To Be or Not to Be, That Was Not the Question: A Rhetorical Study of Kalākaua’s Legends and Myths of Hawaii: The Fables and Folk-Lore of a Strange People

In 1898, Lee and Shepard, a partnership in Boston, published Queen Lydia Kamaka‘eha Lili‘uokalani’s Hawai‘i’s Story by Hawai‘i’s Queen, an English-language, conventionally Victorian autobiography written as part of her campaign to retrieve her crown from the United States, and the Provisional Government who had overthrown her. Many scholars have explored the political and cultural dimensions of the queen’s Story, and Lydia Kualapai offers a detailed overview of the text in her 2001 doctoral dissertation, “Cast in Print: The Nineteenth-Century Hawaiian Imaginary.” This paper, however, examines another royal text, written ten years before the queen’s book. In 1888, a New York publishing company run by Charles L. Webster and Samuel Langhorne Clemens printed King David La‘amea Kamanakapu‘u Mahinulani Nalaiaehuokalani Lumialani Kalākaua’s Legends and Myths of Hawaii, a handsome English-language, conventional anthropological text containing a detailed and illustrated history of the Hawaiian people, twenty-one separate Hawaiian legends, and a dictionary/glossary of Hawaiian words. In an 1885 letter to Clemens, Rollin Mallory Daggett, late U. S. Consol to Hawai‘i, explained that he had “collaborated with the King on a collection of ‘legends of love, chivalry and barbaric pomp, extending back over seven hundred years, and in a measure, connecting the
dynasties of that period” (Weisenburger 161). That Kalākaua was already working with Daggett on a book in 1885 is significant. Though published after the king was forced to sign the Bayonet Constitution of 1887, *Legends* can not be interpreted exclusively as a response to that event, but as part of a much longer, much more extensive, royal political strategy to preserve Hawaiian culture. Three years in the making, *Legends* is the product of gathering, careful compilation, extensive editing, and production. Like his sister’s *Story* then, Kalākaua’s book was part of the Hawaiian monarch’s efforts to maintain sovereignty by preventing Hawai‘i’s *haole* politicians from turning the kingdom over to the United States.

After providing a brief overview of Hawai‘i’s political, economic, and social climate in the mid-1880s, this essay examines Kalākaua’s other spectacles of political display during his reign; assesses Daggett’s contributions to *Legends and Myths*; discusses the motives of Samuel Clemens and Charles L. Webster for publishing Kalākaua’s book; conducts a rhetorical study of *Legends and Myths* as a text designed to convince American and other western readers of the king’s ability to lead Hawai‘i as a “civilized” ruler; reviews the book’s initial critical reception; and argues that even those who read and reviewed *Legends and Myths* appreciatively ultimately did not consider Kalākaua’s case to be significant or compelling enough to prevent Hawai‘i’s annexation by the United States.

I. Hawai‘i in the 1870s and 1880s, and Kalākaua’s Spectacles of Royal Displays

*Legends and Myths of Hawaii* was very much a product of its time. As king, Kalākaua was for Hawaiians the symbol and embodiment of their connection to the land and to their rights—essentially to their survival. As Jon Osorio writes, at this time, the “King was the Nation. A weakened king symbolized, therefore, a weakened nation” (438). Kalākaua’s reign
was both a concentrated effort to respond to the critical situation of his people, and an annoyance and a grave concern for haole politicians and businessmen. As the most powerful Hawaiian, Kalākaua sought to re-introduce all that was Hawaiian back into a society where the haole had tried to confine or stop such things, or employ them for their own uses: the ‘āina, the hula, the prestigious image of the king, and so on. In her introduction to Kalakaua: Hawaii’s Last King, Kristin Zambucka says that for foreign businessmen “to secure their hold on the people they had to obliterate all that was Hawaiian.” “How can you kill a culture and retain a people?”, Zambucka goes on to ask—and so, essentially, did Kalākaua (1). His reply was to labor unceasingly at restoring and strengthening his people by resurrecting and celebrating their culture.

Many grave matters in the kingdom required Kalākaua’s attention in 1874. Economic crises greeted his ascension in the form of crippling debt. Within three months the kingdom built up a debt of $84,700—a huge amount at the time. Politically, haole politicians had gained greater influence in the Legislature, and as a way of trying to satisfy them, Kalākaua negotiated the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, which not only shifted resources and power from himself to the sugar businessmen, but also made increasingly large numbers of plantation workers necessary. Between 1877 and 1890, over 55,000 workers immigrated to Hawai‘i. They brought such diseases as small pox and leprosy with them, and Hawaiians suffered severely from epidemics, accelerating the already swift declines in the native population. In “King Kalakaua: An International Perspective,” Nicholas Schweizer says, “The mortality rate of the Native people exceeded the birth rate with depressing regularity,” while “the small but vigorous Caucasian population kept growing just as steadily as the Native ranks were thinning” (107). Eleven years
before Kalākaua’s reign, in a letter to Secretary of State William Seward, U. S. Minister to Hawaii James McBryde warned that “The native population is decreasing so rapidly as to produce the general, if not universal belief that within a short period, say from 20-40 years, there will not be enough of them remaining to perpetuate this government.” McBryde concludes ominously: “This being the case, these islands must, of necessity, pass into other hands and their destiny controlled by other people” (Blount Report 153). In 1887, a group of haole business leaders, lawyers, and politicians who called themselves the Hawaiian League created the Bayonet Constitution, which essentially removed all governing power from Kalākaua. He lost the “right to appoint judges and justices, and the ministry was made responsible to the people, not to the King” (Doughtery 161).

In the preceding thirteen years, however, Kalākaua had adopted a variety of strategies to stop the colonization and loss of his kingdom. Many of these strategies involved legal, political, and personal negotiations, intrigues, and initiatives. For my purposes, however, the most significant were his spectacles of display, designed to convince those inside and outside of Hawai‘i that he possessed the intelligence and ability to lead, to revive Hawaiian culture, and to make other peoples and nations recognize Hawai‘i as an independent nation. First, he displayed himself, his people, and their culture to the world through events like the World Exhibitions. Second, he made a traveling spectacle of himself through public appearances and journeys. Third, he made a variety of visual reproductions of himself that his people—Hawaiians and haole alike—would see as assertions of his kingship. And finally, Kalākaua proclaims the beauty and dignity of his kingdom, and its forms of self-government, through music.

Immediately after the start of his reign, Kalākaua sought world recognition of himself as
the ruling sovereign of an independent nation by making sure Hawai‘i participated in various
world exhibitions. By sending Hawaiian products and artifacts to such exhibits, the king cleverly
countered western assumptions that Hawaiians were nothing but savages. Kalākaua noted that at
the 1876 exhibition held in Philadelphia as part of the Grand Centennial celebrations, which as
many as nine million people attended, “a separate department is reserved for every nation to be
represented at the Exhibition, and a place is reserved for Hawaii.” He insured “that all our
merchantable articles of product will be fully represented at Philadelphia, whereby we may
become better known in the world’s commerce” (“Exhibition Facts” and Allen 81-82). Kalākaua
also sent objects from his Hale Nauā Society, and portraits of the queen and himself, to the
international exhibit in Sydney in 1888, and he also sent materials to the Paris Exhibition
Universelle in 1899 (see Figures 1 and 2). By participating in these larger arenas of spectacle
and display, the king exhibited Hawai‘i as a separate entity, and as a world market competitor to
be recognized.

On more than one occasion, the king famously exported himself as a physical display of
Hawai‘i. In 1881, he becomes the first king to circumnavigate the globe. As he visited the
major intellectual centers of the world at this time, he was the cause of a continuous spectacle of
display, as powerful foreign leaders hosted extravagant dinners for him, welcomed him with
grand parades, and awarded him distinguished honors. In Japan, for instance, Kalākaua received
numerous Orders and Decorations from the Emperor. Recognizing that participating in this
international network required him to reciprocate, the King immediately created additional
classifications for Hawaiian Orders and Decorations (Greer 77). Over the course of his Tour, he
bestowed more than sixty-eight Orders and Decorations upon princes, emperors, dukes, kings,
queens, and even the Pope, as part of his efforts to strengthen foreign relations, to introduce Hawai‘i as a small competitor among powerful empires, and to present himself as king.

He did not neglect to make such displays back home as well. Nine years after election, Kalākaua crowned himself and Queen Kapi‘olani. The King organized an unprecedented two-week celebration, one of the greatest spectacles in all of Hawaiian history—his Coronation of 1883. Kalākaua ordered that the festivities should be elaborate. Intermingling Hawaiian and western achievements, ‘Iolani Palace, which had telephones in 1878, and electric lights by 1887, was also formally displayed to the public. One of the carefully designed micro-spectacles was the queen’s crown. While the king’s and queen’s regalia for the Coronation came from Europe, Kapi‘olani’s crown embodied the mixture of Hawaiian and western ways common to Kalākaua’s reign. Jewels prized by the west were set next to the kukui nut valued by Hawaiians, making the crown an intersection of cultural and political spectacles for Hawaiians and haole (see Figure 3).

Arranging for a variety of royal family pictures of himself and Queen Kapi‘olani was another astute political move on Kalākaua’s part. The king took full advantage of photography, an innovative medium of the time. In Colonial Photography and Exhibitions: Representations of the “Native” and the Making of European Identities, Anne Maxwell writes that “the Hawai‘ian royal family set out to appropriate European technologies and artistic practices for the purposes of resisting colonization” (192). According to Maxwell, these photos made possible “the release of imagery that proved that Hawai‘i’s traditional leaders had donned the mantle of modernity and could be trusted to set an example for their subjects. And in fact few nations’ leaders had worked as hard at appearing ‘civilized’ as Hawai‘i’s” (196). The photographs Kalākaua had taken record the desired substance of his image (see Figure 4). His gaze, posture, beard, and
Victorian aristocratic uniform all testify to Kalākaua’s “awareness that the body, appropriately attired and arrayed according to the latest dictates of fashion, was a powerful signifier of cultural and class identity in a society that was being increasingly mediated by visual apparatuses” (Maxwell 199).

After the classic manner of Caesar, Kalākaua also furnished coins and other emblems of government with images of himself and the queen (see Figures 5 and 6). By producing coins and postage stamps representing the queen, himself, and members of the Kamehameha family, Kalākaua insured that the people of Hawai‘i Nei would constantly encounter their sovereign. Perhaps the most compelling emblem of his sovereignty, however, was “Hawai‘i Pono‘i,” the national anthem Kalākaua personally composed for his nation. According to John Charlot, this anthem expressed “Kalakaua’s thought and policy: a unified nation structured in descending ranks; an activist king in the Kamehameha I tradition; a racial emphasis.” A “religious but non-Christian” composition, “Hawai‘i Pono‘i,” like so many postcontact works, seems to exploit the gap between Hawaiian and non-Hawaiian understanding.” Charlot explained that this “obfuscation is traditionally considered a skill in Polynesian literature and was one which, along with poetic genius and reflection, enabled Kalakaua to create the first truly original Hawaiian anthem” (22-23).

The various displays which Kalākaua staged were ultimately significant because they represented sites of struggle. Michael Vann asserted that Kalākaua’s Coronation lū‘au “serves as a testament to the struggle to control Hawaiian culture” (12). Kalākaua repeatedly framed himself as a “civilized” sovereign in photographs because he knew, as Anne McClintock explained, that “the majority of European photographers objectified, spectacularized and
eroticized colonized peoples by reducing them to stereotypes and banishing them to the timeless space of the ethnographic present” (64-65). All of Kalākaua’s notable achievements, however—his World Tour, the introduction of a mail system in Hawai‘i, his high visibility in the Masonic Lodge—are counter spectacles. In this sense, and with the passing of time, their urgency and elaboration increased. Desperate to save his kingdom from falling into non-Hawaiian hands, Kalākaua in the mid 1880s knew he had to reach a much larger, more influential audience by the most prestigious means. Realizing this makes it easier for us to understand what informs the creation of Legends.

II. Legends and Myths and Rollin M. Daggett

It was in 1888 that the King introduced to the world an impressive and elaborate response to his problems. Identified “by many contemporaries as one of the best versed men in the lore of his forefathers,” Kalākaua published for English speakers the first book composed exclusively of Hawaiian mythology (Rose 215; Leib 5). A brilliant and innovative attempt to defend and celebrate his people, the book demystified the origins of Hawaiians, and their ancient arts, beliefs, practices, and government as well. For this spectacle, the King arranged publication by one of the most prestigious publishing companies at this time, Webster and Co., in America’s publishing capital, New York. Webster and Co.’s list of recently published authors was impressive. 1885 saw the appearance of Ulysses S. Grant’s Personal Memoirs and Mark Twain’s Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. The memoirs of Michael Vincent Sheridan, Brigadier General, United States Army, had appeared in 1886, and by 1887, such famous figures as Henry Ward Beecher, U.S. Congressman Samuel Sullivan Cox, and Elizabeth Custer (wife of General George Armstrong Custer) had also signed with Webster. Finally, in 1888, Webster fulfilled its
claim to be the publishing house “only for Kings and full Generals” by printing Kalākaua’s Legends.

In his essay “Migration, Nationalism, and Identity in Hawaii,” Michael Vann claims that “under the guise of ethnology and cultural preservation, [Kalākaua’s] work had a political significance,” and also points to Glen Grant’s Foreword in Legends and Myths as further evidence that the political climate of the late 1880s profoundly shaped the text. We can be sure in this case that the audience for this display was not Kalākaua’s own people. At the time, Hawai‘i had the highest literacy rate in the entire world, and a wealth of written resources composed by and for the Hawaiian community, and published in the newspapers (“He Oia Mau No Kakou”). Hawaiians did not require an English text to revive their culture, if that had been his intention. Had his primary audience been Hawaiians, Hawaiian would be the most appropriate language for Kalākaua’s book. By writing and publishing Legends and Myths in English, he therefore identified his primary audience as non-Hawaiians living outside of Hawai‘i. In fact, while it appeared on the U.S. mainland immediately after publication, Legends and Myths only became available in Hawai‘i in the spring of 1889 (Forbes 296).

Though Kalākaua was clearly capitalizing on a widespread desire for exotic legends and myths from non-European peoples, the actual book provided a history of Hawaiians and an account of the present monarchy, once more demonstrating Jon Osorio’s claim that “Everything Kalākaua did was political” (Personal Interview. 5 March 2003). In fact, “Political and historical accounts make up over five-sixths of the book” (Leib and Day 14). The book presented Hawaiians as a civilized and distinct people with a distinguished history. Throughout, Kalākaua represented himself as a legitimate chiefly heir to the Hawaiian throne, leading his people
through a constitutional monarchy with judicial and legislative branches. The book’s specific audience was therefore presumably those westerners who had the power to oppose any foreign takeover of Hawai‘i.

The first edition of *Legends and Myths* listed Rollin Mallory Daggett as editor and author of the Introduction, and critics continue to debate how much of the text Kalākaua himself contributed. In his Introduction to the 1972 New Edition, Terence Barrow, a Bishop Museum curator from 1964 to 1968, said that “King Kalakaua relates the stories of certain great events with such verve that one can readily imagine he was an eyewitness” (5). But Martha W. Beckwith attributes the “admirable collections of the folk tales of Hawaii” to Daggett (295), and Thomas G. Thrum, a member of the Hawaiian League and dependably racist, observed that “there is much therein that is wholly foreign to ancient Hawaiian customs and thought” (vi). Amos Leib said that “unquestionably the king was familiar with many Hawaiian legends, and possessed genealogical material which was valuable in presenting some of the historical legends, but Daggett was probably the author” (13). Leib noted that in the preface, Kalākaua also credited Lili‘uokalani, John O. Dominis, Walter Gibson, and others for the legends in the text, and Leib even concluded that “to Gibson, Daggett was indebted for two previously published legends. Daggett failed entirely to credit [Rev. William] Ellis directly with the story of Pele and Kahawali. That he drew on Ellis directly or indirectly is obvious from a comparison of parallel passages” (13).

In fact, any attempt to discover how much Kalākaua contributed proves to be extremely difficult. The subject of the book itself created much of the confusion. How can identifying any single “source” be possible for ancient Hawaiian legends that had been orally conveyed
transgenerationally? As already mentioned, the Preface of *Legends* thanked Liliʻuokalani, John Dominis, and others. Daggett and Kalākaua did not, however, indicate whether these contributors provided their versions of legends or myths in a written or oral form, or in Hawaiian or English—and in any case, only Liliʻuokalani and Emma Nakuina Beckley are Hawaiian. Claims for the two names on the cover were also confusing. In his biography of Daggett, Francis Weisenburger claimed that while the King told the legends to Daggett, the American did the “writing, connecting the stories into a historical chain” (162). But the King’s credentials for the project seemed to be acknowledged on all sides. The Preface also thanks Abraham Fornander, “the learned author of “An Account of the Polynesian Race, its Origin and Migrations,”” who in his own Preface wrote that “Among Hawaiian authors and antiquarian literati, to whom I gratefully acknowledge my obligations, are, in the first place, his Majesty King KALAKAUAN, to whose personal courtesy and extensive erudition in Hawaiian antiquities I am indebted to for much valuable information” (v).

A closer look at the life of Rollin Daggett offered some clues as to the possible dynamics at work in the compilation of *Legends and Myths*. Prior to serving in Hawai‘i as U. S. Minister from 1882 to 1885, Daggett had significant experience in the literary and journalism fields. According to Weisenburger, Daggett wrote poetry and plays (88-89); co-edited the *Golden Era* in 1854 (22-23), said to have been “the most important journal ever published on the Pacific slope” (Walker 24); co-founded the *San Francisco Daily Evening Mirror* (47); reported for the *Territorial Enterprise* in 1862 (53); and authored *Braxton’s Bar: A Novel* (1882), which “demonstrates the vivid imagination and literary abilities of a talented writer” (27); and contributed to various magazines and journals (169). Along the way, he also clerked for the
U. S. Circuit and District Courts for Nevada (93), and served as a Congressman (102). During his time in Hawai‘i, Daggett began to study Hawaiian legends and traditions (158), and later published three different poems about Hawai‘i, one of which went through more than one edition. In 1883, his plans for retirement already included composing a historical text about Hawai‘i combined with myths featuring Kamehameha the Great (Goodman to Twain, 1883), and in November 1885, Daggett wrote to his good friend Samuel Clemens about a book which was already underway. Later that month, Daggett took a trip to the east coast with his wife, and Clemens invited him to meet in Hartford. Daggett showed Clemens a portion of the completed manuscript, and Clemens then wrote to his nephew, the manager of Clemens’ printing firm, Charles Webster, about Daggett’s proposal.

This book is clearly *Legends and Myths of Hawaii*, and Kalākaua is involved. Clemens puts it this way:

> R.M. Daggett, late U.S. Minister to the Sandwich Islands (an old friend of mine,)
> has submitted to me a book which I shall be very glad to have, under certain conditions. [. . .] It was constructed by Daggett & the king of the Sandwich Islands, working together, & consists of the (historical) Traditions & legends of the natives [. . .] & of course is very curious & *new*. (341)

This collaboration was the key to the book’s success. The “king’s name would boost sales,” and help the publishing house to keep up its standards as one that brought out books “only for Kings and full Generals.” He had already explained this to his friend:

> It is fresh ground, untouched, unworn, & full of romantic interests. I told Daggett that what was required for success was a *good* book; & that the other nine-tenths
of the requisite of success was that there should be a big name on the back of the good book. So I said that if he could get the King to let his name appear as part author, we wanted the book. (341)

Even at this early stage, Clemens knew pretty well down to the penny the relationship between the king and the book’s potential success: “Without the King’s name in connection with the volume, Daggett should get 15 per cent of the profits above cost [. . .]; with mention of the King in the Introduction as collaborator, 40 per cent of the profits; with both names on the title page as authors, 60 per cent of the profits” (Twain 341-42).

Clemens was clearly excited that the name of a personage such as the king’s would grace a Webster book cover, and he also had other ideas about how to market “His Hawaiian Majesty Kalakaua” as a spectacle. In the same letter to Webster, Clemens wrote that “With a sufficient concession from him [Kalākaua], I would rather have this book than any that is offering now. It can be fascinatingly illustrated” (341-42). Such illustrations would undoubtedly increase Legends’ appeal to America’s late nineteenth-century audiences, and to the artists themselves, for as Carl Dreppard explained, “our early print-sellers and makers were seemingly guided by two motives: one a desire to publish prints that were assured of a ready sale, and the other a desire to satisfy their personal whims” (175).

Following this meeting with Clemens, Daggett began advertising his new book. More importantly, he sent word to the king to speed his portion of the text (Weisenburger 162). When Webster eventually published The Legends and Myths of Hawaii: The Fables and Folk-Lore of a Strange People in 1888, “In his fifty-five page introduction, Daggett summarizes the physical characteristics of the islands, reviews the aboriginal manners and customs, modes of life,
implements and manufactures, discusses the ancient religion with its various divinities, and pays tribute to the work of Christian missionaries” (Weisenburger 163). But Kalākaua supposedly contributed the rest, and when Weisenburger said that Daggett hurried the king in doing his part, this at the very least confirmed that Kalākaua, independently of Daggett, had a part to do (162).

To what degree, then, was Kalākaua the book’s spectacle, and to what degree was he its author? As we had seen, according to Daggett’s biographer, the American produced Legends and Myths, and Beckwith, Thrum, and Leib agree with Weisenburger. What I would note here, however, is that this belief relied at least in part on an argument that as a Hawaiian, Kalākaua could not have written the English legends—that he was simply incapable of such an undertaking. Instead, I would like to proceed on the assumption that such opinions at the very least require us to remain open to alternative arguments. As David Stannard explained in Before the Horror, his detailed critique of historians’ estimates of the Hawaiian population at the time of contact, though the numbers themselves were important—Stannard countered the widespread 300,000 estimate with a claim of approximately one million (50)—the important factor here was that the Euroamerican historians had a personal stake in low population numbers. If there were only 300,000 Hawaiians in 1778, then the devastation caused by western contact becomes “not that bad.” I will therefore approach the issue of Kalākaua’s authorship of Legends and Myths by assuming that Kalākaua did produce the text he was credited with—that is, everything after the Introduction—and see whether this assumption sheds more light on the nature of the work itself.

V. Daggett? Kalākaua?

A comparison of the Introduction and the main body of Legends and Myths revealed distinct differences in content and style. Many of these differences arose from the writers’
conceptions of the work. In keeping with his many other activities, Kalākaua wanted to revive Hawaiian culture, to prove to the west that Hawaiians were “civilized” humans, and to demonstrate that he himself could efficiently lead his kingdom. Daggett, on the other hand, tended to see the book more as a literary project, coupled with heroic characters, and a nostalgia for the past (Weisenburger 161). Here, for instance, was Daggett’s initial description of Hawai‘i:

The legends are of a little archipelago which was unknown to the civilized world until the closing years of the last century, and of a people who for many centuries exchanged no word or product with the rest of mankind; who had lost all knowledge [. . . ] whose origin may be traced to the ancient Cushites of Arabia, and whose legends repeat the story of the Jewish genesis; who developed and passed through an age of chivalry somewhat more barbarous, perhaps, but scarcely less affluent in deeds of enterprise and valor than that which characterized the contemporaneous races of the continental world. (12)

This age of “chivalry” more closely resembled a fantasy world: “As the mind reverts to the past of the Hawaiian group, and dwells for a moment upon the shadowy history of its people, mighty forms rise and disappear—men of the stature of eight or nine feet, crowned with helmets of feathers and bearing spears thirty feet in length” (Daggett 12). And yet, despite this vision of a heroic golden age, Daggett also suggested that our supposed lack of information about pre-contact Hawai‘i means that virtually nothing had actually happened: “The traditions of the period are so meager as to leave the impression that it was one of uninterrupted peace, little having been preserved beyond the genealogies of the governing chiefs” (20). Daggett’s familiar romanticizing of a native people’s origins, and his celebrating of the Hawaiians as both warriors
and peaceful, happy people, give way, however, to Kalākaua’s very different account of Hawaiian history. While Daggett’s Hawaiians are the descendent of Cushites, Kalākaua’s people are deliberate travelers, with established origins and routes: “[T]he islands were first discovered and occupied by a people who had drifted from southern Asia to the islands of the Pacific in the first or second century of the Christian era, and, by migratory stages from the Figis to Samoa and thence to Tahiti, had reached the Hawaiian group in about A. D. 350” (70). This almost scientific precision accounts for the narrator’s careful separation of myth, history, and speculation: “Not withstanding the many sharply drawn and wonderfully preserved historic legends of Hawaii,” Kalākaua writes, “the early settlement of the archipelago is shrouded in mystery” (69). Faced with this shroud, Daggett invoked nine foot ghosts. Kalākaua, instead, referred to “sharply drawn and wonderfully preserved historic legends,” with an emphasis on whatever history was known.

Here, for instance, was his introduction to the book’s first legend, “Hina, the Helen of Hawaii”: That the tale may be better understood by the reader who may not be conversant with the legendary history of the Hawaiian Islands, it will be necessary to refer briefly to the political and social condition of the group at the time” (69). Those who have studied Kalākaua and the legends often comment on the king’s superb qualifications for recording Hawaiian legends and history. Barrow’s introduction to Legends noted that the King told the stories “with such verve that one can readily imagine he was an eyewitness. No doubt he had heard the same tales from the sons and daughters of those who had been present on occasions such as the death of Captain Cook” (5). This was in fact the case. According to biographer Helena Allen, Kalākaua had spent much of his youth with the prophetess and High Chiefess Liliha and his grandmother
Alapai, listening to stories about Liliha’s trip to England, and the extravagant ceremonies organized by Kamehameha II in honor of his father. As for Alapai, she passed on to Kalākaua “lessons and wisdom found in the legends handed down verbally from generation to generation through the mele. She told him of the kahuna and their wisdom in healing, bringing forth blessings, and helping the people to know their history. She was herself a kahuna (a woman of wisdom) and could pass on the art to him” (Allen 16). Long before the mid 1880s, Kalākaua was already collecting—and publishing—legends, genealogies, and mele in his Hawaiian newspaper, Ka Manawa, the first daily printed for Hawaiians, which appeared for two short months in 1870. The king and his sister were both students of Hawaiian history, genealogy, and tales, making Allen’s account of the move towards publication convincing: “By 1886 the collected legends and myths, and even more important, the recalled tales of Liliha and the history of Hawaii’s past, began to find their way into a publishable format through the help of United States Minister Daggett” (204). At least in terms of content, then the king was a culturally rich reservoir that Daggett would have to draw from and depend on, regardless of the king’s role in compiling Legends.

The legends themselves also seem grounded in Hawaiian knowledge and culture, even as they appealed to English-speaking foreign audiences. The account of “Lono and Kaikilani,” for example, was so romantic and dramatic that it resembled those nineteenth-century narratives set in an idealized feudal European society. But at the same time that the narrative suggested to western readers that they shared some similarities with Hawaiians, the legend also contained a Hawaiian ethos that evoked a profound cultural pride. In Kalākaua’s version, Lono, while sitting with his wife Kaikilani, heard a voice: “‘Ho, Kaikilani! Your lover, Heakekoa, is waiting for
you!” Lono accused his wife of infidelity and beat her. Leaving her bleeding on the beach, he angrily set sail and landed in Kailua, O‘ahu, where he did not reveal his royal lineage to anyone. After recovering from her injuries, Kaikilani longed for her husband, and sailed to each island to find him. She finally discovered him in Kailua:

Proceeding alone toward the royal mansion, with a fluttering heart she approached the enclosure, and through an opening the wall discerned the stalwart form of Lono. Stepping aside to avoid his gaze, she began to chant his mele inoa, the song of his own name. [...] He raised his head and listened, and, as the words of the mele floated to him, he recognized the voice of Kaikilani. Rising to his feet, with dignity he now addressed the king: “My royal brother, disguise is no longer necessary or fitting. I am Lonoikamakahiki, son of Keawenui and moi of Hawaii, and the gods have sent to me Kaikilani, my wife.” It is her voice that we now hear. Then, turning and approaching the wall behind which Kaikilani was standing, Lono began chanting her name, coupled with words of tenderness and reconciliation; then, springing over the obstruction, he clasped his faithful wife in his arms, and the past was forgiven and forgotten. (330)

This particular account showed how a legend can be addressed to a western audience while at the same time appealing to Hawaiian nationalistic pride. The western components included the literary, even melodramatic warrior, royal mansions, fluttering hearts, stalwart forms, people clasped in arms, and even pasts “forgiven or forgotten”—although who was actually doing the forgiving and forgetting here was a puzzle. And certainly the story followed the western tradition of “happily ever after,” something which Jon Osorio noted did not necessarily appeal to
the Hawaiian sense of romanticism (Personal Interview. 5 March 2003). But this legend also affirmed specific Hawaiian traditions of nobility. Noble lineage, as confirmed by name chants, was clearly important, and so too was the suggestion that the Hawaiian practice of chanting another’s *mele inoa* not only reunited lovers, but even restored Lono’s status as ali‘i.

A similar blend of Hawaiian and western narrative commentary could be seen in Kalākaua’s “The Tomb of Puupehe: A Legend of the Island of Lanai.” On March 6, 1867 the *Hawaiian Gazette* printed the legend “Tomb of Puupehe” and attributed it to a resident on Lāna‘i. In *Hawaiian Folk Tales*, published in 1907, Thrum supposedly borrowed this version, “The Tomb of Puupehe: A Legend of Lanai” from the *Gazette* (x). Kenneth Emory credited Walter Murray Gibson with the legend in *The Island of Lanai* (1924), and the prominence of Gibson here was interesting, since he was also thanked in Kalākaua’s book. In fact, the version printed in Thrum’s *Hawaiian Folk Tales* so clearly resembled the Kalākaua version that it would be fair to speculate that this was the legend attributed to Gibson in the Preface, and in their 1979 edition of *Hawaiian Legends in English*, Leib and Day also gave Gibson credit (63). In any case, if, the Thrum was a copy of the original printed in 1867 in the *Gazette*, we could compare the 1867-Thrum text and Kalākaua’s version in order to assess Kalākaua’s specific agendas in modifying the text. Under close examination, literally by placing both books side-by-side and reading line by line, the King’s version appeared more suspenseful, dramatic, and romantic.

The legend told of Puʻupehe, the daughter of the chief of Maui, whose unmatched beauty attracted Makakēhau, a warrior of Lāna‘i. Here a significant difference arose. While Thrum’s version said that Makakēhau won Puʻupehe as “the joint prize of love and war,” Kalākaua questioned this, since “Lanai was always a dependency of Maui in the past, and no direct wars
between the two islands are mentioned by tradition” (181 and 449). At least in this instance, then, the King’s knowledge actually led him to deromanticize the story, so that it will be historically accurate. Puʻupehe’s beauty draws Makakēhau to fall in love with her. One day Makakēhau left to fetch water, and secluded Puʻupehe in the cave of Malauea, fearing that other chiefs desired her. Since it was the season of kona, however, terrible rain and wind begin pounding the land. Makakēhau noticed that the waters rose, and will fill the cave of Malauea, where Puʻupehe waited for him. Makakēhau rushed to rescue his love, but could not save her. He erected a tomb in her honor, and placed her body in the tomb of Puʻupehe. He wailed his lament, then jumped from the high cliff of the tomb into the seas below.

The chief differences between Kalākaua’s and Thrum’s versions arose from Makakēhau’s failed rescue of Puʻupehe and in the legends’ conclusions. The Thrum version described Makakēhau’s flight this way:

He knew the storm would fill the cave with the sea and kill his love. He flung aside his calabashes of water and ran down the steep, then across the great valley and beyond its rim he rushed, through the buffetings of the storm, with an agonized heart, down the hill slope to the shore. The sea was up indeed. The yeasty foam of mad surging waves whitened the shore. The thundering buffet of the charging billows chorused with the howl of the tempest. Ah! where should Misty Eyes [Makakēhau] find his love in this blinding storm? (183)

The version in Kalākaua’s book proved more dramatic and suspenseful, as the italicized seemed to point out:
He knew the storm would fill the cave with a wild and sudden rush of waters, and destroy the life of his beautiful Puupehe. Every moment was precious. He flung aside his calabashes of water, and at the top of his speed started down the mountain. With mighty and rapid strides he crossed the great valley, where he met the coming storm in its fury. Over the rim he dashed with an agonized heart, and down the ragged slope of the kula to the shore, which the waves were already lashing in a voice of thunder. The sea was up indeed! The yeasty foam of surging, windrent billows whitened the cliffs, and the tempest chorussed the mad anthem of the battling waves. Oh! where should Misty Eyes seek for his love in the blinding storm? (451).

Kalākaua’s heightened rhetoric emphasized the dramatic, romantic, and anxious nature of Makakēhau’s doomed flight to rescue Pu‘upehe. Here his western audience could recognize familiar themes of love, loss/separation, tragic accidents, and the desire for reunion through death, found in works like Shakespeare’s Romeo and Juliet.

In Thrum’s version, Makakēhau lamented the death of Pu‘upehe and then killed himself this way: “Ceasing his sad wail, Makakehau leaped from the rock into the boiling surge at its base, where his body was crushed in the breakers. The people who beheld the sad scene secured the mangled corpse and buried it with respect in the kupapau of Manele” (185). Once again, the ending in Kalākaua’s book heightened the prose to increase the sympathy for Makakēhau:

Ceasing his sad wail, Makakehau gazed for a moment upon the grave where were buried the light and hope of his life, and then leaped from the rock into the boiling surge at its base. His body was crushed in the breakers. The witnesses of the
sacrifice secured the mangled remains of the dead lover, and interred them with respect in the kupapau of Manele. (452)

The added last gaze, the term “sacrifice,” the reference to the “dead lover,” and even the “interred remains” stressed the elevation and tragic nature of the love. Kalākaua, however, intensified things even further by adding a sentence testifying to the story’s truth: “This is the story told by the old bards of Lanai of the lonely rock of Puupehe, and the still inaccessible summit, with the marks of a grave upon it, attests with reasonable certainty that the mele has something of a foundation in fact” (452). Here, Kalākaua said two things to his western readers. First, the reference to old Lāna‘i storytellers suggested that this legend had been passed down through generations, preserving an important story. But second, the fact that Pu’upehe still was an “inaccessible summit with the marks of a grave upon it,” suggested that the legend, and perhaps other legends, in Kalākaua’s book were in fact true. The king actually began to tap into the curiosity of his readers. “How can this impossible grave exist,” he asked, “Unless the remarkable story I’ve told you is true?”

Textual comparisons of the Introduction and the legends therefore suggested that two separate agendas were at work. While Daggett wrote his own version of the origins of Hawaiians, Kalākaua corrected Daggett’s account. In doing so, Kalākaua said that he would not allow another foreigner to tell his version of Hawaiian history. A look at the language of the king’s legends further confirmed his agenda in appealing to western readers while also communicating specific Hawaiian cultural practices. Though the book’s audience recognized the drama, romance, and “happily ever after” theme of “Lono and Kaikilani,” it also learned of name chants and lineage. Similarly, comparing the King’s version of “The Tomb of Puupehe” with the
earlier version also showed that the book was a political maneuver for the king, since its changes not only enhanced the story for western readers who enjoyed suspense and romance, but also connected the details to specific, still existing landmarks and people. The architecture or compilation of *Legends and Myths*, then, revealed that even at those moments when he seemed to be responding most to western audience expectations, Kalākaua was still at work at convincing western readers, who may have the ability to keep the crown in Hawaiian hands, that he possessed the intelligence to reign over Hawai‘i, that Hawai‘i and the west shared similarities, and that Hawaiians should be recognized as interesting, legitimate, civilized people.

### III. Selling *Legends and Myths*: The Appeal to the Market

The physical format, price, and marketing of Kalākaua’s book also revealed how carefully and thoughtfully his work was being presented to an upper class, western audience outside of Hawai‘i. *Legends* was clearly one of Webster’s featured texts. The $3.50 selling price in 1888 was identical to what Webster charged for Mark Twain’s *A Journey around the World* in 1899, in a “fine Cloth, Gold and Color Design” edition (see Figure 7). Webster was in fact famous for its claims of superior quality. Its salesmen read from scripts about how good Webster’s books were—and not just the writing: “Our artists, who are mentioned in the opposite page, are in the foremost rank of American illustrators” (“The Illustrations”). That salesmen went door to door soliciting subscriptions also suggested something about Webster’s claims to quality: “Selling MT's [Mark Twain’s] books by subscription meant that they cost about three times as much as comparable trade books” (“Bliss’ Book List”). These high prices were part of Webster’s appeal to an upper class buying public. Since “the price of a subscription book, at least two or three times higher than trade novels, and thirty or forty times higher than a dime
novel or a pirated newsprint edition of a foreign novel, suggests that his audience was still bourgeois,” Webster instructed his salesmen “to begin their canvass with the elite leaders of the communities:” “doctors, judges, ministers, and so on” (“Identifying the Audience”). Books such as *Legends* therefore were represented as the best quality literature available, sold in a fashion that consciously appealed to the economic elite. Unfortunately, at least financially, *Legends* did not meet expectations. Perhaps because Clemens offered Daggett sixty percent of the profits if Kalākaua’s name appeared on the book cover, Webster failed to make a large profit from the book. Albert Payne noted that *Legends* “barely paid for the cost of manufacture,” and Jack Nelson added that “although it was well received, it was not a financial success and contributed to the difficulties of Twain’s firm” (etext).

The front cover suggested how careful and calculated the appeal to an elite audience was. An original copy of Kalākaua’s book was a thick, mustard-colored cloth, hardback volume of 522 pages. The book’s spine listed the king as author of the collection—“By His Hawaiian Majesty Kalakaua”—and lower on the book’s spine, readers saw “Edited By Hon. R.M. Daggett.” Printed at the very top of the spine was a stone battle-axe, like the one illustrated in Daggett’s Introduction (13). On the cover, gold gilt appeared in a self consciously archaic calligraphy that seemed to separate *Legends and Myths of Hawaii* from other western books at this time. And so too did the heathenish, almost stereotypically comical drawing on the front cover—an initial confirmation, at least, of the western reader’s expectations. Also found in Daggett’s Introduction, this picture depicted a “Meeting Place of an Ancient Secret Society,” taken “from a painting in the Royal Palace” (52). According to ‘Iolani Palace curator Stuart Ching, this painting was a nineteenth-century watercolor by Robert C. Barnfield (1855-1893),
that did at one time hang in ‘Iolani Palace (Miura email) (see Figure 8). Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum librarians had several renditions, including two entitled “Ancient Hawaii. Place of Worship” from the late 1800s, as well as the A.C. Warren engraving in Daggett’s Introduction, taken from Barnfield’s painting in the palace. In his 1982-83 exhibit “Hawaii: The Royal Isles,” Roger Rose explained how Barnfield’s painting came to be:

The scene actually depicts the Royal Mausoleum at Hale-o-Keawe which Ellis visited in 1779 [. . . .] Barnfield’s rather grotesque copy is one of several works Kalakaua commissioned the English artist to reproduce from late 18th- and early 19th-century historic voyages during his eight-year residence in Honolulu.

Kalakaua hung some of the works, including this one, in ‘Iolani Palace, exhibiting eleven others of similar nature at the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1889. (216)

Barnfield copied “Meeting Place of an Ancient Secret Society” from a sketch by surgeon William Ellis. As part of Captain Cook’s third voyage to Hawai‘i, Ellis drew “A View of a Morai at Owhyhee” while at Kealakekua Bay. Published in 1781 by G. Robinson in London, the drawing appeared in An Authentic Narrative of a Voyage Performed by Captain Cook and Captain Clerke, in His Majesty’s Ships Resolution and Discovery During the Years 1776, 1777, 1778, 1779, and 1780. Ellis also provided a written account of Hale o Keawe:

The heiau at Honaunau was of a special type apparently to Hawaii. It was a puuhonua or heiau of refuge for the guilty fugitive, the noncombatant in war, and even the defeated soldier. Sanctuary was given to those who reached the temple precincts until they were cleared of guilt or safe from war. A charnel house at
Honaunau named *Hale o Keawe* was a sacred depository for the bones of departed kings and chiefs. (152-157)

In a journal entry written in Hawai‘i on Tuesday, August 31, 1886, Barnfield recorded that he “got the Vol. of Plates to Capt. Cook’s Voyages.” The next day he “called at Govt Library for the volume of Plates of Cooks [sic] Voyages & took it to show the King, stayed there about half an hour [. . .] His Majesty desires me to make copies in color of all the Hawaiian views in Cook’s book” (11). Although Barnfield also obtained a copy of *The Voyage of the Blonde* which contained artist Robert Dampier’s sketches of the same heiau, it was clear that the Ellis’ illustration was the source for the painting.

Barnfield’s whole project suggested something about Kalākaua’s overall strategies of display. Roger Rose suggested that by sending to the Paris Exhibit “eleven” other paintings “of similar nature” to “Meeting Place of an Ancient Secret Society,” Kalākaua was seeking to “establish legitimacy and lend precedence to his own Hale Naua Society,” the organization established to preserve and present Hawaiian culture (216). Furthermore, by commissioning these paintings of western images, recorded at the moment that the sacred sites began to lose their power, Kalākaua was also contributing to the dismantling of Hawaiian images. Like the banishment of the kapu system, Barnfield’s rendition of the heiau in a sense denied its sacred meaning, and replaced it with caricature and buffoonery. Of course, like most eighteenth-, nineteenth-, and early twentieth-century artists, when painting the heiau, Barnfield incorporated his own distanced perspective. For Kalākaua to hang Barnfield’s painting and others in ‘Iolani Palace, to send eleven of them to a world exhibition, and even to pick a Barnfield image for his book suggested, however, that by taking charge of distributing western images of Hawai‘i to the
world, Kalākaua was also establishing himself as the arbitrator of what was an appropriate debunking of pre-contact practices. The king was clearly investing money, time, and thought into selecting the images that will show Hawai‘i to the world.

Another image of Hale o Keawe, which Barnfield also knew, further informed us of the significance that this place had for Kalākaua, and Hawaiians. Robert Dampier drew his sketch of the Hōnaunau heiau in 1825. Dampier visited the actual heiau on the Blonde before its departure for England on July 18, 1825, and described his initial encounter with Hale o Keawe this way:

After rowing round one of the points forming the bay of Karakakooa [Kealakekua], the Morai suddenly opened upon our view: it was very prettily situated on the banks of a winding creek, & in the neighborhood of a grove of cocoanut trees. The exterior [. . .] was precisely like the larger huts of the superior chiefs [. . .] encircled by a strong Palisadoe of trunks of cocoanut trees. The fence formed a sort of court yard round the Morai. Here in all directions were planted rude looking carved wooden images, of all shapes & dimensions, whose misshapen forms & hideous countenances, exhibited a most grotesque spectacle. [. . .] Under these were deposited the bones of mighty kings & potent warriors, Sandwich heroes of other days, who once revered & worshipped these grim looking Idols as their Penates. (67).

What was especially striking about Dampier’s account, however, was that like his drawing, it was the last representation we had of Hale o Keawe before it was dismantled:

[I]t was made known to [the old priest at the heiau] that Lord Byron had procured Pitts to consent to possess himself with the persons of as many Gods as he desired
[. . .] the rapacious inclinations of our party suddenly began to manifest themselves [. . .] I threw aside my pencil, & regardless of the divine punishment attending such shameless sacrilege, took ample share in the depopulation of this ancient sanctuary. (67)

Another valuable aspect of Dampier’s record was that both his sketch and description of the heiau suggested that it was much larger in fact than Ellis’ drawing outlined. Therefore, the size and the significance of its destruction were both part of the image’s meaning.

In some form, Barnfield’s picture was the source for A. C. Warren’s high quality engraving that appeared in Daggett’s introduction to *Legends*. Though it is possible, I suppose, that Warren saw the original painting here in the islands—if he ever visited—he probably was working from a copy he consulted on the mainland. An anonymous copy very similar to Barnfield’s painting, which according to DeSoto Brown comes from a lantern slide purchased by photographer Christian Hedemann in the 1890s, can be found in Bishop Museum Archives. Brown also remarked that it was highly unlikely that the original Barnfield painting was sent to Warren, and suggested that Warren most likely made his engraving from a photograph copy of “Meeting Place of An Ancient Secret Society” (Personal Interview. 18 March 2003). Warren’s participation in the book project further confirmed the level of quality Webster set for itself and *Legends*. In late nineteenth-century America art, A. C. Warren was well known for his fine craftsmanship. Warren contributed nine elaborate steel engravings to the 1874 *Picturesque America*, a 1,144 page royal quarto containing “forty-nine steel-engraved plates and hundreds of wood-engraved full-page pictures and smaller text illustrations.” Critics hailed this text as “an unsurpassed product of the maturity of American wood engraving” and “a high point of
American steel engraving” (Moritz 35). Confirmed as one of the best, Warren brought sophistication and prestige to engraving, Webster and Legends. And yet, despite the royal authorship and illustration selection, the upper class, prestigious publishing firm, and the highly skilled engraver, the resulting image was more stereotypic and exoticized than the original Ellis drawing, or even the Dampier sketch, in its depiction of a heiau for western audiences. As engraved by Warren, the masks seemed to be comical and crude, suggesting that precontact Hawaiian culture was exotic and primitive. Daggett’s caption, “Meeting Place of an Ancient Secret Society,” could also be read as invoking cultish and heathenish associations, although Roger Rose’s suggestion of an allusion to Hale Nauā should be kept in mind. The fact that Barnfield’s painting may hang in a royal palace hardly suggested that Hawaiian monarchs like Kalākaua associated themselves with these apparently dark practices. Instead, the picture functioned as deliberate spectacle. In The Society of the Spectacle, Guy Debord argued the following:

The spectacle appears at once as society itself, as a part of society and as a means of unification. As a part of society, it is that sector where all attention, all consciousness, converges. Being isolated, and precisely for that reason, this sector is the locus of illusion and false consciousness; the unity it imposes is merely the official language of generalized separation. The spectacle is not a collection of images; rather, it is a social relationship between people that is mediated by images. (Mirzoeff 142)

That this cover picture came to stand preeminently for Hawai‘i’s culture suggested something about the ways that western publishers used illustrations to advertise a non-western people.
Furthermore, though the picture’s presence perhaps related in some way to one of the Hawaiian legends in the book, and though the engraving of the painting did appear in the Introduction, it remained isolated without any explanation in the text. What then accounted for this apparent contradiction between the emblem, and my suggestion that the book sought to de-exoticize Hawai‘i and Hawaiian culture? I would argue that the nature of nineteenth-century publishing meant that you could not entirely tell a book by its cover—or even by its illustrations.

To return to the issue of marketing, the way Webster generated sales of its books had a great deal of influence on the cover illustration. Webster sold books by subscription, and “The point of the subscription system was to sell a book before it was published. It was MT’s policy, in fact, not to publish a work until 40,000 copies had been sold” (“The Sales Prospectus”). Part of the subscription sales strategy involved producing various sales prospecti. A typical prospectus “was put together by a publisher out of sample pages from a forthcoming book. It was designed to catch a consumer's eye, so the cover was often quite fancy” (“The Sales Prospectus”). As Railton explained:

A prospectus re-presents the work of literature as a commodity in a very blunt way [. . .]. MT and his publishers were perfectly willing to mislead potential readers. The main goal was to suggest how much, in size and weight as well as amusement and instruction, buyers will get for their money. Little effort was made to preserve anything like the aesthetic integrity of a work, so that, for example, the prospectus of Innocents Abroad features in the beginning many serious full-page illustrations of scenes from the Holy Land, even though the narrative doesn’t get there until the end, and even though MT’s text treats those
same scenes in a very different spirit. Religious works were an early staple of subscription firms, and an agent could use the prospectus of *Innocents* to sell the book that way. (“The Sales Prospectus”)

Given this business practice, Webster’s manipulation of Ellis’ original drawing could be interpreted as a marketing scheme—and one not even intended to reflect the book’s contents accurately. Seeking large profits by attracting numerous buyers, Webster most likely chose the most striking illustrations and stereotypes from the text, including the stone battle axe on the book’s spine, to lure curious readers.

Another form of display, one that Kalākaua had far more control of, was also at work when the reader looked inside. The various images of war—the warrior heads at the secret meeting place, and the battle-axe on the spine—are dispelled when the reader opened the book, and immediately confronted a majestic and stately portrait of King Kalākaua, with his signature at the bottom. The king appeared in an ornate European style uniform, strongly establishing his ties to western nobility. Throughout his reign, Kalākaua worked hard to sustain this link.

Michael Vann noted that the king’s “body was regularly adorned with various crosses and medallions based upon European motifs” (66). Comparing the first edition with more recent editions of *Legends and Myths* showed that the original volume was far more concerned with presenting the king. In the 1888 edition, Kalākaua’s majestic portrait and signature at the bottom was the first thing to greet the reader. The title page, with “New York: Charles L. Webster and Company 1888,” followed the king’s picture on the right, with the copyright information, “1887 By Charles L. Webster & Co. H.J. Hewitt, Printer & Electrotyper, 27 Rose St., NY” on the back of that page. The Preface came next, followed by a map of Hawai‘i, and then the Table of
Contents. Once the book was open, then, the celebrity emphasis became clear. The king came first, and then the publishing house. Daggett’s preface followed, with the actual representation of Hawai‘i, the map, coming last, just before the Table of Contents. The 1972 *Legends and Myths* reprinting suggested how priorities had changed. Instead of the exotic totemic “Meeting Place of an Ancient Secret Society,” the front cover reproduced a single carved pre-contact woman figure. The title was enormous, while the royal author’s name seemed to have shrunk—it was the least significant thing on the cover. Inside, the portrait followed the title page, diminishing the effect of Kalākaua’s physical presence as the compiler, as the author, and as the ruling king of Hawai‘i. The Table of Contents now preceded both Barrow’s Introduction to the New Edition and Daggett’s Introduction, which seemed more like prefacing material than important content. It was the legends, not the author and the editor, that matter. And the place—the map now preceded Daggett.

**IV. *Legends and Myths*: Parallels and Distinctions**

In its method of presentation Kalākaua’s book functioned much like other folklore and anthropological books during the nineteenth-century whose authors employed western methods of scholarship to present fairy tales, creation and origin myths, and legends as a way to unfold the beginnings of different peoples. The king would have been familiar with legends of origin published by Europeans, and Scandinavians especially. Similarly, through Hawaiian legends of origin and history, Kalākaua showed what made Hawaiians distinct from other peoples. In other ways, Kalākaua’s book mirrored the work of authors like the brothers Grimm, who published their first book of folk tales in 1812. The Grimms’ source was also the current possessors of oral tradition, that long chain that parents added to by passing their stories on to children. The
Grimms had a special interest in stories that included Germany and German culture (“The True Story of the Real Brothers Grimm”), with Jack Zipes going so far as to accuse the brothers of creating the folk tales “in order to dupe the general public in the name of nationalism” (xvii). Kalākaua announced that “any great people have a history,” and he presented his book as confirmation that the relationship between the Hawaiian past and present was a noble and intelligent history. In her own preface explaining the publication of the “Kumulipo,” Lili’uokalani wrote that the creation chant “may also be of value to genealogists and scientific men of a few societies to which a copy will be forwarded. The folk-lore or traditions of an aboriginal people have of late years been considered of inestimable value” (375). Kalākaua participated as well in this western, academic, and scholarly discourse by writing Legends, and therefore contributing his own people to the dialogue. Legends and Myths of Hawaii was part of that diverse group of collections recording English fairy tales and other folk tales (1890), the creation and origin myths of the Blackfoot (1908), the myths and legends of China (1922), and the African Genesis (1937) (“Folklore and Mythology Electronic Texts”).

Part of this project, however, seemed to require validating the new contributors by stressing their resemblances to the revered classical myths. Kalākaua plainly and repeatedly asserted that Polynesian and Greek legends “resemble each other” (69). Kalākaua’s Table of Contents explicitly linked six legends to European characters, social institutions, and even religious concepts: “Hina, the Helen of Hawaii,” “The Royal Hunchback,” “The Apotheosis of Pele,” “Umi, the Peasant Prince of Hawaii,” “Kaiana, the Last of the Hawaiian Knights,” and “Lohiau, the Lover of a Goddess.” By appropriating the terms of specific, well-known and appreciated western narratives in this way, alien texts became not only familiar, but enticing as
well. And reader interest was the key concern. The Preface announced that “Those following have been selected as the most striking and characteristic of what remains of the fabulous folklore of the Hawaiian group” (7). These chosen legends presented Hawaiian culture in all its western glory—a land of chivalry, romance, tragic justice, and deities affecting human fortunes.

In the next few lines the king set out to accomplish several tasks. Through his own words, Kalākaua presented himself as the readers’ informed guide and translator. Well-versed in Greek mythology, he acknowledged this tradition’s comprehensiveness, while insisting on his own culture’s affinities with classical narrative traditions: “The story of the Iliad is a dramatic record of the love and hate, wrong and revenge, courage and custom, passion and superstition, of mythical Greece, and embraces in a single brilliant recital events which the historic bards of other lands, lacking the genius of Homer, have sent down the centuries in fragments” (69). Such easy displays of learning disproved any charges of savagery that hostile outsiders might direct at him or Hawaiians. Classical Greece and ancient Hawai‘i had similar stories, archetypes, character types, and thinking, and Hawai‘i’s legends, like Greece’s, testified to a sacred and organized history that needed to be recognized and respected.

Underlying these comparative discussions was an explicitly humanist agenda: “Human nature has been substantially the same in all ages,” Kalākaua asserted, “differing only in the ardor of its passions and appetites, as affected by the zone of its habitat and its peculiar physical surroundings” (69). His entire pattern of allusion within the chapter titles and subtitles, and his discussion of classical Greek myths, provided ways for the western reader to identify with the narratives and figures. “Hina, the Helen of Hawaii,” for example, immediately placed the western audience in a comfort zone. The Iliad plot was so familiar that the reader practically
knew the story before reading it. Another rhetorical device Kalākaua used was to provide a Character List on the page facing the first page of the legend (see Figure 9). Such lists made the legend itself physically resemble the format of a western Classical, Elizabethan, or contemporary play. Further linking Hawaiians to the audience, Kalākaua declared that “Hence almost every nation, barbarous and civilized, has had its Helen and its Troy, its Paris and its Agamemnon, its Hector and its demi-gods; and Hawaii is not an exception” (69). Given the shared legacy of legendary warlike and humane heroes and heroines, Hawaiians were no more savages than those people who considered Greek classical mythology as part of their own traditions.

The subtitle for this legend—“A Story of Hawaiian Chivalry in the Twelfth Century” established further cultural links. In an English speaking tradition, the words “chivalry” and “twelfth century” invoked Camelot, King Arthur, and knights in shining armor—the whole European medieval tradition. Given the nineteenth-century’s nostalgic attitudes about this period, Kalākaua’s strategy here tied Hawaiian narratives to the most loved narratives in the western tradition. “Chivalry” also implicitly denied that Hawaiians were savages, since the term implied brave fighting in the name of honor and justice. The narrative parallel between the “Helen of Troy” and “Hina, the Helen of Hawaii” were striking, going far beyond the theme of unsurpassed beauty. In the case of Helen, “the larger story is involved with the people around her, their rise and fall.” In fact, “In most accounts of her final years she was not even made to pay for her part in the calamity that touched virtually every family in Greece” (“About Helen of Troy”). Similarly, Hina’s unmatched beauty served as an element in a story that actually concentrated on the bravery of fearless warriors such as Kaupe‘epe‘e, her captor, and Nīheu, her son.
The legend itself, however, has as much to say about Hawai‘i’s current situation as it did about classical myth. A warrior in the ancestral line of the first group of migrants to Hawai‘i, Kaupe‘epe‘e detested those alien chiefs who came to conquer the islands. In fact, “so profound was his detestation of the alien chiefs that he resolved to devote his life to such warfare as he might be able to make upon them and their subjects” (72). Hina herself came from the line of the Paumakua family, some of those hated later arrivals who landed in Hawaii in approximately A. D. 1090 (71). In this legend, then, Kalākaua showed western readers that Hawaiians (Kaupe‘epe‘e) may like a foreigner (Hina), may even fall in love with and marry a foreigner, but still recognized the foreigner as such. The story and Kalākaua both distinguished those foreigners who came to Hawai‘i to conquer the land for themselves from those indigenous Hawaiians who already claimed an ownership over the land. By stressing how his main character fondly welcomed some foreigners but resisted those who amorally sought to intrude, to steal, to disturb the peace of the islands, and to kill its people, Kalākaua provided a story of how a threatened Hawaiian culture could be seen to accept and reject the influences of foreigners. It was not the fact that the people were from elsewhere, but their intentions, then provoked love or hate. Kalākaua’s assertion of his right to pick and choose which influences were welcomed also informed the publication in 1889 of He Kumulipo no Kaii Mamo a ia Alapai Wahine, an account of the creation of the world. Here the king firmly stated that Hawaiians were born of gods and that Hawaiians accepted the process of evolution—a claim that troubled the Christian Church greatly. Such deliberate and specific acts were examples of how Kalākaua used narrative to voice his opposition to specific kinds of foreign infiltration in the islands (Osorio, Jonathan. Personal Interview. 5 March 2003).
And yet, such a conclusion hardly jumped out of the text, because Kalākaua’s actual narrative was such a dense blend of Hawaiian lore and western literary methods for representing the exotic. Here was the description of Kaupe‘epe‘e’s Moloka‘i palace, where he imprisoned Hina:

The large private room of the three communicating apartments, the one designed for her personal occupation, was a model of barbaric taste and comfort, and to its adornment many of the exposed districts of Oahu and Maui had unwillingly contributed. Its walls were tapestried with finely-woven and brilliantly-colored mattings, dropped from festoons of shells and underlapping a carpet of hardier material covering the level ground-floor. The beams of the ceiling were also studded with shells and gaudily stained. [ . . . ] Light was admitted through two small openings immediately under the eaves, and from the door when its heavy curtains were looped aside. (79-80)

Despite the references to shells—and perhaps matting—this example of “barbaric taste and comfort” was more like a Persian harem than a Moloka‘i hale (see Figure 10). Here pre-contact Hawaiians resembled those Middle Eastern peoples whom westerners found fascinatingly exotic, and orientalized in their accounts. In fact, the illustration provided in Legends entitled “Type of Ancient King in State,” which had the curtains, doors, and sumptuousness described above, was almost certainly a picture of the interior of the nineteenth-century Opera House, across the street from ‘Iolani Palace in Honolulu. Nor should this representation of Kaupe‘epe‘e’s palace be surprising, since it was typical of publishing practices of Kalākaua’s time. According to Brown,
when Webster needed an illustration for Legends, the publisher would have generally been satisfied with any high quality illustrations, so long as they vaguely seemed to be suitable.

The last example of Kalākaua’s efforts to share his culture with western readers took the form of an Appendix (see Figure 11). The book’s last eight pages provided a glossary to the Hawaiian Legends with an Explanatory Note, and an introduction to basic Hawaiian words and concepts. An account of the Hawaiian alphabet was followed by a word list, running from A and ending with Z, that supplied Hawaiian words with English translations. The Hawaiian words for cardinal numbers, the names of the twelve months of the year, and the names of the days in a month followed. Clearly writing a book for a western audience unfamiliar with the Hawaiian language, Kalākaua provided an almost scholarly apparatus to display Hawaiian as a specific, highly-structured, but translatable language.

This Appendix was only the last in a series of strategies that together made Legends a coherent and effective argument that Hawaiians were a civilized people with their own divine origins and history, recorded in legends not only similar to the stories of the western classical traditions, but also to those recorded by the Brothers Grimm and other scholars at this time. In addition, this project confirmed Osorio’s claim that “everything Kalākaua did was political” (Personal Interview. 5 March 2003). Considering the chaotic political climate of Hawai‘i during his time, Kalākaua’s book was also an appeal for support from an upper class, wealthy, politically knowledgeable, white Euroamerican public, who was perhaps able to influence America’s relations with the Hawaiian kingdom.
V. Reviews of *Legends and Myths* by Nineteenth-Century Mainland American Newspapers

While some reviews of *Legends and Myths* simply praised it—San Francisco’s *Bulletin* called it a “most important contribution to the recorded folk-lore of the world” (qtd. in Weisenburger 163)—most reviews in mainland newspapers tended to admire the book from a position I will call “distanced-privileging.” No matter how positive, these American and European critics assumed themselves to be part of the world’s most advanced society, and evaluated accounts of other cultures in terms of how far along they were in the same historical continuum that ultimately led to American and European society. An extensive review in an 1889 edition of the *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune* even identified the precise moment in western history that Hawai‘i had reached:

> One hesitates to apply the word “savages” to the Polynesians whose heroic and amorous adventures are recounted with a wealth and grace of fancy, a dramatic skill of arrangement, and a pervading poetry and picturesqueness which entitle them to a rank with the best of those stories of the Middle Ages which we are accustomed to regard as marking decided progress from barbarism.

The reviewer’s account of Hawai‘i seemed to fit perfectly with Kalākaua’s agenda for the text. Clearly, Hawai‘i was not just a source for fantastic tales, but a complex, sophisticated, “civilized” culture:

> These legends are by no means stories of merely savage life. The people who furnished the outlines equally with their successors whose lively imaginations clothed with the brilliant hues of romance, were assuredly very far in advance of the savage state. They possessed what must properly be termed a civilization.
They had a settled government, an organized religion, clearly defined classes and occupations, standing armies, arts and industries, a military science, and perhaps as important and fertile a tradition of the kind which precedes and furnishes the germs of literature as many of the Oriental peoples in the same general stage of progress are known to have evolved.

Even Kalākaua’s efforts to link Hawai‘i’s legends, tales, and history to the high parts of European medievalism, as celebrated in the nineteenth-century, had clearly been successful. Hawaiian “civilization stands out conspicuously for enlightenment and humanity when compared with that of many semi-barbarous peoples, and the chivalry, love of military power, pride, sense of personal honor, and above all, elevated sentiment of love, which are exhibited throughout their legends, loses nothing by the closest comparison with European medieval traditions.”

And yet, through such comparisons, even positive reviews presented Hawai‘i’s legends as artifacts of the past. In Europe’s case, the medieval world turned eventually into our modern, developed, civilized world. What was disturbing here was that the reviewers often assumed that Hawai‘i’s fate was not to develop, but to disappear. As the Semi-Weekly Tribune writer put it, “the entire series of stories is of value and interest, and when we consider how steadily and with what fearful rapidity the people of Hawaii are approaching extinction under the influence of Western civilization, it is matter for thankfulness that so much of their tradition and folk-lore has been thus preserved and given permanent and even admirable literary form.”

An 1889 review of Legends and Myths in The Dial addressed even more directly Kalākaua’s agenda to present himself as a worthy and competent ruler. After noting that “Traveller’s tales and newspaper reports have not prepared us to expect much of good from his
Hawaiian Majesty Kalakaua,” the reviewer remarked that despite the king’s “failings as a man or a sovereign, he has certainly done a good service to his country as author of ‘The Legends and Myths of Hawaii.’” But here too, the value of the book seemed to be directly related to the pace of Hawaiians’ extinction. *The Dial* gave thanks that someone of Kalākaua’s abilities was presiding over the culture’s disappearance: “That he should be one of their own royal family while yet the race retains some semblance of authority in the fair land of its fathers, and before it has finally succumbed to the greeds and vices of civilization on the way it is so surely and rapidly going, is most fitting” (137). Within this review and many others written on *Legends*, a “Last of the Mohicans” attitude prevailed. This admirable and cultured people would inevitably die out due to its inability to “survive.” *The Dial* went on to recognize and praise Kalākaua’s humanistic efforts to show the common elements between Hawaiian and western narrative traditions: “indeed, it is a constant surprise and pleasure to find so many of the familiar myths in slightly different dress, and to realize, in his Majesty’s words, that ‘human nature has been substantially the same in all ages, differing only in the ardor of its passions and appetites, as affected by the zone of its habitat and its peculiar physical surroundings’” (137, 138).

Kalākaua’s specific attempts to establish parallels with the classical heritage were successful as well: “Hawaii’s Helen is named Hina, and its Paris Kaupeepee, but in general outlines the Greek and Polynesian legends are similar; its chiefs and priests claim kinship with the gods, and step by step trace back their lineage to a sinning pair whose reentrance to the joys of Paradise was prevented by the large white bird of *Kana*” (138). And yet, this review also referred to *Legends* as Kalākaua’s “last will and testament” for Hawaiian culture, quoting with approval from Daggett’s “valuable introduction,” and its “prophecy of the rapidly-approaching time when the
footprints of these once healthy and happy children of nature will grow more and more dim along the sands of their reef-sheltered shore, and fainter and fainter will come their simple songs from the shadows of the palms, until finally their voices will be heard no more forever” (137, 138). Ultimately, then, the worth and emotional power of Kalākaua’s writings were actually increased because they represented the final records of a virtually extinct people.

A review for Boston’s *The Literary World*, dated September 14, 1889, put all these responses together in a single essay. It too recognized the parallels between Hawaiian legends and other fabulous tales: “The tender passion, prodigies of strength and valor, the supernatural, the angelic and the fiendish, the magical and the poetical, form the common staple of these tales.” Yet “one comes upon a scene or an incident which reminds one of the Arabian Nights; again upon a page which reads like a leaf torn out of the history of the Aztecs” (305). This reviewer also praised the educational and historical soundness and value of Daggett’s Introduction, and in particular, the success of the book’s attempt to show how Hawai‘i had progressed and developed over time: “Some sixty pages of the work in hand are devoted to a survey of Hawaiian history, mythology, geography, and political economy; an intelligent, interesting and, in the main, well-written account.” Daggett also suggested that those “in search of a compact and comprehensive statement of the whole situation, ancient and modern, will find it here. The passage from savagery to civilization is traced step by step” (305). As for the legends themselves, the declared work of Kalākaua, the *Literary World* praised these “tales drawn from the folklore of the islands, dealing with popular heroes, the national eras, and the fabulous events which enliven the generic imagination” (305).
But at this point, the *Literary World* announced its assumptions and prejudices in a way that basically refuted Kalākaua’s personal claims, and any claims to Hawaiian achievement as well: “We suspect that the editorship preponderates over the authorship of this octavo of over half a thousand pages,” the reviewer wrote, “But that, perhaps, is to be expected in a literary product of the romantic and picturesque island, the whole of whose recent history has been so largely shaped by American influence.” And then came the ultimate refutation of Kalākaua’s argument: “Neither King Kalakaua, however, nor the Honorable Mr. Daggett pay full justice in their Introduction to the American missionaries, without whose half a century of toil the Hawaiian Islands would never have become what they are.” It was perhaps this lack of acknowledgement that caused *Literary World* to describe *Legends* as a “second place finish.”

The assumption here was transparent. The rapid advances in Hawaiian culture and civilizations had been the result of contact with the missionaries, and Hawai‘i would only continue to become a civilized nation if it increasingly allowed the missionaries to shape its development.

This was hardly the conclusion Kalākaua wanted his readers to draw from his book, but many clearly did. Western readers definitely recognized Hawaiians as a people with distinguished origins, and a rich history and culture. They found *Legends and Myths* valuable and interesting—an important contribution to the publications of folklore. Such responses were very similar to those produced by Kalākaua’s other great display of himself: his World Tour of 1883. Summing up that year, Thrum wrote that “The period under review will be noted on account of the tour of the king around the world,” which was highly successful: “It is a matter of congratulations that our king has been received everywhere with the highest honors” (66-67). Kalākaua was well received internationally, and in the ways he wanted. The “cordial welcome”
of Lord Provost of Edinburgh, Sir Thomas J. Boyd, to Kalākaua in Scotland must have been highly gratifying:

We are pleased to think of the vast progress in civilization which their people have made during the present century. In the last seven years, when His Majesty has been King, further progress had been made, and during that time great material prosperity [...] in a largely increased revenue . . . We must all greatly admire the public spirit and love of his people=s good shown in his thus going through the world in their best interests. (*The Highlander*)

The most prestigious of world hosts on the tour, the Queen of England, met with Kalākaua and was impressed with him. All of Europe, however, responded this way:

Throughout Europe he was honored by royalty and hailed by the common people who lined the streets when he went abroad and serenaded him at night. The extent of his learning was a source of constant amazement to everyone. The Vienna *Wiener Zeitung* said: “He evidenced a surprising knowledge of all technical sciences, art collections, music, and he is a thorough gentleman in dress, manner, speech. His kindness is such as to make him beloved by everyone who meets him.” (*Allen* 128)

Even America welcomed the traveling monarch. San Francisco greeted him with a twenty-one gun salute, and thousands cheered Kalākaua there. At a dinner hosted by members of the California Legislature, someone shouted out that he was “Kalakaua the Colossus of the Pacific” (*Allen* 111). William Armstrong, traveling companion to the king and strong annexationist, somewhat grudgingly described another San Francisco dinner by the consul general of the
Emperor of China: “It was said to be the costliest dinner ever hosted by the Chinese in America. Twenty tables were covered with heavy embroidered crimson satin [. . .] American, Hawaiian, and Chinese flags were intertwined on pillars; the Consul, in a gorgeous costume of silk, sat with the king on his right hand” (16).

Yet the admiring and supportive words from Europe and America ultimately proved to be of no help in Kalākaua’s, and later Liliʻuokalani’s, campaign to save the kingdom. The immediate results of Kalākaua’s tour proved valuable. Leading nations willingly recognized Hawaiʻi as a nation and Kalākaua as king. He was extremely charming and overwhelmingly likable. Yet the wonderful impressions and memories of Kalākaua created by his Tour or by his book did not translate into any kind of resistance to the internal takeover of Hawaiʻi. Part of the reason for this odd mixture of admiration and unconcern lay in the generic nature of Legends and Myths. Critics, saw the legends, and even the Introduction, as a marvelous record of a dying people. Readers could sentimentalize over such literature, but they did not need to feel that this disappearance should be prevented. Even more to the point, however, Legends did not succeed in convincing the majority of mainland Americans and Europeans that noble Hawaiians with chiefly blood should rule Hawaiʻi because the majority either had no interest in Hawaiʻi, or had interests that overrode any cultural concern. By the 1880s, the pro-annexationists in Hawaiʻi and the United States did not care whether or not Kalākaua was a worthy, intelligent Hawaiian king, capable of governing a “civilized” people such as the Hawaiians. Nor did Congress care whether or not Hawaiian aliʻi had a heritage and history similar to the west’s. Military and economic concerns prevailed. Americans with an interest in the Pacific cared more about the Pearl River or Pearl Harbor than they did about the legendary history of Hawaiians. Congress ultimately
ignored the king’s pleas for the recognition of his people’s distinguished, divine past because enough members of the House had their vision set on obtaining Hawai‘i as a military port in the Pacific.

J. G. Speed’s 1891 “King Kalakaua of Hawaii,” for instance, stressed that Hawai‘i’s “geographical importance,” which proved advantageous “to the shipping interests of all countries having a large commerce in the western ocean,” required “a stable and a friendly government in Hawaii” (95). Lorrin A. Thurston made his argument for Hawaiian annexation by appealing to a very different, and more influential audience: “One of the first principles in naval warfare is, that an operating fleet must have a base of supply and repair. Any country in possession of Hawaii would possess a base of operations within four or five days steaming distance of any part of the Pacific Coast” (4). Thurston highlighted the strategic advantages that Hawai‘i presented to its colonizing country. Hawai‘i had already become “The Key of the North Pacific,” playing host to thousands of American naval men en route to other ports. With control over the Pearl River Lagoon, the U. S. could secure this critical location in the Pacific. The matter at hand, then, became one of politics, power, and money. As Jonathan Osorio put it, “the Hawaiian believed that the Hawaiian Nation was real; [yet] the haole did not,” and “if the mō‘ī were to be discarded, the Native a poor and fading minority, and English the natural language of the new republic, then what was the point of independence from America, Great Britain, or Canada for that matter?” (285 and 411). An American-run Legislature, a successfully-growing foreign population, more and more powerful foreign-owned and operated businesses—the islands obviously did become more American. At this point, it did not matter whether Hawaiians came from Asia or Aryan roots, whether Kalākaua recounted ancient ali‘i as peaceful or aggressive rulers, or if Hawai‘i’s
history shared similarities with Europe. Americans want Hawai‘i, and culture would not stop that.

Mary Louise Pratt said the “contact zone” incorporated “social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths as they are lived in the world today” (80). Kalākaua’s *Legends and Myths* operated in such a “contact zone,” seeking to manipulate rhetorically those on the advantageous side of such asymmetrical selections thanks to colonialism. The goal was to have Hawaiians and their rulers recognized as legitimate, and if “in essence, the reign of Kalakaua was all about legitimacy,” then the king’s actions and decisions—including the creation and publication of *Legends*—were successful in asserting this fact (285).

That Kalākaua, upon whose shoulders rested the perpetuation of the Hawaiian people, did all he could to save his kingdom was undeniable. Preserving culture and heritage in a time of depressing uncertainty, Kalākaua repeatedly moved with an insistent urgency. He advertised, celebrated, and literally showed off Hawai‘i and Hawaiian culture to the world in order to save his kingdom. At the same time he reached out to his own people in order to sustain their culture, developing the genealogy-based Hale Nauā society, introducing hula at the Coronation, writing “Hawai‘i Pono‘ī,” publishing the “Kumulipo,” Kalākaua also reached out to mainland haole audiences, seeking their aid in keeping “Hawai‘i for Hawaiians” by compiling the first-ever English language collection of Hawaiian myths and legends.

And not without some success, at least here in Hawai‘i. Bookstores still feature Kalākaua’s text as a prominent book about Hawaiian history. More importantly, Hawaiian Studies professors, such as Jonathan Osorio uses *Legends and Myths* in the classroom to teach
students about Kalākaua, nineteenth-century writing and resistance narratives in Hawai‘i, and Hawaiian legends. Kalākaua still preserves his people: “Indeed, it is not difficult to imagine how crippled any revival of Hawaiian sovereignty and cultural expression would have been for future generations without the contributions of this mō‘ī” (412).
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