PACIFIC STUDIES

Vol. 10, No. 2 March 1987

REALITY AND FANTASY: THE FOSTER CHILD IN HAWAIIAN MYTHS AND CUSTOMS

Katharine Luomala
University of Hawaii

Hawaiians, like other Pacific islanders, narrate prose sagas that incorporate motifs of the quest of a character, almost always male, to learn the identity of and then to locate his biological father.[1] As the father is either a great chief or a god, the youth expects to receive the privileges and rights that he believes are his birthright. Nine Hawaiian characters --eight male, one female (patterned after the male)--ask their female caretaker, "Who is my father?" Although the query is expressed in two tale-types also present elsewhere in the Pacific, no other archipelago has as many different semihistorical, mythical, and fictitious heroes who ask about their unknown father as the Hawaiian Islands.[2]

The principal tale-type as developed in Hawaii begins with a roving chief or sky god having a romantic encounter with a woman usually of lower rank than himself. Before going home he gives her tokens of his rank and a name for their anticipated son. She rears the child alone or, more commonly, with her brother or husband, who punishes the child for behaving as if he were a chief. The unhappy child, feeling himself a misfit in this environment, asks his mother: "Who is my father?" Evasive at first, she finally tells him the truth and advises him how to find his father. When he has located him he proves, often with difficulty at first, that he is indeed his son and entitled to his birthright. The saga often portrays him next as a usurping chief who displaces his elder half-brother or a god to gain great power. He may also marry his royal half-

sister to have offspring of higher rank than himself. But it is the early events in the hero's career that are the major focus of interest here.

The hero of the second tale-type is always named Laka. When his playmates make him aware that unlike them he has no father, he asks his mother, "Who is my father?" He learns that his father was murdered on another island while seeking a birth gift for him. Laka determines to build a canoe and go off to gain revenge and bring home his father's bones. After forest spirits restore a tree each time he has irreverently chopped it down for a canoe, his mother or grandmother tells him how to placate them. Once the spirits are appeased, they make his canoe and he leaves with supernatural companions to successfully avenge his father's death and bring home his bones.[3] Getting the bones is important for otherwise enemies might dishonor them by making them into fishhooks or other artifacts.

Psychoanalysts, psychologists, social workers, and others have observed in both normal and neurotic children and adults, male and female, what they call the "foster-child fantasy," according to which an individual believes that he is not the child of the ordinary couple who are rearing him but is the offspring of renowned, albeit unknown, parents. The motif of a male foster child who is reared without knowing that his natural parents are great personages occurs in many Old World and Near Eastern myths that Freud and his followers, particularly Otto Rank, have interpreted in terms of their psychoanalytical theories. Because in the Hawaiian sagas only the father's identity is unknown to the child, it is of interest to analyze them in relation to the psychoanalysts' theories--which are based on a different culture--and as a reflection of traditional Hawaiian social customs with regard to parentage, rank, adoption, and fosterage. First, I will present a selection of relevant theories of Western psychoanalysts and psychologists based on Euroamerican and Near Eastern culture.

Psychoanalytical Theories of the Foster-Child Fantasy

Otto Rank, while recognizing the importance of cultural variability and diffusion in narratives about the quest for the unknown father, emphasized that their ultimate origin is in the human psyche.[4] The mythmaker, he wrote, created the myth from retrograde infantile fantasies and credited the hero with his own personal infantile history. Rank discerned a pattern, despite differences in expression, in accounts of the lives of fifteen mythic or semimythic Old World heroes. The noble parents have some difficulty with conception, such as prolonged barren-

ness, continence, or taboos on intercourse. When the hero is born they have him exposed, frequently to a watery death, because before or during the pregnancy a prophetic dream or an oracle has cautioned against his birth, usually because of danger that will befall his father. Saved and reared by lowly foster parents or animals until grown, the youth then leaves and after unusual adventures finds his true parents. Although they may acknowledge him as their son he may nevertheless take revenge, especially against his father, for having abandoned him. He may later win honors and fame but his life may end in tragedy. Of the many variations of the pattern, the best known is the Oedipus myth, in which the hero unwittingly slays his father and marries his mother.

The hero, according to Rank, represents Ego acting out in narrative form the Freudian "family romance" of real life. The young child at first idealizes and overvalues his parents as all-powerful and wonderful. However, as he grows more independent he becomes disillusioned by their ordinariness, real or imagined neglect, discrimination, or unsympathetic treatment. He then fancies, sometimes under the influence of romantic stories, that he is not their child but that of exalted persons. The latter represent the idealized parents he once thought his true parents were. As his sexual awareness develops, his strong sentimental attachment to his mother leads him to alter his fantasies so that he now wishes to eliminate competition for her affections. He therefore rebels against his father with the subconscious intent of displacing him. Nevertheless, he usually conceals his forbidden erotic wishes by trying to free himself from parental authority, develop a mature, integrated personality, and achieve his goals. As he grows older he consciously but ambivalently criticizes his fantasy while subconsciously clinging to it. Even as a normal adult he may revert to it in dreams. The male's Oedipus complex thus described has its counterpart in the female's Electra complex.

Fantasies of foster parentage and noble lineage led some of Philip R. Lehrman's patients to delusions of grandeur of being a crown prince or princess deprived of a rightful heritage.[5] Among milder expressions of their fantasy, these individuals evinced great interest in their genealogy, were estranged from their family, denied their nationality, changed their name, joined secret societies, or either sought or bestowed titles and degrees. An individual's fantasy might be released by a national upheaval or a major shift of residence. An immigrant, for instance, might revise his personal history in order to claim that he had high social position and estates in his homeland. On the other hand, the fantasies of a normal individual generally became the basis of constructive plans and actions, not of deception as an imposter or poseur.

To test the theory that all or most children have the foster-child fantasy during the development of the "family romance" and are influenced by it, Edmund S. Conklin in 1920 issued a questionnaire to 904 male and female students of late high school and early college age.[6] In the sample 28.5 percent had voluntary immediate recall of the fantasy, mainly in an incipient, unclear stage as a belief, daydream, or casual thought. More than half had it between the ages of eight to twelve. Slightly more girls than boys recalled it. The fantasy lasted either a brief time or as long as two years, with an occasional respondent still clinging to it. Almost as many who at first believed themselves of inferior as opposed to superior origin revised that fantasy to include greatness as they became more independent and lost the feeling of helplessness that had made them believe themselves orphans or foundlings.

Some respondents believed that their "real" parents were wealthy, noble, famous, or royal, or were supernatural beings. There were also those who thought that they were of status similar to that of the assumed foster parents. Many gave additional reasons for their fantasy that were not on Rank's list of real or imagined parental mistreatment and neglect, lack of affection, and suggestions from stories. These additional reasons included philosophizing (especially by boys) and knowing or hearing of actual cases of adoption and fosterage. Other reasons were dissatisfaction with economic limitations (usually by those with the fantasy of highborn parentage), absence of mental and physical family resemblance (especially by girls), encounters with famous people, and peculiar family circumstances (stepparent, family quarrels, marital infidelity, and parents' prolonged absences). Some individuals, having conceived the idea, sought proof, but others became depressed, ran away, and engaged in alienating behavior. Still others tried to behave better through gratitude to their assumed foster parents.

Since the psychoanalysts and psychologists have formulated and illustrated the foster-child fantasy almost entirely on the basis of Euroamerican and Near Eastern society and literature, it is of interest to see how both fantasy and reality are expressed in the narratives, beliefs, and customs of a different society, namely the Hawaiian, in which paternity was frequently actually in doubt.

Nine Hawaiian Father-Seekers

Of the nine Hawaiian characters asking "Who is my father?" because they do not believe that their male caretaker is their biological father, only the demigods Māui and Laka are known outside the Hawaiian

Islands, and only Laka's father is dead.[7] The Hawaiian Māui is the only Hawaiian father-seeker born in nonhuman form. His mother, Hina-of-the-fire, bore him as an egg, which hatched into a crowing cock that then became a male child.

Three heroes who actually lived in the Hawaiian Islands around the fifteenth or sixteenth century A.D. are ʻUmi-a-Liloa, son of Liloa, the sacred paramount chief of northwestern Hawaii, and a very low-ranking chiefess; ʻUmi's future brother-in-law Kiha-a-Piʻilani, son of Piʻilani, the ruling chief of eastern Maui, and his highborn queen; and Pākaʻa, son of a commoner named Kūanuʻuanu, King Keawe-a-ʻUmi's chief steward, navigator, and councilor. Kūanuʻuanu named his expected son by a minor chief's daughter for Keawe's scaly and wrinkled *(pākaʻa)* skin caused by his excessive indulgence in kava, a chief's privilege. Both Kiha and ʻUmi became great kings and conquerors while both Pākaʻa and his son served Keawe, as did Kūanuʻuanu. In genealogies Māui, ʻUmi, and Kiha are listed among the ancestors of Kings Kamehameha I and Kalākaua. There appears to be no genealogy for Pākaʻa, perhaps because his low rank did not permit him to keep one, which only chiefs could do. A high chief might give a valuable commoner a nominal title of chief as Keawe did to Pākaʻa and his father, but such titles were outside the category of inherited rank as a chief.

Three heroes and a heroine are completely fictitious and no one claims descent from them in royal genealogies. Unlike the matter-of-fact narrative style of the sagas about ʻUmi, Kiha, and Pākaʻa, the sagas about the four fictitious characters are florid in style, the incidents fantastic, and supernatural characters much in evidence. Each of the four has a highborn father and a mother who is usually a commoner. One hero's mother, however, is exceptional in being the supernatural queen of a floating island where she has a romance with an earthly ruling chief. Their son's name, Na-kuʻe-maka-pau-i-ke-ahi (Eyebrows burnt off in the fire), commemorates the chief's accident while trying to teach the queen to make fire and cook food, which were not known on her island. Like several other romantic and precocious heroes, Nakuʻemaka is born three years after his father's departure, walks on the second day, talks on the third, and plays darts on the sixth day with big boys who taunt him for being fatherless.

Another fictitious hero is Kalani-manuiʻa (High Chief Manuiʻa), whose name reflects his father's pride in his own rank and that of his anticipated son despite the mother being a commoner. How Nīʻau-e-poʻo, a cloudland king's son, got his name and what it means is uncertain.[8] If it were Nīʻau-ʻe-ʻe-poʻo (Coconut leaf midrib climbing to the

summit) it would refer to the boy's journey to his sky father on a stretching coconut tree (a familiar narrative device) .[9] Actually Nīʻau just sat on the tree as it rose, he did not climb it, but he is not the only hero or heroine to do that in a story. The fourth fictitious character is a female named Lau-kia-manu-i-Kahiki (Bird trapping leaf in Kahiki), her cloudland father's name for his anticipated daughter by a commoner.

I have located thirteen published narratives in which each of the nine father-seekers asks directly or indirectly about the father's identity. Three versions with the query relate to ʻUmi; two each to Laka and Pākaʻa; and one each to Māui, Kiha, Kalanimanuiʻa, Nīʻau, Laukia-manu, and Nakuʻemaka.[10]

Although only three narrators have ʻUmi ask about his father, none of the numerous other references to him express any doubt of his being the son of Liloa's misalliance with a low-ranking woman. Perhaps the other narrators regarded ʻUmi's query as superfluous since, like the three storytellers who include it, they have ʻUmi's mother protest to her husband that the boy he is beating is not his son but King Liloa's. The mother's protest naming the natural father is sufficient for ʻUmi to seek out King Liloa.

All narrators agree that Kiha, the younger son of the ruling chief of eastern Maui and his highborn wife of an important Oahu family, was reared by his royal mother and her kin at the court of Queen Kūkaniloko on Oahu. However, only one narrator describes Kiha's boyhood and states that when the boy's maternal uncle scolded him for wasting food he asked his mother about his absent father. It seems unlikely that the son of two such prominent persons would never have heard at the Oahu court that his father was Chief Piʻilani of Maui. This narrator, like the three who have ʻUmi ask about his father's identity, is trying to adapt another famous legendary chief to the popular hero pattern. He has used stock incidents to fill a gap in knowledge about the boy Kiha's relationships with his mother and other caretakers.

Obscurities in those variants with the child's query can be illuminated by those without it. The demigod Māui's query, for instance, occurs only in an ambiguous name chant that is a cryptic biography of his life from birth to death, listing his struggles to gain power and usurp the privileges of gods. The chant is part of the *Kumulipo,* a genealogical creation chant compiled in its present form perhaps around A.D. 1700. Hina is puzzled because although she has slept with neither a fowl nor a man she has given birth to an egg that hatched into a cock and became a male child, called Māui-of-the-malo. A malo is a frequent symbol for sexual intercourse, and the cock, of a usurping chief. After defying his

maternal uncles and the gods Kane and Kanaloa, Māui asks his mother who his father is. She denies that he has a father, saying that the loincloth of Akalana (Kalana) is his father. The fact that she sends him to his *makua kāne*, male parent, for a fishhook called Mānai-a-ka-lani (Needle of the sky) hints that his father is a sky god. The difficulty in this context is that *makua kāne* may designate the father, uncle, or male cousin of either the mother's or the father's generation.

However, a fragmentary prose narrative that lacks the query identifies the father with the sky, for he is Makali'i (Pleiades), to whom Māui travels on a stretching coconut tree. The latter is his transformed maternal uncle who earlier took the shape of a canoe to transport Hina to her dream lover, Makali'i, then on Kauai. The two had eight children, including Māui, before they separated.[11]

A different myth without the query about the father also throws light on the name chant. In one of its two variants, Kane and Kanaloa magically impregnate Hina when, while bathing, she puts on the malo of Chief Kalana-mahiki of Hilo. In this fragment the egg Hina bears becomes Māui, whom she sends, when he has grown up, to live with his father, Kalana-mahiki, and his half-brothers. The two tokens--the chief's malo and his staff--that she now gives him were not mentioned earlier.[12] There the story ends. The other variant, while fuller, lacks the tokens, the egg, and the malo owner's name. The owner, however, is obviously a chief because the malo is red, the color of chiefs. And when Hina tells her husband, Akalana, about the red malo he says, "We shall have a lord."[13]

These two variants suggest that Akalana (Kalana) is Hina's nominal husband but not Māui's real father. Narratives about Māui, like those about 'Umi and Kiha, have assimilated him to the hero pattern to give him a more distinguished father than his mother's less impressive husband. The process in which Māui asks who his father is was already well under way by A.D. 1700.

Two heroes whose careers resemble those of the nine characters and have been based on the traditional hero pattern have not been included in this study. This is because they do not need to ask "Who is my father?"[14] They have always known his identity. Each, taking his father's tokens with him, leaves his mother and stepfather or foster father to join his natural father in the sky. The father of one of the two heroes asks the mother to use the name Ke-au-nini-'ula-o-ka-lani (The restless red current of heaven) if their anticipated child is a boy. Keaunini does not ask his mother who his father is but only how to reach him. When he meets his father they fight and Keaunini kills him

because the father did not give him a chance to display the tokens and prove his relationship. The other hero, Na-maka-o-ka-pāoʻo (The eyes of the goby), presumably was also named by his father but the narrator does not say so. The storyteller, obviously beginning to create a new saga from old materials, neither integrated nor completed his story. How the boy learned his father's name and whereabouts is not divulged nor even how he reached his cloudland father.

The following outline gives the principal elements of those parts of the sagas that concern the parentage, childhood, and meeting with the father of each of the nine characters. Excluded are both the father's numerous adventures that led to his meeting the mother and the hero's later career. Laka, son of Wahieloa and Hina, and Kiha, son of Piʻilani and Lāʻielohelohe, are absent from Part I of the outline because unlike the other characters they were not conceived at a clandestine meeting; they were born to parents who were already married to each other.

Part I. The Parents' Meeting and Separation

A roving chief ("king") of Hawaii, Oahu, or a cloudland has an affair with a woman at her bathing place. When she becomes pregnant he leaves her with a name for the expected child and tokens of rank by which it can later prove its paternity. The father may also instruct the mother about how the child should present itself to him in order to be recognized. On returning to his domain he may prepare amenities for the child's expected arrival. (The child's name is given below in parentheses.)

The Couple

- *Father.* An earthly chief or king: Liloa (ʻUmi); Kaewaeoho (Nakuʻemaka); Kū (Kalanimanuiʻa); Akalana or Kalana-mahiki (Māui, variants). A commoner: Kūanuʻuanu (Pākaʻa). A supernatural sky god or king: Kane and Kanaloa or Makaliʻi (Māui, variants); Kūalakaʻi (Nīʻau); Makiʻioeoe (Laukiamanu).
- *Mother.* A commoner: Kaunoʻa (Kalanimanuiʻa); Hina (Nīʻau); Hina (Laukiamanu). A minor chiefess: Lāʻamaomao (Pākaʻa); Akāhikuleana (ʻUmi). A supernatural being: Hina-of-the-fire (Māui); Kaanaelike (Nakuʻemaka).[15]

Father's Instructions

- *Child's Name.* Formula: "If a boy, name it (father's choice), if a girl, name it for your side." Exception: "If a girl, name it Laukiamanuikahiki, if a boy, Makiʻioeoe."
- *Orders for Child's Recognition.* Child is to present tokens to its father. Exceptions: No tokens left for Pākaʻa, Nakuʻemaka, and

Māui (except in one variant). Child must also arrive in a red canoe with red sails, red crew, and red gear (Nīʻau, Laukiamanu).

- *Tokens.* Malo, warclub, whale-tooth necklace (ʻUmi); malo, spear (Kalanimanuiʻa); red feather helmet, cape, canoe (Nīʻau); feather cloak, whale-tooth necklace, bracelet (Laukiamanu); chief's malo and staff (Māui, variant).
- *Father's Preparations.* Taboos his royal wife's daughter for expected son's wife (Nīʻau); taboos bathing pool and other amenities for expected child (Nīʻau, Laukiamanu).

Part II. The Child's Upbringing

The child, reared by the mother and her kin, feels a misfit. Its uncle or stepfather mistreats it, or if reared only by the mother it notices that other children have a father. The child may have more than one reason for asking the mother who its father is. Sometimes evasive at first, she identifies the father, produces the tokens (if any), and advises the child about the journey and how to behave toward its father.

Caretakers

- *Primary caretaker.* Mother (ʻUmi, Kiha, Pākaʻa, Nakuʻemaka, Kalanimanuiʻa, Nīʻau, Laukiamanu, Māui, and Laka in one variant); grandmother (Laka, in another variant).
- *Secondary caretakers.* Stepfather (ʻUmi, Laukiamanu, Kalanimanuiʻa, Māui). Maternal kin: grandparents, ancestor (Nīʻau); grandmother, grandaunt (Laukiamanu); uncle (ʻUmi, Kiha, Pākaʻa); uncles (Māui, one variant); mother or grandmother (Laka, variants).

Child's Queries to Mother about Father

- *Age.* Six days old (Nakuʻemaka); four years old (Pākaʻa); "not yet grown up" (Laka); pre-adolescent or adolescent (implied for others).
- *Reasons for Queries.* Observes playmates have a father (Laka, Nīʻau, implied for Nakuʻemaka); reflects, wonders, reasons about father (ʻUmi, Pākaʻa, Māui); wants more power after defeating uncles and gods (Māui); hears mother tell stepfather (ʻUmi, Kalanimanuiʻa); feels real father would be kinder (Kiha, Laukiamanu, implied for ʻUmi); unhappy because male caretaker punishes him for generosity with food to playmates (ʻUmi, Kalanimanuiʻa, Laukiamanu), eating before him (ʻUmi), eating too much (ʻUmi, Kiha), destroying plants (Kiha), all characteristics of a chief.
- *Number of Queries before Learning Truth.* One (ʻUmi, Kiha); two (Nakuʻemaka, Māui, Laka); asks for ten days (Kalanimanuiʻa); asks persistently (Pākaʻa, Nīʻau, Laukiamanu).

- *Form of Query.* ʻUmi: "Have I not a different father?" Or, "Have I no other father but this one?" "Is he my only *makua?"* Or, "Is this indeed my father?" Kiha: "Where is my father? This is not my father. He is a man who gets angry with me." Pākaʻa, after rejecting statement that his maternal uncle, a small boy, is his father: "Who is my father and where is he?" Or, he "began to wonder where his father was." Kalanimanuiʻa: "Who then is my father?" Nakuʻemaka, after playing with boys who have a father and saying that he knew he had a father because he knew the reason for his name, asks, "Where is my father?" Nīʻau "asked where his own father might be." Māui "reflected, asked who was his father." Laka: "How is it that I have no father while other children have one?" Or, his long-lost father "is asked about by Laka." Laukiamanu "began questioning who her own father was until the mother could stand it no longer."

Mother's Initial Reply if Evasive. To Kalanimanuiʻa: "You have no father, this (her husband) is your father." To Nīʻau: "Alas! He is dead, only we two are left." To Laukiamanu: "The cliff is your father" (cliff denies this); "the bamboo is your father" (bamboo denies this, names the father); the mother confirms this. To Nakuʻemaka: "You have no father." To Pākaʻa: "Mailou (her young brother) is your father." To Māui, "You have no father." To Laka: "Ask your grandmother."

Mother's Aid in Finding Father

- *Gives Material Objects.* Father's tokens (ʻUmi, Kalanimanuiʻa, Māui, variant; Nīʻau forgets to take them); calabash of winds and bundle with white malo, fine grass cape, fan (Pākaʻa); red canoe and escort on her rolling island (Nakuʻemaka); canoe and food (Kiha).
- *Gives Other Help.* Sends her young brother ʻŌmaʻokamau as attendant to carry warclub (ʻUmi); explains route, proper behavior to be acknowledged by father--namely, sit on his lap (permitted only to his own children), tell name, show tokens if any (ʻUmi, Kiha, Pākaʻa), but Kiha as younger son is to sit on father's left knee, take food and drink from his left hand, as the right side belongs to older son; sends child to her elders for help (Nīʻau, Laukiamanu, Laka); advises how to placate forest spirits (Laka, variant).
- *Mother's Helpful Elders.* Her parents give direction-finding bow and arrow (Nīʻau); shape-shifting ancestor or uncle takes child to sky (Nīʾau, Māui in one variant); child's blind, banana-cooking grandmother and grandaunt provide stretching bamboo to sky

(Laukiamanu); grandmother advises how to placate forest spirits to get canoe and four supernatural men become his crew (Laka, variants).

- *Mother's Lack of Help.* Neither mentions nor gives tokens to daughter (Laukiamanu).

Part III. Journey and Arrival at Father's Court

On the journey to an earthly or sky father, the child's adventures, if any, may be pleasant or hazardous. No child is immediately accepted by its father. It may even be killed and later magically restored to life when priests identify its spirit. Ceremonies and marriage may follow but may be marred by the mother's revenge against the father for initially rejecting their son. There is no information on Māui's reception.

Events Enroute. Mother recites protective spells as stretching tree raises frightened boy to sky (Nīʻau); child wins games with boys in sky (Nīʻau); acquires friend of same sex in sky (Nīʻau, Laukiamanu); adopts one or more boys as sons and companions (ʻUmi); joins crew of sight-seeing king to reach Hawaii (Pākaʻa).

Arrival at Court

- *Father's Initial Rejection.* Has guards seize or try to seize apparent taboo-breaker (ʻUmi, Pākaʻa, Laukiamanu, Nakuʻemaka); drops child from lap (ʻUmi), or tries but fails to drop child from lap (Pākaʻa); surprised at younger son sitting on his right knee and taking food from his right hand (Kiha); has child killed (Kalanimanuiʻa's body thrown in ocean; bodies of Nīʻau and friend to become burnt sacrifices; Laukiamanu thrown in pigpen, to be killed and baked later); no information (Māui); encounters witch guarding his dead father's bones (Laka).
- *Reasons.* Child has no tokens or red canoe (refused to go in one); uses tabooed amenities (Nīʻau, Laukiamanu); marries tabooed half-sister (Nīʻau); gets no chance to show tokens or tell name (Kalanimanuiʻa); is unrecognized on lap (ʻUmi, Kiha, Pākaʻa, Nakuʻemaka).

Father's Acknowledgment. Sees his necklace on child (ʻUmi); hears son's name (Kiha, Pākaʻa); recognizes son when he shifts to his right knee (Pākaʻa); priest identifies child (Nakuʻemaka); when priests say the slain child's spirit rises from sea each night, father has it netted (Nīʻau, Kalanimanuiʻa); ancestor Niu-ola-hiki (Life extending coconut tree), who raised child to sky, now takes eel form to have sea gods resuscitate Nīʻau and turn friend into a red fish; priests partially restore and resuscitate slain child's body (Kalani-

manui‘a); grandaunt in owl form brings tokens, chants parentage (Laukiamanu); no information on means of identification (Māui).

Some Subsequent Events

- *Ceremonies.* Symbolic navel-cutting ceremony to confirm son’s identity (‘Umi); feast of celebration (Naku‘emaka); faulty rites to appease Niuolahiki, a factor in father’s death (Nī‘au); beauty contest, magically judged, selects completely restored son as winner (Kalanimanui‘a).
- *Revenge.* Father orders guards killed and baked for not recognizing child (Naku‘emaka, Laukiamanu); mother angry over father’s initial rejection kills him, he becomes a fish (Nī‘au); mother would have killed father but son helps him with wife-identification contest (Naku‘emaka);[16] Laka and his crew kill the guardian of his father’s bones and take them home.
- *Trouble with Siblings.* Elder half-brother angry at child usurping his privileges and rights; to escape death when brother becomes king, hero hides incognito in exile; priests recognize him, help him kill and depose half-brother and become king (‘Umi, Kiha); brothers’ broken taboo causes magically hooked islands to scatter (Māui).
- *Marriage.* Hero weds half-sister (‘Umi, Nī‘au, Kalanimanui‘a); weds half-brother (Laukiamanu).

Psychological Factors in the Sagas

Each Hawaiian male character’s puzzlement about his true father recalls the foster-child fantasies of Conklin’s American respondents and Freud’s and Ranks theories, based on Old World and Near Eastern myths, that narrators project into each character’s life their own childhood fantasies based on the “family romance.” Of Conklin’s respondents, more girls than boys reported having the fantasy, but in traditional narratives in Hawaii and other parts of the Pacific males are almost always the father-seekers. In Polynesian narratives, in fact, I have come across only three examples of a female quest for the unknown father; each example, whether from Hawaii, New Zealand, or the Tokelaus, is differently developed.[17] The saga about the Hawaiian girl, Laukiamanu, was, I suggest, adapted from those about male father-seekers, most specifically that about Nī‘au; the Nī‘au saga, in turn, may have been inspired by that about Kalanimanui‘a. The three sagas constitute a unit with numerous detailed similarities beyond those they share with the other sagas.

When the child asks the decisive question, “Who is my father?” that

will change his life, he is, except for very precocious youngsters like Naku‘emaka and Pāka‘a, at a pre-adolescent or adolescent stage like Conklin’s respondents. The child’s uncertainty about his natural father, some storytellers suggest, originated earlier and then crystallized. The same applies to Conklin’s respondents except that they thought they had been reared by two adoptive parents, not by a surrogate father and a natural mother.

Like Conklin’s respondents, the Hawaiian characters had other reasons for asking the question besides their tendency to reflect and feel unhappy and alienated. Like the Old World and Near Eastern heroes, the Hawaiians were reared under humble or unusual circumstances, but the Hawaiian reasons usually developed from the child being punished by the surrogate father for chieflike behavior relating to food when, presumably, he was a commoner (except for Kiha). A chief always had plenty of food to eat but had the responsibility to distribute some to his dependents in return for their having produced it and having otherwise served him. The child ate too much, wasted food, destroyed plants, distributed family food generously to his playmates, or, feeling superior to his surrogate father, ate before he did. Chieflike qualities were also evident in his skill in surfing and other sports. Except for a child like Laka reared in a one-parent home, the father-seekers appear to have been well-liked by their peers, doubtless because of their generosity. In the one-parent home without a male authority the child’s chieflike quality was exhibited by his success in games, which led his playmates to taunt him as fatherless.

Most Hawaiian father-seekers had a substitute male parent who was either the mother’s husband or one of her brothers. The substitute is a commoner or, like Kiha’s uncle, of lower rank than the natural father. The image of the surrogate father is negative, and perhaps to further degrade him few narrators bother to give his name. He and the child, whether male or female, are mutually hostile, with food as the most frequent source of overt dispute. Psychologically, he displaces the real father as the object of the growing child’s rebellion and disillusionment. Nonetheless, after assuming his rightful rank, the child rarely takes revenge for earlier mistreatment. After all, the man had mistakenly assumed (except in the case of Kiha and perhaps Māui) that the child was his and must be taught behavior appropriate to the humble way of life he would always lead. He and the child are not only hostile to each other but probably jealous, for there is a very close and loving bond between mother and son. The substitute father’s role highlights the child’s supernatural or chieflike qualities, provides a contrast with the

natural father who represents the ideal, and motivates the son to ask if he has no other father but this man. The answer to the query propels him out into the world to achieve his destiny.

Each father-seeker, male or female, is either the mother's only child or narrators have obscured the presence of half-brothers and half-sisters who would compete for the mother's affection. Māui, known to have brothers, is an exception., but the *Kumulipo,* after naming them, completely ignores them. In prose narratives, however, they function importantly as Māui's foils and marplots. Sibling rivalry is most developed as a theme after the son has been accepted at his natural father's court. He must then contend with mistrust, jealousy, and physical danger not only from his half-brother, his father's chosen heir and his first-born son by a high-ranking chiefess, but from court attendants. The father himself, once he is certain that the newcomer is his son, performs the role of the ideal father in all but one important respect. He does not choose him, instead of his half-brother, as his heir and successor.

Unlike the Old World and Near Eastern myths, the Hawaiian narratives omit the warning against the child's birth, the child's abandonment, and its later revenge for the abandonment. In most Old World sagas, the hero is reared by neither of his natural parents; in the Hawaiian, the child's natural mother always rears her child and lives with him among her kinfolk who assist in rearing him.

Hawaiian narrators do not treat the natural father's absence as abandonment since he left a name for the expected child and, in most cases, tokens of his rank to confirm the child's paternity. Narrators justify his absence as due to homesickness, the call of official duties, the need to prepare for the child's eventual arrival in his kingdom, and the search for a birth gift. Abandonment is thus glossed over. The child, on learning who his natural father is, does not feel he was abandoned; instead, he is happy and eager to join him.

Although the child questions who his natural father is, he never doubts that the woman rearing him is his real mother. The girl Laukiamanu, although seemingly hostile to her mother as well as to her mother's husband, takes for granted that she is living with her natural mother. The male father-seeker has a very protective mother who plays a large role in his life from the time of his birth until his departure. While he detaches himself from her by leaving, she may reappear in his life later. 'Umi's mother is a model. She rears him carefully, protests her husband's mistreatment of him, identifies his father, gives him the tokens, and tells him how to reach the court. She also gives him her younger brother, about 'Umi's age, as his squire. After King Liloa's

death when ‘Umi has to escape with his life from his hostile half-brother, now the king, he regresses and returns for shelter to her. However, she warns him he is not safe with her but should seek safety in exile outside his half-brother’s kingdom. After he becomes king, ‘Umi’s bond with his mother remains strong. He invites her to live at the court with her husband and her children born since his departure from home.

A father-seeker’s mother can also be extremely vindictive on his behalf. Naku‘emaka and Nī‘au each have a mother who enables them to journey to their father and who later takes revenge against the father for having initially rejected their son. Naku‘emaka remains loyal to his father, who escapes death only through his assistance, but Nī‘au’s father is slain and transformed into a fish.

Each mother at first evades telling her son of his father’s identity, perhaps through reluctance to have him leave her, grow up, and face the dangers inherent in his ambition to claim his heritage. Each mother is determined--and is sometimes supported by her parents, grandparents, and ancestors--that his natural father shall acknowledge him and grant him the status they feel is due him. The son’s journey is both a psychological and a physical transition. It marks the death of his childhood and the start of his adult life. It removes him from his mother’s side and her limited social environment to a larger arena and great danger.

The case of the girl Laukiamanu presents a problem. Her mother appears hostile to her, but this may be due to the narrator forgetting to mention the father’s tokens--both when he leaves and when the girl departs to find him. The mother never mentions the tokens and Laukiamanu leaves without them. The mother earlier seems reluctant to admit that the girl’s father is the king that Bamboo told her about. She does tell the girl of her father’s requirements as to the canoe and its gear that will identify her on her arrival. The headstrong and impatient girl will not listen, although the mother warns that she will suffer “untold agony.” She then sends the girl to her own older relatives for transportation on a stretching bamboo to the king’s cloudland. The tokens are mentioned for the first time when the grandmother flies in with them and saves the girl’s life. At last she is accepted by her father. The apparent ambiguity of the mother may have resulted from jealousy of her daughter becoming the pampered chiefess in her former lover’s court.

The Hawaiian introduction of the conventional “Who is my father?” query into narratives about real kings like ‘Umi and Kiha recalls Thomas Mann’s statement that not only does the biographer seek to assimilate his subject’s life to a conventionalized form but that the subject may

also see his life as the reanimation of myth, not, however, as "I am like--" but as "I am--."[18] The outline of these nine sagas illustrates the application of the pattern not only to semihistorical kings but to demigods and fictitious characters. Fantasy and reality have shaped the pattern. The many Hawaiian social customs relating to fosterage, adoption, parenthood, and rank have inspired children and even adults to believe that the fantasies in the sagas could become realities in their own life. These social customs are discussed next.

A Basis for Fantasy in Social Reality

Hawaiians surpassed other island peoples in the number of stories of mythic, semihistorical, and fictitious characters inquiring about their biological father's identity; they probably also surpassed them in elaborating a set of customs of adoption and fosterage not only of children but of adults. If, as Robert H. Lowie stated, "Oceania as a whole represents a main center for adoption carried to unusual lengths,"[19] then Hawaii may well be the heart of that center.

Following is a summary of the pattern of adoption and fosterage of which there were (and still are) many variations and exceptions--enough to excite a young person's imagination to develop a latent fantasy of having very distinguished parents. In Hawaiian fantasies these ideal parents would be even more distinguished than the known natural or adoptive parents, for many, if not most, children, whether born of chiefs or commoners, were reared by other than their natural parents. Adoption followed class lines with commoners adopting children of commoners and chiefs those of chiefly rank. The natural parents either retained primary rights or surrendered them temporarily to surrogate parents. To prevent supernatural punishment with the child as the victim, the natural parents had to fully approve the transfer, agree with the substitute parents as to whether the transfer was temporary or permanent, not quarrel with them over the child, and if the transfer was supposed to be permanent, not take back the child unless the adoptive parents died. As the two sets of parents were usually kinfolk, members of the same extended family *('ohana)* or close friends who usually lived near each other, the child was not cut off from its biological parents or extended family and was not kept ignorant of its origin. The adoption of the child was intended to reinforce existing alliances and create new ones beneficial to all concerned.[20]

The grandparents' claim to grandchildren took precedence over that of the natural parents, who had to get their consent to keep a child to

rear for themselves. The firstborn, if a boy, customarily went to the paternal grandparents; a girl went to the maternal grandparents. According to Mary Kawena Pukui, "The whole feeling was that the first grandchild *belonged* [her italics] to the grandparents. The natural mother had the baby on a kind of 'loan' basis." Children born later might be adopted by the grandparents' siblings and lateral relatives and then by the parents' siblings and lateral relatives and friends. Adoptive parents reared and educated the child in a way appropriate to its birth order, social class, sex, and future career. An adopted child, particularly if firstborn, often became an indulged favorite but was responsible for becoming the family specialist in its traditional knowledge, supervising and caring for younger siblings, and eventually serving as family leader and counselor.[21]

English translators of Hawaiian texts often use the English terms "adoption" and "fosterage" interchangeably, and the line between them in Hawaiian custom sometimes appears to waver. But whether this is the result of different regional usage in the past or of modern Hawaiian interpretations is not clear. Two major Hawaiian terms relevant to the matter are *ho'okama* (to be discussed later) and *hānai*. According to Pukui and Elbert, *hānai* as a noun refers to an adopted or foster child.[22] As an adjective it describes either the nurtured or the nurturing person. The child in question is *keiki hānai* or *he hānai*. As a verb *hānai* means to feed, rear, nourish, and sustain. I find that the adoptive parent, if a commoner, is called *makua hānai*, but if of chiefly rank, more properly, *kahu hānai*. Pukui, emphasizing the permanency of the *hānai* relationship, has stated that a child "is the *hānai* of his permanent, adoptive parents" and the relationship is as permanent as that in modern legal adoption *(ho'ohiki).*[23] The difference is that in modern legal adoption outside the family the child severs all ties with natural parents and other kin, whereas in *hānai* he retains contact with his natural parents and *'ohana.* How generally Pukui's interpretation of *hānai* as a permanent relationship would have been accepted in earlier times is uncertain. According to Pukui, a child cared for temporarily or part-time by foster parents was called *luhi,* and its natural parents had the right to reclaim it when they wished. Today some individuals reared for a long time by other than their natural parents either do not understand or remember whether they were *luhi* or *hānai* of a relative, the foster child or the adopted child.[24] They also confuse the relationship with modern legal adoption and may seek legally to get a share of the adoptive parents' property.

References to 'Umi's boyhood demonstrate the varied traditional uses

of the term *hānai.* When ‘Umi, who had been carefully brought up *(hānai)* by his natural mother, Akāhiakuleana, asked her if the man who beat him was his only *makua kāne* (literally, male parent) and if he had a different one, he either hoped or suspected that the man was not his *luau‘i makua kāne* (“true” or natural father) but either his *makua kāne hānai* (“feeding” or adoptive father) or *makua kāne kōlea* (stepfather) and that he was his keiki *hānai* (“feeding” or adopted son). ‘Umi, listeners know, is not contemplating merely moving to a nearby relative’s or friend’s house following the custom of commoners’ children who, whether ill treated or not, roamed at will from one household to another. Because ‘Umi already knew that he had another *makua kāne*—his mother’s younger brother ‘Ōma‘okamau—it is clear that he is asking about a more mature *makua kāne.* The term designates either the natural father or the uncles and male cousins of both parents’ generation.

David Malo called ‘Umi’s stepfather *makua kōlea* (literally, plover parent), a metaphor likening a stepfather to the migratory Pacific Golden Plover, which does not breed in Hawaii but winters there before flying back to the Arctic to nest and raise its young. Although N. B. Emerson commented that the metaphor is “used rightly without a laugh,” one still hears it said jokingly, Emerson considered *makua kōlea* “a very significant phrase” because “of the uncertainty of the parentage on the male side,” as expressed in the proverb “One can be sure of the mother but not of the father.”[25]

Proof of the identity of both parents was important to chiefs in traditional culture, for chiefs constituted a caste-like class apart from commoners. Long genealogies of both parents supported claims of a chief to a certain rank, within their own class.[26] If it was not definitely known which of two chiefs was a child’s father, presumably either the one with the higher rank or the one more generally accepted was used in the formal genealogy. The highest ranking chiefs and chiefesses were regarded as the earthly representatives of their divine ancestors, and great care was taken that there be no doubt as to who the father of a firstborn child was.

According to Abraham Fornander, a chief’s rank, being determined by birth, did not decline if he lost possessions or influence, nor could it be raised by wealth and power. He might, however, through alliances by marriage and adoption “raise the rank of his children higher than his own, such as by marriage with a chiefess of higher rank than his own, marrying with a sister, or by their adoption into a family of higher rank than the father.”[27]Ruling chiefs married several chiefesses for political reasons and to have high-ranking children. Kamehameha the Great is

an example. Both the mother and the maternal aunt of his sacred wife Keʻōpūolani, who bore Kamehameha II and III, considered Kamehameha, like all chiefs from the island of Hawaii, of inferior rank; his military successes could not alter the fact in their minds.

Paternity was often in doubt as there was much sexual freedom, even for sacred chiefs and chiefesses once they had produced an heir. Nineteenth-century historians cite many examples of uncertain paternity among chiefs and chiefesses. The most famous example is ʻUmi's descendant Kamehameha the Great, who had always thought that Chief Keoua of the island of Hawaii was his natural father until a few years after he conquered all the islands but Kauai. In S. M. Kamakau's account, Kamehameha, on hearing that Chief Kameʻeiamoku was dying at Lahaina, Maui, went to him. Kameʻeiamoku had attended Kamehameha since his boyhood and was one of his four great counselors who had engineered his rise to power and made him king. Kameʻeiamoku kissed Kamehameha and said, "I have something to tell you: Ka-hekili was your father, you were not Keoua's son. Here are the tokens that you are the son of Ka-hekili." What the tokens were is not stated. Kamehameha commented that it was strange that his lifelong friend told him this now; had he told him earlier his "brothers" (Maui kinsmen) need not have died, for the rule could have been divided with them. His counselor explained that it was better to have conquered the islands because with one ruler over them there would be peace.[28] Kahekili, whom Fornander called "the reputed, if not the acknowledged father of Kamehameha I," was a very high chief who before his death in 1794 ruled Maui, Molokai, Lanai, and Oahu.[29] Kamehameha had fought against him in invasions of Maui led by Keoua's half-brother Kalaniʻōpuʻu and later by himself.

The old counselor's dying revelation sheds light on why Kahekili, on hearing of Kamehameha's birth on Hawaii, had sent his half-brothers, the twins Kameʻeiamoku and Kamanawa, to serve the child as honored attendants *(kahu),* a role they faithfully played even against their relatives until their death. Kamakau commented that it was an ancient custom "for the chief of one island to give a child to the chief of another island. This is the reason why Ka-hekili has often been called the father of Kamehameha, for chiefs of Hawaii and Maui were closely related, and this is why the twins Ka-meʻe-ia-moku and Ka-manawa, who were the children of Ke-kau-like, ruling chief of Maui, were made tabu to live on Hawaii as associates for the child of Ka-hekili."[30]

The revelation, it is said, led Kamehameha to consider himself an *aliʻi po'olua* (double-headed chief), but Kamakau's account does not support

an implication by E. S. C. Handy and Mary K. Pukui that Kamehameha and other Hawaiians thought that he had two biological sires, a phenomenon that they claimed was "believed to occur among *ali'i.*"[31] Among other examples of double-headed chiefs is one of Kamehameha's wives, Kaheiheimālie, who was said to be the daughter of either Ke'eaumoku (another of Kamehameha's great counselors) or perhaps Kanekoa.[32] Sometimes a chiefess was already pregnant by one husband when she became the wife of another in whose household her *po'olua* child was born. One such child was Ke'elikōlani (Princess Ruth), Kamehameha's great-granddaughter, born in 1826. Her mother, it seems, was pregnant by Chief Kahalai'a when she became the wife of Chief Kekūanaō'a who is listed as the father of the child, said to be *po'olua,* "that is, a child of two fathers, which was considered a great honor by chiefs of that period."[33] Malo, explaining the term *po'olua* differently, stated that when a chiefess with a high chief as father but a lower-ranking chiefess as mother gave her child by her husband to another chief for adoption the child was called *ali'i po'olua.*[34] Sometimes a *po'olua* child resulted from deliberate planning, but whether only among commoners or also among chiefs is unclear. If a woman bore only stillbirths or no children her husband might approve of her having relations with another man because, it was believed, if she had a child by him then she and her husband would have children of their own after that. If a woman was uncertain which of two men had fathered her child both men might jointly accept it as theirs. The double-headed child then had more sets of relatives to care for it and the relatives had at the same time extended their alliances.

According to Malo, "Women very often gave their children to men with whom they had illicit relations," and a chief who had children by secret amours might recognize some of the children, some not. One who was told of his chiefly ancestry, although the public might not always know of it, was called "a chief with an ancestry" because he knew and could prove his pedigree. A child who merely knew but could not prove his chiefly bond was a "clothes-rack chief' because he put on airs such as not permitting anyone to put their clothes on his shelf.[35] Malo did not state the rank, if any, of the women he referred to but presumably they were chiefesses but of lower rank than the chief. Usually if mates were of different rank their offspring became lesser chiefs in the ruler's court.[36]

Although the social classes were theoretically endogamous and caste-like, casual mating occurred across class lines, providing children of commoners with a social basis for nourishing the fantasy of being the

offspring of a great chief. The mating might have been during a paramount chief's circuit of his domain with his retinue, or like 'Umi's royal father Liloa after his return from a journey to dedicate a heiau. Sometimes a chief or a chiefess either at court or in the country took a fancy to an attractive commoner. Neither the commoner nor the commoner's spouse dared object although the ranking lover's spouse might. To prevent any offspring born from such liaisons claiming rank through a blood tie, chiefly families had them killed in infancy. It was particularly important that a king's children resulting from such liaisons be killed, either at the order of the king or his council of high chiefs, to forestall any claims to rank or, more importantly, rulership.

King Liloa, it would seem, acted most irregularly in leaving tokens of his rank for a son by a woman of lowly birth, perhaps not even a member of the chiefly class. Customarily, the offspring of such a mating would have been sought out and killed to prevent what did happen--'Umi's arrival at court with the tokens, his acceptance by Liloa, and when Liloa died, his transformation into a dangerous competitor of his royal half-brother for power.

If the liaison was unwittingly or deliberately with an attractive *kauwā* (member of a segregated, polluting caste), families made every effort to separate the couple, and if a child were born "it would be dashed to death against a rock," according to Malo. If a woman knew neither the name nor the lineage of her child's father, the child was called, according to Handy and Pukui, *keiki* a *ka pueo* (child of an owl), the term for one begotten by the roadside by an unidentified man.[37]

Kamakau has stated, "There is no country person who did not have a chiefly ancestor. The *kauwa* too had a few born of them [chiefs] who concealed their relationship on the side of the slave."[38] Sexual freedom was such that an ambitious boy living as a commoner had abundant cause to fantasize being related to a chief, and to dream of someday having his rank recognized and chiefly privileges accorded him. A chief from whom many claimed descent was Keawe, one of 'Umi's sons and successors, and, it will be recalled, the ruling chief that Paka'a served. Keawe, who had five (some say seven) aristocratic official wives, also had, according to Fornander, "numerous amours with women of low degree and with the daughters of the common people." As a result some genealogists "greatly blamed [him for] thereby impairing the purity of the aristocratic blood and giving rise to pretensions that in after ages . . . became difficult to disprove." Nonetheless, Fornander "found . . . no name or family claiming descent from him and setting up pretensions accordingly, unless they were actually and historically descend-

ed from one of his five wives. . . ."[39] He was writing no doubt of members of the chiefly class, not of commoners who would talk among themselves of his amours.

Nevertheless, legendary and historical accounts tell of chiefs engaging in battle for supremacy and fighting not only with weapons but with ritualized boasts of high birth and taunts about the other's low ancestry. After describing young Kamehameha's battles on Hawaii against a rival chief, Kamakau added:

> The strife between the chiefs took the form of denying each other's pure descent from a line of high chiefs. Each was well-versed in genealogical lines, oratory, and minute details in the histories of chiefs, their birthplaces, rules of government, and the signs and omens that revealed their rank as chiefs. Both sides also had composers of meles who chanted the names of ancestors, the high and godlike rank of their own chief, and the mean ancestry of the other. This form of controversy between two chiefs is well-known today and will be remembered for all time.[40]

A malicious person could start a rumor questioning an opponent's reputed paternity, or a commoner might claim high birth through his father with the hope of rising in the world. Beckwith wrote:

> But for genealogical purposes a wife's children were generally accepted as his own by the nominal husband unless the actual parent was in a position of advantage in rank and power which made him worth cultivating by an ambitious offspring. The journey of a first-born child of his mother to seek recognition of a highborn father in a distant land is hence a favorite theme of Hawaiian sagas and romances.
>
> The effect of such loose matrimonial relations in a land where inherited blood counted above all things in establishing the perquisites of rank is to be seen in the dual pattern of court genealogies, where an unbroken line of descent often depends upon the female when a male parent fails. The Keawe line from ʻUmi is twice so preserved on the ʻUlu genealogy. Both genealogies for the Kalakaua family derive finally through the mother.[41]

Even if a youth proved that his natural father was an important chief or king and was accepted at court, he was handicapped by his mother's

lowly birth. To belong to the highest echelon of chiefs and chiefesses, a person had to have not only a high-ranking father but a high-ranking mother. Traditionally a king chose his successor on the basis of his first-born son's mother's rank being superior to that of the king's other wives. However, he consulted other high chiefs to get their support for his decision. If several chiefesses were of equally high rank, a king took all of them as wives to prevent their taking husbands whose children would compete on the basis of rank for power after his death. For the same reason his marriage to his sister or half-sister was desirable to insure the purity of the line and produce a child higher in rank than both parents. If the most eligible son was considered incapable by the ruler and his council he was passed over for a better qualified younger son or someone outside the immediate family. If the sons were all by women of inferior chiefly rank, the daughter of the highest ranking wife would be the king's successor, but only two such cases are known.[42]

When 'Umi's foster-child fantasy became reality and his royal father acknowledged him, his mother's humble status, whether that of commoner or very low-ranking chiefess, was debated by friends and enemies. To jealous Hākau, 'Umi's royal half-brother and their father's heir, 'Umi's mother was even lower than a commoner. After calling her a *wahine kauwā* ("slave" or outcast woman), he told Liloa that he had a *kauwā* for a son, a shocking insult to Liloa because ordinarily neither chief nor commoner would sleep with an untouchable. 'Umi's defenders claimed that his mother and Liloa were cousins through a common highborn ancestor, a relationship that Liloa himself had ascertained at their romantic meeting by asking "Who is your father?" Also, when he met 'Umi he asked kindly after his mother and sent presents to her and her husband. According to Kamakau, 'Umi's mother's genealogy "shows that they [her kin] had fallen very low."[43]

'Umi's enemies called him *noanoa* (commoner), *keiki kapa ali'i* (part chief), as well as *kūkae pōpolo*, *keiki lepo pōpolo*, and *lepolepo*, which metaphorically refer to a chief whose mother was said to be a commoner but literally refers to excrement from eating *pōpolo* greens.[44] These terms, said Kamakau, "might have been right or perhaps they were not, but he was victorious and ruled the kingdom."[45] Nonetheless, whatever power and glory a chief achieved through courage and ambition could not, as Fornander pointed out, raise his rank, although he could raise that of his children.

When 'Umi became king, a priest named Kaleioku (or Ka'oleioku), who had adopted him when he was in exile and was responsible for his deposing Hākau, advised him how to rule and whom to marry to have high-ranking children in order to dampen the criticism of the high

chiefs that his mother's lowly birth did not warrant his becoming king. Thereupon, ʻUmi took several blue-blooded chiefesses as his official wives, most importantly his half-sister Kapukini-a-Liloa, who bore two of his successors (although she thought ʻUmi's rank slight). One of the sons was Keawe the Great. ʻUmi may also have married Pinea, Hākau's daughter named for her mother. More is known about his wife Piʻikea, daughter of King Piʻilani and Queen Lāʻielohelohe of Maui and sister of Piʻilani's chosen successor and firstborn named Lono-a-Piʻi and of Kiha-a-Piʻilani. The latter, with ʻUmi's military support, was to depose and kill Lono to become king. ʻUmi also mated with country women by whom he had numerous children; it is said that if any commoner on the island of Hawaii declared that ʻUmi-a-Liloa was not his ancestor it was through ignorance of his ancestry.[46] This recalls Fornander's remark that anyone who did not claim descent from Keawe did not want to do so.

King Piʻilani, it should be added, had been called *kūkae pōpolo* and *kūkae paoa* (stinking excrement) for the same reason as ʻUmi. His mother's pedigree was not even remembered or perhaps conveniently forgotten, but Fornander charitably thought that she "was probably some Maui chiefess."[47] To have children of higher rank than himself, Piʻilani married his paternal cousin, highborn Lāʻielohelohe of the important Kalona family on Oahu where she preferred to live and where she reared Kiha.

Events relating to ʻUmi's and Kiha's overcoming the handicap of being a king's younger son illustrate another type of adoption besides that of children. A young adult might be adopted as a protege by a person older than himself, who would take him into his household to feed, protect, train, and counsel so that the careers of both the adopted ward and the adoptive parent would be advanced. ʻUmi and Kiha each became a protégé of an older man, when, after their royal father's death, they had to flee and live incognito in exile as commoners to escape death at the hands of the new king, their abusive and insulting older brother, who had always resented having his prerogatives threatened or actually usurped.

Chroniclers differ about exactly how ʻUmi and Kiha eventually became king, but what follows provides a notion of the events and their adoptive father's role in them.

Each chief had the good fortune to be recognized by one or more wily and ambitious priests who, hoping later to be rewarded, adopted the exiled youth in order to depose the hated new king and replace him with his junior. Kaleioku, a priest and lower in rank than ʻUmi, made ʻUmi

his *haku* (lord, master) and *ali'i* (chief) and made himself 'Umi's *kahu hānai* (adoptive father). He took 'Umi, his commoner wife, and their children into his household to care *(hānai)* for them. He also began to *hānai* (feed, support) 'Umi's loyal companions and others to build an army against Hākau. The proverb *Hānai kanaka, hiki ke ho'oūnauna,* meaning "Feed human beings, for they can be sent on errands," refers to the benefits of treating an adopted child well.[48] Perhaps Kaleioku had the proverb in mind. Reciprocally, the army in serving Kaleioku and 'Umi could be said to *hānai* them. When 'Umi became king he rewarded Kaleioku with lands and the position of high priest and chief counselor, and brought his mother and her younger children to live at court. Nothing is said of his two children by his commoner wife or of their ever trying to claim 'Umi as father and benefit from the relationship.

In exile on Maui with his highborn wife, Kumaka, Kiha was adopted by Chief Kahu'akole, who advised him to put aside Kumaka and marry the Hana chief's favorite daughter Kōleamoku in order to get her father, Chief Ho'olae-makua, to support him against Lono-a-Pi'i.[49] Ho'olae disowned Kōlea, saying that she should have first married Lono to whom she was tabooed and that after that she could have taken another husband. When the couple's son Kauhiokalani was born, Kiha sent Kōlea with the child to ask Ho'olae for certain lands. This request for strategic lands made Ho'olae realize that his hated son-in-law was not a commoner but Chief Kiha who was planning to rebel against King Lono-a-Pi'i, to whom he was loyal. He refused the request but kept the firstborn son of Kōlea and Kiha to *hānai*. Kahu'akole then sent Kiha to his brother-in-law 'Umi for help. Urged by Pi'ikea and approved by Kaleioku, 'Umi invaded and conquered Maui. Among the dead were Lono-a-Pi'i and Ho'olae, but Kiha ordered that Kōlea and Kauhiokalani be spared. One assumes that Kiha then took his son to rear, but he is not mentioned again until after Kiha's death when he reappears serving his half-brother King Kamalālāwalu, son of Kiha and Kumaka (whom Kiha had taken back).[50] After 'Umi and Kiha had apportioned the conquered lands, 'Umi returned to Hawaii, but sent Kiha one of his and Pi'ikea's two sons. Kiha, however, despised his sister's children because of their father 'Umi's humble origin on his mother's side. (Yet 'Umi had just made him king!) Kiha treated the *hānai* with contempt, and when he killed the youth's favorite attendant *(kahu),* the youth died of grief.[51]

'Umi had other problems arising from his wife Pi'ikea's family. Her mother, Lā'ielohelohe, apparently did not scorn Pi'ikea's and 'Umi's children, as it is said that she asked for the firstborn and 'Umi promised

it. He broke that promise, but promised the next, and so on without ever intending to honor his promise. He made these false promises, according to one chronicler, because he had once vowed that, contrary to custom, he would not permit someone else to rear any child of his. Finally, when Pi'ikea was pregnant again, Lā'ie sent her supernatural ancestresses, "grandmothers," to Hawaii once more. This time they had the gods strike 'Umi's people dead at night. When he heard of the deaths, he foolishly went out to fight the gods. Meanwhile the grandmothers, acting as midwives, obtained the newborn and carried it to Oahu. Thus, says a chronicler, it came into Lā'ie's possession, that is, was adopted by her.[52]

According to Kamakau, "It was regarded as a great honor for a chief to be reared by his grandparents, and for the chiefs to rear their children's children. This made the chiefs beloved."[53] A grandchild, particularly if it was the mother's firstborn, was much indulged. Kekāuluohi, daughter and firstborn of Kaheiheimālie and Kala'i-mamahu (Kamehameha's younger half-brother), was reared by her maternal grandparents, Namahana and Ke'eaumoku, who "fondled her as if she were a feather lei from the precious *mamo* bird." She was "a favorite above all the other grandchildren," and was also the favorite of the uncles and cousins of her aunt Ka'ahumanu, her mother's older sister and one of Kamehameha's wives. Kekāuluohi was looked on as the family head, and her father's own trusted *kahu* and the latter's kin were her caretakers.

When Kamehameha took Kaheiheimālie from his half-brother to be one of his wives, the child probably remained with her maternal grandparents because Kaheiheimālie had refused to let Kamehameha adopt her at her birth because she loved Kala'i-mamahu and wanted to rear their child. Kekāuluohi later became Kamehameha's youngest wife, cowife *(punalua)* with her mother, her mother's sister, and other high-ranking chiefesses. After Kamehameha's death his son Liholiho (Kamehameha II) took her as one of his wives but later gave her to his friend Kana'ina. By Kana'ina she had a son Lunalilo who succeeded Kamehameha V as king. She and Kana'ina were the adoptive parents *(kahu hānai)* not only of Kalama, who became the wife of Kauikeaoūli (Kamehameha III), but of the royal couple's second son.[54]

At the time that her aunt Ka'ahumanu was caring for Princess Ruth, Kekāuluohi helped her rear Ka'ahumanu's grandnephew and her own nephew, David Kamehameha, firstborn of Kīna'u and Kekuānaō'a. Kīna'u was Kekāuluohi's half-sister and like her had been one of Liholiho's wives. David's birth had helped reconcile Ka'ahumanu to Kīna'u's

refusal to marry Kauikeaouli (Kamehameha III) in accord with the wish of Kamehameha the Great that Kīnaʻu and Kamāmalu, his daughters by Kaheiheimālie, marry his sons by Keʻōpūolani, his sacred wife, to continue his line.[55] Kamamalu, also one of the wives of Liholiho (Kamehameha II), had died with him in London.

Kekāuluohi's adoption by her grandparents and her subsequent adoption of others is only one of many examples concerning the highest nobility and royalty. With rare exceptions, a royal or other highborn child was given by its parents at birth or soon after to another high chief or chiefess, usually related in some way, who became its *kahu hānai*. The term *kahu*, with or without a descriptive adjective, refers only to the guardian or attendant of a child (or adult) of status, not to that of a commoner. A ruling chief with no children of his own might have his *hānai* child succeed him if the child was old enough. People praised a wealthy chief or chiefess who reared a poor chief's child. More than one wealthy *kahu hānai* made his adopted child his heir.[56] A minor chief who reared a high-ranking chief's child benefitted socially and politically, as did his children. For the same reason a high chief might rear a child of a chief only a degree higher than himself. Royalty also found it politically advantageous to rear their relatives' children and grandchildren and to have relatives rear theirs.

Each of Kamehameha's two sons by his sacred wife Keʻōpūolani (his niece who outranked him) was given to a *kahu hānai*. However, in 1797 the firstborn, Liholiho, was taken from his original caretaker after his maternal grandmother reported that the infant (then about six months old) was not getting the right diet and the wet nurses were careless.[57] A chiefly child had several chiefesses as wet nurses because of numerous taboos relating to their duties that if violated would supernaturally harm and pollute the sacred child.[58] Kamehameha then gave Liholiho to Kaʻahumanu, his favorite wife and cousin, to rear, and thereby had this son with him much more than was customary.

Chiefs jockeyed for the honor of being a highborn child's *kahu hānai*, and the chosen chief was present at the birth, ready with wet nurses who were chiefesses in his family. After several chiefs had begged Keʻōpūolani for her next child, she promised it to her *kahu*, Kuakini, brother of Kaʻahumanu and Kaheiheimālie. When the child was born in 1814 (the date is uncertain), Kuakini, thinking it stillborn, rejected it. Kaikioʻewa, one of the king's cousins and brothers-in-law, arrived in time for his accompanying high priest Kapihe to get the newborn to breathe and was made Kauikeaoūli's *kahu hānai*. When Kaikioʻewa was appointed governor of Kauai to replace Kahalaiʻa, the latter was

appointed the boy's *kahu hānai* to console him for being removed as governor. When Kauikeaouli became King Kamehameha III in 1825, succeeding Liholiho, he was only ten or eleven years old. He had a succession of guardians with various responsibilities, but Kaikio'ewa continued as a major *kahu* until his death in 1839, and would stop at nothing, even at the risk of his life, to further the well-being of the king and the kingdom.[59] Kaikio'ewa was also the adoptive father of Moses Kekuaiwa Kamehameha, second son of Kīna'u and Kekūanaō'a, and made him his heir.

A *kahu hānai* who reared his *hānai* child from infancy was responsible for its personal care and upbringing and supervised other *kahu,* his relatives, who assisted in caring for it. As usual the natural parents maintained close contact with the adoptive parents and the child, but where royal children were concerned the situation of a *kahu hānai* differed. He obviously did not have primary rights to a child who was in the line of succession, and he could be relieved of his position or have it modified as the natural parents and other advisors of the king and queen decided. Kamehameha the Great, before his death in 1819, appointed a *kahu-nui* (or *kahu ali'i),* a supreme kahu, who was over all kahu *hānai* and other kahu associated with the royal family. Kamehameha appointed the chief he most trusted, Ulumaheihei Hoapili, Kame'eiamoku's son, as the sacred family's chief guardian. He also entrusted to him the hiding of his bones after death. Further, he gave him Ke'ōpūolani as his wife (after her death in 1823, Hoapili married Kaheiheimālie). Until his death in 1840, Hoapili, who had great authority, was constantly consulted by members of the royal family and by other chiefs and chiefesses in matters relating to the royal family, upon whom the welfare of the kingdom depended. It was to him, for instance, that Kīna'u and Kekāuluohi, the young king's "foster mothers ," went with others to discuss the errant behavior of Kauikeaouli after Ka'ahumanu's death.[60]

'Umi's refusal to give his mother-in-law his children to rear shows that Hawaiian parents did not always give up their children readily to others to rear. The experiences of Ke'ōpūolani and Kīna'u further illustrate the point. Ke'ōpūolani "wept when they [her two sons] were taken front her to be brought up by other chiefs and chiefesses. The mother yielded until it came to the last child and this one's rearing she would not give: to another." The child was Princess Nāhi'ena'ena, born in 1815.[61]

Each of Kīna'u's and Kekūanaō'a's four sons had been adopted--David by Ka'ahumanu, Moses by Kaikio'ewa, Lot (later Kamehameha

V) by Nāhiʻenaʻena, and Alexander (later Kamehameha IV) by Kauikeaoūli, who made him his heir. When Kīnaʻuʼs last child, Victoria Kamāmalu, was born in 1838, she refused her maternal uncle Kuakiniʼs request to take the child to the island of Hawaii to rear. Defying custom, she herself nursed it and her adopted daughter Pauahi, but made John Papa Iʻi and his wife Sarai her childʼs kahu. Their covenant, as Iʻi put it, was that he and Sarai would be the ones to carry the child, soothe it, and hold it on their laps.[62] Kīnaʻu at the time was Premier of the kingdom, and Iʻi, a chief with important relatives and associated with the royal court since boyhood, had served both Liholiho and Kauikeaoūli and was now Kīnaʻuʼs secretary and adviser. When Kīnaʻu died the following year, Iʻi and Sarai became Kamāmaluʼs foster ʻparents under Kekūanaōʻaʼs supervision.

A *kahu hānai* was sometimes called an *ʻūhā* (lap), which expresses the intimacy of guardian and ward. The term *ʻūhā* was also used in other contexts. Some chiefesses were said to have tabooed laps. They were unable to rear either their own or adopted children because their aumakua, or personal god, would make the children waste away or become crippled. The children thrived if adopted by others. The devoted aumakua, people said, did not want the chiefess soiled by a baby. If she could rear daughters but not sons it was because her aumakua was male and, like a husband, jealous of sons. If a child accidentally wet a sacred chiefʼs lap, he might have it killed or take it as a foster child. The parents, who would be the chiefʼs personal attendants, would not be responsible if the chief himself picked up the baby and got wet; however, he could still keep the child. Usually only a royal child had the right to sit on its royal parentʼs lap. ʻUmi, in asserting his claim to King Liloa as his father, escaped the kingʼs guards to sit on his lap.[63]

Despite its many guardians, a chiefly child was subject to hazards, which could inspire a lowborn child with fantasies of exalted lineage. Chiefs sometimes hid in the country with their children and lived incognito as commoners because of the abundance of food there, a desire to obscure the familyʼs history as captives, weariness of observing their own taboos, and fear of the ruling chief who was perhaps a usurper.[64] For example, after his power as a ruling chief on Hawaii was seized by Kamaiʻole, Kanipahu hid his two sons (half-brothers) Kalāpana and Kalahuimoku with trusted friends in secluded Waimanu Valley, Hamakua district, where Kamaiʻole would not find and kill them. Kalāpanaʼs mother and perhaps Kalahuimokuʼs remained with the boys. Years later when Kanipahu, who had been living as a commoner on Molokai, was asked to overthrow Kamaiʻole he refused because he was ashamed of the

calloused humps on his neck from carrying heavy burdens. He sent the messenger on to Kalāpana, his chosen successor. Kalāpana fought and killed Kamai'ole to become the ruling chief. His descendants included Liloa, 'Umi, and Kamehameha; 'Umi's mother was one of Kalāpana's half-brother's descendants.[65]

Other hazards to children of rank came not only from shifting political conditions but from kidnapping, abduction, murder, abandonment, substitution, and mysterious disappearance. Kamehameha, a valuable political pawn, was kidnapped at birth and an attempt was made to abduct him when he was probably in his teens. Pregnant Keku'iapoiwa, a high-ranking chiefess and wife of Keoua, one of the war chiefs of Alapa'i-nui, a ruling chief on Hawaii, was in an expedition led by Alapa'i (Keoua's adoptive father) against the ruler of Maui. One cold and stormy night while the fleet was still at harbor before leaving for Maui, Keku'iapoiwa gave birth to Kamehameha unattended while her guards and the chiefs slept. To be alone was most unusual because in any crisis of illness, death, or birth, kinfolk and others gathered to give psychological and practical assistance. In the case of a highborn chiefess protection was necessary to prevent a substitution or kidnapping. Nae'ole, a Kohala chief who wanted to be the kahu of Keku'iapoiwa's child and was waiting for the birth, made a hole in the thatch, snatched the newborn, and escaped with it. After its whereabouts were discovered some time later, the kidnapper and his younger sister were permitted, strange to say, to keep the child for about five years.[66] Then Alapa'i-nui took him for his favorite wife, Keaka, to rear. Kamehameha became very fond of his foster mother and her male cousin (an older relative of John Papa I'i) who helped to rear him.

Earlier, Alapa'i had adopted Kamehameha's father Keoua and his half-brother Kalani'ōpu'u, and had taken their very high-ranking mother, his cousin, as a wife. Both natural fathers were dead; Kalani'ōpu'u's father had been slain by his half-brother, Keoua's father, and the latter had died in battle against Alapa'i. Historians ask, Did Alapa'i adopt the fatherless youths through kindness, or "to prevent them from hatching treason and revolt in the provinces," or both? The half-brothers, after becoming Alapa'i's war chiefs, distrusted him, feeling that he had no real regard for them. When Keoua died after a lingering illness, it was rumored that Alapa'i's sorcery had killed him. Fornander has rejected this black view of Alapa'i and considered Kalani'ōpu'u's next action ill-advised.[67]

According to I'i, Kalani'ōpu'u was mindful of Keoua's request that he look after Kamehameha, "who would have no other father to care for

him." Fornander and Kamakau describe how he later risked his life attempting to abduct Kamehameha. He failed, and indecisive warfare against Alapa'i erupted.[68] Anticipating another attempt at abduction and control of Kamehameha, Alapa'i before his death warned Keawe-'ōpala, his son by Keaka, not to let Kalani'ōpu'u take Kamehameha away. When Kamehameha was about twenty and both Alapa'i and Kamehameha's natural mother were dead, Kalani'ōpu'u became his guardian and killed Keawe'ōpala in battle to become the ruling chief with Kamehameha at his side.

There is a famous example of an adoptive father's treachery against his adopted son. Kahahana, an Oahu taboo chief, was adopted by King Kahekili of Maui as an infant. In 1773 when a council of Oahu chiefs selected Kahahana as their new king, crafty Kahekili, eager to capture Oahu for himself, used various strategems. The first included asking Kahahana to give him certain strategic Oahu lands as a reward for bringing him up. The Oahu council of chiefs refused the request. Although the faithful but gullible Kahahana fought with Kahekili against Kalani'ōpu'u, the Maui king continued to plot and finally created a situation that in 1783 enabled him to invade and conquer Oahu. Kahahana, who was captured after about two years in hiding, was murdered and sacrificed by his adoptive father at a heiau in Waikiki.[69]

Perhaps Kamehameha's mother's experience in having her newborn kidnapped led Ke'ōpūolani to warn Kuakini, selected as her next child's *kahu hānai*, to be present at the birth to prevent someone else gaining possession of it. Substitution of one newborn for another was also a possibility. Ke'ōpūolani herself was almost replaced by another, although not at birth. She was so sacred that when she was with her wet nurse *(kahu hānai waiū)*, anyone who dared approach or touch her would be burned to death. Yet her guardians, thinking her homely and puny, decided to substitute their own healthy daughter for her. They were thwarted, it is said, by a dog which entered where the daughter was sleeping and bit off the fingers of one hand. Kamakau commented, "The servant might have been the chiefess had not God willed it otherwise."[70]

Another instance of the unreliability of some caretakers concerns the taboo chiefess Kapi'olani, Kame'eiamoku's granddaughter and Ulumaheihei Hoapili's niece. When she was probably about five years old she was abandoned and almost died. Because Kamehameha was fighting the chiefs of Hilo where Kapi'olani lived, her caretakers *(kahu mālama)* fled with her into the forest, but "tossed her into a clump of ferns . . .

because her weight retarded them when danger was near." A man named Hoʻomiʻi, hearing the child's wailing, investigated, recognized Kapiʻolani, and "picked her up and ran with sorrow for her in his heart . . . she might have died. If an enemy had found her, then she would have been killed."[71] Ironically, among the meanings of *mālama* are fidelity and loyalty.

According to Kamakau, "Some chiefs hid their children in the backwoods, and brought them up as commoners, and some children ran away into the back country and became countrymen."[72] How, why, and when Kai-ehu, Kameʻeiamoku's son by an unidentified mother, disappeared has not been recorded. He was "born at the time of the battle of ʻIao Valley" (1790) and vanished. Kameʻeiamoku had his son Ulumaheihei Hoapili search for his younger brother, "but no one knew where he was staying." Hoapili did not locate him until 1834 (if Kamakau's date is correct), and by that time Kameʻeiamoku had been dead more than thirty years, Hoapili was nearly sixty, and the missing son was forty-four. Kaiehu "had been brought up in the country under the name of Ka-puni-ʻai," and when he was found he was "peddling fish at Kaʻanapali for some back countrymen who had no idea whose child he was." Unfortunately, nothing more is said about Kaiehu. Of the child's disappearance, Kamakau laconically remarked, "This is why the chiefs appointed a number of kahu to watch over a chiefs child." One wonders if Kaiehu ever wondered if he were a chiefs child and if his case led some Maui commoners to imagine that they too might be the long-lost sons of high chiefs.

Kaiehu presumably had become a waif and like some waifs who survived had perhaps been adopted and reared as a servant to the adoptive family. A waifs treatment differed from that of a child adopted from a relative or friend, who might become such a pet that food would be dribbled into its mouth to prevent its choking on lumps, and who might be beautified to be exhibited in a rural beauty contest.[73]

A Kaʻū family's ancestress is said to have been adopted as a child by her older maternal aunt who so neglected her that she ran away. She was found by an elderly couple who lovingly cared for her. Her natural parents knew nothing of her whereabouts until a prophetic dream led to a reunion just as the girl was about to be married. The bride at this time decreed that hereafter in her family only a younger sibling, not an older one, would be permitted to adopt a niece or nephew.[74]

Besides biological relationships, Hawaiians, as Handy and Pukui point out, have "three secondary categories of relationship whose basis is social rather than biological." They are *hānai* (the "feeding" relation-

ship), marriage, and *ho'okama.* The latter, however, is only one of several structured and recognized types of friendship that constitute informal adoption. *Ho'okama* means literally "to 'make' a child," and figuratively, "to adopt a child in friendship." The adopted and adopter are not biologically related or, at least, not close enough to be a consideration. The *ho'okama* relationship, which is "quite different from the 'feeding' relationship," may be between persons of the same or opposite sex and of different ages. An adult may adopt a child, an elderly adult may adopt a younger adult. The relationship is based on "mutual affection and agreement, at first tacit, then unobtrusively discussed, between the child and the older person," and involves "love, respect, and courtesy, but not necessarily responsibility of any sort, and rarely a change of residence." The adopted individual is regarded as a member of the adoptive parent's family. If one party is indifferent to a tentative *ho'okama* or the parents strongly object, the matter is dropped. The adoptive parent, the one who initiated the relationship, is called *makua ho'okama* (parent making-child); an adopted son is *keiki ho'okama;* an adopted daughter is *kaikamahine ho'okama.* The relationship is somewhat comparable to that between a godparent and a godchild.[75] In its broadest traditional sense, *keiki ho'okama* is how a chief in his role of *makua ho'okama* regards all those who are dependent on him.

Variations of *ho'okama* are evident in an example from the 'Umi saga with regard to the rapidity of the development of the relationship, the change of residence, the deep responsibility between the adopter and the adoptee for each other, and the junior status of the adoptee in relation to the adopter.

Ten-year-old 'Umi, en route to his royal father, adopted three boys as his *keiki ho'okama.* For two of them, Pi'imaiwa'a and Ko'i, he first asked their own and their parents' permission, and they also asked their parents' permission. According to Kamakau, Pi'imaiwa'a's parents, recognizing 'Umi as a chief because of the royal tokens, gave him their son "to live or to die in his service." Pi'imaiwa'a joked that 'Umi had a son now who had grown up for him in one day. Versions differ as to the third boy, 'Ōma'okamau. According to Fornander, the boy was 'Umi's maternal uncle *(makua kāne),* but the narrator later refers to him as a *keiki ho'okama.* In Kamakau's version, 'Umi and the boy were not biologically related and 'Umi had made him his *keiki ho'okama* long before leaving home with him; the adoption had been one more cause of 'Umi's stepfather's anger toward him. [76]

Thomas Thrum states, *"Keiki hookama,* lit. adopted child, in this case is more that of a sworn boon companion, as they were lads together

and in no sense as father and son. It illustrates a custom of companionship in expectation of sharing in the honors and good things of life. A close attendant, not a menial servant."[77] When 'Umi became king he did reward his loyal companions and he chose Ko'i to hide his bones when he died. Although the boys were contemporaries and boon companions, 'Umi, who outranked them, was their lord *(haku)* as well as *makua ho'okama.*

Only 'Umi among the father-seekers of the sagas had *keiki ho'okama,* but Nī'au and Laukiamanu had each acquired an intimate friend *(aikāne)* of the same sex in the royal father's cloudland before the father recognized his offspring. In each case the father-seeker outranked the *aikāne.* In Nī'au's case, a boy named Uhu'ula (Red parrot fish) who admired Nī'au's skill in games asked to become his *aikāne,* to which he agreed. Whether it was Laukiamanu or her unnamed friend who first suggested that they become *aikāne* is not stated. When the king's guards burned both Nī'au and Uhu'ula to death, Nī'au's ancestors restored him to life but transformed his friend into a red parrot fish. When Laukiamanu was thrown into a pigpen, she refused her friend's request to join her because she needed her to bring food. Later, when Laukiamanu, recognized by her father, was set free, she made her *aikāne* a high chiefess and had her live with her. In each case a strong bond of affection and loyalty existed between the two *aikāne,* with the junior friend dying or willing to die if necessary. Only Laukiamanu's friend survived to be rewarded.

The *aikāne* relationship as described here is that of an intimate (but not homosexual) friendship between two members of the same sex, never between members of the opposite sex. The relationship is also called *hale aikāne* (house friend) because of the mutual hospitality of the friends and their families. To each friend the other's relatives of the parental generation are *inoa makua* (parents-in-name), who care for their offspring's friend as they would blood kin. Descendants of two *aikāne* sometimes continue to feel the link.[78] The relationship of the two friends is comparable to Old World blood brotherhood (and sisterhood), but no accompanying ritual has been reported for the Hawaiian relationship.

That the *aikāne* relationship is a kind of informal adoption is explicitly stated by Fornander:

> Among the members of the *Aha-Alii* [Congregation of Chiefs, descended on either the Ulu or Nanaulu line] it was not unusual that two young men adopted each other in weal or woe at all

> hazards, even that of life itself; and if in after life these two found themselves, in war time, in opposing ranks, and one was taken prisoner, his life was invariably spared if he could find means to make himself known to his foster-brother on the opposite side, who was bound to obtain it from the captor or the commanding chief. And there is no instance on record in all the legends and traditions that this singular friendship ever made default.[79]

Another custom is that described by Handy and Pukui of "making" a spouse. This is an adoptive platonic marital relationship, a kind of honorary marriage, and, like *ho'okama* and *aikāne*, it is a structured and recognized friendship. According to Handy and Pukui,

> A boy or man may take a great fancy to a girl or woman, married or unmarried. He tells her or his parents that he wants her as his "adoptive wife" or *wahine ho'owahine* [woman made-wife]. This does not imply having the sexual husband-wife relationship, but a sort of brother-sister relationship. . . . Sometimes a girl suggests that a certain man or boy become her *kāne ho'okane* [man made-husband].[80]

The girl or boy chosen may be a mere child while the proposed partner is a mature adult. Once the agreement has been made, the family and relatives of the individual who first suggested the relationship may cement it with a feast, for which a small pig is roasted. That any such feast formally concludes a *ho'okama* or *aikāne* agreement has not been reported.

Each partner has, in effect, a life-long friend of the opposite sex, an honorary spouse who is recognized as such by their families and friends. They are loyal, devoted, affectionate, and companionable without any sexual or economic involvement, but they exchange gifts. A poor but industrious man, unable to support a wife because of family obligations, may become a girl's *ho'okāne.* From then on he brings whatever presents he can to her and if she marries to her husband as well. He and her husband treat each other as brothers and her husband regards him as a *punalua,* here used to refer to a sister's husband. The *punalua* will be as fond of his honorary spouse's children as if they were his own.[81]

Another form of platonic relationship is the reverse of that just described in that established sexual partners temporarily or permanently adopt each other as brother and sister and use appropriate

kinship terms to each other. *Hoʻokaikuahine* refers to a man "making" a sister of his wife, who then calls him *kaikunāne* (brother) and he calls her *kaikuahine* (sister). Kiha and Chiefess Kumaka, who had fled into exile together to escape from King Lono-a-Piʻi, had this relationship temporarily. Kumaka, according to Thrum, had been Kiha's "companion in his trials and tribulations, even in those that might mean death. He made a sister of his wife." And called her sister. This was because his adoptive father, Kahuʻakole, believed that if Kiha put aside Kumaka and married Kōleamoku, the latter's powerful father would side with Kiha in his plot to depose Lono-a-Piʻi. Apparently Kahuʻakole thought it more effective politically to keep Kiha's identity as a chief secret and not have Kōleamoku and Kumaka live together as *punalua,* here meaning two wives sharing a husband, Because the plan failed, Kahuʻakole told Kiha to leave Kōleamoku and go back to Kumaka. When Kiha became king, Kumaka bore Kamalālāwalu, who, when Kiha died, became king. [82]

The general features of the Hawaiian foster-child fantasy, as expressed in the hero sagas, resemble those elements of Near Eastern and European sagas that psychoanalysts have described as part of a male or female child's normal psychological development toward maturity. (Such sagas, it should be noted, occur in other parts of the world besides those noted here.) Hawaiian social conditions under which a latent foster-child fantasy could emerge and flourish differed, however, from those in the Near East and Euramerica. As this survey has shown, the concepts of adoption and inherited rank were among the dominant features of Hawaiian social customs and hero sagas.

Hawaiians carried the concept of adoption to exceptional lengths as a means to establish and formalize new social relationships between members of the same social class, whether of commoners or of chiefs, in order to increase the number of individuals and families who looked to each other for emotional support and, in the most common form of adoption, economic support as well. For chiefs there was the further advantage of political and military support. The concept of adoption was used even to formalize close bonds of affection between two unrelated and economically independent individuals. Two women might adopt each other as sisters, two men take each other as brothers, and a husband and wife become brother and sister. Further, a man or woman, boy or girl, regardless of age, might become the honorary, nonsexual spouse of a member of the opposite sex; or they might assume a role comparable to that of godparent or godchild to a member of the same or opposite sex.

Additionally, an individual might adopt one or more of his contemporaries as his "children," or an adult might become the adoptive parent of a younger adult; in each case, however, the adoptive parent trained and supported the adopted child and in turn was served by it. The concept of adoption was also carried into government, for a chief was metaphorically the adoptive father of dependents on his lands and they were under his control. In various ways, then, fictive kinship bonds were created that were phrased in terms of adoption.

The most prevalent pattern of adoption was that which under certain conditions could give both form and stimulus to a latent foster-child fantasy. This pattern involved parents giving up their children (male or female), albeit reluctantly at times, to be reared and economically supported by their relatives or close friends of the same social class as themselves, while they, in turn, adopted the children of others to rear. With rare exceptions, adopted children were not cut off from their natural parents, for the two sets of parents and their kin were in frequent contact with each other and the children. A royal child's adoptive parents who had charge of its personal and intimate daily care were supervised by the child's senior relatives to insure that the child was protected and trained for its future role. A child, male or female, who was a member of the chiefly class was taught both parents' genealogies and everything else such a child should know. A commoner's child learned about its relatives as well as the taboos and guardian gods it had inherited.

Such in theory and usual practice was the pattern of adoption followed in adopting children at birth or soon thereafter. That a child knew the identity of both his adoptive and natural parents would not preclude his development in terms of the "family romance." In fact, a male would have two fathers to rebel against and two mothers whose affection he wished to reserve for himself. And there would still be the longing for the ideal father who was superior to both the natural and the adoptive one.

Certain social conditions provided fertile ground in which a foster-child fantasy could grow. As has often been pointed out, the natural father's identity, unlike the mother's, was often uncertain. Some children were of double-headed paternity. Some children did not know the identity of their natural parents. This might happen if their adoptive parents took them to a distant locality or another island, where they lost contact with their natural parents and if neglected or mistreated ran away to become perhaps waifs adopted by strangers. Warfare, political intrigue, and ambition particularly endangered highborn children regardless of the care their adoptive parents and caretakers gave them.

Records tell of such children being kidnapped, abducted, abandoned, possibly substituted for another, or completely lost from sight.

And despite the attention the chiefly class gave to arranging marriages to maintain a pure line, misalliances and casual affairs cut across classes. Efforts to destroy the offspring at birth did not always succeed, especially if the mother was a commoner whose name the chief did not know. A survivor might or might not be able to prove his genealogical claim to rank and win his chiefly father's acceptance. The mother of a child "begotten by the roadside" would not know the father's identity or lineage.

These social conditions indicate why in the Hawaiian sagas attention centers on only the father being unknown until he proves to be a ruling chief, a god, or important court retainer with the nominal title of chief. That the father-seeker is male except in one saga expresses the psychic superiority of men over women, who were regarded as inferior and polluting, regardless of rank. Nevertheless, that one saga suggests that the foster-child fantasy was also present among girls and women.

What is known about the Hawaiian foster-child fantasy must be inferred from the sagas since there is no study of the fantasy among living Hawaiians. It is interesting, however, how frequently one hears an individual claiming, and perhaps with proof, to be a descendant of a renowned chief of the nineteenth century or even of three centuries earlier. Other chiefs besides Keawe and 'Umi scattered their favors so widely that the fantasy of exalted ancestry if not of parentage survives in modern society. What form the present fantasy of distinguished parentage takes remains to be learned.

NOTES

1. Luomala 1940, 1961b.

2. Kirtley 1971:364, H1381.2.2, H1381.2.2.1, H1381.2.2.1.1.

3. Kirtley 1971:202, D1602.2; 160, C939.3; Luomala 1955:161-178; Beckwith 1940: 259-275; Beckwith 1930.

4. Rank 1914:82.

5. Lehrman 1927.

6. This study took place in Oregon (U.S.). See Conklin 1920; Conklin 1935:140ff.

7. See Luomala 1949, a monograph on Māui, and Luomala 1955:85-98 on Māui; Luomala 1955: 161-178 on Rata (cognate of Laka).

8. Beckwith (1940:483) was surely thinking of *nīʻaupiʻo*, a term for rank, when she wrote: "The name Niauepo'o is a class title in Hawaii for chiefs of the highest rank, born from the marriage of close relatives among high chiefs." She spells the term for rank correctly later (1951:13-14). *Nīʻaupiʻo*, literally, "bent coconut rib, i.e., of the same stock," identifies the "offspring of the marriage of a brother and sister, or half-brother and half-sister" (Pukui and Elbert 1957:245). Examples occur in the father-seeking narratives.

9. See Beckwith (1940:478-488) on the stretching-tree shape-shifter and symbolism.

1O. Only versions with the father-seeker's query are listed below; each narrator tends to tell his version differently. Fornander (1880, vol. 2) has discussed ʻUmi, Kiha, and Pakaʻa in their historical context.

ʻUmi. Fornander 1917, vol. 4:178-235 (said to combine Malo's and Kamakau's accounts); Malo 1951:257-265; Pogue 1978:147-153; Kamakau 1961:1-21 (lacks the query, but a footnote, p. 1, cites other versions); Beckwith 1919:649-650; Beckwith 1940:389-391, abstracts.

Kiha. Thrum 1923:77-86, from *The Polynesian* 1 (1840); Thrum 1923:73-76, from *Kuokoa,* 18 Nov. 1865 (part of a version, no query); Beckwith 1919:650; Beckwith 1940:387-389, abstracts; Kamakau 1961:22-33 (no query but a footnote, p. 22, cites other versions).

Pākaʻa. Thrum 1923:53-67; Rice 1923:69-89; Beckwith 1919:650-651; Beckwith 1940:86-87, abstracts.

Māui. Beckwith 1951:135-136, Beckwith translation; Beckwith 1940:227-229, from Hoʻolapa; Luomala 1949: 111-112, from Lili'uokalani.

Laka. Thrum 1907: 111-l12; Beckwith 1930; Beckwith 1940:263-264, abstracts.

Nakuʻemakapauikeahi. Rice 1923:19-31.

Kalanimanuiʻa. Fornander 1917, vol. 4:540-553; Beckwith 1919:657; Beckwith 1940:479-480, abstracts. Kamakau (19613169) mentions a place named Kalanimanuiʻa in ʻEwa, Oahu, where a great battle was fought in 1794.

Nīʻauepoʻo. Pukui 1933:179-185; Beckwith 1940:279, abstract.

Laukiamanuikahiki. Fornander 1917, vol. 4:596-609; Beckwith 1919:655; Beckwith 1940:513-514. abstracts.

11. Dickey 1917:16-18: Beckwith 1940:231-232, abstract.

12. Bastian 1883:278; brief reference, 232.

13. Luomala 1961a:155; Beckwith 1940:229.

14. The two heroes are:

Keaunini. Beckwith 1940:506-513, abstracts; Westervelt 1915:163-223; Thrum 1923: 220-227; Fornander l880, vol. 2:49, 56-57; Fornander 1919, vol. 6:345; M. K. Pukui, unpublished version.

Namakaokapāoʻo. Fornander 1919, vol. 5:274-283: Beckwith 1940:480-481, abstract.

15. Ku and Hina--with or without descriptive epithets relating to fertility of people, land, and sea--are a parental pair in religion, myth, and romance. Kū-waho-ilo (Maggot-mouthed Kū) is Kaanaelike's grandfather; she climbed to him on a stretching coconut tree and returned on his long tongue. His long tongue also scooped up the remains of ʻUmi's half-brother, whom he sacrificed to the gods. On Ku and Hina, see Beckwith 1940:12-30; on floating islands and cloudlands, see ibid,. 67-80.

16. A narrative without Naku'emaka concerns Anelike (Kaanaelike) and her earthly husband, a fisherman; after a separation she has him distinguish her from her eleven sisters (Green 1926:115-118).

17. Burrows 1923:143-173, Fakaofo, Tokelaus; Smith 1913, vol. 1:146ff., one of several Maori (New Zealand) versions.

18. Mann 1937.

19. Lowie 1930:460.

20. Handy and Pukui 1958:71-72; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972, vol. 2:36. See Howard et al. (1970) for a survey of traditional and modern customs of adoption and fosterage.

21. Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972, vol. 1:49, 51-53; Kamakau 1964:26-27.

22. Pukui and Elbert 1957:52.

23. Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972, vol. 1:131-132. A legally adopted child is called *keiki hānai ho'ohiki* (Pukui and Elbert 1957:64). On *luhi*, see Beckwith 1919:595.

24. Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972, vol. 1:131-132.

25. Malo 1951:260, 265 n.4 by Emerson; Handy and Pukui 1958:68-69. Namakaokapāo'o's father was also called *mukua kāne kōlea* (Fornander 1919, vol. 5:277).

26. Malo 1951:54-56, 60, 63 n.17; Fornander 1880, vol. 2:28-30; Kamakau 1964:4-6; Beckwith 1951:11-14.

27. Fornander 1880, vol. 2:27-29. As Fornander said, "Once a chief always a chief," and no crime he committed could alter that fact for him and his children. On Kamehameha, see Kamakau 1961:208, 260; Fornander 1880, vol. 2:320.

28. Kamakau 1961:188-189.

29. Fornander 1880, vol. 2:260.

30. Kamakau 1961:68. Kahekili was Kekaulike's son but the twins' father was said to have been Keawe-poepoe (Kamakau 1961:31; Fornander 1880, vol. 2:154 n. 4).

31. Handy and Pukui 1958:54.

32. Kamakau 1961:385. Kamakau points out the advantages of Kaheiheimālie's double-headed paternity and the kin she shared with Kamehameha.

33. Ibid.:347. Fornander 1880, vol. 2:108, does not mention the double-headed paternity.

34. Malo 1951:56.

35. Ibid.

36. Handy and Pukui 1958:79.

37. Malo 1951:70; Handy and Pukui 1958:196. 'Umi, Liloa's favorite, was, Liloa said, "the boy that will make my bones live, this child of an owl" (Kamakau 1961:9). Liloa, calling him "owl's child," perhaps one of his heir Hākau's insults about 'Umi's mother's origin, seems to mean that nonetheless 'Umi would one day do him more honor than highborn Hākau who was a pleasure-seeker, woman-chaser, and cruel to commoners. The

expression "the bones live" also is used by elders about a considerate and kind child (Handy and Pukui 1958:179).

38. Kamakau 1961:4. On *kauwā*, see Malo 1951:68-72; Handy and Pukui 1958:79, 204-205; Kamakau 1964:8-9.

39. Fornander 1880, vol. 2:112-113.

40. Kamakau 1961:152-153.

41. Beckwith 1951:30. See Fornander (1880, vol. 2:139, n. 1) for an example of such a controversy between Kamehameha's supporters and his opponents.

42. Wilkes 1856, vol. 4:31. Kamehameha's children by Keʻōpūolani superseded his older children by wives of lesser rank.

43. Kamakau 1961:4.

44. Pukui and Elbert 1957:162; Malo 1951:55; Kamakau 1961:1, 3, 15, 242; Kamakau 1964:4,6; Fornander 1917, vol. 4:238 n.2.

45. Kamakau 1961:3.

46. Ibid.:19.

47. Fornander 1917, vol. 4:238, chant and n.2; on Piʻilani's mother, see Fornander 1880, vol. 2:83.

48. Handy and Pukui 1958:168.

49. Kamakau 1961:25-32; Thrum 1923:73-76. Accounts vary, but according to Fornander (1880, vol. 2:206), Kumaka was Kahuʻakole's sister.

50. Kamakau 1961:56.

51. Ibid.:32. The unfortunate youth's name was Aihakoko. According to Fornander (1880, vol. 2:103-104), Aihakoko was 'Umi's daughter, not son, but met a "tragical end" on Maui. Thrum (1923:85-86) states that Kiha's counselors had him let 'Umi's two sons rule instead of himself during 'Umi's lifetime.

52. Kamakau 1961:20; Fornander 1917, vol. 4:230-232 (from Kamakau).

53. Kamakau 1961:347.

54. Ibid.:391, 393, 394 (Kekāuluohi's birth); 253, 341, 394, 395 (her mother Kaheiheimālie and Kamehameha I); 279-280 (Kekāuluohi's marriages, adopted children).

55. Kamakau 1961:279-280, 290; Ii 1959:152. Kīnaʻu herself had been reared by her maternal aunt, Peleuli, one of the wives of Kamehameha I (Kamakau 1961:346).

56. Kamakau 1961:347.

57. Ii 1959:15.

58. Beckwith 1932:126, 163 n. 55; Kamakau 1961:259.

59. Kamakau 1961:263-265, 269, 337-339; 348 (on Moses).

60. Beckwith 1932:122, 123 *(kahu aliʻi* and *kahu hānai);* Kamakau 1961:288, 304, 336-337 (Hoapili as guardian); 212, 215 (Hoapili as caretaker of Kamehameha's bones); 261,

263, 352, 393 (Hoapili as husband of Keʻōpūolani and Kaheiheimālie). Hoapili also helped rear Lot Kapuaiwa, later Kamehameha V.

61. Kamakau 1961:260. Kaheiheimālie, it will be recalled, refused to let Kamehameha I adopt Kekāuluohi.

62. Ii 1959:161, 163, 164, 166, 167. Both Dr. G. P. Judd and Ii advised Kīnaʻu not to take the infant to Kuakini on Hawaii. Kamehameha III later appointed Ii *kahu* of the royal and other highborn children, some from the outer islands, attending the missionary Royal School in Honolulu. Ii devotes most of chapter 12 (161-177) to his ward Victoria Kamāmalu (1838-1866).

63. Handy and Pukui 1958:48-49; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972, vol. 1: 192, 202-203.

64. Kamakau 1961:347; Kamakau 1964:6, 10.

65. Malo 1951:247-251; Fornander 1880, vol. 2:40-41, 74; Kamakau 1961:4.

66. Fornander 1880, vol. 2:135-136; Kamakau 1961:67-69; Ii 1959:3, 6.

67. Fornander 1880, vol. 2:134, 142-143; Ii 1959:3; Kamakau 1961:75.

68. Ii 1959:3; Fornander 1880, vol. 2:143-144; Kamakau 1961:75-76.

69. Fornander 1880, vol. 2:217-226; Kamakau 1961:128-138.

70. Kamakau 1961:259.

71. Ibid.:379-380.

72. Ibid.:347-348.

73. Kamakau 1964:26-27; Handy and Pukui 1958:71,101-102.

74. Green 1926:71-79.

75. Handy and Pukui 1958:44, 71-72 (quotations); see also Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972, vol. 1:167; Pukui and Elbert 1957:115. Kenn (1939:48) differs from Handy and Pukui on *hoʻokama*, saying that if a childless chief took a relative's child to rear with the intent of passing on his title, privileges, and possessions to it and the parents surrendered their rights, the process was called *hoʻokama*, a term also used, he said, for modern legal adoption. *Hānai* to him implies a less complete transfer of parental rights.

76. Kamakau 1961:6. For accounts of the adoption, see Fornander 1917, vol. 4:201, 203, 221); Kamakau 1961:5-7.

77. Fornander 1917, vol. 4:182 n. 2 by Thomas Thrum.

78. Handy and Pukui 1958:73. They also discuss other categories of friendship.

79. Fornander 1917, vol. 4:29-30.

80. Handy and Pukui 1958:55.

81. Handy and Pukui 1958:54-56, 57, 73; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972, vol. 1:167; Pukui and Elbert 1957:327.

82. Thrum 1923:73; Kamakau 1961:25; Pukui and Elbert 1957:108.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bastian, A. 1883. *Inselgruppen in Oceanien: Reiseergebnisse und Studien.* Berlin: Dumler.

Beckwith, M. W. 1919. *The Hawaiian Romance of Laieikawai, by S. N. Haleole.* Washington D.C.: Bureau of American Ethnology Report 33.

———. 1930. "He Moolelo no Laka Wahieloa," from Jonah Kaiwaaea, with English translation of "The Story about Laka and Wahieloa." Notebook Vol. 5 (Ms.), in Bishop Museum Archives.

———. 1932. *Kepelino's Traditions of Hawaii.* B. P. Bishop Museum Bulletin 95. Honolulu: Bishop Museum.

———. 1940. *Hawaiian Mythology.* New Haven: Yale University Press. Reprint. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1970.

———. 1951. *The Kumulipo. A Hawaiian Creation Chant.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Reprint. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1972.

Burrows, W. 1923. "Some Notes and Legends of a South Sea Island. Fakaofo of the Tokelau Group." *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 32:143-173.

Conklin, E. S. 1920. "The Foster-Child Fantasy." *American Journal of Psychology* 31:59-76.

———. 1935. *Principles of Adolescent Psychology.* New York: Henry Holt & Co.

Dickey, L. A. 1917. "Stories of Wailua, Kauai." *Hawaiian Historical Society 25th Annual Report,* 14-36.

Fornander, A. 1880. *An Account of the Polynesian Race. Its Origins and Migrations and the Ancient History of the Hawaiian People.* Vol. 2. London: Kegan Paul. Reprint. 3 vols. in 1. Rutland, VT: Tuttle, 1973.

———. 1916-1920. *Fornander Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folk-lore.* Edited by T. G. Thrum. B. P. Bishop Museum Memoirs 4-6 (vol. 4, 1917; vol. 6, 1919). Honolulu: Bishop Museum.

Green, L. C. S. 1926. *Folk-tales from Hawaii.* Publications of the Foundation, second series, no. 7. Poughkeepsie, N.Y.: Vassar Folk-lore Foundation.

Handy, E. S. C., and M. K. Pukui. 1958. *The Polynesian Family System in Ka-'u, Hawaii.* Wellington, N.Z.: The Polynesian Society.

Howard, A., et al. 1970. "Traditional and Modern Adoption Patterns in Hawaii." In *Adoption in Eastern Oceania,* edited by V. Carroll. Association of Social Anthropology of Oceania Monograph 1:21-51. Honolulu.

[i, J. P. 1959. *Fragments of Hawaiian History.* Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.

Kamakau, S. M. 1961. *Ruling Chiefs of Hawaii.* Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press.

———. 1964. *Ka Poʻe Kahiko. The People of Old.* B. P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 51. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.

Kenn, C. W. 1939. "Some Hawaiian Relationship Terms Re-examined." *Social Process in Hawaii* 5:46-50. Honolulu: Sociology Club of the University of Hawaii.

Kirtley, B. F. 1971. *A Motif-Index of Traditional Polynesian Narratiues.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Lehrman, P. R. 1927. "The Fantasy of Not Belonging to One's Family." *Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry* 16:1015-1023.

Lowie, R. H. 1930. "Adoption-Primitive." In *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences,* edited by K. A. Seligman. New York: Macmillan.

Luomala, K. 1940. "Notes on the Development of Polynesian Hero-Cycles." *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 49:367-374. Reprinted 1941 in *Polynesian Anthropological Studies,* Polynesian Society Memoir 17.

———. 1949. *Maui-of-a-Thousand-Tricks. His Oceanic and European Biographers.* B. P. Bishop Museum Bulletin 198. Honolulu: Bishop Museum.

———. 1955. *Voices on the Wind. Polynesian Myths and Chants.* Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.

———. 1961a. "A Dynamic in Oceanic Maui Myths: Visual Illustrations with Reference to Hawaiian Localization." *Fabula* 4:137-162.

———. 1961b. "The Fantasy of Distinguished Parentage in Polynesian Narratives" (abstract). In *Abstracts of Symposium Papers, 10th Pacific Science Congress,* p. 93. Honolulu.

Malo, D. 1951. *Hawaiian Antiquities (Moolelo Hawaii).* Translated by N. B. Emerson, 1890. B. P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 2. Second edition. Honolulu: Bishop Museum. First published in 1903, different pagination.

Mann, T. 1937. *Freud, Goethe,* Wagner. New York: A. A. Knopf.

Pogue, J. F. 1978. *Moolelo of Ancient Hawaii.* Translated by C. W. Kenn. Honolulu: Topgallant.

Pukui, M. K. 1933. *Hawaiian Folk Tales.* Publications of the Foundation, third series, no. 13. Poughkeepsie, N.Y.: Vassar Folk-lore Foundation.

Pukui, M. K., and S. H. Elbert. *1957. Hawaiian-English Dictionary.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Pukui, M. K., E. W. Haertig, and C. A. Lee. 1972. *Nānā i ke Kumu* (Look to the Source). 2 vols. Honolulu: Hui Hānai.

Rank, O. 1914. *The Myth of the Birth of the Hero.* New York: Nervous and Mental Disease Pub.

Rice, W. H. 1923. *Hawaiian Legends.* B. P. Bishop Museum Bulletin 3. Honolulu: Bishop Museum.

Smith, S. P. 1913. *Lore of the Whare Wananga.* 2 vols. Polynesian Society Memoirs 3 and 4. New Plymouth, N.Z.

Thrum, T. G. 1907. *Hawaiian Folk Tales.* Chicago: A. C. McClurg.

——. 1923. *More Hawaiian Folk Tales.* Chicago: A. C. McClurg.

Westervelt, W. D. 1915. *Legends of Gods and Ghosts.* Boston: Geo. E. Ellis.

Wilkes, C. 1856. *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition. 5* vols. New York: G. P. Putnam.