

(RE)MEMBERING 'UPENA OF INTIMACIES:
A KANAKA MAOLI MO'OLELO BEYOND QUEER THEORY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF HAWAI'I IN PARTIAL FULLFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
ENGLISH

MAY 2018

By
Jamaica Heolimeleikalani Osorio

Dissertation Committe:
Craig Howes, Chair
Cristina Bacchilega
Candace Fujikane
ku'ualoha ho'omanawanui
Noenoe Silva

HE MELE NO HŌPOE: A DEDICATION

I saw you dancing in the distance

Pulling my glance with the diction of your stance

Gliding over the land like water

over itself

Rolling flowered mist

With a name that speaks too much of your magic

Nānāhuki,

Too heavy for the diphthong of my tongue

Instead, let me call you Hōpoe

I have seen you gathering parts of yourself in the form of yellow lehua there

I have been with you from the beginning

I only wait for the pahu to sound for our ha'a to begin

You created of this stranger in me

A lover

Let me cover your body in the sacred skin of this nahele

plant you a fortress of rumbling lehua trees

each blossom a promise to return my love

to move your rhythm again

for your ea to find home in my mele

Can you see those strange men
Watching from beyond the page
see the way they have drawn us naked and grown
they miss your skin feathered with yellow lehua
writing us into stillness into silence
how it seems through them,
we have been forgotten

I wonder how it is they cannot see
I wonder
what has made them so blind

NĀ MAHALO

First, to my kūpuna who survived and thrived for me to come to be, who passed down the promises of their kūpuna, who taught me the value of memory and the good fortunate of grace, who are my first and most important archive and the original caretakers of this ‘upena, mahalo.

To Eliza Leialoha Kamakawiwo‘ole, thank you for every mo‘olelo spoken or sung you gifted to your grandson. Each is an heirloom I will cherish forever.

To Granny Groovy, thank you for loving and supporting, unconditionally, the Pele inside of me. Thank you for Portuguese bean soup and fireplaces, for lei making and hair braiding. Thank you for the gift of memory.

To Puna, thank you for always knowing the melody, for always asking me to sing louder, and for never letting me forget just how great aloha is.

To all of my kūpuna, mahalo for the honor to live my life in service to you, your ‘ike and our mo‘olelo.

Second, mahalo piha to all the kumu I've had the privilege of learning from. From my first kumu at Ānuenuē: Kumu Kalina, Kumu Leinani, Kumu Kehau, Kumu Malia, and Kumu Mehana, who gave me my leo, and instilled in me a love for education, mo‘olelo, and Hawaiian politics while also offering me the invaluable lesson of aloha ‘āina. Thank you for the immeasurable gift of never having to question if I am Hawaiian enough.

To the kumu and advisors at Kamehameha Kapālama who looked beyond all the “limitations” I was assumed to have by virtue of studying at a kaiapuni school, and instead saw my promise. To Mrs. Ahu, Umi Perkins, and Samantha LandrySmith, mahalo for pushing me to expand my understanding of what I was capable of in and beyond the classroom.

To my undergraduate professors, Cherrie Moraga and Michael Wilcox, thank you for arming me with language and theoretical analyses to pair with my pain and rage. Thank you for showing me the power of (re)membering and healing and investing in my emotional wellbeing. Above all thank you for pushing me to grow and expand far beyond my comfort zone, so that I could eventually take all these skills and lessons back home.

To the kumu and fierce wāhine who helped me find Hi‘iaka: Lilikalā Kame‘eleihiwa, ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui, and Noelani Arista, who talked me through imagining my first iteration of this project (my undergraduate thesis), I cannot thank you enough for your time and mentorship. To Kumu Lehua Yim, who shared daily writing accountability emails with me for months during my senior year at Stanford, and insisted that I was capable of creation, your impact on me and this work will never be forgotten.

Mahalo piha to all the many mentors and professors I’ve been blessed with at UHM, Cristina Bacchilega, Laura Lyons, Paul Lyons (rest in power), Hokulani Aikau, Subramanian Shankar, Craig Santos Perez, Brandy Nālani McDougall, Kahikina de Silva, Noenoe Silva and the many other kumu and classmates who’ve touched me and my scholarship along the way. Mahalo for scaring me, pushing me, and always assuring me of my kuleana and potential.

Mahalo to my entire dissertation committee for your service and support. A special mahalo to Candace Fujikane for giving your time, encouragement and aloha to this project and an especially big mahalo to my dissertation Chair, Craig Howes, who has been with me every step of the way. This project would not have been possible without you. Thank you for taking on this arduous kuleana with me and for supporting me, unconditionally.

To Haunani, mahalo for all the fine baskets you wove to hold us, for all the memory you sacrificed so that we would never forget again. Mahalo for teaching me it’s okay to be angry, and

to value, most of all, my lāhui. Mahalo for bringing my kōko‘olua and so many more of my hoā back home. Mahalo for never making yourself small.

To all the other Kānaka Maoli struggling, fighting, and building in and outside of this university, I see you, I thank you, I aloha you. Mahalo for your books, your stories, your sweat, your testimony, your protests, your poems, your songs, your wai, your lo‘i and mala. Thank you for paving the way.

And to all the other kumu who taught me in classrooms, from books and in lecture halls, mahalo. To those who cultivated me in lo‘i and mala, who taught me that you can’t just write about ‘āina you need to be in ‘āina, mahalo. To the kumu of stages, choral rooms, and concert halls, who first taught this voice to ring out loud, mahalo. To the kumu in gyms, on soccer and rugby pitches, who helped me learn to never be afraid to be strong, mahalo. To those who mentored me in the ocean, mahalo. To the leaders who taught from the front of a marching line, who gave speeches and held their fists high, who taught me the language, stories, and songs of our people, mahalo. Mahalo for the time and commitment you have invested in me. Your love and ‘ike is a gift I will spend my life trying to deserve and repay.

And finally, mahalo to my ‘ohana.

To my kōko‘olua, No‘u Revilla, whose faith and support in me is only matched by your own outstanding brilliance and beauty, mahalo. For all the late nights “discussing” feminism, queer theory, and activism, mahalo for never going easy on me. Mahalo for standing by my side and imagining and creating our own ‘upena every day. Mahalo for allowing me, a wahinepō‘aimoku, to return, even after our ulu lehua had burned. For forgiveness, for aloha, , Mahalo piha iā ‘oe, e ku‘u kōko‘olua aloha.

To Kāne, Duncan, Hali‘a, Lehua, and all my hoa hānau far and near, thank you for believing in me, for loving me, and for never letting me take myself too seriously.

To my many mākua, but especially my Aunty Leolinda, thank you for always being my cheerleader and my confidant. For being our mo‘okū‘auhau and the living caretaker of our Osorio ‘upena of pilina, mahalo.

To my mother, Mary Carol Osorio, who wholeheartedly took on the painful challenge of raising a strong defiant mana wahine, mahalo. Whose love for Hawai‘i and our lāhui is the single strongest motivation for me to continue to push my belief in the possibilities of allyship and solidarity. Who dreamed every dream I ever had with and for me, unconditionally. Mahalo iā ‘oe e ku‘u makuahine. Aloha wau iā ‘oe.

To my father, Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo‘ole Osorio, no words can express my love and admiration for you. Thank you for my name, for my voice, and my quick wit. Thank you for mornings united in quiet contemplation, and for all the mele and mo‘olelo we share and cherish. Thank you for your kindness, laughter and leadership. Thank you for the guidance and the space to make my own way and to find this mo‘olelo. Thank you for not letting me go to law school. Thank you for raising and investing in a generation of Kānaka Maoli aloha ‘āina for me to stand with. You are my first kumu, my favorite mele, and my most beloved mo‘olelo. You are the voice inside of my head that keeps me moving when times get tough. You are the kalo to my ‘ohā. Thank you for making room for me on your path. It’s an honor to serve this lāhui and ‘ohana beside you.

To my beloved Hōpoe, who called me to dive deep into this mo‘olelo, who taught me to read closely and dig deeply. Who taught me to listen and see beyond the page. Who led me back

to my body, who taught me what aloha means and who urged me to find and mend my ‘upena, mahalo. Mahalo. Mahalo.

And to everyone else bound in this beautiful ‘upena of pilina with me, who planted seeds for this ulu lehua to grow, mahalo piha. Without you all, none of this would be possible.

Ke aloha nui,

Jamaica Heolimeleikalani Osorio

ABSTRACT

First and foremost, this dissertation takes aloha seriously. By exploring the ‘Ōiwi concepts of aloha ‘āina and pilina at the intersections of ‘ike Hawai‘i, Indigenous queer theory, and Indigenous feminisms, I offer an interdisciplinary investigation of ea, or Kanaka Maoli modes of nation-building and governance. Specifically, through a close examination of Hi‘iakaikapoliopole mo‘olelo, I begin in Chapter One with a discussion of the ways aloha ‘āina spins *‘upena of intimacies*, which I engage as both an ethics and practice of relationality grounded in ‘Ōiwi land, memory, and desire. Chapter One also includes a review of Indigenous queer theory and mo‘olelo literary criticism in which I also discuss how our ‘upena represents Kanaka Maoli alternatives to settler logics of heterosexism, cisheteropatriarchy, and heteronormativity. Chapter Two elaborates on my Kanaka Maoli methodologies of research, writing, and translation and maps the path of this dissertation through an engagement with Hawai‘i’s archive of 19th and 20th century nūpepa. I offer in Chapter Two a new approach to addressing the many problems of the translation of Hawaiian language materials. I call this practice, “rigorous paraphrase.” In Chapter Three and Chapter Four I cast our ‘upena of intimacies across the Hiiaka archive and investigate pilina, intimacy, and ‘āina. Finally, in Chapter Five I narrow the focus, moving from suggesting the expansiveness of our ‘upena of intimacies to articulating a specific set of relationships that can help us see how the ongoing dislocations, disintegration, and disembodiment of our Kanaka Maoli relationships continue to obstruct our ability to challenge and offer alternatives to settler colonialism.

To each ‘āina she departs Hiiaka chants: “Mai pōina ‘oe ia‘u,” and like Hiiaka, this work also prioritizes ‘āina-based methodologies of (re)membering. In this dissertation, I join a succession of storytellers, scholars, and activists who have fought and continue to struggle to decolonize and

deoccupy Hawai‘i. This *‘upena of intimacies* is part of a larger call to action to take aloha seriously, to (re)member our kūpuna, and to create deoccupied and decolonial Kanaka Maoli futures.

A NOTE ABOUT LANGUAGE USE:

To maintain the integrity of cited materials from the nūpepa, diacriticals will not be used in any translations or paraphrases unless they are present in the original text. To maintain consistency of spelling, to avoid confusion, but most of all to respect the mana of the inoa portrayed in this mo‘olelo by our kūpuna, I have also opted to refrain from using diacriticals in the spelling of all proper nouns (authors, subjects, and ‘āina) in the mo‘olelo. Because it is the widely practiced convention to utilize diacriticals in current critical and theoretical writing, the previous rule will be disregarded in my own original analysis, theorizing, and writing; and therefore, diacriticals will be used in those cases where their use has been established, including the spelling of Hawai‘i. While this may cause some confusion or a sense of inconsistency, I believe this to be an important political choice when theorizing in English and ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i.

In terms of pronoun usage in English, gender neutral pronouns (they, theirs, them) will be used whenever gender is not explicitly known, even at the expense of conventional subject-verb agreement. I am choosing to do this because given the subject of this dissertation, decentering the gender binary whenever possible is a desirable goal.

Finally, the word “mana” will be used frequently throughout this dissertation without continual clarification. Mana can mean divine power, authority, and privilege, or it can mean a version of a story. I will be speaking frequently about our mana as power, and the many mana of our mo‘olelo, leaving it to the reader, now advised, to determine the appropriate or pleasing associations that this important word and idea has in specific circumstances.

TABLES & FIGURES

TABLE 1	‘Ohana	81
TABLE 2	Kauoha	84
TABLE 3	Kaiko‘eke	92
TABLE 4	Aikāne	94
TABLE 5	Ho‘āikāne	97
TABLE 6	Kōko‘olua	112
TABLE 7	Nā Inoa o Pele	125
TABLE 8	Nā Inoa o Hiiaka	127
TABLE 9	Nā Inoa o Nanahuki / Hopoe	130
TABLE 10	Nā Inoa o Lohiau	132
TABLE 11A	Nā Mele o Wahineomao	143
TABLE 11B	Nā Mele o Wahineomao	144
TABLE 11C	Nā Mele o Wahineomao	146
TABLE 12	Mai Poina oe iau	168

TABLE OF CONTENTS

HE MELE NO HŌPOE: A DEDICATION	ii
NĀ MAHALO	iv
ABSTRACT	ix
LANGUAGE USE	X
‘ŌLELO MUA: BEGINNING TO (RE)MEMBER	1
CHAPTER ONE: ALOHA ‘ĀINA AS PILINA	11
CHAPTER TWO: ARCHIVE AND METHODS	39
CHAPTER THREE: THE EA OF PILINA	75
FOR MY FAVORITE SPRING, “PUNA” LEONETTA KEOLAOKALANI KINARD	113
CHAPTER FOUR: ‘ĀINA, THE ‘AHA OF OUR ‘UPENA	116
CHAPTER FIVE: KAMA‘ĀINA: PILINA AND KULEANA IN A TIME OF REMOVAL	149
‘ŌLELO PĪNA‘I: EPILOGUE	174
BIBLIOGRAPHY	178

‘Ōlelo Mua: Beginning to (Re)member

‘O Maalolaninui ke kāne ‘o Lonokaumakahiki ka wahine
Noho pū lāua a hānau ‘ia ‘o Imaikalani he kāne

‘O Imaikalani ke kāne ‘o Kekookalani ka wahine
Noho pū lāua a hānau ‘ia ‘o Paaluhi Kahinuonalani he kāne

‘O Paaluhi Kahinuonalani ke kāne ‘o Piipii Kealiiwaiwaiole ka wahine
Noho pū lāua a hānau ‘ia ‘o Charles Moses Kamakawiwooleokamehameha he kāne

‘O Hainaloha ke kāne ‘o Niau ka wahine
Noho pū lāua a hānau ‘ia ‘o Kaluaihonolulu he wahine

‘O Kaluaihonolulu ka wahine ‘o Nakooka ke kāne
Noho pū lāua a hānau ‘ia ‘o Kapahu he wahine

‘O Kapahu ka wahine ‘o Kua ke kāne
Noho pū lāua a hānau ‘ia ‘o Daisy Kealiiaiawaawa he wahine

‘O Charles Moses Kamakawiwo‘oleokamehameha ke kāne ‘o Daisy Kealiiaiawaawa ka wahine
Noho pū lāua a hānau ‘ia ‘o Eliza Leialoha Kamakawiwo‘ole he wahine

‘O Eliza Leialoha Kamakawiwo‘ole ka wahine ‘o Emil Montero Osorio ke kāne
Noho pū lāua a hānau ‘ia ‘o Elroy Thomas Leialoha Osorio he kāne

‘O Manuawai ke kāne ‘o Keao ka wahine
Noho pū lāua a hānau ‘ia ‘o Sarah Piikea Papanui he wahine

‘O Sarah Piikea Papanui ka wahine ‘o Kam Sheong Akiona ke kāne
Noho pū lāua a ma Kona Hema hānau ‘ia ‘o Nani Kaluahine Kimoe Akiona he wahine

‘O Nani Kaluahine Kimoe Akiona ka wahine ‘o Leroy Adam Anthony Kay ke kāne
Noho pū lāua a hānau ‘ia ‘o Clara Ku‘ulei Kay he wahine

‘O Elroy Thomas Leialoha Osorio ke kāne ‘o Clara Ku‘ulei Kay ka wahine
Noho pū lāua ma Hilo hānau ‘ia ‘o Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo‘ole Osorio he kāne

‘O Edward Lawrence Dunn ke kāne ‘o Genevieve Catherine Offer ka wahine
Noho pū lāua a hānau ‘ia ‘o Mary Carol Dunn he wahine

‘O Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo‘ole Osorio ke kāne ‘o Mary Carol Dunn ka wahine
Noho pū lāua a hānau ‘ia ‘o Jamaica Heolimeleikalani Osorio

November 1959, Kilauea Iki

When my father was eight years old, he took a trip with his older brother Tom and their paternal grandparents to bear witness to the eruption at Kilauea Iki. The four Osorios piled into the car and made the long drive from Hilo into Volcano. As they were driving they could see Kilauea Iki spitting her magma up into the atmosphere. My father recalls how they could see the fountain from inside the car. At its highest, it soared up over eleven hundred feet.

They parked along the side of the road, then walked the lehua- and ‘ōhelo-lined path, now known as Devastation Trail. I imagine that when they arrived at the lookout the two boys were struck by the awe only known to someone who has witnessed some kind of birthing—here, their one hānau expanding.

They had only been at the edge of Kilauea Iki for a moment when my father, the youngest traveler, and too young to have fully internalized what stories are meant to be quiet, or to know which names can be said out loud, leaned over to his very Christian grandmother and asked, “Ma, is that Pele?”

As silently and quickly as Pele’s path can change, as swiftly as she can target new prey and swallow new ‘ili, my great grandmother turned her back to the Luahine, and walked along the trail, back to the car. She climbed in and shut the door.

Annoyed with his brother’s naiveté, Tom snapped, “Why’d you have to go and ask that for?” He had known what my father did not. Tom knew not to speak of Pele—that fierce and powerful akua who had stood starkly in opposition to the teachings the boys had received in their Sunday school classes from their grandmother. Through his elder sibling wisdom, Tom had learned which stories were meant for casual conversation, and which were to be left as whispers—caught in the back of the throat, not to be freed casually, if ever.

As the three Osorio kāne took the long trail back to the car, my father absorbed this devastating lesson as well. And I imagine how that punishing silence, closing like a steel car door against a boy's curiosity about how an island can give birth from nothing if she too is not a God, had itself developed through long force of habit.

This story tells me a few things about this beautiful, strong, and punishing woman, my great grandmother Eliza Leialoha Kamakawiwo'ole Osorio. It tells me that she loved Hawai'i. God, Eliza must have loved Hawai'i—she sang about Hawai'i, wrote about Hawai'i, and must have also believed in the mana of Hawai'i if she so clearly wanted to take that drive to bear witness to her one hānau growing.

The story also tells me that she loved her 'ohana. Eliza didn't venture to Kilauea Iki alone. She chose to take her mo'opuna, to share with these boys that moment of pure awe that comes from observing this birthing. Because to love our 'ohana is to share intimacy with them, to create memories that will become mo'olelo for future generations. From what I've heard, Eliza was full of this kind of aloha.

But most of all, this mo'olelo tells me that my great grandmother was not only a God-fearing, but a Pele-fearing woman. When my father uttered Pele's name, it was her power, not Jesus's, that forced my great grandmother to look away and retreat from the burning crater. In two syllables His pre-eminence had been challenged. My father had realized what Tom did not say, and what Eliza already must have known—that a woman who births land out of darkness is, was, and will always be a God.

Once spoken, it was Pele's mana that would not allow my kupuna to witness it any longer, because it challenged the mo'olelo Eliza had been taught in her father's sanctuary. In this moment, my great grandmother was confronted and torn in half by two distinctly different

mo‘olelo—one that celebrated the mana in everything around and inside of her, and another that gave her virtue, structure, and a path not to devastation, but to paradise.

This is the mo‘olelo I think about, when I wonder how traditions and memory come to be dismembered over time. How fear turns to shame, and finally hardens to silence. How a family, born from Kilauea’s fiery belly, comes to deny their kupuna and akua’s first name, Pelehonuamea. How a young boy, and later a whole family, are urged to forget, or like Tom at least remain silent, about their first home in Pele’s poli.

August 1996, Pālolo Valley

My first major assignment at Ke Kula Kaiapuni ‘o Ānuehue was to compile my mo‘okū‘auhau. Over and over again, we were told about the kuleana we carried in our names, and how as Kānaka Maoli we ourselves would come to carry the kuleana of these names with us everywhere we go. ‘Ōlelo no‘eau filled in the gaps between lesson and practice. “Ua maika‘i ke kalo i ka ‘ohā”—by knowing and reciting our genealogies, we were engaging in an ancient practice of accountability and pilina. Our mo‘okū‘auhau was at the center of this lesson.

The official two-page worksheet laid out a formula for what ‘ohana should look like. Two parents, children, a single marriage, kāne, and wāhine were all essential pieces of the complete puzzle. We were taught to treat these mo‘okū‘auhau as prized possessions, passed down from one generation to the next, and perhaps the medicine to cure this colonial sickness. In many ways, my mo‘okū‘auhau was the first mo‘olelo I was gifted--the first I memorized, and the first I was taught to value greatly.

I’ve learned since then that mo‘okū‘auhau are not just important because they place us within a particular, and sometimes even constricting, familial context. They are also important

because they are place-based records—evidence and narrative. They are important as both history and story, past and present, personal and political. But to a storyteller, mo‘okū‘auhau are also incomplete—mana of a larger narrative. And while mo‘okū‘auhau are effective at telling certain stories, I have come to realize that they are not the only archive I should cherish.

Like families, mo‘okū‘auhau can seem fragmented, imperfect. But they are a beginning. Mine is my beginning. So these days I come to my mo‘okū‘auhau ready to read along its margins, to fill in what lives beyond the genre of this practice. Today I come to my mo‘okū‘auhau asking what parts of my ‘upena of intimacies are intact and what parts have been lost or forgotten. I ask what can this mo‘olelo, the mo‘olelo of my ‘ohana, tell me about pilina. As a child in a family of storytellers, I find these questions natural and necessary.

It is no surprise, then, that I have chosen to research and write a dissertation about relationships. Many people seem to think of relationships as ecosystems existing between two people at a time. I prefer to think of them in a Kanaka Maoli context, as ‘upena or nets of intimacies, a concept I will elaborate throughout the course of this dissertation. With our ‘upena we begin by taking intimacy seriously, then over time work to understand the many ways we can articulate pilina and intimacy with each other and our ‘āina. We can learn that being bound and accountable to each other means that I am also bound and accountable to your intimacies and accountabilities. This exponentially expands the possibilities of pleasure and responsibility. Because both matter.

If relationships are about intimacies, then this dissertation is also about considering the many forms intimacy can take, and how certain relationships and intimacies are pursued and practiced. Some intimacies are realized through sex, some through experiencing together a sunrise or a cold rain, some through the simple yet important act of sharing names. Especially in

the face of a settler colonial project that has worked towards punishing, mocking, or eliminating certain forms and practices of intimacy, it is important that this project take intimacy seriously, in its many shape-shifting forms.

‘Upena of Intimacies:

In the next chapter I outline some of the valuable tools Indigenous queer theory provides for naming and mapping the violences directed at our practices of intimacy and kinship. A significant contribution of this dissertation, however, will be a metaphor for Kanaka Maoli intimacy that not only offers a rationale for site analysis and a means for explaining with greater nuanced readings of specific moments or events in the mo‘olelo, but also suggests language for articulating our opposition to these violences in our history, and for revealing the value of our mo‘olelo for our practices of (re)membering today. I therefore imagine and cast ‘upena of intimacies over Indigenous practices of desire and kinship.

‘Upena are materially relevant for discussing pilina because like our pilina, our ‘upena are made out of and reflect our ‘āina and environment. The ‘aha that bind our many nae together come from our land, shaped and spun by our own hands. ‘Upena, like pilina, require great and constant care to maintain their good condition. Keeping in mind our ‘upena also encourages us to articulate clearly and strongly how our intimacies are connected and accountable to each other.

‘Upena can also come with a set of negative connotations. Not always are ‘upena used to catch fish; sometimes we become caught and caged in ‘upena. I honor the metaphor of the ‘upena for our pilina by also being attentive to what our pilina can become if not tended to. As our lives push us to reckon with the violence we have endured and inflicted on each other through our relationships and pilina, let us always remember that ‘upena can both cradle and

strangle. When we keep this in mind while studying the many attacks on kānaka, our practices, and our ‘āina, we can certainly trace the wear and damage on our beloved ‘upena, and know where to begin repairs.

In this dissertation, I offer some suggestions and initial attempts at mending these ‘upena we share with each other. I walk through the task of making the ‘aha—the woven or braided cord—that when knotted (nae) brings us together. In doing so, I think about all the rope we have already braided as a lāhui—tying together our kūpuna, Haunani-Kay Trask,¹ Imaikalani Kalahahele,² Noelani Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, Bryan Kamaoli Kuwada,³ and many others here unnamed. I think about how all this ‘aha helps us in mending the ‘upena we have the kuleana to carry.

Ultimately it is both what makes our ‘upena and what that ‘upena holds that is most important. Our mo‘olelo teach us that our ‘upena are as diverse as our kānaka, but what all these ‘upena share is what they carry for us: possibility. In the face of all we have endured, and all the ways our intimacy between each other has been straightened and damaged, possibility, and our many practices of aloha, are revolutionary.

Continuing the actions of our haku ‘upena, in this dissertation I will display a constellation of intimacies that articulate our distinct ways of relating to one another as kānaka. I will acknowledge the trauma our ‘upena has suffered—where the lines have been cut, tangled, or displaced. I will also trace the ‘aha that lead us to our bodies, to each other, and to our ‘āina.

By beginning with my own mo‘okū‘auhau, I am therefore saying that my ‘upena of intimacies is relevant and necessary to this project. Kanaka Maoli epistemologies are not just

¹ (Trask 1994, 55)

² (Kalahahele 2002, 29)

³ (Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua and Kuwada 2016)

handy frameworks or tools, but intimate and essential practices of research. To discuss pilina in mo‘olelo as an ‘upena without unfolding a bit of my own ‘upena before you would be a disservice to these mo‘olelo and all they have to teach us.

Because this dissertation is about pilina, mo‘olelo, and mo‘okū‘auhau, the work of this prologue must be to haku an ‘upena that reveals the important nae or intersections of scholarship, research, and mo‘olelo that have insisted on this work’s becoming.

(Re)membering:

This dissertation is above all a (re)membering. In 2002 my father published his first book, *Dismembering Lāhui*. Like those of his university kumu and his contemporaries, his intellectual contribution was a detailed study of the devastation inflicted on our kingdom, communities, and families by colonialism and the American invasion and occupation of our country. Like Haunani-Kay Trask’s earth-shattering speech that called Hawaiians to recognize, now and forever, that “We are NOT Americans,” *Dismembering Lāhui* dug deeply into the latter half of Hawai‘i’s kingdom period to empower our lāhui to understand how businessmen of primarily American descent and their U.S. allies were able to usurp and exercise enough power to overthrow, and eventually stage manage what they would call an annexation, of our aupuni. His book became an essential text of Hawaiian scholarship.

Because of my father, his kūmu and mau hoa hana—Kekuni Blaisdell, Haunani-Kay Trask, Lilikalā Kame‘eleihiwa, Kanalu Young, Noenoe Silva, and Davianna McGregor—and all their haumāna who have come before me, it is no longer necessary to prove that this tragedy happened. Kānaka Maoli growing up and studying today know, and know how, our lāhui was dismembered. This earlier intellectual commitment, rigor, and sacrifice when dealing with our

mo‘olelo has granted Kanaka Maoli intellectuals of today the opportunity to survey that dismembering, and to think about how we will (re)member and heal ourselves, our communities, and our ‘āina.

With this in mind, I present to the scholarly community, and offer to my lāhui, “(Re)membering ‘Upena of Intimacies: A Kanaka Maoli Mo‘olelo beyond Queer Theory.” The labor of my intellectual ancestors has made it possible. It represents, however, my own practice of recalling and piecing together the different mana of mo‘olelo I have had the honor to carry—a practice of taking stock and taking action. It examines mo‘okū‘auhau and the pilina between ‘ohana. It also considers how our stories are dismembered and (re)membered again.

Chapter One begins with an evaluation of the impact that reading and taking seriously the pilina created through practicing aloha ‘āina has had, and can continue to have. Chapter One also offers a review of Indigenous queer theory and mo‘olelo literary criticism—two of the major points of intersection and inspiration from which my work emerges. Chapter Two explains my Kanaka Maoli methodologies of research, writing, and translation, and describes the interventions our expansive ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i archive helps me make into established practices of handling and representing ‘ike. Chapters Three and Four cast our ‘upena of intimacies across the Hiiaka archive. Here I offer close investigations of pilina, intimacy, and ‘āina. Finally, in Chapter Five I narrow the focus, moving from suggesting the expansiveness of our ‘upena of intimacies to articulating a specific set of relationships that can help us see how the ongoing dislocations, disintegration, and disembodiment of our Kanaka Maoli relationships continue to obstruct our ability to challenge and offer alternatives to settler colonialism. As the concluding chapter, Chapter Five also offers some proposed actions for contemporary Kānaka Maoli to practice a political and cultural (re)membering.

Ultimately, this dissertation is a call to all our k̄anaka to join in the mending of our pilina and ‘upena, together. Ke aloha nō iā ‘oukou pākahi a pau. I am glad you are here.

CHAPTER ONE:

ALOHA ‘ĀINA AS PILINA

Whether the actual term aloha ‘āina is used or not, nearly every contemporary Kanaka Maoli scholar has necessarily engaged with its ethics and practice. Aloha ‘āina is central to any mo‘olelo of Hawai‘i because our specific connection and relationship to land informs all of Kanaka Maoli ontology and epistemology. It is the central and orienting framework for any attempt to understand what it means to be Kanaka Maoli. And understanding who we are—intimately, personally, and politically, in the face of continued removal—becomes more and more important, as Kānaka continue to struggle to regain and sustain any kind of personal and political self-determination in Hawai‘i.

Aloha ‘āina has been translated by scholars in many ways, including love for the land, love for one’s country, and patriotism. Our full understanding of its meaning, however, emerges from a vast collection of mo‘olelo, mele, political commentary, and petitions, much of which significantly precedes 19th century written literacy in Hawai‘i. While defining aloha ‘āina as patriotism conforms to some of the ways our kūpuna defined it for themselves in the 19th century,⁴ critiques of this particular understanding have made important gestures towards disassembling some of the imported and imposed colonial assumptions, such as the alignment of nationhood and patriarchy. Such critiques warn us to be careful when trying to make meaning of aloha ‘āina, so that we do not perpetuate the very colonial sicknesses that hinder its practice today. Kumu Noenoe Silva’s direct challenge of the use of patriotism as a definition of aloha ‘āina is significant here: “where nationalism and patriotism tend to exalt the virtues of a people or a race, aloha ‘āina exalts the land” (2004, 11). It is “a complex concept that includes recognizing that we are an

⁴ For instance, Hui Aloha ‘Āina was also known as the Hawaiian Patriotic League.

integral part of the ‘āina and the ‘āina is an integral part of us” (2017, 4).

Silva’s definition of aloha ‘āina brings us back to our archive, so that we remember the critical difference David Malo draws between moku and ‘āina in his *Mo‘olelo Hawai‘i*: the living of kānaka on a moku is what transforms it into ‘āina.⁵ In this way we are pushed to remember the reciprocal pilina between our ‘āina and our Kānaka—that both have the mana to transform and feed each other. It is this recognition of a reciprocal and genealogical relationship that distinguishes aloha ‘āina from other forms of nationhood and nationalism. Patriotism, for example, commonly compels the heterosexual male’s duty to the Western Imperial War machine as a form of service to his forefathers. Whereas state-centric nationalism therefore depends upon the deployment of patriarchy to maintain itself, aloha ‘āina understands and values the relationship between the self and ‘āina through a complex mo‘okū‘auhau of pilina—a model for which patriarchy is neither required, nor useful. To celebrate the ‘āina, and one’s personal and intimate relationship with her, offers a counter epistemology to Western nationalism—a counter gender and relational matrix that I have called an ‘upena of pilina.⁶

In the coming chapters I will describe how Kanaka Maoli articulations and practices of pilina and intimacy with each other are profoundly intertwined with our pilina and intimacy with ‘āina. Our mo‘olelo continually show us this correlation, also impressing upon us how aloha ‘āina informs our articulation of aloha to each other. Any unraveling of our complex ‘upena of

⁵ “Elua inoa i kapa ia ma ka mokupuni, he moku ka inoa, he aina kahi inoa, ma ka moku ana ia ke kai ua kapa ia he moku, a ma ka noho ana a kanaka, ua kapa ia he aikane ka inoa” (Malo 1996, 10).

⁶ Chapter Three defines and elaborates upon the ‘upena of pilina as the distinct, diverse web of relations between Kānaka represented in our Hiiaka Mo‘olelo. These pilina are transitively articulated and practiced, compounding the possibilities of pleasure and kuleana. For example, Lohiau as “kēlā kāne a kākou” (that kāne of ours) creates an ‘upena of pilina between Pele and her kaikaina that makes compounded states of pleasure and accountability not offered by heteropaternal monogamy possible.

pilina and intimacy therefore also disembodies our practices of governance and nationalism. In addition to the obvious religious and moral agendas being imposed, bringing patriarchy into Kanaka Maoli relationships through the advocacy of the nuclear household also served the nineteenth-century missionaries' wish to replace aloha 'āina practices with western notions of nationalism and patriotism (Grimshaw 1989). Because of this history of dispossession, interpersonal intimacy—how we practice pilina—must be restored as a central component of Kānaka Maoli nation building.

Understanding and practicing aloha is the necessary first step. Without re-embodiment of the vibrant and diverse ways we have embodied aloha as a people, there can be no aloha 'āina. It will not be enough to de-occupy Hawai'i now, while assuming that we will deal with issues of gender, pilina and “sexuality” later. Rather, our specific and diverse articulations of gender, relationality, and pilina must lead us into and through a nation building movement that truly honors our values and distinct needs as a people. Silva's valuable concept of “mo'okū'auhau consciousness” focuses attention on how Kānaka orient themselves within that web of relations described in our mo'olelo—an 'upena that among other functions determines one's kuleana to the collective (lāhui) and to 'āina (Silva 2017, 6). What I am offering here is a look at the intimacy practiced within the mo'okū'auhau, and an argument for the vital importance of understanding this intimacy, if we truly wish to understand the orientating frameworks that aloha 'āina and mo'okū'auhau supply.

Whether I fully realized it or not, aloha 'āina has always played a pivotal role in my analysis of Kanaka Maoli mo'olelo. As an enthusiast, I have paid the closest attention to those moments when mo'olelo and aloha 'āina mutually inform each other, offering an enhanced perspective on a particular Kanaka Maoli epistemology and/or practice. Nor am I alone in being

attracted to such moments. Some of the most insistent proponents of grounding Kanaka Maoli scholarship and practice, and particularly our reading of mo‘olelo, in aloha ‘āina are wāhine. Haunani-Kay Trask, Noenoe Silva, ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui, Brandy Nālani McDougall, Noelani Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, and Mahealani Dudoit have all contributed significantly to our growing understanding that aloha ‘āina is not just an important Kanaka Maoli political ideology, but the essential and foundational epistemology out of which our mo‘olelo and practices emerge and reflect (Dudoit 1999; Trask 1999, ho‘omanawanui 2007, McDougall 2011, Silva 2014, Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua et al. 2014). As Noenoe Silva explains, “All genres of Hawaiian literature, with the exception of translated works from other languages, reflect our people’s close relationship to and deep love for the ‘āina” (2014, 103).

For her, and for many other Kanaka Maoli wāhine, aloha ‘āina is not simply reflected in our literature, but actually practiced through the proliferation of our literatures. These wāhine scholars constantly confirm Trask’s claim that “the whole Hawaiian movement is poetic. *Aloha aina* (love for the land) is poetic” (Dudoit 1999). Rather than focusing on defining, these wāhine work towards *articulating* aloha ‘āina through example—an approach I am following and taking forward here. As Kanaka Maoli scholars, we constantly recognize that it is “impossible to convey all of the cultural coding that English strips away, and equally impossible to avoid the Western cultural coding that English adds” (Silva 2004, 12).

Recognizing these problems and dangers as a necessary consequence of translation, I will therefore practice a politics of refusal, invoking and articulating instances of aloha ‘āina in the mo‘olelo and mo‘okū‘auhau without succumbing to the pressure to reduce them, or their informing concept, to a supposed English equivalent (Aiu 2010). If successful, my method should not only allow aloha ‘āina to suffice, but to resonate accurately and fully because it

escapes translation. Because of my politics of refusal and my practice of rigorous paraphrase, which I will describe more fully in the following chapter, there are many words in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i strung throughout my own writing without translation. Should you find a term illusive, wehewehe.org is an appropriate source to begin to survey definitions of Hawaiian terms across multiple dictionaries.

We can best guard against mistranslation and misrepresentation by returning to one of our most important waihona of ‘ike, our published mo‘olelo, and examining carefully how our kūpuna manifested aloha ‘āina in our literature and lives. Our mo‘olelo not only offer valuable instruction in the meaning and practice of aloha ‘āina, but actually anticipated our need as contemporary Kānaka for this ‘ike. Because the nūpepa have served as my primary archive for this dissertation, I turn to them now to offer some examples of how their vivid discussions of aloha ‘āina have informed my own analysis of the ‘upena of pilina in the mo‘olelo.

In the late 19th century, Joseph Nāwahī, aloha ‘āina and founder and editor of the nūpepa *Ke Aloha Aina*,⁷ wrote a series of pieces about aloha ‘āina that offered as an analogy the properties of a magnet. On the second-last page of the nūpepa’s first issue, in an article entitled “Ke Aloha Aina, Heaha ia?” [What is Aloha ‘Āina?], he wrote,

O ke Aloha Aina, oia ka ume Mageneti iloko o ka puuwai o ka Lahui, e kaohi ana i ka noho Kuokoa Lanakila ana o kona one hanau ponoī . . . ina i hookokoke ia na kui hao Mageneti i kahi hookahi, alaila, he mea maopopo loa me ke kanalua ole o ka manao ua

⁷ Editors: 1895: Joseph Nawahi, 1896-1897; Mrs. Joseph (Emma Aima) Nawahi, Edward L. Like, S.P. Kanoa, 1897-1899; Joseph (Emma Aima) Nawahi, Edward L. Like, 1899-1901; Edward Like, 1903; Edward Like, Alex Nawahi, S.W. Kamakawo, 1906; Edward Like, Sam Kanio, Kuaela, 1907; Edward Like, Sam Kanio, 1908; Edward Like, 1911-1912; J.M. Poepoe, 1914; D.K. Kahaulelio, 1915; T.J. Ryan, 1915-1918; Jesse Uluihi, 1919; T.J. Ryan, 1920; Edward K. Hanapi (Mookini 1974, 4).

ume like no lakou a pau loa kekahi i kekahi (*Ke Aloha Aina*, May 25, 1895, 7).

In the editorial, the author describes the power of aloha ‘āina by comparing it to the mana of a magnet. In this description, we learn how aloha ‘āina articulates not only a magnetic force that draws a kanaka to their ‘āina, but also creates and maintains a pilina between kanaka and ‘āina. Further, the author is making a direct connection between aloha ‘āina and one’s desire and struggle for independence. On the same page, an article entitled “Ka Mana o ka Mageneti” explicitly relates the properties of magnets to the pilina between those of the lāhui:

Pela no na kanaka i piha i ke aloha no ko lakou Aina hanau no hoi. Ua hiki ia lakou ke hoolauna mai i na kanaka a me na keiki, a me na ohana o lakou; a ike mai ia lakou iloko o ka ume mageneti o ke Aloha Aina (*Ke Aloha Aina*, May 25, 1895, 7).⁸

In this editorial, the author articulates the way aloha ‘āina also results in a pilina between kānaka, in that aloha ‘āina are able to recognize the aloha ‘āina in each other.

This account of aloha ‘āina offers a peek into the intimacy of aloha. Rather than a political imperative that draws people together through reason, self-interest, and propaganda, aloha ‘āina is an internal love for place and community so strong that it cannot be overcome. Aloha ‘āina is also a Kanaka Maoli’s natural and imbedded practice of relating to one’s home. Aloha ‘āina is that pull to place, that internal compass orienting Kānaka Maoli toward intimacy and self-governance simultaneously.

The effective practice of aloha ‘āina creates and maintains two relationships: to the land itself, to that which feeds; and though that ‘upena of pilina, to one’s community. These are themselves inseparable, relying upon each other for survival. Because of the unending series of

⁸ The copy of this editorial is damaged near the margins and therefore my transcription is my best attempt at reproducing the passage *vebatim*.

attacks upon our Kanaka Maoli land base, which forces Kānaka to assert constantly our kuleana to manage and govern our own lands, many contemporary scholars have focused on the political imperative of aloha ‘āina—that felt need to recognize, articulate, and live one’s pilina to the ‘āina. I argue however that our engagement with aloha ‘āina as that diverse and vibrant collection of multi-bodied relationships between Kānaka Maoli, their ancestors, peers, descendants, and the environment—the powerful unifying alignment and attraction that Nāwahī likened to magnetism—has been neglected.

Through careful analysis and evaluation of mo‘olelo, this dissertation will show that just as Hiiaka is held in the poli of her elder sister Pele, all pilina, all intimacy, is carried in the poli of our ‘āina. Further, with pilina as its living structure, aloha ‘āina is an embodied counter narrative not only to colonialism and occupation, but to heteropatriarchy⁹ and heteropaternalism as well.¹⁰

Wading into the difficult questions posed by pilina, I look to the mo‘olelo and ask, what does it mean physically, emotionally, and spiritually to aloha our ‘āina? What will emerge if we follow aloha beyond plastic consumerism, biblical imagination, and legal definitions, and engage in aloha as transformative kinship beyond anything recently articulated? If we can begin to answer this question, to understand and remember how we are pili to each other and to our ‘āina, all things linked in a diverse ‘upena of pilina, we can start to understand the potential benefits of disrupting current embodiments of these pilina that restrict our personal relationships and practices of desire, and our pilina as a nation. This dissertation therefore seeks to reground the

⁹ Maile Arvin defines heteropatriarchy as that state of affairs in which “heterosexuality and patriarchy are perceived as normal and natural, and in which other configurations are perceived as abnormal, aberrant, and abhorrent” (Arvin et al. 2013, 13). Andrea Smith calls it “the building block of US empire” (2006, 71).

¹⁰ “The presumption that heteropatriarchal nuclear-domestic arrangements, in which the father is both center and leader/boss, should serve as the model for social arrangements of the state and its institutions” (Arvin et al. 2013, 13).

political theory of aloha ‘āina within the personal intimacy of one’s relationship to ‘āina and lāhui.

Why Mo‘olelo Matter:

This project is also about mo‘olelo, a diverse collection of stories, histories, prophecies, songs, poems, chants, and genealogies that are written, spoken, sung, chanted, and felt. Just as studying pilina requires overcoming an intricate set of assumptions about relationships and intimacy embedded in us through patriarchy, studying mo‘olelo requires challenging established notions about history and literature. Mo‘olelo eludes these categories, offering access into a world where ideas about facts and single authoritative truths become complicated and nuanced in unfamiliar ways. For this dissertation, fully engaging with the possibilities of mo‘olelo also reveals the need for dismantling the borders between the academic and the creative. Studying mo‘olelo demands a rigorous creativity; writing about mo‘olelo challenges language, and specifically, the English language in which this dissertation is written.

Above all, exploring mo‘olelo requires recognizing and often shedding many imported western assumptions about what literature is and isn’t. Specifically, mo‘olelo refuse to align themselves within a fiction and non-fiction binary. We must also embrace some further undeniable truths. Mo‘olelo is not folklore or legend. Mo‘olelo is not fantasy. Nor is mo‘olelo always written down—an important point, because western knowledges prioritize the written word. In these cases, mo‘olelo must also resist logocentric arguments “that naively assume that writing is somehow unchangeable or incorruptible,” and therefore closer to historical fact (McDougall 2011, 74).

Instead of being frozen in time and ink, mo‘olelo move and shape-shift. They have many kino. Within the context of occupation, when often only one truth, one version of history and justice, can be allowed to survive, mo‘olelo offers many truths and many mana, refusing to be reduced to a single authoritative fact or version. Taking mo‘olelo seriously can therefore allow for a more nuanced reading and understanding of history. By being many bodied, as a genre, mo‘olelo are inherently counter-hegemonic, regardless of content, and consequently uniquely positioned to challenge white historiography and its occupying grip on Hawai‘i.

Mo‘olelo like the Mo‘olelo o Hiiakaikapoliopole offer an additional resistance to hegemony. As ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui explains, “The Pele and Hi‘iaka mo‘olelo published between 1860 and 1928 were an alternative story to Amer-European colonialism" (2014, 98). In the ensuing analysis, ho‘omanawanui focuses on how “[t]he huluhia discourse embodied in the Pele and Hi‘iaka mo‘olelo expresses Indigenous literary nationalism, presenting and asserting an alternative mo‘olelo of Kanaka Maoli and our ‘āina, a counter-narrative to settler colonial religion (Christianity), Western science (like geography and geology), and politics" (2014, 165). In addition to this huluhia discourse, prevalent throughout every Kanaka Maoli recorded mana of Hiiaka, many other sites of resistance to western hegemony are discernible within this mo‘olelo. Among other things, this dissertation focuses on how the complex nature of relationships displayed in these mo‘olelo challenged, and continue to challenge, western notions of relationality and responsibility.

In brief, Kanaka Maoli writing about pilina and aloha ‘āina necessarily explores the intrinsic and pervasive nature of reciprocity and accountability between kānaka and ‘āina not always easily found in western literatures. As McDougall explains, Hiiaka and other “mo‘olelo and mo‘okū‘auhau are pedagogical sites offering not only protocols for how the ‘āina and we as

Kānaka Maoli should be treated and governed, but also models for various means of warranted resistance in the face of unjust rule” (2011, 276). In other words, these mo‘olelo represent alternative ways Kānaka could, and should, live, love, and govern.

For this and other reasons, mo‘olelo is a practice of kū‘ē (resistance) and kūkulu (building).¹¹ Not only do these mo‘olelo challenge those haole narratives that depicted Hawaiians as lazy, illiterate savages; they also offer alternatives to stubbornly enduring structures of violence and occupation, such as patriarchy. Ultimately, these practices of kū‘ē and kūkulu are also generative sites of healing. We therefore turn to these mo‘olelo, knowing that there is creation in destruction. Our existence and literary production are not reactive, but generative. Like Pele, who carefully and fully devours entire ‘ili when necessary, we are birthing land for Kānaka to move upon and cause to flourish once more.

Indigenous Interventions into Feminist Queer Theories:

Indigenous and women of color feminists and queer theorists have been speaking back to and critiquing “carceral feminism” and Indigenous studies since at least the 1980s (Davis 2016). One result of this labor has been a sustained effort to reimagine Indigenous nationhood and the very nature of what it means to be a feminist. To articulate where my research enters into the fields of Indigenous feminism and queer theory, I will start with the work of Indigenous queer poet and scholar Paula Gunn Allen to show how early scholars exposed the link between colonialism and patriarchy, which is an essential assumption of my method. Second, I will

¹¹ Although not in any formal publication, this mana‘o was first coined by Kanaka Maoli scholar/activist/organizer Andre Perez. Perez describes kū‘ē and kūkulu on record in an Office of Hawaiian Affairs Board of Trustees meeting on June 29, 2017 as our “philosophy of change,” that requires Kānaka be both attentive to building and creating as we are to resisting (Office of Hawaiian Affairs Board of Trustees Meeting, June 29, 2017).

discuss some of the obstacles traditional “whitestream” feminism has set before contemporary Indigenous feminists that must be surmounted (Arvin et al 2013). Third, I will trace some of the most recent and compelling interventions Indigenous scholars have made in their efforts to indigenize feminism and queer theory. This tracing will include encounters with the work of Haunani-Kay Trask, Andrea Smith, Maile Arvin, Eve Tuck, and Angie Morrill. I will conclude with a discussion of some specific mana wahine interventions by Haunani-Kay Trask and Noelani Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua that place ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i at the center of re-imagining sovereignty, a move I suggest is invaluable for the work of reclaiming our Kanaka Maoli practices and articulations of intimacy and desire.

In *Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions*, Allen focuses on the spirituality of “Indian” culture, on the enduring power of “Indians,” and perhaps above all, on what she calls the “gynocratic” tribal lifestyle. Allen calls out how the colonizers’ patriarchal fear of gynocracy motivated their physical and cultural genocide of American Indian tribes. “The colonizers saw (and rightly) that as long as women held unquestioned power of such magnitude, attempts at total conquest of the continents were bound to fail” (1992, 3), she writes, and much of *The Sacred Hoop* is a walk back towards redeploying these female empowered and centered traditions as interventions into our current patriarchal experiences. To do so, Allen interrogates how the disruption of tribal relationships between men and women, and between human, land, and universe, have contributed to the traumas faced by Indigenous peoples today. I therefore find her work a powerful influence on my own inquiry into which relationships (pilina) between our Kānaka and our ‘āina have been disrupted. Furthermore, because *The Sacred Hoop* is a meditation on “writers, histories, events and spiritual recoveries” leading up to 1984, it was one of the first texts to engage with issues at the intersection of patriarchy, gender, and Indigenous

theory. Her work therefore was an important and groundbreaking intervention in Native studies that focused on the impact of colonization on how gender is reimagined and re-inscribed in the nation state.

Although not perhaps consciously, when Allen discusses the “patriarchalization” of colonization, she is also raising issues about heteropaternalism, a twenty-first century term. “Effecting the social transformation from egalitarian, gynocentric systems to hierarchical, patriarchal systems requires meeting four objectives,” she writes: “The first is accomplished when the primacy of female as creator is displaced and replaced by male-gendered creators (generally genetic, as the Great Spirit concept overtakes the multiplicitous tribal designation of deity)” (1992, 41). The three objectives of patriarchy that follow are coercion of Indian forms of governance, displacement from tribal lands, and the replacement of the “clan” structure with the nuclear family. I would argue that each of these objectives of patriarchy can be detected in how our ‘upena of intimacies has been dismembered. Allen and later scholars argue that this refiguring of relationships between Indigenous peoples, their kin, and their land is a primary cause of the trauma that Indigenous people are fighting against to this day. Through such disruptions of these genealogical relationships between Indigenous peoples and their land base, they are further physically displaced from their tribal lands.

While this argument for the connection between patriarchy and colonization is deeply compelling and effectively articulated, Indigenous feminists must nevertheless work constantly against a current of “whitestream” feminism that has excluded many Indigenous women from feminist spaces, and therefore deterred many Indigenous women from having any interest in participating in the first place. As Annette Jaimes explains,

One perspective on “feminism” among Native American women is that the emphasis has been on individuality as conceived by early Western feminists who wanted more equality with men in the prevailing patriarchal sociopolitical structures in U. S. American society and who premised their struggle on democratic ideals for gender equity. (2003, 59)

For Indigenous feminists, one reaction to this particular obstacle has been to articulate what are the primary issues and concerns of Indigenous women, and to identify how whiteman feminism reproduces some of the causes of these challenges. For Kānaka Maoli (and other Indigenous) wāhine, this means that rather than celebrating feminism outright, Kanaka scholars must not just distinguish between the needs and desires of Indigenous women and white women, but celebrate the differences between mana wahine and whiteman feminism.

Scholars such as Haunani-Kay Trask and ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui have published significant work in articulating a politics of mana wahine. Indeed, while mana wahine is “individually embodied,” Trask insists that women seek “collective self-determination,” which necessarily includes achieving pono (balance) with our men (Trask 1999, 91). Mana wahine is also distinct from feminism because it is by definition rooted in place and ‘āina. As ho‘omanawanui explains in “Mana Wahine, Education and Nation-building: Lessons from the Epic of Pele and Hi‘iaka for Kanaka Maoli Today,” a relationship with ‘āina and a land base is a strict requirement for the way mana wahine is inspired and manifested (2010). Mana wahine is therefore an embodiment of the power offered to Kanaka Maoli wāhine through their genealogical relationship to ‘āina that works towards pono (balance) with the other natural forces in the world.

The second immediate obstacle faced by Indigenous feminists comes from within our own communities. Patriarchy has not only disrupted women’s traditional roles and paths to

power, but is structured in a way meant to sustain itself. One very important tool in sustaining the desired inequities is through a limited empowering of Indigenous men in the process of its reproduction. “Because American culture, like Western civilization generally, is patriarchal,” Trask writes in *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai‘i*, “that is, structured and justified by values that emphasize male dominance over women and nature, American institutions reward men and male-dominated behavior with positions of power” (1999, 92). In short, “Men are rewarded, including Native men, for collaboration” (1999, 94), and Trask states emphatically that Kanaka men are offered incentives, and even access to institutional power, for reproducing patriarchy. Here then we can see the dire need to make Indigenous feminisms relevant to Indigenous women *and* men if we wish to achieve a true and full decolonization of an Indigenous nationhood.

By examining carefully the interlocking logics of settler colonialism, heteropatriarchy, and white supremacy, Indigenous feminists of the last decade have offered many paths toward understanding the structures of empire that house us all (Arvin et al. 2013). These movements toward theoretical comprehension have been initiated by Indigenous feminists in response to the lack of discussion in whitestream feminism and traditional Native studies of the critical issues facing Native women. These movements also work to conceptualize the structures of empire, such as settler colonialism, and how these structures operate through the bodies of Indigenous women and men. Engaging with Indigenous visions of feminism can help a theoretical framework emerge that has the potential to speak beyond the issue of sexism, and to work towards articulating necessarily new forms of nationhood within an overarching decolonial project (Arvin et al 2013).

But what does feminism do for Indigenous peoples seeking sovereignty? How does, and how can, feminism disrupt settler colonialism? According to Lisa Hall, it was in the women of color (WOC) feminist calls for intersectionality, with their accompanying intersections of race, gender, and class, that the possibilities of Indigenous feminisms were first born (2005, 16). But even when proposed by WOC feminists, intersectionality often failed to address issues of indigeneity and settler colonialism, which Indigenous women argued were central to dethroning heterosexism. For this reason, Indigenous feminisms argued that in addition to including settler colonialism as one of the many intersections to trace within a feminist critique, a decolonial praxis must become a focal point for understanding how overcoming sexism requires the unsettling of settler colonialism. Within this decolonial praxis, the need for a new vocabulary to theorize properly the intersections among settler colonialism, colonization, and patriarchy became obvious in the face of the widespread desire to articulate fully the relationship between feminism and sovereignty.

Just twenty years after Allen's discussion of patriarchalization, and three years after Jaimes' Indigenous critique of feminism, Andrea Smith coined the term "heteropatriarchy" and advanced a brief but powerful model of intersectionality. In her 2006 article, "Heteropatriarchy and the three Pillars of White Supremacy," Smith explains that the term refers to more than just the combination of two logics—heteronormativity and patriarchy. Instead, Smith is pointing out how hierarchies are normalized among racialized groups, then taken for granted, in ways that ultimately feed empire and support the continued settler colonial reality that many Indigenous peoples face. Like Allen, Smith displays the unmistakable connections between colonization and patriarchy while also revealing that web of additional hierarchies that trap all Indigenous (and settler) peoples in a settler colonial relationship.

Smith describes how patriarchy has come to be taken for granted in (and outside) Indigenous communities as somehow “natural,” rather than a part of how Indigenous peoples have been displaced and dismembered. Here Smith’s work is directly relevant to some of the problems with translating aloha ‘āina as “patriotism,” since to do so draws us into the same trap of injecting patriarchy into our articulations of governance. Partly because of this, Hawai‘i, like many other Indigenous communities, has failed to look beyond nation state models. Smith’s conceptualization of heteropatriarchy strongly suggests that Indigenous peoples can (and should) begin to envision futures beyond the normalizing hierarchies of patriarchy by recognizing that they are created by colonialism and empire. To do this, however, we must uncover, recover, and practice alternative ways of relating to each other and organizing ourselves.

Six years after Smith’s transformative essay on heteropatriarchy, Maile Arvin, Eve Tuck, and Angie Morrill published “Decolonizing Feminism: Challenging Connections between Settler Colonialism and Heteropatriarchy.” While standing on the shoulders of Smith and such shared older intellectual ancestors as Annette Jaimes and Paula Allen, these three scholars fortify the intellectual connections to be made when discussing settler colonialism and heteropatriarchy. Drawing on their intimate understanding of the transformative terminology introduced by earlier scholars, including heteropaternalism, heteropatriarchy, and settler colonialism, Arvin, Tuck, and Morrill articulate a feminist theory that is unapologetically Indigenous, and offer five important interventions that Native feminist theories should make into Gender and Women’s Studies. For my purposes, I will concentrate on three of the five.¹²

¹² The five challenges offered by the authors are “Problematize Settler Colonialism and Its Intersections, Refuse Erasure But Do More Than Include, Craft Alliances That Directly Address Differences, Recognize Indigenous Ways of Knowing, [and] Question Academic Participation in Indigenous Dispossession” (Arvin et al. 13).

All of these interventions emerge from a deeply engaged politics of questioning and destabilizing settler colonialism. While acknowledging the valuable work of gender and women's studies in unmasking gender and race as social constructions, Arvin, Tuck, and Morrill assert that these fields have "failed to adequately address settler colonialism," in part because they have not interrogated the "myth of misogyny and racism as a to-be-expected characteristic of human nature" (Arvin et al. 2013, 9). Only through a nuanced study and discussion of settler colonialism can this myth truly be deconstructed. By studying settler colonialism, heteropatriarchy can be dissected, allowing scholars to interrogate how "heterosexuality and patriarchy are perceived as normal and natural," while "other configurations are perceived as abnormal, aberrant, and abhorrent" (Arvin et al. 2013, 13). Destabilizing settler colonialism also allows for conceiving of possibilities beyond the nation state, and consequently, beyond the normalized logics of heterosexism and patriarchy embedded in such states. In this dissertation, I at times consider Hawaiian studies, for all its accomplishments, as a discipline that could benefit greatly from the interventions Arvin et al. call for below.

The first specific intervention Arvin, Tuck, and Morrill make into women's and gender studies is to incite these disciplines to "*problematize and theorize the intersections of settler colonialism, heteropatriarchy, and heteropaternalism*" (2013, 14). By problematizing how Indigenous peoples have been organized into nuclear families and forced to exercise modern sexualities that support the nation state, these scholars argue that the underlying logic of settler colonialism can be revealed and contested. Here we see a direct link between the characterization of heteropaternalism and Allen's discussion of patriarchalization. But

importantly for Kanaka Maoli scholars, Arvin, Tuck, and Morrill further outline the effects of re-organizing Indigenous peoples into nuclear households as part of the larger project to limit Indigenous claims to their ‘āina.

The settler colonial logic of gendering nationhood always includes normalizing the hierarchies informing heterosexism, heteropaternalism, and heteropatriarchy. These interlocking logics integral to settler colonialism create a foundation for normalizing additional hierarchies that inform the construction of colonial nationhood. By damaging and undermining Indigenous forms of kinship (our ‘upena of intimacies), and demanding that many of these relationships be replaced by the “‘proper,’ modern sexuali[ties]” sanctioned by heteropaternalism, these structures function as the “cornerstone in the production of a citizenry that will support and bolster the ‘nation-state’ as natural” (Arvin et al 2013, 14). One need not look any further than the Indian Act of 1876 to see clearly how “the enforcement of ‘proper’ gender roles is entangled in settler nations’ attempts to limit and manage Indigenous peoples’ claims to land” (Arvin et al 2013, 15).

For Kānaka Maoli, the most obvious and crucial example of how heteropaternalism and the gendering involved in colonialism disrupt Native claims to land is the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act (HHCA). In 1921 the HHCA not only legalized insidious blood logics that presumed those with more “blood” were more “Hawaiian,” but also adopted principles of nuclear familyhood that allowed only certain Kānaka Maoli with a legally sufficient blood quantum to pass on land—and only to immediate nuclear descendants. Here “modern” sexualities and heteropaternalism combine to mandate that Kanaka Maoli wāhine must pair with Kanaka Maoli kāne, each with the required quantum, to make, protect, or pass on their claims over land (Kauanui 2008).

Indigenous queer theory responds to such eugenic atrocities by examining the gendered violence of settler colonialism as a “structure” and system that “calls for a sustained denaturalizing critique” (Morgensen, 2). We begin with Indigenous queer theory because “taking sexuality seriously as a logic of colonial power has the potential to further decolonize Native studies” (Finley, 33). Using much of the same language of Indigenous feminisms, including insisting on an engagement with heteropatriarchy and heteropaternalism, Indigenous queer theorists have begun to demonstrate how “settler sexualities” have variously been imposed on Indigenous peoples to further the project of colonization (Mogensen). For example, as I noted previously, Arvin et al. examine heteropaternalism as “the presumption that heteropatriarchal nuclear-domestic arrangements, in which the father is both center and leader/boss, should serve as the model for social arrangements of the state and its institutions” (2013, 13).

For Kānaka Maoli, taking sexuality and pilina seriously has significant ramifications for how we imagine and materialize our families, homes, communities, and above all, our nation. When we are attentive to how sexuality comes to define the family, we see how heteropatriarchy is also the backbone of the normalization of the nuclear family. Though presented as a harmless and “natural” phenomenon, the many ways that state and society only recognize the nuclear family as legitimate commits a significant violence against the very nature of Kanaka Maoli relationships by insisting that they are not isolatable, independent, or “nuclear.” Colonialism constantly enlists heteropatriarchy and heteropaternalism to naturalize the very hierarchies that maintain colonial power in Native territories. As Finley explains, “Native interpersonal and community relationships are affected by pressure to conform to the nuclear family and the hierarchies implicit in heteropatriarchy, which in turn, are internalized. The control of sexuality, for Native communities and Native studies, is an extension of internalized

colonialism” (34). In Hawai‘i, the result has been that heteropatriarchy poisons pilina.

A significant conclusion to be drawn from this Indigenous queer theory analysis is the importance of challenging naturalized notions of “family.” “‘The Family’ is no mere metaphor but a crucial technology by which modern power is produced and exercised” (2006, 72), Andrea Smith writes, for this “family,” like any other organizing logic of the colonizer, is exercised for the benefit of the settler state and at the expense of the Native peoples. Or as Mark Rifkin explains, “Heteronormativity legitimizes the liberal settler state by presenting the political economy of privatization as simply an expression of the natural conditions for human intimacy, reproduction, and resource distribution; thus, the critique of heteronormativity offers a potent means for challenging the ideological process by which settler governance comes to appear (or at least to narrate itself as) self evident” (2011, 25). This dissertation extends this critique into Hawai‘i by seeking out Kanaka Maoli conditions and embodiments of intimacy beyond privatization.

The second major intervention made by Arvin, Tuck, and Morrill is a critique of whitestream inclusion. While traditional “whitestream” feminism sees inclusion into heteropatriarchal power as a fundamental goal, these scholars problematize how “inclusion” is often presented as the only desire of women by focusing on how discourses of inclusion themselves presuppose hierarchies of the state that violently control and “absorb” Indigenous peoples, “rather than allow institutions like feminism and the nation-state to be radically transformed by differing perspectives and goals” (Arvin et al 2013, 17). Indigenous feminisms work towards imagining better circumstances and social models outside of the settler state—not solely through inclusion within it. Here lies an important and distinctive way Indigenous feminisms are reimagining nationhood. While many scholars and activists dedicate

themselves to working through the United Nations or U.S. government to settle claims or achieve nationhood, Indigenous feminisms push beyond the authority of colonial structures, advocating for new forms of governance not modeled after the nation state, and not dependent on collaborating, or working within it.

Arvin, Tuck, and Morrill also problematize whitestream feminist interventions that depict Native men as the root of Indigenous women's problems, arguing once more that the enemy of Indigenous women is the "historical and ongoing imposition of colonial, heteropatriarchal structures" in their societies (2013, 18). In my articulation of the need to (re)member an 'upena of intimacies, I argue that the pilina between all our kānaka and our lands are of vital importance. It is not just wāhine who have been, and continue to be, harmed by the dismembering of our 'upena of intimacies, but our kāne as well. This argument does not dismiss the violence undeniably inflicted by Indigenous men. To emphasize heteropatriarchal structures, however, is to turn our attention towards finding a remedy for the disease, rather than to be directed toward focusing on a symptom—in this case, horizontal oppression.

Through a detailed critique of empire, settler colonialism, and patriarchy, Indigenous feminisms can see beyond the simplistic scapegoating of all men for the oppression of women. Native feminisms recognize that the logics of sexism, as created by heterosexism, are not inherent to Native men, and therefore, women are not above all striving for equal access to the patriarchy already granted to men. Rather, Indigenous feminisms work towards ending how Indigenous men participate within and reproduce these logics of sexism and patriarchy. The task is to envision new futures, rooted in traditional Indigenous relationships with our lands and each other, that move beyond the normalizing logics of patriarchy, and celebrate culturally rooted forms of empowerment.

The third intervention advocated by Arvin, Tuck, and Morrill is the need to work towards whitestream feminist recognition of Indigenous knowledges. Here a fine and delicate line between recognition and appropriation needs to be maintained. Gender and women's studies need to disrupt the colonial ideologies and epistemologies taken for granted in their discourses that continue to subjugate Indigenous people, *without* claiming Indigenous knowledge or status. Arvin, Tuck, and Morrill therefore suggest that *honoring* rather than *assuming* multiple epistemologies is a viable and sufficient strategy for destabilizing the idea of a singular epistemology and ideology as part of the movement towards decolonization.

Ultimately, Arvin, Tuck, and Morrill are calling for scholarship that is more aware of how settler colonialism and heteropatriarchy are enacted and reenacted in and beyond the academy. Scholars in all fields, but particularly those in queer, gender, and women's studies, must come to terms with and change how they participate in supporting the ideologies of the nation state through their disciplines. And in doing so, queer, gender, and women's studies can decolonize themselves, moving their own disciplines beyond the limited imagined confines of the nation state that presupposes patriarchy and violence, and toward an envisioning of greater possibilities and more just futures.

Kanaka Interventions into Indigenous Feminist Queer Theory

By drawing upon their distinctive perspectives to challenge the status quo in Hawai'i, this work also follows the lead of those Kanaka Maoli wāhine who have been instrumental in the blossoming of contemporary Hawaiian scholarship. These wāhine and their allies have been vigilantly aware and appreciative of feminism and its powerful critiques, but have for understandable reasons not embraced fully the principles of feminist and queer theory.

Historically, these fields have inflicted, at times, an additional violence on our communities by refusing on theoretical grounds to allow Kanaka Maoli values and practices to be evaluated from a Kanaka Maoli perspective. Because of this, feminism and her many waves of influences that have inspired and shaped the formation of queer theory have also necessarily been held at an arm's length by Kanaka Maoli scholars.

Nonetheless, Kanaka Maoli wāhine have been repeatedly engaging in a kind of Indigenous feminism concerned with the relationship between colonialism, patriarchy, and 'āina. Many of these activists and theorists are rightfully identified as wāhine mana. Kanaka Maoli women writers have also insistently distinguished mana wahine from whitestream feminism. "Western ideas of feminism react against, resist or seek equality with patriarchy," writes Haunani-Kay Trask, "Mana Wahine does neither." In the same vein, ku'ualoha ho'omanawanui explains that "Native women's issues differ from haole (white) women's: our struggle is against colonialism as we fight for self-determination as a people, not a gender" (2013, 28). These wāhine mana, many of them mentioned in the preceding section, are making arguments that closely parallel how Indigenous feminists have criticized whitestream feminism for failing to address and respect issues faced by Indigenous women seeking self-determination. At its core, mana wahine is invested in pono with Kanaka Maoli men, rather than focusing on a power imbalance between kāne and wāhine that results in an injustice. In essence, and above all, we wish to liberate our lāhui.

Mana wahine is also distinct from whitestream feminism in that it is rooted in place and 'āina, and therefore rooted in 'ōlelo and mo'olelo. Our wāhine today draw strength from their contemporaries, ali'i, akua, and from the 'āina, which provides the foundation and life for all inspiration as well as being the canvas upon which to enact and exert mana wahine desires.

These desires prioritize aloha ‘āina, mo‘okū‘auhau (genealogy), kuleana, and pono. ‘Āina empowers wāhine to exercise leadership in the lāhui and their families. Genealogically related to that which births land, wāhine not only reflect and channel the all-encompassing power of ‘āina, but are also the servants most prepared to protect her.

In *From a Native Daughter*, Trask discusses how settler colonialism (although not yet named as such) is a structure that oppresses Kānaka Maoli. In part two of the collection, she writes frankly about the role of mana wahine and wahine leadership in the Hawaiian sovereignty movement, arguing that Kanaka Maoli women undeniably lead it. By turning towards Kanaka Maoli epistemologies that honor wāhine and their responsibility to care for the lāhui as an extension of their kuleana to care for their families, Trask defines Kanaka Maoli leadership in Kanaka Maoli terms that prioritize kuleana and genealogy, thereby revolutionizing the possible imaginings of nationhood.

In addition to embracing Indigenous understandings of mana rather than Western views of institutionalized power, Trask destabilizes the reader’s understanding of “rights” ideologies. In “Women’s Mana and Hawaiian Sovereignty,” Trask examines the links between the valuing of “rights” and the “greatly obscured historical reality of American colonialism” (1999, 88). She demonstrates how the language of “rights” and “civil rights” legitimizes American control and authority. These ideologies further displace Kānaka Maoli from true (maoli) cultural practices that actually define who we are. For instance, while Trask doesn’t use the term “kuleana” here, a close reading suggests that what she is truly concerned with is how replacing kuleana with rights is a purposeful colonizing measure that works towards making Americans out of Hawaiians. Trask argues that the awarding of such rights as the ability to participate in the American democratic process did not actually liberate Hawaiians, but rather,

“accelerated the de-Hawaiianization” of our people, lands, and lāhui (1999, 88). Added to that is the issue of the individual nature of American rights ideologies that prioritizes individual liberty above collective reciprocity and kuleana. In a Kanaka Maoli sense, there are no undeniable absolute rights for private citizens; rather, kuleana is earned and those with it are held accountable to it.

By foregrounding mana and pono in her articulation of proper Kanaka Maoli leadership, Trask also demonstrates how returning to ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i is a necessary step toward decolonizing the nation state and creating new forms of governance that recognize and honor how Kānaka enact power. Her rejection of “rights” ideologies, and her argument that Kānaka must adopt practices that are definitively Hawaiian (i.e., kuleana), reveals another way that language matters in our understanding and articulation of leadership and organizing. By valuing and advocating for pono, mana, and kuleana over equality, power, and rights, Trask pushes Kānaka Maoli toward a re-imagined view of sovereignty rooted in responsibility, relationships, and balance that is already reflected in mo‘olelo, genealogies, and ‘āina. Embodied in our ‘upena of intimacies, these values and principles are guides for how we as Kānaka must practice pilina and reciprocity.

In 2014, Noelani Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, Ikaika Hussey, and Erin Kahunawaika‘ala Wright edited a collection of essays that maps out the work of the Hawaiian sovereignty movement Trask was at the center of in 1993. In addition to celebrating the significant and life changing work done by Kanaka Maoli activists from the even earlier beginnings of this movement, and chronicling how Kānaka Maoli have been actively involved in the making of our histories, *A Nation Rising: Hawaiian Movements for Life, Land, and Sovereignty* also “collectively explores the political philosophy and driving ethic of ea” (Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua et al. 2014, 3). In doing so, the editors carve out and articulate a Hawaiian political philosophy that offers opportunity

beyond “sovereignty” and the nation-state.

In Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua’s introduction, she describes the volume as a gathering of voices that have worked to restore many facets of Kanaka Maoli life for the betterment of all people in Hawai‘i. Exploring these voices and the movements they emerge from will reveal how ea and other Hawaiian ideologies challenge colonial projections that present themselves as a singular reality. At the root of the collection is ea, which Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua defines as being of the land and of the people. Unlike the concept of sovereignty, ea forces us to acknowledge its unbreakable relationship to ‘āina. Furthermore, “Like breathing, ea cannot be achieved or possessed; it requires constant action day after day, generation after generation” (2014, 4). Here Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua articulates the essential nature of ea for Kanaka Maoli survival and demonstrates how Kanaka understandings of self-determination are rooted in interdependence rather than independence.

Like Trask, Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua emphasizes the political nature of culture, and therefore how culture and language revitalizing must be imperatives in the Hawaiian sovereignty movement. Kānaka Maoli must move their ea through oli, dance, writing, reading, acting, and creating, in order to live “sovereign.” I would only make explicit that we must also move our ea through our pilina with each other. Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua and Trask remind Kānaka Maoli that our arts and cultures are not just political, but the ea that sustain us. Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua’s focus on ea, and Trask’s elaboration of mana, pono, and kuleana, are therefore carrying out exactly the work that Indigenous feminist scholars are calling for. By moving beyond the language and desires of the nation state, and by engaging with ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, these mana wāhine are imagining futures for Kānaka Maoli rooted in forces, such as ‘āina and those within pilina, that empower us.

It is therefore from this junction that my own research into and theorizing of Kanaka Maoli pilina and intimacy depart. I argue that just as the nuclear family, heteropaternalism, heteropatriarchy, and settler colonialism are entwined, pilina and ea are profoundly, though far less destructively, implicated in each other. Indeed, by providing an alternative to the male-oriented and governed nuclear family, pilina and kinship are counter-hegemonic, challenging the single and authoritative claim such a family places on Kanaka understandings of relationality and community. But pilina and kinship offer more than an alternative metaphor for resisting the destructive technology of the settler state. They also represent a whole set of interpersonal accountabilities and possibilities for pleasure at the piko of the Kanaka's relationship to their community and their 'āina. A major goal of this dissertation is to articulate more fully and accurately some of the many forms of pilina, thereby allowing us to imagine and seek to realize the possibilities offered by communities freed from the settler state organization of "family." And because i ka wā ma mua i ka wā ma hope, this dissertation proposes to un-"queer" Kanaka Maoli pilina, desires, and pleasures by turning to one of the most common homes for such mana'o and feelings: our archive of mo'olelo.

While this project undoubtedly seeks to understand and challenge the normalizing logics of hetero patriarchy/paternalism/normativity, it is also important to recognize that queer identified Native peoples specifically, as they "defy their queered encounters with settler colonialism," are leading our "peoples in reimagining modes of embodiment, desire, and collectivity" (Morgensen, 25). At the same time as I am seeking out the aikāne, punalua, po'olua, hoapili, kōko'olua, and ho'āo of our kūpuna in our mo'olelo, as a method for understanding the complicated 'upena of relationships whose 'aha are threaded through the entire fabric of Kanaka Maoli society and community, other Native queers are recalling and creating their own languages

to respond to the disruptions and trauma they've experienced as the seventh generation whose sexuality, desires, and genders have been policed by a foreign settler "authority." I argue that this desire to create language to speak to our current conditions is not only powerful, but necessary. These Natives all remind us to pay attention to the violence of the nuclear family, not only on other Native queers, but on our entire relational orientation as a lāhui.

In applying the relevant and useful aspects of the theories briefly outlined above to my practice of engaging with a Kanaka Maoli context and archive, I follow strategies and methods directed toward developing a queer theory of our piko in Hawai'i. The first is insisting on the mana of mo'olelo as evidence and legitimized 'ike. This project does not seek to discover or put forth any single definition for any of the terms central to this project. Rather, by taking mo'olelo seriously as evidence, this dissertation seeks to become one more mana of the mo'olelo on Kanaka Maoli pilina emerging from a much older mo'okū'auhau of desire. Together, these mo'olelo allow us to be intentional, specific, and grounded when responding to the gendered and sexual violence posed by colonialism. Mo'olelo can take us beyond the thinning terms of kinship, queer, and sexuality; mo'olelo ultimately have the mana to offer up a Kanaka Maoli theory of pilina and desire.

Articulating these mana'o, and taking pilina and desire seriously, matters greatly to the lāhui, because beginning to recognize and articulate the many shapes of pilina and relationships within a Kanaka Maoli ethos waiting for us in the archive will also allow us to understand and create an alternative to existing models of embodiment and nation statehood. In the following chapters, I will unfold a section of our 'upena, and examine some of its nae, ultimately to suggest how a greater understanding of pilina and Kanaka Maoli desire is instrumentally important to our nation building and decolonization.

CHAPTER TWO: ARCHIVE AND METHODS

Introduction:

In the introduction, I set forth what re-reading aloha ‘āina would contribute to a growing field of Indigenous politics by way of intervening in the intersections of Indigenous feminism and Indigenous queer theory. This intervention centers on a method I call (re)membering ‘upena of intimacies, which reads aloha ‘āina as pilina that requires contemporary Kānaka to attend to the resurgence of a decolonial intimacy between Kānaka, their ‘āina, and each other. Before we can lu‘u deep into the Hiiaka archive to unfold and map our expansive ‘upena of intimacies, we must however unpack what methods will direct our practice and theorizing in order to enter into our mo‘olelo effectively and (re)member our ‘upena.

To begin, I will discuss how this project requires that we read and theorize from a place of abundance. To do so honors the richness of our Hawaiian language archive, and insists that “consulting” the archive is not nearly sufficient. When seeking to understand earlier Kanaka Maoli practices of pilina, scholars like myself must lu‘u into the Hawaiian language archive, rather than attempting to stand on the shore, and merely cast a line or two into its bounty. When working with ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i resources we must also keep in mind the politics of translation and remain cautious of how our theorizing from Hawaiian language materials is itself an act of translation. To fully elaborate on this method of theorizing from abundance, I will first pose some preliminary questions about the problems of translation, outline my approach of rigorous paraphrase, and offer a mapping of the archive consulted for this project.

After discussing the process of theorizing from abundance I will suggest how the metaphor of the ‘upena can not only be applied to our understanding of our practices of intimacy but also to our understanding of the pilina between texts in our archive, their authors, and audiences. Paying close attention to the ‘aha between these points supports our practice of theorizing from abundance as well, since such scrutiny requires establishing the context for the pilina between text, the greater archive, and the political histories from which they emerged.

Abundance

It has been said that “the opposite of violence is not nonviolence, it is creation.”¹³ When we begin with abundance—with all that has been (re)membered and all that we continue to (re)member today—we do the work of creation. To do so is also to honor our position in this epic mo‘okū‘auhau of Kanaka intellectuals, practitioners, and ‘ai pōhaku. Where once we had to outline the devastation, survey the fault lines, examine the many ways our kūpuna, we ourselves, and our practices have been and continue to be dismembered, today we are offered the kuleana to honor, celebrate, and theorize from abundance. Where once we had to begin to document the depletion of our resources, the desecration of our sacred places, our collapse of population, and the destruction of our Maoli institutions, today we are all practicing resurgence, in a collective turn towards creation. This dissertation does both—mourn and heal, grieve and celebrate—but prioritizes the (re)membering from a place of inherited abundance. Thanks to our kūpuna, Kānaka Maoli are one of very few Indigenous peoples with an archive to turn to that provides that abundance. The nūpepa archive made this dissertation possible.

¹³ (Da Silva et al. 2015)

When I use the term nūpepa I am speaking of an archive of Hawaiian language newspapers that came into existence in 1834 and continues to expand to this day. This archive is formidable, not only because of the period of time it covers, but also because of the number and diversity of the newspapers, editors, authors, and distinct audiences it produced. While a few trickles of this Hawaiian language newspaper tradition appear from time to time today, the flood of publications entered the archive between 1834 and 1948. During that time, “Hawaiian writers filled 125,000 pages in nearly 100 different newspapers with their writings” (Nogelmeier 2010, xii).

This repository, one of the largest collections of Indigenous writing in any Indigenous language in the world, can certainly be described as “abundant.” Previous scholars have discussed with great rigor how and why this archive became inaccessible to most Kānaka today, largely because of the deliberate erasure of Hawaiian language practices in our communities (Wong, 1999; Kuwada, 2009). As Hawaiian scholarship has developed over the past half century, however, more and more Kanaka Maoli intellectuals have invested in the necessary learning of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i to benefit from this primary archive of ‘ike Hawai‘i. Because of this dedication, in virtually any field of knowledge relevant to Hawai‘i, at least one Kanaka or ally is insisting upon the need to consult Hawaiian language resources to carry out successfully ethical, historically responsible research.

More recently, however, such Kanaka Maoli scholars as Noelani Arista¹⁴ and Noenoe Silva have shown through their theorizing and their research practices that “consultation” of Hawaiian language resources is not nearly adequate (Silva 2017). As a historian, Arista has called on scholars of Hawaiian history to contextualize ‘ike garnered from the nūpepa by

¹⁴ Forthcoming critical biography of David Malo

situating it in its time and location—a practice only possible if one dives deeply into the abundance of nūpepa resources. Noeone Silva’s most recent publication, *The Power of the Steel Tipped Pen*, demonstrates this important practice in a clear and decisive fashion. Her deep and intimate study of Joseph Kānepu‘u and Joseph Poepoe sets them within an assembled history of Hawaiian intellectual life. Both wāhine mana show what is possible when Kanaka Maoli scholars invest decades of attentive consideration and aloha to our Hawaiian language archives. Neither Arista or Silva is “consulting” or dipping into Hawaiian language resources. They are diving deep. Here I attempt to follow their lead, assuring readers that in this dissertation and beyond, I intend to submerge myself repeatedly in this shared, expansive archive, as I progress in my research of the mo‘olelo of Hiiaka.

Problems of Translation

One reason frequently offered for the necessity of engaging fully with the available Hawaiian language resources is our increased familiarity with the problems and politics of translation. In *Scandals of Translation*, American theorist Lawrence Venuti reminds us that “although the history of colonialism varies significantly according to place and period, it does reveal a consistent, no, an inevitable reliance on translation” (1998, 165), and many translation theorists and historians have explored how the practice has been deployed as a specific process of colonialism that continues to impact the way we read, interpret, and understand our own pasts (Bassnet 1980, Niranjana 1992, Venuti 1998, Silva 2004, Bacchilega 2007, Tymoczko 2010, Spivak 2012, Brisset 2012, Shankar 2012). The extensively conducted act of translating Kanaka Maoli culture and practices for outside audiences not only decontextualized and reshaped our traditions, but also bestowed on the Western translators the supposed status of unquestioned

“experts” on all things Hawaiian. As Cristina Bacchilega observes, additional consequences were that Kānaka Maoli become “informants only,” and that the texts selected for translation were often represented as “devoid of political content or strife” (2007, 14).

Such colonial translation practices carry out “a discursive strategy of containment or domestication that requires rewriting the other in the dominant language’s terms” (Bacchilega 2007, 15). In Hawai‘i, Thrum, Emerson, Westervelt, and Beckwith are some of the haole writers and translators who reorganized or left out large portions of mo‘olelo they acquired and appropriated from uncited Native sources. Such intentional acts of colonialism through translation—in this case, the absorption of Hawaiian language materials into English as the “authoritative” language—result is a great divide, leaving certain languages and people visible and recognizable, and others not (McDougall 2011, McDougall 2015, Bacchilega 2007).

Nor are historical translations the only ones we must approach attentively when anticipating the problems of the practice. The choice to read contemporary translations, or even to translate ourselves, must be made with a firm understanding that translation is always at best an interpretation, with all the accompanying cultural coding that entails. Such caution is not only beneficial for ourselves, but for the audiences of our production. As Bryan Kuwada explains in “To Translate or Not To Translate,”

Contemporary readers outside of the field of translation theory tend to have unrealistic expectations of what translations actually are. Such readers are searching for “literal” translations, as if such a thing could exist—something that successfully makes 1-1 substitutions of language, content, and context. As scholars of Hawaiian language and

‘ike Hawai‘i we have generally under-theorized the impact of our mo‘olelo being reduced to writing.¹⁵

While the technology of written literacy was instrumental in creating our Hawaiian language archive, it is also important to be highly attentive to how that technology itself served as more than just the medium for transporting information and mo‘olelo. As Laiana Wong explains, “Literacy having been introduced by the missionaries, it is highly unlikely that the writing style of Hawaiian authors developed in the absence of foreign influence and censorship” (1999, 102).

In response to these inherent problems of translation, especially in a colonial or heavily coercive context, Subramanian Shankar has argued that we need to develop “now, more than ever, a vigorous culture of translation—a widely disseminated and rich understanding of translation. Important as actual acts of translation are, it is also necessary to popularize a general understanding of translation that foregrounds interpretation rather than fidelity” (2012, 141). In the face of a steadily increasing amount of effort devoted to translating Hawaiian language materials to provide more access to our community, we must therefore also be developing this recommended “culture of translation” to increase familiarity with how to approach and read translated works appropriately. As we increasingly turn to the nūpepa and other Hawaiian language archival materials, and “consulting” and translating our great works of literature become even more frequent activities, we must recognize that more and more Kānaka will in turn be reading our mo‘olelo in translation. Greater access must therefore be coupled with greater educating of readers about what it means to read a text in translation, lest they, and even we, fall into the trap of taking for granted the necessarily inexact and interpretative nature of

¹⁵ A number of scholars have addressed this issue (hoomanawnaui 2007, 84-103; ho‘omanawanui 2014, 33-64; Silva 2014, 102-117).

translated works.

Given these challenges, some Hawaiian language scholars and advocates for the Hawaiian language have argued that we should move away from translation. If people wish to access Hawaiian language materials, they should learn to ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i (Wong, 1999). Certainly, there is no downside to more Kānaka investing themselves in learning our ‘ōlelo, so although I do not support what would amount to a ban on translation projects, in my own work I try to find ways to encourage Kānaka and scholars interested in ‘ike Hawai‘i to develop our own relationship with ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, proceeding from the understanding that there is simply no proper substitute for being able to read these texts for ourselves in our ‘ōlelo makuahine.

This encouragement extends to another implication of translation theory that deserves more attention when we study Hawaiian materials: how analyzing, critically interpreting, evaluating, or even simply writing about Hawaiian language materials in English are themselves all acts of translation. Much of the scholarship written about our archive has itself had to participate in translation to display our work effectively. I am thinking here about how many contemporary scholars provide their readers with the Hawaiian language source material, but also their own translations of this material before conducting their analysis and evaluation. As I have collected, read carefully, evaluated, and then written about these Hawaiian language materials, I have become increasingly convinced that the problems of translation remain, even when as scholars we draw almost exclusively on those texts written in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i. Since neither a total refusal to translate, nor the development of a culture of translation, fully achieves the goal of accountability to this Hawaiian language archive, as a consequence of the need I see for new creative and responsible ways of writing about Hawaiian language materials, I am adopting here a practice I am calling rigorous paraphrase.

Rigorous Paraphrase

With the publication of Noenoe Silva's first book *Aloha Betrayed* in 2004 came a new standard of how to write thoughtfully and ethically about Hawaiian language materials in English publications. What we learned was that any and all analysis and translation of Hawaiian language materials must not just include, but grant visible priority to the original source text. This allowed Hawaiian language scholars to read the source and the author's translation side by side before moving on to the analysis, often on the same page. Both the author and the reader were now held accountable to the source text, which could speak for itself. To follow this writing and publication strategy, and to have a major university press agree to this foregrounding, was a revolutionary practice in Hawaiian scholarship that has since been followed by such Hawaiian intellectuals as ku'ualoha ho'omanawanui, Noelani Arista, and Nālani McDougall. Hawaiian language scholars reading their work can therefore critically engage with the sources of contemporary scholars' analysis.¹⁶

Because of the near collapse of our 'ōlelo Hawai'i over the past century, however, most readers of contemporary scholarship are not fluent in Hawaiian, and rely more heavily, if not entirely, on the scholar's translation. Herein lies the problem of translation: because our readers approach our scholarly translations without a knowledge of translation theory and the politics of translation, we reaffirm that longstanding assumption that translations are sufficient substitutes for the source text, and therefore facilitate the reader's skipping over the source and relying

¹⁶ There are earlier full academic translations of mo'olelo that presented the 'ōlelo Hawai'i side by side with the English translations, beginning with Beckwith's translation of *Lā'ieikawai* (Hale'ole 1997), followed by Frazier's translation of *Kaluaiko'olau* (Pi'ilani 2001), and proceeding right up to Awaiaulu's two-volume edition and translation of *Ka Mo'olelo o Hi'iakaikapoliopole* (Hooulumahie 2007). While not perfect, these texts were committed to the premise that access to the text in its original language is essential.

instead upon our translation and interpretation of the material at issue. Because we earn the trust of the readers by providing the Hawaiian text, our translations are then all too often taken at face value, without nearly enough critical investigation.

Paraphrases, on the other hand, are not trusted in the same way that translations are and certainly not accepted as replacements for the source material. In fact, the general public understands that paraphrases are what translations should be understood to be: interpretations and reductions of source materials. By choosing instead to rely greatly on what I am calling rigorous paraphrase within the body of my scholarship, I am therefore attempting to foreground for the readers how I am engaging directly with the Hawaiian language text without supplying them with the alluring distraction of a full “translation” that pulls them away from the source. What remains is the scholar’s critical approach to speaking directly to and with the source text. It should be noted, however, that including the ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i source text is essential to this method of rigorous paraphrase, because it still provides Hawaiian language scholars with the immediate opportunity to engage with that material independently from my provided analysis, while it also encourages non-speakers to take on the task of language learning to participate more fully in the conversation.

What you will therefore find in this dissertation is an absence of formal translations with the exception of short sentences, and an extensive use of rigorous paraphrase. When Hawaiian language materials are discussed, you will be offered source texts standing firmly in their own language, because there is ‘ike and kaona that develop through the exact unfolding of the passage that cannot necessarily be reproduced through translation. What will then follow will often be a fluid paraphrase, provided simultaneously with the analysis of the Hawaiian language material. Drawing from a theory of translation refusal (Aiu 2010), this practice of rigorous paraphrase

continuously points the reader back to the Hawaiian language source text, rather than to a supplied translation/interpretation, and serves to alert the non-Hawaiian language reader such a process is always in operation with any English-language engagement with a Hawaiian language text.

While this practice of rigorous paraphrase does not solve all of the many problems resulting from over a century of our pilina as Kānaka Maoli to our ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i being damaged or forsaken, it does attempt to respond to the challenges posed by translation. Ultimately, what I am resisting is that assumption that analyzing Hawaiian language materials always requires full and formal translations, primarily because the presence of such translations in practice impedes the process of trying to understand and learn from these texts within their own logic.

Recognizing the contexts, including the linguistic ones, from which Hawaiian language materials emerge is ultimately more important. For the sake of readability, in those cases when substantial passages are cited that have close or significant parallel passages in other mana of the mo‘olelo, those parallel passages will be noted in the footnotes, but reproduced only when an inconsistency or alternate details are the subject of my analysis.

When speaking of intimacy, language must be both precise and nuanced. When describing the intimacy of Kānaka, language must be able to move and shape shift, responding to the vibrant possibilities of all the ways these intimate pilina can breathe and move. For this reason, language is arguably the greatest challenge facing this dissertation. I am not speaking only about the differences between ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i and English, but also about the difficulties of translating, of making comprehensible, ancient Hawaiian practices of intimacy for our profoundly foreign contemporary context. Multiple acts of translation are taking place at every stage of this project, and the many problems that arise need to be recognized and confronted.

And as I have already indicated, this project also situates itself at the intersection of distinct fields of study with their own preferred languages and vocabularies. When necessary and appropriate, this dissertation seeks to speak intelligibly to these fields without losing its primary focus, which is to describe, analyze, and ultimately construct and offer a mo‘olelo about Kanaka Maoli pilina that resists as much as possible being lost to colonization and translation.

For example, queer, gay, and lesbian studies resonate with terms such as sexuality, but because sexuality often tends to refer to an identity rather than a relationship, the term seems insufficient and inappropriate for discussing how k̄anaka related to each other. Terms such as kinship similarly draw attention in Native American and Indigenous Studies; however, that term’s free and ungrounded use in past scholarship not rooted in a Kanaka Maoli archive paradoxically proves to be a limiting factor. Even the term relationship itself is so common and familiar, yet so overflowing with specific yet often contradictory assumptions and connotations, it ultimately isn’t dexterous enough to capture the conditions of Kanaka Maoli interpersonal relations.

To confront these challenges I will attempt whenever possible to allow the archive to speak for itself. Rather than attempting to capture some supposed essence of particular relationships through offering a black and white definition, I will provide examples that describe certain specific relations materially and metaphorically. Whenever possible, Hawaiian terms will be employed when analyzing Hawaiian mana‘o. For instance, a word such as “aikāne” will not be sharply defined, because to do so would demonstrate a complete misunderstanding of the very nature of Kanaka Maoli aikāne relationships. Instead, pilina such as aikāne, po‘olua, kōko‘olua, punalua, hō‘ao, and others will be described, but also invoked through examples that allow them to dance fully in the dissertation, as they should. Wherever possible, terms such as sexuality,

relationship, and even desire will be subordinated to Hawaiian terms, or avoided entirely. This method is not just corrective, but generative, requiring that old language be revived so that new language with the ability to carry and reflect the changing weight of these pilina can emerge.

The challenge of language also arises in any discussion of genre. As previously suggested, Kanaka Maoli genres of writing do not necessarily translate well into English literary genres. For example, whereas canonical English literary texts have conventionally been divided into fiction and non-fiction, and then further sorted into existing sub-genres—poetry, drama, and fiction. Kanaka Maoli “texts” cannot be immediately assigned to fiction and non-fiction categories. This issue of orientation to the text parallels our perceptions of own ontologies, and in particular, our pre-conceived notions of “fact” and “truth.” Like Albert Wendt, I believe Hawai‘i (and Oceania) deserves “more than an attempt at mundane fact,” and therefore when discussing and analyzing the mo‘olelo of Laieikawai, Kamehameha, and other ali‘i mo‘olelo, unless there is a Hawaiian narrative or aesthetic term for describing a particular mode, these texts will all be analyzed as mo‘olelo, and mo‘olelo alone.

Map of Archive

Because the nūpepa archive includes over 100 Hawaiian language newspapers published between 1834 and our contemporary era, only through significant narrowing can any part of this archive be investigated in any meaningful way. Rather than claiming to lu‘u into the entire moana of nūpepa, for this dissertation I have chosen to submerge myself intimately in four mana of the mo‘olelo of Hiiakaikapoliopole: Kapihenui’s 1861-1862 mana of “He Moolelo no Hiiakaikapoliopole” from *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, John E. Bush and Simeon Paaluhi’s 1893

mana of “Ka Moolelo o Hiiakaikapoliopole” from *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, Hooulumahiehie’s¹⁷ 1906 mana of “Ka Moolelo o Hiiakaikapoliopole” from *Ka Na’i Aupuni*,¹⁸ and Joseph Mokuohai Poepoe’s 1908-1911 mana of “Ka Moolelo Kaa o Hiiakaikapoliopole” in *Kuokoa Home Rula*. Written by four different authors across five different newspapers, these mana of Hiiaka represent major contributions to the overall archive of this mo‘olelo.

A community of Kanaka Maoli literary scholars agrees that these mana, and the rest of the Hiiaka mo‘olelo, were authored and published as a part of a larger moment to perpetuate Kanaka Maoli mo‘olelo, and to serve as counter-hegemonic narratives that remain valuable to Kānaka to this day. In turn, these mo‘olelo represent a significant component of a larger “Hawaiian literary nationalism” that “provided a counter-narrative to the dominant discourses of settler colonialism, which imagined (constructed) Kanaka Maoli differently from how they imagined themselves” (ho‘omanawanui 2014). Both McDougall and ho‘omanawanui focus on this lāhui-building function of mo‘olelo, which serve as “pedagogical sites offering not only protocols for how the ‘āina and we as Kānaka Maoli should be treated and governed, but also models for various means of warranted resistance in the face of unjust rule” (McDougall 2011, 276). McDougall further asserts that these mo‘olelo “articulate a Kanaka Maoli theory of warranted resistance by emphasizing justice, mana wahine, and humor; and that this is precisely why these mo‘olelo continue to be so popular, retold again and again within the nineteenth-century and now, in contemporary Kanaka Maoli literature by so many writers” (2011, 276).

¹⁷ Ho‘oulumāhiehie was a pen name for Poepoe, often used when he was authoring material that wasn’t entirely his own. For a detailed discussion of this attribution, see Silva 2017, 141.

¹⁸ This mana first began in *Hawaii Aloha*, but when that paper was discontinued it was taken up in Poepoe’s *Ka Na’i Aupuni* (Awaiaulu, 431).

This counter-hegemonic and lāhui-constructing function is something that all of these mana of Hiiaka to varying degrees have in common.

As mana of a shared mo‘olelo, these texts of Hiiaka also share a certain inexhaustibility. Hooulumahie describes Hiiaka as a sacred text,¹⁹ and as such Hiiaka is not just a narrative but a world-making narrative, and because these authors and audiences were constantly articulating and maintaining the pilina between these mana, each Hiiaka mana, while distinct, is also representative of the whole. The authors insist on presenting their mana as complete in themselves, but also as contributions to what could be called the larger meta mo‘olelo of Hiiakaikapoliopole. Because of the frequency and the modes of its re-production and republication, and the analysis offered by the various authors of this mo‘olelo regarding the significance of the ‘ike found within it, I come to the Hiiaka mo‘olelo in its entirety as arguably our largest interpretive manual, proving a rich and varied epistemology and hermeneutic for reading other mo‘olelo and for understanding nā mea Hawai‘i.

As part of the obligation to provide context, what follows is a brief account of the newspapers that published these mana of the mo‘olelo, of the known or presumed authors, and of what makes each mana distinct.

Kapihenui, “He Moolelo no Hiiakaikapoliopole,”

Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika, December 26, 1861 – July 27, 1862.

Founded by the ‘ahahui ho‘opuka nūpepa and edited by G. W. Mila, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika* was the first Hawaiian-language newspaper to be published entirely by Native Hawaiians (Silva 2017). Between September 26, 1861 and May 14, 1863 its weekly installments

¹⁹ “he moolelo kapu loa” (*Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, May 24, 1906, 1).

expressed strong Hawaiian nationalistic sentiments (Mookini 1974, Chapin 2000). This paper represents a significant moment in Hawaiian history when Kānaka were exercising their intellectual autonomy by publishing their own materials: “*Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika* demonstrated that Kanaka Maoli had mastered the technology of the haole (the printing press and the palapala), and then went further to show off their skills in both traditional literature and modern political writing” (Silva 2004, 73).

In addition to informing its readers about specific happenings in the Hawaiian kingdom between 1861 and 1863, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika* clearly demonstrates to readers today how seriously our kūpuna believed in the political power of mo‘olelo. The publishing of mo‘olelo and ka‘ao was a major activity of *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*; in fact, “Moolelo no Kawelo” fills all six columns of the front page of the very first issue. Through such choices and the general prominence of mo‘olelo in this publication, “*Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika* reflected and communicated a specifically Kanaka national identity. This national identity was based in the ancient cosmology and the realm of the sacred that the haole did not share” (Silva 2004, 85).

It is also clear that neither the editors nor the readers thought these mo‘olelo were being published purely as entertainment. In 1862, during the weekly publication of this mana of Hiiaka, the paper printed a letter from Kanaka Maoli scholar, writer, and intellectual Joseph Kānepu‘u criticizing *Ka Hoku o Ka Pakipika* for shortening and condensing large sections of mele and oli.

Ua ike au, ua hakina ka moolelo o Hiiakaikapoliopole, ua hakina kona mau mele e pili ana i na “huli,” a pehea la anei e loa ai na koena i na hanauna hope o kakou, ke makemake lakou e nana, aole no e loa, e hele ana kakou i ka nalowale, e hele ana o Kau ka makuahine o M. G. Kapihenui [ka mea kākau i kēia mo‘olelo Hiiakaikapoliopole] i ka

nalowale. E makemake ana ka hanauna Hawaii o na la A. D. 1870, a me A. D. 1880, a me A. D. 1890, a me A. D. 1990. (Kanepuu, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, October 30, 1862, 1)

By invoking us, the Kānaka of the future, and our anticipated desire and great need to read these mo‘olelo in their entirety, without alteration, Kānepu‘u in this critique of the nūpepa displays what Noenoe Silva calls “mo‘okū‘auhau consciousness” (2017, 7). This is the political context that “He Moolelo no Hiiakaikapoliopole” appears within, just three months after the paper’s founding, and because this mo‘olelo was selected to be published in this first Hawaiian-run newspaper, it is one of the mana selected for further study in this dissertation.

Finished in July of 1862, and containing 61,000 words—the equivalent of 112 single-spaced typescript pages—when compared to the twelve other mana of Hiiaka published in our nūpepa, Kapihenui’s is of medium length (ho‘omanawanui 2007). Because this mo‘olelo ran for seven consecutive months in a weekly newspaper that appeared for less than two years, Hiiakaikapoliopole made up a substantial portion of the nūpepa’s content.

J. Bush and S. Paaluhī, “Ka Moolelo o Hiiakaikapoliopole,”

***Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, January 5, 1893 – July 12, 1893.**

Founded in August of 1889 and edited²⁰ by John E. Bush, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui* was a daily Hawaiian nationalist newspaper in the truest sense of the phrase. Bush and his team of editors were unrelenting in their support of Hawaiian sovereignty and autonomy. *Ka Leo o ka Lahui* demonstrated this through its editorials and its political use of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i. As haole began to usurp more power in the Kingdom, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui* continued to insist on printing only in

²⁰ Editors: J.W. Mikasobe (1889); F. Meka (1890); John E. Bush (1891 and 1894); Kaunamano (1893); S.P. Kanoa (1896); Thomas Spencer (1896) (Mookini 1974, 27).

Hawaiian. Further, “After the overthrow of the Queen, it printed her protest (Caucasian establishment papers did not) and kept her appeals to the U.S. government before the public. When Bush and other editors complained in print of injustices by the Provisional Government and Republic of Hawaii, such as curbing press freedom, they were fined and jailed for ‘conspiracy’ and ‘seditious libel’” (Mookini 1974).

“Ka Moolelo o Hiiakaikapoliopole” began appearing in *Ka Leo o ka Lahui* on January 5, 1893, just twelve days before the overthrow of the Hawaiian government. Bush, the publisher and editor of *Ka Leo o Ka Lahui*, and Paaluhi continued the daily installments of the mo‘olelo until its completion in July of 1893. In his introductory remarks (“‘Ōlelo Hoakaka”) to the first installment, Bush wrote the following:

He nani no hoi a he nanea maoli no na moolelo a me na kaa o ka wa kahiko o ko kakou aina, a he mea no hoi a ka Hawaii e hiipoi ai e like me ka hialaai o kela me keia lahui i na moolelo, na kaa, a me na mele, o ko lakou aina hanau. O keia hauleule ana o na moolelo oia kekahi ouli a na kilo e nana ai me ka naau i piha i na manao hopohopo no ka mau ana o kona lahui maluna o ka aina o kona mau kupuna, no ka mea, e hoike mau ana ka moolelo io maoli o na aina i kakau ia na moolelo” (Paaluhi and Bush, *Ka Leo o Ka Lahui*, January 5, 1893: 1)

Here Bush described the goodness of relaxing to enjoy the mo‘olelo of our past, the mo‘olelo that emerged from our ‘āina. To Bush, these mo‘olelo were amazing feats of our kūpuna that were meant to be cherished (hiipoi). But these mo‘olelo were more significant than pure entertainment. In fact, Bush saw the return to reading these mo‘olelo as an important act for those looking to the future with great concern over whether their lāhui would continue to thrive in the lands of their kūpuna. Ultimately, Bush argues that it would be our mo‘olelo that would

hold and protect the truths of our ‘āina. The next day, Bush continued to contextualize his mo‘olelo in another ‘ōlelo hoakaka:

Aole he loihi o ka noho ana o ka lahui a nalo aku mai ke ao, ke hoomaloka a hoopoina lakou i ka hiipoi ana me na ohohia nui i na moolelo a me na mele o na ano a pau, a kamailio mau imua o ka poe opio i kumu e mau ai na hooipo a me na li’a ana o ka naau o ke kanaka i ke aloha aina ma muli o ka hooni ana o na moolelo a me na mele e pili ana i kona one hanau na wahi pana, a me na hana kaulana a kona mau kupuna.²¹

Here Bush argues that should we lose sight and appreciation for our mo‘olelo, it would not be long until we would disappear as a people. Bush knew, as we continue to know to this day, that our mo‘olelo would be a foundation and inspiring guide for our people to perpetuate our practices of aloha ‘āina. When this mo‘olelo is read closely, and these introductions taken seriously, it is clear that this mo‘olelo was being printed with the hopes that it would facilitate a continued aloha and pilina between Kānaka and their aupuni and ‘āina. Thankfully we Kānaka have the opportunity to learn more about our pilina to our ‘āina today by taking seriously the need to lu‘u deep into these narratives. This is what has allowed and inspired me to dive deep into Hiiaka mo‘olelo and recognize a pilina to major concerns about land and the lāhui at the time of publication, because these texts were indeed responses to those concerns.

In addition to this contextualizing provided before the first and second installments, the mo‘olelo itself begins by declaring itself a narrative about governance and leadership. While other mana of the mo‘olelo emphasize Pele’s status as an ali‘i, Bush and Paaluhi use direct language to tie the Pele ‘ohana to ideas of leading and governing. Rather than Pele and her ‘ohana setting out on a journey to find Pele’s kāne Waiolohia, or to escape their elder sister

²¹ This passage is also found in Noenoe Silva’s *The Power of the Steel Tipped Pen*, 5.

Namakaokahai, in Paaluhi and Bush's mana of the mo'olelo, the Pele 'ohana are on a huaka'i na'i 'āina, a journey to conquer and govern. In fact, in the first installment of the mo'olelo we see that Pele's coming to Hawai'i was not actually welcomed by the kama'āina (ua kuee aku na kamaaina), until after Pele and her 'ohana displayed such strength and virtue that they were eventually respected, and the protesting against them ceased (hooki pu iho la ke kue o na kamaaina). Paaluhi and Bush offered this mo'olelo in *Ka Leo o ka Lahui* to feed the imagination and pride of the lāhui in the creativity of their own 'āina hānau (*Ka Leo o Ka Lahui*, January 5, 1893, 1).

Like Kapihenui's mana, Bush and Paaluhi's Hiiaka mana is of medium length. It is the second shortest of the four mana of Hiiaka discussed in this dissertation, totaling approximately 70,000 words. Much of Paaluhi and Bush's mana is also closely modeled upon Kapihenui's mana, sharing many distinctly similar passages, phrasings, and episodes not present in the other two mana of the mo'olelo.

Hooulumahiehe, "Ka Moolelo o Hiiakaikapoliopole,"

***Ka Na'i Aupuni*, June 1, 1906 – November 30, 1906**

Founded in 1905, *Ka Na'i Aupuni* was a Hawaiian-run newspaper edited and published by leaders of the Home Rule Party, Charles Kahiliaulani Notley and Joseph Mokuohai Poepoe. This daily paper was created as a companion to the weekly issues published by *Kuokoa Home Rula* and was run by the same people (Silva 2017, Mookini 1974). Particularly concerned with issues of self-determination for Kānaka Maoli in the face of annexation, the paper published a wide variety of mo'olelo and political editorials, as well as national (Hawaiian) and international news. Much like *Ka Hoku o Ka Pakipika*, *Ka Na'i Aupuni* devoted the entire first page of its first

issue to a mo‘olelo: “Kamehameha I. Ka Na-i Aupuni o Hawaii.” This mo‘olelo obviously served to contextualize and historicize the name choice for the nūpepa, while also demonstrating something of the editors’ political foundations. “Kamehameha I. Ka Na-i Aupuni o Hawaii” ran continuously from that opening issue until November 16, 1906.

When Poepoe began publishing “Ka Moolelo o Hiiakaikapoliopele” under the pseudonym Hooulumahiehie on June 1, 1906, both “Kamehameha: Ka Na-i Aupuni o Hawaii” and “Ka Moolelo Hawaii Kahiko” were also underway in *Ka Na’i Aupuni*. All three mo‘olelo have been attributed to either Hooulumahiehie or Poepoe himself. This particular mana of Hiiaka actually began in *Hawaii Aloha*, but was reprinted and completed in its entirety in *Ka Na’i Aupuni*.

E hoomauiaku ana nohoi ka hoopukaia ana ‘ku o na mahele o ka moolelo elike me ia i puka mua mai ai i kinohi ma keia nupepa; a e holo like ana keia mau mahele elua i kela ame keia puka ana o KA NA’I Aupuni. A o ka poe i loa ole na mahelehele mua o keia moolelo, elike me ia i puka ai ma ka buke moolelo HAWAII ALOHA, e loa ana ia mau mahele ia lakou ma keia hoopuka hou ana.

MEA KAKAU, Moolelo o Hiiaka-i-ka-poli-o-Pele. (*Ka Na’i Aupuni*, June 1, 1906, 3)

In this “Olello [*sic*] Hoakaka” to the first installment, Hooulumahiehie explains that they will continue with the next *Hawaii Aloha* installment and reprint the previously published installments, so that the entire lehulehu could follow along.

This mana of Hiiaka represents an important shift in the way Hiiaka mo‘olelo were to be published. When Kapihenui’s mana appeared decades earlier in *Ka Hoku o Ka Pakipika*, Kānepu‘u raised concerns that mele and oli were being cut and removed for the sake of brevity,

asking “pehea la anei e loa ai na koena i na hanauna hope o kākou, ke makemake lakou e nana [?],” how will the remainder be found by those who wish to see it? (Silva 2004, 76). Years later, the *Na ‘i Aupuni* mana of Hiiaka seemed determined to answer that question by including all it could of the mo‘olelo from mele, to oli, to long stretches of fantastic narrative. The result was the largest mana of Hiiaka in the nūpepa, totaling nearly 300,000 words.

In addition to increasing the content, Hooulumahiehie also approaches the composition of this text as a scholar. He cites from and attributes parts of the mo‘olelo to different bodies of ‘ike. He responds to current criticism coming from other papers. He even attempts to mediate a conversation about how Hiiaka might fit into another popular narrative of the time, the Bible. Time after time, Hooulumahiehie also speaks directly to his readers, reminding them that this mo‘olelo has a far greater purpose than mere entertainment.²² For example, in the latter half of the series, the great cultural and political relevance of this mo‘olelo today is described:

E ka makamaka heluhelu, ua ike na kilo, na kuhikuhi puuone, na makaula, na kahuna, ka papa huli-honua o kela ame keia mokupuni o Hawaii nei i ka wa kahiko i keia moolelo o Hiiakaikapoliopole, a ua lilo keia moolelo i papa huli honua, i papa wanana a i papa hoola kanaka na ia poe.

A ma ia ano, ua lilo keia moolelo he moolelo kapu loa ma waena o lakou. Aohe e kaoo wale ia keia moolelo aia wale no a ku ka mohai. A iloko hoi o ke kapu e hanaia ai.
(May 24, 1906, 4)

Hooulumahiehie explains how this mo‘olelo became an archive of ‘ike for prophets, planners, and seers in every part of Hawai‘i to turn to; that in fact it was a foundation for a great amount of

²² *Ka Na ‘i Aupuni*, June 16, 1906, 3; *Ka Na ‘i Aupuni*, July 7, 1906, 3; *Ka Na ‘i Aupuni*, September 24, 1906, 3; *Ka Na ‘i Aupuni*, May 24, 1906, 4; *Ka Na ‘i Aupuni*, June 8, 1906, 4.

‘ike. Because of the abundance of ‘ike shared within the mo‘olelo, this story became sacred to our people; and it was a mo‘olelo that encompassed all of Hawai‘i, from where our sun rose, to where it set. Hooulumahiehie was a practicing scholar; he researched and wrote these mo‘olelo with the same rigor as we research and write academic books today, often offering his readers multiple citations for the information he included in the narrative.

Poepoe, “Ka Moolelo Kaa o Hiiakaikapoliopole,”

***Kuokoa Home Rula*, January 10, 1908 – January 20, 1911.**

Founded in 1901, *Kuokoa Home Rula* was a Hawaiian-run weekly newspaper also published and edited by Charles Kahiliaulani Notley and Joseph Mokuohai Poepoe (Mookini 1974, Chapin 2000). The first six years of the paper have been lost to us, so we cannot say for sure what they included; however, we do know that *Kuokoa Home Rula* was a newspaper of the Independent Home Rule Party, and therefore distributed information about the party, and about Hawaiian politics and Native Hawaiian rights. Like *Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, *Kuokoa Home Rula* published many mo‘olelo, but also included more editorials and news (Silva 2017).

“Ka Moolelo Kaa o Hiiakaikapoliopole” first appeared in *Kuokoa Home Rula* in January of 1908 and continued in weekly installments until January of 1911. It is the second longest mana of Hiiaka, at just under 200,000 words, and like the Hooulumahiehie mana includes well over 200 chants (ho‘omanawanui 2007, 437). In the mo‘olelo’s first installment the author wrote:

Mamuli o ke koiia ana mai o Mr. Charles Kahiliaulani ka Ona a Luna
hooponopono nui o keia nūpepa, e na poe he lehulehu loa, e hoopuka hou ia ka Moolelo o
Hiiakaikapoli-o-Pele ma keia hoomaka hou ana o ka makou nei pepa makua, KUOKOA
HOME RULA, ke hookoia aku nei ia mau leo ikuwa o ko makou poe heluhelu; a, nolaila,

ke hoopuka aku nei makou i ka omaka mua o ua moolelo hialaai nui ia nei, ma keia helu o ka makou pepa. (*Kuokoa Home Rula*, January 10, 1908, 1)²³

In his introduction Poepoe explained how this mo‘olelo was requested heavily by the readers of that paper, and that they were printing it to fulfill that request:

A ma keia hoomaka hou ana o ka Hiiaka, e ikeia ana he mau aui ana i ko kekahi mau mahelehele i puka mua ai maloko o ka nūpepa KA NA’I AUPUNI ma ka M. H. 1906. O keia mau aui hou e ikeia ana ma keia puka ana mamuli o ka loaahou ana mai i ko makou mea kakau moolelo, he Hiiaka i kapaia o ko Maui Hiiaka ia. O ka mahele Hiiaka mua i puka ai ma Ka NA’I AUPUNI, a i hoomaka ai nohoi ma keia pepa ma ia manawa no, ua oleloia o ko Hawaii Hiiaka ia. O ka mea i loaahou ia makou, oia ka makou e hana aku nei no ka hooko ana i ka makemake o ko makou poe heluhelu. (*Kuokoa Home Rula*, January 10, 1908, 1)

Poepoe continued by alerting his readers that they would see installments previously published in *Ka Na’i Aupuni* alongside new materials that he had recently acquired. It is here we learn that these mana come not just from specific authors, but also from specific places. Poepoe tells the readers that the mana they will read in *Kuokoa Home Rula* is in fact a mana from Maui, while the previously published Hiiaka were mana belonging to Hawai‘i.

E hoomaopopoia, eia na poe naauao o kakou iho nei a me ko na aina e, ke apu mai nei i na moolelo kahiko o Hawaii nei, [o ka] kakou poe opio [naauao? naaupo?] hoi, ke hoohehema nui nei i keia kumu waiwai nui o ka aina oiwi. Aohe huli, aohe imi, aohe no he makemake ia mau mea. Aka, no makou iho, ke hoomau nei makou i keia hana no

²³ For clarification on this transcription I consulted Kumu Noenoe Silva’s copy of this compiled mo‘olelo, which includes a typed transcript of the first installment of the mo‘olelo.

ka makemake ? hoouluia [?] a hoomauiaku ka ikeia ana o na moolelo a kaa kahiko o Hawaii nei i hiki ai ke malamaia e kakou, ka lahui.

Me ka mahalo,

JOSEPH M. POEPOE.

Mea Kakau Moolelo Hiiaka (*Kuokoa Home Rula*, January 10, 1908, 1)²⁴

Poepoe finishes by cautioning his readers to be alert to how these mo‘olelo have been misprinted and under-researched in the past. He encourages his readers to take seriously this task of perpetuating these mo‘olelo together as a lāhui. For Poepoe, the cause of and need for these mo‘olelo were paramount, and his kuleana to present the mo‘olelo properly was not something to take lightly. As a lāhui, we continue to benefit from his intense sense of kuleana to this task.

Mapping the ‘Upena our Archive Creates

When closely read and interrogated, each of the four mana of Hiiaka outlined above provide an abundance of valuable ‘ike relating to ‘āina, pilina, and intimacy. When we lu‘u into these texts individually, we can see up close the nae that bind the ‘upena of intimacies within each narrative. Read together as a collection, however, they offer not only a fuller picture of pilina within a wider context of mo‘olelo, but also an understanding of how these mana themselves, the authors who wrote them, and the kānaka who read and cherish them are fashioning an ‘upena of pilina themselves. To read these texts is to (re)member the ‘upena of intimacies within the narrative of the text, and to (re)member how these texts make ‘upena of their own that we as readers are also bound into and within. As the authors of these mana of

²⁴ As mentioned above, for clarification on this transcription I consulted Kumu Noenoe Silva’s copy of this compiled mo‘olelo, which includes a typed transcript of the first installment of the mo‘olelo.

Hiiaka talk back to each other, or demonstrate the many ‘aha this mo‘olelo creates, or address their audience directly, an ‘upena joins us, them, and their offered mo‘olelo together as well. But for these Kanaka Maoli intellectuals of the 19th and 20th century to create ‘upena of pilina, they had to be scholars in their own right. They were deeply familiar with a diversity of mana of Hiiaka, and often cited them in their compositions. And when Hooulumahie published Hiiaka in 1905 and 1906, he celebrated that many mana of these mo‘olelo had survived:

Malia paha, he mahele pololei no keia ma ia kumu o ka moolelo Hiiaka, a o ka ka mea kakau no nae keia i hoike ae la i kana mahele. He mea maikai no ke hoolaha akea ia ae ka moolelo Hiiaka i kulike ole me ka ka mea kakau e hoopuka nei. (*Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, December 26, 1905, 1).

To Hooulumahie, the diversity of these mana in their details and narratives was a strength of Kanaka Maoli mo‘olelo, and it was a good thing that this paper could make public another mana that was not identical to past publications.

Perhaps this diversity of mo‘olelo was important to Hooulumahie because he, too, understood, like Paaluhi and Bush, how the fortunes of the mo‘olelo over time must certainly have caused some portions of it to change, and even be disfigured: “E like me ke ano mau o na moolelo o ka wa kahiko i haawi waha ia mai kahi hanauna mai a kekahi hanauna, ua lilo mau ke ano o ka moolelo, a ua hookikepakepa ia iho hoi i kela a me keia manawa o ka poe malama mookuauhau moolelo” (*Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, January 5, 1893, 1). Because Paaluhi and Bush recognized this process of components almost certainly falling away during the evolution of a specific mana of a mo‘olelo through its transition from generation to generation, they knew how necessary it was for all the various mana to be understood in pilina to each other. No single mana is the authoritative “original” from which the others deviate; rather, these narratives and mele are

all part of the ‘aha that together create an entire ‘upena to capture the weight of the ‘ike this mo‘olelo carries. Many passages within the archive that I have examined closely can demonstrate that these authors approached telling and retelling these mo‘olelo with this understanding. The following passage, written by Hooulumahiehie, shows this quite clearly:

Aole ka mea kakau e haakoi ana, eia iaia ka nioniolo loa o ka moolelo o Hiiaka, a he ana-puu a he ana kee aku hoi ka kekaki. Aole pela. Aka, ke hoopuka nei ka mea kakau i keia “Aulani” o Hiiaka, e like me na mea i loa mai iaia mai kekahi poe kakau moolelo kahiko mai a i paa hoi ka mo‘olelo o Hiiaka, me ka manaolana e loa ana no na hooponopono ia ana mai e ka poe makaukau maoli i kela moolelo waiwai nui o Hawaii kahiko. (July 6, 1906, 3)

Here Hooulumahiehie makes it clear that he is not offering his mana of Hiiaka as the single true version of this mo‘olelo. Instead he positions himself in relation to the other mana, saying this is the mana that he has been offered:

O kela a me keia mea mawaena o ko makou poe heluhelu, e manao ana he mau hoopolelei a he mau hooponopono kana i makemake ai ma na wahi o keia moolelo i kulike ole me ka mea i loa iaia, ua oluolu loa makou e hoouna pololei mai ua makamaka la i kana hooponopono i ka Lunahooponopono o keia Buke Moolelo, a e hoopuka ia aku no ia mau mea maloko o keia buke.

Ke makemake nui nei ka Ahahui Moolelo HAWAII LANI HONUA, e houluulu a e hoakoakoa pono i na moolelo, na mele, na kuauhau a mea ano nui o ke au kahiko o Hawaii nei, no ka pomaikai o ka hanauna opio o “Hawaii Aloha.” (Hooulumahiehie, July 6, 1906, 3)

In setting forth this mana, Hooulumahiehie hopes it will encourage those with an intimate pilina to this mo‘olelo to correct any errors on his part. Here we learn that authors not only accepted critique and corrections, but welcomed them, because they understood that it would be through such critique that the mo‘olelo would continue to grow and become known to more of the lāhui, which would certainly be for the best for the next generation of Kānaka Maoli.

With these greater intentions in mind, it became critical that Kanaka Maoli intellectuals of the 19th and 20th century did not undermine each other in their publications. Rather than refute or contradict the work of previous mana, Hooulumahiehie and Poepoe would gesture simply to the differences between their mo‘olelo and others by saying “ma kahi mahele o ka moolelo,” allowing the reader to follow along more easily and not be confused by diverging narratives. Such a gesture did not claim that the other mana were wrong or incomplete. Gracious in what they were contributing, even though the authors produced very substantial mana of the mo‘olelo, they were not attempting to contain the entire Hiiaka tradition in one mana. The Kānaka who authored mana of the mo‘olelo in the 20th century knew and indicated very clearly that they were continuing a tradition, and that therefore their work would draw heavily from the work of the previous scholars.

He mahele ano nui keia, a ke minamina nei ka mea kakau i ka loa ole ana iaia
ona [o na] mahelehele Hiiaka i loa i kahi poe paanaau, a i ole, e paa nei paha he mau
buke kakaulima o keia moolelo, mai ko lakou mau kupuna a poe makua mai hoi.

O ka mea i loa i ka mea kakau i keia wa, mailoko mai no ia o ekolu mau mahele
moolelo Hiiaka i paa i ke kakauia. (Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*. January 7, 1910, 4)

It took a certain kind of humility to compose these mo‘olelo in the 20th century—knowing and honoring what ‘ike one had, yet realizing that additional ‘ike must be found elsewhere. Poepoe

spoke directly to this, recognizing his own shortcoming, and even being saddened that he didn't possess all the 'ike known to those who have memorized the mo'olelo. But Poepoe acknowledges that he did not learn this mo'olelo in the way his kūpuna once did, through sharing orally and through memorization, so he reminds his audience that his latest version of the mo'olelo was also assembled in part from the three previously published mana of Hiiaka. It is this humility, which Poepoe and the other authors display in their mana, that allows them not only to coexist, but thrive in pilina with each other.

It is important, however, to recognize that although difference, and even disagreement could be welcomed, any lack of rigor was discouraged and publically exposed. For example, in December of 1905, Hooulumahiehie calls out the translator N. B. Emerson of David Malo's manuscript, "Hawaiian Antiquities," for failing to represent the Hawaiian materials properly, explaining that "Ke hoike nei ka mea kakau i keia manao i mea e alakai hewa ole ia ai ka noonoo o na Hawaii opio, ma keia hope aku, i ko lakou heluhelu ana i keia buke moolelo Hawaii a Davida Malo i unuhiia ai ma ka olelo Beretania" (Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na'i Aupuni*, December 11, 1905, 1). Hooulumahiehie does this to ensure that no readers, and especially young ones, are misled or confused by the translator's erroneous alteration of the mo'olelo.

In the next issue published on December 12, 1905, Hooulumahiehie says bluntly that he has no idea who the translator's informant is—"aole i maopopo owai la nei J. K. K. a ua mea unuhi nei e kuhikuhi nei" (1)—perhaps as a way to call out a failure on Emerson's part to reach out to the proper sources. Such a lack of pilina and intimacy to other writers might also point to a lack of authority and accountability in telling these mo'olelo. Here we see how pilina to the literary community and the mo'olelo itself is significant to the overall tradition of this epic. In this case, ho'opāpā was also an important feature of these mo'olelo, for it can help to distinguish

between the diversity of ‘ike in this tradition, and when some folks were simply stepping out of bounds.

Beyond Hiiaka

Hiiaka mo‘olelo were not being retold in a vacuum. In addition to drawing out the ‘aha between Hiiaka mana, Kanaka Maoli authors and intellectuals of the 19th and 20th century were also recognizing the pilina between Hiiaka and other mo‘olelo in the literary genealogy. One mo‘olelo often cited in Poepoe’s and Hooulumahiehie’s mana of the mo‘olelo was ka moololo o Kuapakaa, also known as Ka Ipu Makani o Laamaomao. The pilina between these two mo‘olelo makes sense, given the role makani play in both narratives, so it is hardly surprising when Hooulumahiehie points out, “Ua like a ua like ole paha kekahi mau makani me ko ka mea i ikeia ma ka moololo o Kuapakaa,” these makani are perhaps similar to that of the makani in Kuapakaa. As a scholar, Hooulumahiehie also makes sure to cite books (perhaps unpublished) by J. W. Naihe (Kohala) and D. K. Waialeale as sources of his makani. Hooulumahiehie includes these makani in his Hiiaka specifically because “he mahele hoi keia i ike ole ia ma na moololo o Hiiaka i hoolahaia mamua aku nei,” they have not yet appeared in other mana of this mo‘olelo (*Ka Na’i Aupuni*, June 19, 1906, 3).

It is because these makani and inoa ‘āina have not yet been published in Hiiaka mo‘olelo that Hooulumahiehie asks the patience of his readers as he includes them in this mana. For Hooulumahiehie this task cannot be avoided—“aole hiki i ka mea kakau ke alo ae—because he sees it as his kuleana to publish every bit of the mo‘olelo he has knowledge of “no ka pomaikai o ka hanauna hou,” for the next generation of Kānaka (*Ka Na’i Aupuni*, June 19, 1906, 3). On April 24, 1908, we learn that the pilina between the Moololo of Kuapakaa and Hiiaka, and the

preservation of these makani, are so significant that Poepoe decided to publish these passages in *Kuokoa Home Rula* in almost identical fashion to what was published two years earlier in *Ka Na'i Aupuni*.²⁵

Of course it wasn't just Kuapakaa who provided additional material and evidence for the significance of Hiiaka mo'olelo. Poepoe and Hooulumahiehie were constantly drawing out the 'aha between Hiiaka mo'olelo and other mele and mo'olelo ko'ihonua. In some places, Poepoe relied on mele to demonstrate the validity of a part of his mele, or to point out the location of a long-forgotten homeland, Hapakuela. And in others, he wove effortlessly together the mo'okū'auhau in Hiiaka with the mele ko'ihonua of famed chiefs. In one passage, Hooulumahiehie seamlessly substantiates his mo'okū'auhau of Haumea in Hiiakaikapoliopole by following the 'aha of his 'upena out in three distinct but important directions. First, Hooulumahiehie points out that this genealogy of Haumea can be found in both the mele ko'ihonua of the Oahu chief, Kualii, and the Kauai chief, Kaumualii.²⁶ Hooulumahiehie also uses this an opportunity to show how his mo'okū'auhau of Haumea offers an alternative to a famed

²⁵ “Ua like a ua like ole paha kekahi mau makani me ko ka mea i ikeia ma ka moololo o Kuapakaa. O keia nae na mea i loa i ka mea kakau ma keia moololo Hiiaka, i kopeia mai e ia mai ka buke mai a J. W. Naihe o Kohala, a mai ka buke mai hoi a D. K. Waialeale. A he mahele no hoi keia i ike ole ia ma na moololo Hiiaka i hoolahaia mamua aku nei.

A maanei ke nonoi aku nei ka mea kakau i ka hoa'loha heluhelu, e haawi mai i kana mau hoomanawanui ana no keia nee ana aku o ka moololo o Hiiaka-i-ka-poli, oiai e nee aku ana keia mahele o ka moololo ma na inoa aina a me na inoa makani a puni o Kauai, a he kulana panoonoo no ia o ka moololo; aka, aole hiki i ka mea kakau ke alo ae i keia haawina, no ka mea, ua hookumuia keia moololo mamuli o ka manao ana o ka mea kakau e pau pono na mea a pau—ke au-nui a me ke au-iki—o keia moololo, no ka pomaikai o ka hanauna hou o Hawaii nei ma keia hope aku” (Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*, April 24, 1908, 1).

²⁶ “A o keia kahea hai kupuna a Hiiaka i hoikeia ae la, ua ikeia no ia ma ke mele 'koihonua' o Kualii, ka Moi o Oahu nei, pela no me ke mele 'koihonua' o Kaumualii, ke alii o Kauai, oia hoi o “Ke Kala Kumalohioia a o ke mele no nae hoi ia i oleloia ai, no Kualii no ia 'koihonua” (Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na'i Aupuni*, September 24, 1906, 3).

Hawaiian genealogy, the Kumulipo.²⁷ It is significant that these mo‘olelo could be read in relationship to each other, sometimes because they agreed, and sometimes because they were opposed. This great diversity of ‘ike adds to the overall wealth of mo‘olelo.

Of the authors studied in this dissertation, Poepoe has the most citations in his mana of Hiiaka. Often, he included mele or ko‘ihonua from beyond the Hiiaka archive to substantiate a part of his narrative. For example, when mapping out the many foundations of Kilauea, and describing the final papakū, Loloimehani, Poepoe includes a passage from the mele ko‘ihonua “Wela ka Lani, o Owe” (*Kuokoa Home Rula*, February 14, 1908, 3). In continuing this practice of citing mele and ko‘ihonua, Poepoe was not only strengthening and (re)membering the ‘aha between each of the mo‘olelo, but also working to “hooiaio” his own mo‘olelo (*Kuokoa Home Rula*, January 31, 1908, 1). Poepoe revealed quite clearly in his publication of Hiiaka that he was not only a scholar, but a skilled rope maker, and his deeply intentional practice of citation has proved to be incredibly meaningful when working towards understanding the relationships among distinct historic mo‘olelo today. Ultimately, we also learn a great deal about where ‘ike stems from, and that our kūpuna understood that mele provided an incredible archive of evidence that should and can be relied upon for historical information.

Breaking the Fourth Wall, Pilina between Author and Audience

Much of the work described above was made visible by authors speaking directly to their readers. Authors of Hiiaka and other mo‘olelo broke the fourth wall²⁸ frequently in their

²⁷ A ua hoikeya no keia papa-kuau-hau a Hiiaka i kahea ai maloko o ka Moo-kuauhau Kumulipo. A ke kauhā nei keia kau a Hiiaka, i ka o aio [*sic*] o keia mahele kuauhau e pili ana ia Paliku, a loa mai o Haumea, oia no hoi o Papa, wahine a Wakea” (Hooulumahie, *Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, September 24, 1906, 3).

²⁸ The theater term for when the actors speak directly to their audience.

narratives—sometimes to provide a citation or evidence for the validity of their particular telling; sometimes to ho‘opāpā with another scholar or author; other times to clarify, offer a transition, or even call special attention to a significant moment in the narrative. In Her Book *Voices of Fire*, ho‘omanawnaui calls these moments “authorial asides,” and points out how they were employed in Hiiaka mo‘olelo as “strong storytelling strategies” that pointed back to the literary techniques embedded in Hawaiian literature’s long and rich life as an oral tradition (2014, 42). In *The Power of the Steel Tipped Pen*, Silva argues that these asides also demonstrate “mo‘okū‘auhau consciousness,” in that authors such as Poepoe were persistent in insuring that current and subsequent generations of Kānaka Maoli would recognize the importance of certain information (2017, 151).

I want to consider this literary technique in terms of its performing and managing a particular intimacy and pilina between author and readers. In theater, when actors speak directly to their audience, they are breaking the “fourth wall,” that imaginary solid boundary separating the performers and their world from the audience members and theirs. This is much the same for our Kanaka Maoli authors and audiences of the 19th and 20th century. When Poepoe, Hooulumahie, Paaluhi and Bush, and even Kapihenui address the readers directly, often demanding their attention, they are demonstrating how such a boundary between writer and reader is not only unnecessary, but damaging to the writer’s overall cause as a ha‘i mo‘olelo. In this sense, Kanaka use of this technique differs from that of 19-century European authors because our intellectual ancestors were calling attention to an actual pilina and mo‘okū‘auhau shared with their readership. This technique also invokes a sense of orality, as breaking the fourth wall in theater and other performance arts actually calls attention to the fact of shared space. By addressing the readers, these authors are not simply offering footnotes of information

to follow up on at another time, but taking a breath within the overall narrative to share directly and personally ‘ike that enriches the understanding of their mana of Hiiaka within the larger ‘upena of Kanaka Maoli ‘ike and mo‘olelo. Finally, such asides not only call attention to the overall impact of the ‘upena of Kanaka Maoli mo‘olelo, but also affirm the great aloha shared between authors and their audiences.

The author often breaks the fourth wall to insure that readers follow the most significant course in a narrative that offers many different paths. But such moments are more than just aids for readers. Going beyond a rhetorical conceit, the authors’ breaking down the fourth wall between themselves, the mo‘olelo, and their lāhui and readership is predicated on an actual and sincere intimacy between writer and reader. These readers are more than just an audience. They are hoa, hoa‘loha heluhelu, makamaka, and one day, mo‘opuna of the authors themselves. And by addressing readers as hoa,²⁹ these authors displayed and (re)membered the importance of the role the reader and companion would play in continuing the process of binding and securing these mo‘olelo within our ‘upena of literature. Such asides often began with a direct and intimate address—“e kuu makamaka heluhelu,” “e ka hoa heluhelu,” or “E kuu hoa‘loha”—followed by whatever essential information or citation the author wants to provide. Examples of this technique are found frequently in Poepoe’s and Hooulumahie’s mana of the mo‘olelo, and to a lesser extent within Kapihenui’s and Bush and Paaluhi’s versions.

²⁹ Hoa. 1. n. Companion, friend, associate, colleague, comrade, partner, mate, peer, fellow, antagonist (if followed by a word such as kua or paio). Cf. *hoahānau*, *hoa hele*, *hoaloha*, *hoa paio*, and saying, *cold I*. Kona hoa, his friend. Hoa a ka Hale o nā Lunamaka‘āinana, member of the House of Representatives. ho‘o.hoa To make friends. (PPN soa.). 2. nvt. To tie, bind, secure, rig; rigging, lashing. See *hoa wa‘a*. (Pukui and Elbert 1986, 73)

We learn through these addresses that the audience are no strangers to the author; in fact, sharing this mo‘olelo affirms and maintains a particular intimacy between the writer and the public. Pilina can be affirmed through the great care a writer takes to represent these mo‘olelo properly. As we will see, these authors teach us to cherish the pilina and intimacies displayed between Hiiaka and her contemporaries. But direct address compellingly reminds us that we should also pay serious attention to the pilina between 19th and 20th century kānaka as they persevered in collecting, telling, and cherishing their mo‘olelo—for themselves, and for the next and future hanauna.

‘Upena as Intergenerational Memory

As we look in on these mo‘olelo over a century later, we are not just witnessing their ‘upena as they unfold before us through the authors’ composition and from our reading of these texts. In fact, we are the intended and rightful inheritors and guardians of these ‘upena. Our kūpuna created these ‘aha with the hope that they would some day draw us close to our kūpuna—to participate within this literary movement of recovery and (re)membering, but in the process, also to better understand our history and language, which they feared would disappear. We know this because the authors and intellectuals responsible for publishing these mo‘olelo wrote explicitly about the purpose of taking on these laborious endeavors, speaking not only directly to their contemporaries, but to and about us as well.

At the beginning of this chapter, we encountered Kānepu‘u’s address to editors of *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*. He insisted that the mo‘olelo be published in their entirety because he was dedicated to working intentionally and tirelessly not only for his contemporaries, but for the next generation, and for our current generations of Kānaka. As a Kanaka Maoli wahine born in May

of 1990, it is not at all lost on me that Kānepu‘u’s industry and encouragement to his intellectual peers resulted in gifts delivered to the many kānaka who lived after him, and in fact to me personally. And in offering this gift to us, in this way, he reminds us that we too must take on this work with integrity and aloha, and consider how our pilina to these mo‘olelo will ultimately connect us to Kānaka of 2028, 2038, 2048, and 2148. Our mo‘opuna will know and build upon our great mo‘olelo only if we too recognize that our kūpuna were securing the ‘aha to bind us in pilina to these mo‘olelo and to them. Through that pilina, we can recognize and ‘auamo the kuleana of telling these mo‘olelo today.

Not only Kānepu‘u was concerned with passing the legacy of these mo‘olelo on into the future. Texts authored by Hooulumahiehie and Poepoe articulated frequently a deep investment in preserving these mo‘olelo properly for the next generation of Kānaka ‘ōpio. In Hooulumahiehie’s mo‘olelo he spoke of the necessity of telling these mo‘olelo to ensure the “pomaikai o ka hanauna hou o Hawaii nei ma keia hope aku,” the good fortune of the next generation of Kānaka of Hawai‘i (*Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, June 19, 1906, 3).³⁰ As a public intellectual, Poepoe was so concerned for the future of Hawai‘i that he helped to found a literary organization, “Ahahui Moololo Hawaii Lani Honua,” that would collect and bring together the many mo‘olelo, mele, and genealogies for the prosperity of the next generations of Hawai‘i.³¹ According to Hooulumahiehie, this ‘ahahui planned to publish a collection of the many great

³⁰ Also found in Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*, April 24, 1908, 1.

³¹ “Ke makemake nui nei ka Ahahui Moololo HAWAII LANI HONUA, e houluulu a e hoakoakoa pono i na moololo, na mele, na kuauhau a me ano nui o ke au kahiko o Hawaii nei, no ka pomaikai o ka hanauna opio o “Hawaii Aloha” (Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, July 6, 1906, 3).

genealogies of Hawai‘i, also for the benefit of the next generation of young Kānaka (Hooulumahie, *Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, September 24, 1906, 3).

Through their tireless dedication, these scholars, authors, and storytellers mapped an ‘upena of their own, one that they hoped we would continue to tend, protect, and cherish, even to this day. Our lives in 2018 would perhaps be completely unrecognizable to these ancestors of ours, just as parts of their lives seem often inconceivable to us. And yet, our kūpuna prophesized that these mo‘olelo would continue to be relevant, would continue to guide us in our understanding of ourselves and of our beloved ‘āina. They believed that if they carefully prepared an ‘upena that could hold our mo‘olelo and sustain the pilina between us all, that we would be properly cared for. Our kūpuna did the hard work to make this ‘upena possible. To return to this ‘upena, to hold the ‘aha they so intentionally and carefully fashioned, to read their words and hold them close in the language they were raised to think, speak, and dream in, is to (re)member the pilina between ourselves and our kūpuna. It is to practice a kinship so many violences have tried to destroy. It is to do the undoing of dismembering, it is to create, it is to (re)member, and it is a privilege.

As we prepare to engage seriously with the pilina between Hiiaka and her intimates, we must honor, give aloha, and care for the pilina between ourselves and our kūpuna, a pilina that they declared time and time again they wished for us to know and maintain.

CHAPTER THREE:
THE EA OF PILINA

Introduction:

In the past thirty years Kanaka Maoli scholars have begun to lay the groundwork for unpacking the colonial structures that have plagued Hawai‘i since 1778. Historians, geographers, political scientists, literary scholars, legal scholars, anthropologists, voyagers, feminist theorists, linguists, and others have all waded into the complicated present and history of the collision between Hawai‘i and the West, and its social, political, environmental, and economic effects on Hawai‘i and its native Kānaka Maoli. What has resulted from this multi-decade movement to ‘imi ‘ike is a canon of Kānaka Maoli texts that challenges the status quo of largely white historiography that has plagued Hawai‘i since the landing of James Cook in the 18th century.

Kanaka Maoli scholars have demonstrated the excellence of our kūpuna by conducting rigorous research into the civilization that was formed, maintained, then transformed over many centuries, here in the most geographically isolated place on earth. Because of the work of our intellectual kūpuna, Kanaka Maoli scholars today can build our scholarship upon a firm foundation of research on Kanaka Maoli land tenure, legal structures, literature, political engagement, science, and resource management that has developed as part of the ongoing process of sustaining and protecting an ongoing resurgence of cultural practices, and of waging a fight to regain political, economic, intellectual, and social sovereignty. The steady accumulation of original research by Kānaka Maoli has resulted in a rigorous theorizing of the historical and ongoing occupation of Hawai‘i, and a highly-informed critique of the material effects of settler colonialism. What my intellectual ancestors have given me are the means to honor my pilina to

them through this mo‘okū‘auhau. My task here and now is to take pilina and relationality seriously, as I seek to join this growing genealogy of Kanaka Maoli intellectual workers.

One of the major shaping forces in this resurgence of Kanaka Maoli intellectualism is the essential nature of aloha ‘āina to all things Hawaiian. This dissertation displays its importance by zeroing in on how aloha ‘āina assumes a particular ethic of pilina and relationality. What does it mean, physically and emotionally, to aloha our ‘āina? As I asked in the introduction, what would emerge if we took aloha seriously, reaching beyond plastic consumerism, beyond the biblical imagination, beyond imposed legal definitions, to understand how aloha is transformative kinship beyond anything we have previously articulated? In short, what might happen, what might we learn, if we try to understand the ea of pilina?

To begin to construct my own papakū for understanding Kanaka Maoli relationships, I start from the premise that understanding aloha ‘āina requires understanding aloha first. For the purposes of this dissertation, I first consider aloha as verb, as action, as a reciprocal pilina between many bodies. Subsequently, I will engage with and further articulate the importance of aloha ‘āina at the nexus of aloha as action within our mo‘olelo.

A discussion of aloha must also be about relationships. Many people today think of relationships as ecosystems existing between two people at a time. In a Kanaka Maoli context, I prefer to think instead about ‘upena of intimacy. Within many mo‘olelo, this idea can be recognized in how siblings, or those in other intimate relationships, take on kāne or wahine lovers as communal. In *Ka Mo‘olelo o Hiiakaikapoliopole*, Lohiau is often referred to as “kela kane a kakou,” (that kāne of ours) and Hopoe is often referred to as “ko kaua aikane” (our aikāne). When bound and accountable to another, we are therefore also bound and accountable to each other’s intimacies and accountabilities. This expands exponentially the possibilities of

pleasure and responsibility. Such relationships teach us that reciprocity and accountability matter, and that intimacy is many bodied and overflowing. This is the ea of pilina.

If relationships are about intimacies and kuleana, then this dissertation is also about understanding the many forms intimacy can take, and how certain relationships and intimacy are pursued, established, practiced, and maintained. Some pilina are pursued through sex, others through sharing a sunrise, and some even through the simple yet important act of sharing names. The abundant forms of Kanaka Maoli intimacies stand in direct contrast to the singular presentation of heteronormativity. In the face of a colonial project that works towards the elimination of certain forms of intimacy, it is important that my project take intimacy seriously, in its many varied and shape-shifting forms.

This project must therefore prioritize relationships that stand as alternatives to heteropatriarchal articulations of intimacy and relationships. A major strategy of this dissertation is to examine a wide enough range of Kanaka Maoli intimacies and desires to articulate a Kanaka Maoli “queer” theory. By rooting this theorizing within an archive that articulates many non-heteropatriarchal relationships, this project will additionally add nuance to emerging Indigenous queer theories already coming to question any understanding of Kanaka Maoli desire and intimacy organized through straight / queer binaries. Such queer theorizing also links Kanaka Maoli ‘ike to a growing field that has already begun to mark the connections between the policing and legislation of intimacy and the administration and control of Indigenous land and resources.

In researching and writing about relationships I have paid special attention to the term aikāne, because it directs us toward intimacies beyond the heteropatriarchal standard we have been trained to recognize and practice. This dissertation is not however purely a meditation on

aikāne relationships. Instead, aikāne is an opportunity to arrive at and discuss other non-heteropatriachal and non-monogamous relationships that lie outside of our “civility.” Aikāne offers a first step into a world unmolested by toxic monogamy and heteropatriarchy. Beginning with aikāne and gathering from our po‘owai of mo‘olelo also allows me to analyze Kanaka Maoli pilina lying perhaps beyond a legalistic imagination, but within an elaborate living framework that prioritizes logics of kapu, kuleana, and pleasure. Even a cursory glance into Kanaka Maoli mo‘olelo reveals that our kūpuna not only tolerated these modes of intimacy; they imagined, embodied, and celebrated them. This dissertation is part of my contribution to that continued embodiment and celebration.

Mapping Hiiaka’s ‘Upena of Pilina

In the next chapter, we will discuss Hiiaka mo‘olelo in terms of cartography, unpacking how the mo‘olelo itself has an intimate pilina to place, displayed through the mapping of the mo‘olelo across our ‘āina. In this chapter, we will explore how Hiiaka mo‘olelo comprise an archive of intimacy and pilina among kānaka. Among the qualities that make this archive significant is the publishing of mana of the mo‘olelo over time. Extensive and detailed research by such Pele scholars as John Charlot and ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui reveals that Hiiaka mo‘olelo appeared at least thirteen times in serial form within our nūpepa between 1861 and 1928 (ho‘omanawanui 2007, 436-438). That these mo‘olelo reappeared repeatedly, at great length, and with significant overlap and cross-referencing for over sixty years, represents more than a longstanding appreciation and aloha for this particular narrative. It also suggests that kānaka found this mo‘olelo deeply relevant to a variety of contemporary issues over a substantial period of time.

Scholars such as Brandy Nālani McDougall, ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui, Noelani Arista, Noenoe Silva, and others have written extensively about how our mo‘olelo, mele, and other narratives served as a forum within our nūpepa and other publications for analysis, commentary, and guidance regarding contemporary issues. From the publishing and translating of the *Kumulipo* during the reigns of Kalākaua and Lili‘uokalani as a means for asserting not only their mana to rule, but also the mana of the aupuni of Hawai‘i in the face of great international and internal pressure and encroachment, to the republishing of the Hiiaka mo‘olelo in 1893, at the moment of the illegal overthrow and eventual American occupation of our Kingdom, my intellectual kua‘ana have shown how mo‘olelo such as these have offered counter hegemonic narratives in the face of a multitude of domestic and international challenges (McDougall 2011; ho‘omanawanui 2007). Our kūpuna selected certain mo‘olelo deliberately for publication—and the history of Hiiaka mo‘olelo is a prime example. Thirteen times over nearly seventy years—this history speaks to this mo‘olelo’s significance and value to our kūpuna. And its relevance continues 150 years later, providing lessons and guidance for our lives in contemporary Hawai‘i.

Among many other things, this archive provides detailed accounts of pilina, and their fortunes in the face of multiple waves of foreign influence and transformation in Hawai‘i. Because Hiiaka mo‘olelo are about ‘ohana, migration, and aloha among kānaka, akua, and each other, many distinct kinds of pilina appear throughout its narrative. In terms of especially intimate pilina, the following rise up in the foreground: aikāne, kāne/wahine, ho‘āo, kōko‘olua, kaiko‘eke, kaikua‘ana/kaikaina, kupuna/mo‘opuna, hoa paio/ hoa ho‘opa‘apa‘a, pōki‘i, haku/akua, hoahānau, and kaikunāne/kaikuahine. While the ‘upena of every one of these pilina connect the pilina and the kānaka sharing it to their ‘āina, other terms specifically identify pilina that kānaka have to land and with others of that place: kama‘āina, kupa ‘āina, malihini, kia‘i,

ali‘i, and akua. Each of these pilina can be further nuanced by an intentional use of Hawaiian pronouns to signify who and how kānaka are bound in a particular ‘upena. Through my own research, I have learned that many pilina ordinarily read within a western framework as exclusively between two people often actually refer to intimacies shared between several siblings, lovers, and companions. The ‘upena of pilina further takes for granted that no matter how seemingly disconnected two or more kānaka might be, no matter how many nae (or degrees of separation) lie between them, no matter how far and wide the ‘upena must be cast to touch them all, when pulled tight in the fist of the lawai‘a, all these nae are drawn and bound close together. As a result, if any nae or knot is severed, weakened, or somehow compromised, the entire ‘upena threatens to unravel.

In this chapter I will discuss some of these diverse relational terms, and provide examples that show how such relations are distinctly different from their customary English and western translations, largely because of how kānaka recognized kuleana and inclusion within these intimacies. Through an analysis of these terms as encountered and enacted in the mo‘olelo of Hiiaka and in the greater history of our people, I will also offer my thoughts on the relevance of these pilina to kānaka today, as we seek to dismantle such structures of oppression as patriarchy and heterosexism. Finally, by drawing on theory addressing the politics of translation, I will offer an additional layer of analysis that addresses how translation often recreates and reinforces such structures as patriarchy, heterosexism, and white supremacy, and how in turn our mo‘olelo can assist us in deconstructing these imposed forces.

Since a primary goal of this research is to disengage from the patriarchy written and translated over our pilina, I will focus on the terms most significantly appropriated by patriarchy—those related to ‘ohana:

‘Ohana:

TABLE 1: ‘OHANA		
TERM	Pukui and Elbert Definition	Examples
KAIKUA‘ANA	Older sibling or cousin of the same sex; sibling or cousin of the same sex of the senior line, whether older or younger	Pele (to the Hiiaka Sisters) Hiiaka sisters (to Hiiakaikapoliopele)
KAIKAINA	n. Younger sibling or cousin of the same sex, as younger brother or male cousin of a male, or younger sister or female cousin of a female; sibling or cousin of the same sex of the junior line, whether older or younger.	Na Hiiaka a Pau (to Pele) Hiiakaikapoliopele (to her elder Hiiaka sisters)
KAIKUNĀNE	n. Brother or male cousin of a female.	Kamohoalii, Kanehoalani, Lonomakua, etc.
KAIKUAHINE	n. Sister or female cousin of a male.	Kahuanui (to Lohiau) Pele (to her brothers)
HOAHĀNAU	n. Cousin; brother or sister, as a church member.	All of the Pele clan
PŌKI‘I	1. Younger brother or sister or closely related younger cousin, often spoken affectionately.	Hiiaka
HĀNAU MUA	n. First-born child, especially the eldest living member of the senior branch of a family; senior, older brother or sister.	Pele
PUNAHELE	nvs. A favorite or pet; to treat as a favorite (children were often treated as favorites; they might be carried on the grandparent’s shoulders, and songs were composed for them); favoritism.	Hiiaka
HAKU	1. n. Lord, master, overseer, employer, owner, possessor, proprietor. A chief was often addressed as ē ku‘u haku, my master. See Haku-o-Hawai‘i . Kona haku, his lord. ‘O Iēhowa ka Haku (Isa. 50.5), the Lord Jehovah. ho‘o.haku To act as haku, dominate; to treat as a haku; to rule others, sometimes without authority; bossy. ‘A ‘ole ‘oe e ho‘ohaku maluna ona me ka ‘o‘olea (<i>Oihk.</i> 25.43), you shall not rule over him with rigor. (PCP fatu.)	Hiiaka – “Pokii haku” (to her kaikuaana) Hiiaka – “Haku” (to Pauopalaa) Pele – to her kaikaina and kaikunāne

Because Hiiaka mo‘olelo begin with the migration of the Pele ‘ohana from Kahiki or Hapakuela to Hawai‘i i ka wā kahiko, the first pilina we encounter are genealogical. When Pele begins her

journey to Hawai‘i, she leaves behind her makuahine³² and makuakāne³³ (Joseph Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*, January 10, 1908, 3). In some versions, this is because she is driven out of Kahiki by her kaikua‘ana Namakaokahai. In others, Pele is on a huaka‘i ‘imi kāne (a man-seeking journey) to find her beloved kāne snatched by her kaikaina, Pelekumukalani (Joseph Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*, January 10, 1908, 3). Depending on the mana, Pele, as the hānau mua or hiapo of her ‘ohana, is also its ali‘i, and travels with various kaikunāne and kaikaina who are subject to her leadership. The one kaikaina who travels to Hawai‘i in every mana of the mo‘olelo is the pōki‘i punahele, Hiiakaikapoliopole. Although anywhere from eight to forty other Hiiaka sisters appear in the different mana of Hiiaka, as the pōki‘i, Hiiakaikapoliopole is not only the youngest of the Pele ‘ohana, but also the punahele. While the other Hiiaka sisters travel on the wa‘a of their kaikunāne, Kamohoalii, to Hawai‘i, Hiiakaikapoliopole is carried in an egg form in the bosom of her ali‘i and kaikua‘ana, Pele. This particularly intimate pilina between Hiiaka and Pele accounts for the name Hiiakaikapoliopole (Hiiaka in the bosom of Pele).

I loko nei no oe o kuu poli i kou wa he wahi opuu wale no, a hookanaka no oe ilaila, a huli, a kolo, a hele a nui no oe i kuu poli nei. A oia no ke kumu i heaia ai kou inoa o Hiiakaikapoliopole. Ua noho kaikuaana a makuahine no hoi au nou. Nolaila, e ae ana anei oe e kii i ke kane a kaua i Kauai? (Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, July 3, 1906, 3)

Here we see that Hiiaka is not just the punahele of her kaikua‘ana Pele, but considered to be a child of Pele. Hooulumahiehie describes how Pele carried Hiiaka from her time as a seedling. Pele herself declares that her pilina as kaikua‘ana to her kaikaina resembles—or actually is—the

³² Kahinalii (Poepoe) in some versions and Haumea (Paaluhi and Bush) in others.

³³ Kanehoalani (Poepoe) Kuanailo (Bush and Paaluhi) Kamanuwai (Kapihenui).

aloha and pilina between mother and daughter. Having shared Pele’s bosom, and even “born” of Pele, Hiiaka’s pilina to her is more entwined than that of “just” siblings. Since Pele has no children spoken of in this mana, Hiiakaikapoliopole is the rightful inheritor of the ‘ohana lineage. When Pele’s time is passed, whether through death, improper leadership, or some other cause, Hiiaka will become the hānau mua of the family. Other readings suggest that because the two wahine have shared one body and therefore share mana with each other, Hiiakaikapoliopole is another embodiment of Pele herself. This nuanced pilina between Pele and Hiiaka is important because of the conflicts that emerge in the mo‘olelo regarding governance in the ‘ohana and lāhui.

Through the migration and movement of this ‘ohana, we learn not only about the shifting dynamics of genealogical pilina, but also about leadership, ‘ohana, and pono. The primary terms of pilina introduced for ‘ohana are kaikua‘ana, kaikaina, hoahānau, kaikunāne, kupuna, makua, mo‘opuna, pōki‘i, hānau mua, and punahele. All those who travel with Pele to Hawai‘i are described as being of the same hanauna (generation) as her—kaikaina, kaikūnane, hoahānau, pōki‘i, and so forth.³⁴ And here is an issue of translation. While all of her traveling companions are frequently labeled “siblings,” any of the terms listed above can expand out to embrace any ‘ohana of the same generation, regardless of how many times removed. Or as Mary Kawena Pukui explains in the first volume of *Nānā i ke Kumu*, “you may be 13th or 14th cousins, as we define relationships today, but in Hawaiian terms, if you are of the same generation, you are all brothers and sisters” (1972, 167). Furthermore, within a patriarchal society, the eldest brother—Kamohoalii or Lonomakua perhaps—would be the ali‘i of this ‘ohana. But as Pukui once more

³⁴ With the exception of the Poepoe mana in which Laka and Ehu also join Pele on her huaka‘i ‘imi kāne

notes, “Genealogy rather than age or sex determined *hānau mua* status” (1972, 127). We learn here that Pele’s *hānau mua* status indicates that she is the highest ranking of her *hoahānau*, and not simply the oldest. Recognition of her lofty genealogical roots makes her the *ali‘i* of her ‘ohana, and her siblings are her *maka‘āinana*.

Therefore, all of the Pele ‘ohana *kāne* and *wāhine* are subject to her leadership, and the *hoahānau* stay relatively balanced and stable in this regard—until Pele breaks a sacred *kauoha* between herself and her *pōki‘i*.

TABLE 2: KAUOHA

TERM	Definition	Source
KAU.OHA (NVT.)	Order, command, demand, testament, decree, precept, will, message, statement; to order, command, direct, send for, subscribe, dictate, assign, decree, entrust, bequest, commit into the hands of; to summon, to order, as groceries or goods. <i>Kauoha ‘ia</i> , entrusted, as to God’s power. <i>Ma ke kauoha</i> , legal notice. <i>‘Ōuli kauoha</i> , sign of the imperative. <i>He kauoha na ka ‘aha</i> , a judicial decree. <i>Ke‘ehia i ka ho‘ounauna</i> , <i>ke‘ehia i ke kauoha</i> (prayer), trample on the evil messenger, trample on the evil order. <i>Make kauoha ‘ole</i> , die intestate, without a will. <i>Keiki kāne lawe kauoha</i> , messenger boy.	Pukui and Elbert
Kau-o-ha (V.)	1. To give a dying charge; to make a bequest or a parting charge. <i>Isa.</i> 38:1. Hence, to make a will. NOTE.—Ancient wills, of course, were verbal; now, by law, they must be written. 2. To give a charge on any subject; to command; to put in charge or trust, as one dying or going away; <i>kauoha ae la oia</i> (o Kamehameha) <i>ia Kauikeaouli e noho i alii no Hawaii nei</i> , he (Kamehameha) <i>gave in charge</i> to Kauikeaouli to reign as king over the Hawaiian Islands. 3. To commit into the hands of another. <i>1 Pet.</i> 4:19. 4. To give orders concerning a person or thing. <i>Kin.</i> 12:20. 5. To commit to paper, i.e., to write down; <i>nolaila, ke kauoha aku nei au i ko‘u manao ma keia palapala, i ike oe i ko‘u manao</i> .	Andrews
Kau-o-ha (S.)	1. A will, verbal or written; a command; a charge; a dying request. 2. A covenant; a commission; a judicial decision.	Andrews

**KAUOHA
(N.)**

3. A determination; a decree.
4. Beggary.

1. A will, verbal or written; a command; a charge; a dying request. (A written will is now called palapalakauoha or palapalahooilina.)

2. A covenant; a commission; a judicial decision.

3. A determination; a decree.

**KAUOHA
(KĀ'U-Ō'-
HA)
(V.)**

1. To give a dying charge; to make a bequest or a parting charge; hence, to make a will. (Ancient wills, of course, were verbal.)

2. To give a charge on any subject; to command; to put in charge, as one dying or going away: kauoha ae la oia (o Kamehameha) ia Kauikeaouli e noho i alii no Hawaii nei; he (Kamehameha) gave in charge to Kauikeaouli to reign as king over the Hawaiian islands.

3. To commit into the hands of another.

4. To give orders concerning a person or thing.

5. To write down; nolaila, ke kauoha aku nei au i ko'u manao ma keia palapala, i ike oe i ko'u manao.

Parker

Parker

As with other Hawaiian ali'i, Pele's power, leadership, and kuleana to rule are protected as long as she leads and rules in ways that are pono. When Pele defies Hiiaka's kauoha to protect Hopoe, and sends her raging fires into Hopoe's ulu lehua at Keaau, Hiiaka's retaliation is therefore not only understood by her 'ohana, but justified and supported. As a result, when Pele sends her other Hiiaka sisters to kill Lohiau and their pōki'i haku, none of the sisters takes her command to heart. Hooulumahie expresses this conflict with the following passage: "A ia wa oia i huli ae ai a kena mai la i na kaikaina Hiiaka ona, e pii lakou e kuni i ke kane a ke kaikaina i ke ahi, Aohe Hiiaka i hoolohe iho i keia kauoha a ua Pele nei" (*Ka Na'i Aupuni*, August 20, 1906, 4). In this mana of the mo'olelo, Pele instructs the Hiiaka sisters to climb the crater and kill Hiiaka and their kāne, Lohiau. But we learn immediately that not one of these sisters took seriously the command of their kaikua'ana.

A hiki ua poe Hiiaka nei iluna i kahi a Hiiaka ma e ku ana, pane mai la o Hiiaka-i-ka-alei i ka pokii kaikaina.

Hemo ka piko la e ka hoahanau. Eia makou mamuli o ke kauoha a ke kaikuaana haku o kākou. A i pii mai la makou e hooko i kana kauoha. . . .

O ka huna o ke ahi ka makou e hoopa ae i ko kane, a o ka nui o ke ahi, ea, me makou no ia. He keu kau a ke kane ui. “Pali ka hoi ke kua; mahina ke alo – O ke ku no a ua kanaka ui” (*Ka Na’i Aupuni*, August 21, 1906, 4).

Instead, when the Hiiaka sisters reached their pōki’i (Hiiakaikapoliopole) and their kāne, they acknowledged that the umbilical cord is severed between them, and vowed not to send all their fire to Lohiau and their pōki’i.

All the Hiiaka sisters were raised to know Pele as their kaikua’ana, their haku (leader/guide), and their ali’i. All of the Hiiaka sisters know that to defy any ali’i is a crime punishable by death. However, rather than participate blindly in the injustice Pele has put in motion, first by killing Hopoe and second by deciding to kill Lohiau and Hiiakaikapoliopole, these kaikaina of hers—these maka’āinana, these commoners—resist her command. Though these kaikaina are ultimately not killed for their rebellion, it is important to note that they resist knowing that death is the likely consequence.

Much like the phrase “Mō ka piko la,”³⁵ the Hiiakas’ declaration “Hemo ka piko la” announces broken ties within this ‘ohana. It is this conflict, this severing of the family ties through the unjust acts of the kaikua’ana (Pele), that informs these kaikaina’s decision to disobey her commands. Without that piko, that umbilical cord or kaula shared between them as hoahānau, Pele is no longer a worthy ali’i or kaikua’ana. And as the piko is seen to be severed, so is their loyalty to her. This is what allows the Hiiaka sisters to spare Hiiakaikapoliopole, and

³⁵ “*Mō ka piko la* (“severed are the umbilical cords”) was a clear pronouncement that a family tie was broken” (Pukui, 1972, 185).

eventually leads to the entire ‘ohana, including Pele, making amends and restoring pono within their pilina.

Paaluhi and Bush emphasize this governance aspect of the ‘ohana pilina. In the first issue of their mana of Hiiakaikapoliopele, they explicitly refer to the Pele “Lahui” and their migration:

Ma ka moolelo maoli, ua oleloia he ohana nui o Pele a me kona mau kaikaina a me kona mau kaikunane. Ua pae ae lakou ma ka Mokupuni o Hawaii i ka wa kahiko, o Pele ke alii a pau o keia ohana a me na kanaka malalo ona, a ua hookahua iho ko lakou noho ana ma ke alo o Maunaloa. Ua kuee aku na kamaaina, aka, no ka ikaika o keia poe ua lanakila lakou ma mua o na kamaaina, a mamuli o ka ui o na wahine o keia lahui a me na kane, ua hooki pu iho la ke kue o na kamaaina i ka poe malihini. (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, January 5 1893, 1)

As I mentioned in chapter two, throughout this mana, the allusions to lāhui, governance, and ali‘i continue with reference to Pele and her ‘ohana. We learn from the passage above that Pele is the ali‘i of her ‘ohana and her siblings are therefore her maka‘āinana. In Bush and Paaluhi’s mana of Hiiaka, the Pele ‘ohana is not merely on a journey from Kahiki; rather, Pele and her lāhui kanaka are on a “huakai nai aina,” and because of that their migration to Hawai‘i was challenged by the kama‘āina at first, until Pele could prove herself a worthy ali‘i (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, January 6, 1893, 1).

Just days before the illegal overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i, Pele and her ‘ohana sailed through the pages of *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, displaying a different kind of governance and huluhia than the usurping threat of force about to be experienced in Hawai‘i. According to the authors, “Ua holo mai o Pele me kona mau kaikaina a me na kaikunane ma ka lakou huakai nai aina” (January 6, 1). (*Pele and her siblings traveled together on their journey to conquer new*

land). As the authors mentioned before, the kama‘āina’s resistance to this new ‘ohana was short lived, as Pele and her ‘ohana proved themselves to be worthy through their strength and beauty.³⁶

Because the Pele ‘ohana is a lāhui and a family, the rebellion of her sisters is much more significant. Pele’s kauoha that her younger sisters use her fires to kill Lohiau is not just a command of an elder sister, but the command of their chief. The Hiiaka sisters’ refusal to take this kauoha to heart demonstrates how these Hiiaka are attempting to restore balance within their lāhui. Ultimately, balance is restored, and the dynamics of leadership within the ‘ohana shift. While Pele is not removed as the head of her ‘ohana and lāhui, Hiiaka’s mana is recognized, and she can coexist with her kaikua‘ana.

We can consult the rules that govern the Pele ‘ohana as a lāhui when attempting to imagine alternative norms for governance in our current aupuni. What makes the Pele lāhui distinct from patriarchal forms of governance is not a lack of violence, or a lack of hierarchy, but its status as a system in which violence and hierarchies are checked when abused. Although the oldest and most powerful member, and the mō‘ī of her ‘ohana, Pele is not free from scrutiny and resistance. Pele’s right and ability to rule requires that her pilina to her subjects (‘ohana) must be cared for and maintained. When those pilina are defiled, severed, or taken for granted, Pele’s capacity to lead is weakened, making her vulnerable to attack or kahuli (overthrow).

That all but four of the known published mana of Hiiaka mo‘olelo were published during or after the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom should not be lost on the reader. It should not be surprising that our kūpuna would choose to author and publish, over and over, a mo‘olelo

³⁶ Throughout the mo‘olelo there is an obsession with categorizing kānaka as kanaka maika‘i versus kanaka ‘ino. Kānaka maika‘i are physically strong and beautiful in appearance; however, their beauty also comes with a particular ‘ano and virtue. Kānaka ‘ino are of little virtue, and their ugliness is derived from their vices and lack of morality.

that so intimately discusses the politics of ‘ohana, leadership, and governance. Neither should it be lost on us that our mo‘olelo stress the importance of pilina to leadership and governance. Because the new governing entity had no pilina, understood as reciprocal connection, aloha, and mutually-bound kuleana, with the governed, publishing mo‘olelo such as Hiiakaikapoliopole would have continually called attention to that absence.

The pilina next to be discussed extends the range of reference beyond the Kanaka Maoli ‘ohana. While ‘ohana refers to those descended from the same root—i.e., those who share a common genealogy—these pilina engage and intersect with the ‘ohana and society in many ways.

Kāne/Wahine

Hawaiian dictionaries are consistent in their translation of kāne and wahine. Pukui and Elbert, Andrews, and Parker all define kāne as both the male sex and man gender and wahine as the woman gender and female sex, importing into the word all the biases inherent to patriarchy and western gender and sex hierarchies. After defining kāne and wahine as sex and gender in a binary comes the predictable presentation of kāne and wahine as husband and wife. Like all translations, these definitions reduce to a mandated relationship what in actuality can be a far more fluid, shape shifting, and multibodied pilina than the conventional meaning of “marriage” could ever hold. This substitution introduces and reinforces heteropatriarchy within the intimacy between kāne and wahine by imposing a primary pillar of patriarchy and heterosexism.

Marriage.

When we turn to our mo‘olelo, we immediately how see how inadequate these translations and definitions are. Many figures are bound as kāne and wahine in the mo‘olelo of

Hiiakaikapoliopele. Some of these figures play significant roles in the overall arc of the mo‘olelo; some appear only in passing. Most notably, Lohiau is marked as a kāne to Pele, all the Hiiaka sisters, and Wahineomao at different points of the mo‘olelo. Hiiaka is also said to have Kauakahiapaoa, Kaanahau, and Makaukiu as kāne, and Pele is known to have Wahieloa and Ulumawao as kāne as well. These pilina do not conflict with or invalidate each other. Rather, figures in the mo‘olelo openly discuss how siblings and companions share the pleasure and kuleana that come with having a kāne. Perhaps the most famous example of this can be found in Pele’s address to her kaikaina after Pele’s spirit returns from Kauai:

E, auhea oukou e o‘u mau pokii? He wahi manao ko‘u imua o oukou. He kane ka kakou, aia la i ka moku kaili La o Kamawaelualani, i Kauai Nui moku lehua. O Haena ke Kalana aina; o na Hala o Naue i ke kai, ke awa pae; a o Lohiau ka ipo. O ke kane ka hoi ia, kii’na (Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, June 29, 1906, 3).³⁷

In this passage Pele introduces her kaikaina to their kāne (kane ka kakou) and requests that one of her sisters take up the task of fetching him for them. This episode and its assigning of Lohiau as a kāne to all the Hiiaka sisters is consistent across the archive I have studied. The main condition set in this particular kauoha (command) is that whoever retrieves Lohiau will abstain from physical intimacy until after Pele has him, then makes his body noa to them. Lohiau is also aware of this agreement. Before Pele’s spirit returns to her body in Kilauea (Hawai‘i), she tells Lohiau that she will send for him, and that he is to refrain from sexual intimacy with wāhine, until after Pele is able to noa his body.

. . . e hoi au a Hawaii, hana au i ka hale o kaua a maikai, alaila, kii mai ka luna ia oe, i kii

³⁷Parallel passage found in Poepe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*, June 5, 1908, 1.

mai auanei ka luna ia oe, a he luna kane, mai hele ae oe, aka, i kii mai ka luna a he luna wahine, o ka luna ka hoi ia, hele ae oe i Hawaii, elima po, elima ao, pa i kela kihi o Kilauea, i keia kihi o Kilauea, alaila, noa ko oiwi kapu ia'u, alaila, lilo aku oe na ka wahine e. (Kapihenui, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, December 26, 1861, 1)

When Pele is departing from Haena she tells her kāne that once she has returned to Kilauea, she will send a wahine to retrieve him, and that he is not to sleep with anyone until the two of them have slept together in Kilauea.

Pele offers a similar kauoha to her kaikaina: “Kipaku aku o Pele, o hele, aohe au aloha ana mai ia'u, o kii i ke kane a kaua a hiki ia nei, a noa ia'u, alaila, lilo ke kane nau, na ka wahine maikai” (Kapihenui, *Ka Hoku o Ka Pakipika*, January 2, 1862, 1). The agreement is clear to all parties. Lohiau is a kāne to Pele and all the Hiiaka sisters. All Hiiaka, the muli loa and her sisters, need to do is to wait until Pele first indulges in all the beauties of Haena, and then that privilege will be allowed to the Hiiaka sisters.

By understanding the conditions set for these pilina, we can see that it is not jealousy that throws Pele into a rage after Hiiaka seduces Lohiau at the edge of Kilauea, but that Hiiaka, *like Pele*, has broken a sacred kauoha to malama the kapu on his body until Pele can noa that kapu. It is also important to note that it is not Hiiaka's sleeping with Lohiau that makes them kāne and wahine, but Lohiau's and Hiiaka's pilina to Pele that initially connects them as kāne and wahine. And for the same reason, once Wahineomao joins her companion Hiiaka on their huaka'i ki'i kāne, she too becomes a wahine of Lohiau's and Lohiau a kāne of hers.

While the kuleana of and to the kāne is clarified through the intentional use of collective pronouns such as kākou, mākou, or the even more selective kāua, subtle differences exist between the shared pilina of Hiiaka, Pele, and Lohiau, and the pilina of Wahineomao and

Lohiau. In the first pilina, Pele and Hiiaka both ho‘āo Lohiau. The Hawaiian language dictionaries all agree that ho‘āo refers to a marriage, with Parker saying that ho‘āo is “The ancient Hawaiian marriage custom.” This translation poses a few obvious problems, both for our reading of Hiiaka, and for the greater project of “reading” and interpreting Kanaka Maoli “traditions.” The first difficulty is that there was no marriage in Hawai‘i until after the arrival of missionaries in 1820, and only in the later 1820s did ali‘i begin to forsake the embrace of multiple intimate partners. In fact, scholars such as Jonathan Osorio have discussed the ways mid-nineteenth century laws created the conditions and practice of marriage and monogamy to spread (2002, 24-43). However, Pele and Hiiaka are figures in a mo‘olelo told about kānaka who lived in ka wā kahiko, and therefore were not affected by later encroachments of the virtue of monogamy and marriage. Even by Christian Hawaiian readers, Hiiaka and Pele could not be expected to practice these recently introduced religious traditions.

Much like the restriction of kāne and wahine to the institution of marriage, kaiko‘eke is translated by Pukui and Elbert, Andrews, and Parker as “Brother-in-law” Pukui adds a more gendered dynamic to this pilina, describing it as a term referring to “Brother-in-law or male cousin-in-law of a male; [or a] sister-in-law or female cousin-in-law of a female” (Pukui and Elbert 1986, 116).³⁸ In the mo‘olelo of Hiiaka, kaiko‘eke describes the pilina between Hiiaka and

38

TABLE 3: KAIKO‘EKE

TERM	Definition	Source
KAIKO‘EKE (N.)	n. Brother-in-law or male cousin-in-law of a male; sister-in-law or female cousin-in-law of a female. Cf. ko‘eke . Kona kaiko‘eke, his kaiko‘eke. (PPN ta‘okete.)	Pukui & Elbert
Kai-ko-e-ke (S.)	s. A brother-in-law; a sister-in-law; generally designated by <i>kane</i> or <i>wahine</i> .	Andrews
KAIKOEKE (KĀ‘I-KŌ‘-Ē‘-KE) (N.)	A brother-in-law; a sister-in-law; generally further designated by the word, kane or wahine.	Parker

Kahuanui (Lohiau's kaikuahine),³⁹ Lohiau and Nakoaoala (Kahuanui's kāne),⁴⁰ and Lohiau and Nonomakua (Pele and Hiiaka's kaikunāne).⁴¹

The term emphasizes a particular nae in the 'upena of pilina in 'ohana. Perhaps because Hiiaka, as a wahine, does not have kaikuahine, but rather has kaika'ana and kaikaina, and therefore it would be inappropriate to refer to Kahuanui as "kela kaikuahine a kāua," kaiko'eke is a term used to show how they are all bound together through the pilina of Lohiau and Hiiaka. Poepoe and Hooulumahiehie choose the term kaiko'eke to emphasize the specific bond between these two wāhine, a bond with no relationship to marriage. And here arises another instance where translating pilina into acceptable Christian relations and identities exposes the working relationship between translation and settler colonialism. Transforming these pilina and ancient traditions into tools for affirming Christianity and "settler sexualities" is part of the process of entrenching western traditions within our own (Morgensen 2011). To write settler sexuality, patriarchy, and the nuclear family into our mo'olelo is to obscure, or even unravel, the complex 'upena of relations that actually organized our society, thereby furthering the ongoing agenda of settler colonialism by erasing alternatives to the 21st century household and civilization.

Therefore, rather than reduce these pilina to the results of marriage, let us explore what we do know about these kāne and wahine referred to as kaiko'eke. We know that Pele takes on many kāne in this and other mo'olelo. We know that Hiiaka does the same, while also taking on multiple aikāne of her own. We know that Lohiau is kāne to these two (and other) sisters, and to Wahineomao, and also an aikāne to Kauakahiapaoa. We know as well that these pilina intersect

³⁹ In Poepoe, Hooulumahiehie, and Kapihenui

⁴⁰ In Kapihenui

⁴¹ In Kapihenui

and connect without creating conflict or trauma unless kapu or kauoha are broken. Finally, we ultimately must recognize that none of this looks anything like the relations created and valued by the western institution of marriage.

Aikāne

		TABLE 4: AIKĀNE
TERM	Definition	Source
AI.KĀNE (NVS)	nvs. Friend; friendly; to become a friend. See <u>hale aikāne</u> . Kāna aikāne, his friend. Moe aikāne, to commit Sodomy (<i>rare</i>). ho. ‘ai.kāne To be a friend, make friends, befriend.	Pukui & Elbert
Ai-ka-ne (V.)	v. <i>Ai</i> , No. 8, and <i>kane</i> , male. 1. To cohabit, as male with male, or female with female. 2. To commit sodomy; hence	Andrews
Ai-ka-ne (N.)	s. An intimate friend of the same sex; a friend or companion of the same sex. 2. Those who mutually give and receive presents, being of the same sex. 3. Sodomy; dissoluteness of habit.	Andrews
AIKANE (Ā'I-KĀ'- NĒ) (N.)	1. A sodomite. (Obsolete.) 2. An intimate and trustworthy companion; a friend.	Parker
AIKANE (ĀI-KĀ'- NĒ) (V.)	1. To commit sodomy. (Obsolete.) 2. To exercise a kindly feeling or good will toward another; to act the part of a friend; to become a friend.	Parker

Although using the term aikāne and maintaining its practice have declined drastically in the modern era, historically, both were widespread. “Aikāne” appears well over 1,000 times within the mana of Hiiaka published by Poepoe, Hooulumahiehie (in the Awaiaulu edition), Kapihenui, and Paaluhi and Bush. Within Hiiaka mo‘olelo, aikāne describes pilina between wāhine, such as Hiiaka, Wahineomao, Hopoe, Kahuanui, and Pauopalaa, and between kāne, such as Lohiau and Kauakahiapaoa. Less frequently, aikāne can refer to the pilina between kāne and

wahine, and sometimes it seems to be equivalent to ipo.⁴² Cursory research shows that aikāne also describes pilina of such ali‘i as Kaahumanu, Keelikolani, Kiwalao, Kamehameha, Kahekili, Kauikeaouli, Keoua, and Liholiho with others—which directly contradicts Pukui and Handy’s statement that such relationships would have been “looked upon with contempt by commoners and by the true ali‘i” (Pukui, 1978, 73).

If the identification of aikāne pilina in the mo‘olelo of Hiiaka between beloved ali‘i and akua wasn’t enough to confirm that these pilina were respected within Kanaka Maoli society, one need only consider the aloha these late 19th and early 20th century authors wrote into the accounts of aikāne pilina. Almost entirely omitted or translated out of our English language archive of mo‘olelo, within the ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i archive, the aloha immediately appears. Of all the pilina Hiiaka shared with others as a wahine, pōki‘i, kaikaina, and even haku, none seems so valued, and even transformative, as the pilina with her aikāne, Hopoe. This pilina quite literally transforms each of these wahine, their ‘āina, their pilina with others, and the direction and results of the entire mo‘olelo. The aloha between Hiiaka and Hopoe ultimately turns the kaikaina against her own kaikua‘ana (and ali‘i) in some versions, even leads Hiiaka to attempt to kill Pele by destroying the crater at Kilauea. Although we will examine other aikāne pilina in this archive, because of its intensity, we will begin with Hiiaka and Hopoe.

The pilina of Hiiakaikapoliopole offer answers to many questions about such relations’ many pleasures and responsibilities. How for instance is the pilina between sisters different from that between kāne and wahine, aikāne and other hoapili? How do different pilina intersect, compound, and complicate each other? What does the pilina of Hiiaka and Hopoe teach us about the nature of aloha? A one moment in the mo‘olelo, Hiiaka discovers that the origin of

⁴² Bishop Museum Archives, Kealanahele, Mekela, Interviewee HAW 55.3.1 (Track 6)

Nanahuki's name was her love of gathering lehua at Hopoe. Upon learning this, Hiiaka makes one of the grandest gestures of aloha I have ever encountered. Hiiaka proclaims that Nanahuki will now forever be known as Hopoe – that she and the lehua grove at Hopoe will be one and the same (Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*, July 31, 1908, 1). At this moment, Hopoe herself becomes the lehua that Hiiaka carries with her and draws inspiration from throughout her journey and life.

This part of the mo'olelo is often overlooked, but it reminds us that aloha is an active verb, is tactile. Aloha plants seeds, grows, and transforms the 'āina around us. Aloha is distinct because it cannot be commodified, and therefore bought or sold. It creates—aloha is always creating. Pele uses lava. Her aloha is both rage and rapture; destruction and creation. For Hiiaka, aloha can be reforestation. What I have learned from this mo'olelo is if it does not transform us, it is not aloha. Further, if it is not marked on the 'āina, it is not aloha, or at least, it is not the aloha our kūpuna were raised with, cultivated, and, carefully passed down in our mo'olelo to us.

To better hold and celebrate the aloha and pilina that overflows between aikāne, I have come to this mo'olelo seeking Hiiaka and Hopoe in the forest of Keaau. What I've discovered are six major episodes/themes in their saga of aloha: Launa, Kauoha, Hāli'ali'a, Make, Na'au'auā and Mākaia. Launa are those mahele that depict the first encounters and meetings between Hiiaka and Hopoe. Here we learn most about how aikāne relationships are negotiated; here we learn most about what it means to “ho'āikāne.” If pilina is an 'upena of intimacy, paying attention to launa helps us to understand how the 'aha of aikāne is brought together and tied.

Kauoha are those scenes that depict Hiiaka's appeal to Pele to protect Hopoe. Because these kauoha happen as an exchange between the two sisters, they show how kāne/wahine relationships can intersect with aikāne relationships. Hāli'ali'a are the many moments when Hiiaka looks back fondly on her time with Hopoe as she continues on her journey to fetch her

sister’s lover. In both kauoha and hāli‘ali‘a, we learn about the incredible commitment possible between two aikāne at the same time as we explore some of the great emotional and physical intimacies and pleasures shared between aikāne.

The final three themes are deeply entwined. A major episode is the death (make) of Hopoe, which results in two distinct responses: Na‘au‘auā and Mākaia. All three speak to the intimacy shared between Hiiaka and Hopoe by representing Hiiaka’s grief at the death of her aikāne, which informs us about the boundless loyalty found in aikāne pilina. Although not every aikāne pilina in the mo‘olelo has as many distinct components as Hiiaka’s and Hopoe’s, they all display an intense emotional and physical intimacy, a great reciprocal commitment, and that boundless loyalty. Through these qualities, we witness the aloha between aikāne.

To analyze aikāne pilina, we must start at their beginning. How do aikāne become aikāne? What does it mean to ho‘āikāne?

TABLE 5: HO‘ĀIKĀNE

TERM	Definition	Source
Ho-ai-ka-ne (V.)	<i>v.</i> Ho for hoo, ai and kane. See AIKANE. 1. To commit the sin against nature; to commit sodomy; applied to either sex. 2. To be an intimate friend of the same sex, i. e., to give and receive favors from one of the same sex. <i>Laieik.</i> 81. 3. To act the part of an aikane or intimate friend. 4. To make friends, as two persons about to fight. <i>Laieik.</i> 47.	Andrews
Ho-ai-ka-ne (S.)	<i>s.</i> A friend on terms of reciprocity. 2. The house where such friends reside or meet.	Andrews
HOAIKANE (HO’-A’I-KĀ-NE) (V.)	[Ho for hoo, ai and kane.] See aikane. 1. To commit sodomy. 2. To be an intimate friend of the same sex. 3. To be an intimate friend. 4. To make friends with a person of whom one is afraid. (<i>Laieik.</i> p. 47.) 5. To make friends.	Parker

While Pukui and Elbert do not explicitly, both Andrews and Parker define ho‘āikāne as the act of committing “sodomy.” To enter into an aikāne pilina is to “sin against nature.” This is definitely not what Hiiaka recalls when Wahineomao asks her how she and Hopoe became aikāne. Instead, Hiiaka offers a touching mo‘olelo about her first encounter with Hopoe, and their acts of ho‘āikāne:

“Ia wa ninau aku la au i ua kaikamahine nei i kona inoa. Alaila hoike mai la oia ia‘u i kona inoa ma ka olelo ana mai: “O ko‘u inoa maa mau, a o ia nohoi ko‘u inoa i kaheaia ai au e ko‘u mau makua mai ko‘u mau la opipio mai a nui wale au, e like me kau i ike mai la ia‘u i keia wa, o Nanahuki no ia. O ko‘u inoa keia i kamaaina i na kanaka apau; aka, ua kahea no nae hoi kekahi poe ia‘u, a he kakaikahi wale no nae ia poe, o Hopoe ko‘u inoa, mamuli o ko‘u pii mau i ka ako lehua i kela ulu lehua e ulu mai la. O ka inoa o kela ulu-lehua, o ia no o Hopoe. Ia wa olelo aku la au iaia i ka i ana aku: E lawe ai ia oe i aikane oe na‘u, a e mau loa aku hoi kou inoa o Hopoe. Ua ae mai la nohoi kela i ka‘u nonoi ana aku iaia i aikane oia na‘u; a lawe nohoi oia i ka inoa a‘u i olelo aku ai iaia, o kona inoa ia. Pela iho la ke ano o ko maua hoaikane ana, a lilo ai kona hale i hale kipa no‘u. . . .” (Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*, July 31, 1908, 1)

Hiiaka describes the two exchanging names at their first meeting. Hopoe tells Hiiaka that her given name is Nanahuki but some (very few) people call her Hopoe because she is known for ascending to the grove called Hopoe to pick lehua. Hiiaka’s responds by asking Hopoe if she can take her as an aikāne. To formalize this pilina, Hiiaka says that Nanahuki will now forever be known as Hopoe. Through this act of simultaneously confirming her name, her connection to the lehua grove, and her pilina to Hiiaka, the two become aikāne. Or as Hiiaka says, “this was the manner in which we ho‘āikāne(d) and her home became an open home to me.”

Three important lessons can be drawn from this excerpt. First, that the act of ho‘aikāne is one to be celebrated. Hiiaka shares this mo‘olelo about her aikāne with aloha, not shame. Second, to ho‘aikāne is to act with nature, rather than against it. Hiiaka and Hopoe’s relationship is mediated through ‘āina. Hiiaka is the one who places lehua groves to flourish after Pele’s lava flow, and Hopoe becomes forever known as that lehua when Hiiaka insists that Hopoe become her true name. Third, aikāne are intimate enough to change their inoa—a significant fact, given the importance of naming. That Hiiaka replaces the name Nanahuki shows that she is deeply connected to Hopoe almost immediately.

These practices of launa and ho‘aikāne continue in other aikāne pilina as well. For Hiiaka and Wahineomao, the sharing of names is also a ceremonial part of the process of becoming aikāne.

. . . a nolaila, e ninau aku ana au ia oe,--Owai kou inoa? E hai mai oe i’au i kou inoa, no ka mea, ua makemake au i aikane oe na’u. . . .

[“]No ko’u inoa ea, e hai aku no hoi au ia oe, oiai ua hoaikane ae la kua, o Hiiaka au i ka-poli-o-Pele; a o ko ia nei inoa, o Pa-uopalaa.[”] (Hooulumahie, *Ka Na’i Aupuni*, July 12, 1906, 3)

The passage above describes the scene of these two wāhine shortly after departing Kilauea. Hiiaka comes across Wahineomao, and helps her to complete her offering to Pele. When Wahineomao rejoins Hiiaka and Pauopalaa on their huaka‘i ki‘i kāne, Wahineomao requests that Hiiaka offer up her name for the two wāhine to become aikāne. Hiiaka agrees to share her name specifically because they have decided to ho‘aikāne. And echoing the theme that began with Hiiaka and Hopoe, later in the mo‘olelo, when Hiiaka mā pass through Hilo, Wahineomao’s home also becomes a hale kipa for Hiiaka.

In the launa and hāli‘ali‘a episodes we also learn about how aikāne share pleasure. For Hiiaka and Hopoe, it is through hula and surfing. After they have become aikāne, Hopoe teaches Hiiaka how to dance hula. After mastering their hula le‘a, they take the dance to the sea:

Ia laua nei i hee mai ai i ka nalu, ua ku ae la o Hiiaka maluna o kona papa, a kani ae la ke oli ma kona waha, oiai nohoi e oni haaheo ana kona kino me ka nani. A na ia nei hoi ka haa iluna o kona papa, oia nohoi ka wa i lewa ae ai ka hope oni o Hopoe i ke kai. O Hiiaka kai luna; a o Hopoe kai lalo, a kaulana ae la na oni ame na lewa elua o Puna, oia hoi ka lewa luna ame ka lewa lalo, hui iho me ke ala o ka polo hinano, aohe mea maikai a koe aku. (Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*, June 12, 1908, 1)

Poepoe’s wording in this episode of the mo‘olelo is devoted to sexual and playful kaona. The two young wāhine who have just become acquainted seek pleasure from each other in the ocean. Surfing (he‘enalu) here provides the language for sex, as they dance out their pleasure on and with each other. The description, like the sex, ranges from playful and tantalizing to specific forms of play between new lovers suggested in the phrase, “hui iho me ke ala o ka polo hinano,” which will appear many times over in the Hiiaka mo‘olelo to describe the physical intimacy shared between aikāne; for instance, in this passage involving many aikāne:

Ia po nohoi a ao, honi ana o Lohiau-ipo a me Kauakahiapaoa i ke ala o ka hinano o ko laua aina; a no ka polo hinano ke ala i honiia, mau ana na ihu o ua mau alii nei i na ihu o na wahine a laua, oia o Hiiaka ame Wahineomao. (Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, November 30, 1906, 4)

Here Hooulumahiehie describes the kāne inhaling the ala polo hinano together, which might lead the reader to assume that these kāne are simply being intimate with their wāhine. From the Hawaiian, however, it is clear that Lohiau and Kauakahiapaoa are inhaling the ala polo hinano

together, as Hiiaka and Hopoe had done earlier. Only after these aikāne kāne share in the hīnano of their ‘āina do they press their noses (honi) to their wāhine. It is also important to note that the kāne do all of this together as aikāne. Sharing pleasure with each other and with others is common for Lohiau and Kauakahiapaoa; in fact, so significant is this sharing for these aikāne that Kauakahiapaoa laments in moments of pleasure that his aikāne cannot join him. Towards the end of the Hooulumahiehe mana of Hiiakaikapoliopole, Kauakahiapaoa and Pele come together—first in battle, and then in pleasure. After spending several days and nights indulging in the “nani o Puna” (the pleasures and beauties of Puna), he tells her, “‘Hu mai la ka hoi ko’u aloha i kuu aikane, ka mea nana i o-u mua ka maka o ka wauke i ke kaha o Haena?’” (Love is welling up inside of me for my aikāne, the one who was the first to nip the bud of Wauke in Haena). Here we see that ‘āina (Haena) participates significantly in the pleasure between Kauakahiapaoa and his aikāne, and that the power of their aloha and pleasure is recalled in moments of shared pleasure with others. When Pele asks Kauakahiapaoa why his thoughts are turned to his aikāne, he replies,

I kuu hoonuu hookahi nohoi paha i ka puni a maua. Nana ka ono e loaa, e kaana pu ana no maua, ina hoi na’u ka ono e loaa, ke hoonuu like ole no maua.

Pela ko maua ano o ka noho ana, a na kona kaawale ana mai ia nei, i ke kiiia ana ae hoi e hele mai i Hawaii nei, no ka hoao ana me oe. Eia ka o kona hele mai no ia a waiho na iwi i ka aina o ka maku koe. O kona hele aina loa aku la no paha ia la?

(Hooulumahiehe, *Ka Na’i Aupuni*, October 25, 1906, 4)

Kauakahiapaoa is distraught that he has indulged in some of his aikāne’s (Lohiau’s) favorite pleasures without him. In the past, should pleasure be offered to one, it would be shared by both. It is therefore not guilt, but sadness and grief that triggers Kauakahiapaoa’s lamentation about

indulging in pleasure without his aikāne. Here with Pele, he realizes for the first time that he may never again share all the delicacies and pleasures life has to offer with his beloved aikāne. This grief turns a moment of great intimacy and pleasure into one of mourning. The aloha between Lohiau and Kauakahiapaoa would never allow either of them to forget the many ways they have come together to ai as aikāne.

Or the many places, as can be seen in the aloha and pilina between Hiiaka and Hopoe. On the long journey back from Kauai, Hiiaka stops on Oahu and looks ahead toward Hawai‘i island in remembrance of her beloved aikāne. When she does this,

hu ae-la ke aloha iloko ona no ia aikane ana, no Hopoe.

Ala mai la na hoomanao ana iloko ona no ke kaha one o Aalamauu a laua e holoholo ai, a o ke kai hulei-lua no hoi a laua e auau ai.

Kau mai la kona mau maka i na opihi kau pali a laua e pakuikui ai i wahi kamau no ka la pololi; a hoomanao pu ae la oia i ka wai koo-lihilihi a laua e inu ai. (Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*, September 23, 1910, 4)⁴³

Hiiaka recalls with aloha her affection for her aikāne Hōpoe, as well as the seas where they swam together, and the cliffs they clung to while gathering ‘ōpihi.

When read ma ka ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, the reader knows for certain that no desires were left unmet or spared, and that place is part of the pleasure. Hiiaka and Hopoe are sharing their desires and bodies together in acts of pleasure with nature, just as Lohiau and Kauakahiapaoa share their kino and ‘āina. When Kauakahiapaoa remembers his most intimate moments with his aikāne, Haena comes to the forefront of his mind. When he shares pleasure with Pele, all of Puna is revealed to him. And when Hiiaka reminisces about her moe kino ‘ana with Hopoe, she of course

⁴³ A parallel passage is found in Hooulumahiehe, *Ka Na'i Aupuni*, April 28, 1906, 4.

recalls Aalamauu and the kai at Haena (Hawai‘i). ‘Āina in all these cases is not deployed simply as metaphor to mask pleasure and le‘a from the reader, nor is it setting or backdrop. Pleasure and le‘a come from the ‘āina; it is our pilina to it that we share between us, that makes pleasure possible. This is true for the many different pilina in our mo‘olelo, and will be discussed further in Chapter Four.

When Hiiaka and Hopoe bid farewell, they both feel and understand the weight of this separation. Hiiaka has been called to return mauka, so that her sister Pele can urge Hiiakaikapoliopole to take on her huaka‘i ki‘i kāne. As Hiiaka is about to depart, she tightly grasps her pā‘ū in one hand and turns to Hopoe to honi her on the nose. As they embrace, both are moved to tears. Hiiaka then turns away, to return to Kilauea.⁴⁴ Neither wahine knows that this will be the last time they will share a honi between their human bodies. Neither wāhine knows what will come of Hopoe, her lehua grove, and her hale ho‘okipa. The aikāne only know that the aloha shared between them is grand, and painful to leave.

Through the launa ‘ana of Hiiaka and Hopoe and Hiiaka’s hāli‘ali‘a ‘ana for Hopoe, we learn that these aikāne share names, homes, ai, ‘ai, honi, hula, waves, and waimaka. We see that aikāne are invited in to the most intimate shared spaces, and their hunger is immediately satisfied. We also see the pain of pulling two aikāne away from each other. We learn that intimacy shared between aikāne is an act shared with ‘āina—an act that cannot be properly described or practiced without ‘āina. When Kauakahiapaoa laments the loss of his aikāne

⁴⁴ Kakua ae la keia i kona wahi pa-u a pae i ka hope “oni o Mauna Loa kikala upehupehu,” huli ae la a honi i ka ihu o ke aikane, me ka helelei pu ana iho o kona mau waimaka, a pela nohoi me Hopoe iloko oia haawina like. Me na huaolelo panai aloha hope loa mawaena o Hii ame kana aikane, huli ae la keia a hoi aku la me ke kaikunane no ka home lua o Kilauea. Ua olelo ia no nae ma keia moololo, pupuu no a hoolei loa noho ana laua i ka lua (Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula* 6/12/1908, 1).

Lohiau, he also laments the distance of their home, Hā'ena. The two, pilina with 'āina and pilina to others, are deeply intertwined. Hiiaka, Hopoe, and Wahineomao dance in the face of Andrews' definition of ho'āikāne. They make love that plants lehua, and they share pleasures that tease breaking waves out of a calm bay. To ho'āikāne in our mo'olelo is to enact all the possibilities of pleasure between two bodies, or more, learned from how 'āina grounds that pleasure to be shared and treasured between us.

Aikāne: Kauoha, Protection, and Commitment

Like the other pilina in this mo'olelo, aikāne is not just bound by pleasure, but by kuleana as well. Aikāne are deeply loyal and committed, even when that comes at the greatest price. To begin to understand these kuleana between aikāne, let us turn to the kauoha between the sisters Hiiaka and Pele, which display those aspects of intimacy that require us to protect the ones we love. What does kauoha, in this case the command or demand from one sister to another about a loved one, reveal about the intricate and complicated 'upena of relations between these intimates? Through the Hiiakaikapoliopole epic, kauoha offer us insight into how the Pele 'ohana is governed. In most cases, Pele issues a kauoha to a sister, a brother, or even to her lover, Lohiau. The kauoha mutually exchanged between Pele and her youngest sister Hiiakaikapoliopole, however, touch more people, because they are shaped not only by the pilina between these wāhine, but also by the pilina with their lovers they are protecting.

When Hiiaka returns from Keaau, Pele urges her to travel to Kauai to retrieve Lohiau, and do so without breaking the kapu on his body. After Hiiaka does this, and after Pele lifts the kapu, then he will become a kāne to all the Hiiaka sisters, a "kāne a kākou." Hiiaka's response is relatively consistent across the mana: "E malama pono loa oe i ka'u mea aloha he aikane oia o

Hopoe a hoi hoi au.” You must take proper care of my beloved, she is an aikāne to me, Hopoe, until I return. (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o Ka Lahui*, Jan. 17, 1893, 1).

While Hiiakaikapoliopole’s elder Hiiaka sisters refused Pele’s request to fetch Lohiau because they fear the journey, the pōki‘i is only concerned for the wellbeing of her aikāne. Hiiaka’s command also reflects a shared kuleana between the pilina of Hiiaka and Hopoe and that of Pele and Lohiau. In fact, Hiiaka equates them: “‘O Lohiau kau ipo aloha, a eia au ke kii nei i kau aloha a loa i ka loa. O Hopoe hoi ka’u aloha, e malama oe (Pele) iaia”⁴⁵ (Hooulumahie, *Ka Na’i Aupuni*, July 9, 1906, 3).

In Poepoe’s mana of Hiiakaikapoliopole, Hiiaka offers this kauoha to her Hiiaka kaikua‘ana as well, reminding them that she is taking on this journey at great risk to herself: “Eia au ke hele nei i ka *makaia* a ka haku kaikuaana o kakou”⁴⁶ In return, she delivers the kauoha that they should not disrupt Hopoe and her ulu lehua, and should resist plucking or gathering from Hopoe’s ulu lehua: “aohe o’u makemake e ako oukou i na lehua o kana ululehua. E kapu ia mau lehua nana.”⁴⁷ Hiiaka reminds her kaikua‘ana of the abundance of lehua to be found elsewhere in Hawai‘i, and that out of respect for her taking on this huaka‘i for them, they should heed her kauoha (Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*, June 26, 1908, 1).

These passages not only show Hiiaka’s mana as a pōki‘i and punahele of Pele, and therefore someone worthy of issuing a kauoha of her own, but also that aikāne pilina were respected, rather than being queered, as in our society. It is telling as well that no significant kauoha are issued in Hiiaka mo‘olelo outside of the pilina between Hiiaka and Pele, largely

⁴⁵ Lohiau is your beloved, and here I am headed to fetch your love. Hopoe is my beloved, you must care for her.

⁴⁶ Here I am going on the treacherous journey for our elder sister.

⁴⁷ You shall not trouble or pluck her lehua grove. That lehua is kapu to her.

because no one else has the mana to kauoha Pele to do much of anything, which also fits within the governing structures, or pilina, of the Pele Lāhui.

Commitment & Loyalty

Only after Hiiaka departs from Kilauea do we begin to learn about what kuleana comes with this particular aikāne pilina. It plays out on the journey, largely between Hiiaka and her “hoa puku’i i ka ua ame ke koekoe,”⁴⁸ Wahineomao. During this huaka‘i, Wahineomao is Hiiaka’s “aikane i ke alo,”⁴⁹ who will endure with her all the trials and obstacles that come their way (Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*, Sept. 23, 1910, 4). Through this endurance, we learn about the nature of this particular pilina. In contemporary terms, Wahineomao is quite literally a “ride or die” companion. While a handful of characters join and then depart from Hiiaka and her huaka‘i,⁵⁰ only her “aikane i ke alo,” Wahineomao, remains with her until the end. Within the entire Hiiaka moololo, only twice does Wahineomao gesture toward departing from her aikāne. When Hiiaka mā are in Kailua, Oahu, on their way to Kauai to fetch Lohiau, Hiiaka offers up a chant to Kaanahau, her kāne whom she has just slept with. Because of this, Wahineomao becomes quite agitated, and she confronts Hiiaka:

“He keu no hoi oe, e aikane! He hana hoohaehae maoli no paha keia au ia’u, e noke mai nei i ke olioli i ko kane. Mea ae no oe o kuu kane, mea iho no o kuu kane. O kahi aku la nohoi paha ia o ke kane, i noho ia aku la nohoi paha e oe. Ka! Heaha hoi kou ano, e aikane. Ina penei mau oe, e ke aikane, e hana ai, ea, e aho ko kua kaawale. O ko’u alahele no keia imi ae au i ko’u wahi e pono ai. I lawe mai nei ka oe ia’u a nei aina

⁴⁸ My companion who joined and endured with me in the cold and rain.

⁴⁹ My aikāne in the flesh

⁵⁰ Papanuiolaka, Pauopalaa (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, 1893)

malihini, loa a kau kane, a haalele mai oe ia'u. Ehia ka hoi mea aloha, o nei mau iwi. E waiho paha auanei o'u mau iwi i ke kula o Kaea, e like me ka olelo a kahiko?"

(Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na'i Aupuni*, January 20, 1906, 4)

Wahineomao lashes out at her aikāne for going on and on about her new kāne (Kaanahau). A cursory or Western reading might suggest that Wahineomao does this out of jealousy; however, when we read closely we see that Wahineomao takes issue with Hiiaka's description of Kaanahau as "Kuu kane" (my kāne). Wahineomao's gesture to leave arises from a fear of being left behind, a fear that Hiiaka will not honor the intimate pilina between them. By becoming Hiiaka's aikāne, Wahineomao has pledged to go where Hiiaka goes. Wherever they both shall die, Wahineomao's bones will rest beside those of her beloved. In this passage, however, she fears her bones will be left behind to dry alone, due to the loss of pono and reciprocity in their pilina. Luckily, Hiiaka quickly remedies the situation, putting her aikāne at ease by reassuring her that she has misunderstood:

"Ia'u i paeaea ae nei i kuu kau i hana ae nei no Ulamawao, a hiki i ka pau ana, ia wa i ano e ae nei kuu mau maka, a ua kuhi au ua ike ae nei oe ia ano e ana ae nei o'u. O ko'u ike aku nei no ia i ke kaikuaana haku o kaua, ua hele nohoi a kahu ka ena i na onohi maka. Hoomaopopo iho la au, ua huhu ke kaikuaana o kakou ia'u no kuu hili ana me ke kanaka nana ka ai a kakou i ai mai nei. A oia ke kumu o'u i kau ae nei i kela kau au i manao mai nei ia'u, e ke aikane, he kani-aa aloha maoli i ke kane a kaua. Na kaua nohoi paha ia kane, ua loa hoi ia'u." (Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na'i Aupuni*, January 20, 1906, 4)

Hiiaka explains that she offered the chant because she feared Pele was angry with her for straying from her explicit task to fetch Lohiau. Most importantly, she assures Wahineomao that Kaanahau is a kāne to them both, "Na kaua nohoi paha ia kane." Wahineomao is immediately

satisfied with this explanation, and the two continue along their journey together, never to speak of this moment again.

The simplicity of this solution may seem strange to us. Hiiaka has just slept with a beautiful man, yet her aikāne is quickly and easily reassured. This is possible because in aikāne pilina there is no expectation that commitment and loyalty require monogamy. It is not Hiiaka's aloha for Kaanahau that hurts, angers, and scares Wahineomao, but the possibility that Hiiaka might forsake Wahineomao, and cut the cords between them. When this fear is addressed, and Hiiaka assures Wahineomao that Kaanahau is a kāne to them both—another nae in their 'upena of pilina—pono is restored in their aikāne pilina, and they can continue their journey together.

The second and final time that Wahineomao considers departing from her aikāne comes from a fear that she may be contributing to Hiiaka's troubles. The reciprocal nature of their pilina will not allow Hiiaka to dismiss her aikāne, even if to do so would ease her journey. But when Wahineomao suggests that her presence is a heavy burden, Hiiaka speaks of the trauma that would occur should their cord be unraveled: “‘o kou pili ana mai ia'u, he mama ia no'u. O kou kaawale mai a'u aku, he kaumaha ia no'u. Aia kou pilikia a pilikia au. Nolaila, mai haalele mai oe ia'u” (Hooulumahie, *Ka Na'i Aupuni*, February 23, 1906, 4). Your pilina to me lightens my load; to be separated from you would be a heavy burden for me. Should you be troubled, so am I. Therefore, do not leave me. Their ability to overcome burdens together, to struggle forward on their huaka'i through many different 'āina, only strengthens their pilina as aikāne. This is why Wahineomao can confidently say, “‘He mau iwi io no keia ua pili mahope ou,”” these bones of mine are indeed bound to you (Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*, July 24, 1908, 1). The two know for certain that where one shall go, the other will follow. This is the darker side of pilina. Deep and

intimate pleasure are often shared, but heavy kuleana and arduous undertakings can be required as well.

Na‘au‘auā

The last three stages in the Hiiaka and Hopoe saga all lie on this darker side: Make (death), Mākaia,⁵¹ and Na‘au‘auā.⁵² Because the fates of Lohiau and Hopoe are similar, and because all the pilina in this mo‘olelo are interlocked within the ‘upena of intimacies, these stages are also reflected in the pilina between Lohiau and Kauakahiapaoa, and between Wahineomao and Hiiaka. The death of a loved one links these three cases of na‘au‘auā and mākaia for Hopoe (Hiiaka’s aikāne) and Lohiau (Hiiaka’s kāne and Kauakahiapaoa’s aikāne). Hopoe’s death arouses within Hiiaka a desire to avenge her aikāne. She decides she will uphold the kapu on Lohiau’s body until she reaches Kilauea,⁵³ then defile the kapu before the eyes of her sister. This action not only takes revenge for the death of her beloved at the hands of Pele, but also poses a direct threat to her sister’s leadership and mana. By breaking her kaikua‘ana’s kauoha, Hiiaka asserts that Pele is no longer her ali‘i. As previously discussed, here the piko

⁵¹ “nvi. Revenge, vengeance, treachery, betrayal, traitor, betrayer, turncoat; treacherous. (*Laie* 513.) Kū ho‘i kāu hana i ka mākaia, you’ve behaved treacherously” (Pukui and Elbert 1986, 225).

⁵² “nvi. Intense grief; anguish so great that it may lead to suicide; to mourn, grieve. Na‘au‘auā hele, to wander about in grief. (Pukui and Elbert 1986, 257)

⁵³ “No ka pau ole o kona manao aloha i ke aikane ia Hopoe, no ka hooko ole o ke kaikuaana i ka ia nei kauoha, nolaila, e malama hoi keia i kana kauoha a hiki i kona alo, alaila, hooko keia i ko ia nei manao, a pela io no, no ka mea, o ka ia nei mea hoi i papa aku ai i ke kaikuaana, aole hoi ia i malama pono, nolaila, hoomau hoi keia i ko ia nei manao huhu malaila” (Kapihenui, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, April 10, 1862, 4).

“me ka manao no nae o Hiiakaikapoliopole aia a hiki i Hawaii a ike mai na maka o Pele, alaila, lilo mua no ia ia nei ka hoomaa o ke kane, pela ko ia nei manao iloko iho” (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, April 26, 1893, 4).

between these two sisters is *mō 'ia* (severed). Hiiaka's decision to disobey her sister's *kauoha* is also an act of *na'au'auā*, because she knows that to maintain her position as the *ali'i* in her 'ohana, Pele will retaliate with full force against her and Lohiau. She does. Lohiau is killed, and Hiiaka leaves Kilauea, now mourning for both her *aikāne* and her *kāne*.

When word of Lohiau's death reaches Kauai, it sets another journey of *mākaia* and *na'au'auā* into motion. Kauakahiapaoa vows not to wear his *malo* again until he stands before the eyes of Pele and exacts his revenge.⁵⁴ When Kauakahiapaoa arrives in Hawai'i, Pele recognizes that he is on a quest for *mākaia*, and also for his own death, so that he may rejoin Lohiau. Pele sees this, and tells her sister Hiiakaikaalemoē:

Ua makemake oia e kupu ae ko'u inaina nona, no na huaolelo ana i hoopuka mai la, a kii aku au e pepehi iaia, a hookahi kona make ana me ke aikane ana. Aka, aole nae oia e make ana ia'u.

A o kau hana wale no, oia ko'u kena ana aku ia oe, e Hiiakaikaalei, e kii oe a loa kela kanaka, a lawe mai ilalo nei i ku ai kana makaia. (Hooulumahie, *Ka Na'i Aupuni*, October 18, 1906, 4)

Here Pele explains to her *kaikaina* (Hiiakaikaalei), that Kauakahiapaoa is staging a quest for revenge that he knows will end in his death. But Pele's intention is not to kill Kauakahiapaoa, because he has done nothing to earn such a fate. Rather, it was Pele who harmed Kauakahiapaoa by killing Lohiau, and therefore she welcomes Kauakahiapaoa's quest for revenge. It is clear,

⁵⁴ "Uwe ae ana keia me ka hemo pu o ka malo, alaila, olelo o Kahuakaiapaoa ma ka inoa o ka mea nana i hana ka lani, a me ka honua, ke hoohiki nei au, aole au e hume i ka malo kapu kuu mea a omuo i ka lihilihi o Pele, a hia i na maka o Pele, o kuu wahi hakina kalo hoi a i na maka o Pele, o ka walewale ae nei o na onohi o Pele, o ka ono o kuu wahi kalo, ma'u ola no ka hiki malihini ana i Hawaii" (Bush and Paaluhī, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, June 30, 1893, 4)

however, that he still intends to na‘au‘auā in response to the death of his aikāne,⁵⁵ declaring “eia au mahope o kuu aikane a moe pu aku maua i ka ehu a Lono me kuu aikane” Here I am coming for my aikāne and we shall rest together in the mist of Lono (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, July 3, 1893, 4).⁵⁶

Conclusion

While each of these mana is a mo‘olelo in its own right, differing in small and sometimes meaningful ways, a vibrant, strong and vast ‘upena of pilina holds the Hiiaka mo‘olelo and its waihona together for us. Study of our mo‘olelo teaches us that these pilina are functionally dynamic. They exist to fulfill particular needs. These pilina are also not “identities,” but complex relationships. Pilina breathe, move, and shape shift. That our pilina have survived so many generations of transformation and change suggests that there might be something we could learn from them today. Ea is here offered to us, and what I am breathing in and out from this mo‘olelo is that we need our pilina, in all their shapes and shades, and we need to embrace them with all their nuances, rather than reduce them to western supposed equivalents. No substitutes for our vibrant and culturally specific pilina can be found in the English language or the Western imagination.

It is not just that these specific pilina lack proper English and Western names, but that together these pilina (and others) inform a society whose understanding of relationality, responsibility, and aloha reach far beyond the nuclear household and heteronormativity. Whereas in English, nearly every meaningful relationship is somehow mediated by marriage, or

⁵⁵ “[O] ko Kahuakaiapaoa manao no ia, e naauauwa ana no, a make pu me ke aikane, no ka mea, ua pili aloha laua” (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, July 3, 1893, 4)

⁵⁶ “[O]ia wale no ke holo i Hawaii, e uwe ai i ka makena o ke aikane, i make aku no ia ua pono no, no ka mea, o ko Kauakaiapaoa manao no ia, e naauauwa ana no, a make pu me ke aikane, no ka mea, ua pili aloha laua” (Kapihenui, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, July 10, 1862, 4)

considered illegitimate, Kanaka Maoli pilina are all legitimate; our many intimacies are neither contradictory nor reductive. Furthermore, whereas in Western civilization virtue is the province of those who comply with marriage, monogamy, and heteronormativity, Kanaka Maoli must recognize and carry out their kuleana within their complex matrix of pilina to be a “kanaka maika‘i” (virtuous).

Unearthing these pilina is but the first and easier step in our decolonization. We must apply this ‘ike to our lives to breathe ea back into our pilina with each other. To do so will require that we question our own assumptions about how we take for granted our intimacies. When we do the emotional labor of finding, identifying, and honoring our kōko‘olua,⁵⁷ our kāne and wāhine, our aikāne and kaiko‘eke, our hoa hele and hoa paio, we in turn do the important work of unlearning patriarchy. And in that unlearning, we prepare ourselves for the difficult work of spinning our ‘aha to (re)member and create anew our ‘upena.

57

TABLE 6: KŌKO‘OLUA

TERM	Definition	Source
KŌ,KO‘O.LUA (N.)	n. Companion, partner, associate, fellow worker, mate, partnership, second (in a dual), union (always of two). Kona kōko‘olua, his companion.	Pukui and Elbert
Ko-koo-lu-a (S.)	s. A staff; a cane; hence, a second; an assistant; a helper; a companion; a union of two; two-fold; two-together. <i>Luk.</i> 12:52.	Andrews
KOKOOLUA (KŌ'-KO'O- LŪ'-A) (N.)	1. A second staff; hence, 2. A second; an assistant; a helper; a companion; a union of two. 3. Two-fold; two together; two persons in concord.	Parker

FOR MY FAVORITE SPRING, “PUNA” LEONETTA KEOLAOKALANI KINARD

Puna is a moku in the South-East corner of Hawai‘i island and home to at least 27 smaller ahupua‘a, including Keaau, Kapoho, and Keahialaka. Puna is also the home of Pele and Hiiaka, where Kilauea lives and burns. When puna comes from the word kupuna, it can serve as an affectionate name for our grandparents and elders. But puna can also be a spring, where water emerges from the ‘āina to feed her people.

In my life, Puna has been all this and more. She is the only living wahine in my ‘ohana from my grandparents’ hanauna. Puna is 92 years young and fierce, but she sometimes forgets things—where she is, how old she is. Sometimes she forgets us. Her daughter, grandchildren, nieces and nephews. But there are a handful of things that Puna always holds safe in the center of her sacred spring.

A few years ago, Puna took a spill at home and ended up in Kuakini Hospital. The doctors tried to ask her a set of standard questions to assess her neurological health. They asked her about the date, their current location, about her name, about the woman standing next to her (her daughter, Leolinda). She struggled with these questions. But the answers to certain questions she knew like a prayer. If you ask Puna what her nationality is, she will tell you, for herself, that she is Hawaiian. And although most days she struggles to remember that she has lived in Pāoa for the past twenty years, she is always quick to remind us that she is a kama‘āina of Hilo.

This is a major cause of conflict for Puna. Many times, she struggles with knowing she is not “home.” She wants to be back in Hilo, under the ua Kanilehua and in the Moani winds. When I sit alone with Puna in her living room, she will ask me, again and again, “Are we in Hilo?” I say, “No, Aunty, we are in your home in Pāoa.” When this upsets her, I consider lying; but instead I comfort her with music. I find an old tape of my father singing “Ua Like nō a Like”

and press play. Then, for the next hour, we bounce back and forth the names of all the Hawai‘i island mele and musicians that we can recall. This is our favorite game. And Puna always wins.

Puna longs so much for an island where she hasn’t lived for decades that she often packs a bag when no one is looking, and injures herself trying to carry her belongings to the door. This endless cycle of trying to leave is both devastating and exhausting for our ‘ohana, and especially for her daughter Leolinda. But perhaps even worse than our sadness about her physical and emotional pain is the trauma of knowing that Puna is not trying to leave us, but trying to return to herself. Her ‘āina, her home, her Hilo.

I think about what this means, to feel so displaced from your one hānau, while in a perfectly suitable home that you have filled with your aloha and ‘ohana for over two decades. I think about that primal insistence to return to the sands of our birth. I think about how Nāwahī, the editor of *Ke Aloha Aina*, defined aloha ‘āina as a constant magnetic pull toward one’s place that cannot be weakened or deterred. I think about Puna, being pulled, pulled, pulled home, always and every day. I think about how Puna steps outside of herself to try to go home, and how much aloha she must have for her ‘āina. And then I think about another kupuna of mine, a kupuna I share with Puna.

Hiiakaikapoliopole.

Wahi a ka mo‘olelo, during her journey across the Pae ‘Āina, Hiiaka comes to Punahoa with her aikāne Wahineomao and attendant Pauopalaa. The people of Punahoa are suspicious of these newcomers, so Hiiaka lies to the ali‘i, saying that her name is Keahialaka and that she is from Puna. In a sense, Hiiaka is saying, I am Puna from Puna. Her tie to place, unlike her name, cannot be severed or cast aside--much like Puna’s pilina to Hilo cannot be forgotten. What matters most to Hiiaka here is to maintain her pilina to her ‘āina kulāiwi, Puna. To do so, she

takes on an inoa of her place and wears it like a genealogy. When Hiiaka finally gets to Kauai and Lohiau, she then turns right around and fights tirelessly to return to her home, even though home after home is offered to her along the way.

Hiiaka survives the trip home, and lives out her days in the bosom of Kilauea, in her home moku of Puna. My Puna will live the rest of her days here on my one hānau, Oahu, and I know this will trouble her until the day she is no longer with us on this honua.

But something can be cherished here; something celebrated about our shared pilina and aloha for our place, and for our ‘āina. I know that even after profound trauma of my body and mind, my pilina to my kūpuna, through my ‘āina, will remain. And if some day I find myself forgetting, confused and lost in obscure corners of my memory, I hope I am lucky enough to retain the kind of ‘ohana that Puna has cultivated in her poli. A punahele to sing me back home. A mo‘opuna to share all the melodies of Hilo, and to shower me in the Kanilehua. An ‘ohana that will always let me sing, out loud, about what I long for. Home.

When Puna seems lost to herself and to us, we bring out our guitars and play the old Hilo songs. “‘O ‘oe nō ka‘u i ‘upu ai,” she sings, and we know exactly what she means.

CHAPTER FOUR:
‘ĀINA, THE ‘AHA OF OUR ‘UPENA

Introduction:

“In our culture, ancestry is paramount” (Trask 1999, 17). Our insistence on the primacy of ancestry and the significance of mo‘okū‘auhau is one major way that we as kānaka have continued to sustain pilina to this day. Mana comes from one’s great accomplishments and feats of strength and wit, but also from one’s pilina and kinship within a mo‘okū‘auhau (Kame‘eleihiwa 1992, 20). And of course, aloha ‘āina is at the very piko of our mo‘okū‘auhau. Because our understanding and practice of aloha ‘āina always remind us that we descend from ‘āina, our valuing of mo‘okū‘auhau must be accompanied by an awareness of the role that ‘āina plays within our genealogies and our experience of all things Hawaiian.

The first half of this chapter analyzes how Hiiakaikapoliopele mo‘olelo are waihona of ‘āina, and how ‘āina in Kanaka Maoli mo‘olelo in general function not as the “setting,” but as active participants in the narrative. I will discuss how ‘āina is deployed as record, evidence, character, body, and metaphor throughout narratives, cumulatively representing an aloha ‘āina literary consciousness. The chapter’s second half returns to our ‘upena of intimacies as part of a reading strategy for understanding how aloha ‘āina affects and organizes how we practice pilina between each other. What ultimately makes the ‘upena an effective metaphor for pilina and aloha ‘āina is ‘āina’s role as the mediating factor between all pilina.

Like the ‘aha in our ‘upena, specific ‘āina often serve to hold the pilina between us together. When asked “What do ‘āina and aloha ‘āina have to do with Kanaka Maoli literature and relationships?” this chapter answers emphatically, “‘Āina is everything to us, to our mo‘olelo and to our pilina.”

We have seen how the Hiiaka mo‘olelo functions as a waihona of pilina, but it is also an origin story, not only for Kanaka Maoli ontologies and epistemologies, but for the intimacies with which k̄anaka relate to one another through ‘āina, which is itself an actor who moves, changes form, and (re)members events. In the Hiiaka mo‘olelo, ‘āina grows out of the sea, or as pōhaku flies into the ocean and becomes smaller islands (Mokolii, Pohakuloa), or as lava covers other subjects. ‘Āina shifts, shakes, and shatters. It also represents multitudes. References to ‘āina and place names far outnumber references to k̄anaka, kupua, and akua—in Kapihenui, Bush and Paaluhi, and Hooulumahie, by at least two to one, and in Poepoe’s mana by three to one. Clearly, these authors take every opportunity to enrich the mo‘olelo by providing specific details about each place the characters occupy or pass through.

When for instance Kapihenui introduces us to Pele in 1861, the first thing we learn about her is that she lives “iuka o Kalua” (*Ka Hoku o Ka Pakipika*, December 26, 1861, 1). It would not have been surprising for this mo‘olelo to begin with a mo‘okū‘auhau, tracing Pele’s lineage, but apparently her ‘āina, Kalua (ka lua of Kilauea), needs to precede genealogy. When Bush and Paaluhi take up this mo‘olelo in 1893, a combination of genealogy and significant ‘āina comprises the first two substantial paragraphs following the ‘ōlelo hoakaka in the second installment of the mo‘olelo:

O Kuahailo ke kane, noho ae la Haumea, ka wahine, hanau mai na kaikamahine, a o Pele ka haku makahiapo o lakou, a mahope mai na pokii kaikaina Ma Kahiki kahi i hanau a i hanai ia ai keia ohana kupua, a mailaila lakou i hele mai ai a pae ma na mokupuni liilii o ke komohana, a mailaila i mai hele ai a hiki loa aku ma Hawaii (*Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, January 6, 1893, 1).

According to Bush and Paaluhi, Kuahailo and Haumea were the parents of Pele, but she and her siblings, extensively listed in the place marked here by the ellipsis, came from Kahiki to Hawai‘i. Hooulumahie and Poepoe similarly weave genealogical information regarding Pele together with essential information about where she was born and raised (Kahiki or Hapakuela) and how she came to be in Hawai‘i. But the description of Pele’s migration to Hawai‘i explains not just how Pele’s mo‘olelo came to be a Hawaiian mo‘olelo, but also how Hawai‘i came to be Hawai‘i. As Pele and her siblings migrate, ‘āina is transformed in their wake, siblings are left behind as *kia‘i* of *wahi pana*, craters are dug, and their fires lit. From Nihoa to Hawai‘i, Pele thrusts her ‘ō‘ō to ‘eli her way across the pae ‘āina in search of a home. What results from this extended migration are Halalii, Kilauea (Kauai), Moanalua, Leahi, Puowaena, Ihihilauea, Maunaloa (Molokai), Kauhako, Kalaupapa, Kalanuiohua, Moaulanuikanalua, Haleakala, Puuolai, Puulena, Ohunui, Kilauea, and Mokuaweoweo. These craters and *pu‘u* are the physical record of Pele’s movement, marking the stages of the mo‘olelo, and providing for us evidence for the narrative. In the same way that these *wahi pana* are Pele’s legacy, Mokolii and Moiliili are the living story of Hiiaka’s travels to Kauai. On their journeys, and even when they stay at home, Pele mā are creating and transforming ‘āina, and the ‘āina remembers, and continues to tell their story.

It is through these moments that we learn that in mo‘olelo ‘āina is both actor and evidence, or as Bush and Paaluhi wrote, “aole no hoi he aina e ikeā nei i nele i na hoailona o ko lakou noho ana,” every land they passed through and lived in, bore their hō‘ailona (*Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, January 6, 1893, 1). Just as our mo‘okū‘auhau organize how, where, and when we kānaka lived, our ‘āina offers a genealogy for how, where, and when Pele mā lived. Both this mo‘olelo and our genealogies are therefore offering a “Hawaiian concept of time, and they order space around us,” as they also offer a record of the *pilina* between kānaka and ‘āina (Kame‘eleihiwa

1992, 19). Because both mo‘okū‘auhau and ‘āina are illuminating a Hawaiian concept of intimacy, we can investigate how ‘āina makes and organizes its own logics of pilina, and this intimacy includes not just how ‘āina came to be, but also how certain events are pili to certain ‘āina as well.

These mo‘olelo share a geography that spans islands and crosses oceans. We also understand from Chapter Two, because these mo‘olelo have a genealogy themselves, each mana written as part of a larger narrative, the authors are attentive to the mo‘olelo that came before and will follow after, and consciously reinvoked or elaborate upon not only the larger genealogical context, but also the ‘āina that embodies and enacts it. When Poepoe or Hooulumahie cite their sources, or point to other mele and mo‘olelo, they are expanding the intricate ‘upena of these mo‘okū‘auhau, but Poepoe in particular teaches us essential lessons about how these genealogies are deeply pili to ‘āina and place. The various mana of the Hiiaka mo‘olelo do not just describe or evoke ‘āina, but register how they themselves emerge from a particular ‘āina. So when Poepoe introduces his mana by providing all the information he thought most relevant for readers to know, he declares that this Hiiaka is known to be “ko Maui Hiiaka,” whereas the previously published mana of Hiiaka in *Ka Na‘i Aupuni* was “ko Hawaii Hiiaka” (*Kuokoa Home Rula*, January 10, 1908, 1). Later in the mo‘olelo we learn that Oahu too has its own specific mana of Hiiaka, although it is unclear through Poepoe’s writing if it has ever been published (Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*, September 10, 1909, 2).⁵⁸

⁵⁸ “Ma ko Oahu nei mahele Hiiaka, ua oleloia, he waa e holo ana mai Kewaula mai no Kauai, oi a ka waa i kau ai o Hiiaka ame Wahineomao, a holo ai laua a pae i Kalihikai, i Kauai ka pae ana. O na mea no laua keia waa oia o Kawaikumuole (K) ame Kalehuapeekoa (W).”

Poepoe’s introduction informs us as readers that these mo‘olelo are both defining and being defined by place. Furthermore, through the singular possessive pronoun “ko” we learn that mo‘olelo *belong* to ‘āina. These ‘āina are born with these mo‘olelo already potentially inhabiting them, and inherited by the people of those places— “ka moolelo o ko Hawaii poe” (Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*, November 27, 1908, 1). Further, Poepoe often breaks the fourth wall to elaborate when his Maui mana of Hiiaka differs or diverges from mana born of other ‘āina, without trying to establish which mana is “correct.” So for instance, “E ka makamaka heluhelu, ma keia wahi i kaawale hou ai na mana moolelo elua o Hiiaka, ka Hawaii ame ko Maui, a e nana ana kua ma keia wahi aku i keia kaawale ana” (*Kuokoa Home Rula*, December 18, 1908, 3). In this way, Poepoe acknowledges these mo‘olelo are born not just out of land, but from a particular place, always reminding us that like the pilina between kanaka and place, the intimacy between mo‘olelo and place, is specific.

In our mo‘olelo, pilina to ‘āina can be evoked and described in a multitude of ways. Our beauty and strength can be communicated through ‘āina; we can share a specific relationship to ‘āina as a kama‘āina, malihini, kupu‘āina, or ki‘ai‘āina; or we can represent and come to even embody our ‘āina.

Beauty

ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui and Noenoe Silva have articulated on multiple occasions how Kanaka Maoli mo‘olelo such as Pele offer alternatives to Western beauty standards, in part because wahine strength and beauty are rooted in an appreciation and respect for ‘āina (ho‘omanawanui 2010, 209; ho‘omanawanui 2007, 418-435; Silva 2007, 173-176). All four of the mana foregrounded in this dissertation demonstrate clear, articulate connections between

beauty, strength and ‘āina. In Kapihenui’s Hiiaka, we see this in how Hiiaka mā are frequently referred to as “wahine maikai”: their physical beauty and virtue are both unquestioned, and marked by their ability to remain both pili and representative of their ‘āina. In the same way that the legend of Hiiaka’s beauty precedes them in their journey, so does their virtue, “aohe wahine maikai e ae ma Hawaii nei” (Kapihenui, *Ka Hoku o Ka Pakipika*, January 23, 1862, 1).

This trend continues in Bush and Paaluhi’s mana of the mo‘olelo. When she enters any new place, Hiiaka’s beauty and virtue as a wahine maika‘i are unquestioned. First as in Kapihenui’s mana, her status as a wahine maika‘i is incomparable: “aohe wahine maikai e ae ma Hawaii nei e like me ia nei” (February 28, 1893, 1), and earlier her beauty is described as beyond anything known (“ui launaole”) (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, January 12, 1893, 1). The practice follows for Pele when she arrives at Haena. The people draw upon a popular ‘ōlelo no‘eau, “pali ke kua, mahina ke alo,” to express how Pele’s beauty echoes the world around her-- in the cliff’s edge and the mahina’s luster (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, January 12, 1893, 1).

In Hooulumahiehie and Poepoe’s longer mana of Hiiaka, these descriptions of beauty and ‘āina blossom. Both Poepoe and Hooulumahiehie compare Hiiaka’s backside to the majestic slopes of Maunaloa:

Eia o Hiiaka ke ku nei, ua kaei ae la no i ka hope nui maikai o Maunaloa (a he u‘i hoi tau!), me ka pa-u kalukalu i wiliia me ka mokila a me ka pahapaha o Polihale.

He luaole no hoi ka nani o ua Ui nei o ka Palekoki Uwili o Halemaumau. Ke alawa iho ma ka aoao, he uhekeheke hoi tau; hoi ae no mahope, e ike ana no oe i ka mea i kaulana ai ka Maunaloa i ke kikala upehupehu, ke hoi mai hoi oe mamua, mai nana oe i

na onohi maka o Hiiaka, o kuku auanei oe i na lihilihi o ka eha koni. (Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*, April 22, 1910, 4)⁵⁹

Poepoe writes of a powerfully stunning wahine, adorned in the kalukalu and pahapaha of Polihale. Hiiaka’s staggering beauty and strength is not just compared to Maunaloa; rather, to know and see Hiiaka is to understand precisely how majestic Maunaloa is. Here we learn, above all, that the magnificence of this woman of the crater, this lightning-skirted beauty of Halemaumau, is second to none *because* she resembles and honors her land.

But that is not all. It is also said, “ua like ka nono ula o na papalina o keia wahine me ka wai ula liliko o ka ohelo, a o kona ili, ua like me ka pua hala memele maikai”; the red of her cheeks resembled the young sweet nectar of the ‘ōhelo, and her skin was fine like the beautiful hala blossom. And “o kona oiwi apau, he ui hooheno e nupu hulili ai ka houpo o ka aoao oolea,⁶⁰ a hiki nohoi ke ‘lala iho i ka wai’ ka olelo ana (Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na’i Aupuni*, June 2, 1906, 3). All together, Hiiaka’s astounding beauty lit and stoked the fires in the houpo of all who encountered her. To see Hiiaka was to experience a beauty second to none. Kāne (and wāhine alike) were dazzled by the earth-arousing beauty of this woman—a beauty that spoke of Hiiaka’s pilina to ‘āina, and aroused the ‘āina within her admirers: “O ka ui keia, aohe kauwila o ka wao laau e ole ke kolo hou o kona mau a.” (Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na’i Aupuni*, July 27, 1906, 3).

⁵⁹ Parallel Passage: Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na’i Aupuni*, April 3, 1906, 4.

⁶⁰ Ka aoao oolea, the strong group (sex), is a common phrase in 19th and 20th century writing used to describe kāne while the phrase ka aoao palupalu, the soft (or weak) group (sex) is usually offered as the female counterpart. Although beyond the scope of this dissertation, this phrase in our ‘ōlelo makuahine brings up important questions about the way haole ideas about male supremacy were imported into our own language. Therefore it will take more than simply addressing the issues of translation and presentation of our mo‘olelo in English to sufficiently address male supremacy in our communities and mo‘olelo.

Like Hiiaka, Pele's beauty and mana are described in relation to her 'āina, but while as the Wahine Pō'aimoku, Hiiaka's beauty can be described through references that cross the entire pae 'āina, the 'āina linked to Pele's mana and beauty are distinctly from Puna and the Kilauea area. Like her pōki'i, Pele's beauty is unrivaled, "aole i kana mai." But Pele brings with her all the distinctive and enticing scents of Puna: "ke ala o ke Kupaoa, o ke Kupalii, o ka Hala, o ka Lehua, o ka Olapa, ka Maile, ka Hinano, ka Awapuhi, a pela wale aku" (Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na'i Aupuni*, June 7, 1906, 3). Where Hiiaka's hips conjure mountains out of the sea, Pele carries the fragrance of Puna with her wherever she goes. This chief of the rising of the sun at Haehae displays every possible shade and scent of attractiveness, and her features are aptly compared to the Māhealani moon.⁶¹ Both Hiiaka and Pele exhibit a mana and beauty so overwhelming that they are recognized by every new place and person to encounter them.

From their stunning beauty pili to 'āina also comes their strength, for to carry mountains and lightning on our hips, or the power of the mahina in the glow of our faces, is to harness the mana those features embody. This is why Kanaka Maoli articulations of pilina move beyond the rhetorical conceit of a metaphor. When the pilina of our akua and kānaka to 'āina is described, we must understand it as a real material relationship to 'āina, rather than simply making a comparison through a literary device. In Western literature, metaphor is primarily a rhetorical tool that makes compressed comparisons between two things by presenting them as an identity. In 'ōlelo Hawai'i, we are actually experiencing the already existing mana of pilina.

⁶¹ "He mea oiaio, ua hookuu pau iho la ua Moiwahine nei o ka hikina a ka La ma Ha'eha'e i kona nani apau maluna iho ona. A ua oleloia, ua like ka lamalama o na helehena o ua Pele nei i keia wa ma ka mahina piha i ka po o Mahealani. He ui hoi tau!" (Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na'i Aupuni* June 8, 1906, 3).

It is ‘āina itself that allows both Hiiaka and Pele to have their way in this mo‘olelo. Pele carries out her deeds with her hot and penetrating ‘ā; Hiiaka’s battles are won with the help of her lightning skirt and lima kapu o Kilauea. Without their compelling pilina to ‘āina, these wāhine would not have the mana to complete any of their famous actions, or overcome any of the obstacles confronting them in this mo‘olelo.

‘Āina & Inoa Kanaka:

Earlier in this chapter, I mentioned that in terms of numbers, there are far more references to different ‘āina than kānaka in this mo‘olelo. The reason now becomes clear—when kānaka shine in the mo‘olelo, they do so by being likened to, or by embodying ‘āina in some way. In our mo‘olelo Hawai‘i, such comparisons go beyond the rhetorical conceits of metaphor or personification; our authors are articulating an intimacy between these kānaka and their ‘āina. One very common way that kānaka are related to ‘āina is through the sharing of inoa. Pilina between kānaka and their ‘āina do not merely result from an expression of admiration. Such pilina are reflective, displaying a kanaka’s embodying of their ‘āina. In the mana of the mo‘olelo of Hiiakaikapoliopole, dozens of ali‘i, kia‘i, and kama‘āina are both kānaka and the ‘āina itself. They share personality traits, physical likeness, and identity. When we say aloha ‘āina is a significant part of a Kanaka Maoli worldview, we are therefore saying that our aloha for ‘āina is so intimate that we aspire to be ‘āina, and we draw out and celebrate the pilina of our greatest chiefs and protectors to the ‘āina itself, so that both are immortalized in our mo‘olelo.

Familiar examples of this in the mo‘olelo are Hopoe being the name of Hiiaka’s aikāne and the ulu lehua she embodies; Punahoa, the beautiful surfing ali‘i who rules over the kai at Punahoa; and Kaena, the kaikunāne to the Pele ‘ohana who is the kia‘i of the most western point

of Oahu, Kaena. But there are dozens more examples. “Personification,” the bestowing of human qualities on non-human things, is the exact opposite of what is going on here. Our kūpuna made kānaka out of these places, to guard, protect, honor, and exalt our ‘āina. We also learn from examining these pilina between ‘āina and kānaka that terms we might think of as identities are also intimate relationships. When we say that Punahoa is the ali‘i wahine of Punahoa, we are also saying that to be a chief means to be bound to a particular place. Our successes and accomplishments are our ‘āina’s successes and accomplishments. Everything that we do and achieve is literally in the name of our kānaka and our ‘āina. Leadership (or being an ali‘i) is not a position or a distinction. It is a relationship.

This connection between ‘āina and kānaka is especially strong for the most significant kānaka in the mo‘olelo. The vast majority of the many epithets given to Hiiaka, Pele, Lohiau, and Hopoe are ‘aha tethering them to their ‘āina.

TABLE 7: NĀ INOA O PELE

WAHINE NEI O KA LUA	Poepoe. Mar. 6, 1908, 1	Pele & Kalua
MOIWAHINE NEI OF MAULIOLA HALE	Poepoe. May 29, 1908, 1	Pele & Kalua
KA WAHINE O KA LUA	Poepoe. Mar. 25, 1910, 1	Pele & Kalua
KA WAHINE I KILAUEA	Poepoe. June 3, 1910, 4 Hooulumahiehie. July 10, 1906, 3 Kapihenui. Feb. 13, 1862, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Mar. 21, 1893, 4	Pele & Kalua
UA MOI NEI O HALEMAUMAU	Hooulumahiehie. June 5, 1906, 3	Pele & Kalua
UA ALII WAHINE NEI O KA LUA	Hooulumahiehie. June 8, 1906, 3	Pele & Kalua
KA MOI WAHINE O HALEMAUMAU, A O KA AHI KANANA HOI O KILAUEA	Hooulumahiehie. June 12, 1906, 3	Pele & Kalua
LUA WAHINE O KA LANI	Bush and Paaluhi. Mar. 22, 1893, 4	Pele & Kalua
KA WAHINE O KA POLOHINANO O PUNA	Poepoe. April 3, 1908, 1	Puna
KA WAHINE O KA PAIA ALA O PUNA	Hooulumahiehie. June 15, 1906, 3	Puna

KA MOI WAHINE O KE AHI A LOA MA PUNA	Hooulumahiehie. June 20, 1906, 4	Puna
KEIKI MAKAHIAPO O KAI O PUNA HAUMEA WAHINE	Bush and Paaluhi. June 16, 1893, 4 Poepoe. June 25, 1909, 4 Poepoe. June 3, 1910, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Apr. 11, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie . July 10, 1906, 3 Kapihenui. Feb. 13, 1862, 4	Puna Haumea
PELEHONUAMEA	Poepoe. June 3, 1910, 4 Hooulumahiehie . July 10, 1906, 3 Hooulumahiehie. Apr. 11, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Apr. 18, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Sept. 5, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Sept. 21, 1906, 4 Kapihenui. Feb 13, 1862, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Mar. 22, 1893, 4	Haumea
AI POHAKU O HAUMEA	Hooulumahiehie. Mar. 13, 1906, 4	Haumea
KUKUENA WAHINE	Poepoe. June 3, 1910, 4 Hooulumahiehie. July 10, 1906, 3	Ahi & Ai
PELE-AI-HONUA	Poepoe. Oct. 19, 1909, 4	Ahi & Ai
AIMOKU	Poepoe. Mar. 11, 1909, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Mar. 20, 1906, 4	Ahi & Ai
KA MOI WAHINE O KE AHI A LOA MA PUNA	Hooulumahiehie. June 20, 1906, 4	Ahi & Ai
WAHINE AI LEHUA O KAIMUKUPUKU	Bush and Paaluhi. June 16, 1893, 4 Kapihenui. June 19, 1862, 4	Ahi & Ai
PELEAIHONUAMEA	Hooulumahiehie. Aug. 18, 1906, 4	Ahi & Ai
WAHINEKAPU	Poepoe. Jan. 28, 1910, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Mar. 6, 1906, 4 Kapihenui. Jan. 9, 1862, 1 Hooulumahiehie. June 21, 1906, 3 Hooulumahiehie. Aug. 31, 1906, 4 Kapihenui. July 10, 1862, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Jan. 5, 1893, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Jan. 19, 1893, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Feb 8, 1893, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Feb 9, 1893, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Mar. 9, 1893, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Apr. 14, 1893, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. June 20, 1893, 4	Kapu
AWIHIOKALANI	Poepoe. June 26, 1908, 1	
KUPUNA WAHINE	Poepoe. June 3, 1909, 4	
KE KUMU O KAHIKI	Hooulumahiehie. Mar. 13, 1906, 4	
ALIIWAHINE	Bush and Paaluhi. Jan 5, 1893, 1	
PELEALIIWAHINE	Bush and Paaluhi. Jan 6, 1893, 1	

HANAUMUA	Bush and Paaluhi. Jan 18, 1893, 1 Bush and Paaluhi. Jan 19, 1893, 1
WAHINE A MAKALII	Poepoe. June 3, 1909, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Mar. 22, 1893, 4

He wahine kino lau nō o Pele, Pele is a woman of many forms. And with every form comes a name to honor that form. Like all inoa, Pele's represent her dynamic personality and her many personal qualities. As a wahine both of and from the Lua, she is most often given names that articulate her pilina to Kalua (Kilauea) and ahi. We learn through these names that Pele is not just like lava, Kilauea, Puna, or even Haumea; she is that which she has been named. Her pilina to Kilauea, Puna, Haumea, Kahiki, and her ahi and 'ā make her Pele Ka Wahine Kapu, because it is from these pilina that her mana emerges.

TABLE 8: NĀ INOA O HIIAKA

KA WAHINE HOI O KA HIKINA A KA LA	Hooulumahiehie, Jan. 29, 1906, 4	Hikina
KA WAHINE MAI KA HIKINA A KA LA MA HAEHAE	Hooulumahiehie, Mar. 30, 1906, 4 Poepoe. April 15, 2010, 4	Hikina
KA WAHINE I KA HIKINA A KA LA	Hooulumahiehie, Apr. 16 1906, 4 Poepoe. July 1, 1910, 4	Hikina
KA WAHINE AI LAAU O PUNA	Hooulumahiehie, Jan. 29, 1906, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Mar. 31, 1893, 4 Kapihenui. Feb 20, 1862, 4	Puna
HII I KA IU O PUNA	Hooulumahiehie, July 23, 1906, 3	Puna
KA MEA MAIKAI O PUNA	Hooulumahiehie, July 30, 1906, 4	Puna
AKUA WAHINE O PUNA	Kapihenui. Feb. 20, 1862, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Mar. 31, 1893, 4	Puna
KA LEHUA O PUNA	Poepoe. Jul. 2, 1909, 4	Puna
KEAHIALAKA	Hooulumahiehie, Oct. 1, 1906, 4	Puna
HIIAKA I KA IU O NA MOKU	Hooulumahiehie, Apr. 16 1906, 4	Nā Moku
HIIAKAIKAIUONAMOKU	Hooulumahiehie, Nov. 9, 1906, 4	Nā Moku
HIIAKAIUONAMOKU	Hooulumahiehie, April 25, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie, May 5, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. May 26, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. July 20, 1906, 3 Hooulumahiehie. Sept. 14, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Sept. 19, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Nov. 9, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Nov. 20, 1906, 4	Nā Moku

HII-I-KA-IU-O-NA-MOKU	Poepoe, Aug. 5, 1910, 4 Poepoe. Sept. 3, 1909, 4	Nā Moku
HII-(AKA)-I-KA-IU-O-NA-MOKU	Hooulumahiehie. Jan 19, 1906, 4	Nā Moku
HII I KA WEKIU O NA MOKU	Hooulumahiehie. Feb. 20, 1906, 4	Nā Moku
HII NEI I KA IU O NA MOKU	Hooulumahiehie. May 10, 1906, 4	Nā Moku
HII WAHINEPOAIMOKU	Hooulumahiehie. Nov. 30, 1906, 4	Nā Moku
WAHINEPOAI-MOKU	Poepoe. Jan. 31, 1908, 4 Poepoe. Nov. 13, 1908, 4 Poepoe. Nov. 20, 1908, 1 Poepoe. Dec. 11, 1908, 1 Poepoe. Dec. 25, 1908, 1 Poepoe. Jan. 29, 1909, 4 Poepoe. Feb. 5, 1909, 4 Poepoe. Feb. 26, 1909, 4 Poepoe. Apr. 15, 1910, 4	Nā Moku
WAHINEPOAIMOKU	Hooulumahiehie. Oct. 3, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. July 24, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Jan. 2, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Feb 2, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Feb. 6, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Feb. 8, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Mar. 30, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Apr. 21, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. May 14, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. May 26, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Aug. 6, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Aug. 8, 1906, 4	Nā Moku
HII I KA POLI A KE ALOHA	Hooulumahiehie. Aug. 30, 1906, 4	& Pele
HII NEI I KA POLI O PELE	Hooulumahiehie. Apr. 14, 1906, 4	& Pele
HII-I-KA-POLI-O-KO-IPO	Poepoe, Dec. 31, 1909, 4	& Pele
HIIAKA AU I KA POLI O PELE	Poepoe, Mar. 25, 1910, 4	& Pele
KUU POLI	Hooulumahiehie. June 30, 1906, 3 Hooulumahiehie. Sept. 25, 1906, 4	& Pele
KUU POKII I KA POLI	Hooulumahiehie. June 5, 1906, 3	& Pele
WAHINE I KA POLI O	Hooulumahiehie. Jan. 2, 1906, 4	& Pele
KINOLAUWAHINE		
KA LALA I KA ULU O WAHINEKAPU	Bush and Paaluhi. Mar. 31, 1893, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Apr. 13, 1893, 4	& Pele
KAIKAINA HAKU	Kapihenui. Jan 23, 1862, 1	& Pele
KAIKAINA MULI LOA	Bush and Paaluhi. Feb 7, 1893, 4	& Pele
ALII WAHINE OPIO O KA LUA O	Hooulumahiehie. June 19, 1906, 4	Ka Lua
KILAUEA		
HIIAKA, KA EUEU O KA PALEKOKI	Hooulumahiehie. Feb. 26, 1906, 4	Ka Lua
UILA O HALEMAUMAU		
KA EUEU O KA PALEKOKI UWILA	Poepoe. Dec. 31, 1909, 4	Ka Lua
O HALEMAUMAU		

KA PALEKOKI UWI LA O HALEMAUMAU	Poepoe. Apr. 22, 1910, 4	Ka Lua
KA WAHINE O KA PALEKOKI UILA O HALEMAUMAU	Hooulumahiehie. July 4, 1906, 4	Ka Lua
KA WAHINE O KALUA	Kapihenui. Jan 23, 1862, 1	Ka Lua
KE KAIKAINA MANA O KA WAHINE O KA LUA	Hooulumahiehie. July 23, 1906, 4	Ka Lua
UA UI NEI O KA PALEKOKI UILA O HALEMAUMAU	Hooulumahiehie. Dec. 25, 1905, 1 Hooulumahiehie. Jan. 4, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Jan. 9, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. June 19, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. June 22, 1906, 4	Ka Lua
KA EUEU O KILAUEA	Poepoe. Dec. 11, 1908, 1	Ka Lua
WAHINE AI POHAKU / AI MOKU / AI MOKU LEHUA	Hooulumahiehie. Aug. 8, 1906, 3	Ai Pohaku
HII WAHINEPOAIMOKU WAHINEPOAIMOKU	Hooulumahiehie. Nov. 30, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Jan. 2, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Feb 2, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Feb. 5, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Feb. 8, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Mar. 30, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Apr. 21, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. May 14, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. May 26, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. July 24, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Aug. 6, 1906, 3 Hooulumahiehie. Aug. 8, 1906, 3 Hooulumahiehie. Oct. 3, 1906, 3	Poaimoku Poaimoku
WAHINEPOAI-MOKU	Poepoe. Jan. 31, 1908, 1 Poepoe. Nov. 13, 1908, 1 Poepoe. Nov. 20, 1908, 1 Poepoe. Dec. 11, 1908, 1 Poepoe. Dec. 25. 1908, 1 Poepoe. Jan 29, 1909, 4 Poepoe. Feb. 5, 1909, 4 Poepoe. Feb. 26, 1909, 4 Poepoe. April 15, 1910, 4	Poaimoku
HII-I-KA-WEKIU	Poepoe. Dec. 10, 1909, 4	Wekiu
KAHELEHOOKAHI	Poepoe. Apr. 9, 1909, 4	Poaimoku
KOOLAUWAHINE	Poepoe. Apr. 29, 1908, 4	Koolau

As we can see in the table above, Hiiaka follows the example of her kaikua‘ana; she too is a wahine of many names—more in fact than Pele. She is the woman of Puna, of the bosom of Pele,

and the woman who encircles the islands. Furthermore, Hiiaka belongs and is pili to Puna, Ka Hikina, Pele and Ka Lua, and so are her accomplishments.

The aligning of these magnificent kupua with ‘āina is of course aloha ‘āina. If we are attentive to the pilina between these kānaka and their ‘āina, we can easily recognize that Pele is not just an akua who lives in Kilauea. Pele is the lava, the crater, and the kindling fire. And by virtue of their intimacy, so too is Hiiaka. Hiiaka and Pele not only have names that bind them together (Hiiakaikapoliopole, Wahine i ka poli of kinolauwahine, ke kaikaina mana o ka wahine o ka lua), but also share names (ka wahine o ka lua, Wahinekapu, aipohaku, Keiki makahiapo o kai o Puna). Their inoa tell a mo‘olelo about pilina to each other and to ‘āina. Nor are these epithets literary ties between the kanaka and their ‘āina, but acts of assertion towards recognizing that these amazing wahine, akua, ali‘i and kia‘i are their ‘āina. In the mo‘olelo of Hiiakaikapoliopole, this truth is told most clearly through the descriptions of Pele and the killing of Hopoe.

TABLE 9: NĀ INOA O NANAHUKI / HOPOE

WAHINEKAPU	Kapihenui. Jan. 9, 1862, 1	Kapu
KA ULU O WAHINEKAPU	Kapihenui. Jan. 9, 1862, 1	Ulu, Kapu
MOKULEHUA	Kapihenui. Feb 20, 1862, 4	Ulu/Lehua
WAHINE KUI LEHUA O HOPOE	Hooulumahiehie. Aug. 7. 1906, 3	Ulu/Lehua

Like Hiiaka and Pele, Hopoe is a woman of several names, and therefore several bodies. We know from the previous chapter that when Hiiaka meets Hopoe, Hiiaka learns that Hopoe’s given name is “Nanahuki,” but she is commonly called Hopoe because of all the time she spent at the sea of Hopoe gathering ‘ōpihi. When Hiiaka learns this, she offers Hopoe an ulu lehua all her own in Keaau. Through this exchange, Hopoe does not only become Hiiaka’s aikāne, or the wahine kui lehua. She is the “Mokulehua” itself. This becomes clearer when we read closely the

account of Hiiaka gives her kauoha to her sisters about not disturbing Hopoe. Hiiaka does not focus exclusively on Hopoe's human form, but warns her kaikua'ana not to disturb the entire place of Hopoe, and especially the ulu lehua:

Kauoha mai hoi o Hiiakaikapoliiopele i ke kaikuaana. Ke kii nei au i ke kane, a kua, ke noho nei hoi oe, a i ai hoi oe i kahi nei o kua, e ai no oe ma na wahi o kua a pau, a o kuu moku lehua nei la, mai ai oe malaila, ae mai la o Pele. Olelo hou aku la no o Hiiakaikapoliiopele, i noho oe a, kuia e ko la inaina, i ai oe ia uka nei, a i iho oe i kai o Puna e ai ai, ai no oe ma na wahi a pau o Puna, o kuu aikane, mai ai oe, ae mai la o Pele i na kauoha a pau a ke kaikaina. No ka mea ua maikai ia mau mea i ko Pele manao, e like hoi me ka Pele kauoha iaia nei. . . . (Kapihenui, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, January 2, 1862, 1).

Hiiaka is emphatic with her kaikua'ana. While she is off retrieving her kaikua'ana's beloved, Pele is not to ai (eat, conquer, or have sex with) Hiiaka's beloved moku lehua. In fact, Hiiaka's love for Hopoe is so great that she permits Pele to send her fires to "ai" anywhere in Puna, her beloved home, so long as she stays clear of her aikāne and her ulu lehua at Hopoe. When Pele breaks this kauoha and Hopoe is killed, the mo'olelo describes Pele's lava descending on the ulu lehua, rather than upon Hopoe's human form.

When Wahineomao asks Hiiaka for whom she is crying out, Hiiaka tells her that she is grieving for their aikāne, Hopoe.⁶² When this happens in Bush and Paaluhi's mana, Wahineomao is confused and in disbelief. Wahineomao questions her aikāne, "wahahee oe e

⁶² "e kokoke mai ana i kou wahi, kahi a'u i kau aloha aku ai ia aikane a kua, oia nohoi o Hopoe. No ia wahine ka'u i ula leo ae nei. A i maliu mai ke kaikuaana o kakou pono, a i maliu ole mai, aohe mea kaumaha a koe wale aku o nei huakai a kakou e hele nei" (Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*, February 5, 1909, 4).

Hiiakaikapoliopole, owai ka mea nana e ako ka lehua? Hele mai la no oe ka mea nana e ako, aole mea nana e ako hou mahope, a he kanalua au i ka hiki ia Pele ke hana peia” (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, March 29, 1893, 4). Wahineomao goes so far as to question Hiiaka’s truthfulness. She cannot believe someone else would ever pluck her lehua blossoms.

Dozens of passages throughout every mana of this mo‘olelo show Hiiaka mourning both the death of her aikāne and the burning of the ulu lehua itself.⁶³ In these passages, the deep and intimate pilina between Hiiaka and Hopoe is repeatedly referenced in concert with the pilina between Hopoe and her ulu Lehua. Hopoe’s human and her ulu lehua forms were entirely devoured by Pele when she sent her fires into Hopoe, and because Hopoe was human and the lehua itself, Hiiaka mourns both fully.

TABLE 10: NĀ INOA O LOHIAU

LOHIAUIPO I NA HALA O NAUE I KE KAI	Poepoe. Jul. 1, 1910, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Aug. 8, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Aug. 15, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. Sept. 14, 4 Hooulumahiehie. May 12, 1906, 4	Naue i ke kai
LOHIAU I NA HALA O NAUE I KE KAI	Hooulumahiehie. Apr. 17, 1906, 4	Naue i ke kai
LOHIAUIPO I KA MAKANI PAHELEHALA O WAINIHA, I KE KUPAOA O NA POLO HINANO O NAUE I KE KAI	Hooulumahiehie. Nov. 9, 1906, 4	Naue i ke kai Polo Hinano
LOHIAU I KA POLO HINANO I HAENA	Hooulumahiehie. May 9, 1906, 4	Haena
UA KEIKI HULA KA LAU NEI O KAUAI	Hooulumahiehie. June 20, 1906, 4	Kauai
KAMAKAOKEALOHA	Kapihenui. July 10, 1862, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. July 3, 1893, 4	Aloha

Lohiau’s many names follow the trend of the other kanaka in the mo‘olelo, in that each inoa deeply ties him to his ‘āina of Haena, Kauai. Therefore, just as Hopoe is the ‘ulu lehua in

⁶³ Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, May 29, 1906, 4. Kapihenui, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, February 20, 1862, 1. Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, April 26, 1893, 4.

Keaau, and evoked in every lehua reference throughout the mo‘olelo, so too is Lohiau bound to Hā‘ena and the hala o naue i ke kai.

Nānā i ke Kumu, ‘Āina and Hawaiian Intimacy:

As early chapters have noted, many contemporary Kanaka Maoli scholars have repeatedly written about what it means for Hawaiians to practice aloha ‘āina. Much of this work begins with an undeniable truth: Kānaka Maoli have a deep and personal relationship with their ‘āina that determines what aloha ‘āina means, looks like, and produces. And yet, while important and valuable work has discussed aloha ‘āina in terms of politics and society, little has considered aloha ‘āina in terms of relatedness and pilina. What does aloha ‘āina teach us about intimacy? In the first half of this chapter, I have offered examples from the Hiiaka mo‘olelo of how kānaka and ‘āina are related to each other through the sharing of names, characteristics, places, and even identities. Now I will look at how ‘āina influences how we practice, describe, and remember intimacy with others. I want to suggest that ‘āina has been and always will be our waihona for understanding and practicing intimacy.

As a creation story, Hiiakaikapoliopole describes the birth of islands, of lehua groves, of volcanoes, and through volcanoes, of ‘āina. And because it relates the act of creation, it is also story filled with pleasure. Throughout the hundreds of pages of these mana of the mo‘olelo, we are constantly encountering accounts of Puna’s sweet caressing scent of the polohīnano, or of the bitter taste of the wai ko‘olihilihi. Hooulumahiehie’s mana is the most descriptive: long, beautiful, and detailed accounts of sex between kānaka are frequent and easily found.

What will not be found, however, are detailed anatomical descriptions. When we read about the nights Pele and Lohiau shared together after they decided to ho‘āo, we are not told

about Pele’s or Lohiau’s bodies. In fact, very few specific details appear anywhere in this mo‘olelo about what Lohiau looks or feels like. Instead, we are offered elaborate descriptions of the lands that these two ali‘i came from. In the first scene of Lohiau and Pele having sex, Hooulumahiehie writes, “Ua ike o Lohiau-ipo i ka nani o Puna—ua honi i ke ala o ka hinano—ua mukiki i ka wai lehua o Panaewa—ua lei ia Hoakalei—ua inu i ka wai koo lihilihi—ua kaa niniau i ka wiliwai—a ua eha i ka eha lima ole a ke aloha. Aloha wale Puna aina paia ala i ka hala” (*Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, June 13, 1906, 3). In later encounters, Lohiau is so enticed by Pele that he is becomes quite lost (lilo loa) in the beauties of Puna (*Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, June 14, 1906, 3). Through these passages we learn that for Lohiau, sleeping with Pele means experiencing far more than her assumed human form. It is to enjoy deeply all the beauties of Puna, including the scent of the hinano and hala, and the sweet taste of the wai lehua of Panaewa. Pele’s name appears nowhere in this passage, but because we know that Pele is not only her human form, but all of her wahi, we recognize that what we read is detailing a Pele and Lohiau affair of aloha.

And we also learn by example that the most intimate thing we can do with another person is to share our ‘āina with them. Few if any kānaka in this mo‘olelo are as pili as its namesake, Hiiakaikapoliopole, and Pele, who held her in her bosom. In fact, these women not only share Pele’s poli, but the same pilina to Puna. As a result, when Hiiaka seeks revenge and sleeps with Lohiau, the passage describing the love making duplicates the earlier account of Pele’s sleeping with Lohiau: “Ua ike o Lohiau-ipo i ka nani o Puna—ua [*sic*] ua honi i ke ala o ka hinano—ua mukiki i ka wai lehua o Puna—ua lei ia Hoakalei—ua inu i ka wai koolihilihi—ua kaani-ni au i ka wili wai—a ua eha i ka eha lima ole a ke aloha. Aloha wale Puna, aina paia ala i ka hala” (*Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, August 18, 1906, 4). That these passages are identical except for one substitution of Puna for Panaewa suggests that author is above all calling attention to the complicated nature of

the ‘upena of intimacies connecting Pele, Lohiau, Hiiaka—and Puna. But for all of the overlapping nae and ‘aha, we are left with a simple truth: to be intimate with Pele or Hiiaka is to be enticed into Puna, to smell the hinano, and to drink the waters of the lehua of Panaewa and Puna. They are quite literally ali‘i of Puna and the surrounding area. But the pilina between Pele, Hiiaka, and Puna also insure that Lohiau’s experiences of intimacy with these two formidable wāhine will be very similar.

Many accounts of sex with Hiiaka foreground references to Puna. Take for example this description of her night of pleasure with the beautiful Chief of Kailua (Kaanahau), which at times sounds familiar:

Ua ike iho la o Hiiaka i ka nani o Kailua—ua hoopapa i ka oopu maka peke o Kawainui—ua ike kumaka i ka ui o Makalei, a ua eha Kaukaopua i ka eha lima ole a ke aloha, ke wili la i ka wili wai a ka makemake. (Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, January 18, 1906, 4)

A o Kaanahau hoi, ka ui o Kailua, ua inu oia i ka wai koo-lihilihi o Puna, ua nowelo i ka pua lehua o Panaewa, ua ike i ka nani o Aipo—ua maele i ke anu o Hauailiki—A pela iho la i hookoia ai na makemake elua i holo like ke kaunu i Waiolohia. (January 19, 1906, 4)

Here Hiiaka experiences and is very pleased by all the famed beauties and tributes of Kailua—from the ‘o‘opu of Kawainui to the strong trunk of the Makalei tree. In turn, Kaanahau is granted the gift of sipping the pleasurable waters of Puna, just as Lohiau has with Pele and later will with Hiiaka. Nor is it only the affairs between Pele, Hiiaka, and their lovers that are described through ‘āina; in fact, it is the only way physical intimacy is portrayed in the mo‘olelo. Take for example this passage describing the sexual encounter between Kauakahiapaoa and Pele near the close of

the mo‘olelo:

Ua ike ae la o Kauakahiapaoa i kanani o Halemaumau, ua inu i ka wai ono
hoomalule o ka puna wai koo lihilihi o Puna, ua wela ke kikala o ua keiki nei o ka ua
hoopulu hinano o Naue, ua kai-olohia i ka pupu o Puna, ua uo ia ka nani o Kauai, ua kuiia
ke aloha i ka iwihilo. Aohe mea nani a koe aku. (Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na‘i Aupuni*,
October 25, 1906, 4)

Like Lohiau, Kauakahiapaoa experiences the beauties of Halemaumau, and the wai ‘ono and
ko‘o lihilihi of Puna. And again, Pele’s name need not be mentioned, because to evoke
Halemaumau is to evoke the woman of the crater, Pele.

We also find evocations of ‘āina in passages describing the intimacy between aikāne.
When Hiiaka and Hopoe’s intimacy is first mentioned in the Bush and Paaluhi mana, Hiiaka is
described as plucking and stringing a lei lehua (e nanea ana i ka ako a i ke kui pua lei lehua). Of
course, the verbs “ako” (pluck) and “kui” (pierce/penetrate) are for obvious reasons often used to
describe both lei making and sex. And because the lehua is of course a kinolau of Hopoe, when
Hiiaka strings her lei lehua, we are meant to understand that Hiiaka and Hopoe are being
intimate with each other. Immediately following this passage, Hiiaka offers the following mele:

Ke haa la Puna i ka makani,
Haa ka uluhala i Keaau,
Haa Haena me Hopoe,
Haa ka wahine ami i kai o Nanahuki la
Hula lea wa—le
I kai o Nanahuki —e

(Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o Hawaii*, January 10, 1893, 1)

In this mele, three k̄naka, Puna (Hiiaka), Haena, and Hopoe, are all engaging in a “hula lea,” a pleasurable dance together in the sea of Nanahuki. It is only in Bush and Paaluhi’s mana of this mo‘olelo that Haena is revealed to be more than just a place. This often cited and performed mele takes on greater and more pleasurable meaning when read with the understanding that before Hiiaka was able to ho‘āikāne with Hopoe, Hopoe was seen dancing hula with Haena at waters of Nanahuki, so in fact this is a mele about these wāhine and their wahi enjoying their hula le‘a together.⁶⁴

But in the shorter mana of Hiiaka written by Kapihenui, and by Bush and Paaluhi, there is customarily less time devoted to describing sexual encounters, so the most substantial accounts come primarily from the mana of Hooulumahie and Poepoe. What we still find, however, is that whenever sexual intimacy appears in the mo‘olelo, whenever the author takes the opportunity to ho‘omanawanui in the pleasurable moments shared between k̄naka, such encounters are described with and through ‘āina. Such passages are important for several reasons. First, they offer a significant amount of ‘āina-based knowledge. When Kaanahau has sex with Hiiaka, place names (Kailua, Kawainui), including names of significant features (Makalei) are passed on. Other passages preserve the names of winds, rains, and streams. These features of our ‘āina are therefore a primary and favored way of thinking about how our kanaka bodies engage in pleasure.

Following this example, if one of our authors had composed a mo‘olelo about a moment of sexual intimacy between me and another wahine, it would perhaps have read: “Ua ike oia i ka nani o Palolo, ua honi i ke ala o ke awapuhi melelemele, ua luu i ka wai huihui o Kaau a inu i ka

⁶⁴ “‘ike e aku la o Pele ia Hopoe laua o Haena e hula mai ana iloko o ke kai o Puna” (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o Hawaii* Jan. 10, 1893, 1).

ua līlīlehua.” Aside from being a superior way to describe the intense pleasure of being intimate with another kanaka, these passages are useful because they teach us about the pilina between our intimates and their ‘āina. The passage above records my pilina to Palolo, my one hānau, and the mo‘o awapuhi melemele and ke‘oke‘o, the ki‘ai of the valley, as well as the chilling waters of Kaaui crater that fed many lo‘i throughout the ‘ili, and the valley’s beautiful rain, the ua Līlīlehua. These passages are therefore mnemonic devices that ensure we properly recognize the wealth and beauty of our ‘āina and insist on our pilina to her.

A careful reading of the Hiiaka mo‘olelo therefore reveals that this is how Kānaka Maoli discuss intimacy. These devices are not screens or analogies, employed out of fear of missionary disapproval, or out of shame in our own sexuality and desires. Rather, they recognize pilina, and admire our ‘āina. We know from the rigorous scholarship of Noelani Arista that kaona means far more than just hidden meanings, or “figurative multiplicity.” In fact, the mana of kaona is that it moves the audience to think or “conceptualize history—in a kaona conscious way” (2010, 666). For Brandy Nālani McDougall, the use of kaona is also an exercise of aesthetic sovereignty, or what she calls “kaona connectivity,” which “as a practice, requires us to connect with our kūpuna as well as with each other” (2016, 5). McDougall’s investigation of kaona is well paired with my own, because it also focuses on how practicing pilina is an essential part of practicing kaona. Only when we read these mo‘olelo carefully, and enjoy the pleasure of these encounters, do we fully realize that ‘āina provide an opportunity for deploying kaona to mask yet celebrate sexuality and intimacy. Being intimate and pili with our ‘āina teaches us how to be intimate and pili to each other. Like Bush and Paaluhi, the composer of the famed “Manu ‘Ō‘ō” does not choose to describe an ‘ō‘ō sipping the nectar from a lehua blossom because of shame, or a desire to conceal the experience of one wahine sipping the wai ko‘o lihilihi from another. Rather, it was

from watching our manu mūkīkī their lovers that we kānaka learned to care for, cherish, and enjoy our lovers.⁶⁵

When our composers describe Kailua meeting Puna, or Hiiaka fondling the ‘o‘opu of Kawainui, they do so because being raised by our ‘āina, experiencing its flourishing and loving our ‘āina, informs how we practice aloha and pleasure with each other. When we deploy kaona sexually, as when we playfully compare ourselves to manu ‘ō‘ō and our lovers to lehua, it would be good for us to reflect on the pilina these metaphors are (re)membering for us kānaka today. They are lessons in love, pleasure, care, and consent.

Commitment and ‘Āina

Physical intimacy is probably the more le‘ale‘a part of our pilina to ‘āina to discuss, but ‘āina binds the ‘aha between us and those we are pili to in many significant ways. We have discussed how kānaka are represented by the places they are from, and how kānaka pilina to their one hānau or the places they choose to noho pa‘a. But as we have also seen, Hiiaka mo‘olelo do more than confirm that the places we come from are important. These mo‘olelo also show us how pilina with our intimates is marked by and mapped on the ‘āina we cross. Throughout the mo‘olelo, Hiiaka describes her pilina through those places that they have become intimate to

⁶⁵ O ka manu mukiki,
Ale lehua aka manu;
O ka Awa iwi lena,
I ka uka o ka Liu;
O ka manu,
Hahai lau awa o Puna;
Aia ika laau,
Ka Awa o Puna;
O Puna hoi—e. (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, February 7, 1893, 4)

together, that remind them of their pilina. When Hiiaka witnesses the burning of her aikāne from Pohakea, Hopoe becomes her “hoa . . . i ka wai o Pohakea” (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o Ka Lahui*, April 26, 1893, 4). This happens not because Hiiaka and Hopoe were ever in Pohakea together, but because Hiiaka carries her pilina and aloha for Hopoe on this journey, and it is at Pohakea that she realizes her beloved has been killed. But being together in the same place can also create multiple specific pilina that strengthen the sense of pilina. Through this chant Hiiaka offers to honor each of her intimates, we learn that Wahineomao is Hiiaka’s aikāne and hoa of Haena, Kalalau, Koolau, Mahinui, and “na wahi a pau,”⁶⁶ and that Lohiau is her kāne of Haena, Polihale, Ewa, Puuloa, Mana, Malilua, and Puakukui.⁶⁷

No episode in the Hiiaka mo‘olelo displays this more intensely than the Kapihenui and the Bush and Paaluhi mana of Hiiaka’s response when Lohiau is killed by Pele. After Pele has killed Hopoe, Lohiau, and Wahineomao, Hiiaka leaves Kilauea, vowing never to return. This departure frustrates and angers Pele, so she seeks out and revives Wahineomao, now Hiiaka’s only remaining aikāne, to ask her about the details of the huaka‘i to Kauai and back.

Wahineomao responds angrily:

Ae, aole no ko kaikaina ka hewa, nou no ka hewa, i ka maua hele ana a Oahu, ma
Kailua i kahi o Kanahau (sic), moe maua ilaila a ao ae hele no maua a Kahuku, ike mai
mai (sic) no ko kaikaina i ka mokulehua kapu a olua, ua pau i ka ai ia e oe, a ka moana o

⁶⁶ These kau can be found in the following sources: Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, April 21-23, 1906, 4; Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, September 26-27, 1906, 4; Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*, July 23, 1909, 4; Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*, April 23, 1910, 4.

⁶⁷ These kau can be found in the following sources: Kapihenui, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, March 6, 1862, Kapihenui, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, March 20, 1862; Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, April 28, 1893, Kapihenui, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, April 3, 1862; Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, May 1, 1893; Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, May 9, 1893, Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, June 20, 1893, Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, June 23, 1893.

Kauai, ike no ko kaikaina i ka make o ke aikane ana ia oe o Hopoe me ke kane a laua o Haena, ua ai ia e oe ua make, oia ke kumu o ko kaikaina ho-ao ana i ke kane a olua.

A hiki maua i Kauai, ua make ke kane a olua, hoi mai no oe make no ko make, i haawe no ko aloha ka mua i make ai, lapaau maua aola, o ka pili ana no ia o ke kane me ko kaikaina pili me a‘u pau ka pa ana o ke kane me ia, me a‘u wale no ke kane a hiki wale no makou i Hawaii nei, a no kou malama ole ana i ke kauoha a ko kaikaina, nolaila, lawe mai nei kela i ke kane a olua me ka malama i kau kauoha, me ka malu o ke kino o ke kane a olua, a ike oe. (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, June 21, 1893, 4)

Alaila, hana kela e like me kona manao, oia la, aole i hewa ko kaikaina, o oe no kai. (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, June 22, 1893, 4).

For Wahineomao, Pele is wholly to blame—“nou no ka hewa”—for the death of Lohiau, and for Hiiaka leaving Kilauea. Wahineomao provides the timeline of their journey, and describes Hiiaka witnessing the death of her aikāne while traveling to fetch Lohiau. This was the act that provoked Hiiaka’s desire to seek revenge on her sister by sleeping with Lohiau.

We learn a great deal about the pilina between Wahineomao and Hiiaka from Wahineomao’s standing up to Pele in this way. Wahineomao knows, as we do, that to speak back to Pele can easily result in death. But Wahineomao does this eagerly, because it is her kuleana to rest beside her aikāne, making her defiance “olelo naauauwa no.” Because Wahineomao does not believe that Hiiaka will be spared by their kaikua‘ana, she intentionally angers Pele, hoping that this rage will also be cast upon her, and allow her to die with her aikāne (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, June 22, 1893, 4).⁶⁸ Instead of killing Wahineomao, however, Pele gives her a

⁶⁸ “Ke ano o keia olelo a Wahineomao, e hooweliweli nei i ka hewa no Pele, he olelo naauauwa no, i ke aloha i ke kane a me ke aikane me Hiiakaikapoliopole, e manao ana o Wahineomao e hoowili ana keia i kela olelo i mea no Pele e huhu ai ia iaia, hookahi la hoi ka

task: “e kii oe i ko aikane, i kii oe a hoi mai kuu kaikaina ia oe ola oe ia’u, aka, i hoi ole mai kuu kaikaina ia oe, make oe ia’u i keia la” (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, June 22, 1893, 4). “Go and retrieve your beloved aikāne. If you succeed, I will not kill you; however, if my kaikaina does not return with you, you will die at my hand.” Because Wahineomao is determined to spend the rest of her days with her aikāne—in life, or death—she wholeheartedly takes on this task, and leaves Kilauea immediately with Hiiaka’s kaikunāne, Keowahimakaakaua, to find her beloved Hiiaka.

Wahineomao finds her in a full state of mourning for her beloved Hopoe and Lohiau.

Wahineomao urges her to return with her, but Hiiaka refuses:

O hoi, aole au e hoi aku, wahi a Hiiakaikapoliopole, aole au e hoi, eia au mamuli o ke kane a kaua, o ka luhi a kaua i au ai i ke kai makamaka ole, i au ai kaua i ke alanui papawaa, i hele ai kaua i ke kaha makamaka ole, kuleana ole, hookahi no kuleana o ke kane; i hele ai kaua i ka la kulolia wale iho no, ai ole, ia ole o ka la pololi, a maona aku i ka pua o ke aloha, o hoi, eia au mamuli o ke kane a kaua. (Kapihenui, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, July 3, 1862, 4)

Instead, Hiiaka wails out in mourning for their kāne, Lohiauipo, and for the long and lonesome journey she and Wahineomao took, with no kuleana other than the kāne who is now gone.

Frustrated by Hiiaka’s refusal, Wahineomao turns to Keowahimakaakaua and says, “ke hoole mai nei keia, aole e hoi mai me kaua” (Hiiaka is refusing, she will not return with us).

Keowahimakakaua then urges Wahineomao to call out with aloha for her aikāne, and to remind her of the places they journeyed to together, the places they were intimate. Keowahimakaakaua

make pu ana me ke kane, a me ke aikane no ko ia nei manao aole e ola ana ke aikane e make ana no” (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, June 22, 1893, 4).

insists that this will cause Hiiaka to return.⁶⁹

While Wahineomao worries that she cannot haku a mele that will persuade Hiiaka to return, Keowahimakaakaua is convinced that recalling these places will inspire an effective mele even if she is not a true haku mele.⁷⁰ Wahineomao follows his instructions and composes a series of mele to entice Hiiaka home with her. The first three mele honor the ‘āina and kai of Kauai, the land where they together revived then retrieved their kāne Lohiau.

TABLE 11A: NĀ MELE O WAHIEOMAO

#	Kapihenui (KHP)	Bush and Paaluhi (KLL)
1	Kuu aikāne i ka wai liu o Mana Pahaleolea i Maulua hoolale waa, E holo ka lawakua, E uwe aku oe e ke koolau, Aloha na hoa i makamaka ole, Kuu aikane i ka hale uiki a ka leo e, Auhea oe, hoi mai kua e. (July 3, 1862, 4)	Kuu aikane i ka wai liu o Mana Paha leolea i Maulua hoolale waa E holo ka Lawakua E uwe aku oe e ke Koolau Aloha na hoa i makamaka ole Kuu kane i ka hale uiki a ka leo e Auhea oe hoi mai kua (June 23, 1893, 4)
2	Kuu aikane i ka wai iliahi ula o Makaweli Hinana ia wai o Luhi Hoa I ke kapa ahoa, Eu hoi kua he koolau nei, Kuu aikane i ka moana, Ka malama wale no—e, Auhea oe, hoi mai kua, (July 3, 1862, 4)	Kuu aikane i ka wai iliahi ula o Makaweli Hinaha ia wai o Luhi Hoa i ke kapa Ahoa Eu hoi kua ke Koolau nei Kuu aikane i ka moana Ka malama wale no—e Auhea oe hoi mai kua (June 23, 1893, 4)
3	Kuu aikane i ka pali o Kalalau Mai ka pali kuukuu kaula o Haena, Kookolu kākou e haele nei,	Kuu aikane i ka pali o Kalalau Mai ka pali kuukuu kaula o Haena Kookolu kakou e haele nei

⁶⁹ “. . . hooalohaloha aku no oe, ma kahi no a olua i hele ai la, i pili ai olua la, malaila, no oe, e hooalohaloha aku ai, malia o o [*sic*] aloha mai, hoi mai hoi” (Kapihenui, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, July 3, 1862, 4) * Parallel Passage: (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, June 22, 1893, 4)

⁷⁰ Ka! owau ka mea loa ole o ke mele o ka maua hele ana, a hoi wale mai no makou, a Oahu, i ka hale hula kilu o Peleula, o ia nei no o ke kane a maua ka mea mele o makou, owau, aole au wahi mele, na ke kane mai a maua ka’u wahi mele i ao mai ia’u, ole loa aku hoi paha keia, I mai o Keowahimakaakana.

Noonoo ae no oe ma kahi no a olua i hele ai la, malia o loa ae kahi mele, alaila, kulou keia noonoo, oia kulou no o ia nei a liuliu, ia aku keia, ka!” (Kapihenui, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, July 3, 1862, 4)

I ha i ka manao e,
 Auhea oe, hoi mai kaula e
 (July 10, 1862, 4)

I ha i ka manao e
 Auhea oe hoi mai kaula e
 (June 26, 1893, 4)

Because of this recitation of these places and mo‘olelo of their journey together, Hiiaka begins to recall her own pilina to Wahineomao through her own mourning for Lohiau and Hopoe.

Although Hiiaka continues to insist that she will not return with Wahineomao, she does give up her na‘au‘auā for their kāne Lohiauipo, suggesting that Wahineomao and Hiiaka’s collective remembering of all their shared troubles and hardships at these places is what encourages Hiiaka to “hookuu” her na‘au‘auā for the kāne.⁷¹

Because Hiiaka continues to refuse Wahineomao’s request, she continues to haku mele for her beloved. The next four mele detail their travels back to Hawai‘i from Kauai. In these mele, Wahineomao recalls the dirt of Lihue, the ua Poaihala of Kahaluu and Kailua. She calls upon the kuahiwi (Maunaloa) and wai koo of Molokai, finally returning to Puna, their beloved home. With each mele, Wahineomao begs her beloved, let us return (hoi mai kaula).

TABLE 11B: NĀ MELE O WAHINEOMAO

#	Kapihenui (KHP)	Bush and Paaluhi (KLL)
4	Kuu aikane i ka hale wai e, Hale hau anu o Lihue, Hale kamaa i ka lepo e, Hoohoa i ke kukui o Kanehoa, Auhea oe, hoi mai kaula, (July 10, 1862, 4)	Kuu aikane i ka hale wai e Hale hau anu o Lihue Hale kamaa i ka lepo e Hoohoa i ke kukui o Kanehoa Auhea oe hoi mai kaula (June 26, 1893, 4)
5	Kuu aikane i ka ua poaihala o Kahaluu, Nihi Mololani a puakea, Kuu aikane i ka ua holio o Koolau,	Kuu aikane i ka ua poaihala o Kahaluu Nihi mololani Apuakea Kuu aikane i ka ua Holio o Koolau

⁷¹ A pau ia mele a ia nei, nonoi ae no o Hiiakaikapoliopole i ka ihu o ke aikane, a hookuu aku ia ia e naauauwa no i ke aloha o ke kane, o ka luhi no o laua i hele ai i na wahi pilikia, ka makamaka i ike ia’i kela aina o Kauai, pela mai no ke aikane (Kapihenui, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, July 10, 1862, 4).

	Kuu aikane i ka mehana a ka uha e, Auhea oe, hoi mai kaula, (July 10, 1862, 4)	Kuu aikane i ka mehana a ka uha e Auhea oe hoi mai kaula (June 26, 1893, 4)
6	Kuu aikane i ke kaha o Hilia, Mai ka lai luahine o oa Kamanu, E hoolale mai ana i ka Malako, E ala ua ao kaula e auwe, E uwe aku ana ia Kalae, I kuahiwi o Maunaloa Ola i ka hale Ohai, Huakai o Hilia la, Auhea oe hoi mai kaula, (July 10, 1862, 4)	Kuu aikane i ke kaha o Hilia, Mai ka lai luahine o Oakamanu. E hoolale mai ana i ka Malako E ala ua ao kaula e, auwe E uwe aku ana ia Kalae I kuahiwi o Maunaloa Ola i ka hale Ohai Huakai o Hilia la Auhea oe hoi mai kaula (June 26, 1893, 4)
7	Kuu aikane i ka waa koo o Molokai E koo aku ana i halana Laemakani, Ke palauma wale la no i ka umauma e, Kuu aikane i ke ola a ka hua o ke kai, Auhea oe hoi mai kaula, (July 10, 1862 4)	Kuu aikane i ka waa koo o Molokai E koo aku ana i hala na Laeamakani [<i>sic</i>] Ke palauma wale no i ka umauma Kuu aikane i ke ola a ka hua o ke kai Auhea oe hoi mai kaula. (June 26, 1893, 4)
8	Kuu aikane i ka uluhala o Puna e, Kuu aikane i ka ua kanikoo o Hilo e, Auhea oe, hoi mai kaula (July 10, 1862, 4)	Kuu aikane i ka uluhala o Puna e Kuu aikane i ka ua kanikoo o Hilo Auhea oe hoi mai kaula (June 27, 1893, 4)

When, however, Hiiaka continues to refuse, Wahineomao is distraught. She has followed the instructions of their kaikunāne, to no avail. She has called out all the places they were intimate to together, until none remained (“aole aku wahi i koe”).⁷² But once more Keowahimakaakaula advises his hoahale (Wahineomao), “Noonoo hou ia aku paha ma na wahi a olua i pili ai me ke kane a olua, i moe pu ai, i hele pu ai i ke anu me ke koekoe” think again of the places you both were pili to your kāne, the places you three slept together, the places you endured in the blistering cold (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, June 27, 1893, 4).⁷³

Up until this point, Wahineomao had focused on recalling her own pilina to Hiiaka, as

⁷² “I aku la o Wahineomao i kona hoa, o na wahi iho la no ia a maua i hele pu ai la, i pili ai, aole aku wahi i koe” (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, June 27 1893, 4)

⁷³ Parallel passage: Kapihenui, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, July 10, 1862, 4* *Damaged and partially illegible.*

her aikāne wale nō. But within our ‘upena of intimacies, pilina can compound, as when Hiiaka and Wahineomao took on Lohiau as their kāne. Not only was the wāhine pilina as aikāne strengthened, but the pilina and kuleana *between the three of them* was compounded.

In this final mele, Wahineomao follows the instructions of her hoa hele, and recalls the pilina between herself, her aikāne, and their kāne.

TABLE 11C: NĀ MELE O WAHIEOMAO

#	Kapihenui (KHP)	Bush and Paaluhi
8	Kuu aikane i ka la o lalo e, A po kaena i kehu a ke kai, Kipu ae la i ka lau o ka ai, Pala ehū i ka la, Ka lau o ka ulu o Poloa e, po wale hoi, E hōpo mai ana ka oe ia’u, I ke hoa o ka ua o ka la, O ke anu o ke koekoe, Auhea oe, hoi mai kaua (July 10, 1862, 4)	Kuu aikane i ka la o lalo e A po Kaena i ka ehū a ke kai, Kipu ae la i ka lau o ka ai Palaehū i ka la Ka lau o ka ulu o Poloa, no wale hoi E hōoipo mai an aka oe ia’u I ke hoa o ka ua o ka la O ke anu o ke koekoe Auhea oe, hoi mai kaua (June 27, 1893, 4)

Wahineomao sings out, recalling the spraying seas, how the three were fed together, the warm embraces that helped them endure the shivering cold. And when she does this, when she composes a mele that (re)members the ‘aha between the three of them and calls out to her aikāne, “hoi mai kaua,” Hiiaka finally and wholeheartedly agrees: “ae, akahi au a hoi me oe.” At this moment, Hiiaka honors the hardships she and her aikāne endured together in all the places that they journeyed, “i au ai i ke kai makamaka ole, i ka pololi ai,” as they hungered in their quest across the lonesome seas (Kapihenui, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, July 10, 1862, 4).⁷⁴

These episodes are significant because they confirm that just as the pleasure shared between aikāne is marked by ‘āina and place, so too is their kuleana to each other. Throughout

⁷⁴ Parallel passage: Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, June 27, 1893, 4. These episodes are also included in the Hoouluamahie mana, although not identically with how they appear here.

the Hiiaka archive, there are countless examples of Hiiaka honoring her pilina to Wahineomao by recalling in verse and prose all the places and trials they had journeyed through together. Hiiaka recalls the cold rains, the turbulent seas, the vicious opponents; and she does this all by name. These obstacles are entirely specific to the ‘āina where they encountered them. The relationship to place is so central in their pilina, that it is those places and pilikia that Wahineomao must remind Hiiaka of to convince her to give up her mourning for Lohiau and Hopoe and return home to Kilauea. We learn here that pilina and kuleana can be recounted and remembered through ‘āina. In fact, because Hiiaka eventually chooses to return to Kilauea, the recollection of ‘āina is what saves both Hiiaka and Wahineomao from being killed by Pele. Should that ‘āina have been forgotten or forsaken, Hiiaka and Wahineomao would have died.

As we work to unpack and understand more fully what it means to practice aloha ‘āina, these mo‘olelo must be taken seriously. What binds Hiiaka and Wahineomao so closely together is not just their mutual aloha but their aloha ‘āina. It is the ‘aha that entwines them, tying them to each other and to their ‘āina aloha.

Conclusion

These mana‘o I offer should not be surprising. Kanaka Maoli scholars have argued repeatedly and pervasively that our mo‘olelo reflect a deep connection between our kānaka and our ‘āina (Trask 1999a; Trask 1999b; Trask 1999c; Silva 2004; Silva 2017; ho‘omanawanui 2015; ho‘omanawanui 2007; ho‘omanawanui 2010; ho‘omanawanui 2013; ho‘omanawanui 2014; McDougall 2011; McDougall 2016). This ‘ike has been firmly established in our contemporary scholarship. This chapter has therefore been devoted to peering into parts of our archive to see exactly what that “connection” looks like. When we read Hiiaka closely, it becomes clear that this pilina to ‘āina is the standard by which we understand our pilina with

each other. Our relationship to our ‘āina is our kumu, and every intimacy we practice thereafter echoes the intimacies learned from our beautiful home.

This is valuable ‘ike, and especially because of our current state of being displaced and disenfranchised from our land base. Removed from our wahi pana, their mo‘olelo, and the ‘ike they offer us, we must continue our struggle to practice pono pilina between us kānaka. When we declare that our mo‘olelo are crucial, because they offer us ways of knowing generations in the making, we must also acknowledge the kuleana to do the difficult work of uncovering every bit of those epistemologies and their accompanying practices.

Our nation building requires us to understand these mo‘olelo, and especially in the service of a movement that insists on the primacy of aloha ‘āina. We must interrogate more fully what this powerful concept rooted in intimacy entails. In this dissertation, aloha ‘āina is first, last, and always a pilina. I hope that these first four chapters contribute something to our understanding of how aloha ‘āina is the very fiber of our practice of pilina, and not just to the lands we were born to, or the lands we come to love, but also the kānaka with whom we forged deep and lasting intimacies. Our great expansive ‘upena contains many and diverse articulations of relationality, but aloha ‘āina is the ‘aha, the cordage we use to tie these nae together. Aloha ‘āina holds us all accountable, not just for how we protect and mālama our ancestral practices of loving our land, but also our ancestral ways of loving and caring for each other.

As we continue along this path, trying to learn the many things our ‘āina surely has to teach us about food sovereignty, humility, grace, and generosity, let us always remember to dig a little deeper, to celebrate all the ways we aloha each other—as we do, and through, our ‘āina.

CHAPTER FIVE:

KAMA'ĀINA: PILINA AND KULEANA IN A TIME OF REMOVAL

Dismembering Home:

We know by now that all pilina is personal, and the disruption and refusal of our pilina is political. To discuss pilina to 'āina I must therefore begin here, at my piko, my one hānau. Waikīkī.

When I was a child, my family spent our weekends rolling in the shore break at Kaimana Beach Park. It might be hard to imagine, but even in the early 90s, parts of Waikīkī were still ruled by Kanaka Maoli and local families. Before the city and county of Honolulu was mining sand from the ocean floor to beef up a shoreline eroding into the sea because of over development. Before the metered stalls, running along Kapi'olani Park. Long before “The State of Hawai'i” was expecting nearly 9 million visitors a year, and before it imposed a sit and lie ban that specifically targeted and criminalized Hawai'i's poorest for simply existing, for being an eyesore on that prime commodity, Waikīkī Beach.

Over twenty-seven years, the transformation of Waikīkī has been overwhelming. Its shoreline and those who frequent it are nearly unrecognizable to me. Kanaka Maoli and local families navigating between the hordes of visitors are now the exception, rather than the rule. And because we come to this shoreline less and less, it is not just that Kaimana becomes less familiar to us. We become foreign to her.

Kaimana is a place intimately entwined into my relationship—my pilina—with my family. Here is where I learned to swim in the ocean, securely clinging to my father's broad shoulders. Where I almost drowned when I decided to disobey my mother. Where my brother

and I conquered our fear of heights when we jumped off the Natatorium wall and the lifeguard tower together. Where I taught my sisters to body board—unsuccessfully. This is where we celebrate birthdays and adoptions, and bid farewell to lifelong friends.

But I do not go to Kaimana much anymore. In fact, I only go there when my mother or father insist on my attendance at a particular family gathering. The beach itself is uncomfortable. The manufactured sand is chalky and clings to the skin in an unnatural way. The shoreline is crowded with American, European, and Japanese tourists, and the parking lots are hostile. So now when I come to Kaimana, I am overcome with the feeling that I do not belong. As a Kanaka Maoli born and raised in the ahupua‘a of Waikīkī, this is not only saddening but troubling to me. By historical standards, this shoreline was a kuleana given to me by birth—a kuleana I would have to work to uphold, but a kuleana that I had every right, and responsibility, to practice. Today access to that practice is obstructed by hotels, parking fees, and massive crowds of malihini. And in some ways, these obstructions have also impacted my pilina with my ‘ohana, and to a larger extent, to my lāhui.

In the previous chapters, I began carrying out this work by preparing an overview of the theoretical fields to which this dissertation responds. Chapter One drew upon and evaluated significant scholarship from Indigenous studies, Indigenous feminisms, and Indigenous queer theory to learn how some fields of study have begun to draw our attention to the intimate and productive relationships between feminism, queer theory, and understandings of sovereignty. Indigenous literary critique has been joined with Kanaka Maoli mo‘olelo critique to provide vocabularies and methods for approaching Kanaka Maoli mo‘olelo in terms of their own standards of excellence.

In Chapter Two I offered an overview of my methodology and methods when consulting Hawaiian language and nūpepa resources. I articulated a theory of rigorous paraphrase necessary when analyzing large collections of Hawaiian language material in English scholarship, and insisted on the necessity of approaching this archive from a place of abundance. Chapter Three identified and evaluated the multitude of Kanaka Maoli relationships that together form an expansive and dynamic matrix that I have called an ‘upena of pilina. And in Chapter Four, I began by discussing the intimate, pervasive role of ‘āina in mo‘olelo as something more than setting or backdrop, and I offered a series of readings that demonstrate how each and every one of these pilina between kānaka is informed and mediated by a pilina with ‘āina, thereby celebrating the links between the expression of intimacy and place.

In this concluding chapter I narrow the focus to a specific set of relationships that can help us see how the ongoing dislocation, disintegration, and disembodiment of our Kanaka Maoli relationships has affected, and continues to obstruct, our ability to challenge and offer alternatives to settler colonialism. The pilina at issue are those between kama‘āina and malihini, and more specifically, how the kuleana of such pilina are articulated in mo‘olelo. Essential here will be our understanding of these positions within relationships, which contrast sharply with how they are represented and practiced as part of the technologies of settler colonialism in Hawai‘i. I will conclude with some thoughts on how Kānaka Maoli can initiate the practice of (re)membering these pilina through specific acts of survivance and resurgence as kama‘āina in their ‘āina.

Kuleana:

Kuleana, malihini, and kama‘āina are words so commonly used in Hawai‘i that they seem at times to elude definition. They all gesture toward values that resonate with many, but their complexity and richness of meaning also makes them vulnerable to appropriation and commodification. Such appropriation, and our insistence on maintaining the mana of these words and their related values, are political acts. In this chapter I will describe what our mo‘olelo teach us about kuleana, malihini, and kama‘āina, and discuss how these practices and values are inherently political. I will also argue that returning as kama‘āina to a responsible articulation guided by our mo‘olelo of our kuleana to places will put us on the path toward becoming fully aloha ‘āina, who can effectively challenge the settler state apparatus and its control of our aupuni and ‘āina.

When people use the word kuleana in Hawai‘i, they usually assume it means something like responsibility. But like most translations, this is far too flat a term to capture what kuleana actually is. In the *Hawaiian Dictionary* Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel Elbert define kuleana as a “Right, privilege, concern, [and] responsibility,” but also offer “property,” “estate,” “title,” “claim,” and “ownership” as meanings. This cluster of definitions illustrates how the term and the value of kuleana have been appropriated and commodified to assist in creating and maintaining the US occupation and settler colonialism in Hawai‘i. Even in the most supposedly neutral source of information about meaning, we can watch how through the definition of kuleana, ‘āina is transformed into property, ready for sale and exploitation.

Significantly, Pukui provides examples of usage that link kuleana to pilina: “‘O Hina kō mākou kuleana, ‘a‘ole ‘o ke kāne, we are related through Hina, not through the husband.” Relation therefore produces kuleana. And yet, while Pukui points to how pilina comes with

kuleana, such definitions become buried within such state apparatus terms as property ownership and marriage. What we are encountering here is the methodical relationship between translation and settler colonialism. If we wish to circumvent this, and to engage with these terms, values, and relationships for ourselves, we must turn to primary ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i sources, and encounter kuleana and pilina far less inflected by institutions such as marriage and capitalism.

In *Lei Momi o ‘Ewa*, Sarah Nakoa declares her kuleana that arises from her relationship to a particular place: “No‘u iho, ua loa‘a he kuleana ia‘u e kama‘ilio aku i kēia pūpū no ko‘u ‘ike ‘ana, ko‘u lawai‘a pū ‘ana, a me ko‘u ‘ai ‘ana i ia mea i ko‘u wā kamali‘i” (1979, 21). Nakoa explains that her kuleana to these pūpū o Ewa comes from bearing witness, from being a practitioner concerned with a resource’s sustainability, and from being someone who is literally fed by her pilina to that place. Therefore, for Nakoa, kuleana is something practiced rather than something held or owned as property. Ewa is Sarah Nakoa’s ‘āina⁷⁵ because it feeds her, and because of that, she has a kuleana to Ewa.⁷⁶ This kuleana comes from a lifetime of living in reciprocity with the moku of Ewa. Does Nakoa hold title to a parcel of land in Ewa? Perhaps—but any land title held by her or her ‘ohana would be irrelevant, having no bearing *in itself* on her kuleana to Ewa and to the mo‘olelo she offers us.

In Kapihenui’s mana o Hiiakaikapoliopole, Hiiaka demonstrates how stepping beyond our kuleana and being maha‘oi can be incredibly dangerous and result in great hardship. After she returns to Kilauea, and their kāne, Lohiau, is killed by Pele, she is distraught and leaves once more. When Pele send Wahineomao to retrieve Hiiaka and convince her to return, Hiiaka responds in anger:

⁷⁵ ‘āina can be translated as “That which feeds”

⁷⁶ In her interview with Lary Kimura on the show *Ka Leo Hawai‘i*, Nākoa uses the words kua‘āina and kama‘āina to describe her family’s pilina to Ewa (October 25, 1972, HV 24:12).

. . . eia au mamuli o ke kane a kaua, o ka luhi a kaua i au ai i ke kai makamaka ole, i au ai kaua i ke alanui papawaa, i hele ai kaua i ke kaha makamaka ole, kuleana ole, hookahi no kuleana o ke kane (Kapihenui, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, July 3rd 1862, 4)

Hiiaka reflects on the arduous task of retrieving their kāne, emphasizing how this task required her to travel as a stranger in unfamiliar lands. For Hiiaka, to be in a land as a stranger (malihini), to be without pili to the land, is to be in a land without kuleana. Hiiaka declares here that this was a journey of great personal sacrifice, because to be estranged from land is a hardship in and of itself. She shows us the magnitude of this sacrifice, and her investment in its result, by refusing to return to an ‘āina she has long been bound to, Kilauea.

In the Hooulumahieie mana of Hiiakaikapoliopole, Hiiaka makes sure to maintain that kuleana to her beloved home, Kilauea, regardless of her return: “Heaha la auanei hoi! Ua hoi la au mamuli o kau kauoha. Eia nae; aole au e noho ana me oe. O ko‘u kuleana noho no nae o ka lua nei o Kilauea a pela a hoes i Lalo o-Mehani me a‘u no ia” (Hooulumahieie, *Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, September 28, 1906, 4). Here we learn that kuleana can be maintained by those no longer living in a particular place. Hiiaka’s pilina to Kilauea continues, even after her physical displacement. Hiiaka’s kuleana to Kilauea allows her to return whenever she pleases, but on her own terms. She will not be estranged from her home ‘āina. This example has far reaching consequences, because it sheds light on the contemporary issue of diaspora. Our mo‘olelo offer us insight that can help us understand how Kānaka in the diaspora can begin to unpack their particular kuleana to place and lāhui.

Hiiaka also shows us that pilina can produce kuleana in the form of opportunity and rights of passage. When Papanuioleka asks to join Hiiaka and her companions on their journey to retrieve Lohiau, Hiiaka only agrees because she believes that Papanuioleka’s pilina to her is

enough to trust that she will uphold her kuleana as a traveling companion: “he pilikana oe no Haumea, e noho mai la i ka lua o Kilauea; nolaila, he pilikana oe no Haumea, a ua pili no hoi oe ia’u. Nolaila, ina ua makemake loa oe i ka hele, alaila, e hele no . . . ” [“you are kin to Haumea, and therefore have a kinship to me. Therefore, if you truly wish to join us, then, you shall”] (Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na’i Aupuni*, September 12, 1906, 3). Hiiaka and Papanuioleka also know that as with every kuleana, Papanuioleka’s right to join the journey comes with a responsibility. In this case, the kuleana is simple. As Papanuioleka acknowledges, “he pili au iloko ou, nolaila, o kau wahi e hele ai, o ko’u wahi no ia e hele aku ai; aohe mea nana e wehe i ka’u pili me oe . . . ” (Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na’i Aupuni*, September 13, 1906, 3). [I have a kinship with you, therefore, where you shall go, shall be the place that I shall go; There is nothing that shall unfasten my partnership with you]. Here Hooulumahiehie shows how this pilina, and the kuleana to uphold it, are powerful enough to meet biblical standards.⁷⁷ But Papanuioleka goes back on her word, and abandons her kuleana to Hiiaka mā. As a result, she quickly falls ill and dies.⁷⁸ Hiiaka mo‘olelo therefore push us to recognize the consequences of dishonoring our pilina and the kuleana that comes along with it. Papanuioleka’s disrupting, then turning away from the kuleana that comes with being pili to someone, has the most serious personal result possible—death.

For those outside of a Hawaiian context predictably struggling to understand kuleana, thinking about positionality might be a good first step. This cultural studies concept⁷⁹ offers a

⁷⁷ “ma kou wahi e hele ai, malaila au e hele ai, ma kou wahi e moe ai, malaila au e moe ai: o kou poe kanaka, no’u ia poe kanaka, e kou Akua, no’u ia Akua.” Ruta 1:16.

⁷⁸ (Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na’i Aupuni*, September 15, 1906, 3) (Bush and Paaluhi, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, January 24, 1893, 4).

⁷⁹ “The concept of positionality is used by cultural studies writers to indicate that knowledge and ‘voice’ are always located within the vectors of time, space and social power. Thus, the notion of positionality expresses epistemological concerns regarding the who, where, when and why of speaking, judgement and comprehension. That is, specific acculturated persons make truth-claims at an exact and distinct time and place with particular reasons in mind. Consequently,

framework for beginning to grasp something as dynamic as kuleana, because like positionality, kuleana involves a tremendous amount of personal and community awareness, and a well-formed familiarity with systematic power structures such as white supremacy and settler colonialism. Kuleana, however, is a more dynamic, less fixed set of authorities, responsibilities, and privileges that shift within a complex 'upena of pilina. Kuleana is therefore both positionally and relationally articulated and practiced.

Understanding kuleana in this way also assists in effectively articulating its obligations as opposed to American "rights" discourses. Ponder for a moment Haunani-Kay Trask's foundational analysis in *From a Native Daughter*, which describes the links between rights ideologies and the "greatly obscured historical reality of American colonialism" (1999a, 88). Trask demonstrates how the language of "rights" and civil rights has been deployed to legitimize American control and authority. Such ideological assertions further displace Kānaka Maoli from cultural practices that define who we are. While she doesn't actually use the term "kuleana," a close reading suggests that she is revealing how replacing kuleana with "rights" is a purposeful colonizing measure designed to make Americans out of Hawaiians. Her central assertion is that awarding Native Hawaiians the right to participate in the American democratic process did not liberate Hawaiians, but rather, "accelerated the de-Hawaiianization" of our people, lands, and lāhui (1999a, 88). Such a discourse presumes that the greatest gift Hawaiians can be offered is an abstract set of rights that somehow replaces kuleana to place.

By making mana and pono essential to her articulation of proper Kanaka Maoli

knowledge is not to be understood as a neutral or objective phenomenon but as a social and cultural production since the 'position' from which knowledge is enunciated will shape the very character of that knowledge" (Baker 2004).

leadership, Trask shows how returning to ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i is a necessary step in the process of decolonizing the nation state and creating new forms of governance that honor how Kānaka exercise power. Her criticism of “rights,” with its corollary that Kānaka must return to practices that are definitively Hawaiian, is another example of showing how language matters. By replacing equality, power, and rights with pono, mana, and kuleana, with all the attendant elaborations and distinctions, Trask pushes Kānaka Maoli toward a wholly re-imagined understanding of sovereignty, one rooted in responsibility and balance entirely reflected in their genealogies and ‘āina.

This understanding of our interlocking authority and accountability to each other (kuleana) is an increasingly important lesson to share with ourselves, and with our settlers and our visitors, as America and Hawai‘i continue their struggle to build solidarities, allyship, and pilina across multiple intersections of oppressions and privilege. Not understanding positionality and relationality in Hawai‘i creates huge problems for everyone with regard to kuleana, representation, and decision making. That governing institutions malihini to our people and run by settlers are making major decisions about development, education, and militarization confirms that there is an urgent need to understand more fully pilina and relationality to the people, places, and histories that surround us.

Kama‘āina, the ones who (re)member:

We have seen that Kānaka Maoli recognized an abundance of distinct and dynamic practices that enacted pilina between people, gods, and places in our mo‘olelo. From aikāne to kaiko‘eke, such relationships are practiced by kānaka sensitive to the dynamics of that specific pilina. Here we will explore what our mo‘olelo can tell us about an apparent relationship binary

that has been appropriated and usurped to maintain the tourist settler state in Hawai‘i. The two relationships are malihini and kama‘āina, and unpacking, then historicizing the fortunes of these pilina will assist us in finding a path towards reclaiming our intimate pilina to place as well.

In Hawaiian dictionaries, malihini is a term used to designate people who are strangers or foreigners to a particular place or people. Pukui and Elbert define malihini as “nvs. Stranger, foreigner, newcomer, tourist, guest, company; one unfamiliar with a place or custom; new, unfamiliar, unusual, rare, introduced, of foreign origin; for the first time.” Andrews adds that to be a malihini is to “be or to live as a stranger,” and Parker defines a malihini as “A stranger; a non-resident; a transient person; a person from another place. *Oihk.* 20:2. FIG. One that has not been seen for some time.” Although calling someone a malihini seemingly offers an identity to that person, it is crucially important to recognize that malihini is not an identity, but a relationship. Malihini describes someone without pilina to specific lands, people, and cultures—a stranger to someone, something, or someplace.

Positioned in contrast to malihini is kama‘āina. According to Pukui and Elbert, kama‘āina means “Native-born, one born in a place, host; native plant; acquainted, familiar, *Lit.*, land child.” In the Andrews dictionary, kama‘āina is defined as “*Kama*, child, and *aina*, land. LIT. A child of the land. A native born in any place and continuing to live in that place.” Whereas these definitions focus on the role of birth in determining one’s relationship to place as kama‘āina, Parker defines kama‘āina as “the present residents in a place; a citizen; especially one of long standing.” In Hawai‘i today, Parker’s definition comes closest to reflecting how kama‘āina has been perverted, exploited, and commodified into a consumer reward system offering kama‘āina—or locals, by this definition—certain rights and privileges. Such appropriations of Kanaka Maoli pilina for commercial purposes do not of course completely

invalidate Parker's interpretation of kama'āina as having to do with a relationship to where one currently resides. But the equation of kama'āina with "local" demands that we must be cautious and mindful about how kama'āina as a concept is stripped here of its practice of kuleana and pilina in ways that can and do help to maintain a settler state that centers "local" peoples, thereby erasing the distinction between settler and Indigenous, and then advocating instead for local claims to Indigenous lands and recourses. Such recoding has implications for the meaning of malihini, which has come to be equated with tourist, a specific brand of visitor created by global capitalism and corporate tourism who neither has or recognizes kuleana to anything other than capital.

This purposeful and insidious translation of malihini and kama'āina into an identity void of kuleana erases the specific intimacies that traditionally mark one's pilina, replacing them with capitalism as the defining matrix for one's relationship to place. This is textbook settler colonialism. As Maile Arvin, Eve Tuck, and Angie Morrill explain, settler colonialism is "a persistent social and political formation in which newcomers/colonizers/settlers come to a place, claim it as their own, and do whatever it takes to disappear the Indigenous peoples that are there" (2013, 12). Replacing our pilina to 'āina with commerce and capitalism becomes the justification for settlers physically displacing our kānaka. Declaring oneself a kama'āina, without any understanding of what kuleana that requires culturally, therefore re-enacts the long-practiced strategy of "immigrants (particularly haole from the U.S. continent) to proclaim themselves Hawaiian while asserting our indigenous heritage, including our lands, as their own" (Trask 1999.1, 168).

Our Hiiaka mo'olelo teach us that being in, entering into, and maintaining a kama'āina relationship are not passive states of happening to be born or existing in a particular place.

Because questions of pilina and kuleana immediately arise whenever anyone arrives somewhere new, as large narratives of migration and expansive travel from one place to another, Hiiaka mo‘olelo foreground malihini and kama‘āina as central concepts, with many substantial sections of the mo‘olelo devoted to how various figures question or comment on the malihini relation of Hiiaka as she enters each and every ‘ili on her journey. As for being kama‘āina, that is shown to be actively earned and practiced in a variety of distinct ways. On many occasions, characters sustain their relationship to their own one hānau while becoming kama‘āina in other places through an intimate pilina informed by a particular practice of kuleana.

In Hiiaka mo‘olelo, kama‘āina is not exclusively defined by where one was born, but demonstrated by one’s ‘ike and practice of maintaining it. For example, after following the sounds of Lohiau and Kauakahiapaoa’s drums and chanting, Pele arrives on Kauai and is greeted as a malihini. The kama‘āina of Haena are enchanted by the staggering beauty of this stranger, whose exquisiteness is unmatched on the whole island of Kauai. Before long, Pele is confronted by a mo‘o kia‘i of that place, Kilioe, who is immediately suspicious of Pele’s presence and intentions. When Lohiau asks Pele to offer up a hula, Kilioe’s jealousy is aroused. Pele replies, saying that rather than dance she will offer up the wind names from Nihoa to Kauai. To which Kilioe responds: “‘E! Hele no hoi apau ua makani o Nihoa mai a ianei alaila, he kamaaina oe no nei mau paemoku, a he malihini makou” [If you should offer up all the winds from Nihoa to this place then you would be the kama‘āina of our island, and we would be the malihini] ((Houulumahiehie, *Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, June 16, 1906, 3). Kilioe is doubly jealous—both of Lohiau’s admiration for Pele, and of the pilina to Kilioe’s own ‘āina that Pele offers to demonstrate—as if Pele’s presence threatened Kilioe’s pilina to her home ‘āina. For her part, Pele knows that some show of her relation as kama‘āina would be necessary to earn a pilina to

the people of Kauai, and to Lohiau in particular. Earlier in the same mana of the mo‘olelo, Pele addresses Lohiau’s distrust of her as a malihini: “A i mea e hoike aku ai i ka oiaio o ko’u kamaaina mai Kaula mai a hiki i ka mokupuni o Kauai nei, ua paanaau ia’u na makani apau o keia mau mokupuni” [In order to show that I am a true kama‘āina to these lands all the way until this place called Kauai, I have memorized all the winds of this island] ((Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na’i Aupuni*, June 13, 1906, 3). As in the mo‘olelo of Kuapakaa from *Ipumakani a La‘amaomo*, ‘ike about ‘āina, and in particular, about makani, becomes significant evidence for demonstrating one’s pilina and kuleana to place.

Nor is this the only time a Pele family member demonstrates an intimate pilina with a place through their extensive ‘ike. ‘Ike and pilina become a commonly woven theme in Hiiaka mo‘olelo to demonstrate the mana of ‘ike, ‘ōlelo, and one’s own ability to uphold his or her kuleana to place. Much later in the mo‘olelo, after Hiiaka and her aikāne and kōko‘olua have revived Lohiau, they begin to make their trip home to Kilauea. As Hiiaka mā are departing from Kauai, Hiiaka’s aikāne, Wahineomao, asks Lohiau to offer up the name of the places as they pass them. But before Lohiau can answer Hiiaka responds: “Auhea oe e aikane, he kamaaina au no Kauai nei. O ko’u aina mua keia o ka noho ana i ko makou holo ana mai a Nihoa, Kaula, Niihau a hoes nohoi ia nei” (Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na’i Aupuni*, April 26, 1906, 4). Hiiaka boastfully claims that she is a kama‘āina of Kauai because it was the first place that Pele mā came to after passing Nihoa, Kaula and Niihau. Hiiaka backs up this claim immediately by listing off the names of the places and winds of each ‘ili they pass. It is here that Lohiau realizes that Hiiaka is also a kama‘āina to his one hānau. He responds,

“He keu io no kou kamaaina i nei mau wahi o Kauai nei; a kamaaina pu nohoi oe i na makani. Kahi au o kela wahine wale no la hoi o olua ke kamaaina ia Kauai nei, eia no

ka hoi o oe kekahi kamaaina.

“O makou o ka poe i hanau i keia aina a nui a make a ola hou nohoi ia Kauai nei; aohe paanaau ia makou keia mau wahi, a he oki loa aku hoi na makani. Eia nae, ia oe keia, ua hele a wale waha.” (Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na'i Aupuni*, April 27, 1906, 4)

Because Hiiaka can remember and display this ‘ike, Lohiau is compelled to confirm her as a kama‘āina to Kauai. By doing so he points out another way that Hiiaka and her kaikua‘ana are pili, because they now have both demonstrated they are kama‘āina to his home. And Lohiau celebrates the superior ‘ike held by these two women about Kauai. Many who have grown up there would not be able to recite this ‘ike.

In addition to being significant because it adds to the theme of displaying ‘ike about place and makani to prove one’s claim to kama‘āina, this passage is important because it is reproduced in the later mana attributed to Poepoe. He found this particular episode crucial enough to reproduce the same phrasing almost identically.⁸⁰ Both mana attributed to Poepoe and Hooulumahiehie demonstrate an imperative need that their readership recognize this particular path towards becoming kama‘āina through the proper cultivation of ‘ike. Nor should this be surprising, when we remember that Poepoe’s introduction of his Hiiaka mana in 1908 began with a call for more rigorous study of the ‘ike preserved in our mo‘olelo. Just as Hiiaka has set the challenge and the bar for what ‘ike must be possessed to fulfill the kuleana of being a kama‘āina, Poepoe sets the bar and challenge for any mo‘okū‘auhau or haku mo‘olelo who hope to claim a

⁸⁰ “I keia wahi, akahi no o Lohiau a pane mai ia Hiiaka me keia mau olelo: “He keu io no k‘ou (sic) kamaaina i nei oKauai (sic) nei; a kamaaina pu nohoi oe i na makani. Kuhi au o kela wahine wale no ke kamaaiana ia Kaua nei, eia ka hoi o oe kekeahi kamaaina. ‘O makou ka poe i hanau ia Kauai nei, aohe paanaau ia makou keia mau wahi, a he oki loa aku hoi na makani. E ia nae, ia oe keia, ua hele a wale waha” (Poepoe, *Kuokoa Home Rula*, July 19, 1910, 4).

kuleana to these mo‘olelo. To Poepoe, this mo‘olelo is far more than narrative and entertainment. It demonstrates the excellence of Hawaiian thought, standing as an important archive of ‘ike Hawai‘i that should be treated as such.

E hoomaopopoia, eia na poe naauao o kākou iho nei a me ko na aina e ke apu mai nei i na moolelo kahiki o Hawaiia nei, [o ka] lakou poe opio [naauao/po] hoi, ke hoohemahema nui nei i keia kumu waiwai nui o ka aina oiwi. Aohe huli, aohe imi, aohe no he makemake ia mau mea. Aka, no makou iho, ke hoomau nei makou i keia hana no ka makemake Maoli e hoouluia [?] a hoomauiaku ka ike ia ana o na mo‘olelo a kaa kahiko o Hawaii nei i hiki ai ke malamaia e kākou, ka lahui. (*Kuokoa Home Rula*, Jan 10 1908, 1)⁸¹

Poepoe reminds his readers of the kuleana that comes with carrying and protecting these mo‘olelo. He urges us to consider the way ignorant people have not cared properly for this ‘ike that is so dear to us. He reminds us that we are continuing these practices and sharing these mo‘olelo to sustain and care for our lāhui, now set within a territorial American government.

Like one’s kuleana to tell a particular mo‘olelo, the claim to kama‘āina can always be challenged. Ho‘opāpā therefore becomes an important skill to weed out those who will not honor the kuleana of our places or our ‘ike. Here too, we see the unstable and dynamic nature of what some call an identity, but which this archive demonstrates to be, in fact, a relationship. If people cannot show how they are kama‘āina, then they cannot be true kama‘āina to that place or those peoples. It is specifically because these pilina come with kuleana and authority that ho‘opāpā is an appropriate reaction to someone’s claim of kama‘āina.

⁸¹ For clarification on this transcription I consulted Kumu Noenoe Silva’s copy of this compiled mo‘olelo which includes a typed transcript of the first installment of the mo‘olelo.

Hooulumahiehie further shows how kama‘āina becomes the premier rank of authority when entering into a new place. Although Hiiaka is indisputably the alaka‘i of her hui, Wahineomao is honored with the kuleana to alaka‘i their group through the ‘āina to which she is kama‘āina. While for instance Hiiaka mā are traveling through Punahoa, Hiiaka explains to her aikāne why she shall be the one to represent them:

Auheā oe e aikāne? E hoolohe mai oe, oia i he maka kamaaina kou i kahi poi o keia wahi, a he oi loa aku hoi kou kamaaina i na alii o Punahoa nei; nolaila, i ko kakou hele ana a hoea i kahi o ke alii ea, ia oe auanei ka olelo a kaua, a o ka noho malie wale aku no ka’u; aia no hoi a ku ka olelo i kahi o ka’u apana hana, a’u no hoi e ike aku ai he hana io ia, alaila, o ka’u wahi no hoi ia e olelo ai a e hana ai. (Hooulumahiehie, *Ka Na’i Aupuni*, September 29, 1906, 3)

Because Wahineomao is a kama‘āina of Hilo and therefore has a pilina to Punahoa, Hiiaka instructs Wahineomao to speak for them when they meet the ali‘i of that place. Here we see how even kuleana is positionally and relationally articulated. What makes Hiiaka a good alaka‘i to her hui is that she recognizes the limitations of her kuleana from place to place. She knows when and where are appropriate places for her to lead and speak, and when she must yield to those whose relationships with place and people are superior to her own. Time and time again in Hiiaka mo‘olelo we see this respect and accommodation of kama‘āina, pilina, and ‘ike, whether in the company of the ali‘i of a place or in determining the order of kilu players.⁸² At its simplest, then, kama‘āina relate to the land and her people as ‘ohana, and those who travel often, like our

⁸² When Hiiaka mā arrive at Peleula’s home in Kou (Honolulu), Peleula suggests that all engage in a game of kilu. Hiiaka responds to this invitation saying, “Mamua aku paha kamaaina, a honua, alaila, mahope aku ka malihini” First perhaps all the kama‘āina should partake, and then the malihini after. Peleula agrees and they engage in an exciting game of kilu (Kapihenui, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, April 3, 1862, 1).

Wahinepoaimoku, are attuned to recognize the claims and the limitations of their own pilina to particular places, lest they overstep their kuleana.

In many mana of our Hiiaka mo‘olelo, her malihini status is emphasized. This makes sense because Hiiaka is a mo‘olelo about someone whose journey maps out all of these islands—their mo‘olelo, people, and important geological features. But read through the intersection of this mo‘olelo and our ‘ōlelo no‘eau, Hiiaka becomes less a mo‘olelo about a malihini going from place to place, and more about how malihini come to practice reciprocal pilina to places beyond the sands of their birth to become kama‘āina.

Pukui translates the ‘ōlelo no‘eau, “Ho‘okahi no lā o ka malihini,” to mean “A stranger only for a day. After the first day as a guest, one must help with the work.” This reminds us as readers and kānaka that to be a role model of kanaka values, Hiiaka must be far more than a journeying malihini (Pukui, 115). And if we follow the guidance of our alaka‘i, Hiiaka, we too can develop and maintain intimate relationships with our places and peoples, thereby disrupting settler strategies that alienate and isolate us from our land and our communities.

“Ho‘okahi no lā o ka malihini” is a historic value that in company with the narratives in our mo‘olelo rejects the settler state’s preference and demand that Hawai‘i should always be on call for visitor entertainment and hospitality. This practice, which puts “malihini”/visitors in the powerful role as buyers, and kānaka/kama‘āina as sellers, sustains the power of the settler state by dehumanizing Kanaka Maoli bodies and culture. Our mo‘olelo, however, can show us what deservedly happens to malihini who overstay their welcome by not putting in the work to develop a more respectful pilina to place and people. Today, more than ever, we must recognize the consequence of choosing to remain as malihini in our own land: complicity in maintaining oppressive structures such as settler colonialism.

Being a tourist malihini is easy--it is literally a vacation from whatever responsibilities visitors might have where they live. But longstanding Hawai‘i residents, and even kānaka, can and do act like malihini too. What I am saying is that we all—kānaka and haole—by living here have the kuleana to become more than malihini to each other and to our places. To do this is hard but rewarding work that will transform our communities, expand our capacities, and help to heal our societies. In the language of Indigenous studies, this is the work of identifying and practicing settler responsibility, or what I like to call ke kuleana malihini. If settler colonialism is a structure rather than an event, then dismantling that system must begin with unpacking and understanding our diverse kuleana to ‘āina and each other—moving through our time as malihini in an appropriate fashion, before becoming kama‘āina to our places and communities. Reckoning with these difficult questions will allow kānaka and settlers alike to recognize who our alaka‘i and ali‘i are, or should be, and then to support and hold them accountable.

Mai Poina:

Many contemporary scholars and leaders in our sovereignty movement have articulated an important need to center our nation building in aloha ‘āina (Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua et al. 2014). They speak of a need to return to our places, to turn our hands down to the dirt and practice malama ‘āina. To reconnect with our land base. All of these are important steps towards healing a Kanaka Maoli community whose values and identities have been deeply harmed by a colonial project now generations old. The truth is, however, that we cannot aloha ‘āina if we don’t know what aloha means. We must heal our pilina with each other just as much as we heal with our ‘āina, and re-learn to love in the ways that our kūpuna did—deeply, and without fear of harm or persecution.

Hiiaka and other mo‘olelo offer example after example of distinct practices of aloha between people and all the sources that feed them. Hiiaka shows us that to be a kama‘āina is to both feed and be fed, to love and be loved by place and community. She teaches us that no self-appointed leaders go unchecked, or unquestioned. No human force is so supreme that it can circumvent the rules of intimacy and pilina between community and ‘āina, that can rewrite the intimate practices of ‘ohana that have existed in Hawai‘i since time immemorial. But Hiiaka is not the only mo‘olelo that teaches us this vital lesson. Scattered throughout our nūpepa archive, and in the embodied archive of our kūpuna who still remember these mele and mo‘olelo, are countless narratives and melodies that inform and remind us time and time again about the great diversity and power of Kanaka Maoli intimacy. Aloha ‘āina is just one very important way we continue to practice intimacy in a Hawaiian way.

As we as Kānaka continue to struggle with how we should care for our ‘āina and govern ourselves, we must turn to these mo‘olelo because they provide a plethora of models. As we attempt to enact alternatives to the status quo in Hawai‘i, we must take up the study of our mo‘olelo as vigorously as we study kingdom and legal history. Our aupuni was one way our kūpuna imagined and practiced governance and community, but our mo‘olelo offer an abundance of options. At the center of this call is a need to remember what it truly means to carry the kuleana of being a kama‘āina to our places. Any supposed kama‘āina without a clearly acknowledged and intensely practiced aloha and pilina to ‘āina and intimates is in danger of becoming a wandering child, without a place to call home. And without that country or ‘āina to which you are magnetically pulled, you cannot practice aloha ‘āina. For aloha ‘āina is not a metaphor or a political theory, but how we greet each other and the ‘āina as family, no matter how much time has passed, and also how we remember that we have kuleana here to fulfill.

The mo‘olelo of Hiiakaikapoliopele very clearly describes many of these bodies of pilina, as well as the trauma and insecurity that results from their disruption. Hiiaka herself recognizes, and even fears such trauma. As Hiiaka is traveling home to Hawai‘i with her newly revived kāne, she offers chant after chant to the places she has become pili to. She repeatedly expresses her desire not to be forgotten by these places. “Mai poina oe iau,” do not forget me, she says, over and over again. When she does this, she also calls out to the following places as hoa, companions with whom she has cultivated a sincere pilina. Here is a partial list:

**TABLE 12: MAI POINA OE IAU
SOURCE**

PLACE	SOURCE
HALEHAU	Kapihenui. Apr. 3, 1862, 4 Hooulumahiehie. June 6, 1906, 4
HAPUU	Bush and Paaluhi. May 3, 1893, 4 Hooulumahiehie. June 13, 1906
HAUPU	Kapihenui. Apr. 3, 1862, 4
HONOULIULI	Kapihenui. Apr. 3, 1862, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Apr. 28, 1893, 4
KAALA	Kapihenui. Feb. 13, 1862, 4
KAEHUMOE	Bush and Paaluhi. Apr. 28, 1893, 4
KAENA	Bush and Paaluhi. Apr. 27, 1893, 4
KALAIHAUOLA	Kapihenui. Apr. 3, 1862, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. May 3, 1893, 4 Hooulumahiehie. June 13, 1906, 4
KALALAU	Kapihenui. Mar. 13, 1862, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Apr. 20, 1893, 4
KAMAE	Kapihenui. Feb. 13, 1862, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Mar. 27, 1893, 4
KANEHOA	Kapihenui. Apr. 3, 1862, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. May 1, 1893, 4 Hooulumahiehie. June 6, 1906, 4
KAPAHI	Kapihenui. Mar. 6, 1862, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Apr. 10, 1893, 4
KEAHUMOE	Kapihenui. Apr. 3, 1862, 4
KEALIA	Kapihenui. Apr. 3, 1862, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. May 2, 1893, 4

	Hooulumahiehie. June 13, 1906, 4
KINIMAKALEHUA	Kapihenui. Apr. 3, 1862, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. May 2, 1893, 4 Hooulumahiehie. June 13, 1906, 4
LALEA	Kapihenui. Mar. 6, 1862, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Apr. 10, 1893, 4
LANILOA	Kapihenui. Feb. 13, 1862, 4
LEINONO	Kapihenui. Apr. 3, 1862, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Apr. 28, 1893, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. May 2, 1893, 4 Hooulumahiehie. June 2, 1906, 4 Hooulumahiehie. June 13, 1906, 4
LIHUE	Kapihenui. Mar. 20, 1862, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Apr. 28, 1893, 4 Hooulumahiehie. June 1, 1906, 4
NAWAHINEOKAMA	Kapihenui. Apr. 3, 1862, 4
NAWAHINEOKAMAOMAO	Hooulumahiehie. June 5, 1906, 4
NUUANU	Bush and Paaluhi. May 3, 1893, 4
POHAKUOKAUAI	Kapihenui. Mar. 20, 1862, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. Apr. 27, 1893, 4
PUUKAPOLEI	Bush and Paaluhi. Apr. 28, 1893, 4
PUUKUA	Kapihenui. Apr. 3, 1862, 4 Bush and Paaluhi. May 1, 1893, 4 Hooulumahiehie. June 6, 1906, 4
PUUOKAPOLEI	Kapihenui. Apr. 3, 1862, 4 Hooulumahiehie. June 5, 1906, 4

To be forgotten by a place one has earned a particular pilina to would clearly be devastating for Hiiaka. It would mean that the place now refuses to recognize her pilina, and therefore transforms her from kama‘āina into malihini. By composing mele after mele for each of these wahi pana, and by pleading “Mai poina oe iau,” Hiiaka is doing the important work of (re)membering her own ‘upena of intimacies, cultivated during her huaka‘i ki‘i kāne.

What this part of Hiiaka mo‘olelo tells us is that Kānaka Maoli not only wish to live sustainable, equitable, and fulfilling lives in relationship to each other and our lands, but to be known and loved by our lands as well. Hiiaka reminds us that we long not to be forgotten or left behind. Our mo‘olelo also remind us that when we do the work to build and maintain these relationships, being torn away from them, regardless of the cause, is serious trauma. This is the pilina that comes with aloha ‘āina. Like all other relationships, kama‘āina is reciprocal. So therefore, this famous, oft-cited aspect of the Hiiaka mo‘olelo reveals that our ‘āina in its own ways remembers how we aloha, honor, or dismiss our ‘āina. Like our bodies, our ‘āina carry intergenerational aloha and trauma. So if I want to be remembered by Waikīkī, then I must remember Waikīkī back, and if I do not want to be refused or forgotten, then I must not refuse Waikīkī.

If we seek to reclaim our kuleana to call this place home, we all have more to learn about these places, their mo‘olelo, their histories, and their succession of names. With the help of many friends, this week I was directed to resources that properly account for Kaimana Beach’s historic name, Kapua. By learning her name, I am coming to this place both as my new friend, and as a friend I must heal old wounds with – a friend with whom I must practice my pilina. In addition to the all-important structural work necessary to liberate Kānaka Maoli from the oppressive forces of settler colonialism, we must also engage in a few simple yet important practices of resurgence as Kānaka if we wish to heal ourselves and our ‘āina. We must first return to the lands where we (or our kūpuna) were once kama‘āina. We must fight to remember these places as they still are, beneath the scars of their development, beyond the ways they have been pimped out for economic opportunity. In my own life, this means returning to Waikīkī. With my ‘ohana, I will recover and sing the old melodies and ‘ōlelo of our shared kūpuna, showering Waikīkī’s

shoreline with our voices. These simple acts of resurgence are especially important in those places that the Fake State of Hawai‘i and the City and County have made abundantly clear that Kānaka are not welcome, except on government terms. Part of our trauma of being displaced and removed from Waikīkī and our other ‘āina is our awareness that they have been left alone with strangers, transformed and forgotten. To again practice our pilina, we must offer what we know best, our mo‘olelo and music, back to these places. And we must say, “‘Ā‘ole mākou e poina iā ‘oe.” We will not forget you or refuse you again.

And when we do this, when we are there, practicing our pilina and aloha with our places, we remember some of the many ways and reasons we aloha each other. We remember the reasons we cherish a place. For my ‘ohana, we remember how the sand used to feel soft and crumbling between our toes. We remember the salt of the ocean on our lips. We tell our stories and are told stories as well. And despite, or even because of, the trauma she has experienced, we accept Waikīkī, and all her shades. She is not debris, she is not hotels, concrete, or capitalism. She is the playground of our ali‘i, she is 77 acres of loko i‘a producing 23,000 pounds of fish per year to feed our communities (Kame‘eleihiwa 2017). She is home, and it is our kuleana to remember that. We are then (re)membered in that remembering. Our ‘upena of pilina is once more secure, unquestioned, and undeterred, and our ‘ohana and lāhui are made stronger for it.

Conclusion

Eve Tuck, Angie Morrill, and Wayne Yang remind us that “Decolonization is not a metaphor” (Tuck et al. 2012); and neither is aloha ‘āina. It requires practicing and (re)membering our entire ‘upena. Aloha ‘āina means that we must take useful theories crafted beyond our shores seriously, but then place them in rigorous conversation with our archive and our ‘ōlelo if they are

to take root and become relevant. As Chris Finley writes, we must “Historicize our traditions” (2012, 38). It is not enough to say that Kānaka Maoli are distinct, or even exceptional; we must understand and practice what makes our people distinct, and one way that can begin is by mending our entire ‘upena of intimacies. Only by doing this difficult, sometimes uncomfortable, but also deeply pleasurable work will we come to understand why we cannot plan to de-occupy Hawai‘i now, and deal with issues of gender, pilina, “sexuality,” and other forms of gendered violence, such as militarism and development, later. Our specific and diverse articulations of gender, relationality, and pilina will lead and guide us into and through a nation building movement that honors our values and distinct needs as a people. By studying, understanding, and practicing pilina, we will demonstrate that our movement for ea is not one that strives to change who governs, but one that labors to transform what governance means.

And at another level of pilina, our archive and our ‘upena of intimacies have lessons to teach our Indigenous, queer, and POC brethen as well. Pilina remind us that leadership is not a position, but a relationship. Pilina insist on protecting the intimacy of solidarity, and taking seriously our intersectional identities and experiences. Our ‘upena of intimacies and mo‘olelo provide countless examples of healthy, pono relationships and modes of governance that offer alternatives to the one we are participating in now. It will be up to us, and our allies, to decide how to apply this ‘ike. Will we allow this ea to feed us, or will we allow ourselves and our kūpuna to continue to be buried and erased?

Kānaka Maoli know that something more than Christian and Western relationality exists. We know this in our na‘au, and we practice it in our ‘ohana and communities. But we do not speak of our ‘upena of intimacies openly, and with nuance. We don’t call out these pilina by name; we do not widely possess the vocabulary or the intimate knowledge of our mo‘olelo to

deploy them in conversations, or use them to affirm ourselves and to fight the patriarchy, homophobia, and bad governance that continue to plague our lives and our home. In the fight to dismantle patriarchy, we must offer an alternate ground to stand upon. Here, I offer a small handful of alternatives among the thousands in our archive. These alternatives have the mana to take you back to your body, to your aloha, to you ‘āina. I know, because they have taken me back to mine. Practicing these alternatives is practicing decolonization.

Therefore, I offer you folks these ideas, these mo‘olelo, in the hopes that they give you back some ea, some aloha, some alternative to the status quo. It is my hope that we use this ‘ike to question our own assumptions and the things we take for granted. It is my hope that we find and identify our kōko‘olua, our kāne and wahine, our aikāne and kaiko‘eke, our hoa hele and hoa paio. Use their names, pay attention to the way they transform us and our world, understand the ea each pilina brings to our lives and community, and then do the hard work of making the ‘aha, the rope that will heal and re-member our torn ‘upena, so that we may all ho‘oulu hou kēia lāhui together.

‘ŌLELO PĪNA‘I: EPILOGUE

My grandmother Clara Ku‘ulei Kay, Granny Groovy, a beautiful mo‘opuna of Kona Chiefs, lived out her final days in the center of Pele’s poli. A godly woman, she believed in and practiced kindness and aloha, and also like her mother-in-law, she believed fiercely in Iesu. My family would spend our thanksgivings with her in Volcano. Granny Groovy’s home was tucked away in the forest, and we spent most of our hours as children getting lost between the ‘ōhi‘a and kupukupu.

When we visited our kupuna, we slept in what I would later come to know as one of Pele’s many poli. Those visits were full of fresh papaya, Portuguese bean soup, laughter, and of course music. As the primary caretaker of my family’s ‘upena of pilina, Granny Groovy was the center of any family gathering. While she was alive there was not a single Thanksgiving holiday that didn’t involve a massive family gathering of Osorios.

When I was eight years old, I went to visit Granny Groovy alone. Forty years after my father walked back along that long quiet devastating trail from Kilauea Iki, I took my first solo airplane trip to Volcano for the summer. Granny Groovy and I gardened, ate papaya, said grace, strung lei—and hiked to Kilauea Iki. We saw what was left after Pele’s path had cut through the forest, marveled at Puu Puai, and felt the heat of Pele’s kiss on our cheeks.

I did not ask about Pele. I did not think I was allowed to. I only watched, listened, and felt her presence. This is how I know that sometimes silence can be passed down through generations until it becomes tradition.

Years later, I remembered another detail of that trip. Hanging on my grandmother’s living room wall was a simply-framed photograph of another green and white home in Volcano. Nailed to the front was its name. A single word. Hiiaka. I came to learn that the house belonged

to my Great Grandmother Eliza. When the summer heat became a burden, Eliza and Emil, my great grandparents, would leave Hilo for Volcano to stay in this home. Hiiaka.



It is unfortunate that I did not know our mo‘olelo better at that time. Like my father, I might have asked about Pele. But now, in my (re)membering his mo‘olelo and mine, I realize that I have spent much of my life gathering the courage and the kuleana to ask about Pele.

I am telling you this part of the mo‘olelo now because I think it’s important to know how my ‘ohana continued to recognize their Pele ‘ohana long after they had become Christians. And especially Eliza. Too challenged by the thought and power of Pele to discuss her with my father, her grandson, she still found refuge every summer in Pele’s poli. Hiiaka.

A true Honolulu girl, I got homesick, and flew home after only a couple of weeks in Volcano. But given what has happened since, I think that something must have been planted in me during those days living in Pele’s poli. Hiiaka. Sometimes a single seed can produce a forest of rumbling lehua trees.

Granny Groovy died less than six months later. The poli I had known, loved, and was held in, was gone. But now I am thinking about what makes a poli, and what kind of poli I want to be. What I will hold, protect, and nurture.

When she died, I was broken and felt abandoned. So I left her god, Eliza’s god, my father’s god behind, and went searching for my own. (I eventually found 400,000.) Two thanksgivings after Granny Groovy’s passing, my family returned to Hawai‘i. From the time my

parents had started a family, it was the longest gap between visits for any of us. It was also the first time my father would return to his one hānau and not be called into his mother's poli.

During this trip my father, my mother, my two siblings and I made the drive to Kilauea Iki. I wanted to remember the feeling of heat on my cheeks. I was missing my kupuna, and wanted some reminder of her embrace. We took the long hike on Devastation Trail.

And I am mesmerized. I trace Pele's stretch marks across the hillside's spine. Her dark skirt wraps handfuls of small kīpuka—reminders of what can survive the destruction of creation. I will cherish them, as memories themselves of what once was, and what can be again.

My mother, my brother Duncan, and baby sister Hali'a take off before us. I take my time with Pele. I learn her curve. Standing with my father, we trace her story—our story—in quiet. I do not know what he is thinking, only that we are both captured by the power of this 'āina. We walk slowly, overwhelmed by the dark pō surrounding us. My father, thinking of his mother. Me, thinking of all the luahine in my 'ohana. Hiiaka.

This is where and when he tells me that when he dies, he does not want to join Granny Groovy in the ocean. He would like to be scattered here, somewhere along the black and darkening devastation. I grab his hand and we stand there, in silent awe of this mo'okū'auhau we are simultaneously creating and being created out of.

Today I wonder if he was also thinking about the first time he took this walk, engulfed in a different kind of stillness. I wonder if this place will always be marked in quiet for us, and if we'll ever be able to tell the difference between reverence and silence.

Like the mana of mo'olelo I have studied, these are just some of the stories I encounter when I read my mo'okū'auhau. Sometimes being a storyteller involves listening to all the mo'olelo you're offered. Sometimes it is about sitting at home, alone, piecing puzzles together.

You know by now that this is the mo‘olelo of a young wahine born into a mo‘okū‘auhau of mo‘olelo, who grew up to look for Hiiaka, and her aloha for everything around her.

I did not grow up knowing Pele as my kupuna, or being able to recognize her many hō‘ailona. So I didn’t learn everything Pele could teach me. But you can bet my children will. And hopefully so will yours. In (re)membering what we know, nothing is ever exhausted. There is still so much to recall. This is how we (re)member. How we bring our tattered ‘upena back together and spin the frayed and torn ‘aha into a line to cast into our past, our future and create all the possibility that our kūpuna deserve. And this is only one of the many pilina we were born to practice.

Mahalo for being a part of my ‘upena, a ke aloha nō e ku‘u hoa o kēia mau mo‘olelo a pau. Auhea ‘oe, e ho‘i mai kāua.

‘A‘ole i pau.

Bibliography

- Aiu, Pua‘ala‘okalani D. “Ne‘e Papa I Ke Ō Mau: Language as an Indicator of Hawaiian Resistance and Power.” *Translation, Resistance, Activism*, edited by Maria Tymoczko, University of Massachusetts Press, 2010, pp. 89–107.
- Allen, Chadwick. *Blood Narrative: Indigenous Identity in American Indian and Maori Literary and Activist Texts*, Duke University Press, 2002.
- . “Introduction.” *Trans-Indigenous: Methodologies for Global Native Literary Studies*, University of Minnesota, 2012, pp. xi–xxxiv.
- Allen, Paula Gunn. *Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions*, Beacon, 1986.
- Andrews, Lorrin. *A Dictionary of the Hawaiian Language*, edited by Henry H. Parker, Board of Commissioners of Public Archives, 1922.
- Arista, Noelani. “Listening to Leoiki: Engaging Sources in Hawaiian History,” *Biography* 32.1 (2009): 66–73.
- . “Navigating Uncharted Oceans of Meaning: Kaona as Historical and Interpretive Method,” *PMLA: Journal of the Modern Language Association of America*, vol. 125, no. 3, 2010, pp. 663–69.
- Arvin, Maile, Eve Tuck, and Angie Morrill. “Decolonizing Feminism: Challenging Connections between Settler Colonialism and Heteropatriarchy,” *Feminist Formations*, vol. 25, no. 1, 2013, pp. 8–34.
- Asad, Talal. “A Comment on Translation Critique and Subversion,” *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross-Cultural Texts*, edited by Carol Maier and Anuradha Dingwaney Needham, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1995, pp. 325–331.

- Barker, Joanne, ed. *Sovereignty Matters: Locations of Contestation and Possibility in Indigenous Struggles for Self-Determination*, University of Nebraska, 2005.
- Baker, Mona. "Translation and Activism: Emerging Patterns of Narrative Community," *The Massachusetts Review*, vol. 43, no. 3, 2015, pp. 462–484.
- Bacchilega, Cristina. *Legendary Hawai'i and the Politics of Place: Tradition, Translation, and Tourism*, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- . "Narrative Cultures, Situated Story Webs, and the Politics of Relation," *Narrative Culture*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2015, pp. 27–46.
- Baker, Tammy Haili'ōpua. "Lā'ieikawai," Unpublished Script, 2015.
- Bassnett, Susan. *Translation Studies*, Routledge, 1980, pp. 1–11.
- Benjamin, Walter. "The Translator's Task," *Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 3rd ed., Routledge, 2012, pp. 75–83.
- Brisset, Anne. "The Search for a Native Language: Translation and Cultural Identity," *Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 3rd ed., Routledge, 2012, pp. 281–311.
- Bush, John E. and S. Paaluhi. "'Ka Moolelo o Hiiakaikapoliopole,'" *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, January 5, 1893-July 12, 1893, vol. 2.
- Byrd, Jodi. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism (First Peoples: New Directions Indigenous)*, University of Minnesota, 2011.
- Chapin, Helen Geracimos. *Guide to Newspapers of Hawai'i: 1834–2000*, Hawaiian Historical Society, 2000.

Charlot, John. "Pele and Hiiaka: The Hawaiian-Language Newspaper Series," *Anthropos*, vol. 93, 1998, pp. 55–75.

Cheyfitz, Eric. "Introduction," *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from The Tempest to Tarzan*, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997, pp. xi–xx.

Davis, Angela. "Freedom Is a Constant Struggle," Kennedy Theater, Honolulu, 8 April 2016, Speech.

Da Silva, Denise, Maile Arvin, Brian Chung, Chris Finley, Ma Vang, Lee Ann Wang, and Kit Myers. "Decolonial Love and Loving in the Academic Industrial Complex as a Radical Form of Resistance," Critical Ethnic Studies Association Conference, May 2, 2015, York University, Roundtable.

Desha, Stephen L., Sr. *Kamehameha and his Warrior Kekūhaupi'o*, Translated by Frances N. Frazier, Kamehameha Schools Press, 2000, Translated from *He moolelo kaa no Kuhaupio ke koa Kaulana o ke au o Kamehameha ka Nui, Ka Hoku o Hawaii*, December 16, 1920–September 11, 1924.

Driskill, Qwo-Li, Chris Finley, Brian Joseph Gilley, and Scott Lauria Morgensen, eds. *Queer Indigenous Studies: Critical Interventions in Theory, Politics, and Literature*, University of Arizona Press, 2011.

Driskill Qwo-Li, Daniel Heath Justice, Deborah Miranda, and Lisa Tatonetti, eds. *Sovereign Erotics: A Collection of Two-Spirit Literature*, University of Arizona Press, 2011.

Dudoit, D. Māhealani. "Against Extinction: A Legacy of Native Hawaiian Resistance Literature," 1999, pp. 1–13.

E Ho'omau: Pele Searches for a Home. Prod. 'Ōiwi TV, Pacific Resources for Education and Learning, 2012.

- Elbert, Samuel H. *Spoken Hawaiian*, University of Hawai‘i Press, 1970.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. “The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem,” *Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 3rd ed, Routledge, 2012, pp. 162–167.
- Finley, Chris. “Decolonizing the Queer Native Body (and Recovering the Native Bull-Dyke): ‘Bringing Sexy Back’ and Out of Native Studies Closet,” In Driskill et al. *Queer Indigenous Studies*, pp. 31–42.
- Fornander, Abraham, and Thomas G. Thrum. *Fornander Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folk-lore*, Bishop Museum, 1916.
- Fujikane, Candace, and Okamura, Jonathan, ed. *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai‘i*, University of Hawai‘i Press, 2008.
- Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, Noelani, Ikaika Hussey, and Erin Kahunawaika‘ala Wright, eds. *A Nation Rising: Hawaiian Movements for Life, Land, and Sovereignty*, Duke University Press, 2014.
- Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, Noelani, and Bryan Kamaoli Kuwada. “Remaking the ‘Aha: Braiding Strands of Hawaiian Self-rule, Genealogy and Ritual,” Native America Indigenous Studies Association Conference, 21, May 2016, University of Hawai‘i, Mānoa, HI, Conference Presentation.
- Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, Noelani, Ikaika Hussey, and Erin Kahunawaika‘ala Wright, eds. *A Nation Rising: Hawaiian Movements for Life, Land, and Sovereignty*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2014. Print.
- Grimshaw, Patricia. *Paths of Duty: American Missionary Wives in Nineteenth-Century Hawaii*,

- University of Hawai‘i Press, 1989.
- Hālau ‘o Kekuhi. *Hi‘iaka i ka Poli o Pele: Journey Into The Sacred*, Mountain Apple Company, 2007. CD.
- Hale‘ole, S. N. *Laieikawai*, edited by Dennis Kawaharada, Richard Hamasaki, and Esther Mo‘okini, translated by Martha Warren Beckwith, Kalamakū Press, 2006. Translated from *Laieikawai, ke kaikamahine kaulana o Kahauokapaka me Malaekahana, Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, November 29, 1862–April 4, 1863.
- Hale‘ole, S N. *Laieikawai*, translated by Martha Warren Beckwith, First People’s Production, 1997.
- Hall, Lisa Kahaleole. “Navigating Our Own ‘Sea of Islands’: Remapping a Theoretical Space for Hawaiian Women and Indigenous Feminism,” *Wicazo Sa Review*, Vol. 24, no. 2, 2009, pp. 15–38.
- Hau‘ofa, Epeli. “Our Sea of Islands,” *The Contemporary Pacific*, vol. 6, no. 1, 1994, pp. 147–161.
- . *We Are the Ocean*, University of Hawai‘i, 2008.
- ho‘omanawanui, ku‘ualoha. “He Lei Ho‘oheno No Nā Kau A Kau: Language, Performance, And Form In Hawaiian Poetry,” *Contemporary Pacific*, vol. 17, no. 1, 2005, pp. 29–81.
- . “Mana Wahine, Education and Nation-building: Lessons from the Epic of Pele and Hi‘iaka for Kanaka Maoli Today,” *Multicultural Perspectives*, vol. 12, no. 4, 2010, pp. 206–12.
- . “Mana Wahine: Feminism and Nationalism in Hawaiian Literature,” *Anglistica*, vol. 17, no. 1, 2013.
- . “Pele’s Appeal: Mo‘olelo, Kaona, and Huluhia in ‘Pele and Hiiaka’ Literature (1860–1928),” University of Hawai‘i, PhD dissertation, 2007.

- . *Voices of Fire: Reweaving the Literary Lei of Pele and Hi'iaka*, University of Minnesota Press, 2014.
- Hooulumahie. "Ka Moolelo o Hiiaka-i-ka-poli-o-Pele," *Ka Na'i Aupuni*, 1 December 1905-30 November 1906.
- . "Hiiakaikapoliopole," translated by Mary Kawena Pukui, HEN II, 1161 - 1224 (December 1, 1905 -January 16, 1906).
- . "Hiiakaikapoliopole," translated by Mary Kawena Pukui, (September 18, 1924-July 17, 1928), Bishop Museum, HEN V.3
- . *Ka Mo'olelo o Hiiakaikapoliopole / The Epic Tale of Hiiakaikapoliopole*, edited and translated by Puakea Nogelmeier, 2 vols, Awaiaulu Press, 2007.
- Jaimes, M. Annette. "'Patriarchal Colonialism' and Indigenism: Implications for Native Feminist Spirituality and Native Womanism," *Hypatia*, vol. 18, no. 2, 2003, pp. 58–69.
- Justice, Daniel Heath. *Sovereign Erotics: A Collection of 2 Spirit Literature*, University of Arizona, 2011.
- Kalaehele, Imaikalani. "Make Rope," *Kalaehele*, Kalamaku Press, 2002.
- "Ka Le'a O Ke Ola: A Forum on Kanaka Maoli Culture, Sexuality, and Spirituality," featuring Noenoe Silva, Kaleikoa Kaeo, and Ku'umeaaloha Gomes, Honolulu, HI, 2001.
- Kamakau, Samuel Mānaiakalani. *Ke Kumu Aupuni: Ka Mo'olelo Hawai'i No Kamehameha Ka Na'i Aupuni a Me Kāna Aupuni i Ho'okumu Ai*, edited by Puakea Nogelmeier, 'Ahahui 'Ōlelo Hawai'i, 1996.
- . *Ke Aupuni Mō'ī: Ka Mo'olelo Hawai'i No Kauikeaouli, Keiki Ho'oilina a Kamehameha a Me Ke Aupuni Āna I Noho Mō'ī Ai*, Kamehameha Schools, 2001.
- . *Ruling Chiefs of Hawaii*, Kamehameha Schools, 1992.

- Kame‘eleihiwa, Lilikalā. *Native Land and Foreign Desires: Pehea Lā and Pono Ai*, Bishop Museum Press, 1992.
- . *Na Wahine Kapu: Divine Hawaiian Women*, ‘Ai Pōhaku Press, 1999.
- . “Waikīkī,” *NASPA Western Regional Conference*, 6, June 2017, Hilton Waikīkī, Waikīkī, HI. Conference Keynote.
- Kanahele, Pua Kanaka‘ole. *Holo Mai Pele*, Pacific Islanders in Communications and Edith Kanaka‘ole Foundation, 2001, Film.
- . *Ka Honua Ola: ‘Eli‘eli Kau Mai / The Living Earth: Descend, Deepen the Revelation*, Kamehameha Publishing, 2011.
- Kapihenui, M.J. “He Moolelo no Hiiakaikapoliopole,” *Ka Hoku o Ka Pakipika*, December 26, 1861 – July 27, 1862.
- Kauanui, Kēhaulani. *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity*, Duke University Press, 2008.
- King, Thomas. *The Truth About Stories*, House of Anansi Press, 2003.
- Kuwada, Bryan. “How Blue Is His Beard?: An Examination of the 1862 Hawaiian-Language Translation of ‘Bluebeard’,” *Marvels & Tales*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2014, pp. 17–39.
- . “To Translate or Not to Translate: Revising the Translating of Hawaiian Language Texts,” *Biography: An Interdisciplinary Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2009, pp. 54–65.
- LaDuke, Winona. *Recovering the Sacred: The Power of Naming and Claiming*, South End Press, 2005.
- Lefevre, André. “Mother Courage’s Cucumbers: Text, System and Refraction in a Theory of Literature,” *Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 3rd ed., Routledge, 2012, pp. 203–219.

Lili‘uokalani, trans. *The Kumulipo: A Hawaiian Creation Myth*, 1897, Pueo Press, 1978. Print.

Adapted and Translated from *He pule hoolaa alii: he kumulipo no Ka-I-imamao, a ia Alapai Wahine*. [The Kālakaua manuscript. Honolulu: Pa‘iia e ka Hui Pa‘ipalapala Elele, 1889.]

---. *Hawaii’s Story by Hawaii’s Queen*, 1898, Hui Hānai, 2013.

Lyon, Jeffrey. “No Ka Baibala Hemolele: The Making of the Hawaiian Bible,” *Palapala*, vol. 1, 2017, pp. 113-151.

Lyons, Scott Richard. “Rhetorical Sovereignty: What Do American Indians Want from Writing?” *College Composition and Communication*, vo. 51, no. 3, 2000, pp. 447-68.

Malo, Davida. *Ka Moolelo Hawaii: Hawaiian Traditions*, edited and translated by Malcolm Naea Chun, First People’s Production, 1996.

McDougall, Brandy Nālani. *Finding Meaning: Kaona and Contemporary Hawaiian Literature*, University of Arizona Press, 2016.

---. “‘O Ka Lipo O Ka Lā, ‘O Ka Lipo O Ka Pō: Cosmogenic Kaona in Contemporary Kanaka Maoli Literature,” University of Hawai‘i, PhD dissertation, 2011.

McDougall, Brandy Nālani, and Georgeanne Nordstrom. “Ma Ka Hana Ka ‘Ike (In the Work is the Knowledge): Kaona as Rhetorical Action,” *National Council of Teacher of English*, vol. 63, no. 1, 2011, pp. 98–121.

Meyer, Manulani. *Ho‘oulu: Our Time of Becoming : Collected Early Writings of Manulani Meyer*, ‘Ai Pōhaku, 2003.

Mookini, Esther K. *The Hawaiian Newspapers*, Topgallant Publishing Co., 1974.

Morgensen, Scott Lauria. *Spaces Between Us: Queer Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Decolonization*. University of Minnesota Press, 2011.

- Morris, Robert J. "Aikane: Accounts of Hawaiian Same-Sex Relationships in the Journals of Captain Cook's Third Voyage (1776–80)," *Journal of Homosexuality*, vol. 19, no. 4, 1990, pp. 21–54.
- . "Same-Sex Friendships in Hawaiian Lore: Constructing the Canon," *Oceanic Homosexualities*, edited by Stephen O. Murray, Garland Publishing, 1992, pp. 7–102.
- . "Translators, Traitors, and Traducers: Perjuring Hawaiian Same-Sex Texts Through Deliberate Mistranslation," *Journal of Homosexuality*, vol. 51, no. 3, 2006, pp. 25–47.
- Nakoa, Sarah. "Ka Leo Hawai'i 012," *Kani'āina*, edited by Larry Kimura, Ulukau: Electronic Library, 25 Oct. 1972. <[http://ulukau.org/kaniaina/cgi-bin/kaniaina?a=d&d=A19721025-KLH-HV24-012&e=-----en-20--1--txt-txIN%7ctxTI%7ctxTA%7ctxCO%7ctxTY%7ctxLA%7ctxKE%7ctxPR%7ctxSG%7ctxTO%7ctxTG%7ctxSM%7ctxTR%7ctxSP%7ctxCT%7ctxET%7ctxHT-ewa-----](http://ulukau.org/kaniaina/cgi-bin/kaniaina?a=d&d=A19721025-KLH-HV24-012&e=-----en-20--1--txt-txIN%7ctxTI%7ctxTA%7ctxCO%7ctxTY%7ctxLA%7ctxKE%7ctxPR%7ctxSG%7ctxTO%7ctxTG%7ctxSM%7ctxTR%7ctxSP%7ctxCT%7ctxET%7ctxHT-ewa----->)>.
- . *Lei Momi o Ewa, Ka Ahahui 'Ōlelo Hawai'i*, 1979.
- Nakuina, Emma Metcalf. *Hawaii, Its People, Their Legends*, T.H., 1904.
- Nakuina, Moses K. *Moolelo Hawaii O Pakaa a Me Kua Pakaa, Na Kahu Iwikuamoo O Keawenuiaumi, Ke Alii O Hawaii, a O Na Moopuna Hoi a Laamaomao! Ke Kamaeu Nana I Hoolakalaka Na Makani a Pau O Na Mokupuni O Hawaii Nei, a Uhao Iloko O Kana Ipu Kaulana I Kapaia O Ka Ipumakani a Laamaomao*. Kalamaku Press, 1902.
- Niranjana, Tejaswini. "Introduction: History in Translation," *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context*, University of California, 1992, pp. 1–46.
- Nogelmeier, Puakea. *Mai Pa'a i Ka Leo: Historical Voice in Hawaiian Primary Materials: Looking Forward and Listening Back*, Bishop Museum, 2010.

- Oliveira, Kapā'anaokalāokeola Nākoa. *Ancestral Places: Understanding Kanaka Geographies*, Oregon State University, 2014.
- Osorio, Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo'ole. *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887*, University of Hawai'i Press, 2002.
- Pi'ilani. *The True Story of Kaluaiko'olau*, translated by Frances N. Frazier, University of Hawai'i Press, 2001. Translated and reduced from Sheldon, J. G. M., and Pi'ilani, *Kaluaikoolau, ke kaeaea o na Pali Kalalau a me na Kahei o Ahi o Kamaile: Piilani, ka wahine i molia i ke ola, ke kiu alo ehu poka: Kaleimanu, ka hua o ko laua puhaka, ka opio haokila iloko o na inea: he moolelo oiaio i piha me na haawina o ke aloha walohia. Ke Kuleana Mana Hoolaha iloko o ke Keena Puuku o ka Teritore o Hawaii*, 1906. Print.
- Poepoe, J. M. "Ka Moolelo Kaa o Hiiaka-i-ka-Poli-o-pele," *Kuokoa Home Rula*, January 10, 1908–January 10, 1911.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena, and Samuel H. Elbert. *Hawaiian Dictionary: Hawaiian-English, English-Hawaiian*, University of Hawai'i Press, 1986.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena, and Samuel H. Elbert. *Hawaiian Grammar*, U of Hawai'i Press, 1979.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena, and E. S. Craighill Handy. *The Polynesian Family System in Ka'u, Hawai'i*, Polynesian Society, 1950.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena, E. W. Haertig, and Catherine A. Lee. *Nānā I Ke Kumu = Look to the Source*, Hui Hānai, 1979.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena. *Ōlelo No'eau: Hawaiian Proverbs & Poetical Sayings*, Bishop Museum Press, 1983.
- Rice, William Hyde. "He Moolelo no Pele a me kona Kaikaina Hiiaka i ka Polio Pele," *Ka Hoku o Hawaii*, vol. 3, no. 4 - Vol. 3, no. 20, May 21, 1908-September 10, 1908.

- Rifkin, Mark. *When Did Indians Become Straight?: Kinship, the History of Sexuality, and Native Sovereignty*, Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Shankar, S. "The 'Problem' of Translation," *Flesh and Fish Blood: Post-Colonialism, Translation, and the Vernacular*, University of California, 2012, pp. 103–142.
- Silva, Noenoe K. *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to Annexation*, Duke University Press, 2004.
- . "Hawaiian Literature in Hawaiian," *The Oxford Handbook of Indigenous American Literature*, edited by James H. Cox and Daniel Heath Justice, Oxford University Press, 2014.
- . "Pele, Hiiaka, and Haumea: Women and Power in two Hawaiian Mo‘olelo," *Pacific Studies*, vol. 30, no. 1-2, 2007, pp. 159–181.
- . *The Power of the Steel-Tipped Pen: Reconstructing Native Hawaiian Intellectual History*, Duke University Press, 2017.
- Smith, Andrea. "Heteropatriarchy and the Three Pillars of White Supremacy: Rethinking Women of Color Organizing," *Color of Violence: The INCITE! Anthology*, South End Press, 2006, pp. 66–73.
- . "Queer Theory and Native Studies: The Heteronormativity of Settler Colonialism," *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, vol. 16, no. 1-2, 2010, pp. 41–68.
- Smith, Andrea; Audra Simpson, ed. *Theorizing Native Studies*, Duke University Press, 2014
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, 2nd. ed., Zed Books, 2012.
- Sommerville, Alice TePunga. *Once Were Pacific: Maori Connections to Oceania*, University of Minnesota, 2012.

- Spivak, Gayatri. "The Politics of Translation." *The Translation Studies Reader*, Ed. Lawrence Venuti, 3rd ed., Routledge, 2012, pp. 312–330.
- . "Translation as Culture," *Parallax*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2000, pp. 13–24.
- . "Translation into English." *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation*, Princeton University Press, 2005, pp. 93–110.
- Teaiwa, Teresia. "Bikinis and Other S/pacific N/oceans," *Militarized Currents : Toward a Decolonized Future in Asia and the Pacific*, edited by Setsu Shigematsu and Keith L Camacho, University of Minnesota, 2010, pp.15-32.
- . "L(o)osing the Edge." *The Contemporary Pacific* 13.2 (2001): 343–365. Web.
- Trask, Haunani-Kay. "Decolonizing Hawaiian Literature," In *Inside Out: Literature, Cultural Politics, and Identity in the New Pacific*, edited by Vilsoni Hereniko and Rob Wilson, Rowman & Littlefield, 1999, pp. 17–26.
- . *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i*, University of Hawai'i Press, 1999a.
- . *Light in the Crevice Never Seen*, Calyx Books, 1994.
- . *Night Is a Sharkskin Drum*, University of Hawai'i Press, 2002.
- . "Writing in Captivity: Poetry in a Time of Decolonization," In *Inside Out: Literature, Cultural Politics, and Identity in the New Pacific*, edited by Vilsoni Hereniko and Rob Wilson, Rowman & Littlefield, 1999, pp. 51-55.
- Tuck, Eve, and K Wayne Yang. "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2012, pp. 1–40.
- Tymoczko, Maria. "The Space and Time of Activist Translation," *Translation, Resistance Activism*, University of Massachusetts Press, 2010, pp. 227–254.

- . "Translation, Resistance, Activism: An Overview," *Translation, Resistance, Activism*, University of Massachusetts Press, 2010, pp. 1–22.
- Venuti, Lawrence. "Local Contingencies: Translation and National Identities," *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation*, edited by Sandra Bermann and Michael Wood, Princeton University Press, 2005, 177–202.
- . *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*, Routledge, 1998.
- "Visitor Statistics," Visitor Statistics Visitor Statistics Comments, Web, 29 Nov. 2017."
<http://dbedt.hawaii.gov/visitor/>
- Vizenor, Gerald. *Survivance: Narratives of Native Presence*, University of Nebraska, 2008.
- Warrior, Robert. *The People and the Word: Reading Native Non-Fiction*, University of Minnesota, 2005.
- Wendt, Albert. "Tatauing the Post-Colonial Body," *Inside Out: Literature, Cultural Politics, and Identity in the New Pacific*, edited by Wilsoni Hereniko, Rowman & Littlefield, 1999, pp. 399-412.
- . "Towards a New Oceania," *Seaweeds and Constructions*, vol. 5, 1997, pp. 71-85.
- Winduo, Steven Edmund. "Unwriting Oceania: The Repositioning of the Pacific Writer Scholars Within a Folk Narrative Space," *New Literary History*, vol. 31, no. 3, 2000, pp. 599–613.
- Wong, Laiana. "Authenticity and the Revitalization of Hawaiian," *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 1, 1999, pp. 94–115.