Leur zèle dans la recherche est grand.

Maintes fois, à ce qu’on m’assure, des spectateurs de la race des ordonnateurs sont entrés dans la chambre aux transformations, où pourtant fréquemment des accidents graves ou la mort même atteignent l’adulte qui s’y expose, entre là dans l’espoir d’une rénovation.

Un obscurcissement de l’ancienne personnalité y est presque fatal. Mais ils s’y livrent sans regret, pour l’exaltant culte de la Métamorphose qui périt chairs et terre. . . .

« . . . vous avez vu Poddema sous un signe. Elle a vécu sous d’autres. Elle vivra sous d’autres encore. Métamorphose! Métamorphose, qui engloutit et refait des métamorphoses. Chez nous, un moment ouvre un océan de siècles. »

Great is their zeal in the search.

A good many times, as I was assured, spectators from the race of overseers have entered the chamber of transformations, where however serious accidents or death itself frequently strike the adult who exposes himself to it, having entered there in the hope of a renovation.

A dimming there of the former personality is almost fatal. But they give themselves over to it without regret, for the exalting cult of Metamorphosis, who moulds flesh and earth. . . .
“...you have seen Poddema under one sign. It has lived under others. It will live under still others. Metamorphosis! Metamorphosis, who devours and remakes metamorphoses. With our people one moment opens an ocean of centuries.”]—Henri Michaux, “Ici, Poddema,” in Ailleurs

This essay, originally published in Social Analysis no. 10, May 1982, was written as a diachronic complement to my synchronic study of the Hawaiian political-ritual system in the second half of the eighteenth century (Valeri 1985a). Its main purpose is to bring to light and explain some hitherto unrecognized transformations of this system as reflected in the complex of temples attached to King Kamehameha’s last residence in Kailua during the second decade of the nineteenth century.

On the one hand, the analysis of these transformations seems to vindicate the sincerity of Kamehameha’s repeated claims of religious conservatism (for a statement made just before his death, see Kotzebue 1821: 311). Indeed, as Marshall Sahlins (1981: 46) points out, the very move to Kailua, away from the degrading commercialism of Honolulu, was motivated by the king’s preoccupation with preserving the purity of the traditional ritual base of kingship.

But on the other hand my analysis also shows that the temple complex in Kailua translated in an outwardly traditional form certain changes that had occurred in Hawaiian society and that were undermining the traditional system of kingship. In this respect I hope to have furnished here another piece of the puzzle of the quick abolition of the traditional political-ritual system a few months after Kamehameha’s death in 1819.

Since 1982, we have learned more about some of the points discussed here, particularly from Sahlins’ Islands of history (1985). Nevertheless, I find little to change in my interpretation of the facts or in my general outlook on the relationship between structural analysis and historiography (cf. Valeri 1990b [see Chapter IV, this volume]). Therefore the essay is reprinted here unchanged, except for minimal stylistic and bibliographic adjustments.

1. The preceding is the author’s prefatory addition to the 1991 reprint of this article in the volume Clio in Oceania: Toward a historical anthropology (edited by Aletta Biersack). —Ed.
**Introduction**

I begin my paper with a discussion of the available information on the royal temples of Honolulu and Kailua during the period 1809 to 1819. This discussion is necessary because of certain obscurities in the literature and because the systematic character of the relationships between and among the temples has so far remained unrecognized.

In order to follow this discussion it is necessary to keep in mind a few facts about the classification of the Hawaiian male gods. Many of them—not unlike Greek or Roman gods (cf. Gernet and Boulanger 1932: 266–67)—have a binomial name, a feature that points to the fact that they are particularized forms of four major gods: Kū, Lono, Kāne, Kanaloa, in order of their importance. These “major gods” should be considered more as “categories of the divine” than as personal gods. It is their particularized forms that are the object of most cults, although it is possible to have recourse to the unmarked forms in an unmarked cultic situation or when the totality of the aspects of a major god is involved. The suffix added to the god category specifies which aspect of the god is being worshiped and it often indexes the worshiper as well. Thus Kūkā‘ilimoku (“Kū-island-snatcher”) is a violent warlike form of Kū, particularly associated with the ruling dynasty of the island of Hawai‘i, to which Kamehameha belonged. The war gods of the other dynasties are also particularizations of Kū, but they have different names.

Among the suffixed forms of the four major gods, those that are suffixed by -nuiākea (“vast expanse”) coincide with the god category. Consider, for instance, Kānenuiākea. John Stokes, summarizing information obtained from Hawaiian sources, defines him as “a general name of a class of gods,” that is, the class of the Kāne gods (Stokes n.d.: GR 2 box 2.2). Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel Elbert (1971: 391), for their part, define Kūniuākea as “the head of all the Kū gods,” encompassing all the other forms, including Kūkā‘ilimoku (cf. Beckwith 1940: 26; Kauhane 1865).

Although the unmarked forms of the gods and those that are suffixed by -nuiākea are identical from the extensional point of view, the latter are more personalized than the former. The four god categories encompass, through their particularized forms, every aspect of reality (Handy 1972: 23; Handy 1968). They are brought into relationship with society by the rituals connected with kingship.

Although there are four major gods, two of them, Kāne and Kanaloa, are hardly separable. As Martha Beckwith (1940: 60) re-
marks: “about Kanaloa as a god apart from Kāne there is very little information” (cf. Emerson 1892: 16). As a matter of fact, these two gods are twins (Kumulipo v. 1714 in Beckwith 1951: 230; cf. Bastian 1881: 131–32; Liliuokalani 1897: 23, 65; Marcuse 1894: 97). Thus, underlying the quadripartition of the pantheon, we find a tripartition, with Kanaloa as an adjunct to Kāne. In fact, as we shall see, the major gods associated with the royal temples in Honolulu and Kailua are Kū, Lono, and Kāne. Kanaloa is never mentioned as having his own temple in the temple complexes associated with the royal residence in Honolulu and Kailua.

However, in the course of the paper, another divine triad will appear even more important. This triad is formed by Lono and the two most important forms of Kū: Kūnuiākea and Kūkā‘ilimoku. Ultimately, it is the couple Kū/Lono that is crucial.

The royal temple complex in Honolulu (1809 to 1812)
When he returned to O‘ahu, in the fall of 1803 or in the winter of 1804 (Kuykendall 1938: 47–49), Kamehameha took up residence in Waikīkī, the traditional seat of O‘ahu royalty. We know that he stayed there at least until 1807 (Iselin n.d.: 75; see also Patterson 1817: 65–67) and that in 1809 he had already moved to Honolulu (Campbell [1822] 1967: 91).

Unfortunately, we do not have information on the structure of the royal residence in Waikīkī or on the temples attached to it. We only know that Kamehameha did not live far from Le‘ahi, the site of the luakini temple of Papa‘ena‘ena, which was dedicated to Kū. The luakini were temples of human sacrifice in which the most important rituals controlled by the kings were performed. These rituals concerned either war or the promotion of agriculture: in other words, either the conquest of the land or its fertilization by the king (Malo n.d.: ch. 36, v. 78; ch. 37, v. 10).

From the time King Kahekili conquered O‘ahu (traditional date: 1783; see Kamakau 1961: 136; Fornander 1880, 2: 222–27), Papa‘ena‘ena had been the most important temple of the island

2. The definition of the word luakini quoted by Andrews in his dictionary (Andrews 1865: 351): “o ka luakini, oia ka heiau a ke ali‘i nui e no‘e aku ai i na ‘kua ona” (“the luakini is the king’s temple in which he makes requests to his god”).
Since 1804 at least (ʻĪlī 1963: 33–37), Liholiho—the sacred son of Kamehameha—had had the main role in its rituals. It is likely that this continued to be the case after the court moved to nearby Honolulu.

The temple complex constructed in association with the new royal residence is described by John Papa ʻĪlī in these terms:

There was a beach there, and heiau [“temple”] houses, each one enclosed with a fence. Wooden female images stood outside of each enclosure, with iholena and popoʻulu bananas in front of them. There were maoli bananas before the male images at the lele altar inside the enclosure of lama wood. Back of the male images of wood was an ʻanuʻu tower, about 8 yards (iscilei) high and 6 yards wide. It stood on the right side of the house, and was covered with strips of white ʻoloa tapa attached to the sticks resembling thatching sticks. The opu tower was just as tall and broad as the ʻanuʻu, and was wrapped in an ʻaeokahalooa tapa that resembled a moelola tapa. The small lama branches at its top were like unruly hair, going every which way. The opu stood on the left side of the house, facing the images and the ʻanuʻu. Between the two towers and extending from one to the other was a fine pavement of stones. In line with the middle of the pavement were the gate and the house which was called the Hale o Lono, where Liholiho was staying. It was thatched with dried ti leaves, just as Hale o Keawe in Honaunau, Hawai, was thatched. Houses of this kind were all thatched with ti leaves, and all the posts and beams were of lama wood. The Hale o Lono was like a heiau. There were two others like it in the vicinity, one called the Hale Hui and the other, Hale o Kaili. The Hale Hui was the dwelling for miscellaneous gods and Hale o Kaili was for the god Kaili, or Kukailimoku. (ʻĪlī 1963: 56–58; originally published in Ka Nupepa Kuokoa, July 31, 1869)

This text suggests that three houses or chapels—each “like a heiau”—were included in this temple complex:

1) Hale o Kāʻili (‘house of Kāʻili’): This was where Kamehameha’s war god, Kū in his form Kūkāʻiliʻilimoku (‘Kū-island-snatcher’)—often

abbreviated to Kāʻili—was kept (ibid.: 58). Here Kamehameha himself worshiped;

2) *Hale o Lono* ("house of Lono"): This temple, consecrated to the god Lono, was the ritual residence of Liholiho for the greater part of each month (ibid.: 56–58);

3) *Hale hui* ("house for miscellaneous gods"): It is likely that this chapel was similar to the royal *hale hui ʻili maiʻa* ("house for miscellaneous gods [but also: "meeting house"] lined with banana fiber sheathing") at Kailua, which I shall discuss later (ibid.: 123). This house contained Kamehameha’s gods of political sorcery. Perhaps Honolulu’s *hale hui* coincided with the *hale hui* that ʻĪtī mentions in another context (ibid.: 64) and that functioned as Kamehameha’s *hale mua* or "ritual eating house" (cf. Ross 1904: 63).

Near the temple complex and, perhaps significantly, near the house of Kalanimoku, Kamehameha’s “prime minister” (ibid.: 91), were situated additional houses containing important sorcery gods (Kālaipāhoa, Kihawahine, etc.). These too must have been *hale ʻili maiʻa*, like the corresponding ones in Kailua (Kamakau 1964: 135; 1961: 179–80).

The description of “the King’s *morai* ['temple']” given by Alexander Ross—who visited Honolulu in 1811—seems to confirm that, contrary to what Rockwood’s map and reconstruction of the *hale o Lono* (in ʻĪtī 1963: 57, 65), in conjunction with the ambiguities of ʻĪtī’s text, may lead one to think, the *hale o Kāʻili, hale o Lono*, and *hale hui* were three different chapels in the same complex and not three separate temples:

4. A close reading of the evidence demonstrates that these houses were indeed near the royal temple complex. ʻĪtī mentions the existence of a trail passing between “the houses of the gods and the *heiau*” (1963: 91). Moreover, it appears that Kalanimoku’s residence (and therefore the houses of the sorcery gods that were near it) was close to the royal temples, since it was situated to the west or northwest of chiefess Kekauonohi’s place (cf. ibid.: 100, referring to Mokuuaikaia, one of Kalanimoku’s houses), and not the east, as erroneously shown on Rockwood’s map of Honolulu in 1810 (included in ʻĪtī 1963: 65, 90). According to Dorothy Barrère (letter to the author, August 5, 1981), the location near the royal temples is confirmed by Gorham Gilman’s description of Honolulu in 1840 (Gilman 1904: 76; cf. ʻĪtī 1963: 100).
shape of the human figure, cut and covered with various devices; the head large, and the rude sculpture on it presenting the likeness of a human face, covered on the top with a black cowl. About thirty yards from the houses, all round about, was a clear spot called the “king’s tabooed ground,” surrounded by an enclosure. This sacred spot is often rigorously tabooed and set apart for penance. (Ross 1904: 65)

Two of the five “houses” mentioned by Ross could in fact be the “towers” mentioned by ʻĪtī. A foreigner would not be able to tell the difference between a “tower” and a “house,” since the former had proportions (8 yards high and 6 yards wide, according to ʻĪtī) that would make differentiating it from a house difficult when it was seen at a distance. Three “real” houses are left: one could be identified with the hale o Kāʻili, another with the hale o Lono, and the third one with the hale hui “for the miscellaneous gods” (ʻĪtī 1963: 58). It seems likely that this last chapel was less important and noticeable than the other two, since Gabriel Franchère, who was a companion of Ross, mentions only two “temples” that were attached to the “royal palace” (Franchère 1820: 49).

The material realization of each hale in fact matters little, since this term may refer both to a simple chapel and to a complex including several structures (see Valeri 1985a: 173–86). For this reason I call

5. Note that Franchère mistakes Honolulu for Waikīkī. His description of Kamehameha’s compound, however, especially when compared with that given by his traveling companion Alexander Ross, who does not make the same mistake, establishes beyond doubt that he is speaking of Honolulu instead of Waikīkī. To complicate matters even further, ʻĪtī writes in another passage: “Papalima was the keeper of the god Kaili in the coconut grove of Honuakaha” (ʻĪtī 1963: 101). Honuakaha was quite distant from Kamehameha’s residence and from Liholiho’s hale o Lono (ibid.: 90). But it is likely that this statement does not imply that the hale o Kāʻili was situated in that grove; rather, it implies that the keeper of Kūkāʻilimoku performed there certain rituals pertaining to the god such as, it seems, scooping out the eyes of the transgressors (ibid.: 101).


6. Particularly in the case of the hale o Kāʻili a separate complex of different structures was the more usual arrangement (see, for instance, Wilkes 1843, 4: 506; Stokes n.d.: GR I box 9.48: 24, 83; Ellis 1842, 4: 98, 119).
“temple” any structure, whatever its complexity and scale, that houses a god (as well as other deities attached to him).

The material arrangement adopted in the royal residence at Honolulu, however, emphasizes that the different “temples” built there were conceived as part of one single system associated with kingship. This system is translated there into a visible whole. Hence its exemplary value for our attempt at analyzing the conceptual relationships between and among royal temples.

Before we proceed further, an important feature of the site chosen for building the royal chapels must be noted. It appears that it was identical with that of the temple of Pākākā, which, until 1783, had housed Kūho‘one‘enu‘u, the war god of the O‘ahu dynasty (Kamakau 1865b; see also Westervelt 1915: 27). In all probability, the image of that god was kept, along with that of Kūkā‘ilimoku, in the hale o Kā‘ili, thereby contributing to ensure Kamehameha’s grip on the island (cf. Kamakau 1964: 135).

The connection of Liholiho’s and Kamehameha’s chapels with the site of the old Pākākā temple is demonstrated by the fact that they were near the canoe landing of the same name, which was traditionally associated with the temple (see Rockwood 1957; Elbert n.d., 3: 610; Pukui et al. 1974: 175), and by a statement contained in a land case (Equity 200: 9). 7 Apparently, Stokes even believed that ‘Ītī’s description of the temple houses quoted above referred to the traditional Pākākā temple (see Stokes n.d.: GR 2 box 2.4; GR 1 box 8.33). In support of this hypothesis, he gave an excerpt from Kamakau’s 1865 article pertaining to the ancient temple and its god (1865b), with an excerpt from ‘Ītī’s text quoted above (whose authorship Stokes ignored; n.d.: GR 1 box 8.33). Some years later, the archaeologist J. Gilbert McAllister transformed Stokes’s hypothesis into a “proven fact” by patching the two excerpts together and giving them as a single continuous text, which he attributed to S. M. Kamakau alone (McAllister 1933: 81). 8 In fact, neither ‘Ītī nor Kamakau explicitly indicate a

---

7. Marshall Sahlins has kindly provided me with a copy of this important document. The temple complex of Pākākā is, unfortunately, not mentioned in the standard work on the sites of O‘ahu (Sterling and Summers 1962).

8. Moreover, he claims to have found this “text” in Thrum’s collection of papers, preserved in the Bishop Museum Library in Honolulu. I have been unable to find such a text in Thrum’s papers. It is more probable that McAllister’s source was Stokes, whom he misunderstood, at any rate.
connection between the temples built in 1809 and the old Pākākā temple. Nevertheless, this connection existed as we have seen. Indeed, it was usual for the conqueror to build his temple on the ruins of the temple of the conquered.

The royal temple complex in Kailua (1813 to 1819)
Toward the end of 1812, Kamehameha and Liholiho returned to the island of Hawai‘i. At the beginning of 1813, they settled in Kailua (‘Īi 1963: 113; Barrère 1975: 2). The royal temples conceptually associated with this new residence were the following:

1) The luakini temple of Hikiau, situated at Kealakekua, at some distance from Kailua. Being the highest ranking luakini temple of the district (Kona) in which the king resided (‘Īi 1963: 115; cf. 160), Hikiau housed the highest ranking god: Kū in his all-encompassing form (cf. Pukui and Elbert 1971: 391), called Kūnuiākea, “Kū of the wide expanse” (King 1967: 621, cf. 506, 516). This temple was connected with Liholiho, who, in 1801 or 1802 (Kamakau 1961: 187–88) had become the head of the royal cults, thereby assuming the highest prerogatives of kingship. These involved a connection with the supreme form of Kū. Consequently, Liholiho regularly officiated in Hikiau at the beginning and end of each lunar month (‘Īi 1963: 123; cf. Laanui [1838] 1930) and at any other important occasion;

2) A second luakini temple was situated in Kailua proper. It was the temple named Keikipu‘ipu‘i, which, according to tradition, had originally been built by King Līloa, an ancestor of the dynasty to which Kamehameha and Liholiho belonged. It had been rebuilt or restored as a temple of the war god Kūkā‘ilimoku (Fornander 1880, 2: 52; cf. Stokes n.d.: GR 1 box 9.48: 16; Thrum 1908: 70) in preparation for King Kalani‘ōpu‘u’s war against Kahekili, king of Maui. Shortly before 1794 (Vancouver 1801, 5: 100–3; Barrère 1975: 4), Kamehameha had restored it again, as a preliminary to his expedition against Maui and O‘ahu (which he conquered in 1795).

Since Keikipu‘ipu‘i had been a temple of Kūkā‘ilimoku, one would expect it to correspond to Kamehameha’s hale o Kā‘ili in Honolulu. The fact is that in 1813 it was restored (Kamakau 1961: 203; Marin 1973: 211) as a temple of Liholiho, not of Kamehameha, and no mention is made of a connection with Kūkā‘ilimoku at that time. On the contrary, we know that this god continued to be associated with Kamehameha, and that its image was kept in the king’s per-
sonal temple, ‘Ahu‘ena, together with sorcery gods (Ellis 1842, 4: 427);

3) Near Keikipu‘ipu‘i a hale o Lono was built and this became, as in Honolulu, the ordinary ritual residence of Liholiho (‘Ī‘ī 1963: 110, 121);

4) At some distance from the complex Keikipu‘ipu‘i / hale o Lono were situated Kamehameha’s residence (ibid.: 119) and his personal temple, called ‘Ahu‘ena (ibid.: 122–23). Like Keikipu‘ipu‘i, the original ‘Ahu‘ena had been built, according to tradition, by King Līloa, probably as a war temple (Thrum 1907: 43; Ellis 1842, 4: 427). In all likelihood, it was renovated by several predecessors of Kamehameha (Barrère 1975: 7). In 1813, Kamehameha rebuilt it as a hale hui ‘ili mai‘a (‘Ī‘ī 1963: 123), a temple for sorcery gods (Kamakau 1961: 179). It corresponded, therefore, to the hale hui ‘ili mai‘a of Honolulu. However, as in Honolulu, the sorcery gods Kālaipāhoa, Kihawahine, and so forth, were housed in separate hale ‘ili mai‘a (Kamakau 1964: 135; 1961: 179–80).

Before addressing the question of the homologies and differences between the Kailua and the Honolulu systems, a few points must be discussed in order to add to our information or to assess parts of it. From 1813 to 1819, Liholiho, following the ritual calendar, alternately officiated in Hikiau, the main luakini temple of the island of Hawai‘i, and in the hale o Lono at Kailua. This alternation manifested his role in connecting the two main forms of worship: the worship of Kū and the worship of Lono (Malo 1951: 159). We have no direct proof that he

9. Kamehameha’s renovation was completed in June 1813 (Marin 1973: 211). The literary and iconographic documentation on ‘Ahu‘ena is excellently discussed by Barrère (1975: 7–9, and passim).

10. It seems that two Kālaipāhoa images had a closer connection with ‘Ahu‘ena. This can be deduced from a comparison of Louis Choris’ sketch of ‘Ahu‘ena with a passage by William Ellis. According to the latter, Kālaipāhoa “was a middling-sized wooden image, curiously carved; the arms were extended, the fingers spread out, the head was ornamented with human hair, and the widely extended mouth was armed with rows of shark’s teeth” (Ellis 1842, 4: 91). Now, Choris represented two images with extended arms and fingers spread out on ‘Ahu‘ena’s stone platform, just behind the tower, but on the outside of the fence encompassing the temple (see a reproduction of Choris’ sketch in Barrère 1975: 7). One similar image survives and is preserved at the British Museum. From a photograph published by Halley Cox and William Davenport (1974: 28), it appears that it has at least one shark tooth.
had also officiated at both the luakini temple of Papa'ena'ena and the temple of Lono in Honolulu, when he lived there from 1809 to 1812; but this seems likely, since Papa'ena'ena was the main temple of the island O'ahu, as Hikiau was the main temple of the island of Hawai'i. It seems reasonable to infer that Liholiho, as “head of the worship” and therefore, as we shall see, principal king, had to maintain a regular relationship with Papa'ena'ena, as he did later with Hikiau. Moreover, it was precisely in Papa'ena'ena that Liholiho’s position as “head of worship” was reconfirmed in 1804 (‘Īi 1963: 33–37).

A further conclusion may be drawn from the structural equivalence of Hikiau and Papa'ena'ena. We know for sure that the main god in Hikiau was Kū in the form of Kūnuiākea (King 1967: 621); we are not informed by our sources on the identity of the main god in Papa'ena'ena. However, he must have been Kūnuiākea because this god was usually associated with the principal temple of a kingdom.

We must, however, discuss a document that, at first sight, seems to prove that there existed—in 1804 at any rate—a connection between Papa'ena'ena and Kūkā'īlimoku. This is the prayer with which, in 1804, Liholiho consecrated three human sacrifices in that temple. The prayer begins in this way:

O Ku, Kukā'īlimoku,
Ku of the bitter path,
Lononuiākea,
Kane and Kanaloa,
Here are all the offerings
Before you. (‘Īi 1963: 37)

In the first line, Kūkā'īlimoku is invoked after the unmarked Kū and there is no mention of Kūnuiākea in this prayer. Does this establish that the main god of Papa'ena'ena is Kūkā'īlimoku and not Kūnuiākea? Certainly not. In the first place, the prayer, as reported by Kamakau in an almost identical form and context, substitutes Kūnuiākea for Kūkā'īlimoku (Kamakau 1976: 143). But even if we consider ‘Īi’s version only, we must interpret it by taking into consideration the fact that Kūnuiākea and unmarked Kū are hardly distinguishable. From this point of view it is clear (and this is confirmed by the analysis of the temple ritual) that in the above-mentioned prayer Kū, who is mentioned first, is identical with Kūnuiākea, whereas Kūkā'īlimoku, who is mentioned second, is one of the encompassed forms of the god (cf. Pukui and Elbert 1971: 391). One
should remember that the use of the unmarked (instead of the marked) form of the name of the gods may be motivated by purely poetic constraints. Thus, in the third line of the prayer, Lono is mentioned in his extended form (Lononuiākea) because he has a whole line to himself, while Kāne and Kanaloa, crowded into one line, are given in their unmarked form. These differences have no demonstrable semantic content. At any rate, the occurrence of the name Kūkāʻilimoku in Liholiho’s prayer is also explained by the fact that, as we shall see, Kūkāʻilimoku plays an important role in the temple of Kūnuiākea as well.

In conclusion, ‘Īi’s text of Liholiho’s prayer in 1804 does not establish that the main god worshiped in Papaʻenaʻena was Kūkāʻilimoku instead of Kūnuiākea, any more than it establishes that this main god was Lono or Kāne or Kanaloa, who are also mentioned in the prayer and associated with the sacrifice to Kū. But, as we have noted, an invocation to Kūnuiākea also implies, in a sense, an invocation to Kūkāʻilimoku, since the latter is encompassed by the former. Moreover, in 1804, when Kamehameha and Liholiho had just arrived in Oʻahu and their army was prostrated by an epidemic, there had certainly been no time to build a special temple for Kūkāʻilimoku. In fact, there is no proof that such a temple was built before 1809. Consequently, up to that time Kamehameha worshiped Kūkāʻilimoku in Papaʻenaʻena and thus this god must have been more closely associated with Kūnuiākea. But by the same token, we must suppose that once a special temple was built for Kūkāʻilimoku in Honolulu after 1809, the Kūnuiākea aspect of Kū must have been given greater emphasis in Papaʻenaʻena.
The problems
Schematically, the Honolulu system consisted of a basic dichotomy: temples associated with Liholiho vs. temples associated with Kamehameha. Each term of the dichotomy was further dichotomized:

```
Liholiho
   main luakini (Papa'ena'ena). Main god: Kūnuiākea.
      hale o Lono. Main god: Lono

Kamehameha
   hale o Kā'ili. Main god: Kūkā'ilimoku (Kā'ili)
      hale hui 'ili mai'a. Sorcery gods
      + additional houses of “Kālaipāhoa” gods
```

The basic dichotomy was preserved in the Kailua system, but its content was partially modified:

```
Liholiho
   main (Hikiau), Main god: Kūnuiākea
      luakini
         secondary (Keikipu'ipu'i). Main god: probably Kūnuiākea as well

Kamehameha
   hale o Lono. Main god: Lono
      hale hui 'ili mai'a. ('Ahu'ena). Sorcery gods + additional houses of “Kālaipāhoa” gods
```

The main modification was the neutralization of the hale o Kā'ili (Keikipu'ipu'i), which lost its connection with the war god and was moved into the Liholiho pole of the system. I shall attempt to explain this change in structural terms. But in order to be able to do so, it is first necessary to bring out the structure underlying the traditional
system of royal temples, which was reflected in Honolulu (see Valeri 1985a: 183–88).

This structure raises a number of problems. The principal one concerns the very signification of the diarchy Liholiho/Kamehameha and the connection of each ruler with different kinds of temples and gods. A second problem concerns the relationship between the two forms of Kū, the temples associated with them, and the rituals performed in them. A third problem refers to the special relationship that seems to have existed, via Liholiho, between Kūnuiākea and Lono. Finally, what is the relationship between the sorcery gods and Kūkāʻilimoku, a relationship indicated by the fact that they were both connected with Kamehameha?

The diarchic arrangement
A diarchic form of kingship recurs throughout Hawaiian history. Although this fact is of the utmost importance for the interpretation of several events and processes, it has not been fully understood.11 Typically, the diarchy consists of an “active” ruler, who is of relatively inferior rank but who has a great deal of concrete power, and of a “passive” one, who has superior rank (cf. Hocart 1970). The active ruler tends to be involved in military activities, to be a “conquering king,” whereas the passive one (who can even be female), is a “peaceful king” in whom are vested the supreme religious prerogatives of kingship. Of course, this scheme can be complicated. Also, it is by no means necessary that the two fundamental components of kingship (the “conquering” and the “peaceful,” the “active” and the “passive,” the “unstable” and the “stable,” etc.) be identified with two different individuals. They can be associated with two different stages of a transformation that involves a single king. Moreover, this transformation can be realized at different levels and in different temporal units. It can, for instance, regulate the entire biography of a king, who will typically begin as a “wild conqueror” and end his reign as a “domesticated,” peaceful ruler (cf. Valeri 1985b [Chapter II, this volume], 1990c [Chapter V, this volume]).

11. See my studies of this fact, published after the present essay was written (Valeri 1985b [see Chapter II, this volume], 1990b [see Chapter IV, this volume], 1990c [see Chapter V, this volume]). Diarchic tendencies are common to many systems of kingship (cf. Valeri 1980b [see Chapter I, this volume]). So far, there has been no complete study of the Hawaiian political system. See, among others, Levin 1968; Valeri 1972, 1976; Earle 1978; Sahlins 1981.
In other words, the diarchic solution is only one possible manifestation of a more fundamental duality that concerns kingship itself and that, in Hawaiian thought, in fact characterizes every kind of power and “divine power” (mana) in particular (cf. Valeri 1985a: chs. 3, 5; Valeri 1985b [Chapter II, this volume]). It is especially expressed and summarized by the opposition between the two main forms of Kū: Kūkā‘ilimoku and Kūnui‘kea. The former represents Kū (and more generally, the divine) in his conquering, active, violent aspect. Kūkā‘ilimoku means “Kū-island-snatcher”: he is a war god and corresponds to the warlike activities of the king or to the warrior king, the active king. In contrast, Kūnui‘kea represents Kū in his all-encompassing, stable, and restrained aspect. As I have noted, Kūnui‘kea is identified with Kū as a class that encompasses all the Kū gods; he therefore encompasses Kūkā‘ilimoku himself (cf. Kamakau 1964: 7). In a sense, the two gods are complementary: Kūkā‘ilimoku represents conquest, the movement toward encompassment; Kūnui‘kea represents the achieved encompassment, the stabilized and restrained state of a divine power that is productively—as opposed to destructively—connected with the land.

A diarchy correlated with the two aspects of Kū is inscribed in the very origin myth of the dynasty to which Kamehameha and Liholiho belonged. According to this myth, King Līloa left the highest prerogative of kingship—the right to offer human sacrifices in the main luakini temples (and the supremacy over the land that went with that right; cf. ʻĪtī 1963: 4–6; Kamakau 1961: 129, 120, 121; Fornander 1880, 2: 308, 218)—to his sacred, genealogically legitimate son, Hākau. On the other hand, he left Kūkā‘ilimoku to ʻUmi, his illegitimate, “wild” son, who was conceived in the forest and in a polluting manner (Kamakau 1961: 3; Fornander 1916–20, 4: 115).

This myth constitutes a charter for the kingship of the island of Hawai‘i. It is not surprising, therefore, to see the diarchic arrangement inscribed in the myth repeated in later generations. For instance, the king who reigned at the time of Cook’s visit, Kalaniʻōpuʻu, settled his succession according to the archetypal scheme: he left the supreme prerogatives to his sacred son Kiwalaʻō and Kūkā‘ilimoku to his nephew Kamehameha. It is well known that Kamehameha (like ʻUmi before him) killed his co-ruler and usurped his rights. But the importance of the diarchic scheme is demonstrated by the fact that Kamehameha reapplied it when he gave the highest priestly prerogatives of kingship to his sacred son, Liholiho. This happened in 1801–2, on
the eve of an expedition against Kaua'i, which was the immediate cause of Kamehameha’s move from the island of Hawai’i to that of O’ahu (cf. Kuykendall 1938: 48–49). The historian S. M. Kamakau narrates the cession in these terms:

When all the preparations for the expedition to Kaua’i were completed, Kamehameha called together his counsellors and hereditary kahunas [“priests”]. . . . And he appointed Liholiho, then in his fifth year, his heir to inherit the rule. This was proclaimed, and he was then for the first time given the tabu of the heiau. Kamehameha made him the head of the worship of the gods, and he was carried by a kahu [“guardian”] to be proclaimed in the heiaus of Maui and Oahu (Kamakau 1961: 187–88; cf. 221; cf. Thrum 1909: 45).

Liholiho was thus officially appointed “heir to inherit the rule” of Kamehameha. But this entailed the immediate cession by Kamehameha to Liholiho of the highest prerogatives of kingship: the right to perform the main temple rituals and to consecrate human sacrifices to Kūnuiākea at least. Thus, the appointment of Liholiho as a successor was at the same time the creation of a diarchic arrangement—a crucial fact that has escaped the attention of students of Hawaiian history.

Kamehameha’s decision to give the supreme prerogatives of kingship to Liholiho was equivalent to their reversion to Kiwala’ō’s line, since Liholiho was the son of Kiwalaʻō’s only surviving issue, Keōpūolani (whom Kamehameha had captured and married) and therefore the legitimate heir to his maternal grandfather's prerogatives. Liholiho’s rank was in fact superior to Kamehameha’s, who treated him as his “god” (Kamakau 1961: 208).

The attribution of those prerogatives to Liholiho was not only—if at all—due to Kamehameha’s legitimism. It was also a clever political move. Maui and O’ahu were, through Kiwalaʻō’s mother (who was Kahekili’s sister), Liholiho’s inheritance. At a time when Kamehameha intended to conquer Kaua’i for good, he needed to be sure of the support of the people of Maui and O’ahu, who, in fact, welcomed Liholiho as their beloved ruler. This explains why Kamehameha spent one year in Maui, while Liholiho was busy making the circuit of the island, reconsecrating the main temples of each district and receiving the homage of the people (Kamakau 1961: 188; Thrum 1909: 44–47; cf. Thrum 1917: 55). It also explains why in O’ahu Liholiho was solemnly reconfirmed in his role, as already mentioned.
Moreover, it should be kept in mind that Liholiho was intentionally generated as the synthesis of the two dynasties—those of Hawai‘i and Maui—that had competed for supremacy over the archipelago. He embodied, then, the unification of the islands Kamehameha had brought about as a conqueror but that he could not adequately personify himself. Only Liholiho could represent the peaceful and ordered culmination of Kamehameha’s reign, a promised land that, apparently, Kamehameha could not reach, although he guided his people toward it. This explains why, as attested by Kamakau’s text quoted above, the diarchic arrangement was also conceived as an arrangement for Kamehameha’s succession or even as its partial anticipation. Thus, the synchronic complementarity of the two rulers expressed in fact a diachronic relationship, a direction impressed upon the entire political process of conquest on the eve of its completion with the conquest of Kaua‘i.

The ritual of Kū
We have now to understand the relationship between the diarchy and its ritual correlates. We shall begin by considering the basic plot of the ritual performed in the temples of Kū. I emphasize from the outset that this ritual seems to be identical for the temples of Kūkā‘ilimoku and those of Kūnuiākea. This is demonstrated by the fact that all the descriptions of the ritual are in agreement, although two of them (Malo 1951: 158–76 and Kelou Kamakau in Fornander 1916–20, 4: 8–30) evidently refer to the rites performed in the temple of Hikiau, which was consecrated to Kūnuiākea (King 1967: 621), while another source (collected by Judd, in Wilkes 1845, 4: 506, cf. 85) refers to the rites performed in the hale o Kā‘ili in Kohala (cf. Stokes n.d.: GR 1 box 9.48).

In both types of temples the main image was in wood and is referred to generically in the texts by the name Haku ʻōhi‘a, “Lord ʻōhi‘a.” The name refers to the ʻōhi‘a lehua tree (Metrosyderos macropus, M. collina), from which the image was carved.

The ritual of Kū was extremely complex. I have analyzed it in detail elsewhere.\textsuperscript{13} For present purposes it is sufficient to describe it in outline. Four main stages can be distinguished:

1) The king, preceded by the feather images (the principal one represented the war god Kūkā`ilimoku), went to the zone in the mountains called \textit{wao akua} (“the inland region of the gods”) and there selected a tree from which to carve the main image for the temple. The tree was addressed as a god even before it was transformed into an image. It was the god Kū in one of its natural, wild “bodies” (kino).

After a human sacrifice, the tree was felled. The direction in which it fell indicated, especially prior to a war, the land over which the king would rule (Wilkes 1845, 4: 506).

After the image had been carved, the party, preceded by the feather gods, triumphantly returned to the inhabited land. Whoever was encountered on the path of the gods was put to death. Shouts and songs of victory accompanied the procession, which represented the violent conquest of the land by the god Kū. Following the arrival of the gods in front of the temple, the \textit{kauila nui} rite was performed. In this rite, the idea was made even more explicit that Kū, in his violent form (represented by feather images), was conquering the land;

2) The next series of rites took place inside the temple, where the Haku ʻōhiʻa was symbolically born (his “navel cord” was cut), reached manhood (he was given a loincloth), and became an \textit{akua maoli}, “true, real god.” Each of these stages in the development of the god was made possible by the rites that involved human sacrifices and thus neutralized his violent aspect by satisfying it;

3) The next stage consisted of a ceremony in which the social hierarchy was reproduced during a collective meal. Hundreds of pigs were sacrificed and eaten by the congregation. The share received and the order in which it was received indexed the rank of each person. Significantly this rite was called \textit{hono}, the Hawaiian equivalent of \textit{fono} in Western Polynesia;\textsuperscript{14}

4) The final stage was represented by a rite in which the highest ranking chieftesses were brought into contact with the temple so as to

\textsuperscript{13} See Valeri (1985a: ch. 8) for both this complete analysis and the sources on which the following summary is based. For the present purpose it is sufficient to describe it in outline.

\textsuperscript{14} The \textit{fono} is usually an assembled body of ranked titleholders, with various social functions (cf. Goldman 1970: 271–75, 335, 373).
be fertilized by the god.15 The men, who had been separated from the women during the entire ritual period, were now reunited with them: thus the ritual fertilization of the women anticipated the empirical one.

In order to understand this ritual, it is necessary to remember that in Hawaii, as in other Polynesian cultures, the gods manifested themselves in natural species, in images, and in humans (Firth 1930–31; Gough 1973: 195; Handy 1968). All these manifestations were related to one another in the temple ritual, which consisted of the transformation of a natural manifestation (kino, “body”) of the god Kū into an image (ki‘i) of the same god. But the image of the god was in reality the idealized image of man. Moreover, it was considered the matrix of human life, the transcendental condition of its being. This is indicated by the fact that the fertilizing powers of the men that attended the ritual derived from the fertilizing powers of the god. The transformation of the god Kū also sustained the divinity of his main transformer, the king, who was considered, in one important dimension of his being, as a manifestation of Kū. Thus, the ritual had the effect of transforming a natural manifestation of the god into two interrelated cultural manifestations: the image and the king.

It would be futile even to attempt to summarize the amazing complexity of meaning of this ritual. Here, I mention a few points relevant to an understanding of the dual nature of Hawaiian kingship and of its religious correlates.

In his initial manifestation (the ‘ōhi‘a lehua tree) the god had a wild form that, moreover, connoted the “inland region of the gods.” That is, the tree was a metaphor of the divine in its totally transcendent, uncontrolled, and therefore dangerous aspect. In order to appropriate the divine powers and to control them, it was necessary to bring the wild god into society. By felling the tree in the forest, the king killed Kū in his natural form and opened the way for his rebirth in a controlled, humanized form.

However, this initial act was not sufficient to neutralize the wildness of the god, which manifested itself in the god’s destroying every person encountered on his way from the forest to the temple.

15. This is the so-called ka‘i‘oloa rite. The contact is established through the goddesses worshiped in an annex (hale o Papa) of the luakini (Malo n.d.: 178–79; Kelou Kamakau in Fornander 1916–20, 4: 29). See the discussion in Valeri 1985a: 327–32.
The god became a positive and productive power only after having been “bound” in the “aha binding rites” inside the temple.

The king was associated with each state of the transformation of the god, which paralleled his own transformation. Like the god, the king was conceived as an initially uncontrolled and external power that penetrated the society and conquered it by violence. In fact, the first part of the ritual, the one that took place outside the temple, also constituted a threat from the king against both his enemies and his own people.

The ritual metaphorically posited force and conquest as its first and necessary moment. But it also set the stage for their transcendence, and so for the passage of the king from a state in which his power was not controlled by society to one in which it was identified with the society as a whole and therefore with its reproduction and its life. This passage, encompassed by the passage of the god from an uncontrolled to a controlled state, legitimized the king every time the temple ritual was performed.

16. As the prayers uttered during the ritual demonstrate, its aim was, ultimately, to promote the life of the entire society. The Hawaiian temple ritual certainly conformed to Hocart’s idea that ritual is a “technique of life-giving” (Hocart 1970: 33) or, even better, an “organization for life” that depends on the “coordination of actions” (ibid.: 37). See, for instance, Kamakau’s reflection: “Hawaiians were people who prayed much for the life of the body” (1863c).

17. The necessity of constantly repeating the ritual indicates that the contradiction between the two aspects of kingship is never definitively transcended. This correlates with the absence of a coronation or installation ritual proper in Hawaii. The installation ritual was traditionally the temple ritual itself, and it had to be constantly repeated.

Interestingly enough, the early stage of Indian kingship, as described by J. C. Heesterman (1957 and 1978), was similar to the Hawaiian in this respect. In both societies, the king was periodically re legitimated by establishing a connection between the “wild” outside and the “cultivated” inside. According to Heesterman, this reflects the following paradox: “the king has to belong to the community, but at the same time he must be foreign to it so as to guarantee his authority” (Heesterman 1978: 9). In the Hawaiian case, however, the “foreign” character of the king was rather a metaphor of the dimension of force and constraint, which was the precondition of authority. Authority itself was obtained by the transformation of force inside society, by harnessing it to the values of the society. As I have noted elsewhere, Heesterman’s interpretation is too mecha nistic and it underestimates the transformative and dialectical aspects of the ritual legitimation of the king (see Valeri 1980b: 751–53 [Chapter I, this volume]).
The ritual of Kū, on both cosmological and political levels, manifested and mediated the duality of power. As I have noted, in its strongest form this duality was represented by the hierarchical opposition between Kūkāʻilimoku and Kūnuiʻkea. We have also seen that the latter was opposed to the former just as the final realization of a process is opposed to its initial condition. The hierarchical opposition of the two gods, therefore, was expressed by their different position in a temporal structure. Ultimately, Kūnuiʻkea was the Aufhebung of Kūkāʻilimoku, the latter a god who, as it were, was left behind as a stage in the process of the divine power. This transformative relationship between the two gods was clearly represented by the temple ritual. Outside the temple, the feather images of Kū, of which the image of Kūkāʻilimoku was the principal one, were foregrounded. In the procession from the mountain to the temple, they preceded the Haku ʻōhiʻa. Moreover, this wooden image, destined to represent the domesticated form of Kū, was still covered with ferns and therefore invisible; it was also kept in a horizontal position, which contrasted with the erect position it would assume inside the temple. Even more striking is the fact that only the feather gods participated in the kauila nui rite, which explicitly represented the conquest of the land by Kū.

Inside the temple the wooden image predominated in all the rites and the feather gods receded into the background. As we shall see, it is not certain that the wooden image always represented Kūnuiʻkea (although Beckwith 1940: 26, for example, takes this position); but insofar as it did, the ritual of Kū can be described as the transformation of a state indexed by Kūkāʻilimoku to a state indexed by Kūnuiʻkea.

Ultimately, at the political level the first state coincided with the violence and counterviolence that characterized the individualistic or factionalistic competition for power. At this stage, “wild,” acquisitive power dominated.

As for the state indexed by Kūnuiʻkea, it represented the transformation of the king into the representative of the entire society. His stabilized power temporarily excluded struggle, violence, and competition; it even made them impossible. **18** Significantly, the passage from

---

18. Thus, Kū manifested himself in two opposite, but complementary, aspects, which corresponded to analogous aspects of the king. Like the god, the king was conceived as all-powerful and therefore as dangerous in his “free,” “wild” state. He had therefore to be transformed into a totally constrained being. The temple ritual, of course, brought about this transformation, but its effects were
the outside of the temple, where Kūkā‘īlimoku predominated, to the inside, where Kūnuiākea predominated, was connoted by the prescription of violence. Thus, the victims that were offered to the god inside the temple had to be slain outside it. Moreover, every trace of blood and any other sign of violence had to be eliminated before the corpse could be introduced into the sacred precincts (Valeri 1985a: 337–38). The offerings that took place inside the temple, then, connoted the transcendence of violence by the denial of violence. In this way, the dead and disordered victims were transubstantiated into the living and ordered god.

From the temple of Kūkā‘īlimoku to the temple of Kūnuiākea
The analysis of the ritual of Kū revealed an opposition between two forms of the god: the feather image and the wooden image, or Haku ‘ōhi‘a. We have also seen that the opposition between the two images was strongest when the former represented Kūkā‘īlimoku and the latter Kūnuiākea. Evidently, this “strong” form of opposition could be realized in a temple—such as Hikiau—in which the Haku ‘ōhi‘a was identified with Kūnuiākea. But what about a temple consecrated to Kūkā‘īlimoku? This problem is closely related to another: what differentiates a temple of Kūkā‘īlimoku from a temple of Kūnuiākea? It is difficult to solve these problems satisfactorily given the evidence at our disposal.

As I have noted, Beckwith (1940: 26) seems to believe that in all temples of Kū the Haku ‘ōhi‘a represented Kūnuiākea. Pukui and Elbert (1971: 391) follow her in this opinion. They do not explain, however, why certain temples were specifically associated with Kūkā‘īlimoku and what this implies. If we accept their hypothesis, we must admit that the name hale o Kā‘ili was given to a temple simply because the feather image of Kū was stored in one of its houses, not because its main wooden image represented Kūkā‘īlimoku.

maintained by the everyday ritual prescriptions and taboos that surrounded the king and made him, at times, totally dependent, materially speaking, on his subordinates. The paradoxical relationship between the “total freedom” of the king’s power and the “total ritual constraint” whereby that power is sublimated and preserved was by no means confined to the Hawaiian kings. Norbert Elias has effectively shown that these “two aspects of the same phenomenon” (Elias 1983: 139) also characterized modern European kingship.
There is a source, however, that identifies the main wooden image of a temple with Kūkāʻilimoku. This source is William Ellis’ journal and it concerns the temple of Puʻukoholā on the island of Hawaiʻi. Ellis reports having seen the holes where wooden idols of varied size and shape formerly stood, casting their hideous stares in every direction. Tairi or Kukairimoku, a large wooden image, crowned with a helmet, and covered with red feathers, the favourite war-god of Kamehameha, was the principal. To him the heiau was dedicated, and for his occasional residence it was built. On the day in which he was brought within its precincts, vast offerings of fruit, hogs, and dogs were presented, and not less than eleven human victims were immolated on his altars. (Ellis 1842, 4: 98; 1828: 83)

The reliability of Ellis’ testimonial, however, must be doubted in view of two facts. First, he visited the temple after the abolition of the traditional religious system, when the images had already been removed. He did not himself see the wooden statue of Kūkāʻilimoku he describes. Second, his account betrays a certain confusion between Kūkāʻilimoku’s feather image and the Haku ʻōhiʻa. In fact, he writes that the wooden god was “covered with red feathers.” Although a few feathers could be glued to a wooden statue as an offering (cf. Arago 1840, 2: 61–62), it seems quite unlikely that a wooden image was covered with such precious feathers; they could not resist for a long time the attacks of rain and wind. Furthermore, Arago, who visited the temple in 1819, before the images were removed, did not observe any wooden god covered with feathers (Arago 1822, 2: 161).” Ellis must have confused the feather image of Kūkāʻilimoku—whose foundation material is constituted by “split ʻieʻie aerial rootlets which are arranged into warps and wefts” (Hiroa 1957: 505)—with the wooden Haku ʻōhiʻa. His mention of the “occasional presence” of Kūkāʻilimoku’s image in the temple confirms that his informant referred to the portable feather god.

Probably because he noticed the discrepancies in Ellis’ account, Stokes took his description of the god to mean that Kāʻili was “a wooden idol crowned with a red-feathered helmet” (Stokes n.d.: GR 1 box 8.33). However, this is not quite what Ellis says.

19. It is not mentioned by previous visitors either (see Menzies 1920: 57). On Puʻukoholā, see also Patterson 1817: 71; Iselin n.d.: 71; A.B.F.M. Missionaries 1821: 113–21, 115–16.
Thus, the identity of the *Haku ʻōhiʻa* in Puʻukoholā temple seems difficult to establish with any degree of certainty. Perhaps we should take a clue from the very lack of a specific determination of the *Haku ʻōhiʻa* in the texts that describe the temple rituals and entertain the possibility that this image was polyvalent. In other words, according to the contexts and occasions in which the temple ritual was performed, the *Haku ʻōhiʻa* referred to variously named, more or less stabilized, forms of Kū.

This interpretation would make sense both of the reluctance of the texts, which describe a decontextualized ritual scenario, to identify more specifically the *Haku ʻōhiʻa*, and of the fact that many temples could be used both for war and for peaceful or apotropaic purposes on different occasions (cf. Malo 1951:160–61; ʻĪrī 1963: 33).

Nevertheless, I hesitate to identify the *Haku ʻōhiʻa* erected in a *hale o Kāʻili* with Kūkāʻilimoku, because in the Hawaiian texts the name Kūkāʻilimoku seems to refer invariably to a feather image, and in fact to one single image that had been handed down from the time of Līloa at least.

Since the transformation from the “wild” to the “domesticated” form of Kū took place in both the *hale o Kāʻili* and the temple of Kūnuiākea, the question of the articulation of these two apparently identical transformations arises.

I would maintain that the transformation that took place in a *hale o Kāʻili* was less complete in its results than the one that took place in a temple of Kūnuiākea. Therefore the *hale o Kāʻili* was more strongly associated with Kūkāʻilimoku, which in fact it housed, than with Kūnuiākea.

I would also argue that the transformation that took place in the supreme temple of the kingdom completed the one that took place in the *hale o Kāʻili* by repeating it at a higher level. The fact that the feather image of Kūkāʻilimoku was not permanently housed in such a temple indicates that in it Kūnuiākea was more strongly opposed to Kūkāʻilimoku.

Since the transformation that took place in the temple specifically associated with Kūnuiākea completed the one that was performed in the *hale o Kāʻili*, the former encompassed the latter. This encompass-

---

20. See, for instance, the first chapter of “Ka Mooolelo o Hawaiʻi nei” by S. M. Kamakau (1865a), where Kūkāʻilimoku is referred to as *he akua hulu*, “a feather god.”
ment, however, could take a synchronic form or a diachronic one. In
the first case, the two performances were made at the same time by
rulers of different rank, probably using different feather images. The
relationship between the two performances was, then, only a special
case of the relationship that obtained between the performances of
the Kū ritual that were made in inferior temples all over the territory
of the kingdom, and those that were made by the supreme ruler in
the main temple. For instance, we know from the journals of the Van-
couver expedition that in 1793, at the same time that Kamehameha
was performing the Kū ritual in the main temple of Hikiau, one of his
associates of relatively inferior rank, Ke'eaumoku, was performing it
in the temple of Pu'ukoholā (Menzies n.d.: February 13, 1793; Puget
n.d.: 13 February 1793; Bell 1929: October, 61–62; Manby 1929:
July, 39; Vancouver 1801, 3: 183, 187).

The most complex, but also the most revealing, articulation be-
tween a performance in a temple of Kūkā'ilimoku and a performance
in a temple of Kūnuiākea was the diachronic one. This type of articu-
lation is best understood when viewed in connection with war.

Let us briefly consider the facts. Each act of war was preceded by a
performance of the temple ritual, in which divinatory and propitiatory
rituals were also made (Ellis 1842, 4: 150–51).

The ritual anticipated victory by representing it. Moreover, since
enemies of the king, taken prisoner in previous wars, were often the
victims of the human sacrifices, these vanquished enemies became
icons of the enemies that the king hoped to vanquish.

As soon as the ritual was declared successful, the actual battle
could take place. Divinations and propitiations were repeated on the
battlefield (ʻĪʻi 1963: 14, Fornander 1916–20, 4: 366); then the main
war god (Kūkā'ilimoku in the island of Hawai‘i) and the other feather
gods were put in front of the army (Ellis 1842, 4: 157–58). To these
gods the first fallen enemies were offered (Kamakau 1961: 73–74,
133, 136; Manby 1929: August, 43; Menzies 1920: 93; Malo n.d.: ch.
38 v. 14). When the actual battle was won, a new performance of the
temple ritual took place, during which the fallen enemies (together
with some prisoners and/or transgressors) were again offered, this
time to the Haku ʻōhiʻa, who represented, as we have seen, the sta-
bilized state of the god Kū (cf. Kamakau 1976: 142–43; cf. also Van-
couver 1801, 3: 254; Fornander 1916–20, 4: 344–46; Byron 1826: 8,
153).
I call the first performance anticipatory, the second confirmatory. As we know, they were formally identical in that they both represented the transformation of the uncontrolled form of Kū into the controlled one. But in the first performance this transformation was simply anticipated: by representing a passage from disorder to order it was hoped that it would be realized and therefore that the enemies would be defeated in the forthcoming battle. However, the ritual process was only a *symbol* of a real process, not its *substitute*. Thus, after the performance of the anticipatory rites, the king had to go to battle in order to realize what had been simply represented. This shift to the battlefield also implied that in the anticipatory performance the passage from the wild to the domesticated form of Kū was not only imperfect, but also reversible. In fact, after the conclusion of the ritual, the emphasis had to be put again on Kūkā‘ilimoku, who was brought to the battlefield to be efficacious there.

Only the confirmatory performance, the one that followed the real victory and destruction of the rebels or enemies, could represent a definitive and irreversible (for the time being) transformation of Kū.

I would maintain that, ideally, the anticipatory performance would take place in the temple that housed Kūkā‘ilimoku, whereas the confirmatory one would take place in a temple of Kūnu‘akea. It was also possible for the same temple to be the stage of both performances, but in this case, only the second would bring about a definitive transformation of that temple’s Haku ‘ōhi’a.

It should be noted that this is only a hypothesis, since most of the available descriptions of the temple rituals are totally decontextual-


Of course, since ritual was believed to lend efficacy to the real war actions, its symbols must have been considered as more than mere symbols. They provided no substitute for real action, however. Also, they proved to be more than mere symbols only retrospectively, when the symbolized had been *made real* on the battlefield. The confirmatory ritual confirmed, precisely, that such a realization was ultimately due to the performance of ritual, to which the extraritual event was now brought back. Thus, belief was fixed and reproduced through a complex dialectics of ritual and extraritual events.

Naturally, the whole question of the relationship between symbol and symbolized is infinitely complex. For the present purpose, I have drastically simplified my position (sketched in Valeri 1981b [see Chapter X, this volume]), which is equally distant from that of Lienhardt (1961: 283) and from that of Skorupski (1976: 141–44).
ized. However, a syntagmatic relationship of the type that I have indicated is not suggested by logic only; it is also suggested by certain historical events, for instance, by one that occurred toward the end of the reign of King Kalaniʻōpuʻu of the island of Hawaiʻi.

ʻImakakoloa, the ruler of Puna, one of the six main districts of the island of Hawaiʻi, rebelled against Kalaniʻōpuʻu. The latter was at that time in the district of Waipiʻo and prepared his army to crush the rebellion. Before departing, however, he built the temple of Moaʻula. Then he moved to Hilo, where he built a second temple. After these anticipatory and propitiatory rites, his army went to fight in Puna. ʻImakakoloa was eventually defeated and went into hiding. While waiting for his capture, Kalaniʻōpuʻu moved to the district of Kaʻū; and there he built the temple of Pākini, in which the rebel chief was finally sacrificed (Kamakau 1961: 108–9; Fornander 1880, 2: 202; Thrum 1908: 55–56, 58; Pukui et al. 1974: 153; Emerson n.d.: 532).

Thomas Thrum (1908: 55–56) writes that the temple of Moaʻula, in which the first set of anticipatory rites was performed, was consecrated to Kūkāʻilimoku. I infer from the following facts a connection between Kūnuiākea and the temple of Pākini, in which the confirmatory rites were made.

Before the war against ʻImakakoloa, Kalaniʻōpuʻu settled his succession by nominating his sacred son Kiwalaʻō supreme ruler over the land. This implied that Kīwalaʻō was connected with Kūnuiākea, the supreme form of Kū. To his nephew Kamehameha, who was inferior in rank, Kalaniʻōpuʻu left the war god Kūkāʻilimoku (Kamakau 1961: 107). The expedition against ʻImakakoloa was to be the first test of this diarchic arrangement. It is likely that Kamehameha, as keeper of Kūkāʻilimoku, was involved in the sacrifices that took place in Moaʻula, if, as Thrum claims, this temple was indeed consecrated to Kūkāʻilimoku. But it is certain that the plan was to let Kīwalaʻō play the main role in Pākini, by offering the rebel in sacrifice. As it turned out, Kamehameha usurped Kīwalaʻō’s prerogative and offered the human sacrifice himself. This action was perceived as an intolerable attempt at a coup d’etat, so much so that Kalaniʻōpuʻu asked Kamehameha to leave the court (Kamakau 1961: 108–9). Fornander (1880, 2: 202) marvels at this, because he believes that it was Kamehameha who had the right to offer human sacrifices, since he was the keeper of the god Kūkāʻilimoku. But Fornander, like other interpreters after him, fails to understand the opposition between the two forms of Kū and its correlation with the two aspects of kingship or even, as in this case,
with two rulers. Kamehameha could perhaps be delegated to offer preliminary sacrifices to Kū in his form Kūkā'ilimoku, either in hale o Kā'ili or on the battlefield (cf. 'Īi 1963: 9); but only Kiwala'ō, in his capacity of supreme ruler, could offer the concluding sacrifice to Kūnuiākea in the luakini temple. Therefore, the fact that the temple of Pākini was set up for Kiwala'ō to offer a human sacrifice indicates that it was dedicated to Kūnuiākea and not to Kūkā'ilimoku. Kamehameha’s planned exclusion from this sacrifice is obviously significant in this context. If my interpretation is correct, we have here a case in which the transition from the dominance of Kūkā'ilimoku to the dominance of Kūnuiākea is correlated with the transition from one category of temple to another and from one category of ruler to another.

From Kūnuiākea to Lono
Having thus clarified, as much as is possible, the relationship between the two temples of Kū and between the rulers (or aspects of a single ruler) connected with them, we must now move on to a further problem: why is Liholiho, the ruler connected with Kūnuiākea, also connected with Lono and his temple?

22. This is further confirmed by a tradition reported by Joseph Emerson. According to his informant, the sacrifice that Kiwala'ō was due to consecrate in the temple of Pākini belonged to the category named puku (Emerson n.d.: 525, 532). This word is glossed “final offering; to end” by Pukui and Elbert (1971: 325). Thus Kiwala'ō’s sacrifice was indeed concluding, confirmatory: it was supposed to mark the end of the process opened with war.

23. The temple of Pākini was considered at the times of Edward Handy’s research (1935, 1954, 1959) as a heiau ho’oulu’ai (“temple for the increase of food”) and was said to be dedicated to Kā‘e‘apua, “Kane of the clouds” (Handy 1972: 580-82, cf. 387). Although the appellation ho’oulu’ai is not incompatible with a luakini (Malo 1951: 152), for reasons that will appear later, Pākini’s ancient connection with the royal rites of human sacrifice, and therefore with Kū, is still testified today by the fact that it is also called a heiau po‘okanaka (Pukui et al. 1974: 175). This name means “temple of the human head,” and it refers to the custom of putting the skulls of the human victims on the temple railings. According to Stoller, however, the name should be translated “temple of the leader of the people” (ibid.: GR 1 box 8.33). He explains that “in this class would be conducted all the services affecting the head of the government and the people as a whole” (ibid.: GR 1 box 9.48, p. 5). At any rate, this confirms that the temple of Pākini was originally conceived of as the temple of the supreme, all-encompassing ruler and therefore of his god Kūnuiākea.
It is well known that the cult of Lono was the second main cult associated with kingship (Malo 1951: 159). Thus, it was quite natural for the main temple of Lono to be associated with a king. This, however, does not explain why it was associated with Liholiho, that is, with the ruler who was also associated with Kūnuiākea.

In order to explain this fact, we must consider the sequential relationship between the rituals of Kū and those of Lono. Every year, at the conclusion of the New Year’s festival, during which the temples were closed, the king restored his main luakini or built a new one (Ise-lin n.d.: 73; Malo n.d.: 158; ‘Īi 1963: 122, Andrews 1865: 155; Remy 1862: 74). The building of a luakini, doubtless because it was usually associated with war (cf. Malo n.d.: ch. 36 v. 78; ch. 37 v. 10), which brought about the destruction of the crops,24 and because it distracted labor from the production of food, was said to cause a famine in the land (Malo 1951: 189). Hence, after the ritual process that transformed Kū from his wild to his domesticated aspect had been completed, the king built a temple of Lono (of the māpele variety; ibid.) in order to “bring prosperity to the land” (ibid.).

Moreover, after the luakini and the māpele had been built,

the king went on a tour about the island, putting up heiau as he went. This circuit was called a palaloa. Next the king made an uno o Lono [another variety of temple of Lono], and each of the chiefs erected an ewea which was a heiau to bring rain [this temple was also connected with Lono]. (Ibid.: 190)

When the chiefs had built their temples of Lono, the commoners could build theirs, so that “the land might live” (Kamakau 1976: 129). And it did indeed come alive and produce. As Malo goes on to say:

If all these matters relating to the worship of the gods were attended to, then the king was highly commended as a righteous King. And when the people perceived this, they devoted themselves with diligence to their farms and their fishing, while the woman folk industriously beat out and printed their tapa. Thus it was that the king worked away in the worship of the gods year after year. (Malo 1951: 190)

---

24. As Menzies writes, the destruction of the plantations “is their principal mode of carrying war, for we understand that their battles, though frequent, were not of any long continuance or very bloody” (Menzies 1920: 115, cf. 117: cf. Beaglehole 1967: 378; Shaler 1808).
It is clear, then, that the rites of Kū and the rites of Lono were part of a global process of transformation. This process began in wild nature, in which the divine power existed in its uncontrolled and destructive state. The god emphasized at this stage was Kūkā‘ilimoku. The divine power was then appropriated and domesticated, and it was absorbed in part by the men who participated in the temple ritual, by eating the food consecrated to the god (Kamakau 1976: 144). This second stage occurred under the aegis of Kūniʻakea. Finally, the men who had participated in the ritual applied to the women who had been excluded, and to the land, the divine fertilizing power that they had acquired in the temple. This last stage, during which the divine power was spread throughout the land and multiplied the crops and the people, was encompassed by Lono and his rites.

In this scheme, the gods are not considered as discrete entities, but as reified symbols of different states of the relationship between divine and human worlds, between nature and man. One god resulted from the transformation of another. As Kūniʻakea was, in a sense, the transformation of Kūkāʻilimoku, so Lono was the transformation of Kūniʻakea. The latter transition was already anticipated at the end of the temple ritual, when Kūniʻakea assumed, in relationship to the high-ranking women, the fertilizing role that Lono would assume in relationship to all women and to the land (impersonated by Papa, who was both the primordial ancestress and the flat surface of the land or the foundation of the latter).

Moreover, the ritual transformation of wild power into productive power brought about an empirical productivity that must be considered as part of the entire process.

As the passage by Malo quoted above suggests, the efficacy of the ritual ultimately derived from the fact that belief is self-fulfilling: acting in agreement with the belief that ritual is successful and therefore by working under the leadership of a king, the people made the ritual really successful and therefore created the empirical conditions that confirmed their belief in its efficacy. But to be believable in the first place, the ritual must have represented a process whose outcome was desired and considered proper (cf. Mauss 1950: 89–90, 118–19). This representation concerned both a process of the self and a process of the community. The two were in fact equated: the passage of the community from a state of disorder (war, conflict, etc.) to a state of order (peace, harmony, etc.) was represented as the ordering and growing of a person (the god), who appeared as the ideal, desired state.
of the subject. Thus the god and his closest reflection among humans, the king, represented not a static order, but order as the processual transcendence of disorder (cf. Valeri 1980b [Chapter I, this volume]).

In conclusion, if we consider the gods and their temples as stages in a process, Liholihō’s connection with Lono follows from his connection with Kūnuiākea. Both gods represented the stable pole of kingship: one in its more transcendent, all-encompassing aspect; the other in its more immanent aspect, which was concretely connected with the land and with the people. 25

Although the king conquered the land with Kūkā’īlimoku, he obtained authority over it with Kūnuiākea and Lono; no wonder, then, that when the diarchic solution was adopted, the supreme authority over the land was vested in the ruler associated with the transition from Kūnuiākea to Lono. By means of that transition, the king (represented by his gods) entered peacefully and productively into the land, instead of entering it in a violent and destructive fashion—as represented in the initial sections of the ritual.

Spatial and temporal realizations of the transformation

The fundamental transformation from Kū to Lono, outlined above, was realized in different spatial and, especially, temporal forms. It seems, for instance, that a temple of Lono was often spatially connected with a temple of Kū. This was certainly the case in Kealakekua, where the luakini temple of Hikiau was associated with a hale o Lono (Samwell 1967: 1162; Lisiansky 1814: 105–6; cf. Manby 1929, July, 43; Bell 1929, October, 78). Also, from 1813 to 1819 the luakini temple of Keikipu‘ipu‘i was close to Liholiho’s hale o Lono (Ītī 1963: 110, 121).

More important, and better documented, is the temporal aspect of the transformation from Kū to Lono. There was, as I have indicated, an initial transformation at the beginning of the eight-month period during which the temples were open and war was lawful; there were also transformations, of varying complexity, that took place in connection with acts of war. The timing of these performances was regulated by the calendar, which also determined the four regular monthly performances of shorter versions of the main rituals. Now it seems that the calendrical system inscribed the performances in a temporal

25. It was in this sense that Lono was a “god of the people,” a “popular god,” as he is often called.
framework that was itself organized by the transformation from Kū to Lono.

Let us consider the monthly cycle first. The first performance of the temple ritual, which began at the new moon, occurred during the kapu of Kū, the monthly period of time consecrated to Kū. The last performance occurred during the kapu period of Kāne. The third, during the kapu period of Kanaloa. It is tempting, therefore, to conclude that the second occurred during a period of time consecrated to Lono. However, the period in which the second monthly performance took place was called kapu hua, not kapu Lono. Hua refers to the full moon that occurred during the kapu hua. As for Lono, he gave his name to the last day of the kapu Kāne, a day that was also the last in which temple rituals were performed before the beginning of the new month.

Nevertheless a connection of the kapu hua with Lono can perhaps be established. In fact, the kapu hua coincided calendrically with the period during which the ho’omahanahana (“warming up”) ritual was performed, following a full-blown (ten-day-long) temple ritual (Malo 1951: 176). Since Malo declares that after the performance of the luakini temple ritual, the king performed rites of Lono in order to “bring prosperity to the land” (ibid.: 189), it is likely that the ho’omahanahana ritual, which “warmed up”—most probably—the land to make it fertile, was connected with Lono.

From the above evidence, it seems that the transformation from Kū to Lono was inscribed in the monthly calendar at two levels:

1) When the performance that occurred during the kapu Kū continued for a full-blown ritual period (ten days; an anahulu), the “warming up” rite took place during the kapu hua, which then connoted Lono. As the moon was full, at the end of kapu hua, so was the process of transformation of the divine. In fact, the full moon was a principal metaphor of the divine: the day on which it occurred was called akua, “divine” (ibid.: 32);

2) Since the first night of the ritual month was consecrated to Kū, and the last night of the month in which a ritual performance took place was consecrated to Lono, it seems that the regular monthly ritu-

26. The connection between the kapu hua and Lono, god of fertility, seems to be confirmed by two interrelated facts. Hua means “fruitful,” and because of that nuptials took place the night before the beginning of the kapu hua (see Pukui and Elbert 1971: 24, the entry for ho’ao).
als were encompassed by a temporal structure that inscribed them in a global transformation from Kū to Lono. This transformation, then, coincided with the very direction of social time.

Turning now to the yearly cycle, we find that the same transformation from Kū to Lono occurred. In fact, the performance of the monthly form of the transformation for eight months brought about a yearly transformation. The period of eight months during which Kū was the dominant god was succeeded by a period of four months dominated by Lono. The latter period included the New Year’s festival, from which Kū and the violence he represented were excluded.

The spatial context could combine with the temporal one. Although the two main stages of the transformation from Kū to Lono could take place in the same temple (the opposition, here, was exclusively chronological), it could also take place in different temples (in this case a spatial opposition was added).

We have examples of both cases. Thus, during the period 1813 to 1819, Liholiho performed both rites that opened the month and those that concluded it in the luakini temple of Hikiau, whose main god was Kūnuiākea (ʻĪi 1963: 123; cf. Laanui [1838] 1930). He probably did the same in the temple of Papa'ena'ena from 1809 to 1812. But ʻĪi also mentions one case in which Liholiho, in the same years, performed the final rites of the month in a temple of Lono (ʻĪi 1963: 59–61). It is likely that the different meanings of the contexts in which each monthly transformation took place explain these variations. Thus, in the case reported by ʻĪi, Liholiho was probably emphasizing the healing consequences of the transformation by performing its last stage in a temple that had a medical connotation.

There was, then, an ideal and logical link between performances of the ritual at different times and in different temples. This link was specified by giving emphasis to different aspects of the ritual transformation connected with the different locations and times in which the performance occurred.

The king’s presence at the different performances linked them in the most significant way. Rituals were regularly performed in each temple by the priests in charge. But a single performance and, a fortiori, groups of successive performances were given special relevance by the presence of the king or of some higher ranking noble in the role of principal sacrificer. (The performance of human sacrifices required, in any case, the presence of the king or of an aliʻi [“noble”] specially delegated by him.) Thus, the king linked various performan-
ces in one “discourse” that continued throughout the month and the
year. By his presence at selected temples at different moments, he
could state his intentions (war, peace, etc.) and emphasize his connection with certain territories.

The king’s linking of the temples also took place in a transannual temporality. His reign, as a whole, could oscillate between lengthy periods dominated by war (in which, therefore, the connection with the temples of Kūkā‘ilimoku was preponderant) and periods dominated by peace (and therefore mainly connected with temples of Kūnuiākea and Lono). Moreover, it could also reflect an irreversible shift from one pole to another. Typically, a reign would begin with an emphasis on the Kūkā‘ilimoku pole and terminate by being centered on the Kūnuiākea/Lono pole.

Thus, the transformation that in its normal form took place in the temple even characterized the life course of a king. This is illustrated by the biography of the paradigmatic king ‘Umi. Moreover, ‘Umi’s biography actually correlates his shift from the Kūkā‘ilimoku pole to the Kūnuiākea one with the analogous shift that took place during a crucial performance of the temple ritual in which he succeeded in taking Hākau’s place as a supreme ruler! One could not demonstrate better the homology between the career of a king and the process that took place in the temple ritual (Kamakau 1961: 14; Fornander 1916–20, 4: 198–205; Valeri 1985b [Chapter II, this volume]).

Kamehameha’s reign offers a striking example of the shift from the violent (Kūkā‘ilimoku) to the peaceful (Kūnuiākea/Lono) pole. This shift is represented by the successive connections that Kamehameha established with various temples, either directly or indirectly through Liholiho. As we have seen, Kamehameha began his career being connected with Kūkā‘ilimoku. He later usurped the prerogatives of Kiwala‘ō, the supreme ruler. These prerogatives involved a special relationship with Kūnuiākea. However, it seems that during Kamehameha’s period of conquest, his main connection continued to be, quite logically, with Kūkā‘ilimoku and his temples. Kūkā‘ilimoku reached the peak of his importance when Kamehameha built the temple Pu‘ukoholā, which was said to have given him control of the entire island of Hawai‘i. After he sacrificed Keoua, his last important rival, in 1792, Kamehameha gradually shifted toward the Kūnuiākea/Lono pole, as is testified by the fact that he resided near Hikiau, where Vancouver found him in 1793 (Vancouver 1801, 3: 211). From 1793 to 1801, Kamehameha seems to have resided on
and off near Hikiau (cf. Peron 1824, 2: 159–60; Townsend n.d.: 7, 23) with one major interruption. This was the time of the expedition of 1795–96 that secured the islands of Maui, Moloka‘i, and O‘ahu to his rule (Broughton 1804: 32–34; 68–69). The beginning of a shift back to the Kūkā‘ilimoku pole was already evident shortly before 1794, when Kamehameha restored the temple of Keikipū‘ipu‘i in Kailua (cf. Vancouver 1801, 5: 100–103; Barrère 1975: 4), which, as we know from Fornander (1880, 2: 151–52), was connected with Kūkā‘ilimoku. The restoration of this temple clearly manifested his intention to wrest the leeward islands from the aging King Kahekili.

In fact, Keikipū‘ipu‘i evoked previous attempts to conquer those islands, since it had previously been rebuilt by Kalani‘ōpu‘u with that purpose in mind (Thrum 1908: 70). The intervention of Vancouver, who attempted to bring about peace between Kahekili and Kamehameha, froze the situation. But shortly after Vancouver’s definitive departure in 1794, Kahekili died in O‘ahu (Kuykendall 1938: 44). The events that followed his death gave Kamehameha the occasion to intervene and to secure O‘ahu, Moloka‘i, and Maui in 1795. Before his expedition, Kamehameha restored a hale o Kā‘ili in Kohala (Wilkes 1845, 4: 506; Stokes n.d.: I box 9.48). He also attempted to conquer Kaua‘i, the last island that escaped his control, but failed. Suddenly a rebellion broke out in 1796 in the island of Hawai‘i and he had to return there to quell it (Kuykendall 1938: 47–48).

During the next six years Kamehameha resumed his peaceful aspect and, significantly, lived near Hikiau again. But he also began building a great fleet in order to conquer Kaua‘i. In 1801 the fleet was ready in Kawaihau (Andrews 1865: 556) near the temple of Pu‘ukoholā, where, undoubtedly, the rituals for war were performed, thereby emphasizing once again the Kūkā‘ilimoku pole. At the same time, however, Kamehameha marked the fact that his reign was globally shifting toward the peaceful pole. He did this by establishing a diarchy in which Liholiho maintained a permanent connection with Kūmuiakea and Lono. By virtue of this connection, Liholiho represented and anticipated the all-encompassing, peaceful, and stabilized outcome of the entire political process initiated by Kamehameha: once Kaua‘i could be taken, the conquering and violent aspects of Hawaiian kingship would be definitively overcome.

27. He had occasionally resided there even before (cf. Mortimer 1791: 52; Quimper 1937: 2).
Thus, the Honolulu temple system must be seen both as a reflection of a traditional structural scheme and as a statement in context. As the latter, it connected past and future, it gave meaning to Kamehameha’s career, and it pointed to Liholiho as his inevitable successor, not so much once Kamehameha had died but once the task of active reunification by conquest had been completed.

**The transformation as realized in 1779**

The hypothesis of a transformative relationship between Kū and Lono clarifies certain aspects of the historical events of which Captain Cook was protagonist in 1779. In their turn, these events contribute to lending validity to the hypothesis. It is therefore appropriate to discuss them at this point.

Let us first consider the temple of Hikiau, in which some of those events took place. It was divided into two parts by “a ruinous old building of wood” (Cook and King 1784, 3: 6)—namely, the *hale pahu* or “drum house” (cf. ‘Īi 1963: 33–35; Malo 1951: 162). The part on the land side contained the main altar (*lele*) and the so-called orcler-tower, at the foot of which were situated twelve images. The middle one represented Kūnuiākea, the main god of Hikiau (King 1967: 506).

The part of the temple situated on the sea side contained two houses facing each other. In front of one of these, at the entrance of the temple and probably guarding it (cf. ‘Īi 1963: 34–35), were two images. Inside, in the area between the two houses, two other images were found. These certainly represented Lono, since, as we shall see in a moment, a rite connected with this god was performed at their base.

It appears, then, that the higher, land-side part of Hikiau was connected with Kūnuiākea, while the lower, sea-side part was connected with Lono. This underscores the close relationship between the two gods, which is further illustrated, as we have seen, by the connection of Hikiau as a whole with the adjacent *hale o Lono*.

Now the “adoration that was paid to Captain Cook,” as James King describes it (Cook and King 1784, 3: 6), manifested in transformative terms the hierarchical relationship existing between both these gods and the sacred spaces connected with them.

Cook arrived in Hawai‘i during the season when the god Lono was believed to return to the archipelago in order to preside over the New Year’s festival (Makahiki). Hence, he was identified with that god.
When he landed on January 17, 1779, Cook was brought to Hikiau. He was first presented to the images at the entrance of the temple, then introduced into it. But the crucial point is that he was not immediately connected with the images of Lono, neither those in the lower part of Hikiau nor those in front of the adjacent hale o Lono. Instead, he was brought to the upper part of the temple and consecrated there to Kūnuiākea. From King’s description it appears that the priest acted as Cook’s sacrificer. First he reconsecrated a hog already laid on the altar in front of Kūnuiākea’s image, by praying and, characteristically, letting the hog fall on the ground (cf. Malo n.d.: 169–70, 173); then he led Cook to the tower, a means of communication with the god (cf. Ellis 1842, 4: 97). At this point he wrapped Cook in red bark cloth and sacrificed a live pig by smashing it to the ground, again as in the luakini temple ritual. Finally, the officiating priest introduced Cook to the twelve images and asked him to kiss that of Kūnuiākea, which was wrapped in red bark cloth, like Cook himself.

This rite was very similar or identical to the one performed for the king when he sacrificed to Kūnuiākea. As I have demonstrated elsewhere (see Valeri 1985a), its purpose was to identify the king with the god. This identification was made possible by the victim, which substituted for the sacrificer and was integrated into the god by being “eaten” by him, and by the use of other symbolic devices, such as the wrapping of both the god and the king in red cloth or red feather cloaks.

After this rite was completed, Cook was brought into the Lono side of the temple and seated between the two images that were situated there. In that position he went through a rite identical to the hānaipū rite, in which the image of Lono as god of the Makahiki festival was consecrated by the feeding of his bearer (cf. ‘Ītī 1963: 75; K. Kamakau in Fornander 1916–20, 4: 40–43; Sahlins 1981: 21).

Two things are clear. First, Cook was considered divine, just as a king was considered divine: he was a human manifestation of the god; he was both king and god. Second, Cook could not simply be Lono; he had to become Lono by first being connected with Kūnuiākea. Apparently, only this transformation could fully establish his identity as the god of the Makahiki—that is, establish it in a ritually controlled way, not as an unmediated and uncontrolled fact, as was the case before Cook’s arrival at Kealakekua bay, when he was still circling the island.

Only after this rite had taken place was Cook worshiped as a manifestation of Lono-of-the-Makahiki, first in the principal hale o Lono,
then in several other similar temples of lesser importance (Cook and King 1784, 3: 13–14). This again seems to correspond to the prescribed sequence, as reconstructed above.

This historical event, then, confirms the existence of a transformative relationship between Kūnuiākea and Lono. But it also shows that by connecting Cook only with the second part of the ritual transformation (from Kūnuiākea to Lono), the priests of Hikiau implicitly presented him as the end of a process of which at that time the reigning king Kalaniʻōpuʻu represented only the initial stage. Since 1776, Kalaniʻōpuʻu, being at war with King Kahekili of Maui, had been emphasizing his connection with the war god Kūkāʻilimoku at the expense of his connection with Kūnuiākea and Lono. There are several indications of this fact. We know that, shortly before going to war, the king had refurbished the temple of Keikipuʻipuʻi, which housed Kūkāʻilimoku and which had been placed in the care of the priest Holoaʻe (Fornander 1880, 2: 151–52; Stokes n.d.: GR 1 box 948: 16; Thrum 1908: 70, 43).

In contrast, Hikiau, the temple of Kūnuiākea that was controlled by the highest priest in the island, Kaʻōō (Samwell 1967: 1169; cf. King 1967: 620), and which was closely associated with Lono as well,

28. A confusion created by Fornander (1880, 2: 183 n. 1) and reproduced by John Cawte Beaglehole in his edition of the journals of Cook’s expedition (Beaglehole 1967: 510 n.2 and passim) must be dispelled at this point. Fornander believes that Kaʻōō (spelled “Kao” or “Cahoo” by the British) and Holoaʻe were probably two names given to the same person—namely, the “high priest.” Fornander’s hypothesis is motivated by the fact that whereas the English accounts mention Kaʻōō as the high priest, the Hawaiian tradition claims that Holoaʻe was the priest of Kūkāʻilimoku at that time. Since Fornander, as we have seen, fails to recognize the difference between Kūkāʻilimoku and Kūnuiākea, he cannot understand why two different priests should be mentioned. In my opinion, the Hawaiian tradition and the British accounts must refer to two different priests, since the former points to Holoaʻe’s connection with Keikipuʻipuʻi, while the latter indicate that Kaʻōō was connected with Hikiau. This connection is demonstrated by the fact that all the gifts that the English received from the priests of Hikiau were made in the name of Kaʻōō (King 1967: 509, 510), and by the fact that his grandson “Kairekeeaa” presided in his absence over the rites performed for Cook (Cook and King 1784, 3: 159; King 1967: 509, cf. 514–15).

To my thesis that Holoaʻe and Kaʻōō were two different priests, it could be objected that Holoaʻe is never mentioned by the British; but this objection is easily repelled. It is likely that, as a priest of Kūkāʻilimoku, Holoaʻe was excluded from the festival of Lono and, a fortiori, from approaching Cook, who was identified with Lono.
was in a state of disrepair (King 1967: 507; Samwell 1967: 1177), an evident sign of the fact that it had not been renovated by the king for several years. Moreover, it is significant that at the time of the festival of Lono as New Year god (Lonomakua), Kalaniʻōpuʻu was not present at Hikiau, where the image of the god was apparently kept (cf. ʻĪi 1963: 115; Malo 1951: 150), but was still waging war on Maui, perhaps even during the period in which warfare was tabooed by the New Year god (cf. Kuykendall 1938: 16).

This situation probably explains why in 1779 the priests of Hikiau were eager to oppose Cook to Kalaniʻōpuʻu. The former could be seen to represent the final stage—sanctioned in this case by the god Lono himself—of a transformation from violence to peace that Kalaniʻōpuʻu seemed incapable of effecting. As long as Kalaniʻōpuʻu remained identified with the violent pole of kingship, indexed by Kūkāʻilimoku, he was unable to restore Hikiau and fully move into the pole of kingship indexed by Kūnuiʻakea/Lono.

However, Cook’s status remained ambiguous since it was possible to interpret it in two different ways: he could either follow the ritual schedule of the Makahiki festival and leave the island at the time when Lono annually returned to Kahiki, the land of the gods, or he could stay permanently, thereby becoming the realization of a permanent transformation of kingship.

In point of fact, as Marshall Sahlins has demonstrated (Sahlins 1981), Cook did leave “on schedule.” Once he left, the ambiguity seemed to have been dispelled: Cook/Lono did not permanently take Kalaniʻōpuʻu’s place, thereby frustrating, one suspects, the secret hopes of at least some of the priests of Hikiau.

An accident, however, suddenly reversed this interpretation of Cook’s status. The foremost of the Resolution, one of Cook’s ships, was damaged, thereby necessitating a return to Kealakekua for repairs. Cook/Lono was at this point violating the annual ritual schedule. It seemed as if he wished to take permanently the place of Kalaniʻōpuʻu. Though, understandably, the priests of Hikiau (or some of them) remained on friendly terms with Cook, Kalaniʻōpuʻu and his party displayed an increasing hostility. The crisis was precipitated when Cook attempted to take Kalaniʻōpuʻu prisoner, an act that was probably interpreted as the consummation of the king’s deposition.

29. An obvious index of this adoption of Cook by the priests of Hikiau is given by the fact that they provided most of the gifts received by the British.
As a consequence, Cook was slain. However, his bones were incorporated as regalia by Kalaniʻōpuʻu (cf. Sahlins 1979, 1981).

Following Cook’s murder, the “passage to the Lono pole” remained purely “symbolic” and, apparently, the normal order of things was restored. In reality, the appropriation of Cook was eventually to bring about the irreversible transformation that it had attempted to avoid. In point of fact, the king’s relationship with Cook became an index of his relationship with the foreigners, which created the conditions that made possible an enduring reunification of the archipelago and thereby the transcendence of war (cf. Golovnin 1979: 195). Thus, with the progress of the reunification and the development of trade, the Cook aspect became more and more prominent in Lono. At the same time that Liholiho’s connection with Lonomakua was emphasized (cf. Campbell [1822] 1967: 130), the bones of Cook were brought in procession during the Makahiki festival (Ellis 1842, 4: 136; Martin 1817, 2: 66–67; Mathison 1825: 431–32; Sahlins 1979: 335).

The growing importance of this transformed cult of Lono connected with Liholiho, which has been documented by Sahlins (1979, 1981), parallels the growing importance of sorcery, at the expense of war, in the Kamehameha pole of kingship. It is precisely this phenomenon that explains the modifications interposed in the system of royal temples in 1813. But in order to address this problem, it is first necessary to explain the relationship between war gods and sorcery gods in the traditional system.

The sorcery gods
The political function of Kamehameha’s sorcery gods, particularly the so-called Kālaipāhoa gods (Kamakau 1964: 135–36), is quite apparent. They were called mau akua ʻimi aupuni (“gods who sought kingdoms”). Kamakau, who reports this information, also writes: “they were all gods in tree form who helped their worshippers to attain kingdoms” (ibid.: 129). Their function was thus quite similar to that of the war gods (cf. Kamakau 1961: 166). Both destroyed the enemies of order: rivals of the king or transgressors. But the connection between the war gods and their effect was visible to everybody. In contrast, the role of the sorcery gods in the misfortunes or the death of the king’s enemies was not patent and was discoverable only by interpretation. Nevertheless, the victims of sorcery were considered equivalent to the sacrificial victims proper, as a glance at the text of the sorcery spells used to kill enemies will demonstrate.
Consider, for instance, these lines taken from a spell:

Seize the victim, O Kama!
The maggots crawl in your head, o victim! (Kamakau 1964: 123)

Not only is the spell directed against a man who is called “victim” but the maggots mentioned in the second line parallel the maggots in which Kū materializes in order to devour the sacrifices offered to him (hence the appellation of Kūwahailo: “Kū-maggot-mouth”).

Consider also this spell:

For a life, a death,
a great ka’upu bird is calling
sounding nearby, calling out.
What is the food it is calling for?
A man is the food it is calling for. (ibid.: 125)

Here again, there is a parallel with sacrifice proper, since the bird of prey (ka’upu, in this case) is one of the forms the god took to devour the victim, and also because the idea of substitution (a death for life), so typical of sacrifice, is exploited.

Of course, the connection between sorcery and human sacrifice, invisible and visible violence, was based on the fact that in both practices the gods were considered as the main agents and the main beneficiaries: they fed on the victims. Hawaiian sorcery consistently relied on the operations of special gods and not only on the power of the spell (moreover, sorcery often implied the performance of sacrifices). Actually, it was precisely in sorcery that the role of the gods was paramount (everything happened invisibly), while in war and in sacrifice human action played a fundamental role.

The connection between sorcery gods and war gods is confirmed by the fact that the war gods could also be used in sorcery. Indeed, Beckwith goes so far as to write that “all images of war gods named under the Kū group are in fact sorcery gods” (Beckwith 1940: 110). In the context of sorcery, the modus operandi of Kūkā‘ilimoku was similar to that of the sorcery gods and in particular of the Kālaipāhoa gods: they took the form of a light that moved very quickly and struck

30. Moreover, Kūwahailo was both the introducer of human sacrifice and a sorcery god (Pukui and Elbert 1971: 391).

31. This explains why it is called “an unclean bird” by Kepelino (1858: 1133).
the intended victims; they could also appear as a shooting star or as lightning (Ellis 1842, 4: 119; Kamakau 1964: 137; Westervelt 1915: 114). Like certain sorcery gods (such as Kāneikōleamoku), Kūkāʻilimoku could take the form of a bird and move around in this way (cf. Kamakau 1961: 211).

Sorcery gods and war gods had another important feature in common: they were less distinguished from their material embodiment than, for instance, Kūnuiakea. Actually, the sorcery gods (and the Kālaipāhoa gods in particular) were essentially fetishes. As Kamakau writes, “Kālaipāhoa ma were not images of gods, akua kiʻi—they were themselves the gods, he akua” (Kamakau 1964: 136). To some extent, the war gods had the nature of fetishes as well. For instance, the war gods of Maui and Oʻahu inhered in the wood from which part of their image was made (Westervelt 1915: 23–27). Their image, then, was not simply a representation that could be carved again from another piece of wood. Of course, Hawaiian writers, conditioned by the special horror that their Calvinist teachers felt for “idolatry,” exaggerated the opposition between sorcery gods and the “great gods.” They claimed that the images of the latter, contrary to those of the former, were “only images” and not the gods themselves. This rigid opposition was hardly justified. As we have seen, even the image of Kūnuiakea was carved into a tree that was supposed to be a natural manifestation of the god; moreover, the image was not just a representation, since at one point of the temple ritual it was referred to as akua maoli, “real (or true) god.” Nevertheless, the god did not coincide with the image, although he was controlled through it and contained in it. From this point of view, the opposition established by the Hawaiian authors was justified. Moreover, we find that this opposition corresponded to the opposition between two successive states of the Haku ʻōhiʻa in the temple ritual. In its first state the Haku ʻōhiʻa was essentially a fetish god associated with other fetish gods, such as Kūkāʻilimoku. In its final stage, however, the Haku ʻōhiʻa was partially defetishized. This process of partial defetishization was also a process of deindividualization of both the god and his worshipers. When the gods have no existence separate from their empirical embodiment, they are then purely individual and can only be controlled by those who own them. They can therefore be put to purely individual ends.

32. As a matter of fact, the tree was initially a purely individual materialization of the god.
When, on the contrary, the gods have a transcendent existence separate from their representations or material embodiments, they do not belong exclusively to any individual (insofar as different individuals or communities can make a representation of the god, they can all establish a relationship with him) and they cannot, therefore, be identified with individualistic or particularistic ends.\textsuperscript{33}

Two facts emerge from this discussion:

1) The sorcery gods were a milder equivalent of the war gods and in fact sorcery and war could be two fields in which the same gods manifested their power;

2) The sorcery gods occupied the extreme pole in a continuum in which one pole was associated with individualistic action, which employed completely fetishized gods, and the other was associated with forms of action that represented the global society and its values, and which employed relatively defetishized gods. The temple ritual transcended the former in order to establish the latter.

\textbf{From human sacrifice to sorcery}

The preceding discussion of sorcery makes it possible for us to consider the temples connected with Kamehameha and Liholiho during their residence in Kailua (island of Hawai‘i) from 1813 to 1819 (the year of Kamehameha’s death).

As we have seen, the Kailua system was similar in structure to the one in Honolulu. Both systems were centered on the main \textit{luakini} temple of the island; in both, there was a basic opposition between the personal temples of Liholiho and those of Kamehameha, and Liholiho was connected with a \textit{hale o Lono} and with the main \textit{luakini} temple.

However, the Kailua system differed from the one in Honolulu in two important respects:

1) The temple of Keikipu’ipu’i, which used to house Kūkā‘ilimoku, was restored as a temple of Liholiho and lost its connection with the war god (Freycinet 1839, in Freycinet 1824–39: 524, 552–53, 598; Arago 1822, 2: 114–15);

\textsuperscript{33}My analysis, here, obviously owes much to the writings of William Robertson Smith (1889) and E. E. Evans-Pritchard (1937, 1956). For a wider background, see Valeri (1979 [see Appendix III, this volume]).

In order to understand these innovations, a brief glance at the political context is necessary.

We have seen that, in 1802, Kamehameha left the island of Hawai‘i in order to conquer the last stronghold of resistance, Kaua‘i, which was then ruled by King Kaumuali‘i. After a sojourn in Maui, Kamehameha’s fleet reached O‘ahu in 1803 (cf. Cleveland 1843, 2: 228, 230; Turnbull 1813: 204). There, an epidemic decimated the army and the expedition against Kaua‘i had to be postponed. Finally, by threats and diplomacy, Kaumuali‘i was persuaded to come to Honolulu to recognize Kamehameha’s supremacy (1810). Having peacefully completed the conquest of the entire archipelago, Kamehameha could return to the island of Hawai‘i at the end of 1812. Significantly, both he and Liholiho attended to the rites of the Makahiki (the New Year’s festival presided over by Lono) near Hikiau, the temple that represented the peaceful and stable pole of kingship (‘Īi 1963: 115). At the beginning of 1813 the two rulers moved to Kailua.

The building or restoration of temples in that locality provided an occasion to express the definitive transcendence of war that had been achieved by the peaceful settlement of the Kaua‘i affair. Both the decision to neutralize Keikipu‘ipu‘i’s connection with war by associating it with Liholiho and the building of a sorcery temple as the personal temple of Kamehameha were related to this transcendence. At the same time, the association of Keikipu‘ipu‘i with the memory of the wars waged by Kalanīpōpu‘u and Kamehameha against the leeward islands must have been still too fresh not to warrant the impression that its restoration also contained an implicit threat against those islands, which the court had just left. Peace reigned, but if the people of O‘ahu or Maui wanted to rebel, Kamehameha was quite prepared to move Keikipu‘ipu‘i back into the Kūkā‘ilimoku pole and to replicate the expeditions of 1795 and 1802. In sum, Keikipu‘ipu‘i contained, after 1813, two opposite statements: one explicit, the other tacitly present in everybody’s mind.

The neutralization of the war temple also meant that the only temple left for Kamehameha to claim as his own was a temple for the sorcery gods, who represented the milder form of the active, violent pole of kingship. We have already noted that ‘Ahu‘ena, Kame-
hameha’s personal temple, housed his sorcery gods. Let us now demonstrate this statement in full.

‘Ī‘ī (1963: 123) describes ‘Ahu‘ena in these terms:

Ahuna house, which was a heiau, was enclosed with a fence of lama wood and within this fence, toward the front on the west and facing inland, there was an anu‘u tower. A row of images stood along its front, as befitted a Hale o Lono. Images stood at the northwest corner of the house, with a stone pavement in front of them that extended as far as the western gate and as far as the fence east of the house. On the west side of the outer entrance was a large image named Koleamoku, on whose helmet perched the figure of a plover.

In the center of the house was a fireplace for cooking bananas. Opposite the door at the back wall of the house, in line with the fireplace and the entrance, was a Kane image. This image was of the nature of an ololupe god, a god who led spirits; and that part of the house was his place. All the bananas cooked there were laid before his kuahu altar, where those who took part in the ceremonies prayed.

This is one of the prayers:

\[
\text{Ololupe ke alaka‘i uhane,} \\
\text{Pau ai kamahele,} \\
\text{He kanaka he ‘kua e kane.}
\]

Ololupe, guide of spirits, 
Destroying traveler, 
[Destroy] the man [and] the spirit, O Kane.

There were many more prayers of that nature. Prayers of today are much better than those of yesterday. Indeed, the old religion even condoned killing.

A secret council met there to discuss matters pertaining to the government and to loyalty and rebellion. This was a continuation of the practice on Oahu. The council said that the ololupe god would perhaps be charged to bring hither the spirits of the rebellious to be destroyed.

It should be noted from the outset that the appellation hale o Lono, which ‘Ī‘ī gives en passant to ‘Ahu‘ena, refers to the architectural type to which this temple belongs, not to the fact that it was consecrated to the god Lono. The only hale o Lono proper belonged to Liholiho;
moreover, all the gods mentioned in connection with ‘Ahu’ena were unrelated to Lono. In reality ‘Ī’s text clearly establishes that ‘Ahu’ena was the equivalent of the hale hui in Honolulu. In addition to this main sorcery temple, special houses for the Kālaipāhoa gods were built in Kailua, as they had been in Honolulu.

The offering of bananas to all these sorcery gods (Kamakau 1964: 135; ‘Ī 1963: 123) and the banana fiber sheathing of their houses (hale ‘ili mai’a) immediately indicate that these gods were forms of the god Kāne. According to Hawaiian theory, the species offered to a given god had to be the ones in which he materialized, his kino lau (“innumerable bodies”). Now bananas were usually offered to the twin gods Kāne and Kanaloa. And among the numerous forms of these “major gods,” we find, precisely, some of the most important gods worshiped in the various hale ‘ili mai’a of Honolulu and of Kailua. That the so-called Kālaipāhoa gods were connected with Kāne is confirmed by their origin myth. The main god that “entered” the trees in which the Kālaipāhoa gods were later carved was Kāneikaulana‘ula, one of the forms of Kane (Kamakau 1964: 129; Ellis 1842, 4: 93). As for Ololufe, ‘Ī refers to him as a “Kane image” (‘Ī 1963: 123). He is addressed as the god Kāne in the prayer quoted by ‘Ī (ibid.; cf. also Malo 1951: 113). The other god connected with ‘Ahu’ena, Kōleamoku, whose large image stood in front of the temple house, was also a form of Kāne, as his full name (Kāneikōleamoku)—given by ‘Ī in another context (1963: 4.5)—testifies. This god was connected with medical sorcery (Malo 1951: 109).

Interestingly, in Honolulu Kāneikōleamoku was not worshiped in Kamehameha’s hale hui ‘ili mai’a, but in a special house that, together with that of Lonopuha (another healing god), was kept by a medical priest (‘Ī 1963: 45–46). It is possible that these houses had a connection with Liholiho, since they were adjacent to his “profane” residence, Ho‘okuku (ibid.: 59). Moreover, we know that Liholiho performed various medical rites in a house (hale lau) dedicated to Lonomakua, which was some distance from Ho‘okuku (ibid.: 60). Since all three houses for the healing gods were near Liholiho’s profane residence, it is possible that they were part of the same complex to which Liholiho was connected through the house of Lonomakua. At any rate, we have seen that there was a conceptual connection between Liholiho and the healing cults. In Kailua, however, Kamehameha was directly connected with Kāneikōleamoku. This fact is related to a global shift of Kamehameha toward the “domesticated”
pole of kingship, a shift testified by his decision not to build a hale o Kāʻili but to replace it with its “milder” equivalent, the temple of the sorcery gods. Since sorcery (ʻanāʻanā) can be used for both negative and positive purposes, the sorcery gods could function both as destroyers and as healers in ‘Ahu‘ena (cf. Pukui et al. 1972–79, 2: 122).

Our previous discussion of the relationship between war cults and sorcery makes the signification of ‘Ahu‘ena clear: it was a temple dedicated to a political use of sorcery, which perpetuated the violent aspect of kingship in its purely invisible, interpretive form. Death and sickness were not visibly and directly inflicted by the warrior-king but were imputed to the invisible and indirect practices of the sorcerer-king. However, as we have seen, both practices were conceptually related and considered equivalent: Kūkā‘ilimoku himself seems to have been housed in ‘Ahu‘ena (Ellis 1842, 4: 427) but evidently was downgraded to his sorcery dimension. Thus, when Kamakau writes that Kamehameha established ‘Ahu‘ena “for the sacrifice of human beings to his blood-thirsty gods” (1961: 180), we should not take his words literally, but interpret them in the light of statement to the effect that “the ololupe god would perhaps be charged to bring hither the spirits of the rebellious to be destroyed” (ʻĪʻī 1963: 123).

With Kamehameha’s shift, however, the opposition and complementarity between himself and Liholiho became less intense. In fact, a certain return toward the indifferention of kingship seems to have begun. This is already indicated by the fact that Kamehameha took over some of the healing gods apparently connected with Liholiho and therefore assumed some aspects of the beneficial and peaceful ruler. Again, Kamehameha increasingly occupied himself with the promotion of productive work (fishing and agriculture) among his people. The warrior-king appears to have become a fisherman-king and a farmer-king (see Kamakau 1961: 174, 177–78, 190, 192; Pogue 1858: 51). Production and fertility were thus seen less as the consequence of Liholiho’s symbolic transformation of violence into stability and peace than as the consequence of an absence of war that was directly attributed to Kamehameha.

At the ritual level, the loss of importance of Liholiho’s functions must have been dramatically apparent because of the decrease in the number of human sacrifices. Moreover, the few victims sacrificed

---

34. The decrease accelerated in Liholiho’s time but had already begun with Kamehameha’s reunification of the island of Hawai‘i (cf. Bell 1929–30, 2 [1]}
during this period were transgressors; the principal victims, the enemy warriors, were completely lacking (Golovnin 1979: 207; Laanui [1838] 1930).

Thus, the real transcendence of war by Kamehameha undermined its symbolic transcendence by Liholiho. This must have been apparent already in Honolulu, since there, too, human sacrifices were few and limited to transgressors. But, at least until 1810, war was a real possibility and was explicitly planned by Kamehameha. The complementarity of the warrior-king and of the priestly king could therefore be sustained at the symbolic level. However, when it became superfluous even to plan war, the entire system was implicitly threatened, emptied as it was of its main purpose.

The building of ‘Ahu‘ena was in a sense the recognition that something irreversible and new had happened and that the kingly power was assuming a new and less transcendent basis. S. M. Kamakau shows himself conscious of the profound transformation implied by the choice of sorcery as a generalized language for expressing relationships of power.

In the old days, and down through Kahekili’s time, there were no conspicuous god-houses built for Kalaipahoa ma. The gods were kept restricted lest the people imitate them and get out of control, and worship these gods in order to take the lives of other people or to menace the lives of the chiefs. But some of the chiefs acquired kalaipahoa (kumuhaka) gods, and their kahu [“keepers”] kept them hidden away inside the house. . . . But when they [the people] saw that Kamehameha I openly built houses for his Kalaipahoa and Pua gods, then these evil ways of killing men grew. (Kamakau 1964: 137)

Sorcery, then, implied a generalized competition for power in which, in essence, the king was bound to be increasingly conceived as an individual among other individuals, only much more powerful than his competitors.\(^3\) The choice of sorcery as the dominant form of ex-

\(^3\) The diffusion of sorcery from the king to his subjects was openly acknowledged at the death of Kamehameha, when his Kalaipahoa gods were divided into as many pieces as there were principal chiefs and distributed to them (Ellis 1842, 4: 91-92).

The spreading of sorcery in Hawaii, as a correlate of the increased individualism and of the weakening of the kingly authority, is paralleled by the
pression of political relations, then, exactly translated the new realities of power that had been taking shape in Hawai‘i since, at least, Vancouver’s time. Kamehameha’s victories were, to a large extent, due to his ability to accumulate the new economic and symbolic power that came from trade with the Europeans; and in the early part of the nineteenth century, the development of the sandalwood trade increased the importance of the new economic power (Bradley 1942: 53–120). It is not by chance that the settlement of the Kaua‘i question by diplomacy coincided with the development of the sandalwood trade; in fact, European traders had an important role in bringing about the settlement (Kuykendall 1938: 50).

Kamehameha’s downgrading of his war gods and the emphasis he gave to sorcery, then, translated the new situation at the ritual level. Sorcery perfectly expressed, in traditional Hawaiian idiom, the two features that characterized this new reality: the transcendence of war and the individualistic, competitive nature of the accumulation and use of commercial wealth. Moreover, sorcery harmonized with this incipient individualism because it tended to “internalize” the conceptualization of social processes and consequently to devalue their objectified ritual expression.

The increasing importance of sorcery as a substitute for war, and therefore of the Ololulu and Kālaipāhoa worship by Kamehameha, paralleled the increasing importance of the transformed cult of Lono, which I have mentioned above. In this cult the “Cook” aspect of Liholiho was heightened at the expense of his Kūnuiākea aspect. A con-


37. Naturally, Kamehameha reduced the competitive aspect by controlling trade; but his successor was unable to retain this control.

38. Choris, who visited the islands in 1816, wrote that at the time “les insulaires semblaient ne pas avoir beaucoup de respect pour ces images des dieux; ils en faisaient des objets de plaisanterie” (Choris 1822: 123; see also von Chamisso 1864: 139–40; A. B. F. M. Missionaries 1820: 335.) Cf. Kamehameha’s attitude in Gough (1973: 135). This treatment of images and gods was traditional in certain contexts, however (see Valeri 1981b [Chapter X, this volume]); it was only intensified and generalized at the end of Kamehameha’s reign.
sideration of this parallel shift concerning Liholiho adds, perhaps, another dimension to the decision, taken in 1813, to neutralize the traditional opposition between Keikipu’ipu’i and Hikiau. That opposition had been a factor in Cook’s death; but his death had been the beginning of a process that ultimately brought about the transcendence of that opposition by transcending war and human sacrifice once and for all. Thus, retrospectively, Cook’s death must have appeared as the sacrifice that eventually put an end to all sacrifices. Hawaii was then ready for Christianity, before it knew it. Christ would soon take the place that Cook had occupied in his stead. No wonder, then, that the English discoverer would become the bête noire of the missionaries for his impious usurpation of a god’s place.

But to return to the shores of Kailua. As a result of the transformations outlined above, the traditional ritual and ideological basis of kingship was crumbling when Kamehameha died in 1819. Significantly, Liholiho could become Kamehameha’s actual successor only by making official the de facto desacralization of the king and abolishing the entire ritual system connected with kingship. He, the sacred king, had to become the unhappy and powerless figurehead of an oligarchy of merchant-chiefs. And his cousin Kekuaokalani, to whom Kamehameha had, somewhat perversely, left the care of the god Kūkā‘ilimoku (and therefore his own role as warrior-king vis-à-vis Liholiho), bitterly discovered on the battlefield that the old order that he had attempted to uphold against the European-backed army of Liholiho had become as empty and powerless as Kūkā‘ilimoku himself. Thus—as in a more famous story—the twilight of the gods was brought about by the power of gold. But as long as Kamehameha was alive, the gods in the royal temples continued to reconcile the past and the present and to conjure the dark future. Although his enterprises brought Hawaii to the threshold of the “modern world,” one can say of Kamehameha, as Henry James said of the “last of the Valerii,” “he never was, if you will, a completely modern man.”

**Conclusion: Structure and historical process**

We may pause, in conclusion, to consider some of the implications of this study and to formulate its substantive conclusions in a larger context. In this essay I have tried to illuminate a historical process by reference to a structure and, reciprocally, to illuminate a structure by reference to a historical process. In the latter, the structure displays itself; in the former, the process can be perceived as orderly. The
structure is therefore a condition of intelligibility of the process as much as the process is a condition of intelligibility of the structure. Neither is intelligible per se, without reference to the other. The paradoxical result of this fact is that the structure becomes fully intelligible only in the process of change and the process is intelligible only when it displays a certain changelessness.

This complementarity of structure and process is particularly relevant in the Hawaiian case, where the structure itself was conceived as the scheme of a process. In fact, we have seen that the royal ritual attempted to organize the political process by orienting it in a particular direction, by transforming war and conquest into peace and stability. But this implied a contradictory relationship between ritual and social praxis. On the one hand, ritual was a model for reality. Because of its molding effect and because it created consensus around a ruler who impersonated the model, ritual had a direct relationship with social reality. But on the other hand, the reproduction of ritual, and therefore its very existence, was an index of the fact that what it symbolized was never really translated into practice, could never be.

In other words, a ritual that described the transcendence of war could survive in a meaningful way only because it coexisted with a social reality in which war could not really be transcended, except provisionally. The whole paradox of the historical process that I have described is that the fulfillment of the promise contained in ritual undermined the existence of ritual, since only its nonfulfillment could reproduce it. Thus it is not a matter, here, of viewing ritual as a reflection of a praxis in its own right, which enabled the lag between the ultimate ideological justification of political action and its actual realization to be provisionally obliterated. To put it differently: the fact that ritual had to be abandoned once what it represented could acquire a sustained existence of its own was the secret implication of ritual itself. No wonder, then, that in 1819 the process of translating representation into sustained existence was brought to a conclusion by rejecting the ritual that had anticipated it at the symbolic level.

If my analysis of the royal ritual is correct, then, this ritual was the symptom and the expression of a lack of fit between ideology and practice. A few words will give an idea of the reasons for this.

In order to control or to conquer a territory, a king needed to attract a large number of followers. He could do so by means of gifts and promises of land grants, which were fulfilled once a certain district was conquered with his allies’ help. Thus the political system
promoted conquest and expansion, until they encountered their limits. These were constituted by the inability of the king to retain his control over an increasing number of subordinate allies, each of whom attempted to emulate him, and by the resistance of his potential victims, at whose expense he attracted new followers or maintained the old ones. Moreover, once all the conquerable lands had been obtained, the king had little to offer his subordinates. On the contrary, he required prestations from them. He became burdensome and revolts broke out. The political system was thus generated by war and inevitably generated war. Accordingly, the permanence of peace and stability was structurally impossible. The process of transcendence of conflict and war, the “rebinding” of society, guided by the ritual that represented them, had to be repeated endlessly.

The real transcendence of war was only made possible by an exogenous factor: European technology and European trade. The process of pacification and unification of the archipelago correlated with a transformation of the traditional political system brought about by Kamehameha (cf. Kuykendall 1938: 51–54). This transformation affected ritual partly through conscious manipulation (as testified by the building of different varieties of temples), partly because of “mechanical” effects. As we have seen, the lack of war devalued the role of Kūkā‘ilimoku; it made it impossible to represent in its full and due form the passage from Kūkā‘ilimoku to Kūnuiākea and from the latter to Lono. To this “mechanical” effect of the political process on the ritual one, Kamehameha reacted by establishing the ritual diarchy upon an increasingly new basis. He himself developed the sorcery aspect of kingship. Liholiho had to develop the Cook/Lono aspect, although he continued to perform the old ritual in the form in which it could be performed in the absence of war. During the Kailua period, the old and the new structures uneasily coexisted. But the new structure in formation was more successful in undermining the old system than in establishing a new one. For one thing, sorcery could not procure enemies as victims to be sacrificed in the temple of Kūnuiākea; it simply “killed” people. It was more like police work than like sacrifice, and it could not dynamically connect the two rulers in the same ritual process.

It is clear that, in Kamehameha’s mind, sorcery had to take care of the internal political relationships, whereas Liholiho’s connection with Hikiau, in addition to being a relic from the traditional past, was meant to establish the legitimacy of the new system by reference to an
encompassing exterior that was increasingly associated with the new
gods revealed by Cook, who had initially appeared as an old one in
that temple: the Europeans (the British in particular) and their wealth
(see Sahlins 1979). But beyond a certain point, the basis of power
could as well become this wealth pure and simple. Indeed, real trade
definitely did displace ritual trade. I do not know, then, if the aboli-
tion of the ritual system in 1819 is more impressive for the spirit of
innovation that it shows or for the historical respect for the past it dis-
plays. The past had indeed become past: it could not be meddled
with by going too far on the road of ritual innovation and manipula-
tion. Consciousness intervened in the unconscious or semiconscious
process. As usual in such cases, a turning point, a “revolution,” was
the result.
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