and Chiefs from the time I arrived at manhood; have held offices of high trust under the Government; been a member of the Legislative Council of the Kingdom; am still a member of the House of Nobles, and of the Privy Council of State; have been a Justice of the Supreme Court for thirteen years, from 1851 to 1864, and resigned on account of infirmity and old age. (qtd. in Hartwell 8; translator unknown)

While the House of Nobles was a life appointment, his claim that he was still a Privy Councilor is puzzling. Membership was at the mōʻī’s pleasure, and ʻĪʻī had certainly not been attending. Perhaps there was an error in translation; the document does not provide ʻĪʻī’s original statement.
But this brief autobiographical account is significant, because it shows how ʻĪʻī understood his own life six months before his death. It is a self-written epitaph.

ʻĪʻī continued writing his series for the *Nupepa Kuokoa*, which had made him one of their seventy-eight officers responsible for recruiting subscribers. His district was ʻEwa (ʻ“Na Luna”; ʻ“I ka Poe”). The first three installments for 1870 listed the trails he knew on Oʻahu, described places, and offered vignettes about people associated with them (ʻ“Na Hunahuna” 1, 8, 15 Jan. 1870). In the fourth column, he resumes his recollections of his early service to Liholiho, and the relocation of the royal court to Hawaiʻi Island (22 Jan. 1870). From January 29 to February 26, 1870, he recalls his time there, including the death of his uncle Papa ʻĪʻī, the famine in Kailua-Kona, and a description of the royal court at Kamakahonu (29, Jan., 5, 12, 19, 26 Feb. 1870). From there, ʻĪʻī’s branched out to discuss the Ahuʻena heiau that Kamehameha built at Kamakahonu, offered two origin stories for life-giving and death-dealing practices, and then described Kamehameha’s dealings with foreigners in that period (26 Feb., 5, 12, Mar. 1870). In his installment for March 26, 1870, he concludes this account of Kamehameha, and begins to describe the mōʻī’s efforts to prepare Liholiho to rule. Here, ʻĪʻī recollects waiting outside of the Ahuʻena for Liholiho as he spoke with his father and the aliʻi of the mōʻī’s council. ʻĪʻī also reveals here that he was the only kahu to accompany Liholiho on the double canoe on his visits to different heiau to perform the ceremonies expected of the heir to the kingdom. The installments from April 2 to 30 were a treatise on canoes: how to paddle single and double hulled canoes, how to right them when they overturned, how to steer them, and the importance of knowing how to read the sky, wind, and currents when out at sea—of special interest to a former ship captain (2, 16, 30 Apr. 1870). The column for April 30 offered brief stories of people.
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renowned for their canoe and surfing skills, such as Kamehameha and Kaʻahumanu.

ʻĪʻī’s last two columns were published posthumously on May 14 and 28. The first installment discusses various surf spots on Hawai‘i, O‘ahu, Maui, Kaua‘i, and Ni‘ihau. He concludes this column by writing that it contains the limit of his knowledge on this subject. The readers must fill in the rest. The final installment is about surfboards and bodysurfing, and includes a vignette about Kamehameha and Gideon La‘anui, but then shifts to a discussion of hula implements and kinds of hula. The column ends with a vignette about Liholiho’s expertise at playing the kāʻeke (a kind of drum), and the people placed with him because they were also skilled at that art. There is no suggestion that this would be the last fragment—he clearly felt he had much more to share.

Sometime in early 1870, another epidemic hit the Islands. It came in the form of two fevers: “one of a continued irritative type, the other scarlet fever” (Hutchison). The President of the Board of Health, Ferdinand William Hutchison, announced that “The ‘fever’ so much spoken about as having such a rapid and fatal termination is scarlatina anginos,” and ʻĪʻī probably contracted this in April (“Annual”). Complications put his life in jeopardy (“Annual”), and at some point he moved to Honolulu to seek help for the pain (“Ka Make i Walohia”). But his fight was over. At one p.m. on May 2, he passed away at Mililani (“Ka Make ana o Ka Mea Hanohano”). Death was the one spear that ʻĪʻī could not parry.

* * *

The day after ʻĪʻī died, Samuel M. Kamakau, the same Kamakau whom ʻĪʻī had publicly humiliated, rose up in the legislative assembly, and moved to prorogue that day’s session until the next day in light of ʻĪʻī’s passing, and to require that legislators would wear a black band of mourning for thirty days in his honor (Journal of the Legislative Assembly 1870 11). Especially
given the source, it is therefore even more striking that this tribute was perhaps the most notable one he would receive from his peers and his nation. Though it had been a custom in earlier years, Kamehameha V did not release a statement marking the death of this statesman who had served the nation for several decades, and in his opening speech for the 1872 Legislative Assembly (no session was held in 1871), though he did note that Kamehameha III’s ali‘i wahine, Kalama, had passed away on September 20, 1870 (Lydecker 120), Lot did not mention ʻĪʻī. I think this can be interpreted as a slight. Certainly mentioning ʻĪʻī’s death would have been appropriate when observing the passing of Kalama, given how important a role ʻĪʻī had played in her husband’s life.

The newspapers at the time of his death recognized John Papa ʻĪʻī as an exceptional aliʻi who had offered a lifetime of loyal service to his various mōʻī and his nation. On May 4, the Hawaiian Gazette announced “A meeting of the bar will take place to-day, to introduce and pass resolutions in memory of the late Hon. John Ii, and tendering the condolences of that body to the family of the deceased” (Announcement). Several papers published obituaries. Some of the facts were shaky. The Hawaiian Gazette and Ke Au Okoa got his year of birth wrong, and while Nupepa Kuokoa gave the correct year, the day was off (“Death”; “Ka Make i Walohia”). But all of them accurately describe ʻĪʻī’s entry into the royal court through his uncle Papa, who was kahu to Kamehameha I and Kamehameha II; his close relationship with aliʻi; his education by the first missionaries; his role as hānai father and guardian of Kamāmalu; and his many political contributions (“Death”; “Ka Make i Walohia”; “Ka make ana o Ka Mea Hanohano”). Each obituary also offered unique information. The Hawaiian Gazette reported that ʻĪʻī took two items with him when he presented himself as a political hostage in the Laplace affair: “his bible and
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hymn book.” He also “excited the admiration on board by his gentlemanly and christian deportment” (“Death”). The tribute in Ke Au Okoa drew upon traditional ‘Ōiwi poetics to express sorrow at his passing: “ua pauaho mai la kekahi makua i keia noho ana, a ua kunewa [,] kahana lani aku la kela i ka aina Polikua a Kane. He u, he minamina, he haakokoi a ke kaumaha, a he mokumokuhua ka naau i na hoomanao ana nona!” [A father has departed this life and passed the heavenly turning point to Kāne’s land in the invisible beyond. A moan, regret, and a flood of grief as emotions are torn loose at thoughts of him!] (“Ka Make i Walohia”). Though living at Waiawa in ‘Ewa before he died, he was at Mililani when the “ahailono a ka make” [messenger of death] arrived, “kah i kaa i iloko o na poho lima o ka elele a ka make; a hiki wale i ka haalele ana mai la ‘o koa waa i koa kanaka’” [where the messenger of death took him in the hollows of his hands until the war canoe quit the warrior]. Readers also learned here that when he retired as Supreme Court Justice, the legislature had awarded him an annuity for his many years of service (“Ka Make i Walohia”).

Not surprisingly, the longest obituary appeared in the Nupepa Kuokoa (“Ka make ana o Ka Mea Hanohano”), which ‘Ī‘ī had championed, and in his last years also written extensively for. Readers learned that ‘Ī‘ī’s father had been from ‘Ewa, and his mother had been from Hawai‘i. According to the tribute, “No kona maamaa loa i ka noho ana imua o ke alo ali‘i me ka hoopono, ua lilo oia he kanaka i makemake nui ia, a no ka loli hikiwawe ana hoi kekahi ma ke ano hou” [Because his conduct was righteous when he lived at court, he was greatly favored, and also because he quickly adapted to new ways]. In addition to being Kamāmalu’s hānai father, “He makua a he kahu malama keia no na alii opio e ola nei i keia wa a me kekahi poe i hala e aku, a nolaila, ua aie nui na alii i kona kiai ana me ka makee alii pu” [He was a father and a kahu for young ali‘i who are currently alive and for some others who have passed, and therefore, the
aliʻi are deeply indebted to him because he guarded them with great care. *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* also praised ʻĪʻī’s expertise as a chanter: “Usa piha kona wahiona hoomanao i ka paanaau i na mele olioli o na wa kahiko a me na mele a naʻlili i haku ai, a ua lawe pu aku la oia me ia mau buke mele” [His mental library was filled with chants of olden times and mele aliʻi had composed that he had memorized, which he took with him]. So extensive was his knowledge, that “Ke hoomanao nei makou i ka make ana o Kamehameha IV, ua olioli mele ia e ia kekahi po holookoa mai ke ahiahi a wehewehe kai ao [sic, kaiao]” [We recall that when Kamehameha IV died, he chanted an entire night, from dusk to dawn] (“Ka make ana o Ka Mea Hanohano”).

On May 14, *Kuokoa* published a description of ʻĪʻī’s funeral:

Ma ke ahiahi la Sabati iho nei, e like me na Hoolaha, ua Hoolewa ae ke kino kupapau o Ka Mea Hanohano nona kela inoa maluna ae, mai kona home noho aku ma Mililani, a komo iloko o ka luakini, a mahope o ka haiia ana o ka haiolelo Hoolewa, ua laweia aku la kona pahu, e hoomana maloko o ka Hale lua o L. Haalelea e ku nei ma ka ilina o Kawaiahao

[Last Sunday evening, as given in the announcement, the casket of the Honorable One named above was carried in a procession from his home Mililani and deposited in the cemetery, and after the commemoration speech, his casket was deposited in the vault of L. Haʻalele located in the Kawaiahaʻo Cemetery. (“Ka Hoolewa”)

Although ʻĪʻī was buried with Levi Haʻalele that day, he was eventually moved to his Waipiʻo estate (Hitchcock 34), and still later to Oʻahu Cemetery in Nuʻuanu, where he rests today (Appendix F).

This succinct summary of ʻĪʻī’s funeral stands in stark contrast to the detailed account of
a fund-raising banquet at Waikīkī for a new church at Kamōʻiliʻili that appeared in the column next to ʻĪʻī’s funeral notice (“Ka Ahaaina”). Held the day before the funeral, the event was well attended by such notables as William Charles Lunalilo, Lydia Kamakaʻeha and other unnamed aliʻi. ʻĪʻī’s marriage to Maraea had received more attention. The name of the pastor who presided over his funeral, and the names of the persons attending it, are not given.

On July 2, 1870, the Hawaiian Evangelical Association commemorated ʻĪʻī in its annual report (“Annual”). One of the “licensed Hawaiian preachers,” who had recently passed away from “the epidemic fever then prevailing,” “The Honorable John Li was one of the early converts to Christianity. He was very useful to the pioneer missionaries in their acquiring the language, in preparing schoolbooks, and in translating the Scriptures. He was an active, zealous and humble Christian.” The account finishes by reporting that in “The last two or three years of his life, he preached the Gospel to the people at Ewa, and was very much beloved by them. In the month of April, he was taken sick with a fever, and died in the triumphs of faith on the 2nd of May” (“Annual”).

Then there was the matter of ʻĪʻī’s estate. He had appointed his kaikaina (younger brother or male cousin) J. Komoikehuehu and Albert Francis Judd, the son of his friend Dr. Gerrit P. Judd, as executors of his last will and testament and legal guardians of the estate of his daughter Irene (ʻĪʻī Probate 482 1: 7). ʻĪʻī owned real estate on Hawaiʻi, Oʻahu, Maui, and Molokaʻi with an estimated value of $10,000 (1: 1). On Hawaiʻi, he owned 2.76 acres in Ponohawai in Hilo (1: 69); a 1.235 acre house lot in Waipunaula in Kona (1: 68); and 4.34 acres in Kekaha in the ahupuaʻa of Haleʻape in Kohala (1: 68). On Oʻahu, he owned the 20,542-acre ahupuaʻa of Waipiʻo (1: 68); .75 acres in Kalawahine, Honolulu (1: 68); two lands in Pāwaʻa, Waikīkī, one of which was 1.52 acres (the other acreage is not given) (1: 68); 53.75 acres in Makaua, Koʻolauloa
(1: 69); 70.86 acres in Punalu‘u (1: 69); 2.56 acres in Ma‘ema‘e, Nu‘uanu (1: 69); and a 109-fathom house lot in Pana‘ewa in Kamakahala, Honolulu (1: 69). On Maui, he owned the ahupua‘a of Aleamai in Hana (1: 69); a house lot in Pu‘uuuewa in Lahaina (1: 69); one taro patch in Uhao (1: 69); and two lands in Kapunaakea (1: 69). On Moloka‘i, he owned the ahupua‘a of Keopukapaiole (1: 69), and two lands in Kapunaakea (1: 69).

The inventory of his personal property is very extensive, and offers an interesting glimpse into his household (1: 37–8). He owned a tombstone; it is not stated whether it was engraved. He owned one hundred and ten cattle and eleven horses. His library consisted of eight bibles in Hawaiian, two new bibles in Hawaiian, five “Baibala Haole Kaahumanu” [bibles in English that belonged to Ka‘ahumanu], sixteen hymnbooks, eleven law books, and twenty-five assorted books in English (1: 37). He had three writing desks, one large and two small. He owned a piano, a world globe, and four paintings. His wardrobe included two coats, six white vests, thirteen black vests, four shirts, and two pairs of trousers. He had two large mirrors (1: 38). He owned two dining tables, sixteen dining chairs, two large settees, seven parlor chairs, a black rocking chair, a sick chair, and eight beds. His dinnerware included two clay dishes, twelve small plates, seventeen tea plates, twenty-three white plates, eleven long plates, two large wooden plates, seven glass cups, one silver knife, five silver butter knives, twelve silver forks, five large silver forks, seven coconut bowls, two wooden calabashes, twenty-six small gourd bowls, one pepper grinder, nine food-carrying nets, and five spittoons (1: 38).

And so, three months shy of turning seventy, John Papa ʻĪʻī died and was buried, leaving behind a daughter and a wife, a substantial amount of property, his newspaper series, and some other writings. He had raised hänai children to adulthood, but he was deprived of this pleasure.
with Irene, who was only seven months old when he died. She would only know her father through her mother, his compatriots, and perhaps through his memoirs.
EPILOGUE

HE KĀNAENAE NO IOANE KANEIKAKAMA PAPA ʻĪʻĪ –

WORDS IN PRAISE OF JOHN KANEIKAKAMA PAPA ʻĪʻĪ

Less than two years before he died, John Papa ʻĪʻĪ had no biological heirs to inherit his substantial estate. Yet at sixty-nine, he fathered a daughter who would inherit his wealth—and then he died. Irene’s early childhood would be further marked with upheaval and tragedy, although fortunately, her adulthood became far more settled. Like Kauikeaouli, ʻĪʻĪ asked a Chief Supreme Court Justice to be an executor for his will: Albert Francis Judd, son of ʻĪʻĪ’s longtime colleague Gerrit P. Judd. The other executor was J. Komoikehuehu, a close relative who was a lawyer, and who had served as a judge, and as a legislative representative for Waiʻanae and ʻEwa (Editorial. Ka Nupepa Kuokoa and Ke Au Okoa 7 Oct. 1876). Judd proved a wise choice; Komoikehuehu less so. Komoikehuehu and ʻĪʻĪ’s widow Maraea were rather lax in meeting their responsibility to preserve and increase Irene’s wealth, at least partially because after ʻĪʻĪ’s death, they began living together in “a most irregular household, having large cadres of friends of both parties feeding on them: so that it appears there were more than twenty people unproductive, and living on this Estate” (ʻĪʻĪ Probate 482 1: 116–7). Because Komoikehuehu and Maraea did not keep a consistent account of their expenditures (1: 16), they were reprimanded, and Judd kept a close eye on them. On January 7, 1875, Komoikehuehu was replaced as Irene’s co-guardian by Sanford B. Dole (2: 195–6), but this change probably had more to do with the fact that Komoikehuehu contracted leprosy, and by July 24, 1876 he had been exiled to Kalawao on Molokai (1: 100), where he died intestate on October 25, 1876 (“Aha Hookolokolo”; “Na Make ma Kalawao”).
Some time earlier, on February 7, 1874, Maraea had married John T. Brown (Probate 482 1: 140). At one point, she moved to Hilo, and after six months of illness, she died at there on September 2, 1876. She was buried in Hilo at “Home Lani” [Heavenly Home] cemetery (Editorial Ka Nupepa Kuokoa and Ke Au Okoa 16 Sept. 1876). Irene was therefore an orphan a month before her seventh birthday. She grew up between the homes of her legal guardian, Justice Judd, and Rev. Charles McEwan Hyde (“Hale ia’”). Her guardians were the highest judicial authority in the Hawaiian kingdom and a major leader in the Congregational Church. The daughter of the man who had served as a hānai father to so many ali‘i became herself a foster child.

On September 30, 1886, the day before she turned seventeen, Irene married Charles Augustus Brown (Editorial Ko Hawaii Pae Aina). Justice Judd and Sanford Dole petitioned on November 13, 1886 to be discharged as guardians because her marriage meant “the termination of the trust” (ʻĪʻī Probate 482 3: 372). Irene proved to be the matriarch for a dynasty—the ʻĪʻī Brown family. From her two sons, George ʻĪʻī Brown and Francis Hyde ʻĪʻī Brown (“Hala”) would come several grandchildren, who themselves would have many more.61 From a single child born in the last year of his long life, ʻĪʻī ended up having numerous descendants in a prominent and influential family that like their founder would be heavily involved in politics, business, and philanthropy. Irene divorced Brown, and married Carl Holloway on June 27, 1901 (“Mare o Irene”). She died on August 26, 1922, before her fifty-third birthday. (“Na Make” Ka Nupepa Kuokoa 31 Aug. 1922). She was cremated, and her ashes deposited at Waipiʻo, ʻEwa (“Hala”). Her death notice in Ka Nupepa Kuokoa incorrectly identified her mother Malaea as ʻĪʻī’s second wife—she was in fact his fourth. According to her obituary “i hiki aku ke kuleana o

61 For a partial list of ʻĪʻī’s numerous descendants, see I‘i/Brown Family: Oral Histories.
when her sons reached majority, each would receive one million dollars] (“Hala”). At the time of her death, then, Irene’s estate was worth at least two million dollars, which would have “the same buying power as $26,942,080.92” today (Dollar Times). ‘Ī‘ī had left his daughter well provided for.

For many years after ‘Ī‘ī’s death, his name would appear in the many public announcements regarding his estate. Those who had known him in their youth would sometimes recall him. In 1879, When John M. Kapena gave a speech in connection with Mōʻī David Kalākaua’s placing of the cornerstone for his palace (74), the elderly ‘Ī‘ī was included in a poetic visualization of notable statesmen from earlier times “who served and labored for the good of the country and the progress of the nation”: “Now before the mind’s eye the stooping form of John Ii” (74, 78). In his newspaper series “Reminiscences of Honolulu Thirty-Five Years Ago,” which appeared in the Saturday Press, Rev. Henry L. Sheldon mentioned ‘Ī‘ī several times (29 Oct., 5, 26 Nov. 1881; 4 Nov., 9 Dec. 1882; 10 Mar., 8 Dec. 1883), describing him as “one of the foremost in intelligence and character of the native petty chiefs” (10 Sept. 1881). On October 15, 1907, Kawaiahaʻo Church held a dedication ceremony for a marble memorial tablet for ‘Ī‘ī (“Tablets”). On that occasion, Rev. Stephen L. Desha offered a few words. He “referred to Ii as one of the high chiefs of the islands who had enjoyed the confidence of royalty, who was a member of Kawaiahao Church when Bingham was pastor.” According to Desha, “Not was he only powerful for good in the work of the church, but he had always been noted as a man of great physical strength. One day a young prince had been thrown by an ill-tempered horse and Ii, to revenge royalty, killed the animal with one blow of his fist” (“Tablets”). The tablet reads: “He Pohaku Hoomanao keia i hoonohoia no Ioane Ii. Kekahi o na hoahanau mua o ka ekalesia o Kawaiahao. Ua waiho mai oia i keia ola i ka la 2 o Mei 1870” [This is a Memorial Tablet for
Ioane ʻĪʻī. One of the first church members of Kawaiahaʻo Church. He left this life on May 2, 1870] (Appendix 6).

In 1920, ʻĪʻī was briefly mentioned in The Centennial Book: One Hundred Years of Christian Civilization in Hawaii, 1820–1920 (19, 27). Included was a reproduction of a daguerreotype of him taken about 1851 (np; “Daguerreotype”),62 which seems to be the first published portrait of him (Appendix A). In 1928, Rev. Henry Hodges Parker’s “Reminiscences of Judge John Ii,” with the same photograph, appeared in the Honolulu Star Bulletin Centenary Number, 1828–1928. With the exception of the commemorative obituaries published immediately after his passing in 1870, Parker’s article is the only substantial memorial for ʻĪʻī in the first sixty years after his death. Fragments of Hawaiian History was first published in August 1959, eighty-nine years after his passing.

ʻĪʻī has a number of grave markers. Though he now rests alone at Oʻahu Cemetery, at some point a memorial tombstone was placed for him at the Kawaiahaʻo Church. It reads: “Hoomano Aloha no Mr. & Mrs. John K. Ii” [In loving memory of Mr. & Mrs. Ii] (Appendix F). ʻĪʻī had four wives, so it is not entirely clear to whom this refers, but the stone itself is to the left of one dedicated to Sarai Hiwauli, which reads “He mea hoomano ia Salai Hiwauli, wahine a Ioane Ii Make i Nawiliwili Kauai Aug. 29, 1856, Hanau i Kahaluu Oahu Sept. 14, 1804. Kona mau Makahiki a pau 51 mak. 11 mal. 15 la. I Kor. 15.57. E hoomaikaiia hoi ke Akua, ka mea nana i haawi mai ia kakou ka lanakila ma ko kakou Haku, ma o Iesu Kristo la” [A memorial for Sarai Hiwauli, wife of Ioane ʻĪʻī who died at Nawiliwili, Kauaʻi on August 29, 1856, and born at Kahaluʻu, Oʻahu on September 14, 1804. Her age was fifty-one years, eleven months, and fifteen
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days. 1 Corinthians 15:57: Praise to God who gave us victory through our Lord, Jesus Christ] (Appendix F). The tombstone at O‘ahu Cemetery bears two words: “John Ii” (Appendix F).

* * *

Here are some final thoughts, shared from the perspective of his biographer. From his earliest childhood until the day he died, ʻĪʻī was strongly motivated by an innate sense of justice, a generous spirit, and a heightened awareness of the importance of kuleana. Strong-willed, but not excessively so, above all, ʻĪʻī was courageous. Courage comes in many forms—physical, emotional, intellectual, spiritual, and moral. ʻĪʻī displayed these distinct, yet often overlapping, forms of bravery throughout his life as he confronted many changes, personal and national challenges, and tragedies. He was not afraid of physical confrontation, readily offering protection to those whom he thought needed it. During epidemics, he would often help others without a care about his own safety. He was a philanthropist who opened his house up to those in need, participated in many organizations, and made donations to worthy causes. He also had the rare quality of being able to admit when he was wrong. He never sought fame or power for himself, but because of who he was, he became well-known, and wielded a substantial amount of influence not simply because of the various governmental positions he held, but because people respected his opinion. Perhaps because he weathered the passage into the royal household when he was ten years old, he was not afraid to learn new things or take on new positions. He was intellectually curious—questioning what he learned or was told, weighing it for its intellectual, moral, and practical worth. He was fully committed to his gods, first the traditional gods of Hawai‘i, and then to Jehovah, and he had faith in himself—a rare trait indeed. His intellectual, moral, and spiritual grounding was phenomenal. He was far-seeing and incredibly focused on what was good for his ali‘i, and his fellow Hawaiians. He had a deep love for his nation and for
the ʻāina itself. Aware of his place in all his various communities, he navigated fluidly between them. He was intelligent without a great deal of ego. He was fearless. I suspect that ʻĪʻī would have made an excellent, though very stern, mōʻī. He was indisputably an excellent kahu. Above all, he possessed gravitas.

In a word, I find ʻĪʻī inspiring. As a Kanaka Maoli, coming to know his life and writings have offered important lessons about facing challenges and changes at the personal, familial, social, political, intellectual, spiritual, and physical levels. His life is an important reminder of what it means to be Kanaka Maoli in the face of great and often rapid changes. He lived his life in accordance with those core cultural values that our kūpuna have handed down through the ages: upholding our various kuleana, having a good work ethic, valuing learning and the arts of listening and speaking well, making the effort to improve ourselves, and always striving to be pono. By pono, I mean that holistic balance we achieve when we are physically, spiritually, morally, and intellectually ethical, and in equilibrium with ourselves, with others, with our ancestors, with our gods, and with the environment (land, sea, and sky)—a challenging goal, but our greatest and most rewarding task. Even when he became a devout Christian, ʻĪʻī continued to see people, places, and things through the lens of Hawaiian epistemology. His distinctly ʻŌiwi worldview informed all his actions, and was the subject of his writings in the last years of his life. This point is perhaps the most important. In the face of challenges and changes, we are and will always be ʻŌiwi—connected to our ancestors through a piko that is genealogical, cultural, spiritual, and intellectual. I believe that like ʻĪʻī, we must practice patience in the face of adversity, but always strive strongly for justice, and most importantly, value our traditional knowledges and practices, which are best accessed through ka ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi (the Hawaiian language).
While researching and writing this life, John Papa ʻĪʻī became as real to me as it is possible for someone to be who died ninety years before I was born. Writing about him has been extremely moving, and frankly, at times very difficult. Despite his efforts to preserve the independence of the Hawaiian kingdom during the turbulent decades of Kauikeaouli’s reign, our nation was eventually overcome by a greater political power. I hope that this story of his life will move and inspire others. It is the account of a Hawaiian who rose to what I believe to be greatness through sheer willpower, a determination to survive, but also to do good, and who was deeply compelled to be pono.

My moʻolelo of John Papa ʻĪʻī ends here, but he lives on in his numerous human and written progeny—including this biography. E ola mau nā pua a Ioane Kaneiakama Papa ʻĪʻī—Long live the descendants of John Kaneiakama Papa ʻĪʻī.
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Appendix D. “Daguerreotype of John Papa Ii; Hawaii.” Photographer unknown, ca. 1851.

Bishop Museum Archives, Honolulu.
Appendix F.1. Gravestone memorial to Mr. and Mrs. John K. ʻĪʻī at Kawaiahaʻo Church cemetery, and the tombstone for Sarai Hiwauli. Photo by Marie Alohalani Brown.
Appendix F.2. ʻĪʻī’s final resting place at Oʻahu Cemetery. Photo by Marie Alohalani Brown.
APPENDIX G. Memorial Tablet for ʻĪʻī

He Pohaku Hoomanao keia i hoomohoia no Ioane Li.
Kekahi o na heahanau mua o ka ekalesia o Kawaiahaʻo.
Ua waiho mai oia i keia ola ana i ka la 2 o Mei 1870.

Appendix G. Memorial tablet for ʻĪʻī inside the Kawaiahaʻo church. Photo by Marie Alohulani Brown.
APPENDIX H: John Papa ʻĪʻī’s Newspaper Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Newspaper and page</th>
<th>Title of Article</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-27-1836</td>
<td>KKH 34</td>
<td>O ka Hoole Rama</td>
<td>Group petition to Kamehameha III to ban the sale of rum. Published twice in this issue (pages 34 and 36).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-27-1836</td>
<td>KKH 36</td>
<td>O ka Hoole Rama</td>
<td>Group petition to Kamehameha III to ban the sale of rum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-11-1836</td>
<td>KKH 38</td>
<td>O ka Hoole Rama</td>
<td>ʻĪʻī’s letter to governing aliʻi urging them to take a stand against rum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2-1839</td>
<td>KKH 62</td>
<td>Pohaku Lele</td>
<td>ʻĪʻī recalls seeing meteors in September 1825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2-1839</td>
<td>KKH 62</td>
<td>Moku Ili Ole</td>
<td>A false report of a shipwreck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-11-1839</td>
<td>KKH 83-4</td>
<td>Untitled.</td>
<td>Group letter in support of ʻĪʻī after his strange encounter with Kealoha, who has been spreading rumors about him in connection with the death-dealing practice ho‘opi‘opi‘o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10-1839</td>
<td>KKH 89-90</td>
<td>No ka Hoopiopio</td>
<td>Ho‘opi‘opi‘o is a sham and its practitioners are liars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-22-1839</td>
<td>KKH 101-2</td>
<td>He Moolelo no Kinau</td>
<td>This biography for Kīnaʻu is the first example of ‘Ī‘i’s life writing. His signoff indicates another installment was forthcoming, but the paper closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1-1841</td>
<td>TP 186-7</td>
<td>Translation. John Ii’s Speech, Delivered at Rev. H. Bingham’s Church On Thanksgiving Day, Jan. 1. 1841</td>
<td>In this thanksgiving speech about the blessings received from God, ‘Ī‘i relates what his life was like under the ‘Ai kapu system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1-1847</td>
<td>KE 22</td>
<td>Ka wawahi o J. Ii i na olelo a P. A. Brinsmade</td>
<td>Response to Brinsmade’s statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1-1847</td>
<td>KE 33-35</td>
<td>hope o ka J. Ii olelo no Berinimake</td>
<td>Response to Brinsmade’s statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1-1847</td>
<td>KE 54</td>
<td>No ke pai aina</td>
<td>On eviction from land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-25-1856</td>
<td>TPCA</td>
<td>John Ii’s Speech, Delivered at the Stone Church, on Thanksgiving Day,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-22-1862</td>
<td>KNK 2</td>
<td>No ke kanu Pulupulu</td>
<td>On the cultivation of cotton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8-1862</td>
<td>KHOKP 4</td>
<td>He inoa no Kauikeaouli</td>
<td>This mele inoa may be by ʻĪʻī, but it seems strange that he would 1) publish a mele in this paper since he deeply disapproved of it, and 2) that he would sign it only with “Ii,” seeing that he has always signed his name in full or at least with his first initial and his last name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10-1863</td>
<td>KNK 3</td>
<td>Manao paiapai</td>
<td>Advocating farming, especially cotton cultivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-17-1863</td>
<td>KNK 2</td>
<td>Na olelo paiai a J. Ii imua o ka Ahahui Kuokoa</td>
<td>Support for the Ahahui Kuokoa and the Kuokoa newspaper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-16-1864</td>
<td>KNK 2</td>
<td>Untitled [Aloha Oukou]</td>
<td>Acceptance of missionaries’ offer to tour Kauaʻi with them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-1-1864</td>
<td>KNK 3</td>
<td>Wahi Moolelo no Kaai</td>
<td>Obituary for Kaʻai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-21-1865</td>
<td>KNK 3</td>
<td>Palapala mai Uapou mai</td>
<td>Explanation about the trip to Nuʻuhiwa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-4-1865</td>
<td>KNK 4</td>
<td>He wahi Mooolelo no ko Hanaia make</td>
<td>ʻĪʻī’s account of Hanaia’s passing, the Fatuhiva girl he hosted at his home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2-1866</td>
<td>KNK 3</td>
<td>Ke ola a me ka make ana iho o Victoria K.</td>
<td>Series on Kamāmalu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaahumanu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9-1866</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Ke ola a me ka make ana iho o Victoria K.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaahumanu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-16-1866</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Ke ola a me ka make ana iho o Victoria K.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaahumanu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-30-1866</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Ke ola a me ka make ana iho o Victoria K.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaahumanu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-14-1866</td>
<td>KNK 4</td>
<td>Victoria K.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaahumanu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-4-1866</td>
<td>KNK 3</td>
<td>Ola ana a make ana o V. Kamamalu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-18-1866</td>
<td>KNK 3</td>
<td>Ola a make ana o Kamamalu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-5-1868</td>
<td>KNK 3</td>
<td>Untitled.</td>
<td>Series on Kekūanāo’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-19-1868</td>
<td>KNK 2</td>
<td>Kanaenae Aloha no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2-1869</td>
<td>KNK 4</td>
<td>Kanaenae Aloha no ka Imihaku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-16-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Kanaenae aloha no ka mea i make</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-30-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Kanaenae aloha no ka mea i make</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-27-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-13-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-20-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-27-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-3-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ʻĪʻī’s treatise on Hawaiian history and his memoirs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-17-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-24-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-15-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-22-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-29-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-5-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-26-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-3-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-17-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Hunahuna Moolelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-24-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Hunahuna Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-31-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Hunahuna Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-7-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Hunahuna Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-14-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Hunahuna Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-21-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Hunahuna Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-4-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-18-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-25-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-2-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-9-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-16-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-23-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-30-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-13-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-4-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-11-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-18-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-25-1869</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1-1870</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-8-1870</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-15-1870</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-22-1870</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-29-1870</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5-1870</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-12-1870</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-19-1870</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-26-1870</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5-1870</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-12-1870</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-19-1870</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-26-1870</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2-1870</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16-1870</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-30-1870</td>
<td>KNK 1</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-14-1870</td>
<td>KNK 4</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-28-1870</td>
<td>KNK 4</td>
<td>Na Hunahuna no ka Moolelo Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-1859</td>
<td>Book published by Bishop Museum</td>
<td>Fragments of Hawaiian History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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