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1.0 INTRODUCTION

To support the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) in preparation of a Cultural Impact Assessment for the Hawaiian Monk Seal PEIS, extensive research and analysis was undertaken to better understand the role that monk seals may have played in traditional Hawaiian society. As part of this research, a thorough examination was made of both archaeological and archival resources. The evidence of seal remains recovered from archaeological excavations conducted within the Hawaiian Islands was examined. Dictionaries and other references were scoured to identify the various Hawaiian language terms used for the Hawaiian monk seal, as well as for other types of seals. A search was made of references to seals in traditional oli (chants) and mo’olelo (stories, legends, and traditional histories), as well as in the accounts of early Western visitors, articles in Hawaiian language newspapers, and other historic documents. A review of more contemporary references to Hawaiian monk seals and their significance was also conducted. The results of this research and analysis are presented below.

2.0 THE EARLY PRESENCE OF MONK SEALS IN THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS

The Hawaiian monk seal (Monachus schauinslandi) is among the most evolutionarily ancient of the living members of the Phocidae family of true seals (Culliney 2006:108). They appeared in the eastern North Atlantic approximately 15 million years ago and then dispersed westward to the Caribbean and Central America (Lowry et al. 2011:397, Fyler et al. 2005:1276). Biologists continue to debate when monk seals may have reached the Hawaiian Islands, with estimates ranging from 15 million to 3.5 million years ago (Lavigne 1998:1, Fyler et al. 2005:1276). One of the closest relatives to the Hawaiian monk seal was the now-extinct Caribbean monk seal. It is likely that the ancestors of the Hawaiian monk seal moved from the Caribbean Sea into the Pacific Ocean through the Central American Seaway, which was located near the present Isthmus of Panama, and which closed approximately 3 million years ago (Lavigne 1998:1, Fyler et al. 2005:1276). At some time following their entry into the Pacific, a founder population of monk seals established itself in Hawai’i (Culliney 2006:109).

While the prevailing opinion among marine mammal scientists and the National Marine Fisheries Service is that monk seals have occupied the entire Hawaiian archipelago since the time of their initial arrival, direct physical evidence of their presence within the MHI is limited (Ragen 1999:184). This limited evidence has led to some debate as to whether monk seal populations occupied the waters of the MHI at the time of the arrival of the first Polynesian voyagers (Ragen 2003:1).

Bishop Museum zoologist Alan Ziegler, who analyzed the faunal remains recovered from numerous archaeological excavations conducted within the MHI (with the exception of Lāna‘i, Kaho‘olawe and Ni‘ihau) between 1986 and 1999, found no monk seal bones in any of the midden assemblages he examined (one exception, the upland Lapakahi site, is noted below; Sara Collins, pers. comm.). This led him to state, in his 2002 book Hawaiian Natural History, Ecology, and Evolution (2002) that, “The absence of skeletal material from both paleontological and archaeological sites on the MHI suggests that, for obscure reasons, the species [Hawaiian monk seals] may always have been scarce in the vicinity of large young islands of the
archipelago, preferring instead the small sandy atolls” (Zeigler 2002:244). There exists no biological reason why monk seals would prefer the “small sandy atolls” of the NWHI to the “larger young islands” of the MHI. Both the NWHI and the MHI posses a somewhat similar range of marine habitats including beaches on which to haul out and sheltered reefs in which to hunt for food (Ragen 1999:184 and Ragen 2003:1). It has been estimated that if monk seals were distributed throughout the Hawaiian archipelago prior to the arrival of the first Polynesians, “they may have comprised a metapopulation of perhaps 13, 14, or more colonies” (Ragen 1999:184). Given these estimates, how do we account for the scarcity of monk seal remains in paleontological and archaeological assemblages as noted by Zeigler?

The lack of paleontological evidence for the presence Hawaiian monk seals within the MHI is not surprising. Given their aquatic nature, and the fact that they seldom haul out further inland than the high tide line, it seems unlikely that the skeletal remains of Hawaiian monk seals would have been naturally incorporated into the terrestrial fossil assemblage. Monk seal carcasses are more likely to have been carried by the tide back into the sea where they would have been consumed by predators and their bones scattered over the sea bottom to be ground into sand by the action of the waves or incorporated into the bottom sediments (Ragen 1999:184).

The relative scarcity of monk seal bones in archaeological assemblages is more problematic and requires more detailed investigation. If monk seal populations were relatively abundant within the MHI at the time of the arrival of the first Polynesians, the animals would have offered a readily available food source that would be expected to be exploited by these early settlers, as well as by their descendants. One would therefore expect to find monk seal remains among the food debris excavated at traditional Hawaiian residence structures, particularly at those sites dating from the early settlement period. To date, monk seal remains have only been recovered from two confirmed traditional archaeological contexts. As discussed below (and summarized in the conclusions presented in Section 8), more detailed analysis reveals factors and considerations that may in part account for the relative absence of documented archeological evidence of monk seal presence within the MHI at the time of first Polynesian arrival.

3.0 Evidence of Monk Seal Remains in Archaeological Deposits

In the preparation of this report, an effort was made to identify all of the instances in which Hawaiian monk seal remains have been recovered from archaeological excavations within the MHI. As has already been mentioned, Dr. Alan Zeigler, the staff zoologist at the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum, made identifications of faunal assemblages from a number of archaeological excavations conducted in the MHI (with the exception of Lāna‘i, Kaho‘olawe and Ni‘ihau) between 1986 and 1999. The faunal remains were from archaeological sites excavated by researchers from the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum, Cultural Surveys Hawai‘i, Inc., the International Archaeological Research Institute, Inc., and Paul H. Rosendahl, Inc. None of the assemblages examined by Dr. Zeigler (with the exception of the upland Lapakahi site discussed below) was found to contain any seal bone or bone that could be identified as marine mammal (Sara Collins, pers. comm.).

The authors of this study also consulted Dr. Sara Collins, an archaeologist and authority on human and faunal osteology who has examined and identified the remains from numerous
archaeological excavations in Hawai’i. Dr. Collins indicated that she had never come across any seal bone in any of the collections she has examined. She noted, however, that it is possible that seal bone could be present among the literally millions of bone fragments identified as “medium mammal” or “large mammal” recovered from excavations over the decades since attempts were first made to identify faunal remains in archaeological assemblages.

Dr. Marshall Weisler has conducted analyses of excavated faunal material from early deposits at all archaeological sites on the western third of Moloka’i Island (which now possesses a small but viable Hawaiian monk seal population) and has found no seal remains (Weisler 2013, pers. comm.). He is of the opinion that if monk seals were present when Hawaiians resided along the shoreline of West Molokai, then the bones of monk seals should be present within the archaeological deposits, but they are not. Although the monk seal population within the MHI may never have been very large, one would still expect to find a bone or two in the early deposits which were extensively excavated on West Moloka’i (Weisler 2013, pers. comm.).

After extensive inquiry, which included a search of the available literature and consultation with various members of the archaeological community in Hawai’i, a total of four instances were found in which identified seal bones are known to have been recovered from archaeological deposits.

- A single seal rib bone was reported from a pre-Contact house site in upland North Kohala (Lapakahi) on the island of Hawai’i.
- A single sternum was excavated from the site of Nu’alolo Kai on the island of Kaua’i.
- Seal phalanges were recovered from a post-Contact deposit at a Hawaiian house site in coastal North Kohala.
- A complete seal carcass was found in a pit during excavation of a subsurface cultural deposit in Wailuku on the island of Maui.

Lapakahi
Excavations conducted by Dr. Paul Rosendahl at Site 7402, a large earthen residential platform in upland Lapakahi in the district of North Kohala on the island of Hawai’i yielded a portion of a single rib bone identified as belonging to a Hawaiian monk seal. The site is situated in the midst of upland agricultural fields traditionally used for the cultivation of dryland crops. It consisted of an earthen platform with an L-shaped windbreak wall along its rear. The entire structure measures approximately 15 by 6 meters. Excavations into the interior of the platform revealed the presence of multiple fire hearths and yielded an abundance of cultural material suggesting that the platform served as the foundation for a pole and thatch occupation structure (Rosendahl 1972:247-263). The single seal bone was recovered from one of the wall trenches. Also recovered from the site were bones of the Polynesian rat (Rattus exulans), dog (Canus familiaris), pig (Sus scrofa), numerous unidentified medium-sized mammal bones, and the bones of domestic chicken (Gallus, gallus) and medium sized duck (Rosendahl 1972: 257-258). A single radiocarbon date recovered from 10 to 15 centimeters below ground surface yielded a range at one standard deviation of A. D. 1418 to 1618, 1466 to 1666 and 1538 to 1738, placing the occupation of the structure within the pre-Contact period somewhere between A. D. 1418 and 1738.

The excavations in upland Lapakahi were undertaken in association with the University of
In Chapter V of his dissertation (Rosendahl 1972: 325), Rosendahl indicates that Dr. Alan Ziegler identified the mammal and bird remains from the Lapakahi midden. Some of the mammal bone recovered from the site appeared to represent debitage (wastage) from the manufacture of bone artifacts. Given this evidence of bone tool manufacture, it is possible that the single seal rib bone was brought onto the site to serve as raw material for tool making rather than as food. Seal bone is denser than that of land mammals such as dog and pig, but not as dense as other marine mammals like whales or dolphins (Sara Collins 2013, pers. comm.). It can be used in the manufacture of bone fishhooks or similar items.

**Nu‘alolo Kai**
The valley of Nu‘alolo Kai is located on the remote Na Pali coast of the island of Kaua‘i. In 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1964 researchers from the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum under the direction of Dr. Kenneth Emory conducted excavations at Site 50-30-01-196, set of stone faced terraces located beneath the sheltering overhang of the valley’s eastern cliffs. Due to its location, in the rain shadow of these cliffs, excavators found the site to possess excellent preservation conditions, and managed to recover perishable objects such as wood and textiles. Their excavations encountered buried structural floors, fire hearths and other subsurface features, as well as numerous traditional artifacts. The cultural deposit at Site 196 extended to a depth of nearly 2 meters below the ground surface (Graves et al. 2005:1). In the early 1990s, archaeologists from the University of Hawai‘i compiled a comprehensive computerized inventory of the cultural materials recovered from the site, including many objects not previously documented (Graves et al. 2005:1). Radiocarbon dates suggest that the earliest occupation of the site may have taken place around A.D. 1290 to 1450 (Graves et al. 2005:37). The presence of historic artifacts in the upper most levels indicates that the site continued in use up into the post-Contact period.

The Site 196 complex was originally divided during excavation into four major architectural features (K2, K3, K4 and K5). The bulk of the Bishop Museum excavations were conducted in K3, a complex located toward the center of the site that consists of at least two and possibly four terraces separated by stone faced retaining walls (Graves et al. 2005:4). During the excavation, soil was sifted through ¼ inch screens so as to recover artifacts and faunal remains (Graves et al. 2005:6). Recent analysis of the faunal material excavated by both the Bishop Museum and later by the University of Hawai‘i conducted by Dr. Julie Field identified a single monk seal bone from the site. This bone, an adult sternum, was recovered from somewhere between the surface and 29 inches depth in unit H5 of site K3. The sternum was unmodified. Existing dates associated with this level of the deposit puts it very late, at or after A.D. 1700 (Field 2013:pers. comm.).

The upland Lapakahi site and Site 196-K3 at Nualolo Kai appear to be the only known archaeological sites within the MHI dating from the period prior to Western contact at which seal remains have been found.

**North Kohala**
Hawaiian monk seal bones were also recovered by archaeologist Dr. Robert Rechtman at a Hawaiian household in coastal North Kohala that appears to date from the historic period (1850s to 1860s). The identification of the remains was made with the assistance of several pinniped experts, including Thomas Wake. Rechtman notes that, “A single front right
intermediate phalanges of a juvenile monk seal was found during data recovery excavations at SIHP [State Inventory of Historic Places] Site 25006, a mid-nineteenth century house site situated along the North Kohala coastline in Kukuipahu Ahupua’a. This site appears to have been a Hawaiian household based on design and cultural material present. The bone was recovered near a hearth feature, but does not appear to represent dietary remains. Rather, this item seems to have been used in conjunction with ritual or ceremonial activity as it has been modified with the incision of a stick-figure image on its flat ventral side (Rechtman in prep.). Any interpretation of this incised image and its possible significance must await further analysis and investigation by Rechtman.

Wailuku
An entire articulated monk seal carcass was discovered during data recovery excavations of a buried cultural deposit (State Inventory of Historic Places site number 50-50-04-4127) conducted in 1996 prior to road improvements along Lower Main Street in Wailuku on the island of Maui. The work was conducted by Eric M. Fredericksen and Demaris L. Fredericksen (Fredericksen and Fredericksen 1996). These excavations uncovered two cultural layers that were overlaid by one to two meters of imported fill soil associated with the historic Kahului Railroad and the paving of Lower Main. The articulated skeleton of a juvenile Hawaiian monk seal was found within an elongated basin-shaped excavated pit (Test Unit 2A, Feature 8). The fill of the pit consisted of clean sand and did not contain any cultural material. The skull of the seal appeared to have been severely fractured, perhaps by a blow to the head. “There was no evidence that indicated that the seal had been collected for food. Rather, it appears that the seal had been laid on its back or left side and intentionally buried” (Fredericksen and Fredericksen 1996:21, 50).

The pit in which the remains of the seal rested appeared to have been dug down from the lower levels of Layer I, a 15 to 19 centimeter deep disturbed soil layer containing a mix of pre-Contact and historic material, and into Layer II, an undisturbed pre-Contact deposit dated to between AD 1570 and 1780 (Fredericksen and Fredericksen 1996:19,49). In the area of the feature, the upper 8 to 12 centimeters of Layer I contained pieces of coal and fragments of early 20th century bottle glass. Food debris and indigenous artifacts (a basalt abrader and a fragment of volcanic glass) were also found in Layer I (Fredericksen and Fredericksen 1996:19). It is not clear from the archaeological evidence exactly when the pit containing the seal remains was dug, but it seems probable that it may have been excavated some time in the early historic period. The juvenile monk seal, its skull crushed, appears to have been placed in the hole and buried over. Whether any meat was removed from the carcass prior to its deposition is also uncertain.

3.1 Analysis
Confirmed archaeological evidence of Hawaiian monk seal presence within the MHI prior to Western contact is limited. It consists of a single monk seal rib bone excavated at an upland house site and a sternum recovered from a coastal occupation deposit. Neither of these bones was recovered from particularly early contexts. The inland Lapakahi site may date to somewhere between A.D. 1418 and 1738, while the Nu’alolo Kai deposit appears to date at or after A.D. 1700. The monk seal remains recovered could derive from individuals belonging to a resident population within the MHI or they could represent stray animals that found their way down to the MHI from the NWHI. The Nu’alolo Kai sternum could alternately be from an animal caught by Kaua’i residents fishing up in the NWHI.
The question of butchery adds another complication to the archaeological equation, and may in part account for the scarcity of Hawaiian monk seal remains in traditional archaeological contexts. An adult Hawaiian monk seal measures from approximately 6 to 7 feet in length and can weigh between 300 to 500 pounds. Even a juvenile seal would be difficult to carry for any distance. It seems unlikely therefore, given its size and weight, that a seal killed for food would be transported from the shoreline where it was killed to the hunter’s place of residence for butchering. It is more likely that the seal carcass would be butchered on the beach and only the meat carried to the consumption site. Alternately, an *imu* (earth oven) could have been dug into the sand and the entire carcass cooked in situ. It is unlikely, given wave disturbance and other natural factors, that such a preparation site would survive archaeologically. This butchering strategy may help to account for the scarcity of monk seal remains at traditional occupation sites.

In contrast to the relative scarcity of seal remains from Hawaiian sites, seal bones have been found at 174 archaeological sites in Aotearoa (New Zealand), the only other Polynesian island group where seals are endemic (Smith 1989:78). Seal populations are presently (and appear in the past to have been) much more abundant in Aotearoa than in the Hawaiian archipelago, and thus would be more common in the archaeological record. Ethnographic data and archaeological reconstructions of pre-Contact butchering methods in Aotearoa suggest that seal flesh was commonly separated from the bones at kill sites prior to transportation or preservation (Smith 1985:11-15). Seal bones would therefore not be expected to be found at consumption sites located at a considerable distance from the kill site, though fresh seal meat on the bone was apparently transported over shorter distances (Smith 1989:81). There are also indications that certain seal species had a much greater geographic distribution in the pre-Contact period than at present. It has been suggested that human predation was a contributing factor to this shrinkage of their natural ranges (Smith 1989:100-101).

Direct human predation appears to be a major factor in observed changes in the distribution of seal populations in Aotearoa. Seals of various ages were actively hunted, particularly juveniles and subadults. This appears to have led to the extirpation of local populations in several areas (Smith 1989:101). A similar scenario may have occurred with monk seals in the MHI. It seems probable that on their arrival in Hawai‘i, the early Polynesian voyagers found a native population of Hawaiian monk seals occupying the MHI. This resident population of seals would have offered a ready source of easily obtainable protein. As suggested by Timothy Ragen (Ragen 1999:185), intensive hunting by humans, as well as disturbance by other recently introduced land mammals (such as the Polynesian dog), may have led to a dramatic drop in seal numbers and the eventual local extirpation of the resident seal population in the MHI. A somewhat similar scenario has been offered to explain the extinction of the various species of native ground birds that were present within the MHI prior to human arrival.

Given the estimated small size of any such an indigenous seal population, it appears possible that intensive hunting over a period of one or two generation might have killed off, or driven away, any pre-existing native population of Hawaiian monk seals. The archaeological evidence of this extirpation would be limited to sites dating to the very early period of human occupation of the archipelago.

Up until recently it was the general opinion of the archaeological community that the initial
Polynesian settlement of the Hawaiian Islands took place some time between approximately 300 and 750 AD (Kirch 2011;3). This estimation was based upon radiocarbon dates recovered from what were considered to be early colonization period layers present within a small number of coastal sites. Recent refinements to the radiocarbon chronology have led to the reevaluation of this estimate. It is presently believed that the initial Polynesian discovery and colonization of the archipelago may have occurred between approximately 1000 and 1200 AD (Kirch 2011;3). The only identified archaeological sites within the MHI which may date to this early colonization period are the Bellows dune site (O18) at Waimānalo, O’ahu (Pearson 1971); the Pu‘u Ali‘i (H1) sand dune site at South Point, Hawai‘i Island, and the nearby Waiahukini Shelter (H8) at Waiahukini, Hawai‘i Island (Emory and Sinoto 1969). None of these sites have been found to contain monk seal remains.

4.0 Traditional Perspectives on the Hawaiian Monk Seal

The archaeological evidence would seem to indicate that for much of the period from the arrival of the first Polynesian voyagers up until Western contact the Hawaiian monk seal was not abundant within the MHI, and there was little direct contact between monk seal populations and human populations. This conclusion seems to be supported by the ethnohistorical evidence.

The consumption of seal meat is not mentioned in either traditional or early historic accounts of Hawaiian cultural practices, suggesting that it did not form a significant component of the Hawaiian diet. While traditional kapu (prohibitions) restricted the consumption of certain food items at certain times of the year or by certain segments of the population (pork and some varieties of bananas were among the foods prohibited to women: Malo 1951:29), there is no evidence in the traditional literature to suggest that seal meat was considered kapu. Monk seal remains do not appear in Hawaiian material culture as raw materials for tools or other objects. There are no traditional artifacts that are known to have been made from seal bone, skin or teeth. While dog tooth ornaments were fairly common (Buck 1964:553-561) and both porpoise (Buck 1964:546) and whale (Buck 1964:535-538) teeth are known to have been made into neck ornaments, there are no recorded instances of seal teeth being worn as ornamentation. Seal bone may have been used in the manufacture of fishhooks and other bone tools (as was dog, pig, whale and even human bone), but if so, no such tools have been directly identified.

The absence of images of monk seals in traditional Hawaiian petroglyphs can not necessarily be taken as an indicator of their physical absence from the MHI. Although certain animals, such as dogs, turtles and, to a lesser extent, chickens, appear commonly as motifs in Hawaiian rock art, other domestic animals, such as pigs, appear only rarely, if at all (Cox and Stasack 1970:19). There are no known petroglyph depictions of dolphins or whales, and only one possible symbol representing a shark (Cox and Stasack 1970:68), and yet these animals, particularly the shark, appear commonly in the traditional literature, and are known to have been both hunted and revered by traditional Hawaiian society (Reeve 1991).

Even if a local population of Hawaiian monk seals did not exist within the MHI during the pre-Contact period, it would be reasonable to expect that the existence of monk seals would have been known to the early Hawaiians. Archaeological evidence for an early Polynesian presence on the islands of Nihoa and Mokumanamana (Necker) in the NWHI suggests that the early
voyagers explored (and settled) at least a portion of the Leeward Chain and would have come in contact with the resident population of monk seals. The occupation of the higher of the Leeward Islands appears, however, to have taken place relatively early in the Polynesian settlement of the Hawaiian Archipelago and not to have been very prolonged. Following this initial period, contact with monk seals may have been restricted to a relatively small number of fishermen visiting the fishing grounds of the NWHI from Kaua‘i and Ni‘ihau.

To further investigate the role (if any) that monk seals may have played in traditional Hawaiian culture prior to Western contact, an examination was made of Hawaiian language sources.

4.1 Hawaiian Terms for Monk Seal
If the existence of the Hawaiian monk seal was generally known to the pre-Contact human population of the MHI then one would expect there to be one relatively standardized name used to refer to these marine mammals. This does not appear to have been the case. Instead, when one examines the range of Hawaiian dictionaries and other language sources one finds a variety of words used to refer to seals. Since, however, all of these written sources date to the post-Contact period, after the traditionally oral language was transformed into a written one, it becomes even more difficult to determine which terms may have been traditional and which came into use after Western contact when Hawaiian sailors were introduced to seals resident in the NWHI and on the western coast of America.

In attempting to determine the common term(s) used in the Hawaiian language to refer to the Hawaiian monk seal, it is important to look at the earliest published Hawaiian texts, as well as the range of words and definitions presented in the various dictionaries prepared since the early years of Western contact.

In its traditional form ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i is a spoken, rather than a written, language. Although various early Western explorers, beginning with Captain Cook, compiled rough vocabularies of Hawaiian words, it was not until the arrival of the Protestant missionaries in the early 1800s that any systematic attempt was made to translate the rich complexities of the spoken language onto a written page. The earliest Hawaiian dictionaries were prepared at Lāhainaluna Seminary which was founded in 1831 for the Christian education for young Hawaiian men. In 1845 the press at Lāhainaluna published Joseph S. Emerson and Artemis Bishop’s He Hoakaolelo No Na Huaolelo Beritania I Me Kokua I Na Kanaka Hawaii E Ao Ana Ia Olelo, a collection of English words and phrases with definitions in Hawaiian (Emerson and Bishop 1845).

In their book, Emerson and Bishop provide two definitions for the English word “seal”. The first of these, which appears to refer to the marine mammal, is “he ʻilio o ke kai” (Emerson and Bishop 1845:141). The Hawaiian he is the demonstrative used at the beginning of a phrase (Pukui and Elbert 1971:58), ‘ilio is the word for dog (Pukui and Elbert 1971:92), o can be translated as “of” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:252), ke is the demonstrative often translated as “the” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:130), and kai means the sea (Pukui and Elbert 1971:107). Thus the term he ‘ilio o ke kai could roughly be translated as ‘the dog of the sea’.

The second definition given by Emerson and Bishop is “he wepa kapili palapala”. This term, which can be translated literally as ‘the wafer joining together paper’, appears to refer to the
wafer of wax (seal) affixed to official documents. The Hawaiian word wepa is a transliteration of the English word wafer (Emerson and Bishop 1845:179). The definition given by Emerson and Bishop for the verb seal is “e hoopaa i ka wepa” (the making fast by means of the wafer), while the noun for sealing wax is “he kepau kapili palapala me he wepa la” (the resin that joins together paper with the wafer) (Emerson and Bishop 1845:141). The secondary usage of the word seal in the English language to refer to a wax or printed seal affixed to a document can result in confusion for unwary individuals seeking early definitions for the Hawaiian names given to monk seals.

The most comprehensive of the early dictionaries published at Lāhaināluna was A Dictionary of the Hawaiian Language, compiled by Lorrin Andrews’ in 1865. In preparing his dictionary of roughly 15,000 words, Andrews, who was head of Lāhaināluna at the time, drew primarily on the writings of native Hawaiian speakers, as well as word lists and vocabularies compile by his fellow missionaries and native scholars such as Samuel Kamakau (Andrews 1895:iv-v).

In its section of “English-Hawaiian Vocabulary”, Andrews’ dictionary gives the definition of seal as “he ilio o ke kai” (Andrews 1865:546), using the same term employed by Emerson and Bishop. The term “he ilio o ke kai”, however, does not appear in the “Dictionary of the Hawaiian Language” section of Andrews’ work, nor is there any reference to seal under any form of the Hawaiian word “ilio”.

As with Emerson and Bishop, Andrews lists the word “Seal” twice. The first definition, “he ilio o ke kai”, appears to refer to the marine mammal, while the second, “e hoopaa i ka wefa” (e ho’opa’ a ka wefa), literally ‘to make fast by means of the wafer’, refers to a wax or paper seal placed or printed on a document (Andrews 1865:546).

In 1887, An English-Hawaiian Dictionary was prepared by Howard R. Hitchcock (who also served as Principal of the Lāhaināluna Seminary) at the request of the Board of Education of the Kingdom of Hawai’i for use in the public schools. This dictionary gives the primary definition of the noun seal as “Ilio o ke kai”, echoing both Emerson and Bishop, and Andrews (Hitchcock 1968:182). Secondary definitions listed include the terms “He sila” (literally “the seal”, with sila being a Hawaiian adaptation of the English word seal) and “hoailona pai” (Hitchcock 1968:182). The Hawaiian word hō’ailona or ‘ailona means a sign, symbol, emblem, or token of recognition (Pukui and Elbert 1971:10), while the word pa’i means to slap, clap or to print (Pukui and Elbert 1971:278). This would suggest that the term hō’ailona pa’i refers to printing a symbol or affixing a seal. The verb seal is translated by Hitchcock as “E sila” (Hitchcock 1968:182), which suggests that, at least in this case, the post-Contact word sila refers to a wax or paper seal, not to the animal.” Hitchcock’s is the first dictionary in which the term kila or sila occurs. Neither word appears in the original 1865 versions of Lorrin Andrews’ A Dictionary of the Hawaiian Language.

In 1922, Lorrin Andrew’s original dictionary was revised by the Reverend Henry Hodges Parker and republished under the direction of the Board of Commissioners of Public Archives of the Territory of Hawai’i. This new version incorporated definitions prepared by the missionary Lorenzo Lyons (1807-1886) and various other sources into the body of the original Andrews Dictionary. It also included the revision of many definitions and the inclusion of diacritical marks (Andrews 1922:iii-iv). This revised dictionary no longer contains an “English-Hawaiian Vocabulary”, so there is no direct definition provided for the English word seal. As
with Andrews' original dictionary, the term “he ilio o ke kai” does not appear among the Hawaiian words, nor is there any reference to seal under any form of the word “ilio”.

In 1940, Henry P. Judd published *The Hawaiian Language*, which contained a Hawaiian-English Vocabulary (Judd 1940). This vocabulary included neither he ‘ilio o ke kai, ‘ilio o ke kai, nor any term beginning with ‘ilio other than simply “ilio” meaning dog (Judd 1940:97).

Five years later, an English-Hawaiian, Hawaiian-English vocabulary was compiled by Henry P. Judd, Mary Kawena Pukui and John F. G. Stokes. In the English-Hawaiian vocabulary the authors differentiate seal “mammal” from seal “die”. They provide two definitions for the word seal (mammal), “‘ili‘o ho‘lo i Kauaua” and “uwalō” (Judd et al. 1945:167). In their Hawaiian-English vocabulary, Judd, Pukui and Stokes translate “uwalo” as “to cry out” (Judd et al. 1945:311). They do not include “‘ili‘o ho‘lo i Kauaua” in the Hawaiian-English vocabulary. In the English-Hawaiian vocabulary the terms given for seal (die) are “ki‘la” and “hōailo‘na pa‘i”, while to seal is given as “ki‘la” (Judd et al. 1945:311).

In their *Hawaiian Dictionary*, first completed in 1957, Hawaiian language scholars Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel Elbert give the term for both seal “1. Emblem” and “2. Mammal”. The term for seal (emblem) is given as “Kīla” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:135), which is translated in the Hawaiian-English portion of the dictionary as “also Sila. Seal, deed, patent; sealed; to fix a seal” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:139). Alternate terms are “uwepa”, “ho‘opapa”, “kuni”, and “hulu” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:135).

The term for seal (mammal) is given as “‘Ilio-holo-i-kauaua” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:135). In the Hawaiian-English portion of the dictionary this is translated as “seal”, literally “dog running in the toughness” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:93). The term, as they translate it, appears to be a combination of ‘ilio, the word for dog (Pukui and Elbert 1971:92); holo meaning “to run, sail, ride, go” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:72); i the participle “to, at, in, on, by, because of, due to, by means of” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:87); and kauaua, a term not directly found in the dictionary, but possibly a combining of ka, “the one” or “of” and uaua, “tough, sinewy, glutinous, viscid” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:335).

‘Ilio-holo-i-kauaua is today the most common term in contemporary ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i used to refer to the monk seal. It is often translated as “the dog that runs in the rough seas” (Watson et al. 2011:390), though there is nothing in Pukui and Elbert’s original translation to suggest that kauaua should be rendered as either rough or rough seas. This translation seems to derive more from a desire to explicate the somewhat confusing original translation, than from any linguistic reality. In their *Hawaiian Dictionary*, Pukui and Elbert provide the following Hawaiian terms for rough sea, “kai ko‘o” and “‘ōkaikai” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:130). Under the term rough, “as sea or wind”, they give “pikipikiō”, “ālo‘alo‘a”, “lo‘alo‘a”, “la‘ola‘o”, “hālo‘alo‘a”, “āulu”, “olo‘i‘a”, “pūkalakī”, “kū‘ulukū”, “nalunalu”, “ōnalunalu”, “puleleho”, and “maleuwō” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:130). None of these terms appear related to kauaua.

Pukui and Elbert’s *Hawaiian Dictionary* is the first instance in which the term ‘ilio-holo-i-kauaua occurs in a Hawaiian language dictionary. It appears possible that Mary Kawena Pukui encountered the term when translating articles in Hawaiian language newspapers (see Section 4.1.4). The Hawaiian texts of these newspaper articles would not have included diacritical
marks indicating how the words were to be pronounced. The word *uaua* can be pronounced one of four ways; as *uaua*, meaning either “tough, sinewy, glutinous” or “a variety of taro” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:335); as *u’a’u’a*, meaning “a tapa dyed with ‘ōlena (turmeric) or *noni*” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:335); as *ʻua’ua*, a variant spelling of ‘uovā*uovā*, which itself is an intensification of ‘uovā, which means “to shout, cry out, sound loud” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:346); or ‘u’a’u’a an intensification of ‘u*a, which means “useless, vain, to no profit” or “a coarse mat or tapa” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:334).

It is intriguing to recall that a slightly earlier Hawaiian vocabulary also prepared with the help of Mary Kawena Pukui (Judd et al. 1945) gives as an alternate name for the monk seal the word *uwalo*. This word it then translates as “to cry out” (Judd et al. 1945:311). The definition for *uwalo* (also given as *ualo*) provided by Pukui and Elbert is “to call out, as for help; to resound” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:346). This is very similar to the translation of word ‘ua’ua, which is an intensification of the word ‘uovā, “to shout, cry out, sound loud” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:346). Given the sonorous bark for which the monk seal is well known, it seems possible that an alternate interpretation of *ka-uaua* is *ka-ʻuaʻua*, the one that cries out.

The historian Abraham Fornander, who was fluent in Hawaiian and married to a chiefess of O’ahu, translates the phrase “holo i ka uaua” as “running at the voice” (see Section 5.4.3). It appears that he is interpreting the word used in the phrase as *ʻuaʻua*, rather than *uaua*. His translation also suggests that “ka-uaua” might be translated as “the voice”. It is possible that this same version of the word appears in the name *iʻlioholoikauaua*, and that this name for the Hawaiian monk seal might be translated as “the dog running (to, at, in, on, or by) the voice”.

Although the terms mentioned above are the only ones that appear in the English-Hawaiian section of Pukui and Elbert’s *Hawaiian Dictionary*, Another term that appears in the Hawaiian-English section is “hulu”. Among the ten possible definitions given for this word is “8. Seal, named for its valuable fur. Rare” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:84). One of the more common definitions of *hulu* is “fur, wool, fleece, human body hair” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:84). This is the first appearance of the definition of seal for the word *hulu*. In his 1865 dictionary, Lorrrin Andrews defines *hulu* as “a feather of a bird”, “a bristle of a hog”, “the hair of the body”, “wool” (Andrews 1865:225). Parker’s revision of Andrews’ dictionary translates it as “a feather or feathers”, “every kind of hair excepting the hair of the head”, “wool”, and “fleece” (Andrews 1922:214). Judd translates *hulu* as “feather, wool” (Judd 1940:96), while Judd, Pukui and Stokes translate *hulu* as “feathers, wool, hair in general” (Judd et al. 1945:244). Hitchcock gives as the Hawaiian term for fur, “Hulu palupalu” (Hitchcock 1968:93), (palupalu meaning soft) (Pukui and Elbert 1971:288).

In explaining the use of this evidently rare term, Pukui and Elbert suggest that the word *hulu* was used to refer to the seal due to “its valuable fur”. This might suggest that the use of *hulu* to refer to seals developed during the early historic period, and that the word was used in reference to arctic fur seals that were being hunted at that time for their pelts. Sealing vessels often stopped in the Islands to re-provision, and Hawaiians were taken on as sailors on many of these vessels. It seems unlikely that the term *hulu* is a traditional name for the Hawaiian Monk.
seal, which, being a resident of the tropics, does not possess the dense under-fur that characterizes its arctic cousins.

Some possible support for this suggestion can be found in Rev. Henry Hodges Parker’s 1922 revision of Lorrin Andrews 1865 dictionary, which defines the noun “Ohulu (ō'-hū'-lu)” as meaning “A seal hunter”, “O, to spear, and hulu, fur or feathers” (Andrews 1922:478). Pukui and Elbert provide a similar translation for “ō hulu”, “Seal hunter; to spear seals. Lit., spear fur” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:256). In contrast, Andrews’ original 1865 dictionary defines “Ohulu” as “a person that sails or goes on the ocean; he kanaka ohulu no ka moana” (Andrews 1865:82). There is no mention in this earlier version of seal hunting. This definition seems to have been added to the dictionary by Parker, though it is not clear what his source was.

In recent years the Hawaiian Lexicon Committee has attempted to compile a list of Hawaiian words that have been created, collected, and approved by the Committee from 1987 through 2000. Their Māmaka Kaiao: A Modern Hawaiian Vocabulary, gives the Hawaiian word for seal as “Sila” (Kōmike Hua’ōlelo, 2003:349). The fur seal is identified as “Sila pūhuluhulu”, while the monk seal is identified as “Sila Hawai’i”. As with a number of words in the Māmaka Kaiao, these appear to be recent creations derived in part from their English equivalents.

In comparing the various words found in Hawaiian vocabularies and dictionaries since 1845, it appears that the earliest documented terms used to refer to monk seals are he ‘ilio o ke kai and ‘ilio o ke kai (Error! Reference source not found.). Later alternate names include uwalo, ‘ilioholoikauaua, and hulu.

Table 1. Terms for Seal Found in Hawaiian Dictionaries and Vocabularies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Possible Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Emerson and Bishop, He Hoakaolelo No Na Huaolelo Beritania</td>
<td>he ilio o ke kai</td>
<td>the dog of the sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Lorrin Andrews, A Dictionary of the Hawaiian Language</td>
<td>he ilio o ke kai</td>
<td>the dog of the sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Howard R. Hitchcock, An English-Hawaiian Dictionary</td>
<td>ilio o ke kai</td>
<td>dog of the sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Lorrin Andrews, A Dictionary of the Hawaiian Language revised by Henry Parker</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Judd, Pukui and Stokes, Introduction to the Hawaiian Language</td>
<td>‘ilio ho’lo i Kauaua</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Judd, Pukui and Stokes, Introduction to the Hawaiian Language</td>
<td>uwa’lo</td>
<td>“to cry out”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Pukui and Elbert, Hawaiian Dictionary</td>
<td>‘ilio-holo-i-kauaua</td>
<td>“dog running in the toughness”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Pukui and Elbert, Hawaiian Dictionary</td>
<td>hulu</td>
<td>“seal, named for its valuable fur”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Hawaiian Lexicon Committee, Māmaka Kaiao</td>
<td>sila</td>
<td>“seal (Sila pūhuluhulu, fur seal; Sila Hawai’i, monk seal)”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Place Names
In their various publications related to monk seals (Kittinger et al. 2011, Kittinger et al. 2012, Watson et al. 2012), Kittinger and his fellow authors identify a number of place names that they suggest are in some way associated with Hawaiian monk seals (Error! Reference source not found.). Many of these names include the word ‘ilio. In most cases, however, it seems more
reasonable to suggest that the names refer to or are in some way associated with dogs rather than seals.
Table 2. Place Names Identified by Kittinger et al. as Referring to Monk Seals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>Physical Feature</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Possible Translation</th>
<th>Association with Hawaiian Monk Seals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Īlio-pi‘i</td>
<td>Cape and bay</td>
<td>Kalaupapa, Molokai</td>
<td>“climbing dog” (Pukui et al., 1974;56)</td>
<td>Modern observation of seals in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lae o Ka ‘Īlio</td>
<td>Cape</td>
<td>Hā‘ena, Kaua‘i</td>
<td>Cape of the dog</td>
<td>Modern observation of seals in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka-lae-o-ka-‘ilio</td>
<td>Cape</td>
<td>Northwest Moloka‘i</td>
<td>The cape of the dog</td>
<td>Similarity to name of cape at Hā‘ena, Kaua‘i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka-lae-o-ka-‘ilio</td>
<td>Cape</td>
<td>Kaupō, Maui</td>
<td>The cape of the dog</td>
<td>No known association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāne‘ilio</td>
<td>Cape</td>
<td>Waianae, O‘ahu</td>
<td>“dog Kāne”</td>
<td>No known association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pu‘uanahulu</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>Kona, Hawai‘i Island</td>
<td>“ten-day hill”</td>
<td>No known association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holoikauaua</td>
<td>Atoll</td>
<td>Pearl and Hermes Atoll</td>
<td>running in the roughness</td>
<td>Modern name given to the island</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Īlio-pi‘i
The name of this small cape and associated bay on the Kalaupapa peninsula of Moloka‘i can be translated as meaning literally “climbing dog” (Pukui et al., 1974). It has been mentioned as possibly having been named for the Hawaiian monk seal (Kittinger et al. 2011:15). The suggested evidence for this is the contemporary presence of seals in the area. Kittinger and his fellow authors state that, “The historical name seems appropriate, as monk seals commonly pup on beaches in this area in modern times” (Kittinger et al. 2011:15). The fact that the formerly populous, but now lightly populated Kalaupapa Peninsula, which is also a Federally protected National Historic Park, has become a common birthing area for Hawaiian monk seals is not surprising. The contemporary presence of monk seals in this area, however, does not necessarily infer that monk seals were present there during the pre-Contact period or that the area was named after them.

Since the place name ‘Īlio-pi‘i refers to a cape and bay, it might be suggested that the area is more likely to be associated with seals than dogs. The traditional origins of such place names, however, are not always so simply perceived. The name of such a wahi pana (storied place) may come from some legendary or mythological or poetic association. An example of an unrelated but perhaps similar poetic association can be found in a traditional hula ala‘apapa (a form of dramatic hula) that comes from the epic story of Hi‘iaka, sister of the volcano goddess Pele, and her journey to Kauai. In describing the windward side of the island of O‘ahu the hula mele states:

Ua holo-wai na kaha-wai;
Ua ko-kā wale na pali.
Aia ka wai la i ka ilina, he ilio,
He ilio hae, ke nahu nei e puka

Full run the streams, a rushing flood;
The mountain walls leap with the rain.
See the water climbing its bounds like a dog,
A raging dog, gnawing its way to pass out. (Emerson 1909:59)
Lae o Ka ‘Ilio
In his book Hā’ena: Through the Eyes of the Ancestors, Carlos Andrade identify a cape on the rural north shore of Kaua’i Island near Hā’ena as being associated with the Hawaiian monk seal. The traditional name of this cape (lae) can be literally translated as “the cape of the dog”. The place name is also known in its abbreviated form, Ka-‘ilio, which translates as “the dog” (Pukui et al. 1974:69). Andrade writes that Lae o Ka ‘Ilio, which he translates as “the headland of the dog,” “refers to the endangered Hawaiian monk seal known to Hawaiians as ‘ilio hele i ka uaua (dog running in the rough seas). Residents saw seals there even in the days before the federally established laws now protecting them caused a dramatic increase in their numbers in the main Hawaiian islands” (Andrade 2008). Here again the association of the place name with seals rather than dogs is related to the historically recent observation of monk seals in the area rather than any traditional association.

Kittinger and his follow authors state that, “‘Ilio-pi‘i on Moloka‘i and Lae o Ka ‘Ilio on Kaua‘i, are historical names that likely reference places where monk seals were common in historical times” (Kittinger et al. 2011:15). As has been pointed out, there appears to be no direct evidence for this association other than the fact that monk seals have been noted in these areas in modern times. They also note that various other places throughout the archipelago may warrant more research to determine whether they are associated with the Hawaiian monk seal. The locations of these “places with names that potentially reference monk seals” are shown on a map in their 2012 paper (Kittinger et al. 2012:Figure1). Among the place names included are Lae o Ka ‘Ilio on northwest Moloka‘i; Ka Lae o Ka ‘Ilio at Kaupō, Maui; Kane‘ilio point on the Wai‘anae coast of O‘ahu; Kū‘ilioloa, also in Wai‘anae; Ka‘ō‘io point on the windward coast of O‘ahu; and Pu‘uanahulu in North Kona on Hawai‘i Island.

Ka Lae o Ka ‘Ilio
Also known as ‘Ilio and Ka-‘ilio (Pūkui et al., 1974:72), ‘Ilio Point, Lae o Ka ‘Ilio is a headland on the northwestern coast of Moloka‘i. Its name can be translated as “the cape of the dog” (Pūkui et al., 1974:72). Kittinger and his co-authors suggest that it is “possible the site was named for the frequent presence of monk seals, like its counterpart on Kaua‘i” (Kittinger 2011:16). Moloka‘i kupuna (elder) Harriet Ne, however, has stated that the point gained its name for its association with an ancient legend of a red dog (Ne et al. 1992, DLNR 2009).

Ka Lae o Ka ‘Ilio
Another Lae o Ka ‘Ilio marked in the Kittinger map is located at Kau-pō on Maui. Here again there is no know association between this cape, whose name can be translated as “the cape of the dog” (Pūkui et al., 1974:72), with the Hawaiian monk seal.

Kāne‘ilio
Kāne‘ilio, a point on the Waianae coast of O‘ahu, also appears on the Kittinger map. The place name, which literally means “dog Kāne”, is said to be the site of a heiau (temple) “dedicated to Kū-‘ilio-loa, a legendary giant man-dog” (Pukui et al. 1974:84). Kittinger and his fellow authors state that, “mo‘olelo about this site [the heiau, which is also shown on their map] reference a dog that would bark at the ocean when enemies were coming.” They admit that, ”Respondents that identified this site said that although the name has ‘ilio (dog) in it, it does not necessarily mean it was named after the monk seal” (Kittinger et al. 2011:15).
Kū‘ilioloa
Kū‘ilioloa is the name of the heiau located at the extreme tip of Kāne‘ilio point on the Wai‘anae coast of O‘ahu. The name also appears on Kittinger’s map. The literally translation of the name of this heiau is “long dog of Kū” (Pukui et al. 1974:129). The heiau appears to be “named for a legendary dog who protected travelers: later the qualities of a bad dog were unfairly attributed to him” (Pukui et al. 1974:129). Located along the coast, the heiau is surrounded on three sides by water (McAllister 1933:113). According to Elspeth Sterling and Catherine Summers, authors of Sites of Oahu, Kū‘ilioloa Heiau was partially destroyed by the U. S. Army which constructed a concrete bunker on the site during World War II. Its remains were still visible in 1954 (Sterling and Summers 1978:69). In the late 1970s, the heiau was rebuilt by the Wai‘anae community.

Historian Samuel Mānaiakalani Kamakau notes that “Lonoka‘eho came from Kahiki with his big dog Kū‘ilioloa” (Kamakau 1991:111). There are many traditions concerning Kū‘ilioloa who is sometimes described as “a dog with a human body and supernatural powers” (Beckwith 1970:347).

Pu‘uanahulu
The hill of Pu‘uanahulu, located on the inland slopes of the North Kona district of Hawai‘i Island, also appears on the Kittinger map. The hill, whose name means literally “ten-day hill,” is “perhaps named for a supernatural dog of that name” (Pukui et al. 1974:195). “The body of Anahulu, a supernatural dog that was changed to stone by Pele” rests in a sea pool along the Kona coast near Ka Lae o Ka ‘ilio (Pukui et al. 1974:72). The pu‘u (hill) of the supernatural dog Anahulu does not appear to be associated with the Hawaiian monk seal.

Holoikauaua
Holoikauaua is a modern Hawaiian name for the Pearl and Hermes Atoll is mentioned by Kittinger et al. The name is not an ancient one, but it was given to the atoll following the establishment of the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument, in reference to the Hawaiian monk seals that frequent the area. The Monument Management Plan states that, “The name Holoikauaua celebrates the Hawaiian monk seals that haul out and rest here (USFWS et al. 2008).

There appears to be no direct evidence to suggest that any of the place names identified by Kittinger and his fellow authors are associated with the Hawaiian monk seal. The present study has been unable to find any place name within the MHI that can be directly related to monk seal presence during the traditional period or to any tradition or legend related to the Hawaiian monk seal.

4.3 References to Monk Seals in Traditional Literature
If a resident population of Hawaiian monk seals was present in the MHI throughout the pre-Contact period, one might expect to find mention of monk seals in oral literature of ancient Hawai‘i. Although much of this literature was lost in the transition of ‘ōlelo Hawaii from a spoken to a written language, much of it survived. An examination of the surviving written oli (chants not for dancing), hula (chants for dancing) and mo‘olelo (stories, mythologies, legends and historical narratives) have yielded few definitive references seals. Only one mo‘olelo was found that mentions the Hawaiian monk seal (see below). Much of Hawaiian traditional literature was never written down and has been passed through the generations within
individual families. These stories remain to a large extend inaccessible to the general researcher. As Kittinger and his fellow authors discovered during their interviews, “several respondents also noted that much of the information we sought about monk seals was deliberately kept hūnā, or secret, in keeping with tradition and because such knowledge had been improperly used in the past” (Kittinger et al. 2011:10).

The Kumulipo
The ko‘ihonua, the great genealogical chants, trace back the ancestry of the ali‘i ‘ōhana (chiefly families) of Hawai‘i through the generations. The most well known of these genealogical chants is the Kumulipo, which begins at the creation of the world and enumerates many of the plants and animals that were part of the Hawaiian cosmos. The Kumulipo mentions both land and sea creatures, often linking a land plant or animal with one from the sea.

Hanau ka ‘A‘ala’ula noho i kai
Kia‘i ia e ka ‘A‘ala‘ala-wai-nui noho i uka (Beckwith 1972:188)

Born was the ‘Ala‘ala moss living in the sea
Guarded by the ‘Ala‘ala mint living on the land (Beckwith 1972:59)

Although the chant includes reference to other marine mammals, the nai‘a (porpoise) in line 138 and the palaoa (whale) in line 251, the monk seal does not appear in any of its known names among the animals mentioned in the Kumulipo. Kittinger and his fellow researchers, however, have suggested the seal is referred in the sixth stanza of the chant.

The Kalākaua text reads:

He ‘iole ko uka, he ‘iole ko kai
He ‘iole holo i ka uaua (Beckwith 1951:201)

The folklorist Martha Beckwith translated these lines as:

A rat in the uplands, a rat by the sea
A rat running beside the wave (Beckwith 1951:88)

The line “He ‘iole holo i ka uaua” has been taken to refer to monk seals due to its similarity to the term ‘iliholoikauaua. The word ‘iole, which appears in this line refers not to the dog (‘ilio), but to the Polynesia rat (‘iole) (Pukui and Elbert 1971:125). Thus the line has been translated by Beckwith as “A rat running beside the wave” (Beckwith 1951:88). Kittinger, Bambico, Watson and Glazier suggest that, “the description of the ʻioleholoikauaua as “a rat running beside the wave,” is reminiscent of monk seals and the description of the monk seal in this section of the Kumulipo is also consistent with other descriptions and perceptions of monk seal behavior found in Hawaiian language sources” (Kittinger et al. 2011:14).

An alternate translation of the line is given by Hawaiian scholar Rubelite Kawena Johnson.

An alternate translation of the line is given by Hawaiian scholar Rubelite Kawena Johnson.

A rat for the upland, a rat for the shore,
A determined rat running tough. (Johnson 2000:23)
This line of the chant is but one of a series metaphorical references to the nibbling of rats. As Beckwith explains it in her commentary to the poem, “Kupihea is probably right in interpreting the spread of the rat family from upland to shore and their nibbling habits as symbolic of the rise of new lines of chiefs under whom taboos multiplied. Especially it refers perhaps to the land to landlords and these again to subordinate overseers, each taking toll from the crops...” (Beckwith 1951:86). This interpretation would tend to suggest that it is the ‘iole (rat) with its attendant symbolic meaning that is referred to here rather than the monk seal. The line’s apparent connection to the Hawaiian monk seal is simply due to a similarity in the use of words and not a deliberate reference.

The Kumu Honua
A similar confusion of words has led Kittinger and his fellow authors to suggest that the Hawaiian monk seal is also mentioned in the traditions associated with Hawai‘i-Loa and with the creation of the first man, Kumu Honua (there is some question as to whether this creation tradition was strongly influenced by Christian mythologies introduced in the years following Western contact; Barrera 1969). Judge Abraham Fornander, in his Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folklore (traditional mo‘olelo gather from Hawaiian authors to be used as source material in the writing of his multi-volume Account of the Polynesia Race) includes the “Legend of Hawaii-loa” which was “compiled and condensed in English from Kepelino and S. M. Kamakau”. As part of this mo‘olelo he refers to the tradition of Kumu Honua and describes the animals that were created to keep company with this first man in the Hawaiian Eden.

Among the animals enumerated in the legend as dwelling in peace and comfort with Kumu Honua in Kalani i Hauola were:

Ka puua nui Hihimanu a Kane (the large Hihimanu hog of Kane); ka ilio nui niho oi a Kane (the large sharp-toothed dog of Kane); ka ilio holo i ka uaua a Lono (the dog running at the voice of Lono); ka puua maoli (the common hog); ka ilio ali‘i a Kane (the royal dog of Kane); na moo (lizards); na moo niho nui, niho oi, wawaka a Kane (the sharp, long toothed, iridescent lizard of Kane)… (Fornander 1919:273-274)

Fornander translates “ka ilio holo i ka uaua a Lono” as “the dog running at the voice of Lono.” Although ‘iliholoikauaua is one of the Hawaiian terms used for seal, its use here suggests that it appears in the legend as a descriptive of a dog rather than a seal. The god Lono is traditionally associated with lightning and the sound of rolling thunder (Beckwith 1970:41), thus the voice of Lono may be a poetic reference to thunder.

Interestingly, Fornander’s early translation of the phrase “holo i ka uaua”, “running at the voice”, suggests that the word used in the phrase is ‘ua‘ua, rather than uaua, and that “ka-uaua” might be translated as “the voice”. It is possible that this same version of the word appears in the term used to refer to the Hawaiian monk seal, ‘iliholoikauaua.

Hi‘iaka
Another proposed reference to the Hawaiian monk seal in traditional mo‘olelo, as suggested by Kittinger, Bambico, Watson and Glazier, comes from The Epic Tale of Hi‘iakaiakapiopele as translated by Puakea Nogelmeier, professor of Hawaiian language at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (Nogelmeier, 2006). This mo‘olelo, originally printed in the Hawaiian language newspaper Hawai‘i Aloha and then in the Ka Na‘i Aupuni between July 1905 and November 1906,
recounts the journey of Hi‘iakaikapoiolpele, sister of the volcano goddess Pele, and her companion Wahine‘ōma‘o, from Hawai‘i Island to Kaua‘i to find and bring back Pele’s lover Lohiau. As Hi‘iaka and her companion are passing along the Ko‘olau coast of the island of O‘ahu, she points out a rock formation, “shaped like an ‘īlio, a dog, with the head, the body, and all the features of a dog?” (Nogelmeier 2006). Hi‘iaka explains that:

That is no stone carved by man, but rather the rock form of one of our uncles, one I mentioned to you. That is Kauhike‘imakaolani. He is the ‘īlio hā that Kane brought from Kahiki, and he is always seen yonder, at Ka‘oio Point [Ka lae o ka ‘ōio, the point of the bone fish, which marks the boundary between the districts of Ko‘olau Poko and Ko‘olau Loa (Pukui et al. 1974:72)], that high spot before one reaches the flatlands on the way to Kane‘ohe. The third place where he’s often seen is at the mouth of Nu‘uanu Valley, where one enters Kahaukomo (Nogelmeier, 2006).

When Wahine‘ōma‘o asks what is an ‘īlio hā, Hi‘iaka responds that, “‘Īlio hā is like saying ‘īlio kāhā, an oversized, hulking dog, the same way a pig can be oversized. It means it is huge, heavy, plump, and fleshy. But this dog-uncle of ours you see there has the body of a massive dog, and the largest expanse of his fur is on his head and neck …” (Nogelmeier 2006).

Kittinger and his fellow authors see this description of the ‘īlio kāhā (“huge, heavy, plump, and fleshy “) as reminiscent of the physical appearance of the Hawaiian monk seal. In their Hawaiian Dictionary, Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel Elbert define the word kāhā as “Large, fat, plump, as of a well-fed dog” (Pukui and Elbert 1970:103). This suggests that the term was used to refer to large dogs. There is nothing else in the mo‘olelo to suggest that the ‘īlio hā was a monk seal rather than “a massive dog”.

Mo‘olelo of Pinao and Kamālama

There is at least one extant mo‘olelo which does make mention of the Hawaiian monk seal. Unlike the previously mentioned oli and mo‘olelo, which were set down in writing during the early historic period, this tradition was passed down orally and only recorded relatively recently. Included in the Appendix to the Historic and Contemporary Significance of the Endangered Hawaiian Monk Seal in Native Hawaiian Culture is the partial transcript on an interview in which a kupuna from the district of Ka‘ū on the island of Hawai‘i relates a mo‘olelo regarding a seal that was told to her by her father-in-law (Kittinger et al. 2011:31).

The authors of the report indicate that, “The following is an oral tradition and story (mo‘olelo) from a kupuna interviewed on Hawai‘i Island, near Ka Lae o ka ‘Īlio (“the cape of the dog”), about the monk seal. Names and some information have been withheld to protect the identity of the respondent” (Kittinger et al. 2011:31).

I’m from Ka‘ū [Hawai‘i Island], but originally I come from Moloka‘i, from the area called Kalama‘ula. I relocated here [to Ka‘ū] because of my husband. My husband was a cowboy by trade. Today I’m going to share with you a little mo‘olelo, a little story that comes from the opposite end called Ka Lae. A lot of people call this area South Point, but it’s really Ka Lae. Now in this area, there was this young woman and her name was Kamālama. And Kamālama had a good friend who she loved dearly and his name was Pinao. Well Pinao and Kamālama were always happy together. They loved each other dearly. But one day, Kua, the Shark God, he’s traveling the mo‘o‘ua, the ocean. He sees her
[Kamālama] [heart fluttering motion]. Hū [oh] my goodness, he loves this young lady. No. She don’t want him at all. Kua is very upset; and so Kua causes a pō'ino. He puts a curse on this young lady, Kamālama, and Pinao. And, Kamālama no longer stays as a woman; but she withdraws to the ocean and she becomes an ‘aukai, a sea-god or a seal. And poor Pinao. Pinao who stands so very tall; now begin to bear wings and he begin to flutter and fly. He becomes a dragonfly. Aue! They no longer can be together. And whenever Kamālama come up to the white sand, at this particular beach, she’s not able to embrace her good friend Pinao. And Pinao, he comes and he flutters down upon her, and he is no longer able to hold her anymore. Well, the god Kū, finally comes to realize what is happening; and he feels love and compassion for this young couple, for this young man and this young lady. And so what happens: Kū decides that this should not happen, that Kua’s jealousy gets in the way. And so, the god Kū decides to make a new rule, and he says: when Nā Huihui [reference to the star cluster Nā-Huihui-a-Makali‘i, otherwise known as Pleiades, whose rise & fall in the Hawaiian night skies marks the start and end of the Makahiki Season, generally from end Oct/beg Nov to end Jan/beg Feb] all the stars shine during these particular months then this young man and this young lady will be able to have the… This young man and this young lady will be able to share this time to Kū, to take on their human forms again, so that they will no longer be this dragonfly, nor will she be this ‘aukai, this seadog or this seal of the ocean. And so from the months of October, November, December [until] part of February, they then take on this form, and they come back to who they really were; and they’re able to enjoy each other’s company, and to embrace each other once again. And so this is the short story of Pinao and Kamālama. I’m not sure if that’s what you was looking for. I doubt if you’re going to find it in any books, like you do [the mo‘olelo of] Kauila because I heard this, again, from my father-in-law. When he was here, he was busy sharing things. And he was trying to recall things and I didn’t realize what he was doing is recalling because he was going to go on his journey [pass away]. He was going to leave us. And so, um, most of the stories that I am sharing every now and then, I haven’t seen it in any book. So, and, I haven’t shared this, except for my own family. This is the first time I’ve shared it outside” (Kittinger et al. 2011:31-32).

The narrator of this mo‘olelo states of Kamālama that after her transformation she “no longer stays as a woman; but she withdraws to the ocean and she becomes an ‘aukai, a sea-god or a seal.” The word used, ‘aukai, means “to travel or swim by sea; seafaring; sailor” (Pukui and Elbert 1971:29, the word does not appear in Andrews 1865 dictionary, the term ‘ilio ‘aukai refers to a “sea dog, experienced sailor”, or a “warship”, Pukui and Elbert 1971:93). The term ‘aukai, “to travel or swim by sea; seafaring” seems an apt description for a seal, though whether it is being used in the tale as a poetic descriptor or as a true name is uncertain.

Pinao is the Hawaiian work for dragonfly, while the name ka mālama can be roughly translated as the one who cares for (Pukui and Elbert 1971:214). Kamalama without the diacritical mark over the ā is the name of a star and means literally “the light”, (Pukui and Elbert 1971:116).

The shark god Kua, mentioned in the story of Pinao and Kamālama appears in the mo‘olelo of Kaehuikimanopuuloa (the little elu colored shark of Pu‘uloa) as related by Thomas G. Thrum in his More Hawaiian Folk Tales. Thrum translated and condensed the story from a version published in the Hawaiian language newspaper Au Okoa for November 24, 1870. Here he is described as “Kua, king-shark of Kona” (Thrum 1923:295). It is Kua who guides Kaehuikimanopuuloa and his companions on their travels to distant Kahiki (Thrum 1923:303). A version of the same story is told by Padraic Colum in his Legends of Hawaii (Colum 1937:89).
5.0 HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE HAWAIIAN MONK SEAL

There is little evidence to suggest that the Hawaiian monk seal formed an important component of traditional Hawaiian culture. The early Western visitors to the MHI make no direct reference to them, nor do they appear in the works of early Hawaiian historians. With increasing Western contact, however, Hawaiians became acquainted with seals, both in the NWHI and along the western coast of America. From the early historic period onward references to seals begin to appear in Hawaiian language newspapers.

5.1 Early Hawaiian Historians

None of the early Hawaiian historians working to document their traditional culture in the first generations following Western contact make any direct mention of the Hawaiian monk seal. In his book *Mo’olelo Hawai‘i* (translated from the Hawaiian by Nathaniel B. Emerson in 1898) the Hawaiian historian David Malo lists and describes the various domestic and wild animals present within the Islands before Contact. In describing these creatures, both indigenous and Polynesian introduced, he makes mention of the pig, dog, wild and domestic fowls, other wild birds, the bat, and various insects (Malo 1951:46). In describing fish and other sea animals he mentions the sea turtle, the shark, dolphins and whales, but makes no reference to seals (Malo 1951:47).

5.2 Hawaiian Language Newspapers

A number of Hawaiian language newspapers were published from the 1830s to the early 1900s. These newspapers, printed in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, provide a vast reservoir of information concerning Hawaiian culture. Since relatively few books, other than basic grammars and school texts, were published in the Hawaiian language at that time, the newspapers served as almost the sole outlet for any Hawaiian writing in his or her native tongue. As such, they functioned as repositories for traditional legends and cultural histories, venues for the discussion of current political issues, and resources on government laws and policies. Over the last decade, efforts have been undertaken by a number of organization and individuals to make the information contained in these newspapers available to the general public.

In order to determine how often and in what contexts references to seals appear in Hawaiian language newspapers, a search was made of the existing online databases of published newspapers. A list of articles found to contain references to seals is contained in Error! Reference source not found..

Table 3. Articles From the Hawaiian Language Newspapers that Contain Any Reference to Seals, Listed in Chronological Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Hawaiian Term</th>
<th>Possible Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841, 3 August</td>
<td>Ka Nonanona</td>
<td>sila</td>
<td>seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859, 19 October</td>
<td>Ka Hae Hawai‘i</td>
<td>iliokai, ilio o kai</td>
<td>seadog, dog of [the] sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864, 17 December</td>
<td>Ka Nupepa Kuokoa</td>
<td>ilioholoikauaua</td>
<td>dog running in the useless (not used to describe a seal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865, 25 May</td>
<td>Ka Nupepa Kuokoa</td>
<td>sila</td>
<td>seals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865, 29 June</td>
<td>Ka Nupepa Kuokoa</td>
<td>ilioholoikauaua</td>
<td>dogs running in the rough seas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867, 1 November</td>
<td>Ke Alaula</td>
<td>‘ilio-holo-ika-</td>
<td>dog-running-in-the-rough-seas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A search of Hawaiian language newspapers revealed several references to seals, which were referred to by various names. In most cases the articles that mention seals refer either to sealing voyages or describing an account of travels in the arctic (one reference is contained in a Hawaiian translation of Jules Verne’s *Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea*). There do not appear to be any articles that directly address seals in traditional Hawaiian culture or the presence of seals within the MHI.

Kittinger, Bambico, Watson and Glazier identify one article, published in the February 1834 issue of the paper *Ka Lama Hawai‘i* and entitled No Kekahi Aoao Kahiko (Concerning an Ancient Way of Life), which they propose, “suggests that monk seal furs were collected as part of customary tribute to the land managers (Konohiki)” (Kittinger et al. 2011:12). The specific portion of the article that they cite for this interpretation reads:

No kekahi aoao kahiko.
Eia kekahi mea kupanaha a makou; o ke kukini. Ina i oeleloia he mau kukini; apopo, holo; alaila, hele mai la kanaka he nui loa me ka waiwai, a pili a mau iho la, alaila, hele aku la ua mau kanaka la elua a hiki i ka Pahuku. Kukini mai la ua mau kanaka la, a hopu i ka pahu kekahi, alaila, eo ae la nana. Olioli iho la ka poe i ko. Aka, o ka poe i eo, mihi iho la lakou i ke eo ana. Ina e oele ke Konohiki i na makaainana, apopo kakou koee a pau, a ahiahi iho, hoike i ka waiwai: Alaila, hana iho la lakou i ua mau mea nei a ke Konohiki i oeleo mai ai, o ka puua, o ka ilio, o ke kapa, o ke olona, o ka hulu, o ka upena, o kela mea keia mea a pau. Oia ka waiwai, a makou i hoike ai i ka wa kahiko.

It has been translated as:

*Concerning an ancient way of life.*
*Here is something wondrous for us: runners. If some runners said: tomorrow, is a race; and then a multitude of persons came with money, and continued to place bets down, and then, two of these persons then ran until they reached the goal. These people then raced, and grabbed the baton, and then, it was won for him. The people were then joyful for the triumph. But, as for the persons who lost, they apologized for losing. If the Konohiki said to the citizens, tomorrow we all walk until the evening to show the tribute: and then, they lay down these things the Konohiki requested: pig, dog, cloth, fiber, fur, fishing net, everything. These are the goods that we exhibited in ancient days.*

A more appropriate translation of the list of offerings requested from the maka‘āinana (common people) by the konohiki (land manager) would be ‘o ka pu‘a‘a (pigs), ‘o ka ‘ilio (dogs), ‘o ke kapa (bark cloth), ‘o ke olonā (cord of olonā fiber), ‘o ka hulu (feathers, these would have been the
brightly colored feathers of forest birds woven into the cloaks and helmets of the chiefs), ‘o kaʻupena (fishing nets). Bird feathers are known to have been part of the duty collected by chiefs. This seems more likely than the pelts of monk seals.

The earliest known article in a Hawaiian language newspaper to mention seals appears in an August 1841 issue of the paper Ka Nonanona in an article entitled No Ka Ulu Moku Imi Aina (About the Land Exploration Fleet). The article tells of the arrival in the Islands of the ships of the U.S. Exploring Expedition under Captain Wilkes, and of the Expedition’s travels in the Antarctic, which the writer describes as “filled with ice, no people, just walruses and seals were the animals that belonged there”. In this article the words used for the Antarctic seals is “sila”.

The newspaper Ka Nonanona for 3 August 1841 has an article entitled:

No Ka Ulu Moku Imi Aina.
I ka malama o Okatoba 1841, hiki mai la ka ulu moku ini aina no Amerikahuipuia, ma Honolulu nei. Eha moku, o ka moku nui, (i ka Winisani, a me ka Pikaka) a elua hoi moku nuku iho, o ka Naia, a me ka Malolo a o Kali Wilika ko lakou ali'i nui. Ua ima aina na ulu moku nei ma ka huina loa, a ua ike lakou i ka aina nui malaila, i ka la 13 o januari, 1840, ma ka latitu 65°20' lonitu 104°24'. Popilikia i a ko lakou holo ana ma kela moana hema, no ka nui loa i ka hau; me he mau moku aina nui la, e lana wale ana, a e hui kau ana, ua hau paa nei ma kela wahi. Ili ka Pikaka i ka moku hau, a mai nahaha loa: ua pakela no nae no ke akamai loa o kona kapena o Hudesona. Holo kokoke i kela aina hema ka Winisani i 1700 mile a ike pinepine; lakou i ka aina; he aina pali, paupu i ka hau, aole kanaka, he mau walerusa, a me na sila wale no ko laila holoholona. Pau keia; Holo mai aku la keia ulu moku imi aina, a i keia mai la iho nei i ka la 15 o lune, hoi hou mai la ka Pikaka, o Hudesona ke alii a me ka Pulolo. Ua huli lakou i kekahi pae aina; (Kininika ma inoa ma ka olelo Enelani.) aia ma ka poaiwaena, ma ke komohana hema mai ia nei aku. He pae moku liili kela, he haahaa, a he ano loa ka holo ana o na moku ma kela wahi, no ka ike ole ia o na wahi papau a me na moku liili. Aka, ua pau i ka hulilia a me ka palapalaia na wahi pilikia olaila e ko ka Pikaka a.

About the Land Exploration Fleet.
In the month of October 1841, the land exploration fleet arrived from the United States of America, here in Honolulu. There were four ships, the large ships, (the Vincennes, and the Peacock) as well as two nose diving ships, the Dolphin, and the Flying Fish and Charles Wilkes was their high commander. The fleet explored land in it’s entire length, and they saw great lands there, on the 13th day of January, 1840, in the latitude 65°30' longitude 104°24'. Their progression was troubled upon that Antarctic [sic] ocean, because of the expanse of the ice; like great big islets, just floating, haphazard [sic.] in that place. The Pikaka was run aground on an iceberg, and very nearly wrecked: we escaped because of the good judgment of his Captain Hudson. The Vincennes approached that arctic land which is 1700 miles and they frequently saw land; a precipice, filled with ice, no people, just walruses and seals were the animals that belonged there. This is done.

(http://ulukau.org/collect/nupepa/index/assoc/HASH41b7.dir/004_0_001_003_009_01_ful_18410803.pdf)

An article in an October 1859 issue of Ka Hae Hawai‘i, entitled No Ke Kakau Hoike Ana I Na Moku (Regarding writing bonds for vessels) appears to be a discussion of government requirement for seagoing vessels, some of which are involved in the hunt for whales and seals (“a whaling vessel and a sea dog investigating vessel”). The two terms for seal used in this article are “iliokai” (literally sea dog) and “ilio o kai” (dog of [the] sea). This usage is similar to
Emerson and Bishop’s 1845 phrase “he ilio o ke kai” and Lorrin Andrews’ 1865 dictionary’s “he ilio o ke kai” (see Section 5.4.1). The article reads:

Haʻawina XXIV
No Ke Kakau Hoike Ana I Na Moku
…waia okohola, a no ka imi ana i na iliokai, ma ka moa o ka mea nona kekahai hapa o ia moku, ina he kanaka kupa ia a he kanaka kupa ole paha, a ina e noho paa aha oia iloko o keia Aupuni….

Pauku 636. Ma ke kakau hoike ana i kekahai moku, e like me ka olelo a ka pauku maluna ae nei, e koi aku ka Luna Dute Nui, i ka mea nana i noi mai ao ke kakau hoike ana, e haawi mai oia i palapala hoopaa me na hope kupono i ka mana o ka Luna Dute Nui, no na dala aole emi mai malalo o na haneri elua, aole hoi o iku i elua tausani, e hoolaliekea e ka Luna Dute Nui me ka nui o na tona o ka moku; e olelo ana ia palapala hoopaa, e hanaia ka palapala hoike i ke kakau ana no ka moku, ana i haawiia‘i wale no, aole hoi e kuaiia, a e haawi lilo ole ia, a e hooliloia paha ma ke anio a ae, i kekahai kanaka; a ina e lilo ia moku a pau, a o kekahai hapa paha o ka moku, ina aole ia he moku okohola o moku imi ilio o kai, no kekahai haole a mau haole paha i kupa ole ma keia Aupuni, a ina paha e poino, a i lawe pioia paha e kekahai enemi, a i hoopauia i ke ahi, a i wawahiia ka moku paha,…..

Article XXIV.
Regarding writing bonds for vessels
…disgraced whaling, and for searching for the seadog, in the ocean of the one for whom is half of the vessel, if a citizen or not a citizen, and if permanently residing in this Kingdom.

Paragraph 636. In bond writing for a vessel, similar to the language of the paragraph directly above, the Chief Customs Officer requires, of the one who request the bond writing, to give him an insurance policy with equitable legal surety as is the will of the Chief Customs Officer, for a sum not less than $200.00, and not too exceed $2,000.00, to be matched by the Chief Customs Officer with the larger part of the tonnage of the insurance policy shall be done in writing for the vessel, only for what he was awarded, not to be sold, and not to be granted absolutely, or conveyed in a different manner, to a person; and if the entire vessel is transferred, or half of the vessel, or if it is not a whaling vessel and a sea dog [dog of (the) sea] investigating vessel, for a foreigner or foreigners not citizens in this Kingdom, or if damaged, or if abducted by an enemy, and consumed in a fire, or ship-wrecked,…..

An article in a December 1864 issue of Ka Nupepa Kuokoa entitled Ka Lā‘au Ka-umaka e pau ai ka Niniaole O Nā Maka Hū‘alu Pepe‘ekue O W.H. Kalae-O-Kaena (The Beloved Medicine that cured the waterlessness of the thick viscous membrane covering the eye of W.H. Kalae-O-Kaena (loose skin over the eyeball; slight viscous membrane covering the eye) is the first instance where we encounter the term “ʻilioholoikauaua”. Interestingly, this article does not directly refer to the Hawaiian monk seal, or any other kind of seal. Instead, the term “ʻilioholoikauaua” appears to be a poetic or proverbial epithet referencing to a despised or ill thought of individual. The entire article is couched in a strongly poetic and allusive style (common to some forms of Hawaiian discourse). It is either saying that the individual is as despicable as a seal, or more likely, that he is like a dog running in ka ‘u’a’u’a, where the word ‘u’a’u’a is an
intensification of ‘u’a, which means “useless, vain, to no profit”. It seems likely that the phrase is being used here to characterize the individual as useless. The article reads:

Ka Lā‘au Ka-umaka e pau ai ka Niniaole O Nā Maka Hū‘alu Pepe‘ekue O W.H. Kalae-O-Kaena:
E Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko’a E; Aloha ‘oe: -- Ua ‘ikea iho ma kou ‘ao‘ao 3 o ke Kahua kaau o ka lā 27 o ‘Okatoba, Helu 44 o oke “Kilohana Po‘okela o ka Lāhui Hawai‘i.” Aia ma laila ka pehina (throwing/pelting, as of rain) mai nei a W.H. Kalaeokaena, i nā pōhaku ‘elekū pukapuka o nā hekūli ku‘i-pāmalō a ua ‘iliholoikauaa lā, ‘alu‘alu pāpā‘i niho kekē o Koholāloa; e hāhā po‘e ele lā i ua i‘a lā o ka ‘aīna āna (W.H.K.) e noho lā; me he lhuanu lā e mana‘o ana e hina o ‘Aiwohikupua, i ka hele wahi ‘ana a kani ka pola o ka malo; ‘ī! e olo ho‘i! Hina lā ana kei! A ‘o paha e olo ka hina o ke ‘A‘ali‘ikūmakani o Ka‘ū iā ‘oe, e nā lā‘auohala kumu Pūhala ne‘ine‘i.

The Beloved Medicine that cured the waterlessness of the thick viscous membrane covering the eye of W.H. Kalae-O-Kaena (loose skin over the eyeball; slight viscous membrane covering the eye)
Dear Independent Newspaper; Greetings to you: -- It was observed in your 3rd page of the war section on the 27th day of October, Number 44 of Book III of the “Foremost Champion for the Hawaiian Nation.” There was W.H. Kalaeokaena’s raining of the hole riddled basalt rocks [bullets] of the roaring thunder-without rain [gun] upon this dog-running-in-the-rough-seas; the misshapen crab claw of Koholāloa, ignorantly groping for this fish on the land where he (W.H.K.) lives; like the lhuanu wind thinking to topple over ‘Aiwohikupua, going somewhere until the flap of the loincloth sounds; ‘ā! resounding! glorious toppling! and perhaps resounding the steady blowing of the ‘A‘ali‘ikūmakani wind of Ka‘ū to you, the hala leaves of the grove of the low-lying hala trees.

An 1865 article in Ka Nupepa Kuokoa entitled Ka Pepehi Kohola Ana Me Ka Mahu for which there is no present English translation appears to concern the hunting of whales. It refers to, “na kohola a me na sila”, which very roughly translates as “the whales with the seals”. Here again, the word for seal is “sila”, a local adaptation of the original English word. The article reads:

Ua ike iho makou maloko o na nupepa Sekotia i ka nui o ka pomaikai i loaa i na kanaka nona na moku mahu huila mahope ma ka lawaia kohola ana. Ua ikeia ua holo aku mai ke aina aku o Dunedi (Dundee) eono moku mahu ma na wahi hau e alualu ai i na kohola a me na sila (seal). Ua hoi mai lakou me na tona aila 645, a 107 1/2 tona pakahi, o ka hiku o ka moku ua poholo ma ia holo ana; oiai he umikumamalu moku mahu a he umikumamaono moku pea i hoounaia mai Pitaheke (Peterhead) aku, ua hoi mai lakou me na tona aila 388, aneane 38 tona aila ka oi o na moku mahu pakahi mamua o na moku pea.

A June 1865 article in Ka Nupepa Kuokoa entitled He ‘Aumoku hou, e holo ana ka Wēlau ‘Ākau (A new fleet, sailing to the North Pole) contains the first known instance in a Hawaiian language newspaper where seals are referred to as ‘iliholoikauaa. The article discusses a British expedition to the North Pole and describes the arctic landscape. “Just snow is what is
An article in a November 1867 edition of the newspaper Ke Alaula, entitled Kokoke aku lâkou i ka Wêlau ‘Ākau (They are approaching the North Pole) appears to concern another expedition to the North Pole. Once again the term “‘ilio-holo-ika-uaua” is used to refer to arctic seals (in this case probably the fur seal). The article has two references to seals. “Their clothing to keep warm was the pelt of the dog-running-in-the-rough-seas and the other slippery, furry animals.” “They catch on the seashore the dogs-running-in-the-rough-seas and the sea elephants.” The article reads:

A new fleet, sailing to the North Pole.

Captain Osborne is preparing the British battleships to sail to the North Pole. Two small steamships were wanted with 120 men, and in the coming year 1866 he will set sail. During the summer they will sail through Baffin Bay in the west of Greenland, and stay awhile in there like for the dogs to tow until they arrive at the Pole. We are to be sure the ones living here in the warmth of Hawai‘i, unacquainted with the chill of this place. The mercury of the thermometer lowered once to 50 degrees below zero. Just snow is what is seen there, no plants; the polar bear is still important, with the dogs-running-in-the-rough-seas, and the sea elephants. Inside, the people stay in igloos with fur clothing, and as for their food it is rich meat and oil and other things.

Captain Osborne is preparing the British battleships to sail to the North Pole. Two small steamships were wanted with 120 men, and in the coming year 1866 he will set sail. During the summer they will sail through Baffin Bay in the west of Greenland, and stay awhile in there like for the dogs to tow until they arrive at the Pole. We are to be sure the ones living here in the warmth of Hawai‘i, unacquainted with the chill of this place. The mercury of the thermometer lowered once to 50 degrees below zero. Just snow is what is seen there, no plants; the polar bear is still important, with the dogs-running-in-the-rough-seas, and the sea elephants. Inside, the people stay in igloos with fur clothing, and as for their food it is rich meat and oil and other things.

A new fleet, sailing to the North Pole.

Captain Osborne is preparing the British battleships to sail to the North Pole. Two small steamships were wanted with 120 men, and in the coming year 1866 he will set sail. During the summer they will sail through Baffin Bay in the west of Greenland, and stay awhile in there like for the dogs to tow until they arrive at the Pole. We are to be sure the ones living here in the warmth of Hawai‘i, unacquainted with the chill of this place. The mercury of the thermometer lowered once to 50 degrees below zero. Just snow is what is seen there, no plants; the polar bear is still important, with the dogs-running-in-the-rough-seas, and the sea elephants. Inside, the people stay in igloos with fur clothing, and as for their food it is rich meat and oil and other things.

There, beer and alcoholic drinks become as hard as stone. In the winter, they have a long night for many months; the moon is a little better, because, the moon there has very good clear, bright moonlight; and there is a kind of strange light there named the Aurora Borealis otherwise known as the Northern Lights. At the Pole it’s night there for six months, and day for six months. If Captain Osborne actually goes there, the Pole’s name will be truly famous, because, he will be the first man to go there.
Kokoke aku lākou i ka Wēlau ‘Ākau.
I ka noho ‘ana o lākou i ka moku, holo a’e kekahi po’e o lākou i ka ‘ākau ha[u] aku ma luna o nā holopapa i kauō ‘ia e nā ‘ilio. Ke ‘ike lā ‘oukou ma ke kī‘i ma luna a’e nei i ke ‘ano o ka ho‘okaula ‘ia o nā ‘ilio, a ho‘ohui ‘ia lākou e kauō i ka holopapa. Noho iho ke kanaka ma luna o ka papa, a kauō māmā loa ‘ia ‘o ‘ia e nā ‘ilio ma luna o ka hau pa’a. I kekahi manawa ‘elima a ‘eono ‘ilio kā i ho‘opa’a ‘ia i ka papa; i kekahi ho‘i he nui aku – he ‘umikūmāmāhā a ‘umikūmāmāono paha. Holo aku kekahi po’e o lākou i ka ‘ākau a hiki i ka latitu 82° 30‘. I laila ‘ike aku lākou i ka Moana Anu ‘Ākau. ‘Akahi nā a launa kokoke aku kekahi i ka wēlau ‘ākau e like me kēia – 450 wale nō mile koe a loa’a aku nō. Akā, ’a‘ole nō he kanaka i hiki aku i laila, no ke anu loa – make e ma‘i nō i ke anu. ’A‘ole i loa’a iā lākou he wahi meheu no Sir Ioane Feranekelina. Ma hope loa mai ua loa’a ‘ia i kekahi po‘e ‘ē a‘e. ‘Elua a ‘ekolu paha o kēia po‘e a Kauka Kaina i loa’a i ka ma‘i a make; ho‘okahi i loa’a i ke anu ma kekahi wāwae a ‘oki ‘ia aku a kā wāwae; lilo ho‘i ‘elua manamana wāwae o kekahi. ‘O ko lākou kapa e mehana aī, ‘o ka ‘ili o ka ‘ilio-holo-ika-uaua a me nā holoholona huluhulu pahe’e ‘e a‘e, e like me kā nā kānaka i ho‘ike‘ike ‘ia ma ke kī‘i ma luna a’e nei.

They are approaching the North Pole.
When they were staying on the ship, a group of them went to the icy north on top of the sled dragged by the dogs. You see in the picture above the disposition of the harnessed dogs, and they are united to drag the sled. The people sit on top of the sled, and he is quickly sled by the dogs on top of the hard snow. One time five maybe six dogs were secured to the sled; another time more – fourteen maybe fifteen. Some of them went to the north until the latitude 82° 30‘. There they saw Arctic Ocean. It was the first time someone approached the end of the north pole like this – just 450 miles left until the end. But, there was no person that could go there, because of the extreme cold – becoming deathly ill because of the cold. They didn’t find a trace of Sir John Franklin. A long time afterward, it was reached by other people. Two maybe three of these groups and Doctor Kaina got sick and died; one got frostbite on a foot and the foot was cut off; and two toes of one was lost as well. Their clothing to keep warm was the pelt of the dog-running-in-the-rough-seas and the other slippery, furry animals, like the men shown in the picture directly above.

It continues:

…and lilo-holo-i-ka-uaua a me nā elepani kai. He maka‘u nā kama‘aina Ekimo i kēia holoholona nui, akā make nō ia lākou i kekahi manawa. I ka ho‘i ‘ana mai o Kauka Kalina i Piledelepia, ho‘opuka ‘o ia he buke mo‘olelo o nā mea āina i ‘ike ai ma ia ‘āina anu, a ua piha ia buke i nā ki‘i nani loa. Eia mai ke kī‘i o ka ‘elepani-kai.

…your animal to attend. Doctor Kaina also eats dogs and rats they found on the ship. They catch on the seashore the dogs-running-in-the-rough-seas and the sea elephants. The local Eskimo are afraid of this big animal, but they also sometimes kill it. When Doctor Kaina returned from Philadelphia, he published a story book of the things he saw in this frozen land, and this book was filled with very beautiful pictures. Here is the picture of the sea elephant.
A February 1876 article in *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* was one of a series that consisted of a Hawaiian translation of Jules Verne’s book *Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea*. In this section of the book, the harpooner Ned Land speaks with disgust of the food they eat on the *Nautilus*. One of these foods is broiled seal meat, “the broiled meat of the dog-running-in-the-rough-seas”.

The newspaper *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* (Buke XV, Helu 8, Feberuari 19, 1876) for 19 February 1876:

“Ba,” i uilani a’e ai o Nede me nā ‘ano huhū: “he aha kāu i mana’o ai no nā mea a kākou e ai ai ma’anei? He ake honu, he lālā manō, a me nā ‘i o kō’ala ‘a o ka ʻĪlioholoikauaua.”


An August 1876 article in *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* consists of another chapter in the Hawaiian translation of Jules Verne’s *Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea*. Here Captain Nemo shoots “a large animal, a vicious otter, an animal somewhat like the dog-running-in-the-roughseas.”

The article reads:


Aia ma kēia wahi, he mea e ka lehulehu o nā i’a li‘ili‘i o kēlā me kēia ‘ano, i kūpono ‘ole no ke ki ‘ana me nā pōkā. A no ka lelehu loa o nā i’a li‘ili‘i, ua hiki pono ‘ole ia‘u ke ‘ike aku i nā mea nui; akā, ‘o Kapena Nimo, ua ‘ike akula nō ia i kekahi holoholono[a] nui, he otera ka ‘ino, he holohona ‘ano like me ka ʻilio holo-ikauaua; a ‘o ke ki koke akula nō ia no ia o ua Kapena Nimo, a mae ana ua holoholona nei. He ‘elima kapua‘i kona loa, a he mea ho‘i i makemake nui ia, no ka nani o kona hulu. ‘O nā kapa i hana ‘ia no loko mai o ia ‘ano hulu, he $400.00 ke kumuku‘a‘ia. Ua ‘ike nuai ia nā kapa o kēia ‘ano ma nā mākea o Rusia a me Kina. ‘O kahi noho nui o kēia ‘ano holoholona, aia ma ka Moana Pakipika ‘Ākau.

20,000 Leagues Under The Sea! The Wonders of the Ocean! The Path Of Secret And Mystery of 1866! Section 1, Chapter XVI, A Fleet At Sea.

In this place is something of a multitude, a variety of little fish, for which it is illegal to shoot with bullets. And because of the very duskiness of the little fish, I couldn’t properly see the larger things; but, Captain Nimo then saw a large animal, a vicious otter, an animal somewhat like the dog-running-in-the-roughseas (seal); and Captain Nimo then shot it, and this animal slumped over. It is five foot long, and something for which it is greatly desired, is the beauty of its coat. Blankets made from this type of fur is a costly $400.00. Blankets of this type are largely seen in the markets of Russia and China. The place where this type of animal mainly inhabits is the North Pacific Ocean.
In this article published in a March 1894 edition of Ka Makaʻainana the term ‘ilio holo i ka uaua, which is used elsewhere to refer to directly to seals, is employed for its secondary meaning. The writer plays on meaning of the word ‘u’a’u’a (useless, vain, to no profit) and the word holo (run), as well as the physical image of the seal. “This is our time to demonstrate our unity, there is no time for us to run; else indeed the Kingdom officials and possibly the learned persons below them, truly without a nation, but, released to that group, will then slacken in their moral resolve like the dog-running-in-the-rough-seas. But, as for the nation, it will transform and separate; and then, truly be taken unto the depths of the ocean, and properly arranged there.” The term ‘ilio holo i ka uaua is used as a poetic metaphor for someone lacking in moral resolve.

The article reads:

Mai Pūlama Aku.
‘O ia nō kēia mākou e uwalo aku nei i nā hoa makaʻainana a pau, mai pūlama aku i nā hana a kēia poʻe no ka mea pili i ka pono koho balota no nā ‘elele i ka ‘aha hana kumukānāwai a lākou. Ua lohe ‘ia mai aia kā nā poʻe o na Kona a me Kaʻū, Hawaiʻi, ke pikokoi nui lā e kākau inoa ma lalo o ka hoʻohiki a ua poʻe pākahā nei, a mākou nō hoʻi i hōʻaiʻai aku ai ma ka helu i hala i ka waiwai ‘ole o ko ka lāhui kumu hana aku pēlā, no ka mea, ke hoʻokō, ‘o ka ‘apono ‘ana nō ia iā lākou nei, a lilo kā lākou nei ‘ino i hana mai ai iā kākou i mea maikaʻi. ‘O kā mākou hoʻi e makemake nei, ‘o ia nō ko kākou kuʻi mai nō i ka wā, ‘oiai, ia ia Amerika Huipū ‘ia ka hana. No ka mea, ua ‘oiaiʻo loa nō kā mākou i hoʻomahuʻi aku ai inā kākou e kōkua ‘ole aku, ‘aʻale loa lākou e ‘ike ‘ia mai a hului ke ao nei. ‘O ko kākou wā kēia e hoʻike ai i ko kākou lōkahī, ‘aʻohe manawa e aku nō kākou; a inā nō ‘o nā poʻe lawelawe ‘oihana Aupuni a poʻe naʻauo[o] paha ma lalo o lākou, ‘aʻohe nō ia o ka lāhui, akā, e hoʻokuʻu aku nō i kēlā poʻe a ‘aluʻalu aku i ko lākou pono e like lā me nā ‘ilio holo i ka uaua. Aka, no ka lāhui hoʻi, e unuhi mai nō a kaʻawale; a laila, lawe aku nō a kāi hohonu, hoʻokuene pono iho ‘ana i laila.

Donʻt Bother.
This is what we declare to all of the fellow residents, donʻt bother with the activities of this group because they are associated with the equal ballot election for the delegates in their constitutional labor convention. It was heard, there were the groups of Kona and Kaʻū, Hawaiʻi, largely gathering to register beneath the names of these crooks, and we also released in the list of offenses national concerns and such that are unbeneficial, because, when ratified, it will then be enforced by them, and their offenses will become worthless to our benefit. As for our needs, itʻs for us to rise to the time, while the United States is reasonable. Because, our impersonation was incredibly accurate, if we didnʻt render aid, they certainly wouldnʻt have been seen until the day was over. This is our time to demonstrate our unity, there is no time for us to run; else indeed the Kingdom officials and possibly the learned persons below them, truly without a nation, but, released to that group, will then slacken in their moral resolve like the dog-running-in-the-rough-seas. But, as for the nation, it will transform and separate; and then, truly be taken unto the depths of the ocean, and properly arranged there.

An article by T. H. Poaha in Elua Nupepa Kuokoa, September 1924, describes the coast of California and refers to the presence of seals by the famous Cliff House. Here, interestingly, the word used for seal is “uwalo”, as given by Henry P. Judd, Mary Kawena Pukui and John F. G. Stokes in their 1945 English-Hawaiian vocabulary. The article reads:
The place name ‘īliopi’i appears occasionally in the Hawaiian language newspaper, but in each case it refers to the cape on Kalaupapa, Moloka‘i, and there is no reference to Hawaiian monk seals.

Although less than 10% of Hawaiian language newspaper articles have been transcribed and made searchable, it is still possible to draw some tentative conclusions based on the use of the various terms for seal in the articles to which we have access. The earliest known reference to seals appears in an article from 1841, four years prior to Emerson and Bishop’s vocabulary. The author of this article refers to seals by the Hawaiian version of their English name, “sila”. This might suggest that there was no generally agreed upon Hawaiian name for seal at that time.

Later articles give various names for seal; “iliokai” and “ilio o kai” (1859), “sila” (1865), “ilioholoikauaua” (1865, 1867, 1876, 1894), “uwalo” (1924). Most of these terms (or combinations of words similar to them) appear in the various Hawaiian dictionaries. It is interesting to note that the term ‘ilioholoikauaua, which is generally accepted today as the name for the Hawaiian monk seal, does not appear in use until the mid 1860s. None of the Hawaiian language articles identified mention the Hawaiian monk seal, and most make reference to either the Arctic or Antarctic seals.

5.3 Western Visitors
Beginning with the journals of Captain James Cook, the accounts of the early Western voyagers who visited Hawai‘i provide us with detailed descriptions of the natural and cultural landscape of the islands. Nowhere in of these accounts is there any mention of Hawaiian monk seals being either directly observed or reported in the MHI.

It was not until Western voyagers reached the NWHI that the first references to seals began to appear in their writings. In 1805 the Russian explorer Urey Lisiansky observed seals on a beach of the island that now bears his name, Lisianski Island near French Frigate Shoals (Lisiansky 1814). This appears to be the first record of the existence of the Hawaiian monk seal. Lisianski notes that four seals were killed and others were observed (Ragen 1999:186). In 1825 Benjamin Morrell, captain of the whaling ship Tartar, who provided the first detailed observations of most of the NWHI, reported what he thought were elephant seals on some of the islands (Morrell 1832:215-219; Ragen 1999:186). These were most likely monk seals. In 1827-28, the ship Moller documented seals on the newly discovered island of Laysan (Ragen 1999:186). The crews of ships wrecked in the NWHI, such as the Parker wrecked on Kure Atoll in 1842, the Holder Borden wrecked on Lisianski Island in 1844, and the Signaw wrecked on Kure Atoll in 1870, report taking seals for food, as did ships searching for guano deposits (the Manuokawai in 1857) or simply exploring the islands (the Rodolph in 1850) (Ragen 1999:186). The ship General Siegel, which was shark fishing in the NWHI in 1886 reports catching monk seals to use as bait (Ragen 1999:186).
5.4 Native Contact Between the MHI and the NWHI
While evidence appears to indicate that most of the native population of the MHI were not familiar with the Hawaiian monk seal prior to Western contact, the possibility exists that fishermen from some communities on Kaua‘i and Ni‘ihau may have encountered monk seals during fishing expeditions to the NWHI. That the knowledge of the existence of the NWHI was not widespread is evidenced by the reaction the small number of Hawaiians from the island of Kaua‘i who accompanied the Western exploring expedition that first “discovered” the islands. In 1788, Captain Colnett of the Prince of Wales became the first Westerner to chance upon the island of Nihoa, the closest of the NWHI to the main islands of the chain. Colnett had with him on board the Prince of Wales, “some natives of Attowai [Kaua‘i] who expressed great surprise that there should be land so near to these islands...of which not only themselves, but all their countrymen were totally ignorant” (Vancouver 1798:81-82).

According to the Robinson family who own the island of Ni‘ihau, the residents of that island had the capability to travel to Ka‘ula and Nihoa Islands by canoe, and some people from Ni‘ihau would spend three months in the summer on Nihoa Island until the late 1800s (Iversen et al. 1990:23). However, analyses of 113 whalers’ logs visiting the NWHI from 1791 to 1878 contain no reference to Native Hawaiian fishermen (Iversen et al. 1990:22).

In 1857, King Kamehameha IV sailed to the leeward island of Nihoa aboard the Schooner Manuokawai. The ship’s log records that, “At 10 a.m. went ashore (got upset in the landing). The King and Governor [Kekūanao‘a] landed at the same time in a canoe...About a dozen seal were found on the beach and the King shot several of them” (Emory 1928:9). The Captain of the vessel, Captain Paty, gave the following account of their visit to Nihoa on April 27, 1857, “...on the sand beach ten or twelve hair seals were found; they didn’t take much notice of us until His Majesty [King Kamehameha IV] had shot several, when they became more scared” (Kenyon and Rice 1959:216). On the king’s return to Honolulu, he instructed Captain John Paty to survey the remainder of the NWHI and claim them for the government of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i. During that voyage, Paty noted that the beaches of the islands abounded with seals. On Nihoa he found a dozen seals hauled out on the single beach (Paty 1857:42-43).

5.5 Historic Hunting of Monk Seals in the NWHI
The earliest commercial hunting of seals in the NWHI appears to have occurred soon after they were first described by Lisiansky. In 1824, the brig Aiona returned to Honolulu following a sealing expedition to the NWHI (Bailey 1952:4). The taking of seals for their fur and oil had been begun as early as the mid-1700s along the Pacific Coast of the Americas. Various seals in North Pacific waters, including the Guadalupe fur seals, northern fur seals, California sea lions, and Stellar sea lions were slaughtered by the thousands for their fur, blubber and other body parts, while northern elephant seals were targeted for their thick blubber which was boiled down for oil (Ellis 2003:161-178). Like whale oil, the oil obtained from the blubber of seals was used for lamp fuel, lubricants, cooking oil, soap and innumerable other products.

In 1859, the bark 249 tons Gambia went sealing in the NWHI. She left Honolulu on April 26, and cruised among the Leeward Islands, returning on August 7. The Gambia is reported to have obtained 240 barrels of seal oil, 1,500 skins, a quantity of shark fins and oil (Anonymous 1859; Cobb 1902:496-497, Ragen 1999:186). How accurate these numbers are, and whether all of this cargo was obtained in the NWHI is still in question.
Within a relatively short span of years, the population of Hawaiian monk seals in the NWHI had been reduced so drastically that the seal grounds were deserted as the population was not large enough to make hunting the seals commercially viable. Guano diggers, bird hunters, and
whalers further depleted the remnant seal population during the late 1800s and early 1900s (Kenyon and Rice 1959:215).

**Historic Reports of Monk Seals in the MHI**

It has been possible to find only one clearly documented early historic case of a Hawaiian monk seal being reported from the MHI. In 1900 a monk seal was seen at Hilo Bay on the island of Hawai‘i. “A sick or helpless seal was caught by the natives in Hilo Bay, Hawaii, towed ashore, killed and eaten. Unfortunately I was too late to secure any part of the animal for identification, but the natives assured me that solitary seals occurred on the coast about once in 10 years or so. They were very curious and asked many questions as to the habitat of the animal, its nature, food, and habits, about which they knew nothing” (H. W. Henshaw as quoted in Bailey 1952:5). The results of this encounter between native Hawaiians and the indigenous Hawaiian monk seal readily suggest why, at the time of Western contact, there was no resident population of monk seals in the MHI.

**6.0 CONTEMPORARY PERSPECTIVES ON THE HAWAIIAN MONK SEAL**

**6.1 Contemporary Names**

In his book *The Hawaiian Monk Seal*, Patrick Ching notes that, “on the island of Ni‘ihau, a privately owned island where Hawaiian is the primary language, there are at least two names for the seal. According to Keith Robinson, whose family owns the island, “one is *sila*, derived from the word seal, and the other is ‘ilio-holo-kai, meaning ‘the dog that runs in the sea’” (Ching 1994:7). While the term *sila* corresponds with the earliest documented name for seals found in the Hawaiian language newspapers, the latter term is similar to both the early dictionary term for monk seal, *he ‘ilio o ke kai*, and the later *‘ilio-holo-i-kauaua* (see Section 4.1).

In their 2011 report on the *Historic and Contemporary Significance of the Endangered Hawaiian Monk Seal in Native Hawaiian Culture*, prepared for NOAA, John Kittinger, Trisann Māhealani Bambico, Trisha Kehaulani Watson and Edward W. Glazier mention that, “Mo‘olelo (oral stories) with community elders (*kūpuna*) and native language speakers have confirmed” the use of the term *hulu* for the monk seal. Their informants also indicated “the use of the term *nā mea hulu* (the furry ones) for the monk seal species.” They indicated that, “Some respondents knew of other names for the monk seal, but declined to provide the names because of worries about how the names would be used” (Kittinger et a. 2011:11).

**6.2 Monk Seals as Family ‘Aumākua**

In their report of interviews conducted in 2011 under a grant from NOAA, Kittinger, Bambico, Watson and Glazier noted that; “Some interviewees described families on Hawai‘i and O‘ahu islands that consider the species to be ‘aumākua, the “family or personal gods, deified ancestors who might assume the shape of…[various animals]” (Pukui and Elbert, 1986 [1971]). ‘Aumākua are traditionally protected by their associated families and various cultural protocols are followed to steward the relationships between the family and their spiritual guardian. Notably, the monk seal is not named as a common ‘aumākua (Pukui and Elbert, 1986 [1971]), but this does not necessarily mean that the families have recently adopted this cultural association. ‘Aumakua can be associated with families for many generations, reaching far back into history, or can be recent additions based on events that carry special cultural meaning and significance.
Additionally, some communities have conducted spiritual ceremonies for monk seals during which the monk seal is recognized as part of the ‘ohana, or family. Respondents have said that the details of such activities are deliberately kept hūnā, or secret” (Kittinger et al. 2011:16-17).

In further clarifying this, the authors indicate that it was difficult to obtain specific information on this aspect of human-monk seal relationships as one knowledgeable individual passed away before they could be interviewed while another refused to be interviewed.

6.3 Mythological Associations
Kittinger and his co-authors also reported that, “Some respondents shared mo’olelo (oral traditions/stories) about monk seals that indicated a mythological association with the species. In one account from the island of Moloka’i, a kupuna (community elder) told of a monk seal who appeared in the area in 1947 and washed up without a head. The kupuna indicated it was the work of Kauhuhu, the famed shark god of the area who patrolled the waters from Moananui to Pelekunu. Another mo’olelo from Hawai’i Island tells of a pair of lovers who suffered the wrath of the jealous shark god Kua [discussed in Section 4.3]. After his affections were spurned, he curses the woman, turning her into a monk seal and her male companion into a dragonfly so the two could not be together. The pair was later reunited in their human forms by the god Kū. These mo’olelo indicate a historical cultural association with the monk seal, but appear to be limited to a few places where familial traditions have preserved the stories” (Kittinger et al. 2011:17).

6.4 Stewardship
The authors of the 2011 study go on to note that, “For some kūpuna, the specific origins of the animal [the Hawaiian monk seal] and its significance in Hawaiian culture are irrelevant, as the traditional Hawaiian sense of stewardship extends to all species and the environment. One respondent, for example, expressed, “whether they are hānai [adopted] or hānau [born of, as in a son or daughter], monk seals are part of the ocean and we, humans, have an obligation to protect them.” This perspective has also been shared by other community elders interviewed about the monk seal” (Kittinger et al. 2011:17).

6.5 The Monk Seal as Invasive Species
In contrast to the apparently symbiotic relationship between Hawaiians and monk seals suggested by some informants during the 2011 study, other individuals interviewed expressed a strongly negative reaction to monk seal presence. “Among these respondents, the seal is viewed as endemic to the NWHI but not to the MHI. Some respondents view the seal as an invasive species in the MHI and believe the seal should remain in the NWHI only. Respondents commonly cite the lack of Hawaiian cultural references to the seal in traditional chants, hula [dance] and other knowledge forms. Other respondents pointed to the lack of evidence that the monk seal was ever used for food, tools, weapons, fabrics, medicine, or combustible material. One respondent emphasized that, “everything in Hawai’i had a common use… since there was no [use], then it must not be native.” Other respondents pointed to the lack of monk seal bones (iwi) found in archeological excavations or petroglyphs (ki’i pōhaku) depicting monk seals. Respondents on Maui were not aware of any place names, sacred sites (wahi pani) or fishing shrines (ko’a) named after the monk seal. They also mentioned that their kūpuna (elders) never mentioned the monk seal, and that they did not know of any families that regarded the monk seal as their ‘aumakua (spiritual family guardian) (Kittinger et al. 2011:17).
7.0 IMPLICATIONS OF TRADITIONAL AND HISTORIC DATA

7.1 Multiple Names
The multiplicity of terms found in Hawaiian dictionaries, traditional mo'olelo, and Hawaiian language newspaper articles, would appear to suggest that there was not one generally accepted name for the Hawaiian monk seal. This, in turn, may indicate that monk seals were not widely or generally known to traditional populations.

The other marine and terrestrial mammals present within the archipelago prior to western contact are all generally identified by a single name. The domestic dog is known generally as ‘īlio, with variations on the name (‘īlio māku’e, a native brown dog, ‘īlio pe’elu’a, a brindled dog, etc., Pukui and Elbert 1971:92-93) describing different types of dogs. The only traditional name for dog that does not include the word ‘īlio, ‘apowai also appears to relate to a specific type of dog (“a type of Hawaiian dog with solid grayish-brown body and nose tip and eyes of the same color, believed to love water and consequently offered as a sacrifice to mo’o water spirits”, Pukui and Elbert 1971:27) and is not a general name. The same is true for the other mammals that accompanied the early Polynesian voyagers who initially settled the Hawaiian Islands such as the pig (pua’a; pua’a hiwa meaning a solid black pig, pua’a ‘ia’aua meaning a young female pig, etc., Pukui and Elbert 1971:114), and the Polynesia rat (‘iole; ‘iole nui meaning a large rat, Pukui and Elbert 1971:125). The native bat, which the Polynesians found here on their arrival, was known alternately as ‘ōpe’ape’a, pe’a, or pe’ape’a (Pukui and Elbert 1971:11, the word pe’a is also one of the names for a sail, Pukui and Elbert 1971:297).

Of the other marine mammals found in Hawaiian waters, the whale was known either as koholā or palaoa (Pukui and Elbert 1971:175). Forms of both of these terms are found throughout much of Polynesia and appear related to the proto-Polynesian word tafura’a (Richards 2008:1) and the early Polynesian word paraoa (Richards 2008:2). The dolphin is referred to as nai’a or nu’ao (Pukui and Elbert 1971:117).

The voyagers who first encountered these islands would not have been likely to possess a traditional name for seals, as there are no seal populations native to the islands of southern Polynesian (though fur seals are known to visit Tonga on rare occasions, Richards 2008:5). The only other Polynesian group to encounter local seal populations, the Māori who settled Aotearoa (New Zealand), had various names for seal depending upon the species they belonged to (fur seals, elephant seals, leopard seals) and the locality. Rhys Richards notes that, “Different groups of Māori used different names for the same marine mammal from district to district. Moreover, this transference phenomenon has several parallels among fish and birds. Many inshore fishermen know that Māori names for some fish species change bewilderingly from coast to coast, and from place to place” (Richards 2008:5). It appears that as Māori populations spread along the coasts of the large islands of Aotearoa dialectic differences developed and names changed. None of the known Māori names (fur seals: pakakē, pakakā, kekeno, kakerangi, kakeraki, karewaka, oioi, tūpoupou, puhina, mimiha, popoikore, elephant seals: whakāhau, whakāhau, whakāhu, kautakoa, pākahokaho, poutoko, kake, kaki, ihupuku, leopard seals: rāpoka, popoiangore, popoiangori, popoiakore, Richards 2008:5), bear any similarity to the documented Hawaiian language terms for seal. The likelihood is that these names developed indigenously as the Māori encountered the various pinniped species. The same might be suggested for Hawaiian names.
Several of the Hawaiian terms documented identify seals by their resemblance to a more familiar animal, the ‘īlio (the domestic dog), that had accompanied the early Polynesian voyagers who initially settled the Hawaiian Islands. It is interesting to note that several non-native mammals were given names based upon their rough similarity to the familiar dog. These include the skunk (‘īlio hohono, literally “bad-smelling dog” Pukui and Elbert 1971:93), the beaver (‘īlio-hulu-pāpale, literally “hat-fur dog” Pukui and Elbert 1971:93).

Though there is not enough existing evidence to conclusively determine whether monk seals were present within the MHI at the time of initial Polynesian settlement, the archaeological, linguistic and ethnographic evidence would seem to suggest that there was not a resident monk seal population extant within the MHI during the latter portion of the pre-Contact period. It is likely that contact between Native Hawaiians and monk seals during this period was limited to occasional encounters when far ranging individual would come down from the main population centers in the NWHI. Monk seals did not rise in the consciousness of Hawaiian culture until they were encountered in large numbers during the historic exploration of the NWHI.

8.0 Conclusions

Although monk seals appear to have been present within the Hawaiian archipelago as early as 3.5 million years ago, there is little direct evidence of human and monk seal interactions prior to Western contact, either in the archaeological record or the traditional literature.

Bones of Hawaiian monk seals are known to have been recovered from only four archaeological excavations conducted within the main Hawaiian Islands. Only two of these sites have been confirmed as dating from the period prior to Western contact. Although it has been suggested that this scarcity of seal remains from archaeological contexts may indicate that monk seals were not present within the MHI prior to the arrival of the first Polynesians (Zeigler 2002:244), it appears more likely that the Polynesian arrival itself resulted in a decrease in resident monk seal populations within the MHI (Ragen 1999:185).

Any tentative conclusions concerning monk seal presence in the MHI drawn from the archaeological evidence are complicated by several factors. Given its size and weight, if a monk seal was caught and butchered for food, it is most likely that the butchering would have taken place near to where the animal was killed, with the carcass being left on the beach and only the meat carried to the consumption site. Alternately, an imu (earth oven) could have been dug into the sand and the entire carcass cooked in situ. Either of these scenarios would have resulted in the bones of the animal not being transported to the occupation site and therefore not being incorporated into the archeological record.

Given the abundance of fragmentary and otherwise unidentified or unidentifiable medium mammal bones recovered from archaeological excavations conducted throughout the MHI, the possibility exists that seal bones recovered from some excavations have not been identified or categorized as such.
The scarcity of monk seal remains recovered from archaeological contexts may also simply reflect the relative abundance of monk seal populations. Given what we know of Hawaiian monk seal biology, seal populations present within the MHI at the time of first Polynesian contact would have consisted of only a few hundreds to no more than a few thousands of individuals. Their expected percentage representation within archaeological midden (food debris) assemblages would therefore be relatively small compared to the many thousands of individuals of other species of mammals, birds and fish that formed part of the early Hawaiian diet.

Identified archaeological sites dating from the early settlement period of Hawaiian prehistory, the time at which monk seals would be expected to be most numerous within the MHI, are relatively rare. The paucity of these sites would further decrease the sample size of potentially recovered monk seal remains.

While the archaeological evidence provides no definitive answer to the question of whether monk seals were present within the MHI at the time of Polynesian arrival, it does seem to indicate that they were not abundant within the MHI for much of period prior to Western contact. This conclusion is further supported by the ethnohistorical evidence.

The physical presence of monk seals within the MHI is not reflected in the material culture of Hawai`i at the time of contact. Neither the bones nor the teeth of the Hawaiian monk seal appear to have been used in the creation of traditional tools or ornaments.

Unlike the mammals that arrived in Hawai`i with the early Polynesian voyages, the dog (`ilio), pig (pua`a), and rat (iole), all of which were identified by a single Hawaiian name, seals were found to be referred to in `ōlelo Hawai`i (the Hawaiian language) by several different terms. Among there were he `ilio o ke kai (the dog of the sea, also `ilio o ke kai), `ilio-holo-kai (the dog that runs in the sea), `ilio-holo-i-kauaua (dog running in the toughness), uwa`lo (to cry out), hulu (fur; possibly a historic usage to refer to arctic fur seals), and kila or sila (an adaptation of the English word seal). With their furred bodies and bark-like calls, it is easy to see how seals were identified as the dogs of the sea. The range of different names used to refer to these animals, however, some of which were derived from the English term seal, might suggest that seals were not frequently encountered by the Hawaiians of the pre-Contact period.

References to seals in the traditional literature are relatively rare, and it is not until the historic period, when Hawaiian sailors began to take part in voyages to the arctic to capture fur seals for the China trade, and local vessels began actively hunting the newly discovered monk seal populations within the NWHI, that mentions of seals begin to appear with any regularity in Hawaiian language sources. Although the early accounts of Western visitors to the islands are replete with detailed descriptions of the various plants and animals they encountered, there appear to be no references to the presence of Hawaiian monk seals within the MHI. It is not until Western ships began visiting the NWHI that we be begin to encounter descriptions of the monk seal. All of these archaeological, ethnographic and archival sources would appear to suggest that throughout most of the pre-Contact and into the early historic period monk seals were not common visitors to the MHI.
Although it has been suggested (Zeigler 2002:244, Ragen 2003:1) that the original range of the indigenous Hawaiian monk seal may not have extended down into the MHI, this does not seem reasonable given the similarity in the marine environments of the NWHI and the MHI. Both areas would have offered a similar range of suitable habitats, an abundance of available food resources, and a relative scarcity of predators, at least until the arrival of humans.

A more likely scenario is that, soon after the arrival for the first Polynesian voyagers, the seal population of the MHI became extinct, in much the same manner as many species of indigenous Hawaiian land birds, through a combination of human predation and the impacts of the terrestrial mammals (rats, pigs, and dogs) that accompanied the voyagers from their homeland in southern Polynesia (Ragen 1999:185). Monk seals hauled out onto the beaches of these newly discovered islands would have offered an easily obtainable food source for the first settlers. It is also well documented that, as its name might imply, the monk seal does not adapt well to disturbance from dogs or humans (Ragen 1999). Those monk seals resident within the MHI that were not killed for food would most likely have translocated themselves to the NWHI where they were much less likely to be threatened or disturbed. The relatively small monk seal population that occupied the MHI could have been extirpated within a few generations. While stray individuals undoubtedly occasionally found their way down from the NWHI, it appears probable that there was not a significant resident monk seal population in the MHI throughout much of the pre-Contact period.
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