English Summary

The topic of this dissertation is the redevelopment of traditional Hawaiian oratory. Oratory is an indespensible part of pan-Polynesian cultural life. It is a dynamic institution that remains vibrant in places such as Sāmoa and Aotearoa. Hawaiian oration, however, barely exists amongst contemporary Hawaiian speakers. Like many other facets of traditional Hawaiian life, it is an endangered art form that has suffered from a grave lack of attention.

For the past eight years, I have been developing and teaching classical Hawaiian literary analysis and oratory to Hawaiian language immersion high school and upper-division college students. Since 2003, I have 1) pieced together an outline with which one could create what I termed “haʻiʻōlelo kuʻuna,” a speech patterned on classical Hawaiian literary conventions; 2) developed a research strategy to inform traditional Hawaiian speechmaking; and 3) through my own speeches, served as a role model for students in praxis. Such ethno-culturally Hawaiian expressions of rhetorical flourish contrast deeply with mainstream American “speech giving” in style (verbal and nonverbal), content, spiritual intent, and overall élán! This type of expression would bring contemporary Hawaiian oratory closer to that which is revered in other Polynesian cultures. Through this dissertation, I present my research on the history of Hawaiian oratory in order to connect my present-day expression with its age-old tradition, and then present my own model for revitalizing Hawaiian oratory.

This dissertation is presented in two main parts. Part one is an analysis of material on traditional Hawaiian and Polynesian oratory. The written material on traditional Hawaiian oratory is analyzed in chapter three, with a thorough examination of the office of the kākāʻōlelo,1 the generally accepted term for "Hawaiian orator." Because the material on traditional Hawaiian oratory has proven to be so very limited, it is supplemented by an examination of two other

1 Aside from the customary italicization of newspaper titles, it is the expressed wish of this study that Hawaiian vernacular not be italicized in a manner that denotes the usage as a foreign language.
Polynesian oratorical traditions which are still vibrantly alive and which have been documented. Chapter one describes the lāuga (Sāmoan oratory) and chapter two the whaikōrero (Māori oratory of Aotearoa), based on written English language sources and my interviews with master orators. Chapter four, the culminating chapter of part one, contemplates some lessons drawn from the review of lāuga and whaikōrero which can inform the redevelopment of Hawaiian oratory in the present. Part two describes the establishment and growth of contemporary Hawaiian oratory amongst those of the P-20 Hawaiian medium education program of Hilo, Hawai‘i. Chapter five summarizes the development of contemporary Hawaiian oratory in the P-20 program at Hilo, and chapter six profiles my own personal maturation in learning, developing, and later teaching contemporary Hawaiian oratory. Chapter seven details my academic approach to the development of oratory along traditional lines, and chapter eight describes the actual outline I use to perform such oratory. I describe each chapter below in further detail.

Chapter one reviews lāuga, Sāmoan oratory, in seven different parts: 1) introductory remarks regarding the main resources utilized; 2) settings where lāuga is performed/heard; 3) general outlines of lāuga along with an explication of each part; 4) the style of language used, especially in regards to the view of spiritual power in language, use of formal speech register, and paralanguage; 5) literary features that characterize lāuga; 6) body language used in performing lāuga; and 7) my interview with lāuga master ‘Aumua Mata‘itusi Simanu, accompanied by her daughter Manumaua Luafata Simanu-Klutz.

Chapter two reviews whaikōrero, Māori oratory of Aotearoa, in ten different parts: 1) introductory remarks about the main resources used; 2) settings where whaikōrero is performed/heard, with a concentration on the protocols of a welcoming ceremony and types of whaikōrero; 3) the general outline of whaikōrero with an explication of each part; 4) the style of language used; 5) features that characterize whaikōrero; 6) accompanying body language; 7) the selection of a kaikōrero (whaikōrero speaker), including the process of becoming a kaikōrero,
restrictions that apply at funerals, as well as the relations of the office to women; 8) the skills necessary for *whaikōrero*; 9) perspectives on instruction; and 10) my interview with *whaikōrero* expert Timoti Kāretu and five of his students, Chris Winitana, Te Aro Moxon, Justin Tipa, Leon Te Pairi Blake, and Jason King.

Chapter three reviews the material on kākāʻōlelo. As defined by Pukui and Elbert (1986:119), there are two main aspects of the office, orator and counselor. As both aspects were probably combined in classical Hawaiian culture (up to 1820), the emphasis in writings on that period is on the counselor aspect. The chapter is laid out in five main parts: 1) lexical descriptions of kākāʻōlelo between 1834—1986; 2) a literature review examining contemporary sources, three secondary sources (Beckwith, Buck, Chun) and the NHCAP project #1995.310 (Bishop Museum) which collected speeches from early Hawaiian newspapers; 3) primary Hawaiian language sources on kākāʻōlelo in the classical period before 1820 (Desha, Fornander, ʻĪʻī, Kamakau, Kepelino, Malo, Poepeoe, Hoʻolaupāʻi & Papakilo online collection of Hawaiian newspapers); 4) a brief analysis of hoʻopāpā (contest of wits) in the classical period as a foundational basis for envisioning Hawaiian oratory; and 5) an examination of the last domains of Hawaiian oratory in the government/judicial system and in the church before its contemporary reintroduction. As this chapter is a crucial part of the dissertation, I describe the individual parts below in further detail.

1) Regarding lexical descriptions, kākāʻōlelo is defined by Andrews (1836:62) as "a counsellor, a lawgiver, a scribe, one skilled in language." Although one can infer a lot from the description "one skilled in language," it does not constitute definitive evidence: it says nothing of the skill referred to, or if such skill was used in formal speeches. Emerson and Bishop (1845:107) defines an orator as "he mea akamai i ka olelo, he kakaolelo" (one skilled in language, a kakaolelo). There is no clear relationship of kākāʻōlelo to oratory given in Andrews (1865 [1974]), Hitchcock (1887), or Parker (1922). Andrews (1865 [1974:250]) adds to his previous definition, "kekahi poe kanaka akamai i ke kakaolelo, certain men skillful in judgement";
Hitchcock (1887:145) lists "haiolelo" for oration, oratorical, and oratory; and as Parker is a revised version of Andrews (1865), there is no alteration in definition. Pukui and Elbert (1957:111; 1971:111; 1986:119) define kākāʻōlelo as "orator, person skilled in the use of language; counselor, adviser, storyteller; oratory; to orate. Lit., to fence [with] words."

2) Beckwith, Buck, and Chun discuss Hawaiian oratory in general and nonspecific terms, often characterizing it in likeness to Polynesian oratory (mainly that of Sāmoa, Aotearoa, and Tahiti). It is important to note that none of these studies were carried out utilizing primary Hawaiian language sources, and aside from Chun, Beckwith and Buck provide mere mentions of "Hawaiian oratory" against the backdrop of Polynesia. NHCAP Project #1995.310 was carried out as a true present-time effort to revive Hawaiian speechmaking. Although it is not a "how to" type of project, thirty speeches were garnered from Hawaiian language newspapers and put forth as practical means for development. Two additional important parts of this project are: a) a sub-project on hoʻopāpā (contest of wits), and b) the description of ʻālina ʻāina (epithetical expressions of place). I am most interested in the use of hoʻopāpā as a means of building a language perspective suitable for oration.

3) Primary sources for the classical period of Hawaiian culture were examined for historical substantiation. Malo and Kepelino are reviewed separately from the rest, as these two were the only ones who wrote about the kākāʻōlelo as a subject (albeit briefly); all other writers characterize the kākāʻōlelo within context of a narrative with hardly any further explication. Although limited, these sources show the kākāʻōlelo to have been a polymath responsible for voicing historical authority and expertise in all matters of the royal court, ranging from politics to genealogy and history to education, probably also one who jested with humorous wit to entertain in times of leisure and repose. The kākāʻōlelo was also recognized as an expert in explicating esoteric knowledge embedded in riddles and prophecies; a figure who was able to compose great genealogical chants; and one who could prognosticate through the interpretation of signs in
nature, dreams, and human bodily features. Notwithstanding all of these characteristics, there exists no example of his oratorical performance and/or skills, or any description of such an oration.

4) Although hoʻopāpā is detailed enough in classical writings to form a dissertation topic all on its own, I look to hoʻopāpā as a means to build a concentrated perspective on lanage, one that can serve as a vehicle to perform Hawaiian oratory successfully. The way in which subject matter is handled and categorized in nomenclature for instruction, the way in which such nomenclature is utilized, along with the protocol that governs such "verbal pyrotechnics," all these are features that can have a profoundly positive impact on the further development of contemporary Hawaiian oratory.

5) This final section discusses the last probable domains in which Hawaiian oratory was utilized: in the government/judicial sector and the church. Concerning the government and judicial sector, I reviewed all broadsides of the State of Hawaiʻi Archives from 1839 onward, specifically fifty-five speeches and communiqués, of which only five contained some kind of rhetorical flourish. I also looked at printed Hawaiian speeches of historical figures: Joseph K. Nāwahī, Robert William Kalanihiapo Wilcox, and the later Governor Samuel Wilder King. Concerning the domain of the church, I researched documents (sermons, speeches, writings, etc.) at the Hawaiian Historical Society and the Hawaiian Mission Children's Library. Although the materials in both domains display wit and clever usages of traditional thought and lexical items, I found no clear example of the type of Hawaiian oration that I would consider on a par with traditional Polynesian oration shaped for modern society, one that intensively employs esoteric and traditional expressions and lexical items, but framed in a way befitting modernity.

I also include a section of eighty-eight usages of kākāʻōlelo as exhibited through the Hawaiian language newspapers mainly from the Hoʻolaupaʻi database. Of the eighty-nine
mentions of "kakaolelo/kaka olelo," concerned traditional chieftdom, concerned politics, concerned Christianity, concerned law firm advertisements.

In conclusion, I present a two-part summary of the characteristics of the kākāʻōlelo. The first part shows the kākāʻōlelo in a traditional context, and the second part shows the evolution of the kākāʻōlelo in more contemporary times:

- one who was privy to and participated in the sacred council of chiefs (ʻahakūka/ʻahaʻōlelo/ʻahakūkā malū/ʻaha kākāʻōlelo);
- one who was listed with other experts of a kingdom (priest, diviners, geomancers, etc.);
- one who was specifically characterized by Malo as a kālaimoku (high counselor; prime minister); included in this characterization is one whose office overlaps with another depending on situation, as in kākāʻōlelo + kālaimoku; kākāʻōlelo + genealogist; kākāʻōlelo + war strategist; kākāʻōlelo + composer of sacred genealogical chants;
- one who cared for the histories and genealogies of the chiefs, as well as one who instructed the chiefs in the geography of historical events (mainly for the advancement of warfare);
- a role in which chiefs were educated in (by kākāʻōlelo);
- a foreteller who could reveal intimate knowledge of spiritual embodiments in nature, dreams, and in human features;
- a learned one who had the ability to puzzle out esoteric knowledge encoded in poetry, prose, and especially in riddles;
- a hereditary office that was passed down in a kākāʻōlelo family line.

- a scribe of Jewish law; expert on government law;
- Isaiah 9:6 portrays Jesus as a kākāʻōlelo (counselor);
- an evangelist;
- a politician and a lobbyist;
- one who is verbose and rambles on (like a mother constantly scolding her child, or a rambling politician);
- an editor of a newspaper.

This research was done so that I could affirm the oratorical side of the kākāʻōlelo in a traditional context. Given the lack of specific description of the oratory of the traditional kākāʻōlelo, such an affirmation is equivocal. Nevertheless, I am firm in my belief that the kākāʻōlelo was an orator, one who spoke with great rhetorical flourish. 1) As early as 1836, Andrews defines the kākāʻōlelo as one who is skilled in language; in 1845, Emerson and Bishop define the kākāʻōlelo directly as an orator. These are of the earliest definitions that exist regarding the kākāʻōlelo since the advent of writing amongst Hawaiians. 2) The term continues to be used
for political speechmaking during the later 19th century for figures such as John Edward Bush, Stephen Langhern Desha, Joseph Kahoʻolule Nāwahī, Charles Kahiliaulani Notely, Joseph Mokuʻōhai Poeoe, and numerous others, an indication that its original meaning included the aspect of speechmaking. Since "kākāʻōlelo" was used during that period for an orator, I believe that conceptualization would have to have been grounded in some earlier usage. This practice probably is similar to the continuation of the term "luakini" (major heiau to the god Kū) for a modern day church. 3) Despite the lack of documented kākāʻōlelo oratory, during the age of Hawaiian writing, rhetorical flourishes were spun into most eloquently built poetry and prose. If it could be written, it could be spoken; if it could be spoken, it could be fashioned into an oratorical presentation: kākāʻōlelo! It is through this dissertation that I make my bold statement: kākāʻōlelo and traditionally styled Hawaiian oratory is one in the same. My present day development of the concept and praxis of kākāʻōlelo is based on the styling of classical writings, and therefore, remains firmly in the vein of tradition. As a large part of the polymathy of the kākāʻōlelo deals with language (by means of expert counsel in history and genealogy; composition of esoteric poetry, as well as the revealing of esoteric thought as a means to counsel), the oratorical element in my mind would be most a natural expression of such counsel and the imparting of historical/esoterical knowledge.

Chapter four closes part one of this paper by drawing a relationship in spirit between the lāuga and whaikōrero and the contemporary development of traditional Hawaiian oratory. I use the term "spirit" here to describe overarching ideals that the two Polynesian traditions share, notwithstanding the marked differences between them. I contemplate four basic ideals that both lāuga and whaikōrero exhibit, namely, 1) both traditions have basic outlines for dramatic oratorical expression; 2) both traditions have absolutely no tolerance for error or ignorance, and will even go as far as to cut off an ill prepared speaker in a number of dramatic ways; 3) both traditions have very stringent cultural norms that guide neophytes in becoming orators; and 4)
both traditions believe wholeheartedly in traditionally framed oratory as a means to continually remember the distant past through the maintenance of classical lexical items, canonical phrases, historical accounts, etc. Lāuga is not lāuga if done in plain Sāmoan, and definitely not recognized as such if performed in English; whaikōrero is not whaikōrero if done in plain Māori, and also not recognized as such if performed in English. Contemporary kākāʻōlelo could benefit much from such spiritual lessons, but they must be applied in a cautious way, not only being respectful of our own Hawaiian traditional knowledge and spirit, but also to allow for acquisition and acceptance amongst those of our ever growing Hawaiian speaking communities.

In taking a look at contemporary development of Hawaiian oratory, part two begins with a description of the P-20 Hawaiian medium education consortium of Hilo, Hawai‘i, as it relates to the establishment and development of traditionally framed Hawaiian oratory. I provide brief historical background for each of the four main components of the consortium: the ‘Aha Pūnana Leo Inc. (a non-profit corporation established to support Hawaiian language revitalization); Ka Haka ‘Ula O Keʻelilōlani College of Hawaiian Language with its P-12 laboratory schools, and Hilo's ‘Imiloa Astronomy Center. I further describe five central context in which speechmaking is being developed and required amongst the consortium: 1) morning and afternoon assemblies, 2) welcoming ceremonies, 3) graduation ceremonies, 4) recognition and memorial ceremonies, and 5) other gatherings (namely the weekly family enrichment assembly at the laboratory schools and at funerals). Chapter five closes with interviews of two 1st generation developers of this consortium whom I look to as mentors in classical speechmaking, Larry L. Kimura and Dr. Kalena Silva.

Chapter six provides a concise autobiography that outlines my educational growth and progression in becoming a proponent for traditional Hawaiian speechmaking. After providing my familial background, I discuss three main areas of influence: 1) my educational background, 2) my makua hoʻokama (life mentor of Hawaiian knowledge), the late Gerald W. Duarte, and 3) my
experiences with native speakers from the community of Ni‘ihau that spanned some fifteen plus years. I was most fortunate to have spent so much time with such treasured oldsters. Their language/paralanguage have become the exemplar that fills my "mind's eye and ear." Their voices fill my mind's ear during my research of traditional Hawaiian literature, and their manner of being has served as a model with which I developed my contemporary form of Hawaiian oratory.

Chapter six then ends with a description of how I came upon the ideas to develop Hawaiian speechmaking, which segues into chapter seven where I discuss my methods of development.

Chapter seven details my three-pronged developmental method for speechmaking. Prong one describes my pedagogy utilizing traditional Hawaiian literature through the perspective of the Kumu Honua Mauli Ola Hawaiian educational philosophy (‘Aha Pūnana Leo and Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani 2009). Using this philosophy analytically, together with the study and employment of ethno-literary devices and lexical items, I have developed five broad research questions that I use to build speech content. This approach to literature allows students/researches to understand literary pieces more comprehensively by critically thinking through questions like those developed below:

1. What is the specific example of Hawaiian culture being examined/studied?
2. What traditional knowledge exists regarding this particular example?
   - Relevant pieces of literature, native and foreign historical accounts, oral histories, and if applicable, a juxtaposition with other Pacific native cultures should be examined.
3. What behavioral patterns are recognized in this specific example?
   - Superior vs. inferior; familial vs. distant; prominent vs. subtle body language or activity; etc. Note: The physical behavior of your body (i.e. body language) plays an extremely important role in any particular situation. This makes all the difference in what constitutes a sincere apology, a playful comment, or the effectiveness of a rascal teasing.
4. What is the appropriate and all-inclusive vernacular that can be gathered from the specific example?
   - As much as possible, one needs to pay particular attention to the specific vernacular in order to properly re-teach a particular piece of knowledge that makes proper connections with students’ lives. It also allows for the building of vocabulary that plays an essential role in critical thinking in analyzing the play of words in a particular situation that ultimately create meaning through the part-whole relationship.
5. What spiritual interpretations can be observed about the example itself, as well as the context in which the example takes place?

Just as literary theories become “lenses” through which literary text can be explicated, the Kumu Honua Mauli Ola becomes a cultural lens through which one can view familial, educational, and whole life experiences in a holistically Hawaiian way.

Prong two is the recognition and usage of lexical items, which relies heavily on Pawley's (1986) ideas concerning "vernacular understandings of knowing a language" to formulate the basic idea of the usage of appropriate lexical items in speeches. Concerning the usage of "lexical items," in this paper, I have expanded its scope to include formulaic expressions and canonical phrases as well. Basically, this concept reminds the speaker to pay attention to terms/phrases that are indigenous to the relevant cultural domain and apply them appropriately. For example, one would not "hāʻawi" (give, as a gift) a "kīʻaha" (regular drinking cup) of ‘awa (kava) to the gods on a "pākaukau" (as in a dining table), but rather "kaumaha" (offer) an "ʻapu" (coconut shell cup which can be specifically used for drinking ‘awa) of ‘awa to the gods on a "lele" (alter). If one were to give a speech about Kamehameha I, one would speak of his "makuakāne hanauna" (uncle), not his "ʻanakala" (contemporary Hawaiian transliteration of "uncle" that was not in existence during the time of Kamehameha I); one would use "ʻāhaʻilono" (messenger spared to return and tell of the mass slaughter), not "waha ʻōlelo" (spokesperson); "ʻahaʻōlelo" (sacred council), not "hālāwai" (meeting of a more casual nature). Accordingly, if one were giving a speech about lāʻau lapaʻau (traditional Hawaiian medicine), hula (Hawaiian dance), or kaʻakaua (war strategies), appropriate lexical items should be expected. At the close of this section, I illustrate the concept by identifying lexical items used in several brief literary examples.

Prong three is the recognition of ethno-literary devices and their usage in speechmaking as a means of maintaining continuity with traditional style. I provide a list below of such devices, and in this chapter, I interpret each device and provide examples exhibited in classical literature. I
close chapter seven with a full-scale example of a four-page letter written in 1878 with all literary devices identified within.

Meiwi Moʻokalaleo  
(Ethno-literary Devices)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moʻokūʻauhau</td>
<td>An introduction of the main characters of the story by means of their genealogy, place where they were born and raised, and other pertinent information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helu</td>
<td>A list of some sort—a sequence of actions, the members of a semantic class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pīnaʻi</td>
<td>A repetition of words or actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inoa (ʻāina / kanaka / kapakapa)</td>
<td>The usage of place, personal, and epithetical names appropriately and contextually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mele</td>
<td>The usage of chant / song in a literary piece that comes directly from the original context itself, or from an external source used to educate or entertain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻIkioma / ʻōlelo noʻeau / Hoʻokāʻau / Nane / Kaona</td>
<td>The usage of Hawaiian idiomatic phrases, proverbial sayings, wittiness, and riddles that create double meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoʻokalakupua</td>
<td>Hawaiian supernatural characteristics or acts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʻĒkoʻa</td>
<td>Use of opposites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kīkahō Kualehelehe / Kōkua</td>
<td>Interjection in two basic forms: one that imposes the writer's personal thoughts, and one that provides further explanation of a particular event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuhia / Puanaʻi</td>
<td>A reference to knowledge from another source or the usage of a direct quote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoʻolauna / Pani</td>
<td>Introductory remarks that at times describe the reasons for publishing the story; concluding remarks may give hint to an upcoming publication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopena</td>
<td>Phrases that point to present-day results from within the story, usually in the form of &quot;a hiki i kēia lā&quot; (until this very day).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuʻi</td>
<td>A conjunctive device that joins one episode of the story to the next, usually by &quot;putting one character to rest&quot; and preparing to &quot;look at the next one.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuʻina hoʻi</td>
<td>A conjunctive device that joins thoughts (sentences) one to the other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter eight looks at the actual fruit of my past research, my outline for creating a traditional Hawaiian speech (graph below).

No Ka ʻOlokeʻa Haʻiʻōlelo Haʻakoʻikoʻi Hawaiʻi
(Hawaiian oration outline)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kohu</th>
<th>Imagery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoʻokanaka</td>
<td>Personification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akapili</td>
<td>Apposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoʻomakili</td>
<td>Flashfowarding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I describe each part in detail, and also describe the way in which I initially started teaching speechmaking. I provide my basic rubric used for assessment, and also provide two examples of speeches in which I have identified lexical items and ethno-literary devices. The first example is taken from a speech given by Larry L. Kimura in 1999 for a ceremony performed at Mokuola, Hilo, Hawaiʻi; the second example is one of my own speeches given in 2005. This chapter ends with summarizing thoughts regarding a revitalized kākāʻōlelo, which include ideas on vocal
expression and body language, as well as the use of hand-held objects to be further investigated and implemented in speechmaking.

This work can have an impact on Hawaiʻi in many ways. One, it will bring to the fore a most interesting aspect of traditional life that has lain dormant for generations. Second, it will better characterize Hawaiian oratory for the Hawaiian language/culture revitalization community by providing sound examples in order to ensure continuity and proper creativity. Third, it will describe the methods I have developed to allow Hawaiian oratory to be taught in a way that will allow future generations to once again participate in this vibrant aspect of pan-Polynesian life. Lastly, it will join other research projects/products that serve as an example of responsible revitalization efforts (researching past examples thoroughly to create anew).