

Ke Ha'a Lā Puna i ka Makani: Pele and Hi'iaka Mo'olelo and the Possibilities for Hawaiian Literary Analysis

ku'ualoha ho'omanawanui

Ke ha'a lā Puna i ka makani	<i>Puna is dancing in the breeze</i>
Ha'a ka ulu hala i Kea'au	<i>The hala groves at Kea'au dance</i>
Ha'a Hā'ena me Hōpoe	<i>Hā'ena and Hōpoe dance</i>
Ha'a ka wahine	<i>The woman dances</i>
'Ami i kai o Nānāhuki	<i>[She] dances at the sea of Nānāhuki</i>
Hula le'a wale	<i>Dancing is delightfully pleasing</i>
I kai o Nānāhuki	<i>At the sea of Nānāhuki</i>
'O Puna kai kūwā i ka hala	<i>The voice of Puna resounds</i>
Pae i ka leo o ke kai	<i>The voice of the sea is carried</i>
Ke lū lā i nā pua lehua	<i>While the lehua blossoms are being scattered</i>
Nānā i kai o Hōpoe	<i>Look towards the sea of Hōpoe</i>
Ka wahine 'ami i kai o Nānāhuki	<i>The dancing woman is below, towards Nānāhuki</i>
Hula le'a wale	<i>Dancing is delightfully pleasing</i>
I kai o Nānāhuki	<i>At the sea of Nānāhuki.¹</i>

(Kanahele & Wise, 1989: iii)

'Ōlelo Mua

In 2003, the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa political science department sponsored a symposium titled "Indigenizing the University." This symposium featured indigenous scholars such as Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Graham Smith, and Taiaiake Alfred who addressed how Indigenous political theory and methods of research were necessary to support indigenous research, and how changes to the university personnel structure were needed to include indigenous people at every level of the university. A central question emerged for me from that symposium—is it possible to indigenize research theories, methods, and practices within the discipline I study, research, and work in—English? If so, how? This essay explores selected examples of my ongoing development of culturally informed theories that guide the interpretation of Hawaiian orature and literature in nineteenth century Hawai'i and beyond. Specifically, these are concepts developed within

indigenous Hawaiian cultural practice adapted to the discourse of literary analysis, namely kuleana (one's rights *and* responsibilities), mo'okū'auhau (genealogy), and makawalu (multiple perspectives).

I begin with a broader overview of the issues and scholarship which informs my approach, followed by a discussion of the selected indigenous concepts listed above and how I've applied them to literary analysis, focusing on the literary production of the Hawaiian volcano goddess Pele and her favorite youngest sister Hi'iakaikapoliopole (hereafter referred to as Hi'iaka). With over thirteen separate narratives authored by multiple authors over a period of approximately fifty years, this literature provides one of the most extensive bases for comparative analysis within a single mo'olelo (story, history). As we begin this exploration of specific aspects of Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo, the lines of oli (chant) in the opening epigraph, "Ke Ha'a Lā Puna i ka Makani" (Puna is dancing in the breeze), remind us that in Hawaiian

epistemology, movement or action is evoked by ‘ōlelo (language) and the power of words.

Because the study of literature is linked to disciplines closely associated with colonialism, such as English, anthropology, and folklore studies, it is uncommon for Kanaka Maoli (Native Hawaiian) or other indigenous texts to be analyzed utilizing indigenous perspectives, methodologies, or theories. This is not unusual, as Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s work addresses. In *Decolonizing Methodologies* (1999), Tuhiwai Smith recognizes that

research is a significant site of struggle between the interests and ways of knowing of the West and the interests and ways of resisting of the Other . . . it is surely difficult to discuss research methodology and indigenous peoples together, in the same breath, without having an analysis of imperialism, without understanding the complex ways in which the pursuit of knowledge is deeply embedded in the multiple layers of imperial and colonial practices.” (p. 2)

This is true in literary studies as well. With a focus on western literary theory, literary studies is a colonial and a colonizing practice which tends to ignore or devalue indigenous texts. Tuhiwai Smith’s encouragement of indigenous scholars to challenge ourselves to reach back to our kūpuna (ancestors) and cultural protocols in conducting our academic research is as important in indigenizing the field of literary studies as any other discipline. Similarly, Manu Meyer (2003) promotes Native Hawaiian epistemology as an important foundation of Kanaka Maoli cultural practice, including academia. In her scholarship on Hawaiian literature, Haunani Kay Trask (1999a) accurately described the writing process for Kanaka Maoli as “writing in captivity” (p. 17). Trask (1999b) argues that Kanaka Maoli texts have been held captive because of colonialism, and calls for decolonized analysis (p. 167). My research focuses on Hawaiian literature, particularly decolonizing and indigenizing analysis of such. I was trained in three academic disciplines (Hawaiian studies, religion, and English), and the differences in theoretical training and research methodologies between them are somewhat divergent. Collectively, the works by Tuhiwai Smith,

Meyer, and Trask inform the indigenizing approaches to the analysis of Hawaiian literature I work with, demonstrating that indigenous research methodologies transcend disciplinary boundaries.

My literary analysis of Pele and Hi’iaka mo’olelo begins such a valuable undertaking within the discipline of literary studies, playing a small part in the recovery of our literary traditions which were lost through aggressive colonial practices that banned our native language and suppressed our indigenous narratives. By providing an indigenous counter-analysis to colonial scholarship that has typically romanticized, infantilized, or vilified Kānaka Maoli and our cultural productions (such as mo’olelo), my research seeks to kahuli (overturn) these problematic interpolations and to support the continuing reevaluation of these texts in culturally relevant and pono (appropriate) ways. It is therefore appropriate that such research benefit the larger Kanaka Maoli and perhaps other indigenous communities through a process Pualani Kanaka’ole Kanahele aptly describes as “unveil[ing] for ourselves the knowledge of our ancestors” (Kanahele & Wise, 1989, p. iii).

Towards a new Oceania—disciplinary background of literary studies in the Pacific

In the introduction to *Nuanua, Pacific Writing in English Since 1980* (1995), Albert Wendt categorizes indigenous Pacific literature as a post-colonial literature, defining this term as “not just mean[ing] after; it also means around, through, out of, alongside, and against” (p. 3). Indigenous Pacific literature embodies all of these meanings. It isn’t just indigenous Pacific writing that works around, through, alongside, and against colonial literary productions, but indigenous theories and methodologies in the study of our literature as well.

In his essay “Towards a New Oceania” (1993), Wendt writes about the influence of our ancestors on us, stating, “Our dead are woven into our souls like the hypnotic music of bone flutes: we can never escape them. If we let them they can help illuminate us to ourselves and to one another. They can be the source of new-found pride, self-respect, and wisdom” (p. 10). It is with this source of ancestral inspiration in mind that I engage in the challenge of introducing indigenous

theory into literary studies, beginning with an analysis of Pele and Hi'iaka, a central mo'olelo in our repository of traditional literature.

Indigenous methodologies: kuleana, makawalu, mo'okū'auhau

The formation of a "kuleana consciousness"

Kuleana means both right *and* responsibility, an important cultural concept; in the academy, it is applicable to the concept of one's right to engage in academic inquiry, or to share information, as well as one's responsibilities in this knowledge and sharing. Indigenous scholars must be cognizant of what and how we have a right to know and share; as kahu (caretakers) of knowledge, we are responsible to our advisors, disciplines, and institutions, but we have equal responsibility to our ancestors, lāhui (nation), and 'āina.

Indigenous scholars represent our cultures and communities as well as our disciplines within the academy; professional and personal kuleana is different, but overlapping. We have kuleana as scholars to get degrees and promote ourselves in our fields. But we also maintain kuleana to the families and communities that we come from, to not only benefit ourselves professionally, but to represent them well and to give back. Kuleana involves how we choose our research topics; we have a relationship to our subjects, the responsibility to seek permission to engage and follow cultural protocols, to know what is kapu (sacred, off limits) and what is noa (public, free of restriction) within the parameters of our research. Kuleana also involves the second cultural component I am examining, mo'okū'auhau.

Mo'okū'auhau is typically viewed as our personal family history or genealogy, linking us in the present to our kūpuna who come before us. My engagement in Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo research is a kuleana informed by my own mo'okū'auhau—my Hawaiian kūpuna are from Puna on my paternal grandmother's side and Ka'ū on my paternal grandfather's side. These are lands that Pele's volcanic abode straddles, where my kūpuna and 'ohana (family) of these lands acknowledge her as ancestor and worship her as goddess. I could not have commenced my research without

the permission of my 'ohana, nor have continued without their kāko'o (support).

Kuleana also implies an understanding of what is kapu and what is noa in sharing, researching, and publishing. In the case of Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo, there are 'ohana and hula hālau, for example, who protect the traditions passed down within them and may not want their knowledge made public by someone else (or at all), and these traditions are thus kapu *to me* as an academic researcher at various levels. Over the years, some individuals and hālau have shared information with me to better my own personal understanding of the Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo, while asking me not to write about these chants or stories. Their willingness to share information with me is based on established trust and a personal friendship with me. But I in turn may not necessarily publish or otherwise make this information public, as it is beyond my kuleana to research, discuss, and write about these stories without authorization from the families they belong to. Thus, I studied the publicly available mo'olelo, those which were deemed noa by being printed in the widely circulated and publicly available Hawaiian newspapers. This is an important point to acknowledge when practicing scholarship with a "kuleana consciousness," meaning, a consciousness informed by a sensitivity to kuleana—again, right *and* responsibility—to culture, to family, to subject. In other words, it is not okay just to get the green light to commence with research from the professor, the committee, or the department head. The Pele traditions are real cultural practices and beliefs for real people; Pele *is* family. She is not Madame Pele, she is Tūtū Pele. She is a grandmother, an ancestress. It is very important to remember and respect that. This is part of the indigenous methodology I employ, but I am not alone.

In the introduction to the second edition of *The Polynesian Family System in Ka-u, Hawai'i* (Pukui, Handy, & Handy, 1972), Terence Barrow discusses how authors E. S. Craighill Handy and Elizabeth Green Handy had increased access to the Ka'ū community because they were hānai (adopted into the family) by their colleague Mary Kawena Pukui's mother, Pa'ahana Wiggin, a full-blooded Hawaiian woman with deep roots there, "as a means of forestalling mali-

cious gossip or Hawaiian resistance to the overcurious haoles” (p. xii). Of this practice Barrow writes, “When word of this act passed along the Hawaiian grapevine, the expedition’s path was made easy where it would otherwise have been difficult” (ibid.). Pukui’s full Hawaiian name, Kawena’ulaokalaniahī’iakaikapolio pelenāleilehuaapele (The Rosy Glow of the Heavens of Hī’iaka in the bosom of Pele wearing the crimson lehua wreaths of the volcano goddess²) is given for the purpose of demonstrating her genealogical link to the goddess (p. xvii). The authors then state

Her lineage is from the ali’i . . . and kahuna . . . of Ka’u and its neighboring district of Puna. As the names given reveal, hers is the heritage of the mytho-poetic nature gods of Hawai’i known as the Pele clan or family, which include Lono-makua (the embodiment of cloud, rain and thunder), Kane-hekili (lightning), Wahine-’oma’o (the “woman clad in green,” i.e., the verdure of the forests), Laka . . . the tutelary god of the hula ritual, Hī’iaka (of the rainbow and healing waters), and other minor figures. (ibid.)

By including this information up front, the authors establish (for both Kanaka and non-Kanaka Maoli audiences) their kuleana to take up this groundbreaking study. Barrow remarks on the importance of this work when he writes

The authors of this book helped to initiate the new era in Hawaiian research in which living twentieth-century Hawaiians were given a central role as participants in the studies made. Dr. Handy [a non-Hawaiian] and Kawena Pukui were among the first who made enquiries in the field among Hawaiians resident on their traditional lands. This approach to gathering knowledge may seem normal enough today, but in the first decades of this century [when this study was conducted in 1935] there was a prevailing opinion that all knowledge the Hawaiians might have had was lost forever. (Pukui, Handy, & Handy, 1972, p. xi)

In Hawaiian cultural thought, the connection, and more specifically, the familial relationship between ‘āina and kanaka, is irrefutable. Hawaiian tradition describes Hāloa-naka, the first kalo (taro) plant and child of the gods Wākea (Great Expanse of Sky) and

his daughter Ho’ohōkūkalani (To Generate Stars in the Heavens) as the progenitor of the lāhui Hawai’i (Native Hawaiians), which solidifies the familial relationship between ‘āina and kanaka (Kame’eleihiwa, 1992, p. 25). The Hawaiian term for Native is kama’āina, literally, “land child” (Pukui & Elbert, 1986, p. 124). Even more relevant to this study, Pukui, Handy, and Handy (1972) write specifically about the relationship between kanaka and ‘āina as mediated through the relationship with Pele and her ‘ohana:

To comprehend the psyche of our old Hawaiians it is necessary to enlarge the implications of the word “relationship” beyond the limitations of the “interpersonal” or social. The subjective relationships that dominate the Polynesian psyche are with all nature, in its totality, and all its parts separately apprehended and sensed as personal . . . Pele is volcanism in all its forms, while her sisters are rainbows seen at sea, rosy glow of dawn on clouds and mountains (Hī’iaka), the green cloak of jungle of the upland forest (Wahine’oma’o). (p. 118)

More importantly, kanaka were and still are given these godly names that “confer status” to the carrier

these names, given and spoken with a sense of potency and prestige, even today perpetuate the sense of the reality and sanctity of these Persons, when borne by living descendants of these lines. Lono and Ku, Pele and Hī’iaka and many other aumakua . . . have their namesakes amongst living descendants of their lineage. (ibid.)

When I am asked how I came to choose this topic, my answer is always the same: I did not choose it, it chose me. I strongly believe I am guided by my kūpuna on this path of discovery and scholarship. I also have a strong sense of what this kuleana means to me, my ‘ohana, and the greater Hawaiian nation. The goal of implementing and following a practice of Kuleana consciousness is to transform peoples’ conscious understanding of how one approaches and works with a given topic of study with cultural protocols, practices, and parameters in mind. Within literary studies, it is an intentional nudge to shift the aim of not just what one reads, but how one reads, i.e., how one reads Hawaiian literary studies versus Biblical studies, for example. That while we might understand going into the

research that these areas are different from each other, what we get out of it is also different, based in part on a kuleana consciousness-based research methodology.

Understanding our kuleana in approaching and working with a topic also influences how we better understand the kuleana consciousness exhibited within the texts and how the stories unfold—what is revealed, what is not, who reveals knowledge, when, and how, and to whom, when it is withheld and why, and the consequences of each.

Conceptual strategy for organizing research—mo'okū'auhau

One of the foundational tenets of Hawaiian culture is mo'okū'auhau—genealogy. Mo'okū'auhau literally means “genealogical succession” (Pukui & Elbert, 1986, p. 254). The root word, mo'o, is a “succession, series, especially a genealogical line, lineage” (ibid.). The word mo'o is also connected to literature; mo'olelo (or mo'o'olelo) are narratives, histories and stories of all kind, both oral and written; mo'o akua are stories concerning the gods (ibid.). While mo'okū'auhau is most familiar in the study of human lineage, Hawaiian mo'olelo can also be studied in this cultural framework.

Mo'okū'auhau is a useful cultural concept in organizing, approaching, and studying Hawaiian literature, including Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo, in a way that makes sense from an indigenous perspective. An initial research question guiding my study examined whether these were unique, unrelated texts, or was there some connection between them? This was an important question to ask: if the texts were completely unrelated, it offered possibilities for analysis that would be unique and challenging—multiple versions of mo'olelo are commonly uncredited, and studied as folklore. Texts credited to a conclusive author are considered literature, with any duplication of the material by subsequent authors seen as plagiarism. Yet some mo'olelo were credited to writers, complicated by the fact that some of the names given as “authors” are believed to be or have been proven to be pseudonyms.³ In either case, the Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo have provided a unique opportunity to study indigenous literature in a way that defies common western literary analysis and classification.

Examining the mo'olelo from a genealogical perspective allows, in part, for an understanding of the texts in relationship with each other, as outlined in the following table.

Year	STRAND 1	UNRELATED	STRAND 2
1860		HAUOLOA	
1861	KAPIHENUI		
1865		KA'AWALOA	
1883		MAILE WREATH	KA'ILI [NAKAUINA]
1893	PA'ALUHI & BUSH 1		
1899	PA'ALUHI & BUSH 2 BPBM FHILL 23 (no date)	MANU	
1904			EMMA [NAKAUINA]
1905			HO'OULUMĀHIEHIE 1
1906			HO'OULUMĀHIEHIE 2
1908		RICE	POEPOE
1915	EMERSON		
1916		WESTERVELT	
1923		RICE	
1928			DESHA
2002			KANAKA'OLE
2006			NOGELMEIER

Table 1. Textual Mo'okū'auhau between the major Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo, 1860–2006

At first glance, it might appear that these texts are multiple retellings of the same story with little (if anything) in common. A closer examination, however, reveals a relationship between them in content and context, represented in the table by genealogy chart-type lines, linking the texts with the closest relationships in genealogical “strands.” The hiapo (eldest) strand beginning with Kapihenui (1861–1862) is almost reprinted word for word by Pa'aluhi and Bush (1893), with some interesting variations. Emma Beckley Nakuina (1883), the only Kanaka Maoli to publish an English language version of the mo'olelo, is the hiapo text in the second strand of the mo'okū'auhau. Later reprints include Desha (1928), a nearly identical reprint of Ho'oulumāhiehie (1905–1906), and Poepoe⁴ (1908),

which is thematically indistinguishable from Ka'ili. These mo'olelo inform the contemporary publications by the Edith Kanaka'ole Foundation (2002) and reprint and translation of Ho'oulumāhie by Nogelmeier (2006). The mo'olelo by Hau'ola (1860), Ka'awa (1865), the *Maile Wreath* (no date), Manu (1899), Rice (1908, 1923) and Westervelt (1916) have no discernible relationship to either strand (Kapihenui or Ka'ili), or to each other; Rice's 1923 publication is a brief summary of his 1908 Hawaiian language mo'olelo.

Relationships, especially family relationships, are of utmost importance in Hawaiian culture. Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa (1992) writes that

when recounting a history in Hawaiian terms, it is . . . important to examine the beginnings of and the relatedness of the players. These genealogical relationships form the parameters of cultural patterns inherently reproduced in Hawaiian history. They reveal the Hawaiian orientation to the world about us, in particular, to Land and control of the Land. (p. 3)

The occupation (noho) of land is a central theme in Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo; Pele and her 'ohana alternately create and destroy it and assert their authority over it and over competing genealogies, such as mo'o (lizards) and other kupua (shape shifting) figures. Mo'okū'auhau is such a central cultural concept that the entire universe is thought to be the result of a genealogical relationship, the most well-known version being Kumulipo. An exquisite and extensive 2,108 line cosmogonic genealogy, Kumulipo (which can be translated as "source of deep darkness") recounts hundreds of generations of human relationships which extend back to the creation of the universe in pō, the beginning of time.

Drawing from this important cultural concept, I extend the metaphorical used of mo'okū'auhau to include a Kanaka poetics of articulation based on multidimensional relationships within, between, and surrounding the individual texts. It is a kaona or metaphorically-driven, multiply-layered idea which can be viewed in several specific ways:

- ❖ Traditional mo'olelo come from the 'āina. They are about the relationships between 'āina, kānaka, and akua, and also about how the 'āina has come into

its present form (such as when the bodies of slain mo'o become specific geographic features, as when Hi'iaka slays Mokoli'i (Little Lizard), resulting in the islet Mokoli'i, thought of as the tip of the mo'o's tail sticking up out of the water. This small island is related to the nearby valley called Hakipu'u (Broken Back) representing the body of the slain lizard) (ho'omanawanui, 2008). They include the naming of wahi pana (geographic features or places made famous through stories), and the naming and character of winds, rains, conditions of the environment, etc., which demonstrate Hawaiian intelligence of, familiarity with, and relationship to the 'āina.

- ❖ Kānaka are genealogically related to each other, to Pele and Hi'iaka, and to the 'āina. Thus, for Kānaka Maoli, these mo'olelo are family stories; they are also stories about the interconnected relationships between kānaka, 'āina, and akua.
- ❖ The story variants are thus related to each other. They are also about affirming the relationships between people to each other and to the 'āina. Different islands produced different versions of the mo'olelo to highlight or downplay certain perspectives or mana'o related to place. Over time, people on those islands perhaps began to tell or know the mo'olelo in that particular way, which can be viewed as regionalized family resemblances.
- ❖ The writers and editors consciously chose to develop these mo'olelo into what becomes literary genealogical lines—a "mo'o mo'olelo" so to speak—strands of which vary, although ultimately they are related to each other.
- ❖ Ultimately, the strong theme of aloha 'āina (literally "love for the land;" a Hawaiian expression of patriotism) which resonates throughout the Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo is made manifest by this mo'okū'auhau within and between the mo'olelo. Noenoe Silva (2004) presents a similar explanation when describing aloha 'āina:
- ❖ Aloha 'āina is an old Kanaka concept based on the family relationship of the people to the land, and on the idea that people actually were born of the material of the land. According to traditional Hawaiian

cosmologies, all things on the earth are alive and are the kinolau—the many physical bodies—of gods, who are themselves physically related to people in genealogies . . . The islands, the taro, and the people are thus conceived of as members of the same family who love and sustain each other. In the struggle against annexation, Joseph Nāwahī, John Ailuene Bush, and others developed “aloha ‘āina” as a discourse of resistance, and simultaneously as a particularly Kanaka style of defensive nationalism.

In a culture which mediates human genealogy through the mating of Papahānaumoku (Earth Mother) and Wākea (Sky Father), the extension of a genealogical concept to Hawaiian texts makes sense in a specific way. In her 2001 master's thesis applying Meyer's work on Hawaiian epistemology to contemporary Hawaiian literature, Monica Ka'imipono Ka'iwi identifies strands of the literature by generations, utilizing another genealogical approach.

As Silva points out, aloha ‘āina is a discourse of resistance (and nationalism), one informed by a discourse of genealogy, as Kanaka pride in heritage is rooted in the ‘āina. These concepts are particularly relevant to the study of this mo'olelo about akua who are physical manifestations of ‘āina and elements of nature; what better way to present and enact literary aloha ‘āina than through the Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo, ancestors who embody the ‘āina itself?

There are multiple ways to organize, analyze, and discuss texts; classification by date, author, or related themes are probably the most common, all of which I use within my scholarship. Yet as Kumulipo also demonstrates, other avenues of systematic and culturally appropriate classification methods are also valid and useful.⁵ An examination of the larger body of these Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo reveals a more closely linked relationship between some texts over others. Moreover, just as family genealogies are linked to particular islands or specific locations, such an ‘āina-rooted pattern also emerges within the different genealogical strands of the Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo. For example, writing from Kailua, Ko'olaupoko, Kapihenui (1861–1862) presents an O'ahu version of the mo'olelo. Poepoe makes specific mention of having Maui and Hawai'i

island versions in his possession, which he is careful to delineate throughout the course of the mo'olelo (*Kuokoa Home Rula*, January 10, 1908, p. 1).

Further analysis reveals an even closer relationship (and influence) between specific texts, as demonstrated earlier in Table 1. These varying traditions speak to the richness and diversity of Hawaiian verbal and literary arts, and to the depth and breadth of the Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo in particular. The multiple perspectives offered in the differing versions demonstrate makawalu, multiple perspectives or insights into the mo'olelo. This complexity is demonstrated in the corpus of Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo in other ways, as authors, texts, publications, versions of mo'olelo, editors, and even languages relate to one another in intricately interwoven ways.

Makawalu—understanding the metaphor of the eight-eyed bat

If later writers were aware of Kapihenui's published mo'olelo, why keep writing and offering alternative mo'olelo? John Charlot (1977) argues that the writers function as redactors, choosing to add in, edit out, or change details and episodes as they saw fit. I argue there was more agency on behalf of Kanaka Maoli writers than just redactors; collectively their reasons for publishing multiple versions by multiple writers speak to a much more sophisticated cultural action informed by cultural practice—makawalu (multiple perspectives). Creativity certainly should be considered. However, the multiple versions of the mo'olelo are part of a nuanced mo'okū'auhau extending beyond blood relations to relationships with schools of thought, practice, politics, and ‘āina.

The word makawalu literally means, “eight eyes,” and connotes an understanding of multiple, many, or numerous (Pukui & Elbert 1986, p. 228). Martha Warren Beckwith (1970) identifies eight as an important number in different dimensions across the Pacific (p. 209–210). In Hawaiian mythology, Pe'ape'amakawalu is an eight-eyed bat, the nemesis of the kupua (trickster) Maui (ibid. p. 228–229). The pig-god Kamapua'a battles Lonoka'eho, a chiefly character with “eight foreheads of stone” (ibid. p. 209; Fornander, 1921, p. 327–328). A known metaphor in

traditional literature, makawalu is an indigenous concept utilized in other contemporary contexts by Pualani Kanaka'ole Kanahēle, and applied in other indigenous educational contexts by Monica Ka'imipono Kaiwi and Walter Kahumoku (2006). Makawalu is applicable in indigenous scholarship as it encourages the scholar to break free of a more singular or perhaps pedestrian approach to one's topic; it is also applicable in studying the Pele mo'olelo because of the multiplicity of texts, mele (songs), oli (chants), pule (prayers), context, and meaning.

Like other literatures, Kanaka Maoli mo'olelo reflect and uphold Hawaiian cultural values, language, and identity. By doing so, they demonstrate the depth of knowledge, civility, and intelligence contained within these traditions. These texts were originally composed in 'ōlelo Hawai'i (Hawaiian language) during the mid-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, an era that saw the loss of a sovereign kingdom and the subsequent annexation of Hawai'i to the United States. These mo'olelo served to inform, encourage, and, sometimes, provide guidance in the ongoing struggle to retain and value Kanaka Maoli cultural knowledge and practices during these politically and culturally tumultuous decades. In contrast, Nathaniel B. Emerson's *Pele and Hi'iaka* (1915), the most well-known publication of the Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo, reframes the story to fit western literary functions and aesthetics. Emerson does this in part through a generic reference to the previously published Hawaiian texts in his preface, before proceeding to offer a highly edited, condensed version pieced together from several versions of the mo'olelo penned by more knowledgeable Kānaka Maoli. Instead of upholding Hawaiian cultural values in a way meant to exhibit cultural artistic achievement, Emerson's text justifies the ongoing colonization of Hawai'i. Penned for an English-speaking, primarily American, audience, Emerson's agenda is to provide insight for this foreign audience into the indigenous people and culture of their newly acquired U.S. possession, the Hawaiian islands.

Asserting an indigenous analysis of Hawaiian literature is another application of makawalu. By offering a counter-perspective to western-based scholarship, a new understanding of the literature that is culturally

appropriate is revealed. One example is seeing the vast reproduction of Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo (and not mo'olelo for other akua figures, such as Lono or Kāne, for example) as part of the cultural value placed on performative texts. There are hundreds if not thousands of hula-related oli and mele associated with Pele and Hi'iaka from the oral traditions preserved on printed page. Kapihenui (1861–1862), the first published Pele and Hi'iaka epic, contains nearly 300 oli, mele, and pule. Despite the wealth of chants and other culturally important information Kapihenui's mo'olelo provides, it has been described as "poor literature" because it comes across as very mechanical (Charlot, 1998). Throughout the text, Kapihenui's language is highly repetitive, repeatedly introducing most of the oli with the phrase, "Alaila, ua hele lāua a oli 'o ia penei—" (Then the two of them went on, and she chanted like this—). Throughout the mo'olelo, there is very little variation of sentence structure or language; he repeats the above phrase, for example, 57 times.

Analyzing the text from an alternative, indigenous perspective, however, reveals a different conclusion. An important question to ask, particularly taking into account the time period and historical context is, What is going on here? Does Kapihenui have as a goal to write "good" literature informed by western aesthetics, meaning, to vary his word choices and sentence structures? To follow western rules of style and grammar? What I concluded by analyzing the mo'olelo within an indigenous framework acknowledging the performative nature of oral tradition is that as the very first mo'olelo transferred to the palapala (written page) from the oral tradition, Kapihenui is not necessarily trying to create a grand piece of Hawaiian *literature*. Rather, he is trying to capture an oral tradition on paper for the first time, one which would prominently feature poetry and highly minimize prose. As the century progressed and Kanaka Maoli became more ma'a (adept) to western literary aesthetics (and, one may conceivably argue, less familiar with older traditions because of increasing colonialism), the prose narratives became longer and more complex. Thus, the organization of the mo'olelo in an indigenous framework is different from that of the west, in part because the reliance on an oral-based poetic structure aids performance and

memorization more so than a longer and more complex prose narrative.

Therefore, in Kapihenui, the short sequences of prose function as links between the poetry in a way I've described in analyzing other literature using a lei metaphor: the short lines of prose are the string that hold the pua (lit. flowers; metaphorically, chants) (Pukui & Elbert, 1986, p. 344). Pele and Hi'iaka are also very intimately connected to hula, which is performance. Moreover, hula is a dance form that requires words; oli and mele are crucial for choreography. Consequently, there is an inherent link between the performative aspect of the text and the text itself.

To use a different analogy, imagine sitting near the pā hula (dance platform) at Kē'e, Kaua'i where scenes from the Pele epic are performed. Is it desirable to sit through long lines of prose text? No—the audience wants to get right to the story, to see it unfold through the hula, to hear the mele, to participate in the performance. Understanding this performative aspect of the mo'olelo which may have influenced Kapihenui invites a re-interpretation of his mo'olelo. From a western perspective, it may not be the most engaging piece of literature to read. But I can easily visualize the struggle Kapihenui might have had—how does one take a beautiful, dynamic, three-dimensional mo'olelo, that when it's performed as hula, mele, and oli engages the senses through visual, auditory, olfactory, organic, and kinesthetic elements—how does a writer take all of that into consideration and reduce it to words on paper? Is this writing on a piece of paper hula? No. Is this a vibrant, dynamic part of the culture? No, although it does allow for continuity of the practice during the extensive period of hula being banned except for touristic performances in commercial contexts (Silva, 2000). It must have been very difficult to take up that task; I have tremendous aloha (respect, admiration) for Kapihenui, because I can't imagine the difficulty of being in his position, the first one to attempt that work.

Makawalu II: wa'a, lei haku, and a huluhia discourse

Three primary metaphors I use throughout my work to frame Hawaiian literary analysis within cultural parameters are mo'okū'auhau, wa'a (canoe; ves-

sel), and lei haku (braided garland). Having discussed mo'okū'auhau above, I will turn here to the metaphoric application of the wa'a and the lei haku to Pele and Hi'iaka literary analysis.

Wa'a is typically understood as a canoe (Pukui & Elbert, 1986, p. 375). In his collection of poems *Star Waka* (1999), Māori poet Robert Sullivan widens the metaphoric use of wa'a/waka as a vessel of different kinds of transport, particularly in poems like "Honda Waka" (comparing his automobile to a canoe) and "2140 A.D." (future space travel) (p. 7, 8). In a Hawaiian context, wa'a metaphorically refers to a woman; it is also applied to moving masses of molten lava (Pukui & Elbert, 1986, p. 375). Pele and her 'ohana travel to Hawai'i from Kahiki (ancient homeland) in a wa'a. Hi'iaka and her companions must travel between islands in wa'a; for centuries, the wa'a was the most important vehicle of transportation from island to island across the vast expanse of Te Tai Moana Nui (Oceania). On another level, the mo'olelo itself is a wa'a, a vehicle transporting our ancestors and ancestral knowledge across space and time, continuing to enlighten and inspire us, reminding us who they were, who we come from and by extension, who we are today. Each mo'olelo is a wa'a that carries the mana'o (thoughts) and intentions of each writer; it serves as a metaphoric vehicle for each of their mo'okū'auhau pili koko (personal genealogies) as well.

The final metaphor is that of the lei haku; it has been used in other contexts, such as to describe 'ōlelo Hawai'i (Hopkins, 1992) and to describe contemporary Hawaiian poetry (ho'omanawanui, 2005). It is an appropriate metaphor to describe the Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo as well—there is a close connection between lei haku as adornment in hula performance and Hi'iaka herself, who is a noted lei maker.

The mea kākau (writers) of the large corpus of Pele and Hi'iaka literature weave together a significant correlation of seemingly unrelated practices, such as aspects of religion and culture, as well as gender and power politics. One example is the link between hula and lua (fighting arts). Another is demonstrated in 'anā'anā. Often mis-translated into English as "witchcraft" or "sorcery," even in Hawaiian sources (Pukui & Elbert, 1986, p. 24), 'anā'anā embodies the

two sides of the healing arts: the power to give or restore life through prayer and supplication (via Hi'iaka), and the power to take life through similar means (via Pele's other sister, Kapō'ulakīna'ū). The 'ōlelo no'eau (proverb), i ka 'ōlelo ke ola, i ka 'ōlelo ka make (in the word there is life, in the word there is death) encapsulates the culturally important concept of word power, which is demonstrated in several ways throughout the Pele narratives. This is prominently featured in the extensive "dueling" chant sequences between representatives of the Pele clan, most notably with Hi'iaka and the clan's enemies, in the use of canonized vocabulary for Pele which reveals her power, and through 'ōlelo no'eau for Pele, some of which also allude to resistance. Not only is Pele a goddess with her own literature, she also has her own vocabulary. For example, huluhia, a canonized word throughout the Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo, applies not only to the flow of lava "overturning" the established order on the land, but also, I argue, spoke metaphorically to Kānaka Maoli from the 1860s to the 1930s to kahuli or resist western colonization through what I call a "huluhia discourse."

A traditional way to express this huluhia discourse is embedded in the epithet for Pele, noho Pele i ka 'āhiu (Pele stays in the wild) (Charlot, 1998). This epithet speaks not only to Pele's powerful female nature (definitely not "feminine" or demure by Western standards), but to her stature as a goddess having the authority to kahuli the sovereignty over the land established by Kāne and the other male gods, *without the fear of retribution*. Furthermore, while the worship of male gods centered on the practice of 'aikapu (literally, "sacred eating," where men and women ate separately and certain foods were restricted from women), Pele worshippers were considered 'aikū. 'Aikū means to "to eat freely; to do as one wishes; to break taboos or transgress" (Pukui & Elbert, 1986, p. 10). It also means "to eat in an improper manner" or "to take food that is set apart as temporarily or permanently sacred or forbidden to use," and "to act contrary to custom, prescribed rule, or established precedent; to overlook, disregard, or take no notice of a tabu" (Kame'eleihiwa, 1996, p. 145). In practice, this perhaps meant that Pele followers did not have to follow the 'aikapu mandated by the kāhuna for the male gods. Kame'eleihiwa (1996) further speculates that it "may

have been that the Pele *kapu* were not the same as those practiced by the *Ali'i Nui* who lived under the 'Aikapu," particularly since "the political power of the 'Aikapu depended most heavily upon the worship of Kū, or Kūnuiākea, at the *luakini*" (ibid.). Arguably, the practice of 'aikū demonstrates another dimension to Pele's godly stature, and reveals the strength of her female mana. It also demonstrates the intertwining of mana wahine and political power. This concept of mana wahine metaphorically applied to the publishing of Pele mo'olelo throughout the politically tumultuous years from the 1860s to the 1930s, a time when the aggressive colonial push to wrest control of Hawai'i intensified.

Prior to colonization, the relationship between Kānaka Maoli and Pele was internally varied in the context of traditional polytheistic religious practices, as Kānaka Maoli worshipped nā Akua (gods) most suitable to their 'ohana, geographic regions, or occupations.⁶ With the coming of missionaries, who sought to implant the "jealous God" of Christian monotheism upon the hearts (and land) of Kānaka Maoli, the relationship between most Kānaka Maoli and our indigenous gods was irrevocably altered—for many, it was completely severed.

Thus, in tracing the history of Kanaka Maoli-produced Pele literature as a literature of resistance to western colonization, it is important to acknowledge and examine the politicized intertextuality of the various mo'olelo. On one hand, the narratives of Kanaka Maoli authors were in competition with colonial writers. On the other hand, these two strands of literature also inform each other. This interweaving is no mere coincidence for Kanaka Maoli writers, who have actively sought to disrupt the colonial appropriation of our traditional mo'olelo. Thus, rather than seeing Kanaka Maoli-produced texts as acts of submission and domestication, I read them as political strategies embodying resistance, especially as they involve cultural and linguistic coding. Furthermore, this strategy of resistance *worked* because it was well executed, playing to dismissive colonial attitudes that wrote off these narratives as "pagan" myths and "harmless" folktales. Conversely, the haole misunderstanding of the cultural and linguistic codes embodied in these mo'olelo resulted in misappropriations of the texts.

Thus, Kanaka Maoli continue to weave a lei of resistance to colonization through our literary and performing arts, of which Pele and Hi'iaka literature is but one example. Likewise, we continue to assert our indigenous right to claim our traditions, practices, and cultural knowledge, and to claim the 'āina that is formed from the body of our ancestral deity—Pele—upon which we are still sustained as a lāhui.

The power of Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo is inextricably linked to mo'okū'auhau, mana wahine (female power), and religion, a political undertone implied through association with each. Pele was and is revered as god and ancestor. As with the taro-child Hāloanaka, Kanaka Maoli are genealogically connected with Pele. Incarnated as Pelehonuamea, she is a form of Papahānaumoku, the Hawaiian earth mother, or closely linked to her because she is—as lava—the creator of new land. Pele is associated with the birth and growth of land in other ways, including through her relationship with her siblings, such as her numerous Hi'iaka sisters, who collectively and metaphorically represent the healing of the land through the regeneration of vegetation upon it after it is devoured or created by their elder sister, Pele (Kanahale in Puhipau & Landers, 1989). Thus, Pele and Hi'iaka work in tandem, reflecting two lines of Hawaiian cultural thought: the reciprocally supportive relationship between older and younger siblings, an important Hawaiian value upon which traditional society was based, and the balance of opposing principles as represented by the Hawaiian value of pono (Kame'eleihiwa, 1992, p. 25–26).

Pele is an important symbol in part because she is the only female volcano deity in the Pacific. Thus, the corpus of Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo raises issues of gender, sexuality, and desire, themes presented throughout the literature. For example, Pele has the authority and ability to overpower males, both godly and human. Another is the presentation of aikāne (same-sex and bisexual) relationships within the narratives, suggesting that these behaviors fall within the norm and are acceptable for both genders. Desirability is linked to performance (hula and oli) where the men perform for the women (rather than the other way around) to attract a lover.

Ha'ina 'ia mai ana ka puana (conclusion)

Ha'ina 'ia mai ana ka puana; the story has been told. For many and varied reasons, indigenized theories, approaches, and methodologies are applicable to what we as indigenous scholars do within the walls of the academy. In my own teaching, research, and writing, I advocate for the importance of recognizing that the lessons inherent in our traditional mo'olelo are applicable today within a cultural context; they are not just cute stories from long ago to be mislabeled and dissected as folklore, mythology, or oral traditions. Within the context of literary studies, indigenous theories, methodologies and practices are important aspects in understanding our own literary history, traditions, and practices. As the Pele and Hi'iaka mo'olelo exemplify, there is much to be discovered, because despite the immense repository of Hawaiian-language Pele literature, Pele and Hi'iaka “are sisters . . . that we [still] do not know much about” (Kanahale & Wise, 1989, p. i). Overall, as indigenous scholars who represent our culture and larger communities in the academy, we must be at the forefront of excellence and demand of ourselves and others that pono scholarship be done with aloha—with love and respect, goodness and generosity—benefiting our work, our cultures, and our lāhui.

REFERENCES

- Beckwith, M. (1970). *Hawaiian mythology*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Charlot, J. (1977). The application of form and redaction criticism to Hawaiian literature. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 86(4), 479–501.
- Charlot, J. (1998). Pele and Hi'iaka: the Hawaiian-language newspaper series. *Anthropos*, 93, 55–75.
- Desha, S. L., & Keonaona, J. (1924, September 18–1928, July 17). He moolelo kaa no Hiiakaikapoliopole, ka wahine i ka hikina ka la a o ka ui palekoki uila o Halemaumau. *Hoku o Hawaii*, 18(17)–22(8), pp. 1, 4.
- Emerson, N. (1915). *Pele and Hi'iaka, a myth from Hawaii*. Honolulu: Star-Bulletin.
- Fornander, A. (1917). *Fornander Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folklore, vol. V*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- Hauola, B. K. (1860, July 4–August 15). He wahi kaa o me kekahi mele pu. *Ka Hae Hawaii*, 5(14)–5(20), p. 60.
- ho'omanawanui, k. (2005). He lei ho'oheno no nā kau a kau: Language, performance and form in contemporary Hawaiian poetry. In *The contemporary Pacific*, 17 (1), 29–81.

- ho'omanawanui, k. (2007). *Pele's appeal: mo'oku'auhau, kaona, and huluhia in Pele and Hi'iaka literature, 1861–1928*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Accession Order No. AAT 3288107).
- ho'omanawanui, k. (2008). This land is your land, this land was my land: Representations of 'āina in contemporary literature of Hawai'i. In C. Fujikane & J. Okamura (Eds), *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Ho'oulumāhiehie. (1905, July 15–November 24). Ka moolelo o Hiiaka-i-ka-poli-o-pele, ka wahine i ka hikina a ka la. *Hawaii Aloha*, pp. 1,4
- Ho'oulumāhiehie. (2006). *The epic tale of Hi'iakaikapoliopole: Woman of the sunrise, lightning-skirted beauty of Halema'uma'u* (M. P. Nogelmeier, (Trans.). Honolulu: Awaiaulu Press.
- Hopkins, P. (1992). *Ka lei ha'aeo*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Kaawa, P. W. (1865, February 2–February 9). Ka moolelo no Pele, kana hana, kona mana, a me kona noho ana. Ka hoomana kahiko, helu 5, *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 4(5)–4(6), pp. 1–2, 1.
- Kaili [Emma Nakuina]. (1883, August 25–October 13). A Hawaiian legend by a Hawaiian native. *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, 2(3)–2(15), p. 3.
- Kaiwi, M. (2001). *I ulu no nā lālā i ke kumu: An epistemological examination of native Hawaiian literature* (Master's thesis). The University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Kaiwi, M., & Kahumoku, W. (2006). Makawalu: standards, curriculum and assessment for literature through an indigenous perspective. *Hūlili, multidisciplinary research on Hawaiian well-being*, 3(1), 183–206.
- Kame'eleihiwa, L. (1992). *Native lands and foreign desires: Pehea la e pono ai?* Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- Kame'eleihiwa, L. (1996). *A legendary tradition of Kamapua'a, the Hawaiian pig-god*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- Ka mo'olelo o Hi'iaka. (n.d.) *Maile Wreath*, Bishop Museum Archives H.52.
- Ka mo'olelo o Hi'iaka-i-ka-poli-o-pele, ka wahine i ka hikina a ka la, a o ka ui palekoki uwila o Halemaumau. (1905, December 1–1906, October 17). *Ka Na'i Aupuni*, 1(5)–1(30). p. 1 and 1(31)–2(116), p. 4.
- Kanahele, P. (2001). *Holo mai Pele*. Honolulu and Hilo: Pacific Islanders in Communications and the Edith Kana'ole Foundation.
- Kanahele, P., & Wise, K. (1989). *Ka honua ola, the living earth*. Honolulu: Center for Hawaiian Studies, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Kapihenui, M. J. (December 26, 1861 – July 17, 1862). He moolelo no Hiiakaikapoliopole. *Ka hoku o ka Pakipika*.
- Manu, M. (1899, May 13–December 30). He moolelo kaaow Hawaii no ke kauhā nui weliweli ma waena o Pele-Keahialoa me Waka-Keakaikawai. He mau kupua wahine kaeaea. *Ka Loea Kalaiaina*, 3(18)–3(50)vol. 3, pp. 1, 4.
- Paaluhī, S., & Bush, J. E. (1893, January 5–July 12). He moolelo no Hiiakaikapoliopole. *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, 2(616)–2(724), p. 1.
- Poepoe, J. M. (1908, January 10–1911, January 3). Ka moolelo kaaow Hiiaka-i-ka-poli-o-pele. *Kuokoa Home Rula*, 6(2)–9(2), pp. 1, 4.
- Puhipau & Landers, J. (1989). *Pele's appeal*. Na'alehu, Hawaii: Nā Maka o ka 'Āina Productions.
- Pukui, M., & Elbert, S. (1986). *Hawaiian dictionary, revised edition*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Pukui, M., Handy, E.S.C., & Handy, E. (1972). *The Polynesian family systems in Ka-u, Hawai'i*. Rutland, VT: Charles E. Tuttle.
- Rice, W. H. (1923). *Hawaiian Legends*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- Rice, W. H. (1908, May 21–September 10). He moolelo no Pele a me kona kaikaina Hiiaka i ka Poli o Pele. *Hoku o Hawaii*, 3(4)–3(20), pp. 1, 4.
- Silva, N. (2000). He kanawai e hoopau i na hula kuolo Hawai'i: The political economy of banning the hula (1857–1870). *Hawaiian journal of history*, 34, 29–48.
- Silva, N. (2004). *Aloha betrayed, native Hawaiian resistance to American colonialism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Sullivan, R. (1999). *Star waka*. Auckland, NZ: Auckland University Press.
- Trask, H. (1999a). Writing in captivity: Poetry in a time of decolonization. In W. Hereniko & R. Wilson (Eds), *Inside out: Literature, cultural politics, and identity in the new Pacific*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Dunedin, NZ: University of Otago Press.
- Wendt, A. (1993). Towards a new Oceania. In P. Sharrad (Ed), *Readings in Pacific literature*. Wollongong, Australia: New Literatures Research Centre, University of Wollongong.
- Wendt, A. Introduction. (1995). *Nuanua, Pacific writing since 1980*. Auckland, NZ: Auckland University Press.
- Westervelt, W. D. (1916). *Hawaiian Legends of Volcanoes*. Charles E. Tuttle: Rutland, VT.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ “Ke Ha’a Lā Puna” is “the first recorded hula in the Pele and Hi'iaka saga” (Kanahele & Wise, 1989: 65–66).
- ² Pukui's Hawaiian name and its translation are broken into three parts by Barrow; I have condensed them into one name and one translation here.
- ³ An example is the ongoing discussion of whether Ho'oulumāhiehie, considered by scholars working in the area to be a pseudonym, is actually Joseph Poepoe, who also published under his own name (see Charlot, 1998; Silva, 2004; Nogelmeier in Ho'oulumāhiehie, 2006; and ho'omanawanui, 2007).
- ⁴ Poepoe was editor of the newspaper *Ka Na'i Aupuni* at the time the mo'olelo was published
- ⁵ One example in Kumulipo is the ordering of the birth of fish in the second wā (time period; chapter). While one western method of classification is by size, i.e., smallest (simplest) to largest (most complex), the birth order of fish species builds on root words, sounds, mnemonic tools, and is a kind of linked assonance, or morphological phonology: i.e., “i'a” (fish) and “nai'a” (dolphin) (see ho'omanawanui, 2005, p. 37).
- ⁶ This is discussed in depth by Pukui and Handy (1972).