

Nā Kuhia ma *Hawaiian Antiquities*: Nathaniel Emerson a me nā Kānaka ‘Ōiwi Hawai‘i i Kōkua ma ka ‘Ike Hawai‘i

The Notes to *Hawaiian Antiquities*: Nathaniel Emerson and His Native Hawaiian Consultants

Charles M. Langlas

‘ŌLELO HŌ‘ULU‘ULU / SUMMARY

Ma kēia ‘atikala nei, kālailai a loiloi ‘ia nā kuhia o hope a Nathaniel Emerson (‘Emekona) i ho‘okomo ai ma *Hawaiian Antiquities* (Malo [1903] 1951), kāna unuhina i kā Davida Malo Ka Moolelo Hawaii (i kākau lima ‘ia ma waena o 1841 a me 1853). ‘O kā ‘Emekona hana ma ia puke, ‘a‘ole he unuhi wale nō, akā, he ho‘okomo pū ‘ana i ka ‘ikepili hou ma ia mau kuhia, a i kekahi manawa, he ho‘ohalahala i kā Malo. I mea e maopopo pono ai i kā Malo i kākau ai, ua noi kōkua ‘o ‘Emekona i mau kānaka ‘ōiwi Hawai‘i, he ‘umikūmākolū ka nui i hō‘ike ‘ia ko lākou inoa ma *Hawaiian Antiquities*, a i ‘ole, ma ke kāmua mua o ia puke. Ua hō‘ike nō ia mau kānaka i mau mea iā ‘Emekona, a ‘o kekahi, he waiwai, e like me nā pule i ho‘oili ‘ia iā lākou. No kekahi mau kumuhana na‘e, ‘a‘ole nui kā lākou ‘ike, e like me ka ‘oihana makahiki a me ka ‘oihana luakini i pau ‘ē ma mua o ko lākou wā.

Pono e ana maika‘i ‘ia ia mau kuhia. I kekahi manawa, he waiwai ka ‘ike, a i kekahi manawa, he hewa ke nānā pono ‘ia. I kekahi manawa, hāpai ‘o ‘Emekona i ka mana‘o ua pā‘ewa ‘o Malo ma kāna i kākau ai, a i ‘ole, ua hewa wale kāna. I la‘ana, kākau ‘o ‘Emekona ‘a‘ole i hiki iā Malo ke wehewehe pono i ke ‘ano o ka ho‘omana Hawai‘i kahiko, no ka mea, he kanaka ia ‘akahi a huli i ka ho‘omana Kalikiano. Ua mana‘o pēlā ‘o ‘Emekona no kona kuhi hewa i ka mana‘o o kekahi paukū ma kā Malo mo‘olelo e pili ana i ka mana‘o o nā kānaka ‘ōiwi no nā akua ki‘i ma ka heiau. Ma ka nānā ‘ana i ia ‘ano hemahema o nā kuhia a ‘Emekona ma *Hawaiian Antiquities*, he kūpono ke kānalua i ka pololei loa o kāna unuhina kekahi.

In *Hawaiian Antiquities* (Malo [1903] 1951), Nathaniel Emerson not only translated Davida Malo’s *Ka Moolelo Hawaii* (handwritten ca. 1841–53), he also added numerous endnotes to supplement and often to critique what Malo had written. This article analyzes and evaluates those notes. In order to help him understand Malo’s account, Emerson consulted with many Native Hawaiians, thirteen of whom are identified in the printed version of *Hawaiian Antiquities* or in an earlier draft. The consultants provided Emerson with valuable material (prayers in particular) that he included in the notes, but they had limited knowledge on many of the topics covered by Malo, especially concerning the *makahiki* and *luakini* rituals that had ended before their time.

The notes need to be assessed carefully: often they provide valuable supplementary information, but sometimes Emerson seems definitely wrong. Some of the notes complain that Malo was biased or mistaken in something he wrote. The article concludes that often this is the result of Emerson's failure to understand Malo. For example, Emerson argues that as a recent convert to Christianity, Malo was unable to fairly describe traditional Hawaiian religion, on the basis of his mistaken reading of Malo's passage on the Hawaiian use of god figures in the *heiau*. The failures exhibited in the notes to *Hawaiian Antiquities* should make us cautious as well of accepting uncritically Emerson's translation.

INTRODUCTION

When Nathaniel Emerson published *Hawaiian Antiquities* (Malo [1903] 1951), his translation of Davida Malo's (n.d.) manuscript *Ka Moolelo Hawaii*, he added a great many endnotes to many chapters of Malo's text. Malo's *Ka Moolelo Hawaii* is one of the earliest and most authoritative texts written by a Native Hawaiian that describes Hawaiian culture during the reign of Kamehameha I, before the arrival of Christian missionaries in 1820. It has unparalleled value to students of traditional Hawaiian culture, both because of its encyclopedic nature and because Malo was a participant in Hawaiian culture, and one who received special training. Malo was born in 1795 and spent his youth in the company of 'Auwae, a counselor and genealogist to Kamehameha, and in the courts of Kuakini and Keōpūolani.¹ He was, therefore, well acquainted with the pre-Christian religious ceremonies, the government, and the nature of the courts of *ali'i* (chiefs) prior to 1820 that form an important part of his *mo'olelo* (story, record), all of which ended or changed greatly after 1820. He wrote his *mo'olelo* over a considerable period, stretching from about 1841 to his death in 1853.² The status of Emerson's notes, however, is quite different from that of Malo's *mo'olelo*, since Emerson was not a Native Hawaiian and did his work much later. Although Emerson worked with Native Hawaiian consultants in the 1890s during the process of translating Malo's text and adding notes, those Hawaiians were born too late to have gained a detailed knowledge through their own experience of many of the topics described by Malo.

In this paper, I analyze and evaluate Emerson's numerous notes to *Hawaiian Antiquities*. Examination of the notes also throws light on the quality of Emerson's translation, a matter that will be considered at the end of the paper. Emerson's notes were edited by William D. Alexander (Christian 1951, xxi). Alexander omitted some of Emerson's notes—presumably because he thought them dubious—and in some cases he added a critical comment marked with his initials, W. D. A. Emerson's notes sometimes provide commentary on what Malo wrote, but more often they provide additional information. Emerson apparently saw his task as more than translating Malo's *Ka Moolelo Hawaii*, thinking that it extended also to critiquing and supplementing what Malo had written. As Valerio Valeri (1985, xxiv) noted many years ago, much of this additional information is potentially of great value, but it is difficult for the reader to be sure of its validity:

As for Emerson's notes, I am convinced that they are a mixture of data of great value and unfounded or misunderstood information. It is thus necessary to consider Malo's Hawaiian text and Emerson's notes as two completely different sources.

The notes are voluminous, amounting to nearly five hundred individual notes, some of them several pages long. Nearly four hundred of them provide additional cultural information related to Malo's topics or define Hawaiian terms. In most cases, the information is apparently based on Emerson's consultation with Native Hawaiians, but he usually does not provide their names in *Hawaiian Antiquities* or describe the basis of their knowledge. Emerson also relied on the published material of others who researched Hawaiian topics, including Fornander ([1878–80] 1969) and his own brother, Joseph S. Emerson (1892).

My interest in analyzing Emerson's notes derives from the work that Jeffrey Lyon and I did in editing Malo's handwritten text *Ka Moolelo Hawaii* for publication (Malo, forthcoming). During our work, we discovered that Emerson's translation had significant flaws, and we decided to produce a new English translation. That still left questions about Emerson's notes. What is their value? And what were his sources? Research among Emerson's papers at the Huntington Library turned up the second draft of *Hawaiian Antiquities*. No first draft was found there. Subsequent research at the Hawaiian Historical Society turned up five chapters of the first draft of *Hawaiian Antiquities*. Handwritten notes on the back of pages of both drafts provide more information than appears in the published version of *Hawaiian Antiquities* about the names of his Native Hawaiian consultants and what they told him, allowing a better assessment of the value of the notes.

Malo (forthcoming, vol. 2, introduction) apparently worked on his *mo'olelo* over many years, beginning in 1840 or 1841 and continuing up to his death in 1853. It was still incomplete at Malo's death and was never published during the nineteenth century. In 1859, the original manuscript was purchased by the Hawaiian government (*ibid.*). After the overthrow of the monarchy, it apparently came into the hands of Alfred Carter at Bishop Estate; then, in 1908, it was given to the Bernice P. Bishop Museum (*ibid.*), where it remains today, designated as Hi.L.18, the "Carter copy."

Emerson worked on translating Malo's *mo'olelo* from perhaps 1891 to 1897. Emerson's second draft translation is dated 1892–93 (Emerson Papers, EMR 48–52),³ so he must have begun the translation before that. We know that he continued to work on it up through 1897 because the notes from Hawaiian consultants written on the back of the second draft are dated 1896–97. A December 1897 newspaper column in *The Independent* states that the translation was complete by that date. The translation was purchased by the Bishop Museum in 1898 and first published by the museum in 1903 (Christian 1951, xix).

The gap between Malo's writing of *Ka Moolelo Hawaii* and Emerson's consultation with Native Hawaiians is important. Even during his lifetime, Malo was recognized as a storehouse of traditional knowledge, knowledge that was held by few others (Arista, forthcoming). At the time of Emerson's consultation with Hawaiians, some forty years had passed since Malo's writing. Undoubtedly by then, many things that Malo wrote about were known to living Hawaiians only through written sources or in fragmentary fashion, as knowledge passed down from their elders. There were no longer any wit-

nesses left to the pre-Christian religion or to the Hawaiian government and court of the *ali'i* prior to 1820. Other Hawaiians, notably Kēlou Kamakau and John Papa ʻĪʻī, who were participants in as well as witnesses of the pre-1820 culture, and Samuel Mānaiakalani Kamakau, who collected information from such people, had written extensively about those things. The importance of participating and witnessing, as opposed to collecting information, can be seen by comparing the account of the *luakini* and *makahiki* religious rituals by S. M. Kamakau (1865; 1870) with those of Kēlou Kamakau (1919) and ʻĪʻī (August 14–October 2, 1869). S. M. Kamakau's account contains much less detail. Emerson does not seem to have used the work of Kēlou Kamakau or ʻĪʻī at all.⁴ He was familiar with a couple of S. M. Kamakau's newspaper columns, but probably not those dealing with the *makahiki* and *luakini* rituals.⁵ Some of Emerson's consultants were familiar with the published work of S. M. Kamakau, and perhaps with that of ʻĪʻī.⁶ However, there is no evidence that Emerson discussed the work of either writer with his consultants. What Emerson's consultants clearly did pass on to him were memorized pieces such as *pule* (prayers) and *mo'olelo*, presumably learned from their elders.

I. ANALYSIS OF THE NOTES

Categorization by Type

Emerson's notes to *Hawaiian Antiquities* are categorized chapter by chapter in table 1 below.⁷ Examination of the totals shows that about seven-tenths⁸ of the notes (those 348⁹ given in columns 3 and 4 out of a total of 490 notes) can be categorized as "informative"—they provide additional information beyond what Malo wrote about things Hawaiian, either Hawaiian customs or Hawaiian language.¹⁰ These notes provide thirty-one *pule* and fourteen *mele* (chants) that are not part of Malo's text, most of them probably not found elsewhere. They also provide other cultural information. For example, in chapter 12, "No na Wa ma loko o ka Makahiki" (The Divisions of the Year), Malo (n.d.) describes the month names used on Hawai'i Island where he grew up, and the corresponding English months. Emerson's note 2 to that chapter describes the different calendrical systems used on Moloka'i, O'ahu, and Kaua'i according to Hawaiian consultants from those islands (O. K. Kapule for Moloka'i, Kukahiko for O'ahu, and an unnamed consultant for Kaua'i who had learned from "an old man of Waimea, Kauai, who was a famous *kaka-olelo*") (Malo [1903] 1951, 33–34). As in this case, the information in the 348 notes is often quite important for adding to our understanding of traditional Hawaiian culture.

However, the supplementary information given by Emerson cannot always be accepted as valid. In my assessment, Emerson's supplementary information in these informative notes seems definitely wrong in sixteen cases (eleven notes plus parts of five more)¹¹ and probably wrong in two additional notes, as shown in table 1 (designated in brackets as "wrong" or "pr. wrong" in columns 3 and 4). The errors will be further examined later.

Turning to the remaining three-tenths of Emerson's notes (142 out of 490), in forty of them (those given in columns 5 and 6), Emerson corrects or complains about what Malo wrote—a word is misspelled, Malo's language is impossible to understand, his

Table 1. Types of notes in *Hawaiian Antiquities* by chapter

Chapter	Total notes	Informative notes on customs	Informative notes on language	Complaints about language	Complaints about info or viewpoint	Other	Comment or analysis
1	6						6
2	1					1	
3	2					1	1
4	10	4	1			5	
5	8	1	4		3 [3 wrong]		
6	4	1 2/3	2			1/3	
7	11	3	7			1	
8	3		2 1/3		1/3	1/3	
9	15	11	3			1	
10	6		3	2		1	
11	0						
12	6	2	2		1	1	
13	8	3 [2 wrong]	4 [1 wrong]	1 [wrong]			
14	7	4 [1/2 wrong]			3		
15	7	2	3 + 1/2 + 1/2		1/2 + 1/2		
16	7	7 [1 wrong]					
17	3	2				1	
18	21	6	8	1 [wrong]	1	1	4
19	19	14 [2 pr. wrong]	4				1
20	2	1 1/2				1/2	
21	2	1			1 [wrong]		
22	6	4					2
23	17	9	2		1 1/2 [1/2 wrong]	1/2	4
24	30	5 1/2	11	3		2	8 1/2
25	2	1			1		
26	1	1/2				1/2	
27	5	2	1				2
28	10	6	2				2
29	6	2 1/2	1/2		1 [wrong]		2
30	11	8					3
31	4	2 1/2	1		1/2 [wrong]		
32	6	2		1	2 [1 wrong]		1
33	9	7	2				
34	24	11	9 [1 wrong]	1			3
35	8	2	6 [1/2 wrong]				

Continued on next page

Table 1. *Continued*

Chapter	Total notes	Informative notes on customs	Informative notes on language	Complaints about language	Complaints about info or viewpoint	Other	Comment or analysis
36	32	15 [2 wrong]	9 [1 wrong]				8 [1 wrong]
37	42	25 [½ wrong]	12 ½	½ + ½ + ½	1	1	1
38	31	16	8 ½ [1 wrong]	3 [1 wrong]	½		3
39	5	2	1		1		1
40	14	10	2 [1 wrong]			1	1
41A–UU (E 41–57)*	35	21 ½	3 [½ wrong]	3	3 ½ [2 wrong]		4
42 (E 58)*	5		1			3	1
43 (E 59)	14	1 ½ [½ wrong]	2				10 ½
44 (E 60)	0						
45 (E 61)	3						3
46 (E 62)	6	5 ½			½		
47 (E 63)	0						
48 (E 64)	2				1 [wrong]		1
49 (E 65)	1		1				
50 (E 66)	3	1					2
51 (E 67)	10	3 [1 wrong]	3				4
Total notes	490	226 ⅔	121 ⅕	15 ½	24 ⅖	22 ⅙	79
Total wrong	29	6 + 3 × ½	5 + ½ + ½	2	12 + ½	0	1
Probably wrong	2	2					

* The chapter numbers following chapter 41 are given according to the numbers in the Langlas and Lyon edition (Malo, forthcoming). Emerson's chapter numbers are given in parentheses following an *E* for Emerson's edition.

viewpoint is biased by his Christianity, and so on. Some of Emerson's corrections are valid, and his complaints about Malo's language are often understandable—the manuscript was not a final edited draft and there are some very difficult passages. Sometimes, however, Emerson's complaint betrays his failure to grasp what Malo intended. Those complaining notes will be analyzed in the next section. The twenty-two notes categorized as “other” mostly provide comparative information—comparisons to what Emerson knew of other Polynesian cultures and occasionally parallels in Western literature. The seventy-nine notes categorized as “comments/analysis” are just that. For the most part, they seem reasonable.

Categorization by Source of Information

My attempt to determine the sources of information that Emerson used for his notes is only partially conclusive. That is particularly the case when it comes to the question of how much Emerson relied on what he knew from his own lived experience, as opposed to what he learned from consultants or from other published work. A rough

Table 2. Chronology of Emerson's life*

1839	Born to missionary parents at Waialua, O'ahu, and raised there
1850s (?)	Attended Oahu College (Punahou) in Honolulu (Emerson Papers, EMR 10)
1861	Entered Williams College in Massachusetts (Emerson Papers, EMR 10)
1862	Enlisted in the US infantry
1864	Returned to college
1865	Received BA from Williams College
1865–69	Attended Harvard Medical School, then New York College of Physicians and Surgeons
1869	Received a doctorate in medicine and began his practice in New York City
1878	Returned to Hawai'i to work for Board of Health as general inspector of "lepers and leper stations"
(1879–86	gap in material)
1887–90	Appointed President of the Board of Health
1890–93	Conducted research on Hawaiian subjects—mainly canoes and canoe-building, also fishhooks and nets, <i>heiau</i> , <i>inoa pōhaku</i> , sorcery, and bird catching (Kelsey, n.d.; various MSS in Emerson Papers)
1892–93	Wrote second draft of translation for <i>Hawaiian Antiquities</i> (Emerson Papers, EMR 47–53)
1893	Published <i>The Long Voyages of the Ancient Hawaiians</i>
1895	Published "The Bird Hunters of Ancient Hawaii"
1896–98	Conducted research on Hawaiian subjects—including <i>kauā</i> , <i>hewa</i> and <i>pono</i> , <i>hale nauā</i> , <i>pule</i> (Emerson, Diary for 1896–98); notes from consultants written on second draft of his translation of Malo's Ka Moolelo Hawaii manuscript
1898	Bishop Museum purchased his translation of Malo's Ka Moolelo Hawaii
ca. 1901	Kept notebook regarding the Hawaiian Hula (Emerson Papers, EMR 347)
1903–5	Wrote notes for <i>Unwritten Literature of Hawaii</i> (Emerson Papers, EMR 348; published in 1909)
1905	Appointed as doctor for Hale Halewai; served until his death
1908	Wrote early draft of <i>Pele and Hiika</i> (Emerson Papers, EMR 299; published in 1915)
1915	Died

* The chronology is based on obituaries in the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin* (1915) and *Ke Aloha Aina* (1915), notes and manuscripts in the Nathaniel Bright Emerson collection of the Huntington Library, and Emerson's diaries. The run of Emerson's diaries known to me date from 1862–72, 1881–92 (EMR 396–400, Huntington Library), 1896–98 (held privately), and finally 1907, 1909–15 (EMR 405–412, Huntington Library). The 1881–92 diary has a big gap after 1881, then begins again with January 1892. The actual diaries for 1892–93, 1904, and 1906 have not been located, but Theodore Kelsey (n.d.) made copious extracts from them (now at the Hawai'i State Archives).

chronology of Emerson's life is provided above, emphasizing his Hawaiian research and publications, to help assess his general knowledge of things Hawaiian at the time he translated Malo's *Ka Moololo Hawaii* and his search for additional knowledge to help understand the manuscript.

Emerson learned Hawaiian as a boy growing up in Waialua before he was sent to Oahu College at Punahou. According to an obituary, he was fluent in Hawaiian in his youth (*Ke Aloha Aina* 1915). Presumably, Emerson also learned some things about Native Hawaiian life before he was sent to school at Punahou, but perhaps not that much.¹² When Emerson returned to Hawai'i from the US in 1878, he had nearly forgotten his Hawaiian ("ua ane poina kekahi mau mea ia ia"), but he began speaking Hawaiian again and strove to become fluent ("ua imi ikaika loa hou oia") (*Ke Aloha Aina* 1915). However, his Hawaiian would not have been sufficient to understand many of the rare and archaic words used by Malo without the help of native speakers, especially the words of the *pule* and *mele*.

Emerson's diaries and manuscripts give the impression that he was not making enquiries into Hawaiian traditions and culture until 1890, around the time he began to translate Malo's *Ka Moololo Hawaii* manuscript. During the time he was translating, he sought help to understand many of the words and passages in the manuscript, and he sought more information on many topics. This is obvious not only from the notes to *Hawaiian Antiquities* and the notes to the second draft, but also from Emerson's diaries, which are full of material on many Hawaiian subjects. In 1890–93, he was gathering information on Hawaiian canoes and canoe building and on bird catching. The information on bird catching resulted in his 1895 publication "The Bird Hunters of Ancient Hawaii." What he learned concerning both subjects was surely applied to the relevant chapters of *Hawaiian Antiquities*.¹³ In 1896–98, he was gathering information on *kauā* and on *hewa* and *pono* (harmful and beneficial acts), information that was incorporated into the *Hawaiian Antiquities* endnotes for the chapters on those subjects. He was probably also gathering relevant information in 1894–95, but no diaries have come to light for those years. As well as consulting Native Hawaiians, Emerson was also reading the published work of Abraham Fornander ([1878–80] 1969) and W. D. Alexander (1891), and at least a couple newspaper articles by Samuel Kamakau (see p. 4).

2. EMERSON'S NATIVE HAWAIIAN CONSULTANTS

Based on examination of the published version of *Hawaiian Antiquities*, on earlier drafts of the work, and on Emerson's diaries, thirteen Native Hawaiians can be identified as individuals Emerson consulted for information. Fifty-four contributions of information for notes and ten suggestions for translation can be identified. The names of those consultants are given in the following table, together with the number of notes for which they contributed information. Many additional contributions cannot be traced to a particular individual, including the information in the notes shown in table 4 under "anonymous consultant" and arguably those under "likely anonymous consultant" as well.

Biographical Sketches of Consultants

The first six individuals listed in table 3 might be considered major consultants for *Hawaiian Antiquities*. All six were men living in Honolulu, all six were political figures to some degree, and four were newspapermen. None of them were old enough to have been a witness to Hawaiian society before the 1819 overthrow of the *'ai kapu*, the event that ended religious services at the *heiau*. The oldest of them, Kukahiko, was born in 1818, and the others considerably later.

The first consultant, J. K. Kaunamano, is well documented. He was a political leader, Hawaiian patriot, and newspaper editor. He died in 1902, aged about sixty (*Hawaiian Star* 1902), so he must have been born about 1842, probably in Hāmākua on Hawai'i Island. He served in the House of Representatives for Hāmākua in 1864–67 and again in 1880–86, lost his seat in the 1887 special election following the change in voting requirements under the Bayonet Constitution, and was elected again for 1892–93 (Lydecker 1918, 293). Although he represented Hawai'i Island in the legislature, he

Table 3. Number of endnote contributions identified per consultant

Name	Contribs. in HA*	Additional contribs. ID'd.†	Translation suggestions	MSS with addtl. info.‡
J. K. Kaunamano	3 {+ 1}§	12 {+ 1}	2	2
O. K. Kapule	7	89	2	2
J. S. Kukahiko		2 {+ 1}		
T. C. Polikapu	2	4 {+ 1}	4	2
W. H. Kahumoku		2		1
J. M. Poepoe		2	2	
L. K. Keliipio		1		1
Koalii		1 likely		
Oni		1		
W. P. Namahoe		1		
Nawahineelua	1			
E. O. Kapule	1			
Waialeale	1			
Total note contributions	15 {+ 1}	35 {+ 3}	10	8

* Contribs. in HA = Endnote contributions identified by Emerson in *Hawaiian Antiquities*

† Additional Contribs. ID'd. = Endnote contributions identified by Emerson in his first or second draft

‡ MSS with Addtl. Info. = Manuscripts in the Emerson Papers collection of the Huntington Library that contain additional information not included in *Hawaiian Antiquities*

§ Numbers given in brackets are for information given in a complaining note.

was apparently based in Honolulu. He served on Kalākaua's Privy Council (Silva 2017, 113). After the sugar planters forced the Bayonet Constitution on Kalākaua in 1887, radically limiting his power over government, Robert Wilcox and others carried out a rebellion in 1889 to restore power to Kalākaua. Kaunamano was implicated in the conspiracy to rebel and imprisoned (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1889; *Daily Bulletin* 1889). In 1893, Kaunamano was president of the Hui Kalaiaina (Beta 1893), the Native Hawaiian political party opposed to the Reform Party that represented the interests of the sugar planters who forced the Bayonet Constitution on Kalākaua and subsequently overthrew Lili'uokalani. In the 1890s, he served as editor of several Hawaiian-language newspapers that opposed the overthrow of the monarchy and annexation by the US, including *Ka Leo o ka Lahui* and *Ka Nupepa Aloha Aina* (Mookini 1974, 51). In 1895, in the aftermath of the Wilcox rebellion against the Republic of Hawai'i, he was imprisoned for his editorials critical of the haole planter establishment that was in charge of the government (Chapin 1996, 103).

In 1861, Kaunamano was part of the group that established the first "nationalist" Hawaiian-language newspaper, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika* (Mookini 1974, 16). He seems to have been the one who entered the "Kanikau Aloha no ka Naauao" in the first issue of the paper, the *mele* that aroused the ire of a haole writer (Puni-maemae) who mistakenly thought it celebrated prostitution because it uses sexual words to express love of learning.¹⁴ From November 6 to December 25, 1862, he published in the same newspaper the tale "He Moolelo no Aukelenuiaiku." Kaunamano was evidently well versed in Hawaiian literary traditions. Emerson calls him an "eminent Hawaiian scholar," "well skilled in the lore of his country" (Malo [1903] 1951, 35, 95). Among the papers of the Emerson collection at the Huntington Library are several manuscripts derived from Emerson's work with Kaunamano, including a couple of tales and a discussion of the *pule* used in 'anā'anā sorcery.

O. K. Kapule came from Kalua'aha on Moloka'i (Malo [1903] 1951, 34). He was born in 1845 at Mapulehu, Moloka'i, and died in 1898 in Honolulu (*Ke Aloha Aina*, July 23, 1898). Although little information is available about Kapule, he was evidently a minor political figure. He ran unsuccessfully as a candidate for the House of Representatives for Kona, O'ahu, in 1880 (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1880), and he was a member of the committee (along with two others of Emerson's consultants, Kaunamano and Polikapu) that welcomed Lili'uokalani back in 1898 from her journey to America to oppose annexation (*Ke Aloha Aina* 1898). Judging by three *pule* and the tale of Hiku and Kawelu that he gave Emerson, he learned a considerable amount of traditional lore growing up on Moloka'i.¹⁵ As a boy, he also saw the game of *no'a* played (Malo [1903] 1951, 226).

J. S. (Sam) Kukahiko¹⁶ was the oldest of the major consultants. He died in 1895, aged about seventy-seven years old, so he must have been born about 1818. He came from Ho'okena in South Kona, Hawai'i Island, and lived at Kaka'ako, Honolulu, during the time Emerson consulted him. His obituary says that he was "replete with a store of anecdotes of the ancient chiefs, chiefesses and priests" (*Hawaiian Star* 1895). He too was a Hawaiian patriot. He was one of a group that presented a petition to Kalākaua seeking to overturn the Bayonet Constitution in 1890 (*Ko Hawaii Pae Aina* 1890). In 1893, he was a notable member of the Hui Aloha Aina (*Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, March 27,

1893), the Hawaiian group that formed to protest the overthrow of Lili'uokalani and presented petitions to the US government opposing annexation.

Thomas C. Polikapu¹⁷ was apparently from Kaua'i¹⁸ and lived at 'Auwaiolimu, Honolulu, during the time Emerson consulted him (Malo [1903] 1951, 159). He died in December 1913 (*Hawaii Holomua* 1913), but no information has been found as to his birthdate. He was a newspaperman and a Hawaiian patriot. In 1889, he joined Wilcox in his rebellion to restore power to Kalākaua after the imposition of the Bayonet Constitution (*Ko Hawaii Pae Aina* 1889). He was a leader of the Hui Kalaiaina in the late 1890s (*Ke Aloha Aina* 1895). After annexation, he joined the Home Rula party, serving as a delegate to the 1912 convention and as a member of the Mana Hooke (executive committee?) (*Honolulu Star-Bulletin* 1912). In 1893, he was one of six *luna* (bosses) of the *Nupepa Puka La Aloha Aina* according to the October 21 issue. He was evidently concerned with preserving traditional tales. He wrote one of the manuscripts in the Emerson collection at the Huntington Library (EMR 443, He Moolelo no Maui), having obtained it from an old man named D. Kapohaku (Malo [1903] 1951, 159). A newspaper column written by J. M. Poepoe (1905) says that Polikapu was the president of an organization called Ka Ahahui Moolelo "Hawaii Lani-Honua" that presumably was collecting traditional tales, and says also that Polikapu helped Poepoe obtain the "mo'olelo o Hi'iaka" that he published.

W. Hapa Kahumoku was born (date unknown) in Puna, Hawai'i, and died in 1898 in Honolulu (*Ke Aloha Aina*, August 27, 1898). He wrote for the newspapers *Ke Alakai o Hawaii*, *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, and *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina* in the late 1880s and early 1890s (*Ke Alakai o Hawaii* 1887; *Hawaii Holomua* 1891). By 1895, he was a member of the Hui Repubalika (Republican Party) and supported the party resolution opposing the return of the monarchy (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1895). He gave Emerson information on canoes.

Joseph Moku'ōhai Poepoe is probably the best known of the major consultants. Like Kaunamano and Polikapu, he was a politician as well as a newspaperman. Poepoe was born at Honomaka'u, Kohala, Hawai'i Island, in 1852 and died at Honolulu in 1913 (*Ke Aloha Aina* 1913). He was brought to Honolulu at a young age, studied law, and was licensed as a lawyer in 1884 (*Ke Aloha Aina* 1912). He served as the editor of many Hawaiian-language newspapers, including *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa Home Rula*, *Ka Na'i Aupuni*, and *Ke Aloha Aina* (Mookini 1974, 52). He also published serially many important works in those papers, including "Ka Moolelo Kaa o Hiiakaikapoliopole," "Ka Moolelo Hawaii Kahiko," and "Ka Moolelo o ka Moi Kamehameha I."

Poepoe was active politically as well. He ran unsuccessfully in 1883 as a candidate for the House of Representatives (Kawainui 1883) and again in 1887 (Silva 2017, 111). He supported Kalākaua's policies in the newspaper *Ka Elele Puka La* (Kalaukoa 1888), and he was involved in the 1889 Wilcox rebellion to restore power to Kalākaua after the imposition of the Bayonet Constitution (*Ko Hawaii Pae Aina* 1889).¹⁹ During Lili'uokalani's reign, he supported her when she was opposed by her own cabinet in 1891 (*Ka Leo o ka Lahui* 1891). In general, he continued to support Lili'uokalani and the monarchy throughout her rule (Silva 2017, 118–19). However, after the overthrow of the monarchy and the establishment of the provisional government, he pledged allegiance to the new government, an act for which he was attacked by the national-

ist Hawaiians who opposed it and who wished to restore Lili'uokalani to the throne (*Ka Leo o ka Lahui* 1894). During the period of the Republic of Hawai'i, he supported the Republican administration and favored annexation to the US (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1897). During the territorial period, Poepoe was active in the Home Rula party that worked to promote Native Hawaiian interests within the framework of the United States. He ran unsuccessfully several times for the territorial House of Representatives (*Ke Aloha Aina* 1912) before finally winning election in 1913, not long before his death (*ibid.*, 1913). Although only one of Emerson's notes can be attributed to Poepoe, he also helped Emerson translate uncommon Hawaiian words.

Mention should also be made of a seventh consultant, George Kaiwiae Koalii, who came originally from Kona, Hawai'i Island, and lived at Kalihi Waena on O'ahu when Emerson consulted him (Emerson Papers, EMR 126). He was at least a child in 1840, and he died in 1919.²⁰ Koalii was one of the *maka'ainana* (commoners) who rioted and beat the legislators in 1874 when they chose Kalākaua as *mō'ī* (sovereign) over Queen Emma (*Nuhou* 1874). He ran for election to the House of Representatives in 1878 but failed to win the seat (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1878). Emerson consulted him on canoes and canoe building: manuscript EMR 143 in the Emerson collection of the Huntington Library is titled "Statements of George Koalii on Hawaiian Canoes (May 21, 1892)." The interview was part of Emerson's considerable research on canoes (never published), but Emerson was working on the translation of Malo's *Ka Moolelo Hawaii* at the same time. Emerson made a copy of Malo's Hawaiian text of chapter 34, "No ko Hawaii nei Waa" (Concerning Hawaiian Canoes), apparently to show to Koalii for comments. Written on top of the manuscript (Emerson Papers, EMR 46) is the sentence "Koalii thinks this is according to the Maui ceremony not Hawaii," in relation to paragraph 5, chapter 34.

Emerson's Relationship to His Consultants

How did Emerson select his consultants? Although there can be no conclusive answer to this question, the seven considered above were all public figures, easily accessible to him in Honolulu where he was living. Emerson does not seem to have scoured the countryside looking for obscure Hawaiians with special knowledge; but quite likely that was unnecessary, because his informants had come from the countryside. (Four came from country areas of Hawai'i Island, one from Kaua'i, one from Moloka'i; no information was found for the seventh.) The consultants seem to have been knowledgeable about old Hawaiian customs, either because of what they learned in their youth (Kukahiko, Kapule, Koalii) or because they actively collected such information (Kaunamano, Polikapu, Poepoe). Emerson's consultants were perhaps a somewhat limited selection from the knowledgeable Native Hawaiian population alive in the 1890s. For example, during the period he was translating Malo's *mo'olelo*, Emerson apparently did not consult with S. L. K. Peleioholani, a well-known *ali'i* living in Honolulu who was knowledgeable about Hawaiian traditions. Peleioholani was an important source for Poepoe's "Moolelo o Kamehameha I" because of his extensive knowledge. Poepoe wrote that Peleioholani was taught "i nei mea he kuauhau alii ame ka moolelo Hawaii" (this thing of *ali'i* genealogy and the history/ethnography of Hawai'i), beginning at three years old (*Ka Na'i Aupuni* 1906). Emerson did consult Peleioholani in 1906 (Kelsey, n.d.), apparently while he was working on the material

for *Pele and Hiʻiaka* (Emerson Papers, EMR 56), but there is no record of his having consulted him earlier.

Little has been found about Emerson's relationship to his consultants. In some cases, it seems clear that he paid them: D. Kama Kaumiumi gave him considerable information on canoes (Emerson Papers, EMR 131), and a letter from him says he was paid "for work" (Emerson Papers, EMR 1195). Likewise, the old *kumu hula* (hula teacher) Namakeelua who talked with Emerson several times about hula was paid "for work" (Emerson 1896–98). This is verified in the obituary of Emerson that appeared in *Ke Aloha Aina* (1915).

He nui kana mau kanaka Hawaii o ka hele ana e ninaninau ana no na mea e pili ana i na moolelo Hawaii, ua lawe pu ae oia ia mau kanaka Hawaii no kona home, a uku aku ia lakou no ko lakou luhi.

[He nui kāna mau kānaka Hawai'i o ka hele 'ana e ninaninau ana no nā mea e pili ana i nā mo'olelo Hawai'i. Ua lawe pū a'e 'o ia i ia mau kānaka Hawai'i no kona home, a uku aku iā lākou no ko lākou luhi.] (My modernization)

There were many Native Hawaiians who went to be interviewed about the history/ethnography of Hawai'i. He brought those Native Hawaiians to his home and paid them for their trouble. (My translation)

But it seems unlikely to me that Emerson always paid his consultants. In two instances, Emerson met someone at the fish market and obtained information—a "fragment of a paha [chant]" from Kamauliawa (Kelsey, n.d., Diary for 1892–93, 51) and information from W. P. Namahoe about dyeing kapa (Emerson Papers, EMR 48). That hardly sounds like a formal, paid arrangement.

Emerson was part of the haole establishment that first weakened and then overthrew the Hawaiian monarchy. He was a member of the Hawaiian League that forced the 1887 Bayonet Constitution on Kalākaua, greatly restricting his power and increasing that of the wealthy haole establishment. In fact, he helped in drawing up the Bayonet Constitution (Kuykendall 1967, 367n). After the overthrow of Lili'uokalani, he supported the provisional government and the succeeding Republic of Hawai'i, and he supported annexation to the US as a territory (*Ka Leo o ka Lahui* 1893; *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1899). Most of his seven major consultants were on the other side of the political fence, so far as their politics can be determined. Four of them (Kukahiko, Kaunamano, Kapule, Polikapu) opposed the overthrow of Lili'uokalani and annexation to the US. Only two (Poepoe and Kahumoku) supported the government of the Republic of Hawai'i and annexation. However, political difference does not seem to have gotten in the way of cooperation with Emerson in his search for information on things Hawaiian.²¹

Emerson clearly valued the knowledge of his consultants, but he did not take it in uncritically, as can be seen in examples of information he received from Kaunamano, apparently his most important consultant. In *Hawaiian Antiquities* (Malo [1903] 1951, 62n8), Emerson wrote, "One informant [Kaunamano, according to the second draft] says the *kapu-wohi* was possessed by a young chief who had not yet known carnal intercourse. I do not trust this statement." On the back of the second draft of *Hawaiian Antiquities* is a translation by Kaunamano of one of the *pule* used in the *luakini* renewal

service that begins “Mau ho‘ē‘ē . . .” (Malo, forthcoming, vol. 2, 37:55–61);²² Emerson did not use it. He wrote in pencil following the translation (Emerson Papers, EMR 51), “All a mistake. Erroneous.” Regarding information given him by Kaunamano on the operation of the ancient *hale nauā*, Emerson wrote (Malo [1903] 1951, 200n8), “It is clear that the ideas of J. K. K. are too much influenced by the Hale Naua which Kalakaua founded.”

Further illustration of Emerson’s critical approach and the limits of his consultants’ knowledge are found in the notes regarding two obscure phrases, “ia e” and “hemu,” used in several of the *pule* (see Malo, forthcoming, vol. 2, 37:13, 28:11, 37:30, 40:11). For “ia e,” Emerson wrote that “Hawaiian authorities are able to throw no light, and conjecture, but little light upon the true meaning of *Ia*. It is evidently the name or appellation of, or stands to represent, some deity” (Malo [1903] 1951, 180n19). In other words, the consultants made guesses but did not really know the meaning. In this case, Emerson decided to leave the Hawaiian word “ia” untranslated, probably the best procedure. For “hemu” as well, Emerson’s consultants could only guess. Emerson wrote that, “in consulting Hawaiian scholars as to the meaning of this word I found that they either had no opinion about it or that no two of them agreed. I have also found that the same person held a different opinion at different times” (ibid., 179n16). Emerson wrote further that “the language [of the *pule*] is evidently quite archaic, and it seems probable that the word is no longer used in the same meaning” (ibid., 99n4). However, he decided to take the opinion of a “learned Hawaiian” (probably Kaunamano) who thought that “mu” (*mū*) in the context of the *pule* meant “to be silent”; thus “hemu” (*he mū*) meant “he is/they are silent” (ibid., 179n16).²³

Emerson collected a great deal of information from his consultants while he was working on translating Malo’s *mo‘olelo*. He seems to have incorporated many of the *pule* and *mele* that they gave him into the notes, but at the same time, considerable material seemingly relevant to *Hawaiian Antiquities* was radically abbreviated or left out. Among this material is the information in three manuscripts of the Nathaniel Emerson Papers at the Huntington Library: EMR 47, chapter 31 (ca. 1892) containing a version of the tale of Hiku and Kawelu by O. K. Kapule; EMR 143, Statements of George Koalii on Hawaiian Canoes (1892); and EMR 494, Na Pule o ka Wa Kahiko (1893) containing information on ‘*anā‘anā*’ sorcery from Kaunamano (including several *pule*). There is also considerable material on canoes from Emerson’s 1892–93 diary (Kelsey, n.d.) that was not incorporated into the notes to *Hawaiian Antiquities*.

3. ASSESSMENT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION FOUND IN THE NOTES

In table 4 below, I have categorized Emerson’s sources for the 348 notes that give information on Hawaiian customs or language under five headings: “likely own knowledge,” “likely anonymous consultant,” “anonymous consultant,” “consultant identified,” and “published source.” In some cases, the nature of the source is clear, but in others I have had to guess. A source is categorized as “consultant identified” if the name of the consultant is given in the note to the published text or in the drafts. In a few cases, the name of the consultant can be surmised from information given about

Table 4. Sources for notes with cultural or language information by chapter

Chapter	Total information	Likely own knowledge	Likely anonymous consultant	Anonymous consultant*	Consultant identified: no. of notes + name(s) attributed to	Published source: no. of notes + name attributed to
1	0					
2	0					
3	0					
4	5	1	1			3 Fornander (1969)
5	5	3	2			
6	3 2/3	3			1/3 Polikapu	1/3 Fornander (1969)
7	10	7	2	1		
8	2 1/2	2 1/2				
9	14	11			2 Koalii? + 1/2 JKK [†] + 1/2 Waialeale {Kukahiko} [‡]	
10	3	2		1		
11	0					
12	4	1			1/2 JKK + 1/2 OKK [†] + 1/2 Nawahineelua + 1/2 Kukahiko [doubtful: n. 5]	1 WDA [†] (1891)
13	7	5 [wrong: n. 2]	2 [wrong: n. 3, 4]			
14	4	1	3 [wrong: pt. 8 n. 1]			
15	6	6				
16	7	5	1 [wrong: n. 1]		1 Namahoe	
17	2		1		1 Polikapu	

Continued on next page

Table 4. *Continued*

Chapter	Total information	Likely own knowledge	Likely anonymous consultant	Anonymous consultant*	Consultant identified: no. of notes + name(s) attributed to	Published source: no. of notes + name attributed to
18	14	2 [doubtful: n. 2]	9	1 ½ [doubtful: n. 5]	2 ½ JKK [doubtful: n. 3, pt. n. 8]	
19	18	5 [prob. wrong: nn. 11, 16] [doubtful: n. 9]	13			
20	1 ½			½	½ Polikapu + ½ OKK {JKK, Polikapu}‡	1 Malo (18:41) 1 Malo (34:14–18) 1 JSE† (1892) 1 Malo (37:97–98)
21	1					
22	4		3			
23	11	7	2	1	+ ½ JKK + ½ Kukahiko {JKK}‡	
24	16 ½	10	1	3		
25	1	1				
26	½	½				
27	3	1	1	1 [doubtful: n. 4]		
28	8	2 ½	4	1	½ OKK	
29	3		1	2		
30	8		4 [doubtful: n. 5]	1		
31	3 ½		2 ½		1 OKK + 2 probably OKK ½ OKK + ½ Polikapu [doubtful: pt. n. 4]	
32	2		2			
33	9		8		½ OKK	

34	20	2 ½	10 ½ [wrong: n. 3]			2 OKK + 2 Kahumoku + 1 Oni + probably 1 Koaliti ¹¹	1 WDA (1891)
35	8		2 ½ [wrong: pt. n. 5]	1 [doubtful: n. 7]	2	2 JKK + ½ EOK ⁺	
36	24		11 [wrong: n. 6; Q: nn. 19, 24, 26–28]	4 ½ [wrong: n. 32]	4 ½ [wrong: n. 23; doubtful: n. 2; Q: n. 7]	1 ½ JKK + 1 Poepee, + ½ + ½ Polikapu	½ WDA (1891)
37	37 ½		16 [wrong: pt. n. 2] [doubtful: nn. 1, 3, 12, 15, 16, 18, pt. 28]	8 ½ [doubtful: n. 26]	9 [doubtful: n. 29]	½ OKK + 2 ½ JKK	1 Malo (chap. 45)
38	24 ½	3	12 ½ [doubtful: n. 4] [Q: n. 5]	3	5 [Q: n. 30]	2 ½ OKK + 1 ½ JKK [wrong: n. 12]	
39	3	3	8	3			
40	12	4	[wrong: n. 10]	4			
41A–UU (E 41–57)** Hana Le'ale'a	24 ½	5 ½	12 [wrong: 41P, pt. n. 1] [doubtful: 41A, nn. 5, 9]	[Q: n. 13]	4 ½	2 OKK + ½ JKK	
42	1	1			1	1 Poepee [wrong: pt. n. 9]	½ Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika (1861)
43 (E 59)	3 ½	1					
44	0						
45 (E 61)	0						
46 (E 62)	5 ½						
47	0						
48	0						4 ½ Forlander (1969)

Continued on next page

Table 4. *Continued*

Chapter	Total information	Likely own knowledge	Likely anonymous consultant	Anonymous consultant*	Consultant identified: no. of notes + name(s) attributed to	Published source: no. of notes + name attributed to
49 (E 65)	1	1				
50 (E 66)	1					1 Formander (1969)
51 (E 67)	6	6 [wrong: n. 1]				
Total notes	348 ½	117 ½	136	39	39 ⅓	16 ⅝
Total problematic cases	wrong: 16 (11 + parts of 5 notes); probably wrong: 2 doubtful: 23 (20 + parts of 3 notes) Q: 8	wrong: 3 117 ½	wrong: 10 (6 + parts of 4 notes); probably wrong: 2 doubtful: 12 (11 + part of another note) Q: 6	wrong: 1	wrong: 2 (1 + part of another note) doubtful: 4 (2 + parts of 2 notes)	

* A contribution is shown as “anonymous consultant” if Emerson’s note states “I am informed” or “I have a statement.”

† OKK stands for O. K. Kapule, JKK for J. K. Kaunamano, WDA for William D. Alexander, and JSE for Joseph S. Emerson.

‡ Names in wavy brackets {} are for consultants for a complaining note not counted in the table.

§ Pt. stands for part.

¹¹ Twelve consultants on the subject of canoes are mentioned in Emerson’s diaries or in the manuscripts in the Huntington collection. One of them, Koalii, gave Emerson a long account on canoe building, but no specific note can be traced to him.

* Q indicates a note of questionable validity.

** The chapter numbers following chapter 41 are given according to the numbering in the Langlas and Lyon edition (Malo, forthcoming). Emerson’s chapter numbers are given in parentheses, following an E for Emerson’s edition.

the consultant or by comparison to a manuscript in the Emerson Papers collection at the Huntington Library. A source is categorized as “anonymous consultant” if it contains the phrase “I am informed” or “I have a statement.” A source is categorized as “published source” if such a source is given in the note or can be reasonably inferred by comparison to that source.

The more problematic categories are “likely anonymous consultant” and “likely own knowledge.” “Likely anonymous consultant” is assigned to all those notes containing *pule* without attribution based on the assumption that an anonymous Native Hawaiian consultant gave the *pule* to Emerson. In addition, it includes those other notes that seem to require specialized knowledge that Emerson probably did not have.²⁴ “Likely own knowledge” includes the remaining notes that seem likely to be based on knowledge Emerson possessed as a result of his early life growing up in Hawai‘i or his later residence in Hawai‘i after returning from the US.

A substantial number of Emerson’s informative notes are problematic, based on information available from other sources or on careful examination of Malo’s manuscript. As column 2 of the forgoing table 4 indicates, sixteen cases are assessed as wrong (eleven notes plus parts of five more), two as probably wrong, and twenty-three as doubtful (twenty notes plus parts of three more). Altogether, that makes forty-one notes that contain material assessed as wrong or doubtful. Eight additional notes indicated by a Q are of questionable status because they contain unique information that cannot be either verified or shown to be wrong. The sixteen cases assessed as wrong are discussed below.

Notes in *Hawaiian Antiquities* with Erroneous Translation of Terms

- Chapter 13, note 2. Malo (n.d., 13:7) gives the term “kea” (*ke‘a*) for an uncastrated hog. Emerson reads it as *kea* (without an *‘okina*) and translates it as “teaser,” from the word *keakea*, “to tease.”
- Chapter 34, note 3. Emerson gives a dubious translation for the name of the Hawaiian god written by Malo (n.d.) as “kualanawao.” He reads it as *kū ala nā wao* and translates it as “there stand the forests.” According to Pukui and Elbert (1971), the name is *Kū‘alanawao*, “Kū [of the] upland offering,” a translation that fits better with the usual Hawaiian mode of naming various aspects of the god Kū. (Compare the names for Kū in S. M. Kamakau [1964:58–59]).
- Chapter 35, note 5. Emerson amplifies Malo’s (n.d., 35:7) brief statement that a *mele inoa* was composed for an unborn *ali‘i* by describing the nature of the *mele inoa*. Emerson then proceeds to define *ko‘ihonua* as follows: “*Ko-i-honua* was not, as mistakenly supposed, a particular kind of *mele*. If related to the tone or manner of utterance of the *mele inoa*, it meant that the *inoa* was to be recited in an ordinary conversational tone, and not after the manner called *oli*, that is applied to a singing tone.” This is surely wrong; the *ko‘ihonua* is a genre of *mele* distinct from the *mele inoa*, not a style of chanting, according to both Pukui and Elbert (1986, 160) and S. M. Kamakau (1868). Emerson’s own notes, taken from O. K. Kapule (Kelsey, n.d., Miscellaneous), contradict his note: “The ko‘i-honua was a culling and gathering of phrases to apply to the name of a king to give him renown. It was a sort of weaving or bouquet-making—a posy of song.”
- Chapter 36, note 32. In 36:77, Malo (n.d.) writes that after the four-month long *makahiki* season was over, the *ali‘i* and all their men returned to the *haipule* rites. In the context of Malo’s description of the *makahiki* season and the *luakini* ritual season, it is

clear that *haiṗule* refers specifically to the religious ritual of the *luakini* season, which ritual had been in abeyance during the *makahiki* season. The term *haiṗule* was taken from the pre-Christian Hawaiian religious vocabulary and used by the early missionary Bible translators to mean “religious, devout.” Subsequently, the term continued in use with the same meaning within the Hawaiian Christian community. Emerson fails to understand the meaning of *haiṗule* in the overall framework of Malo’s discussion and defines *haiṗule* in the Christian sense as follows: “*Hai-ṗule* means the repeating of prayers. The same word continues in use today and means religious devotion, prayer and the external rites of religion, even the thing itself.”²⁵

- Chapter 38, note 12. Emerson confuses the two types of Hawaiian spears, writing that, according to his consultant from Moloka‘i, the *ihe* was the long spear and the *pololū* the short spear. (W. D. Alexander added a correction to this note.) Most likely the consultant was O. K. Kapule. It seems more likely that Emerson made a mistake in his notes than that Kapule gave wrong information.
- Chapter 40, note 10. In his note, Emerson translates “lawaia upapalu” (*lawai‘a ‘upāpalu*) as “ordinary angling,” but it would be more accurate to translate it as “fishing for ‘*upāpalu* fish.”
- Chapter 41P (E 51),²⁶ note 1. In 41P:3, Malo describes the *pū kaula* (cord-knot tricksters) who attracted people to bet on their knotting by chanting an amusing chant in *kepakepa* style. In the note, Emerson erroneously defines *kepakepa* as “to amuse” rather than as a style of chanting (see Pukui and Elbert 1986, 145).
- Chapter 43 (E 59), note 9. Emerson reads the name of the female Hawaiian ancestor Ho‘ohokukalani in 43:16 as *ho‘ohōkū (i) ka lani* and mistranslates it as “to bestud the heavens with stars, the starry sky.” Pukui and Elbert (1971, 384) give the spelling as “Ho‘ohoku-i-ka-lani” and state that the segment *hoku* “may be cognate with Tahitian *hotu*, to produce fruit” (indicating that it does not mean “star”).

Notes in *Hawaiian Antiquities* with Erroneous Supplementary Information on Customs

- Chapter 13, notes 3 and 4. In his translation of 13:11 on the *pueo* (native Hawaiian owl) and the ‘*io* (native Hawaiian hawk), Emerson writes, “These birds are caught by means of the bird pole (*kia*), by the use of the covert,³ or by means of the net⁴” (Emerson’s endnote symbols; Malo [1903] 1951, 38). To begin with, his translation must be wrong: the second method noted by Malo (n.d.) is the use of the *peheu*, a snare rather than a covert; the third method noted by Malo (ibid.) is *hahau*, clubbing. Emerson’s note 3 regarding *peheu* says, “The covert was to ambush the hunter,” which is obviously a misstatement. Presumably, he meant to write that the hunter uses a covert to ambush the bird. Emerson’s note 4 regarding *hahau* says, “A net with a wide mouth was laid in the track in which the birds walked to reach their nest.” This compounds the error of his translation “by means of the net,” instead of “by clubbing.” A net may perhaps have been used to catch the ground-nesting *pueo* (not the ‘*io*), but that cannot be the method that Malo was referring to.
- Chapter 14, note 1. In 14:1, Malo (n.d.) lists three types of bundles of hard poi, which Emerson describes in his note. Emerson’s note says that the “*omao*” (‘*ōma‘o*) and the “*holo-ai*” (*holo ‘ai*) were both long and cylindrical, but that must be wrong for the ‘*ōma‘o*. Andrews ([1865] 2003, 92) describes the ‘*ōma‘o* as “a round bundle, as of food, sharp above and round below.” Kelsey’s (n.d.) notes on Emerson’s diary for 1904 contain a drawing that precisely matches Andrews’s description.
- Chapter 16, note 1. Emerson’s note states that in addition to the bark of *wauke* and *māmaki*, the bark of *olonā* and *hau*, not mentioned by Malo, was also used to make *kapa*.

According to Abbott (1992, 51), *hau* has been “erroneously listed” for making *kapa*. It cannot be used because its fibers cannot be felted. Probably that is also true of *olonā*.

- Chapter 36, note 6. See the following paragraph.
- Chapter 36, note 23. In 36:64, Malo (n.d.) says that the *makahiki* gods were taken into the (*hale*) *wai ea*, one of the structures within the *heiau luakini*, after being carried around the island. Emerson’s note says he has been told that those gods were kept in a *luakini* named *Wai ea*, one on each of the four main islands. In this case, either his consultant gave him misinformation or (more likely) he misinterpreted what he was told.
- Chapter 37, note 2; and Chapter 51 (E 67), note 1. See the second following paragraph concerning *ho‘omāhanahana*.

Two egregious examples will be examined in detail. Firstly, Emerson’s note 6 to Malo’s chapter 36 on the *makahiki* festival gives an undoubtedly erroneous derivation for the name of the ritual *kui ke pā*, which Malo (n.d., 36:21–25) describes as the process of putting together and decorating the *akua loa*, a god image of Lono, prior to its being carried on a circuit around the island during the festival. Emerson writes the following (Malo [1903] 1951, 154n6):

Ku-i-ke-paa means to halt, to stand still. The application of the word to this use is due to the fact that in going after the tree from which to make the *akua loa*, when the procession, at the head of which was the high priest, bearing a feather-idol, came to where the tree was growing, the priest halted, and, planting the staff that bore the idol in the ground, gave the order *kuikepaa*, and the whole company came to a standstill. During the felling of the tree and the carving of it to make the idol, the feather-god was always present, the staff that supported it being planted in the ground.

We know that this is nonsense because of the description of the ritual *kui ke pā* by Kēlou Kamakau (ca. 1773–1838), a writer even older than Malo.²⁷ Kamakau (1919, 41) describes the ritual, as follows:

A po iho la i o Olekulua kauo iho la ke akua laau i keia po, a pule iho la na kahuna i keia po, a ao la, kuwi iho la ke pa, o ke akua makahiki i ke ao i o Olepau, a he la kapu loa keia.

[A pō ihola iō ‘Ole Kū Lua, kauō ihola ke akua lā‘au i kēia pō, a pule ihola nā kāhuna i kēia pō, a ao lā, kui ihola ke pā, ‘o ke akua makahiki, i ke ao iō ‘Ole Pau, a he lā kapu loa kēia.] (My modernization)

The priests prayed throughout the night, and in the morning, the day of *Ole-kupau* (23rd), the *makahiki* image was decorated. This was a very sacred day. (Translation from Kēlou Kamakau 1919, 40)²⁸

It is obvious from Kamakau’s Hawaiian (as well as the translation) that the term *kui ke pā* means “to *kui*” (join something together), not “to *kū*” (stop). The rest of Emerson’s note about the procession to fell a tree for the *akua loa* is plausible, but it has the flavor of a story concocted to explain the term.

In the second example, Emerson’s note 2 to chapter 37 on the *luakini* ritual (Malo [1903] 1951, 176n2), as well as his erroneous translation of 37:5 (*ibid.*, 160), describe the *ho‘omāhanahana* as a “resting spell” during the ritual to renew the *heiau luakini*.

Malo (forthcoming, 37:5) does not say what the *ho'omāhanahana* is, writing only the following:

He umi mau la e kapu ai, alaila, noa, aka, i nee pu ke kapu ana a hiki i ka hoomahana-hana, he umikumamaha la e kapu ai, alaila, noa.

[He 'umi mau lā e kapu ai, a laila, noa. Akā, i ne'e pū ke kapu 'ana a hiki i ka ho'omāhanahana, he 'umikumamāhā lā e kapu ai; a laila, noa.]

[The *luakini*] was made *kapu* for ten days, and then made *noa*. But if the *kapu* continued until the *ho'omāhanahana* ritual, it lasted for fourteen days, and then [it] was made *noa*.

Emerson gives the same mistaken interpretation of *ho'omāhanahana* as “a resting period” in note 1 to chapter 51 (E 67). There he writes (Malo [1903] 1951, 265n1), “*Hoomahana-hana* means, literally, to warm, to cause to be warm. In this connection it probably refers to that relaxation from the rigors of temple worship spoken of in connection with the *luakini*.” Emerson’s interpretation is contradicted by John Papa ‘Īī (September 18, 1869), who was a witness to the ritual. ‘Īī says that the *ho'omāhanahana* was a shorter *luakini* ritual of two to three days held after the regular ten-day ritual, with only a small number of pigs offered. A later paragraph by Malo (n.d., 37:118) actually says much the same thing.

Emerson’s failure to understand the meaning of *kui ke pā* or *ho'omāhanahana* is not surprising. They were part of religious rituals—the *makahiki* festival and the *luakini* renewal ritual—that had ended in 1819 with the abandonment of the *'ai kapu* (separate eating of men from women). None of Emerson’s consultants could have been witnesses to those rituals. Although the accounts of Kēlou Kamakau and ‘Īī had been written, they were apparently not used by Emerson to aid his translation of Malo’s *mo'olelo*.²⁹ More serious than Emerson’s failure to understand such ritual details is the fact that he (together perhaps with his consultants) made a guess about them without labeling it as such, and the guess was wrong. Clearly one should be cautious in accepting what Emerson writes so confidently, especially when he writes about old religious rituals.

4. ASSESSMENT OF EMERSON’S COMPLAINTS AND CORRECTIONS

In forty-six cases (thirty-five notes plus parts of eleven others), Emerson corrects or complains about what Malo wrote, sometimes concerning Malo’s language and sometimes concerning his information. These corrections and complaints are a mixed bag: some of them seem justified (fifteen) and others clearly not justified (fifteen).³⁰ In six of the complaining notes, Emerson makes a valid correction to Malo’s text or information.³¹ In nine others, he makes a complaint about the written Hawaiian that seems reasonable.³² Seven of those nine are complaints about the text of a *pule*—the words are run together, or the text is badly written and difficult to understand. That is certainly true of most of the *pule*: Lyon and I make the same point about the *pule* and *mele*, that the language is often very difficult to understand (Malo, forthcoming, vol. 2, introduction).

In fifteen of the complaining notes in *Hawaiian Antiquities*, listed below, Emerson

writes that Malo is mistaken, but that does not seem to be the case. Often Emerson seems not to have really understood what Malo was saying.

Erroneous Complaining Notes in *Hawaiian Antiquities*

- Chapter 5, notes 2, 3, and 7. Emerson argues in these notes that Malo (n.d., 5:2–3) is mistaken in his explanation of the use of terms for directions. Malo’s explanation is somewhat difficult to follow, but it is simple at base. He says that if you are on the east side of the island looking out to sea, you can say that the north side of the island is to the north (*‘ākau*) or that it is to your left (*hema*, which also means “south”) and so forth. It seems outrageous for Emerson to say that Malo is “mistaken.”
- Chapter 13, note 7. See the following paragraph.
- Chapter 18, note 9. Emerson argues that in 18:48, Malo’s “*pualii*” (*pualii*, child of an *ali*’i) “is evidently a mistake and it should be *puali* (*pū*’*ali*), “the literal meaning of which is band or cohort or company.” There seems to be no basis for this change; *pualii* makes reasonable sense in the context.
- Chapter 21, note 1, concerning *hewa* and *pono*. See the second and third following paragraphs.
- Chapter 23, note 16 (last portion); chapter 29, note 6; chapter 31, note 1; and chapter 32, note 6; all concerning Malo’s view of Native Hawaiian religion. See the fourth to seventh following paragraphs.
- Chapter 37, note 34. Emerson says that Malo’s (n.d.) statement in 37:72 that a *kanaka lawehala* (person who had committed an offense) was sacrificed in the *luakini* is wrong. “That a criminal was chosen for this sacrifice is not to be credited. . . . The victim must be perfect and blameless.” Malo (n.d.) uses the same term *kanaka lawehala* for the sacrifice in three other places in the chapter, so it is clearly not a slip. In addition, historical evidence makes it clear that Emerson is wrong, that men who broke *kapu* were often sacrificed at the *heiau luakini*, as was Kanihonui, for example, who broke Kamehameha’s *kapu* that no other man should sleep with Ka’ahumanu (‘Īī 1869).
- Chapter 38, note 1. Emerson complains about Malo’s term for the high priest, writing, “*Kahuna o na kii*” is not a legitimate expression. The high priest is undoubtedly meant by the writer.” Emerson is surely right that the high priest, usually termed *kahuna nui*, is meant. But it seems extreme to say that the term used by the expert Davida Malo is “not legitimate.”
- Chapter 41A (E 41), note 3, concerning Malo’s view of Native Hawaiian religion. See the fourth to seventh following paragraphs.
- Chapter 41P (E 51), note 2. Emerson mistranslates Malo’s Hawaiian in 41P:4, which says, “A laila, hana maalea ka poe pu i mua o kanaka a paa no ke kanaka ma kekahi aoao, o ke kau la a paa no hoi kekahi kanaka ma kela aoao o ke kaula” (A laila, hana ma’alea ka po’e pū i mua o kānaka, a pa’a nō ke kanaka ma kekahi ‘ao’ao o ke kaula, a pa’a nō ho’i kekahi kanaka ma kēlā ‘ao’ao o ke kaula) (Malo, forthcoming). Emerson translates it as “The performers very cunningly gave one end of the line into the hands of one man and the other end into the hand of another man to hold” (Malo [1903] 1951, 227). He then complains in the note that “the statement that the juggler allowed outsiders to hold the ends of the line is, on the face of it, absurd and improbable” (*ibid.*, 229n2). But that is not how Malo’s Hawaiian should be understood. Malo (forthcoming, vol. 2, 41P:4) describes a team of three players, two of whom hold the ends of the cord while the third makes a knot in the middle.
- Chapter 48 (E 64), note 2. In 48:31, Malo (n.d.) says that when Kaumuali’i came to O’ahu to meet with Kamehameha, Kamehameha spared his life, following the

example of the ancient ruler Kalaunuiohūa. In his note, Emerson says this is untrue, that “Kamehameha basely plotted to take the life of Kaumualiʻi by poisoning him” and that “Kaumualiʻi was saved only by the interference of Isaac Davis, who warned the king of Kauai of his danger” and was afterward poisoned for that. Emerson is probably reporting the story current in his day, since Alexander (1891, 156) gives the same account. But Native Hawaiian historical sources give a different account. ʻĪʻĪ (October 30, 1869) says that it was suggested to kill Kaumualiʻi, but that Kamehameha did not agree. Further, he says that Davis warned Kaumualiʻi against the chief Naihe who meant to kill him (ʻĪʻĪ, November 13, 1869). Concerning the death, he says that Davis was an old man already and it was only a rumor that he died as a result of giving warning. S. M. Kamakau (1867) says much the same thing.

Seven egregious examples of complaining notes where Emerson claims Malo was mistaken will be discussed more fully. The first example concerns section 27 of chapter 13, “No na Holoholona” (Concerning Animals), where Malo (forthcoming) says that “a pig and a dog” have come from foreign lands. It seems clear that Malo is here writing of new breeds of pig and dog, since he has earlier (13:1–4) written of the pig and the dog as animals that either were always here in Hawaiʻi or (more likely) were brought by the old people by canoe. Emerson misunderstands Malo here, almost willfully it seems, and writes in note 4 to that chapter (Malo [1903] 1951, 41n4), “The pig, *puaa*, and the dog, *ilio*, were here in Hawaii long before the first white man landed on these shores; they are not modern importations.”

The second example concerns Malo’s chapter 21, “No na Hewa me na Pono,” which Langlas and Lyon (Malo forthcoming, vol. 2) translate as “Concerning *Hewa* and *Pono*” (Harmful and Beneficial Acts). In this case, Emerson fails to understand the framework of Malo’s discussion. He translates *hewa* and *pono* variously as “wrong conduct” and “right conduct” or as “sin” and “virtue” (Malo [1903] 1951, chapter 21). He understands Malo’s discussion through a Western notion of morality and complains in note 1 to that chapter (*ibid.*, 76) that Malo has left out a great deal. He asks, “What did the ancient Hawaiians seriously regard as wrong?” He then lists five types of action, four of them breaches of *kapu* or religious duty. A more careful and non-ethnocentric reading of Malo’s chapter (Lyon 2011; Malo, forthcoming, vol. 2, introduction) makes it clear that Malo was describing a narrower sphere of action. He was describing acts that are socially harmful or beneficial, not acts that relate to the Hawaiian gods or to the religion-based power of the *aliʻi*. Emerson had the assistance of two Native Hawaiian consultants, Kaunamano and Polikapu, in constructing his list of “wrongs,” but he probably did not give them the whole of Malo’s chapter and ask how they understood it. If he had, he might have better understood Malo’s purpose in writing the chapter.

In the case of this chapter 21 on *hewa* and *pono*, as in the case of chapter 13 on *holoholona* (animals), Emerson’s lack of understanding seems to stem from his failure to appreciate Malo’s use of the traditional method of transmitting knowledge by the use of *helu papa*, enumeration of the members of a class of things. As first noted by John Charlot (2005, 219–27), classical Hawaiian education prior to the influence of the missionaries sent by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions depended heavily on the memorization of lists of all the items in a semantic domain. Malo often organizes a paragraph or a whole chapter as a list, presumably because that is how he learned that material (see Malo, forthcoming, vol. 2, introduction).

Regarding the *hewa* and *pono* list, Emerson has failed to understand the extent of the semantic domain. Often Malo appears to list all the traditional items for the domain and then to add newly introduced items at the end. Regarding the list of animals, Emerson has failed to notice that pig and dog come into the earlier part of the list of animals already here before the coming of foreigners as well as the latter part of the list of new animals.

The other five examples all relate to Emerson's distorted view of Malo's description of traditional Hawaiian religion. Emerson persists in arguing that Malo, as a converted Christian, was unable to describe Hawaiian religion fairly. He first states this in the introduction to *Hawaiian Antiquities* (Malo [1903] 1951, viii–ix):

In after years, when his mind had been impregnated with the vivifying influence of the new faith from across the ocean, his affections were so entirely turned against the whole [Hawaiian] system, not only of idol-worship, but all the entertainments of song, dance and sport as well, that his judgment seems often to be warped, causing him to confound together the evil and the good, the innocent and the guilty, the harmless and the depraved in one sweeping condemnation. . . .

The attitude of David Malo's mind toward the system of thought from which he was delivered . . . was . . . one of complete alienation not to say intolerance, and gives ground for the generalization that it is hopeless to expect a recent convert to occupy a position of judicial fairness to the system of religion and thought from which he has been rescued.

In fact, Malo's account of traditional Hawaiian religion is mostly descriptive, without critical comment, except for three chapters (chap. 11, "No ka Ai Kapu ana"; chap. 31, "No ke Kilokilo Uhane"; and chap. 32, "No na Akua Noho"). (For further discussion, see Malo, forthcoming, vol. 2, introduction.) His account of Hawaiian religion is also very extensive: sixteen of the fifty-one chapters deal with traditional Hawaiian religion, nearly half of the pages. It is hard to understand why Malo should have described Hawaiian religion in such detail if his attitude was simply one of condemnation.

Emerson seems to misunderstand what Malo wrote about Hawaiian religious belief and then to accuse him of failing to do justice to it. In note 16 to chapter 23, "The Worship of Idols" (No ka Hoomana ana i na Akua Kii), Emerson writes:

Apropos of the title placed at the head of the chapter, the question arises, did the Hawaiian worship the idol? Or did they rather use it as an emblem of the spiritual being back of it.

I do not share with Mr. Malo the belief that the imagination and thoughts of the ancient worshipper went no higher than the image before which he bowed. Very naturally in the enthusiasm of deliverance from idolatrous superstition, Mr. Malo was unable to do justice to the system from which he had escaped. (Malo [1903] 1951, 85n16)

Firstly, Emerson mistranslates Malo's chapter title "No ka Hoomana ana i na Akua Kii" as "The Worship of Idols." Lyon and I believe that Malo uses the term *akua ki'i* for the Hawaiian gods that were represented by images, and therefore we translate the title as "Concerning Religious Services to the Gods" (Malo, forthcoming, vol. 2).

Secondly, Malo (ibid., 23:23) makes clear that the Hawaiian gods did not reside in the images, but rather in the heavens:

O keia [mau] akua a pau, mai na kanaka a na lii Ua manao ia, aia no keia poe akua ma ka lani. aole loa kekahi kanaka a me kekahi alii, i ike i ko lakou ano. (Brackets supplied by editors)

[‘O kēia mau akua a pau, mai nā kānaka a nā ali‘i, ua mana‘o ‘ia, aia nō kēia po‘e akua ma ka lani. ‘A‘ole loa kekahi kanaka a me kekahi ali‘i i ike i ko lākou ‘ano.]

All of these gods, from those of the commoners to those of the *ali‘i*, were thought to reside in the heavens. There most definitely was no commoner nor *ali‘i* who knew their nature.³³

Malo (ibid., 23:27) goes on to compare Hawaiian worship of gods through images to what is done in the Roman Catholic church, praying in front of the image to worship the actual god in the heavens. Emerson makes the same unfounded complaint in two other notes. In note 6 to chapter 29, again in reference to use of images, Emerson says, “Mr. Malo unwittingly, probably as the result of the new theology which had come for the enlightenment of him and his people, was inclined to do scant justice to the discarded ideas of his heathen ancestors” (Malo [1903] 1951, 107n6). In note 3 to chapter 41A (E 41), Emerson says that Malo makes the “assumption that the worship of the Hawaiians was mere idol worship” (ibid., 215n3).

Similarly, Emerson casts doubt on a couple of Malo’s other statements about Hawaiian religion. In note 1 to chapter 31, Emerson comments on Malo’s phrase “make mau loa” (everlasting death), that it “would seem to be an imported thought, not at all native to the Polynesian mind” (Malo [1903] 1951, 114n1). This seems wrong. Malo’s phrase is essentially the same as *make loa*, given by Pukui and Elbert (1986, 228), who note in their dictionary that there was a distinction in pre-Christian thought between *make*, entry into the spirit realm, and *make loa*, the utter annihilation of the spirit. In note 6 to chapter 32, Emerson comments on Malo’s statement that many Hawaiians viewed those who acted possessed by a god (*akua noho*) as deceivers, writing, “There were probably very few Hawaiians in ancient times who did not look with awe upon the manifestations of the akua noho” (Malo [1903] 1951, 118n6). There is no way to verify the truth of what Malo wrote, of course, but the many examples he gives (Malo forthcoming, 32:13–14) of skeptical Hawaiians making fun of those who acted possessed seem convincing to this reader.

Furthermore, it is Emerson himself who introduces pejorative adjectives for Hawaiian religion into his translation in *Hawaiian Antiquities*, using the terms *idolatrous* and *superstitious* (Malo [1903] 1951, 12:24, 31:1). The reader of Emerson’s translation has no way of knowing that these are not based on Malo’s words and do not necessarily represent his view of traditional Hawaiian religion.

5. OVERALL EVALUATION OF EMERSON’S NOTES AND TRANSLATION

Examining the whole body of Emerson’s notes to *Hawaiian Antiquities*, one is struck first of all by the quantity of information provided by him. He did a great deal of work with Native Hawaiian consultants to try to understand what Malo wrote, and much

of his information is a valuable addition to our knowledge of Hawaiian culture before 1820. On closer examination of the notes, however, one is dismayed by how much of the material in the notes is wrong or questionable. About 11 percent of the additional information given by Emerson seems to be wrong or dubious (37 notes out of 348)³⁴ and about 30 percent of the complaints seem unjustified (14 ½ notes out of 46).

Two major factors appear to have led to this erroneous or questionable material in Emerson's notes: (1) the limited knowledge concerning many of Malo's topics among Emerson's Hawaiian consultants by the time of his work, and (2) Emerson's failure at times to comprehend the larger framework of what Malo wrote. Emerson's consultants were often unable to help him by explaining the meaning of a word or by filling in details about an activity. They sometimes conjectured when they did not know, and sometimes Emerson accepted the conjecture and incorporated it into a note that turns out to be wrong or dubious. This happened with chapters on various topics, but particularly with those chapters that describe activities long abandoned—the pre-1820 court of the ruler (chaps. 18 and 19) and government (chap. 38), and the religious rituals abandoned in 1819 relating to the *makahiki* (chap. 36) and the *luakini* (chap. 37). Other religious activities, such as *kuni* (counter-sorcery, described in chap. 28) and *lapa'au* (healing, described in chap. 30), continued through the nineteenth century, so the consultants would have had more knowledge to share concerning them. Likewise, they knew about traditional house building, canoe carving, farming, and fishing.

Among the materials that Emerson's consultants gave him and that he incorporated into the notes, some of the most valuable are pieces that would have been transmitted through memorization—*pule*, *mele*, and *mo'olelo*. *Pule* used in the *makahiki* and the *luakini* services had been passed on to some of the Hawaiians Emerson talked to, even though they had never witnessed and knew little about those religious services.

Emerson's effort to understand and translate Malo's *mo'olelo* sometimes suffers from a failure to comprehend the larger framework of Malo's work. It seems that he concentrated on translating individual paragraphs without sufficiently examining the whole of a chapter or a series of chapters. This has been discussed earlier concerning Emerson's comments on Malo's supposed inability to fairly describe traditional Hawaiian religion and Emerson's failure to grasp Malo's organization by the use of traditional lists (*helu papa*). A further example discussed earlier is Emerson's failure to understand the pre-Christian meaning of *haipule*, as covering only religious activities of the *luakini* season, not religious activity in general and certainly not the religious rituals of the *makahiki* season. Surely if Emerson had carefully studied how Malo used the term in the chapters on the *makahiki* and the *luakini*, he would have understood that.

Whether Emerson's consultants might have helped him to a better understanding of Malo's larger framework is not clear. He seems to have given a copy of Malo's Hawaiian text of chapter 34, "No ka Waa" (Concerning Canoes), to Koalii to read, but it is not clear if he gave copies of other chapters to consultants or if he only asked them specific questions about the contents. Even if he did give them chapters to read—he might, for example, have given a copy of chapter 21, "No na Hewa a me na Pono," to Kaunamano and Polikapu—they were probably not sufficiently engaged in the work of understanding Malo's *mo'olelo* to have improved Emerson's understanding of that larger framework.

Reading the whole body of Emerson's notes gives one the impression that he was often irritated at what Malo had written and that he was not sufficiently aware or respectful of what Malo had done in constructing his *Ka Moolelo Hawaii*. This is not so apparent in reading Emerson's translation, even in comparing it to Malo's Hawaiian text, but it becomes obvious in examining Emerson's notes. That attitude should, of course, make us cautious of uncritically accepting Emerson's translation as well as his notes to the translation.

NOTES

1. See the account of Malo's life by Keohokaua (1854), the obituary of Malo by A. (1853), and the obituary of 'Auwae (*Ka Lama Hawaii* 1834).

2. Malo's *Ka Moolelo Hawaii* was still incomplete at the time of his death (Malo, forthcoming, vol. 2, introduction).

3. EMR plus a number stands for a specific manuscript from the Nathaniel Bright Emerson Papers at the Huntington Library, San Marino, California.

4. See pp. 21–22, and especially notes 28 and 30, for evidence that Emerson did not use the work of Kēlou Kamakau or 'Īʻ.

5. Among the papers in the Emerson collection at the Huntington Library are two that deal with S. M. Kamakau's newspaper articles: EMR 134 contains notes on carving the canoe from his "Ka Moolelo Hawaii" (Kamakau 1869); EMR 257 is an extract from his "A Song for Kualii" (Kamakau 1875). It is unlikely that Emerson read S. M. Kamakau's articles on the *luakini* service. S. M. Kamakau's account, while brief, contains details not found elsewhere, and none of those details are found in Emerson's notes.

6. Joseph Poepoe, one of Emerson's consultants, refers to S. M. Kamakau's writing a number of times in his 1905–6 work "Ka Moolelo Hawaii Kahiko," published in the newspaper *Ka Na'i Aupuni*. J. K. Kaunamano, another consultant, was probably familiar with the writing of both S. M. Kamakau and 'Īʻ, since he began writing for the newspapers in the 1860s when both of them were publishing their work in the newspapers (see p. 10).

7. The categorization is rough but sufficient to give a general idea of what the notes contain.

8. In some cases, a note fits into more than one category and has been counted in table 1 as a fraction in each category.

9. Totals have been rounded to whole numbers in the discussion.

10. Two notes written by W. D. Alexander have been excluded from the totals.

11. Each note assessed as partly wrong is counted as one case.

12. A better assessment of what Emerson learned as a child about Native Hawaiian life might be possible through a research of his correspondence and that of his parents held at the Huntington Library, but that is beyond the scope of this paper.

13. Among the papers in the Nathaniel Bright Emerson collection at the Huntington Library are eleven essays and note compilations concerning the *wa'a* (canoe), but Emerson seems not to have published any of them.

14. The mele was composed by J. W. Kaiwi, a Hawaiian missionary to the Marquesas (Puni-nupepa 1861). Kaunamano, however, was apparently the one responsible for entering it in the newspaper (*Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika* 1861).

15. Kapule's *pule* and tale are found in the Nathaniel Bright Emerson Papers at the Huntington Library. Three *pule* are found in manuscript EMR 50, one for 'anā'anā, one for *kuni* (countering 'anā'anā), and one for 'oki 'ana i ka piko o ka hale (cutting the thatch "navel" of the house before moving in). The last *pule* is also given in *Hawaiian Antiquities* (Malo [1903] 1951, 125). His tale of Hiku and Kawelu is in Emerson's manuscript EMR 47.

16. Sometimes Kukahiko's name is written as Kekukahiko.

17. The name is written variously as Polikapu and Polikapa in both handwritten and printed sources.

18. Polikapu describes seeing a *mo'o* (water spirit) when he was a boy at Wainiha, Kaua'i (Emerson Papers, EMR 546).

19. According to court testimony, Poepoe was involved in meetings to plan the rebellion (*Daily Bulletin* 1889), but he opposed the action that Wilcox carried out, "on account of not having force enough" (*Pacific Commercial Advertiser* 1889).

20. Koalii saw the god Olopuē at Kailua, Hawai'i Island, in the time of Kuakini (Emerson Papers, EMR 143). Kuakini died in 1844. If Koalii was perhaps eight when he saw the god, he must have been born by at least 1836. His death is recorded in *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* (1919).

21. Noenoe Silva (2017, 126) makes a similar point about cooperation between Poepoe and his Native Hawaiian political opponents during the period of the Republic of Hawai'i, that they were willing "to work together to leave a written legacy [of Hawaiian knowledge] for future generations."

22. References to Malo's *mo'olelo* are given by chapter:numbered paragraph (rather than by page number), whether the reference is to Malo's (n.d.) original manuscript, to Emerson's translation in *Hawaiian Antiquities*, or to the forthcoming translation by Langlas and Lyon. In this case, 37:55–61 stands for paragraphs 55–61 of chapter 37.

23. Emerson's transcription as "he mu" (*he mū*) and translation as "he is silent/they are silent" is one possibility. Lyon and I chose instead to write the word as "hemū" and translate it as "be gone" (Malo, forthcoming, vol. 2, 27:13).

24. A reviewer suggested that Emerson may have used information from Hawaiian-language newspaper articles without attribution, stating that Emerson did that for his book *Pele and Hiiaka: A Myth from Hawaii* (1915). Certainly that is possible, but a ten-hour search of the newspapers on the Papakilo Database (www.papakilodatabase.com) for material corresponding to Emerson's notes on the *makahiki* and *luakini* failed to turn up any likely cases. Readers with special research interests who utilize both Emerson's notes to *Hawaiian Antiquities* and Hawaiian-language newspapers are asked to keep an eye out for such cases and inform the writer of this article.

25. Emerson seems to understand the word *haipule* as *ha'i pule*, which would mean, as he says, "repeat prayers."

26. Chapter numbers for Malo's *Ka Moolelo Hawaii* are given here as in the forthcoming edition by Langlas and Lyon. We have chosen to follow Malo's manuscript and combine all of the amusement sections in chapter 41, giving each section a letter designation (from A to UU). Emerson, on the other hand, gave each amusement section its own chapter number in *Hawaiian Antiquities*. Therefore, Emerson's chapter numbers are different after chapter 40. The corresponding chapter number in *Hawaiian Antiquities* is given in parentheses following an E for Emerson.

27. Kēlou Kamakau's manuscript account of the *makahiki* festival and the *luakini* renewal ritual, subsequently published in the *Formander Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folk-lore* (1919), is found among Emerson's papers at the Huntington Library (catalogued as EMR 58). There are also some notes by Emerson concerning some of the vocabulary found in the manuscript (EMR 515, Notes Regarding Kamakau's Small Book). However, Emerson did not apparently make much use of Kamakau's account in trying to understand Malo's chapters on the *makahiki* and the *luakini* renewal ritual.

28. The translator of Kēlou Kamakau's work is not clearly identified. Thomas Thrum is given credit on the cover of the volume as editor of all the translations (not as translator). The initial translator may have been John Wise or Emma Nakuina, credited for many of the translations (Valeri 1985, xxvii), or it may have been W. D. Alexander since the manuscript came from his collection, according to Thrum (1919).

29. For Kēlou Kamakau's account, see the preceding note. ʻĪʻs account, published in *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* in 1868–70, was apparently unknown to Emerson.

30. There are ten additional complaints. Two of the complaints (chap. 32, n. 1; chap. 18, n. 18) do not seem valid and three are petty (chap. 8, n. 3; chap. 39, n. 4; chap. 38, n. 11). For five notes, it is difficult to determine if Emerson is right or not (chap. 10, n. 2; chap. 32, n. 2; chap. 38, n. 31; chap. 46, n. 6; chap. 48, n. 4).

31. Notes that make valid corrections: n. 7 to chap. 12, n. 4 to chap. 14, n. 1 to chap. 23, n. 2 to chap. 32, n. 9 to chap. 34, n. 2 to chap. 44.

32. Notes that make valid complaints about the written Hawaiian: nn. 19, 20, 21 to chap. 14, n. 1 to chap. 25, nn. 26, 28, 29 to chap. 37, n. 3 to chap. 45, n. 5 to chap. 48.

33. Later in chapter 23, Malo describes gods as being in various places—the heavens, the atmosphere, the earth, the water.

34. More precisely, there are thirty-three notes and eight parts of informative notes assessed as wrong, i.e., forty-one cases.

REFERENCES

- A. 1853. "Obituary." *The Polynesian*. November 5, 1853.
- Abbott, Isabella. 1992. *Lāʻau Hawaiʻi: Traditional Hawaiian Uses of Plants*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- Alexander, William DeWitt. 1891. *A Brief History of the Hawaiian People*. New York: American Book Company.
- Andrews, Lorrin. (1865) 2003. *A Dictionary of the Hawaiian Language*. Honolulu: Island Heritage Publishing.
- Arista, Noelani. Forthcoming. "David Malo, a Hawaiian Life." In *Ka Moʻolelo Hawaiʻi*, vol. 2, by Davida Malo. Edited and translated by Charles Langlas and Jeffrey Lyon. Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press.
- Beta, Solomona. 1893. Letter to Hon. J. K. Kaunamano. *Ka Nupepa Puka La Aloha Aina*. November 1, 1893.
- Chapin, Helen G. 1996. *Shaping History: The Role of Newspapers in Hawaiʻi*. Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press.
- Charlot, John. 2005. *Classical Hawaiian Education: Generations of Hawaiian Culture*. Lāʻie, Hawaiʻi: Pacific Institute, Brigham Young University–Hawaii.
- Christian, Eloise. 1951. Preface to the 1951 edition. In *Hawaiian Antiquities*, by Nathaniel Bright Emerson, xxi–xxii. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- Daily Bulletin*. 1889. "October Term: Trial of R. W. Wilcox for Conspiracy Before His Honor the Chief Justice." October 30, 1889.
- Emerson, Joseph S. 1892. "Some Hawaiian Beliefs Regarding Spirits." *Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society for 1891*, 10–17.
- Emerson, Nathaniel Bright. 1893. *The Long Voyages of the Ancient Hawaiians*. Papers of the Hawaiian Historical Society, no. 5. Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Company.
- . 1894. "The Bird Hunters of Ancient Hawaiʻi." *Hawaiian Annual for 1895*.
- . 1896–98. Diary. Copy held privately.
- . 1915. *Pele and Hiiaka: A Myth from Hawaii*. Honolulu: Honolulu Star-Bulletin.
- . Miscellaneous N. B. Emerson Notes. Kekahuna Collection, box 2, folder 22. Hawaiʻi State Archives, Honolulu.
- . Nathaniel Bright Emerson Papers. Huntington Library, San Marino, California: EMR 10. Biographical Information. Box 1
EMR 46. Extract from *Ka Moolelo Hawaii*. Box 2
EMR 47–53. Hawaiian Antiquities. Monograph [second draft] [1892–93]. Box 2

- EMR 58. Kamakau of Kaawaloa. Hawaiian Antiquities. Essay. Box 2
- EMR 131. Notes and Extracts from A Contribution to the Study of the Waa, or Hawaiian Canoe by D. Kama Kaumiumi (May 12 [1892]). Box 4
- EMR 143. Statements of George Koalii on Hawaiian Canoes (May 21, 1892). Box 4
- EMR 299. *The Story of Pele and Hiiaka*: monograph, first draft? published as *Pele and Hiiaka: A Myth from Hawaii* (June 4, 1908). Box 8
- EMR 347. Notebook regarding the Hawaiian Hula [ca. 1901]. Box 9
- EMR 348. Notes for *Unwritten Literature of Hawaii: The Sacred Songs of the Hula* (1903–5). Box 9
- EMR 396–98. Diaries (1862–63, 1863, 1864))
- EMR 399. Diary (1871–72)
- EMR 400. Diary (1881–Jan. 29, 1892)
- EMR 405. Diary (1907)
- EMR 406–12. Diaries (1909–15)
- EMR 443. He Moolelo no Maui. Short story [first draft?] (May 29, 1893). Box 13
- EMR 494. Na Pule o ka Wa Kahiko. Essay (June 29, 1893). Box 15
- EMR 515. Notes regarding Kamakau's Small Book. Box 15
- EMR 546. Regarding Mo'o. Essay. Box 15
- EMR 1195. Kaumiumi, D. Kama. 1 letter (Mar. 16, 1895) to Nathaniel Bright Emerson. Box 23.
- Fornander, Abraham. (1878–80) 1969. *An Account of the Polynesian Race, Its Origin and Migrations and the Ancient History of the Hawaiian People to the Times of Kamehameha I*. 3 vols. Rutland and Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Co.
- Hawaiian Star*. 1895. "An Aged Native: Death of a City Hawaiian of Prominence." June 14, 1895.
- . 1902. "Died. Kaunamano." May 5, 1902.
- Hawaii Holomua*. 1891. "Ka Huakai Alii a ka Moi." May 2, 1891.
- . 1913. "Nuhou Kuloko." December 27, 1913.
- Honolulu Star-Bulletin*. 1912. "Home Rulers Losing Many Old Leaders." July 29, 1912.
- ʻĪʻi, John Papa. 1869. "Na Hunahuna o ka Moolelo Hawaii." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, August 14, 21, 28; September 18, 25; October 2, 30; November 13, 1869.
- Independent*. 1897. "A Valuable Work." December 4, 1897.
- Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*. 1861. "Ua puka mai iloko o ka Hae Hawaii o keia pule, he olelo pono na Punimaemae ia Puni Nupepa." October 10, 1861.
- Ka Lama Hawaii*. 1834. "Make." December 17, 1834.
- Kalaukoa, A. 1888. "Pololei." *Ke Alakai o Hawaii*, October 6, 1888.
- Ka Leo o ka Lahui*. 1891. "Nuhou Kuloko." February 23, 1891.
- . 1892. "Halawai Makaanana Ohohia Nui ma Manamana." January 2, 1892.
- . 1893. "Na Hoa." March 27, 1893.
- . 1893. "Ke Kanikela Hou o Amerika." September 22, 1893.
- . 1894. "Waiwai Ole." October 11, 1894.
- Kamakau, Kēlou [Kamakau o Kaawaloa]. 1919. "No na Oihana Kahuna Kahiko, Concerning Ancient Religious Ceremonies." In *Fornander Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folklore*, by Abraham Fornander. Edited by Thomas G. Thrum. *Memoirs of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum*, vol. 6, part 1, 2–45.
- Kamakau, S. M. 1865. "Ka Moolelo o Hawaii nei." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, August 12, 1865.
- . 1867. "Ka Moolelo o Kamehameha I." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, August 10, 1867.
- . 1868. "Palapala mai ka Haku Moolelo o Hawaii nei." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, August 8, 1868.
- . 1869. "Ka Moolelo Hawaii." *Ke Au Okoa*, December 9, 1869.

- . 1870. “Ka Moolelo Hawaii.” *Ke Au Okoa*, February 17, 24; March 3, 1870.
- . 1875. “A Song for Kualii.” *The Islander*, September 17–October 29, 1875.
- . 1964. *Ka Po‘e Kahiko: The People of Old*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- Ka Na‘i Aupuni*. 1906. “He Hoakaka mai ke Alii S. L. Peleioholani mai.” April 2, 1906.
- Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. 1878. “Nuhou Ku Loko.” February 9, 1878.
- . 1880. “Na Inoa o ka Lanakila.” January 1, 1880.
- . 1889. “Haunaale Kaua Hoao e Hookahuli i ke Aupuni.” August 3, 1889.
- . 1895. “Halawai o ka Hui Repubalika.” March 2, 1895.
- . 1897. “Ahea la Pau ke Kuhihewa o ka Lahui.” March 19, 1897.
- . 1899. “Pane no na Ninau Pili Aupuni a ke ‘Cali’; Na iliili konane a na Kalai Aupuni like ole; E Hone ana no i ke Kumu o ka Hana.” October 20, 1899.
- . 1919. “Na Make.” February 7, 1919.
- Kaunamano, J. 1862. “He Moolelo no Aukelenuiaiku.” *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, November 6–December 25, 1862.
- Kawainui, J. U. 1883. “Ka Poe Koho Barota Kokua Kuhina.” *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*, August 4, 1883.
- Ke Alakai o Hawaii*. 1887. Masthead, August 31, 1887.
- Ke Aloha Aina*. 1895. “Koho ia na Luna Nui o ka Ahahui Kalaiaina.” November 23, 1895.
- . 1898. “Hala Hou no he Hawaii.” July 23, 1898.
- . 1898. “Ke Kuahaua Nui no ka Hoohiwahiwa Alii.” July 9, 1898.
- . 1898. “Maloko o ka Halemai Moiwahine i ke kakahiaka Poakolu nei i hookuu mai ai o Kahumoku i kona ola ana.” August 27, 1898.
- . 1912. “Joseph Mokuohai Poepoe.” October 26, 1912.
- . 1913. “Hoalohalo no J. M. Poepoe.” April 26, 1913.
- . 1915. “Haalele mai Oia i Keia Ola ana oiai ma Kana Huakai Kaahela: Make o Kauka Emekona ma ka Moana oiai Oia e Huli Hoi mai ana.” July 24, 1915.
- Kelsey, Theodore. n.d. *Hawaiian Extracts from Nathaniel Bright Emerson’s Diary*. Kekahuna Collection. Hawai‘i State Archives, Honolulu:
Diary for 1892–93. Box 1, folder 7
Diaries for 1904, 1906, 1909. Box 2, folder 22.
- Keohokaua, I. 1854. “Ka Moolelo no Davida Malo.” *Ka Elele*, May 15, 1854.
- . 1854. “Moolelo no Davida Malo.” *Ka Elele*, June 2, 1854.
- Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*. 1889. “Na Poe Hookahuli Aupuni i Waihoia no ke Kiure.” August 24, 1889.
- . 1890. “Na Makapaa Alai i ke Komite Hookahuli Kumukanawai.” August 16 1890.
- Kuykendall, Ralph. 1967. *The Hawaiian Kingdom. Volume 3, 1874–1893: The Kalakaua Dynasty*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Lydecker, Robert C. 1918. *Roster Legislatures of Hawaii, 1841–1918: Constitutions of Monarchy and Republic, Speeches of Sovereigns and President*. Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette.
- Lyon, Jeffrey. 2011. “Davida Malo, Nathaniel Emerson, and the ‘Sins’ of Hawaiians: An Analysis of Emerson’s *Hawaiian Antiquities* as a Guide to Malo’s *Mo‘olelo Hawai‘i*,” *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being* 7: 91–132.
- Malo, Davida. (1903) 1951. *Hawaiian Antiquities (Moolelo Hawaii)*. Translated by Nathaniel B. Emerson. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- . n.d. *Ka Moolelo Hawaii*. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Archives, file HI.L.18 (“Carter Copy”).
- . Forthcoming. *The Mo‘olelo Hawai‘i of Davida Malo*, 2 vols. Edited and translated by Charles Langlas and Jeffrey Lyon. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Mookini, Esther K. 1974. *The Hawaiian Newspapers*. Honolulu: Topgallant Publishing.
- Nuhou*. 1874. “He Olelo Oiaio.” February 17, 1874.

- Nupepa Puka La Aloha Aina*. 1893. "O keia iho na Inoa o ko makou mau Luna." October 21, 1893.
- Pacific Commercial Advertiser (Daily)*. 1889. "Supreme Court. At Chambers. Tuesday, Oct. 29. Before His Honor Justice Dole. Equity Division." October 30, 1889.
- Poepoe, Joseph Mokuohai. 1905. "He Hoakaka aku." *Ka Na'i Aupuni*, December 18, 1905.
- . 1906. "Ka Moolelo Hawaii Kahiko." *Ka Na'i Aupuni*, February 1–November 19, 1906.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena, and Samuel H. Elbert. 1971. Glossary of Hawaiian Gods, Demigods, Family Gods and a Few Heroes. In *Hawaiian Dictionary: Hawaiian-English, English-Hawaiian*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- . 1986. *Hawaiian Dictionary: Hawaiian-English, English-Hawaiian, Revised and Enlarged Edition*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Puni-nupepa. 1861. Letter to the editor. *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*. September 26, 1861.
- Silva, Noenoe. 2017. *The Power of the Steel-Tipped Pen: Reconstructing Native Hawaiian Intellectual History*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.
- Thrum, Thomas G. 1919. Preface. In *Fornander Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folk-lore*, by Abraham Fornander. Edited by Thomas G. Thrum. Memoirs of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum, vol. 6, part 1.
- Valeri, Valerio. 1985. *Kingship and Sacrifice: Ritual and Society in Ancient Hawaii*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.